



OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
MONTGOMERY COUNTY MARYLAND

MEGAN DAVEY LIMARZI, ESQ.
INSPECTOR GENERAL

Light-Duty Fleet Vehicles and Driver Suitability
Inspection

OIG Publication # OIG-22-013

MARCH 28, 2022

51 MONROE STREET, SUITE 600 | ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850
240 777 8240 |  MONTGOMERYCOUNTYMD.GOV/OIG

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In keeping with our mandate to review the effectiveness and efficiency of county programs and operations, we initiated this inspection of the county's controls over light-duty vehicles and driver suitability. Inspections differ from traditional OIG engagements in that they include physical verification of assets or program components at a specific moment in time. The county's fleet includes approximately 885 light-duty vehicles. In fiscal year (FY) 2020, the Division of Fleet Management Services within the Department of General Services expended approximately \$180,000 to purchase six new vehicles and \$1.7 million to replace 51 vehicles that had reached their life expectancy. In FY 2021, no new vehicles were purchased however \$1.4 million was spent on replacement vehicles. The Division of Risk Management (Risk) within the Department of Finance is tasked with reviewing the driving record of county employees approved to operate county-owned vehicles or regularly use a personal vehicle for county business to ensure employees meet policy requirements.

OBJECTIVES

Through this inspection we attempted to determine (1) if the county can account for all of its light-duty administrative vehicles; and (2) if the county's Division of Risk Management followed established procedures in determining the suitability of employees to operate assigned county vehicles.

SCOPE & STANDARDS

Our inspection was conducted between June and December 2021 in accordance with the *Association of Inspectors General Principles and Quality Standards for Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews by Offices of Inspector General (May 2014)*.

RESULTS

- We were able to locate all 103 vehicles in our sample.
- The county has lax controls over its fleet vehicles and provides limited guidance and training regarding the roles and responsibilities of departments in managing fleet vehicles.
- Risk is not obtaining or reviewing the driving records of employees with driver's licenses from states other than Maryland.
- Departments do not always notify Risk when employees are approved to operate county vehicles or regularly drive a personal vehicle for county business, nor do they provide documentation required by policy.
- Risk continues to monitor the driving records of persons no longer employed by the county or who no longer have a need to operate a county vehicle.
- Risk does not always monitor changes to drivers' records or take appropriate action when the driver's license of an approved employee was suspended or revoked.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Develop formal guidance detailing department roles and responsibilities in managing fleet vehicles.
- Implement a process to obtain and routinely review the driving record of all applicable employees.
- Provide training to departments and ensure Risk receives a copy of the driver's license of all approved employees.
- Develop policy to ensure Risk is notified when an approved driver terminates employment with the county and which requires Risk to cease monitoring their driving record.
- Implement a process to more effectively monitor notifications received from the automated driving record flagging program and take appropriate action when warranted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
BACKGROUND	1
OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY.....	2
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3
OIG COMMENTS TO THE CAO'S RESPONSE	11
APPENDIX A: THE CAO'S RESPONSE	12

BACKGROUND

The Division of Fleet Management Services (FMS) within the Department of General Services (DGS) serves as the county's vehicle asset manager. The county's fleet includes approximately 885 light-duty vehicles, comprised primarily of sedans and SUVs utilized for non-public safety activities. In fiscal year (FY) 2020, the FMS expended approximately \$180,000 to purchase six new vehicles and \$1.7 million to replace 51 vehicles that had reached their life expectancy. No new vehicles were added to the fleet in FY 2021 but \$1.4 million was spent on 48 replacement vehicles.

Administrative Procedure (AP) 1-4, last updated in December of 2012, governs the assignment and use of county-owned vehicles and the regular use of personal vehicles while on county business. According to policy, county vehicles may be assigned to specific individuals or to department motor pools for use by any approved employee. Some employees who have been assigned vehicles are authorized to take them home; however, most county-owned vehicles must be parked overnight at designated locations.

Prior to operating a county-owned vehicle or regularly driving a personal vehicle while on county business, an employee must first obtain their department director's approval by providing a copy of their driver's license to their supervisor. Every employee that operates a county vehicle must maintain a valid driver's license and may be disciplined for failure to notify the county if their driver's license has been suspended or revoked¹.

Each county department is responsible for keeping up-to-date vehicle assignment and driver records for every employee who operates a county vehicle or regularly drives their personal vehicle while on county business. All departments that acquire vehicles through the FMS have a fleet coordinator who serves as a liaison between the FMS and the department and who is responsible for the administrative functions related to their department's vehicle fleet. In most instances, the fleet coordinator position is a collateral duty for an employee.

Policy requires that the Division of Risk Management (Risk) within the Department of Finance "obtain, maintain, and on a routine basis review the driving record of the County employees who do or could drive a County vehicle or who regularly drive a personal vehicle while on County business." Per AP 1-4, departments must provide Risk with a copy of the driver's license for each employee who obtained their director's approval to operate a county-owned vehicle or who regularly drives a personal vehicle while on county business. Policy also requires Risk to notify departments if the license of an approved driver is suspended or revoked, or if an employee was convicted of driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol within the preceding 12 months. To assist with this effort, Risk subscribes to NICUSA, an on-line service of the Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA) that provides access to Maryland drivers' license records.

¹ Administrative Procedure 1-4 Section 5.0, outlines employee responsibilities and states "Failure to notify the County of any suspension or revocation of a driver's license may be a factor for consideration for personnel evaluation and/or disciplinary purposes."

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

Through this inspection we sought to determine (1) if the county can account for all of its light-duty administrative vehicles, and (2) if Risk followed established procedures in determining the suitability of employees to operate assigned county vehicles and use of personal vehicles while on county business.

Our inspection did not include county employees with commercial driver's licenses (CDL) as these individuals typically drive buses, trucks, and other heavy equipment. Although there are several federal regulations that pertain to CDL drivers, there is no county policy that specifically covers this specialized group.

Our scope included the light-duty administrative vehicle inventory as reported to us by the FMS on July 19, 2021. From the reported inventory of 885 vehicles, we excluded those that are assigned to independent county agencies and those whose primary mission is public safety. This resulted in a total population of 737 light-duty administrative vehicles.

We utilized a data analytics program to generate a random sample of 103 vehicles which represented approximately 14 percent of our total population of 737 light-duty administrative vehicles. Over the course of four weeks, we located all 103 vehicles and verified the vehicle identification numbers, county-assigned equipment numbers, and license plates. Of the 103 vehicles, we located 55 through unannounced site visits. The remaining 48 vehicles were either brought to us at one of three pre-arranged locations or made available for inspection at various maintenance facilities.

We noted that the county does not maintain a complete list of all persons authorized to drive county vehicles or employees who regularly use a personal vehicle for county business. Therefore, we were not able to test whether Risk was routinely reviewing drivers' records of all authorized drivers. We did however compare an FMS list of employees who were assigned vehicles with a list of employees Risk enrolled in NICUSA.

Our review was conducted between June 11, 2021, and December 30, 2021, in accordance with the Association of Inspectors General, Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspector General (May 2014).

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conducting this inspection, we noted that the responsibility for managing light-duty administrative vehicles is divided between the FMS and individual departments. We also observed that the process designed to ensure the suitability of drivers is shared among Risk, the FMS, and individual departments. We found that these divisions in responsibilities lead to shortcomings in the county's ability to minimize risk and account for all fleet vehicles. Exacerbating this issue is the fact that pertinent policies have not been updated since 2012, and that some employees involved in the process have a general lack of understanding regarding the roles, responsibilities, and requirements for operating county vehicles.

In working with FMS staff and department fleet coordinators, we were able to locate all 103 vehicles in our test sample. The effort however was prolonged and made more difficult because of poor recordkeeping by the FMS and departments. We were provided records that were sometimes incomplete or inaccurate. This in turn required additional coordination and multiple attempts to locate certain vehicles in our sample.

While assessing whether Risk followed established procedures in reviewing the suitability of employees to operate assigned county vehicles, we noted some instances where Risk was not following requirements outlined in AP 1-4. However, their ability to comply with some policies was impacted by the departments not providing Risk with information about all approved drivers. As a result, the driving records of a potentially large number of employees operating county vehicles or regularly driving personal vehicles for county business are not being reviewed by Risk.

Through this inspection we also noted some deficiencies with AP 1-4 that the county should consider remedying in their current effort to revamp county policies. These shortcomings may expose the county to increased liability by not limiting the use of county vehicles. Specifically, current policy states that "only authorized personnel directly associated with County business will travel in County vehicles on a regular basis." As written, the policy seems to allow for occasional or infrequent travel by unauthorized personnel.

Similarly, AP 1-4 does not specifically prohibit employees from using county-owned vehicles to conduct personal errands or other nonwork-related activities. Instead, policy seems to focus on employee status ("personnel directly associated with County business") and not the permissible use of county vehicles. Additionally, the county should consider implementing a requirement for departments to record and maintain information such as mileage, destination, or purpose of travel when a vehicle is used.

Accounting for Light-Duty Administrative Vehicles

Finding 1: The county has lax controls over its fleet vehicles and provides limited guidance and training regarding the roles and responsibilities of departments in managing fleet vehicles.

As noted, we were able to locate all 103 vehicles in our sample, however, poor recordkeeping and a lack of understanding among fleet coordinators of their roles, responsibilities, and requirements complicated our efforts. Many of the fleet coordinators we spoke to told us they had never received formal training or guidance regarding the responsibilities of a fleet coordinator. Although the FMS told us that they hosted semi-annual fleet coordinator meetings prior to the pandemic, some fleet coordinators said they were not aware of these meetings and others said they chose not to attend.

AP 1-4 requires that each department maintain accurate and current data in the FMS Vehicle Assignment System (VAS), to include approved drivers and vehicle assignments. We learned that the VAS however has not been accessible to fleet coordinators since February 2020. The FMS told us that once the system was taken off-line, they advised fleet coordinators to email them necessary changes in lieu of updating the VAS. Five of the 13 fleet coordinators we spoke to had never heard of the VAS and were unaware of their responsibility to provide the FMS with updated vehicle information. One fleet coordinator told us that they were familiar with the VAS but had not been updating the system as required by policy, and we learned that not all fleet coordinators were aware of the option to email the FMS with updates.

While working with fleet coordinators to locate the vehicles in our sample, we observed a lack of consistency in how vehicle information is maintained as well as lax controls over the vehicles themselves. We noted some departments kept organized files with detailed vehicle and driver information in contrast to others that maintained minimal records. Similarly, we saw that some departments, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, had robust protocols to secure keys and checkout vehicles. Other departments however left keys readily accessible and had nominal procedures in place to ensure they knew who was driving a particular vehicle or that the driver had a valid license. We were told that regardless of the protocols in place, employees did not always comply with vehicle checkout procedures.

During our inspection, we learned of an instance in which two employees exchanged their assigned vehicles without informing their fleet coordinator. In another case, we were told that a department motor pool vehicle was missing for approximately four months and never reported to the police. It was later discovered that an employee from another department mistook the vehicle for one of their own and then parked it at a different location.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While attempting to locate vehicles parked at remote locations, we observed the effect of a lack of consistency in record keeping and casual controls over vehicles. During our unannounced site visits conducted after-hours, we discovered that some vehicles were not parked at their designated location. Our inspection revealed that the county allows employees who are assigned vehicles to park them overnight at approximately 161 different locations, many of which are unsecure and situated at the far boundaries of the county. We noted the county has no automated means to determine the location of a vehicle. Absent routine inspections or other methods to account for vehicles parked at remote locations, a vulnerability exists in that county-owned vehicles could be taken home by employees or parked overnight at unauthorized locations.

Recommendation 1

We Recommend the County:

Develop formal guidance detailing department roles and responsibilities in managing fleet vehicles, to include fleet coordinator roles, procedures on securing motor pool vehicles and keys, outlining a process for employees to obtain access to department motor pool vehicles, and controls over vehicles parked at remote locations.

Suitability of Vehicle Operators

We found that many departments had a general lack of awareness regarding their responsibility to provide Risk the driver's license information of any employee approved to operate a county vehicle or regularly drive a personal vehicle while on county business. We also noted that Risk and individual departments were often not following key elements of applicable policy and that policy did not adequately address vulnerabilities.

Finding 2: Risk is not obtaining or reviewing the driving records of employees with driver's licenses from states other than Maryland.

AP 1-4 assigns Risk the responsibility to "obtain, maintain, and on a routine basis review the driving record of the County employees who do or could drive a County vehicle or who regularly drive a personal vehicle while on County business." Policy requires that Risk notify the Director of DGS and the affected department director when Risk is alerted that an employee's driver's license was suspended or revoked, or if the employee was convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs within the preceding 12 months. These infractions may result in the employee being prohibited from operating a county vehicle or using a personal vehicle for county business.

The AP also requires Risk to “subscribe to the States of Maryland, Virginia, and if available, Pennsylvania, Delaware, West Virginia and District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Association (MVA) flagging program with the list of all County employees who do or could drive a County vehicle”. Additionally, policy states that each year Risk must obtain the driving record of any employee approved by their department director to drive a county vehicle or regularly drive a personal vehicle while on county business. Although Risk subscribes to NICUSA² to review and monitor the drivers’ records of employees with Maryland driver’s licenses, they have no process in place to obtain or monitor the driving records of employees who are licensed to drive in other states.

The OIG issued a report in December 2011 titled *Review of the Vehicle Management Practices of the Fleet Management Services Division’s Administrative Vehicle Light Fleet*. One of the findings detailed in this report was “County agencies are not in compliance with certain Administrative Procedures pertaining to employees’ driver’s licenses and employees’ driving records under AP 1-4.” In response to this finding, the Chief Administrative Officer stated that AP 1-4 was being revised and would include a requirement that employees who drive county vehicles and possess an out-of-state driver’s license must provide Risk a copy of their driving record every January.” This requirement however does not appear in the current version of AP 1-4.

During a contract solicitation in 2014, Risk determined that more than 1,000 of the then 13,915 county employees lived outside of Maryland, though they did not know how many of those employees drive county vehicles or regularly use a personal vehicle for county business. Risk attempted to subscribe to the flagging program operated by the Virginia MVA in 2016, but Risk and the Office of the County Attorney determined that the agreement language required by the Commonwealth of Virginia was not acceptable and therefore they abandoned the effort. According to Risk, the District of Columbia and other surrounding states do not offer automated flagging systems and instead require that separate inquiries and associated payments be submitted for each query. Risk told us that they do not have the staffing resources to submit individual requests to multiple states.

Because Risk does not monitor the driving records of employees with out-of-state driver’s licenses, it is unknown how many of these employees are driving county vehicles or regularly using their personal vehicles for county business and may have a suspended driver’s license or serious infraction. This could result in an unlicensed person driving a county vehicle and potentially exposing the county to increased liability.

² NICUSA is an online service that monitors and receives updated drivers’ records from the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA). Access to NICUSA is restricted to authorized users approved by the MDOT MVA. All NICUSA users must comply with the Federal Driver Privacy Protection Act (DPPA).

Recommendation 2

We Recommend the County:

Implement a process to obtain and routinely review the driving record of all employees who are approved to drive county vehicles or regularly drive a personal vehicle while on county business, regardless of which state issued the employee's driver's license.

Finding 3: Departments do not always notify Risk when employees are approved to operate county vehicles or regularly drive a personal vehicle for county business, nor do they provide documentation required by policy.

AP 1-4 directs departments to inform Risk when an employee receives approval to operate a county vehicle or regularly drive a personal vehicle while on county business. Departments must also provide Risk a copy of the approved employee's driver's license for "follow up and routine verification and maintenance of their driving records." However, during our inspection we observed that some fleet coordinators were not familiar with these requirements. We subsequently asked fleet coordinators to confirm if anyone in their department was notifying Risk. Not all fleet coordinators for the 13 sampled departments responded, however, four confirmed that no one in their department had been providing Risk with the required information.

Through our observation, it does not appear Risk has assumed a proactive role to ensure all departments provide information on approved drivers. Risk is beholden to the departments to provide them with the necessary information to properly monitor drivers. Without this information, Risk is unable to meet their obligation to obtain and monitor the driving records of all county employees who are approved to operate county vehicles or regularly drive a personal vehicle while on county business.

Recommendation 3

We Recommend the County:

Provide training for departments and enforce requirements to ensure that all employees approved to drive a county vehicle or to regularly use a personal vehicle for county business are reported to Risk and a copy of the employee's driver's license is submitted.

Finding 4: Risk continues to monitor the driving records of persons no longer employed by the county or who no longer have a need to operate a county vehicle.

Under current policy and guidance, there is no requirement that Risk be notified when an employee terminates their employment with the county or no longer has a need to operate a

county vehicle. Absent receiving notification, Risk has no way of knowing the change in status and therefore continues to needlessly monitor certain driving records. This creates additional work for staff and invokes privacy concerns.

To determine the extent to which employees remained enrolled in the NICUSA monitoring program after separating from the county, we tested 58 randomly selected names from the 3,646 names monitored by the county through the NICUSA program. We found that only 15 of the 58 names in our sample population were current county employees. We confirmed that 20 of the remaining 43 were names of former employees whose driver's records were still being monitored by Risk even though they were no longer employed by the county. We were unable to verify if the remaining 23 individuals in our sample were ever county employees.

There is no apparent official need to continue monitoring the driving records of former employees. The Federal Driver Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2721, provides that a government agency may only obtain personal information related to a motor vehicle record "when carrying out its functions." Additionally, the Maryland General Provisions Article §4-102 states that a political subdivision of the State may only keep information about a person that "is needed by the State, the political subdivision, or the unit to accomplish a governmental purpose that is authorized or required to be accomplished". By not removing former employees from the NICUSA monitoring program, Risk may be inadvertently violating these laws.

Recommendation 4

We Recommend the County:

- (a) Develop policy requiring departments to inform Risk when an approved driver terminates their employment with the county, or no longer has a need to drive a county vehicle or regularly use a personal vehicle for county business.**
- (b) Develop policy to cease the monitoring of drivers' records for persons who terminate their employment with the county, or no longer have a need to drive a county vehicle or regularly use a personal vehicle for county business.**

Finding 5: Risk does not always monitor or act on notifications received from the NICUSA program.

Our inspection established that Risk is not obtaining or reviewing the driving record of all employees who are authorized to drive county vehicles or regularly use a personal vehicle for county business. Additionally, we found that Risk does not always take appropriate action after receiving a notification from NICUSA.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

If a department notifies Risk that an employee with a Maryland driver's license has received approval to operate a county-owned vehicle or regularly use a personal vehicle for county business, Risk enrolls the employee in the NICUSA monitoring program. Thereafter, NICUSA notifies Risk by email whenever there is a change to the enrolled employee's driving record, to include the posting of traffic infractions as well as address and name changes. After receiving a notification of a change to a driver's record, Risk staff must log into NICUSA to determine whether the change could affect the employee's suitability to operate a county vehicle or regularly drive a personal vehicle for county business. If the notification is due to an employee's license being suspended or a conviction for driving under the influence, Risk is required to notify the Director of DGS and the director of the affected department.

During interviews, staff from Risk confirmed that they routinely receive notifications from the NICUSA program and characterized most as the result of an address or name change of an enrolled driver. Staff also reported that January 2018 was the last time they received notification of a suspended license or serious infraction by a county employee. This seemed improbable given that there are 3,646 employee names enrolled in the NICUSA monitoring program.

Given the large number of NICUSA enrollees and the lack of reported infractions, we questioned the accuracy and effectiveness of the monitoring program. We therefore designed two tests to assess the process utilized by Risk to obtain and review the driving records of employees enrolled in the NICUSA monitoring program. Our first test sought to determine how many employees with assigned light-duty vehicles are currently enrolled in the NICUSA monitoring program, as required by policy. The objective of our second test was to determine if any of the county employees currently being monitored recently had their driver's license suspended or revoked.

We obtained a spreadsheet from the FMS that contained the names of all known county employees that have an assigned light-duty administrative vehicle as reported by department fleet coordinators. We observed several instances of duplicate or incomplete names which we excluded from our sample, resulting in a final count of 417 known employees assigned vehicles. We then requested the list of employees Risk monitors through NICUSA. Using data analytic software, we determined that only 144 of the 417 known employees with assigned vehicles are enrolled in the NICUSA monitoring program. As such, it appears Risk does not obtain or review the driving records of almost two thirds of employees with assigned light-duty administrative vehicles.

It is important to note that most employees who operate county vehicles do not have an assigned vehicle and the county has no comprehensive list of all employees that have been approved to operate county vehicles or regularly drive a personal vehicle while on county business. Therefore, we were not able to determine how many of these employees may also have not been enrolled in NICUSA.

To test the assertion by Risk that they have not received notification of a suspended or revoked driver's license since 2018, we contacted representatives from NICUSA for assistance. NICUSA staff queried their system for the period of March 2020 through July 2021 and identified five instances in which notifications were sent to Risk regarding a suspension of a monitored employee's license. We subsequently determined that only one of the five individuals identified was a county employee at the time their license was suspended. We verified that three of the individuals were former county employees and therefore should have been removed from the NICUSA monitoring program. In reviewing the records available to us, we were not able to verify if the fifth individual had ever been employed by the county.

We contacted the supervisor of the current county employee whose license was suspended to determine if they were notified of the suspension. The supervisor stated that Risk did not inform them of the suspension but shared that the employee's duties no longer require them to drive a county vehicle and the employee had not driven a county vehicle for several years.

During a demonstration by Risk staff of how they utilize the NICUSA program, we observed how cumbersome the system interface is to navigate. We also noted that monitoring NICUSA notifications is a collateral duty for the sole Risk employee primarily responsible for the program. Given that the county has 3,646 names enrolled with NICUSA, it is understandable that properly monitoring and acting upon notifications may be an overwhelming task. However, when notifications received from NICUSA are not properly monitored and acted upon, a vulnerability exists in that employees with suspended licenses or serious motor vehicle infractions may continue to operate county-owned vehicles.

Recommendation 5

We Recommend the County:

Implement a process to more effectively monitor NICUSA notifications and take appropriate action when they learn a county employee's driver's license has been suspended or revoked.

OIG COMMENTS TO THE CAO'S RESPONSE

The CAO's response to our report is included in its entirety in Appendix A. The response notes general concurrence with the OIG's recommendations. The CAO's response to recommendation 2 however seems to indicate the possibility that implementing the recommendation may not be probable. The following is provided in response:

Finding 2: Risk is not obtaining or reviewing the driving records of employees with driver's licenses from states other than Maryland.

Recommendation 2: We recommend the county implement a process to obtain and routinely review the driving record of all employees who are approved to drive county vehicles or regularly drive a personal vehicle while on county business, regardless of which state issued the employee's driver's license.

CAO Response: We concur in concept. As noted in the draft report, there are numerous challenges to the availability of such information in a reliable and easily accessible form. As we revise the AP, we will assess the options available to the County to address this recommendation.

OIG Comment to CAO Response: The discussion around our finding details that current policy already requires that Risk annually obtain the out-of-state driving record of any employee approved by their department director to drive a county vehicle or regularly drive a personal vehicle while on county business. We also note that in response to a 2011 OIG report the CAO already provided a reliable and accessible method for obtaining these records when writing that "AP1-4 was being revised and would include a requirement that employees who drive county vehicles and possess an out-of-state driver's license must provide Risk a copy of their driving record every January." Our recommendation is an extension of what the county has already recognized as a necessary step to minimizing the risks associated with permitting employees to drive county vehicles and regularly operate personal vehicles while on county business.

We expect specific details related to the county's actions and plans to implement our recommendations to be included in the Internal Auditor's fiscal year 2022 annual report which, in accordance with County Code §2-25A, is due in the fall of 2022.

APPENDIX A: THE CAO'S RESPONSE

The Chief Administrative Officer provided the following response to our report:



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Marc Elrich
County Executive

Richard S. Madaleno
Chief Administrative Officer

MEMORANDUM

March 22, 2022

TO: Megan Davey Limarzi, Inspector General

FROM: Richard S. Madaleno, Chief Administrative Officer 

SUBJECT: Inspector General Confidential Draft Report: Inspection of Controls Over Light Duty Fleet Vehicles and Driver Suitability (OIG Publication #OIG-22-00X)

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the issues identified in the draft report. As noted in the report, all vehicles in the selected inspection sample were able to be located and accounted for. As we emerge from the challenges associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, we are already taking steps to strengthen our controls and processes, including re-instituting regular fleet coordinator meetings, and updating the current Administrative Procedure (AP) 1-4, *Assignment and Use of County Vehicles and Use of Personal Vehicles While on County Business*. We will use this AP update as an opportunity to re-examine existing processes and policies and make the necessary changes to improve oversight and reporting by departments, as well as to enhance central enforcement and monitoring. We are committed to ensuring that County employees operate vehicles safely and in accordance with County policies.

Recommendation 1: We recommend the County develop formal guidance detailing department roles and responsibilities in managing fleet vehicles, to include fleet coordinator roles, procedures on securing motor pool vehicles and keys, outlining a process for employees to obtain access to department motor pool vehicles, and controls over vehicles parked at remote locations.

CAO Response: We concur. In conjunction with updating the AP, we will be developing supplemental department guidance to address these issues. This will be accomplished in the form of a Fleet Coordinators Handbook that will identify the duties outlined in AP 1-4 as well as outline monitoring procedures and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the department fleet coordinator.

Recommendation 2: We recommend the County implement a process to obtain and routinely review the driving record of all employees who are approved to drive county vehicles or regularly drive a personal vehicle while on county business, regardless of which state issued the employee's driver license.

101 Monroe Street • Rockville, Maryland 20850
240-777-2500 • 240-777-2544 TTY • 240-777-2518 FAX
www.montgomerycountymd.gov

Inspector General Confidential Draft Report: Inspection of Controls Over Light Duty Fleet Vehicles and Driver Suitability (OIG Publication #OIG-22-00X)

March 24, 2022

Page 2 of 2

CAO Response: We concur in concept. As noted in the draft report, there are numerous challenges to the availability of such information in a reliable and easily accessible form. As we revise the AP, we will assess the options available to the County to address this recommendation.

Recommendation 3: We recommend the County provide training for departments and enforce requirements to ensure that all employees approved to drive a county vehicle or to regularly use a personal vehicle for county business are reported to Risk and a copy of the employee's driver's license is submitted.

CAO Response: We concur. We recognize that enhanced training of department fleet coordinators is a critical component of an effective fleet management program given the decentralized nature of the program's administration, and the reliance on departments for compliance. We will be developing an ongoing training program for fleet coordinators, in conjunction with the regular fleet coordinator meetings, and will be requiring participation by fleet coordinators as part of this role.

Recommendation 4: We recommend the County

- (a) Develop policy requiring departments to inform Risk when an approved driver terminates their employment with the county, or no longer has a need to drive a county vehicle or regularly use a personal vehicle for county business.
- (b) Develop policy to cease the monitoring of drivers' records for persons who terminate their employment with the county, or no longer have a need to drive a county vehicle or regularly use a personal vehicle for county business.

CAO Response: We concur. These issues will be addressed as part of the process we have already begin to review and update the AP.

Recommendation 5: We recommend the County implement a process to more effectively monitor NICUSA notifications and take appropriate action when they learn a county employee's driver license has been suspended or revoked.

CAO Response: We concur. As part of the process to review and update the AP, we will address this issue, including exploring requiring a more direct role by department fleet coordinators in the NICUSA monitoring process.

Thank you for bringing these matters to our attention.

cc: Fariba Kassiri, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Office of the County Executive
David Dise, Director, Department of General Services
Michael Coveyou, Director, Department of Finance
Bill Broglie, Internal Audit Manager, Office of the County Executive