STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
INSPECTION CHECKLIST
Chapter 6
Command Overtime

Command: Special Services Unit	Division: Inland Division	Number: 805
Evaluated by: Eric Robles, Sergeant/Joette Wilson, AGPA		Date: 12/15/2009
Assisted by: Francine Mena, Office Technician/Anita Molina, Office Technician		Date: 12/15/2009

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead Inspector's Signature: Joette Wilson	
☒ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection			
Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Follow-up Inspection	Commander's Signature: [signature] ASPT	Date: 12/30/09
For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6, HPM 40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and 10, HPM 10.5, Chapter 2, and HPM 10.3, Chapters 24 and 28.			

Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation.

1. Is the hiring company/agency for reimbursable overtime being held responsible for paying a minimum of four hours of overtime per CHP uniformed employee, regardless of length of service/detail?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
2. Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellation notification is made 24 hours or less prior to the scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellation?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
3. Are reimbursable special project codes being used for all overtime associated with reimbursable special projects?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks: Even though special project codes are being used for all overtime associated with reimbursable special projects - some of the job duties related to the reimbursable special project codes are not within the scope of the grant.
4. Is the commander ensuring nonuniformed personnel overtime hours are not reflected on the Report of Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Special Projects?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
5. Is the commander ensuring non-reimbursable overtime is not being claimed for an employee, other than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacation or compensated time off for hours worked during their regular work shift time?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
6. Is "RDO" being written in the "Notes" section of the CHP 415, Daly Field Record, for overtime worked on	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Overtime

a regular day off?				
7. Is there a CHP 90, Report of Court Appearance - Civil Action, completed for each officer or sergeant when overtime is associated for civil court?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
8. Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
9. Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command level for the time period audited.
11. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
12. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
13. Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks: Ninety-two employees are assigned to Special Services. Of those 92 employees 34 have CTO balances in the mid 300s to the high 400's. Managers and supervisors continually monitor CTO balances and discuss with the employees the importance of remaining within established CTO guidelines and when appropriate suggest that CTO be used in lieu of other credits when requesting time off.
14. Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
16. Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
17. Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks: The MARs are not maintained by Special Services. Since Special Services is part of the Division office MARs are signed by the Division Commander's designee and maintained by the Division clerical office for three years as required.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
INSPECTION CHECKLIST
Chapter 6
Command Grant Management

Command: Special Services Unit	Division: Inland Division	Number: 805
Evaluated by: Joette Wilson, AGPA/Eric Robles, Sergeant		Date: 12/15/2009
Assisted by: Francine Mena, Office Technician/Anita Molina, Office Technician		Date: 12/15/2009

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead Inspector's Signature:	
☒ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection			
Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Follow-up Inspection	Commander's Signature: CAPT	Date: 12/30/09
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6			

Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation.

1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.
4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
5. Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.
6. Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Grant Management

7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.
8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks:
9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of $5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
16. Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. • Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Grant Management

18. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.
19. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.
20. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	☐ Yes	☒ No	☐ N/A	Remarks: Street Racing Grant funds were not used appropriately.
21. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.
22. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Remarks: No occurrences at Command Level.
Questions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Management Unit				
23. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
24. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
25. Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
26. Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Special Services	Division: Inland Division	Chapter: 6
Inspected by: Eric Robles, Sergeant/Joette Wilson, AGPA		Date: 12/15/2009

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required.

TYPE OF INSPECTION ☒ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level	Total hours expended on the inspection: 2 Hours	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes ☒ No	Forward to: Assistant Commissioner, Field Office of Inspections Due Date: 01/28/2009	

Chapter Inspection:

Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices:

Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement:

Inspector's Findings:

Reimbursable special project codes are being used for all overtime associated with reimbursable special projects, but an audit of several of the CHP 415s for investigative services officers indicated that some of the job duties related to one of the special project codes were not within the scope of the grant. This was brought to the attention of the Special Services managers and they confirmed that in the future this would not reoccur.

Ninety-two employees are assigned to the Special Services command. Of those ninety-two employees thirty-four have CTO balances in the mid 300s to the high 400s. Managers and supervisors continually monitor CTO balances and discuss with the employees the importance of remaining within established CTO guidelines and when appropriate suggest that CTO be used in lieu of other credits when requesting time off.

The MARs are not maintained by the Special Services command. Since Special Services is a command within the Division office MARs are signed by the Division Commander's designee and maintained by the Division clerical office for three years as required.

Command: Special Services	Division: Inland Division	Chapter: 6
Inspected by: Eric Robles, Sergeant/Joette Wilson, AGPA		Date: 12/15/2009

A random sampling of the uniformed CHP 90's and correlating CHP 415's revealed several CHP 415's did not reflect the appropriate documentation for each civil court appearance. After discussing the review procedures with the Area Commander it was noted most of the time the CHP 90 and CHP 415 ere reviewed separately. Consequently, there is no means to ensure the overtime claimed on the CHP 90 and the CHP 415 are the same.

A review of grant management overtime revealed Street Racing funds were inappropriately used. Uniformed personnel utilized grant overtime to conduct business unrelated to the grant and worked only during weekday morning/early afternoon hours.

Commander's Response: ☒ Concur or ☐ Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

The Area Commander was made aware of the discrepancies between the CHP 90's and the correlating CHP 415's. It was recommended the Area establish procedures for the submission of the CHP 90 and CHP 415 to supervisors for review.

The Area Commander was made aware of the discrepancies with the utilization of grant overtime funding.