

governmentattic.org

"Rummaging in the government's attic"

Description of document: Closing memoranda for twenty-one (21) National Labor

Relations Board (NLRB) Office of Inspector General

(OIG) investigations, 2015-2016

Requested date: 19-January-2017

Released date: 07-March-2017

Posted date: 08-October-2018

Source of document: FOIA Request

NLRB FOIA Officer

National Labor Relations Board

1015 Half Street, SE

4th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20570 Fax: (202) 273-FOIA (3642)

The governmentattic.org web site ("the site") is noncommercial and free to the public. The site and materials made available on the site, such as this file, are for reference only. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals have made every effort to make this information as complete and as accurate as possible, however, there may be mistakes and omissions, both typographical and in content. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage caused, or alleged to have been caused, directly or indirectly, by the information provided on the governmentattic.org web site or in this file. The public records published on the site were obtained from government agencies using proper legal channels. Each document is identified as to the source. Any concerns about the contents of the site should be directed to the agency originating the document in question. GovernmentAttic.org is not responsible for the contents of documents published on the website.



United States Government NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Washington, DC 20570-0001

March 7, 2017

This letter is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, dated January 19, 2017, seeking "[a] digital copy of the final report, report of investigation, closing memo, and any other final dispository [sic] document or closing memo or referral letter" for the following closed investigations: OIG-I-476, OIG-I-497, OIG-I-498, OIG-I-499, OIG-I-500, OIG-I-502, OIG-I-505, OIG-I-506, OIG-I-507, OIG-I-508, OIG-I-509, OIG-I-510, OIG-I-511, OIG-I-512, OIG-I-513, OIG-I-514, OIG-I-515, OIG-I-516, OIG-I-521, OIG-I-524, and OIG-I-525. The request was referred to the Office of Inspector General (OIG) by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) on February 6, 2017. This request was assigned FOIA tracking number **OIG-2017-007** by the OIG and **LR-2017-0940** by the NLRB's FOIA Branch. Our search revealed 38 responsive records: 21 closing memoranda and 17 investigative reports.

Closing memoranda

The closing memoranda are provided as an enclosure. Redactions have been made to portions of the closing memoranda to protect the privacy interests of the individuals named in these records. Those redactions were made pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6, which pertains to information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and FOIA Exemption 7(C), which pertains to records or information complied for law enforcement purposes, the release of which could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6) and (7)(C). Furthermore, information that would disclose techniques and procedures for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions has been redacted from these records pursuant to the policies embodied in FOIA Exemption 7(E). 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(7)(E). Finally, redactions have been made to portions of these records to protect the material containing deliberative process. Those redactions were made pursuant to FOIA Exemption 5, which protects the decision making processes of government agencies. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(5).

Investigative reports

I conclude that any responsive records constituting investigative reports involving a completed and/or closed investigation by the OIG are exempt from disclosure pursuant to Exemptions 6, 7(C) and 7(D) of FOIA. See 5 U.S.C. §§ 522(b)(6), (7)(C) and (7)(D).

In the processing of investigations, the OIG obtains much information from individuals who would be reluctant or who would refuse to supply such information if it were routinely disclosed pursuant to a request under the FOIA. In carrying out his responsibilities, the Inspector General must be able to obtain all potentially relevant information. The protection of the identities of individuals and the substance of the information they provide is an important means of assuring the Inspector General's continuing ability to obtain such relevant information. Compelled disclosure of the information would substantially deter voluntary cooperation, hinder obtaining information from all potential sources and, consequently, substantially interfere with present and future enforcement proceedings. See NLRB v. Robbins Tire and Rubber Co., 437 U.S. 214 (1978). Additionally, release of information about individuals referred to in such documents would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of their personal privacy, and you have made no showing of public interest in the disclosure of such information that would outweigh those privacy interests. See, e.g., Department of Justice v. Reporters Committee, 489 U.S. 749 (1989); Department of the Air Force v. Rose, 425 U.S. 352 (1976). I conclude that the deletion of names from the investigative reports would not preserve the interests recognized by these exemptions. since disclosure of the material contained therein would, itself, constitute invasions of personal privacy, reveal confidential sources and, therefore, interfere with enforcement proceedings.

I also conclude that investigative reports involving completed/closed investigations by the OIG are privileged from disclosure by Exemption 5 of the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b) (5), since they are intra-agency memoranda and attorney work-products which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with this Agency. The legislative history of Exemption 5 makes it clear that this subsection of the FOIA was designed to protect and promote the objectives of fostering frank deliberation and consultation within the Agency and to prevent premature disclosure of recommendations which could disrupt the decision-making process. Investigative reports from the Inspector General to the Board and/or the General Counsel clearly reflect the deliberative and consultative process of the Agency which Exemption 5 protects from forced disclosure. See NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 421 U.S. 132 (1975).

Regarding FOIA processing fees, we determined that our review process resulted in what could be considered de minimis chargeable cost. As such, it is not necessary to determine your fee category.

If you need any further assistance or would like to discuss any aspect of your request, please do not hesitate to contact the NLRB FOIA Public Liaison at (202) 273-0902 or by email at FOIAPublicLiason@nlrb.gov. Additionally, you may contact the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA mediation services they offer. The contact information for OGIS is as follows: Office of Government Information Services, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road- OGIS, College Park, MD, 20740-6001, email at ogis@nara.gov, telephone at (202) 741-5770, toll free at (877) 684-6448, or facsimile at (202) 741-5769.

Page 3 March 7, 2017

I am responsible for the above determination. You may obtain a review of this determination under the provisions of the NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.177(c)(2)(v), by filing an appeal with the Division of Legal Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 1015 Half Street, SE, Washington, DC 20570, or by email to DLCFOIAAppeal@nlrb.gov, within 90 calendar days from the date of this letter, such period to run on the calendar day after the date of this letter. Any appeal should contain a complete statement of the reasons upon which it is based. Should you have any questions concerning this letter, you may contact me at (202) 273-1961 or by email at james.tatum@nlrb.gov.

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(c). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist.

Sincerely,

James E. Tatum, Jr.

Counsel to the Inspector General

rumes E. Jakum &

Enclosure

cc: NLRB FOIA Officer (w/o enclosure)



Memorandum

March 16, 2015

To:

File

From

D. Berry Du/Kan Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-476

This investigation was initiated on June 15, 2012. The case involved an allegation that Exempt. 6, 7(C), (subject), Exemption 6, 7(C), Region, improperly released official information in a Exemption 6, 7(C) filing. Our investigation substantiated the allegation. On September 2, 2014, we issued an investigative report. Because the subject was a possible 6,7(C) in a 6,7(C) matter in 6,7(C), the report was provided to the Exemption 6, 7(C) that matter. The subject's 6,7(C) was dimissed and he did not prevail on appeal. The Division of Legal Counsel has information regarding the disposition of the 6,7(C) matter. The case is closed.



Memorandum

March 16, 2015

To:

File

From:

D. Berry Dut

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-497

This investigation was initiated on February 4, 2014. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C), (subject), Exemption 6, 7(C), Region was biased by improperly releasing information. We found that the allegation was not substantiated. On March 18, 2014, we sent a letter to Exemption 6, 7(C) that explained our findings. We issued a memorandum to the Division of Operations-Management, on March 4, 2015, to address what we considered to be Exemption 5 by the subject. The subject was counseled. The case is closed.



Memorandum

March 2, 2015

To:

File

From:

D. Berry Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-498

The investigation was initiated on March 7, 2014. The case involved an allegation that Exempt. 6.7(C) (subject), Exempt. 6.7(C) in the Exemption 6,7(C) Exemption 6,7(C) smoked marijuania in the workplace. When interviewed, the subject denied the allegation. Based upon the information collected during the investigation, we found that the allegation was substantiated and, on August 6, 2014, a report was issued with a recommendation for appropriate dispciplinary , a disciplinary decision was issued for a 3-day suspension. On action. On Exemption 6, 7(C) March 2, 2015, the Agency's Special Counsel reported that the subject failed to submit a timely grievence, and that he deciplinary decision was now final. The U.S. Attorney's Office, in declined prosecution. .Case closed.



Memorandum

| January 28, | 2015 |
|--|--|
| То: | David Berry Inspector General |
| From: | James Tatum, Jr. Counsel |
| Subject: | Completed Investigation OIG-I-499 |
| that Exemption that he was investigative to the Divisi with the NL | uly 8, 2014, we initiated the investigation. The investigation involved allegations (a, 7(C)), Region (b), misused the Government-Owned Vehicle, and involved in a hit and run (property damage) while misusing said vehicle. Our efforts substantiated the allegation. On January 14, 2015, we reported our findings on of Operations Mangement. On Exemption 6, 7(C) the subject resigned his position RB. |
| Approved Exemp | 2/18/2016 Date |



Memorandum

| January 6, | , ZU | 13 |
|------------|------|----|
|------------|------|----|

To:

David Berry

Inspector General

From:

James Tatum, Jr.

Counsel

Subject:

Completed Investigation OIG-I-500

On August 25, 2014, we initiated the investigation. The investigation involved allegations that Exemption 6, 7(C) (Exemption 6, 7(C)) Region misused official time and a Government computer to post derogatory comments on Facebook. Our investigative efforts substantiated the allegation. On August 29, 2014, we reported our findings to the Division of Operations-Mangement. On Exemption 6, 7(C), the subject was removed.

Because no additional investigation is appropriate, I recommend that the case be closed.

Amproved

Date



Memorandum

May 4, 2015

To:

David Berry

Inspector General

From:

James Tatum, Jr

Counsel

Subject:

Completed Investigation OIG-I-502

On August 19, 2014, we initiated the investigation. The investigation involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C). Region will violated the terms and conditions of the Agency's Telework Agreement by leaving his home during his telework hours to run a personal errand. Our investigative efforts substantiated the allegation. On October 24, 2014, we reported our findings to the Division of Operations-Mangement. On Exemption 6, 7(C), the subject entered into an Alternative Discipline Agreement with the Agency.

Because no additional investigation is appropriate, I recommend that the case be closed.

Approved

BWW15 Date



| Memora | andum |
|--|--|
| March 16, | 2015 |
| То: | David Berry Inspector General |
| From: | James Tatum, Jr. Counsel |
| Subject: | Completed Investigation OIG-I-505 |
| Exempt 6, 7(C) subject was investigative. We interview were working subject. Based on the property of the pro | September 15, 2014, we were notified of the allegation against Exemption 6, 7(C) (subject), an Exemption 6, 7(C), Region Specifically, the allegation was that the sentering her arrival time into the sign-in log earlier than her actual arrival time. Our we efforts substantiated the allegation. Were informed by Region management that it would be difficult to conduct an with the subject. Additionally, we were informed by Region management that they are management that they are management that it would be assed upon this information, on February 2, 2015, we determined that it would be to refer this matter back to Region management for their review and appropriate |
| Exemption 6, Human Res | sources, Special Counsel and the Division of Operations, Manugenes |
| Вес | ause no additional investigation is appropriate, I recommend that the case be closed. |



Memorandum

February 9, 2015

To:

File

From:

Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-506

This investigation was initiated on January 6, 2013. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C), (subject), Exemption 6, 7(C) Region miused the Government travel card. On Exemption 6, 7(C), during the investigative interview, the subject resigned. The case is closed.



Memorandum

| August 5, 2 | 015 |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| To: | David Berry Inspector General |
| From: | James Tatum, Jr. Counsel |
| Subject: | Completed Investigation OIG-I-507 |
| allegation the Exemption 6, 7(C) Virginia. To Exemption 6, 7(C) investigation 6, 7(C) substantiate Division of Division of Agency. On 6, 7(C) 6, 7(C) 6, 7(C) 6, 7(C) | |
| Approved | August 5, 2015 Date |



Memorandum

August 12, 2015

To:

David Berry

Inspector General

From:

James Tatum, Jr.

Counsel

Subject:

Completed Investigation OIG-I-508

On February 23, 2015, we initiated the investigation. The investigation involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C). Exemption 6, 7(C). Region misused the Government-Owned Vehicle, and that he was involved in an accident while misusing the vehicle. Our investigative efforts did not substantiated the allegation. At the time of the accident, the subject was operating a rental car. The subject did not have a duty to use the rental car only for official business. An employee who is renting a car while on official government travel may use the car for personal business provided the employee does not charge the government for the personal portion of the use. The subject did not attempt to charge the Agency for any part of the rental and has stated that he only intends to seek reimbursement for the time that he used the rental car for official Agency business.

Because no additional investigation is appropriate, I recommend that the case be closed.

Approved

Date

Memorandum

| June 4, 2015 | 5 |
|---|--|
| То: | David Berry Inspector General |
| From: | James Tatum, Jr. Counsel |
| Subject: | Completed Investigation OIG-I-509 |
| allegation th Exemption 6, 6,7(C) during substantiate leave for tim | Tebruary 25, 2015, we initiated the investigation. The investigation involved an last Exemption 6, 7(C) Exemption 6, 7(C |



Memorandum

February 16, 2016

To:

File

From:

D. Berry

Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-510

This investigation was initiated on February 25, 2015. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C) Exemption 6, 7(C) misused a Government vehicle. We issued a report that substantiated the allegation. The Division of Operations-Management imposed the statutory minimum discipline of a 1-month suspension. The subject then filed a grievance. In settlement of the grievance the Agency agreed to discipline the subject for negligent performance of her of her duties in lieu of misuse use of a Government vehicle and impose a 15-day suspension. The case is now closed.



Memorandum

January 15, 2016

To:

File

From:

D. Berry Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-511

This investigation was initiated on April 14, 2015. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C) miused the Government computer and internet access by viewing sexually explicit material. On July 14, 2015, we issued a resport substanting the allegation. On Exemption 6, 7(C) the subject agreed to retire in liue of disciplinary action. The retirement was effective Exemption 6, 7(C) Because no further action is necessary, the case is closed.



Memorandum

September 30, 2016

To:

File

From:

D. Berry

Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-512

This investigation was initiated on June 1, 2015. The case involved an allegation that lixemption 6, 7(C), Region, misused a Government owned vehicle. We did not substantiate the allegation. The subject used the GOV to attend training. Additional allegations of the an improper gift to superior were not substantiated in that he manager receiving the gift was not the subject's superior at the time of the gift and the gift was not accepted in a personal capacity by the manager. Because no further action is necessary, the case is closed.



Memorandum

September 30, 2016

To:

File

From:

D. Berry

Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-513

This investigation was initiated on June 1, 2015. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C), Exemption 6, 7(C), Region, was in possession of a controlled substance. The allegation was substantiated. The subject was placed on an indefinite suspension while she was on trial for the offense. After her conviction, she was given a last chance agreement for a period of 2 years. Because no further action is necessary, the case is closed.



Memorandum

September 30, 2016

To:

File

From:

D. Berry

Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-514

This investigation was initiated on June 1, 2015. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C), Exemption 6, 7(C), Region, misused the Government Travel Card. The allegation was substantiated, and we issued a report on October 2, 2015. The subject received a 10-day suspenseion that was later settled as part of an agreement for a resignation in lieu of removal. Because no further action is necessary, the case is closed.





Memorandum

February 18, 2016

To:

File

From:

D. Berry Inspector General

_ _ . _ _

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-515

This investigation was initiated on June 8, 2015. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C) , Exemption 6, 7(C) , Region , accessed the 6, 7(C) database for an unauthorized purpose. The investigation substantiated the allegation and that subject improperly provided the report to his 6, 7(C). On August 27, 2015, we issued an investigative report. On Exemption 6, 7(C) , the subject was removed. On Exemption 6, 7(C) , an arbitrator ordered that the subject be reinstated in the position of a Exemption 6, 7(C). The case is now closed.



Memorandum

February 17, 2016

To:

File

From:

D. Berry

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-516

This investigation was initiated on August 11, 2015. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C) Region (A), had a conflict of interest in the performance of his official duties because he was also the Exemption 6, 7(C) Our investigation found that, although the allegation was not substantiated, the subject violated the Government ethics regulations by soliciting donations from prohibited sources and by misusing the Government computer and time for activities related to the Exemption 6, 7(C) On November 11, 2015, we issued an investigative report. The report was provided to Exemption 6, 7(C)

[Exemption 6, 7(C)]

[Exempt

Exemption 7(E)



Memorandum

September 30, 2016

To:

File

From:

D. Berry

Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-523

This investigation was initiated on December 16, 2016. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C), 5(C), used the Agency resources to view sexually explicit material. During the investigation that he has a learning disability. A summary report was issued to the Exemption 6, 7(C). Thereafter, the subject was counseled and his Internent access was restricted. Because no further action is necessary, the case is closed.



Memorandum

September 30, 2016

To:

File

From:

D. Berry

Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-524

This investigation was initiated on April 21, 2016. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6, 7(C) Region , made a false statement regarding her time and attendance. Our investigative efforts substantied the allegation. Prosecution was declined. The subject agreed to retire in line of disciplinary action. Because no further action is necessary, the case is closed.



Memorandum

September 30, 2016

To:

File

From:

D. Berry

Inspector General

Subject: Completed Investigation ICO OIG-I-525

This investigation was initiated on May 23, 2016. The case involved an allegation that Exemption 6.7(C), an Exemption 6.7(C), used official resources to harass people on the Internt and that he may have violated the Hatch Act. After we intiated the investigation, the subject was removed as a probabitionary employee. Because no further action is necessary, the case is closed.