



Parking Structures

2017-MS-3



Thomas P. DiNapoli

Table of Contents

	Page
AUTHORITY LETTER	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
INTRODUCTION	4
Background	4
Objective	5
Scope and Methodology	5
Comments of Local Officials	5
PARKING STRUCTURES	6
Inspections and Repairs	7
Capital Planning	13
Recommendations	14
APPENDIX A Repair Issues	15
APPENDIX B Responses From Local Officials	19
APPENDIX C Audit Methodology and Standards	22
APPENDIX D How to Obtain Additional Copies of the Report	23
APPENDIX E Local Regional Office Listing	24

State of New York Office of the State Comptroller

Division of Local Government and School Accountability

December 2017

Dear Local Officials:

A top priority of the Office of the State Comptroller is to help local government officials manage government resources efficiently and effectively and, by so doing, provide accountability for tax dollars spent to support government operations. The Comptroller oversees the fiscal affairs of local governments statewide, as well as compliance with relevant statutes and observance of good business practices. This fiscal oversight is accomplished, in part, through our audits, which identify opportunities for improving operations and local governance. Audits also can identify strategies to reduce costs and to strengthen controls intended to safeguard local government assets.

Following is a report of our audit titled Parking Structures. This audit was conducted pursuant to Article V, Section 1 of the State Constitution and the State Comptroller's authority as set forth in Article 3 of the New York State General Municipal Law.

This audit's results and recommendations are resources for local government officials to use in effectively managing operations and in meeting the expectations of their constituents. If you have questions about this report, please feel free to contact the Statewide Audits office, as listed at the end of this report.

Respectfully submitted,

*Office of the State Comptroller
Division of Local Government
and School Accountability*



State of New York Office of the State Comptroller

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Municipalities face substantial challenges in properly maintaining parking structures to be safe and acceptable for public use. Accordingly, the process of continuously conducting inspections and using the results from inspections to create a clear plan for repairs should be implemented.

Officials should have qualified engineers conduct regular inspections on the structural condition of their local government's parking garages. When officials are informed about the structural status of their garages, it helps them make better maintenance decisions to ensure public safety. Inspections also allow for improved long-term capital planning. Without regular inspections by qualified engineers, officials cannot be certain of the structural status of their parking structures, resulting in increased risks to the public.

New York State Property Maintenance Code requires that all elevators be maintained to safely carry all imposed loads, and that they operate properly and are free from physical and fire hazards. The code specifies that elevators be inspected at intervals not to exceed six months by certified elevator inspectors. Entities operating elevators are responsible for ensuring that they are inspected in compliance with statute.

Scope and Objective

The objective of our audit was to determine whether municipal parking structures were regularly inspected and repaired for the period January 1, 2015 through December 2, 2016. We extended the scope of our audit back to July 2005 and forward to May 2017 to review inspection reports and repair documentation. Our audit addressed the following related question:

- Are municipalities ensuring municipal parking structures are periodically inspected to identify repair needs and ensuring repair needs are completed to ensure public safety?

Audit Results

We audited six entities throughout the State that operate public parking structures. These entities were: Albany Parking Authority and the Cities of Buffalo, Ithaca, Rochester, Syracuse and White Plains.

These local governments have varying processes in place to inspect and monitor their parking structures. Although available reports indicate that the structures do not have any urgent repair needs, most units could improve their internal controls over parking structures and elevators. Albany, Syracuse and Rochester contract with engineering firms experienced in structural inspections to regularly inspect

their parking structures. Albany and Syracuse contract for annual structural inspections and Rochester contracts for biannual structural inspections. These units also have fewer issues identified in their inspections, and they repair the majority or all of the issues.

Buffalo, Ithaca and White Plains do not contract with engineering firms experienced in structural inspections to conduct regular inspections. Ithaca and White Plains use their own personnel and city engineers to monitor the garages, while Buffalo uses its own personnel and an operating vendor to monitor its structures. These local governments contract with engineers for structural inspections periodically, on an as-needed basis. Buffalo's and White Plains' reports identify a greater number of needed repairs. The lack of establishing regular inspection intervals has resulted in three Buffalo, two White Plains and possibly two Ithaca parking structures not having structural inspections within the last 10 years. As a result, officials may not be aware of all potential issues, increasing the risk to public safety.

Buffalo, Ithaca, Rochester, Syracuse and White Plains also have elevators with violations, comments on identified issues,¹ and/or uninspected elevators, and they did not make all repairs, which jeopardizes public safety. For example, none of Syracuse's nine operational elevators were re-inspected within six months. Further, all elevators have violations, with a total of 27 violations (for example, fire extinguisher, suspension ropes, emergency phones, elevator car positioning and ventilation). Moreover, 10 violations from the May/June 2016 inspection were also cited in the October 2015 inspection.

Finally, all units had long-term capital plans, but Ithaca's, Syracuse's and White Plains' plans were not based on structural inspections. Therefore, these plans may not contain all top prioritizing items and may not have sufficient resources allocated.

Comments of Local Officials

The results of our audit and recommendations have been discussed with local officials, and their comments, which appear in Appendix B, have been considered in preparing this report.

¹ Comments are other repairs that should be made that are indicated on the inspection reports. However, they are not considered violations. For example, oil and water on the pit floor is not an elevator violation, but is listed as a comment on the inspection report.

Introduction

Background

Parking structures are exposed directly to weather and other environmental conditions, such as extreme temperature changes, rain, snow, deicing salts, road grime and dampness, which directly influence their durability and have the potential to create performance problems. The potential severity of these problems will depend on the geographic location of the structure and local environmental conditions.

While there are no State or federal laws requiring periodic structural inspections, some entities that operate these structures have implemented laws and informal practices to ensure that they are structurally sound. Municipalities have historically increased inspection mandates in response to parking structure failures. For example, in 1998, the City of Syracuse updated its Property Conservation Code to require annual inspections of parking structures in response to the MONY garage collapse of 1994. This structure failure was the result of a 115-foot portion of the second level collapsing down to the first. Prior to the 1994 collapse, a 1988 study of the garage stated the need for millions of dollars in repairs. However, these repairs were neglected and never completed. As another example, in 2009 the City of Rochester implemented a parking structure maintenance program that strives to have each City-owned parking structure inspected every two years in response to the 2006 South Avenue structure collapse. This structure failure was the result of rust within the steel cable and post system that supported the ramp.

New York State Property Maintenance Code requires that all elevators be maintained to safely carry all imposed loads, and that they operate properly and are free from physical and fire hazards. The code specifies that elevators be inspected at intervals not to exceed six months by certified elevator inspectors. Capital planning should have a clear mission – to maintain and/or improve a local government's capital assets over time. Inspections allow for improved long-term capital plans.

We selected six units throughout New York State: Albany Parking Authority and the Cities of Buffalo, Ithaca, Rochester, Syracuse and White Plains. We judgmentally selected units across the State that had more than one parking structure (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Parking Structure Entities			
Entity	Number of Parking Structures	Number of Parking Spaces	Annual Parking Structure Revenue (in millions)
Albany Parking Authority	3	2,594	\$3.5
City of Buffalo	9	8,621	\$8.1
City of Ithaca	3	1,049	\$2.9
City of Rochester	9 ^a	10,091	\$6.8
City of Syracuse	5	4,238	\$3.4
City of White Plains	8	9,557	\$11.2

^a The Midtown Garage was in the process of being sold during the audit.

Objective

The objective of our audit was to determine whether municipal parking structures were regularly inspected and repaired. Our audit addressed the following related question:

- Are municipalities ensuring municipal parking structures are periodically inspected to identify repair needs and ensuring repair needs are completed to ensure public safety?

Scope and Methodology

We examined six entities regarding their practices of inspection and maintenance of parking structures. These entities included one parking authority and five cities for the period January 1, 2015 through December 2, 2016. We expanded our review back to July 2005 and forward to May 2017 to review inspections and repairs reports.

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS). More information on such standards and the methodology used in performing this audit are included in Appendix C of this report.

Comments of Local Officials

The results of our audit and recommendations have been discussed with local officials, and their comments, which appear in Appendix B, have been considered in preparing this report.

Parking Structures

Good business practice dictates that local officials be aware of the structural status of any structure they operate to ensure public safety and assist in long-term planning. New York State Property Maintenance Code specifies that elevator inspections be performed every six months by a qualified elevator inspector. Sound business practices include both long-term and short-term capital project planning, which serves to identify and prioritize anticipated needs based on a strategic plan.

The local governments we reviewed have varying processes in place to inspect and monitor their parking structures. Although available reports indicate that the structures do not have any urgent repair needs, most units could improve their internal controls over parking structures and elevators. Three units (Albany, Syracuse and Rochester) are regularly contracting with engineering firms experienced in structural inspections to inspect their parking structures. Albany and Syracuse conduct annual structural inspections and Rochester conducts biannual structural inspections. These units have fewer issues identified in their inspections, and they repair the majority or all of the issues.

Ithaca and White Plains use their own personnel and city engineers to monitor the garages, while Buffalo uses its own personnel and an operating vendor to monitor its structures. Buffalo, Ithaca and White Plains contract for structural inspections periodically, on an as-needed basis. Their reports identified a greater number of needed repairs. The lack of establishing regular inspection intervals has resulted in three Buffalo, two White Plains and possibly two Ithaca parking structures not having structural inspections within the last 10 years. As a result, officials may not be aware of all potential issues, increasing the risk to public safety.

Further, Buffalo, Ithaca, Rochester, Syracuse and White Plains have elevators with violations, comments on identified issues and/or uninspected elevators and did not make all repairs, which jeopardizes public safety. For example, none of Syracuse's nine operational elevators were re-inspected within six months. Further, all elevators have violations, with a total of 27 violations (for example, fire extinguisher, suspension ropes, emergency phones, elevator car positioning and ventilation). Moreover, 10 violations from the May/June 2016 inspection were also cited in the October 2015 inspection with the same reasons. Finally, the units had long-term capital plans,

but Ithaca’s, Syracuse’s and White Plains’ plans were not based on structural inspections. Therefore, they may not contain all top prioritizing items and may not have sufficient resources allocated.

Inspections and Repairs

Good business practices stipulate that local officials should know the structural status of their parking structures because they are significant and costly pieces of civil infrastructure that are open to the public. Structures are subjected to intense stresses, such as corrosion from deicing salt and the on-again, off-again weight of parked cars. Preventative inspections may bring issues to the forefront, prior to major structural issues. Additionally, given the varying weather conditions that the parking structure elevators are exposed to, above and beyond regular wear and tear, these inspections are an even greater importance.

Parking Structures – Good business practices dictate that parking structures should have regular structural inspections by engineering firms experienced in structural inspections, and identified issues should be evaluated and addressed. The units are taking varying approaches to monitoring parking structure statuses. Albany has a lending agreement that requires annual structural inspections, while Rochester established procedures for biannual inspections. In response to a collapse, Syracuse passed a local law requiring annual inspections (Figure 2). The proactive approaches implemented by management in these units (sometimes referred to as the “tone at the top”) may have resulted in them addressing issues before they become larger problems.

Figure 2: Inspection Summary

	Number of Structures	Inspection Frequency	Urgent Priority	Immediate Issues Identified	Remaining Issues
Albany	3	Annual	0	0	0
Rochester	9	Biannual	0	11	1
Syracuse	5	Annual	0	11	3

Albany’s inspection and repair process is a best practice. It contracts with an engineering firm to perform annual structural inspections, draft the bidding documents, oversee repairs to ensure they are completed satisfactorily and issue a report that there are no outstanding repairs. Rochester also has good practices: officials contract with an engineering firm to perform biannual structural inspections, help prioritize issues and develop annual capital repair plans that address identified issues. Officials told us the remaining issue (entrance/exit access) may be in a future capital project. Syracuse contracts for annual inspections and obtains statements regarding the current worthiness

of the structures. Officials told us the remaining three issues (loose overhead concrete, corrosion of precast steel anchors and aluminum railing at roof level) were not repaired because funding limitations required additional prioritization.

Buffalo, Ithaca and White Plains do not perform regular structural inspections (Figure 3). Instead, they contract for structural inspections when they (Buffalo – Commissioner of Parking and garage management vendor) (Ithaca – Director of Parking and engineering department) (White Plains – Department of Public Works mechanical engineer) feel it is necessary. They rely on their own visual inspections of the garages to identify potential issues. While Ithaca and White Plains have engineers on staff to visually evaluate the structures, Buffalo does not use an engineer to make preliminary assessments of the garages. Because these structural inspections are not occurring regularly, officials may be unaware of potential issues or upcoming necessary repairs for the parking structures. Finally, they appear to be more reactive to potential issues because they contract for inspections after they feel an issue has arose. This suggests that, without regular structural inspections, the quantity of identified issues is substantially greater.

Figure 3: Inspection Summary

	Number of Structures	Number of Inspections	Urgent Priority	High Priority	Remaining Issues
Buffalo	9	4	0	37	18
Ithaca	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White Plains	8	4	0	32	6

Within the last 10 years, Buffalo contracted for inspections of four of its structures, while White Plains contracted for inspections of three structures. Ithaca is in the process of receiving a structural inspection for two sections of the Green Street structure. In addition, Ithaca officials told us they may have had two additional structural inspections within the last 10 years, but they could not provide any inspection documentation. Examples of unrepaired issues include:

- Buffalo – Officials told us 14 of the unrepaired issues were repaired, but could not provide documentation (deteriorated, loose, cracking concrete and brick). They also told us the remaining four issues are deferred (concrete corbel repair, epoxy crack injection and façade repairs, concrete and guardrail replacement).

- White Plains – The Commissioner of Parking told us one issue was repaired (replacement of gutters) but could not provide documentation or that improvements of the pump capacity were not necessary. He also told us two recommendations would make the issues worse (installation of waterproofing joints and replacement of grade slabs) and two issues were pending (drainage inlets and verifying concrete reinforcement). Finally, officials told us one issue was reported incorrectly (repair of concrete slab and beams) because there are no beams in that location.

The lack of establishing regular inspection intervals has resulted in three Buffalo, two White Plains and possibly two Ithaca parking structures not having structural inspections within the last 10 years. As a result, officials may not be aware of all potential issues, increasing the risk to public safety.

When contracting for inspections, units should document the reason for the inspections, obtain inspection results and document decisions of how and when the issues will be addressed. This information would help provide transparency to the public and support the basis for anticipated capital projects. With exception of Albany and Rochester, the units did not always obtain inspection reports and document their decisions or repair statuses. For example:

- Buffalo – Officials told us that they do not document the reasons they contract for structural inspections, which order to address issues, timelines or who will make the repairs. In addition, the project manager² told us he checks on repairs. However, he did not keep a log of repairs requested or whether they were completed.
- Ithaca – The Director of Engineering Services told us that officials decide when structural inspections are conducted by an outside engineering firm when they determine it is necessary, but do not document the reason. The City completed a major renovation in the fall of 2016. However, it did not have documentation to indicate that the repairs were necessary or addressed the most pressing issues. Further, City officials told us that the City contracted for a structural inspection of the Seneca Street structure around 2011, but did not have documentation showing complete results, and Dryden Garage around 2007, but could not provide us with

² Buffalo contracts with a not-for-profit entity to operate its parking structures. The project manager works for the vendor.

the report. In addition, officials do not have documentation to support their decision regarding the assessment for a project that is currently under way, nor any documentation of why they have selected the areas to work on.

- Syracuse – Officials told us they discuss the identified issues and determine how to proceed. However, there is no documentation to support how officials prioritized the identified repairs, projected timelines or costs, or determined whether the repairs were to be made with City employees or through competitive bids. A Department of Public Works (DPW) employee told us he will send work orders to a DPW Supervisor for repairs to be made by City employees or will go to the Common Council to request appropriations for vendor repairs. He also told us he usually visits each garage weekly to monitor garage conditions and check on repairs. However, he did not keep a log of the repairs he requested or whether they were completed. Instead, he monitors repairs by observations.
- White Plains – Officials told us they discuss the identified issues and determine how to proceed. However, there is no documentation to support how officials prioritized the identified repairs or the disposition of repairs not undertaken. While capital issues are being addressed, the Parking and DPW Departments discuss the status of the repairs during capital project bi-monthly meetings. The meeting minutes indicated general discussions of project phases – repair category, disposition, repair progression and current status. However, not all projects are documented. Once the issue is repaired, the DPW engineer will certify the work and notify the supervisor. However, neither the DPW engineer nor the supervisor maintain a log or documentation of certified work.

Without documentation to support City officials' decisions and the current status of some repairs, there is less transparency to officials and the community that the parking structures are being adequately maintained (Appendix A lists the status of known issues identified by available inspections).

Elevator Inspections – New York State Property Maintenance Code requires that all elevators be maintained to safely carry all imposed loads, and that they operate properly and are free from physical and fire hazards. The Code specifies that elevator inspections be completed at intervals not to exceed six months by certified elevator inspectors. Elevator inspection reports cite elevators as having violations and comments. When an elevator has a violation that results in it failing

inspection, it is shut-down. Such violations resulting in failure can include elevators that will not set in the safeties. Elevators also can have violations that do not necessarily mean they failed inspection. The inspection report could list them as a pass with violations. For example, replace hoisting ropes due to reduction diameter. Inspections can also include comments for items that need to be repaired that are not as high risk as violations. For example, oil and water on the pit floor is not an elevator violation, but can be listed on the inspection report as a comment. In the event of a failing inspection or violations, repairs should be made to ensure public safety.

Unless elevators failed inspection, the inspection reports we reviewed did not contain sufficient detail to determine which repairs listed were violations or comments. Therefore, we grouped them together. Albany has four elevators, and all had passing inspections within the past six months of our review. However, Buffalo, Ithaca, Syracuse, Rochester and White Plains had a combination of uninspected elevators and elevators with violations or comments, and some have no documentation that corrective actions were taken (See Appendix B for details of elevator testing results). For example:

- Buffalo – The City’s operational parking structures have 18 elevators. We reviewed recent elevator inspection reports and found that all 18 were inspected within the past six months.³ For the most recently completed inspections, 14 elevators had violations or comments and four had no violations. Officials told us that they were unaware whether violations, such as a properly tested and maintained ABC fire extinguisher, ascending overspeed protection shall be provided, and five-year, full load and rated speed safety tests overdue, were repaired.
- Rochester – The City’s parking structures have 27 elevators, and the City contracts separately for elevator inspections and maintenance. Within the last six months, 26 elevators were inspected: 18 elevators did not have violations, eight elevators had violations or comments (for example, replace hoisting ropes due to reduction of diameter, water and oil shall not be allowed to accumulate on pit floor, and emergency phone), and one elevator was closed. In addition, inspections did not occur every six months as required by law, at times only occurring at 14-month intervals. Officials could not provide documentation that the violations were repaired.

³ As of when we left field work.

- Ithaca – The City’s parking structures have three elevators. We reviewed three elevator inspection reports from July and October 2016. Two elevators were inspected within the required six months, and one elevator was re-inspected after six months. Two elevators had a total of six violations or comments (floor, capacity plate, fire extinguisher, wiring, pulse belt monitor and lighting). We reviewed letters documenting that five violations or comments were repaired. A DPW employee told us that the final violation (leakage) was not addressed because of the winter weather.
- Syracuse – The City’s parking structures have 10 elevators. One elevator is closed because repairs require significant capital outlay. We reviewed nine elevator inspection reports from May/June 2016 and found that none of the elevators were re-inspected within six months. Three elevators were re-inspected after eight months and six were re-inspected after six and a half months. Further, all elevators had violations or comments, with a total of 27 violations (for example, fire extinguisher, suspension ropes, emergency phones, elevator car positioning and ventilation). Moreover, 10 violations from the May/June 2016 inspection were cited in the October 2015 inspection with the same violations. Officials told us they plan to issue a request for proposals for the elevator repairs.
- White Plains – Local law⁴ requires elevators be inspected annually by a City code enforcement officer. The City’s parking structures have 31 elevators. Two elevators are closed and require a capital project to be placed back in service.

The City had an inspection date and results for 20 elevators indicating they had been inspected within a year. However, all had violations, with a total of 56 violations or comments (for example, hoist ropes, fire service, direction limit, lighting, intercom, rust accumulation, maintenance logs, smoke head and fire extinguishers). Officials were unable to provide documentation that repairs were made for these violations. An additional elevator was inspected in the last year. However, City officials maintained a notice of inspection, but there is no documentation of the inspection results.

Seven elevators had not been inspected in 2016; their most recent inspection reports were dated between 19 and 31 months prior to our

⁴ For purposes of this audit, we assume that the requirement contained in the City's transportation code that elevators be inspected annually by City Code enforcement officer applies.

review. One elevator had no documentation regarding when it was last inspected, and no results of inspection.

Without ensuring elevators are regularly inspected and violations and comments corrected, there is an increased risk to public safety.

Capital Planning

Capital planning should have a clear mission – to maintain and/or improve a local government’s capital assets over time. Such planning serves to identify and prioritize anticipated needs based on a strategic plan. Effective capital project plans establish a clear project scope accompanied by detailed estimates of cost and timelines for project phases and final completion. The process of prioritizing capital investments can ensure key assets are repaired or replaced before an emergency occurs. Such planning not only establishes an entity’s capital project needs, but helps establish overall budgetary control as well. Often, long-term capital plans range from three-to-five years and are supplemented by annual plans that distinguish short-term from long-term needs. Capital project plans should have the flexibility to address unexpected situations, including those impacting the health and safety of parking structure employees and patrons.

Since Albany completed major renovations to its parking structures in 2012, it has no anticipated capital projects in the near future. However, as required by its debt agreement, it continues to annually set aside \$150,000 for future repairs. Albany currently has \$1 million for future projects.

Although Rochester and Syracuse had structural inspections that identified issues to be addressed, they did not use the information similarly. Rochester’s five-year capital plan is based on identified inspection issues and includes prioritizing projects, project scopes, timeframes and costs. Conversely, Syracuse’s five-year capital plan includes an allocation for capital project work, but it does not identify specific projects, scopes, timeframes or costs. Syracuse officials told us the plan does not identify specific projects so that they can identify projects as needed. The lack of proper planning for specific projects leaves Syracuse at risk of not having sufficient resources available to address necessary repairs.

While Buffalo, Ithaca and White Plains have long-term capital plans, because they do not have current structural inspections for all garages and do not know the status of certain identified issues, they are at increased risk that they may not be considering all potential issues, and/or have sufficient resources available to address necessary repairs. Without regular structural inspections, the effectiveness of a long-term plan is diminished because officials do not have complete

information to make informed decisions. In addition, officials cannot be certain that they are allocating sufficient resources to cover future needs.

Recommendations

The Common Councils should:

1. Consider establishing regular structural inspection cycles for the parking structures.

Officials should:

2. Document inspection decisions, priorities and dispositions of identified needed repairs and update as necessary.
3. Ensure operational elevators are inspected, as required, and meet minimum code requirements.
4. Develop capital plans based on inspection reports and documented decisions.

APPENDIX A

REPAIR ISSUES

Albany Parking Authority					
Garage	Year Built	Inspection Year	Number of Immediate Repair Issues	Immediate Repair Issues Unaddressed	Repairs Completed, Missing Documentation
Inspected Structures:					
Riverfront (Columbia)	1984	2015	0	0	0
Green-Hudson	1986	2015	0	0	0
Quackenbush	2000	2015	0	0	0

City of Buffalo					
Garage	Year Built	Year Inspected	Number of Immediate Repair Issues	Immediate Repair Issues Not Addressed	Repairs Completed, Missing Documentation
Inspected Structures:					
Mohawk	1954	2011	16	0	14
Main Place	1970	2009	0	NA	NA
Turner	1973	2014	16	4	0
Auspurger	1983	2014	5	0	0
Uninspected Structures:					
One Seneca	1969	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Fernbach	1989	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Gallagher	1976	2005	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

City of Ithaca					
Garage	Year Built	Year Inspected	Number of Immediate Repair Issues	Immediate Repair Issues Not Addressed	Repairs Completed, Missing Documentation
Inspected Structures:					
Green Street	1975	2016	0	0	0
Uninspected Structures:					
Dryden Road	1987	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Seneca-Tioga Street	1975	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

City of Rochester					
Garage	Year Built	Year Inspected	Number of Immediate Repair Issues	Immediate Repair Issues Not Addressed	Repairs Completed, Missing Documentation
Inspected Structures:					
Court Street	1995	2014	2	0	0
East End	1983	2013	0	NA	NA
Genesee Crossroads	1969	2015	0	NA	NA
High Falls	1993	2014	0	NA	NA
Mortimer	2008	2015	5	1	0
Sister Cities	1990	2015	0	NA	NA
South Avenue	1974	2016	4	0	0
Washington Square	1988	2014	0	NA	NA
Uninspected Structures:					
Midtown	2014	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

City of Syracuse					
Garage	Year Built	Year Inspected	Number of Immediate Repair Issues	Immediate Repair Issues Not Addressed	Repairs Completed, Missing Documentation
Inspected Structures:					
Fayette Street	1985	2015	4	0	0
Harrison Street	1992	2015	0	0	0
Madison-Irving	1986	2015	3	0	0
Mony/Axa	1968	2015	2	2	0
Washington Street	1990	2015	2	1	0

City of White Plains					
Garage	Year Built	Year Inspected	Number of Immediate Repair Issues	Immediate Repair Issues Not Addressed	Repairs Completed, Missing Documentation
Inspected Structures:					
Chester-Maple	1967	2011	14	0	0
Lexington-Grove	1980	2011	8	0	0
Library	1974	2008	6	4	1
TransCenter	1987	2008	4	1	
Uninspected Structures:					
Hamilton-Main	1969	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Longview-Cromwell	2008	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Lyon Place	2014	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
White Plains Center	2003	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Elevator Inspections

Entity	Total Number of Elevators in Operation	Elevators Inspected (Six Months)	Elevators With No Violations (Within Six Months)	Elevators With Violations or Comments (Within Six Months)	Elevators With Unknown Inspections Results (Within Six Months)	Number of Violations or Comments	Documented Violation or Comment Repairs	Unresolved Violations or Comments (or No Documentation of Addressing Violations)	Number of Uninspected Elevators Within Last Six Months
Albany Parking Authority	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Buffalo	18	18	4	14	0	17	0	17	0
City of Ithaca	3	3	1	2	0	6	5	1	0
City of Rochester	27	26	18	8 ^a	0	10	0	10	0
City of Syracuse	9	9	0	9	0	27	0	27	0

^a Officials closed one failed elevator.

Elevator Inspections

Entity	Total Number of Elevators in Operation	Elevators Inspected (12 Months)	Elevators With No Violations (Within 12 Months)	Elevators With Violations or Comments (Within 12 Months)	Elevators With Unknown Inspections Results (Within 12 Months)	Number of Violations or Comments	Documented Violation or Comment Repairs	Unresolved Violations or Comments (or No Documentation of Addressing Violations)	Number of Uninspected Elevators Within Last 12 Months
City of White Plains	29	21		20	1	56	0	56	7

APPENDIX B

RESPONSES FROM LOCAL OFFICIALS

We provided a draft copy of this global report to the six entities we audited and requested responses.

The following comments were excerpted from the responses received.

We provided a draft copy of the global report to all six entities we audited and requested a response from each entity. We received responses from all entities.

Local officials generally agreed with our findings and recommendations. The following comments were excerpted from the responses received. Comments that were specific to findings at a particular entity are not included here, but are instead addressed in the entity's individual report. Each entity's individual report includes its response to our audit of the entity.

Inspections:

Albany – "...The Albany Parking Authority appreciates being noted as an organization that maintains and follows best practices. The safety of our staff and customers, as well as our fiduciary responsibility to our bond holders, are all important to the success of our mission."

Buffalo – "...To be more systematic and complete in our analysis moving forward we plan to use outside consultants to provide structural inspections of our older parking structures at least once every five years and whenever and wherever a structure has been compromised by storm, flood, collision or natural or manmade occurrence. This plan for systematic analysis is in line with recent efforts by The New York State Senate and Assembly (S7669/A9614) to regulate the inspection of parking structures, and will apply to structures over 30 years old..."

Ithaca – "...While we certainly like to be in a position to conduct annual or biannual structural engineering inspections, current funding does not allow it. ... We believe our current practices strike the appropriate balance of ensuring public safety within the available funding..."

Rochester – "... We appreciate the audit acknowledgement of Rochester's good practices in contracting with an engineering firm to perform annual and biannual inspections, prioritize identified issues, and development of annual capital repair plans to perform repairs..."

Syracuse – "...The City concurs that parking structures, particularly in the State of New York, are exposed "directly to weather and other environmental conditions, such as extreme temperature change, rain, snow, deicing salts, road grime and dampness." These conditions, along with irregular, infrequent or non-existent structural reviews may have contributed to the various structure collapses noted in your report. The City agrees that the parking structures should have regular structural inspections and codified that practice in their local laws more than twenty years ago, in 1994. Based on the findings of this audit, the City would support State Law codifying this practice, for public and private facilities, so that structure owners may make better maintenance decisions and to ensure public safety..."

White Plains – "...After reviewing the report and having had the opportunity to discuss the annual garage inspection protocol utilized by the other municipalities, it has been decided that, in addition to the inspection program currently carried out by the in-house City engineers, the City will retain an independent engineering firm experienced with structural inspections to perform annual structural assessments of all the City's parking structures..."

Elevators:

Ithaca – “...We would like to point out that it is extremely difficult to get the elevator maintenance company to schedule mandated inspections and to repair problems in a timely manner. We have a contract to have our elevators inspected every six months, yet the maintenance company has let this timeline slip, and it is only with a great deal of intervention on our part that we are able to get them to come when they should. ... Options for elevator maintenance companies are extremely limited. We would not be surprised to learn that the other four cities were having similar struggles...”

Capital Planning:

Buffalo – “...The State Comptroller’s report emphasizes how structural analyses from qualified engineers can inform and improve long term capital planning. Our experience agrees with that conclusion and we have long used assessments by engineers to drive our long term capital planning...”

Syracuse – “... The City agreed that capital planning’s mission should be to maintain and improve assets over time. We acknowledge that moving targets are not helpful...”

APPENDIX C

AUDIT METHODOLOGY AND STANDARDS

To achieve our audit objective and obtain valid audit evidence, we performed the following procedures:

- We reviewed the Regulations set forth by New York State’s 2010 Property Maintenance Code, General Municipal Law and the 2010 Fire Code and applicable policies and procedures. We reviewed local laws requiring parking structure inspections, if applicable.
- We interviewed local officials and employees to determine the parking structure inspection and repair processes.
- We reviewed available structural inspections reports and contracts, bidding documents and work orders to determine whether identified repairs were made or scheduled to be repaired.
- We reviewed elevator inspection documents and repair documentation.
- We performed walk-through observations of parking structures.
- We reviewed the long-term capital plans for reasonableness and documentation to support anticipated projects.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with GAGAS. 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 objective. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective.

APPENDIX D

HOW TO OBTAIN ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT

To obtain copies of this report, write or visit our web page:

Office of the State Comptroller
Public Information Office
110 State Street, 15th Floor
Albany, New York 12236
(518) 474-4015
<http://www.osc.state.ny.us/localgov/>

APPENDIX E
OFFICE OF THE STATE COMPTROLLER
DIVISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT
AND SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY

Andrew A. SanFilippo, Executive Deputy Comptroller
Gabriel F. Deyo, Deputy Comptroller
Tracey Hitchen Boyd, Assistant Comptroller

LOCAL REGIONAL OFFICE LISTING

BINGHAMTON REGIONAL OFFICE

H. Todd Eames, Chief Examiner
Office of the State Comptroller
State Office Building, Suite 1702
44 Hawley Street
Binghamton, New York 13901-4417
(607) 721-8306 Fax (607) 721-8313
Email: Muni-Binghamton@osc.state.ny.us

Serving: Broome, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware,
Otsego, Schoharie, Sullivan, Tioga, Tompkins Counties

BUFFALO REGIONAL OFFICE

Jeffrey D. Mazula, Chief Examiner
Office of the State Comptroller
295 Main Street, Suite 1032
Buffalo, New York 14203-2510
(716) 847-3647 Fax (716) 847-3643
Email: Muni-Buffalo@osc.state.ny.us

Serving: Allegany, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Erie,
Genesee, Niagara, Orleans, Wyoming Counties

GLENS FALLS REGIONAL OFFICE

Jeffrey P. Leonard, Chief Examiner
Office of the State Comptroller
One Broad Street Plaza
Glens Falls, New York 12801-4396
(518) 793-0057 Fax (518) 793-5797
Email: Muni-GlensFalls@osc.state.ny.us

Serving: Albany, Clinton, Essex, Franklin,
Fulton, Hamilton, Montgomery, Rensselaer,
Saratoga, Schenectady, Warren, Washington Counties

HAUPPAUGE REGIONAL OFFICE

Ira McCracken, Chief Examiner
Office of the State Comptroller
NYS Office Building, Room 3A10
250 Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, New York 11788-5533
(631) 952-6534 Fax (631) 952-6530
Email: Muni-Hauppauge@osc.state.ny.us

Serving: Nassau and Suffolk Counties

NEWBURGH REGIONAL OFFICE

Tenneh Blamah, Chief Examiner
Office of the State Comptroller
33 Airport Center Drive, Suite 103
New Windsor, New York 12553-4725
(845) 567-0858 Fax (845) 567-0080
Email: Muni-Newburgh@osc.state.ny.us

Serving: Columbia, Dutchess, Greene, Orange,
Putnam, Rockland, Ulster, Westchester Counties

ROCHESTER REGIONAL OFFICE

Edward V. Grant, Jr., Chief Examiner
Office of the State Comptroller
The Powers Building
16 West Main Street, Suite 522
Rochester, New York 14614-1608
(585) 454-2460 Fax (585) 454-3545
Email: Muni-Rochester@osc.state.ny.us

Serving: Cayuga, Chemung, Livingston, Monroe,
Ontario, Schuyler, Seneca, Steuben, Wayne, Yates Counties

SYRACUSE REGIONAL OFFICE

Rebecca Wilcox, Chief Examiner
Office of the State Comptroller
State Office Building, Room 409
333 E. Washington Street
Syracuse, New York 13202-1428
(315) 428-4192 Fax (315) 426-2119
Email: Muni-Syracuse@osc.state.ny.us

Serving: Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison,
Oneida, Onondaga, Oswego, St. Lawrence Counties

STATEWIDE AUDITS

Ann C. Singer, Chief Examiner
State Office Building, Suite 1702
44 Hawley Street
Binghamton, New York 13901-4417
(607) 721-8306 Fax (607) 721-8313