

**DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY**  
**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE**

**Report Number 96-05**  
**September 23, 1996**

---

**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**

**Acting University Auditor: Larry Mandel**  
**Audit Manager: Norman Buettner**  
**Senior Auditor: Douglas Kennedy**

---

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

---

# CONTENTS

---

## INTRODUCTION

<b>Purpose</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Scope and Methodology</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Background</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Opinion</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>

---

## OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

<b>Purchasing and Contracts</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Sole Source Purchases</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Vendor Files</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Notice of Contract Award</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Statements of Compliance</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Consultant Contracts</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Service Orders</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Agreements and Leases</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Auxiliary Organization Sub-Leases</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Facility Rental Rate Schedule</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>Insurance Requirements</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>Motor Vehicle Inspections</b> .....	<b>13</b>

**APPENDICES**

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

**ABBREVIATIONS**

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

---

## 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 1191 (1993). The extended delegation of AB 1191 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 Physical Plant, and Vice President Administration and Finance Office. 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 also followed up on the recommendations contained in Audit Report # 90-23 dated December 16, 1991, subject: Purchasing and Contracting, CSU, Northridge.**

**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 1191 (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 have visited the California State University, Northridge campus between April 25, 1996 and June 13, 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 details of the report, compliance with legislative delegations and both 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

#### SOLE SOURCE PURCHASES [6]

Some sole source purchases over \$10,000 were approved by the acting director of Purchasing without a written delegation of authority, while others did not have a written sole source justification. Providing a written sole source justification together with a signature by the chief business officer/designee indicates that the campus has adhered to current CSU bidding requirements.

#### VENDOR FILES [6]

The campus had not developed a vendor file system for vendors solicited for quotes or bids. This is a repeat finding from our prior audit conducted in 1991. Establishment of a vendor file system increases the ability of the campus to contract appropriate vendors and helps insure that a fair proportion of the campus business is awarded to small businesses and firms owned by minorities or women.

#### NOTICE OF CONTRACT AWARD [7]

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. This is a repeat finding from our prior audit conducted in 1991. 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.

## STATEMENTS OF COMPLIANCE [8]

Statements of Compliance, indicating adherence to the state's non-discrimination program, were not regularly obtained for non-sole source purchases over \$10,000. Including the statement of compliance criteria in all formal bid procedures reduces the risk of awards to vendors who may not be observing the nondiscrimination program requirements of the State of California.

## CONSULTANT CONTRACTS [8]

### Progress Payments

The campus was not following CSU progress payment requirements. Withholding ten percent of progress payments decreases the risk of consultants being fully compensated without properly completing their contracted work.

### Consultancy Proposal Analysis Forms

The campus was not requiring completion of Consultancy Proposal Analysis forms. This is a repeat finding from our prior audit conducted in 1991. Completion of a Consultancy Proposal Analysis Form provides documentation of the propriety of using an independent contractor, rather than an employee to do a specific job.

### Project Coordinators

Campus procedures for utilizing project coordinators for consultant contracts was deficient. This is a repeat finding from our prior audit conducted in 1991. Assigning a project coordinator to monitor the requirements in a consultant contract should result in proper completion of the project.

## SERVICE ORDERS [10]

The campus had not established adequate procedures to control maximum expenditure levels for service orders. This is a repeat finding from our prior audit conducted in 1991. Establishment of specific controls reduces the risk of service orders exceeding the CSU maximum expenditure level and ensures that the campus is within the guidelines in regard to competitive bidding requirements.

## AGREEMENTS AND LEASES

### AUXILIARY ORGANIZATION SUB-LEASES [11]

A campus auxiliary organization was licensing the use of campus property to an off campus for-profit organization without the approval of the Chancellor's office. Review of campus property agreements with off campus for-profit organizations by the Chancellor's Office results in the most favorable contractual conditions among the auxiliary, campus and the CSU.

### **FACILITY RENTAL RATE SCHEDULE [12]**

The campus has not updated its schedule of facility rental rates since 1990. **Establishing a procedure for a periodic review, update and approval to the fee schedule provides the campus with a more accurate reimbursement to the general fund for services rendered.**

### **INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS [12]**

State and auxiliary organizations were not maintaining current certificates of insurance for leases and license agreements involving use of campus facilities. Assuring that supporting files contain evidence of appropriate insurance coverage during the length of all contracts, leases and license agreements reduces the potential risk to the campus and the CSU.

### **MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTIONS [13]**

The campus motor vehicle inspection program was deficient in several areas. Assuring the motor vehicle inspection program is fully implemented will improve the overall safety, efficiency and economic well being of the campus motor vehicle fleet.

---

# OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

## PURCHASING AND CONTRACTS

### SOLE SOURCE PURCHASES

Some sole source purchases over \$10,000 were approved by the acting director of Purchasing without a written delegation of authority, while others did not have a written sole source justification.

Ten of fifteen sole source purchases in the sample over \$10,000 were not approved by the chief business officer or his designee. Two of the fifteen sole source purchases did not have a sole source justification on file.

BF 94-23 states that a sole source procurement is permissible only when a determination has been made, and approved in writing, that only one source exists for the required product or service. BF 94-23 also requires that a 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.

Subsequent to the effective date of BF 94-23, the campus had not developed procedures to address the delegation of sole source purchasing authority.

By not providing a sole source justification, the campus has bypassed mandated bidding requirements. Lack of a signature by the chief business officer/designee may also indicate that the campus has not opened the competition to all viable vendors.

#### **Recommendation 1**

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 director of purchasing has been formally delegated authority by the chief business officer to review and approve all sole source purchases in excess of \$10,000.

### VENDOR FILES

A vendor file system had not been established for vendors solicited for quotes or bids. This is a repeat finding from our prior audit conducted in 1991.

SUAM Section 2420 requires that the purchasing office maintain active vendor files for commodities, services and construction. In support of state policy to ensure that a fair proportion of the state's business be awarded to small businesses and firms owned by minorities or women, identification of these firms must be made in the vendor files.

The contract administrator indicated that, although a prior action had been taken to develop a vendor data base, it had not been implemented.

Not maintaining current vendor files reduces the ability of the campus to contact appropriate vendors when making purchases of commodities, services, and construction and to ensure that a fair proportion of the campus business is awarded to small businesses and firms owned by minorities or women.

**Recommendation 2**

We recommend that the campus establish an active vendor file system for commodities, services and construction.

**Campus Response**

An active vendor file system for commodities, services, and construction in accordance with National Institute of Governmental Purchasing (NIGP) commodity/service classifications will be instituted as part of the on-line purchasing system implementation. The pilot program will begin January 1997.

**NOTICE OF CONTRACT AWARD**

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. This is a repeat finding from our prior audit conducted in 1991.

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.

The purchasing officer contracts administrator indicated that the DFEH automatic input screen was developed for the computerized purchasing system but the report was never developed.

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.

**Recommendation 3**

We recommend that the campus develop procedures to insure that a Notice of Contract will be filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing for every purchase and contract over \$5,000.

**Campus Response**

Effective September 1996, quarterly reports of all subject purchases are being forwarded to DFEH.

## STATEMENTS OF COMPLIANCE

Statements of Compliance, indicating adherence to the state's non-discrimination program, were not regularly obtained for non-sole source purchases over \$10,000. Eighteen of twenty-three non-sole source purchases in our sample over \$10,000 did not have a Statements of Compliance filed with the bids.

SUAM Section 2411.07.01 requires that bids in the amount of \$10,000 or more must be accompanied by a fully executed Statement of Compliance ( Std. Form 19). In lieu of using the Std. Form 19, campuses may include the following provision on their IFB form:

Statement Of Compliance: The bidder's signature affixed hereon and dated shall constitute a certification under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the bidder has, unless exempted, complied with the nondiscrimination program requirements of Government Code Section 12990 and Title 2, California Code of Regulations, Section 8103.

The contract administrator indicated that both service orders and standard agreements contain the Statement of Compliance requirement; the commodities form did not.

Failure to include the statement of compliance criteria in all formal bid procedures increases the risk of awards to vendors who may not be observing the nondiscrimination program requirements of the state of California.

### **Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the campus revise their commodities purchase requirements to include the Statement of Compliance and assure all bid procedures for purchases of goods and services of \$10,000 or more contain this requirement.

### **Campus Response**

The requirement for Statements of Compliance has been included in the boiler plate provisions for all competitive procurements in excess of \$10,000.

## CONSULTANT CONTRACTS

### Progress Payments

The campus was not following CSU progress payment requirements.

SUAM Section 2571.05.01 requires that, in computing the amount of any progress payment, the campus shall determine the amount the contractor has earned for work performed or costs incurred during the period for which payment is being made, based on the terms of the contract. The campus shall withhold

at least ten percent of the amount earned pending satisfactory completion of the entire contract and the evaluation of the contractor.

Three of the five consultant contracts reviewed contained progress payments. None of the three contained a provision that ten percent should be withheld. The contract administrator indicated that she was not aware of the requirement to withhold any amount. The accounts payable manager indicated that the ten percent withholding is applied only when it is specified in the contract.

Not withholding ten percent of progress payments increases the risk of consultants being fully compensated without properly completing their contracted work.

### **Recommendation 5**

We recommend that the campus establish appropriate procedures to ensure that ten percent of the amount earned on progress payments is withheld pending satisfactory completion of the entire contract.

### **Campus Response**

Effective immediately, all future consultant contracts under which progress payments are authorized will include a provision that ten percent (10%) of the amount earned will be withheld pending satisfactory completion of the entire contract.

### Consultancy Proposal Analysis Forms

The campus was not requiring completion of Consultancy Proposal Analysis Forms. None of the five consultant contracts in the sample had a Consultancy Proposal Analysis Form. This is a repeat finding from our prior audit conducted in 1991.

SUAM Section 2571 requires that a Consultancy Proposal Analysis Form be completed in order to determine the propriety of using an independent contractor, rather than an employee, to do a specific job.

The Contract Administrator indicated that, although the campus purchasing manual contained a requirement that a Consultancy Proposal Analysis Form be used, application of this process was inadvertently overlooked.

Not completing a Consultancy Proposal Analysis Form results in a lack of documentation concerning the propriety of using an independent contractor, rather than an employee, to do a specific job.

### **Recommendation 6**

We recommend that the campus assure that a Consultancy Proposal Analysis Form is used to assess and validate the need for hiring any independent contractor (consultant) rather than an employee.

### **Campus Response**

Procedures have been implemented to assure compliance with independent contractor/consultant regulations.

### Project Coordinators

Campus procedures for utilizing project coordinators for consultant contracts was deficient. This is a repeat finding from our prior audit conducted in 1991.

Three of the five consultant contracts did not have project coordinators named in the contract. In addition, the invoices for the two contracts that named the project coordinators were not approved by the project coordinators.

SUAM Section 2571.06 states in part:

. . . Each contract for consulting services will provide for and specify a person by name or by position within the campus to be the project coordinator. This person will have the overall responsibility to evaluate and to follow up on the work of the consultant. . . .

The contract administrator indicated that the purchasing office was not requiring a project coordinator be named in the consultant contract, in part, due to the accounts from which payments are approved are often controlled by individuals other than the project coordinator.

Not assigning a project coordinator to monitor the requirements in a consultant contract could result in payment for incomplete work.

### **Recommendation 7**

We recommend that the campus identify a project coordinator in each consultant contract to assure proper completion of the contractual requirements.

### **Campus Response**

Effective immediately, requisitioning activities entering into consultant contracts will be required by Purchasing to identify a responsible "coordinator" who will be required to certify work completion before progress or full payments are issued by Accounts Payable (AP). The name of said coordinator and requirement for their work completion certification will be included in the Special Provisions of the contract document.

### **SERVICE ORDERS**

The campus had not established adequate procedures to control maximum expenditure levels for service orders. This is a repeat finding from our prior audit conducted in 1991.

Our review indicated that nine service orders issued between July 1995 and April 1996 were over the \$20,000 maximum.

SUAM Section 2576.02 has specifically established a maximum expenditure level of \$20,000 for service orders.

The purchasing office contract administrator indicated the staff had not been made aware of the maximum expenditure level of \$20,000 for service orders.

Without specific procedures, including maximum spending levels, service orders may be used to circumvent competitive bidding requirements.

**Recommendation 8**

We recommend that the campus establish procedures to prevent the issue of service orders exceeding \$20,000.

**Campus Response**

All requisitions for services in excess of \$20,000 received by the Purchasing Department will be forwarded to the director of purchasing for review and discussion with the requisitioning activity.

**AGREEMENTS AND LEASES**

**AUXILIARY ORGANIZATION SUB-LEASES**

A campus auxiliary organization was licensing the use of campus property to an off campus for-profit organization without the approval of the Chancellor's office.

The North Campus Development Corporation, a campus auxiliary organization, was licensing the use of part of the campus it has leased from the CSU. This property is licensed to a for profit organization that has control of the property.

SUAM Section 2710 states:

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 auxiliary classified this agreement as a license and did not consider it a lease that required the Chancellor's Office approval.

Entering into sub-lease/license 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 9**

---

**OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES**

We recommend that the campus strengthen procedures to assure that sub-leases/licenses between auxiliaries and off campus groups for use of state facilities be sent to the Chancellor's Office for prior approval.

### **Campus Response**

Procedures will be implemented to assure sub-leases/licenses between auxiliaries and off-campus groups for use of state facilities are approved by the Chancellor's Office.

### **FACILITY RENTAL RATE SCHEDULE**

The campus has not updated its schedule of facility rental rates since 1990.

Several fee rates have changed on the campus in the last six years while others, such as the costs associated with police, parking officers and custodial services, have not. We reviewed nine licenses involving lease of campus space that were in effect during June 1996. Four of these documents contained fees different from the approved fee schedule.

SUAM Section 2710.04 requires that the president approve a schedule of rental rates for the use of campus property and that schedule be on file in campus administrative offices.

The campus has not been requiring periodic reviews, updates and approvals to the fee schedule.

Not periodically updating the facility rental rate schedule reduces the amount of cost reimbursements to the general fund.

### **Recommendation 10**

We recommend that the campus establish procedures to periodically review, update and approve their facility rental fee schedule.

### **Campus Response**

Procedures will be established to review, update, and approve rental fee schedules on a periodic basis.

### **INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS**

State and auxiliary organizations were not maintaining current certificates of insurance for leases and license agreements involving use of campus facilities.

The period of coverage on the certificates of insurance on file had often lapsed prior to the end of the lease/license agreement term. This situation generally occurred whenever the terms of the agreement were for longer than one year or the initial certificate of insurance's coverage expired prior to the end of the term stipulated in the agreement. In addition, four of eight licenses issued by an auxiliary for short term use of campus property were not properly supported by a certificate of insurance from the licensee.

SUAM Section 2520.03 et seq. contains pertinent liability insurance provisions. In addition, the CSU Office of Risk management has cooperated on the publication of the CSU Insurance Requirements in Contracts Manual dated January 1993 which has been distributed to the campuses. In addition the contract, lease or license documents contain specific insurance requirements.

In general, we observed that the cause for not properly monitoring certificates of insurance was attributable to the non-assignment of responsibility for this process.

Failure to assure that certificates of insurance meet contractual requirements for the duration of the term of any contract/lease/license increases the potential risk to the campus and the CSU.

### **Recommendation 11**

We recommend that the campus strengthen existing procedures to assure that all contracts, leases and licenses involving the need for liability insurance contain appropriate coverage through the length of the contract.

### **Campus Response**

Long-term agreements will be reviewed on a monthly basis by the manager of the University Licensing Program to assure that current certificates of insurance are in force for the duration of the agreement.

All other agreements will be rechecked prior to scheduled event date to assure certificates are in force and on file.

## **MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTIONS**

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

Our review indicated that:

1. There was no delegation of authority from the president to the current motor vehicle inspector.
2. There was no record of consistent weekly and monthly vehicle inspections.
3. Seven of eight files for vehicles acquired since 1990 did not contain a copy of a predelivery inspection report. The auto garage data base did contain an entry that the inspection had been made.
4. Annual safety/maintenance inspection forms are not being retained. The auto garage supervisor indicated these forms are destroyed after the inspection is made and an appropriate entry is made in the data base.

SUAM section 2700 et seq. addresses the vehicle inspection process required in the CSU. The campus motor vehicle inspection program, for which the campus motor vehicle inspector is responsible, must include: predelivery inspections; periodic safety/preventive maintenance inspections; repair inspections; survey inspections operator inspections; van/bus safety inspections and: emission control inspections.

Title II, Division 3, Part 5.5, Chapter 5, Article 3, Section 14755 of the California Government Code states in part:

. . . (b) The director shall not authorize the destruction of any record subject to audit until he has determined that the audit has been performed.

The auto garage supervisor indicated that inspection records are routinely destroyed after certain information has been entered into his data base in order to reduce the amount of paperwork being stored in his area.

When motor vehicle inspection reports are destroyed before they are subject to an audit, it cannot be determined what was specifically inspected or who performed the inspection.

Not assuring that the motor vehicle inspection program is fully implemented increases the risk that the overall safety, efficiency and economic well being of the campus motor vehicle fleet is less than satisfactory.

**Recommendation 12**

We recommend that the campus assure procedures are in place to address all the motor vehicle inspection requirements discussed above.

**Campus Response**

The director of Physical Plant will assure procedures are in place to conduct monthly inspections, preventative maintenance inspections, repair inspections, survey inspections, operator inspections, van/bus safety inspections, emission control inspections and pre-delivery inspections on the campus fleet, electric and gas carts, and grounds vehicles. These procedures will be in effect by November 1, 1996.

**Recommendation 13**

We recommend that the campus establish procedures related to the retention of motor vehicle inspection records that will provide evidence of the most recent inspection categories being completed.

**Campus Responses:**

1. Delegation of authority from the president to the current motor vehicle inspector.

Campus Response: The Auto Shop supervisor will be formally delegated the authority to perform inspections by the president of the university.

2. There was no record of consistent weekly and monthly vehicle inspections.

Campus Response: Weekly inspections are to be performed by the vehicle operator (SUAM 2973.02). The weekly inspection documents are to be submitted to the campus vehicle inspector the Monday following the previous Friday's inspection. Physical Plant will assure departments are trained and

---

**OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES**

educated on procedures for weekly inspections. The Auto Shop supervisor will maintain files of weekly inspection documents.

3. Seven of eight files for vehicles acquired since 1990 did not contain a copy of a pre-delivery inspection report. The auto garage database did contain an entry that the inspection had been made.

Campus Response: Pre-delivery inspection documentation will be on file in the Auto Shop and the Work Control Center in Physical Plant Management for any vehicles purchased by the campus in the future.

4. Annual Safety/maintenance inspection forms are not being retained. The Auto Garage supervisor indicated these forms are destroyed after the inspection is made and an appropriate entry is made on the database.

Campus Response: Annual inspection documents will be maintained on file in the Auto Shop. These records will not be authorized for destruction until such time as an audit has been performed.

---

**APPENDIX A:  
PERSONNEL CONTACTED**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
<b>Blenda Wilson</b>	<b>President</b>
<b>Clarence Askew</b>	<b>Manager, Asset Management</b>
<b>Thomas Brown</b>	<b>Assistant Director, Engineering Services</b>
<b>Bill Chatham</b>	<b>Associate Vice President, Facilities Planning &amp; Operations</b>
<b>Karen Clark</b>	<b>University Licensing Manager</b>
<b>William Cooper</b>	<b>Procurement and Support Services Officer</b>
<b>Arthur Elbert</b>	<b>Vice President Administration &amp; Finance</b>
<b>Karen Hoefel</b>	<b>Director, Finance &amp; Logistical Services</b>
<b>Christie Kelly</b>	<b>Acting Assistant to the Student Union Executive Director</b>
<b>Irving Langworthy</b>	<b>Auto Garage Supervisor</b>
<b>David Reeves</b>	<b>Assistant Director, Trades, Physical Plant Management</b>
<b>Judy Reyes</b>	<b>Accounts Payable Manager</b>
<b>Mary Sosa</b>	<b>Contracts Administrator, Purchasing</b>