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Honorable Mayor and Board of County Commissioners,

We conducted an audit of procurement and operational practices at Port Everglades (Port). The audit initially began when Port management alleged that a current and a former employee had potentially misappropriated equipment and materials, some of which they had purchased on County purchasing cards (P-Cards). Shortly after notification by management, we received several additional allegations from two employees at the Port. A preliminary review of the allegations and related P-Card purchases indicated that a full procurement and operational audit was necessary. Therefore, we conducted a procurement and operational audit. Opportunities for Improvement are included in the report.

The audit also includes assessing the substantiation of the allegations reported by complainants. We have included a comprehensive list of allegations received and assessed, along with the disposition of each in Appendix A.

We appreciate the cooperation and assistance provided by County Administration and Port staff throughout our audit process.

Respectfully submitted,

Bob Melton
County Auditor

cc: Bertha Henry, County Administrator
    Andrew Meyers, County Attorney
    Glenn Wiltshire, Acting Chief Executive & Port Director, Port Everglades
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

After notification by management of potential wrongdoing, we conducted an audit of procurement and operational practices at Port Everglades (Port). During our audit, other significant allegations were received, which required our immediate attention.

We conclude gross mismanagement has occurred regarding Port procurement and operational practices. Some Port employees were misappropriating equipment, supplies and materials purchased using the County’s P-Cards. In addition, P-Card misuse was commonplace with grossly inadequate P-Card procedures, processes, and controls. We conclude that work order and inventory internal procedures and controls were not only grossly inadequate, but nonexistent when this audit was initiated. We conclude that Port employees used County-owned backflow test kits for personal business outside the Port. Report No. 19-08, Audit of Backflow Assembly Devices & Testing at Port Everglades, issued on April 4, 2019 is incorporated herein by reference. Controls over disposal of wastewater in Port facilities are not adequate, and dumping may have occurred, which is not in compliance with laws and regulations. Leased space in the Foreign Trade Zone is not accounted for appropriately, with grossly inadequate controls.

Because of the grossly inadequate procedures and controls, additional fraud and misappropriation of resources other than those identified during the audit could be occurring without detection. We can provide no reasonable assurance that all such instances have been identified.

During our audit, we noted numerous procedures and controls that are basic to this type of operation, which have been nonexistent or ineffective. These areas contribute to gross financial mismanagement.

No comprehensive inventory system exists. Although the Port has approximately twenty storeroom locations where parts and supplies are stored, there is no inventory system to track quantities of each part on hand and their issuance to those employees who need them. There is no centralized receiving system or comprehensive tracking of purchased equipment and supplies. When items are purchased, they do not all come to the central storeroom at the Port to get logged in, tracked, tagged (if applicable) before being dispensed to the individual shops and employees. The current practice is that Port Public Works employees purchase inventory and either pick up the items from vendors, or have items delivered to the central storeroom or any of the twenty storerooms (Plumbing, Carpentry, Garage, etc.). As a result, Port management does not know whether the parts and supplies were formally received and included as part of...
Port inventory, or whether these items were used, stored or potentially misappropriated. The lack of comprehensive inventory counts in all likelihood, has led to the unnecessary purchase of parts that were already on hand. During our five-year audit period, the Public Works Section purchased over $11 million in parts, equipment and services using P-Cards. This situation has been exacerbated by instructions of Supervisors to employees to always buy more parts than they actually need (supposedly to make sure they had the item on hand for future use). We also noted that access to storerooms has not been tightly controlled. Storerooms were left unlocked and unattended, and Sales Representatives frequently entered the storerooms to sell supplies, equipment, and parts with minimum controls. We could not determine whether over 7,000 P-Card purchases totaling approximately $5 million for items purportedly delivered to the Port were received. Because of these minimal or nonexistent controls, significant parts and supplies could have been misappropriated without detection. For this type of operation, a comprehensive inventory system is a basic necessity.

No work order system was in use at the time the audit was initiated. Consequently, accountabilities for parts needed for repairs and other job tasks being performed are precluded. In this type of operation, the use of work order is a basic and necessary control to help ensure effective use of resources.

Controls over P-Card purchases have been grossly inadequate. Over 30 P-Cards were issued to employees in the Public Works Section and the employees were then allowed discretion to purchase goods and services to use in the course of their work. From October 5, 2012 to July 6, 2018, the Public Works Section had P-Card transactions totaling $11.9 million which represents approximately 57% of the $21 million total of all P-Card transactions at the Port during the same period. Approximately $279,000 in potentially inappropriate purchases were made from companies affiliated with one employee. On July 17, 2019, the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida, filed a criminal complaint against the Former Storekeeper 1 on one count of conspiracy to obtain by fraud, property of programs receiving Federal funds, Title 18, United States Code, Section 371. During the audit period, the Port paid $128,946 to Z & Z, Inc. (Z & Z), which we consider questionable. We found items that could not be verified as having been received or installed on Port property. This includes fire hydrants, battery operated faucets, hammer arrestors, backflow kits, check valves, and gate valves. The transactions also included repairs to Port equipment that the employee confirmed, never occurred. The US Attorney charged some Port employees and Z & Z’s owner, for Conspiracy to Obtain by Fraud Property of Programs Receiving Federal Funds. Also, during the audit period, the Port paid $166,396 to Companies 1, 2 and 3 owned by a single individual, which we consider questionable. We found items or services that could not be verified as having been received or installed on Port property. Questionable purchases totaling $48,897 were made by a former plumber.
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Executive Summary

There was no requirement for the purchases of goods and services to be tied to the jobs the employees were working on, and there were no checks and balances, other than transaction limits of $3,500, daily limits of $6,000, and the monthly limit of $20,000. Approvers of P-Card transactions were not required to be the employee’s supervisor; instead, supervisors of other areas frequently approved P-Card transactions for employees of other sections. Additionally, when employees would reach their transaction or monthly credit limit, it was a common practice to request other employees to make the purchases for them. In many instances, these other employees were not in the same trade area and may not have had the technical knowledge to know whether the order was appropriate. We noted 30 invoices for P-Card transactions totaling $13,064 for one P-Card Holder (Refrigeration Mechanic 1) that were stamped reviewed by the cardholder’s uncle, a Supervisor (Skilled Trades Supervisor 1) at the Port, creating a potential conflict of interest. We noted 186 transactions totaling $360,645 that appeared to be ‘split’ across multiple purchases to circumvent the purchasing limits established in the Procurement Code. We noted 966 of 13,717 (7%) transactions totaling $589,565 were approved by P-Card Approvers without adequate supporting documentation.

No emphasis was placed by Port management to try to obtain the best (or even a reasonable) price. Instead, at least informally, employees were told to buy from small businesses, where possible, and spread the business around. Although the Port had access to Master Agreements which establish competitive prices for commonly used parts and supplies, employees were not instructed to use them, and, in some cases, employees were not aware of how to determine whether a Master Agreement existed for the needed items. As a result, we noted many instances where it appears excessive prices have been paid, resulting in the waste of public funds.

Dumping of untested wastewater into Port Everglades sewer pumping stations located at the Port was not adequately controlled or monitored. Due to the lack of testing of wastewater or other satisfactory controls, there is little assurance that the composition of dumped wastewater was within legal (statutory and contractual) guidelines. We noted that at least one dumping location (lift station) was left unlocked and could be readily accessed by a hauler for the dumping of wastewater without detection. We also noted instances where untested wastewater from the Port of Miami was allowed to be dumped at the Port. Because of the lack of processes and controls, kickbacks or other bribery schemes could have occurred in collusion with Port staff without detection.

Port Management did not implement adequate internal controls to monitor and verify that tenants occupied only leased storeroom space in the Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ). Leased space within the FTZ was practically controlled almost entirely by one Port employee. We noted that one tenant had the ability to occupy more warehousing space without compensation to the
County. A former property manager alleged that an FTZ Tenant inappropriately occupied vacant warehouse space for five years, estimating $2.8 Million in potential loss of revenue to Port Everglades. Because the Port did not have adequate controls to monitor leases and vacant space, we are unable to determine whether this tenant inappropriately occupied the vacant space. Further, because of the grossly inadequate controls and procedures, we are unable to provide reasonable assurance that the proper amount of space has been utilized by any tenant, or that no funds have been misappropriated through bribes or other fraud schemes. Improprieties could occur without detection.

Management has a fiduciary responsibility to manage operations in an efficient and effective manner, with adequate controls to help ensure public resources are used appropriately and wisely. The situations noted above, when combined and considered in totality, constitute gross financial mismanagement, with fiduciary responsibilities not fulfilled by Port management.

Our report contains a total of 84 recommendations for improvement. Management agrees or partially agrees with all recommendations for improvement. Management’s response to our recommendations is included in this report and is attached as Appendix Q in its entirety.
INTRODUCTION

Scope and Methodology

The Office of the County Auditor conducts audits of Broward County’s entities, programs, activities, and contractors to provide the Board of County Commissioners, Broward County’s residents, County management, and other stakeholders unbiased, timely, and relevant information for use in promoting government accountability and stewardship and improving government operations.

After notification by management of potential wrongdoing, we conducted an audit of procurement and operational practices at Port Everglades (Port). During our audit, other significant allegations were received, which required our immediate attention. The overall objectives of our audit were to determine whether:

1. Port employees were misappropriating equipment, supplies and materials purchased using the County’s Purchasing Cards (P-Cards).
2. Work order and inventory internal procedures and controls are adequate.
3. Port employees used County-owned backflow test kits for personal business outside the Port.
4. Wastewater is disposed according to laws and regulations.
5. Leased space in the Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) is accounted for appropriately.
6. Any opportunities for improvement exist.

To determine whether Port employees were misappropriating equipment and materials purchased using the County’s P-Cards, we reviewed P-Card invoices, e-mails, researched companies, and attempted to determine whether purchased items were on Port property or in storerooms. We also conducted interviews of various management and staff of the Port.

To determine whether work order and inventory internal procedures and controls are adequate, we reviewed and evaluated inventory, purchasing and work order systems and performed inventory counts to reconcile to the financial records. We also reviewed P-Card transactions, documentation, and approvals and interviewed Port management and staff of the Port.

To determine whether Port employees used County-owned backflow test kits for personal business outside the Port, we reviewed inventory of Port-owned backflow test kits, and available
backflow device certifications and usage locations for comparison against known Port properties. Report No. 19-08, Audit of Backflow Assembly Devices & Testing at Port Everglades, issued on April 4, 2019 is incorporated herein by reference. Opportunities presented in Report No. 19-08 are not repeated in this report.

To determine whether wastewater is disposed of according to laws and regulations, we reviewed wastewater policies and procedures, reviewed Port Everglades’ tariffs, interviewed City of Fort Lauderdale Wastewater Plant personnel, interviewed Port staff, and inquired of Broward County’s Environmental Engineering and Water and Wastewater Division. We also inspected financial records and dumping logs.

To determine whether leased space in the FTZ is accounted for appropriately, we reviewed allegations made by a complainant, reviewed leases for FTZ storerooms, interviewed Port staff, interviewed FTZ tenants, and performed site visits in the FTZ. We also inspected reservations for use of non-leased storeroom space in the FTZ.

We conducted this 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.

Our audit included such tests of records and other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. The audit period was October 5, 2012 through July 6, 2018. However, transactions, processes, and situations reviewed were not limited by the audit period.

**Overall Conclusion**

We conclude gross mismanagement has occurred regarding Port procurement and operational practices. Some Port employees were misappropriating equipment, supplies and materials purchased using the County’s P-Cards. In addition, P-Card misuse was commonplace with grossly inadequate P-Card procedures, processes, and controls. We conclude that work order and inventory internal procedures and controls are not only grossly inadequate, but nonexistent when this audit was initiated. We conclude that Port employees used County-owned backflow test kits for personal business outside the Port. Report No. 19-08, Audit of Backflow Assembly Devices & Testing at Port Everglades, issued on April 4, 2019 is incorporated herein by reference. Controls over disposal of wastewater in Port facilities are not adequate, and dumping may have occurred, which is not in compliance with laws and regulations. Leased space in the Foreign Trade Zone is not accounted for appropriately, with grossly inadequate controls.
Because of the grossly inadequate procedures and controls, additional fraud and misappropriation of resources other than those identified during the audit could be occurring without detection. We can provide no reasonable assurance that all such instances have been identified. Opportunities For Improvement are presented in this report.

**Report Organization**

This report presents the results of our review regarding procurement and operational practices at the Port, as well as additional concerns we identified, and recommendations designed to address our observations. As such, a significant amount of material is included herein. To facilitate the review of this information, we have separated our audit results into several sections.

- Section I: Overall Gross Mismanagement
- Section II: Procurement
- Section III: Inventory and Work Orders
- Section IV: Other Processes and Practices
- Section V: Wastewater Disposal
- Section VI: FTZ Warehouse Leases
- Section VII: Backflow Devices

Allegations received by our office, along with our related conclusions on each allegation are summarized in **Appendix A**.

Other supporting information is presented in subsequent Appendices.

**Port Background**

Port Everglades has over 2,190 acres and is one of the deepest Ports in the Nation. The Port had over 4,000 ship calls from vessels ranging from mega cruise ships to container ships and tankers of all sizes. The Port is ranked as the world’s third busiest cruise port, the 11th busiest international containerized cargo port in the United States and South Florida’s main seaport for receiving petroleum products, which are distributed to over 12 County areas in South Florida. The Port also leases land, office space and warehouse space under 90 separate leases with lease terms ranging from one to ten years.
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Port has 251 employees and is divided into six sections: Business Administration, Finance, Business Development, Operations, Seaport Planning and Seaport Construction. Figure 1 summarizes Port’s budgeted revenues for Fiscal Year 2019:

Figure 1
Budgeted Port Revenues Fiscal Year 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum</td>
<td>$35,855,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container</td>
<td>$34,931,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise</td>
<td>$56,643,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Garages</td>
<td>$8,977,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>$16,548,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal and State Grants</td>
<td>$18,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>$11,415,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budgeted Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,770,920</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Port’s Fiscal Year 2019 Adopted Budget

Figure 2 is the Port’s current organizational chart.

Figure 2
Port Everglades Organizational Chart

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information provided by Port Administration
Background

On July 6, 2018, our Office received a call from the then Deputy Director of Port Everglades (Deputy Director). The Deputy Director informed us of an alleged fraudulent situation at the Port involving Purchasing Cards (P-Cards). The allegation involved a former employee (Plumber 1), a current employee who had been placed on Administrative Leave (Plumber 2), and a vendor (Company 1). Broward Sheriff’s Office (BSO) had already been contacted and a Detective assigned.

Port Everglades (Port) Management suspected that Plumber 1 and potentially Plumber 2 were either ordering parts for their private plumbing business or were selling parts that were paid for by the County. They also indicated that the address on file for Company 1, from which purchases were made, is a house in Pompano Beach. It was further alleged that the owner of Company 1 works for a major plumbing supply company, from which the Port also purchases.

On July 9, 2018, our Office began an audit of Port procurement to evaluate the allegations. We immediately requested that the Purchasing Division suspend twenty P-Cards assigned to Port Operations Division Public Works Section employees, and subsequently requested the suspension of five additional P-Cards.

During our review of procurement, other operational practices were brought to our attention requiring our immediate attention.

Gross financial mismanagement has occurred in the Port’s Operations Division. During our audit, we noted numerous procedures and controls that are basic to this type of operation, which have been nonexistent or ineffective. Specifically, we noted the following areas, which contribute to gross financial mismanagement:

A. **No comprehensive inventory system exists.** Although the Port has approximately twenty storeroom locations where parts and supplies are stored, there is no inventory system to track quantities of each part on hand and issuance to those employees who need them. There is no centralized receiving system or comprehensive tracking of purchased equipment and supplies. When items are purchased, they do not all come to the central storeroom at the Port to get logged in, tracked, tagged (if applicable) before being dispensed to the individual shops and employees. The current practice is that Port Public Works employees purchase inventory, pick up from the vendors, or have them delivered either to the central storeroom or any of the twenty storerooms (Plumbing, Carpentry, Garage, etc.). As a result, Port management does not know whether the parts and supplies were formally received and included as part of Port inventory, or whether these items were used, stored or potentially misappropriated.

At the end of the Fiscal Year 2017, annual physical inventory counts, which should be performed for all storerooms, were only taken at three of the twenty storerooms. However, during our audit we found significantly more storerooms with inventory of significant value that Port Finance was unaware and, therefore, did not include in the physical counts and present on the financial statements. The lack of comprehensive inventory counts in all likelihood, has led to the unnecessary purchase of parts that were already on hand. During our five-year audit period, the Public Works Section purchased over $11 million in parts, equipment and services using P-Cards. This situation has been exacerbated by instructions of Supervisors to employees to always buy more parts than they actually need (supposedly to make sure they had the item on hand for future use).

We also noted that access to storerooms has not been tightly controlled. Storerooms were left unlocked and unattended, and Sales Representatives frequently entered the...
storerooms to sell supplies, equipment, and parts with minimum controls. Because of these minimal or nonexistent controls, significant parts and supplies could have been misappropriated without detection. For this type of operation, a comprehensive inventory system is a basic necessity. See Section III, Opportunities for Improvements Nos. 20 – 24 for more information regarding the lack of a comprehensive inventory system.

B. No work order system was in use at the time the audit was initiated. Consequently, accountabilities for parts needed for repairs and other job tasks being performed are precluded. In this type of operation, the use of work order is a basic and necessary control to help ensure effective use of resources. Because of the lack of a work order system, significant parts and supplies could have been misappropriated without detection. See Section III, Opportunity for Improvement No. 25.

C. Controls over P-Card purchases have been grossly inadequate. Over 30 P-Cards were issued to employees in the Public Works Section and the employees were then allowed discretion to purchase goods and services to use in the course of their work. There was no requirement for the purchases of goods and services to be tied to the jobs the employees were working on, and there were no checks and balances, other than transaction limits of $3,500, daily limits of $6,000, and the monthly limit of $20,000.

Approvers of P-Card transactions were not required to be the employee’s supervisor; instead, supervisors of other areas frequently approved P-Card transactions for employees of other sections. Additionally, when employees would reach their transaction or monthly credit limit, it was a common practice to request other employees to make the purchases for them. In many instances, these other employees were not in the same trade area and may not have had the technical knowledge to know whether the order was appropriate. See Section II, Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 2 – 19 for more information regarding the lack of effective procedures and lack of a centralized P-Card procurement and approval function.

D. No emphasis was placed by Port management to try to obtain the best (or even a reasonable) price. Instead, at least informally, employees were told to buy from small businesses, where possible, and spread the business around. Although the Port had access to Master Agreements which establish competitive prices for commonly used parts and supplies, employees were not instructed to use them, and, in some cases, employees were not aware of how to determine whether a Master Agreement existed for the needed items. As a result, we noted many instances where it appears excessive prices have been
paid, resulting in the waste of public funds. See Section II, Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 9 & 19 for more detailed information regarding the lack of an emphasis on price and instances of excessive prices being paid.

E. Dumping of untested wastewater into Port Everglades sewer pumping stations located at the Port was not adequately controlled or monitored. Due to the lack of testing of wastewater or other satisfactory controls, there is little assurance that the composition of dumped wastewater was within legal (statutory and contractual) guidelines. We noted that at least one dumping location (lift station) was left unlocked and could be readily accessed by a hauler for the dumping of wastewater without detection. We also noted instances where untested wastewater from the Port of Miami was allowed to be dumped at the Port. Because of the lack of processes and controls, kickbacks or other bribery schemes could have occurred in collusion with Port staff without detection. See Section V, Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 34 – 36 for more information about the dumping of wastewater.

F. Port Management did not implement adequate internal controls to monitor and verify that tenants occupied only leased storeroom space in the Foreign Trade Zone. Leased space within the FTZ was practically controlled almost entirely by one Port employee. We noted that one tenant had the ability to occupy more warehousing space without compensation to the County. Additionally, we identified that management did not keep adequate records on tenants’ use of leased storeroom space. Due to the lack of internal controls, there is significantly increased risk of collusion between Port staff and FTZ tenants without Port management’s knowledge. Thus, improprieties could occur without detection. See Section VI, Opportunity for Improvement Nos. 37 – 39 for more information about the use of storeroom space in Port Everglades Foreign Trade Zone.

G. The use of backflow of test kits were not appropriately monitored by Port management. Additionally, annual backflow device assembly certifications were not in compliance with federal, state, and local regulatory requirements. We noted that in several instances, Port plumbing staff used Port owned backflow test kits to financially enrich themselves. Additionally, for the years reviewed, we identified a significant lack of annual backflow assembly device testing throughout Port property. We also identified that for three years, no record of backflow device testing was maintained. See Section VII for more detailed information on backflow test kits and backflow device testing.

The Port Operations Director had oversight responsibilities for these areas of mismanagement. In an interview, the Port Operations Director stated that he was not aware that staff was not
using a work order system or did not have a perpetual inventory system. He also stated that he thought complete annual physical counts were being conducted. However, the Port Operations Director either knew or should have known these systems and activities were not being done. The potential lack of knowledge/failure to ensure the most basic and fundamental systems and activities were in place, indicate a level of gross mismanagement.

Management has a fiduciary responsibility to manage operations in an efficient and effective manner, with adequate controls to help ensure public resources are used appropriately and wisely. The situations noted above, when combined and considered in totality, constitute gross financial mismanagement, with fiduciary responsibilities not fulfilled by Port management.

### Recommendation 1

**We recommend** management:

A. **Immediately direct that the recommendations in this report be implemented as soon as possible and take all disciplinary action considered necessary.**

B. **Review the number of P-Card Holders in other areas of the Port and assess whether there are excessive numbers of card holders**

C. **Ensure recommendations contained in this report are implemented elsewhere at the Port, as applicable.**

### Management’s Response

A. **Management concurs.** The Port Everglades Department has been directed to implement the recommendations. Specifics on the status of implementation are included in the responses to each applicable recommendation. The Port Everglades Department management will also continue to work with the Human Resources Division and Office of the County Attorney to pursue appropriate disciplinary action in accordance with County Policy and/or applicable collective bargaining agreements.

B. **Management concurs and already completed.** A review of Port P-Card users was completed in Fall 2018 that resulted in a significant reduction in Port Everglades Department employees with P-Cards. Additionally, Management will periodically review Port P-Card users.

C. **Management concurs and has implemented.** In addition to current Broward County P-Card Policy, the Port Everglades Department specific procedures to P-card use and
internal controls were implemented through a February 4, 2019 memorandum to all Port staff.
Background

**Port Everglades Operations Division**

The Port Everglades Operations Division oversees all operational functions within Port Everglades (Port), including coordination and control of the movement of all ships, cargo, and passengers moving through the seaport and maintenance of the facilities affecting those movements in order to ensure prompt and efficient service to Port users. The Operations Division includes the following four sections:

- Harbormaster
- Linehandlers
- Container Cranes
- Public Works

**Public Works Section**

During our audit period, the Public Works Section is responsible for the maintenance and repair of the County-owned facilities and equipment (except container cranes) throughout the Port. The Public Works Section is divided into two functional areas: Operations and Facilities Maintenance. The Operations area performs painting, signage, fender construction, heavy equipment operation, and building services. The Facilities Maintenance area is responsible for maintaining the Port’s facilities, loading bridges, grounds, pump stations, vehicles, and pavement. This includes 52 buildings encompassing approximately three million square feet of space.

Both areas employ trades personnel that cover various disciplines. A list of trades along with a brief description of responsibilities by section are shown in Figure 3.
# Figure 3

Operations and Facilities Maintenance Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>Paints Port-owned buildings, structures and equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Maker</td>
<td>Designs, creates, prints, mounts, and installs signage around the Port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fender Construction</td>
<td>Performs scheduled and emergency repairs on fenders, rub rails and bollards on the berths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Services</td>
<td>Custodian services for Port-owned facilities and Customs and Border Patrol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>Maintains landscaping, mowing, trimming, trees, irrigation and chemical applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>Maintains Port-owned vehicles and equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Equipment Operator</td>
<td>Operates equipment requiring commercial drivers’ licenses such as street sweepers, backhoes, and dump trucks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Worker</td>
<td>Cleans and maintains interior of terminals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship Service</td>
<td>Provides trash removal services and empties exterior trash cans around the Port.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Maintenance Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>Writes requisitions, receives and logs inventory items, and processes counter releases for products and supplies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>Performs repairs and preventive maintenance functions on electrical lighting, high mast lights and fiber optic and ship to Port network systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading Bridge Maintenance</td>
<td>Performs scheduled and emergency repairs and preventive maintenance functions on loading bridge systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker</td>
<td>General all-purpose labor work force for the Port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>Performs scheduled and emergency repairs and preventive maintenance functions on the plumbing, water and sewage systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Door Maintenance</td>
<td>Performs scheduled and emergency repairs and preventive maintenance on overhead doors, automatic doors, gates and gate access controls and systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>Performs scheduled and emergency repairs for metal related items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Maintenance</td>
<td>Performs scheduled and emergency repairs as well as preventive maintenance functions on the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems within the Port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Performs scheduled and emergency repairs as well as preventive maintenance functions on locks, door hardware, cabinetry, concrete, drywall, floor and ceiling tile. Assembles shelving, desks, and other prebuilt items. Builds custom furniture and other related items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information provided by Port Management.*
As advised by Port management, the Facilities Maintenance function in the Operation Division has been moved to the Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance Division. The transition was initiated in October 2017 and was fully completed in January 2019. This reorganization brings both preventive and capital maintenance under the supervision of the Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance Division.

**Port’s Public Works Purchasing Card Usage**

A Purchasing Card (P-Card) is a credit card designed to provide County employees with an efficient and reliable way to make non-recurring, low dollar purchases. The Port’s Public Works Section assigns P-Cards to trades personnel in order to facilitate the purchase of equipment and supplies necessary to maintain the Port’s assets.

As shown in **Figure 4**, from October 5, 2012 to July 6, 2018, the Public Works Section had P-Card transactions totaling $11.9 million which represents approximately 57% of the $21 million total of all P-Card transactions at the Port during the same period.

**Figure 4**
Port Everglades P-Card Transactions (in millions)

![Figure 4 Port Everglades P-Card Transactions](chart)

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from County Financial Systems

**General P-Card Transaction Processing**

According to Purchasing Card Program Policies and Procedures Manual revised July 16, 2018, P-Cards can be used for single purchases up to $3,500 (including all associated costs such as shipping and handling), unless a transaction limit increase is approved by the Purchasing Division Director. It is important to note that the current single transaction limit of $3,500 has been in place since February 2016. This amount has been increased to its current level, as shown in **Figure**
5. P-Cards may also be authorized as a travel card to pay certain approved expenses during County authorized travel.

Figure 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>P-Card Single Transaction Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to January 2013</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2013 to January 2016</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016 to Present</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from the Purchasing Division

P-Card purchases must be used for County business purposes. In addition to the single transaction limit mentioned above, additional purchasing limits per P-Card are in place. Specifically, the daily limit for total purchases is $6,000, and the monthly total purchase limit is $20,000. The “splitting” of purchases into smaller bundles to circumvent these transaction limits is prohibited.

P-Card Program Participant Responsibilities

The Purchasing Division’s P-Card Administrator is responsible for the overall administration and oversight of the P-Card Program, including:

- establishing and maintaining P-Card Program policy and procedural guidance for agency participants;
- serving as the primary contact between the County and the Bank;
- providing training for P-Card Program participants;
- providing support to participating agencies;
- suspending Card Holder privileges when Card Holders and/or Approvers fail to comply with P-Card Program policies and procedures;
- cooperating with audit and investigative authorities with respect to identifying and mitigating suspected, alleged, or confirmed instances of waste, fraud or abuse related to the P-Card Program;
- conducting routine quarterly transaction reviews and investigations of potential P-Card violations and issuing the appropriate sanctions;
- providing quarterly transaction reports to the Office of the County Auditor, identifying all individuals whose P-Cards have been revoked and/or reinstated.
The Director of each participating agency is responsible for a thorough review of monthly expenditures, ensuring all transactions conform to the policies and procedures. Roles within divisions include a P-Card Coordinator, Approver, and Holder. Figure 6 shows a brief description of the responsibilities of each role.

**Figure 6**
P-Card Program Roles with Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-Card Coordinator</td>
<td>P-Card Coordinators are designated by each agency’s Director to manage P-Card Program activities, in cooperation with the Purchasing Division. They are responsible for requests to the Purchasing Division for new P-Card orders, cancellations, reinstatements, name changes, approver changes, and alerting the P-Card Administrator to cancel or transfer an account when a Card Holder is leaving the participating agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Card Approver</td>
<td>P-Card Approvers are responsible for ensuring Card Holder compliance with requirements of the P-Card Program and ensuring that Card Holders enter the correct budget line item number, and attach receipts and supporting documentation in PeopleSoft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Card Holder</td>
<td>P-Card Holders are responsible for a diligent review of all P-Card transactions to ensure that all transactions conform to policies and procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of County Auditor with information obtained from the Purchasing Card Program Policies and Procedures Manual revised July 16, 2018*

Each individual assigned a P-Card (P-Card Holder) must complete training and sign an agreement to abide by all P-Card policies and procedures. The County maintains a zero-tolerance policy for personal purchases using the P-Card. Personal use of the P-Card for any reason may result in immediate revocation of P-Card privileges.

**Port’s Public Works P-Card Transaction Analysis**

We reviewed a list of all active and inactive P-Card Holders within Public Works during the audit period of October 2012 to July 2018. There are 48 current and former Public Works employees who were assigned P-Cards among different trade areas. We judgmentally selected 37 current and former P-Card Holders who had transactions totaling $50,000 or more, and one employee who had supervisory responsibilities that had transactions below this level. A list of Port’s Public Works P-Card Holders with transaction amounts from October 5, 2012 through July 6, 2018 is
provided in Appendix B. For these P-Card Holders, we reviewed approximately 19,000 transactions totaling approximately $11.8 million in purchases.

**Our Analytical Procedures**

Our analytical procedures identified potentially fraudulent transactions, and other violations of P-Card Program requirements. For each potential violation identified, we interviewed key cardholders, approvers, management personnel, and vendors; performed vendor site visits; and conducted background research on vendor companies.
SECTION II: OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Our audit disclosed certain policies, procedures and practices that could be improved. Our audit was neither designed nor intended to be a detailed study of every relevant system, procedure or transaction. Accordingly, the Opportunities for Improvement presented in this report may not be all-inclusive of areas where improvement may be needed.

Opportunities for Improvements in this section identify and detail a multitude of significant system deficiencies, potentially fraudulent purchases and practices, and concerns regarding procurement controls that were either not in place or were circumvented by employees. Our recommendations focus on the implementation of systems and practices which may help prevent, deter and, if necessary, detect future re-occurrences of these abuses. The Opportunities for Improvement in this section are organized into the following categories:

- Significant and Pervasive Control Weaknesses
- Fraudulent or Inappropriate Transactions
- Lack of Controls Over P-Card Processes

Significant and Pervasive Control Weaknesses

2. Lack of Internal Controls Allowed Fraudulent or Inappropriate Transactions, and Violations of County Policy to Occur Without Detection.

The P-Card Program Policies and Procedures Manual (P-Card Program), which provides general guidelines to ensure accountability for the P-Card Program is not consistently followed. In addition, the Port did not establish an adequate internal control environment based on P-Card Program guidelines as required for all departments, offices, and divisions participating in the P-Card Program. Specifically, we noted the following pervasive weaknesses that led to fraud, waste and abuse related to the P-Card Program:

A. Agency Directors, responsible for the proper management and oversight of Agency P-Card activities, including compliance with the P-Card Program did not fulfill their oversight responsibilities. Specifically, we noted:

   i. Management allowed the issuance of P-Cards to over 30 employees in the Public Works Section without adequate controls and procedures to ensure
accountability as required by County Policy. See **Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 3 - 19**.

ii. Management failed to perform an adequate review of Monthly P-Card Expenditure reports to ensure their staff’s compliance with County P-Card Policies. See **Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 3 - 19**.

B. Inadequate, improper, and incomplete review by P-Card Approvers, primarily responsible for auditing their assigned P-Card Holder’s transactions during monthly reconciliations, resulted in:

i. The approval of P-Card transactions without adequate documentation, obscured and illegible documentation, and lack of a valid business purpose. See **Opportunity for Improvement No. 16**.

ii. The approval of purchases from inactive companies. See **Opportunity for Improvement No. 8**.

iii. The approval of purchase transactions made by or for employee family members. See **Opportunity for Improvement No. 12**.

iv. The approval of purchase transactions made by employees for items outside of their line of business. See **Opportunity for Improvement No. 17**.

County Policy requires that all transactions are thoroughly reviewed, conform to P-Card Policy, and are valid, and complete and accurate records of P-Card purchases are retained, including physical or electronic copies of receipts.

C. P-Cards are not only used for official County business by the employee whose name is on the card as required by County Policy, some purchases were made for personal use. County Policy prohibits the personal use of P-Cards. Misuse of a P-Card may result in revocation of the P-Card, disciplinary action, termination, and possible filing of criminal charges. See **Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 10 & 17**.

D. Established and authorized procurement contracts (Master Agreements) were not used when available. Failure to purchase using a Master Agreement or Procurement Contract where one exists for the required commodity or service is a prohibited use. P-Card Approvers are responsible for ensuring that the appropriate procurement method is used. See **Opportunity for Improvement No. 19**.
E. Procedures were not established to ensure the price paid for goods and services using P-Cards were fair and reasonable as required by County Policy. See Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 9 & 19.

F. Procedures were not established to prevent or detect the unauthorized practice of splitting transactions to circumvent P-Card transaction limits as required by County Policy, leading to the widespread use of this method by:

   i. Individual Cardholders
   ii. Multiple Cardholders colluding to perform the activity
   iii. Cardholders and Vendors colluding to perform this activity

P-Card Approvers are responsible for ensuring that purchases are not split to avoid competitive solicitations. Known purchases over $3,500 must be made using competitive procurement methods unless prior approval is obtained by the Director of Purchasing. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 13.

G. Procedures were not established to receive and inspect all ordered goods/services or be advised in writing by the person receiving the goods as required by County Policy. In many instances, management has no assurance that items purchased were received or used by the Port. See Opportunities for Improvement No. 14.

H. Purchase receipts did not consistently provide sufficient detail regarding the item purchased, including a printout of the item ordered, if necessary. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 16.

I. Procedures were not established to ensure the delivery of goods/services purchased by the Cardholder to a Broward County workplace to allow proper receipt and inspection. County Policy prohibits an order to be delivered to a personal residence or any non-County location. See Opportunity for Improvement Nos. 7 & 14.

J. P-Card transaction dispute procedures are not consistently followed to ensure resolution and adequate documentation required by County Policy. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 18.

K. Conflicts of interests and outside employment rules were not consistently enforced as required by County Policy. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 12.

It is essential to implement and maintain adequate and effective system controls over the P-Card process to help ensure public resources are used appropriately. The deficiencies noted above
contributed to the fraudulent or inappropriate transactions and misuse of P-Card without detection.

**Recommendation 2**

_We recommend_ management establish an adequate internal control environment based on P-Card Program guidelines as required for all departments, offices, and divisions participating in the P-Card Program.

**Management’s Response**

*Management concurs and already implemented.* Effective August 22, 2018, the Port Everglades Department established a program requiring a checks-and-balances procedure in the use of P-Cards at the Port Public Works areas of both Facilities Maintenance and Operations. A memorandum documenting the process was distributed that day. The process requires the completion of a Purchase Request Form Cover Sheet that is initiated by the tradesperson requesting materials/supplies. That form is presented to that person’s supervisor for review and approval. In Facilities Maintenance, the form is next sent to the manager and then on to the director level person who assigns the P-Card holder to make the purchase. In Operations, the form goes from the supervisor to the Assistant Director of the Operations Division. Upon receipt or pick-up of the purchased materials, they are brought to the Central Storeroom, inventoried, and placed in storage. As those materials are subsequently needed by the trades people, they are issued from the Central Storeroom by the warehouse supervisor or storekeepers along with a counter release form for the materials being removed from the Central Storeroom.

As mentioned in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 1C., a Port Everglades Department-wide memorandum on P-Card use, procedures and internal controls was issued on February 4, 2019.

In addition, Management reviewed the five components of internal control over P-Cards and certain procurement operations which include the Control Environment, Risk Assessment, Control Activities, Information and Communication, and Monitoring. In evaluating the cause of the deficiency in internal control that led to the discovery of long-term fraud at Port Everglades, Management evaluated the Design, Implementation, and Operation of the applicable existing Internal Controls and designed and implemented additional controls to compensate for weakness in previously established controls.

The Internal Control over P-Cards is administered through the PeopleSoft Enterprise Resource Planning system which includes a P-Card control module that delivers the training and administration of the P-Card program including acknowledgement of duties, cardholder substantiation of transactions, and supervisory approval of transactions. While the County Auditor’s Office had completed a review of Port Everglades Department Procurement Card Transactions (Report No. 18-1) on October 3, 2017 with no opportunities for improvement noted, as discussed in the Auditor’s report, the internal control environment over P-Cards and certain other matters at Port Everglades were not acceptable and fostered collusion among employees who disregarded their duties and engaged in criminal activity.
Limitations in monitoring allowed fraudulent activity to occur undetected until the point of discovery and reporting by persons not engaged in the fraud.

Management has designed additional control activities to address the deficiency in internal control by developing and implementing new Monitoring Activities that include the establishment of a new P-Card Audit team in the Accounting Division in July 2019. The P-Card Audit team utilizes computer aided analysis and review to conduct an audit of P-Card transactions each month to identify twenty-four conditions that include deficiency in supporting documentation, transaction splitting, questionable charges, and certain inappropriate uses by P-Card holders. As part of their analysis, the P-Card Audit team will utilize a Decline Report from our P-Card provider, Wells Fargo, that is used in the industry by both their corporate and government clients. The Accounting Division will follow-up on its findings and address issues with cardholders to resolve its findings. The added transactional analysis, review and inquiry add a layer of deterrent to fraud, waste and abuse.

Additionally, the Accounting Division established new training and access to employee certifications for the Accounts Payable Unit. This training and certification provides additional skills and knowledge in the Accounts Payable field and verifies an individual’s comprehensive understanding of their job function and demonstrates an ability to apply that understanding to solve problems and improve processes through best practices. The curriculum includes such topics as internal controls, process functions, technology, tax and regulatory issues, and other accounts payable management topics.

In May of 2019, the Accounts Payable Unit became a member of Institute of Financial Management (IOFM) which is the premier provider of education and training for Accounts Payable and other Account Management professionals. Currently, the five highest level Accounts Payable staff are pursuing certifications through IOFM in Accounts Payable Manager and Accounts Payable Specialist. As of November 20, 2019, two staff members have completed the course work for Accounts Payable Manager, one has completed the course work for Accounts Payable Specialist and two others are in the process of completing the course work in Accounts Payable Specialist. All five staff are expected to complete the Certification Testing Requirement within the next six months. Once granted, these certifications are maintained by earning 15 Continuing Education Units annually to stay up to date with accounts payable technology, internal controls (including fraud detection), and other best practices.

The Accounting Division has also developed a draft County policy for Accounts Payable and P-Card Audit that will further provide increased oversight and enforcement authority to ensure proper use of P-Cards.

**Fraudulent or Inappropriate Transactions**

Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 3 through 12 identify certain potentially fraudulent or inappropriate payments made with the use of P-Cards. It is important to note that several of the individuals and vendors discussed herein have been charged with crimes by the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida.
3. Approximately $279,000 in Potentially Inappropriate Purchases Were Made from Companies Affiliated with One Storekeeper.

We identified $278,952 of purchases made through vendors directly or indirectly affiliated to Former Storekeeper 1. Purchases of $250,867 to these entities were processed using his County P-Card while an additional $28,085 in purchases were made by other Port employees. The other Port employees, who made these purchases, indicated that it was a common practice for the Former Storekeeper 1 to use their P-Cards for purchases or to direct others to make these purchases once his P-Card limit was reached.

The vendor companies, the Former Storekeeper 1 relationship with each, and the amounts spent are shown in Figures 7 and 8.

**Figure 7**

Companies Affiliated to the Former Storekeeper 1, The Total Amount Purchased and Nature of Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Purchased</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Nature of Affiliation</th>
<th>Company Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viravar LLC</td>
<td>$20,441</td>
<td>2/2013 to 12/2013</td>
<td>▪ Former Storekeeper 1 is a registered officer of the corporation.</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Vendor’s mailing address matches the address of a property formerly owned by the Former Storekeeper 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vees Supply LLC</td>
<td>$151,403</td>
<td>12/2013 to 5/2018</td>
<td>▪ Former Storekeeper 1 daughter is a registered officer of the corporation.</td>
<td>Appendix D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Vendor’s mailing address matches the Former Storekeeper 1 current mailing address.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite Distributors LLC</td>
<td>$67,323</td>
<td>8/2014 to 6/2018</td>
<td>▪ Former Storekeeper 1 daughter-in-law is a registered officer of the corporation.</td>
<td>Appendix E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venturi Supplies, Inc.</td>
<td>$36,891</td>
<td>2/2016 to 8/2017</td>
<td>▪ Former Storekeeper 1 son is listed on invoices as a reseller (Invoices altered to display different seller name in County’s accounting records).</td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S H Marketing, Inc.</td>
<td>$2,894</td>
<td>11/2015 to 12/2015</td>
<td>▪ Former Storekeeper 1 son is listed on invoices as a reseller. (Invoices altered</td>
<td>Appendix G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Items purchased from these vendors include microwaves, vacuums, refrigerators, cleaning supplies, toiletries, power tools, folding tables, pop-up tents, generators, portable air conditioner units, and paint. A summary of these items and the amounts spent is shown in Figure 9.
Figure 9

Cost Summary of Items Purchased from Affiliated Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microwaves</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuums</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerators</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folding Tables</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>31,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop-up tents</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable A/C</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning Supplies, Toiletries, Misc.</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>190,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$278,952</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of the County Auditor analysis of Affiliated Company purchases.*

It is a conflict of interest for the Former Storekeeper 1 or any other individuals to make purchases with entities owned by their direct relatives.

Section112.313(3) of the Florida Statutes states:

“No employee of an agency acting in his or her official capacity as a purchasing agent, or public officer acting in his or her official capacity, shall either directly or indirectly purchase, rent, or lease any realty, goods, or services for his or her own agency from any business entity of which the officer or employee or the officer’s or employee’s spouse or child is an officer, partner, director, or proprietor or in which such officer or employee or the officer’s or employee’s spouse or child, or any combination of them, has a material interest.**”

The act of purchasing for a governmental body where the purchasing agent has a personal interest in the vendor may violate state law and erode the public’s trust that fair and open competition is conducted.

We attempted to validate whether these items were received and put to beneficial use by the Port; however, we were unable to do so due to the lack of storeroom and inventory controls necessary to track items purchased, received, and installed (See **Section III**). Our efforts were further hampered by the lack of adequate descriptions of the purchases on the invoices and consumable nature of some items. Issues regarding inventory systems and purchasing controls are examined in further detail in this report.

On May 9, 2019, immediately after we advised County Administration that any disciplinary action would not impede our audit or any potential criminal investigation, the Former Storekeeper 1 was terminated.
On July 17, 2019, the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida, filed a criminal complaint against the Former Storekeeper 1 on one count of conspiracy to obtain by fraud, property of programs receiving Federal funds, Title 18, United States Code, Section 371. Appendix O provides copies of the criminal complaints.

**Recommendation 3**

We recommend management:

A. Cooperate with law enforcement authorities regarding criminal investigations or prosecution.

B. Implement appropriate procedures to ensure conflict of interest and outside employment laws and policies are consistently enforced and monitored.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs.* Since notifying law enforcement in June 2018, the Port Everglades Department has fully cooperated with law enforcement on all investigations or prosecutions and will continue to do so, where appropriate.

B. *Management concurs and has completed.* All employees are required to comply with the County Administrative Policies and Procedures (CAPP), which includes the County’s conflict of interest and outside employment policies. Specifically, the Port Everglades Department revalidated outside employment of Public Works staff on August 6, 2018 and all Port Everglades Department staff on this requirement again on April 17, 2019.

4. **Questionable and Apparently Fraudulent Purchases Totaling $128,946 Were Made From One Company by Port Employees.**

During the audit period, the Port paid $128,946 to Z & Z, Inc. (Z & Z), which we consider questionable. We found items that could not be verified as having been received or installed on Port property. This includes fire hydrants, battery operated faucets, hammer arrestors, backflow kits, check valves, and gate valves. The transactions also included repairs to Port equipment that the employee confirmed, never occurred. We noted specific concerns with approximately $68,000 of fraudulent purchases as follows:
Fire Hydrants & Parts ($24,327):

During the audit period, former employees purchased 14 fire hydrants and related parts from Z & Z, totaling $24,327. The fire hydrants and related parts purchased could not be found installed or in inventory at the Port, and there was no documentation available to show that the hydrants were received at the Port. In addition, during our audit, we noted that Z & Z was not an authorized fire hydrant distributor. If purchases for such items were made for direct County use, it would be common practice to make such purchases through the manufacturers’ authorized distributors.

Battery Operated Faucets ($9,623):

During the audit period, former employees purchased 25 battery operated faucets model ZZ6915XLF from Z & Z, totaling $9,623. The faucets purchased could not be found installed or in inventory at the Port, and there was no documentation available to show that the faucets were received at the Port.

The purchased faucets had a flow rate of 0.5 gallons per minute (gpm) compared to the Port’s standard of 1.5 gpm for battery-powered faucets.

Schedule 80 Red Brass Pipe ($6,682):

During the audit period, former employees purchased 156 feet of 2-inch schedule 80 red brass pipe, product number GRBP80K12, in 12-foot lengths from Z & Z totaling $6,682. The pipes purchased could not be found installed or in inventory at the Port, and there was no documentation available to show that the pipes were received at the Port.

In July 2018, the Port’s Plumbing Supervisor contacted the authorized retailer, Company 17, concerning these purchases and confirmed the product number was exclusive to their company. Company 17 personnel also informed the Plumbing Supervisor that brass pipes were stored at their pipe yard in Alabama and were not sold in Florida in years.
Hammer Arrestors ($3,951):

During the audit period, former employees purchased five Hammer Arrestors (Arrestors) from Z & Z totaling $3,951. The Arrestors purchased could not be found installed or in inventory at the Port, and there was no documentation available to show that the Arrestors were received at the Port.

Company 32, the manufacturer, had no record of manufacturing the units purchased. A company representative stated to Port management that these Arrestors are special ordered items that are sold only to selected distributors in the Country. The company’s records showed no sales in the Florida market during the periods the purchases were made by Port employees.

Backflow Repair Kits ($2,350):

During the audit period, former employees purchased eight backflow repair kits from Z & Z totaling $2,350. The backflow repair kits purchased could not be found installed or in inventory at the Port, and there was no documentation available to show that the backflow repair kits were received at the Port.

The part number for the repair kits were unique to Company 17. Company 17 confirmed with Port management personnel that they have not sold these kits in Florida in more than a year. We also noted the Port paid an inflated price for the kits because similar kits could be purchased from another vendor for $85 per kit, instead of the $293.75 per kit paid to Z & Z.

Check Valves & Installation Kits ($10,505):

During the audit period, former employees purchased 15 check valves and installation kits from Z & Z totaling $10,505. The check valves and installation kits purchased could not be found installed or in inventory at the Port, and there was no documentation available to show that the check valves and installation kits were received at the Port.

Former employees purchased 4-inch and 6-inch check valves at unit prices ranging from $579 to $921. The invoices in the County’s accounting records were marked with the lift stations that
were purportedly repaired. In June 2019, at our request, Port personnel inspected the various Lift Stations to determine whether the valves were in place. The inspection found:

- Four check valves purchased for $2,777 were not found. The inspection found that Lift Stations 18 and 27 were piped for 2-inch check valves and not the 4-inch check valves noted on Z & Z invoices. Port Plumbing staff also did not locate the 4-inch check valves in inventory.

- Six of the remaining check valves and eight installation kits were purchased for $3,647 in for Lift Station #3. In June 2019, plumbing staff found two 4-inch check valves at the lift station; however, they were unable to confirm whether the installed valves were the ones purchased from Z & Z. Port staff stated that the estimated useful life of check valves is ten years, making it unlikely that six new valves would be needed at this location in a twelve-month period.

- Four check valves and installation kits totaling $3,320 were purchased for repairs at Lift Stations 1 and 2. In June 2019, Port Plumbing staff observed the installed check valves at these stations were the same sizes of the valves purchased; however, Port staff were unable to confirm whether the installed valves were the ones purchased from Z & Z.

- The invoice for one check valve was marked “(Check valve for Thompson Pump) pump out sewer - Lift Stations” and could not be located by Port Plumbing staff in June 2019.

**Gate Valves & Installation Kits ($9,777):**

During the audit period, former employees purchased 12 gate valves and installation kits from Z & Z totaling $9,777. Port personnel was unable to confirm installation of the gates valves because they were purportedly installed underground, and there was no documentation available to show that the check valves and installation kits were received at the Port.

**Rebuilding Pillow Blocks ($1,350):**

We noted one transaction between a former P-Card Holder in the Fendering Section and Z & Z for rebuilding Danfoss Pillow Blocks at unit cost of $675. We confirmed the cost of a new Danfoss Pillow Block is approximately $960. This former P-Card Holder resigned after admitting to performing the rebuilding services himself and Z & Z paying the former P-Card Holder part of amount charged to the P–Card.

**Z & Z, Inc.:**
Z & Z operates business from a private residence in Pompano Beach and was a County Certified Small Business Enterprise vendor for the period April 5, 2011 to April 5, 2014.

During the audit period, a total of five Port staff made 88 purchases from Z & Z, totaling $128,946. Based upon our review of numbered invoices submitted to the Port from Z & Z, it appears that nearly all invoicing activity by Z & Z was for purchases made by the Port.

Invoices from Z & Z to the Port were prenumbered, handwritten and 77 of the 88 invoices issued to the Port were consecutively numbered and accounted for almost all invoices issued by Z & Z during the audit period.

Three invoices were not included in the Accounting Records and, as a result, we could not determine the invoice number.

Section 4.d.xi of the P-Card Policy and Procedure Program Manual requires P-Card Holders to receive and inspect all goods/services or be advised in writing by the person receiving the goods. Failure to ensure receipt of items purchased permitted fraudulent transactions to occur undetected.

We question whether any of the purchases from Z & Z were actually received by the Port. Had the Port implemented basic procedures and controls, this situation could have been prevented.

On July 17, 2019, the US Attorney charged three Port employees and Z & Z’s owner, for Conspiracy to Obtain by Fraud Property of Programs Receiving Federal Funds. See Appendix O. The information presented indicates that P-Cards have been used inappropriately by Port employees to pay for materials not received and/or used by County.

**Recommendation 4**

We recommend management:

A. Pursue legal options to seek recovery of amounts fraudulently received from the Port.
B. Ensure appropriate procedures are implemented to receive and inspect items purchased as required by the P-Card Policy and Procedure Program Manual.

C. Perform analytics to proactively review purchasing anomalies and investigate any discrepancies.

Management’s Response

A. Management concurs. In September 2019, the Port provided a Declaration of Broward County losses to the U.S. Attorney’s Office to be submitted as a claim of restitution in connection with these cases. The losses specified in the Declaration included a total of $205,706.90 in payments made by Broward County to Z&Z, Inc., the company operated by Bryan Zascavage, and involving fraud perpetrated by Co-conspirators 1, 2, and 3 as named in the charging document.

Restitution was included in each sentence of the four individuals jointly and severally as co-conspirators totaling $205,706.90. Another former Port employee was ordered to pay restitution totaling $206,297.74 for separate fraudulent P-card transactions as part of their sentencing. A notice of, claim has also been filed with the County’s insurer.

B. Management concurs and has implemented. As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 2, Management has already implemented additional controls and analysis within its processes. Further, Criminal prosecutions, changes in involved staff and management, the effect of audit and investigation activities along with added internal controls, including computer analytics, have all served to change the control environment that allowed questionable purchases to occur. Management will continue to monitor the P-Card and procurement activity as described herein.

C. Same as B

5. Questionable Purchases Totaling $166,396 Were Made From Three Affiliated Companies by Former Fender Construction Worker 1.

During the audit period, the Port paid $166,396 to Companies 1, 2 and 3 owned by a single individual, which we consider questionable. We found items or services that could not be verified as having been received or installed on Port property.

The three companies sold power tools and heavy-duty equipment accessories such as core drill bits, hydraulic hoses and chainsaw parts to the Port. In addition, they provided a wide variety of services, including concrete drilling, saw repair services, rebuilding of hydraulic drills and Danfoss Pillow Blocks. These parts and services were purchased exclusively by a former Employee (Former Fender Construction Worker 1) and his Supervisor (Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2),
and there was no documentation available to show that the items purchased were received at
the Port.

Summarized below in Figure 10 are purchases from the three affiliated companies.

**Figure 10**
Summary of Purchases from Affiliated Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Transaction Amount</th>
<th>No. of Transactions</th>
<th>Billing Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>$41,100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11/2012 to 12/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>$85,960</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1/2015 to 9/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>$39,336</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10/2016 to 3/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$166,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with P-Card information

We noted these transactions occurred in a consecutive manner across companies. The purchases
were for materials and services of a similar nature. During the audit, we noted the following
concerns:

A. Lack of available vendor information - We performed internet searches to verify the
companies’ places of business and qualifications. We were unable to confirm that the
companies occupied any of the addresses noted on the invoices; however, we confirmed
that one of the addresses was a maildrop located in Coral Springs.

B. Companies may not have had the expertise to perform services for which the Port was
billed - We identified 47 transactions totaling $60,774 where the companies may not
have had the expertise to perform the services. This included some services that are
typically provided by Port personnel. The three companies billed for a wide variety of
services including concrete drilling, sawing services, drill rebuilding, trailer boom truck,
and hydraulic hose repairs. Figure 11 shows the amounts billed by each company and
amounts billed for repairs and services.

**Figure 11**
Purchases from Affiliated Companies and Repairs & Services Billed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merchant</th>
<th>Total Amt Billed</th>
<th>Total Amt Billed for Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>$85,960</td>
<td>$30,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>41,100</td>
<td>14,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>39,336</td>
<td>15,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$166,396</td>
<td>$60,774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with P-Card information
We were unable to confirm that the companies had the expertise to perform the repairs and services the County paid for. We also noted the following:

i. **Repair to Hydraulic Boom truck**
   During the 38-month period from December 2014 to March 2018 Company 1, Company 2 and Company 3. billed $12,272 for service and repairs to one Hydraulic Boom Truck and a hydraulic crane truck (Crane). A December 27, 2014, invoice stated that Company 1 inspected and serviced air lines for the brake system and air system on a Hydraulic Boom Truck, repaired and replaced air tanks, inspected the hydraulic lines and systems and inspected and greased cables and Boom for $2,835. In June 2019, we contacted the manufacture company representative and asked about the qualifications needed to perform repairs on a Crane. The representative stated that an Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) certified mechanic can repair the engine and automotive components of the truck; however, a hydraulic technician must repair/service the boom and hydraulic brake lines. The Representative further stated that repair of the hydraulic brake lines may require a State or National certification. We were unable to independently confirm the qualifications of the companies. In addition, the work required on the automotive components of the truck could have been performed by ASE certified mechanics on Port staff.

ii. **Prices for services charged do not consistently appear reasonable and services purchased from companies are typically performed by Port’s staff** – We noted the companies billed a total of $7,260 for rebuilding Danfoss Pillow Blocks, a service they may not have also had the expertise to perform. We further noted two of the transactions with Company 2 for rebuilding Danfoss Pillow Blocks where the cost of repairs exceeded $960, which is the current cost of a new Danfoss Pillow Block. **Figure 12** shows a summary of costs for pillow block rebuilding.
### Figure 12
Summary of Danfoss Pillow Block Rebuilds Paid by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction Date</th>
<th>Merchant</th>
<th>Cost Per Rebuilt Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total Rebuilt Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/25/2013</td>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>$1,246</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2013</td>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2014</td>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31/2014</td>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2014</td>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,260</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with P-Card information

iii. **Services provided at an unusually high frequency**—We noted 16 transactions totaling $21,023 with Company 1 and Company 3 for rebuilding and servicing the hydraulic drill during a thirty-month period, May 2015 to December 2017. The Fendering Section has one hydraulic drill and four bearing housing units (Danfoss Pillow Blocks) for the drill. The rebuilding activities listed in Figures 12 & 13 represent combined repairs of $28,895 ($21,635 + $7,260) for the hydraulic drill and the four Danfoss Pillow Blocks at the Port.
### Figure 13
Summary of Hydraulic Drill Repair and Rebuilds Paid by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount Billed for Service</th>
<th>Service Billed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/28/2015</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>Rebuild hydraulic core drill seals and O-ring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10/2015</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Rebuild Hydraulic drill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2015</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>Rebuild Hydraulic Drill, stand rebuild kit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/2015</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>Service to drill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2015</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Rebuild core drill mount and collar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/2016</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>Rebuild Hydraulic Drill, hydraulic oil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2016</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>Hydraulic flush of steering system, test and tune pressure relief on hydraulic system and drill filter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/2016</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>Rebuild 2 hydraulic drills includes parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/2016</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>Service and repair hydraulic core drill mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3/2016</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>Emergency drill repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11/2016</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>Hydraulic Oil, system Tune, Drill adjustment, line repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/23/2016</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Rebuild 2 hydraulic core drills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17/2017</td>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>Rebuild, overhaul, replate and service grind shaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/2017</td>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>Drill rebuild and overhaul, shaft overhaul, new seals and cups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2017</td>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Drill rig test and service, oil replacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/2017</td>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>Drill rebuild and overhaul, replate and grind shaft, repair housing and pressure test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/2017</td>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>Drill rebuild and overhaul, valve seals, test and filter hydraulic system, pressure relief cartridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$21,635</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with P-Card information

Research conducted by Port staff showed that a new hydraulic drill, similar to the type used in the Fendering area, is approximately $6,700 and $960 for a new housing unit. As a result, the total repair and service cost of $28,895 far exceeded the cost of replacing the drill and housing units.

On July 23, 2019, the former Employee who made 112 of the 114 purchases from the affiliated companies, admitted to a scheme involving another vendor and similar repairs to the same hydraulic drill. On July 31, 2019, construction workers in the Fendering Section stated that repairs to the pillow blocks and the hydraulic drill in the Fendering Section were performed inhouse and they never observed the vendors on property. Therefore, we question whether these repairs were actually provided by the vendor.
iv. **Unable to confirm actual repairs and services to other fendering equipment** – We noted 22 transactions totaling $19,607 for repairing and servicing other fendering equipment, including the chainsaw, boat, pump, and trailer during the period of January 2013 to August 2017. We were unable to confirm whether the repairs and services were actually provided and could not determine whether the companies had the expertise to perform the repairs and services the County paid for.

C. **Unable to confirm receipt of tools, equipment and other items paid for by the Port** - The three companies were paid approximately $133,700 for tools, equipment, and other items and there is no evidence the items were received on Port property. During the period audited, the former Employee purchased power tools, parts, heavy-duty equipment, and accessories such as core drill bits, hydraulic hoses, and chainsaw parts. We contacted the owner of the companies who stated that he met with the Port Employee at a gas station near the Port to hand deliver items.

D. **Use of personal email address to conduct County business** - Of the 113 invoices billed by these entities, twenty-seven invoices totaling $47,702 were sent from the vendor’s email address to the former Employee’s personal email account and later forwarded to the former Employee’s and former Supervisor’s County emails. These invoices were all paid through the P-Card process; however, we could not determine whether the Port received the services and parts billed.

E. **Blank vendor invoice template found on the former employee’s Supervisor’s computer** - The blank invoice template for Company 1 was saved on the former Employee’s Supervisor’s computer hard drive. The former Supervisor is also the P-Card Approver for the former Employee’s P-Card transactions.

The P-Card Policy and Procedure Program Manual requires that procedures are established to ensure the price paid for goods and services using P-Cards are fair and reasonable, and requires that P-Card Holders receive and inspect all goods/services or be advised in writing by the person receiving the goods. Failure to ensure fair and reasonable prices and ensure receipt of items purchased permitted potentially fraudulent transactions to occur undetected.

We question all transactions with these three companies. Because of grossly inadequate procedures and controls, we cannot provide reasonable assurance that any of these goods and services were received by the Port.
### Recommendation 5

**We recommend** management:

A. Work with the Purchasing Division to debar these companies from future County business.

B. Cooperate with any further investigation of these companies and the former Employee.

### Management’s Response

A. *Management concurs.* Due to the confidential nature of this audit, the Port Department waited to begin the debarment process until the publishing of this audit report. Once this Audit Report is published, the Port Department will work with the County’s Purchasing Division to proceed with the formal debarment process as provided in the County Procurement Code.

B. *Management concurs.* Management has and will continue to cooperate with any further investigation of these companies and former Employee where appropriate.

### 6. Questionable Purchases Totaling $48,897 Were Made by Former Plumber 1.

During the audit period, Former Plumber 1 executed 32 transactions totaling $48,976 with Company 33. These questionable purchases included a core drill and an excessive numbers of core bits and cutting blades. Two other Port employees also purchased blades and cutting tools valued at $9,741 during the same period. We were unable to determine whether these purchases were made at the request of Former Plumber 1. We specifically noted the following:

A. Former Plumber 1 purchased 89 core bits and 18 drill accessories valued at approximately $18,000 during the audit period. Core drills and core drill bits (cylindrical drill attachments) are used to drill large circular holes into various materials, such concrete or wood, typically for the purpose of inserting pipes. We interviewed the Port Maintenance Manager who explained that core bits are commonly used in Fendering and not in the Plumbing Section. The Plumbing Section provides maintenance and repair on existing facilities; therefore, the use of core bits, accessories and equipment would be infrequent.

In August 2019, Port Maintenance staff conducted an inventory count of the core bits in the Plumbing Shop. **Figure 14** summarizes the core bits and accessories purchased by Former Plummer 1 and compares these purchases against Port Maintenance staffs’
inventory counts. We noted that the timing of the purchase of these core bits overlapped with a period when similar core bits were also being purchased by another employee in the Fendering Section from another company.

Figure 14
Summary of Core Bit Purchases Compared to Port Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Average Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8&quot; Pro Turbo Core Bit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$522</td>
<td>$522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&quot; Pro Turbo Core Bit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&quot; Pro Turbo Core Bit</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>5,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&quot; Pro Turbo Core Bit</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>4,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&quot; Pro Turbo Core Bit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; Pro Turbo Core Bit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2&quot; Dry granite Bit w/side/protection</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/4&quot; Dry Diamond Bit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&quot; Dry Diamond Bit (Core Bit)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Core Bits</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from invoices.

Note 1: We were unable to determine whether the core bits in inventory August 19, 2019 were the items purchased from this vendor.

B. Former Plumber 1 purchased a Core Drill valued at $1,242 from this vendor. On July 29, 2019, Port personnel reported to us that they could not locate the drill at the Port.

C. Former Plumber 1 purchased an excessive number of blades and cutting tools. During the audit period, he purchased 369 blades and cutting tools totaling $29,468. In one instance, we identified a P-Card receipt for $2,496, which referenced the email address of a company owned by Former Plumber 1.

Port personnel stated that there may be few instances when the Plumbing Section would cut into concrete; however, management of the Maintenance Section considered the purchase of 369 blades excessive. During this same period, two other Port employees also purchased 69 additional blades and cutting tools from the same vendor, valued at $9,741. In total, 438 blades, valued at approximately $39,000 were purchased from this vendor during the audit period.
In August 2019, Port Maintenance staff also conducted a count of blades which were included in inventory and separated for surplus. We compared the purchases of the blades to the inventory count, which are summarized in Figure 15.

### Figure 15
Summary of Cutting Blade Purchases Compared to Port Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blade Description</th>
<th>Average Price</th>
<th>Former Plumber 1</th>
<th>Other Port Employees</th>
<th>Inventory and Surplus 8/19/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20&quot;x.125&quot;x.335&quot;x 1&quot; Pro Asphalt / 3 Step Kicker</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&quot;x.125&quot;x.315&quot;x 1&quot; Pro Concrete / with Kicker</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&quot;x.125&quot;x.335&quot;x1&quot; Ultra / Asphalt w/3 step</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&quot;x.125&quot;x.335&quot;x1&quot;Super Pro / Asphalt w/ recess</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&quot;x.125&quot;x.575&quot;x1&quot; wph / pro concrete</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18&quot; Blade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16&quot;x.125&quot;x.275&quot; mmx1&quot; Dry Heavy-Duty Concrete</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16&quot; Pro Ductile Iron / &quot;Blue Thunder&quot;</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16&quot;x.125&quot;x.275&quot;x1&quot; dry general / purpose power</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14&quot;x.110&quot;x.275&quot;x1&quot; Dry Heavy-Duty Concrete</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,786</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14&quot; Pro Ductile Iron &quot;Blue Thunder&quot; Blade</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14&quot; saw notched soft bond/segmented</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14&quot;x.125&quot;x10mmx1&quot;-20mm / laser welded dry</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&quot; Porcelain Turbo with H&gt;D. / Core</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&quot; Super Turbo General Purpose</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1/2&quot; Porcelain Turbo with H.D. core (saw blades)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>369</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,468</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,741</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from invoices.*
We were unable to determine whether the cutting blades in inventory conducted in August 2019, were the items purchased from this vendor. Because of grossly inadequate procedures and controls, fraud and misappropriation of resources could have occurred without detection. We can provide no reasonable assurance that these items were received and used at the Port.

**Recommendation 6**

*We recommend* management carefully review any proposed purchases from Company 33 and cooperate in any subsequent investigation.

**Management’s Response**

*Management concurs.* The Port Everglades Department is no longer doing business with this company and will cooperate in any subsequent investigations.

7. **Approximately $59,500 of Purchased Items Were Shipped to Vendors’ Representatives’ Residences Rather Than the Port in Violation of County Policy.**

As shown in **Figure 16**, we noted 143 items listed on 67 invoices totaling $59,526 that were shipped to property addresses owned by vendor representatives for Company 4, Company 5, and Company 6 in violation of County Policy, and there was no documentation available to show that the items purchased were received at the Port. Specifically, we noted the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Invoices</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company 4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$47,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59,526</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from invoices.*

A. Fifty-one of 143 (36%) items purchased from Company 4 totaling $47,968, were shipped to a non-Port property address in Dania Beach, owned by the Vendor’s Representative. The items were purchased by a Storekeeper, three former Plumbers and included 1,568 plumbing parts and supplies. **Figure 17** summarizes the items shipped to the vendor’s
representative by employees. In our interview with the Company 4 sales representative, he stated that all items shipped to his house were delivered to the Port by him. However, because of inadequate controls, lack of an inventory system, and central receiving storeroom, we were unable to verify his representation.

**Figure 17**

Purchases from Company 4 Shipped to the Vendor’s Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TRANSACTION DATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storekeeper 1</td>
<td>4/2016</td>
<td>$664</td>
<td>6 Flushometers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Plumber 1</td>
<td>3/2014 to 4/2016</td>
<td>16,985</td>
<td>1152 Plumbing tools supplies and parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,014 25 Nut locker flush valves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>633 2 Wet vacuums, 2 compact blowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Plumber 3</td>
<td>4/2014 to 7/2016</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>207 Plumbing parts and shop Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,568 9 Big John toilet support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,131 1 Water Cooler, 1 eye wash station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,356 62 - Flushometers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,756 30 - Faucets: 6 - Trim cover plates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Plumber 4</td>
<td>6/2018</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>73 Plumbing tools, supplies and parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from invoices.*

B. Eleven of 34 (32%) items purchased from Company 5 totaling $7,198, and five of 439 (1%) items purchased from Company 6 totaling $4,360 were shipped to two property addresses in Boca Raton, owned by the Vendor’s Representative. The items were purchased by two current Storekeepers, a former Storekeeper, a Mechanic, Fending staff and a former Plumber and included cleaning supplies, work chair, and shop tools. **Figure 18** summarizes the items shipped to the vendor’s representative by employees.

**Figure 18**

Purchases from Company 6 & Company 5 Shipped to the Vendors’ Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TRANSACTION DATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storekeeper 1</td>
<td>1/2018</td>
<td>$819</td>
<td>3 cases cleaning supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Storekeeper 2</td>
<td>3/2018</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>2 cases shop supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Dozen shop supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Mechanic 1</td>
<td>1/2018 to 7/2018</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>13 cleaning supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1 tool set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Fender Construction Worker 1</td>
<td>11/2017 to 5/2018</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>24 welding supplies, 18 shop supplies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Procurement and Operational Practices at Port Everglades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TRANSACTION DATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Plumber 2</td>
<td>10/2017 to 6/2018</td>
<td>3,641</td>
<td>51 Shop and cleaning supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,901</td>
<td>37 Shop tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$11,558</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from invoices.

Throughout the course of our audit, several Port employees informed us that the Vendor Representative for Company 5 and Company 6 Specialty Products was a regular visitor to various storerooms and had close relationships with several Port employees, including Storekeepers. The Vendor Representative was also permitted access to inspect storerooms and inventory, and prepared draft itemized lists of tools and supplies to initiate purchases by the Port. On July 29, 2019, upon interviewing the Vendor Representative, she stated that the items that were delivered to her house were to facilitate the attachment of spray nozzles to bottles before delivering them to the Port. We subsequently reviewed the invoices and noted that many items in Figure 18 did not meet that description.

In addition, upon our review of handwritten sales receipts from the Vendor Representative, we identified notes to mark all cartons “Plumbing Shop” and send an email to a private email address belonging to Company 26, as shown in Figure 19. Company 26 is a company owned by Former Plumber 1, charged by the US Attorney for P-Card fraud at the Port. We also noted Former Plumber 3 had sales tickets emailed to his personal email address, as shown in Figure 20.
Figure 19
Company 6 Sales Ticket Requesting That Receipts Are Sent to a Private Email Address of Former Plumber 1 Personal Business

Source: Company 6 Sales Representative’s Records.
Figure 20
Company 6 Sales Ticket Requesting That Receipts Are Sent to Former Plumber 3 Private Email Address.

Source: Company 6 sales representative’s records.
Section A.4.d.xv of the Purchasing Card Policies & Procedures Program Manual states, “All orders purchased by P-Card Holder must be delivered to the P-Card Holder at their Broward County Workplace to allow proper receipt and inspection. Under no circumstances may an order be delivered to a personal residence or any non-County location."

Shipment to a non-Port address could conceal fraudulent activities. Because of grossly inadequate procedures and controls, we were unable to determine whether these items were actually received and used by the Port or whether any improprieties occurred.

**Recommendation 7**

We recommend management:

A. Ensure all purchases made by the Port are delivered to the central storeroom at the Port to allow proper receipt, inspection, and entry into the inventory system.

B. Restrict sales representatives from entering the storerooms.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs and has implemented.* Effective August 2019, after renovation of a building in the Port’s Public Works complex (Building 68), for all Port Facilities Maintenance and Public Works Operations purchases, a formalized procedure has been developed that requires all deliveries to be made to the Port Everglades Central Storeroom. Storekeepers are the primary end-user of purchasing procedures and when orders are placed, they are scheduled for delivery directly to the Central Storeroom. Upon delivery, the products are reviewed for consistency with the order and entered into the Excel inventory database. Pallets of items are broken down to verify quantities and confirmation that they match the original Purchase Order and packing list. Materials that are picked up directly from a vendor must be approved by the Port Warehouse Supervisor in advance and are brought directly to the Central Storeroom where they are entered into an Excel inventory database. All discrepancies of delivered orders are reconciled within 24 hours of delivery and adjustments to billing totals are addressed at that time.

B. *Management concurs.* With the recent creation of the Port Everglades Department Central Storeroom consisting of a consolidated location for all Port Facilities Maintenance and Operations inventory for parts, materials, and consumables that is located within a secured perimeter within the Port Facilities Maintenance Campus, access by the general public is prohibited. Building access is limited to the storeroom employees and a front counter has been created where access is limited to a small area for receipt of items within the storeroom. Storeroom employees have been instructed that no access by anyone is allowed beyond the front desk area.
8. Port Staff Made Purchases Totaling $300,208 from Inactive Corporations and Companies that were not Registered to do Business in Florida.

We noted 298 transactions totaling approximately $300,208 across seven vendors that had inactive corporate status or were not registered to do business in Florida. The vendors purportedly provided maintenance parts and supplies, repair and rebuilding services, canopy tents, air conditioners, washers, dryers, refrigerators, vacuums, and a variety of tools for the various trades. The transactions are summarized in Figure 21.

**Figure 21**

Summary of Transactions with Inactive Corporations and Non-Registered Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inactive/Non-Registered Companies</th>
<th>Vendors</th>
<th>Sunbiz Active Date</th>
<th>No of Invoices Paid During Inactive/Non-Registered Period</th>
<th>Dollar Amounts Paid During Inactive/Non-Registered Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five Inactive Companies</td>
<td>Company 7</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$2,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company 8</td>
<td>9/23/2011</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infinite Distributors, LLC</td>
<td>9/23/2016</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>9/25/2015</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company 6</td>
<td>9/25/2015</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>162,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive Companies Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>$260,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Non-Registered Companies</td>
<td>S H Marketing, Inc.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venturi Supplies, Inc.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Registered Companies Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$39,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
<td>$300,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from corporate status search of P-Card transactions from AMS and PeopleSoft*

It should be noted that six of the seven companies listed in Figure 21 were associated with investigations of two former employees charged in a complaint filed by the US Attorney for receiving kickbacks from Z & Z. There was no documentation available to show that the items and services purchased from these companies were received at the Port and many services purportedly performed by these companies are typically performed by Port personnel.

Section 4.d.x. of the Purchasing Card Policies and Procedures Program Manual states “the P-Card holder is responsible for purchase of product/service from Broward County Certified small business Enterprises (SBE) and/or local Broward County businesses when feasible.” The Purchasing Card Policies and Procedures Program Manual does not require purchases from active corporation or companies registered to do business in Florida. However, the County has a responsibility to purchase from businesses that are legally operating in Florida. Failure to do so may result in legal consequences should there be an issue with the goods or services provided.
The Purchasing Card Policies and Procedures Program Manual does not currently prohibit the purchase of items from unregistered or inactive companies.

**Recommendation 8**

**We recommend** management work with the Purchasing Division to:

A. Implement procedures to periodically validate that vendors doing business with Broward County have the authority to transact business in the State of Florida and are in good standing with the Florida Secretary of State.

B. Update the Purchasing Card Policies and Procedures Program Manual to prohibit the purchase of items from unregistered or inactive companies.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management partially concurs.* Not all Merchant vendors providing services to P-Card users are required to be registered to do business in the State of Florida, such as those providing services outside the State. Management will develop and include appropriate Vendor Responsibility Determination guidance in the next update to the Purchasing Card Program Policies & Procedures Manual. Additionally, Management is developing risk-based strategies to validate P-Card Merchant vendor responsibility for vendors at high risk of being non-responsible and were used by P-Card holders. Management will issue an advisory to P-Card holders that it is their duty to make a reasonable vendor responsibility determination for each purchase.

B. Same as A.
9. Port Employees Purchased Items at Inflated Prices Using P-Cards.

During our audit of P-Card purchases, we noted the following concerns regarding pricing:

A. One former Supervisor (Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2) paid inflated prices for items purchased from Company 29 totaling $18,956 during the period September 2015 to April 2016, and was the only Port employee to purchase from this vendor. The items purchased include data network cable equipment, life vests, and dri-loose absorbents. Company 29 is certified with the State of Florida as an alarm system contractor. The owner and the former Supervisor are connected through a prior employer. We noted that the former Supervisor may have overpaid by a minimum of $10,500. There was no documentation available to show that the items purchased were received at the Port.

B. Port employees purchased supplies at an inflated price from Company 6 when 39% lower prices were available from the same company by using an existing General Services Administration (GSA) agreement, and 18% lower prices were available from competitors.

   i. We identified a GSA agreement with Company 6 for cleaning equipment, accessories, janitorial supplies, cleaning chemicals and other materials that, according to the Purchasing Director, the County should be eligible to utilize. This agreement included several of the items the County purchased from Company 6 during the audit period. We compared the prices for 26 items purchased by the Port from Company 6 to the prices available in the GSA agreement and concluded the Port paid an average of 39% more than prices in the GSA agreement.
Section 21.36 of the Administrative Code of Broward County - Procurement from Contracts of Other Governments and Published Catalog Prices, states:

“The Director of Purchasing may purchase directly, without bid or quotations, from GSA contracts, or from offers whose price exactly equals GSA contracts from vendors awarded such GSA contracts, or from federal, state or local contracts when the contract expressly permits or if the awarding jurisdiction and/or the vendor agree to allow the County to purchase therefrom.”

Since this agreement did not expressly preclude participation by other governmental agencies, the County could apparently use the contract.
ii. We compared the prices for items purchased by the Port from Company 6 to the prices available from Company 9, another vendor used by some Port employees to purchase supplies, and concluded the Port paid an average of 18% more than prices available from Company 9.

Section A.4.d.iv of the Purchasing Card Policies & Procedures Program Manual states, “The P-Card Holder is responsible for ensuring the price paid for goods and services is fair and reasonable”. Failure to ensure fair and reasonable prices results in increased cost to the County.

Throughout the course of our audit, several Port employees informed us that the Sales Representative for Company 5 and Company 6 was a regular visitor in various storerooms and had close relationships with several Port employees, including storekeepers. The Sales Representative was also permitted access to inspect storerooms and inventory, and prepared draft itemized lists of tools and supplies to initiate purchases by the Port.

C. Port employees processed 82 P-Card transactions with Company 10 for air conditioner filters, parts and supplies totaling $144,908. Our audit found that prices charged by Company 10 were excessively high.

i. We noted that Company 10 charged the County excessively high prices for 277 washable filters and routinely billed for multiple items in a single lump sum amount. Washable filters are available in customizable sizes, are reusable and last for several years. We reviewed charges by Company 10 and compared these amounts to current prices for similar filters from another vendor. We determined that the amounts paid to Company 10 exceeded the other vendor’s prices by $9,869 for the 277 filters. Figure 22 shows a price comparison by item.
## Figure 22
Washable Air Filter Price Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invoice Dates</th>
<th>Filter Sizes</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Invoice Total</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/7/2017</td>
<td>23 1/4 x 45 1/2 x 2 Electrostatic 5 Stage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$243</td>
<td>$1,944</td>
<td>$137</td>
<td>$1,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2016</td>
<td>9 3/4 x 9 3/4 x 1 Electrostatic 5 Stage</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5/2016</td>
<td>19 3/8 x 39 x 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/2016</td>
<td>24 1/2 x 44 1/2 x 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/2016</td>
<td>15 1/2 x 39 x 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 1/4 x 39 x 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/2016</td>
<td>15 3/8 x 38 7/8 x 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2015</td>
<td>24 1/4 x 44 1/4 x 2 5 Electrostatic 5 Stage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9/2015</td>
<td>19 3/8 x 38 7/8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5,952</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 3/8 x 38 7/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/15/2015</td>
<td>19 3/4 x 43 1/4 x2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2014</td>
<td>23 1/2 x 39 x 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/2014</td>
<td>15 1/2 x 39 x 2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>277</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$35,150</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$25,281</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Overpayment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$9,869</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from AMS and PeopleSoft

### ii.
In March 2018, Storekeeper 1 and Skill Trades Supervisor 1 at the Port purchased HVAC filter cartridges and filters from Company 10 instead of directly from manufacture and paid $2,882 more than necessary for the items. In July 2019, we contacted the manufacture, obtained current pricing for the items, and compared the costs for the items. **Figure 23** shows the price comparison between the manufacture prices in July 2019 to the lump sum price billed by Company 10.
### Figure 23
Price Comparison Between the Manufacture and Company 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20x20 x12 FILTER 12” CARTRIDGE C 65% MERV 11 (LEGACY 12)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$83.78</td>
<td>$2,681</td>
<td>$6,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12X24X12 LEGACY 12” METAL WITH NO HEAD EXTENDED SURFACE REGID CELL MERV II</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.56</td>
<td>763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
$3,444  
$6,326

**EXCESSIVE AMOUNT PAID BY THE PORT** $2,882

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from AMS, PeopleSoft and external prices.*

Since Port staff routinely purchase equipment, parts and supplies from the manufacture directly. This transaction with Company 10 is questionable.

iii. Company 10’s invoices were lump sum and lacked itemized details such as unit prices, the quantity of items purchased, delivery charges, site visits and other costs. These invoices were approved and paid without management having sufficient detail to understand what is being purchased and at what price. In an interview with the owner of Company 10, he stated that he orders filters from his supplier/manufacturer that are made to the required specifications. When the order is completed, he picks up and delivers them directly to the Port. He further stated that the amounts billed to the County include a markup of the price charged by the supplier, plus the site visit to measure the filters and a delivery cost at an hourly rate of $125. When asked how long he spends on site visits and delivery, he responded that he spends two hours on site visits and two hours on delivery for each order, and at $125 an hour, the additional cost is $500 per order.
As the invoices did not include itemized prices, we were unable to confirm the amounts billed for delivery and site visit fees. It appears the Port unnecessarily and repeatedly paid for site visits for reorders of the same size and quantity of filters.

Port Management has a responsibility to ensure necessary controls are in place, items purchased are actually needed by the Port, and prices are fair and reasonable. Procedures at the Port fulfilled neither of these responsibilities.

We question the propriety of these expenditures with Company 10. Due to grossly inadequate procedures and controls, we cannot provide reasonable assurance that fraud or misappropriation of funds has occurred without detection.

**Recommendation 9**

**We recommend** management:

- **A.** Cooperate with any future investigation involving Company 29 and take appropriate action.

- **B.** Execute a participating addendum to formally authorize use of the existing GSA Agreement with Company 6 / Company 5, if it is determined necessary to continue business with these companies.

- **C.** Cooperate with any future investigation involving Company 10 and take appropriate action.
Management’s Response

A. Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department will cooperate with law enforcement on any future investigation involving the company, where appropriate, and take appropriate action as necessary.

B. Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department is no longer doing business with either of these companies. The last transaction with the companies in Peoplesoft was March 17, 2017.

C. Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department will cooperate with law enforcement on any future investigation involving the company, where appropriate, and take appropriate action as necessary.

10. Port Employees Purchased Items With County Issued P-Card for Personal Use.

We identified numerous instances where Port employees made personal purchases using County P-Cards in violation of the P-Card Program. We noted the following concerns:

A. A former Supervisor (Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2) purchased many items that do not appear to be for a Port related business purpose. Items purchased include a 10’ x 20’ tent with a zippered entrance and foot pads for $498. We confirmed with Port personnel that the tent was not appropriate for Port use and was not currently on Port property. This transaction was approved by the Project Manager.
We noted a shipping document from the former Supervisor’s County email account that listed items being sent to Jamaica. The tent appeared on the shipping document.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Receiver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sony 32&quot; TV</td>
<td>Dread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sony 32&quot; TV</td>
<td>Dread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tent (10x20)</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Box of Legal Paper (8 1/2X14)</td>
<td>Dread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Box of Standard Paper (8 1/2X11)</td>
<td>Dread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tent Brackets</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36&quot;X80&quot; Screen door</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stainless Steel Table/Cart</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Propane Tank</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Propane Tank</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Multa Circular Saw w/extra blades</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>42&quot; Lasko Tower Fan</td>
<td>Dread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>42&quot; Lasko Tower Fan</td>
<td>Dread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>42&quot; Lasko Tower Fan</td>
<td>Dread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>42&quot; Lasko Tower Fan</td>
<td>Dread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Aluminium sheets (3 pieces in package)</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Roll of Fiberglass Screening</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Storage Containers with lids (6 in Box)</td>
<td>Dread</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

During our interview with the former Supervisor, he admitted that he shipped the 10’ x 20’ canopy tent to Jamaica and agreed to reimburse the County for the costs. We were informed by some Port staff that it was common knowledge that he shipped items to Jamaica. Because of the lack of adequate procedures and controls, additional items could have been shipped to Jamaica or otherwise misappropriated without detection.

We further identified 12 invoices from Company 20, a company purportedly owned by the former Supervisor, that were electronically stored on his County computer. Inspection of the invoices showed his home address as the Company 20 business address and the customer’s information lists Kingston, Jamaica. We found no listing for Company 20 on the State of Florida Division of Corporations website.

During interviews with Port staff, some employees stated that the former Supervisor frequently requested that they purchase items for him and they also alleged that he participated in a retail business in Jamaica.
We reviewed Company 20, and compared them to selected Port employees’ P-Card purchases. While we found similar items on Company 20, we were unable to confirm the items listed on Company 20 invoices were purchased with County P-Cards. Also, we did not identify any P-Card purchases by Port Public Works employees from Company 20 during the audit period.

B. On two separate occasions, Former Storekeeper 1 (Rajindra Lallharry) purchased personal items for family members using a County issued P-Card in violation of County’s P-Card Program. The County has a zero-tolerance policy for personal purchases using a P-Card. Personal items purchased included, cellphone case, cellphone screen protector and tool set. See Appendix K for additional detail.

We noted an email where a family member (Daughter) requested the purchase of a cell phone case, providing three options:
i. An inspection of the Employee’s P-Card purchases showed that the Employee purchased two of the three items listed in his daughter’s request.
ii. We noted another email where a family member (Son 2) sent an email with a subject line stating, “Fellowes 49107 100-Piece Super Tool Kit – Newegg.com”. An inspection of the employee’s P-Card purchases showed that the employee purchased the item listed in his son’s request the next day.

![Image of email and invoice]

_Bracketed text in invoice images is redacted._

_C. We also noted an additional 10 P-Card purchases totaling $1,910 for which a valid business purpose could not be readily identified. Purchases identified include medical equipment (such as blood pressure cuffs, stethoscopes, and other non-first-aid related items), garment bags, headphones, knives, and other seemingly personal use items. The following images show three invoices totaling $367 for purchases of medical equipment that for which a business purpose was not identified._
Examples of Three Invoices Purchased for Medical Equipment

The transactions were reviewed and approved by several P-Card Approvers. P-Card Approvers are responsible to determine whether the purchases are for valid County business purposes.
The use of County issued P-Card for personal purchases is strictly prohibited by County Policy. Broward County Purchasing Card Policies and Procedures Program Manual, Section 10 (a-b) states:

“Personal use of the P-Card is not tolerated. All purchases made using the P-Card must be for official County business. Misuse of the P-Card may result in revocation of the P-Card, disciplinary action, termination, and possible filing of criminal charges.”

Personal use of P-Cards is a violation of County Policy and is a misuse of County funds. The Port has already terminated employment of Rajindra Lallharry.

Section B.2 of the Procurement Card Program Manual prohibits the cardholder from using the Procurement Card for any personal use. The manual also restricts the purchase of items that do not meet a County business need. Failure to ensure purchased items were for a legitimate County purpose resulted in the misappropriation of funds.

Because of grossly inadequate procedures and controls, we cannot provide reasonable assurance that we have identified all instances of personal use of P-Card.

**Recommendation 10**

We recommend management:

A. Consider revocation of the P-Card, disciplinary action, termination, and possible filing of criminal charges, if the P-Card is used for non-business-related purpose.

B. Take steps to recover misappropriated funds.

C. Implement procedures to ensure that P-Card purchases support a legitimate County business purpose.

D. Retrain P-Card Approvers to properly review P-Card documentation for accuracy, completeness, and validity of County business purpose.
Management’s Response

A. **Management concurs.** A number of P-Cards for Port Everglades Department employees, including employees covered by the Audit Report, were revoked in July and August 2018, consistent with County P-Card Policy. The Port Everglades Department will continue to follow County P-Card Policy in this regard.

B. **Management concurs.** The Port Everglades Department will work with the County Attorney’s Office to recover any misappropriated funds if possible.

C. **Management concurs and has implemented.** As described in Management’s Response to Recommendation #2, the checks-and-balances procedure has multiple personnel reviewing every request of purchases to help ensure that materials purchased are used for proper pre-approved business purposes (see Attachment 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9).

D. **Management concurs.** All Port Everglades Department P-Card Approvers completed the mandatory County P-Card training in April/May 2019 and will continue to be required to do so as needed (see Attachment 7).

11. **One Storekeeper Solicited the Purchase of Personal Items by Vendors and Accepted Rebates and Gifts.**

Former Storekeeper 1 (Rajindra Lallharry) solicited Vendors to purchase personal items on his behalf and accepted rebates and gifts. During our audit, we noted the following:

A. Former Storekeeper 1 solicited two vendors Company 21 and Company 22, to purchase personal items for him which were invoiced to the County by the vendor and subsequently paid by the County. Items solicited from the vendor included luggage, sandals, personal sexual and grooming products, vitamins, and makeup. See Appendices H and I for additional detail.
B. We noted a purchase by the former Storekeeper from Company 23 on April 29, 2016 where the line item identifies “FREE GIFT AMAZON GIFT CARD $200. Upon contacting the vendor, we confirmed that a $200 Amazon gift was mailed to Former Storekeeper 1. Additionally, through an interview conducted by our Office with a Port employee, the Port Employee, confirmed that Former Storekeeper 1 used his P-Card to purchase from Company 23 to get the $200 Amazon gift card. We were unable to determine how the gift card was handled, once received.

Amazon gift card mailed to Former Storekeeper 1
C. Former Storekeeper 1 received a substantial discount in the amount of $4,700 (70%) on a personal purchase from a Port vendor, Company 24. Review of the Former Storekeeper 1 County emails revealed that this was a purchase to provide furniture and tent rental services for his immediate family member’s wedding. See Appendix J for additional detail.

Vendor invoices showing unusually high discount
Former Storekeeper 1 had significant business relationships with the vendors in question; as shown in Figure 24, which shows the volume of business Former Storekeeper 1 performed with each vendor.
Figure 24
Percentage Business Volume for Each Vendor by Former Storekeeper 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Purchases by Public Works Employees</th>
<th>Purchases by Former Storekeeper 1</th>
<th>Percentage of Purchases by Former Storekeeper 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company 21</td>
<td>$460,280</td>
<td>$177,416</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 22</td>
<td>$128,699</td>
<td>$93,322</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 23</td>
<td>$70,486</td>
<td>$47,091</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 24</td>
<td>$1,910</td>
<td>$1,910</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from AMS and PeopleSoft

Section 112.313(2) of the Florida Statute states:

“No public officer, employee of an agency, local government attorney, or candidate for nomination or election shall solicit or accept anything of value to the recipient, including a gift, loan, reward, promise of future employment, favor, or service, based upon any understanding that the vote, official action, or judgment of the public officer, employee, local government attorney, or candidate would be influenced thereby.”

Accepting items of value as a public officer is a violation of state law and increases the appearance of improprieties in the procurement process. The Port has terminated the employment of the storekeeper. Management should re-train employees that gifts, incentives, or misuse of position will not be tolerated by Port management.

**Recommendation 11**

We recommend management:

A. Periodically train employees and contractors on State and County Policies on accepting gifts and other benefits.

B. Facilitate the monitoring and reporting of suspected violations of County Policy on accepting gifts and other benefits.
Management’s Response

A. Management concurs in part and has implemented in part. County employees are already made aware of and trained on the County employee gift acceptance policy. The topic of gifts is addressed in OnBoard Broward for all new employees. Each year all benefit eligible employees when signing up for benefits during open enrollment are again advised of the County’s policies, including the County’s Gift policy, through their acknowledgement of the County’s ABC’s (About Broward County). Furthermore, every other year, County employees must complete mandatory training of Employment Issues which covers the handling of gifts. This topic is also covered in the County’s Positive Start and FastForward trainings for Supervisors and Managers.

Management believes the issue raised in the Audit Report was not the result of forgetfulness or a lack of awareness or knowledge that led the employee to engage in these actions of misconduct, but willful non-compliance on behalf of certain employees. It is important to note, as indicated in the Audit Report, that the employee involved in these actions was terminated from County employment. Management further believes the act of prosecution of offenders will provide additional deterrence for those employees who lack the integrity the County expects from them and are in a position to engage in this type of misconduct.

B. Same as A.

12. P-Card Transactions for One P-Card Holder Were Reviewed or Approved by a Family Member Creating Potential Conflicts of Interest.

We noted 30 invoices for P-Card transactions totaling $13,064 for one P-Card Holder (Refrigeration Mechanic 1) that were stamped reviewed by the cardholder’s uncle, a Supervisor (Skilled Trades Supervisor 1) at the Port, creating a potential conflict of interest. While the Supervisor did not approve his nephew’s transactions in the Accounting System, we were informed that because of the Supervisor’s expertise in the heating, ventilation, and air condition (HVAC) area, he was required to review HVAC invoices, and the P-Card Approver relied on his review to authorize P-Card transactions in the Accounting System.

According to the Broward County Employee Code of Ethics, employees should avoid the appearance, perception or reality of a conflict of interest. Further, the Code of Ethics requires employees to apply the prudent observer test by asking themselves:

“Would a prudent outside observer think that an employee was influenced in official actions by some offer or expectation of personal gain?”
Would the situation reflect poorly on the employee or the County if it became publicly known?”

If the ‘prudent observer’ response is likely to be 'yes' or even 'possibly', the decision should be made to avoid the issue of conflict of interest from arising. In addition, Chapter 14 of the Broward County Administrative Code, Part XX, Section 14.251 requires:

“... Any conflict between personal interests and official responsibility is to be resolved by consciously avoiding possible conflicts or disclosing the basis of a possible conflict to a supervisor.”

Failure to avoid potential conflicts of interests increases the risk of inappropriate transactions, violates the County’s code of ethics and erodes the public’s trust. In addition, we noted the following:

- Both the P-Card Holder and the Supervisor operate private HVAC businesses, and neither the employee nor the Supervisor completed the outside employment forms or obtain the required approval. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 30.

- Both the uncle and nephew were involved in splitting P-Card transactions to avoid transaction limits. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 13.

Recommendation 12

We recommend management:

A. Ensure that P-Card reviewers and approvers are precluded from reviewing and approving transactions for relatives.

B. Ensure appropriate procedures are implemented to identify, disclose and mitigate potential conflicts of interest.

Management’s Response

A. Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department will work with the Human Resources Division to implement procedures to identify any potential conflicts in this regard.

B. Same as A.
Lack of Control over P-Card Processes

Opportunity for Improvements No. 13 through 19 focus on the absence of preventative, mitigating or detective controls that were either not in place or were circumvented by employees. Failure to implement and maintain procurement controls, resulted in the misuse of P-Cards and the loss of County assets.


We noted 186 transactions totaling $360,645 that appeared to be ‘split’ across multiple purchases to circumvent the purchasing limits established in the Procurement Code. These transactions were split by either the same or multiple employees making purchases to the same company on the same day or over several days. In addition, we did not find any evidence that the P-Card Approvers questioned these transactions during the P-Card transaction approval process. Figure 25 shows the number and dollar value of split transactions by employee title. Figure 26 shows the details of three examples of splitting transactions. The actual invoices for these examples are included in Appendix N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Employee Job Title Per Appendix B</th>
<th># of P-Card Transactions of Splitting</th>
<th>$ of P-Card Transactions of Splitting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Electrician 1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$92,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Former Storekeeper 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$39,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Storekeeper 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$32,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Storekeeper 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$25,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vehicle Mechanic 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$24,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Construction Project Manager 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$20,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$16,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$13,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Warehouse Supervisor 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$10,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maintenance Worker 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$8,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Former Carpenter 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$8,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Refrigeration Mechanic 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$7,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Former Plumber 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$7,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Former Plumber 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$7,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Former Plumber 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$6,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Former Plumber 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Employee Job Title Per Appendix B</td>
<td># of P-Card Transactions of Splitting</td>
<td>$ of P-Card Transactions of Splitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Maintenance Mechanic 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Former Special Skills Supervisor 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Program Project Coordinator 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Former Maintenance Worker 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Former Maintenance Mechanic 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Former Carpenter 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Former PE Building Service Worker 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Maintenance Worker 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Former Maintenance Worker 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Welder 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28 Employees</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 360,645</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with Information obtained from AMS and PeopleSoft P-Card transactions*

**Figure 26**
Details of Three Split Transactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example #</th>
<th>Employee Position</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Transaction Dates</th>
<th>Transaction Amounts</th>
<th>Splitting Scenario</th>
<th>Invoices Appendix #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Electrician 1</td>
<td>Company 30</td>
<td>4/4/2017</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td>Five transactions with the same items, quantities and dollar amounts purchased by one electrician from the same company within a month. The employee later admitted that he split the transactions to remain within P-Card limits.</td>
<td>Appx. N-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/7/2017</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/17/2017</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/20/2017</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/25/2017</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 1</td>
<td>Company 31</td>
<td>1/5/2016</td>
<td>$2,985</td>
<td>Two transactions with the same services and dollar amounts purchased by two Port employees from</td>
<td>Appx. N-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example #</td>
<td>Employee Position</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Transaction Dates</td>
<td>Transaction Amounts</td>
<td>Splitting Scenario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Construction Project Manager 1</td>
<td>Company 10</td>
<td>1/14/2016</td>
<td>$2,985</td>
<td>the same company within 10 days. The company owner later admitted that he was requested by Port employees to split transactions to remain within the P-Card limits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1</td>
<td>Company 10</td>
<td>2/7/2017</td>
<td>$1,985</td>
<td>Two transactions with the same items, quantities and dollar amounts purchased by two Port employees from the same company on the same date.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Refrigeration Mechanic 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/7/2017</td>
<td>$1,985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with information obtained from AMS and PeopleSoft P-Card transactions and interviews with related employees and companies
The following images show excerpts of two invoices for the transactions detailed in Example #3 of Figure 26. These two transactions are purchases for the same items, quantities and dollar amounts, purchased by two different Port employees from the same company on the same date. The company owner later stated that he was requested by the Port employees to split the purchase to remain within the P-Card limits.

During our interviews, selected Port employees acknowledged that they intentionally split transactions to bypass P-Card limits. The practice of splitting P-Card transactions was commonplace to circumvent the requisition process (i.e., the requirement to obtain bids for purchases exceeding $3,500). A vendor interviewed also acknowledged that Port employees made requests to split transactions to make the purchases appear to be within the P-Card limit.
Splitting is prohibited by Section B.2.h. of the P-Card purchasing manual, which states the following:

“Splitting of purchases to circumvent the $3,500 single transaction limit is prohibited and will result in immediate revocation of the card.

A purchase may be made of multiple items, but the total charge cannot exceed $3,500 including shipping, handling and any other charges related to the transaction.

Known purchases over $3,500 must be made using other competitive procurement methods, unless provided approval by the Director of Purchasing to increase the P-Card threshold to allow for completion of the P-Card purchase.”

Failure to establish adequate procedures to prevent or detect the unauthorized practice of splitting transactions to circumvent P-Card transaction limits is a violation of P-Card Program, bypasses the competitive procurement process for larger dollar value purchases, and has contributed to the use of P-Cards for purchases at unreasonable prices.
**Recommendation 13**

**We recommend** management:

A. Take any appropriate disciplinary actions for all employees involved in splitting.

B. Ensure appropriate procedures are implemented for approvers to identify split transactions.

C. Work with the Purchasing Division to periodically perform analytics to prevent or detect the unauthorized practice of splitting transactions.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs.* The Port Everglades Department will review available information and work with the Human Resources Division to determine appropriate disciplinary action, if any.

B. *Management concurs and has implemented.* As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 2, Management has established the P-Card Audit team in the Accounting Division and that team uses computer analytics to identify potential split transactions. The team will address any issues with the P-Cardholder.

C. Same as B.

14. **Approximately $5 Million of Items Delivered to the Port Lacked Sufficient Evidence to Demonstrate the Items Were Received**

We could not determine whether over 7,000 P-Card purchases totaling approximately $5 million for items purportedly delivered to the Port were received. While it is possible that the items were received, the items could have been misappropriated without detection. Excluding items purchased over the counter, items purchased using P-Cards were not centrally received by Port Central Storeroom. Instead, such items were delivered to various Port locations.

During the audit, we noted that management has not implemented procedures to verify receipt of items delivered to the Port. The Purchasing Card Program Manual requires that the P-Card holder receive and inspect all ordered items and services or be advised in writing by the person receiving the goods. It also requires P-Card Approvers to verify items purchased were received by the County and are for valid business use.

Failure to confirm receipt of items purchased by P-Card allowed inappropriate purchases to be charged to the County, as demonstrated throughout this report. Inadequate control over the
purchase, recording and tracking of P-Card purchases resulted in the misuse of P-Cards and the loss of County assets.

**Recommendation 14**

**We recommend** management:

A. Implement procedures to ensure that parts, equipment, supplies or services purchased are received, verified and tracked in an inventory and work order systems.

B. Ensure parts and supplies purchased by storeroom staff are received and independently verified by another Port staff member.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs and has implemented.* As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 7A, effective August 2019, for all Port Facilities Maintenance and Public Works Operations purchases, a formalized procedure has been developed that requires all deliveries to be made to the Port Everglades Central Storeroom located at Building 68. Storekeepers are the primary end user of purchasing procedures and when orders are placed, they are scheduled for delivery directly to the Central Storeroom. Upon delivery, the products are reviewed for consistency with the order and entered into an Excel inventory database. Pallets of items are broken down to verify quantities and confirmation that they match the original Purchase Order and packing list. Materials that are picked up directly from a vendor must be approved by the Port Warehouse Supervisor in advance and are to be brought directly to the Central Storeroom where they are entered into the Excel inventory database. All discrepancies of delivered orders are to be reconciled within 24 hours of delivery and adjustments to billing totals are addressed at that time.

Currently, Port Facilities Maintenance Staff are utilizing a paper work order system created in August 2018, where items needed to complete the work order are managed (see Attachment 8). Actions to implement the Asset Works, Asset Inventory Management (AiM) software package, which is the County’s standardized digital maintenance management software, started in June 2017 (see Attachment 10), and is currently underway with roll out at the Port expected in December 2019 with full implementation in mid-2020. This system will computerize the work order and inventory tracking and management and will fully integrate these functions.
B. Management concurs and has implemented. To address deficiencies in the process, the Port Everglades Department has implemented storeroom and inventory procedures (Attachment 9) and P-Card use and internal controls (Attachment 1 and 2).

15. P-Card Purchases of Sampled Non-Consumable Items Could Not be Located on Port Property.

During our audit, we attempted to verify the existence of a sample of 568 non-consumable items totaling $168,996 at the Port. We observed 124 similar items at the Port and only verified three items to the original invoices. This is because the majority of invoices do not contain specific and sufficient identifying information and the Port does not have an inventory and work order system to track whether the purchases has been received and used. Specifically, we noted the following concerns:

A. We judgmentally selected 568 items of non-consumable items purchases during our audit period, including air conditioners, refrigerators, generators, microwaves, vacuums, tents, and tables totaling $168,996, to determine whether we could verify existence of these items at the Port. We observed 124 similar items on Port properties. However, out of 124 items observed, we can only verify three items totaling $3,737 to the original invoices, as the majority of invoices do not contain specific and sufficient identifying information (such as brand name, model number, serial number and equipment dimensions, etc.). Figure 27 shows the quantity and dollar amounts of non-consumable supplies and equipment sampled, the numbers of items observed and confirmed on Port property.
Figure 27
Non-Consumable Supplies and Equipment Sampled, Observed and Confirmed by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-Card Purchases by Category</th>
<th>Items Sampled</th>
<th>Similar Items Observed at the Port</th>
<th>Items Confirmed to Invoice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Quantity</td>
<td>Total Amts.</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioners</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$ 70,535</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerators</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17,480</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generators</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21,248</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microwaves</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuums</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12,477</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tents</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10,685</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>34,291</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>$168,996</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with Information Obtained from AMS and PeopleSafe and verification from Port staff
Images below show two examples of invoices that did not provide specific identifiable information such as brand name, serial and model numbers.

**Sampled Invoice #1 – Generator**

**Sampled Invoice #2 – Microwave**
We recognized that the useful lives for some items sampled are less than five years. Of the 568 non-consumable items sampled for these five years, 275 items totaling $83,861 were purchased for the two-year period ended July 2018. Of the 275 items, we observed 45 similar items at the Port, but we were able to verify only one unit totaling $2,127 by comparing to its original invoice. As noted previously, the invoices do not contain specific and sufficient identifying information (such as brand name, model number, serial number and equipment dimensions, etc.).

B. We further noted that 416 of 568 items sampled, totaling $89,779, were purchased from five companies associated with Former Storekeeper 1 who pled guilty to criminal complaint charged by the US Attorney. We observed 93 similar items at the Port. However, we could not reconcile the 93 items to the actual invoices, because the invoices did not contain specific and sufficient information.

**Figure 28**

Non-Consumable Supplies and Equipment Purchased from Five Companies Associated with Former Storekeeper 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-Card Purchases by Category</th>
<th>Items Sampled</th>
<th>Similar Items Observed</th>
<th>Items Confirmed to Invoice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Total Amts.</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$25,714</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerators</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13,491</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microwaves</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuums</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5,346</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tents</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>31,382</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>$89,779</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with Information Obtained from AMS and PeopleSoft and verification from Port staff*

The P-Card Program Manual requires the P-Card Holder to receive and inspect all ordered goods and services or be advised in writing by the person receiving the goods. In addition, the act of purchasing for a governmental body where the purchasing agent has a personal interest in the vendor, violates state law and erodes the public’s trust that fair and open competition is conducted.

During our audit period, the Port did not have receiving documents, a central storeroom or a work system to identify the receipt, issuance, use and location of items. The Port is expansive,
and it was difficult for Port personnel to locate the items requested. In addition, no procedures are evident to ensure transactions are at an arm's length and free of conflict. Items purchased using the County's P-Cards have been apparently misappropriated and P-Card transactions with apparent conflict of interest issues lead to P-Card abuse.

It is essential that Port management establish purchase and tracking controls over high risk items. This should include inventories of these types of items, with identified locations and periodic physical verification by independent personnel.

**Recommendation 15**

**We recommend** management:

A. Develop an internal property identification system to track non-consumable items of significant value.

B. Implement property identification tags for items such as generators, refrigerators, iPads, etc.

C. Establish procedures to require periodic physical verification of high-risk items by independent personnel.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs.* As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 14A above, the Port Everglades Department is in the process of transitioning from a paper work order system to an automated system (AiM). Once AiM is implemented, initially in December 2019 with full implementation in mid-2020, the AiM system can be configured to track non-consumable items of significant value.

B. *Management concurs.* The Port follows the equipment asset tagging guidelines of Section 1.7.6 of Broward County CAPP Volume 1, Chapter 11 (Capital Assets) for equipment assets (as defined) costing more than $1,000. Equipment items such as iPads are under this threshold and would not be considered a tagged capital asset for financial reporting purposes; however, pursuant to the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) “best practice” or control over items that are not capitalized, the Port agrees that items such as iPads are considered “controlled capital-type items” requiring special attention and agrees to establish policies and procedures to safeguard these items. Management will further review other GFOA best practices related to tracking inventory, including the tracking of assets that are included as parts within other larger assets.
C. Management concurs. Once the AiM system is operational, Port Finance intends to perform periodic test counts throughout the year to confirm the accuracy of the system data.

16. Over 960 P-Card Transactions Totaling Approximately $590,000 Were Approved Without Adequate Supporting Documents.

We noted 966 of 13,717 (7%) transactions totaling $589,565 were approved by P-Card Approvers without adequate supporting documentation. Supporting invoices were either not submitted to the Approvers, were unrelated to the transaction, were illegible, or lacked sufficient detail about items purchased. The approval of these items without adequate documentation indicate insufficient review by P-Card Approvers.
Example #1 - Supporting Receipt with Insufficient Detail of Items Purchased

The P-Card Program Manual requires P-Card Holders to keep complete and accurate records of P-Card purchases, including maintaining physical or electronic copies of receipts. It also requires P-Card Approvers to review the receipts and determine its valid business purpose. Failure to properly maintain, review and approve adequate supporting documentation of P-Card transactions resulted in inappropriate purchases and allowed fraudulent transactions to remain undetected.

Example #2 - Supporting Receipt with Insufficient Detail of Items Purchased
**Recommendation 16**

**We recommend** management ensure:

A. P-Card Holders comply with the Purchasing Card Program Manual by submitting detailed, complete and accurate vendor invoices or receipts.

B. P-Card Approvers are held accountable to perform adequate review and ensure required supporting documentation is included prior to approval of transactions.

C. Transactions lacking adequate support be disputed and referred to the P-Card Holder for follow-up and resolution before approval.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs and has implemented.* Since the implementation of the August 22, 2018 program, all invoices and receipts are scrutinized by more than one individual. Any shortcomings or inaccuracies are required to be corrected prior to approval by a P-Card Approver.

B. *Management concurs and has implemented.* As indicated in August 22, 2018 program, all supporting documentation and signatures must be in place in order for the P-Card Approver to move forward with approval. Any P-Card Approver not complying with this program will be held accountable.

C. *Management concurs and has implemented.* As indicated in August 22, 2018 program, it is the responsibility of the P-Card Holder to ensure that shortcomings, inaccuracies, and errors are cleared prior to an item being submitted to the P-Card Approver. The P-Card Approver must follow up with the P-Card Holder to resolve incomplete or inaccurate information.

17. **Port Employees Routinely Use Other Port Employees P-Cards to Make Purchases in Violation of County Policy.**

Port employees routinely used other employees’ P-Cards to exceed transaction limits even when such purchases were outside of the P-Card Holders line of business. We specifically noted the following:

A. We noted 141 transactions totaling $113,824 where the purchase was made by an employee other than the P-Card Holder. Seventy two of the 141 (51%) transactions totaling $50,695 were initiated by Former Storekeeper 1 (Rajindra Lallharry) but were paid for using P-Cards belonging to twelve other P-Card Holders.
During interviews with some of these employees, they confirmed that Former Storekeeper 1 kept their P-Card numbers on file and used them to make purchases when he reached his daily or monthly P-Card limit. In other discussions with Port employees...
and management, it was acknowledged that the sharing of P-Cards to make purchases was a common practice.

B. We noted over 135 P-Card transactions valued at approximately $76,000, that were made by employees for items which appear to be outside of their job duties. As shown in Figure 29, one P-Card Holder (Maintenance Worker 2) was never assigned to the Painting Section. However, we noted that he made a high volume of purchases for paints and painting supplies totaling $52,079. Another P-Card Holder (Former Building Service Worker 1) purchased tires and vehicle parts and supplies totaling $24,049, which was not consistent with her job duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-Card Holder Job Title</th>
<th>P-Card Purchases Outside Job Duties</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker 2</td>
<td>Paint and painting supplies</td>
<td>$52,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Building Service Worker 1</td>
<td>Tires and Vehicle Parts and Supplies</td>
<td>$24,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with Information Obtained from AMS and PeopleSoft

During interviews, Port staff indicated that some of these purchases were requested by Storekeepers when they reached their P-Card monthly limit, and other purchases were requested by Supervisors even though the items purchased were not consistent with P-Card Holder’s job responsibilities.

The P-Card Program Manual requires that P-Cards be used only by the employee whose name is embossed on the card. In addition, the Card Holder Agreement requires the P-Card Holder to acknowledge and sign that they will not allow another person to use their P-Card. Failure to follow this policy increases the risk of unauthorized transactions and reduces employee accountability for P-Card transactions. Similarly, requesting a fellow employee to place an order not needed by that employee should be strictly prohibited in order to maintain the accountability required by the P-Card Program.

It is essential that this practice be strictly prohibited. If an increase in an individual limit is needed, it can be requested and approved if deemed necessary by the Purchasing Director.
Recommendation 17

We recommend management:

A. Implement appropriate procedures to ensure P-Cards are only used for official County business by the employee whose name is on the card as required by County Policy.

B. Prohibit the practice of allowing P-Card Holders to request or direct other P-Card Holders to make purchases not directly related to assigned job responsibilities.

C. Revoke the P-Card and take disciplinary actions if violations occur.

Management’s Response

A. Management partially concurs and already implemented. As indicated in the Audit Report, the P-Card Program Manual requires that P-Cards be used only by the employee whose name is embossed on the P-Card. Again, this is not a situation where there is a lack of policy or procedure, but where certain employees have chosen to not comply with the policies. As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 10A, a number of P-Cards for Port Everglades Department employees, including employees covered by this Audit Report, were revoked in July and August 2018, consistent with County P-Card Policy.

Management believes that the prior poor Control Environment at Port Everglades led to the conditions of inappropriate use of P-Cards and that actions taken to date at Port Everglades and the Accounting Division create a stronger deterrent to this type of P-Card misuse.

B. Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department has already limited the number of P-Card users authorized to make purchases, and the intent is to limit P-Cards to Storekeepers and Supervisors for purchases.

C. Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department, in consultation with the P-Card Unit and the Human Resources Division, will take the appropriate administrative actions for any P-Card holders found violating the P-Card policies.

18. P-Card Transaction Dispute Procedures are not Consistently Followed Up to Ensure Timely Resolution and Refunds.

P-Card Holders do not consistently review vendor invoices to ensure billing accuracy and perform necessary follow-up to obtain credits and/or refunds due to the County. Some P-Card Holders interviewed stated that they did not believe this was their responsibility. We identified $2,086 in billing errors, which were not found by the P-Card Holders or Approvers during their review.
process. During our audit, we were able to request one refund and a check for $391 was issued to the County on December 6, 2018. We noted the following instances:

A. Vendor One – Company 1

The P-Card statement showed that $1,100 was double billed by Company 1 on November 4, 2014, and disputed by the County; however, Company 1 did not process the necessary credit.

In addition, Company 1 also charged the County’s P-Card $595 more than the invoiced amount and the overpayment amount was not refunded.

B. Vendor Two – Company 19

During our audit, we identified a refund amount due from a Company 19 since 2017. We contacted the vendor in November 2018, and a refund check was issued totaling $391 in December 2018.
According to Section F.7.c of the Broward County P-Card User Manual, the P-Card Holder must actively monitor their P-Card transactions in PeopleSoft to ensure that credits are issued for erroneous charges. Prior to PeopleSoft, the P-Card User Manual required Card Holders to perform monthly review of subsequent statements and perform follow-up to ensure that vendors process credits due to the County. Failure to perform required follow-up resulted in unissued credits and refunds going undetected.

**Recommendation 18**

**We recommend** management implement appropriate procedures to ensure disputed transactions are followed-up on to ensure timely resolution and obtain refunds or other credits due to the County.

**Management’s Response**

*Management concurs and has implemented.* The Audit report indicates P-Card holders and reviewers are not reviewing supporting documentation from vendors to ensure appropriate charges are incurred and seeking refunds/adjustments as appropriate. As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 2, Management has created a P-Card Audit unit in the Accounting Division that will collect all of the supporting charge documentation and review it to identify appropriateness of charges and opening issues with P-Card holders involved where concerns are identified.

**19. Master Agreements Were Not Consistently Used, Resulting in Waste of County Resources.**

Established and authorized procurement contracts (Master Agreements) negotiated to secure favorable pricing were not used, when available. Failure to purchase using a Master Agreement or Procurement Contract where one exists for the required commodity or service is a prohibited P-Card use. Some P-Card Holders interviewed stated that there was not an emphasis on price. Instead, they were told to spread the business around. Some P-Card Holders interviewed stated they would have no idea as to how to determine whether a Master Agreement existed. We noted the following specific concerns:

A. The County has Master Agreements with six vendors for electrical supplies. We noted one employee who had 106 transactions for electrical supplies on his P-Card totaling $88,305, which were not purchased from vendors on the Master Agreements. We compared the prices for selected electrical items on eleven invoices totaling $27,127 to
the prices in the County's Master Agreement and found that the County overpaid $5,012 (18%).

B. The County has a Master Agreement with Company 25 for standardized air filters. We compared the prices for four selected air filters from vendor, Company 10, and noted that the prices paid to Company 10 ranged from 271% to 678% of the unit price available in the County’s Master Agreement. **Figure 30** shows the price comparison for standard filters.

![Figure 30](image)

**Figure 30**
Price Comparison for Standard Filters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filter Size</th>
<th>Company 10 Unit Price (Calculated)</th>
<th>Master Agreement with Company 25</th>
<th>Company 10 Price vs. Master Agreement Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16X25X1</td>
<td>$6.48</td>
<td>$2.39</td>
<td>271%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16X16X1</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>678%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18X20X1</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>619%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20X20X1</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>656%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with Information Obtained from AMS and PeopleSoft*

Failure to purchase goods and services covered by a Master Agreement, where such an agreement exists, is a violation of the County’s procurement policy and often results in excessive amounts paid by the Port.

**Recommendation 19**

We recommend management implement appropriate procedures to ensure purchases are made using Master Agreements wherever one exists and establish Master Agreements where needed to cover frequent purchases.

**Management’s Response**

*Management concurs and has implemented.* As indicated in the storeroom and inventory procedures, the Port Everglades Department has directed staff to utilize existing Master Agreements first, consistent with existing County Policy. The Port Everglades Department already utilizes existing Master Agreements for reoccurring purchases through, but not limited to Grainger, Lehman Pipe and Plumbing Supply, Ferguson Enterprises, and Wool Plumbing Supply.
Background

Parts, Supplies, and Equipment Management

The Public Works Section maintains a general inventory storeroom to store parts, equipment, and supplies. There are four Storekeeper positions that manage the inventory.

Storekeepers purchase some parts, equipment and supplies for Port personnel. These items are usually purchased with a P-Card or through the use of a purchase requisition, depending on the dollar value of the items ordered. Items purchased by the Storekeeper are either picked up at the vendor’s location or shipped to the Port’s general inventory storeroom. Once parts are received, Storekeepers would store them in storerooms until they are ready for use.

Public Works employees were also allowed to purchase parts, equipment and supplies using individually assigned P-Cards. The majority of these items were picked up directly by the employee and were not formally received by the Storekeepers and not added to inventory. The items were taken directly to a worksite or stored in any of the twenty storeroom locations at the Port.

Fixed Assets

Items purchased with a value of $1,000, or more, are considered fixed assets and are required to be tracked, tagged and reported to the Port’s Finance Division for recording in the accounting system. As of September 30, 2018, the Port’s fixed assets were valued at approximately $168 million.

Inventory

County Policy requires that inventory amounts greater than $25,000 at year-end are recorded as assets on the County’s financial statements. It is the responsibility of each agency director to ensure that its inventory is properly recorded. Agencies must conduct an annual physical inventory of all significant materials and supplies. As of September 30, 2018, inventory at the Port was valued at approximately $2.7 million.
Obsolete, surplus or damaged items must be removed from inventory at least once a year, prior to taking and reporting the year-end inventory. The Port has a large supply of obsolete and unusable inventory located in two bays located in the FTZ and Storage Area 68.

**Work Order System**

According to Port management, a computer work order system (MP2 system) was used in the past to track the inventory purchased; assign tasks to employees; record inventory used, hours taken, tasks performed, and additional maintenance or inventory needed. However, this system was not consistently used, became unreliable, and has not been used for years. Consequently, no work order system exists that tracks work assigned, completed, materials used, or when maintenance is required.
INVENTORY

20. An Inventory Management System has not been Implemented to Record and Track the Purchase of Parts, Supplies and Equipment.

Management has not implemented an inventory management system to record and track parts and other supplies purchased by the Public Works Section. Inventory purchases made by Port personnel during the audit period were not adequately tracked, significantly increasing the Port’s risk of fraud, waste, and abuse.

During our interviews with Port staff, they stated that in past year a computer MP2 system was used to log in purchased inventory and log out inventory; however, this system was not maintained and has not been in use for many years. Currently, the inventory (parts and supplies) purchased by Port staff through their P-Cards, or otherwise, is not tracked and no new replacement system has been implemented. Additionally, there is no centralized receiving system at the Port: workers ordering supplies typically pick up their purchases from the supply houses, or have the purchases delivered to their individual storerooms (e.g., plumbing, electrical) where they were stored or used.

Due to the complete lack of an inventory management and tracking system, we do not know whether all the items purchased were actually received at the Port, nor which tasks the parts were used for, or where they might be stored in any of the multiple storeroom locations at the Port.

An inventory management system is the combination of automated and manual processes that monitor an organization’s stock of supplies, parts and equipment. Without an inventory management system, Port management is unable to identify the quantities and types of parts and supplies on hand, where they are located, ensure all purchases have been received, identify inventory needs, reconcile inventory counts, or detect lost or stolen items. The complete lack of a comprehensive inventory system for this type of operation represents gross mismanagement by Port management and has directly contributed to misappropriations of supplies and funds and allowed such activities to continue for years without detection.

This condition was included in a report issued by the consultant on August 22, 2017. The recommended timeframe for correction was immediate. However, Port management allowed
this condition to continue until after initiation of our audit during which we found the same deficiency condition. Had management taken immediate corrective actions as recommended by the consultant, corrective actions could have been implemented prior to our audit.

**Recommendation 20**

**We recommend** management:

A. Immediately implement an inventory management system.

B. Develop interim action plan to protect existing inventory from theft and ensure the integrity of future inventory purchases.

**Management’s Response**

A. **Management concurs and has implemented.** As of the date of this response, all inventory within the Port’s control within Port Public Works is being tracked in an Excel inventory database. This Excel database was developed through the consolidation of the storeroom function from the various maintenance trades at a variety of locations throughout the Port to the new Central Storeroom. Development of the database was done by Port Facilities Maintenance staff and validated by the Port’s Finance Division. Staff is in the process of acquiring the services of a consulting contractor to further validate the final inventory and prepare a datafile that is consistent with other county agencies and industry that will be used to import into the County’s Asset Management Software, AiM. The acquisition of this contractor is currently being competitively bid through the Purchasing Division. The target for initial implementation of AiM using the Excel inventory database is December 2019 with full implementation in mid-2020. Staff training for AiM usage on Ipads began on November 22, 2019.

B. **Management concurs and has implemented.** The recently completed Central Storeroom facility is located within a secure perimeter with limited and controlled public access. The facility is being equipped with monitored intrusion control and is currently under surveillance by monitored security cameras. Storeroom and inventory procedures are now in place to track items that are brought in and removed from inventory. Only Storekeeper personnel are permitted to remove items from inventory in a controlled environment where monitoring of the transactions occur.
21. Port Management did not Perform a Complete and Accurate Annual Inventory Count as Required by County Policy.

A. Prior to our audit, the Public Works Section had never performed a complete inventory of goods owned by Public Works Section and stored in the respective storerooms. These storerooms cover multiple locations throughout the Port and have thousands of dollars’ worth of inventory that has not been included in inventory counts.

During our audit we noted that from twenty storerooms, only three had ever had any inventory counts; the seventeen other storerooms appear to have been completely omitted from any annual inventory count. The omission of storerooms filled with parts and supplies from annual inventory counts is irresponsible and has resulted in incomplete information and valuation of assets in the Port’s annual financial statements.

In addition to the complete omission of several storerooms during the inventory process, it appears that appropriate practices were not followed in the storerooms that were part of the inventory process. For example, accounting controls stipulate that test counts of inventory should be performed for accuracy and reliability. Our audit of inventory records does not include any recordation of which parts were counted. Of the sections counted, the Port’s Finance Division, or contracted staff took the inventory amounts at face value and did not verify on a test basis the accuracy of the inventory amounts prior to 2018. If this test procedure had been properly performed, the Finance staff may have identified inconsistencies within the inventory count, lack of perpetual inventory system, obsolete inventory, as well as the vast amount of purchases being made by this Section.

Maintaining an inventory system that continually tracks purchases and use of equipment and supplies is important to prevent duplicative purchases and waste of items not used. The physical count validates what has been recorded in inventory during the year. Unless a complete physical count is taken, management might be unaware of damaged, missing or obsolete items. Additionally, it is easier for dishonest employees to commit inventory fraud if there are no physical counts.

Failure to perform an annual physical inventory of all storerooms, permit inventory shortages to go undetected, may understate the inventory records and is in violation of the Accounting policies and procedures.

B. Public Works staff performed inventory counts for the fendering, loading bridges and storerooms for fiscal year 2017 and the results were included in the Port’s financials. During our audit, we performed physical counts of maintenance storerooms in August 2018. We found many storerooms had significant inventory that was not accounted for
or included in the prior year’s inventory and financials. We suggested Port management perform a complete inventory count for the current year ended September 30, 2018; however, only a partial inventory count was conducted and revealed inventory in the following locations:

1) AC Shop storeroom 1  
2) AC Shop storeroom 2  
3) AC Shop 40’ container  
4) AC Shop 20’ container  
5) Electrical Shop storeroom 1  
6) Electrical Shop storeroom 2  
7) Electrical Shop storeroom 3  
8) Building 68/ Bay 1 - partial inventory (Did not include items > 5 yrs. old)  
9) Building 68/ Bay 2 - partial inventory (Did not include items > 5 yrs. old)  
10) North Yard laydown and six 40’ containers  
11) Garage Storage  
12) 20’ container near garage storage  
13) Plumbing Shop  
14) Container 1 – 40’ container near plumbing shop  
15) Container 2 – 40’ container near plumbing shop  
16) Terminal 18 (South) – two storerooms  
17) Line Handler’s shed – loading bridge cylinders  
18) FTZ storage – Bay B1  
19) FTZ storage – Bay B2  
20) Carpenter storeroom

Some inventory in these locations was counted and included in the Port’s financials on September 30, 2018.

Section 1.8, Chapter 10 of the County Administrative Policy and Procedures (CAPP) requires the Port to report and account for all significant inventories greater than $25,000. The Port is responsible for conducting annual physical inventory of all significant materials and supplies. A record of the physical inventory should be maintained and large variances between the inventory count and accounting records must be investigated. The
Port Director is responsible for ensuring policies and procedures are developed to account and value inventory. This policy should be submitted to the Accounting Division Director for approval.

From the images below, we noted the Public Works storerooms maintained in Mid and North Ports. The boxes shaded in yellow were included in the inventory count for fiscal year 2017. All of the other boxes showing storerooms containing Public Works inventory were excluded from the 2017 inventory count.
Lack of a complete inventory count by Public Works may have understated the value of the inventory and lead to inaccurate financial reporting. Because there was no inventory management system to track inventory, Port management was not aware of inventory that should be on hand or was already used, therefore, was not able to compare the physical count to a list or system of record. There is no accountability to ensure items purchased are received, needed and that inventory is not pilfered.

Failure to perform a complete and accurate inventory count may allow lost and stolen inventory to go undetected, violates County Policy, and may impact the Port’s financial statements.

Maintenance of a complete and effective inventory management system, together with a work order system, as discussed in Opportunity for Improvement No. 25, is a basic control for this type of operation. Failure to maintain such represents mismanagement and allows misappropriation of resource and waste to occur without detection.

This condition was included in a report issued by the consultants on August 22, 2017. The recommended timeframe for correction was immediate. However, Port management allowed this condition to continue until after initiation of our audit during which we found the same deficiency condition. Had management taken immediate corrective actions as recommended by the consultant, corrective actions could have been implemented prior to our audit.

**Recommendation 21**

We recommend management:

A. Perform a complete and accurate annual physical inventory counts as of the end of each fiscal year.

B. Require Port Finance staff to:
   a. Conduct test counts to ensure accuracy.
   b. Reconcile physical count to the perpetual inventory and investigate any discrepancies.
Management’s Response

A. **Management concurs in part.** Management concurs that an annual physical inventory count should be completed each fiscal year, but does not concur that such inventory counts did not occur. The Port annually conducts both a physical count of consumable inventory in accordance with Broward County Administrative Policy and Procedures (CAPP) Volume 1, Chapter 10 (Physical Count of Consumable Inventory), and a 100% physical inventory of tangible equipment assets which has been outsourced to an independent contractor since 2014. Up until 2018, however, this count only included the larger storerooms and did not include the smaller satellite locations within the shops. It is staff’s intent to continue conducting these annual inventories as required.

For FY2019, an inventory of tangible equipment assets was conducted by the Port’s vendor, OHC Advisors, Inc., the weeks of July 8th and 15th. The consumable inventory count for materials and supplies (warehouses), fenders, and loading bridge parts was conducted September 26th to 28th, and cranes and BSO inventories were conducted on September 30th.

B. See below:

a. **Management concurs and has completed.** Port Finance conducted test counts during the 2018 and 2019 consumables inventories and intends to continue this practice moving forward.

b. **Management concurs.** Once the AiM system is operational, Port Finance intends to perform periodic test counts throughout the year to confirm the accuracy of the system data.

22. The Port Operations Director Who is in Charge of the Public Works Section was not Aware of the Lack of Inventory or Work Order System.

During our audit, we found that the Port Public Works Section does not use an inventory system and many of the storerooms have never performed an inventory count. We also found that there was no work order system in place to track and determine the staffing and inventory needs depending on the jobs to be performed at the Port. These are basic controls necessary for this type of operation.

We interviewed the Port Operations Director, who is responsible for the Public Works Section and overall Port operations, he stated that he was not aware that staff was not using a work order system or did not have a perpetual inventory system, where all items are tracked and recorded when they are purchased and used. The Port Operations Director stated that he
thought the trade staff were using the work orders or a manual work order system, so he did not question how jobs were performed. He also stated that he thought the nine storerooms had a perpetual inventory and physical counts were performed annually.

This potential lack of knowledge and/or failure to ensure adequate systems were in place regarding the most basic and fundamental activities under his responsibility indicates a level of gross mismanagement of the Public Works Section. Further, the Port Operations Director either knew or should have known that no work order system or perpetual work order system was being used.

This lack of knowledge further indicates that the Port Operations Director never asked for results of inventory counts, or any data regarding work actually performed, supplies used, etc. Without such information, even the most basic management tasks cannot be performed.

Failure to perform management oversight and establish effective controls resulted in uncontrolled spending, misappropriation of resources, inefficient operations, and waste and abuse of County resources.

**Recommendation 22**

We recommend management take disciplinary action as appropriate and reassign responsibilities as needed.

**Management’s Response**

*Management concurs in part.* The Port Everglades Department initiated a reorganization of the Operations and Seaport Engineering and Construction Divisions through the FY18 Budget Process which was a result of a consultant study completed in August 2017. The transition of the maintenance skilled trades employees to a renamed Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance Division did not fully occur until January 2019 with the hiring of an additional Assistant Director for the Division to oversee this significant reorganization.

After more than 30 years of services, the Operations Division Director has submitted a letter indicating his retirement effective December 27, 2019, which was accepted by the Port Everglades Department.
23. Excess and Obsolete Parts and Supplies Inventory Items Have Accumulated and are not Periodically Transferred to Surplus.

During our audit, we performed a physical inventory count and noted many Public Works storerooms had a vast amount of excess, old, and obsolete inventory. Upon inquiry of Port personnel, they stated that a comprehensive surplus of items had not recently been performed. We conferred with the Purchasing Division that confirmed that the Port’s Public Work Section has not processed items for surplus since one loading bridge was added to surplus in 2015. The County Administrative Policy and Procedures (CAPP), Volume 11, Chapter 10, 1.8 F requires that obsolete, surplus or damaged items must be removed from inventory at least once a year prior to taking and reporting the September 30th year-end inventory.

As a result of our audit, Port management has taken action to identify obsolete items that have been segregated and filled two bays in the Foreign Trade Zone and portions of Building #68. As of July 1, 2019, Port completed over 400 Surplus Notification Forms listing a variety of items to be transferred to surplus. Management has not assigned a value to these surplus items and because of the lack of inventory system a value could not be determined by management. We visited the surplus locations and noted many items were in the unopen original packaging. Images below show surplus sites for the Public Works Section.
Surplus Items in Bay A1 of FTZ

Surplus Items in Bay B1 of FTZ
Failure to periodically surplus obsolete, unneeded or damaged items may affect the Port’s financial statements and is a violation of County Policy. This quantity of surplus items is indicative of mismanagement of inventory. If an inventory system was in place, the expenditure of public funds to purchase these excess or obsolete inventory could have been avoided.

It should be noted that the unneeded inventory issue was most likely exacerbated by the practice of some employees always ordering more items than actually needed. For example, during our interviews employees repeatedly stated that supervisors were instructing them to order three items even if they needed just one, etc. This practice has contributed to a waste of County resources.

**Recommendation 23**

We recommend management implement procedures to identify and process surplus items annually through implementation of an inventory management system recommended in **Opportunity for Improvement No. 20.**
Management’s Response

Management concurs. As part of the inventory process, surplus items have already been identified and consolidated in a single location and Port Everglades Department employees are processing them in accordance with County Policy. Once AiM system is operational, staff will be able to review on-hand inventory and materials on an annual basis, consistent with Chapter 7 of the Broward County Internal Control Handbook, Accounting, Payroll, & Tangible Property Procedures, Section III, Surplus Property. Consistent with this policy, items that are obsolete or beyond economical repair will be placed into surplus.

24. Twenty-One New Faucets Valued at $6,780 were Found Among Scrapped Items.

On Wednesday, July 11, 2018, we observed 14 new faucets that were discarded in a recycling drum in the Plumbing Section; some of the faucets were buried under old plumbing parts. A complete inspection of the recycling drum by Port Plumbing staff found seven additional new faucets that were also scrapped.

Twenty faucets were battery operated commonly used throughout the Port terminals, purchased by the County for approximately $6,600, and had a unit price of approximately $330. Some faucets appeared to have minor parts missing, while others appeared intact.

During the audit period, we found the County paid approximately $43,000 for 130 similar faucets purchased from three vendors at discounted average unit price of $330 each. Internet searches conducted by the auditors showed manufacturers list prices of approximately $700.

One of the discarded items was a 4-inch Center Lavatory Faucet typically used at the FTZ or non-terminal locations. During the audit period, we found the County paid approximately $1,080 for six similar faucets purchased from one vendor at a discounted average unit price of $180.
Due to terminations and retirements in the Plumbing Section, we were unable to question plumbing staff to determine whether the faucets were defective when received from the vendors or obtain explanations for failure to return them to the vendor since they should have been warrantied. We were also unable to determine whether they were disassembled or deliberately scrapped so that they could be classified as scrap for other inappropriate reasons.

A former Plumbing Supervisor attempted to return some of the faucets after they were discovered, and one vendor refused to issue credit or accept the defective item. Industry best practice requires that items are inspected upon receipt and immediately returned to the vendor if they are found to be incomplete or defective. Failure to immediately process return of defective items or use of expensive items for parts resulted in waste of County funds.

**Recommendation 24**

**We recommend** management ensure that items purchased are immediately inspected and returned to the vendor when found to be defective.

**Management’s Response**

*Management concurs.* As indicated outlined in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 7A, a new formalized procedure has been implemented for all Port Facilities Maintenance and Public Works Operations purchases which addresses the inspection and return of defective items within 24 hours of delivery.
25. A Work Order System has not Been Implemented to Track the Assignment of Parts and Supplies to Port’s Public Works Jobs.

The Public Works Section does not have a work order system in place to schedule, plan, manage and document labor, parts and supplies used to perform maintenance projects. As a result, there was no comprehensive record of the jobs performed by trades personnel, the number of labor hours, materials consumed, or identification of parts and supplies purchased with County P-Cards for each job. On August 8, 2018, we issued Advisory Memo 111 to Port management, which disclosed the following issues:

- management is unable to track the use of equipment and supplies on Port projects,
- management does not have a method to adequately track project cost, and the history of preventative maintenance for Port assets are not adequately maintained and scheduled, and
- management is not aware of whether items purchased are for a valid Port business purpose.

However, management did not immediately implement a complete manual work order system through our review as we recommended in our advisory memo, dated August 8, 2018. As a result, we issued a second advisory memo, dated January 24, 2019, in which we again recommended management to immediately implement a comprehensive system (see Appendix P). Although management provided documentation indicating some manual work orders were established, interviews with some relevant employees at the time indicated they still did not use work orders.

Failure to maintain a comprehensive work order system constitutes mismanagement of the work process and has allowed misappropriation of funds and resources to occur without detection over extended periods of time. To be effective, the work order system should be tied to inventory processes, and orders for noninventory parts and supplies should be supported by a work order, as applicable.

This condition was included in a report issued by a consultant on August 22, 2017. The recommended timeframe for correction was immediate. However, Port management allowed this condition to continue until after initiation of our audit during which we found the same deficiency condition. Had management taken immediate corrective actions as recommended by the consultant, corrective actions could have been implemented prior to our audit.
Recommendation 25

We recommend management:

A. Implement and maintain a work order system to track and document maintenance services provided at the Port.

B. Require supporting work orders when ordering parts or services and retain the work orders to establish accountability.

Management’s Response

A. Management concurs. Currently, paper work orders are being managed for the majority (approximately 90%) of all tasks that are assigned to trade personnel. As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 14 and other responses, the Port Everglades Department is implementing AiM Asset Management software which is scheduled to begin in December 2019. The AiM software will allow for better management of the work order process and allow for tracking of work orders as they are being processed. Parts or materials utilized for work orders are managed by counter release forms that tie the parts or materials to a specific work order number. With the implementation of AiM, work orders will be automated through the software which will create a centralized record that management will be able to review real time.

B. Same as A.

26. iPads and Accessories Purchased for Use With an Electronic Inventory and Work Order Systems Have not Been Fully Utilized.

In response to the report issued by a consultant on August 22, 2017, the Port purchased 122 tablets for use in transitioning staff to a new work order system. The report recommended the mobile technology to facilitate staff entering work-related tasks in readiness for implementation of the electronic work order and inventory system.

Our audit found that Port personnel purchased 122 iPads and assigned them to selected Port employees in March 2018; however, this system has not been implemented as of May 2019 and some iPad have been shelved during this period of time.

In addition to purchasing expensive equipment that has not been fully utilized, the Port has also been paying monthly equipment and data charges to T-Mobile for the iPads during the period February 2018 to May 2019 totaling $67,642.
As previously noted, the lack of a work order system has several negative impacts to Port operations. However, the purchase of equipment, which was not ready for use, as well as paying for services on such items, is a gross waste of public funds.

**Recommendation 26**

*We recommend* management ensure an implementation plan is in place prior to expending significant funds on system and devices.

**Management’s Response**

*Management concurs in part.* The Port Everglades Department had an implementation plan and began the acquisition of the iPads in November 2017 with the original intent of the roll out of AiM in early 2018 (see Attachment 10). Staff training on iPads began in March 2018. Unfortunately, with the delay in the implementation of AiM, the iPads were not utilized to its intended extent. With AiM being rolled out in December 2019, staff will be utilizing the iPads and accessories more fully.
27. The Port Failed to Take Actions on Recommendations for an Immediate Implementation of a Work Order and Inventory System as Recommended by Consultant in August 2017.

The Port engaged a consultant to perform an Organizational and Functional Operations study of the Port’s Public Works & Maintenance (Public Works) Section and Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance (SE&FM) Division. The report was issued on August 22, 2017. This study included a major recommendation to immediately implement inventory procedures to require all purchases of parts and supplies be made through the Public Works central warehouse and linkage of parts to specific work orders. Implementation of many of the consultant’s recommendations would have addressed some of the fundamental control deficiencies noted in our audit.

During the course of the audit, we noted the Port Operations Director who is responsible for the Public Works Section did not take immediate corrective action as recommended by the consultant. As a result, Public Works Section staff was able to continue out of control purchasing and may have led to misappropriation and pilfering of items purchased using the County’s P-Cards.

The consultant’s study included 27 recommendations designed to improve organization and operations in the Public Works Section and SE&FM Division. On May 6, 2019, we met with management to determine the status update on these recommendations and found that 18 recommendations were implemented and nine are partially implemented. Management has subsequently updated the status in August 2019, which is included in Appendix L.

Failure to immediately implement these recommendations caused the Port to continue to experience losses through the purchase of excessive inventory and payments for fraudulent transactions.

**Recommendation 27**

We recommend management develop a plan with specific goals and timeframes to implement recommendations within this report and the 2017 consultant report.
Management’s Response

*Management concurs in part.* The Port Everglades Department has been implementing the recommendations in the August 2017 consultant report since its completion. To date, 37 of the 58 tasks identified to address the 27 recommendations in the consultant report have been completed. Many of the remaining recommendations are tied to the implementation of AiM, which expected to be rolled out in December 2019. We also concur with implementation of those items contained within this report and will be separately developing an implementation plan and timeline for recommendations not already acted on.

28. **Conflicts of Interest Occurred as a Company Owned by a Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 at the Port Performed HVAC Services for Two Employees He Supervises, a Family Member of One Employee, and a Port Tenant.**

Copies of permits obtained from a search of public records showed that a company owned by the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 was paid approximately $12,900 to replace the HVAC units in the homes of two employees whom he supervised, plus the mother of one of the same employees. These transactions create a conflict of interest, as the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 is in a position of control over the employees. Specifically, the employee may feel pressured to use the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 services, or to pay the amounts charged, without question. Additionally, the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 did not complete the required Outside Employment Request Form and obtain the required approval for such activities.

The company owned by the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 also charged a Port FTZ tenant $400 for HVAC services. However, the work was not performed by the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1, but was instead performed by Former Maintenance Worker 1 whom he supervised. **Appendix M** of this report provides a copy of the invoice for these services. It is noted that Former Maintenance Worker 1 daily assignment at the Port included providing maintenance services to tenants in the FTZ; however, due to the lack of a work order system, we were unable to determine whether work was completed by the individual as part of his regular workday, on the County’s time, or using the County’s materials. However, we noted that the Former Maintenance Worker 1 performing the work was not approved for paid time off on that day.

We further noted that neither the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 nor Former Maintenance Worker 1 disclosed outside employment.
Section 112.311 (1) of the Florida Statutes, states:

“It is essential to the proper conduct and operation of government that public officials be independent and impartial, and that public office is not used for private gain other than the remuneration provided by law. The public interest, therefore, requires that the law protect against any conflict of interest and establish standards for the conduct of elected officials and government employees in situations where conflicts may exist.”

County Policy requires employees to complete an Outside Employment Request Form and obtain appropriate approval. The employee’s signature on the form certifies that:

- **“The proposed employment does not and will not interfere with the efficient performance of regular County duties and will not occur during regular or assigned working hours unless the annual or compensatory leave is used to cover the absence.”**

- **“The proposed employment is not and will not be with an organization that is subject to the regulation of or is doing business with, the Division or Office of the employee, except as expressly permitted by state law.”**

- **“The proposed employment does not and will not involve a conflict of interest or otherwise conflict with any responsibilities as a county employee.”**

- **“The proposed employment does not and will not involve the performance of any duty which should be performed as part of regular county employment...”**

According to the Broward County Employee Code of Ethics, employees should avoid the appearance, perception or reality of a conflict of interest. These conflicts of interest provide opportunities for collusive and inappropriate behavior and compromise the objectivity and independence of the supervisory function.

**Recommendation 28**

**We recommend** management consider appropriate disciplinary action against the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 and ensure that all employees complete disclosure forms related to outside employment to comply with the County’s Code of Ethics.
Management’s Response

*Management concurs.* The Port Everglades Department will work with the Human Resources Division to consider appropriate disciplinary action against the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1, consistent with County procedures and the provisions of the applicable collective bargaining agreement. In April 2019, all Port Department employees were required to complete and submit new Outside Employment Request Forms whether they were seeking outside employment or not.

29. Former and Current Port Employees did not Disclose Outside Employment and Obtain the Required Authorization Resulting in Inappropriate Activities and Conflict of Interest.

Eight of 38 (21%) Public Works Section employees reviewed did not complete the County’s Outside Employment Request Form, which is required of each employee to disclose and request permission to engage in such activities. However, we found evidence that all eight of the employees engaged in outside employment during the audit period. **Figure 31** shows the employee titles and their non-disclosed outside employment.

**Figure 31**
Employee Titles and Their Non-Disclosed Outside Employments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Title</th>
<th>Name of Outside Employer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Former Storekeeper 1 (Rajindra Lallharry) | Viravar LLC  
                                          | Vees Supply LLC  
                                          | Infinite Distributors  
                                          | Venturi Supplies  
                                          | S H Marketing |
| Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2    | Company 20                                     |
| Former Maintenance Worker 1           | Company 11                                     |
| Skilled Trades Supervisor 1           | Company 11                                     |
| Former Plumber 1                      | Company 26                                     |
| Former Plumber 2                      | Company 26                                     |
| Refrigeration Mechanic 1              | Company 27                                     |
| Former Plumber 5                      | Company 28                                     |

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with Information obtained from Port*

Five of the eight employees had a conflict of interest between their outside employment and inappropriate activities conducted at the Port as follows:
Former Storekeeper 1 (Rajindra Lallharry) completed the Outside Employment Request Form and stated that he was not engaged in outside employment. However, this information appeared to be incorrect, falsely stated, as the employee was engaged in outside employment activities. This appears to be an intentional act to obscure important information. This employee conducted inappropriate activities as discussed in Opportunity for Improvement No. 3.

Former Maintenance Worker 1 and the current Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 did not complete the Outside Employment Request Forms. However, the former Maintenance Worker performed HVAC services for a company owned by the supervisor, as discussed in Opportunity for Improvement No. 28.

Former Plumbers 1 and 2 did not complete the Outside Employment Request Forms. However, both Former Plumbers used County owned equipment to perform work for a company owned by the Former Plumber 1 for personal financial gain (see Section VII).

County Policy requires employees to complete an Outside Employment Request Form to disclose outside employment and obtain appropriate approval.

Failure to actively require this disclosure of outside employment activities resulted in ongoing conflicts of interest at the Port. If Port management had been aware of its employees’ activities, management could have taken action to reduce its risk of fraud. This includes limiting purchases from such entities, limiting activities allowed on Port property to Port tenants and employees, or non-approval of such employment and requiring the conflicted employees to cease outside activities and/or alter their employment.

**Recommendation 29**

We recommend management ensure that employees complete Outside Employment Request Forms and take disciplinary action as appropriate.
Management’s Response

Management concurs. All employees are required to comply with the County’s Outside Employment Policy including the completion of the appropriate forms. The Port Everglades Department revalidated forms for Public Works staff on August 6, 2018 (see Attachment 5) and all Port Everglades Department employees were again required to complete and submit new Outside Employment Request Forms whether they were seeking outside employment or not on April 17, 2019 (see Attachment 6). Any employees found to be in violation of the outside employment policy will be addressed consistent with the disciplinary action policy of the County and any applicable collective bargaining agreement.

30. One Port Employee Filed a Whistleblower Complaint with the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs and Professional Standards; However, an Investigative Report Was Never Issued.

One Port Employee (Skilled Trades Supervisor 2) stated that he filed a whistleblower complaint with the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs and Professional Standards (Professional Standards), which alleged that he was verbally threatened and harassed by his former Supervisor (Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 3) because he failed to do non-Port activities at his Supervisor’s house; however, an investigative report was never issued.

During our interview, the Employee stated that he filed a whistleblower complaint in 2007, when he was harassed by his Supervisor. We obtained a copy of the complaint in which the whistleblower stated the following:

- He filed the complaint because his Supervisor at that time had him go to his house to perform repairs and he felt that if he did not perform them it would reflect negatively on his performance evaluation.

- When he went to the Supervisor’s house, he examined the insulation, which had been installed on the air conditioner duct work and recognized it as the same type that he ordered for a repair job at the Port and noted that the material was missing. He knew the material was from the Port because it was the same material, he ordered from a supply company.

- He returned to the Supervisor’s house later in the year to perform more repairs, and he observed four portable air conditioning compressors in his home. He told the Supervisor that they were the property of the Port, took the units, and returned them to the Port.
The Employee also told us during our interview that Professional Standards never issued a report on their investigation of this complaint. He stated that he received a call from Professional Standards approximately two years after he filed his complaint stating that the person handling the investigation was no longer with the County and asking whether or not he wants them to investigate the complaint. The Employee communicates to them that he was very upset that they took so long to look into his complaint, and it did him no good now.

The Employee stated that the Supervisor found out that he filed a whistleblower complaint, and in retaliatory action, he was “black-listed” from overtime for 10 years. He stated that the only occasions he was assigned to overtime was in an emergency, and after his Supervisor retired in 2016.

In the Port Public Works Section, the Supervisors are responsible for allocating overtime to employees. We reviewed Public Works Section payroll records for the past six years and noted that the Employee received significantly more overtime since 2016. However, we could not determine the reason for the increase for overtime in the last two years. We also reviewed other Public Works employees and noted that many received significantly more overtime than the Employee that complained. Figure 32 shows the Employee’s overtime in the past six years.

![Figure 32](Whistleblower’s Overtime for the Past Six Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whistleblower O/T</td>
<td>$17,877</td>
<td>$7,175</td>
<td>$3,615</td>
<td>$2,379</td>
<td>$1,953</td>
<td>$4,156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with Information obtained from payroll records*

Additionally, we were also informed by a Former Property Manager, that he went to Professional Standards to file a whistleblower complaint in 2018 to report potential irregularities with a lease at the FTZ. Professional Standards made him fill out a Financial Disclosure form and not a whistleblower form, which he believed did not provide the same legal protections. He also followed up to determine when an investigation would be conducted and was told that they would not get to it for at least one year.

Failure to follow-up on whistleblower complaints in a timely manner may result in the ongoing perpetration of fraud or other inappropriate activities by employees. Failure to act accordingly discourages employees from future reporting. Additionally, failure to properly protect the identity of whistleblowers may result in retaliation against the employees and does not protect the employees in accordance with the State and Federal Law. Failure to conduct appropriate due diligence to protect employees may also result in litigation against the County.
During our audit, Professional Standards received financial-related complaints, which they referred to our office for investigation. We commend Professional Standards for referring these allegations to our Office for an independent audit with appropriate expertise.

**Recommendation 30**

**We recommend** management:

A. Require Professional Standards to implement policies and procedures in order to timely investigate and respond to whistleblower complaints in writing.

B. Require Professional Standards to coordinate with and disclose to the Office of the County Auditor instances of fraud, abuse and waste for appropriate audit and follow-up.

C. Review and update whistleblower complaint review procedures to ensure adequate processes are in place to investigate claims and protect complainants against retaliation.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs in part.* Management agrees that policies and procedures to timely investigate and respond to whistleblower complaints in writing need to be in place and has such policies in place. Notwithstanding, Management will review its current policies and procedures regarding whistleblower complaints to see if they can be strengthened and update as needed.

In the Audit Report, two instances were raised regarding the timely response to Whistleblower complaints. The first instance was a complaint that was initiated over 12 years ago and subsequently withdrawn by the complainant for lack of action. Due to the length of time (over 12 years) since the complaint, Management was unable to locate any documents to support or refute this contention. The other instance was a complaint received from the former Port Property Manager which was received and forwarded to the County Auditor’s Office to review as a part of this Audit.

B. *Management concurs.* As indicated in the Audit Report, Professional Standards has referred financial-related complaints to the Auditor’s Office and will continue to do so when appropriate. Again, this instant matter is a good example of how the system works properly as this matter was turned over to the County Auditor’s Office by Port Management and County Administration because of the allegations of potential fraud.

C. *Management concurs.* Processes currently exist to investigate whistleblower claims and protect complainants against retaliation. Notwithstanding, Management will
review its current processes regarding whistleblower and retaliation complaints to see if they can be strengthened and update as needed.

31. Port Human Resource Officer is not Independent of Port Management

The Human Resources Officer at Port Everglades acts as a direct employee of the Port and not as an independent employee of Human Resources Division. The County’s Human Resources Division (HRD) provides human resource management services directly to many County agencies; however, a few entities instead directly hire Human Resource Officer (HRO) positions that report to their individual agency directors. This practice circumvents the concept and rationale for a centralized human resource function within the County and potentially creates a conflict of interest for the employee.

The Port HRO has been employed directly by the Port for five years. In interviews with our Office, the Employee stated she has a dual reporting structure, to both the Port and HRD; however, she also stated, “My position is funded by the Port, so I’m a part of management.” During our discussions, the HRO referred to the Director of HRD as ‘my boss downtown’ yet acknowledged that the Port Acting Director “signs off on all human resources related documents at the Port.” These circumstances demonstrate a potential conflict of interest to both the County’s interests and the HRO (all HRO positions). She also stated that she considers herself as a part of Port senior management.

The primary intent of any centralized office is to ensure policies and procedures are developed by individuals who are specialists and experts in their field; to ensure consistency in the application of procedures agency-wide by individuals who are trained by, and report to the single expert agency; and, that the centralized agency is responsible for managing their procedures and their employees’ actions. By creating ‘outsourced’ HRO positions, these primary objectives are circumvented, potentially creating situations where employees in certain County divisions may be treated somewhat differently than those of another agency. All personnel actions should be the ultimate responsibility of the HRD Director, not agency Directors based on their expertise in other fields. Further, with ‘dual reporting’ practices in place, the HRO may be subject to conflicting directives from HRD and their funding agency, creating a dilemma in determining the appropriate course of actions.

Additionally, employees at the work locations sometime consult this position with management personnel concerns. It is important that this position be independent of agency management in dealing with these concerns.
Considering the significant staffing issues that have occurred at the Port along with the misappropriation of resources, it is important that an independent Human Resources Officer deals with Port human resources issues.

It is the best practice across many fields that assignments or caseloads are periodically rotated across managing employees. The goal of rotating practices is to mitigate potential conflicts of interest or complacency, which may occur over time through familiarity, provide potential new perspectives to challenging situations, and potentially correct any oversight or errors which may have previously occurred. This exercise helps to ensure the ongoing objective provision of services organization-wide.

By directly employing its own HRO, the Port limits its ability to benefit from rotating assignment practices. By employing multiple human resource generalist positions, HRD has increased ability to interchange its staff assignments by primary assigned agencies, alphabetic assignments, employee classifications, etc.

**Recommendation 31**

We recommend management immediately rotate the Human Resources Officer at the Port and take action to ensure the independence and objectivity of human resource services across the County by:

A. Ensuring periodic rotation of human resource staff positions across agencies and establish sole responsibility to HRD.

B. Considering elimination of outsourced HRO positions.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs in part.* The Human Resources Officer (HRO) position was designed to provide dedicated human resources services to the County’s larger agencies, many of which have different and unique business needs. While the audit report expresses reasoning to rotate HR staff amongst different agencies, this is not a “best practice,” as stated in the report, for the field of HR nor supportive of why the position was created. HR staff are selected to both maintain Broward County standard HR practices and meet the needs of the agency(s) they serve. To best meet these needs, before placing an individual in that agency, HR Central assesses the HR professional’s past work experiences, education, etc. Once the HR staff is matched with the agency, they are able to provide added value by learning the priorities, culture, and staff of that agency. This knowledge of the agency’s business needs and information leads to enhanced recruiting, training, employee relations, conflict
resolutions, and relations with union representatives. A periodic rotation of human resources staff would be counter-productive and lead to disruption. Accordingly, Management does not concur with periodic rotation of human resources staff at the Port or across the County.

Notwithstanding, Management concurs that there may be other actions it can take to insure the independence and objectivity of human resource services to its agencies. To that end, Management will evaluate its options to ensure such independence and objectivity, which may include transferring the outsourced HRO and other HR positions to the central HR Division.

B. Same as A
32. Employees Should Not Store Personal Items on Port Property.

Our audit identified personal property, which had been stored on Port property by Port employees. Employees stored tables, tiles, and used appliances, including stoves, pumps and refrigerators, which were found intermingled with boxes of County records at the Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ). We also observed stored plumbing parts and supplies in a trailer. Specifically:

A. The Former Maintenance Worker 1 assigned to the FTZ, used Port property to store a variety of personal items. We visited Buildings A & B on the FTZ on August 6, 2018, and observed the employee’s personal items including tables, tiles, and used stoves, pumps, refrigerators, and bicycle, comingle with boxes of County records.
According to Section 3, Item No. 301, Use of Zone/Premises of the Broward County Foreign Trade Zone No. 25 Tariff #4, the FTZ may be only used for the purposes permitted in connection with merchandise (i.e., Domestic Status, Foreign Status and Forwarded) that has been lawfully brought into the Zone in accordance with the Act and CBP regulations, as amended.

B. The Former Plumber 1 purportedly used a trailer for storage of personal items. This trailer was found locked with no current Port staff having the keys or access to the contents. In interviews, plumbing staff reported that they were warned that the trailer contained items owned by the former Plumber.

On September 17, 2018, Port personnel received clearance, accessed the contents, and observed that the roof of the container had leaked, causing damage to the contents. The items retrieved from the trailer included:

   i. Damaged original packaging boxes containing 6" and 8" diamond blades, similar to blades purchased from Company 33,
   ii. Various size valves,
   iii. PVC and copper piping,
   iv. Plumbing repair kits,
   v. Various plumbing tools, and
   vi. Cleaning chemicals.
The former Plumber denied that he owned the contents. Management stated the equipment was not Port property; however, without an inventory system no one would know. We found similar containers in use throughout the Port as overflow storage and management was unable to identify the date these containers were brought onto the property or when the employee began using them, or if their use was for the Port or personal business. Failure to maintain a list of containers by location and to perform routine inspection and inventory of the contents could permit hazardous, illegal or other inappropriate use to go undetected.

During the audit, we also observed flyers, invoices, checks and other personal items for the former Plumber’s business on Port property.

**Recommendation 32**

We recommend management:

A. Specifically prohibit staff from storing personal items on Port property.

B. Ensure access to restricted areas, including the FTZ, are secured to prevent unauthorized use.

C. Ensure that all storage containers on Port property are properly controlled and secured.

D. Ensure that inventory counts include all storage areas.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs.*

B. *Management concurs in part.* In order to access the port restricted area, an individual must have a valid Port ID, and/or a Transportation Workers Identification Credential (TWIC), or be escorted by someone that has one or both of these. The FTZ is a restricted access area and has its own gate staffed with a guard. The instances referenced in the Audit Report were not related to access to restricted areas, but the unauthorized storing of personal items on Port property which is addressed in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 32A above.
C. *Management concurs.* Port Management has already completed a survey of all of the containers being used by the Port for storage. Storage containers on port property are properly controlled and secured.

D. *Management concurs.* Current inventory of all parts, supplies, and materials not presently found in the Central Storeroom are stored within a fenced compound adjacent to the Central Storeroom facility or lay down areas adjacent to the individual shops (i.e. Passenger loading bridge parts, plumbing/utility supplies, etc.). When the consultant contractor is brought on to prepare the final AiM inventory counts, these remaining storage areas will be fully implemented into the Excel inventory database. The current planned schedule for this contractor to begin work is February 2020 and full database implementation in mid-2020.
33. **The Current P-Card Approval Process is Inadequate to Ensure Follow-Up Action and Resolution for Disputed Transactions Are Properly Performed.**

P-Card transactions are imported into PeopleSoft from Wells Fargo Bank on a daily basis. Once received, the transactions are considered ‘staged’, the first of the three statuses available in PeopleSoft. The P-Card approval process then requires the P-Card Holder to review and ‘verify’ all transactions in PeopleSoft, attaching any supporting invoices and entering the appropriate charge codes. On occasion, the P-Card Holder may notice discrepancies in the amounts charged; however, as currently designed, the PeopleSoft does not have a mechanism to flag a ‘disputed’ charge, and regardless of the ‘disputed’ status of the charge, the current process still requires P-Card Holders to ‘verify’ the charge, which is then forwarded to the approver, who must ‘approve’ the amount within the PeopleSoft, regardless of its disputed status, by the 11th day of each month. The Accounting Division in turn pays Wells Fargo for all amounts billed and ‘approved’, including disputed transactions. If the P-Card Holder and/or Accounting staff continue any follow-up activities regarding the questionable charges, after the 11th of each month, a credit may later be processed to the Wells Fargo account, if and when issued by the vendor.

Each possible status for P-Card transactions in PeopleSoft is described in Figure 33:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATES COMPLETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGED</td>
<td>P-Card transaction appears in PeopleSoft after it is posted by Wells Fargo.</td>
<td>Various dates during the month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERIFIED</td>
<td>P-Card Holder reviews transaction, attaches invoice, and enters accounting charge code in PeopleSoft.</td>
<td>Any time after transaction postdate until the 4th of the subsequent month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Approver reviews the transaction invoice, accounting charge code, ensures that invoice excludes sales taxes, and applies approval.</td>
<td>Any time after the date transaction is verified in PeopleSoft until the 11th of the subsequent month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with Information obtained from P-Card Manual*

To facilitate timely and complete payments to Wells Fargo, the approval process mandates that all P-Card transactions, including disputed items, to be ‘approved’ by the 11th day of the subsequent month, regardless of its actual status, and the Accounting Division process payment to Wells Fargo on the 14th day of the month.
The current process requires the P-Card Holder to include a comment in PeopleSoft and does not allow for the disputed transaction to be separately tracked, coded or flagged for additional follow-up. There is no way for the P-Card Holder or the Approver to run a report or receive an automated reminder to ensure follow-up is completed on these charges. Instead, the process relies on the memory and motivation of the involved persons. According to Section F.7.c of the Broward County P-Card User Manual, the P-Card Holder must actively monitor their P-Card transactions in PeopleSoft to ensure that credits are issued for erroneous charges.

Failure to separately track and perform follow-up could result in disputed transactions not timely resolved by vendors and going undetected. Additionally, the practice of ‘verifying’ and ‘approving’ transactions which may be erroneous, is faulty in nature, and is counterintuitive to good business practices.

**Recommendation 33**

**We recommend** management work with the Finance & Administrative Services Department to:

A. Update the P-Card module of PeopleSoft to include a category/status for disputed charges.

B. Implement procedures requiring P-Card Holders to:
   - Immediately dispute the transaction with the vendor and notify the Bank and Accounting Division.
   - Perform follow-up with the vendor and the bank until the matter is resolved.

C. Require monthly reporting and follow-up of any disputed charges, ensuring resolution is complete, within 60 days, and accounts are credited for erroneous charges.

D. Ensure policies and procedures are appropriately updated and staff training is completed.
Management’s Response

A. Management concurs in part and has implemented new controls and procedures. As previously indicated in Management’s Responses to Recommendation Nos. 2 and 18, the newly established P-Card Audit team is using the existing data from the P-Card PeopleSoft module to flag transactions reported as disputed. The P-Card Audit team will monitor for transactions flagged as disputed for ultimate resolution. Further, the P-Card Audit team will update the County’s policies and procedures as appropriate.

B. Same as A.

C. Same as A.

D. Same as A.
Background

In calendar year 2018, Port Everglades had over 4,214 vessels coming in and out of harbor, carrying 3.9 million passengers and 7.4 million tons of cargo. Port Everglades facilitate numerous type services such as fueling, waste removal, cargo storage and transfer of goods.

The normal operation of marine vessels such as cruise, cargo container and military ships produces two types of wastewater:

- **Black/Grey Wastewater** - the waste produced and accumulated from showers, toilets, kitchen sinks and use of detergents.

- **Oily Bilge Wastewater** - the accumulation of contaminants from machinery and equipment such as:
  - Fuel
  - Lubricating oil
  - Engine coolant
  - Grease

Improper removal and disposal of black/grey and oily bilge wastewater can have adverse effects to the surrounding environment and sewer systems if not appropriately treated. As a result, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), allows marine vessels to treat and subsequently dispose of oily bilge wastewater into the certain parts of the ocean, as long as the concentration of oil is within specified standards. Vessels that are not able to meet this requirement are required to store the different types of wastewater until docked. Once a ship is docked at Port Everglades, the Port’s Harbormaster facilitates a transaction between the docked vessel and a wastewater hauler to appropriately remove any accumulated black/grey wastewater and oily bilge wastewater. Presently, there are three licensed wastewater hauler franchisees approved by the Board.

To further facilitate this transaction, Item no. 1036, Sanitary Wastewater removal from vessels of Port Everglades Tariff No. 12, effective October 1, 2006, allows wastewater haulers to dispose of such materials directly into the Port’s sewer system. Disposing into the Port’s sewer system
infrastructure can be done either through a sewer pumping station or directly into a street manhole.

Sewer pumping stations are closed systems specifically designed to accept only wastewater for which they are designed and built to do. As such, Port Everglades sewer pumping stations and other supporting infrastructure were built with the capacity dependent on domestic use from Port operations, i.e., gray/black waters only. Currently, the Port does not have a sewer receiving facility to accept wastewater from outside sources that may contain oils, cooking grease, etc. To receive such wastewater, the Port would need to perform a ‘pretreatment’ process such as installation of a grease trap. This equipment is not presently installed at the Port facilities.

Although the Port is not able to properly receive any type of wastewater from external sources, we noted that the tariff mentioned above does not require wastewater haulers to test the contents removed from marine vessels. Additionally, Port Everglades staff does not test or pretreat the wastewater from vessels prior to its direct disposal into the sewer system’s infrastructure. Therefore, all waters from marine vessels that are disposed of into sewer systems by the Port are untreated and untested. Consequently, it is unknown if oily bilge wastewaters were potentially improperly disposed of into the Port’s sewer system by franchisees or vessels.

A 30-year ‘large user’ agreement between the Port and the City of Fort Lauderdale requires the City to process and treat all wastewater produced by Port Everglades. Article 4, Section 4.1 of this agreement highlights the limitations of the wastewater the City of Fort Lauderdale is willing to process and treat, i.e., what the Port cannot dispose of into its system, such as but not limited to:

- Physical debris
- Fuel types
- Fats, wax, grease or oils in excess of 100 mg/l (i.e., most oily bilge wastewaters)
- Toxic and poisonous substances

Such restrictions are in place due to the design limitations of the George T. Lohmeyer (GTL) Wastewater Treatment Plant under the authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale, the final processing plant for all wastewater pumped through the Port Everglades sewer system. The GTL treatment plant is not designed to process oils, fats grease and contaminants. Therefore, if any wastewater with possible contaminants was improperly disposed of at the Port, then the wastewater would bypass the treatment process and potentially introduce these containments to Florida’s underground environment.
Port Waste Dumping Process

As previously noted, ships with wastewater that needs to be disposed of will request services through the Port Harbormaster. Port Everglades currently uses three Board approved franchisees to haul all types of wastewater from docked vessels.

These franchisees are licensed to haul grey/black and oily bilge water from the ships and dispose at their facilities or another approved receiving facility. Due to the possible petroleum products in the oily bilge water, haulers are required to treat oily bilge water to meet local environmental limits before disposal at any facility.

On occasions, instead of transporting the wastewater, the franchisee would request to dump the waste in the Port’s sewer system. The Harbormaster is the only office that can grant that request and requires that the wastewater be classified as either black/grey water or oily bilge water. If ‘dumping’ is approved by the Harbormaster, then the Director of Operations would direct the Public Works plumbing staff to meet the tankers at a sewer pumping station. The Plumber would open or directly connect the franchise’s tanker to the lift station and the waste would be dumped into the pumping station. After all the material is disposed of, the Plumber and the driver of the tanker signs off on ship manifest form, indicating which lift station was used and the number of gallons dumped, and type of wastewater dumped. This form is then sent to Public Works Administration for record keeping and then sent to Finance for billing.

However, it was reported to us in interviews with Port staff, that on occasion the franchise entities may circumvent this process, and instead of requesting permission to dump the wastewater directly into the Port’s sewer system from the Harbormaster, as required, the franchisee would instead contact a plumber in the Public Works Section, who would facilitate the dumping into the sewer pumping station.
34. Port Everglades Management Allowed Dumping of Approximately 2.5 Million Gallons of Untested and Uncertified Wastewater into the Port Everglades Sewer System from 2014 to 2018.

Based on our review of monthly self-reported ship manifests submitted by wastewater haulers, we identified approximately 2.5 million gallons of wastewater which were disposed of into Port’s sewer systems from 2014 to 2018. According to these reports, the wastewater was collected by the haulers from docked vessels located at both Port Everglades and Port Miami and dumped directly into the Port’s sewer system (Figure 34).

Port management confirmed that they never tested any of the wastewater dumped into the sewer system. Therefore, Port management has no assurance that the waste was not hazardous or contained excessive levels of contaminants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gallons of Untested Wastewater</th>
<th>Revenue Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>19,412</td>
<td>$30,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>595,000</td>
<td>54,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>727,000</td>
<td>67,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>87,800</td>
<td>9,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,084,769</td>
<td>104,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,513,981</td>
<td>$267,107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with Information obtained from Port Finance

In an interview on April 22, 2019, the Port Operations Director stated that disposing of wastewater at the Port is not centralized and the current practice is informal. He further stated that when a hauler needs to dispose of wastewater, a Former Plumber 4 is contacted directly by the hauler, and the paperwork required for billing is collected and submitted to Public Works Administration.

Sanitary Wastewater Removal From Vessels, Item No. 1036 of Port Everglades Tariff No.12 (effective October 1, 2006) permits the Port to collect and dispose of wastewater into the Port’s sewer system:
“When discharging to the Port Everglades sewer system, a Port employee will be assigned to monitor the operation, verify the quantity being discharged, and observe that only sanitary wastewater is being discharged into the sewer system.”

While it is recognized that the tariff requires only sanitary wastewater is to be discharged into the system, this language is inadequate, as it does not specifically require the testing of the wastewater. Testing, not visual confirmation, is necessary to provide assurance that the contents being disposed into the sewer system are in fact sanitary wastewater, and do not contain oily/bilge wastewater or other contaminants. Additionally, no self-certification was required by the Port.

Of the major Florida ports surveyed, we noted that Port Everglades is the only Port that allows disposal of wastewater from vessels into the sewer system. All other Ports contacted stated that wastewater must be hauled and disposed offsite, see Figure 35.

Figure 35
Major Ports in Florida Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port Surveyed</th>
<th>Waste Haulers Allowed to Dump Into Their Sewer System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port Miami</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Tampa</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Canaveral</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Jacksonville</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey conducted by the Office of the County Auditor

A. An interview with the City of Fort Lauderdale wastewater treatment plant staff responsible for collecting, treating and disposing of Port Everglades wastewater revealed that they were unaware of the current practices in place by the Port. However, plant officials stated that they have periodically noticed abnormalities in their treatment process over the last few years. Plant personnel expressed concerns that Port Everglades has not tested any of the wastewater collected from vessels and dumped into its sewer system. Plant personnel further stated that the City of Fort Lauderdale George T. Lohmeyer (GTL) Wastewater Plant is not designed to treat oily bilge waste from ships. Wastewater, with possible contaminants when improperly disposed at the Port, would bypass the treatment process and potentially introduce these containments to Florida’s underground environment.

B. Broward County’s experts do not recommend the Port collect and dispose of vessel wastewater directly into the Port’s sewer system. The Environmental Engineer of the
Environmental Protection Division cited his concerns that no testing for compliance was done prior to the dumping and the sewer pump stations and relevant infrastructure maybe inadequate, “Simply visually observing the wastewater being pumped into the sewer system is not enough to validate that the wastewater is chemically compliant”. Additionally, the Environmental Engineer stated that, “A form of sampling should be done to ensure compliance with the requirements set by the City of Fort Lauderdale Large User Contract.” To accomplish this, the Environmental Engineer believes that a pretreatment program and facility can help. We noted that the City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinances Section 28-209 (a), “Pretreatment facilities requirements” requires the following:

“Users shall provide wastewater treatment as necessary to comply with this article and shall achieve compliance with all categorical pretreatment standards, local limits, and prohibitions set out in division 2 of this article within the time limitations specified by EPA, the state, or the director, whichever is more stringent.”

Finally, the Environmental Engineer is concerned that Port sewer pump stations are specifically designed and permitted to accept, and pump sewage based on an identifiable original source such as, toilets, kitchen sinks and showers. Any modifications or use outside of this original intent can cause unnecessary wear and tear and longer run times for sewer pumps, which can make them more likely to need repairs. The City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinances Section 28-209 (e), “Pretreatment facilities requirements” may require the following:

“grease traps, oil traps, or sand traps, separators, or both, when deemed necessary. The interceptors shall be installed by the industrial users when they are necessary for the proper handling of liquid wastes containing grease in excessive amounts, or any flammable wastes, sand or other harmful ingredients.”

A permitted pretreatment facility in Port Everglades can appropriately accommodate waste haulers dumping wastewater from vessels and aid in compliance with the City of Fort Lauderdale Large User Wastewater Agreement.

We also interviewed the Director of Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance, who stated that, “until the Port knows for sure what is being received from the vessels, we should not allow dumping into our sewer system.”
Without testing, Port management cannot give assurance that the wastewater disposed of met the standards set forth by the City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinance Section 28-204. Failure to properly test the wastewater, heighten the risk that dumping of contaminated wastewater has occurred.

In September 2019, Port management presented the Tariff for Fiscal Year 2020 to the Board of County Commissioners for approval without any provision for testing by the Port. We recommended management before the agenda item was approved by the Board, to include a provision at least to require testing. In response, management changed the tariff to incorporate a reference to their procedure which include testing; however, management denied our request to provide public notice within the tariff document.

**Recommendation 34**

We recommend management cease dumping vessel wastewater into the Port’s sewer system. If the Port chooses to continue to allow wastewater haulers to dump vessel wastewater into the Port’s sewer system, at a minimum, management should take the following actions to ensure compliance:

**A.** Periodically test the wastewater collected from vessels and only allow the disposal of wastewaters within allowable limits set by the City of Fort Lauderdale and the George T. Lohmeyer Wastewater Plant.

**B.** Allow dumping only when appropriately approved and documented in writing by the Harbormaster, as required by tariff.

**C.** Require each of the three franchised haulers to sign a statement certifying their awareness of, and agreement to comply with, all wastewater disposal requirements.
Management’s Response

A. *Management concurs in part.* The discharge of sanitary wastewater from ships at Port Everglades has been authorized under the Port Everglades tariff since 1999, with no issues reported prior to this audit. When the concern was first raised by the County Auditor, Port staff contacted the Environmental Compliance Supervisor with the City of Fort Lauderdale, who indicated there was no prohibition of discharging sewage provided that the requirements of the City Code of Ordinances was complied with. Notwithstanding, to address concerns raised by the County Auditor, the Port’s Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Sanitary wastewater removal and disposal from vessels was updated on September 16, 2019 and sent to all three vessel sanitary waste franchise holders at Port Everglades. Item 8 of the SOP specifically provides: “The franchisee may be required by Port Everglades to sample the waste stream from the ship to verify compliance with the City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinances applicable to the discharge of sanitary wastewater (Chapter 28, Article II entitled Sewers and Sewage Disposal). Port Everglades may also require the franchisee to provide samples of the sanitary wastewater for independent verification by Broward County”.

Furthermore, Port staff is working with staff from the County Water and Wastewater Services to develop and implement sampling and analysis procedures for the sanitary waste.

B. *Management concurs.* As of April 12, 2019, the Port’s Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Sanitary wastewater removal and disposal from vessels was updated to require the vessel sanitary waste franchise holders to provide notice to Port Everglades’ Harbormaster at least 24 hours prior to the scheduling of the discharge operation. The SOP was further updated on September 16, 2019.

C. *Management concurs.* As of September 16, 2019, the Port’s Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Sanitary wastewater removal and disposal from vessels was updated to require the Franchisee to provide a Certification of Compliance statement if wastewater is to be discharged into a lift station at Port Everglades.
35. A Hauler Dumped at least 120,000 Gallons of Untested Wastewater from Port Miami into the Port Everglades Sewer System.

Our review of ship manifests from a wastewater hauler identified multiple occurrences during a three-month period in 2018, when wastewater from Port Miami was dumped into the Port Everglades sewer system. This is significant as the Port Miami does not allow on-site dumping of wastewater from vessels into their sewer system.
On April 22, 2019, in an interview, the Port Operations Director stated that he was unaware that the hauler had collected wastewater from vessels in Port Miami and disposed of the contents in Port Everglades sewer system. He further stated that when this was brought to his attention in August 2018, the practice was immediately halted.

While the Large User Wastewater Agreement with the City of Fort Lauderdale, Section 6.2, allows the Port to collect “all existing and future wastewater flows by it, whether collected within or without its existing service area”, it does not specifically grant the Port approval to engage in receiving wastewater from outside jurisdictions. As a result, by allowing an outside source of untested wastewater to be disposed of directly into the Port’s sewer system without approval, Port Everglades violated the City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinances Section 28-219, “Regulation of waste received from other jurisdictions” which requires the following:

“No waste shall be accepted from other jurisdictions, unless it meets the terms agreed upon in the large user agreement with the appropriate government agencies.”

Further, when the Port accepted the wastewater from Port Miami, the Port acted as a septage receiving facility without being appropriately permitted to do so. Broward County Code of Ordinances Section 34-140 – “Pretreatment of wastewater”, Section (e)(5) requires the following:

“Wastes from locations outside the WWF [wastewater facility] or from persons outside the system who are, by contract or agreement with the County, users of the WWF, shall not be discharged into the WWF or any connected system without previous written approval of the Director. Such discharge shall only be made at a site approved by the Director.”

Finally, as noted in Opportunity For Improvement No. 34, none of the wastewater collected from Port Miami was tested, and as a result of this deficiency, Port management cannot provide assurance that the wastewater collected from the other jurisdiction, Port Miami, complied with the City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinance Section 28-204 – “Prohibited discharges”.

It should be noted that the hauler Company 12, arranged this dumping with Former Plumber 4 rather than Port management. Upon becoming aware of the dumping from Port Miami, the Operations Director communicated to the hauler that they are allowed to collect from Port Miami and dump at Port Everglades one last time and then directed that it is to be discontinued. The Former Plumber 4 who observed and coordinated the dumping, refused our interview request.
Recommendation 35

We recommend management:

A. Prohibit the disposal of wastewater from sources outside of the Port Everglades.

B. Update all hauler franchisee agreements to prohibit disposal of wastewater from sources outside of the Port Everglades.

Management’s Response

A. Management concur. While the Port tariff only allows the discharge of sanitary wastewater from ships in Port Everglades, the three franchised sanitary waste companies were reminded of that prohibition when revised SOPs were provided in April and September 2019.

B. Management concur in part. The current tariff and franchisee agreements already prohibit the disposal of wastewater from sources outside of Port Everglades.


During our audit, we observed the sewer pumping lift station, which is located outside the gated entrance to Port property was unlocked, unmonitored and with the waste hauler’s discharge connection hose in open display. This complete lack of security exposes the Port to liability for receiving untested wastewater into the sewer system and loss of revenue for unreported dumping.

Using Google Maps Satellite Imaging, we identified a photograph of the sewer station pump and discovered what appears to be a discharge connection hose lying on the ground at the time the satellite image was taken.

Satellite Image of the location of the unlocked sewer pumping station with the waste hauler’s connection hose laying on the ground
Our staff visited this location, observed the hose in place and obtained a photo of the sewer pumping station on September 19, 2018, at 8:00PM.

The Port Everglades Operations Director stated, “Prior to April 2019, Port plumbers coordinated all operational activities related to wastewater hauling and disposing on Port property. Port Administration would only be involved at the beginning and end of the process for billing and record keeping.” This lack of involvement and oversight by management is unacceptable given the observations in this report, and the risks to damaging sewer pumping stations.

An unlocked sewer pump station with no compensating monitoring controls in place, can increase the risk of unauthorized wastewater disposal by wastewater haulers. In addition to the lack of controls, we identified that this sewer pumping station is located outside the Port’s security checkpoint, making it easily accessible to the franchisees and to the public. We are unable to determine if this condition was known to the Plumbing Section staff, franchise employees, or for how long such conditions were allowed to continue, or how many gallons were dumped without payment.

Additionally, without adequate security at the Port’s lift stations, management is unable to provide assurance that only authorized wastewater was disposed of and transferred to the GTL Wastewater Plant as required in the November 16, 2001, Large User Wastewater Agreement Between City of Fort Lauderdale and Port Everglades, Article 4.

Management had advised us that all lift stations are currently locked as of June 2019.
Because of the grossly inadequate procedures and controls, fraud schemes and inappropriate dumping could have occurred without detection.

**Recommendation 36**

*We recommend* management lock all sewer stations located on Port property and perform frequent monitoring for unauthorized use.

**Management’s Response**

*Management concurs and has completed.* All Port sewer pump stations are presently locked and secured. Port maintenance staff that have the responsibility for the pump station operations routinely verify that the facilities are locked and ensure that after they are serviced are adequately secured.
Background

Tenants located within the Port Everglades property are afforded the advantage of being strategically located near docks, regulators and transportation hubs. Additionally, as an economic initiative, Broward County, Port Everglades and United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) has established 22 Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) sites within Broward County for specific tenants. Foreign and domestic merchandise may be moved for storage, exhibition, assembly, manufacturing and processing within the FTZ without having to pay duties (taxes). Taxes are required to be paid when the merchandise enters U.S territory for consumption. Port Everglades Foreign Trade Zone No.25, Tariff #4, establishes the authority for the Port to operate FTZ sites with Broward County. Port FTZ sites are managed by a dedicated FTZ manager.

The ‘Main Zone Site 1’ operated by the Port is located within the Port Everglades Jurisdictional Area. Within this location, CBP has ‘activated’ 22.7 acres as FTZ sites, which consist of five storeroom buildings, as shown in Figure 36 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Square Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A-Annex</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building B</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building E</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building F</td>
<td>93,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>388,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Foreign Trade Zone No.25, Tariff #4

Broward County enters into annual lease agreements with FTZ tenants based on the square footage needed to conduct their business. However, the Port recognizes that tenants may occasionally need additional spaces for short periods of time, as such, the Port utilizes open space warehouses that are not leased. To maximize the economic opportunity, Broward County has a process which allows current FTZ tenants to reserve this space in 30-day increments, when needed, for a fee.
FTZ management has the following types of non-leased space available for FTZ tenants to temporarily occupy:

- Inside storeroom space (air conditioned)
- Inside storeroom space (non-air conditioned)
- Inside office space
- Outdoor lots

The temporary rental of vacant space can be an additional source of revenue for the Port for space which was otherwise not used. To temporarily reserve vacant space an FTZ tenant must submit a reservation request with a map of the location needed and if approved, the tenant will receive invoices for the space used and utilities shared. Reservations are done in increments of 30 days and are not prorated. See below for a graphic depiction of the entire process.

*Process to reserve temporary warehouse space in Broward County FTZ. Created by the Office of the County Auditor*
37. Former Property Manager Alleged that FTZ Tenant 1 Inappropriately Occupied Vacant Warehouse Space for Five Years, Estimating $2.8 Million in Potential Loss of Revenue to Port Everglades.

On September 29, 2018, the Former Property Manager filed a complaint with the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs and Professional Standards (Professional Standards) alleging that:

“a tenant within the Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) inappropriately occupied 85,424 sq./ft of storeroom space for five years, amounting to losses of $2,848,757.00 to the Port Everglades”.

During the audit, we identified Building A and A-Annex space is structured in a maze-like form without marker or signs, which increases the likelihood that vacant space could be inappropriately used without detection. Without markings and signs or leased and/or non-leased occupant data, it is difficult to determine what is appropriate and inappropriate use of warehouse space. While some physical barriers exist between Building A and A-Annex, it is still possible for the tenant to access and temporarily store goods in vacant warehouse space without detection and paying additional fees.

The Port Everglades Business Administration Director stated in an interview that, “financial records for the tenant indicated, that they’ve always reserved and paid for the space they occupied in Building A and A-Annex”. However, we examined all the tenant leases and reservations for temporary use of vacant space in Building A and A-Annex for fiscal years 2013 to 2019. Based on the records compiled and analyzed we noted that Building A and A-Annex showed significant vacant space available throughout these years, only until one month prior to fiscal year 2019. This is when lease modifications were made by the tenant after the discovery of unpaid space being used by the Former Property Manager, Figure 37.
### Figure 37
Monthly Average Space Utilization in Building A and A–Annex by all Tenants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year (October 1st – September 30th)</th>
<th>Average Space Leased &amp; Other Appropriate Use of vacant Space (Sq./Ft)</th>
<th>Monthly Average of Vacant Space (Sq./Ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>122,217</td>
<td>97,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>127,005</td>
<td>92,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>125,038</td>
<td>94,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>120,709</td>
<td>99,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>124,095</td>
<td>95,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>129,406</td>
<td>90,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019*</td>
<td>202,378</td>
<td>17,622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fiscal Year 2019 calculation includes the dates September 1st, 2018 to August 31st, 2019 (11 months), to account for.

*Source: Port Administration*

As noted above, we identified that approximately two months after the Former Property Manager began queries of the tenant’s use of vacant space, the tenant increased their leased occupancy size in Building A and A-Annex by 94% (84,426 sq./ft), **Figure 38**.

### Figure 38:
Leased Space by the Tenant from the Fiscal Years 2013 to 2019

*Source: Data Compiled by The Office of the County Auditor*
When our office inquired of the Business Administration Director as to the thoughts on the timing of the change in leased space, he stated that, “It is pure coincidence as they received a large order and forgot to notify the Port that they will be occupying the remaining space (84,426 sq./ft) in Building A”. However, we noted that the Port did not have adequate controls to monitor leases and vacant space as noted in Opportunity for Improvement No. 39. Therefore, we are unable to determine whether this tenant inappropriately occupied the vacant space and validate the reason as to why a significant increase in leased space by the tenant occurred approximately the same time the Former Property Manager filed a complaint with Professional Standards.

Because of the grossly inadequate controls and procedures, we are unable to provide reasonable assurance that the proper amount of space has been utilized, or that no funds have been misappropriated though bribes or other fraud schemes.

**Recommendation 37**

We recommend management immediately conduct an assessment and review all Port leases to ensure tenants are only using space leased to them:

A. If unauthorized use of vacant space is identified during an assessment and review, Port staff should determine amount owed to the County and immediately process billing.

B. Make changes to the lease agreement if necessary, to include additional space.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs in part.* The Port’s new Property Manager was hired on July 29, 2019. The first task assigned to the Property Manager was familiarizing himself with all Port leases. Since then, the Property Manager has systematically reviewed leases and visited tenants. As part of the review process of each individual lease, the Property Manager is verifying that the property under lease matches with the property under use. A number of leases have been renewed since August 2019 and changes have been made, as required.

The instance referenced in the Audit Report was deemed unsubstantiated by Management for lack of evidence. Specifically, in October 2018, following up on a former employee’s allegations that a large tenant in the FTZ had been using space not under lease for a period of six years, Port Management conducted a review of all grid space billed during the period spanning from October 2012 to July 2018. Management’s review show that it invoiced the large tenant for grid space in 298 occasions totaling $1,041,066 in revenue to the Port. Of those invoices, 116 instances
were for grid space inside Warehouse A, totaling $467,593. As a result of Management’s review, the former employee’s allegation was deemed unsubstantiated as there was no evidence to prove that the large tenant had used any non-leased space.

Moving forward, the Property Management Section will identify leases of potential concern to monitor compliance. Leases of potential concern include those which demised space is not defined by a permanent barrier around the perimeter, such as fences or walls. Office leases, warehouse leases where the tenant is occupying the entire space, and land leases which are fenced-off, do not represent a potential concern. These will be reviewed, regardless, as part of a renewal application. Leases of potential concern will be reviewed once a year by the Property Management Section to ensure tenants are only using space leased to them.

B. Management concur. The Port Everglades Tariff No. 4 (Item No. 604) applying to land use in the Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) already provides that an FTZ User found using space not covered by a lease or grid assignment will be charged a holdover rate which is double the applicable grid space rate for a full 30 day period.

38. Port Management Does Not Verify and Monitor Appropriate Space Usage by FTZ Tenants.

We reviewed records, performed interviews, and site visits and found no evidence that the Port conducts space verifications to confirm appropriate space usage by tenants. This lack of monitoring control could allow tenants to occupy more than their leased and reserved warehouse space without compensation to the County.

The current FTZ Manager stated that, “He drives around the FTZ daily and occasionally walks into the warehouses to see what is happening.” He further stated that “other Port employees, such as the Property Manager and Port Public Works staff frequently visited the FTZ and would note any unusual activity by tenants”. However, these activities were not documented. As noted in Opportunity for Improvement No. 39, the FTZ Manager is the only person with both the lease and reservation information for use of warehouse space. As a result, other Port employees would not be able to determine whether space is appropriately used by tenants.

Lack of independent monitoring creates an environment which may allow FTZ tenants to utilize warehouse space without detection and compensation to the Port. This may also allow fraud scheme to occur without detection.
An effective control would be for an independent person to conduct unannounced space audits on a surprise and random basis. Their audits should verify actual occupied space and compare it to the amount of paid space.

Because of the grossly inadequate controls and procedures, we are unable to provide reasonable assurance that the proper amount of space has been utilized, or that no funds have been misappropriated though bribes or other fraud schemes.

**Recommendation 38**

We recommend management:

A. Develop and implement appropriate controls to monitor and ensure compliance with all lease terms.

B. Conduct and document periodic unannounced space audits to ensure tenants are compliant with lease terms. Space audits should be conducted by a person independent of the FTZ leasing function.

**Management’s Response**

A. *Management concurs and has implemented.* The Property Management Section along with a licensed professional surveyor from the Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance Division will make and document periodic unannounced space audits of grid spaces at least once a month to ensure tenants are compliant with lease terms. Grid spaces not enclosed by a barrier (e.g., fence, wall, or combination thereof) will be defined through the use of marks painted on the floor or other form of marking. Grid spaces that are enclosed by a fence, wall, or combination thereof. A record of each inspection, including photographic evidence of the space being occupied, will be kept on a file administered by the Director of Business Administration and/or delegated staff.

B. Same as A.
39. Controls Over the Use of Temporary Vacant Space are Inadequate and Could Permit Unauthorized Use of Space and Undetected Loss of Revenue to the Port.

Port management did not implement controls to ensure the use of temporary vacant space is properly requested and paid for, which could result in undetected loss of revenue to the Port. On May 16, 2019, we met with the current FTZ Manager to understand the process to reserve vacant warehouse and land space by FTZ tenants. The FTZ Manager stated the process is as follows, Figure 39:

![Figure 39: Detailed Process to Reserve Temporary Vacant Space in the FTZ at the Port](source: Prepared by The Office of the County Auditor)

Based on the review of the process we noted the following concerns:

A. The FTZ Manager is the only Port employee who receives and approves FTZ tenants’ reservation requests for temporary use of vacant space and also oversees the tenants’ access to the warehouse space.

A segregation of duties issue exists between step 2 and 3 as displayed in the figure above. The FTZ Manager has the responsibility of approving requests and releasing vacant space to a tenant. Without another independent party involved in between steps 2 and 3,
vacant warehouse space can be released to tenants without a reservation record on file and appropriate billing.

Appropriate segregation of duties coupled with adequate record management helps contribute to a strong internal control environment that can aid in the prevention of errors and fraudulent transactions.

**B.** We identified that no one performed a space verification or temporary space, nor does the Port have procedures to verify actual square footage occupied by the tenant as compared to what they are paying for. As a result, it is possible that a tenant could occupy vacant space for months, even years, without payment to the Port. Fraud could be occurring without detection as a result of the lack of adequate controls.

**C.** Upon review of the reservation requests and billings for temporary use of vacant space during the audit period, we noted that some billings were not supported by written reservation requests. Specifically, we were unable to obtain four of ten (40%) of the written reservation requests made by tenants. The FTZ Manager stated that some reservations were requested verbally. As a result, we were unable to determine billing accuracy for verbal requests. Written reservation requests are important to verify that the billing recorded accurately reflects what was reserved.

Because of the lack of grossly inadequate controls and procedures, we are unable to provide reasonable assurance that the proper amount of space has been utilized, or that no funds have been misappropriated through bribes or other fraud schemes.

**Recommendation 39**

We recommend management:

**A.** Establish appropriate controls, including segregation of duties or management oversight, to reduce the risk of inappropriate activities/fraud.

**B.** Develop and implement procedures to conduct unannounced space verification audits to verify actual square footage occupied by the tenant as compared to the amount paid. The space verification audits should be conducted by someone independent of the FTZ space rental function.

**C.** Require all tenant reservation requests be appropriately documented and retained.
### Management’s Response

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td><em>Management concurs and has implemented.</em> On November 19, 2019, a memorandum was circulated to all on-port FTZ tenants with a revised Standard Operating Procedure for reserving grid space at the on-port FTZ. To segregate duties, reservations will be received by FTZ staff, and approved and sent to billing by the Business Administration Division/Property Management Section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Same as A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td><em>Management concurs.</em> A record of each reservation request will be kept on file administered by the Director of Business Administration and/or delegated staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION VII: BACKFLOW DEVICES

Background

Backflow assembly devices are installed in select residential and all commercial properties to prevent the incorrect flow of contaminants such as: foul water, chemicals, and other pollutants into the public drinking water supply. Pollutants caused by toilets with faulty valves, swimming pools, agricultural, and industrial activity may flow back into the public drinking water supply if these devices are not maintained and certified, affecting public health and safety of employees, visitors, and tenants at the Port.

City of Fort Lauderdale Agreement

In October 2002, the City of Fort Lauderdale, and the Port entered into the Large User Agreement to Provide Water and Wastewater Billing services to Broward County Port Everglades Department. This agreement provides potable drinking water to the Port, their leased properties, and docked ships. Section 14 of the agreement states that the Port is responsible for the following:

“Complying with all federal, state and local regulations regarding water quality on the County’s side of the meters including, but not limited to:

- Cross connection control, which includes backflow assembly device maintenance and certification,
- Line flushing, and
- Bacteriological sampling and testing.”

We received allegation regarding the use backflow devices. Their allegations are discussed below.
Background of Former Plumber 1 (Subject of Allegation 1)

Former Plumber 1 began employment with the Port in March 1994 as a Plumber. His duties included but were not limited to: installing pipes and fixtures, repairing plumbing fixtures, and maintaining the general plumbing infrastructure at the Port. During this time, the employee operated three different plumbing companies, including Company 26, at various times during his employment. The employee retired from the Port in May 2016.

Background of Former Plumber 2 (Subject of Allegation 1)

Former Plumber 2 began employment with the Port in May 2007 as a Plumber. His duties included but were not limited to: installing pipes and fixtures, repairing plumbing fixtures, and maintaining the general plumbing infrastructure at the Port. This employee did not report any outside employment during his service at the Port. The employee resigned from the Port in August 2018.

Allegations

Allegation 1: Port employees used County-owned backflow test kits for personal business outside the Port. – Substantiated

Allegation 2: Port’s backflow assembly devices, which prevent public water supply contamination, were not certified annually as required by city, county, state, and federal requirements and standards. – Substantiated

Due to the potential adverse health and safety of the public water drinking supply at Port Everglades, the Office of the County Auditor issued an interim report, “Audit of Backflow Assembly Devices & Testing at Port Everglades (Interim Report), Report 19-08” addressing the allegations above and the respective findings and recommendations to Broward County Board of County Commissioners on April 16, 2019. That report, along with the recommendation contained therein are incorporated by reference into this report.
Allegations and Audit Conclusions

At the initiation and during the course of our audit, we received allegations of misappropriations from current and former Port employees, as well as referrals from the Professional Standards. This Appendix identifies these allegations, and our related conclusions and comments. Definitions of terms used in our conclusions are identified below:

**Definitions Used in Audit Conclusions on Allegations**

*Substantiated*—There is sufficient evidence to justify a reasonable conclusion that the allegation is true.

*Unsubstantiated*—There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

*Unfounded*—There is sufficient evidence to justify a reasonable conclusion that the allegation is not true.

*Not Audit Issue*—If the allegation were true, there would be no violation of law, regulation, or policy, or waste of funds or resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegation No.</th>
<th>Allegation Summary</th>
<th>Audit Conclusion</th>
<th>Auditor’s Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Port employees are using P-Cards issued to other Port employees.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The vendor representative for a plumbing supplier is also the owner of Z &amp; Z, Inc. another vendor of the Port.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Items purchased from Z &amp; Z, Inc. by Former Plumber 2 (David Moore) were never delivered to the Port.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 signed off on P-Card purchases by employees that did not report to him, including Refrigeration Mechanic 1, Former Plumber 2 (David Moore) and Former Plumber 4.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 1 &amp; 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2 was purchasing items to be delivered to the Port then shipping those items to Jamaica.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Port Human Resource Officer “aims to please the directors than actually be an independent HR person.”</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 performed a private AC installation for Former Carpenter 1 and his mother.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Company 6 charges excessive prices for its products, and the Port could acquire the products Company 6 sells at a less expensive prices somewhere else. Also, the County does not have a master agreement with Company 6.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>One whistleblower believes that Former Storekeeper (Rajindra Lallharry) has a personal relationship with Infinite Distributors.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Port management has not done anything since a whistleblower presented them with the former employee’s invoices for Company 11 that were billed to Port tenants.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>No action had been taken at the time of the audit. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Former Plumber 1 (William Woessner) conducted outside business, Company 26, activity on Port Equipment (identified by serial number) and Former Plumber 2 (Dave Moore) attempted to conceal by dumping records.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 6 &amp; 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Storekeeper 1 uses P-Cards assigned to other Port employees.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A whistleblower stated that Port management has allowed Company 12 to dump into the Port's sewer system.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>While this practice is not illegal itself, controls were inadequate to ensure compliance. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A whistleblower stated that wastewater haulers have unlimited access to dump into lift stations on Port property.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Purchases made from Z &amp; Z were not shipped to the Port while proceeds from that purchase was split between the vendor and Former Plumber 2 (David Moore). Willful duplicate purchases to conceal fraudulent purchases from Z &amp; Z.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>The owner of Z &amp; Z has been charged by the US Attorney for conspiracy to commit fraud concerning programs receiving federal funds. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Company 1 is the company Former Fender Construction Worker 1 (John McGahee) used to buy fenders. He made purchases from them in 2016 and 2017. A whistleblower believes that they are out of business now.</td>
<td>Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17            | P-Card Holders are not seeking the best price items purchased.  
P-Card Holders are purchasing items without conducting a prices analysis. It appears they are not even aware of the prices. It also appears that P-Card Holders believe they are obligated to make purchases from any small business regardless of the cost. | Substantiated    | See Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 9 & 19           |
| 18            | According to a whistleblower, Storekeeper 1 allowed Company 6’s sales representative to go through the Port’s Storeroom and create an itemized list of items to be purchased. Storekeeper 1 will offer his P-Card and sign for the transaction. | Substantiated    | See Opportunity for Improvement No. 7                   |
| 19            | Inappropriate Dumping at the Port. According to a whistleblower, Company 12 was leaving Port Miami to dump waste at the Port. The Director of Port Operations, after learning of this, allowed this to reoccur at least once thereafter. The concern here is that Port Miami has the same lifts as we do at the Port which indicates that the waste hauler Company 12 is dumping here at Port Everglades that is not allowed to be dumped at Port Miami. | Substantiated    | Company 12 dumped waste from Port Miami at Port Everglades. We were unable to substantiate whether the Director of Operations allowed this to reoccur, although he denied such during our interview.  
See Opportunity for Improvement No. 36 |
<p>| 20            | The Port does not validate the amounts of waste being dumped in their lift stations.                                                                                                                                 | Substantiated    | See Opportunity for Improvement No. 34                   |
| 21            | No policy for designating scrap material.                                                                                                                                                                        | Substantiated    | See Opportunity for Improvement No. 23                   |
| 22            | P-Card approvers in PeopleSoft relied on the Supervisor’s or Storekeeper’s signoff to signify that the P-Card purchases were legitimate and received by the Port. They did not verify whether the Supervisor was in charge of the employee who made the P-Card purchase. | Substantiated    | See Opportunity for Improvement No. 1                    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegation No.</th>
<th>Allegation Summary</th>
<th>Audit Conclusion</th>
<th>Auditor's Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Electrician 2 has a business outside the Port.</td>
<td>Not Audit Issue</td>
<td>According to state records, Electrician 2 is the CEO of a Company 18, which was incorporated on April 8, 2014, and is currently active. He filed an outside employment request form with the County on May 15, 2014. He identified himself as a “qualifier” on this form. No P-Card transactions were noted between his company and the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Former Storekeeper 1 (Rajindra Lallharry) appears to be involved with an outside business “supplying things or doing something through Amazon”.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>The issues related to Rajindra Lallharry are purchases from his companies through PayPal, not Amazon. Rajindra Lallharry made substantial purchases from Amazon, however, we could not determine if the items were received at Port due to inadequate records, a lack of inventory or work order systems. See Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 1 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Former Fender Construction Worker 1 (John McGahee) purchased fenders from (unknown) company and paid back under the disguise of rebuilds and such.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>We noted excessive prices for rebuilds. Further, the employee has been charged by the US Attorney for receiving kickbacks. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>There was an incident where a whistleblower thought it was more economical to repair an item for approximately 20% of the cost of a new one.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A manager believed that some equipment should be surplused. A whistleblower is speculating that based on the high quantities of surplused items and the manager’s &quot;covert&quot; activities it is likely that a particular buyer can be especially benefiting from our excess surplus and is being tipped off accordingly.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>Many items were on hand that should have been surplused. We were unable to substantiate whether anyone was benefitting from the surplused items because there were inadequate records, no inventory or work order systems. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Purchases of items seemingly unrelated to Port needs. According to a whistleblower, Storekeeper 1 advised him that he was often asked by Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2, Storekeeper’s Supervisor at the time, to purchase odd items including camp chairs, barbeque grills, propane tanks and the items would disappear or never arrive at the Port after he purchased them for the Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2. Former Maintenance Worker 1 is believed to be the one doing the shipping using an FTZ Tenant, a shipping company closely familiar with Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>We confirmed that Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2 purchased a stove, canopy tent and generators. We also confirmed through email, a list of items that appeared to be a shipping list. We cannot determine whether those items were actually shipped to Jamaica. However, because of a lack of controls at the Port, this could have occurred without detection. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Company 10 is a legitimate company, but they are being used as a passthrough company for air filter purchases. Rather than purchasing air filters from the manufacturer, Company 14, Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 and Refrigeration Mechanic 1 are purchasing Company 14 filters through Company 10 even though Company 14 is located close to Company 10.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>Company 10 purchased filters from Company 14. We noted an invoice showing the services provided to a Port tenant by the former employee using a Company 11’s invoice (Skilled Trades Supervisor 1’s company). However, we were unable to determine whether the services were provided during work hours. See Opportunity for Improvement Nos. 9 &amp; 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 owns an HVAC company called Company 11. Company 11 has done work for Port tenants and Port staff. Refrigeration Mechanic 1 also holds outside employment with Company 11. Former Maintenance Worker 1 is conducting outside employment on County time. Former Maintenance Worker 1 provided a service to Company 11, which is said to be owned by Skilled Trades Supervisor 1. Former Maintenance Worker 1 spends more time working for the vendors on the Port than for the Port. Evidence of this was found in an invoice paying the Former Maintenance Worker 1 $400 via check.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>We noted an invoice showing the services provided to a Port tenant by the former employee using a Company 11 invoice (Skilled Trades Supervisor 1’s company). However, we were unable to determine whether the services were provided during work hours. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 and Refrigeration Mechanic 1 were buying different quantities and sizes of air filters from Company 10 for the same amount. The maintenance manager was unaware whether the Port actually received the air filters that were purchased by them. The number of filters purchased from Company 10 were excessive.</td>
<td>Partially substantiated</td>
<td>We substantiated that Skilled Trades Supervisor 1, and Refrigeration Mechanic 1 splits Company 10 transactions. However, we were unable to determine whether or not items were received because of inadequate records, no inventory or work order systems. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Former Property Manager stated that FTZ Tenant 1 Company 13 underpaid the County approximately $2.8 million in rent for five-year period (2013-2018).</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>Due to the grossly inadequate controls and procedures we were unable to determine the entire period FTZ Tenant 1 Company 13 occupied majority the building. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Former Property Manager stated that FTZ tenants underpaid their storage charges due to lack of controls in grid space utilization.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunities for Improvement Nos. 38 &amp; 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Items purchased from Company 6 do not appear to be entered into the Port inventory. Though the Company 6 transactions are many, the amount of inventory on the shelves in the storeroom appears to be old and not from recent purchases.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>We were unable to substantiate whether items purchased were included in inventory because there were inadequate records, no inventory or work order systems. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 moved a grandfather clock that had previously been stored in a Former Maintenance Worker 1’s office at FTZ.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>The Former Maintenance Worker 1 stated in his interview that the grandfather clock owned by a different employee. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Former Plumber 2 (David Moore) and Former Plumber 4 worked for Former Plumber 1 (William Woessner)’s personal business.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 requested Maintenance Worker 2 purchase paint from Sherwin Williams.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>Maintenance Worker 2 stated in his interview that Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 requested him to purchase paint. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Former Maintenance Worker 1 had personal items in his space at the FTZ. He was not checked by Customs and Border Patrol. It seems that some of the items had either been shipped into the FTZ or out of the FTZ. Former Maintenance Worker 1 admitted that he took items out of the trash and kept them. Port security did not check Former Maintenance Worker 1’s County vehicle as he entered and left Port Everglades.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>See Opportunity for Improvement No. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Former Carpenter 1 received an A/C unit in place of locks and keys purchased for $2,000-$3,000. Company 11 installed an A/C unit in the home of Former Carpenter 1. Within the same week Former Carpenter 1’s purchases peaked. It is alleged that the purchase of $2,000-$3,000 for locks and key was actually fulfilled with an A/C unit. It is likely that Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 approved this transaction.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>While we confirmed that Company 11 installed a central AC unit in employee’s home, we could not connect the purchase of locks to the AC unit. See Opportunity for Improvement No. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Inadequate Security in The Foreign Trade Zone area. According to a whistleblower, both he and Port Maintenance Manager were able to access the FTZ area without questions. It is also alleged that trucks also access the secured area without being questioned. There are few cameras that offer surveillance and no system to track who came in and out.</td>
<td>Partially Substantiated</td>
<td>County employees are not subjected to search when entering the FTZ if they have a TWIC card (Green Badge). They are assumed to be conducting normal business (Port Operation) when entering or leaving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Former Special Skills Supervisor 3 was running a repair shop out of the garage.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>We could not determine if he ran a business at the Port due to inadequate records, a lack of inventory and work order systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 and Former Maintenance Worker 1, through Company 11, are able to charge below market cost for the installation of an A/C because they are obtaining A/C units through P-Card purchases.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>We were unable to substantiate whether items purchased with the Port P-Card were used in a private business because of inadequate records, no inventory or work order systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hindering the audit and investigation process. According to a whistleblower, Port Operations Manager demanded that all files and records be reviewed by Port management before it is passed on to the County Auditor’s Office and the Broward County Sheriff’s Office.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>Port management denied demanding that all information be filtered through them before being provided to the County Auditor and Broward Sherriff’s Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Former Fender Construction Worker 1 (John McGahee) lifestyle is excessive and unreasonable for a Port employee with his income. Mr. McGhee is alleged to own a house in an affluent neighborhood that cost &quot;$780,000 &quot;and owns a &quot;couple fishing companies&quot;.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>The employee personal residence was purchased for $380,000. We noted that he was the vice president of a not for profit corporation in Davie, Company 16 from state records. Total revenues from 2013, 2014 &amp; 2015 were $127,916, $146,003 &amp; $112,802 respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Former Plumber 2 (David Moore) would make purchases from Z &amp; Z and Former Plumber 4 would make duplicate purchases from Company 4.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>We were unable to substantiate whether duplicate purchases were made because there were inadequate records, no inventory or work order systems. Further, Former Plumber 4 refused our interview request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Company 6 does not have consistent pricing. They offer a price in person that differs from the prices on their website.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>This was unsubstantiated due to inadequate records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Refrigeration Mechanic 1 does quite a bit of work for Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 and Company 11 on the weekends.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>Although Refrigeration Mechanic 1 stated to us that he had done work in the past for Company 11, there was no Outside Employment Request Form on file in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>P-Card purchases from Company 10 may not have been received on Port property.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>We were unable to determine whether or not items were received because of inadequate records, no inventory or work order systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 gives his P-Card to former Storekeeper 1 (Rajindra Lallharry) when he exhausted his P-card limit.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 stated in his interview that the former Storekeeper 1 (Rajindra Lallharry) used his P-Card to make purchases without telling him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>One whistleblower alleged that the Assistant Director of Operations, Director of Operations, and a Human Resources Officer were targeting him and a former supervisor for the whistleblower.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>This was unsubstantiated due to inadequate records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Personal vehicles were being serviced by the garage crew prior to Port Maintenance Manager’s arrival.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>We could not determine if personal vehicles were serviced at the Port due to inadequate records, a lack of inventory or work order systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Port retaliated against two whistleblowers at a meeting. Port management facilitated a meeting that allowed Port staff to question whistleblowers regarding their formal complaint to the Office of Professional Standards, County Auditor, and BSO.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>A meeting was held on July 31, 2018, both whistleblowers stated that the allegations occurred, however, all other participants in the meeting denied such.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Storekeeper 1 and all the Storekeepers have a close relationship with Company 6’s sales representative.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>We noted purchases from Company 6 shipped to Company 6 sales representative’s residence. Storekeeper 1 confirmed that he allowed Company 6 sales representative in the storeroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 and Refrigeration Mechanic 1 were buying A/C units that were identified on the invoices as filters with the units to be used by Company 11.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>This was unsubstantiated, due to inadequate records, a lack of inventory and work order systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Former Fender Construction Worker 1 (John McGahee) financed items on his P-Card. Mr. McGahee needed fenders that exceeded the P-Card limit; to circumvent the Procurement code, with the approval of Director of Operations, Mr. McGahee was allowed to purchase the items from Company 1 and pay the cost in monthly installments.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>This was unsubstantiated due to inadequate records, a lack of inventory and work order systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>The leases created were not very strict. For example, FTZ Tenant was paying significantly below market rates. Additionally, the leases were not consistent.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>As advised by Port management, the rental rates at the FTZ were kept low because the tenants were put on month to month lease and no building maintenance was performed due to the anticipated demolition of these buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Former Plumber 4, Former Plumber 2 (David Moore) and Former Plumber 1 (William Woessner) may have been using the County’s account to purchase supplies from Companies 17 and 7, tax-free.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>While we could not determine whether this occurred, the lack of adequate records and procedures would allow this to occur without detection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Vehicle Mechanic 1 allows vendors to keep his P-Card on file for reoccurring purchases which is a violation of the Procurement Code.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>While we could not determine whether this occurred, the lack of adequate records and procedures would allow this to occur without detection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Vehicle Mechanic 1 made a large purchase from Company 6 without having a need for such items. Vehicle Mechanic 1 spent &quot;several thousands of dollars&quot; in Company 6 purchases and distributed it throughout the terminals seemingly without receiving request for such items from terminal workers.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>We were unable to determine whether this situation occurred due to inadequate records and a lack of inventory and work order systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>P-Card Holders may be receiving kickbacks from Company 6.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>While we could not determine whether this occurred, the lack of adequate records and procedures would allow this to occur without detection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>A whistleblower was advised by Deputy Director of Operations to lie to staff when questioned about the Audit/Investigation and if it comes to it &quot;throw Skilled Trades Supervisor 2 under the bus&quot;.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>We could not determine whether this occurred due to lack of adequate records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Former Maintenance Supervisor 1 conducted outside business activity on Port Property. No indication of how long this persisted.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>According to state records, Former Maintenance Supervisor 1 owned a plumbing business named Former Plumber 2 (David Moore) Plumbing in Oakland Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>The number of filters purchased from Company 10 were excessive.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>The prices seem excessive, but due to inadequate records, and a lack of inventory and work order systems, this allegation could not be substantiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>There is a practice of scrapping on the Port though there is a County Policy that bars scrapping. Definition of Scrapping (per a whistleblower): Scrapping would be, parts that's removed, that could be sold for value; i.e., a water heater is saved, so it could be sent to a recycling center for cash, or the brass inside them for air conditioning units, things of that nature. Surplusing is actually putting an item in inventory for future possible use vs. scrapping, which is basically disposing of the item.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>This was unsubstantiated due to inadequate records, a lack of inventory and work order systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>According to a whistleblower, the Port has a common practice of “scrapping”. He believes the County has a policy against “scrapping”. Items are often saved for large shipments at FTZ. Former Maintenance Worker 1 is believed to be the one doing the shipping using FTZ Tenant 1 (Company 13), a shipping company closely familiar with Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2. Refrigeration Mechanic 1, Skilled Trades Supervisor 2, Former Plumber 2 (David Moore) and Former Plumber 4, was said to be involved in the process.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>This was unsubstantiated due to inadequate records, a lack of inventory and work order systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 had a key to the FTZ, gave the key to Welder 1, and then lied to Port Maintenance Manager about whether he ever had a key to the FTZ.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>This was unsubstantiated due to inadequate records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 3 ordered A/C units to be delivered to the Port, then instructed Skilled Trades Supervisor 2 to deliver them to his home. Skilled Trades Supervisor 2 refused, so the Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 3 had someone else do the job.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>The Skilled Trades Supervisor 2 made a complaint to Broward County Professional Standards/Human Rights Section in 2007, and alleged unethical behavior about the Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 3. Professional Standards could not determine whether they investigated this complaint. The Skilled Trades Supervisor 2 stated that two years after the complaint was filed, he received a call from Professional Standards stating that they did not investigate and wanting to know if they should start an investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Former Maintenance Worker 3 worked for Former Plumber 1 (William Woessner)’s personal business.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>After reviewing Former Maintenance Worker 3’s personnel records and searching the internet, we were unable to establish a connection between him and Mr. Woessner’s company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegation No.</td>
<td>Allegation Summary</td>
<td>Audit Conclusion</td>
<td>Auditor's Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Maintenance Mechanic 3 worked for Skilled Trades Supervisor 1’s personal business.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>Maintenance Mechanic 3 filed an Outside Employment Request Form with the County (no filing date was provided). He works part-time as a crew chief for Company 34 since 1990.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Port Maintenance Manager found Former Plumber 1 (William Woessner) paperwork for Company 17 which appears to show a separate account for kickbacks or cash refunds from Company 17 to other parties.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>While we could not determine whether this occurred, the lack of adequate records and procedures would allow this to occur without detection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Maintenance Mechanic 2 stored personal items at the Port</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>While we could not determine whether this occurred, the lack of adequate records and procedures would allow this to occur without detection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>A big plumbing job needed to be done for a neighbor (former Port employee) of the whistleblower by Former Plumber 2 (David Moore), Former Plumber 1 (Bill Woessner), Former Plumber 3, and Former Plumber 4. They drove County vehicles and used Port-owned tools for the job. Some tools were left in the neighbor’s garage after the job was finished.</td>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>While we could not determine whether this occurred, the lack of adequate records and procedures would allow this to occur without detection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Port Maintenance Manager suspected that Construction Project Manager 1 and Former Maintenance Worker 1 were surplousing items and then tipping off customers as to which pallets containing these items were the most valuable to purchase during Broward County auctions. Valuable surplused items could then be shipped to the Caribbean tariff-free since they are used parts.</td>
<td>Unfounded</td>
<td>While we could not find whether this occurred, the lack of adequate records and procedures would allow this to occur without detection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Port’s Public Works P-Card Holders’ Job Titles and Transaction Amounts for FY 2013 through July 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>FY 2013- July 2018 Transaction Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Storekeeper 1</td>
<td>1,263,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storekeeper 1</td>
<td>1,206,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker 1</td>
<td>1,028,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Mechanic 1</td>
<td>887,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storekeeper 2</td>
<td>735,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Carpenter 1</td>
<td>645,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Plumber 1</td>
<td>539,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician 1</td>
<td>494,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Fender Construction Worker 1</td>
<td>458,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 1</td>
<td>448,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Project Manager 1</td>
<td>435,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 1</td>
<td>330,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Maintenance Mechanic 1</td>
<td>267,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 2</td>
<td>265,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder 1</td>
<td>235,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Plumber 2</td>
<td>225,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse Supervisor 1</td>
<td>211,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Carpenter 2</td>
<td>186,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker 2</td>
<td>171,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>FY 2013- July 2018 Transaction Amounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Vehicle Mechanic 1</td>
<td>140,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Plumber 3</td>
<td>140,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigeration Mechanic 1</td>
<td>130,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former PE Building Service Worker 1</td>
<td>124,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Mechanic 2</td>
<td>119,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Maintenance Worker 1</td>
<td>115,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker 3</td>
<td>110,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Maintenance Worker 2</td>
<td>105,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Mechanic 1</td>
<td>99,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Plumber 4</td>
<td>91,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Special Skills Supervisor 3</td>
<td>81,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Skilled Trades Supervisor 2</td>
<td>77,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fender Construction Worker 1</td>
<td>74,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Maintenance Mechanic 2</td>
<td>69,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Project Coordinator 1</td>
<td>68,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter 1</td>
<td>62,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Mechanic 2</td>
<td>59,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter 1</td>
<td>55,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades Supervisor 3</td>
<td>16,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 11,776,146</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the Office of the County Auditor with Information Obtained from the Accounting System of AMS and PeopleSoft*
Viravar LLC

Using the State of Florida Division of Corporations public database search engine (www.sunbiz.org), we searched for possible entities where Rajindra Lallharry is an Officer/Registered Agent. We identified that Rajindra is listed as an Officer/Registered Agent for two entities:

- VIRAVAR LLC and,
- SHIV LINGAM KIRTAN MANDALI INC

![State of Florida Division of Corporations Entities Registered to Rajindra Lallharry (Source: www.sunbiz.org)]
Upon selecting the entity “VIRAVAR LLC No. L12000159501”, we noted that the principal address for Viravar LLC is 814 East Palm Run Dr, North Lauderdale, FL 33068. Additionally, we noted that Viravar LLC had two managing members, Rajindra Lallharry and Individual 1.
We determined that the principal address listed below, is the same address used by Rajindra on his County’s job application for the Port Everglades Storekeeper position.

Port Everglades Storekeeper Application Completed by Rajindra Lallharry (Source: Broward County Human Resources)
Vees Supply LLC

Using Rajindra’s Broward County Property Appraiser’s mailing address and County mailing address, we searched the State of Florida Division of Corporation public records (www.sunbiz.org) and identified one entity: Vees Supply LLC.

Upon further inspection of the entity record, we identified the entity is registered to the same address listed in Rajindra’s County employee records. We further confirmed the Managing Member for the entity Vees Supply LLC is his Daughter, the same Managing Member for the vendor Viravar LLC as identified above.
To confirm whether Vees Supply LLC is a vendor of the Port, we searched transactions processed using County issued P-Cards and identified 90 transactions totaling $151,403.48. We identified that all 90 transactions were processed using PayPal. Of which, 86 transactions were processed by Rajindra Lallharry and the other four transactions were processed by other Port employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11330 NW 45 STREET  
CORAL SPRINGS, FL 33055 |

To confirm whether Vees Supply LLC is a vendor of the Port, we searched transactions processed using County issued P-Cards and identified 90 transactions totaling $151,403.48. We identified that all 90 transactions were processed using PayPal. Of which, 86 transactions were processed by Rajindra Lallharry and the other four transactions were processed by other Port employees.
To identify a relationship between Rajindra Lallharry, Individual 1, and Vees Supply LLC, we inspected Rajindra Lallharry County’s email address inbox.

We noted the following:

i. We identified one email in Rajindra’s County email on April 9, 2013, where Rajindra states, “The vehicle is in both my daughter’s and my name”. Further review of Rajindra’s County email, we obtained a Florida Vehicle Registration, identifying both Individual 1, Rajindra Lallharry as registered owners of a vehicle in the State of Florida.

ii. We identified email communication between Rajindra Lallharry and Individual 1 on January 19, 2018:

Individual 1 - “Hey I’m desperate we phone cut off and I have a phone interview in an hour, are you able to make another payment to V for this month?”

Rajindra Lallharry – “ok”

Individual 1 – “Lol ok so that’s a no?”

Rajindra Lallharry – “No, go ahead, we’ll do it next week”
We confirmed that Rajindra processed a payment to the vendor, Vees Supply LLC on February 6, 2018 for $2,494.68.

Email Communication Between Rajindra Lallharry and Individual 1 (Source: Rajindra Lallharry County Emails)
iii. We identified another email communication sent from a new email address on August 3, 2014. This email message had an attached invoice from Vees Supply LLC.

![Email and Invoice Image]

*Email from Individual 2 with attached Vees Supply LLC invoice (Source: Rajendra Lollharry County Emails)*
Through further review of Rajindra’s County email inbox, we identified another email message sent on July 24, 2014 from the same email address attached with a resume. Inspection of the attachment revealed that the resume belonged to Individual 2.

Email with attached resume belonging to Individual 2 (Source: Rajindra Lalharry County Emails)
We furthered identified email communication where Rajindra is seeking confirmation that the documents he supplemented for Individual 2 is sufficient to file a dependent affidavit with Broward County.

Rajindra Submitting Documents to Broward County Human Resources for a Dependent Affidavit for Individual 2.

Also, we identified that Individual 2 is listed as a joint tenant with Individual 1, and another person, Individual 3 at the address, 11330 Nw 45th St, Coral Springs, Fl 33065. This address is the same address that Rajindra uses as his official County’s mailing address.

Warranty Deed for Individual (Source: Broward County Property Appraiser’s Public Search)
We later identified that Rajindra correctly spells Individual 3’s name while confirming, this person is a dependent of Rajindra.

We conclude that Individual 1 is Rajindra’s daughter, identified as “Daughter” in this report. Additionally, we conclude that Individual 2 is one of Rajindra’s sons, identified as “Son 2” in this report.
Infinite Distributors LLC

Upon review of Rajindra’s County emails, we identified a wedding invitation for Individual 3 and Individual 4, set to be married on November 29, 2013. Individual 3 is identified as the son of “Bobby” Lallharry on the face of the invitation.

Wedding Invitation for Individual 3 and Individual 4 (Source: Rajindra Lallharry County Emails)
Using the State of Florida Division of Corporation public database, we obtained a copy of the Electronic Articles of Organization for Infinite Distributors LLC and identified Individual 4 as the person authorized to manage the entity. Additionally, we identified the address used by Individual 4 is 3462 Coral Springs Dr, Coral Springs Fl, 33065. Articles of Organization for Infinite Distributors LLC were filed approximately 8 months after the wedding invitation date.

Electronic Articles of Organization
For
Florida Limited Liability Company

Article I
The name of the Limited Liability Company is:
INFINITE DISTRIBUTORS LLC

Article II
The street address of the principal office of the Limited Liability Company is:
3462 CORAL SPRINGS DR
CORAL SPRINGS, FL. US 33065

The mailing address of the Limited Liability Company is:
3462 CORAL SPRINGS DR
CORAL SPRINGS, FL. US 33065

Article III
The name and Florida street address of the registered agent is:

[Registered Agent Information Redacted]

Having been named as registered agent and to accept service of process for the above stated limited liability company at the place designated in this certificate, I hereby accept the appointment as registered agent and agree to act in this capacity. I further agree to comply with the provisions of all statutes relating to the proper and complete performance of my duties, and I am familiar with and accept the obligations of my position as registered agent.
Registered Agent Signature: MARSHA DASCH

Article IV
The name and address of person(s) authorized to manage LLC:

[Individual 4 Information Redacted]

Signature of member or an authorized representative:

[Signature Redacted]

I am the member or authorized representative submitting these Articles of Organization and affirm that the facts cited herein are true. I am aware that false information submitted in a document to the Department of State constitutes a third degree felony as provided for in s.817.155, F.S. I understand the requirement to file an annual report between January 1st and May 1st in the calendar year following formation of the LLC and every year thereafter to maintain “active” status.

Articles of Incorporation for Infinite Distributors LLC (Source: www.sunbiz.org)
We confirmed that Individual 3 officially married the son of Rajindra Lallharry, Individual 4 on December 1, 2017 in the City of Deerfield Beach, FL.

Marriage License System - License Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse 1 Name / First Middle Last / Maiden or Surname</th>
<th>Spouse 1 Reside, City:</th>
<th>Spouse 2 Reside, City:</th>
<th>Married By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual 3</td>
<td>CORAL SPRINGS</td>
<td>CORAL SPRINGS</td>
<td>DEPUTY CLERK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Application Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARRIED/RECORDED</td>
<td>12-01-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Date:</th>
<th>Birth Place:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-12-2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriage License for Individual 3 and Individual 4 (Source: Broward County Clerk of Courts)

Rajindra Lallharry completing a dependent affidavit for Individual 3 (Source: Rajindra Lallharry County Email)
Upon review of Rajindra’s County email records, we identified multiple instances where Rajindra received payment confirmation for purchases made from Infinite Distributors LLC. Individual 4 is identified on the face of the email receipts.

Rajindra’s email records indicate that Individual 3 is a dependant of Rajindra Lallharry. We confirmed that Individual 3, the dependent of Rajindra Lallharry identified above, is the son of Rajindra (Bobby) Lallharry identified as “Son 3” in this report. Additionally, public records indicated that Individual 4 is the daughter in law of Rajindra Lallharry, identified as “Daughter – In- Law” in this report.
Venturi Supplies

Upon review of Rajindra’s P-Card transactions, we identified a vendor with a generic name, “PAYPAL* Reseller”. Through review of the invoices submitted by Rajindra for reimbursement, we identified the vendor name as Venturi Supplies. We did not identify this legal name or entity registered in the State of Florida with the Division of Corporations.

![Venturi Supplies Invoice](image)

Venturi Supplies Invoice (Source: AMS Advantage Records)

Upon review of Rajindra’s County email inbox, we identified copies of Venturi Supplies PayPal payment confirmations and noted the following.
Rajindra received an emailed PayPal payment confirmation for Invoice #0156 from Reseller - Venturi Supplies in the amount of $1,658 on February 25, 2016. We noted that this invoice was processed using another Port employee P-Card.

Upon clicking the “View and Pay Invoice” link embedded within the email body, we were directed to PayPal’s website to view the original invoice created by Venturi Supplies. Upon inspection of the PayPal website, we confirmed the original PayPal invoice number to be “INV2-7WC5-ESQA-9SJG-RVGS”.

Venturi Supplies PayPal Payment Confirmation for Invoice #0156
Upon inspection of the original PayPal invoice, we identified Rajindra’s dependent, Individual 2.
However, upon review of the invoice submitted for reconciliation and reimbursement, we noted that Individual 2’s name was removed.

Venturi Supplies Altered AMS Advantage Invoice Submitted without the Individual 2’s Name (Source: Rajindra Lallharry County Email and AMS Advantage Invoice)
SH Marketing

Upon review of Rajindra’s P-Card transactions, we identified another vendor with a generic name, “PAYPAL SH Marketing”. We did not identify this name as a registered entity in the State of Florida with the Division of Corporations. Further review of Rajindra’s County email, we identified two SH Marketing PayPal email payment confirmations and noted the following.

Rajindra received an emailed PayPal payment confirmation for Invoice #2541 from SH Marketing Inc in the amount of $1,778 on November 23, 2015.

Venturi Supplies Altered AMS Advantage Invoice Submitted without the Individual 2’s Name (Source: Rajindra Lallharry County Email and AMS Advantage Invoice)
Upon clicking the “View and Pay Invoice” link embedded within the email body, we were directed to PayPal’s website to view the original invoice created by SH Marketing. Upon inspection of the PayPal website, we confirmed the original PayPal invoice number.

Upon inspection of the original PayPal invoice, we identified a version of Rajindra’s dependent name, Individual 2.

*PayPal Original Invoice #2541 (Source: Rajindra Lallharry County Email and www.paypal.com)*
However, upon review of the invoice submitted for reconciliation and reimbursement, we noted that Individual 2’s name was removed.

![Invoice Image]

_SH Marketing Altered AMS Advantage Invoice Submitted without the Individual 2’s Name (Source: Rajindra Lalllarry County Email and AMS Advantage Invoice)_
As identified in **Section II Opportunity for Improvement No. 11**, Former Storekeeper 1 (Rajindra) made personal item purchases from Company 21. Rajindra’s P-Card purchases accounted for 74 of 241 (31%) totaling $177,416 of all payments made to Company 21 at the Port Everglades during review period.

Review of Rajindra Lallharry email communication with Company 21 revealed frequent communication of purchasing requests and invoices. On July 5, 2016, Rajindra used a Port everglades scanner to scan and email himself a list of personal items.

Review of the attachment sent to Company 21 revealed that Rajindra sent 3 pages:

- Page 1 – List of cleaning supplies and quantities.
- Page 2 – List of personal items with Rajindra’s home address printed on the front.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DVO 94378</td>
<td>Glass cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DVO 94379</td>
<td>Glass jars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FORM 88</td>
<td>Glass degreaser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLO 31036 CT</td>
<td>Urine Rem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VINEGAR</td>
<td>Vinegar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DIA 03659 CT</td>
<td>Removent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 dozen</td>
<td>PUM 12</td>
<td>Pumice stick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PUM JANG</td>
<td>Toilet &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 each</td>
<td>RLF 1985 LG</td>
<td>64 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 box</td>
<td>CSO 091460</td>
<td>Cutters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 each</td>
<td>RHP 2A15 MODEL</td>
<td>Ice Chest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R. LALLHARRY
11330 NW 45th ST
CORAL SPRINGS, FL 33065.
On further review of Rajindra’s email communication with Company 21, we identified another email sent on November 3, 2017, with two separate attachments. Inspection of the email body revealed Rajindra making a preference in the color he would like, as well as the quality of the item because of reviews.

Review of the attachments sent to Company 21 revealed that Rajindra sent the following:

- Attachment 1 – Screen shot from www.amazon.com of a Nike Men’s Solarsoft Comfort Slide Sandal.
Attachment 2-Luggage 3 Piece Set from Amazon.com Emailed Company 21
(Source: Rajindra Lalharry County Email)
As identified in **Section II Opportunity for Improvement No. 11**, Former Storekeeper 1 (Rajindra) made personal item purchases from Company 22. Rajindra’s P-Card purchases accounted for 82 of 118 (69%) totaling $124,302 of all payments made to Company 22 at the Port Everglades during review period. Of the 82 purchases from Rajindra, 62 purchases totaling 93,322 were made using his P-Card and 20 purchases totaling $30,980 were made with other Port employees’ P-Card where the invoices were addressed directly to him.

A review of Rajindra Lallharry email communication with Company 22 revealed frequent communication of purchasing requests and invoices. On July 20, 2016, Rajindra used a Port Everglades scanner to scan and email himself a list of personal items.

Review of the attachment sent to Company 22 revealed that Rajindra sent 2 pages:

- Page 1 – List of personal items.
- Page 2 – Continued list of personal items.
Page 1 of 2 List of Personal Items Sent to Company 22 (Source: Rajindra Lallharry County Email)
List of Personal Items Sent to Company 22 (Source: Rajindra Lallharry County Email)

- Item total: $113.04
- Standard shipping: FREE
- Estimated tax: TBD
- Estimated order total (not including applicable taxes): $113.04
- Total savings: $32.89

Upon review of Rajindra’s County emails, we identified the following:

i. We noted that an email conversation between Rajindra’s wife, Individual 5 and Company 24 on January 23, 2013 was regarding an upcoming religious service.
ii. Further review of Rajindra’s P-Card purchases identified a purchase on December 4, 2012 in the amount of $1,910, approximately a month before the personal email communication.

![Invoice](image)

*Rajindra Lallharry Purchase from Company 24*

iii. We identified another email sent from Rajindra’s wife on October 28, 2013 with an attached invoice from Company 24. Inspection of the invoice revealed the following:

- The event invoiced is scheduled for 11/23/2013.
- Invoiced amount totaling $6,700 before applied discount of $4,700.
- Final amount to be paid $2,000.
**Company 24 Invoice for Personal Event with Substantial Discount**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Strike Date</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Event Date</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Date</td>
<td>Strike Date</td>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Event Date</td>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 x 30 Frame Tent</td>
<td>Solid Side Walls</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>600.00T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEPTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>White Chair Covers w/ Silver swirl &amp; silver organza Sachet</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>900.00T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>132&quot; Solid Polyester Linen Royal blue</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>420.00T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Table Overlays Silver swirl</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>450.00T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEREMONY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40 x 30 Frame Tent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
<td>1,600.00T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Royal Chavari Chairs</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1,750.00T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8 FT Banquet Table</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>140.00T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Burgundy Banquet Linens</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>280.00T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 x 16 Stage</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>160.00T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>White Plastic Folding Chairs</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>100.00T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solid Side Walls</td>
<td>0.00T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery and Pickup (Ground level - within 50' to event site)</td>
<td>100.00T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsibility for all equipment remains with the lessor from time of delivery until time of return. We do not guarantee delivery or pickup times. Company 24 is not responsible for any personal injury or damage caused by misuse of equipment. The renter will assume all risk inherent in the operation and use of the rented equipment by you and anyone else. You agree to assume the entire responsibility for the defense of, and to pay, indemnify, and hold us harmless from and release us from any and all claims from damage to property or bodily injury (including death), resulting from the use, operation or possession of rented equipment or from any cause. Unless agreed otherwise, a 10% non-refundable deposit is required for reservations, the remaining 90% will be due on or before delivery of equipment. Pricing does not include setting up of tables-chairs-linen. Pricing does not include delivery of equipment up stairwell/elevator. SIDEWALLS ARE NOT WIND BARRIERS.

Customer Signature: ______________________________ Date: ____________

---
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### Invoice

**Date:** 8/19/2013  
**Invoice #:** 61955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Delivery Date</th>
<th>Strike Date</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Event Date</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Discount | SUBCONTRACT ITEMS  
White liner @ $1200.00  
Accent draping @ $500 | -4,700.00 | -4,700.00 |

Responsibility for all equipment remains with the lessor from time of delivery until time of return. We do not guarantee delivery or pickup times. We are not responsible for any personal injury or damage caused by misuse of equipment. The receiver will assume all risk inherent in the operation and use of the rented equipment by YOU and anyone else. You agree to assume the entire responsibility for the defense of, and to pay, indemnify, and hold US harmless from and release us from, any and all claims from damage to property or bodily injury (including death), resulting from the use operation or possession of Rented Equipment or from any cause. Unless agreed otherwise, a 50% non-refundable deposit is required for reservations, the remaining 50% will be due on or before delivery of equipment. Pricing does not include setting up of tables/chairs/linens. Pricing does not include delivery of equipment up stairwell/elevator. SIDEWALLS ARE NOT WIND BARRIERS.

**Subtotal:** $2,000.00  
**Sales Tax (0.0%):** $0.00  
**Total:** $2,000.00  
**Payments/Credits:** $0.00  
**Balance Due:** $2,000.00

Customer Signature: ___________________________  
Date: ____________

---

*Page 2 of 2 Company 24 Rental Invoice for Personal Event with Substantial Discount*
Appendix K: Purchases for Family Members

On two separate occasions we identified that Rajindra’s Daughter and Son 2 requested Rajindra to purchase items for them.

i. We identified an email communication sent by Rajindra’s daughter on February 6, 2015 with three links to www.amazon.com and a message

   “if you can get any of these please and thanks...it's okay if you can’t”.

   ![Image of Amazon links]

   *Rajindra’s daughter Request to Purchase Personal Item (Source: Rajindra Lallharry County Email)*

Inspection of Rajindra’s P-Card purchases revealed that Rajindra made two of the three items requested by his daughter:

- Item – SUUER Superman Steel iPhone Case
- Item – Premium Tempered Screen Protector
**Item Requested by Rajindra’s daughter, SUER Superman Steel iPhone Black Case Purchased Rajindra Lallharry Using County P-Card**

- **Request Date:** Monday, March 13, 2016
- **Purchased Date:** Tuesday, April 7, 2016
- **Vendor:** Amazon.com
- **Cost:** $9.82

**Table:**

| Item Requested by Rajindra’s daughter, Premium Tempered Screen Protector Purchased Rajindra Lallharry Using County P-Card | **Vendor:** Amazon.com | **Cost:** $9.82 | **Shipped:** Wednesday, February 18, 2015 | **Details:**
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description:** Premium Tempered Screen Protector | **Quantity:** 2 | **Estimated Delivery Date:** | **Shipped to:** rajindra lallharry 2101 Eisenhower Blvd, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316, United States | **Shipment Details:**
| **Tracking Number:** | **Tracking URL:** | | **Total Before Tax:** $23.18 | **Total After Tax:** $23.18 |
ii. We identified another email communication sent by Rajindra’s son, Son 2 on March 30, 2015. Inspection of the email revealed that no content was explicitly mentioned, however, the subject line of the email stated, “Fellowes 49107 100-Piece Super Tool Kit – Newegg.com”. Review of Rajindra’s P-Card purchases reveal that the item “Fellowes 49107 100-Piece Super Tool Kit” was purchased the next day (April 1, 2015) and subsequently reconciled and reimbursed by the Purchasing Department.

Item Requested by Rajindra’s son, Son 2, Fellowes 49107 100-Piece Super Tool Kit Purchased Rajindra Lallharry Using County P-Card
This listing of recommendations represents the recommendations contained in the report in order of priority of implementation. The status is information reported by Port management as of August 2019.

**Status Legend:** I=Implemented, PI=Partially Implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Recommendation/Timeframe</th>
<th>Cost/(Savings)</th>
<th>Status as of August 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Port should commit to the development of an asset inventory as a first step toward a structured asset management program.</td>
<td>$100,000 for the development of the “horizontal” assets and approximately $800,000 for the facilities asset inventory.</td>
<td>Asset inventory program, AiM is in the process of being implemented. The original effort to implement AiM started in Sept. 2017. We gained more traction in Feb. 2019 by further coordinating amongst staff and the Facilities Maintenance Depart. implementation team at the County. Presently, assets are being tracked on a spreadsheet, MP2 software, and GIS is also now being used to assemble list of assets. This is scheduled to be completed December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should immediately require all purchases of parts and supplies to be made through the central warehouse. Storekeepers should record all parts in inventory and link their use to specific work orders. The Storekeepers should conduct a full inventory count annually, and quarterly counts of one-fourth of the inventory line items.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>All parts and supplies orders are made through the storeroom. Consolidation to a centralized warehouse is on track for fall of 2019. Storekeepers are linking work orders to counter releases. Port conducted an initial full count of all warehouse spaces in July 2018. Ongoing annual and periodic counts are being completed as scheduled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Recommendation/ Timeframe</th>
<th>Cost/ (Savings)</th>
<th>Status as of August 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16      | The PW/M Section should develop and install a preventive maintenance program for all of the Port buildings and building components.  

Timeframe: Begin Immediately. Substantial completion by 1st quarter 2018 | Potential savings of ($68,782) | Programs are in place for HVAC, Elevator, Backflows, Flushing starting in March 2017. Additional refinements will be done September 2020. |
| 18      | The PW/M Section should enhance its ability to implement a more comprehensive preventive maintenance program by adding two additional facilities maintenance positions. The PW/M Section should also be authorized to increase its budgeted allocation for contracted maintenance services to supplement the efforts of internal staff.  

Timeframe: FY 2019 | $114,837 personnel cost, with an additional $54,900 in equipment. Additional $57,418 contracted services | Facilities Maintenance position was filled July 2019. The Operations position is scheduled to be filled September 2019. |
| 19      | The Port should immediately begin the process of outsourcing the maintenance of both the sanitary sewer pump stations and potable water distribution system as a stop gap measure.  

Further, the Port should begin to work with the Human Resources Division on defining the appropriate requirements and job classifications for this type of work in the future.  

Timeframe: Summer, 2017 | $160,000 for outsourced labor and materials. $75 per employee certified | Effort started in July 2017 to outsource sanitary sewer services. Work with HR is ongoing. |
| 23      | The Port should transfer the building trades, and related, positions from PW/M to SE&C.  

Timeframe: Fall, 2017 | The addition of the positions of Facilities Manager and Skilled Trades Supervisor are estimated to cost $159,301. | Started and completed Feb 2019. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Recommendation/ Timeframe</th>
<th>Cost/ (Savings)</th>
<th>Status as of August 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The SE&amp;C Division should add another position of Enterprise Assistant Director with a professional engineering (P.E.) certification. Along with three Construction Project Management Supervisors, this position will have responsibility for direction and oversight of the facilities maintenance and certain engineering/capital project functions. Timeframe: Fall, 2017</td>
<td>$150,000 including salary and benefits at the similar level as the existing position of Enterprise Assistant Director of Capital Projects.</td>
<td>Started and completed in Jan 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The Port should construct a new facility that incorporates offices, work areas and covered storage. It is estimated that the total amount of space required is approximately 57,445 square feet. Timeframe: FY 2020</td>
<td>$9,191,200 (estimated)</td>
<td>Effort to implement this recommendation started in August 2019. Consultant has been identified, waiting for approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In preparation for the installation of the AiM computerized maintenance management system, the PW/M Section should begin requiring all crew members to report elements of their work each day. Timeframe: Immediate</td>
<td>Approximately $38,500</td>
<td>Started in February 2018. iPads have been procured. Trades employees are using iPads for email, photos, and access to port as-build drawings. iPad use expected to continue when AiM implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should begin to define work activities that are commonly performed. Timeframe: Begin immediately. Complete Fall, 2017</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>All work activities have been defined onto a spreadsheet developed in February 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Recommendation/ Timeframe</td>
<td>Cost/ (Savings)</td>
<td>Status as of August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should develop and implement a formal plan and schedule for all major maintenance events for the year. <strong>Timeframe:</strong> Commence FY 2018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Most major activities have been developed or are in the final steps of being developed and implemented. They will be further refined in AiM by September 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Facilities Maintenance Superintendent should generate a monthly performance report on the accomplishment of projected work, and discuss the work accomplished with the Seaport Maintenance Manager, who should brief the Enterprise Director and Enterprise Assistant Director of Operations on accomplishment of work and any deficits. <strong>Timeframe:</strong> Commence FY 2018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Tracking system and performance reporting of accomplishments started in February 2019 and continues to be tracked on an ongoing basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Port should ensure that all employees in facilities maintenance-related positions continue to receive daily Tool Box talks and attend weekly safety meetings after these positions are transferred to SE&amp;C. <strong>Timeframe:</strong> Ongoing</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Program was developed and implemented in Spring of 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>As an interim step until the installation of an automated fuel dispensing system, PW/M Section Mechanics should record the odometer or hour meter readings in the shop to identify those units that are due for PM within the next two-week period. <strong>Timeframe:</strong> Summer, 2017</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Recording of information was implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Recommendation/ Timeframe</td>
<td>Cost/ (Savings)</td>
<td>Status as of August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Port should install a fuel dispensing station with gas and diesel storage tanks and equip the station with an automated fuel dispensing system to capture relevant user, equipment and fueling information. <strong>Timeframe:</strong> Summer, 2018</td>
<td>Cost avoidance of ($7,280) through elimination of travel time. Estimated $300,000 for two fuel storage tanks, fueling station and automated fuel dispensing system.</td>
<td>Fuel tank is slated to be installed with the new consolidated maintenance building. Installation will be approximately 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SE&amp;C should engage with the Purchasing Division to enhance and improve support within the framework of the new commodity-aligned procurement approach. <strong>Timeframe:</strong> FY 2018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Purchasing has been engaged and collectively enhanced our procurement process. Completed January 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SE&amp;C should partner with Broward County Human Resources to identify specificity in career planning for construction project management roles providing a path and incentives for investments in continuing education and cross-training. <strong>Timeframe:</strong> FY 2018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Career and succession planning programs were developed February 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should begin to define service levels for each of its major work activities. <strong>Timeframe:</strong> Begin immediately. Complete Fall, 2017</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>All major activities have been identified and linked to appropriate engineering standards and guidelines. Completed Feb. 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Recommendation/ Timeframe</td>
<td>Cost/ (Savings)</td>
<td>Status as of August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Port should develop a plan for deployment of technology to all PW/M staff to access current data and construction drawings for Port infrastructure. Elaboration of a training plan to support this change is required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Completed roll out for HVAC, Lighting management, Elevator and GIS February 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeframe: Begin development of the plan, Winter 2017. Complete Winter 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The PW/M Section and SE&amp;C Division should engage in an analysis of operations that identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and develop a micro-level plan that feeds into the Port’s strategic plan.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>All department completed SWOT in Nov 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeframe: FY 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should centralize the decision regarding the number and types of items carried in inventory, and discontinue the practice of allowing individual employees to order their preferred supplies.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Ordering of inventory has been centralized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeframe: Immediate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed July 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PW/M should fill the vacant Vehicle Mechanic position.</td>
<td>NA (Position currently authorized)</td>
<td>Position was filled September 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeframe: Fall, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Recommendation/ Timeframe</td>
<td>Cost/ (Savings)</td>
<td>Status as of August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Institute a structured approach to the evaluation of the feasibility of outsourcing. The Department should use, or modify, the scoring methodology provided in Appendix D for all functions performed by the divisions in order to maximize the utilization of internal staff. <strong>Timeframe: FY 2018</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Evaluation has been completed which is being used to utilize outsourcing. Completed April 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should contract, initially, for the employment of predictive testing equipment on an annual basis. In the mid-term, the PW/M staff should selectively acquire this equipment and train its staff in its use. <strong>Timeframe: Contract by Winter, 2017. Procure equipment thereafter</strong></td>
<td>$15,000 to $20,000 annually</td>
<td>Procured infrared device in Sept 2017. Procured Fluke Meter to test electrical devices in July 2017. Additional equipment will be purchased as needed for predictive evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The Port should engage the County’s Human Resources Division to determine the additional compensation attributable to this “Lead Worker” assignment. <strong>Timeframe: FY 2018</strong></td>
<td>Likely some cost impact. County HR should determine.</td>
<td>Working with HR to develop. Revised 8/27/2019 Request to include Lead Worker title in the bargaining agreement has been submitted to County HR. County HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PW/M should formally assess the need to add a Painter position to replace the position that was converted to a full time Sign Maker. <strong>Timeframe: FY 2018</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Painter has been added and filled September 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Recommendation/ Timeframe</td>
<td>Cost/ (Savings)</td>
<td>Status as of August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Both PW/M and SE&amp;C should develop mission statements that define their purposes. The project team has provided some samples that may serve as starting points that may be used to refine to better reflect the wishes of employees. Timeframe: Winter, 2018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Mission statement developed November 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by the County Auditor’s Office based on information provided by Seaport Engineering & Facilities Maintenance Division*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>MATERIALS &amp; SERVICES</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF WORK PERFORMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FILTERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Check reach in cooler not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRIGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working, Found problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R Lifes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>related To Faculty Condenser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Dog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fan Motor. Remove old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Sock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>motor and install New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Shirt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115v Factory recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Cap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>motor. Cycle. To Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Hat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operation, working normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Glove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also Found Corroded Condensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heater and Replace Part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clean Clogged Condensing Coil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Scarf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cover with dust and Debris.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL MATERIALS**

- TOTAL LAVOR

**TOTAL SUMMARY**

- TOTAL MATERIALS
- TOTAL LABOR
- TOTAL

Thank You
Appendix N-1: Splitting Example #1 of Five Transactions with Same Items and Amounts Purchased from Same Company by a Port Electrician 1 Within a Month
SOLD TO:  
BROWARD Cty Bd of Comm/ Acct  
2101 Eisenhower  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

SHIPPED TO: 525  
BROWARD Cty Bd of Comm/ Acct  
2101 Eisenhower  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKU</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ORDER QTY</th>
<th>SHIP QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMT</th>
<th>EXT PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8440608055</td>
<td>LEDSIGN LED-8035K57K 60W RETROFIT LAMP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>3400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Procured Item"

*********************** Credit Card Information  ***********************
*  
* Merchant ID:  
* Card Number:  
* Card Holder: BROWARD Cty Bd of Comm/ Acct  
* Charge Amount: $3400.00  
* Charge Date: 04/07/2017

**PAID IN FULL**

Past due balances are subject to late charges at 1.5% per month.  
All payments are due by the 10th of the month.

Sub Total 3400.00
S & H CHGS 0.00
Sales Tax 0.00
Total Due 3400.00

Broward County Office of the County Auditor  
Page 217
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKU</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ORDER QTY</th>
<th>SHIP QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>EXT PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84400680855</td>
<td>LED SGN LED-8035857K 60W RETROFIT LAMP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>3400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Procured Item*

*************** Credit Card Information ***************
* Merchant ID: [redacted] Time/Date: 15:25:34 26 APR 2017 *
* Card Number [redacted] Card Type: [redacted] *
* Card Holder: BROWARD CTY BD OF CO Auth Code: 029850 *
* Charge Amount: $3400.00 Charge Date: 04/17/2017 *
* PAID IN FULL

Past due balances are subject to late charges at 1.5% per month.
All payments are due by the 10th of the month.

Sub Total 3400.00
S & H CHGS 0.00
Sales Tax 0.00

Total Due 3400.00

Submit ** 04/18/17 Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ORDER QTY</th>
<th>SHIP QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TAX RATE</th>
<th>TOT PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>LEDSCHN LED-8035857K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>3400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```plaintext
LEVEL 3 CENTRAL AREAS C&D
```

REVIEWS BY:

Past due balances are subject to late charges at 1.5% per month.
All payments are due by the 10th of the month.

Sub Total      3400.00
S & H CHGS      0.00
Sales Tax       0.00
Total Due       3400.00
Appendix N-2:
Splitting Example #2 of Two Transactions with Same Services and Dollar Amounts Purchased from Same Company by Two Port Employees Within 10 Days

![Invoice Image]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK PERFORMED ON OUTER EDGE OF CANTILEVERED, TWIN T CONCRETE ROOF SYSTEM IF ABOVE GROUND. INCLUDES HIGH LIFT, SCAFFOLD, VISquine PROTECTION</td>
<td>2,985.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See above for terms. If invoice is not paid in full within 30 days after billing date, the customer agrees to pay interest at the rate of 1.5% per month (18% annually) upon the unpaid portion of this invoice. Releases will not be executed by [REDACTED] until all interest is paid. If lien or suit is brought by [REDACTED] to collect any amounts due or owing under this bill, customer agrees to pay all costs including reasonable attorney’s fees. Customer must contact [REDACTED] about any disputed invoice items within 2 weeks of invoice date. After 2 weeks, invoiced items are no longer up for debate.

WE APPRECIATE YOUR BUSINESS!

52,985.00
BROWARD COUNTY
PORT EVERGLADES DEPT,
1850 ELLER DR
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33316

Due on receipt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK PERFORMED ON OUTER EDGE OF CANTILEVERED TWIN T CONCRETE ROOF SYSTEM 16' ABOVE GROUND. INCLUDES HIGH LIFT, SCAFFOLD, VISQUEINE PROTECTION</td>
<td>2,985.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See above for terms. If invoice is not paid in full within 30 days after billing date, the customer agrees to pay interest at the rate of 1.5% per month (18% annually) upon the unpaid portion of this invoice. Releases will not be executed by [redacted] until all interest is paid. If lien or suit is brought by [redacted] to collect any amount due or owing under this bill, customer agrees to pay all costs including reasonable attorney's fees. Customer must contact [redacted] about any disputed invoice items within 2 weeks of invoice date. After 2 weeks, invoiced items are no longer up for debate.

WE APPRECIATE YOUR BUSINESS.

$2,985.00
Appendix N-3:
Splitting Example #3 of Two Transactions with Same Items, Quantities and Dollar Amounts Purchased by Two Port Employees on Same Date

Invoice

BILL TO
Board of Country Commissioners
115 S Andrews Ave
Suite 221
Ft Lauderdale, FL 33301

DATE       INVOICE #
2/7/2017    17-0028

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>FILTERS FOR TERMINAL 19</td>
<td>1,985.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-19.75 X 43.25 X 2 ELECTROSTATIC 5 STAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-15.75 X 33.75 X 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

$1,985.00

Payments/Credits

-$1,985.00

Balance Due

$0.00
Broward County Office of the County Auditor

Bill To
Board of County Commissioners
115 S Andrews Ave
Suite 221
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Salsa | FILTERS FOR TERM. 18
8-19.75 X 43.25 X 2 ELECTROSTATIC 5 STAGE
4-15.75 X 35.75 X2 | $1,985.00 |

Total
$1,985.00

Payments/Credits
-$1,985.00

Balance Due
$0.00
Appendix O-1: United States District Court Southern District of Florida Criminal Compliant; United States of America v. Rajindra Lallharry

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 19-cr-60205-CR-DIMITROULEAS/SNOW
18 U.S.C. § 371

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

RAJINDRA LALLHARRY,

Defendant.

Jul 17, 2019

INFORMATION

The United States Attorney charges that:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

At all times relevant to this Information:

1. Port Everglades (hereinafter referred to as “the Port) is a seaport in Port Lauderdale, Florida, in Broward County. The Port, a government agency, is a department within the Broward County government. The Port is governed by the Broward County Board of Commissioners. During each of the calendar years 2012 through 2018, the Port received benefits in excess of $10,000 under a federal program involving grants, subsidies, loans, guarantees, insurance, and/or other federal assistance.

2. The Port issued purchase cards (hereinafter referred to as “P-cards”) to employees, which are similar to credit or debit cards. The P-cards were to be used to pay for goods and services utilized by the Port.

3. Defendant RAJINDRA LALLHARRY (hereinafter referred to as “LALLHARRY”) was employed as a storekeeper at the Port. Defendant LALLHARRY was issued a P-card to purchase materials for the Port.
4. Section 26-73(d) of the Code of Ethics for Broward County states, in pertinent part, that in order to avoid an actual or apparent conflict of interest, County employees shall not, in any way, participate in or seek to influence any procurement or other County-related matter in which an immediate family member of the County employee or an entity owned in whole or in part by an immediate family, is seeking or is engaged in business with the County.

5. From in or about October 2012 through in or about May 2018, family members of defendant LALLHARRY owned, in whole or in part, at least five separate companies (hereinafter referred to as the “Family-Owned Companies”) that engaged in business with the Port. Virtually the entire source of income for the Family-Owned Companies were payments from the Port.

6. In or about March 2013, defendant LALLHARRY filed a Chapter 13 bankruptcy petition.

**COUNT 1**

(Conspiracy to Commit Fraud Concerning Programs Receiving Federal Funds, 18 U.S.C. § 371)

1. The General Allegations section of this Information is realleged and expressly incorporated herein as if set forth in full.

2. From in or about October 2012 and continuing through in or about May 2018, in Broward County, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, the defendant,

RAJINDRA LALLHARRY,

being an agent of the Port, did knowingly and willfully, combine, conspire, confederate, and agree with persons known and unknown to the United States Attorney to commit an offense against the United States, that is, to obtain by fraud, in each of the calendar years 2012 through 2018, property owned by and under the care, custody, and control of the Port that was valued at $5,000, or more, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(A).
Objective of the Conspiracy

3. It was the objective of the conspiracy that the defendant and his co-conspirators would unlawfully enrich themselves by utilizing the defendant’s Port issued P-card to unlawfully obtain money for goods and services that were never delivered to the Port.

Manner and Means of the Conspiracy

4. From in or about October 2012 through in or about May 2018, defendant LALLHARRY charged approximately $229,178.26 to his Port issued P-card for the purchase of equipment and supplies from the Family-Owned Companies, including, vacuums, refrigerators and portable air conditioners, that were never delivered to the Port.

5. Funds received by the Family-Owned Companies from the Port were used to pay personal expenses of defendant LALLHARRY and his family, including approximately $101,790.85, which was used to pay the monthly payments due the Chapter 13 trustee overseeing the bankruptcy of defendant LALLHARRY.

6. On more than one occasion, defendant LALLHARRY altered an invoice to remove the name of a family member in order to avoid discovery of the fraudulent scheme.

Overt Acts

7. In furtherance of the conspiracy and to achieve the objective thereof, at least one of the co-conspirators committed or caused to be committed, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, at least one of the following overt acts, among others:

A. On or about May 9, 2018, defendant LALLHARRY used the Port-issued P-card to pay $1,956 to one of the Family-Owned Companies for parts and supplies that were never delivered to the Port.
B. On or about May 10, 2018, defendant LALLHARRY used the Port-issued P-card
to pay $1,865.85 to one of the Family-Owned Companies for supplies that were never delivered
to the Port.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

ARIANA FAJARDO ORSHAN
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

JEFFREY N. KAPLAN
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  

CASE NO.  

vs.  

RAJINDRA LALLHARRY,  

 Defendant.  

CERTIFICATE OF TRIAL ATTORNEY*  

Superseding Case Information:  

New Defendant(s)  Yes  No  
Number of New Defendants  
Total number of counts  

Court Division: (Select One)  

Minmi  Key West  FTP  WPB  FTI  

1. I do hereby certify that:  
   1. I have carefully considered the allegations of the indictment, the number of defendants, the number of probable witnesses and the legal complexities of the indictment/information attached hereto.  
   2. I am aware that the information supplied on this statement will be relied upon by the Judges of this Court in setting their calendars and scheduling criminal trials under the mandate of the Speedy Trial Act, Title 28 U.S.C. Section 3161.  

3. Interpreter: (Yes or No)  No  
   English  

4. This case will take 0 days for the parties to try.  

5. Please check appropriate category and type of offense listed below:  
   (Check only one)  

   I  0 to 5 days  ✔  Petty  
   II  6 to 10 days  ✔  Minor  
   III  11 to 20 days  ☐  Misdem.  
   IV  21 to 60 days  ☐  Felony  
   V  61 days and over  ☐  

6. Has this case been previously filed in this District Court?  NO  (Yes or No)  

   If yes:  
   Judge:  
   (Attach copy of dispositive order)  
   Has a complaint been filed in this matter?  (Yes or No)  

   If yes:  
   Magistrate Case No.  
   Related Miscellaneous numbers:  
   Defendant(s) in federal custody as of  
   Rule 20 from the District of  

   Is this a potential death penalty case?  NO  (Yes or No)  

7. Does this case originate from a matter pending in the Northern Region of the U.S. Attorney's Office prior to October 14, 2003?  ✔ Yes  ☐ No  

8. Does this case originate from a matter pending in the Central Region of the U.S. Attorney's Office prior to September 1, 2005?  ☐ Yes  ✔ No  

Penalty Sheet(s) attached  

REV 4/8/08  

Signature:  

JACK N. KAPLAN  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Court ID No. A5500030
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

PENALTY SHEET

Defendant's Name: RAJINDRA LALLHARRY

Case No: ____________________________________________

Count #: 1

Conspiracy to Obtain by Fraud Property of Programs Receiving Federal Funds.

Title 18, United States Code, Section 371

Max. Penalty: 5 years' imprisonment, a fine of the greater of $250,000 or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, 3 years' supervised release

*Refers only to possible term of incarceration, does not include possible fines, restitution, special assessments, parole terms or forfeitures that may be applicable
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the
Southern District of Florida

United States of America )
v. ) Case No.
RAJINDRA LALLHARRY, ) 19-60205-CR-DIMITROULEAS/SNOW

Defendant

WAIVER OF AN INDICTMENT

I understand that I have been accused of one or more offenses punishable by imprisonment for more than one year. I was advised in open court of my rights and the nature of the proposed charges against me.

After receiving this advice, I waive my right to prosecution by indictment and consent to prosecution by information.

Date: ____________________________

[Signature]

[Defendant's signature]

[Signature]

[Signature of defendant's attorney]

[Signature]

JASON KREISS
Printed name of defendant's attorney

[Signature]

[Judge's signature]

[Signature]

U.S. Magistrate Judge
Judge's printed name and title
Appendix O-2: United States District Court Southern District of Florida Criminal Compliant; United States of America v. William Woessner

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
19-60202-CR-ALTMAN/HUNT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

WILLIAM WOESSNER,

Defendant.

INFORMATION

The United States Attorney charges that:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

At all times relevant to this Information:

1. Port Everglades (hereinafter referred to as “the Port”) is a seaport in Broward County, Florida. The Port, a government agency, is a department within the Broward County government. The Port is governed by the Broward County Board of Commissioners. During each of the calendar years 2008 through 2016, the Port received benefits in excess of $10,000 under a federal program involving grants, subsidies, loans, guarantees, insurance, and/or other federal assistance.

2. The Port issued purchase cards (hereinafter referred to as “P-cards”) to employees, which are similar to credit or debit cards. The P-cards were to be used to pay for goods and services utilized by the Port.

3. Defendant WILLIAM WOESSNER (hereinafter referred to as “WOESSNER”) was employed in the plumbing department of the Port. Defendant WOESSNER was issued a P-card to buy goods and services for the plumbing department.
4. While working as a Port employee, WOESSNER was an owner of a plumbing company (hereinafter referred to as “WOESSNER’s Plumbing Company”).

5. A vendor (hereinafter referred to as “Co-conspirator 1”) provided goods and services to the Port. For some of the goods and services provided, Port employees paid Co-conspirator 1 with their P-cards.

COUNT 1

(Conspiracy To Commit Fraud Concerning Programs Receiving Federal Funds, 18 U.S.C. § 371)

1. The General Allegations section of this Information is realleged and expressly incorporated herein as if set forth in full.

2. From in or about 2008 and continuing through in or about 2016, in Broward County, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, the defendant,

WILLIAM WOESSNER,

being an agent of the Port, did knowingly and willfully, combine, conspire, confederate, and agree with persons known and unknown to the United States Attorney to commit an offense against the United States, that is, to obtain by fraud, in each of the calendar years 2008 through 2016, property owned by and under the care, custody, and control of the Port that was valued at $5,000, or more, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(A).

Objective of the Conspiracy

3. It was the objective of the conspiracy that the defendant and his co-conspirator would unlawfully enrich themselves by utilizing the defendant’s Port issued P-card to unlawfully obtain money for goods and services that were never delivered to the Port.

Manner and Means of the Conspiracy

4. Beginning in or about 2008, defendant WOESSNER agreed with Co-conspirator
1 to utilize defendant **WOESSNER**’s P-card to purchase materials that were never delivered to the Port.

5. Defendant **WOESSNER** provided Co-conspirator 1 with a list of materials that he needed for **WOESSNER**’s Plumbing Company.

6. Defendant **WOESSNER** provided a separate list to Co-conspirator 1 of materials that were generally more expensive that defendant **WOESSNER** knew the Port would need. Co-conspirator 1 submitted a false invoice to the Port reflecting the delivery of the more expensive materials. Co-conspirator 1 was paid for the list of the more expensive materials. Co-conspirator 1 purchased the list of less expensive materials needed by **WOESSNER**’s Plumbing Company, and kept the difference. The less expensive materials purchased by Co-conspirator 1 were obtained and used by **WOESSNER**’s Plumbing Company. Co-conspirator 1 did not deliver the more expensive listed materials nor the less expensive listed materials to the Port.

7. Defendant **WOESSNER** submitted reports to his supervisor reflecting his P-card use, which falsely stated that Co-conspirator 1 was due money for materials received by the Port.

8. During the course of the scheme, defendant **WOESSNER** and Co-conspirator 1 obtained by fraud approximately $153,685.88.

**Overt Acts**

9. In furtherance of the conspiracy and to achieve the objective thereof, at least one of the co-conspirators committed or caused to be committed, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, at least one of the following overt acts, among others:

   A. On or about February 13, 2015, Co-conspirator 1 ordered $484.51 of materials, which defendant **WOESSNER** obtained and intended to use for **WOESSNER**’s Plumbing Company.
B. On or about February 18, 2015, defendant WOESSNER charged $1,994.10 to the P-card issued to him by the Port to pay Co-conspirator I for materials.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

ARIANA EDUARDO ORSHAN
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

JEFFREY N. KAPLAN
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

vs.

WILLIAM WOESSNER,

Defendant.

CASE NO.

CERTIFICATE OF TRIAL ATTORNEY*

New Defendant(s) _____ Yes _____ No

Number of New Defendants Total number of counts ______

I do hereby certify that:

1. I have carefully considered the allegations of the indictment, the number of defendants, the number of probable
   witnesses and the legal complexities of the Indictment/Information attached hereto.

2. I am aware that the information supplied on this statement will be relied upon by the Judges of this Court in
   setting their calendars and scheduling criminal trials under the mandate of the Speedy Trial Act, Title 28 U.S.C.
   Section 3161.

3. Interpreter: (Yes or No)
   List language and/or dialect No

4. This case will take _____ days for the parties to try.

5. Please check appropriate category and type of offense listed below:
   (Check only one)

   I 0 to 5 days  _____  Minor
   II 6 to 10 days  _____  Petty
   III 11 to 20 days  _____  Midem.
   IV 21 to 60 days  _____  Felony
   V 61 days and over  _____

6. Has this case been previously filed in this District Court? No (Yes or No)

If yes:
Judge: ______________ Case No. ______________

Has a complaint been filed in this matter? Yes (Yes or No) No  _____

Magistrate Case No.
Related Miscellaneous numbers:
Defendant(s) in federal custody as of
Defendant(s) in state custody as of
Rule 20 from the District of

Is this a potential death penalty case? No (Yes or No)  No

7. Does this case originate from a matter pending in the Northern Region of the U.S. Attorney's Office prior to
   October 14, 2003? Yes  No

8. Does this case originate from a matter pending in the Central Region of the U.S. Attorney's Office prior to
   September 1, 2007? Yes  No

______________________________
Jeffrey N. Kaplan
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
Florida Bar No. A5500030

Penalty Sheet(s) attached

REV 4/6/08
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

PENALTY SHEET

Defendant's Name: WILLIAM WOESSNER

Case No: ____________________________

Count #: 1

Conspiracy to Obtain by Fraud Property of Programs Receiving Federal Funds,

Title 18, United States Code, Section 371

Max. Penalty: 5 years' imprisonment, a fine of the greater of $250,000 or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, 3 years' supervised release

*Refers only to possible term of incarceration, does not include possible fines, restitution, special assessments, parole terms or forfeitures that may be applicable
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the
Southern District of Florida

United States of America
v.
WILLIAM WOESSNER,

Defendant

Case No.

WAIVER OF AN INDICTMENT

I understand that I have been accused of one or more offenses punishable by imprisonment for more than one
year. I was advised in open court of my rights and the nature of the proposed charges against me.

After receiving this advice, I waive my right to prosecution by indictment and consent to prosecution by
information.

Date: ____________________________

Defendant's signature

Signature of defendant's attorney

Printed name of defendant's attorney

Judge's signature

Judge's printed name and title
Appendix O-3: United States District Court Southern District of Florida Criminal Compliant; United States of America v. David Moore

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
19-60206-CR-UNGARO/HUNT
CASE NO.
18 U.S.C. § 371

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

DAVID MOORE,

Defendant.

/ 

INFORMATION

The United States Attorney charges that:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

At all times relevant to this Information:

1. Port Everglades (hereinafter referred to as “the Port”) is a seaport in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in Broward County. The Port, a government agency, is a department within the Broward County government. The Port is governed by the Broward County Board of Commissioners. During each of the calendar years 2012 through 2018, the Port received benefits in excess of $10,000 under a federal program involving grants, subsidies, loans, guarantees, insurance, and/or other federal assistance.

2. The Port issued purchase cards (hereinafter referred to as “P-cards”) to employees, which are similar to credit or debit cards. The P-cards were to be used to pay for goods and services utilized by the Port.

3. Defendant DAVID MOORE (hereinafter referred to as “MOORE”) was employed in the plumbing department of the Port. Defendant MOORE was issued a P-card to buy goods and services for the plumbing department.
4. A vendor (hereinafter referred to as “Co-conspirator 1”) provided goods and services to the Port. For some of the goods and services provided, Port employees paid Co-conspirator 1 with their P-cards.

**COUNT 1**

(Conspiracy to Commit Fraud Concerning Programs Receiving Federal Funds, 18 U.S.C. § 371)

1. The General Allegations section of this Information is realleged and expressly incorporated herein as if set forth in full.

2. From in or about 2012 and continuing through in or about 2018, in Broward County, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, the defendant, DAVID MOORE,

being an agent of the Port, did knowingly and willfully, combine, conspire, confederate, and agree with persons known and unknown to the United States Attorney to commit an offense against the United States, that is, to obtain by fraud, in each of the calendar years 2012 through 2018, property owned by and under the care, custody, and control of the Port that was valued at $5,000, or more, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(A).

**Objective of the Conspiracy**

3. It was the objective of the conspiracy that the defendant and his co-conspirator would unlawfully enrich themselves by utilizing the defendant’s Port issued P-card to unlawfully obtain money for goods and services that were never delivered to the Port.

**Manner and Means of the Conspiracy**

4. Beginning in or about 2012, defendant MOORE agreed with Co-conspirator 1 to utilize defendant MOORE’s P-card to pay Co-conspirator 1 for materials that were not delivered to the Port.
5. Defendant **MOORE** caused Co-conspirator 1 to submit false invoices to the Port reflecting the delivery of the materials.

6. Defendant **MOORE** would submit a report to his supervisor reflecting his P-card use, which falsely stated that Co-conspirator 1 was due money for materials received by the Port.

7. Defendant **MOORE** and Co-conspirator 1 split the proceeds received. Co-conspirator 1 paid defendant **MOORE** by checks payable to cash issued from his company or his personal account.

8. During the course of the scheme, defendant **MOORE** and Co-conspirator 1 obtained by fraud approximately $36,505.71.

**Overt Acts**

9. In furtherance of the conspiracy and to achieve the objective thereof, at least one of the co-conspirators committed or caused to be committed, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, at least one of the following overt acts, among others:

   A. On or about June 6, 2018, defendant **MOORE** charged $1,736.85 to the P-card issued to him by the Port to pay Co-conspirator 1 for materials that were not delivered.

   B. On or about June 12, 2018, Co-conspirator 1 provided a check payable to cash issued from his personal account to defendant **MOORE** in the amount of $800.

   All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.
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UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

vs.

DAVID MOORE,

Defendant.

CASE NO.

CERTIFICATE OF TRIAL ATTORNEY*

New Defendant(s) ______ Yes ______ No
Number of New Defendants:
Total number of counts:

Court Division: (Select One)

Miami ______ Key West ______
FTL ______ WPB ______ FTP ______

I do hereby certify that:
1. I have carefully considered the allegations of the indictment, the number of defendants, the number of probable witnesses and the legal complexities of the indictment/information attached hereto.

2. I am aware that the information supplied on this statement will be relied upon by the Judges of this Court in setting their calendars and scheduling criminal trials under the mandate of the Speedy Trial Act, Title 28 U.S.C. Section 3161.

3. Interpreter: (Yes or No) No
List language and/or dialect: English

4. This case will take ______ days for the parties to try.

5. Please check appropriate category and type of offense listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0 to 5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6 to 10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>11 to 20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>21 to 60 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>61 days and over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor ______
Misdemeanor ______
Felony ______

6. Has this case been previously filed in this District Court? ______ No (Yes or No)

If yes:

   (Attach copy of dispositive order)

   Has a complaint been filed in this matter? ______ (Yes or No) No ______

   Magistrate Case No.

   Related Miscellaneous numbers:

   Defendant(s) in federal custody as of

   Defendant(s) in state custody as of

   Rule 20 from the District of

   Is this a potential death penalty case? ______ (Yes or No) No ______

7. Does this case originate from a matter pending in the Northern Region of the U.S. Attorney's Office prior to October 14, 2003? ______ Yes ______ No

8. Does this case originate from a matter pending in the Central Region of the U.S. Attorney's Office prior to September 1, 2007? ______ Yes ______ No

Jerey N. Kaplan
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
Florida Bar No. A500030

Penalty Sheet(s) attached

REV 4/5/08
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

PENALTY SHEET

Defendant's Name: DAVID MOORE
Case No: ________________________________

Count #: 1

Conspiracy to Obtain by Fraud Property of Programs Receiving Federal Funds.
Title 18, United States Code, Section 371

Max. Penalty: 5 years' imprisonment, a fine of the greater of $250,000 or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, 3 years' supervised release

*Refers only to possible term of incarceration, does not include possible fines, restitution, special assessments, parole terms or forfeitures that may be applicable
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the
Southern District of Florida

United States of America v. DAVID MOORE, 
Defendant

Case No.

WAIVER OF AN INDICTMENT

I understand that I have been accused of one or more offenses punishable by imprisonment for more than one year. I was advised in open court of my rights and the nature of the proposed charges against me.

After receiving this advice, I waive my right to prosecution by indictment and consent to prosecution by information.

Date:

Signature of defendant’s attorney

Printed name of defendant’s attorney

Judge’s signature

Judge’s printed name and title

Defendant’s signature
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 19-cr-60204-Smith/Valle

18 U.S.C. § 371

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

JOHN MCGAHEE,

Defendant.

/ 

INFORMATION

The United States Attorney charges that:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

At all times relevant to this Information:

1. Port Everglades (hereinafter referred to as “the Port”) is a seaport in Broward County, Florida. The Port, a government agency, is a department within the Broward County government. The Port is governed by the Broward County Board of Commissioners. During each of the calendar years 2011 through 2014, the Port received benefits in excess of $10,000 under a federal program involving grants, subsidies, loans, guarantees, insurance, and/or other federal assistance.

2. The Port issued purchase cards (hereinafter referred to as “P-cards”) to employees, which are similar to credit or debit cards. The P-cards were to be used to pay for goods and services utilized by the Port.

3. Defendant JOHN MCGAHEE (hereinafter referred to as “MCGAHEE”) was employed in the fendering department of the Port. Defendant MCGAHEE was issued a P-card to buy goods and services for the fendering department.
4. A vendor (hereinafter referred to as “Co-conspirator 1”) provided goods and services to the Port, including the maintenance of the hydraulic drills. For some of the goods and services provided, Port employees paid Co-conspirator 1 with their P-cards.

**COUNT 1**

(Conspiracy to Commit Fraud Concerning Programs Receiving Federal Funds, 18 U.S.C. § 371)

1. The General Allegations section of this Information is realleged and expressly incorporated herein as if set forth in full.

2. From in or about 2011 and continuing through in or about January 2014, in Broward County, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, the defendant,

   JOHN MCGAHEE,

being an agent of the Port, did knowingly and willfully, combine, conspire, confederate, and agree with persons known and unknown to the United States Attorney to commit an offense against the United States, that is, to obtain by fraud, in each of the calendar years 2011 through 2014, property owned by and under the care, custody, and control of the Port that was valued at $5,000, or more, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(A).

**Objective of the Conspiracy**

3. It was the objective of the conspiracy that the defendant and his co-conspirator would unlawfully enrich themselves by utilizing the defendant’s Port issued P-card to unlawfully obtain money for goods and services that were never delivered to the Port.

**Manner and Means of the Conspiracy**

4. Beginning in or about 2011, defendant MCGAHEE agreed with Co-conspirator 1 to utilize defendant MCGAHEE’s P-card to pay Co-conspirator 1 for maintenance of hydraulic drills that was not provided.
4. A vendor (hereinafter referred to as “Co-conspirator 1”) provided goods and services to the Port, including the maintenance of the hydraulic drills. For some of the goods and services provided, Port employees paid Co-conspirator 1 with their P-cards.

**COUNT 1**

(Conspiracy to Commit Fraud Concerning Programs Receiving Federal Funds, 18 U.S.C. § 371)

1. The General Allegations section of this Information is realleged and expressly incorporated herein as if set forth in full.

2. From in or about 2011 and continuing through in or about January 2014, in Broward County, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, the defendant, JOHN MCGAHEE, being an agent of the Port, did knowingly and willfully, combine, conspire, confederate, and agree with persons known and unknown to the United States Attorney to commit an offense against the United States, that is, to obtain by fraud, in each of the calendar years 2011 through 2014, property owned by and under the care, custody, and control of the Port that was valued at $5,000, or more, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(A).

**Objective of the Conspiracy**

3. It was the objective of the conspiracy that the defendant and his co-conspirator would unlawfully enrich themselves by utilizing the defendant’s Port issued P-card to unlawfully obtain money for goods and services that were never delivered to the Port.

**Manner and Means of the Conspiracy**

4. Beginning in or about 2011, defendant MCGAHEE agreed with Co-conspirator 1 to utilize defendant MCGAHEE’s P-card to pay Co-conspirator 1 for maintenance of hydraulic drills that was not provided.
5. Defendant MCGAHEE would either provide the necessary maintenance himself or no maintenance work would be done.

6. Defendant MCGAHEE caused Co-conspirator 1 to submit false invoices to the Port reflecting the completed maintenance work.

7. Defendant MCGAHEE would submit a report to his supervisor reflecting his P-card use, which falsely stated that Co-conspirator 1 was due money for maintenance of the hydraulic drills.

8. Defendant MCGAHEE and Co-conspirator 1 split the proceeds received. Co-conspirator 1 paid defendant MCGAHEE by checks payable to cash issued from his company or his personal account.

9. During the course of the scheme defendant MCGAHEE and Co-conspirator 1 obtained by fraud approximately $17,252.16.

**Overt Acts**

10. In furtherance of the conspiracy and to achieve the objective thereof, at least one of the co-conspirators committed or caused to be committed, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, at least one of the following overt acts, among others:

   A. On or about December 23, 2013, defendant MCGAHEE charged $662 to the P-card issued to him by the Port to pay Co-conspirator 1 for services that had not been rendered.

   B. On or about December 29, 2013, Co-conspirator 1 provided a check payable to cash issued from his personal account to defendant MCGAHEE in the amount of $200.
C. On or about January 2, 2014, defendant **MCGAHEE** cashed the check received from Co-conspirator 1 in order to receive his share of the proceeds from the scheme.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

ARIANA FAJARDO ORSHAN
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

JEFFREY N. KAPLAN
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
CERTIFICATE OF TRIAL ATTORNEY*

United States District Court
Southern District of Florida

United States of America

vs.

John McGahee,

Defendant

CASE NO. ________________________________

Court Division: (Select One)

Miami ______ Key West ______

FIL ______ WPB ______ FTP ______

I do hereby certify that:

1. I have carefully considered the allegations of the indictment, the number of defendants, the number of probable witnesses and the legal complexities of the indictment/information attached hereto.

2. I am aware that the information supplied on this statement will be relied upon by the Judges of this Court in setting their calendars and scheduling criminal trials under the mandate of the Speedy Trial Act, Title 28 U.S.C. Section 3161.

3. Interpreter: (Yes or No) ______

Language and/or dialect: ______

4. This case will take ______ days for the parties to try.

5. Please check appropriate category and type of offense listed below:

   (Check only one)

   I 0 to 5 days ______ Minor ______ Petty ______

   II 6 to 10 days ______

   III 11 to 20 days ______ Misdem. ______

   IV 21 to 60 days ______

   V 61 days and over ______

6. Has this case been previously filed in this District Court? ______

   (Yes or No)

   Case No. ______

   (Attach copy of dispositive order)

   Has a complaint been filed in this matter? ______

   (Yes or No) ______

   Magistrate Case No. ______

   Related Miscellaneous numbers: ______

   Defendant(s) in federal custody as of ______

   Defendant(s) in state custody as of ______

   Rule 20 from the District of ______

   Is this a potential death penalty case? ______

   (Yes or No) ______

7. Does this case originate from a matter pending in the Northern Region of the U.S. Attorney's Office prior to October 14, 2003? ______

   Yes ______

   No ______

8. Does this case originate from a matter pending in the Central Region of the U.S. Attorney's Office prior to September 1, 2007? ______

   Yes ______

   No ______

Jeffrey Kaplan
Assistant United States Attorney
Florida Bar No. A5500030

Penalty Sheet(s) attached

REV 4/8/08
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

PENALTY SHEET

Defendant's Name: JOHN MCGAHEE

Case No: ____________________________

Count #: 1

Conspiracy to Obtain by Fraud Property of Programs Receiving Federal Funds.

Title 18, United States Code, Section 371

Max. Penalty: 5 years' imprisonment, a fine of the greater of $250,000 or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, 3 years' supervised release

*Refers only to possible term of incarceration, does not include possible fines, restitution, special assessments, parole terms or forfeitures that may be applicable
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 19-60203-CR-UNGARO/HUNT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

BRYAN ZASCAVAGE,

Defendant.

INFORMATION

The United States Attorney charges that:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

At all times relevant to this Information:

1. Port Everglades (hereinafter referred to as “the Port”) is a seaport in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in Broward County. The Port, a government agency, is a department within the Broward County government. The Port is governed by the Broward County Board of Commissioners. During each of the calendar years 2008 through 2018, the Port received benefits in excess of $10,000 under a federal program involving grants, subsidies, loans, guarantees, insurance, and/or other federal assistance.

2. The Port issued purchase cards (hereinafter referred to as “P-cards”) to employees, which are similar to credit or debit cards. The P-cards were to be used to pay for goods and services utilized by the Port.

3. Defendant BRYAN ZASCAVAGE (hereinafter referred to as “ZASCAVAGE”) operated Z & Z, Inc., which provided goods and services to the Port. For some of the goods and services provided, Port employees paid Z & Z, Inc., with their P-cards.
4. Co-conspirators 1 and 2 were employed in the plumbing department of the Port. Co-conspirators 1 and 2 were issued P-cards to buy goods and services for the plumbing department. Co-conspirator 3 was employed in the tendering department of the Port. Co-conspirator 3 was issued a P-card to buy goods and services for the tendering department, including for the maintenance of hydraulic drills.

5. While working as a Port employee, Co-conspirator 1 was an owner of a plumbing company (hereinafter referred to as “Co-conspirator 1’s Plumbing Company”).

**COUNT 1**

(Conspiracy to Commit Fraud Concerning Programs Receiving Federal Funds, 18 U.S.C. § 371)

1. The General Allegations section of this Information is realleged and expressly incorporated herein as if set forth in full.

2. From in or about 2008 and continuing through in or about 2018, in Broward County, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, the defendant,

   **BRYAN ZASCAVAGE,**

did knowingly and willfully, combine, conspire, confederate, and agree with agents of the Port, that is, Co-conspirators 1, 2, and 3, to commit an offense against the United States, that is, to obtain by fraud, in each of the calendar years 2008 through 2018, property owned by and under the care, custody, and control of the Port that was valued at $5,000, or more, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(A).

**Objective of the Conspiracy**

3. It was the objective of the conspiracy that the defendant and his co-conspirators would unlawfully enrich themselves by utilizing P-cards issued to Port employees to unlawfully obtain money for goods and services that were never delivered to the Port.
Manner and Means of the Conspiracy

Co-conspirator 1

4. Beginning in or about 2008, defendant ZASCNAVAGE agreed with Co-conspirator 1 to utilize Co-conspirator 1’s P-card to pay Z & Z, Inc., for materials that were never delivered to the Port.

5. Co-conspirator 1 provided defendant ZASCNAVAGE with a list of materials that Co-conspirator 1 needed for Co-conspirator 1’s Plumbing Company.

6. Co-conspirator 1 provided a separate list to defendant ZASCNAVAGE of materials that were generally more expensive that Co-conspirator 1 knew the Port would need. Defendant ZASCNAVAGE submitted a false invoice to the Port on behalf of Z & Z, Inc., reflecting the delivery of the more expensive materials. Z & Z, Inc., was paid for the more expensive materials. Defendant ZASCNAVAGE purchased the less expensive materials needed by Co-conspirator 1’s Plumbing Company, and kept the difference. The materials purchased by defendant ZASCNAVAGE were obtained and used by Co-conspirator 1’s Plumbing Company. Defendant ZASCNAVAGE did not deliver the more expensive listed materials nor the less expensive listed materials to the Port.

7. Co-conspirator 1 submitted reports to his supervisor reflecting his P-card use, which falsely stated that Z & Z, Inc., was due money for materials received by the Port.

8. During the course of the scheme with Co-conspirator 1, defendant ZASCNAVAGE and Co-conspirator 1 obtained by fraud approximately $153,685.88.

Co-conspirator 2

9. Beginning in or about 2011, defendant ZASCNAVAGE agreed with Co-conspirator 2 to utilize Co-conspirator 2’s P-card to pay Z & Z, Inc., for materials that were not delivered to
the Port.

10. Defendant ZASCAVAGE submitted false invoices to the Port reflecting the delivery of the materials.

11. Co-conspirator 2 submitted reports to his supervisor reflecting his P-card use, which falsely stated that Z & Z, Inc., was due money for materials received by the Port.

12. Defendant ZASCAVAGE and Co-conspirator 2 split the proceeds received. Defendant ZASCAVAGE paid Co-conspirator 2 by checks payable to cash issued from Z & Z, Inc., or his personal account.

13. During the course of the scheme with Co-conspirator 2, defendant ZASCAVAGE and Co-conspirator 2 obtained by fraud approximately $36,505.71.

Co-conspirator 3

14. Beginning in or about 2011, defendant ZASCAVAGE agreed with Co-conspirator 3 to utilize Co-conspirator 3’s P-card to pay Z & Z, Inc., for the maintenance of hydraulic drills that was not provided to the Port.

15. Co-conspirator 3 would either provide the necessary maintenance himself or no maintenance work would be done.

16. Defendant ZASCAVAGE caused false invoices to be submitted to the Port reflecting the completed maintenance work.

17. Co-conspirator 3 submitted reports to his supervisor reflecting his P-card use, which falsely stated that Z & Z, Inc., was due money for the completed maintenance work.

18. Defendant ZASCAVAGE and Co-conspirator 3 split the proceeds received. Defendant ZASCAVAGE paid Co-conspirator 3 by checks payable to cash issued from Z & Z, Inc., or his personal account.
19. During the course of the scheme with Co-conspirator 3, defendant and Co-conspirator 3 obtained by fraud approximately $17,252.16.

**Overt Acts**

20. In furtherance of the conspiracy and to achieve the objective thereof, at least one of the co-conspirators committed or caused to be committed, in the Southern District of Florida, and elsewhere, at least one of the following overt acts, among others:

A. On or about February 13, 2015, defendant ZASCAVAGE ordered $484.51 of materials, which Co-conspirator 1 obtained and intended to use for Co-conspirator 1’s Plumbing Company.

B. On or about February 18, 2015, Co-conspirator 1 charged $1,994.10 to the P-card issued to Co-conspirator 1 by the Port to pay Z & Z, Inc., for materials.

C. On or about June 6, 2018, Co-conspirator 2 charged $1,736.85 to the P-card issued to Co-conspirator 2 by the Port to pay Z & Z, Inc., for materials that had not been delivered.

D. On or about June 12, 2018, defendant ZASCAVAGE provided a check payable to cash issued from his personal account to Co-conspirator 2 in the amount of $800.

E. On or about December 23, 2013, Co-conspirator 3 charged $662 to the P-card issued to Co-conspirator 3 by the Port to pay Z & Z, Inc., for services that had not been rendered.

F. On or about December 29, 2013, defendant ZASCAVAGE provided a check payable to cash issued from his personal account to Co-conspirator 3 in the amount of $200.
G. On or about January 2, 2014, Co-conspirator 3 cashed the check received from defendant ZASCAYAGE in order to receive his share of the proceeds from the scheme.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

ARIANA F. ARDO ORSHAN
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

JEFFRY N. KAPLAN
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

vs.

BRYAN ZASCAVAGE,

DEFENDANT

CASE NO.

CERTIFICATE OF TRIAL ATTORNEY*

Court Division: (Select One)

Miami_____ Key West_____ FTL_____ WPB_____ FTP_____ New Defendant(s)_____ Yes_____ No

Number of New Defendants____Total number of counts____

I do hereby certify that:

1. I have carefully considered the allegations of the indictment, the number of defendants, the number of probable witnesses and the legal complexities of the indictment/information attached hereto.

2. I am aware that the information supplied on this statement will be relied upon by the Judges of this Court in setting their calendars and scheduling criminal trials under the mandate of the Speedy Trial Act, Title 28 U.S.C. Section 3161.

3. Interpreter: (Yes or No) No

List language and/or dialect:

English

4. This case will take ___ days for the parties to try.

5. Please check appropriate category and type of offense listed below:

(Only one)

I 0 to 5 days_____ Petty_____ No

II 6 to 10 days_____ Minor_____________

III 11 to 20 days_____ Misdem_____________

IV 21 to 60 days_____ Felony___________

V 61 days and over________

6. Has this case been previously filed in this District Court? _____ No (Yes or No)

If yes:

Judge:________________________ Case No.:________________________

Has a complaint been filed in this matter? (Yes or No) No

Magistrate Case No.

Related Miscellaneous numbers:

Defendant(s) in federal custody as of________________________

Defendant(s) in state custody as of________________________

Rule 20 from the District of________________________

Is this a potential death penalty case? (Yes or No) No

7. Does this case originate from a matter pending in the Northern Region of the U.S. Attorney's Office prior to October 14, 2007? Yes_____ No

8. Does this case originate from a matter pending in the Central Region of the U.S. Attorney's Office prior to September 1, 2007? Yes_____ No

Jeffrey N. Kaplan
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
Florida Bar No. A5500030

Penalty Sheet(s) attached

REV 4/2/08
UNIVERSAL STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

PENALTY SHEET

Defendant's Name: BRYAN ZASCAYAVE

Case No: ____________________________

Count #: 1

Conspiracy to Obtain by Fraud Property of Programs Receiving Federal Funds.

Title 18, United States Code, Section 371

Max. Penalty: 5 years imprisonment, a fine of the greater of $250,000 or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, 3 years supervised release.

*Refers only to possible term of incarceration, does not include possible fines, restitution, special assessments, parole terms or forfeitures that may be applicable.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the
Southern District of Florida

United States of America
v.
BRYAN ZASCAVAGE,

Case No. 19-60203-CR-UNGA RO/HUNT

WAIVER OF AN INDICTMENT

I understand that I have been accused of one or more offenses punishable by imprisonment for more than one year. I was advised in open court of my rights and the nature of the proposed charges against me.

After receiving this advice, I waive my right to prosecution by indictment and consent to prosecution by information.

Date: ________________________________

[Defendant’s signature]

[Signature of defendant’s attorney]

[Printed name of defendant’s attorney]

[Judge’s signature]

[Judge’s printed name and title]
Appendix P: Advisory Memoranda

Broward County Office of the County Auditor

Office of the County Auditor
116 S. Andrews Avenue, Room 520 • Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301 • 954-357-7560 • FAX 954-357-7592

Advisory No. 111

August 8, 2018

To: Steven M. Cernak, Chief Executive and Director, Port Everglades Department

From: Bob Melton, County Auditor

Subject: Interim Recommendations for the Port Everglades Procurement Audit

As you know, we are in the process of conducting our fieldwork for the Procurement Audit of your department; however, we have noted significant control weaknesses that require immediate management corrective action. Because of this immediate need, we are issuing this Advisory without waiting for the completion of the audit.

During our audit, we noted that common inventory and purchasing control procedures have not been implemented to receive, record and track supplies at Port Warehouses, and a work order system is not in place to approve purchases and assign supplies and parts to specific projects. This lack of controls may have allowed inappropriate purchases to occur without detection. Specifically:

- Supplies purchased using the procurement cards are not centrally received by Port Central Warehouse. Purchases are either picked up by the employees or delivered to various Port locations, including the trade areas such as Carpentry, Plumbing, HVAC, Electrical, or Garage. The current practice does not maximize segregation of the receiving of goods function from the purchasing function.
- Parts and other supplies are not tracked in an inventory system. The current process does not provide for all parts and supplies purchased and received to be entered into the inventory system.
- No work order system is used for all trades. Parts and supplies issued are not tracked or recorded in a work order system, nor is there a written comprehensive record of all jobs (tasks) performed by trade personnel, the amount of time spent on the jobs and parts or supplies used on the jobs. As a result, there is no control to ensure parts and supplies are used for Port jobs.
- There are no procedures to ensure that parts and supplies purchased using procurement cards are independently verified as received (by someone other than the procurement card holder). Failure to separate the purchase and receipt functions could permit inappropriate purchases, errors, and irregularities to go undetected.
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➢ No restriction is in place to ensure all purchases of parts and supplies are made from Master Agreements or other County contracts when possible. As a result, there is an increased risk of inappropriate vendors being used or less cost-effective purchases being made.

We suggest management immediately implement the following controls to mitigate these weaknesses by requiring:

1. All parts and supplies purchased are delivered to the Central Port Warehouse. This includes Port staff’s pick up of parts from local vendors such as Home Depot, Ferguson, etc.

2. Central warehouse staff to:
   a. Count and verify accuracy of supplies received
   b. Enter all parts and supplies purchased in the current inventory system (MP2 or equivalent), including cost for each item, vendor, invoice number, and purchasing card holder
   c. Obtain an approved work order from trade staff detailing the parts and supplies needed for the job or truck. This work order system should be implemented immediately, on a manual basis if necessary until an automated basis is established.
   d. Enter parts and supplies issued in the inventory system and reference work order number and employee’s name.

3. Parts and supplies purchased by warehouse staff are received and independently verified by another Port staff member.

4. Monthly, procurement card approvers should reconcile purchases in Peoplesoft to MP2 (or equivalent) system report before approving purchases in Peoplesoft. This will ensure that all procurement card purchases are received and validated.

5. All purchases be made from Master Agreements or other County procurement contracts unless the part or supply is not available or in case of emergency. Such exceptions should have clear documentation and justification.

I hope you find this information helpful. If you would like to discuss this further, please feel free to contact me or Kathie-Ann Ulett.

cc: Bertha Henry, County Administrator
    Glenn Wiltshire, Deputy Port Director, Port Everglades
January 24, 2019

To: Steven M. Cernak, Chief Executive and Director, Port Everglades Department

From: Bob Melton, County Auditor

Subject: Follow Up to Interim Recommendations for the Port Everglades Procurement Audit

On August 8, 2018, we issued Advisory Memo No. 111 noting significant control weaknesses that required immediate corrective action by management. Specifically, we found that common inventory and purchasing control procedures were not in place to receive, record, and track supplies and parts to specific projects. At that time, we suggested management immediately implement controls to mitigate these weaknesses. This included suggestions to:

- Enter all parts and supplies purchased in the current inventory system (MP2 or equivalent) including cost of each item, vendor, invoice number, and purchasing card holder.

- Obtain an approved work order system for trade staff detailing the parts or supplies need for the job. This work order system should be implemented immediately, on a manual basis, if necessary, until an automated system is established.

- Enter parts and supplies issued in the inventory system and reference work order number and employee’s name.

To follow up on our suggestions, we performed two site visits at the Public Works garage on January 10, 2019, and January 24, 2019. We interviewed garage staff on duty and the garage supervisor about the process for ordering, receiving, recording and tracking parts and supplies and asked whether there was a work order and inventory tracking system in use at the garage. We found these suggestions have not been implemented to date. Specifically:

- A work order system whether manual or automated has not been implemented.

- There is no inventory system in place to track parts and supplies.
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This continued lack of common inventory and purchasing control procedures may allow inappropriate purchases to occur without detection. Therefore, we again suggest management, immediately implement the following controls by requiring garage staff to:

a. Enter all parts and supplies purchased in the current inventory system (MP2 or equivalent), including cost for each item, vendor, invoice number, and purchasing card holder.

b. Immediately implement a manual work order system, until an automated system can be developed.

c. Enter parts and supplies issued in the inventory system and reference work order number and employee’s name.

During our site visits, we also observed that the garage was not locked, nor protected by any security devices such as alarms or security cameras. Moreover, there was no visitor’s log and inventory in the garage was not stored in a secured stockroom. Therefore, we also suggest management immediately implement controls to ensure that the garage is secured, and inventory is stored in a secured stockroom.

I hope you find this information helpful. If you would like to discuss this further, please feel free to contact me or Kathie-Ann Ulett.

cc: Bertha Henry, County Administrator
    Glenn Wiltshire, Deputy Port Director, Port Everglades
    Brenda Billingsley, Director of Purchasing
Appendix Q: Management’s Response
MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 26, 2019
TO: Robert Melton, County Auditor
FROM: Bertha W. Henry, County Administrator

SUBJECT: Management Response to County Auditor’s Audit of Procurement and Operational Practices at Port Everglades

The Port Everglades Department and the Finance and Administrative Services Department have reviewed the Office of the County Auditor’s Audit Report of Procurement and Operational Practices at Port Everglades and submits the following as Management’s response.

First, it is important to note that this audit was the result of an employee report of potential wrongdoing that was initially brought to the attention of Port Management then subsequently turned over to law enforcement and the County Auditor’s Office. This is an example of how the internal complaint process worked as intended. Through the collaborative efforts of multiple agencies, including law enforcement, the complaint was investigated and led to the arrest and ultimate conviction of a number of individuals. I commend the County Auditor and his Office on their thorough and diligent efforts in this audit and their advising management of potential issues during the process, so Management could take immediate corrective measures as reflected in this response.

In summary, Management accepts most of the Auditor’s opportunities for improvement and has implemented many new procedural enhancements, in advance of and in response to the audit. In addition, many of the deficiencies uncovered were the result of actions and inactions of individuals who colluded to circumvent existing controls. The main individuals who were identified as engaging in inappropriate and fraudulent activities are no longer working for the County and have been prosecuted. Other deficiencies uncovered were the result of internal control systems that were not automated. These systems, most notably the inventory and work order system, are in the process of being automated which is being rolled out in December 2019. With the automated system and strengthening of other internal controls described herein, the Port Everglades Department will be better prepared to identify and stop future inappropriate and unlawful activities.

Further, Management identified shortfalls in the organizational structure at Port Everglades that affected the ability of the Port Director to make the best use of available
resources to oversee the Port’s public works and maintenance functions in 2016. On September 27, 2016, the County Commission approved a reorganization that moved the Seaport Engineering and Construction Division from the County’s Public Works Department to the Port Everglades Department. As noted in this Audit Report, the Port subsequently completed an internal review of the organizational structure being used to deliver these services, contracting with Matrix Corp. to conduct a study of the management of the public works functions at the Port. That study, completed in August 2017, resulted in a number of recommendations, including a restructuring of certain skilled trades public works functions that were previously within the Port’s Operations Division into a renamed Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance Division. On October 17, 2017, the County Commission approved that reorganization. All of the recommendations in the Matrix Corp. study were in the process of being implemented when this audit was initiated by the County Auditor’s Office at the request of the Port Everglades Department in response to evidence of potentially inappropriate P-Card use by some Port public works staff being discovered by a Port supervisor.

Management had also identified the need for a consolidated facility to house all Port public works functions and storage facilities prior to this audit. The County Commission has approved funding to date totaling $15.6 million in the Port Everglades Capital Budget ($3.6M in FY17, $6M in FY19, and $6M in FY20) for the design and construction of the consolidated facility on vacant land in the Northport area of the Port west of the existing Public Works facility. On August 2, 2019, the County Administrator approved an agreement with CPZ Architects for Programming and Schematic Design Services for the facility, and that work is currently underway.

Enclosed below please find detailed responses to each of the Auditor’s opportunities for improvement and recommendations.

Opportunity for Improvement 1: Gross Financial Mismanagement Has Occurred in the Port’s Operations Division.

Recommendations:

A. Management immediately direct that the recommendations in this report be implemented as soon as possible and take all disciplinary action considered necessary.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department has been directed to implement the recommendations. Specifics on the status of implementation are included in the responses to each applicable recommendation. The Port Everglades Department management will also continue to work with the Human Resources Division and Office of the County Attorney to pursue appropriate disciplinary action in accordance with County Policy and/or applicable collective bargaining agreements.
B. Management review the number of P-Card Holders in other areas of the Port and assess whether there are excessive numbers of card holders.

Management's Response: Management concurs and already completed. A review of Port P-Card users was completed in Fall 2018 that resulted in a significant reduction in Port Everglades Department employees with P-Cards. Additionally, Management will periodically review Port P-Card users.

C. Ensure recommendations contained in this report are implemented elsewhere at the Port, as applicable.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has implemented. In addition to current Broward County P-Card Policy, the Port Everglades Department specific procedures to P-card use and internal controls were implemented through a February 4, 2019 memorandum to all Port staff. (see Attachment 1).

Opportunity for Improvement 2: Lack of Internal Controls Allowed Fraudulent or Inappropriate Transactions, and Violations of County Policy to Occur without Detection.

Recommendation: Management establish an adequate internal control environment based on P-Card Program guidelines as required for all departments, offices, and divisions participating in the P-Card Program.

Management's Response: Management concurs and already implemented. Effective August 22, 2018, the Port Everglades Department established a program requiring a checks-and-balances procedure in the use of P-Cards at the Port Public Works areas of both Facilities Maintenance and Operations. A memorandum documenting the process was distributed that day (see Attachment 2). The process requires the completion of a Purchase Request Form Cover Sheet that is initiated by the tradesperson requesting materials/supplies. That form is presented to that person’s supervisor for review and approval. In Facilities Maintenance, the form is next sent to the manager and then on to the director level person who assigns the P-Card holder to make the purchase. In Operations, the form goes from the supervisor to the Assistant Director of the Operations Division (see Attachment 3). Upon receipt or pick-up of the purchased materials, they are brought to the Central Storeroom, inventoried, and placed in storage. As those materials are subsequently needed by the trades people, they are issued from the Central Storeroom by the warehouse supervisor or storekeepers along with a counter release form (see Attachment 4) for the materials being removed from the Central Storeroom.

As mentioned in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 1C., a Port Everglades Department-wide memorandum on P-Card use, procedures and internal controls was issued on February 4, 2019 (see Attachment 1).

In addition, Management reviewed the five components of internal control over P-Cards and certain procurement operations which include the Control Environment, Risk
Assessment, Control Activities, Information and Communication, and Monitoring. In evaluating the cause of the deficiency in internal control that led to the discovery of long-term fraud at Port Everglades, Management evaluated the Design, Implementation, and Operation of the applicable existing Internal Controls and designed and implemented additional controls to compensate for weakness in previously established controls.

The Internal Control over P-Cards is administered through the PeopleSoft Enterprise Resource Planning system which includes a P-Card control module that delivers the training and administration of the P-Card program including acknowledgement of duties, cardholder substantiation of transactions, and supervisory approval of transactions. While the County Auditor’s Office had completed a review of Port Everglades Department Procurement Card Transactions (Report No. 18-1) on October 3, 2017 with no opportunities for improvement noted, as discussed in the Auditor’s report, the internal control environment over P-Cards and certain other matters at Port Everglades were not acceptable and fostered collusion among employees who disregarded their duties and engaged in criminal activity. Limitations in monitoring allowed fraudulent activity to occur undetected until the point of discovery and reporting by persons not engaged in the fraud.

Management has designed additional control activities to address the deficiency in internal control by developing and implementing new Monitoring Activities that include the establishment of a new P-Card Audit team in the Accounting Division in July 2019. The P-Card Audit team utilizes computer aided analysis and review to conduct an audit of P-Card transactions each month to identify twenty-four conditions that include deficiency in supporting documentation, transaction splitting, questionable charges, and certain inappropriate uses by P-Card holders. As part of their analysis, the P-Card Audit team will utilize a Decline Report from our P-Card provider, Wells Fargo, that is used in the industry by both their corporate and government clients. The Accounting Division will follow-up on its findings and address issues with cardholders to resolve its findings. The added transactional analysis, review and inquiry add a layer of deterrent to fraud, waste and abuse.

Additionally, the Accounting Division established new training and access to employee certifications for the Accounts Payable Unit. This training and certification provides additional skills and knowledge in the Accounts Payable field and verifies an individual's comprehensive understanding of their job function and demonstrates an ability to apply that understanding to solve problems and improve processes through best practices. The curriculum includes such topics as internal controls, process functions, technology, tax and regulatory issues, and other accounts payable management topics.

In May of 2019, the Accounts Payable Unit became a member of Institute of Financial Management (IOFM) which is the premier provider of education and training for Accounts Payable and other Account Management professionals. Currently, the five highest level Accounts Payable staff are pursuing certifications through IOFM in Accounts Payable Manager and Accounts Payable Specialist. As of November 20, 2019, two staff members have completed the course work for Accounts Payable Manager, one has completed the
course work for Accounts Payable Specialist and two others are in the process of completing the course work in Accounts Payable Specialist. All five staff are expected to complete the Certification Testing Requirement within the next six months. Once granted, these certifications are maintained by earning 15 Continuing Education Units annually to stay up to date with accounts payable technology, internal controls (including fraud detection), and other best practices.

The Accounting Division has also developed a draft County policy for Accounts Payable and P-Card Audit that will further provide increased oversight and enforcement authority to ensure proper use of P-Cards.

**Opportunity for Improvement 3**: Approximately $279,000 in Potentially Inappropriate Purchases Were Made from Companies Affiliated with One Storekeeper.

**Recommendations:**

A. Cooperate with law enforcement authorities regarding criminal investigations or prosecutions.

Management's Response: *Management concurs.* Since notifying law enforcement in June 2018, the Port Everglades Department has fully cooperated with law enforcement on all investigations or prosecutions and will continue to do so, where appropriate.

B. Implement appropriate procedures to ensure conflict of interest and outside employment laws and policies are consistently enforced and monitored.

Management's Response: *Management concurs and has completed.* All employees are required to comply with the County Administrative Policies and Procedures (CAPP), which includes the County’s conflict of interest and outside employment policies. Specifically, the Port Everglades Department revalidated outside employment of Public Works staff on August 6, 2018 (see Attachment 5) and all Port Everglades Department staff on this requirement again on April 17, 2019 (see Attachment 6).

**Opportunity for Improvement 4**: Questionable and Apparently Fraudulent Purchases Totaling $128,946 Were Made From One Company by Port Employees.

**Recommendations:**

A. Pursue legal options to seek recovery of amounts fraudulently received from the Port.

Management’s Response: *Management concurs.* In September 2019, the Port provided a Declaration of Broward County losses to the U.S. Attorney’s Office to be submitted as a claim of restitution in connection with these cases. The losses specified in the Declaration included a total of $205,706.90 in payments made by Broward County to Z&Z,
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Inc., the company operated by Bryan Zascavage, and involving fraud perpetrated by Co-
conspirators 1, 2, and 3 as named in the charging document.

Restitution was included in each sentence of the four individuals jointly and severally as co-conspirators totaling $205,706.90. Another former Port employee was ordered to pay restitution totaling $206,297.74 for separate fraudulent P-card transactions as part of their sentencing. A notice of, claim has also been filed with the County’s insurer.

B. Ensure appropriate procedures are implemented to receive and inspect items purchased as required by the P-Card Policy and Procedure Program Manual.

C. Perform analytics to proactively review purchasing anomalies and investigate any discrepancies.

Management’s Response to B & C: Management concurs and has implemented. As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 2, Management has already implemented additional controls and analysis within its processes. Further, Criminal prosecutions, changes in involved staff and management, the effect of audit and investigation activities along with added internal controls, including computer analytics, have all served to change the control environment that allowed questionable purchases to occur. Management will continue to monitor the P-Card and procurement activity as described herein.

Opportunity for Improvement 5: Questionable Purchases Totaling $166,396 Were Made From Three Affiliated Companies by Former Fender Construction Worker 1.

Recommendations:

A. Work with Purchasing Division to debar these companies from future County Business.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. Due to the confidential nature of this audit, the Port Department waited to begin the debarment process until the publishing of this audit report. Once this Audit Report is published, the Port Department will work with the County’s Purchasing Division to proceed with the formal debarment process as provided in the County Procurement Code.

B. Cooperate with any further investigation of these companies and former Employee.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. Management has and will continue to cooperate with any further investigation of these companies and former Employee where appropriate.

Opportunity for Improvement 6: Questionable Purchases Totaling $48,897 Were Made by Former Plumber Worker 1.
Recommendation: Carefully review any proposed purchases from Company 33 and cooperate in any subsequent investigation.

Management's Response: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department is no longer doing business with this company and will cooperate in any subsequent investigations.

Opportunity for Improvement 7: Approximately $59,500 of Purchased Items Were Shipped to Vendors' Representatives' Residences Rather Than the Port in Violation of County Policy.

Recommendations:

A. Ensure all purchases made by the Port are delivered to the central storeroom at the Port to allow proper receipt, inspection, and entry into the inventory system.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has implemented. Effective August 2019, after renovation of a building in the Port's Public Works complex (Building 68), for all Port Facilities Maintenance and Public Works Operations purchases, a formalized procedure has been developed that requires all deliveries to be made to the Port Everglades Central Storeroom. Storekeepers are the primary end-user of purchasing procedures and when orders are placed, they are scheduled for delivery directly to the Central Storeroom. Upon delivery, the products are reviewed for consistency with the order and entered into the Excel inventory database. Pallets of items are broken down to verify quantities and confirmation that they match the original Purchase Order and packing list. Materials that are picked up directly from a vendor must be approved by the Port Warehouse Supervisor in advance and are brought directly to the Central Storeroom where they are entered into an Excel inventory database. All discrepancies of delivered orders are reconciled within 24 hours of delivery and adjustments to billing totals are addressed at that time.

B. Restrict sales representatives from entering the storerooms.

Management's Response: Management concurs. With the recent creation of the Port Everglades Department Central Storeroom consisting of a consolidated location for all Port Facilities Maintenance and Operations inventory for parts, materials, and consumables that is located within a secured perimeter within the Port Facilities Maintenance Campus, access by the general public is prohibited. Building access is limited to the storeroom employees and a front counter has been created where access is limited to a small area for receipt of items within the storeroom. Storeroom employees have been instructed that no access by anyone is allowed beyond the front desk area.

Opportunity for Improvement 8: Port Staff Made Purchases Totaling $300,208 from Inactive Corporations and Companies that were not registered to do business in Florida.
Recommendations:

A. Implement procedures to periodically validate that vendors doing business with Broward County have the authority to transact business in the State of Florida and are in good standing with the Florida Secretary of State.

B. Update the Purchasing card Policies and Procedures Programs Manual to prohibit the purchase of items for unregistered or inactive companies.

Management's Response to A & B: Management partially concurs. Not all Merchant vendors providing services to P-Card users are required to be registered to do business in the State of Florida, such as those providing services outside the State. Management will develop and include appropriate Vendor Responsibility Determination guidance in the next update to the Purchasing Card Program Policies & Procedures Manual. Additionally, Management is developing risk-based strategies to validate P-Card Merchant vendor responsibility for vendors at high risk of being non-responsible and were used by P-Card holders. Management will issue an advisory to P-Card holders that it is their duty to make a reasonable vendor responsibility determination for each purchase.

Opportunity for Improvement 9: Port Employees Purchased Items at Inflated Prices Using P-Cards.

Recommendations:

A. Cooperate with any future investigations involving Company 29 and take appropriate action.

Management's Response: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department will cooperate with law enforcement on any future investigation involving the company, where appropriate, and take appropriate action as necessary.

B. Execute a participating addendum to formally authorize use of the existing GSA Agreement with Company 6 / Company 5, if it is determined necessary to continue business with this company.

Management's Response: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department is no longer doing business with either of these companies. The last transaction with the companies in Peoplesoft was March 17, 2017.

C. Cooperate with any future investigations involving Company 10 and take appropriate action.
Management’s Response: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department will cooperate with law enforcement on any future investigation involving the company, where appropriate, and take appropriate action as necessary.

Opportunity for Improvement 10: Port Employees Purchased With County Issued P-Card for Personal Use.

Recommendations:

A. Consider revocation of the P-Card, disciplinary action, termination, and possible filing of criminal charges, if the P-Card is used for non-business-related purpose.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. A number of P-Cards for Port Everglades Department employees, including employees covered by the Audit Report, were revoked in July and August 2018, consistent with County P-Card Policy. The Port Everglades Department will continue to follow County P-Card Policy in this regard.

B. Take steps to recover misappropriated funds.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department will work with the County Attorney’s Office to recover any misappropriated funds if possible.

C. Implement procedures to ensure that P-Card purchases support a legitimate County business purpose.

Management’s Response: Management concurs and has implemented. As described in Management’s Response to Recommendation #2, the checks-and-balances procedure has multiple personnel reviewing every request of purchases to help ensure that materials purchased are used for proper pre-approved business purposes (see Attachment 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9).

D. Retrain P-Card Approvers to properly review P-Card documentation for accuracy, completeness, and validity of County business purpose.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. All Port Everglades Department P-Card Approvers completed the mandatory County P-Card training in April/May 2019 and will continue to be required to do so as needed (see Attachment 7).

Opportunity for Improvement 11: One Storekeeper Solicited the Purchase of Personal Items by Vendors and Accepted Rebates and Gifts.

Recommendations:

A. Periodically train employees and contractors on State and County Policies on accepting gifts and other benefits.
B. Facilitate the monitoring and reporting of suspected violations of County Policy on accepting gifts and other benefits.

Management’s Response A & B: Management concurs in part and has implemented in part. County employees are already made aware of and trained on the County employee gift acceptance policy. The topic of gifts is addressed in OnBoard Broward for all new employees. Each year all benefit eligible employees when signing up for benefits during open enrollment are again advised of the County’s policies, including the County’s Gift policy, through their acknowledgement of the County’s ABC’s (About Broward County). Furthermore, every other year, County employees must complete mandatory training of Employment Issues which covers the handling of gifts. This topic is also covered in the County’s Positive Start and FastForward trainings for Supervisors and Managers.

Management believes the issue raised in the Audit Report was not the result of forgetfulness or a lack of awareness or knowledge that led the employee to engage in these actions of misconduct, but wilful non-compliance on behalf of certain employees. It is important to note, as indicated in the Audit Report, that the employee involved in these actions was terminated from County employment. Management further believes the act of prosecution of offenders will provide additional deterrence for those employees who lack the integrity the County expects from them and are in a position to engage in this type of misconduct.

Opportunity for Improvement 12: P-Card Transactions for One P-card Holder Were Reviewed or Approved by a Family Member Creating Potential Conflicts of Interest.

Recommendations:

A. Ensure that P-Card reviewers and approvers are precluded from reviewing and approving transactions for relatives.

B. Ensure appropriate procedures are implemented to identify, disclose and mitigate potential conflicts of interest.

Management’s Response A & B: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department will work with the Human Resources Division to implement procedures to identify any potential conflicts in this regard.


Recommendations:

A. Take any appropriate disciplinary actions for all employees involved in splitting.
Management’s Response A: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department will review available information and work with the Human Resources Division to determine appropriate disciplinary action, if any.

B. Ensure appropriate procedures are implemented for approvers to identify split transactions.

C. Work with the Purchasing Division to periodically perform analytics to prevent or detect the unauthorized practice of splitting transactions.

Management’s Response B & C: Management concurs and has implemented. As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 2, Management has established the P-Card Audit team in the Accounting Division and that team uses computer analytics to identify potential split transactions. The team will address any issues with the P-Cardholder.

Opportunity for Improvement 14: Approximately $5 Million of Items Delivered to the Port Lacked Sufficient Evidence to Demonstrate the Items Were Received.

Recommendations:

A. Implement procedures to ensure that parts, equipment, supplies or services purchased are received, verified and tracked in an inventory and work order systems.

Management’s Response: Management concurs and has implemented. As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 7A, effective August 2019, for all Port Facilities Maintenance and Public Works Operations purchases, a formalized procedure has been developed that requires all deliveries to be made to the Port Everglades Central Storeroom located at Building 68. Storekeepers are the primary end user of purchasing procedures and when orders are placed, they are scheduled for delivery directly to the Central Storeroom. Upon delivery, the products are reviewed for consistency with the order and entered into an Excel inventory database. Pallets of items are broken down to verify quantities and confirmation that they match the original Purchase Order and packing list. Materials that are picked up directly from a vendor must be approved by the Port Warehouse Supervisor in advance and are to be brought directly to the Central Storeroom where they are entered into the Excel inventory database. All discrepancies of delivered orders are to be reconciled within 24 hours of delivery and adjustments to billing totals are addressed at that time.

Currently, Port Facilities Maintenance Staff are utilizing a paper work order system created in August 2018, where items needed to complete the work order are managed (see Attachment 8). Actions to implement the Asset Works, Asset Inventory Management (AIM) software package, which is the County’s standardized digital maintenance management software, started in June 2017 (see Attachment 10), and is
currently underway with roll out at the Port expected in December 2019 with full implementation in mid-2020. This system will computerize the work order and inventory tracking and management and will fully integrate these functions.

B. Ensure parts and supplies purchased by storeroom staff are received and independently verified by another Port staff member.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has implemented. To address deficiencies in the process, the Port Everglades Department has implemented storeroom and inventory procedures (Attachment 9) and P-Card use and internal controls (Attachment 1 and 2).

Opportunity for Improvement 15: P-Card Purchases of Sampled Non-Consumable Items Could Not be Located on Port Property.

Recommendations:

A. Develop an internal property identification system to track non-consumable items of significant value.

Management's Response: Management concurs. As indicated in Management's Response to Recommendation No. 14A above, the Port Everglades Department is in the process of transitioning from a paper work order system to an automated system (AiM). Once AiM is implemented, initially in December 2019 with full implementation in mid-2020, the AiM system can be configured to track non-consumable items of significant value.

B. Implement property identification tags for items such as generators, refrigerators, iPads, etc.

Management's Response: Management concurs. The Port follows the equipment asset tagging guidelines of Section 1.7.6 of Broward County CAPP Volume 1, Chapter 11 (Capital Assets) for equipment assets (as defined) costing more than $1,000. Equipment items such as iPads are under this threshold and would not be considered a tagged capital asset for financial reporting purposes; however, pursuant to the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) "best practice" or control over items that are not capitalized, the Port agrees that items such as iPads are considered "controlled capital-type items" requiring special attention and agrees to establish policies and procedures to safeguard these items. Management will further review other GFOA best practices related to tracking inventory, including the tracking of assets that are included as parts within other larger assets.
C. Establish procedures to require periodic physical verification of high-risk items by independent personnel.

Management's Response: Management concurs. Once the AiM system is operational, Port Finance intends to perform periodic test counts throughout the year to confirm the accuracy of the system data.

Opportunity for Improvement 16: Over 960 P-Card Transactions Totaling Approximately $590,000 Were Approved Without Adequate Supporting Documents.

Recommendations:

We recommend management ensure:

A. P-Card Holders comply with the Purchasing Card Program Manual by submitting detailed, complete and accurate vendor invoices or receipts.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has implemented. Since the implementation of the August 22, 2018 program, all invoices and receipts are scrutinized by more than one individual (see Attachment 2). Any shortcomings or inaccuracies are required to be corrected prior to approval by a P-Card Approver.

B. P-Card Approvers are held accountable to perform adequate review and ensure required supporting documentation is included prior to approval of transactions.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has implemented. As indicated in August 22, 2018 program (Attachment 2), all supporting documentation and signatures must be in place in order for the P-Card Approver to move forward with approval. Any P-Card Approver not complying with this program will be held accountable.

C. Transactions lacking adequate support be disputed and referred to the P-Card Holder for follow up and resolution before approval.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has implemented. As indicated in August 22, 2018 program (Attachment 2), it is the responsibility of the P-Card Holder to ensure that shortcomings, inaccuracies, and errors are cleared prior to an item being submitted to the P-Card Approver. The P-Card Approver must follow up with the P-Card Holder to resolve incomplete or inaccurate information.

Opportunity for Improvement 17: Port Employees Routinely Use Other Employees P-Cards to Make Purchases in Violation of County Policy.

Recommendations:

A. Implement appropriate procedures to ensure P-Cards are only used for official County business by the employee whose name is on the card as required by County Policy.
November 26, 2019
Management Response to Audit of
Procurement and Operational Practices
at Port Everglades

Management's Response: Management partially concurs and already implemented. As indicated in the Audit Report, the P-Card Program Manual requires that P-Cards be used only by the employee whose name is embossed on the P-Card. Again, this is not a situation where there is a lack of policy or procedure, but where certain employees have chosen to not comply with the policies. As indicated in Management's Response to Recommendation No. 10A, a number of P-Cards for Port Everglades Department employees, including employees covered by this Audit Report, were revoked in July and August 2018, consistent with County P-Card Policy.

Management believes that the prior poor Control Environment at Port Everglades led to the conditions of inappropriate use of P-Cards and that actions taken to date at Port Everglades and the Accounting Division create a stronger deterrent to this type of P-Card misuse.

B. Prohibit the practice of allowing P-Card Holders to request or direct other P-Card Holders to make purchases not directly related to assigned job responsibilities.

Management's Response: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department has already limited the number of P-Card users authorized to make purchases, and the intent is to limit P-Cards to Storekeepers and Supervisors for purchases.

C. Revoke the P-Card and take disciplinary actions if violations occur.

Management's Response: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department, in consultation with the P-Card Unit and the Human Resources Division, will take the appropriate administrative actions for any P-Card holders found violating the P-Card policies.

Opportunity for Improvement 18: P-Card Transaction Dispute Procedures are not Consistently Followed-Up On to Ensure Timely Resolutions of Refunds

Recommendation: Implement appropriate procedures to ensure disputed transactions are followed up to ensure timely resolution and obtain refunds or other credits due to the County.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has implemented. The Audit report indicates P-Card holders and reviewers are not reviewing supporting documentation from vendors to ensure appropriate charges are incurred and seeking refunds/adjustments as appropriate. As indicated in Management's Response to Recommendation No. 2, Management has created a P-Card Audit unit in the Accounting Division that will collect all of the supporting charge documentation and review it to identify appropriateness of charges and opening issues with P-Card holders involved where concerns are identified.
Opportunity for Improvement 19: Master Agreements Were Not Consistently Used, Resulting in Waste of County Resources

Recommendation: Implement appropriate procedures to ensure purchases are made using master agreements wherever one exists and establish Master Agreements where needed to cover frequent purchases.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has implemented. As indicated in the storeroom and inventory procedures (Attachment 9), the Port Everglades Department has directed staff to utilize existing Master Agreements first, consistent with existing County Policy. The Port Everglades Department already utilizes existing Master Agreements for reoccurring purchases through, but not limited to Grainger, Lehman Pipe and Plumbing Supply, Ferguson Enterprises, and Wool Plumbing Supply.

Opportunity for Improvement 20: An Inventory Management System has not been Implemented to Record and Track the Purchase of Parts, Supplies, and Equipment.

Recommendations:

A. Immediately implement an inventory management system.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has implemented. As of the date of this response, all inventory within the Port's control within Port Public Works is being tracked in an Excel inventory database. This Excel database was developed through the consolidation of the storeroom function from the various maintenance trades at a variety of locations throughout the Port to the new Central Storeroom. Development of the database was done by Port Facilities Maintenance staff and validated by the Port's Finance Division. Staff is in the process of acquiring the services of a consulting contractor to further validate the final inventory and prepare a datafile that is consistent with other county agencies and industry that will be used to import into the County's Asset Management Software, AiM. The acquisition of this contractor is currently being competitively bid through the Purchasing Division. The target for initial implementation of AiM using the Excel inventory database is December 2019 with full implementation in mid-2020. Staff training for AiM usage on I pads began on November 22, 2019.

B. Develop interim action plan to protect existing inventory from theft and ensure the integrity of future inventory purchases.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has implemented. The recently completed Central Storeroom facility is located within a secure perimeter with limited and controlled public access. The facility is being equipped with monitored intrusion control and is currently under surveillance by monitored security cameras. Storeroom and inventory procedures are now in place to track items that are brought in and removed from inventory (see Attachment 9). Only Storekeeper personnel are permitted to remove items from inventory in a controlled environment where monitoring of the transactions occur.
Opportunity for Improvement 21: Port Management did not Perform a Complete and Accurate Annual Inventory Count as Required by County Policy.

Recommendations:

A. Perform a complete and accurate annual physical inventory counts as of the end of each fiscal year.

Management's Response: Management concurs in part. Management concurs that an annual physical inventory count should be completed each fiscal year, but does not concur that such inventory counts did not occur. The Port annually conducts both a physical count of consumable inventory in accordance with Broward County Administrative Policy and Procedures (CAPP) Volume 1, Chapter 10 (Physical Count of Consumable Inventory), and a 100% physical inventory of tangible equipment assets which has been outsourced to an independent contractor since 2014. Up until 2018, however, this count only included the larger storerooms and did not include the smaller satellite locations within the shops. It is staff's intent to continue conducting these annual inventories as required.

For FY2019, an inventory of tangible equipment assets was conducted by the Port's vendor, OHC Advisors, Inc., the weeks of July 8th and 15th. The consumable inventory count for materials and supplies (warehouses), fenders, and loading bridge parts was conducted September 26th to 28th, and cranes and BSO inventories were conducted on September 30th.

B. Require Port Finance staff to:

a. Conduct test counts to ensure accuracy.

Management's Response: Management concurs and has completed. Port Finance conducted test counts during the 2018 and 2019 consumables inventories and intends to continue this practice moving forward.

b. Reconcile physical count to the perpetual inventory and investigate any discrepancies.

Management's Response: Management concurs. Once the AiM system is operational, Port Finance intends to perform periodic test counts throughout the year to confirm the accuracy of the system data.

Opportunity for Improvement 22: The Port Operations Director Who is in Charge of the Public Works Section was not Aware of the Lack of Inventory or Work Order System.

Recommendation: Take disciplinary action as appropriate and reassign responsibilities as needed.
Management’s Response: Management concurs in part. The Port Everglades Department initiated a reorganization of the Operations and Seaport Engineering and Construction Divisions through the FY18 Budget Process which was a result of a consultant study completed in August 2017. The transition of the maintenance skilled trades employees to a renamed Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance Division did not fully occur until January 2019 with the hiring of an additional Assistant Director for the Division to oversee this significant reorganization.

After more than 30 years of services, the Operations Division Director has submitted a letter indicating his retirement effective December 27, 2019, which was accepted by the Port Everglades Department.

Opportunity for Improvement 23: Excess and Obsolete Parts and Supplies Inventory Items Have Accumulated and are not Periodically Transferred to Surplus.

Recommendation: Implement procedures to identify and process surplus items annually through implementation of an inventory management system recommended in Opportunity for Improvement No.20.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. As part of the inventory process, surplus items have already been identified and consolidated in a single location and Port Everglades Department employees are processing them in accordance with County Policy. Once AIm system is operational, staff will be able to review on-hand inventory and materials on an annual basis, consistent with Chapter 7 of the Broward County Internal Control Handbook, Accounting, Payroll, & Tangible Property Procedures, Section III, Surplus Property. Consistent with this policy, items that are obsolete or beyond economical repair will be placed into surplus.

Opportunity for Improvement 24: Twenty-One New Faucets Valued at $6,780 were Found Among Scrapped Items.

Recommendation: Ensure that items purchased are immediately inspected and returned to the vendor when found to be defective.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. As indicated outlined in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 7A, a new formalized procedure has been implemented for all Port Facilities Maintenance and Public Works Operations purchases which addresses the inspection and return of defective items within 24 hours of delivery.

Opportunity for Improvement 25: A Work Order System has not Been Implemented to Track the Assignment of Parts and Supplies to Port’s Public Works Jobs.
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Recommendations:

A. Implement and maintain a work order system to track and document maintenance services provided at the Port.

B. Require supporting work orders when ordering parts or services and retain the work order to establish accountability.

Management’s Response A & B: Management concurs. Currently, paper work orders are being managed for the majority (approximately 90%) of all tasks that are assigned to trade personnel (see Attachment 8). As indicated in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 14 and other responses, the Port Everglades Department is implementing AiM Asset Management software which is scheduled to begin in December 2019. The AiM software will allow for better management of the work order process and allow for tracking of work orders as they are being processed. Parts or materials utilized for work orders are managed by counter release forms that tie the parts or materials to a specific work order number (see Attachment 4). With the implementation of AiM, work orders will be automated through the software which will create a centralized record that management will be able to review real time.

Opportunity for Improvement 26: iPads and Accessories Purchased for Use With and Electronic Inventory and Work Order Systems Have not Been Fully Utilized.

Recommendation: Ensure an implementation plan is in place prior to expending significant funds on system and devices.

Management’s Response: Management concurs in part. The Port Everglades Department had an implementation plan and began the acquisition of the iPads in November 2017 with the original intent of the roll out of AiM in early 2018 (see Attachment 10). Staff training on iPads began in March 2018. Unfortunately, with the delay in the implementation of AiM, the iPads were not utilized to its intended extent. With AiM being rolled out in December 2019, staff will be utilizing the iPads and accessories more fully.

Opportunity for Improvement 27: The Port Failed to Take Actions on Recommendations for an Immediate Implementation of a Work Order and Inventory System as Recommended by Consultant in August 2017.

Recommendation: Develop a plan, with specific goals and timeframes to implement recommendations within this report and the 2017 consultant report.

Management’s Response: Management concurs in part. The Port Everglades Department has been implementing the recommendations in the August 2017 consultant report since its completion. To date, 37 of the 58 tasks identified to address the 27 recommendations in the consultant report have been completed. Many of the remaining recommendations are tied to the implementation of AiM, which expected to be rolled out
in December 2019. Please see Attachment 11 for the consultant study Implementation Task List. Please see Attachment 10 for a timeline for AiM implementation. We also concur with implementation of those items contained within this report and will be separately developing an implementation plan and timeline for recommendations not already acted on.

Opportunity for Improvement 28: Conflicts of Interest Occurred as a Company Owned by a Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 at the Port Performed HVAC Services for Two Employees He Supervises, a Family Member of One Employee, and a Port Tenant.

Recommendation: Consider appropriate disciplinary action against the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1 and ensure that all employees complete disclosure forms related to outside employment to comply with the County’s Code of Ethics.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Department will work with the Human Resources Division to consider appropriate disciplinary action against the Skilled Trades Supervisor 1, consistent with County procedures and the provisions of the applicable collective bargaining agreement. In April 2019, all Port Department employees were required to complete and submit new Outside Employment Request Forms whether they were seeking outside employment or not.

Opportunity for Improvement 29: Former and Current Port Employees did not Disclose Outside Employment and Obtain the Required Authorization Resulting in Inappropriate Activities and Conflict of Interest.

Recommendation: Ensure that employees complete outside employment forms and take disciplinary action as appropriate.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. All employees are required to comply with the County’s Outside Employment Policy including the completion of the appropriate forms. The Port Everglades Department revalidated forms for Public Works staff on August 6, 2018 (see Attachment 5) and all Port Everglades Department employees were again required to complete and submit new Outside Employment Request Forms whether they were seeking outside employment or not on April 17, 2019 (see Attachment 6). Any employees found to be in violation of the outside employment policy will be addressed consistent with the disciplinary action policy of the County and any applicable collective bargaining agreement.

Opportunity for Improvement 30: One Port Employee Filed a Whistleblower Complaint with the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs and Professional Standards; However, an Investigative Report Was Never Issued.
Recommendations:

A. *Require Professional Standards to implement policies and procedures in order to timely investigate and respond to whistleblower complaints in writing.*

Management’s Response: *Management concurs in part.* Management agrees that policies and procedures to timely investigate and respond to whistleblower complaints in writing need to be in place and has such policies in place. Notwithstanding, Management will review its current policies and procedures regarding whistleblower complaints to see if they can be strengthened and update as needed.

In the Audit Report, two instances were raised regarding the timely response to Whistleblower complaints. The first instance was a complaint that was initiated over 12 years ago and subsequently withdrawn by the complainant for lack of action. Due to the length of time (over 12 years) since the complaint, Management was unable to locate any documents to support or refute this contention. The other instance was a complaint received from the former Port Property Manager which was received and forwarded to the County Auditor’s Office to review as a part of this Audit.

B. *Require Professional Standards to coordinate with and disclose to the Office of the County Auditor instances of fraud, abuse and waste for appropriate audit and follow-up.*

Management’s Response: *Management concurs.* As indicated in the Audit Report, Professional Standards has referred financial-related complaints to the Auditor’s Office and will continue to do so when appropriate. Again, this instant matter is a good example of how the system works properly as this matter was turned over to the County Auditor’s Office by Port Management and County Administration because of the allegations of potential fraud.

C. *Review and update whistleblower complaint review procedures to ensure adequate processes are in place to investigate claims and protect complainants against retaliation.*

Management’s Response: *Management concurs.* Processes currently exist to investigate whistleblower claims and protect complainants against retaliation. Notwithstanding, Management will review its current processes regarding whistleblower and retaliation complaints to see if they can be strengthened and update as needed.

Opportunity for Improvement 31: *Port Human Resource Officer is not Independent of Port Management*

Recommendations: Management immediately rotate the Human Resources Officer at the Port and take action to insure the independence and objectivity of human resource services across the County by:
A. Ensuring periodic rotation of human resource staff positions across agencies and establish sole responsibility to HRD.

B. Considering elimination of outsources HRO positions.

Management’s Response: Management concurs in part. The Human Resources Officer (HRO) position was designed to provide dedicated human resources services to the County’s larger agencies, many of which have different and unique business needs. While the audit report expresses reasoning to rotate HR staff amongst different agencies, this is not a “best practice,” as stated in the report, for the field of HR nor supportive of why the position was created. HR staff are selected to both maintain Broward County standard HR practices and meet the needs of the agency(s) they serve. To best meet these needs, before placing an individual in that agency, HR Central assesses the HR professional’s past work experiences, education, etc. Once the HR staff is matched with the agency, they are able to provide added value by learning the priorities, culture, and staff of that agency. This knowledge of the agency’s business needs and information leads to enhanced recruiting, training, employee relations, conflict resolutions, and relations with union representatives. A periodic rotation of human resources staff would be counter-productive and lead to disruption. Accordingly, Management does not concur with periodic rotation of human resources staff at the Port or across the County.

Notwithstanding, Management concurs that there may be other actions it can take to insure the independence and objectivity of human resource services to its agencies. To that end, Management will evaluate its options to ensure such independence and objectivity, which may include transferring the outsourced HRO and other HR positions to the central HR Division.

Opportunity for Improvement 32: Employees Should Not Store Personal Items on Port Property.

Recommendations:

A. Specifically prohibit staff from storing personal items on Port property.

Management’s Response: Management concurs.

B. Ensure access to restricted areas, including the FTZ, are secured to prevent unauthorized use.

Management’s Response: Management concurs in part. In order to access the port restricted area, an individual must have a valid Port ID, and/or a Transportation Workers Identification Credential (TWIC), or be escorted by someone that has one or both of these. The FTZ is a restricted access area and has its own gate staffed with a guard. The instances referenced in the Audit Report were not related to access to restricted areas,
but the unauthorized storing of personal items on Port property which is addressed in Management’s Response to Recommendation No. 32A above.

C. Ensure that all storage containers on Port property are properly controlled and secured.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. Port Management has already completed a survey of all of the containers being used by the Port for storage. Storage containers on port property are properly controlled and secured.

D. Inventory counts include all storage areas.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. Current inventory of all parts, supplies, and materials not presently found in the Central Storeroom are stored within a fenced compound adjacent to the Central Storeroom facility or lay down areas adjacent to the individual shops (i.e. Passenger loading bridge parts, plumbing/utility supplies, etc.). When the consultant contractor is brought on to prepare the final AIM inventory counts, these remaining storage areas will be fully implemented into the Excel inventory database. The current planned schedule for this contractor to begin work is February 2020 and full database implementation in mid-2020.


Recommendations:

A. Update the P-Card module of PeopleSoft to include a category/status for disputed charges.

B. Implement procedures requiring P-Card Holders to:
   - Immediately dispute the transaction with the vendor and notify the Bank and Accounting Division.
   - Perform follow-up with the vendor and the bank until the matter is resolved.

C. Require monthly reporting and follow-up of any disputed charges, ensuring resolution is complete, within 60 days, and accounts are credited for erroneous charges.

D. Ensure policies and procedures are appropriately updated and staff training is completed.

Management’s Response: Management concurs in part and has implemented new controls and procedures. As previously indicated in Management’s Responses to Recommendation Nos. 2 and 18, the newly established P-Card Audit team is using the
existing data from the P-Card PeopleSoft module to flag transactions reported as disputed. The P-Card Audit team will monitor for transactions flagged as disputed for ultimate resolution. Further, the P-Card Audit team will update the County’s policies and procedures as appropriate.

**Opportunity for Improvement 34:** Port Everglades Management Allowed Dumping of Approximately 2.5 Million Gallons of Untested and Uncertified Wastewater into the Port Everglades Sewer System from 2014 to 2018.

**Recommendations:**

*Cease dumping vessel wastewater into the Port’s sewer system. If the Port chooses to continue to allow wastewater haulers to dump vessel wastewater into the Port’s sewer system, at a minimum, management should take the following actions to ensure compliance:*

A. *Periodically test the wastewater collected from vessels and only allow the disposal of wastewaters within allowable limits set by the City of Fort Lauderdale and the George T. Lohmeyer Wastewater Plant.*

**Management’s Response:** *Management concurs in part.* The discharge of sanitary wastewater from ships at Port Everglades has been authorized under the Port Everglades tariff since 1999, with no issues reported prior to this audit. When the concern was first raised by the County Auditor, Port staff contacted the Environmental Compliance Supervisor with the City of Fort Lauderdale, who indicated there was no prohibition of discharging sewage provided that the requirements of the City Code of Ordinances was complied with.

Notwithstanding, to address concerns raised by the County Auditor, the Port’s Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Sanitary wastewater removal and disposal from vessels was updated on September 16, 2019 and sent to all three vessel sanitary waste franchise holders at Port Everglades (see Attachment 12). Item 8 of the SOP specifically provides: *"The franchisee may be required by Port Everglades to sample the waste stream from the ship to verify compliance with the City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinances applicable to the discharge of sanitary wastewater (Chapter 28, Article II entitled Sewers and Sewage Disposal). Port Everglades may also require the franchisee to provide samples of the sanitary wastewater for independent verification by Broward County".*

Furthermore, Port staff is working with staff from the County Water and Wastewater Services to develop and implement sampling and analysis procedures for the sanitary waste,

B. *Allow dumping only when appropriately approved and documented in writing by the Harbormaster, as required by tariff.*
Management’s Response: Management concurs. As of April 12, 2019, the Port’s Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Sanitary wastewater removal and disposal from vessels was updated to require the vessel sanitary waste franchise holders to provide notice to Port Everglades’ Harbormaster at least 24 hours prior to the scheduling of the discharge operation (see Attachment 13). The SOP was further updated on September 16, 2019 (see Attachment 12).

C. Require each of the three franchised haulers to sign a statement certifying their awareness of, and agreement to comply with, all wastewater disposal requirements.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. As of September 16, 2019, the Port’s Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Sanitary wastewater removal and disposal from vessels was updated to require the Franchisee to provide a Certification of Compliance statement if wastewater is to be discharged into a lift station at Port Everglades (see Attachment 12).

Opportunity for Improvement 35: A Hauler Dumped at least 120,000 Gallons of Untested Wastewater from Port Miami into the Port Everglades Sewer System.

Recommendations:

A. Prohibit the disposal of wastewater from sources outside of the Port Everglades.

Management’s Response: Management concurs. While the Port tariff only allows the discharge of sanitary wastewater from ships in Port Everglades, the three franchised sanitary waste companies were reminded of that prohibition when revised SOPs were provided in April and September 2019.

B. Update all hauler franchisee agreements to prohibit disposal of wastewater from sources outside of Port Everglades.

Management’s Response: Management concurs in part. The current tariff and franchisee agreements already prohibit the disposal of wastewater from sources outside of Port Everglades.


Recommendation: Lock all sewer stations located on Port property and perform frequent monitoring for unauthorized use.

Management’s Response: Management concurs and has completed. All Port sewer pump stations are presently locked and secured. Port maintenance staff that have the
responsibility for the pump station operations routinely verify that the facilities are locked and ensure that after they are serviced are adequately secured.

**Opportunity for Improvement 37:** Former Property Manager Alleged that FTZ Tenant 1 Inappropriately Occupied Vacant Warehouse Space for Five Years, Estimating $2.8 Million in Potential Loss Revenue to Port Everglades.

**Recommendations:** Immediately conduct an assessment and review all Port leases to ensure tenants are only using space leased to them.

**Management’s Response:** Management concurs in part. The Port’s new Property Manager was hired on July 29, 2019. The first task assigned to the Property Manager was familiarizing himself with all Port leases. Since then, the Property Manager has systematically reviewed leases and visited tenants. As part of the review process of each individual lease, the Property Manager is verifying that the property under lease matches with the property under use. A number of leases have been renewed since August 2019 and changes have been made, as required.

The instances referenced in the Audit Report were deemed unsubstantiated by Management for lack of evidence. Specifically, in October 2018, following up on a former employee’s allegations that a large tenant in the FTZ had been using space not under lease for a period of six years, Port Management conducted a review of all grid space billed during the period spanning from October 2012 to July 2018. Management’s review show that it invoiced the large tenant for grid space in 298 occasions totaling $1,041,066 in revenue to the Port. Of those invoices, 116 instances were for grid space inside Warehouse A, totaling $467,593. As a result of Management’s review, the former employee’s allegation was deemed unsubstantiated as there was no evidence to prove that the large tenant had used any non-leased space.

Moving forward, the Property Management Section will identify leases of potential concern to monitor compliance. Leases of potential concern include those which demised space is not defined by a permanent barrier around the perimeter, such as fences or walls. Office leases, warehouse leases where the tenant is occupying the entire space, and land leases which are fenced-off, do not represent a potential concern. These will be reviewed, regardless, as part of a renewal application. Leases of potential concern will be reviewed once a year by the Property Management Section to ensure tenants are only using space leased to them.

A. If unauthorized use of vacant space is identified during an assessment and review, Port staff should determine amount owed to the County and immediately process billing.

B. Make changes to the lease agreement if necessary, to include additional space.
Management’s Response A & B: Management concurs. The Port Everglades Tariff No. 4 (Item No. 604) applying to land use in the Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) already provides that an FTZ User found using space not covered by a lease or grid assignment will be charged a holdover rate which is double the applicable grid space rate for a full 30 day period.

Opportunity for Improvement 38: Port Management Does Not Verify and Monitor Appropriate Space Usage by FTZ Tenants.

Recommendations:

A. Develop and implement appropriate controls to monitor and ensure compliance with all lease terms.

B. Conduct and document periodic unannounced space audits to ensure tenants are compliant with lease terms. Space audits should be conducted by a person independent of the FTZ leasing function.

Management’s Response A & B: Management concurs and has implemented. The Property Management Section along with a licensed professional surveyor from the Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance Division will make and document periodic unannounced space audits of grid spaces at least once a month to ensure tenants are compliant with lease terms. Grid spaces not enclosed by a barrier (e.g., fence, wall, or combination thereof) will be defined through the use of marks painted on the floor or other form of marking. Grid spaces that are enclosed by a fence, wall, or combination thereof. A record of each inspection, including photographic evidence of the space being occupied, will be kept on a file administered by the Director of Business Administration and/or delegated staff. Please see Attachment 14 for the specific SOP.

Opportunity for Improvement 39: Controls Over the Use of Temporary Vacant Space are Inadequate and Could Permit Unauthorized Use of Space and Undetected Loss of Revenue to the Port.

Recommendations:

A. Establish appropriate controls, including segregation of duties or management oversight, to reduce the risk of inappropriate activities/fraud.

B. Develop and implement procedures to conduct unannounced space verification audits to verify actual square footage occupied by the tenant as compared to the amount paid. The space verification audits should be conducted by someone independent of the FTZ space rental function.
Management's Response A & B: Management concurs and has implemented. On November 19, 2019, a memorandum was circulated to all on-port FTZ tenants with a revised Standard Operating Procedure for reserving grid space at the on-port FTZ (see Attachment 15). To segregate duties, reservations will be received by FTZ staff, and approved and sent to billing by the Business Administration Division/Property Management Section.

C. Require all tenant reservation requests be appropriately documented and retained.

Management's Response: Management concurs. A record of each reservation request will be kept on file administered by the Director of Business Administration and/or delegated staff.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond and provide Management's comments to the Audit. If there are any addition, deletions/omissions, or other changes or modifications to Management’s response, please provide us the opportunity to review prior to issuance. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Attachments

cc: Mayor and Broward County Board of County Commissioners
Monica Cepero, Deputy County Administrator
Andrew Meyers, County Attorney
Glenn Wiltshire, Acting Port Director
George Tablack, Chief Financial Officer
Good afternoon,

Attached you will find a memo with additional procedures to follow. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Please read carefully.

Thank You,

Deborah Kraft

1850 Eiler Drive 6th Floor
Fl. Lauderdale, Fl. 33316
(954) 468-0185
dkraft@broward.org
MEMO

In addition to the current Purchasing Card Policy with Broward County (follow link: http://bc-net/Agencies/purchasing/Documents/Purchasing%20Card%20(P-Card)%20-%20User%20Manual%20(PDF).pdf)

The following new, Purchase Transactions, procedures, for materials and supplies shall be implemented and followed:

1. For any purchase that is in excess of $500.00 (individual or cumulative) a prior approval must be obtained in writing, from the Supervisor before the transaction for that item occurs. Public Works staff will continue to follow separate procedures as previously implemented for their purchases.

2. Purchaser must verify, before any transaction, that the items or services are not available thru a Master Agreement contract that the County has in place. If a Master Agreement is in place you must make sure that the vendor is set up and approved to take P-Card payments and if not, you must pull a catalog requisition for a PO to pay them. **Below find some helpful links on where to find.

3. All items purchased must have an independent verification of the receipt of the items or service by someone other than the employee whose P-Card is used for the said transaction.

4. When reconciling your charges in PeopleSoft you must make sure you have all correct documentation attached which should include Invoice, receipt of payment if possible and no taxes charged, any and all prior approvals, shipping documents noting date of receipt and signed by staff member verifying receipt if available and any descriptions not clearly printed on receipts. All charges must be reconciled by the card holder in PS by close of business on the 7th day of the month. If you do not feel you can make that deadline, please contact your P-Card Coordinator.

5. In the PeopleSoft comment section, where you upload attachments of each purchase, you must include a brief description(s) of the items you purchased, the intended use of said item(s) and if the charge is for a specific location that information also.

6. Approvers finding any discrepancies, please as soon as possible contact the card holder to correct immediately. All approvals must be completed in PeopleSoft by close of business on the 11th of the month.

** http://bc-net/Agencies/purchasing/PurchasingCardProgram/Pages/MAAgreeApptPCARD.aspx
** http://bc-net/Agencies/purchasing/Documents/MA_Report.PDF
** and in PS you can use this query:

BC_PO_PURCHASES_BY_CONTRACT – if you already know a contract number or
This next query if you just want to look by description:

| BC_PO_CNTRCT_ITEMS_DESCR_PRMPT | Contract Items w/ Desc. Prompt |
TO: All Public Works and Facilities Maintenance Employees

THRU: John Foglesong, Director
       Seaport Engineering & Facilities Maintenance Division

       Robert Flint, Director
       Operations Division / Public Works Section

FROM: John Walker, Port Maintenance Manager
       Seaport Engineering & Facilities Maintenance Division

DATE: August 22, 2018

SUBJECT: P-CARD PURCHASE PROCESS

Effective immediately the following process is now in place for Public Works and Facilities Maintenance employees. Detailed below are the modifications to the processes to purchase items on a County P-Card.

1. Tradesman & Storekeepers are required to fill a Purchase Request Coversheet for needed materials.
   a. Quotes, proposals and other relevant data needed to make the purchase are required prior to approval.

2. Supervisor to review the request and ensure proper materials are requested.
   a. Determine if the material being requested is not in stock somewhere on the Port.
   b. Determine if material can be purchased via Master Agreement.
   c. Determine the proper funding codes.

3. Supervisor to submit work order to Maintenance Manager for review & approval
   a. Verify material is not in stock in the Port inventory.
   b. Verify material cannot be purchased via Master Agreement.
   c. Determine if additional material is needed for inventory stock.

4. Maintenance Manager to submit Work Order to Director level for review & approval.

5. Director level to conduct final review and approval.
6. Director level to assign and forward request to P-card holder for purchase.

7. After purchase, all goods must be brought to storeroom.
   a. The Storekeeper will perform the following steps:
      i. Verify order is correct and valid.
      ii. Record parts, material and costs into inventory.
      iii. Issue Counter Release to release material back to trades or project.
      iv. Scan all documents, shipping labels, coversheet approvals and receipts to
          online purchase folder.
   b. Send copy of documentation to P-Card purchaser for upload into PeopleSoft for
      reconciliation.

Any concerns regarding these new procedures are to be address with your direct supervisor through
the proper chain of command.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORT EVERGLADES PURCHASE REQUEST FORM COVER SHEET</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Amount:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund/Program Dept Account</td>
<td>42100</td>
<td>75504000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Name: Vendor Phone: Vendor Address:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person: Trade Person:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor: Purchaser:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager: Director:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADESMAN / EMPLOYEE NAME</td>
<td>STOREKEEPER / SUPERVISOR NAME</td>
<td>COUNTER RELEASE #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION / TRADE</th>
<th>WORK ORDER #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART #</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Employee Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>IT Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Lisa Johnson</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Michael Green</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Emily Brown</td>
<td>HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>David White</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Rachel Brown</td>
<td>HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>555-555-5555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>555-555-5555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Johnson</td>
<td>IT Manager</td>
<td>555-555-5555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jones</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>123 Main St</td>
<td>1/1/2022</td>
<td>12/31/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>456 Central Ave</td>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>1/31/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Williams</td>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>789 Broadway</td>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>2/28/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Lee</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>10111 Elm St</td>
<td>4/1/2022</td>
<td>3/31/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>22222 Pine St</td>
<td>5/1/2022</td>
<td>4/30/2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From: Brevett, Nina
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 5:05 PM
To: Wiltshire, Glenn; Anderton, David; Brasso, Leah; Flint, Robert; Foglesong, John; Hernandez, Jorge; Pyburn, Jim
Cc: Alvarenga, Michelle; White, Jeff; Hamid, Harris; Rozental, Israel; Nguyen, Marjorie; Elie, Jean; Kennedy, Ellen; Buchan, Peg; Gillock, Kathleen
Subject: RE: Outside Employment Forms
Attachments: OutsideEmploymentForm.pdf

Good day,

Friendly reminder, Outside Employment form from all your employees are due by Friday, April 19, 2019.

Thank you,

From: Gillock, Kathleen <KGILLOCK@broward.org>
Sent: Friday, April 5, 2019 11:00 AM
To: Wiltshire, Glenn <GWILTSHIRE@broward.org>; Anderton, David <DANDERTON@broward.org>; Brasso, Leah <LBRASSO@broward.org>; Flint, Robert <RFINT@broward.org>; Foglesong, John <JFOGLESONG@broward.org>; Hernandez, Jorge <jorhernandez@broward.org>; Pyburn, Jim <jpyburn@broward.org>
Cc: Brevett, Nina <NBREVETT@broward.org>; Alvarenga, Michelle <MALVARENGA@broward.org>; White, Jeff <JEWHITE@broward.org>; Hamid, Harris <hhamid@broward.org>; Rozental, Israel <irozental@broward.org>; Nguyen, Marjorie <mnguyen@broward.org>; Elie, Jean <JELIE@broward.org>; Kennedy, Ellen <EKENNEDY@broward.org>; Buchan, Peg <PBUCHAN@broward.org>
Subject: Outside Employment Forms
Importance: High

Hi -
We have been requested from the County's Human Resources Director to have all employees complete and submit an updated Outside Employment Form.
Attached is a copy of the current form, which is also available on the BC-Net – http://bc-net/Agencies/humanresources/forms/OutsideEmploymentForm.pdf.

I am requesting your assistance in distributing the form to all of your staff so they may complete a new form. Directors will need to review and sign the updated
form. Once you have all forms for your Division, please return them to Nina Brevett in Port Human Resources. We will input the information into a County spreadsheet and submit the forms for the Port Department. A copy of the updated forms will also be added to the Department Personnel files.

All employees should completed an updated form, regardless of whether they have outside employment or not, and regardless of when they last submitted a form.

Please return the signed forms to Port Human Resources by Friday, April 19, 2019.

Thank you for your help – if you have any questions, let me know.

Kathleen Gillock, SPHR  
Human Resources Officer  
Port Everglades Department  
1850 Eller Drive, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316  
Office: (954) 468-3539  
Cell: 954-300-6377  
Fax: 954-468-3431
Good morning,
Please see below and set up a time that is good for you.
Thank You

From: PCardAdmin <PCardAdmin@broward.org>
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2019 8:29 AM
To: Buchan, Peg; Cohen, Mitchell; Delacruz, Arnold; Elie, Jean; Flint, Robert; Foglesong, John; Hernandez, Jorge; Kennedy, Ellen; Pyburn, Jim; Wiltshire, Glenn
Subject: FW: MANDATORY P-Card Approver Training in April 2019
Importance: High

COORDINATORS – PLEASE SHARE WITH YOUR AGENCY P-CARD APPROVERS

Dear P-Card Approvers:

The Purchasing Division will be hosting MANDATORY P-Card Approver Training in April 2019.

Please register for one (1) of the following sessions in the Learning Center:
- Monday, 4/8 – 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
- Monday, 4/8 – 2:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
- Wednesday, 4/10 – 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
- Wednesday, 4/10 – 2:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
- Friday, 4/12 – 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
- Friday, 4/12 – 2:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Failure to attend a P-Card Approver Training session will result in the loss of your approver authority.

Thanks in advance for your cooperation!

Looking forward to seeing you at P-Card Approver Training.

Regards,

Purchasing Division
115 South Andrews Avenue, Suite A461
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Port Everglades

Work Order Form

Work Order # 2353

Creation Date: [ ] Immediate (24 hr) [ ] High (2 Day)
[ ] Routine (7 Day) [ ] Low (30 Day)
Assigned Date: ______________________

Trade Supervisor: ______________________ Trade Assigned: ______________________

[ ] Corrective [ ] Billable

Work Order Type: [ ] P Maint. [ ] Inspect

Time Estimate: ______________________ Actual Time: ______________________

Location: ______________________

Employees Assigned: ______________________ Hours Worked Reg/OT: ______________________

Description of Work Order:

Field Notes:

Parts Used (indicate SH for shop parts or PC for p-card purchase):

Equipment Used:

Requested By: ______________________ Completed Date: ______________________

Office Use Only:

Billable Party: ______________________ Total Billable Cost: ______________________
Storeroom & Inventory Procedures

1. Accepting Products from the Warehouse
   a. Work Orders are required for all items being released from the warehouse.
   b. Work order can be hand delivered or emailed to the storeroom
      i. Products (parts) and quantities must be on the work order
      ii. Work Order must be approved by the Supervisor
   c. Storeroom verify stock inventory
      i. If inventory exists, work order is fulfilled through Counter Release process;
         1. Counter Release for products/parts in stock
            a. Storekeeper completes all blocks on the counter release form
               and includes part numbers (if applicable), quantity and description.
            b. Tradesperson signs counter release accepting custody of inventory for use with Work Order, one copy will be given to the Tradesperson.
               i. Person accepting the products must print their name legibly and sign.
            c. Items identified on the counter release form must be assigned to the specific trades-group in MP2 and update the quantity on the inventory spreadsheet.
               ii. If inventory does not exist, requisition process is started; see below number 2 “Purchasing Process”.
2. Purchasing Process
   a. Requisition Process, Inventory (Parts)
      i. Storeroom determines purchase stream path
         1. Requisition: used when a Master Agreement is available
            a. Verify funding is available and the line items match on the
               Master Agreement
         2. P-Card: used for emergencies or when a Master Agreement is not
            available
      ii. Need identified: is need for parts tied to a work order or for inventory
      iii. Supervisor and trades will specify products to be ordered which are not
            already stocked by the storeroom
      iv. Requisition Process
         1. Tradesperson and/or Trades Supervisor must obtain a quote from the
            vendor.
         2. Trades Supervisor will email the quote, the description of the task and
            work order to the Warehouse Supervisor or Contract Grants
            Administrator.
         3. Paper requisition is created with quote attached and circulated through
            Warehouse Supervisor, Department Manager, Finance, Director and
            Port Director (if requisition is over $3500)
         4. Paper Requisition information is added to Requisition Log located in
            the G: Drive (G:/Port/Facilities Maintenance/Requisitions)
         5. Signed requisition is scanned into PeopleSoft; a requisition ID is
            created and submitted for approvals.
            a. Storekeeper's notes on the Requisition ID include:
               i. Work Order Number
               ii. Description of the task
         6. Printout of Requisition ID is printed and put on the board until PO has
            been generated.
         7. Once approved in PeopleSoft, a PO is dispatched. PO is printed and
            put on the board.
   b. P-Card
      i. Tradesperson and/or Trades Supervisor must obtain a quote from the vendor.
      ii. Trades Supervisor will complete a P-Card request form, attach the quote and
          digitally sign.
      iii. Form will be emailed to the Facilities Maintenance Manager or Operations
           Manager and Asst. Director for their signatures.
      iv. Once signed, Assistant Director will task someone with a P-card to make the
          purchase.
      v. Once item is purchased, email the Trades Supervisor any documentation
         showing the item has been purchased
vi. Once products are received; the products, receipt and invoice must be brought to the Warehouse for verification by two personnel other than the person who requested the products.
   1. Personnel verifying products must sign and date the receipt/invoice or packing slip.

vii. Once verified, a Counter Release Form is completed to release the products. (See Section 1.c.1)

viii. Notify the purchaser that products were received and forward, email or hand carry, the receipt to purchaser.
3. Inventory Receiving Processes

General Note: All products purchased must be received and verified by the Warehouse

a. Products to be received by the storeroom must be processed by close of business the following day.
b. Two personnel must verify shipping documents match the products and quantities to be received.
c. All products will be verified and received by someone other than the requestor/purchaser.
d. Quantities and description of the products that are received must match the shipping document and the PO and/or quote.
   i. The quantities will be circled or highlighted on the PO if the line is received in its entirety.
   ii. If the line is partially received, the quantity will be slashed, and the correct quantity received will be written above it and circled.
   iii. Two Storekeepers must sign and date the packing slip

e. Inspect items for damage. If items are damaged, take pictures of the box and the damaged product, immediately notify the vendor and the warehouse supervisor.

f. Clearly mark the box with the Trade the products belong to and date.
   i. Notify the Supervisor, by email, of the Trade-group that products have arrived for pickup, include a copy of the shipping document.
   ii. Place box in a Ready for Pickup bin or Receiving shelf with a copy of the shipping document and blank Counter Release Form
   iii. Trades will have 3 business days to pick up products.
      1. If products are not picked up, they will be put into inventory.

g. Drop Ship: any products not shipped directly to the warehouse
   i. Two Storekeepers will go to verify the packing slip matches the products received
   ii. A Counter Release Form must be completed, and the trade-person will provide a work order, sign and date the Counter Release Form, accepting the shipment.

h. Counter Release Form will be completed at the time the Trade-person comes to pickup
   i. Date, name of Storekeeper, name of Trade Person, Work Order Number (if applicable).
   ii. Part number, quantity and description (if applicable, Capital or Internal Asset tag).
   iii. Trade-person will print, sign and date completed Counter Release Form and will receive carbon copy to be returned to their Supervisor.

i. Product Returns
   i. Refuse delivery for items not ordered
1. Document refusal.
   a. Copy of the packing / bill of lading
   b. Mark as refused and contact vendor
ii. Items accepted at delivery. (i.e. sealed packaging)
   1. Notify the Vendor of any products to be returned.
   2. Ensure the invoice number to be returned is communicated to the vendor.
   3. The credit invoice needs to reflect the invoice number of what is being returned.
   4. Credit invoices need to be sent to Port Account Payables
iii. Returns must be processed by Storeroom within 5 business days
4. Submitting for Payment
   a. Once an invoice has been created, Storekeepers need to process the invoice for payments through Port Accounts Payable.
   b. The product, quantity and pricing must be verified by circling each item on the PO, Invoice and Signed Requisition.
   c. If it's a partial payment, cross out the total cost on the PO and signed requisition and write the total amount of the invoice to be paid and circle.
      i. If the product cost more on the invoice than it does on the PO, the vendor must be notified of the discrepancy and a new invoice must be generated to match the PO. Payment will not be authorized until the invoice has been corrected.
      ii. If the product cost less on the invoice than it does on the PO, line out the price on the PO and signed requisition, write down the adjusted price and circle.
   d. All payments must be signed by Authorized Supervisor or Manager before being submitted for payment.
   e. Scan all documents and send to PortAccountPayable@broward.org for processing.
   f. Enter information on the Port Accounts Payable tracking spreadsheet located in G:/Port/Facilities Maintenance/Requisitions
   g. Completed packet will be filed with the original Requisition, quote and Requisition ID.
A) Period June 2017 - Dec 2017

1. Second week of June 2017, project kick-off meeting. Attendees: Operations supervisors, Cranes team, Port IT, Port Property Management and Broward County Public Work Department / Facilities Maintenance - Implementation Representative (BCPW/FM-IR)
   - Port migration from MP2 to AiM would start with Cranes only. The Port Operations section would keep MP2 for Inventory parts until Cranes is completed, meanwhile Operations would gather assets, parts and properties for the AiM implementation.
   - 2017, BCPW/FM-IR emphasized that County Public Work Department FM Division has no priorities and is encouraging all County Departments to submit the data, who is ready first will be given priority.
   - Priority for implementation was given to Cranes @ the Port.
   - From June to Dec., 2017, several sessions were held between Cranes, Port IT and BCPW/FM-IR to discuss and present the Port with information on how to configure AiM. Bi-weekly or monthly meetings were scheduled. Operations did not regularly participate in the sessions.

2. Cranes:
   - Identified the right data and configuration for assets, facilities, employees, shops, corrective work orders and all settings except for inventory parts and PM. Started working on 6/14/2017, provided the first data batch to BCPW/FM-IR on 7/18/2017. Made some initial testing for corrective work orders without parts.
   - MP2-to-AiM parts mapping task is pending due to Crane Sections concerns (need guarantee that no other County Depts. would access cranes parts). Task still in progress.
   - Cranes is looking forward to find out the way to migrate / create the individual tasks and task steps to configure AiM PM maintenance, based on the PM work orders established in MP2. Task still in progress.

3. Port FM:
   - Port FM worked internally defining and cleaning parts records stored in MP2, looking for options to organize the warehouse: bins definition, locations, inventory parts, etc.
   - Port FM: held internal meetings searching for PeopleSoft account numbers to use for charging inventory parts, also looking for information to configure assets and buildings for tracking basic work orders. Identified Port users and roles, looking for mobile devices and data plan.

4. BCPW/FM-IR:
   - Provided users with assistance to understand the system, giving plenty of samples and feedback on the cranes information gathered. Loaded the data and participated in Cranes testing sessions. Had some family/health issues affecting scheduled meetings and tasks.
   - Project schedule was not provided in full, but meetings scheduled and Agenda provided regularly. Follow up tasks were assigned to Port SMEs for review in the next session.

5. Port IT:
   - Assisted gathering data, mapping and formatting the information provided by Cranes. Tested the data loaded and the system functionality in multiple sessions with the SMEs and BCPW/FM-IR.
B) Period January 2018 - February 2018
1. Cranes:
   - MP2-to-AiM parts mapping task is still pending for discussions with BCPW/FM-IR.
   - Cranes PM configuration in progress.
2. Port FM:
   - Created a new Port demarcation between North, South and Midport
   - Port GIS re-located port properties based on new demarcation
   - iPads rolled out to Port employees. VPN granted to AiM users.
3. BCPW/FM-IR:
   - Missed or re-scheduled several meetings due to personal issues.

C) Period March 2018 – July 2018
1. New priorities assigned to AiM implementation @ Port. Cranes implementation would set on hold until Operations implements a basic work order tracking system; following recommendations from an external company.
2. BCPW/FM-IR:
   - Proposed second go live date for Operations by first week of May 2018 and for cranes by first week of June 2018
   - Requested information regarding: Facilities, Properties, employees and work orders configuration items from Operations.
   - Provides project plan for go-live with activities by module and sequence for Operations.
3. Port FM:
   - Received assistance from Port GIS for fenders, bollards and other properties and assets information.
   - Port FM helps finding/mapping accounts, inventory charging methods, etc.
   - Searches for a company to build the assets information.
4. Port IT:
   - Worked with Port supervisors identifying work order types, work codes and groups.
   - Cleaned, mapped and built files data, as well as tested the system.
5. BCPW/FM-IR:
   - 7/18/2018: Loaded data provided by Port FM regarding properties and erases previous properties, shops provided by Cranes. Data loaded is not in a consisted status to test have with SMEs testing the system; as shops or employees from Port FM were not loaded.
   - On June 2018 BCPW/FM-IR is assigned to a high priority project to implement AiM @ BC Emergency Management Center.
   - After July 2018, no more time devoted to the Port implementation until September 2019.

D) Period September 2018 – February 2019
1. BCPW/FM-IR:
   - Proposes a third re-start for AiM implementation @ Port until after he completes FY2018 Agency Inventory January 2019. Date set for 10/08/2018
AIM implementation @ PEV

- Port IT and BCPW/FM-IR group attend 4 sessions of training provided by asset Works for scripts (programming) creation in Aim and ETL tools usage. The training addressed a solution to set "Shop" as default for funding method for PEV only.

2. Port FM:
   - Keeps digging on inventory accounts for charging expenses.
   - Works with Temp workers and storkeepers to continue the base inventory parts started by County Auditors.
   - On January 2019, Port FM informs that Aim discussions would be on hold until the new Assistant Director of Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance Division starts.

E) Period March 2019 – October 25, 2019

1. Port FM:
   - Port GIS assisted creating a full map with new port properties demarcation and increasing the coverage to the entire port land and building, covering water, lands, roads, lift stations, pier marks location, assets, etc. Provided port electric meters address and account id to BCPW/FM-IR.

2. Port IT:
   - July 2019 provided a new set of files with properties, locations, employees, shops and labor rates, rebuilt and re mapped based on Erik’s latest demarcation. Requires from Brian K. to remove all data previously loaded, clean the port test data and reload the new data set provided.

3. BCPW/FM-IR:
   - July 2019 notifies the Port with his new priorities: FYEnd 2019 Inventory and the deployment of the Energy Management module for the entire County.
   - Proposed a fourth re-start date for Aim deployment @ the Port on October 21, 2019
   - Provides to Port IT and Port GIS feedback regarding files sent on July 2019.


1. BCPW/FM-IR:
   - Provided a fifth re-start date for Aim deployment @ the Port on 11/18/2019 for SMEs training.
   - Offered to provide the maximum of his time for supporting the Port and loading properties provided, as they were ready to load.
   - Offered to provide a project schedule by the COB of 10/28/2019- Pending
   - Requested an updated list of employees, labor rates, shops- Provided by Port on 11/1/2019.
   - Requested a list of charging accounts by shop.- Provided by Port, update in progress after BCPW/FM-IR feedback received on 11/1/2019
   - Requested a list of common vendors.- Pending, in progress
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should immediately require all purchases of parts and supplies to be made through the central warehouse.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>All parts and supplies orders are now made through the central storeroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Storekeepers should record all parts in inventory and link their use to specific work orders.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Storekeepers are linking paper work orders to counter releases. The management software, AIM, is also being developed, which will provide the best possible and paperless solutions in linking all inventory to specific work orders, to begin implementation by December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Storekeepers should conduct a full inventory count annually, and quarterly counts of one-fourth of the inventory line items.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Port conducted an initial full count of all warehouse spaces. The majority of inventory is being relocated to a centralized storeroom. Another full inventory recount was done in September 2019 for Financial Reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PW/M should install automated fuel dispensing system.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Fuel tank is slated to be installed with the new consolidated maintenance building, to be completed by FY 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PW/M Should initiate fleet management and preventative maintenance schedules.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Training on-going, will be fully utilized by December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Institute a structured approach to the evaluation of the feasibility of outsourcing. The department should use, or modify the scoring methodology provided in Appendix D for all functions performed by the divisions in order to maximize the utilization of internal staff.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Evaluation has been completed which is being used to utilize outsourcing. Staff have developed a structured approach to determine the feasibility of utilizing internal staff to complete work or the necessity of outsourcing to a contractor. Some technical work already determined is best suited to be outsourced to a contractor. A list of master agreements with Contractors has been developed and is updated as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should develop and install a PM Program for all of the Port building and building components.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Programs are in place for HVAC, Elevator, Backflows, Lift Stations, Flushing, Water Valve Maintenance. Additional PM Programs will be implemented with the use of AIM starting in December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should also be authorized to increase its budgeted allocation for contracted maintenance services to supplement the efforts of internal staff.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Requests for the needed additional contracted services have been authorized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Outsource the maintenance of the Sanitary Sewer pump stations</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Outsourcing of Sanitary Sewer Pump stations started in May 2018 and is on a continuous basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Outsource the maintenance of the potable water distribution system as a stop gap measure until individuals can be certified.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Two Class C Water Distribution certification employees were hired Summer of 2018. When repairs are beyond in-house capabilities, outsourcing occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should contract, initially, for the employment of predictive</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Predictive testing equipment bought are the infrared device in Sept 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>testing equipment on an annual basis. In the mid-term, the PW/M staff should</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>and the Procured Fluke Meter to test electrical devices in July 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>selectively acquire this equipment and train its staff in its use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional testing material will be brought on line as additional needs are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Establish asset inventory program</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Asset inventory program, AIM, in process of being implemented by December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>2019. Presently Assets are being tracked on a spreadsheet, MP2 software,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and GIS is also now being used to develop assets inventory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>In preparation for the installation of the AIM computerized maintenance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>iPads have been procured. Trades employees are using iPads for email,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management system, the PW/M Section should begin requiring all crew members</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>photos, GIS, and access to port as build drawings on OneDrive. iPads are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to report elements of their work each day establish work order reporting system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>being tracked and monitored in the County AirWatch program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should begin to define work activities that are</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>All work activities have been defined onto a spreadsheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commonly performed activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should begin to define service levels for each of its major</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Major activities (i.e. Backflow certifications, NPDES Certification,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Hydrant Flushing, etc.) have been identified and linked to appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>engineering standards and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should develop and implement a formal plan and schedule for</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Major activities have been developed. AIM is in the process of being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all major maintenance events for the year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>developed, which will incorporate all major maintenance schedules, to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initiated in December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Facilities Maintenance Superintendent should generate a monthly performance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Strategic Business Plan Performance Indicators are being tracked and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report on the accomplishment of projected work, and discuss the work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>reported. Also, a FM Project Report has been developed which shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accomplished with the Seaport Maintenance Manager, who should brief the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>performance, accomplishments, and tracking of projects on a bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise Director and assistant Director of Operations on accomplishment of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work and any deficits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PW/M should continue and formalize weekly safety &amp; employee meeting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Weekly started in Spring of 2017. In Fall of 2018 moved to bi-weekly after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>evaluation of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>PW/M should fill Superintendent Position</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Position was filled in August 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>PW/M should fill 2 vacant supervisor positions</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Positions were filled in July 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PW/M should fill 2 vacant Plumber positions</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>One vacant position has been filled and another is still posted, anticipated to be filled by Fall 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>PW/M should fill vacant Loading Bridge position</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Vacancy was filled. After evaluating workload, two additional positions have been added of which one is filled and interviews scheduled for the 6th position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>PW/M should fill vacant Electrician position</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Position has been filled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Operations should fill vacant Superintendent position</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Job Description is being developed to post position, to be filled by Fall 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Operations should fill vacant Office Support Specialist position</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Position has been posted, to be filled by Fall 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Work with County HR to determine the additional compensation attributable to a &quot;Lead Worker&quot; assignment.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Operations / Facilities</td>
<td>Request to include Lead Worker title in the bargaining agreement has been submitted to County HR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Operations should fill vacant Manager position</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Filled April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Port to transfer the building trades, and related, position from PW/M to SE&amp;C</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Started in February 2018. Full transition occurred in Feb 2019 with the hiring of Asst. Director for FM in order to provide adequate oversight of FM activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SE&amp;C to fill new position of Enterprise Assistant Director with PE certification. To oversee three Construction Project Management Supervisors and responsibility for direction and oversight of the facilities maintenance and certain engineering/capital project functions.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Filled Jan 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Construct a new facility that incorporates offices, work areas covered and uncovered storage, PW currently occupies 53,057 interior sq. ft. requesting $0,000 to 99,000 sq. ft. including training and conference room.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Design Consultant final approval to start design in July 2019. Construction completion in FY 2023. A temporary facility to consolidate the trade staff is in process and is scheduled to be completed by December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Port should develop a plan for deployment of technology to all PW/M staff to access current data and construction drawing for Port infrastructure.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>HVAC, Lighting Management, Elevator Data, and GIS Infrastructure Data is now available to staff for utilization on computers or iPad. AIM deployment by December 2019 will allow for additional data available for use in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The PW/M Section and SE&amp;C Division should engage in an analysis of operations that identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and develop a micro-level plan that feeds into the Port’s strategic plan.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>All divisions completed SWOT exercise in Nov 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Operations should formally assess the need to add a painter position to replace the position that was converted to a full-time Sign Maker.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Painter has been added and filled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Both PW/M and SE&amp;C should develop mission statements that define their purposes.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Mission statement was developed during the SWOT exercise in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The PW/M Section should centralize the decision regarding the number and types of items carried in inventory, and discontinue the practice of allowing individual employees to order their preferred supplies.</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Ordering of inventory has been centralized. A warehouse supervisor position has been filled, who has started to develop the minimum and maximum criteria for inventory parts. This information will be better addressed within AIM, which is being implemented in late 2019. Presently MP2 and an inventory spreadsheet are being utilized to track inventory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>SE&amp;C should engage with the Purchasing Division to enhance and improve support within the framework of the new commodity-aligned procurement approach.</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Purchasing has been engaged and collectively enhanced our procurement process beginning in July 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SE&amp;C should partner with Broward County HR to identify specificity in career planning for construction project management roles providing a path and incentives for investments in continuing education and cross-training.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Career and succession planning in terms of certifications, job advancement training, and additional licensing of staff have been implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Port should ensure that all employees in facilities maintenance related positions continue to receive daily Tool Box talks and attend weekly safety meetings after these positions.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Program was developed and implemented in Spring of 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>PW/M needs to curtail P-CARD usage to emergency or one-time purchases. Push purchasing through the storehouse.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Started this in Spring of 2017, fully implemented in July 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>PW/M to Set up AIM CMMS program for Work Order management</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Implementation in process with roll out in December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>PW/M to set up AIM CMMS program to track inventory usage</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Implementation in process with roll out in December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>PW/M to determine and implement technology platform for field personnel to use to manage and report progress of work order assignments</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Already determined that AIM program requires iPad devices, which staff has begun to use for additional purposes such as photo documentation, parts research, emails, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance to institute certification program for Loading Bridges through the manufacturer FMT</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Safety Certifications for loading bridges and MEGs are to be completed by FMT, who are working with their bankruptcy. Also, an RFP is being developed for additional companies to provide this service, approximate start date December 2019 pending purchasing requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance to set up training program for Loading Bridge mechanics through FMT</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Training Program for loading bridges and MEGs are to be completed by FMT, who are working with as they move through their bankruptcy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Operations to outsource arborist work for Port trees and palms</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>To be completed by December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Train PW/M staff to use iPads to report day to day activity</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Training completed spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Conduct out buildout and collection of Asset Inventory and PM programming for AIM</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Basic Asset Systems are scheduled to be inputted into AIM by December 2019, and a complete Asset Buildout will be completed by December 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>PM/M to develop asset life cycle expectations with associated probable replacement costs</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Being developed in conjunction with the Asset Buildout above, to be completed by December 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PM/M determine certification and licensed required work for Port Assets. Determine if it can be done inhouse or outsourced</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Certifications and licenses have been acquired by staff for work on Port Assets. Otherwise the task is outsourced to licensed companies, such as backflow certifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>PM/M to develop and implement employee training program for Port owned equipment.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Training for new equipment is mandatory, specified in the purchase contract. Existing equipment training is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>PM/M to study vehicle purchase policy. Move away from standard pickup trucks to user specific need vehicles.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Port now purchasing vehicles specific for individual trade use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Develop and implement a comprehensive Fleet PM Program</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Training on-going, will be fully utilized by December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Study PM/M staffing levels in relation to sq. footage maintained by both inhouse and contracted work. Make recommendations for inhouse staffing and contractor levels as needed.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Ongoing. This annual budget process, staffing and funding levels for PM related activities are analyzed for consideration of adequacy of workforce and contracting levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>PM/W to add 2 additional Skilled Trades Mechanics. One Electrician and HVAC mechanic.</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Positions were filled in Spring of 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Put program in place to certify plumbers for Sanitary and Potable water work</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Potable Water Class III and Wastewater Treatment Operator certified employees were hired on Spring 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Succession Planning and training of existing staff to transfer corporate knowledge</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Succession planning &amp; transferring of technical port knowledge amongst staff is discussed in staff meetings and strategies have been developed which include staff of differing shifts working together and sharing individual expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 16, 2019

Mr. Cliff Berry, II, President
Cliff Berry, Inc.
sent via email: compliance@cliffberryinc.com

Subject: Sanitary Wastewater Removal from Vessels

Dear:

On April 12, 2019, a letter was sent to all vessel sanitary wastewater removal service franchisees, outlining procedures to follow for the discharge of ship sanitary wastewater into the Port Everglades’ Sanitary Sewer System (the System) to comply with Port Everglades’ Tariff No. 12, Item No. 1036 – Sanitary wastewater removal and disposal from vessels. On September 10, 2019, the Broward County Board of County Commissioners approved an amendment to that tariff provision (copy attached) that requires changes to the procedures. Below are the revised Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) that will apply to all future discharges of sanitary wastewater from ships at Port Everglades.

Please ensure that your company is adhering to the following revised procedures when discharging sanitary wastewater from vessels calling at Port Everglades. As a reminder, only sanitary wastewater offloaded from vessels calling at Port Everglades will be allowed to be discharged into the System.

SOP for discharging sanitary wastewater into the System:

1. Franchisee shall provide notice to Port Everglades’ Harbormaster at least 24 hours prior to the scheduling of the discharge operation
2. Franchisee shall call the Harbormaster at 954-468-0212 to schedule the discharge operation
3. Franchisee shall provide the Harbormaster with the following details when scheduling the discharge operation:
   a. Date and time of the planned discharge operation
   b. Ship Name and Berth
   c. Projected quantity of sanitary wastewater to be discharged
   d. Whether the wastewater is intended to be discharged into the System
4. If the franchisee’s intent is to discharge the sanitary wastewater into the System through a lift station at Port Everglades, the franchisee must complete and provide the attached Certification of Compliance statement
5. All trucks used for the discharge of sanitary wastewater into the System must go to the
designated lift station prior to loading any wastewater from a ship for Port staff to verify that
the truck is empty and contains no other waste prior to loading. To ensure that the chain of
custody is preserved, trucks must go directly from the ship to the lift station without leaving
Port Everglades

6. A Port employee will be assigned to monitor the discharge operation will meet the franchisee
at the time and designated location identified, and will monitor the discharge operation to
verify the quantity being discharged and to observe that only sanitary wastewater is being
discharged into the System

7. The franchisee is required to provide all paperwork and manifests prior to the offloading
operation. This would include:
   a. A manifest signed by a ship’s officer specifically identifying the vessel name,
      description of the material being discharged, and the estimated total volume to be
      discharged
   b. The signed Certification of Compliance statement is also required if the wastewater
      will be discharged into a lift station on Port Everglades

8. The franchisee may be required by Port Everglades to sample the waste stream from the
ship to verify compliance with the City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinances applicable to
the discharge of sanitary wastewater (Chapter 28, Article II entitled Sewers and Sewage
Disposal). Port Everglades may also require the franchisee to provide samples of the
sanitary wastewater for independent verification by Broward County

9. Monthly written reports of activity and payment of related wharfage and labor charges for the
removal of sanitary wastewater shall be submitted to the Port Everglades Finance Division
within five (5) business days after the end of the month and shall include the dates of
services performed, the name of the vessel(s), number of gallons of product transferred, and
copies of all manifests and certifications

We appreciate your cooperation to this matter and your strict adherence to the SOP described
above.

Sincerely,

Jorge A. Hernández
Director of Business Administration

Cc: Glenn Wiltshire, Acting Chief Executive & Port Director
    Robert Flint, Director of Operations
    John Foglesong, Director of Seaport Engineering and Facilities Maintenance
    Leah Brasso, Director of Finance
    Ángela Osorno-Bellem, Franchise and Business Permits Manager

Attachments
Item No. 1036—Sanitary wastewater removal and disposal from vessels.

Issue No. 14

Effective Date: October 1, 2019

Vessel sanitary wastewater removal shall include the pumping of wastewater from the sanitary holding tanks of vessels to shoreside trucks and portable tanks and subsequent transport from the Port or to a designated on-Port location at which the wastewater is pumped into the Port Everglades sanitary sewer system.

All vessel sanitary wastewater removal services must be performed by entities with a valid vessel sanitary wastewater removal services franchise issued by Broward County.

Entities with a valid vessel sanitary wastewater removal services franchise will be assessed a wharfage charge of $0.0376 per gallon. With the prior written authorization of the Port Everglades Department, a vessel sanitary wastewater services franchisee may discharge sanitary wastewater into the sanitary sewer system of Port Everglades for an additional fee of $0.0670 per gallon. The franchisee must, prior to commencing its discharge of sanitary wastewater into the Port Everglades sanitary sewer system, certify in writing to the Port Everglades Department that the vessel sanitary wastewater to be discharged is in compliance with Section 28-204 of the City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, Code of Ordinances and Port Everglades Department procedures for the discharge of sanitary wastewater into the Port Everglades sanitary sewer system. During all vessel sanitary wastewater discharge activities, a Port Everglades Department employee will be assigned to monitor the discharge activities and verify the quantity of vessel sanitary wastewater being discharged into the Port Everglades sanitary sewer system. Port Everglades Department labor costs will be charged in accordance with Tariff Item No. 1110. Labor costs are payable to the Port Everglades Department in addition to the per-gallon fee.
Certification of Compliance

By signing and submitting this Certification of Compliance, Franchisee certifies that all information provided in this Certification of Compliance is true and correct. Franchisee further certifies that the sanitary wastewater being discharged into the Port's sanitary sewer system, as documented in the referenced manifest(s), complies with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, including, but not limited to, Port Everglades Tariff No. 12, Item No. 1036 – Sanitary wastewater removal from vessels, and the City of Fort Lauderdale's Sewer Use Ordinance (City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinances – Chapter 28, Article II entitled Sewers and Sewage Disposal).

Franchisee certifies that all sanitary wastewater being discharged into the Port's sanitary sewer system originated solely from vessels calling at Port Everglades.

Manifest(s) No(s.): ________________________________

Franchisee's Authorized Representative:
Name and title – typed or printed: ________________________________
Signature (*Required*): ________________________________
Date Signed: ________________________________

Received by:
Name and title – typed or printed: ________________________________
Signature (*Required*): ________________________________
Date Signed: ________________________________

(v1-2019-0916)
April 12, 2019

Via Certified Mail: 91 7108 2133 3931 8287 3528

Mr. Cliff Berry, II, President
Cliff Berry, Inc.
P.O. Box 13079
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

Subject: Sanitary Wastewater Removal from Vessels

Dear Mr. Berry, II:

Recently we reached out to your company, as well as other Vessel Sanitary Waste Water Removal Service franchise holders, inquiring about the procedures currently being followed to discharge wastewater into the Port Everglades’ sanitary sewer system. Staff has learned that in practice there are variations in the way each franchise holder is handling this operation. To achieve a uniform and consistent practice for the disposal of wastewater by all Vessel Sanitary Waste Water Removal Service franchise holders in accordance with Port Everglades’ Tariff No. 12, Item No. 1036 – Sanitary wastewater removal from Vessels, Port staff has developed the below Standard Operating Procedure (SOP).

Please ensure that your company is adhering to the following procedures when offloading sanitary wastewater from vessels calling at Port Everglades (Note: only sanitary wastewater offloaded from vessels calling at Port Everglades will be allowed to be discharged into the sanitary sewer system).

SOP for offloading sanitary wastewater into the sewer system:

1. Franchise holder shall provide notice to Port Everglades at least 24-hour prior to the scheduling of the offloading operation.
2. Franchise holder shall call the Harbormaster at 954-468-0212 to schedule the offloading operation
3. Franchise holder shall provide the Harbormaster with following details when scheduling the offloading operation:
   a. Date and time of the offloading operation
   b. Ship Name and Berth
   c. Projected quantity of sanitary wastewater to be offloaded
   d. Whether the wastewater is intended to be discharged in the Port Everglades’ sanitary sewer system
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4. The Port employee assigned to monitor the operation will meet the franchise holder at the time
   and place designated, and will monitor the operation to verify the quantity being discharged
   and to observe that only sanitary wastewater is being discharged into the sewer system.

5. Franchise holder shall be required to provide all paperwork and manifests prior to the
   offloading operation. The vessel name and total gallons must be identified on the paperwork.

6. Monthly written reports of activity and payment of related wharfage and labor charges for the
   removal of sanitary wastewater shall be submitted to the Port Everglades Finance Division
   within five (5) business days after the end of the month and shall include the dates of services
   performed, the name of the vessel(s), and the number of gallons of product transferred.

We appreciate your attention to this matter and your adherence to the SOP described above.

Sincerely,

Jorge A. Hernández
Director of Business Administration

cc: Glenn Wiltshire, Acting Chief Executive & Port Director
    Robert Flint, Director of Operations
    Jeffrey White, Assistant Director of Operations
    Angela Osorno-Belleme, Franchise and Business Permits Manager
Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)
Reservation of grid space in the Foreign Trade Zone

The Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for the reservation of grid space in the Foreign Trade Zone No. 25’s Main Zone has been updated as of November 18, 2019 (see attached letter).

This memo serves as Port staff’s internal SOP to process reservations of grid space in the Foreign-Trade Zone.

Zone users desirous of utilizing storage space in the Main Zone on a short-term grid space basis are required to provide written application made to the Main Zone’s Operator by hand-delivery or through email. For emailed applications, the SOP for processing the reservation request will be as follows:

1. The FTZ Manager will log the request and notify the Port Property Manager that a request has been logged.
2. The Port Property Manager will verify that the requested space is available and notify the Director of Business Administration.
3. The Director of Business Administration will sign off on the request and notify the Port Surveyor who will contact the tenant and meet with them at the Main Zone to specifically identify/mark-off the requested space. The Port Surveyor and the tenant will sign an acknowledgement of the tenant accepting the space.
4. The Port Surveyor will scan and e-mail a copy of the signed acknowledgement to the shared e-mail inbox (FTZ-Grid@broward.org) and the FTZ Manager will add this to their log for the record. Port Surveyor will return the signed original acknowledgement to Port Property Manager.
5. The Port Surveyor shall make unannounced inspections of grid spaces at least once a month to insure adherence with the terms of the reservation.

If the request is hand-delivered, the responsibilities for processing the reservation request, Step 1 will be modified as follows:

1. The FTZ Manager will log the request, add “Hand-Delivered” to the subject line, e-mail a scanned copy to the shared inbox (FTZ-Grid@broward.org) and notify the Port Property Manager that a request has been logged.

Steps 2 – 5 above remain unchanged.
November 22, 2019

Janne Meinertz, President
American Cruise-Aid Logistics, Inc.
405 Atlantis Road
Suite A101
Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

Subject: Reservation of grid space in the Main Zone Site 1

Dear Ms. Meinertz:

This letter serves as an update to the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for the reservation of grid space in the Foreign-Trade Zone No. 25’s Main Zone, located at 3400 McIntosh Road FTZ# 25 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316. In accordance with the Foreign-Trade Zone No. 25’s Tariff No. 4 ("Tariff"), only existing zone users of the Main Zone ("Zone Users") may be provided with additional space for the purpose of storing merchandise and cargo in connection with a Zone User’s operations pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in a Zone User agreement and/or lease with the Broward County Board of County Commissioners.

Please ensure that, as a Zone User, you are adhering to the following procedures when reserving grid space in the Main Zone:

**SOP for the reservation of grid space in the Main Zone:**

1. Zone Users desirous of utilizing storage space in the Main Zone on a short-term grid space basis, pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Tariff, shall provide written application made to the Main Zone’s Operator by hand-delivery or through email at: FTZ-Grid@broward.org with at least two days prior notice. The following details shall be provided by the Zone User as part of the written application:
   a. Type of grid space being requested, to wit:
      i. Inside warehouse grid space—no A/C
      ii. Inside warehouse grid space—with A/C
      iii. Inside office grid space
      iv. Outdoor grid space
   b. Amount of grid space needed
   c. Zone User’s Point-of-Contact and contact information (name, phone, and email) for matters related to the reservation of grid space

Broward County Board of County Commissioners
Mark D. Bogen • Lamar P. Fisher • Beam Furr • Steve Geller • Dale V.C. Holness • Nan H. Rich • Tim Ryan • Barbara Sharief • Michael Udine
www.broward.org
2. The Port’s Property Management Section will evaluate the request and advise the Zone User whether the type and amount of grid space requested is available.

3. In the event the appropriate grid space is available, a member of Port staff will coordinate with the Zone User to visit the proposed grid space and define it as required. If the perimeter of the space is not clearly defined by walls or fences on all sides, Port staff will act to demark the grid space through the use of paint, tape, barriers, fences, or other suitable means.

4. Port staff shall make unannounced inspections of grid spaces to ensure adherence to the terms of the reservation.

5. Port Everglades will invoice the Zone User for all charges associated with grid space. The Zone User will be solely responsible for making all payments per Tariff Item No. 604 – Storage and Hold Over Rates; Invoices.

Please note that, per Tariff Item No. 604 – Storage and Hold Over Rates; Invoices, in the event cargo or merchandise is placed/stored on grid space without an assignment from the Main Zone Operator, or remains in grid space subsequent to the expiration or termination of a storage period without notification to the Main Zone Operator, the Zone User will be charged a holdover rate, which is double the applicable grid space rate for a complete 30-day period in which the usage without notification or assignment occurred.

We appreciate your attention to this matter and your adherence to the SOP described above.

Sincerely,

Jorge A. Hernández
Director of Business Administration

cc: Miranda McCollo, Director of Finance & Operations – mmccollo@cruse-aid.com
Claus P. Jensen, Director of Operations – cpl@cruse-aid.com
Glenn Wiltshire, Acting Chief Executive & Port Director
David Anderton, Acting Deputy Director
Mitch Cohen, Assistant Director of Business Administration
Robert Jacob, Foreign-Trade Zone Manager
Josh Miller, Property Manager