

MEP Closeout Gap Audit Report

Project: Fire Station No. 3 Addition/Renovation, City of Copperas Cove, TX (public bid project, used here as a test case)

Contractor reviewed (fictional): Coveline Mechanical & Electric LLC

General Contractor (fictional): Meridian Point Construction

Architect (fictional): Larkspur Barrow Architecture

Submission reviewed: Substantial Completion closeout package, 66 documents

Spec basis: Division 01 (closeout-relevant sections) plus Divisions 21, 22, 23, 26 (Fire Suppression, Plumbing, HVAC, Electrical)

Prepared by: Ibrahim, Closeout Control

Executive Summary

We checked all 80 closeout requirements pulled from the project spec against Coveline's 66-document Substantial Completion submission. Every verdict below points to the exact document, or the exact absence of one, that it rests on.

Verdict	Count	Share	What it means
SATISFIED	41	51%	Requirement fully met. Nothing to fix.
PARTIAL	24	30%	The document exists. It has a specific, named defect.
MISSING	8	10%	No document addresses this requirement at all.
NOT-YET-DUE	5	6%	Not a defect. Not contractually due at this stage of the project.
OUT-OF-SCOPE	2	3%	Belongs to the GC's or roofing sub's own package, not this contractor's.

This is not a bad closeout package. Most warranties, test reports, and as-builts on file are complete, signed, and dated correctly, and Coveline's own paperwork is unusually upfront about its own gaps. Several of the defects below were flagged in the documents themselves, before we ever opened them. But 32 of the 80 requirements, 24 partial plus 8 missing, currently stand between this package and a clean Substantial Completion sign-off, which is what releases retainage.

Three patterns explain most of it. The O&M and training package went out under time pressure: final manuals were never transmitted, and training ran ahead of them. Three priced allowance line items were never tracked and will surface again at final payment reconciliation whether or not they're flagged now. And a handful of otherwise-complete documents are sitting on one missing signature.

The Catch That Matters Most

A checklist tool would have marked the final TAB report SATISFIED. It has a date, a signature, and the right agency letterhead. We read it anyway, line by line, and it does not hold up.

The report is dated March 14. But two sentences inside its own body describe events that had not happened yet on March 14: an instruction-of-personnel session it says ran on March 17, and an occupancy inspection it says was completed on April 10. A report cannot correctly describe events three and four weeks in its own future.

This is not a paperwork nitpick. If the report's own dates do not hold together, the TAB agency needs to reissue it before an owner's architect will accept it as final, and only one of the three required occupancy inspections is actually done. That is a corrected report and two site visits standing behind a single line in a spreadsheet that would otherwise read "complete."

That is the difference between a checklist and a read. (Req D23-05, spec citation 23 05 93 §3.7, p.711-712)

A Slice of the Full Register (15 of 80 requirements)

The full report walks all 80 requirements, division by division, with the fix action next to each one. Below is a representative cut across all five divisions and every verdict, so you can see exactly what the citation and evidence trail look like on your own report.

Req ID	Spec Citation	Verdict	Evidence / Defect
D01-01	01 40 00 §3.01 (p.168)	SATISFIED	Test and Inspection Log on file. No action.
D01-05	01 77 00 §1.08.B (p.197-198)	MISSING	Compiled 10-day pre-SC package does not exist; the transmittal log admits it.
D01-06	01 77 00 §1.09 (p.199)	NOT-YET-DUE	Final Completion bundle is not due until the Final Completion inspection is requested.
D01-07	01 77 00 §1.11 (p.199-200)	PARTIAL	General one-year warranty page is unsigned and undated.
D01-16	01 77 01 Item 15 (p.206-207)	OUT-OF-SCOPE	Roofing warranty inspection is not this contractor's MEP scope; tracked at the roofing sub's package.
D01-19	01 78 23 §1.04.C (p.209)	MISSING	Final O&M manuals never transmitted. Training already happened without them. Highest-priority open item.
D21-01	21 00 10 §1.8 (p.602-603)	SATISFIED	One-year fire protection warranty on file. No action.
D21-04	21 00 10 §1.17 (p.607-608)	PARTIAL	Spare-parts receipt included but unsigned; affidavit of payment to sub-subcontractors missing entirely.
D22-01	22 00 00 §1.10 (p.637)	SATISFIED	One-year plumbing warranty on file. No action.
D22-03	22 00 00 §3.5.B (p.642)	PARTIAL	Smoke test and camera inspection both passed; the required video was never delivered to the Owner.
D23-05	23 05 93 §3.7 (p.711-712)	PARTIAL	Final TAB report has an internal date contradiction, see above. Two of three occupancy inspections outstanding.
D23-13	23 81 26 §1.8 (p.755)	MISSING	Split-system tiered warranty (5-year compressor, 15-year heat exchanger) does not exist anywhere in the file set.
D26-02	26 00 00 §1.9 (p.764-765)	MISSING	Additional-materials allowance (signal locations, fire-alarm circuit, 20A circuits) untracked. Hits final payment.

Req ID	Spec Citation	Verdict	Evidence / Defect
D26-04	26 00 00 §1.14 (p.766)	SATISFIED	General electrical warranty on file. No action.
D26-21	26 52 13 §1.8 (p.862)	PARTIAL	Contractor signed the emergency-lighting warranty; manufacturer's countersignature was never obtained.

What This Means for Your Retainage

Retainage does not release on good intentions. It releases when the closeout package matches, line by line, what the contract documents actually require, and someone has to be the one reading both at the same time. On this test project, 32 of 80 requirements would have held up a clean Substantial Completion sign-off, and at least one of them, the TAB report, would have passed a surface check and failed a real one.

Your project has its own spec, its own submission, and its own version of these same three or four problems. The findings will be different. The pattern usually is not: one rushed corner, most often O&M or training, a few unsigned signature lines, and one document that reads fine until someone checks its own dates against each other. We find those before the architect does, while there is still time to fix them without holding up the check.

Your report cites your spec, not this one. Same format, same evidence trail, same 48-hour turnaround, built from the documents you actually send. \$495 flat, no hourly billing. Send the spec and the submission and the clock starts.

Ibrahim

Closeout Control

ibrahim@closeoutcontrol.com

This is a sample report only. The project, contractor, general contractor, and architect named above are fictional constructs built on top of a real, public bid specification for demonstration purposes. No client, real or implied, is associated with this document.