FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Statement of Ranking Member Bennie G. Thompson

Driving Away with Taxpayer Dollars: DHS’s Failure to Effectively Manage the FPS Vehicle Fleet

December 3, 2015 (Washington) – Today, Committee on Homeland Security Ranking Member Bennie G. Thompson (D-MS) delivered the following prepared remarks for the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency hearing entitled “Driving Away with Taxpayer Dollars: DHS’s Failure to Effectively Manage the FPS Vehicle Fleet”:

“After the 1995 domestic terrorist attacks on the Alfred P. Murrah Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, there was broad recognition that Federal buildings, which are symbols of our democracy, must be protected against terrorist attacks while remaining accessible to citizens. In recent years, the increasing number of terrorist plots against diverse U.S. government facilities in Illinois, Washington State, and New York City, as well as attacks on government buildings in other western democracies, such as Canada and Norway, has brought into focus the need to strengthen U.S. Federal building security.

Unfortunately, the primary agency responsible for providing such security—the Federal Protective Service—has a range of longstanding administrative challenges that, to my mind, raise questions about its ability to provide adequate Federal building security. During my time on this Committee, I have recognized the critical mission of the Federal Protective Service and have ensured that the Committee has developed oversight and legislative mechanisms, such as the “Federal Protective Service Improvement and Accountability Act of 2015,” which is also cosponsored by the Ranking Member of this Subcommittee, to address the some of the challenges FPS faces.

At the center of today’s hearing is another challenge at FPS—the management of the law enforcement agency’s vehicle fleet. FPS currently has a fleet of 1,100 vehicles at a cost of 10.7 million dollars. These vehicles are provided to FPS to allow the officers and investigators to store and carry equipment and other necessary protective gear.

This October, the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General found that FPS is not managing its vehicle fleet effectively. According to the IG, FPS has too many vehicles, they pay too much for the vehicles they lease, and FPS officers within the National Capital Region use their vehicles to commute without proper justification. The IG concluded that DHS does not sufficiently oversee FPS fleet management to ensure FPS complies with all Federal and departmental guidelines.

It is very disappointing to know that in certain instances, neither FPS nor DHS were keeping proper records of vehicle data such as mileage reports. Unfortunately, this is something we have heard too many times from the Department. There is money being spent, resources being allocated, and needs purportedly being met, but little to no record keeping being in place. Director Patterson and Mr. Chaleki, when there is no record of where funds are going, it increases the likelihood of questions of waste, fraud, and abuse.

While I understand that FPS and DHS have both concurred with the recommendations of the Inspector General, I would like to hear more from both of you about how these recommendations are being implemented.
Furthermore, since October 2014, when terrorists attacked government sites in Canada, FPS has been operating at an enhanced level, at the direction of DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson. FPS also increased its operations to protect federal buildings during the trial of the Boston Marathon Bomber and during the recent Papal visit to the United States.

I am also curious to know the impact of the increased tempo FPS’s ability to address the fleet management issues raised in the Inspector General’s report. Each time FPS is directed to heighten security operations, new costs are incurred. FPS has no choice but to absorb those costs, often, I suspect, at the expense of addressing longstanding administrative challenges, including vehicle fleet management.

I look forward to hearing from the witnesses today on how FPS can move forward in this heightened threat environment and still address lapses in oversight and accountability.”
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