California Highway Patrol

Investigations of Improper Activities by State Employees, February 2007 Through June 2007

INVESTIGATION I2007-0715 (REPORT I2007-2), SEPTEMBER 2007

Investigative Highlights . . .

The California Highway Patrol:

» ***Paid $881,565 for 51 vans it had not used for their intended purposes more than two years after it purchased them.***

» ***Did not postpone its purchase of the vans until it needed them, resulting in $90,685 in lost interest earnings to the State.***

California Highway Patrol's response as of November 2007

We investigated and substantiated an allegation that the California Highway Patrol (CHP) wasted state funds when it purchased numerous vans that it left virtually unused for at least two years.

Finding: The CHP wasted state funds.

Using three purchase orders, the CHP bought 51 vans for its Motor Carrier program, surveillance, and mail delivery. However, as of June 30, 2007, the 30 vans purchased in October 2004 and the 21 vans purchased in August 2005—at a combined cost of $881,565—had not been used for the special purposes for which they had been purchased. In addition, the CHP has left all but five of the 51 vehicles virtually unused since it purchased them. Further, because the CHP did not postpone its purchases of the vans until it needed them, the State lost interest earnings of approximately $90,385.[1]

The CHP intended to use 48 vans for field inspections in its Motor Carrier program, two vans for surveillance purposes, and one van for mail delivery. Vehicles must be specially modified before they can be put to use for field inspections, surveillance, or mail delivery. However, the CHP does not expect to have any of the 48 vehicles that it purchased for field inspections modified and available for that use until October 2007—more than two years after they were purchased. The CHP completed the necessary modifications to the mail van in June 2007, and as of August 2007 it reported that the modifications to the two surveillance vans were only 50 percent complete because of the State's failure to approve a budget in a timely manner.

In addition, our review of vehicle mileage information shows that the CHP left 46 of the 51 vans almost entirely idle, parked on the CHP property in an outdoor location. Specifically, we determined that as of April 2007 the CHP had driven the 46 vans a total of only 401 miles—an average of nine miles for each van—since it had purchased them in 2004 and 2005. We found that 14 vans had not been driven at all, another 27 vans had been driven from one to 20 miles, and five vans had been driven from 21 to 34 miles. Most of the mileage related to trips to facilities where various items such as roof vents, antennas, and flooring needed to modify these vehicles for their intended purpose were installed. The CHP used the remaining five vans for temporary assignments or to transport equipment. As of April 2007 the Highway Patrol had driven each of the five vans between 167 and 3,420 miles, or an average of 1,901 miles.

[1] This amount is based on interest rates available to the State through its Pooled Money Investment Account Earning Yield Rate.

The CHP gave several reasons for not using the 51 vans for their intended purposes between the time it purchased them in 2004 and 2005 and the completion of our investigation in June 2007. The CHP told us that it planned to assign the vans to the field in fiscal year 2006–07. Further, it stated that modification of the vans had been delayed because of competing priorities, staff shortages, and the development of an equipment strategy that could meet all its users' needs. The CHP officials we interviewed told us that the vans were originally intended for modification and use within the CHP's normal replacement cycle time of approximately 18 months from purchase. However, the CHP stated that because of its workload, the labor-intensive installation of equipment in the two vehicles it purchased for surveillance was delayed beyond the normal cycle. In addition, the CHP officials stated that, although it completed modifications to the mail van, the CHP did not plan to use it until the mail van it was intended to replace either reaches the replacement mileage target of 150,000 miles or was no longer cost-effective to operate. Further, the CHP stated that modification of the 30 vans it received in October 2004—originally scheduled for April 2006—was canceled because of an unforeseen increase in demand for marked patrol cruisers. However, it appears the CHP had not yet developed an equipment strategy for the Motor Carrier program vans at the time it was modifying the marked patrol cruisers.

The CHP did not develop a workable strategy to make the 48 vans it purchased for the Motor Carrier program available for field use prior to making the purchases in 2004 and 2005. We believe the primary cause for delays was the CHP's attempt to develop a prototype vehicle design that could meet the needs of all of its employees who perform field inspections. The CHP developed two prototypes and it expected to complete the second prototype in September 2007, more than two years after it received its first shipment.

CHP's Action: Corrective action taken.

The CHP stated that as of November 6, 2007, all 51 vans had been assigned to locations across the State.