

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
BAKERSFIELD**

**Report Number 96-03
June 18, 1996**

May 6, 1994

Members, Committee on Audit

Ted J. Saenger, Chair
Bernard Goldstein, Vice Chair
Roland E. Arnall Ronald L. Cedillos
James H. Gray William Hauck Joan Otomo-Corgel
Ali C. Razi Frank Y. Wada Stanley T. Wang

Staff

University Auditor: Larry Mandel

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Purpose	1
Scope and Methodology	1
Background	2
Opinion	3
Executive Summary	3

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

Purchasing and Contracts	6
Chancellor's Office Review and Approval	6
Formal Bid Procedures	8
Sole Source	9
Installment Purchases	9
Notice of Contract	9
Service Orders	11
Agreements and Leases	11
Auxiliary Organization Sub-Leases	11
Facility Rental Fee Deposits	14
Motor Vehicle Inspections	15

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Personnel Contacted
- Appendix B: Campus Response
- Appendix C: Chancellor's Acceptance

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
CSCR	California State Contracts Register
CSU	California State University
CSUB	California State University, Bakersfield
CO	Chancellor's Office
DFEH	Department of Fair Employment and Housing
EC	Education Code
EDP	Electronic Data Processing
EO	Executive Order
GC	Government Code
IFB	Invitation for Bid
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
ITR	Information Technology Resources
MVI	Motor Vehicle Inspector
OSMB	Office of Small and Minority Business
PCC	Public Contract Code
PO	Purchase Order
PSSO	Procurement and Support Services Officer
RFP	Request for Proposal
RFQ	Request for Quote
SB	Senate Bill
SUAM	State University Administrative Manual

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

Our principle audit objective was to review and analyze activities to assure that the CSU has acted responsibly under the delegations of authority established by Senate Bill 1828 (1986) and the extended delegation to campus presidents under AB 1911 (1993). The extended delegation of AB 1911 was circulated to the campus under Executive Order 615, Delegation of Acquisition Authority for Personal Property and Services, dated March 23, 1994.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

This review emphasized, but was not limited to, compliance with state laws, Board of Trustee policies, and Office of the Chancellor, principally via the State University Administrative Manual (SUAM) and campus policies, letters and directives. Fiscal year 1995-96 was the primary period of review. Our focus involved the records and procedures within the Purchasing Office and Physical Plant. Specifically, we reviewed and tested the following areas:

- **Specific purchasing and contracting delegations via EO 615;**
- **Insurance;**
- **EDP and telecommunication acquisitions;**
- **Consultant contracts;**
- **Service orders;**
- **Small business procurement and contract policy;**
- **Motor vehicle inspections;**
- **Agreements and leases;**
- **Leasing campus real property;**
- **Contracts for the hiring of space for campus use;**
- **Property transactions and;**
- **Sale or exchange of personal property.**

We have not performed any auditing procedures beyond the date of our report. Accordingly, our comments are based on our knowledge as of that date and should be read with that understanding.

BACKGROUND

In 1986, Senate Bill (SB) 1828 was passed. This bill extended indefinitely certain CSU delegations of authority concerning purchasing, contracting and other areas of Business Management. The bill's intent was to promote greater economy or efficiency in CSU operations. The extended delegation involves the following areas:

SB 1828 DELEGATIONS

SUBJECT	CODE CITATION
Motor Vehicle Inspections	EC 89031.5
Lease of Campus Property	EC 89046
Property transactions (real & personal), easements, rights-of-way, quit claims, and sale or exchange of personal property	EC 89048
Leasing non-university property for university use	EC 89048 (e)
Insurance	GC 11007.7
Purchases/Service Agreements under \$100,000	PCC 10295
Purchasing (Federal Surplus Real Property)	PCC 10389
Acquisitions of EDP and Telecommunications Goods and Services under \$100,000	PCC 12100.5

The bill also added section 89045 (d) to the Education Code. This section requires Trustees' Audit to do a complete audit of the aforementioned delegated subjects at least once every five years. The last audits of these delegated issues occurred during 1991. At that time the SB 1828 delegated items were divided into separate audits under the titles of *Purchasing and Contracting & Motor Vehicle Inspections and Real Property Transactions*. For 1996, the SB 1828 delegated subjects have been combined into one audit which is titled *Delegations of Authority*.

Executive Order 615, Delegation of Acquisition Authority dated March 23, 1994, delegated the procurement authority granted to the CSU under AB 1911 (chapter 1097, Statutes of 1993) to campus presidents. This EO delegates to each campus president the authority to execute and implement the following transactions without regard for dollar limits on behalf of the Board of Trustees:

- A. To purchase, lease or license personal property and incidental services related to the procurement of personal property.
- B. To enter into service contracts and consulting service agreements which are not in connections with a construction contract.

INTRODUCTION

- C. **To purchase information technology resource goods and services (previously referred to as electronic data processing and telecommunications) in accordance with the provisions of Public Contract Code 12100 et seq.**

OPINION

We visited the CSU Bakersfield campus from February 20-28 and April 9-19, 1996, and audited the procedures in effect at that time.

We found that, except for the items noted in the Executive Summary and in the detail of the report, compliance with legislative delegations, CSU and campus policies and procedures was satisfactory.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this section is to provide management with an overview of conditions requiring their attention. Areas of review not mentioned in this section were found to be satisfactory. Numbers in brackets [] refer to page numbers in the report.

PURCHASING AND CONTRACTS

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE REVIEW AND APPROVAL [6]

Chancellor's Office review and approval was not obtained for certain purchases/contracts deemed to be outside the delegation to the campus. Providing the Chancellor's Office the opportunity for review and approval of purchases/contracts which contain unusual provisions reduces the system's vulnerability to legal action.

FORMAL BID PROCEDURES [8]

Neither an Invitation for Bid (IFB), General Provisions nor Statement of Compliance was regularly used for non-sole source purchases over \$10,000. Use of each of the above increases the campus's ability to promote competition and assures a non-discriminatory workplace.

SOLE SOURCE PURCHASES [9]

Some sole source purchases over \$10,000 were approved by the procurement and support services officer (PSSO) without a written delegation of authority. The signature of the chief business officer/designee indicates his, and the campus's support for a sole source purchase.

INTRODUCTION

INSTALLMENT PURCHASES [9]

Two of the three purchase orders (POs) in our sample which crossed more than one fiscal year did not contain the required language in the contract limiting the state's liability if funds were not available in succeeding years. Including the required language reduces the state's liability to pay with funds which have not been authorized.

NOTICE OF CONTRACT [9]

The campus did not file a Notice of Contract with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) on any of the POs and contracts in our sample over \$5,000. Reporting purchases and contracts in excess of \$5,000 to the DFEH increases the ability of that agency to monitor state purchasing procedures for discriminatory practices.

CALIFORNIA STATE CONTRACTS REGISTER [10]

The campus has not established written criteria for use of the California State Contracts Register. Establishing written procedures reduces the risk of non-compliance with the state's mandate for open competition in awarding of contracts.

SERVICE ORDERS [11]

The campus had not developed written procedures for the use and control of service orders. Establishment of specific procedures for the use of service orders will ensure that the campus is within systemwide guidelines in regard to competitive bidding requirements.

AGREEMENTS AND LEASES

AUXILIARY ORGANIZATION SUB-LEASES [11]

Auxiliary organization sub-leases with off-campus groups were not forwarded to the Chancellor's Office for review and approval prior to the implementation date of the agreements. Review and approval of auxiliary organization sub-lease agreements by the Chancellor's Office in a timely manner increases the likelihood that contractual conditions among the auxiliary, campus and the CSU will be beneficial to each of the parties.

SHORT-TERM FACILITY RENTALS [13]

Short-term use of facilities was governed by at least four different on-campus groups, each with a different application, none of which contained all of the language required by the Chancellor's Office. Development and use of a uniform short-term facility license agreement which addresses each of the systemwide requirements will reduce both risk and duplication of administrative effort.

INTRODUCTION

FACILITY RENTAL FEE DEPOSITS [14]

Some facility rental fees were deposited in a CSUB Foundation account, without the knowledge of the campus financial affairs area. Fees collected were expended for items not related to facility use, although the expenses were legitimate campus expenditures. Depositing facility rental fees into the General Fund increases the amount of operating capital budgeted/available to the campus.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTIONS [15]

The campus motor vehicle inspection program was found to be deficient in several areas. Appointing an MVI, or assuring that inspections are carried out in a timely manner by an off-campus agency, enables the campus to account for all aspects of the required motor vehicle inspection program.

PURCHASING AND CONTRACTS

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Chancellor's Office review and approval was not obtained for certain purchases/contracts deemed to be outside the delegation to the campus. Examples of this included:

1. One purchase over \$100,000 made without the taking of a competitive bid.
2. One PO and two contracts which included provisions whereby the campus agreed to indemnify or hold harmless a party to the purchase order/contracts.

BF 94-23, Attachment 1, states that:

Specifically reserved for Chancellor's Office approval are any transactions which exceed \$100,000 and are awarded without the taking of competitive bids.

SUAM Sections 2432.02 & 2522.03 state that:

The following purchases...must be submitted to the Chancellor's Office for approval.

- 2a. Any provision whereby the campus agrees to indemnify or hold harmless any party to the contract or purchase order, or any third person against, or account of, any claim or liability arising out of the contract or purchase order.

The PSSO indicated that the requirement for transmittal to the Chancellor's Office had been overlooked in these instances.

Not providing the Chancellor's Office the opportunity for review and approval reduces the ability to address provisions which may be judged harmful to the system.

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the campus strengthen procedures to ensure that purchases and contracts outside the delegation of authority be transmitted to the Chancellor's Office for review and approval.

Campus Response

The campus is currently establishing written procedures to be used by all the purchasing agents to ensure that all purchases over \$100,000, made without taking a competitive bid, have Chancellor's Office review and approval. The Chancellor's Office review will help ensure that the campus has included all appropriate language.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the campus prepare a written invitation for bid for all non-sole source purchases over \$10,000 which would include the required seven elements, the General Provisions and the Statement of Compliance.

Campus Response

The campus is currently reworking the formal bid procedures, including the use of the Invitation for Bid (IFB) and the standardization of the bid package. These two changes will enable the campus to be confident that the General Provisions from SUAM and Statement of Compliance are regularly used for non-sole source purchases over \$10,000. Standardizing the packages will ensure that all other elements necessary to promote competition and minimize risk are included.

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the campus chief business officer either approve all sole source purchases of \$10,000 or greater or delegate the approval process, in writing, to a specific designee.

Campus Response

The previous chief business officer had always delegated the approval of sole source purchases of \$10,000 or greater to the Procurement Officer, albeit not formally in writing. The campus has recently filled the position of chief business officer and the new incumbent has chosen to retain responsibility for approving sole sources of \$10,000 or greater, therefore, written delegation will not be required at this time.

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the campus ensure that all purchases which cross more than one fiscal year contain language limiting the state's liability.

Campus Response

The elimination of the appropriate language on contracts and purchases which cross fiscal years was an oversight on the part of the campus. We will utilize the newly implemented purchasing system to develop a purchase order (PO) type which represents multi year purchases. This language will then become standard text on those types of PO's.

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the campus develop procedures to ensure that a Notice of Contract will be filed with DFEH for every purchase order and contract over \$5,000.

Campus Response

The campus acknowledges the SUAM requirement and will implement the required procedures to ensure that the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) is notified of all purchases or contracts which exceed \$5000. We encourage pursuing the elimination of this requirement and /or an increase in dollar limits, as it causes a burden on the campus.

FORMAL BID PROCEDURES

Neither an Invitation for Bid (IFB), General Provisions nor Statement of Compliance was regularly used for non-sole source purchases over \$10,000.

The audit sample contained twenty-five POs of \$10,000 or higher. Of those twenty-five, sixteen were sole source approvals. Of the remaining nine, five used an RFP (Request for Proposal) or RFQ (Request for Quote) rather than an IFB and did not contain the required seven elements, the General Provisions, nor the Statement of Compliance. The campus was unable to provide any information on the IFB for one PO (Purchase Order).

SUAM Section 2432.01.01 states that:

On all purchases of \$10,000 and over, the campus shall prepare a formal, written Invitation for Bid. The IFB must incorporate the General Provisions as shown in SUAM Appendix BA 2941-ABS. In addition, the IFB should include the following elements:

1. A clear, concise description of the materials or equipment being purchased.
2. Clearly defined delivery terms and conditions.
3. The method or formula for determining the lowest responsible bidder meeting specifications.
4. A reasonable amount of time for bidders to prepare and submit their bid response prior to the bid due date.
5. The closing date and exact time of opening of sealed bids.
6. Notification that bids received after the closing date and time will not be considered.
7. Notice to all bidders that a five percent preference will be given to bidders who qualify as a small business.

The Assistant PSSO indicated that he was unaware of the requirement to use an IFB. He had used an RFQ for all contracts without realizing the necessity for including all of the elements noted above.

Failure to use the IFB, the General Provisions, the Statement of Compliance, and the citation of a five percent small business preference, reduces the campus's ability to promote competition and risks limitations on the systems purchasing delegation.

SOLE SOURCE

Some sole source purchases over \$10,000 were approved by the PSSO without a written delegation of authority. Of the sixteen sole source purchases over \$10,000 in our sample, three did not have the written approval of the chief business officer/designee.

BF 94-2, attachment 3, states that:

The determination as to whether a procurement has been adequately justified in writing for a sole source award shall be made by the Chief Business Officer or that person's designee.

The PSSO, who signs all purchase orders, indicated that it was his understanding that he had been delegated approval authority for sole source purchases. There was, however, no written delegation and no clear indication of who was eligible, other than the vice president, to sign for the campus.

The signature of the chief business officer/designee indicates his, and the campus's support for a sole source purchase. Lack of such a signature may indicate that the campus has not opened the competition to all viable vendors.

INSTALLMENT PURCHASES

Two of the three POs in our sample which crossed more than one fiscal year did not contain the required language in the contract limiting the state's liability if funds were not available in succeeding years.

SUAM Section 2449.05 states that:

If the terms for a contract for the lease of equipment (or for an installment purchase or a conditional sale) extends into fiscal-year periods subsequent to the one in which it is approved, the contract or purchase document must contain a provision stating that continuation of the contract is subject to the appropriation of funds by the legislature.

The PSSO indicated that the omission of the required language limiting the state's liability was an oversight.

Omitting the required language increases the state's liability to pay with funds which have not been authorized and grants certain legal remedies to the vendor.

NOTICE OF CONTRACT

The campus did not file a Notice of Contract with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) on any of the POs and contracts in our sample over \$5,000.

SUAM Sections 2411.07.02 and 2510.08.05 state that:

Campuses must given notice to the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, Office of Compliance Programs, within ten working days of award of all purchase orders and contracts over \$5,000.

Purchasing Office management indicated that it was unaware of the requirement to file a Notice of Contract and has never done so.

Not reporting purchases and contracts in excess of \$5,000 to the DFEH limits the ability of that agency to monitor state purchasing procedures for discriminatory practices.

CALIFORNIA STATE CONTRACTS REGISTER

The campus has not established written criteria for use of the California State Contracts Register.

BF 94-23, Attachment 8, dated December 1, 1994, states that:

It is the policy of the CSU to advertise in the CSCR whenever possible. Each campus Procurement Officer must establish written criteria for use of the CSCR. Criteria are to include:

1. Types of contractual services and the monetary levels for which the Register will be used.
2. Provisions for approval by the campus Chief Business Officer, of any exemption from established criteria, including emergency contracts, contracts with other public entities, or contracts where it is determined that the state's best interests would be better served by exemption.
3. Procedures for documenting justifications not using the CSCR.

The PSSO indicated that each of his staff was well aware of the criteria for use of the CSCR, but he had never formally written out the necessary procedures.

The lack of written procedures increases the risk of non-compliance with the states mandate for open competition in awarding of contracts.

Recommendation 6

We recommend that the campus procurement office develop, and distribute, written criteria for the use of the California State Contracts Register.

Campus Response

written criteria for the use of the California State Contracts Register. The written procedures will then be distributed to all purchasing agents to ensure consistent use of the Register.

SERVICE ORDERS

The campus had not developed written procedures for the use and control of service orders.

SUAM Section 2576.01 states that:

The campus purchasing office will establish procedures for use and control of service orders. These procedures must be in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, or policies relating to CSU procurement. The service order form shall not be used to circumvent competitive bidding requirements. Written justifications are required when services are to be obtained from a sole source.

The PSSO indicated that each of his staff was well aware of the criteria for use of service orders, but he had never formally written out the necessary procedures.

Without specific procedures, service orders may be used to circumvent competitive bidding requirements.

Recommendation 7

We recommend that the campus PSSO develop, and distribute, written procedures for the use and control of service orders.

Campus Response

As stated above, the procedural changes are being formalized and written, including one for the use and control of service orders. Again, they will be distributed to all purchasing agents to ensure the campus procedures for issuing service orders are consistent.

AGREEMENTS AND LEASES

AUXILIARY ORGANIZATION SUB-LEASES

Auxiliary organization sub-leases with off-campus groups are not being forwarded to the Chancellor's Office for review and approval prior to the implementation date of the agreements.

A review of auxiliary organization sub-leases indicated the following:

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

1. The agreement between the Foundation and ARAMARK to run the food service operation in the cafeteria was not submitted to the C.O.
2. The agreement between the Student Union and Safe 1 Credit Union for space in the SU was not submitted to the C.O.

SUAM Section 2710 states that:

There is no authority for an auxiliary organization to enter agreements for use of state facilities with an off-campus group without approval by the Chancellor's Office.

The campus was unaware of the requirement to send auxiliary sub-leases to the Chancellor's Office for review and approval.

Entering into sub-lease agreements prior to the review and approval of the Chancellor's Office could result in unfavorable contractual conditions among the auxiliary, campus and the CSU.

Recommendation 8

We recommend that the campus establish procedures to assure that all auxiliary organization sub-leases with off-campus groups are submitted to the CO for review and approval *prior* to the effective date of the agreement.

Campus Response

The campus' interpretation of approval procedures from the Chancellor's Office Contracts division and the Chancellor's Office Audit division were not consistent. The recent audit has enabled all parties to discuss the procedures and agree upon when Chancellor Office Contracts division is required to review and approve off-campus sub-leases. We confirm that our understanding is that Chancellor Office approval is always required for third-party leases. When the campus enters a two party lease they are required to obtain Chancellor Office approval for the following:

- Agreements and leases between the university and auxiliary organizations. SUAM 2701.
- Long term leases (exceeding two years or amounts of more than \$3,000.00 per year) with for-profit groups. SUAM 2710/2712.
- Leases between an auxiliary organization with off-campus groups where the lease involves state facilities. SUAM 2710. The CO has stated that sub-leases between auxiliaries do not require their approval; but the leases should otherwise follow SUAM requirements.
- Short term leases (President's Lease) that extended beyond 10 months. SUAM 2711.01.7.

The campus will ensure these procedures are followed on all future sub-lease agreements.

SHORT-TERM FACILITY RENTALS

Short-term use of facilities was governed by at least four different on-campus groups, each with a different application, none of which contained the language that outlines the criteria needed to ensure compliance with policy.

SUAM Section 2710 addresses leases and agreements in general. It states, in part, that:

The following criteria must be considered in evaluating requests for use of facilities by off-campus groups:

1. Proposed use will not interfere with the educational objectives and programs of the campus.
2. Proposed use will not provide an unfair advantage to the organization making the request.
3. Services provided will not be in competition with private enterprise.
4. Use of state property involving liability risk will be justified and appropriate insurance protection secured.

In addition, SUAM Section 2711.01 addresses requirements for short-term (President's) leases:

1. The lease is with:
 - a. A government agency.
 - b. A nonprofit, charitable, educational or character-building organization.
 - c. A group or individual, for educational or noncommercial purposes.
2. The rent specified in the lease is at the applicable rental rate set forth in a schedule of rental rates.
3. The lease is in writing.
4. The lease includes a statement by the Trustees that the property is not needed for campus purposes at the time covered by the lease, and that the lease will not interfere with the requirements of the campus.
5. The lease designates the purpose for which the leased property will be used.
6. The lease conforms to established state leasing requirements.
7. The lease is for a period of ten months or less.
8. The lease contains a provision prohibiting subleasing.

Inclusion of the above criteria in the lease documents would greatly assist in ensuring compliance with policy. Segregating the administration of short-term rentals by type of facility has restricted the campus from producing a uniform set of procedures.

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

Failure to use a coordinated effort in the short-term rental of facilities had created the following problems: insurance requirements were not spelled out in three of the four forms; correct certificates covering the CSU and all of its employees were not always received—and when they were, it was not in a timely manner; payment was oftentimes received after the event had occurred; and the account numbers where the funds were to be deposited were not listed on the forms.

Recommendation 9

We recommend that the campus develop and use a uniform short-term facility license agreement which addresses each of the requirements listed above.

Campus Response

The campus is currently producing a uniform short term facility rental agreement form and corresponding policies and procedures to ensure compliance with required policy. The draft copy has been approved by an attorney, and the policies and procedures allow for all parties involved to have a voice in each rental. In addition, a copy of all completed facility rental forms will be submitted to Academic Scheduling to assure that events are properly coordinated. The completed policies and procedures manual and correspondence rental form will be required to be used by all campus personnel when renting campus facilities. The form requires signatures be obtained from all areas of responsibility before the event is formally scheduled, this assures Procurement can obtain the insurance; Campus Police will be properly staffed; and Accounting will know the estimated revenue and have the ability to track the deposit, etc. It is anticipated that the uniform rental form and manual will alleviate all concerns mentioned in this finding

FACILITY RENTAL FEE DEPOSITS

Some facility rental fees were deposited in a CSUB Foundation account, without the knowledge of the campus financial affairs area. Fees collected were expended for items not related to facility use, although the expenses were legitimate campus expenditures.

SUAM Section 2410.04.01 states that:

Any rental monies received by the Trustees under these or other leasing conditions shall be deposited in the state treasury and credited to the support appropriation of the California State University current during the period of occupancy.

The fees were deposited in the Foundation account rather than the General Fund so that they would be available as needed rather than terminate at the end of the fiscal year.

Failure to deposit facility rental fees into the General Fund reduces the amount of operating capital budgeted/available to the campus.

Recommendation 10

We recommend that the campus:

- a. seek reimbursement from the Foundation for those facility rental fees deposited in an incorrect account; and
- b. develop and implement procedures which will ensure that all rental monies received by the campus are deposited in the General Fund.

Campus Response

The campus has coordinated with the Foundation and has determined the amount of facility rental fees in correctly deposited to a Foundation account. Those funds have been reimbursed by Foundation to the State and deposited in the state facility rental account. The previously discussed Facilities Rental Manual, when implemented, will enable the campus accounting office to schedule rental fees for facility usage and then monitor their collections and account deposits to assure they are properly deposited in appropriate accounts.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTIONS

The campus motor vehicle inspection program was found to be deficient in several areas.

Our review indicated that:

1. The campus did not have (and has not had for the last five years) a designated Motor Vehicle Inspector (MVI). As a result, none of the available files indicated prior repair inspection (to determine necessity), post-repair inspection (to determine adequacy of repairs), or review of dealer charges for accuracy.
2. Files for four of the seven vehicles purchased in the last three years did not indicate that the pre-delivery inspection process was performed.
3. Maintenance files for four of the twenty-two vehicles in our sample showed no evidence of periodic inspections during the last four years. There was no maintenance file for one vehicle.
4. Equipment Inspection Reports were not prepared for any of the vehicles surveyed in the last three years.
6. Only one of the available files for on-campus vehicles indicated that Daily Operator Checklists were being utilized on a regular basis.
7. Five of the seventeen vehicles in our sample which should have been subject to biennial inspection of emission control systems had not received such inspection in the last two years.

SUAM Section 2700 et. seq., addresses the vehicle inspection process required in the CSU. In order to ensure accountability for all aspects of the vehicle inspection program, campuses are required to

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

execute a delegation of authority from the president to a campus official to be designated campus motor vehicle inspector. The campus motor vehicle inspection program, for which the MVI is responsible, must include: predelivery inspection; periodic safety/preventive maintenance inspection; repair inspection; survey inspection; operator inspection; safety inspection; and, emissions control inspection.

The primary cause for the deficiencies noted was the failure to appoint an MVI following the retirement of the incumbent approximately five years ago. In addition, written motor vehicle inspection procedures, which could have been referenced by an off-campus motor pool, had not been developed.

By not appointing an MVI, or assuring that inspections are carried out in a timely manner by an off-campus agency, the campus cannot account for all aspects of the required motor vehicle inspection program. This puts the campus and the state at additional risk of accidents due to lack of proper maintenance.

Recommendation 11

We recommend that the campus:

- a. either appoint an MVI, or assure that inspections are carried out in a timely manner by an off-campus agency; and
- b. develop a written vehicle inspection program addressing each of the areas noted above.

Campus Response

The campus is in the process of appointing a designated Motor Vehicle Inspector (MVI), who will assure that inspections are carried out in a timely manner. In addition, the campus is in the process of developing written motor vehicle inspection procedures to ensure compliance with required policy.

**APPENDIX A:
PERSONNEL CONTACTED**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Tomas Arciniega	President
W. Michael Chertok	Director of Development and Public Affairs
Beverly Conley	Contracts Officer
Irma Gonzalez	Property Clerk
James George	Associate Academic Vice President and Dean, Undergraduate Studies
Margie Lynch	Coordinator, Academic Scheduling Office
Michael Neal	Vice President, Business and Administrative Services
Vicki Parker	Secretary/ Articulation Coordinator
Sharon Taylor	Assistant Vice President, Fiscal and Support Services
Michael Williams	Procurement and Support Services Officer
Frank Yap	Assistant Procurement and Support Services Officer