



Washington State Auditor's Office

Troy Kelley

Integrity • Respect • Independence

State Personal Service Contracts Audit Report

May 22, 2014

Report Number: 1011981



Table of Contents

3	Executive summary
5	Introduction
7	Audit results
8	Recommendations
9	Agency response
11	Concluding remarks from the State Auditor’s Office
12	Appendix A: Audit criteria
15	Appendix B: 2012 contract and amendment filings

Contact information

**Troy Kelley,
State Auditor**

(360) 902-0361

Auditor@sao.wa.gov

**Chuck Pfeil,
Director of Performance Audit**

(360) 902-0366

Chuck.Pfeil@sao.wa.gov

**Thomas Shapley,
Deputy Director of Communications**

(360) 902-0367

Thomas.Shapley@sao.wa.gov

**Mary Leider,
Public Records Officer**

(360) 725-5617

PublicRecords@sao.wa.gov

General information

www.sao.wa.gov

(360) 902-0370

The Washington State Auditor’s Office is an Equal Employment Opportunity employer. Persons with a disability who need assistance in the applications process, or who need this information in an alternate format, may call 360-725-5623 or the telecommunications device for the hearing impaired at 1-800-833-6388.

Executive summary

State agencies are permitted to use personal service contracts to provide professional or technical expertise to perform a specific study, project, or task. During calendar year 2012, state agencies were required to follow Chapter 15 of the Office of Financial Management's State Administrative and Accounting Manual, which outlined state policies for personal service contracting.

Effective October 1, 2011, the authority over personal service contracts transferred from the Office of Financial Management to the Department of Enterprise Services (DES). Due to pending legislative changes, references to the Office of Financial Management in the State Administrative and Accounting Manual were not updated. However the authority for personal service contracts lies with DES.

In 2012, 87 state agencies in Washington filed 1,200 personal service contracts and amendments totaling almost \$429 million. Our audit included a review of 254 contracts and amendments worth \$248 million, filed by 11 agencies. Although we found a number of procurement issues in this audit, we do not consider any of the issues to be significant enough to rise to the level of an audit finding.

We designed the audit to answer the following questions:

1. Did state agencies procure personal service contracts in accordance with state laws and policies?

We tested 202 contracts and identified 41 (20 percent) that were not procured in accordance with state laws, policies and procedures. Some contracts had more than one issue. Specifically we found:

- 24 contracts where the agencies did not thoroughly document the entire procurement process, including the evaluation and selection score sheets.
- 23 contracts where the agencies did not notify successful and unsuccessful bidders in writing.
- 16 contract proposals did not include the time and day of receipt. We could not verify that the agency received the proposals before established deadlines.
- 13 contracts were not filed promptly by agencies with DES. These contracts were filed between three and 365 days past the required filing date.

2. Did state agencies clearly define deliverables in the contract and ensure they were received before paying the contractor?

Overall, the 11 state agencies examined during this audit clearly identified the specific services needed in the personal service contract.

We reviewed 555 invoices totaling \$32.5 million during our audit. We found all but one invoice was adequately supported and reviewed by agency staff to ensure contract services deliverables were received before issuing payment.

3. Were contract amendments made in accordance state policies?

We reviewed 52 contract amendments that were filed in 2012. We found:

- Eleven (21 percent) amendments were signed after the contract term expired. State policies require written contract amendments be signed prior to the contract expiration date.
- Two (4 percent) amendments were not filed promptly with DES.

Although the state policies we used as criteria for our audit have changed, in some cases significantly, our recommendations to state agencies are still applicable.

Recommendations

We recommend state agencies:

- Improve and retain documentation when procuring contracts
- Ensure that established filing and public notice deadlines for contracts and amendments are met
- Ensure complete and accurate information is posted promptly to the Sole Source database
- Ensure all amendments are signed and approved before the original contract period expires

Introduction

Audit authority

We performed this audit under the authority of state law (RCW 43.09.310), which requires the State Auditor to perform post-audits of state agencies. These audits are designed to assess whether agencies have systems in place to ensure accountability over public funds and compliance with state laws and policies.

About personal service contracts

Personal services are defined as professional or technical expertise provided by a consultant to accomplish a specific study, project or task, or other work. During our audit period, state law required agencies to procure personal service contracts valued at more than \$5,000 through competitive bidding.

During 2012, Chapter 15 of the Office of Financial Management's State Administrative and Accounting Manual outlined the procurement policies state agencies were required to follow. **Appendix A** contains the policies in effect during the audit that are under the authority of DES.

In calendar year 2012, 87 state agencies in Washington filed 1,200 personal service contracts and amendments totaling almost \$429 million.

Changes to state contract policies

Effective October 1, 2011, engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5931 transferred authority over personal service contracts from the Office of Financial Management to the newly created Department of Enterprise Services (DES). All procurement rules, including personal service contracts, were consolidated under DES. Due to pending changes in procurement reform, the policies in Chapter 15 were not updated with the DES name. However, the authority of these policies are under this agency.

In March 2012, then-Governor Chris Gregoire signed procurement reform legislation designed to make the procurement process more transparent, competitive and efficient.

Effective January 1, 2013, there were some significant changes to the procurement rules for personal service contracts such as:

- Chapter 15, which deals with personal service contracts, was removed from the State Administrative and Accounting Manual and was no longer effective.
- Revised Code of Washington chapter 39.29, which provides rules for procurement of goods and services, was repealed.
- Agencies are delegated authority to procure goods and services up to thresholds set by DES. Previously there were different procurement requirements for goods and services, personal service contracts and client service contracts.

The procurement and filing requirements reviewed in this audit are changed under the new procurement reform rules. However, our recommendations to the agencies are still applicable.

Audit scope and objectives

We performed a risk assessment to determine which state agencies would be included in our audit. The assessment considered the number and value of contracts and amendments filed in the personal service contracts database, issues identified in prior audits, contract expenditures, and agency responses to a survey regarding their contracting practices. **Appendix B** contains details of all 87 state agencies that filed contracts and amendments during 2012.

We selected 11 state agencies to examine based on the results of the assessment. These agencies filed 375 contracts and amendments valued at more than \$296 million

Exhibit 1 lists the agencies included in this audit.

Exhibit 1. Agencies included in this audit

Agency	Contracts reviewed		Amendments reviewed	
	Number	Value	Number	Value
Health Care Authority	13	\$77,448,227	7	\$327,600
State Investment Board	19	\$60,005,700	0	\$0
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction	70	\$33,161,188	8	\$1,098,519
Department of Early Learning	24	\$31,637,244	14	\$425,003
Labor and Industries	20	\$29,772,412	3	\$46,000
Office of Financial Management	8	\$4,966,199	4	\$56,000
Department of Health	18	\$3,019,890	12	\$260,634
Washington Traffic Safety Commission	9	\$2,290,000	0	\$0
Department of Ecology	12	\$2,498,740	2	\$11,000
Puget Sound Partnership	5	\$771,215	2	\$58,329
Department of Services for the Blind	4	\$265,154	0	\$0
Totals	202	\$245,865,969	52	\$2,283,085

Data source: Personal Service Contracts Database.

We designed the audit to answer these questions:

- Did state agencies procure personal service contracts in accordance with state laws and policies?
- Did state agencies clearly define deliverables in the contract and ensure they were received before paying the contractor?
- Were contract amendments made in accordance with state policies?

Results

Did state agencies procure personal service contracts in accordance with state laws and policies?

We found that 161 (80 percent) of the 202 contracts selected for testing were procured in accordance with state laws and policies. However, nine agencies did not fully comply with procurement requirements for 41 contracts (20 percent). The procurement issues we identified are not significant enough to rise to the level of an audit finding. Each had one or more of the following violations:

1. Inadequate documentation to support the procurement, evaluation and selection process *(24 contracts)*
2. No written notification to the successful and unsuccessful bidders *(23 contracts)*
3. Contract proposals were not consistently marked with date and time received *(16 contracts)*
4. Contracts were filed late with DES. *(13 contracts)*
5. Contract proposals were not reviewed by the appropriate number of evaluators *(eight contracts)*
6. The need for services and justification for procurement was not fully documented *(one contract)*
7. The advertisement of contract proposals did not include all required elements *(five contracts)*
8. Contract solicitation was not posted to Washington's Electronic Business Solution website *(two contracts)*
9. Contract solicitation was not advertised for a minimum of one day *(two contracts)*

Exhibit 2 details the issues by agency.

Exhibit 2. Procurement issues by agency

Agency	Number of contracts with one or more issues	Contract violations issues	Dollar value of contracts with issues	Percentage of contracts reviewed with one or more issues
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction	2	4	\$14,799,999	3%
Washington Traffic Safety Commission	9	1,2,3,4,5	\$2,290,000	100%
Health Care Authority	3	4,7,9	\$1,478,060	23%
Department of Labor and Industries	10	1,2,3	\$965,000	50%
Department of Early Learning	5	1,2,4,7,8	\$754,780	21%
Puget Sound Partnership	4	1,2,3,4	\$739,215	80%
Department of Services for the Blind	4	4,5,6	\$265,154	100%
Department of Ecology	2	1,2,4,5	\$272,000	17%
Department of Health	2	4,7,8,9	\$183,200	11%
Totals	41		\$21,747,408	20%

Did state agencies clearly define contract deliverables and ensure they were received before paying the contractor?

Overall, the 11 state agencies clearly identified the specific services needed in the personal service contract.

We reviewed 555 invoices totaling \$32.5 million during our audit. In all but one instance payments were adequately supported and reviewed by agency staff to ensure contract services were received before payment was authorized.

- One invoice paid by the Department of Services for the Blind, totaling \$65,000, was not supported by evidence that it was reviewed and approved by the agency designee prior to payment.

Were contract amendments made in accordance with state policies?

We tested all 52 amendments filed by the 11 agencies during calendar year 2012 to determine if applicable state policies were followed. We found:

1. Amendments were not signed before the original contract expired.
2. Amendments were filed late with DES.

Exhibit 3 details the issues by agency.

Exhibit 3. Amendments issues by agency

Agency	Number of amendments with one or more issues	Amendment issues	Dollar value of amendments with issues	Percentage of amendments reviewed with one or more issues
Office of Financial Management	3	1,2	\$56,000	75%
Health Care Authority	3	1	\$100,000	43%
Department of Health	1	1	\$40,000	8%
Department of Early Learning	4	1	\$35,750	29%
Totals	11		\$231,750	21%

Recommendations

We recommend state agencies:

- Improve and retain documentation when procuring contracts.
- Ensure that established filing and public notice deadlines for contracts and amendments are met.
- Ensure complete and accurate information is posted promptly to the Sole Source database.
- Ensure all amendments are signed and approved before the original contract period expires.



SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Randy I. Dorn Old Capitol Building · PO BOX 47200 · Olympia, WA 98504-7200 · <http://www.k12.wa.us>

April 28, 2014

Troy Kelley, State Auditor
Insurance Building – Capitol Campus
302 Sid Snyder Ave, SW
Olympia, WA 98504-0021

Dear Auditor Kelley:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the accountability audit report, "State Personal Service Contracts." I question the value of this audit. Effective January 1, 2013, there were significant changes resulting from the new procurement reform rules with a shift in focus from personal service and consulting contracts to sole source contracts. Even so, your Office chose to audit personal service contracts and amendments procured in 2012.

Your auditors reviewed 100 percent of the 2012 personal service contracts for the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). This entailed reviewing 70 contracts, 8 amendments, and 227 invoices. The audit work identified two contracts that we did not file timely with the Department of Enterprise Services. In July 2013, the audit supervisor emailed the audit results and stated "Preliminary determination is that the two [exceptions] are not that significant enough to be in our report." We agree with the audit supervisor, especially since agencies are no longer even required to file personal service contracts that are competitively solicited.

Over eight months later, we received a draft audit report. Not only were we surprised those two exceptions were included in the report, we are disappointed the report does not provide proper perspective of the issues. For example, it does not identify the number of days the contracts were filed late or the reason for a late filing. Nor does it state the filing requirement for those contracts does not apply under the new state law.

I support the State Auditor's Office's intent to maximize limited resources by using a statewide risk assessment to select significant issues to address. However, I am disappointed with your decision to audit 2012 compliance requirements that changed under the new procurement reform rules especially considering the audit was started after the new state law's effective date.

OSPI appreciates the following acknowledgement that was added to the audit report at the request of others, "We do not consider the procurement issues we identified to be significant enough to rise to the level of an audit finding."

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Randy Dorn".

Randy I. Dorn
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction



STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Insurance Building, PO Box 43113 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3113 • (360) 902-0555

May 1, 2014

Ronni Copeland, Assistant State Auditor
State Auditor's Office
P.O. Box 40031
Olympia, WA 98504-0031

Dear Ms. Copeland:

The Office of Financial Management (OFM) appreciates the opportunity to respond to the preliminary draft of the State Personal Services Contracts Audit Report. The report, which covers personal services contracting activity in calendar year 2012, found a few late-filed contract amendments for OFM.

The largest reorganization of Washington state agencies in recent history took effect on October 1, 2011 when the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) officially became a state agency. All OFM contracts staff transferred to DES, leaving OFM without any internal contracting expertise. Several other OFM activities also transferred to DES, while the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and the Office of the State Human Resources Director (OSHRD) were created as part of OFM. OFM had to hire new contracting staff and develop new processes and procedures while also managing the two new units, OCIO and OSHRD. During the audit period, OFM was still in the middle of this transition.

Since that time, the consolidation of the new offices within OFM has been completed, along with the stabilization of the contracting activities. OFM is now working to improve its contracting procedures, including using technology to streamline and enhance the procurement process. With these changes, OFM is confident that no further issues will arise.

In addition to our formal response, we noted two technical issues in the report that we would like to mention. On page 5, you incorrectly state that Chapter 39.26 RCW was repealed. Chapter 39.26 RCW is the new procurement law. Chapter 39.29 RCW was repealed. On page 8, your recommendation is to "ensure (that) complete and accurate information is posted promptly to the services database." There is no longer a "services database" so maintaining this recommendation could be confusing to agencies.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to respond to the report. If you have any questions, please contact Roselyn Marcus at roselyn.marcus@ofm.wa.gov or (360) 902-0434.

Sincerely,

Tracy Guerin
Deputy Director

Concluding remarks from the State Auditor's Office



Washington State Auditor Troy Kelley

State law (RCW 39.26.220) requires the State Auditor's Office to audit contracts and annually report to the Governor and policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature the results of these audits. We audited to provisions of procurement laws and rules that were in effect during the audit period. Although procurement reform became effective January 1, 2013, new rules had not been finalized at the time of our fieldwork. However, we only made recommendations that will continue to be relevant and applicable after the reform.

Sincerely,

Troy Kelley
Washington State Auditor

Appendix A: Audit criteria

Effective October 1, 2011, engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5931 transferred authority over personal service contracts from the Office of Financial Management to the newly created Department of Enterprise Services (DES). All procurement rules, including personal service contracts, were consolidated under DES. Due to pending changes in procurement reform, the policies in Chapter 15 were not updated with the DES name. However, the authority of these policies are under DES.

Office of Financial Management, State Administrative Accounting Manual – Chapter 15 states in part:

[<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/policysc/ch15sc109.pdf>]

15.20 Personal Service Contracts – Competitive Procurement Requirements

15.20.15 Competitive procurement requirements

Chapter 39.29 RCW requires that personal service contracts be competitively procured, with few exceptions. This statute reinforces the state of Washington’s strong public policy favoring competition in the purchase of its goods and services.

A documented, informal process called “evidence of competition” is required for personal service contracts of \$5,000 to \$19,999, and a documented, formal, competitive process called competitive solicitation” is required for contracts of \$20,000 or greater.

15.20.20 Evidence of competition – informal competition

15.20.20.a Written solicitation.

The agency is to prepare and issue an informal, written solicitation document.

15.20.20.b Multiple firms.

The agency is to solicit responses from “multiple firms” in selecting a contractor.

15.20.20.c Evaluation and negotiation.

The agency is to document the time and date when responses were received at the location specified in the solicitation to validate that they were within the due date and time. Document in writing the basis for the award decision. Notify the successful and unsuccessful proposers of the results in writing.

15.20.20.d Documentation.

The agency must thoroughly document the process used to select the contractor and retain the appropriate documentation, including at a minimum the following:

- Names of the firms contacted and/or solicited.
- Copy of the solicitation document issued.
- The WEBS System Identifier Number through which the bid detail can be displayed in WEBS.
- Copies of the responses received.
- Written documentation of the evaluation and selection process.
- Copies of the written notification sent to the successful and unsuccessful firms.
- Copy of the executed contract.

15.20.20.e Report contract to OFM

Report the contract to OFM in the Personal Service Contract Database, in accordance with the requirements of Subsection 15.30.55.

15.20.30 Formal competitive solicitation

15.20.30.a

The formal competitive solicitation for personal service contracts of \$20,000 or more is required, as described in the following subsections.

15.20.30.f Evaluation criteria.

Competitive selection of a successful contractor is to be based on pre-established evaluation criteria identified in the solicitation document. Only criteria related to content in the RFP may be used in the evaluation of proposals.

15.20.30.g Evaluation team.

A minimum of three evaluators shall be used to ensure that applicable disciplinary skills, abilities, knowledge, and objectivity are represented.

15.20.30.i Receipt of proposals.

Proposals, whether electronic or hard copy, are required to be received by a definite time and date and to a specific location or e-mail address.

15.20.30.k Written evaluation.

15.20.30.m Determining the apparent successful contractor and unsuccessful firms.

Based on the evaluation team's recommendation for award, an apparent successful contractor is selected. Notify the firm in writing. Also, notify unsuccessful firms in writing.

15.20.30.n Documentation.

The evaluation and selection process is to be thoroughly documented in order to substantiate that all proposers were treated equally and fairly and that an equitable and impartial competitive process was conducted. Required documentation, at a minimum, is as follows:

- The WEBS System Identifier Number.
- Copy of the solicitation document and any amendments.
- Names of firms notified about the solicitation.
- Copies of all proposals submitted.
- Score sheets used for determining ranking of proposals.
- Copy of written notification to successful and unsuccessful proposers.

15.20.40 Master personal service contracts and convenience personal service contracts

15.20.40.b Department of General Administration (GA).

To procure personal services under the master contracts, a second-tier competition is conducted. Agencies are responsible to maintain adequate documentation of the second-tier competitive process when using GA's master personal service contracts to substantiate that all bidders were treated equally and fairly and that an equitable and impartial competition was conducted.

15.20.40.f Second-tier competitive process under master personal service contracts.

Agencies are responsible to conduct the second-tier competitive process unless other arrangements are made with the agency holding the master contract.

15.40.50 Contract management principles

Contract managers must be mindful of the following:

- In almost all instances, written contracts must be signed by both parties before work can begin under the contract.
- Written contract amendments must be signed prior to the contract expiration date (end date) whenever there is a change to the scope of work, period of performance, or maximum dollar amount (or other financial terms) of the contract.
- When signing a contractor's contract form, provide appropriate review of the contract to ensure adequate protection for the State is included in the contract.
- Services should be performed to the satisfaction of the contract manager before payment is approved.
- All work must be completed within the contract period of performance, including deliverables.

For state agencies, refer to subsection 15.30.75.a, which states the following:

15.30.75 Contract filing and reporting categories for personal service contracts

Personal Service Contracts/Amendments	\$ Threshold For Filing	Filing Period
SOLE SOURCE Contracts and Amendments (singly or cumulatively awarded to a contractor in a fiscal year period by an agency)	\$ 5,000 - \$19,999	10-working day advance filing
	\$20,000 or more	10-working day advance filing
EMERGENCY Contracts and Amendments	\$5000 or more	3-working days from date of execution or start of work, whichever is sooner
COMPETITIVE Contracts and Amendments	\$5,000 to \$19,999	Not required
COMPETITIVE Contracts and Amendments for legal services, financial services, computer and information services	\$20,000 or more	Work may start on or after the working day filed with OFM
COMPETITIVE Contracts and Amendments for: Management Consulting, Organizational Development, Marketing, Communications, Employee Training and Employee Recruiting.	\$20,000 or more	10-working day advance filing
AMENDMENTS to competitive or sole source contracts that result in the contract amount being greater than 50% of the original contract value and/or amendments that constitutes a substantial change in the scope of work, when the amendment results in the contract amount being \$5,000 or more after being amended.	\$5,000 or more (Contract, when amended, totals \$5000 or more)	10-working day advance filing

Appendix B: 2012 contract and amendment filings

The following table details all 1200 contracts and amendments filed by state agencies during calendar year 2012.

Agency	Contracts filed		Amendments filed		Total contracts and amendments filed	
	Number of contracts	Value of contracts	Number of amendments	Value of amendments	Number of contracts and amendments	Value of contracts and amendments
State Board of Accountancy	1	\$175,000			1	\$175,000
Department of Agriculture	3	\$93,891	4	\$28,415	7	\$122,306
Apple Commission	2	\$117,285			2	\$117,285
Washington State Arts Commission	5	\$105,100	1	\$6,419	6	\$111,519
Asparagus Commission	2	\$117,000			2	\$117,000
Office of the Attorney General	1	\$11,000			1	\$11,000
Bellevue College	1	\$41,500			1	\$41,500
Beef Commission	1	\$1,050,000			1	\$1,050,000
Beer Commission			3	\$140,150	3	\$140,150
Blueberry Commission			3	\$85,800	3	\$85,800
Board of Pilotage Commissioners	1	\$35,000	2	\$14,700	3	\$49,700
Bellingham Technical College	1	\$49,938			1	\$49,938
Washington State Commission on Hispanic Affairs	1	\$18,000			1	\$18,000
Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission	4	\$142,150			4	\$142,150
Department of Commerce	17	\$3,895,904	7	\$767,010	24	\$4,662,914
Clover Park Technical College	1	\$24,500			1	\$24,500
Consolidated Technology Services	1	\$96,000	1	\$ -	2	\$96,000
Central Washington University	1	\$40,000			1	\$40,000
Dairy Products Commission	3	\$133,750	5	\$4,149,210	8	\$4,282,960
Department of Enterprise Services	31	27,420,800	249	\$ -	280	\$27,420,800
Department of Financial Institutions	6	\$525,000	1	\$140,000	7	\$665,000
Department of Fish & Wildlife	5	\$13,409,000	2	\$183,932	7	\$13,592,932
Department of Information Services (effective Jan 2012 agency is now Center for Information Services)			1	\$ -	1	\$ -
Department of Natural Resources	16	\$1,600,805	4	\$15,000	20	\$1,615,805

Agency	Contracts filed		Amendments filed		Total contracts and amendments filed	
	Number of contracts	Value of contracts	Number of amendments	Value of amendments	Number of contracts and amendments	Value of contracts and amendments
Department of Corrections	3	\$69,110			3	\$69,110
Department of Health	17	\$3,002,240	35	\$1,082,700	52	\$4,084,940
Department of Licensing	4	\$42,900	9	\$32,000	13	\$74,900
Department of Revenue	4	\$180,900	7	\$1,888,500	11	\$2,069,400
Department of Transportation	13	\$9,115,262	18	\$10,628,738	31	\$19,744,000
Department of Retirement Services	2	\$126,000	4	\$230,000	6	\$356,000
Department of Services for the Blind	2	\$193,204			2	\$193,204
Department of Social and Health Services	29	\$8,535,631	45	\$2,706,057	74	\$11,241,688
Department of Veterans Affairs			1	\$76,000	1	\$76,000
Department of Early Learning	20	\$31,544,757	24	\$8,914,589	44	\$40,459,346
Department of Ecology	11	\$1,842,527	15	\$288,000	26	\$2,130,527
Employment Security Department			9	\$4,772,704	9	\$4,772,704
Everett Community College	2	\$100,000			2	\$100,000
Eastern Washington University	2	\$343,225			2	\$343,225
Fruit Commission	6	\$464,798	4	\$146,200	10	\$610,998
Department of General Administration (agency inactive 6/25/12)	1	\$2,500,000	18	\$ -	19	\$2,500,000
Washington State Gambling Commission	1	\$50,000			1	\$50,000
Office of the Governor	1	\$18,000			1	\$18,000
Grain Commission	14	\$1,638,272	5	\$216,999	19	\$1,855,271
Health Care Authority	12	77,460,727	18	\$1,978,230	30	\$79,438,957
Higher Education Coordinating Board (effective July 2012 agency is now the Student Achievement Council)	2	\$330,000	3	\$150,000	5	\$480,000
Housing Finance Commission	2	\$1,658,400	2	\$375,260	4	\$2,033,660
Washington Higher Education Facilities Authority	1	\$184,000	1	\$ -	2	\$184,000
Hop Commission	3	\$192,000			3	\$192,000
Washington State Horse Racing Commission			1	\$ -	1	\$ -

Agency	Contracts filed		Amendments filed		Total contracts and amendments filed	
	Number of contracts	Value of contracts	Number of amendments	Value of amendments	Number of contracts and amendments	Value of contracts and amendments
Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals	1	\$15,000			1	\$15,000
Office of Insurance Commissioner	2	\$686,900			2	\$686,900
Department of Labor & Industries	18	\$29,743,612	17	\$2,903,604	35	\$32,647,216
Liquor Control Board			1	\$ -	1	\$ -
Washington State Lottery	1	\$95,000	1	\$125,730	2	\$220,730
Military Department	2	\$81,813			2	\$81,813
Office of Financial Management	7	\$4,896,325	12	\$402,358	19	\$5,298,683
Olympic College	2	\$61,746			2	\$61,746
Office of the State Treasurer	2	\$294,500			2	\$294,500
State Parks & Recreation Commission	4	\$315,000	2	\$176,000	6	\$491,000
Peninsula Community College	1	\$19,980			1	\$19,980
Puget Sound Partnership	5	\$774,495	2	\$123,877	7	\$898,372
Red Raspberry Commission			1	\$25,000	1	\$25,000
Washington State Recreation & Conservation Office	2	\$347,417	13	\$302,000	15	\$649,417
Renton Technical College	3	\$286,244			3	\$286,244
Student Achievement Council	4	\$105,700	2	\$721,334	6	\$827,034
Office of the State Auditor	16	\$13,112,792	89	\$5,311,167	105	\$18,423,959
State Board for Community & Technical Colleges	2	\$150,140	6	\$261,907	8	\$412,047
State Conservation Commission	1	\$30,000	2	\$80,000	3	\$110,000
Spokane Community Colleges-District 17	6	\$110,646			6	\$110,646
Secretary of State	2	\$77,000			2	\$77,000
Washington State Investment Board	19	\$60,005,700	3	\$6,486,650	22	\$66,492,350
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction	73	\$59,607,026	54	\$3,303,352	127	\$62,910,378
Washington Traffic Safety Commission	9	\$2,290,000	2	\$95,713	11	\$2,385,713
Skagit Valley College	1	\$175,000			1	\$175,000
The Evergreen State College	4	\$242,600			4	\$242,600
Transportation Improvement Board	1	\$80,244	1	\$3,000	2	\$83,244

Agency	Contracts filed		Amendments filed		Total contracts and amendments filed	
	Number of contracts	Value of contracts	Number of amendments	Value of amendments	Number of contracts and amendments	Value of contracts and amendments
Tobacco Settlement Authority	2	\$440,800	1	\$100,000	3	\$540,800
State Transportation Commission	2	\$938,485			2	\$938,485
Utilities & Transportation Commission	1	\$15,000	1	\$14,250	2	\$29,250
University of Washington	2	\$251,400			2	\$251,400
Workforce Training & Education Coordinating Board	2	\$96,800	1	\$ -	3	\$96,800
Health Care Facilities Authority	3	\$645,000			3	\$645,000
Washington State Historical Society	5	\$96,800			5	\$96,800
Wine Commission	1	\$1,604,500	1	\$1,000,000	2	\$2,604,500
Washington State Patrol	6	\$678,305	10	\$1,019,200	16	\$1,697,505
Washington State University	2	\$124,675			2	\$124,675
Western Washington University	4	\$159,900	2	\$75,000	6	\$234,900
Grand Total	474	\$367,350,121	726	\$61,546,755	1200	\$428,896,876