
Audit Report

Maryland Department of Labor
Division of Labor and Industry

October 2026



OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AUDITS
DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES
MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee

Senator Shelly L. Hettleman (Senate Chair)
Senator Benjamin T. Brooks, Sr.
Senator Paul D. Corderman
Senator Katie Fry Hester
Senator Cheryl C. Kagan
Senator Clarence K. Lam, M.D.
Senator Cory V. McCray
Senator Justin D. Ready
Senator Bryan W. Simonaire
Senator Alonzo T. Washington

Delegate Jared Solomon (House Chair)
Delegate Steven J. Arentz
Delegate Andrea Fletcher Harrison
Delegate Steven C. Johnson
Delegate Mary A. Lehman
Delegate David H. Moon, Esq.
Delegate Julie Palakovich Carr
Delegate Emily K. Shetty, Esq.
Delegate Stephanie M. Smith, Esq.
Delegate Ryan S. Spiegel, Esq.

To Obtain Further Information

Office of Legislative Audits
The Warehouse at Camden Yards
351 West Camden Street, Suite 400
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Phone: 410-946-5900
Maryland Relay: 711
TTY: 410-946-5401 · 301-970-5401
E-mail: webmaster@ola.maryland.gov
Website: ola.maryland.gov

To Report Fraud

The Office of Legislative Audits operates a Fraud Hotline to report fraud, waste, or abuse involving State of Maryland government resources. Reports of fraud, waste, or abuse may be communicated anonymously by a toll-free call to 1-877-FRAUD-11, by mail to the Fraud Hotline, c/o Office of Legislative Audits, or through the Office's website.

Nondiscrimination Statement

The Department of Legislative Services does not discriminate on the basis of age, ancestry, color, creed, marital status, national origin, race, religion, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, or disability in the admission or access to its programs, services, or activities. The Department's Information Officer has been designated to coordinate compliance with the nondiscrimination requirements contained in Section 35.107 of the United States Department of Justice Regulations. Requests for assistance should be directed to the Information Officer at 410-946-5400 or 410-970-5400.

Victoria L. Gruber
Executive Director

Brian S. Tanen, CPA, CFE
Legislative Auditor

DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AUDITS
MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

October 30, 2026

Senator Shelly L. Hettleman, Senate Chair, Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee
Delegate Jared Solomon, House Chair, Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee
Members of Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee
Annapolis, Maryland

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have conducted a fiscal compliance audit of the Maryland Department of Labor (MDL) – Division of Labor and Industry (DLI) for the period beginning February 16, 2022 to March 31, 2026. DLI is responsible for the safety inspections of boilers, pressure vessels, elevators, amusement rides, and railroads. It also enforces certain protective labor laws and administers the Maryland Occupational Safety and Health Act.

Our audit disclosed that DLI did not take sufficient corrective action when the vendor implementing the automated elevator certification and inspection system did not provide critical functionality required by the contract. For example, the system could not fully process citations due to errors and did not have user roles to enable segregation of duties, conditions which were not resolved until calendar year 2024, even though the contract required this functionality in calendar year 2021. Furthermore, DLI allowed the vendor to replace the system without following State procurement regulations and without ensuring the new system functioned as intended.

Our audit also disclosed that DLI did not always issue citations or assess penalties when annual inspections were not conducted, as required by its policy. As of April 2026, DLI records showed 3,490 elevators had been operating for 60 days or more without a valid certification of inspection. Our test of 24 of these elevators identified 20 which had not been assessed penalties totaling $249,000 because they had not been inspected for between 1.5 to 23 years. Additionally, DLI did not ensure violations identified were corrected timely and did not follow up with third-party inspectors when missed violations were identified.

MDL's response to this audit, on behalf of DLI, is included as an appendix to this report. We have edited MDL's response to remove a reference to vendor names or products, as allowed by our policy. In accordance with State law, we have reviewed the response and, while MDL generally agrees with the recommendations in this report, we identified certain instances in which statements in the response disagree or appear to be inconsistent with a report finding and recommendation. In each instance we reviewed and reassessed our audit documentation, and reaffirmed the validity of our finding. In accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards, we have included "auditor's comments" within MDL's response to explain our position. We will advise the Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee of any outstanding issues that we cannot resolve with MDL.

We wish to acknowledge the cooperation extended to us during the audit by DLI.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian S. Tanen

Brian S. Tanen, CPA, CFE
Legislative Auditor

Table of Contents

Background Information 4

Agency Responsibilities 4
Status of Findings From Preceding Audit Report 5

Findings and Recommendations 6

Elevator Certification and Inspection

Finding 1 – The Maryland Department of Labor (MDL) Division of Labor and Industry (DLI) did not take sufficient corrective action when the vendor implementing the automated elevator certification and inspection system did not provide certain critical functionality required by the contract and allowed the vendor to replace the system without following State procurement regulations and without ensuring the new system functioned as intended. 6

Finding 2 – DLI did not always issue citations or assess penalties when annual inspections were not conducted as required by its policy, did not ensure violations identified were corrected timely, and did not follow up with third-party inspectors when DLI identified possible missed violations. 8

Audit Scope, Objectives, and Methodology 11

Exhibit 1 – Listing of Most Recent Office of Legislative Audits Fiscal Compliance Audits of MDL Units as of September 2026 14

Agency Response Appendix

Background Information

Agency Responsibilities

The Division of Labor and Industry (DLI) is a separate unit within the Maryland Department of Labor. The mission of DLI is to protect and promote the health, safety, and employment rights of Maryland citizens. Specifically, DLI administers State laws that deal with employment issues, work-related safety and health issues, and prevailing wages, as well as safety inspections of amusement rides, boilers and pressure vessels, elevators, and railroads. According to the State's records, DLI's expenditures for fiscal year 2025 totaled approximately $24.9 million (See Figure 1).

Figure 1
DLI Positions, Expenditures, and Funding Sources

Full Time Equivalent Positions as of June 30, 2025	
	Positions
Filled	189
Vacant	18
Total	**207**

Fiscal Year 2025 Expenditures	
	Expenditures
Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits	$21,593,483
Technical and Special Fees	120,723
Operating Expenses	3,185,507
Total	**$24,899,713**

Fiscal Year 2025 Funding Sources	
	Funding
General Fund	$ 3,674,168
Special Fund	14,300,647
Federal Fund	6,924,898
Total	**$24,899,713**

Source: State financial and personnel records

Status of Findings From Preceding Audit Report

Our audit included a review to determine the status of the finding contained in our preceding audit report dated January 6, 2023. See Figure 2 for results of our review.

Figure 2
Status of Preceding Findings

Preceding Finding	Finding Description	Implementation Status
Finding 1	DLI had not established adequate accountability and control over certain collections.	Not repeated

Findings and Recommendations

Elevator Certification and Inspection

The Maryland Department of Labor (MDL) Division of Labor and Industry (DLI) is responsible for the certification and inspection of elevators in the State. Each new elevator is required to be inspected by a DLI inspector prior to certification and must be inspected annually by an inspector hired by the elevator owner.

In December 2020, the MDL awarded a five-year contract for a vendor to implement and maintain an automated system to register third-party inspectors, monitor and schedule inspections, issue certificates, process citations for violations, and issue and account for invoices and payments. The contract covered the period from December 17, 2020 through December 16, 2025 with three one-year renewal options. The total contract value, including option years totaled approximately $1.2 million, with $380,000 for implementation of the database and $820,000 for maintenance and support. As of April 2026, DLI paid the vendor $815,600 including all the implementation costs and ongoing maintenance and support.

Finding 1
DLI did not take sufficient corrective action when the vendor implementing the automated elevator certification and inspection system did not provide certain critical functionality required by the contract and allowed the vendor to replace the system without following State procurement regulations and without ensuring the new system functioned as intended.

Analysis
DLI did not take sufficient corrective action when the vendor implementing the automated elevator certification and inspection system did not provide certain critical functionality required by the contract and allowed the vendor to replace the system without following State procurement regulations and without ensuring the new system functioned as intended. Our review disclosed the following conditions:

Certain Required Functionality Not Provided by Vendor
DLI did not take corrective action when the vendor did not provide certain required critical system functionality at all or significantly late despite being paid in full. For example, the contract provided that the system would allow third-party inspector reports to be uploaded by February 2021. However, as of September 3, 2026, the system did not have this functionality resulting in these reports being emailed and manually entered into the system by DLI employees.

In addition, the system was supposed to have the ability to issue citations and establish user roles by calendar year 2021. However, the citation feature was not fully functional at this time since it initially experienced numerous processing errors. Corrections to the citation functionality and user access roles were not implemented until calendar year 2024.

These delays resulted in a backlog of citations, which DLI could not readily quantify, and inhibited DLI's ability to adequately segregate duties over issuing elevator certifications and inspections. According to DLI records, DLI ultimately paid the vendor the entire implementation fee in addition to maintenance and support fees. As of September 3, 2026, DLI has not attempted to recover any of these costs or assess damages on the vendor for failing to implement the system in accordance with the contract.

DLI Did Not Follow State Procurement Regulations

DLI allowed the vendor to replace the system specified in the contract with another system in October 2024 without a new procurement or formal contract modification and without Board of Public Works (BPW) approval. In addition, DLI did not ensure the system was functioning as intended. In this regard, as of September 3, 2026, the new system also did not have certain critical functionality required by the contract. For example, the new system still did not have the aforementioned functionality to upload third-party inspector reports. In addition, DLI could not document that it verified the data was accurately and completely migrated to the new automated system, and our review identified discrepancies between the two systems. For example, payments in the original system totaling approximately $11 million were improperly transferred to the new system as non-payment credits.[1]

State regulations require contract modifications that materially change the scope of the contract to obtain BPW approval. BPW guidance also requires that any proposed modification, notwithstanding the value of the modification, that would materially change the scope of a contract previously approved by the BPW must be brought to the BPW for approval. We were advised by the procurement advisor to the BPW that, in their opinion, "a vendor later providing a different system than what was proposed by that vendor and agreed to by the State in the original procurement contract award would be a change to that procurement contract that should have been done via a contract modification, and that change would likely constitute a 'material change' to the contract, requiring BPW approval."

[1] Non-payment credits are reductions made by DLI to penalties assessed on elevator owners rather than actual payments made by elevator owners.

Recommendation 1
We recommend that DLI, in conjunction with MDL,

a. ensure that in the future, critical functionality required by the contract is received prior to payment;
b. in consultation with legal counsel, perform a comprehensive review to identify amounts to be recovered from the vendor and pursue recovery of these amounts, to the extent practical;
c. obtain retroactive BPW approval for a contract modification for the above contract or perform a competitive procurement in accordance with State regulations; and
d. verify that information was accurately and completely migrated when system changes occurred and correct any errors, including those noted above.

Finding 2
DLI did not always issue citations or assess penalties when annual inspections were not conducted as required by its policy, did not ensure violations identified were corrected timely, and did not follow up with third-party inspectors when DLI identified possible missed violations.

Analysis
DLI did not always issue citations or assess penalties when annual inspections were not conducted as required by its policy, did not ensure violations identified were corrected timely, and did not follow up with third-party inspectors when DLI identified possible missed violations. Our review disclosed the following conditions:

- DLI did not always issue citations or assess penalties when annual inspections were not conducted as required by its policy. According to DLI records, as of April 21, 2026, there were 3,490 elevators operating for more than 60 days without a valid certificate of inspection. Our test of 24 of these elevators with delinquent inspections[2] disclosed that DLI did not issue the required citations or assess penalties totaling $249,000[3] for 20 elevators that had not been inspected for between 1.5 years and 23 years. For example, one elevator that has been out of compliance since November 2019 was not assessed $15,000 in penalties in accordance with DLI policy during our audit period. DLI was unaware of the unissued citations and penalties until we brought this matter to

[2] We selected test items based on significance and risk of time outstanding related to delinquent inspections.
[3] This is based on penalties that should have been assessed during calendar years 2022 through 2026 as of March 2026.

their attention and advised that the aforementioned system deficiencies may have contributed to these going undetected.

- DLI did not ensure elevators were reinspected timely to ensure violations identified during inspections were corrected. State law requires elevators to be reinspected when violations are noted during an inspection. DLI withholds the elevator's certificate and occasionally issues citations and assesses penalties until the issues are corrected. According to DLI records, during our audit period, approximately 49,600 of the 156,900 (31.6 percent) inspections performed identified at least one violation. Our test of 12 of these inspections[4] that identified a violation, disclosed that a reinspection was not conducted on 4 elevators for between 4 and 11 months after the inspection to ensure the violations were corrected. For example, 1 inspection identified a violation that could result in people being trapped in the elevator but was not reinspected for approximately 11 months.

  DLI management stated that it did not believe it is responsible for ensuring that elevators with violations are reinspected timely because these reinspections are the elevators' owners' responsibility. However, in the interest of public safety, we believe that since DLI is responsible for the overall inspection of elevators, it is responsible for ensuring that elevators with violations are reinspected timely.

- DLI did not follow up with third-party inspectors when its monitoring efforts identified possible issues with their inspections. State law requires DLI to monitor third-party inspectors. On a test basis, DLI employees inspect elevators to ensure the accuracy and validity of the third-party inspections. We arbitrarily tested 10 of these inspections during calendar years 2025 and 2026 (through March 2026). Our test disclosed that DLI did not follow up with the third-party inspectors for significant safety violations (such as a safety device that restricted doors from opening between floors not working) identified with 3 elevators that were not identified by the third-party inspector. Rather, DLI just noted the violations on their system without any follow-up with the third-party inspector.

  DLI management stated that it does not follow up with the third-party inspectors unless it is able to establish that the violation existed at the time of the third-party inspection. Given that the aforementioned process was established by DLI to monitor the third-party inspectors as required by State law, DLI should establish procedures to follow up with the third-party

[4] We selected test items from initial inspections performed by both third-party inspectors and State inspectors.

inspectors (such as tracking patterns of issues identified during DLI's monitoring which could be indicative of inadequate third-party inspections).

Recommendation 2

We recommend that DLI

a. issue citations and assess penalties as required by its policy, including in the cases noted above, to ensure that inspections are obtained timely;

b. ensure timely reinspection of elevators to ensure violations identified during inspections are corrected; and

c. establish procedures and follow up with third-party inspectors when it identifies violations that were missed, including those noted above.

Audit Scope, Objectives, and Methodology

We have conducted a fiscal compliance audit of the Maryland Department of Labor (MDL) – Division of Labor and Industry (DLI) for the period beginning February 16, 2022 and ending March 31, 2026. The audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

As prescribed by the State Government Article, Section 2-1221 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, the objectives of this audit were to examine DLI's financial transactions, records, and internal control, and to evaluate its compliance with applicable State laws, rules, and regulations.

In planning and conducting our audit, we focused on the major financial-related areas of operations based on assessments of significance and risk. The areas addressed by the audit included accounts receivable, cash receipts, and DLI's monitoring of compliance with certain laws pertaining to safety inspections for elevators. We also determined the status of the finding contained in our preceding audit report.

Our audit did not include certain support services provided to DLI by the MDL - Office of the Secretary. These support services (such as procurement, payroll, processing of invoices, maintenance of accounting records, and related fiscal functions) are included in the scope of our audit of the Office of the Secretary.

Our assessment of internal controls was based on agency procedures and controls in place at the time of our fieldwork. Our tests of transactions and other auditing procedures were generally focused on the transactions occurring during our audit period of February 16, 2022 to March 31, 2026, but may include transactions before or after this period as we considered necessary to achieve our audit objectives.

To accomplish our audit objectives, our audit procedures included inquiries of appropriate personnel, inspections of documents and records, tests of transactions, and to the extent practicable, observations of DLI's operations. Generally, transactions were selected for testing based on auditor judgment, which primarily considers risk, the timing or dollar amount of the transaction, or the significance of the transaction to the area of operation reviewed. As a matter of course, we do

not normally use sampling in our tests, so unless otherwise specifically indicated, neither statistical nor non-statistical audit sampling was used to select the transactions tested. Therefore, unless sampling is specifically indicated in a finding, the results from any tests conducted or disclosed by us cannot be used to project those results to the entire population from which the test items were selected.

We also performed various data extracts of pertinent information from the State's Financial Management Information System (such as revenue and expenditure data). The extracts are performed as part of ongoing internal processes established by the Office of Legislative Audits and were subject to various tests to determine data reliability. We determined that the data extracted from this source was sufficiently reliable for the purposes the data were used during this audit.

We also extracted data from DLI's automated systems used for monitoring safety inspections for the purpose of testing compliance with State laws and regulations. We performed various tests of the relevant data and determined that the data were sufficiently reliable for the purposes the data were used during the audit. Finally, we performed other auditing procedures that we considered necessary to achieve our audit objectives. The reliability of data used in this report for background or informational purposes was not assessed.

DLI's management is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control. Internal control is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance that objectives pertaining to the reliability of financial records; effectiveness and efficiency of operations, including safeguarding of assets; and compliance with applicable laws, rules, and regulations are achieved. As provided in *Government Auditing Standards*, there are five components of internal control: control environment, risk assessment, control activities, information and communication, and monitoring. Each of the five components, when significant to the audit objectives, and as applicable to DLI, were considered by us during the course of this audit.

Because of inherent limitations in internal control, errors or fraud may nevertheless occur and not be detected. Also, projections of any evaluation of internal control to future periods are subject to the risk that conditions may change or compliance with policies and procedures may deteriorate.

Our reports are designed to assist the Maryland General Assembly in exercising its legislative oversight function and to provide constructive recommendations for improving State operations. As a result, our reports generally do not address activities we reviewed that are functioning properly.

This report includes findings relating to conditions that we consider to be significant deficiencies in the design or operation of internal control that could adversely affect DLI's ability to operate effectively and efficiently, and/or comply with applicable laws, rules, and regulations. Our report also includes findings regarding significant instances of noncompliance with applicable laws, rules, or regulations. Other less significant findings were communicated to DLI that did not warrant inclusion in this report.

The response from MDL, on behalf of DLI, to our findings and recommendations is included as an appendix to this report. As prescribed in the State Government Article, Section 2-1224 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, we will advise MDL regarding the results of our review of its response.

Exhibit 1
Listing of Most Recent Office of Legislative Audits
Fiscal Compliance Audits of Maryland Department of Labor (MDL) Units
As of September 2026

	Name of Audit	Areas Covered	Most Recent Report Date
1	Division of Racing (DOR)	• DOR cash receipts • Racing funds • Distribution of video lottery terminal funds • Licensing • Certain licensee (racetrack) requirements regarding the reporting and distribution of pari-mutuel wagering revenue	04/10/2026
2	Division of Unemployment Insurance (DUI) Part II Unemployment Benefits	• Benefit payments • Claims • Third-party processing • Information system security and control	01/06/2026
3	Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing (DOPL)	• DOPL cash receipts • Licensing • Guaranty funds	07/21/2025
4	Office of the Secretary, Division of Administration, Division of Workforce Development and Adult Learning	• Cash receipts • Payroll • Federal Funds • Procurement and disbursement activities • Grants • Information systems security and control	04/16/2025
5	DUI Part I Unemployment Insurance Tax Contributions	• Employer unemployment contributions • Reimbursements from government agencies and certain non-profit organizations • Accounts receivable • Information systems security and control • Grants	04/08/2025
6	Office of Financial Regulation	• Consumer credit and oversight of financial institutions • Examinations and licensing	09/20/2024

APPENDIX

Maryland
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
100 S. Charles Street Tower 1, 9th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21201
Portia Wu, Secretary

October 20, 2026

Brian S. Tanen, CPA, CFE
Legislative Auditor
Office of Legislative Audits
The Warehouse at Camden Yards
351 West Camden Street, Suite 400
Baltimore, MD 21201

Dear Mr. Tanen:

The Maryland Department of Labor received your October 2, 2026 correspondence transmitting the Office of Legislative Audits' draft audit report.

Enclosed is the Agency Response Form (ARF) addressing the draft audit report for the Maryland Department of Labor - *Division of Labor and Industry* for the period covering November 16, 2020, to January 15, 2025.

Thank you for your continued partnership. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact our office or the Maryland Division of Labor and Industry.

Sincerely,



Portia Wu
Secretary of Labor

Cc: Devki Virk, Commissioner
Division of Labor and Industry

Maryland Department of Labor
Division of Labor and Industry

Agency Response Form

Elevator Certification and Inspection

Finding 1
DLI did not take sufficient corrective action when the vendor implementing the automated elevator certification and inspection system did not provide certain critical functionality required by the contract and allowed the vendor to replace the system without following State procurement regulations and without ensuring the new system functioned as intended.

We recommend that DLI, in conjunction with MDL,

a. ensure that in the future, critical functionality required by the contract is received prior to payment;
b. in consultation with legal counsel, perform a comprehensive review to identify amounts to be recovered from the vendor and pursue recovery of these amounts, to the extent practical;
c. obtain retroactive BPW approval for a contract modification for the above contract or perform a competitive procurement in accordance with State regulations; and
d. verify that information was accurately and completely migrated when system changes occurred and correct any errors, including those noted above.

Agency Response	
Analysis	**Partially Inaccurate**
Please provide additional comments as deemed necessary.	DLI wishes to add important context and clarification to several of the points made by OLA in the analysis of this finding: ● **The citation module came online in February 2022 and was used to issue citations throughout the audit period**. The report inaccurately asserts that the system "could not fully process citations" until calendar year 2024. Although DLI acknowledges that the system did not perform efficiently (motivating the transition to the replacement automated elevator certification and inspection system), the Safety Inspection Unit nonetheless was able to issue 7,291 citations in 2022, 8,880 citations in 2023, and 6,244 citations in 2024, despite the difficulties experienced.

Maryland Department of Labor
Division of Labor and Industry

Agency Response Form

	• Further, **the discrepancies that occurred in the data migration—specifically, the reflection in the automated elevator certification and inspection system of citation reduction amounts as "non payment credits" (see p. 7 and note 1)—resulted in no loss to State revenue.** Those reductions had been properly issued under the Unit's policies prior to the migration, and the amounts owed to the State were either paid or duly referred to the Central Collections Unit. • It is also worth noting that the transition of the elevator database platform to a new platform offered by the same vendor did not result in any changes to the scope of work or the amount of money spent by the Department of Labor on the contract, as the vendor worked closely with the agency to deliver a more efficient platform with better functionality to monitor inspection processes for elevators.		
Recommendation 1a	Agree	**Estimated Completion Date:**	12/1/2026
Please provide details of corrective action or explain disagreement.	The Unit has identified only one remaining deliverable from the technical proposal: the implementation of an interface to enable third-party qualified elevator inspectors to input their reports directly into the automated elevator certification and inspection system. This item is currently under development, with delivery expected prior to December 1.		
Recommendation 1b	Agree	**Estimated Completion Date:**	11/1/2026
Please provide details of corrective action or explain disagreement.	The Unit is consulting with counsel to evaluate the potential for recovery and to assess the legal, financial, and practical considerations associated with pursuing such recovery.		
Recommendation 1c	Agree	**Estimated Completion Date:**	3/1/2027
Please provide details of corrective action or explain disagreement.	As noted above, DLI's platform transition did not change the scope of work provided by the vendor to the agency, nor did it result in any additional cost to the State. Nevertheless, we will seek retroactive approval from BPW. We are currently consulting with the Department of Labor's Office of Procurement and Attorney General's office to determine the steps necessary to do so.		
	Agree	**Estimated Completion Date:**	12/1/2026

Maryland Department of Labor
Division of Labor and Industry

Agency Response Form

Please provide details of corrective action or explain disagreement.	The Unit will work with the vendor to conduct a comprehensive validation of the accuracy of the migrated data and will correct any discrepancies identified.

Auditor's Comment: DLI notes that our analysis is partially factually inaccurate, however, the ensuing comments do not dispute the factual accuracy of the finding. Specifically, DLI's response notes that the report inaccurately asserts that the system "could not fully process citations" until calendar year 2024. However, as noted in the analysis, this feature experienced numerous processing errors that resulted in a backlog of citations and were not corrected until calendar year 2024. DLI's response acknowledges this when it subsequently noted that the system did not perform efficiently.

DLI's response also notes that the discrepancies that occurred in the data migrations, referenced in the analysis, did not result in a loss of State revenue. However, this discrepancy was included as an example because DLI could not document that it verified the data was accurately and completely migrated. Accordingly, we continue to believe our finding is factually accurate.

Maryland Department of Labor
Division of Labor and Industry

Agency Response Form

Finding 2
DLI did not always issue citations or assess penalties when annual inspections were not conducted as required by its policy, did not ensure violations identified were corrected timely, and did not follow up with third-party inspectors when DLI identified possible missed violations.

We recommend that DLI

a. issue citations and assess penalties as required by its policy, including in the cases noted above, to ensure that inspections are obtained timely;
b. ensure timely reinspection of elevators to ensure violations identified during inspections are corrected; and
c. establish procedures and follow up with third-party inspectors when it identifies violations that were missed, including those noted above.

Agency Response	
Analysis	
Please provide additional comments as deemed necessary.	The report lacks essential information regarding DLI's citation data and procedures for cases where a third-party inspector identifies a violation. For example: ● OLA's finding that DLI "did not always issue citations or assess penalties when annual inspections were not conducted" (p. 8) is based on its review of 24 units with expired certificates that did not receive a citation. This selection comprises less than one percent of such units (3,490), and is not representative of that group. In the overwhelming majority of cases, DLI appropriately cited units with expired certificates, issuing 29,677 citations over the four-year period. ● Although the report contends that DLI "did not ensure violations identified" during third-party inspections were corrected timely (p. 9), responsibility for scheduling inspection and for ensuring that elevator units pass inspection rests with the owner of the unit (see Public Safety Article, Section 12-809). DLI appropriately used its tools and authorities to obtain compliance and correction of violations identified during inspections. None of the units tested received a certificate until they successfully passed reinspection, and each of the test units also received appropriate

Maryland Department of Labor
Division of Labor and Industry

Agency Response Form

	citations if issues were not corrected prior to certificate expiration. Further, if a third-party inspector identifies a violation that renders use of the unit unsafe, the inspector must report the issue to the Chief Elevator Inspector. The Chief schedules a State inspector to inspect the unit and, if warranted under Public Safety Article 12-814.1(a)(2), may post an unsafe notice and take the unit out of service until the issue is fixed to ensure protection of the public. In cases where an inspector finds a violation that does not meet that standard, the owner must correct the violation and schedule a reinspection. If the owner fails to correct the violation, DLI withholds the certificate and cites the owner. DLI did so appropriately in each of the cases identified in the report.		
Recommendation 2a	Agree	**Estimated Completion Date:**	Completed
Please provide details of corrective action or explain disagreement.	The Safety Inspection Unit took immediate corrective action with regard to the 20 units identified by OLA, and issued citations and penalties as appropriate. The remaining 4 units identified by OLA had already received appropriate citations.		
Recommendation 2b	Agree	**Estimated Completion Date:**	3/1/2027
Please provide details of corrective action or explain disagreement.	The Safety Inspection Unit will continue to swiftly and appropriately address violations that pose an imminent danger to the public under Public Safety Article 12-814.1(a)(2), and issue citations and penalties to owners whose units have failed inspection. In addition, the Unit will develop a process for addressing (through the citation process) violations identified by inspectors that are serious in nature but that do not warrant taking the unit out of service.		
Recommendation 2c	Agree	**Estimated Completion Date:**	1/1/2027
Please provide details of corrective action or explain disagreement.	The Safety Inspection Unit is improving its procedures for monitoring of third-party qualified elevator inspectors to identify discrepancies more quickly and to enable the Unit to take timely, meaningful action where warranted to ensure consistent inspection quality.		

AUDIT TEAM

Catherine M. Clarke, CPA, CIA, CFE
Audit Manager

Karen J. Howes
Senior Auditor

Chau D. Mai
Malkah B. Safren
Staff Auditors