

Office of the Secretary of State

Kate Brown
Secretary of State

Brian Shipley
Deputy Secretary of State



Audits Division

Gary Blackmer
Director

255 Capitol St. NE, Suite 500
Salem, OR 97310

(503) 986-2255
fax (503) 378-6767

March 11, 2013

Major General Raymond F. Rees, The Adjutant General
Oregon Military Department
1776 Militia Way SE
Salem, Oregon 97309-5047

Dear General Rees:

We have completed audit work of a selected federal program at the Oregon Military Department (department) for the year ended June 30, 2012.

This audit work was not a comprehensive audit of your federal program. We performed this audit work as part of our annual statewide single audit. The audit work performed allowed us, in part, to achieve the following objectives: (1) determine whether the department has complied with laws, regulations, contracts or grants that could have a direct and material effect on the selected federal program and (2) determine whether the department has effective internal controls over compliance with the laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to the selected federal program. We audited the following federal program at the department to determine whether the department substantially complied with the federal requirements relevant to the federal program.

<u>CFDA Number</u>	<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Audit Amount</u>
12.401	National Guard Military Operations and Maintenance	\$30,816,663

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the department's internal control over compliance with requirements that could have a direct and material effect on the major federal program to determine the auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the department's compliance and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the department's internal control over compliance.

A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of the federal program on a timely basis. A material weakness in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material

noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the paragraph above and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies, or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above. However, we identified a deficiency in internal control over compliance that we consider to be a significant deficiency. A significant deficiency in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Significant Deficiency

Suspension and Debarment Verification Process Needs Improvement

Program Title and CFDA Number: National Guard Military Operations and Maintenance
(CFDA 12.401)

Compliance Requirement: Procurement, Suspension, and Debarment

Type of Finding: Significant Deficiency, Non-Compliance

Federal regulations prohibit grant recipients from contracting with parties suspended or debarred from participating in federal programs or activities. Grant recipients are to ensure vendors that receive more than \$25,000 in federal funds are not suspended or debarred from doing business with the federal government.

A vendor may certify in writing that it has not been suspended or debarred and the grantee may rely on that certification. The grantee also may check for suspended or debarred parties by reviewing the Federal Excluded Parties List System (EPLS) maintained by the U.S. General Services Administration or by including a clause in its contract with the vendor.

The Oregon Military Department (department) paid five vendors nearly \$1.5 million in fiscal year 2012 for security and environmental evaluation services and other services without ensuring the vendors were not suspended or debarred from receiving federal funds. For the majority of these expenditures the department used existing statewide price agreements or used the state's procurement services office to issue contracts. The department did not verify suspension and debarment for the price agreement vendors, such as by reviewing EPLS, or have documentation that this was done for the other contracts. In addition, the statewide price agreement we reviewed did not include a clause to ensure compliance with suspension and debarment requirements. While the department has a policy to perform a review of the EPLS and to maintain documentation of that review prior to the execution of a contract, the policy does not require verification of suspension or debarment when a price agreement is used.

Without adequate controls over suspension and debarment requirements, the department cannot ensure federal funds are paid only to eligible vendors. We verified through EPLS that the vendors were not suspended or debarred and are not questioning these costs.

We recommend management implement and follow internal controls to ensure the review for suspension and debarment is performed and documented for all contracts, including price agreements.

The significant deficiency, along with your response, will be included in our Statewide Single Audit Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. Including your response satisfies the federal requirement that management prepare a Corrective Action Plan covering all reported audit findings. Satisfying the federal requirement in this manner, however, can only be accomplished if the response to the significant deficiency includes the information specified by the federal requirement, and only if the response is received in time to be included in the audit report. The following information is required for the response:

- 1) Your agreement or disagreement with the finding. If you do not agree with the audit finding or believe corrective action is not required, include in your response an explanation and specific reasons for your position.
- 2) The corrective action planned.
- 3) The anticipated completion date.
- 4) The name(s) of the contact person(s) responsible for corrective action.

Please respond by March 15, 2013.

This communication is intended solely for the information and use of management, others within the organization, federal awarding agencies, and pass-through entities and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than the specified parties.

We appreciate your staff's assistance and cooperation during this audit. Should you have any questions, please contact Alan Bell or me at (503) 986-2255.

Sincerely,
OREGON AUDITS DIVISION

V. Dale Bond, CPA, CISA, CFE
Audit Manager

VDB:AJB:nmj

cc: Brigadier General Mike Caldwell, Deputy Director
Karl Jorgenson, Director, Financial Administration Division
Bryce Dohrman, Controller
Michael J. Jordan, Director, Department of Administrative Services