



# governmentattic.org

*"Rummaging in the government's attic"*

Description of document: Closing documents for National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA), Office of Inspector General (OIG) investigations closed during CY 2012 - CY 2013

Requested date: 2015

Release date: 30-July-2015

Posted date: 10-December-2018

Source of document: FOIA Request  
NGA FOIA Program Office  
National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency FOIA/PA  
Requester Service Center  
7500 GEOINT Drive, MS N22-SISM  
Springfield, Virginia 22150-7500  
Fax: 571-558-3165  
Email: [FOIANGA@nga.mil](mailto:FOIANGA@nga.mil)  
[FOIA Request Form \(PDF\)](#)

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.



## NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

7500 GEOINT Drive  
Springfield, Virginia 22150

U-204-15/OIG

July 30, 2015

SUBJECT: Freedom of Information Act Request (FOIA Case No. 20140123F)


This is in response to your request for the closing memo, final report, referral memo and Report of Investigation closed by the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA), Office of Inspector General, during the 2012 and 2013 calendar years. Please note, this request was later amended to just a copy of the closing report during the designated time period.

Attached are copies of the closing Reports of the Investigations which were closed during the calendar years of 2012 and 2013 which can be released under your request. Note, the identities of any individuals who may have been identified in the report along with any information that might identify an organization within NGA, were redacted in accordance with FOIA exemption (3) (material exempted from disclosure by statute); specifically 10 U.S.C. § 424 (limiting the release of NGA organizational and personnel information).

You may appeal these redactions in writing to the NGA Inspector General, the appellate authority, within 60 days from the date of this letter. The appeal, which should reference the above FOIA request number, may be sent to the Inspector General, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, Mail Stop N75-OIGC, 7500 GEOINT Drive, Springfield, VA 22150. Please include a copy of this letter with your appeal.

Fees associated with processing your FOIA request have been waived.

Sincerely,

  
Lenore N. Guthrie  
Assistant Inspector General  
for Plans and Programs  
Initial Denial Authority

Enclosure as stated

cc:  
SISCC

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 09-054

**(U) TITLE:** Alleged Time and Attendance Abuse and Misuse of the Shuttle Bus by a [REDACTED] Employee

(U// [REDACTED]) The [REDACTED] investigated allegations that [REDACTED] committed time and attendance abuse and misused the NGA shuttle bus service for commuting purposes on three occasions in March 2009. [REDACTED] is a [REDACTED]

(U// [REDACTED]) In response to the complaint, we analyzed documents, including access control records, master time history records, time sheets, and training records pertaining to [REDACTED] during the period from 7 December 2008 through 6 June 2009. We also obtained sworn testimony from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], who was [REDACTED] supervisor during the majority of the time period under review.

(U// [REDACTED]) Our investigation developed evidence that [REDACTED] committed time and attendance fraud. Our analysis of [REDACTED] time and attendance records found that during the period under review (7 December 2008 through 6 June 2009) [REDACTED] was absent from [REDACTED] workplace during [REDACTED] scheduled tour of duty without authorization for a total of 155 hours and 24 minutes, which equated to \$7,282.45.

(U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] admitted that [REDACTED] had used the shuttle bus on occasion for a portion of [REDACTED] daily commute and that [REDACTED] was verbally disciplined for having done so. We confirmed that [REDACTED], [REDACTED] supervisor at the time, verbally disciplined [REDACTED] on two occasions. [REDACTED] was a [REDACTED] detailee, [REDACTED]

As [REDACTED] supervisor had already addressed [REDACTED] use of the [REDACTED] shuttle bus, we did not investigate the matter further.

---

<sup>1</sup> (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] served as [REDACTED] supervisor from 6 January to 17 June 2009. During this time, [REDACTED] served on active duty as a [REDACTED] in the U.S. Navy. [REDACTED] retired on or about 30 September 2009 and rejoined [REDACTED] as a contractor with [REDACTED], supporting [REDACTED], effective 23 February 2010.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

(U) We recommend that the [REDACTED], [REDACTED], review this matter and consult with the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] and [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] concerning any disciplinary action deemed appropriate, to include recoupment.

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 10-004

(U) TITLE: Alleged Time and Attendance Abuse

### (U) ALLEGATION

(U// [REDACTED] An [REDACTED] employee alleged time and attendance (T&A) abuse by [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] The complainant alleged that [REDACTED] was absent for entire days and arrived at work late and left early without taking leave.

(U// [REDACTED] According to the complainant, the behavior continued for months even after it was brought to the attention of [REDACTED] supervisors, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED].

(U// [REDACTED] The complainant also alleged that [REDACTED] spent "a lot" of government time and resources on a personal pursuit to salvage a ship from the bottom of [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED].

### (U) INVESTIGATION

(U// [REDACTED] The investigation produced evidence that on 100 dates for the period of 24 May 2009 through 2 January 2010, [REDACTED] was not present at [REDACTED] assigned duty location for all of the hours [REDACTED] claimed on [REDACTED] time sheets. We found that [REDACTED] claimed 228 hours when [REDACTED] was not present for duty and did not take leave, a value of \$11,156.04. This would be in violation of 18 USC § 287, False, Fictitious or Fraudulent Claims; 18 USC § 1001, Fraud and False Statements; 5 CFR § 2635.101, Basic obligation of public service; NI 1422.1R10, Work Hours and Overtime; NI 1402.1R11, Leave and Other Absences; and NI 1455.1R6, Employee Adverse Action and Discipline.

(U// [REDACTED] We did not find evidence to corroborate the allegation that [REDACTED], [REDACTED], or [REDACTED] did not take appropriate action concerning [REDACTED] T&A abuse.

(U) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

(U// ) We did not substantiate the allegation that used government time and resources (phone) for personal business. testified that most of business was done at home. We found that used his work phone in accordance with NI 8470.3R8, which allowed limited use of telephones for personal reasons.

**(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// ) We recommend that the , review this report and, in coordination with the and the , take appropriate action.

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 10-015

(U) TITLE: Alleged Misuse of the Government Purchase Card

### (U) ALLEGATION

(U// [REDACTED] Government purchase card (GPC) holder, [REDACTED] misused the GPC by charging \$21,506.40 to it for an off-site meeting, which [REDACTED] identified as a training expenditure.

### (U) INVESTIGATION

(U// [REDACTED] We developed evidence that the GPC was used to pay for facilitation services and customized training by [REDACTED] at [REDACTED], in violation of DoD regulations and the FAR.

### (U) RECOMMENDATION

(U// [REDACTED] We recommend that the [REDACTED] review this report and, in coordination with the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED], take appropriate action.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 10-017

(U) TITLE: Alleged Time and Attendance Abuse

### (U) ALLEGATION

(U// [REDACTED] A complainant alleged time and attendance (T&A) abuse by [REDACTED]. The complainant alleged that [REDACTED] was absent for entire days, arrived at work late, and left early without taking leave. The behavior continued for months even after the complainant brought it to the attention of [REDACTED] first-line supervisor, [REDACTED].

### (U) INVESTIGATION

(U// [REDACTED] We developed evidence that on 80 dates from 7 June to 19 December 2009, [REDACTED] violated Title 18 U.S. Code (USC) § 287, False, Fictitious or Fraudulent Claims; 18 USC § 1001, Fraud and False Statements; Title 5 Code of Federal Regulations § 2635.101, Basic obligation of public service; and [REDACTED] Instruction (NI) 1422.1R10, Work Hours and Overtime. On those dates, [REDACTED] claimed a total of 87 hours and 37 minutes when [REDACTED] was not present for duty and did not take leave, a cost of \$4,279.04.

(U// [REDACTED] We also found that [REDACTED] did not always report to [REDACTED] supervisor at the start and conclusion of [REDACTED] activity in the [REDACTED], as required by NI 6200.1R9, Wellness Program.

(U// [REDACTED] Our investigation disclosed evidence that [REDACTED] may have violated the DoD Financial Management Regulation, which requires officials who approve time and attendance to ensure that recorded work schedules are true, correct, and accurate to the best of their knowledge. In addition, the regulation stipulates that time and attendance data shall reflect a proper and accurate accounting of an employee's actual time, attendance, and leave.

(U// [REDACTED] Based on witness testimony that T&A recording rules were not enforced, we concluded that internal T&A management controls in PVX were inadequate.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]



UNCLASSIFIED//

(U// [REDACTED] We did not find evidence to corroborate the allegation that [REDACTED] did not take action after having been informed of [REDACTED] T&A abuse.

**(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// [REDACTED] We recommend that the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], review this report and, in coordination with the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED], take appropriate action.

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 10-018

(U) TITLE: Alleged Time and Attendance Abuse

### (U) ALLEGATIONS

(U// [REDACTED] An [REDACTED] employee alleged time and attendance (T&A) abuse by [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The complainant alleged that [REDACTED] was absent for entire days and arrived at work late and left early without taking leave. The behavior continued for months even after it was brought to the attention of [REDACTED] first-line supervisor, [REDACTED]

### (U) INVESTIGATION

(U// [REDACTED] We developed evidence that on 82 dates from 21 June to 23 December 2009 [REDACTED] was not present at [REDACTED] assigned duty location for all of the hours [REDACTED] claimed on [REDACTED] time sheets. [REDACTED] claimed 143 hours and 12 minutes of time when [REDACTED] was not present for duty and did not take leave, a value of \$6,994.04.

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] provided sworn testimony that [REDACTED] approved his leave and absences from the workplace to attend monthly meetings of professional organizations. But [REDACTED] testified that [REDACTED] did not authorize the leave, as the meetings were not relevant to [REDACTED] duties and responsibilities. [REDACTED] said the investigation was already underway when [REDACTED] sought [REDACTED] concurrence that [REDACTED] had approval to be absent from work without requesting leave to attend the meetings. [REDACTED] testimony would indicate that [REDACTED] violated 18 USC 1001 by making a false statement under oath and attempted to interfere with an official investigation in violation of NI 1455.1R6.

(U// [REDACTED] Finally, the investigation found that [REDACTED] authorized 22 hours of leave so [REDACTED] could shop for, prepare food for, and clean up after an office party—a cost of \$1,074.48 to the government. This authorization appeared to have violated 31 USC § 1301 (a), the "necessary expense doctrine" which states:

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

**UNCLASSIFIED//** [REDACTED]

(U) Appropriations shall be applied only to the objects for which the appropriations were made except as otherwise by law.

(U// [REDACTED]) The time off did not appear to bear a logical relationship to the purpose of the appropriation nor were party preparation and cleanup mission-related functions for which general appropriations were available.

(U// [REDACTED]) Based on the testimony from all interviewees, the internal controls of [REDACTED] were inadequate in all aspects of T&A management.

(U// [REDACTED]) We did not find evidence to corroborate the allegation concerning [REDACTED].

**(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) We recommend that the [REDACTED], review this report and, in coordination with the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED], take appropriate action.

**UNCLASSIFIED//** [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

CE

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 10-027

**(U) TITLE:** Alleged Time and Attendance Abuse

**(U) ALLEGATION**

(U/ ) abused time and attendance from 13 September 2009 to 14 February 2010. is a .

**(U) INVESTIGATION**

(U/ ) [REDACTED], reported to the Office of Inspector General that for about six months [REDACTED] had been "putting down hours that [REDACTED] is not working" and leaving work early. [REDACTED] also suspected that [REDACTED] may not have worked all the overtime hours [REDACTED] claimed during three weekends in February 2009.

(U// [REDACTED]) We developed evidence that [REDACTED] violated 18 USC § 287, False, Fictitious or Fraudulent Claims; 18 USC § 1001, Fraud and False Statements; 5 CFR § 2635.101, Basic obligation of public service; and NI 1422.1R10, Work Hours and Overtime. [REDACTED] was not present at [REDACTED] assigned duty location for all of the hours [REDACTED] claimed on [REDACTED] time sheets from 13 September 2009 to 14 February 2010. We found that [REDACTED] claimed 51.90 hours or 51 hours and 54 minutes of time worked when [REDACTED] was not present for duty and did not take leave; the claims included 10.75 hours or 10 hours and 45 minutes in overtime. The total value of this unworked time was \$2,194.85.

(U// [REDACTED]) Our investigation also found that [REDACTED] did not report to [REDACTED] supervisor when [REDACTED] finished [REDACTED] activity, as required by NI 6200.1R9, Wellness Program.

**(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) We recommend that the [REDACTED] review this report and in coordination with the [REDACTED] take appropriate action.

(U) [REDACTED] d [REDACTED] n r s t. s s n r  
[REDACTED] s [REDACTED] al [REDACTED] it s [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 10-033

(U) TITLE: Time and Attendance Fraud by a [REDACTED] Employee

(U// [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] investigated an allegation that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] engaged in time and attendance fraud from 3 March 2009 to 15 March 2010.

(U// [REDACTED] The investigation developed evidence to support a finding that [REDACTED] was not present at [REDACTED] assigned duty location for 1,644.77 hours from 3 March 2009 through 8 April 2011.<sup>1</sup> [REDACTED] claimed this time on [REDACTED] time sheets and received \$63,333.58 in salary for it but was not charged any leave. According to the evidence, on multiple occasions during the period under review [REDACTED] did not physically enter any [REDACTED] facility. [REDACTED] could not provide evidence that [REDACTED] worked any of this time.

(U// [REDACTED] During the investigation, we developed evidence that [REDACTED], [REDACTED], failed to adhere to the approving official's responsibilities listed in the DoD Financial Management Regulation, volume 8, chapter 2, ¶¶ 020102 (B); 020208 (A), (B), and (D); 020401; and 020402 (A), by signing and approving inaccurate time sheets for [REDACTED], including times when [REDACTED] did not enter an [REDACTED] building.

(U// [REDACTED] We recommend that the [REDACTED], review this report and, in coordination with the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED], take appropriate action to include recoupment of funds, or leave, or both from [REDACTED]. We also recommend that the [REDACTED] take appropriate action with regard to [REDACTED] failure to fulfill [REDACTED] supervisory responsibilities of ensuring that [REDACTED] accurately recorded [REDACTED] time and attendance.

---

<sup>1</sup> The initial complaint against [REDACTED] was made for the period March 2009 to March 2010. As a result of information [REDACTED] provided during [REDACTED] interview, we broadened the scope of the investigation through 8 April 2011.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

SEP 19 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED]

ATTENTION: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: (U) Referral of Report of Investigation ([REDACTED] Case Number 10-035)

1. (U// [REDACTED]) The [REDACTED] recently completed an investigation into an allegation that [REDACTED] an [REDACTED] employee, received dual educational benefits from both the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] for the same courses, in violation of 38 USC § 3681(a)(2). We developed evidence that the subject violated statutory limitations governing veterans' education benefits. The allegation was initially filed with the Department of Defense Inspector General Hotline, and we prepared the enclosed report of investigation in response to their request. We are forwarding our report, along with the following items gathered by us, to your office for your information and action as appropriate:

a. (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED]

b. (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] - dates from 4 February 2008 through 28 March 2010.

2. (U// [REDACTED]) I also wish to express my appreciation to your office in connection with your support of our investigation by providing us with records and other information pertaining to [REDACTED] receipt of [REDACTED] educational benefits.

3. (U) If you have questions or require additional information, please contact [REDACTED]

Enclosures  
As stated

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 10-039

(U) TITLE: Alleged Time and Attendance Fraud

### (U) ALLEGATION

(U// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was paid for hours that [REDACTED] did not work.

### (U) INVESTIGATION

(U// [REDACTED] Our investigation determined that for the 80-day period of 3 January–24 April 2010, [REDACTED] had no official work schedule, was consistently tardy to work, and consistently left work early. We found that over 25 workdays, there were 78.71 hours at issue, at a total compensation cost of \$4,645.<sup>1</sup> On 22 workdays, [REDACTED] was not in [REDACTED] for the total required regular workhours. We found no leave, travel, or training records that would explain [REDACTED] absences. [REDACTED] did not dispute that [REDACTED] was not at [REDACTED] workstation during the hours at issue.

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] supervisor disagreed on [REDACTED] start time. [REDACTED] supervisor testified that [REDACTED] worked an eight-hour day from 0900 to 1730, but [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] had [REDACTED] supervisor's verbal approval to arrive anytime before 1000. We determined that [REDACTED] was scheduled to work a straight eight-hour work shift, Monday through Friday from 0900 to 1730, in keeping with [REDACTED] policy.

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] consistently arrived after [REDACTED] core hours had begun at 0900. During the period under review, [REDACTED] arrived late more than 96 percent of the time, according to access control records, which recorded [REDACTED] entry time on 60 of the 80 days. On 34 of the 60 days, he arrived at 1000 or later.

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] consistently left work before 1730. According to access control records, [REDACTED] left work early on all 22 workdays when [REDACTED] exit times were recorded. He

<sup>1</sup> (U// [REDACTED] We calculated the total compensation cost by multiplying [REDACTED] hourly pay rate by the total hours at issue (78.71 hours X \$59.02 = \$4,645). The total compensation cost (\$4,645) was rounded to the nearest dollar.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

said [REDACTED] left to conduct research for [REDACTED] at the Library of Congress, local university libraries, or bookstores.<sup>2</sup> [REDACTED] could not provide verification and we could not determine by other means that [REDACTED] was at those locations.

(U// [REDACTED] In addition, we found that [REDACTED] was paid for working three days in February 2010 when he was away with [REDACTED] family. The evidence demonstrated that [REDACTED] did not follow [REDACTED] policy requirements to justify [REDACTED] absence from 3 through 5 February 2010 under NI 1402.1R11, "Leave and Other Absences." In testimony, [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] family were at [REDACTED] second home located in West Virginia from 03 through 05 February 2010. [REDACTED] signed time sheet, certified by [REDACTED] supervisor, for the pay period 31 January through 13 February 2010 showed eight hours regular time for 03 February 2010, eight hours sick leave for 04 February 2010, and four hours sick leave and four hours administrative leave for 05 February 2010. [REDACTED] Master Time History showed that [REDACTED] was credited with 24 regular hours worked for 03 through 05 February 2010.

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] thought there should be an [REDACTED], "Request for Leave or Approved Absence" attached to [REDACTED] timesheet indicating [REDACTED] took three days of sick leave for 03 through 05 February 2010. We found no [REDACTED] for the pay period 31 January through 13 February 2010 and [REDACTED] supervisor could not recall whether [REDACTED] requested sick leave for 03 through 05 February 2010. [REDACTED] could not explain the differences between [REDACTED] time sheet and the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was not aware of [REDACTED] responsibilities to report time accounting errors, and rarely reviewed [REDACTED] leave and earning statements to ensure that there were no errors regarding [REDACTED] time and attendance.

#### **(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// [REDACTED] We recommend that the [REDACTED] review this report and in coordination with the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] take action deemed appropriate.

---

<sup>2</sup> (U) The Library of Congress, Geography and Map Reading Room located in the James Madison Memorial, Madison Building, hours of operation are from 0830 through 1700, Monday through Friday except for Federal Holidays.

UNCLASSIFIED//



UNCLASSIFIED//

JUL 20 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR

SUBJECT: (U) Time and Attendance Abuse and Misuse of Government Computer, Case Number 10-041

1. (U//) Your office referred a matter to us in October 2010 involving a employee assigned to offices at Headquarters and facilities in the area. The employee is and allegedly was involved in time and attendance abuse and computer misuse. We provided your investigator access control records for facilities prior to October 2010 for the period in 2009 that your office was reviewing.
2. (U//) We looked at time and attendance records, access control records, and computer system records for the period of 3 January 2010 to 4 June 2011 and did not identify any abuse or misuse by for that period. Since you found issues with time and attendance and use of Sametime software for an earlier period, we are referring the case back to your office for action. We are enclosing spreadsheets showing the results of our data analysis and the methods used to determine those results. Since is working in an organization and facility, we request that you provide us information regarding any action taken against.
3. (U//) We appreciate the opportunity to work with your staff and look forward to doing so in the future. Should If you have questions or require additional information, please contact or, at

Enclosures  
as stated

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//R

## Case 10-041, [REDACTED] Time and Attendance Analysis

(U// [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] conducted an analysis of [REDACTED] (employee number [REDACTED] time and attendance records for the period of 01 Jan 2010 through 01 Jun 2011. Based on [REDACTED] timesheets and access control records, [REDACTED] was on an 8-hour schedule during the time period analyzed.

1. (U// [REDACTED] **Compensation** – We obtained the following information regarding [REDACTED] compensation from [REDACTED]. We divided the annual salary by 2,087 to get the hourly rate.

Date	Action	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
01/03/2010	Pay Rate Change	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
01/03/2010	Pay Rate Change	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
01/02/2011	Pay Rate Change	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
06/19/2011	Data Change	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
01/01/2012	Pay Rate Change	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

2. (U// [REDACTED] **Timesheets** – We reviewed [REDACTED] timesheets from the [REDACTED] for pay period 201002 (03 Jan 2010 – 16 Jan 2010) through pay period 2011012 (22 May 2011 – 04 Jun 2011); however, time sheets were missing for the following pay periods: 201104 (30 Jan 2011 – 12 Feb 2011), 201105 (13 Feb 2011 – 26 Feb 2011), and 201106 (27 Feb 2011 – 12 Mar 2011). Therefore, we used the [REDACTED] analysis spreadsheet provided by [REDACTED] to get the time worked during those pay periods.
3. (U// [REDACTED] **Travel** – We searched the [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] local and TDY vouchers. [REDACTED] did not have any TDY vouchers during the specified timeframe of the analysis. [REDACTED] had one local voucher during the specified timeframe. The voucher was for [REDACTED] days of parking costs during a training session on 24-25 February 2010. We gave [REDACTED] credit for a full 8-hour day on these two days.
4. (U// [REDACTED] **Training** – We searched the [REDACTED] Training Summary for [REDACTED] training records. According to the [REDACTED] Training Summary, all of the training that [REDACTED] attended during the specified timeframe of analysis was computer-based training, which would have been completed during the normal work day. Therefore, no adjustments to the time and analysis spreadsheet were made to account for time out of the office due to training reported in [REDACTED].
5. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] – We obtained [REDACTED] data (badge reader data) from the following locations. This data was used to calculate the total hours [REDACTED] worked per day. [REDACTED] work day should include [REDACTED] mandatory and uncompensated half-hour meal break for time worked over 6 hours.
  - a. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] – [REDACTED] provided a spreadsheet that noted [REDACTED] access records for [REDACTED] locations.
  - b. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] – We downloaded [REDACTED] data from [REDACTED] Bethesda locations from the 2010 and 2011 Microsoft Access databases for the specified time period.

- c. (U/[REDACTED] [REDACTED] – We downloaded [REDACTED] data from [REDACTED] locations from the 2010 and 2011 Microsoft Access databases for the specified time period.
  - d. (U/[REDACTED] [REDACTED] – We downloaded [REDACTED] data from [REDACTED] location from the 2010 and 2011 Microsoft Access databases for the specified time period. (Note: Due to a badge reader system error, 2010 [REDACTED] data was only available from 31 October – 31 December 2010.)
  - e. (U/[REDACTED] [REDACTED] – We downloaded [REDACTED] data from [REDACTED] from the [REDACTED] for the specified time period.
  - f. (U/[REDACTED] Adjustments – [REDACTED] data lacked formal building exit records for the following dates (04/06/10, 11/08/10, 12/16/10, 03/16/11, and 05/19/11) and adjustments were made to give credit for a complete work day.
  - g. (U/[REDACTED] Other Notes – The analysis generally includes only the initial entry and final exit records. If [REDACTED] traveled from one [REDACTED] location to another during [REDACTED] work day, we gave [REDACTED] credit as time worked. On the following dates (08/04/10, 08/30/10, 09/09/10, 09/15/10, 09/20/10, and 09/29/10) [REDACTED] had large amounts of time with no badge reader activity during the work day. For these dates, we did not include the missing time as time worked, and therefore, there are [REDACTED] entry records and [REDACTED] exit records.
6. (U/[REDACTED] **Early Release Dates and Excused Absences** – We included the following known early releases on the time and attendance spreadsheets. If [REDACTED] was in the office, we gave [REDACTED] credit for the early release to equal a complete 8-hour day. If [REDACTED] didn't have any badge reader data for the date, we did not give credit for the early release.

Date	Source	Hours
01/15/10	NGA (MLK Day)	4
02/05/10	CIA (Fed Gov't closed: weather)	4
02/08-11/10	CIA (Fed Gov't closed: weather)	32
05/28/10	NGA (Memorial Day)	4
07/02/10	NGA (4 <sup>th</sup> of July)	4
09/03/10	NGA (Labor Day)	4
11/24/10	NGA (Thanksgiving)	4
12/23/10	NGA (Christmas)	4
12/30/10	NGA (New Year's Day)	4
01/14/11	NGA (MLK Day)	4
05/27/11	NGA (Memorial Day)	4

7. (U/[REDACTED] **Calendar** – We did not review [REDACTED] calendar to conduct this analysis.

(U) Prepared by: [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 10-064

**(U) TITLE:** Misuse of Position for Financial Gain and Postemployment Restrictions

### **(U) ALLEGATIONS**

(U// [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] received a complaint on 3 September 2010, regarding [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The complaint resulted in two allegations involving [REDACTED]

1. (U// [REDACTED] That [REDACTED] violated Title 18 U.S.C. § 208 when [REDACTED] was employed by [REDACTED] and negotiated an agreement between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] future employer, [REDACTED]
2. (U// [REDACTED] That [REDACTED] violated 18 U.S.C. § 207 by contacting [REDACTED] employees to advocate [REDACTED] interests after [REDACTED] retired.

(U// [REDACTED] Investigators uncovered a third allegation during the investigation when they found e-mails of a sexual nature sent on the [REDACTED] network between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. This use of the [REDACTED] network violated [REDACTED] Instruction 8470.3R8, Electronic Mail and Other Electronic Communications.

### **(U) INVESTIGATION**

(U// [REDACTED] We developed evidence to support a finding that [REDACTED] violated 18 U.S.C. § 208 while [REDACTED] was employed by [REDACTED] and negotiated an [REDACTED] position with [REDACTED] future employer, [REDACTED]. Investigators found that after [REDACTED] created a financial interest with [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] negotiation for future employment, [REDACTED] acted in an official capacity as an [REDACTED] employee to promote a contract between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Specifically, [REDACTED] testified that [REDACTED] appointed [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] point of contact for an Office of Government Ethics waiver of the one-year postgovernment service restriction and an [REDACTED] memorandum of agreement. In addition,

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

48 e-mails between [REDACTED] officials, and [REDACTED] officials demonstrated that while [REDACTED] was still employed at [REDACTED] and had established a financial relationship with [REDACTED] participated "personally and substantially" in [REDACTED] official capacity to implement with [REDACTED]

(U// [REDACTED] Investigators also developed evidence that [REDACTED] had official, nonpersonnel contact with [REDACTED] employees within the one-year restricted period following [REDACTED] retirement from [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] was employed by [REDACTED]. It should be noted, however, that this contact, involving the 2010 analytic review, was initiated by [REDACTED] employees and did not appear to be a contact by [REDACTED] seeking official action from an [REDACTED] employee on behalf of [REDACTED] or any other person, as required under 18 U.S.C. § 207(c).

(U// [REDACTED] We presented the potential violations of 18 U.S.C. § 207(c) and § 208 to the [REDACTED], and were advised that the case did not satisfy the "specific-intent" requirements needed for criminal prosecution under the statutes.

(U// [REDACTED] Our investigation provided evidence that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] violated NI 8470.3R8, Electronic Mail and Other Electronic Communications, which states that unauthorized use may subject the individual to criminal sanctions or other administrative adverse or disciplinary action.

#### **(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// [REDACTED] We are providing our report to the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], the [REDACTED], the [REDACTED], and the [REDACTED] for information and any action deemed appropriate.

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 11-007

(U) TITLE: Misuse of Government Resources (Vehicle)

(U// [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] investigated an allegation that [REDACTED] [REDACTED], drove a government vehicle assigned to [REDACTED] team in [REDACTED], for [REDACTED] personal use from April 2009 through October 2010. The complainant alleged that [REDACTED] made daily personal use of the government van from home to work and back.

### (U) INVESTIGATION

(U// [REDACTED] Our investigation developed clear evidence that [REDACTED] violated provisions of 31 USC § 1344, DoD Directive 4500.36-R, and NI 4500.9R9, by using a government vehicle for a nonofficial purposes. Our investigator obtained testimony from [REDACTED] witnesses who directly observed [REDACTED] use the government vehicle to commute on numerous occasions between [REDACTED] residence and [REDACTED] official duty location. Additionally, [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] understood the rules concerning the use of government vehicles, and provided testimony that [REDACTED] used the government vehicle for [REDACTED] personal convenience on numerous occasions without any supervisory approval. [REDACTED] also confessed to using the government vehicle to transport personal party supplies between the commissary and [REDACTED] place of residence, and that [REDACTED] knew doing so was wrong and "over-the-line."

### (U) RECOMMENDATION

(U// [REDACTED] We recommend that the [REDACTED] review this report and, in coordination with the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED], take appropriate action. We request that the [REDACTED] please notify the [REDACTED] of any administrative action taken in response to [REDACTED] conduct as described above. We specifically request that you describe how the action taken conforms or fails to conform to the statutory requirements of 31 U.S.C. § 1349.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 11-015

(U) TITLE: Time and Attendance Abuse and Violation of the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

(U// [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] investigated an allegation that

[REDACTED] abused [REDACTED] time and attendance and misused the [REDACTED].

### (U) INVESTIGATION

(U// [REDACTED] We developed evidence that [REDACTED] violated [REDACTED] Instruction (NI) 6200.1R9, when [REDACTED] failed to adhere to requirements of the [REDACTED] by limiting [REDACTED] participation to one hour a day three days a week. Our evidence resulted from our analysis of [REDACTED] access control records, time and attendance records, computer log-on and log-off records, and testimony. We also found that [REDACTED] violated this NI by failing to notify [REDACTED] immediate supervisor when [REDACTED] departed for and returned from [REDACTED] activity.

### (U) OTHER MATTERS

(U// [REDACTED] During the investigation, we developed evidence that [REDACTED] management failed to adhere to requirements in the [REDACTED] by not limiting [REDACTED] participation to one hour a day three days a week. [REDACTED] supervisors also violated this NI by failing to require [REDACTED] to notify them before and after [REDACTED] activity.

(U) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

CE

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) CASE NUMBER: 11-018

(U) TITLE: Misuse of Government Travel Charge Card

### (U) ALLEGATION

(U// ) The I received an allegation that  
violated the terms of use of government travel charge card by purchasing  
airline tickets with it when was not in an official travel status.

### (U) INVESTIGATION

(U// ) It admitted and we developed corroborating evidence  
that violated the terms of use of by purchasing airline tickets with it on  
5 and 23 July 2010, when was not on official travel. It promptly  
paid for these purchases from personal funds; however, the expenses were incurred  
in violation of 41 CFR § 301-51.6. We did not find other infractions of regulations with  
regard to use.

### (U) RECOMMENDATION

(U// ) We recommend that the  
review this report and, in coordination with the and the  
, take any action deemed appropriate.

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//



UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

**REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY**

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 11-028

(U) SUBJECT

(U// [REDACTED]

**(U) ALLEGATIONS**

1. (U// [REDACTED] Misuse of [REDACTED] privileges<sup>1</sup>
2. (U// [REDACTED] Abuse of authority

**(U) BACKGROUND**

(U// [REDACTED] On 31 March 2011, the [REDACTED] referred this matter to the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] received the complaint on 28 March 2011 from an anonymous source who alleged that [REDACTED] had been "stirring the pot," trying to pit the people of [REDACTED] against one another. The complainant alleged that [REDACTED] had been using information in [REDACTED] to create animosity by giving out salary information so people knew others' salaries. [REDACTED] allegedly had also been telling employees that [REDACTED] knew some of them were not technically qualified for promotion, performance raises, or assignments they received. The source also alleged that [REDACTED] forwarded e-mails sent to [REDACTED] but edited them or removed context to frame people in a bad light.

**(U) APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS**

- (U) Title 5 U.S. Code § 552a, The Privacy Act of 1974, states:

(U) Records maintained on individuals

(U) (i) Criminal penalties

---

1. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] human resources database.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

(1) Any officer or employee of an agency, who by virtue of his employment or official position, has possession of, or access to, agency records which contain individually identifiable information the disclosure of which is prohibited by this section or by rules or regulations established thereunder, and who knowing that disclosure of the specific material is so prohibited, willfully disclose the material in any manner to any person or agency not entitled to receive it, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$5,000.

(3) Any person who knowingly and willfully requests or obtains any record concerning an individual from an agency under false pretenses shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$5,000.

- (U) 5 Code of Federal Regulations § 2635.702, Use of Public Office for Private Gain, states:

(a) *Inducement or coercion of benefits.* An employee shall not use or permit the use of [REDACTED] Government position or title or any authority associated with [REDACTED] public office in a manner that is intended to coerce or induce another person, including a subordinate, to provide any benefit, financial or otherwise to [REDACTED] or to friends, relatives, or persons with whom the employee is affiliated in a nongovernmental capacity.

(d) Performance of official duties affecting a private interest. To ensure that the performance of his official duties does not give rise to an appearance of use of public office for private gain or giving preferential treatment, an employee whose duties would affect the financial interests of a friend, relative or person with whom [REDACTED] is affiliated in a nongovernmental capacity.

- (U) [REDACTED] Instruction 5500.7R9 ¶ 7.i., DoD Privacy Program Implementation, states:

Penalties. The Privacy Act makes it a misdemeanor subject to maximum fine of \$5,000 to knowingly and willfully request or obtain any record concerning an individual under false pretenses. The Act also establishes similar penalties for violations of the Privacy Act by [REDACTED] employees.

- (U) Human Development Information System(s) Privileged Users Acknowledgement
- (U) AO/PAR Manage Positions Desk Guide, July 2005, [REDACTED] Privacy Act Rules of Conduct

**(U) ALLEGATION 1****(U) Facts**

- (U// [REDACTED] On 13 April 2011, we asked [REDACTED] to conduct a [REDACTED] search to determine if [REDACTED] had permission to access [REDACTED] in the manner described in the complaint and to find out if [REDACTED] could access [REDACTED] searches for the past six months.
- (U// [REDACTED] On 13 April 2011, in a preliminary response [REDACTED] wrote that on 20 November 2006, [REDACTED] supervisor, [REDACTED] validated and implemented [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] reported that neither the [REDACTED] nor [REDACTED] role would provide [REDACTED] access to employees' salaries, although those roles would have enabled [REDACTED] to enter monetary and nonmonetary awards and approve awards for [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED].
- (U// [REDACTED] Furthermore, if [REDACTED] were a [REDACTED] during the [REDACTED] deliberations for [REDACTED] pay panel or review board, [REDACTED] would have seen salary information for the entire pay pool or organization; that would have been outside of the [REDACTED] framework, however.
- (U// [REDACTED] On 6 June 2011, [REDACTED] provided an e-mail summarizing [REDACTED] inquiry into [REDACTED] use. [REDACTED] had [REDACTED] status, meaning that [REDACTED] could access some components of [REDACTED] beyond [REDACTED] own self-service capabilities. [REDACTED] had full privileges as an [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED] for [REDACTED].
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated there was a record of [REDACTED] accessing [REDACTED] since the 2005 time frame but no record of [REDACTED] running queries that revealed employee salaries.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] analysis of [REDACTED] log-in history since January 2005 indicated that [REDACTED] followed a fairly consistent pattern of [REDACTED] access that would be expected of a user with regular self-service and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] roles.
- (U// [REDACTED] There was no indication that [REDACTED] accessed awards or salary data of other employees.

(U// [REDACTED] testified:

- (U// [REDACTED] is presently [REDACTED]
- (U// [REDACTED] In 2006 [REDACTED] was also part of [REDACTED] staff that was responsible for maintaining training and travel records, personnel actions, and all of the human resources requirements through [REDACTED], so [REDACTED] assigned [REDACTED] as the lead in these areas and granted [REDACTED] access to [REDACTED]
- (U// [REDACTED] had duties as the compensation workbench operator in [REDACTED] and ran the spreadsheet. Accordingly, [REDACTED] had access to the salary information for all of the employees and knew what awards they received.
- (U// [REDACTED] had not heard of [REDACTED] providing employee's salary information to other employees in the office.
- (U// [REDACTED] said, in March 2011, [REDACTED], told [REDACTED] that someone from the [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] about the allegations against [REDACTED].
- (U// [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] complaint. [REDACTED] denied abusing [REDACTED] privileges and creating a hostile environment.
- (U// [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] did not know if [REDACTED] had used [REDACTED] to gather information about other employees. [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] would not do that.

(U// [REDACTED] testified:

- (U// [REDACTED] was the [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] supervisor was [REDACTED]
- (U// [REDACTED] described [REDACTED] responsibilities as managing, monitoring inbound and outbound personnel, transfer of personnel from one organization to another, releasing agency opportunity notice ([REDACTED] information, processing [REDACTED] packets, [REDACTED] planning, movements of all [REDACTED] organizations from the various locations to [REDACTED], and maintaining the [REDACTED] performance management systems.
- (U// [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] validated [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED] requester for [REDACTED] in 2006, because training fell under their organization and the role enabled [REDACTED] to approve training for their employees.

- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] had not abused [REDACTED] [REDACTED] privileges to ascertain the salaries of the employees and had not misused those privileges to determine who was qualified or unqualified for promotion within their office.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] denied spreading [REDACTED] information to other employees in [REDACTED]

### **(U) Conclusions**

(U// [REDACTED] Based on the information obtained during the preliminary inquiry, we found no evidence to substantiate the allegation that [REDACTED] misused [REDACTED] authority while performing [REDACTED] duties.

### **(U) Recommendation**

(U// [REDACTED] Recommend no further investigative work on this matter and that this inquiry be closed.

### **(U) ALLEGATION 2**

#### **(U) Facts**

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] testified:

- (U// [REDACTED] In March 2011, [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that someone from the [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was alleged to have been creating a hostile environment by accessing information in [REDACTED] and using it to create animosity.
- (U// [REDACTED]) The complaint also alleged that [REDACTED] had been giving out salary information, so people knew who was making more money than they were.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] allegedly had also been telling the employees that [REDACTED] knew some of them were not technically qualified for promotion, performance raises, or assignments they received.
- (U// [REDACTED] The complaint also alleged that [REDACTED] forwarded e-mails sent to [REDACTED] but edited them or removed context to frame people in a bad light.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] brought these concerns to [REDACTED] attention and [REDACTED] denied abusing [REDACTED] privileges and creating a hostile environment.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] testified that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had been talking about [REDACTED] recent employment with the federal government.

- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] explained that [REDACTED] had been employed in their office as a contractor employee with [REDACTED] before accepting a government position.
- (U// [REDACTED] After [REDACTED] accepted [REDACTED] government position, several people in the office including [REDACTED], questioned whether [REDACTED] was qualified for the position, and [REDACTED] was outspoken about it.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] former [REDACTED], was protective of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] believed that [REDACTED] was giving [REDACTED] preferential treatment, which caused some animosity in the office.
- (U// [REDACTED] During this time [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] would ask [REDACTED] to do something and [REDACTED] would respond that [REDACTED] could not because [REDACTED] wanted [REDACTED] to do something else. [REDACTED] said that scenario would "drive [REDACTED] crazy." [REDACTED] would say, "Why do we have contractors out here that have a job, have a function, and we can't get them to do what they're supposed to do?"
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] testified that after [REDACTED] was selected for [REDACTED] government position [REDACTED] processed [REDACTED] package and submitted the package to [REDACTED] for signature.
- (U// [REDACTED] At that time [REDACTED] could have seen the job announcement and [REDACTED] resume and viewed the findings of the selection panel; however, [REDACTED] did not know if [REDACTED] reviewed these documents.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] had no knowledge that [REDACTED] was editing e-mails to frame others in the office in a bad light.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said nobody complained to [REDACTED] about an e-mail being changed.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] described [REDACTED] as being "very straightforward" and often coming across as "condescending" to others.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said an area where [REDACTED] needed to improve was [REDACTED] ability to communicate. [REDACTED] communicated well enough to get [REDACTED] job done, but [REDACTED] needed to work on [REDACTED] communication.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said in [REDACTED] view everything was "black or white"; there were no gray areas with [REDACTED]

- (U// ) testified there had been times when would ask a question during a staff meeting and response would sound condescending or combative. After the meeting, or some of the others would tell that was out of hand and would have to talk to
- (U// ) described as a "mid to high performer," but had a difficult time communicating with people.

(U// ) testified:

- (U// ) did not edit any e-mails of others in an attempt to frame them in a bad light.
- (U// ) said the allegation was not true that was not performing duties and was too busy trying to find out what others were doing so could complain to management.

#### **(U) Conclusions**

(U// ) Based on the information obtained during the preliminary inquiry, we found no evidence to substantiate the allegation that abused authority while performing duties as the

#### **(U) Recommendation**

(U// ) Recommend no further investigative work on this matter and that this inquiry be closed.

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

NOV 28 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: (U) Referral of Time and Attendance Analysis, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Case Number 11-031

1. (U// [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] has completed a preliminary analysis of an allegation that [REDACTED] may have engaged in time and attendance abuse from 01 January through 12 July 2011. [REDACTED] is a [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

2. (U// [REDACTED] Our analysis of [REDACTED] access control records, T&A documents, and training and travel records for the period referenced above revealed a discrepancy of 19 hours and 09 minutes, worth \$1,315.59 ([REDACTED]). The analysis disclosed the amount of time that [REDACTED] claimed on [REDACTED] T&A records, compared with the amount of time we could confirm independently that [REDACTED] was present at [REDACTED] assigned duty location. The value of the hours that [REDACTED] did not work falls below the [REDACTED] \$5,000 threshold for pursuing a T&A fraud investigation.

3. (U// [REDACTED] We are providing this information for your review and action as you deem appropriate. We did not interview [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] immediate supervisor or conduct any further inquiry regarding the T&A discrepancy. We recommend that you ensure that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] supervisor have the opportunity to provide input regarding the matter. Should you determine that disciplinary action is appropriate, we recommend that you coordinate the action with the [REDACTED]. Please consider recouping any funds paid to [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] was not present for duty.

4. (U) Please furnish us with a report of action taken or planned within [REDACTED] days of your receipt of this memorandum. A tasking was established in [REDACTED] to track the suspense.

5. (U// [REDACTED] Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact

[REDACTED]  
or [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Enclosure  
As stated

(U) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]



UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

JAN 23 2012

## REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 11-048

(U) SUBJECT

(U// [REDACTED]

(U) ALLEGATION

(U) Computer Misuse

(U) BACKGROUND

(U// [REDACTED] On 12 May 2011, the [REDACTED] received a complaint from [REDACTED], who reported that [REDACTED] spent hours on the Internet at work. [REDACTED] stated that the behavior had been going on for some time, even before [REDACTED] became a supervisor. [REDACTED] alleged that [REDACTED] made extensive use of the "Home Shopping Guide" and printed pages of material after surfing the Web.

### (U) APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS

- (U) Title 5 Code of Federal Regulations § 2635.702, Use of public office for private gain
- (U) [REDACTED] Instruction (NI) 8470.2R8 7 (c) (1), Internet Use, 9 December 2009, states:

(U) Employees are authorized limited personal use of network resources and use of an [REDACTED] e-mail address for electronic communications. Personal use of the Internet resources should not adversely affect the performance of official duties, should be of reasonable duration and frequency, and whenever possible, made during the employee's break time such as after duty hours or lunch periods.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

**(U) FACTS**

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] testified:

- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] became [REDACTED] supervisor in March 2011, but has known [REDACTED] since 2004.
- Everyone who had sat next to [REDACTED] or supervised [REDACTED] complained about the amount of time [REDACTED] spent on the Internet, although no one had said anything about it before.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] estimated that [REDACTED] spent five or six hours online on any given day.
- [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was "always" on the phone placing orders from [REDACTED] computer shopping.
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said to the best of [REDACTED] knowledge no one had addressed the Internet usage with [REDACTED]. Prior to March 2011 [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were coworkers, so [REDACTED] supervisor at that time would have been responsible for addressing the issue with [REDACTED].
- (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said several months ago [REDACTED] discussed the issue with [REDACTED]. Initially, [REDACTED] did not want to pursue the matter but finally advised [REDACTED] to report it.

(U// [REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] conducted an analysis of [REDACTED] computer network for the period of 1 April 2010 - 30 May 2010.
- [REDACTED] concluded that [REDACTED] had used [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for personal use to include shopping online and printing documents; however, there were no signs of the misuse or excessive use that [REDACTED] reported.

**(U) CONCLUSIONS**

(U// [REDACTED] We did not find sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegation that [REDACTED] misused the [REDACTED] computer system by spending hours at a time on the Internet, as [REDACTED] supervisor reported.

UNCLASSIFIED//

**(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// ) Recommend no further investigative work on this matter and that this inquiry be closed.

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 11-052

(U) TITLE: Alleged Violation of Intelligence Oversight Regulations

(U/[REDACTED]) The [REDACTED] completed an investigation into an allegation that [REDACTED] improperly collected a photo image of [REDACTED] residential community utilizing [REDACTED] satellite capabilities. [REDACTED] was an [REDACTED].

(U/[REDACTED]) A report of investigation prepared by the [REDACTED] and provided to the [REDACTED] contained an admission by [REDACTED] that, while in [REDACTED] official position, [REDACTED] used a government computer to capture a screen shot of [REDACTED] community, print the image, and download the image onto a thumb drive. [REDACTED] subsequently took the printed image and the thumb drive, which contained the image, to [REDACTED] residence. [REDACTED] also stated that [REDACTED] destroyed the thumb drive and the printed image.

(U/[REDACTED]) We found that [REDACTED] committed an intelligence oversight violation when [REDACTED] collected domestic imagery that was not necessary to conduct a function assigned to [REDACTED] as required by DoD Directive 5240.1R.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

12 DEC 2011

[REDACTED]  
MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: (U) Report of Unused Telecommunication Circuit at [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Case Number 11-056

1. (U// [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] received an email alleging that there is no accreditation for circuit [REDACTED] whose path was completed by [REDACTED] on 24 January 2007, and whose commercial path was completed on 8 May 2007. [REDACTED], has been waiting for an approval letter from the [REDACTED] since 02 August 2010. [REDACTED] paid \$4,339 a month for 51 months (1 May 2007 to 15 July 2011) a total of \$221,144, waiting for the accreditation of the circuit.

2. (U// [REDACTED] This is the [REDACTED] complaint that we have received about [REDACTED] paying for an unused telecommunication circuit [REDACTED]. Please address the allegation about the circuit forwarded above and review [REDACTED] circuit use to determine if the Agency is paying for other circuits that are not being used.

3. (U) We request that you take appropriate action to address these issue and furnish us with a report of any action taken or planned within 30 days of your receipt of this memorandum. An [REDACTED] tasker was opened to track the suspense.

4. (U// [REDACTED] Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] staff,  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Enclosure  
As stated

(U) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

NOV 5 2010

[REDACTED]  
MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED]

SUBJECT:

(U) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

REFERENCE:

(U) Report of Unused Telecommunication Circuit at [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

1. (U// [REDACTED]) The following reply is in response to [REDACTED], dated 30 August 2010. [REDACTED] has conducted a thorough analysis of the claim and has concluded that the claim submitted to the Defense Hotline is accurate. [REDACTED] has taken immediate steps to remedy the situation. Further, [REDACTED] has taken several significant steps in the last five months to improve the efficiency of its telecommunications activities. Details of the steps taken as related to the subject inquiry are below.

2. (U// [REDACTED]) In April 2010, [REDACTED] established the [REDACTED], realigning former Telecommunications Certifying Official activities over to the [REDACTED], so that the appropriate oversights could be applied toward this agency's transport infrastructure.

3. (U// [REDACTED]) In June 2010, [REDACTED] newly established [REDACTED] created the [REDACTED] by which unused or underutilized circuits would be identified and either discontinued or combined with other existing operational requirements currently in place to reduce the agency's telecommunications expenses.

4. (U// [REDACTED]) On 21 June 2010, the program manager for the subject circuit [REDACTED] was informed that the circuit had been identified as a candidate for disconnection and that the subject circuit would be processed for disconnect on 21 July 2010. As stated within the [REDACTED], the program manager was afforded a rebuttal opportunity. The following is an excerpt from the disconnect notification provided to the program manager:

"There has been no activity on this circuit for over 10 years. Further investigation reveals that the affiliated hardware supporting this circuit has never been accredited and that components of this system may be substandard to the [REDACTED] architectural minimum requirements. The monthly recurring charges for this circuit are \$1,135.00. A total of \$136,200.00 has been expended on this circuit since its inception on 9 March 1999."

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

SUBJECT: (U) [REDACTED]

5. (U// [REDACTED]) On 6 July 2010, the program manager responded to the [REDACTED] expressing a desire to provide a response to the 21 June 2010 communication.

6. (U// [REDACTED]) On 12 July 2010, the circuit [REDACTED] program manager briefed the circumstances surrounding the delay in this circuit becoming operational. The program manager stated that the circuit connection had been delayed because of accreditation issues. It was at this forum the program manager agreed to the disconnection of the subject circuit.

7. (U// [REDACTED]) On 13 July 2010, circuit [REDACTED] was added to the [REDACTED] and awaiting further disposition. This disposition included the execution of an engineering order, the updating to configuration management documentation and removal from all baseline documentation, review of supporting hardware that may need to be terminated or relocated, and the subsequent creation of a circuit disconnect order.

8. (U//FOUO) On 1 September 2010, a disconnect order for circuit [REDACTED] was submitted through the [REDACTED] order entry process, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and has seen been disconnected.

6. (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] is committed to provide fiscal accountability on all transport-related activities.

7. (U// [REDACTED]) The [REDACTED] point of contact for this matter is [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 11-058

**(U) TITLE:** Harassment and Hazing

### **(U) ALLEGATIONS**

(U// [REDACTED]) The [REDACTED] initiated this investigation as a result of allegations made by [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], who reported that [REDACTED] was being harassed and hazed by [REDACTED] former supervisor [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], and [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] started the harassment in 2005, which also included alleging that [REDACTED] was abusing [REDACTED] time and attendance. [REDACTED] further alleged that while deployed to Afghanistan in 2008, [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] and condoned [REDACTED] coworkers hazing and harassing [REDACTED]. The hazing included an incident where one of [REDACTED] coworkers placed a human finger in [REDACTED] desk drawer, and when [REDACTED] found the finger, [REDACTED] coworkers and [REDACTED] laughed at [REDACTED] and made comments.

### **(U) INVESTIGATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] did not develop evidence which showed that [REDACTED] harassed [REDACTED]. Also, [REDACTED] did not develop evidence which showed that [REDACTED] harassed or hazed [REDACTED] during their deployment.

### **(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) Provide the [REDACTED] a copy of this report for information purposes.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

12 August 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: DoD IG Hotline Issue regarding [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

On 21 July, 2011, I met with [REDACTED], concerning a hotline complaint concerning the activities of [REDACTED]. The complainant stated that [REDACTED] was attending meetings with [REDACTED] and was involved in issues outside of those associated with [REDACTED] assignment at [REDACTED]. The complainant also stated that [REDACTED] mistreated [REDACTED] staff, and that members of the front office staff had all left.

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] wife had recently started doing work for [REDACTED] as part of [REDACTED] assignment because of [REDACTED] Congressional Affairs background at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] wanted to use [REDACTED] expertise on the [REDACTED] issue since there will be significant Congressional interaction in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] acknowledged that [REDACTED] agreement has not been amended and that the [REDACTED] workforce may not be aware of these new duties. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] had replaced much of the [REDACTED] staff because they had been in those staff jobs much too long and that [REDACTED] wanted the staff to operate at a much faster pace.

Later in the day, I attended a meeting with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], the new [REDACTED]. They agreed that the [REDACTED] must be updated and that [REDACTED] needs to publicize their [REDACTED] activities and personnel. [REDACTED] also noted that tasking of [REDACTED] must come from [REDACTED] and not from [REDACTED]. I noted that [REDACTED] must be very careful that any workplace interactions with [REDACTED] be totally above board because the workforce is watching.

On 26 July, I met with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to review the [REDACTED] and discuss chain of command issues. We were surprised to learn that [REDACTED] was with the [REDACTED] and not between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] discussed ways to ensure that [REDACTED] remained totally within the [REDACTED] chain of command and how to reflect that in the [REDACTED].

On 28 July, I discussed this matter with the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was concerned about the terms of the [REDACTED] and was surprised to learn that the existing [REDACTED] was not with [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] had been told. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] would discuss this with [REDACTED].

On 29 July, [REDACTED] informed me that the [REDACTED] had put a hold on having the [REDACTED] amended to include [REDACTED] work until s/he spoke with [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 11-061

(U) TITLE: Misuse of Official Position and Possession of a Firearm in an [REDACTED] Facility

(U// [REDACTED]) The [REDACTED] investigated an allegation that [REDACTED], misused [REDACTED] assigned [REDACTED] Police credentials while [REDACTED] was not on his official [REDACTED] duties.

(U// [REDACTED]) The [REDACTED] investigation produced evidence through witness testimony and [REDACTED] own admission that [REDACTED] used [REDACTED] credentials in violation of [REDACTED] SOP 0013 (6)(d)(4) to identify [REDACTED] as an [REDACTED] during a traffic stop on 15 August 2011. Specifically, [REDACTED] testified that [REDACTED] did not use [REDACTED] credentials to identify [REDACTED] as an [REDACTED], but [REDACTED] admitted that [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] credential case that contained [REDACTED] driver's license to the [REDACTED] officer on at least one occasion when stopped for speeding.

(U// [REDACTED]) The voluntary search of [REDACTED] vehicle on 25 August 2011 revealed that [REDACTED] brought a personal firearm on the [REDACTED] installation. This action and [REDACTED] own testimony provide evidence that [REDACTED] violated [REDACTED] 412 (6)(e).

(U// [REDACTED]) Testimony and the search results also provide evidence to support a finding that [REDACTED] was not truthful during [REDACTED] interview with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] initially testified that [REDACTED] did not misuse [REDACTED] credentials and [REDACTED] never brought [REDACTED] personal firearm onto the [REDACTED] installation. However, [REDACTED] later admitted that [REDACTED] gave the [REDACTED] an [REDACTED] credential case containing [REDACTED] driver's license, and the search of [REDACTED] vehicle revealed that [REDACTED] brought [REDACTED] personal firearm onto the [REDACTED] installation.

(U// [REDACTED]) We recommend that the [REDACTED] review this report and, in coordination with the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED], take appropriate action.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

MEMORANDUM FOR

SUBJECT: (U) Referral of Time and Attendance Analysis,  
Case Number 11-062

1. (U// The has completed a preliminary analysis of an allegation that may have engaged in time and attendance (T&A) abuse from 01 April through 17 June 2011.

2. (U// Our analysis of access control records, T&A documents, and training and travel records for the period referenced above revealed a discrepancy of 75 hours and 43 minutes, worth \$3,845.05. The analysis disclosed the amount of time that claimed on T&A records, compared with the amount of time we could confirm independently that was present at assigned duty location. The value of the hours that did not work falls below the \$5,000 threshold for pursuing a T&A fraud investigation.

3. (U// We are providing this information for your review and action as you deem appropriate. We did not interview or immediate supervisor or conduct any further inquiry regarding the T&A discrepancy. We recommend ensuring that and supervisor have the opportunity to provide input regarding the matter. Should you determine that disciplinary action is appropriate, we recommend that you coordinate the action with the and the. Please consider recouping any funds paid to when was not present for duty.

4. (U) Please furnish us with a report of action taken or planned within 30 days of your receipt of this memorandum. A tasking was established in to track the suspense.

5. (U// Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact at or at

Enclosure  
As stated

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//

27 October 2011

**Memorandum for File**

On 14 Sep 2011 at approximately 1400, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] met with me in the [REDACTED] spaces. [REDACTED] had called and left a voice message earlier in the day asking that [REDACTED] meet with me.

Upon arrival, [REDACTED] requested assistance in retrieving messages made on [REDACTED] by a [REDACTED] contractor who [REDACTED] claimed was making disparaging comments about [REDACTED] that were both unwelcome and not appreciated. [REDACTED] identified the [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who worked for the [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told me that [REDACTED] had asked [REDACTED] to stop with the comments and it was not until 16 Aug 2011, when [REDACTED] contacted [REDACTED] supervisor by email that the comments ceased. [REDACTED] identified the supervisor as [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] described [REDACTED] as a former "acquaintance" who was assigned to the same [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] in 2002. A mutual friend, [REDACTED], who also worked at [REDACTED] with [REDACTED], had informed [REDACTED] of the comments. [REDACTED] also knew [REDACTED] since 2002, and had met [REDACTED] while in the [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] relayed that on 16 Aug 2011, between 1400 and 1500, [REDACTED] received a phone call on [REDACTED] secure line [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. The unidentified [REDACTED] caller said "I'll get you back."

[REDACTED] relayed that on 8 Sep 2011 [REDACTED] met with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] had contacted [REDACTED] 6 Sep 2011 at approximately 1430 and had requested a meeting – they did not tell [REDACTED] the subject. The [REDACTED] name was [REDACTED]. At the 8 Sep 2011 meeting, [REDACTED] relayed that the [REDACTED] "asked generic questions" and suspected that [REDACTED] was a "[REDACTED]" and were interested in [REDACTED] communications with [REDACTED] family members, particularly [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] explained that [REDACTED] had not spoken with [REDACTED] family for at least [REDACTED] years – they had "disowned" [REDACTED] after high school.

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] suspected that the "unidentified [REDACTED] who called [REDACTED] on 16 Aug 2011, was [REDACTED] who was upset at [REDACTED] because [REDACTED] had contacted [REDACTED] supervisor and asked [REDACTED] to cease with the disparaging comments. [REDACTED] also suspected it was [REDACTED] who contacted the [REDACTED]

On 15 Sep 2011, [REDACTED] called at approximately 0930 and asked that I see [REDACTED] immediately. At 0945 we met in [REDACTED] spaces. With regard to the phone call from the unidentified [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated:

That it was "... not [REDACTED]. I suspected that it may be [REDACTED] ... The whole weekend is when I thought it might be [REDACTED] ... I felt it was [REDACTED] ... I don't have proof." [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had not heard from [REDACTED] since 16 Aug 2011.

I pressed [REDACTED] to identify the [REDACTED] caller and why [REDACTED] would think it was [REDACTED] who made the anonymous call. There were long silent pauses in the conversation.

[REDACTED] then admitted that "I made it [the phone call] up. There was no phone call." When asked why [REDACTED] would make up a story of a phone call from an unidentified [REDACTED] who stated "I'll get you back" and relay that story to a member of the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] replied "Because I wanted to know who made the complaint to the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] thought that the [REDACTED] sessions might help [REDACTED] in identifying who made the complaint to the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had been told that in order to obtain the [REDACTED] sessions, [REDACTED] had to request it through the [REDACTED]

I then asked [REDACTED] if there was anything else [REDACTED] wanted to admit to me or discuss. [REDACTED] said "no" and the interview was concluded.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

**CASE NUMBER:** 11-067

### SUBJECT

### ALLEGATION

Destruction of Government Property (Internal Working Files)

### BACKGROUND

On 28 July 2011, at 1330 hours, the [REDACTED] Hotline received a call from a [REDACTED] caller who did not want to reveal [REDACTED] identity. The caller related that a co-worker of [REDACTED], was committing "sabotage." The caller related that within the past two weeks of the call, [REDACTED] had deleted working files (instructions) from shared folders within the [REDACTED]. The caller did not believe any of the files were classified, but related that [REDACTED] is deleting or has deleted files on purpose because [REDACTED] is upset with [REDACTED] employment in the agency. The caller left the name of [REDACTED] supervisor, [REDACTED]. The caller did not know if [REDACTED] was aware that [REDACTED] was deleting the files but said that even if [REDACTED] was, [REDACTED] would do nothing to correct the problem/issue" because "for the past [REDACTED] years, [REDACTED] has been allowed to do what [REDACTED] wants with no repercussions from [REDACTED]"

### APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS

- **18 U.S.C. § 1361 Destruction of Government Property**, states:

Section 1361 protects 'any property' of the United States or an agency or department thereof, or any property being manufactured or constructed for the United States or an agency or department thereof, from willful depredation or attempted depredation. 'Depredation' has been characterized as the act of plundering, robbing, pillaging or laying waste.

- **NI 8040.1R10 Appendix 1, Records and Information Life-Cycle Management, § 101-05 Office Administration**, states:

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

These files relate to the performance of internal or housekeeping activities within an Office.

- 101 Series—General Administration. These files are for routine administrative operations or procedures that do not pertain to the direct mission of the office.
- 101-05--Office Administration Records are defined as paper, electronic, or both, that relate to the internal administration or housekeeping activities of an office. Such records include: internal activity reports, reference files, and other non-mission activities. Disposition of these files is designated as "Temporary; Destroy/delete when 2 years old."
- **NI 4160.3R6, Investigations of Lost, Damaged, or Destroyed Property, Approved 10 June 2009, 7.b. Procedures, states:**

Investigations are required for all accountable property that is lost, damaged, or destroyed, when caused by or in possession of [REDACTED] personnel. Investigations may be conducted for non-accountable property, when determined appropriate by the approving authority.

#### FACTS

[REDACTED] testified:

- [REDACTED] was the former [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] employee in July 2011, when this incident was reported.
- [REDACTED] had not heard anything about [REDACTED] deleting files or anyone complaining about files missing. [REDACTED] stated that while [REDACTED] worked for [REDACTED] "[REDACTED] did an excellent job logistics-wise."
- [REDACTED] did not think that [REDACTED] would delete any files or do anything "on purpose" or for "sabotage."

[REDACTED], testified:

- [REDACTED] had not deleted any files.
- There was a reorganization in the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] was assigned to a new position. [REDACTED] other people were going to take over [REDACTED] position and [REDACTED] was to train them. However, "we had some difficulties in the training process." The [REDACTED] people taking over for [REDACTED] were [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

- [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] "had some conflict in trying to schedule time for [REDACTED] to be trained."

I did sit down and train [REDACTED] for approximately an hour. I wrote out step-by-step directions on how to do the job, the program management of security incidents and lost property. I also wrote out a step-by-step process on how to do the metrics for the two programs. I tried to actually walk [REDACTED] through one of the processes, but [REDACTED] refused to do it. [REDACTED] said I didn't give [REDACTED] enough information or something. I started training [REDACTED] in May 2011.

- In August 2011, [REDACTED] was still "technically" the program manager for the [REDACTED] programs because [REDACTED] was still "doing the metrics for it and I was still kind of training the [REDACTED] people."
- On 3 August 2011, [REDACTED] accessed the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] folder to update the week's submission, and [REDACTED] saw that [REDACTED] had already written a submission. However, instead of submitting the status of lost property and security incidents, [REDACTED] complained in the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had not been trained on either the lost property or security programs and therefore, would have difficulty in reporting the metrics. "It had nothing to do with the programs or the status of the programs."
- [REDACTED] took out [REDACTED] submission and sent it to [REDACTED], and put in an updated status in the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on both of the programs because "I knew that [REDACTED] personal comments], [were] inappropriate for the [REDACTED]"
- [REDACTED] complaints were the only things [REDACTED] ever took out of either the [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] "It wasn't nothing [sic] deleted, a file or anything. I just updated what [REDACTED] had written and I updated it to reflect the status report." "I never deleted anything, any files or anything."

## CONCLUSION

[REDACTED] inquiry found that there was no evidence to suggest that [REDACTED] committed "sabotage" or deleted working files (instructions) from shared folders within the [REDACTED].

## RECOMMENDATION

Close this case without further investigation.



UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED//

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 11-070

**(U) TITLE:** Time and Attendance Fraud by an Employee

### **(U) ALLEGATION**

(U//) This investigation addressed an allegation of time and attendance fraud referred to the ) by the on 30 August 2011, regarding

### **(U) INVESTIGATION**

(U//) reviewed access control records, organizational time and attendance sheets, master time history from the , Wellness Center sign-in records, e-mail records of 59-minute release authorizations, visitor itineraries, and team-building events. We interviewed team lead, former supervisor, and current supervisor.

(U//) The investigation developed evidence to support a finding that was not present at assigned duty location for 54.55 hours from 26 April through 2 December 2011. claimed this time on time sheets and received \$2,275.28 in salary, but was not charged any leave. could not provide evidence that worked any of this time.

### **(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U//) We recommend that the review this report and, in coordination with the , and , take appropriate action to include recoupment of funds or leave or both from . We also recommend that the take appropriate action to ensure that all employees understand the provisions of Instruction 6200.1R9, Wellness Program, especially Appendix 2, , 4 April 2007.

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 11-072

**(U) TITLE:** Mismanagement and Misconduct

### **(U) ALLEGATIONS**

(U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] initiated this investigation on 9 September 2011, based on information received from the [REDACTED]. They requested an investigation into the following issues relating to possible mismanagement and misconduct by [REDACTED] employees leading up to the death of their [REDACTED].

1. (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] and other [REDACTED] violated the [REDACTED] protocol by failing to delay a scheduled 22 June 2011 polygraph examination for [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] provided documented medical reasons for postponement of the examination.
2. (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] violated [REDACTED] protocol by failing to grant [REDACTED] advanced medical leave.
3. (U//FOUO) [REDACTED], engaged in misconduct during [REDACTED] questioning of [REDACTED] during a polygraph exam on 6 June 2011.

### **(U) INVESTIGATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) We conducted a review of the [REDACTED] investigation of [REDACTED] death (determined to be a suicide), the [REDACTED] policies on granting leave, the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] policies for conducting polygraph exams, the counterintelligence investigation by [REDACTED], the documents found at [REDACTED] desk by [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] death, the access control records and computer logon activity for [REDACTED] in the days before [REDACTED].

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED//**

death, and the audio recording of [REDACTED] 6 June 2011 polygraph examination. We interviewed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

(U// [REDACTED]) On 6 June 2011, [REDACTED] took a suitability polygraph exam as part of [REDACTED] clearance update. [REDACTED] rendered a "No Opinion" result for this exam and scheduled with [REDACTED] to re-take the exam on 22 June 2011. [REDACTED] went to a doctor mid-day on 21 June 2011 and received doctor's notes that recommended [REDACTED] not take the polygraph exam at that time. These notes were never provided to [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] did not show for [REDACTED] 22 June 2011 exam. On 23 June 2011 [REDACTED] was found dead in [REDACTED] home. A search of [REDACTED] office on 24 June 2011 revealed the doctor's notes in a folder on [REDACTED] desk. Access control records and computer logon activity showed that [REDACTED] had returned to work the afternoon after [REDACTED] 21 June doctor's appointment.

(U// [REDACTED]) During the months leading up to June 2011, [REDACTED] requested several leaves, all of which were handled by [REDACTED] within [REDACTED] policy guidelines.

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] conduct during the 6 June 2011 polygraph examination of [REDACTED] was professional and abided by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] guidelines.

(U// [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] investigation did not develop sufficient evidence to substantiate the original allegations.

#### **(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U) No further action is required. The report of investigation is provided for information only.

**UNCLASSIFIED//**

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

30 January 2012

SUBJECT: Case No. 11-074, Possible Time and Attendance Fraud

1. (U// [REDACTED] This case was opened based upon a request for assistance from [REDACTED] requested assistance in collecting the [REDACTED] access control records for [REDACTED] from 1 June 2011 to 23 September 2011.
2. (U) In response to the request, [REDACTED] undertook the following actions to resolve the matter:
  - (U) On 23 September 2011, [REDACTED] requested [REDACTED] control records from [REDACTED]
  - (U) On 23 September 2011, [REDACTED] provided the requested records.
  - (U) On 4 October 2011, the requested records were provided to [REDACTED]
  - (U) On 27 January 2012, [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] had taken the following action:
    - i. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] employment was terminated.
    - ii. (U) They identified 130.2 hours falsely charged. At a billing rate of \$114.18, this totaled \$14,864.33. They will work with our finance/contracting offices to make the contract whole.
3. (U) No further [REDACTED] action on this matter is required. Recommend this case be closed.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
(U) Concur/Nonconcur with recommendation.

cc: AC

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: [REDACTED] Case Number 11-075, [REDACTED] Computer Misuse Report,  
Case Number RES0249-11

REFERENCE: (U) [REDACTED] Instruction 8470.2R8, Internet Usage, 9 December 2009

1. (U// [REDACTED] Attached is a copy of an [REDACTED] investigative report, [REDACTED]. The report contains evidence that [REDACTED] misused government computer resources. [REDACTED] is a contractor employee with [REDACTED]; who formerly worked in [REDACTED] under contract number [REDACTED] which has since been terminated, and currently works under contract number [REDACTED] which supports the [REDACTED].
2. (U// [REDACTED] On March 17, 2011, [REDACTED] conducted audits on the [REDACTED]. The audit showed the profile [REDACTED] was using workstation [REDACTED] to send, receive and store sexually explicit emails. [REDACTED] conducted a preliminary inquiry and found that on March 17, 2011, the profile [REDACTED] while logged into [REDACTED] replied to an email from [REDACTED]. The email contained vulgar language of a sexual nature. The exchange profile is assigned to [REDACTED]. Additionally, [REDACTED] collected a file of the "[REDACTED]" exchange account. Analysis of the file revealed [REDACTED] sexually explicit emails were sent and [REDACTED] explicit emails were stored by the "[REDACTED]" profile. The emails were stored in a subfolder of the inbox labeled "Personal" subfolder "[REDACTED]" and "[REDACTED]".
3. (U) We determined that this matter did not warrant criminal investigation or additional investigation by this office. We are forwarding the [REDACTED] report for your review and determination of any action you deem appropriate.
4. (U) Please provide us with a report of action taken or proposed within 30 days of receipt of this memorandum. This suspense will be tracked to completion through the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] will report overdue suspenses at the [REDACTED] key components meeting.
5. (U// [REDACTED] Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] of my staff, [REDACTED]. Thank you for your cooperation and prompt attention to this matter.

Enclosure  
As stated

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 12-002

**TITLE:** Time and Attendance Abuse

### (U) ALLEGATION

(U// [REDACTED]) The [REDACTED] received an anonymous e-mail on 3 October 2011, alleging that [REDACTED] signed out and left work early "multiple times." The complaint also alleged that management was aware of the issue but had done nothing about it.

### (U) INVESTIGATION

(U// [REDACTED]) Investigators conducted an analysis of [REDACTED] access control records and master time history for the period 27 June–16 December 2011. Initial results indicated that [REDACTED] had **87.44** hours of unaccounted-for time, a loss to the government of **\$5,254.07**. However, after interviewing [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] supervisors and examining additional information and documentation that they provided, we revised the time that [REDACTED] claimed but was not entitled to from 87.44 hours to **1.84** hours, a loss to the government of **\$110.77**. The fewer hours were determined by giving [REDACTED] credit for daily, 45-minute [REDACTED] participation, occasional excused early absences of 59 minutes or less, and other instances that were not accurately reflected on [REDACTED] master time history. [REDACTED] was not charged leave for the remaining 1.84 hours and could not provide evidence that [REDACTED] worked this time.

### (U) OTHER MATTERS

(U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] supervisors knew about and approved [REDACTED] early departures to participate in the [REDACTED] and take advantage of early releases. [REDACTED] Instruction (NI) 1402.1R11 and 1422.1R11 require documentation of any excused absence and NI 6200.1R9 requires documentation of absence for participation in the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] did not follow [REDACTED] policy in either instance. As a result of the investigation, [REDACTED] stated they have "implemented new procedures to document time and attendance of each employee to ensure their hours are consistent with [REDACTED] policy."

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

**(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// ) We recommend that the , review this report, and in coordination with the and the , take any action deemed necessary.

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 12-003

**TITLE:** Alleged Travel Abuse by a [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

### ALLEGATIONS

(U// [REDACTED]) This investigation addressed allegations received on 3 October 2011, based on a letter forwarded from the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] office. [REDACTED] requested a preliminary inquiry into allegations of travel abuse by [REDACTED] and whether or not [REDACTED] travel from [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED] area complied with applicable regulations.

### INVESTIGATION

(U// [REDACTED]) We analyzed [REDACTED] Defense Travel System records for the period 4 January 2010-17 February 2012. We also interviewed [REDACTED] current and former [REDACTED] supervisors, as well as the [REDACTED]

(U// [REDACTED]) Our investigation did not develop evidence to support an allegation of travel abuse on the part of [REDACTED]. Testimony and travel records showed that [REDACTED] travel to [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] was appropriate, in support of the [REDACTED] mission, and complied with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] supervisor and [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] were aware of the travel situation and conveyed their intentions to transfer [REDACTED] back to an [REDACTED] position at [REDACTED], and fill his current position in [REDACTED] with another person.

### RECOMMENDATION

(U// [REDACTED]) We recommend that no further action be taken in regard to this matter.

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]



UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 12-005

**(U) TITLE:** Alleged Abuse of Authority and Creating a Hostile Work Environment

### **(U) ALLEGATIONS**

**(U// [REDACTED])** This investigation addressed two allegations received as an [REDACTED] Hotline complaint on 7 October 2011, regarding [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The complaint alleged that [REDACTED] (1) consistently abused [REDACTED] authority by asking contractors to perform work outside of the contract, and (2) created a hostile work environment for government and contractor employees.

### **(U) INVESTIGATION**

**(U// [REDACTED])** [REDACTED] reviewed the statement of work for the [REDACTED] contract for the specific duties that an [REDACTED] was required to perform. We also analyzed [REDACTED] 360 Insight Survey Feedback Report. We interviewed [REDACTED] former supervisor and former [REDACTED], as well as contractors and government employees who worked with [REDACTED].

**(U// [REDACTED])** Our investigation did not develop evidence to support the allegation that [REDACTED] consistently abused [REDACTED] authority by asking contractors to perform work outside of the contract. We did find, however, that a contractor performed some administrative duties that were not completely in line with the duties of a technical advisor.

**(U// [REDACTED])** Testimony disclosed conflict between [REDACTED] and a former employee. Testimony also revealed that [REDACTED] was aggressive, demanding, and at times abrasive. This conduct had a negative effect on some of [REDACTED] professional relationships. We did not, however, identify specific actions or incidents which showed that [REDACTED] created and fostered a hostile work environment.

### **(U) RECOMMENDATION**

**(U// [REDACTED])** We are providing this report to [REDACTED] management for information.

**(U)** [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 12-008

**(U) TITLE:** Time and Attendance Fraud and Forgery by an [REDACTED] Employee

### **(U) ALLEGATIONS**

(U// [REDACTED]) This investigation addressed two allegations about [REDACTED]. The complaint alleged that [REDACTED] (1) engaged in time and attendance abuse between 4 May and 22 October 2011, and (2) submitted eight forged doctor's notes, giving the appearance that [REDACTED] was under the care of [REDACTED] physician between 4 August and 19 October 2011 when [REDACTED] was not.

### **(U) INVESTIGATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] reviewed and analyzed access control records, training records, organizational time and attendance sheets, master pay records and [REDACTED] activity calendars. They also reviewed the automated records of a medical practice whose services [REDACTED] had used and met with [REDACTED] physician.

(U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] developed evidence that [REDACTED] engaged in time and attendance abuse. The evidence disclosed that [REDACTED] was not present at [REDACTED] assigned duty locations for 223.33 hours that [REDACTED] claimed on [REDACTED] time sheets, a value of \$14,833.87. The [REDACTED] also found that [REDACTED] submitted forged and false doctor's notes, giving the appearance that [REDACTED] was under [REDACTED] physician's care when [REDACTED] was not.

(U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] retired from Federal Service during the investigation. The [REDACTED], declined to pursue this matter criminally, and advised that [REDACTED] should seek administrative remedies.

### **(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) We recommend that the [REDACTED], review this report and, in coordination with the [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], take appropriate action, to include recoupment of funds from [REDACTED] retirement account. In accordance with 31 USC § 3711, Federal agencies are required to attempt collection of debts owed to the U.S. Government.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 12-009

**(U) TITLE:** Alleged Hostile Work Environment and Time and Attendance Fraud

### **(U) ALLEGATIONS**

(U// [REDACTED]) This investigation addressed two complaints received through the [REDACTED] Hotline regarding [REDACTED]. The complaints alleged that [REDACTED] created a hostile work environment and committed time and attendance fraud.

### **(U) INVESTIGATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) We did not find evidence that [REDACTED] created or fostered a hostile working environment. [REDACTED] was demanding and used a direct management style, which some of [REDACTED] employees did not appreciate. [REDACTED] employees found [REDACTED] to be belittling at times.

(U// [REDACTED]) We did not find evidence that [REDACTED] committed time and attendance fraud by arriving at work late and departing early. We obtained testimony from [REDACTED] and reviewed and analyzed relevant documents and data. The review revealed that for the period of 1 January through 15 December 2011, [REDACTED] worked 15.25 more hours than [REDACTED] claimed on [REDACTED] time sheets.

(U// [REDACTED]) We found that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] supervisor did not comply with the requirement in NI 1422.1R10 to establish and retain a written work schedule.

### **(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) We are providing this report to [REDACTED] supervisor for informational purposes and appropriate action, which should include establishing and retaining a written work schedule in accordance with NI 1422.1R10.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

MAR 21 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR

SUBJECT: (U) Transmittal of Final Action Report, Case Number 12-016

1. (U//) The received a report of investigation from the admissions made by , employed by , and working in the at admitted the following:

- On one occasion between 1989 and 1990, masturbated in a at the
- On one occasion between 1989 and 1992, masturbated in vehicle while inside the security fence line at
- Sometime between 1991 and 1992, placed penis on face while at residence,
- Sometime between 2004 and 2005, masturbated in personnel vehicle in the parking lot of a closed restaurant in

2. (U//) The information regarding the incident with was provided to the initiated an investigation into the allegation of sexual abuse of a minor. waived Miranda rights and agreed to be interviewed by admitted that placed penis on face for only seconds while lay on a bed in an upstairs bedroom. explained that actions were due to being young and stupid and that was trying to be funny. denied being sexually gratified or aroused by actions, and ever touching any other child inappropriately.

3. (U//) The made several attempts to interview; however, they declined to be interviewed or discuss the case. No criminal charges will be filed by the against, as the investigation could not move forward without one cooperation.

4. (U//) We are providing this information for any action that you deem to be appropriate. We are not establishing an tasker for this memorandum; however, if you do take action against, please let us know what action you take. If you have questions or require additional information, please contact at or myself at

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

6 December 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]

**(U) SUBJECT:** Misuse of Government Information System

1. **(U) AUTHORITY:** A preliminary inquiry was conducted under the authority and guidance of: U.S.C title 18 Part 1 Chapter 47 Section 1030; "Fraud and Related Activity in Connection with Computers"; "OMB A-130, Appendix III"; NI8010.2R7, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Information Systems Security and Training"; NI8470.2R8, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Internet Usage"; NI8470.3R8, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Use of Electronic Mail and other Electronic Communications"

2. **(U) MATTER INVESTIGATED:** Misuse of [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] network and computer system (Pornography).

3. **(U//FOUO) FACTS:**

a. (U// [REDACTED] On 21 October 2011, an audit of the [REDACTED] network was conducted to discover any potential [REDACTED] misuse. The audit reflected that a specific system and user account were potentially being utilized to query for pornographic images.

b. (U// [REDACTED] On 9 September 2011 between 1230-1244 hours, 15 September 2011 between 1227-1229 hours, 19 September 2011 between 1222-1250 hours, 20 September 2011 between 1233-1239 hours, and 23 September 2011 between 1234-1240 hours the audit showed that userid [REDACTED], assigned to [REDACTED] according to network records, performed queries for pornographic images [REDACTED] on the computer name [REDACTED]

c. (U// [REDACTED] On 14 October 2011 during the 1900 hour, on 22 October 2011 during the 1700 hour, on 11 November during the 2000 hour, and on 18 November 2011 during the 1900 hour the audit showed that userid [REDACTED] assigned to [REDACTED] according to network records, performed queries for pornographic images [REDACTED] on the computer name [REDACTED]

d. (U// [REDACTED] On 29 October 2011 during the 1800 hour and on 3 November 2011 during the 1800 hour the audit showed that userid [REDACTED], assigned to [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
**UNCLASSIFIED//** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] according to network records, performed queries for pornographic images [REDACTED] on the computer name [REDACTED]

4. (U// [REDACTED]) **CONCLUSION:** Base on the evidence obtained to date, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] concludes that a case of misuse of the [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] network and computer system exists against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] past internet usage revealed that [REDACTED] used [REDACTED] separate [REDACTED] workstations to actively search and view pornographic images during the period of 9 September 2011 to 18 November 2011 in direct violation of NI8470.2R8, Paragraph 7, Section D, Number 1.

5. (U// [REDACTED]) **ACTION:** Following this report's review by the [REDACTED], it is requested that [REDACTED] supervisor provide [REDACTED] a written response to this investigation. The response should include a planned course of action regarding [REDACTED] within 30 days of receipt of this report.

6. (U// [REDACTED]) **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

a. (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] shall be cited for the misuse of [REDACTED] (Internet-Pornography).

b. (U// [REDACTED]) A copy of this report should be forwarded by the supervisor for inclusion in the personnel file of [REDACTED], to facilitate official record keeping.

c. (U// [REDACTED]) General Counsel considers legal action as appropriate.

d. (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] investigates any relevant time and attendance issues associated with this investigation.

e. (U// [REDACTED]) All [REDACTED] employees and contractors must attend the required mandatory training prior to receiving access to any [REDACTED] [REDACTED] resource. The mandatory training is accessible through the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] web site on the [REDACTED]. The following training is required and must be attended annually: NGC 013414 "CBT Information Assurance Awareness" and NGC 016094 "CBT-NGA Annual Security Refresher Training."

f. (U// [REDACTED]) The supervisor should obtain a copy of NI 1455.1R6 "[REDACTED] Instruction for Employee Adverse Action and Discipline." This NI applies to civilian employees only. The supervisor should reference Table 2 "Table of Offenses and Penalties," section 5 "Computer Misuse" and follow the guidelines established for the administration of disciplinary and adverse actions within [REDACTED]. A copy of the NI 1455.1R6 instruction is available on the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] web site located on the [REDACTED]

**UNCLASSIFIED//** [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//[REDACTED]

7. (U) Questions regarding this investigation may be directed to the [REDACTED]

[illegible]

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

The image shows a document page that has been almost entirely redacted. A large, solid black rectangle covers the majority of the page's content area. Above this main redaction, there are several smaller black rectangular boxes of different sizes, likely covering headers, footers, or specific sections of text. A single small black square is positioned just below the main redacted area on the left side. The overall appearance is that of a document where all information has been obscured for security or privacy reasons.

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

13 July 2012

SUBJECT: (U) Case No. 12-026, Alleged Time and Attendance Abuse

1. (U// ) This case was opened based on a request for assistance from [REDACTED] on 20 Dec 2011. [REDACTED] requested that the [REDACTED] obtain [REDACTED] and phone records for one of [REDACTED] employees, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] deputy, [REDACTED], would review the records and would notify the [REDACTED] of the results of their analysis. Prior to this request, [REDACTED] requested the [REDACTED] obtain [REDACTED] days of records for [REDACTED] to determine if [REDACTED] was at work for full days and whether or not [REDACTED] was in the building during that time.

(U) (This case was originally assigned to [REDACTED] but was reassigned to [REDACTED] on 1 March 2012, following [REDACTED] departure from [REDACTED])

2. (U// ) In response to the request, [REDACTED] undertook the following actions:
- (U// ) 11 Jul 12: Pulled [REDACTED] data on [REDACTED] and determined that [REDACTED] resigned from employment with [REDACTED] on 6 Apr 12. Contacted [REDACTED] to confirm that [REDACTED] was no longer on [REDACTED] either in an employee or contractor capacity. [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] had resigned on the specified date, after a day's notice to the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] also requested that we close out our inquiry against [REDACTED].
  - (U// ) 29 Mar 12: Phone records were received and provided to [REDACTED].
  - (U// ) 28 Mar 12: [REDACTED] records were received and provided to [REDACTED].
  - (U// ) 7 Mar 12: [REDACTED] requested a full calendar year of [REDACTED] records for [REDACTED] (1 Jan-30 Jun 11)
  - (U// ) 6 Mar 12: [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that they had informally counseled [REDACTED] regarding the amount of time [REDACTED] spent on the phone and also regarding [REDACTED] time and attendance. [REDACTED] stated that since [REDACTED] counseling, they haven't had any further significant problems regarding those issues; however, [REDACTED] said that another issue may have arisen, to include a possible [REDACTED] issue. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] would be meeting with [REDACTED] management chain to discuss alternatives and options. [REDACTED] offered their assistance and [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] would keep the [REDACTED] informed and



~~UNCLASSIFIED//FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

also requested additional [REDACTED] and phone records for [REDACTED] for the period 1 Jan-30 Jun 2011.

- (U// [REDACTED] 20 Jan 12: Received phone records for [REDACTED] and forwarded them to [REDACTED]
- (U// [REDACTED] 12 Jan 12: Delivered phone records to [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] review.

3. (U) No further [REDACTED] action on this matter is required. Recommend this case be closed.

[REDACTED]

4. (U) Concur/Nonconcur.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

## REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

(U) CASE NUMBER: 12-028

(U) SUBJECT

(U//

(U) ALLEGATION

(U// Time and attendance abuse

(U) BACKGROUND

(U) The examined contractor employees assigned to the facility to determine if they were working full scheduled workdays in accordance with the contract statement of work. selected contract number

Subject Matter Expertise, awarded to the firm, because it met the following predetermined parameters:

- It was a level-of-effort contract.
- The contractors had permanent work space at
- The work performed in the had to be done either onsite at a government facility or offsite at a contractor facility.
- Based on access control records, some of the contractor employees were physically in the facility for fewer than eight hours a day.

(U// identified contractor employees assigned to the contract who each seemed to have missed a minimum of hours of work over the -month period from 1 June through 31 August 2010. was one of the employees. As a result we opened an investigation to examine whether was abusing time and attendance at government expense.

(U) SCOPE

(U) Our investigation was conducted in accordance with Instruction 7410.8R3, Inspector General Investigations and Ombudsman Intervention, 27 July 2007, and the "Quality Standards for Investigations," December 2003, set forth by the President's

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//

Council on Integrity and Efficiency (now the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency).

(U// ) We reviewed and compared access control records from all facilities with signed time sheets for the period 1 June through 31 August 2010. We counted only those days when the access control records were available and showed through entry and exit times that worked fewer hours than those claimed on time sheets. Dates showing no entry or exit time were disregarded.

(U) We reviewed the contract statement of work, dated 5 November 2008. It did not specify whether contract employees should take a half-hour lunch break; therefore, we adjusted our analysis of time and attendance to examine straight time without a lunch break.

#### **(U) APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS**

- (U) 18 USC § 287, False, Fictitious, or Fraudulent Claims
- (U) 18 USC § 1001 (a), Fraud and False Statements

#### **(U) FACTS**

- (U// ) We prepared an Excel spreadsheet of time and attendance for each workday from 1 June through 31 August 2010. The spreadsheet contained data from time sheets and access control records.
- (U// ) As the result of the initial analysis, determined that may have abused time and attendance.
- (U) We asked , the prime on the contract, to conduct an internal review and disclose any time and attendance violation.
- (U// ) Since was a assigned as a subcontractor, asked legal department to assist with the time sheet assessment.
- (U// ) was asked to review time sheet history and access control records for the period in question to assess whether time charges appeared appropriate and to disclose any discrepancies.
- (U// ) We provided access control records to for the period. In addition, legal department obtained time sheet history from its system for the same time period. The legal department compared access control records to the time sheet history.

**UNCLASSIFIED//~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~**

**█ CASE NUMBER: 12-028**

(U//█ (U//█ interviewed █ about █ time for the period under review. █ stated that, as a subject matter expert, █ spent considerable time working offsite at █ facility and attending meetings. █ officials confirmed that █ worked a considerable amount of time offsite and this would account for the shortages detailed in █

**(U) CONCLUSIONS**

(U//█ Based on documents and information provided by █ legal department and our analysis, we determined that █ was properly recording his time and attendance and there was no shortage of hours. Therefore, we found no evidence that he engaged in time and attendance abuse.

**(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U//█ We recommend no further investigative work on this matter and closing this inquiry.

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 12-029

(U) SUBJECT

(U// [REDACTED]

(U) ALLEGATION

(U// [REDACTED] Time and attendance abuse

(U) BACKGROUND

(U) The [REDACTED] examined contractor employees assigned to the [REDACTED] facility to determine if they were performing their full scheduled workdays in accordance with the contract statement of work.

[REDACTED] selected contract number [REDACTED] Subject Matter Expertise, awarded to the firm, [REDACTED], because it met the following predetermined parameters:

- It was a level-of-effort contract.
- The contractors had permanent work space at [REDACTED]
- The work performed in the [REDACTED], had to be done either onsite at a government facility or offsite at a contractor facility.
- Based on their access control records, some of the contractor employees were physically in the [REDACTED] facility for fewer than eight hours a day.

(U// [REDACTED] identified [REDACTED] contractor employees assigned to the contract who each seemed to have missed a minimum of [REDACTED] hours of work over the [REDACTED]-month period from 1 June through 31 August 2010. [REDACTED] was one of the [REDACTED] employees. As a result we opened an investigation to examine whether [REDACTED] was abusing time and attendance at government expense.

(U) SCOPE

(U) Our investigation was conducted in accordance with [REDACTED] Instruction 7410.8R3, Inspector General Investigations and Ombudsman Intervention, 27 July 2007, and the "Quality Standards for Investigations," December 2003, set forth by the President's

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

**CASE NUMBER: 12-029**

Council on Integrity and Efficiency (now the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency).

(U// ) We reviewed and compared access control records from all facilities with signed time sheets for the period 1 June through 31 August 2010. We counted only those days when the access control records were available and showed through entry and exit times that worked fewer hours than those claimed on time sheets. Dates showing no entry or exit time were disregarded.

(U) We reviewed the contract statement of work, dated 5 November 2008. It did not designate whether contract employees should take a half-hour lunch break; therefore, we adjusted our analysis of time and attendance to examine straight time without a lunch break.

**(U) APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS**

- (U) 18 USC § 287, False, Fictitious, or Fraudulent Claims
- (U) 18 USC § 1001 (a), Fraud and False Statements

**(U) FACTS**

- (U// ) We prepared an Excel spreadsheet of time and attendance for each workday from 1 June through 31 August 2010. The spreadsheet contained data from time sheets and access control records.
- (U// ) As the result of the initial analysis, determined that may have abused time and attendance.
- (U) We asked , the prime on the contract, to conduct an internal review and disclose any time and attendance violation.
- (U// ) Since was a employee assigned as a subcontractor, asked legal department to assist with the time sheet assessment.
- (U// ) was asked to review time sheet history and access control records for the period in question to assess whether time charges appeared appropriate and to disclose any discrepancies.
- (U// ) We provided access control records to for the period. In addition, legal department obtained time sheet

■ CASE NUMBER: 12-029

history from its system for the same period. The legal department compared  
■ access control records to the time sheet history.

(U//■ interviewed ■ about ■ time for the period under review. ■ stated that, as a subject matter expert, ■ spent considerable time working offsite at ■ facility and attending meetings. ■ officials confirmed that ■ worked a considerable amount of time offsite and this would account for the shortages detailed in ■

#### **(U) CONCLUSIONS**

(U//■ Based on documents and information provided by ■ legal department and our analysis, we determined that ■ was properly recording ■ time and attendance and there was no shortage of hours. Therefore, we found no evidence that ■ engaged in time and attendance abuse.

#### **(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U//■ We recommend no further investigative work on this matter and closing this inquiry.

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 12-030

(U) SUBJECT

(U// [REDACTED]

(U) ALLEGATION

(U// [REDACTED] Time and attendance abuse

(U) BACKGROUND

(U) The [REDACTED] examined contractor employees assigned to the [REDACTED] facility to determine if they were working full scheduled workdays in accordance with the contract statement of work. [REDACTED] selected contract number [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] Subject Matter Expertise, awarded to the firm, [REDACTED], because it met the following predetermined parameters:

- It was a level-of-effort contract.
- The contractors had permanent work space at [REDACTED]
- The work performed in the [REDACTED] had to be done either onsite at a government facility or offsite at a contractor facility.
- Based on access control records some of the contractor employees were physically in the [REDACTED] facility for fewer than eight hours a day.

(U// [REDACTED] identified [REDACTED] contractor employees assigned to the contract who each seemed to have missed a minimum of [REDACTED] hours of work over the [REDACTED]-month period from 1 June through 31 August 2010. [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] employees. As a result we opened an investigation to examine whether [REDACTED] was abusing time and attendance at government expense.

(U) SCOPE

(U) Our investigation was conducted in accordance with [REDACTED] Instruction 7410.8R3, Inspector General Investigations and Ombudsman Intervention, 27 July 2007, and the "Quality Standards for Investigations," December 2003, set forth by the President's

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]



**CASE NUMBER: 12-030**

Council on Integrity and Efficiency (now the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency).

(U// ) We compared access control records from all facilities with signed time sheets for the period 1 June through 31 August 2010. We counted only those days when the access control records were available and showed through entry and exit times that worked fewer hours than those claimed on time sheets. Dates showing no entry or exit time were disregarded.

(U) We reviewed the contract statement of work, dated 5 November 2008. It did not specify whether contract employees should take a half-hour lunch break; therefore, we adjusted our analysis of time and attendance to examine straight time without a lunch break.

**(U) APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS**

- (U) 18 USC § 287, False, Fictitious, or Fraudulent Claims
- (U) 18 USC § 1001 (a), Fraud and False Statements

**(U) FACTS**

- (U// ) We prepared an Excel spreadsheet of time and attendance for each workday from 1 June through 31 August 2010. The spreadsheet contained data from time sheets and access control records.
- (U// ) As the result of the initial analysis, determined that may have abused time and attendance.
- (U) We asked , the prime on the contract, to conduct an internal review and disclose any time and attendance violation.
- (U// ) Since was an employee assigned as a subcontractor, asked legal department on 26 July 2011 to assist with the time sheet assessment.
- (U// ) was asked to review time sheet history and access control records for the period in question to assess whether time charges appeared appropriate and to disclose any discrepancies.
- (U// ) We provided access control records to for the period. In addition, legal department obtained time sheet history from their system for the same period. The legal department compared access control records to the time sheet history reported.

████ CASE NUMBER: 12-030

- (U//████ On 1 September 2011, the owners of █████ interviewed █████ about █████ time for the period under review. █████ stated that █████ spent considerable time working offsite on a project and that █████ government supervisor, █████ was aware of █████ whereabouts.

(U) On 24 October 2011, █████ provided the following statement in an e-mail:

During the time period in question, █████ was heavily involved in the █████ program. As a contract employee assigned █████ job was to support the █████ program. One of █████ responsibilities was to assist █████ in the development of the deployment █████ for the program, which required substantial hours at █████ spaces in █████ due to the proprietary nature of the information involved. As I recall, █████ also did work on the █████ at home after normal business hours. As █████ [subject matter expert] to this effort, █████ presence was also required at frequently held meetings at the █████ and at facilities in █████ and █████

Upon review of the spreadsheet, I submit that █████ omission of detail was in no way a reflection of the work █████ performed for us. █████ was very good about keeping us apprised of █████ whereabouts if █████ was diverted directly offsite, which happened frequently. Such was the nature of the customer set █████ found █████ in.

(U) █████ mentioned during █████ e-mail response that █████ completed unclassified work creating a █████ at home after normal business hours to support the program. It was determined that the work was unclassified and the time was not charged to █████

#### (U) CONCLUSIONS

(U//████ It was determined that Based on the information obtained during the inquiry, we found no evidence that █████ engaged in time and attendance abuse.

#### (U) RECOMMENDATION

(U//████ We recommend no further investigative work on this matter and closing this inquiry.

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 12-033

(U) SUBJECT

(U// [REDACTED]

(U) ALLEGATION

(U// [REDACTED] Time and attendance abuse

(U) BACKGROUND

(U) The [REDACTED] examined contractor employees assigned to the [REDACTED] facility to determine if they were working full scheduled workdays in accordance with the contract statement of work. [REDACTED] selected contract number [REDACTED] awarded to the firm, [REDACTED], because it met the following predetermined parameters:

- It was a level-of-effort contract.
- The contractors had permanent work space at [REDACTED]
- The work performed in the [REDACTED], must be done either onsite at a government facility or offsite at a contractor facility.
- Based on their access control records, some of the contractor employees were physically in the [REDACTED] facility for fewer than eight hours a day.

(U// [REDACTED] identified [REDACTED] contractor employees assigned to the contract who each seemed to have missed a minimum of [REDACTED] hours of work over the [REDACTED]-month period from 1 June through 31 August 2010. [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] employees. As a result we opened an investigation to examine whether [REDACTED] was abusing time and attendance at government expense.

(U) SCOPE

(U) Our investigation was conducted in accordance with [REDACTED] Instruction 7410.8R3, Inspector General Investigations and Ombudsman Intervention, 27 July 2007, and the "Quality Standards for Investigations," December 2003, set forth by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (now the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency).

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

**CASE NUMBER: 12-033**

(U// ) We reviewed and compared access control records from all facilities with signed time sheets for the period 1 June through 31 August 2010. We counted only those days when the access control records were available and showed through entry and exit times that worked fewer hours than those claimed on time sheets. Dates showing no entry or exit time were disregarded.

(U) We reviewed the contract statement of work, dated 5 November 2008. It did not designate whether contract employees should take a half-hour lunch break; therefore, we adjusted our analysis of time and attendance to examine straight time without a lunch break.

**(U) APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS**

- (U) 18 USC § 287, False, Fictitious, or Fraudulent Claims
- (U) 18 USC § 1001 (a), Fraud and False Statements

**(U) FACTS**

- (U// ) We prepared an Excel spreadsheet of time and attendance for each workday from 1 June through 31 August 2010. The spreadsheet contained data from his time sheets and access control records.
- (U// ) As the result of the initial analysis determined that may have abused his time and attendance.
- (U// ) We asked the prime on the contract, to conduct an internal review and disclose any time and attendance violation.
- (U// ) legal department reviewed time sheet history and access control records for the period in question to assess whether time charges appeared appropriate and to disclose any discrepancies.
- (U// ) We provided access control records to for the period 1 June through 31 August 2010. In addition, legal department obtained time sheet history from their system for the same time period. The legal department compared access control records to the time sheet history reported.
- (U// ) interviewed about time for the period under review. stated that, as a subject matter expert, spent considerable time working offsite at facility and attending meetings. officials

UNCLASSIFIED//

**CASE NUMBER: 12-033**

confirmed that [REDACTED] worked a considerable amount of time offsite and this would account for the shortages detailed in [REDACTED]

**(U) CONCLUSIONS** (U// [REDACTED] Based on documents and information provided by [REDACTED] legal department and our analysis, we determined that [REDACTED] was properly recording [REDACTED] time and attendance and there was no shortage of hours. Therefore, we found no evidence that [REDACTED] engaged in time and attendance abuse.

**(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// [REDACTED] We recommend no further investigative work on this matter and closing this inquiry.

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 12-034

(U) TITLE: Alleged Time and Attendance Fraud

(U) SUBJECT

(U//FOUO) [REDACTED]

(U) ALLEGATION

(U// [REDACTED] Time and attendance fraud

(U) BACKGROUND

(U) The [REDACTED] examined contractor employees assigned at the [REDACTED] facility to determine if they were performing their full scheduled workdays in accordance with the contract statement of work.

selected contract number [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] awarded to the firm [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] because it met the following predetermined parameters:

- It was a level-of-effort contract.
- The contractors had permanent work space at [REDACTED]
- The work performed in the [REDACTED], had to be done either onsite at a government facility or offsite at a contractor facility.
- Based on access control records, some of the contractor employees were physically in the [REDACTED] facility for fewer than eight hours a day.

(U//FOUO) During its preliminary review of the contract, [REDACTED] noted that from 1 June through 31 August 2010, [REDACTED] was absent from the [REDACTED] facility more than [REDACTED] hours and that the hours were billed to the agency. As a result, [REDACTED] initiated an investigation to determine whether [REDACTED] defrauded the government.

(U) SCOPE

(U// [REDACTED] Our investigation was conducted in accordance with [REDACTED] Instruction (NI) 7410.8R3, Inspector General Investigations and Ombudsman Intervention, 27 July 2007, and the "Quality Standards for Investigations," November 2011, set forth by the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency.

UNCLASSIFIED//~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

████ CASE NUMBER: 12-034

(U) We reviewed and compared █████ access control records from all █████ facilities with █████ signed time sheets for the period 01 June through 31 August 2010. We counted only those days when the access control records were available and showed through entry and exit times that █████ worked fewer hours than those claimed on █████ time sheets. Dates showing no entry or exit time were disregarded.

(U) We verified with the contracting officer's representative that █████ was assigned full time to █████ in support of the contract statement of work. The █████ specifies the government sites and contractor facilities where work may be performed. We obtained and reviewed the █████ that supports the contract █████ for allowable classified work locations.<sup>1</sup>

The following table lists the allowable locations where █████ may perform work to support the contract.

**(U) Place of Performance** █████

Location	Work Required: Onsite(Government Facility), Offsite (Contractor Facility), No Preference
████████████████████	No Preference
████████████████████	No Preference

**(U) APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS**

- **(U) Title 18 U.S. Code (USC) § 287, False, Fictitious, or Fraudulent Claims,** states:

Whoever makes or presents to any person or officer in the civil, military, or naval service of the United States, or to any department or agency thereof, any claim upon or against the United States, or any department or agency thereof, knowing such claim to be false, fictitious, or fraudulent, shall be imprisoned not more than five years and shall be subject to a fine in the amount provided in this title.

- **(U) 18 USC § 1001 (a), Fraud and False Statements,** states:

Except as otherwise provided in this section, whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully:

1. (U) In DD Form 254, Contract Security Classification Specification item number 13.2, reference item number 8 (Actual Performance).

**CASE NUMBER: 12-034**

Falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact;

Makes any materially false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or representation;

Or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry; shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

- **(U) Federal Acquisition Regulation 31.201-2 Determining Allowability, states:**

(a) A cost is allowable only when the cost complies with all of the following requirements:

- (1) Reasonableness.
- (2) Allocability.
- (3) Standards promulgated by the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Board, if applicable, otherwise, generally accepted accounting principles and practices appropriate to the circumstances.
- (4) Terms of the contract.
- (5) Any limitations set forth in this subpart.

(c) When contractor accounting practices are inconsistent with this Subpart 31.2, costs resulting from such inconsistent practices in excess of the amount that would have resulted from using practices consistent with this subpart are unallowable.

(d) A contractor is responsible for accounting for costs appropriately and for maintaining records, including supporting documentation, adequate to demonstrate that costs claimed have been incurred, are allocable to the contract, and comply with applicable cost principles in this subpart and agency supplements. The contracting officer may disallow all or part of a claimed cost that is inadequately supported.



████ CASE NUMBER: 12-034

**(U) FACTS**

(U) We prepared an Excel spreadsheet of █████ time and attendance for each work day from 1 June through 31 August 2010 (exhibit 1). The spreadsheet contained data from █████ time sheets and access control records.

(U) We asked █████ the prime on the contract, to conduct an initial review and verify the hours billed for █████, and notify this office of any discrepancies discovered. As the result of the initial analysis, █████ determined that █████ may have abused █████ time and attendance.

(U//████ We provided █████ access control records to █████ for the period in question, and █████ legal staff obtained █████ time sheet history and compared the █████ sets of records for the period under review.

(U//████ interviewed █████ regarding █████ time charging during the period under review and █████ provided the following statement in an e-mail, dated 1 December 2011:

████ works for █████, a small subcontractor to █████  
████ has stated that some of the discrepancies in █████ time are accounted for by the fact that sometimes █████ does work at █████ home office either before █████ goes to client-site or after █████ returns from client-site. In addition, █████ has also stated that █████ has a trip report which shows that █████ was on travel with █████ Govt. clients to the █████ from 18 – 20 August.

(U) As a result of the information provided by █████ in their internal review, █████ determined that █████ may have improperly received payment for hours █████ did not work and expanded the scope of the review for the timeframe: 1 June 2010 to 31 December 2010; 1 to 31 January 2011; and 1 June 2011 to 30 September 2011.

(U//FOUO) We prepared an Excel spreadsheet of █████ time and attendance for each workday from 1 June 2010 to 31 December 2010; 1 to 31 January 2011; and 1 June 2011 to 30 September 2011. The spreadsheet contained data from █████ time sheets and access control records. The completed spreadsheet for the leave year 2010, 1 June 2010 to 18 December 2010, revealed that █████ was missing 6 hours and 22 minutes. The completed spreadsheet for the leave year 2011, 19 December 2010 to 31 January 2011 and 1 June 2011 to 30 September 2011 revealed that █████ was missing 20 hours and 44 minutes.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Leave year is a term designated by OPM to describe the federal government's pay periods on an annual basis.

■ CASE NUMBER: 12-034

**(U) Testimony**

(U//FOUO) ■ testified:

(U// ■ owns ■ a subcontractor to ■ and works as a subject matter expert supporting the ■ on the ■ t contract. ■ job is to do collaboration and outreach across the ■

(U// ■ was asked what the address of ■ company was. He said that it is ■ home address, ■. ■ said that ■ is the ■ and it is certified by the ■ as an approved contractor facility to conduct unclassified work. ■ company complies with all of ■ requirements. ■ issued ■ a DD Form 254 on 4 May 2009.

(U// ■ would work from ■ if ■ had unclassified work to complete. ■ also attended unclassified meetings by dialing in from ■ ■ said that ■ would catch up on work and drive over to ■ after the meetings.

(U) As a result of the internal review ■ conducted, statements made by ■, and the email from the contract specialist, ■, per the new ■, that states "unclassified work may be performed at an official contractor facility," we updated his automated time and attendance spreadsheet and accounted for all time that ■ worked.

(U) We determined that ■ home is an approved contractor facility per the DD Form 254 and according to the ■ contract ■ and DD Form 254, the work ■ performed from ■ home office is allowable and complies with the contractor places of performance, government sites and/or contractor facilities.

**(U) CONCLUSIONS**

(U// ■ Based on the information obtained during the inquiry, we found no evidence that ■ engaged in time and attendance abuse.

**(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// ■ We recommend no further investigative work on this matter and closing this inquiry.

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 12-035

(U) TITLE: Alleged Time and Attendance Fraud

(U) SUBJECT

(U// [REDACTED]

(U) ALLEGATION:

(U//FOUO) Alleged Time and Attendance Fraud

(U) BACKGROUND

(U) The [REDACTED] examined contractor employees assigned to the [REDACTED] facility as part of a proactive initiative by this office to determine if they were working full scheduled workdays in accordance with the contract statement of work. [REDACTED] selected contract number [REDACTED] awarded to the firm, [REDACTED], because it met the following predetermined parameters:

- It was a level-of-effort contract.
- The contractors had permanent work space at [REDACTED]
- The work performed in the [REDACTED] had to be done either onsite at a government facility or offsite at a contractor facility.
- Based on access control records some of the contractor employees were physically in the [REDACTED] facility for fewer than eight hours a day.

(U) SCOPE

(U// [REDACTED] Our investigation was conducted in accordance with [REDACTED] Instruction (NI) 7410.8R3, Inspector General Investigations and Ombudsman Intervention, 27 July 2007, and the "Quality Standards for Investigations," December 2003, set forth by the

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

**CASE NUMBER: 12-035**

President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (now the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency [CIGIE]).<sup>1</sup>

(U// ) As part of the proactive review identified contractor employees assigned to the contract who each seemed to have missed a minimum of hours of work over the three-month period from 1 June to 31 August 2010. was of the employees. As a result we opened an investigation to examine whether he was abusing time and attendance at government expense.

(U) We verified with the contracting officer's representative that was assigned full time to supporting work breakdown structure ( 13.2 of the contract statement of work, that states the specific government sites and contractor facilities that work may be performed. The following table lists the allowable locations where work may be performed to support the contract.

**(U) Place of Performance WBS**

Location	Work Required: Onsite(Government Facility), Offsite (Contractor Facility), No Preference
	No Preference
	No Preference

(U) We reviewed the DD Form 254, Contract Security Classification Specification item #13.2 reference item #8 (Actual Performance), that states the specific government sites and contractor facilities that work may be performed. This form supports the contract statement of work for allowable work locations.

(U//FOUO) We compared access control records from all facilities with signed time sheets for the period 1 June to 31 August 2010. We counted only those days when the access control records were available and showed through entry and exit times that worked fewer hours than those claimed on time sheets. Dates showing no entry or exit time were disregarded.

**(U) APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS**

- **(U) Title 18 U.S. Code (USC) § 287, False, Fictitious, or Fraudulent Claims,** states:

Whoever makes or presents to any person or officer in the civil, military, or naval service of the United States, or to any department or agency thereof, any claim upon or against the United States, or any department or agency thereof, knowing such claim to be false,

<sup>1</sup> (U) The Inspector General Reform Act of 2008 created the CIGIE, combining what were the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency and the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency.

**IG CASE NUMBER: 12-035**

fictitious, or fraudulent, shall be imprisoned not more than five years and shall be subject to a fine in the amount provided in this title.

◦ **(U) 18 USC § 1001 (a), Fraud and False Statements, states:**

Except as otherwise provided in this section, whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully:

Falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact;

Makes any materially false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or representation;

Or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry; shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

◦ **(U) FAR Clause 131.201-2 Determining Allowability**

(a) A cost is allowable only when the cost complies with all of the following requirements:

- (1) Reasonableness.
- (2) Allocability.
- (3) Standards promulgated by the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Board, if applicable, otherwise, generally accepted accounting principles and practices appropriate to the circumstances.
- (4) Terms of the contract.
- (5) Any limitations set forth in this subpart.

(b) Certain cost principles in this subpart incorporate the measurement, assignment, and allocability rules of selected CAS and limit the allowability of costs to the amounts determined using the criteria in those selected standards. Only those CAS or portions of standards specifically made applicable by the cost principles in this subpart are mandatory unless the contract is CAS-covered (see Part 30). Business units that are not otherwise subject to these standards under a CAS clause are subject to the selected standards only for the purpose of determining allowability of costs on Government

■ CASE NUMBER: 12-035

contracts. Including the selected standards in the cost principles does not subject the business unit to any other CAS rules and regulations. The applicability of the CAS rules and regulations is determined by the CAS clause, if any, in the contract and the requirements of the standards themselves.

(c) When contractor accounting practices are inconsistent with this Subpart 31.2, costs resulting from such inconsistent practices in excess of the amount that would have resulted from using practices consistent with this subpart are unallowable.

(d) A contractor is responsible for accounting for costs appropriately and for maintaining records, including supporting documentation, adequate to demonstrate that costs claimed have been incurred, are allocable to the contract, and comply with applicable cost principles in this subpart and agency supplements. The contracting officer may disallow all or part of a claimed cost that is inadequately supported.

#### (U) FACTS

- (U//■ We prepared an automated time and attendance Excel spreadsheet of ■ time and attendance for each workday from 1 June through 31 August 2010. ■ The spreadsheet contained data from ■ time sheets and access control records.
- (U//■ As the result of the initial analysis, ■ determined that ■ may have abused ■ time and attendance.
- (U) We asked ■ the prime on the contract, to conduct an internal review and disclose any time and attendance violation.
- (U//■ Since ■ was an ■ employee assigned as a subcontractor, ■ asked ■ legal department to assist with the time sheet assessment for the period of 1 June to 31 August 2010 and assess whether ■ time charges appeared appropriate and/or self disclose any discrepancies.
- (U//■ We provided ■ access control records to ■ for the period. In addition, ■ legal department obtained ■ time sheet history from their system for the same period. The legal department compared ■ access control records to the time sheet history reported.

**IG CASE NUMBER: 12-035**

- (U) On 01 December 2011, [REDACTED] Legal Department provided a summary via email with the results of the internal review. The email provided the following information:

(U) [REDACTED] works for [REDACTED] an independent contractor temporary agency to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] representatives have interviewed [REDACTED] and have stated that for the following days [REDACTED] has evidence (e-mails and outlooks calendar entries) to show that [REDACTED] was off-site for meetings:

[REDACTED]

(U) As a result of the internal review [REDACTED] conducted and the statements made by [REDACTED], we updated the automated time and attendance spreadsheet to account for all time that [REDACTED] worked. Also, the email provided the following information:

(U) [REDACTED] has identified a number of days where [REDACTED] knows [REDACTED] worked from home; note that most of these are weekend days: 7/10, 8/7, 8/8, 8/15, 8/31. For the rest of the time, [REDACTED] has stated that possible explanations may include: working from home, traveling, or perhaps not accounting for time that [REDACTED] stepped outside the turnstiles to stretch or grab something to eat or drink.

(U) We reviewed the contract statement of work and the DD Form 254, Contract Security Classification Specification item #13.2 reference item #8 (Actual Performance), to determine whether working from home is allowable based on the terms of the contract. We determined based on the contract statement of work and the DD Form 254 that specifically states work may only be performed at Government Sites and/or Contractor Facilities. Neither of these documents allow for work to be completed at a contractor's residence.

(U) Based on all the information provided by [REDACTED] and our analysis of [REDACTED] time sheets, master time history, access control records, and travel records showed that [REDACTED] did work all of the hours billed to the government.

CASE NUMBER: 12-035

**(U) Testimony**

(U//

testified:

(U// has been the for two and a half years and has oversight responsibilities for the contract. is currently acting as the and since the previously assigned has moved onto a different team.

(U// was asked if working from home or teleworking was allowed as part of this contract. replied "right now we have no agreement with for them or their subcontractors to do telework that was aware of."

(U// In addition, in an email dated 1 February 2012, stated "the contractor has not been authorized by the or the Representative to telework. The has requested to provide the organization's policy on Telework."

**(U) CONCLUSIONS**

(U// Based on the information obtained during the inquiry, we found no evidence that engaged in time and attendance abuse.

**(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// We recommend no further investigative work on this matter and closing this inquiry.



UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

05 January 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED] INSPECTOR GENERAL

(U) SUBJECT: Misuse of Government Information Technology

1. (U// [REDACTED] AUTHORITY: A preliminary inquiry was conducted under the authority of: DCID 6/3 "Protecting Sensitive Compartmented Information within Information Systems"; ICD Number 503, "Intelligence Community Information Technology Systems Security risk Management, Certification, and Accreditation"; DOD Directive 5220.22-M, National Industrial Security Operating Manual (NISPOM); DOD Directive 8500.1, "Information Assurance"; DOD Directive 8520.1, "Protection of Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI)"; NI 5205.1R3, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Protection of Sensitive Compartmented Information"; NI 8010.11R5, "[REDACTED] Instruction for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Computer Network Connectivity at Contractor and Other Facilities"; NI 8010.15R7, "Access to Removable Media on Classified Networks"; NI 8010.16R2, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Managing Compartmented and Sub-Compartmented Information on Sensitive Compartmented Information Systems"; NI 8010.2R7, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Information System Security and Training"; NI 8100.1R13, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Portable Electronic Devices"; NI 8470.2R8, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Internet Usage."

2. (U// [REDACTED] MATTER INVESTIGATED: Misuse of [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] [REDACTED] network and computer system.

3. (U) FACTS: On 24 October 2011, the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] received notification that a [REDACTED] system identified as [REDACTED] was being used to view pornographic images and compose sexually explicit emails. [REDACTED] investigated the notification and confirmed the attempts at accessing the websites originated from the [REDACTED] profile, which is assigned to [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]). On 07 November 2011, the [REDACTED] Investigator remotely connected to the [REDACTED] and forensically collected a Logical Evidence File (LEF) of the [REDACTED] profile. A forensic review of the LEF and [REDACTED] profile revealed inappropriate and non-work related content. [REDACTED] opened an official investigation and found the following:

a. (U) The [REDACTED] system, under the [REDACTED] profile, accessed six pornographic and inappropriate images via the World Wide Web ([REDACTED]).

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
**UNCLASSIFIED//** [REDACTED]

b. (U) On 09 November 2011, the [REDACTED] Investigator physically acquired a forensic image of the [REDACTED] system's hard drive. Detailed forensic analysis was performed on the entire contents of the hard drive. Analysis of the hard drive did not reveal any additional inappropriate images.

c. (U) However, multiple automated network auditing captures of the [REDACTED] computer system from 29 September 2011-04 January 2012 revealed the [REDACTED] profile accessing pornographic images received via [REDACTED] personal Yahoo webmail accounts. In addition, the personal Yahoo webmail accounts were being used for the purpose of composing sexually explicit emails. The Yahoo account userids used by [REDACTED] were identified as [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] and [REDACTED]). The automated network auditing capture also revealed an attempt to delete the internet history and associated images contained in the Internet Explorer Cache and Cookies repository [REDACTED]

d. (U) NI8470.2R8, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Internet Usage" specifically states "Examples of prohibited uses include: 1) Accessing pornographic sites or downloading images from such sites using [REDACTED]-sponsored accounts or computer equipment. 2) Requesting, ordering, creating, downloading, viewing, storing, copying, or transmitting sexually explicit or sexually oriented materials or services for personal recreation or entertainment while utilizing [REDACTED] sponsored Internet accesses."

4. (U// [REDACTED] **CONCLUSION:** Based on the data obtained to date, [REDACTED] concludes that an ongoing case of [REDACTED] Misuse exists with regard to the usage of the [REDACTED] account. This report has included evidence which supports [REDACTED] has misused [REDACTED] computer system to view inappropriate and pornographic images as well as composing sexually explicit emails. In addition, the manual deletion of evidence suggests that [REDACTED] knew [REDACTED] actions were a violation of [REDACTED] policy and attempted to delete evidence of wrongdoing.

5. (U// [REDACTED] **ACTION:** Following this report's review by [REDACTED] Inspector General, it is requested that [REDACTED] provide the [REDACTED] Inspector General [REDACTED] a written response to this investigation. Response should include a planned course of action regarding [REDACTED] within 30 days of receipt of this report.

6. (U) **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

a. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] should be cited for the unauthorized usage of [REDACTED].

b. (U// [REDACTED] A copy of this report should be forwarded by the [REDACTED] for inclusion in the personnel file of [REDACTED] in order to facilitate official record keeping.

c. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] General Counsel considers legal action as appropriate.

**UNCLASSIFIED//** [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//[REDACTED]

d. (U// [REDACTED] All [REDACTED] employees must attend the required mandatory training prior to receiving access to any [REDACTED] resources. The mandatory training is accessible through the [REDACTED] web site on the [REDACTED]. The following training is required and must be attended annually: [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

7. (U) Questions regarding this investigation may be directed to the [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]

\_\_\_\_\_

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

9 January 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED] Inspector General

**(U) SUBJECT:** Misuse of Government Information System

1. **(U) AUTHORITY:** A preliminary inquiry was conducted under the authority and guidance of: U.S.C title 18 Part 1 Chapter 47 Section 1030; "Fraud and Related Activity in Connection with Computers"; "OMB A-130, Appendix III"; NI8010.2R7, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Information Systems Security and Training"; NI8470.2R8, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Internet Usage"; NI8470.3R8, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Use of Electronic Mail and other Electronic Communications"

2. **(U) MATTER INVESTIGATED:** Misuse of [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] network and computer system (Pornography).

3. **(U// [REDACTED] FACTS:**

a. (U// [REDACTED] On 30 November 2011, an audit of the SBU network was conducted to discover any potential [REDACTED] misuse. The audit reflected that a specific system and user account were potentially being utilized to view pornographic images.

b. (U// [REDACTED] On 30 November 2011 between 1400-1500 hours, the audit showed that userid [REDACTED] assigned to [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) according to network records, was used to access pornographic images in a folder within [REDACTED] home networked 'H:\' directory from the computer name [REDACTED]. The filenames of the images viewed were [REDACTED]

c. (U// [REDACTED] On 12 December 2011, a forensic acquisition of [REDACTED] home directory revealed that the images discovered by the network audit were previously resident within [REDACTED]. However, the images had been deleted. This was confirmed by a review of the thumbs.db database file, located within the folder, which captures a thumbnail of all images that have been viewed within the current folder at any time. ([REDACTED]). [REDACTED] folder path is a mapped network drive to the active

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

directory verified home directory for userid [REDACTED] which is [REDACTED] ([REDACTED])

d. (U// [REDACTED]) The forensic case processor confirmed that userid [REDACTED] had the security identifier [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]) The same [REDACTED] was the owner of the [REDACTED]

e. (U// [REDACTED]) A review of the system security audit logs for workstation [REDACTED] confirms that user [REDACTED] was logged on to the workstation between 1400-1500 hours on 30 November 2011. ([REDACTED])

4. (U// [REDACTED]) **CONCLUSION:** Based on the evidence obtained to date, [REDACTED] concludes that a case of misuse of the [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] network and computer system exists with regard to the usage of [REDACTED].

5. (U// [REDACTED]) **ACTION:** Following this report's review by the [REDACTED] Inspector General, it is requested that [REDACTED] provide the [REDACTED] a written response to this investigation. The response should include a planned course of action regarding [REDACTED] within 30 days of receipt of this report.

6. (U// [REDACTED]) **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

a. (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] shall be cited for the misuse of [REDACTED] (Internet-Pornography).

b. (U// [REDACTED]) A copy of this report should be forwarded by the [REDACTED] for inclusion in the personnel file of [REDACTED] to facilitate official record keeping.

c. (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] General Counsel considers legal action as appropriate.

d. (U// [REDACTED]) [REDACTED] Inspector General investigates any relevant time and attendance issues associated with this investigation.

e. (U// [REDACTED]) All [REDACTED] employees and contractors must attend the required mandatory training prior to receiving access to any [REDACTED] resource. The mandatory training is accessible through the [REDACTED] web site on the [REDACTED]. The following training is required and must be attended annually: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

f. (U// [REDACTED]) The [REDACTED] should consult the contractor's statement of work and contracting company's policies pertaining to disciplinary actions.

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

7. (U) Questions regarding this investigation may be directed to the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] at [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

(U) [REDACTED] CASE NUMBER: 12-040

(U) SUBJECT

(U// [REDACTED]

### (U) ALLEGATIONS

1. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did not attend class on several days so [REDACTED] could take personal vacation while attending the [REDACTED].
2. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] sought out and established unduly familiar relationships with the [REDACTED] military officers attending the course and frequently associated with them outside of class.
3. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] claimed residency status for [REDACTED] to avoid paying taxes in [REDACTED] the state where [REDACTED] resided.

### (U) BACKGROUND

(U//FOUO) On 17 January 2012, this office received a complaint via the [REDACTED] Office of Inspector General Hotline, which reflected [REDACTED] did not attend the required training while attending [REDACTED] had relationships with [REDACTED] military officers and claimed residency in a state where [REDACTED] did not reside.

### (U) APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS

- (U) 18 USC § 287, False, Fictitious or Fraudulent Claims
- (U) 18 USC § 1001, Statements or Entries Generally

### (U) ALLEGATION 1

#### (U) Facts

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

~~UNCLASSIFIED//FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

(U// [REDACTED] We interviewed [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated there was a requirement for instructors to report students who did not attend classes. [REDACTED] reviewed their student accountability records and [REDACTED] was never reported absent from [REDACTED] classes. [REDACTED] also coordinated with the senior team leader, who did not have any reports of [REDACTED] missing any classes.

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was questioned about missing several days of class while on temporary duty (TDY) at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated:

(U// [REDACTED] "I only missed maybe four hours, if that for a dental appointment. My front tooth crown cracked. And it was a front tooth. And I talked to the professor, and then between the professor, I made up the assignments I missed. So I missed four hours by going to the dentist appointment at the beginning of the actual session."

(U// [REDACTED] "Because what happens, the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] come a week before everyone else because everyone else is [REDACTED]. So only the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] military come the week prior for like an integration period. Right there is where you meet all the [REDACTED] and maybe [REDACTED] in that class. And that is the same week I went to the dentist."

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] provided a copy of a letter which was provided to [REDACTED] supervisor from [REDACTED]. The letter reflected the following:

(U// [REDACTED] "[REDACTED] performance at [REDACTED] was singularly outstanding. [REDACTED] successfully completed a one week [REDACTED] as well as the [REDACTED] week [REDACTED] course at the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] class participation during the course reflected a high degree of motivation and an in-depth knowledge of our [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] strategies and their interrelationship with the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]."

(U// [REDACTED] "[REDACTED] was personally selected by [REDACTED] team of instructors to serve in key leadership positions and essential staff positions throughout the exercise period of study. [REDACTED] perspective on national security issues and [REDACTED] experience in national level-intelligence added a critical dimension and were eagerly sought by students and faculty alike."

(U// [REDACTED] "Overall, [REDACTED] represented [REDACTED] in a highly professional manner, exemplifying the highest of standards. [REDACTED] attitude throughout was one of cooperation and understanding. [REDACTED] is the hardest working student I have ever had in class."



always took assignments seriously and gave them full effort. was a pleasure to have as a part of this class. performance clearly indicates a strong potential for handling duties of increased scope and responsibility in leadership."

(U// Conclusion. The investigation found that attended the required classes at

(U) Recommendation. Close this case without further investigation.

## (U) ALLEGATION 2

### (U) Facts

(U// was questioned about interaction with military officers. stated that encourages students to build relationships with the students. One of the goals of the course is to provide the students positive experiences with the students in an effort to demonstrate that what they see on television is not a reflection of all was one of many outgoing and lively students who helped the students adapt to the environment. Lastly, stated there was nothing inappropriate about behavior.

(U// was questioned about relationship with international students during TDY at. stated:

(U// "We had students. That is what the school is all about. That is why it is called. And I mean it takes them about years to get cleared to come through. They get to go the, all that good stuff."

(U// "But we are assigned. And of the team leaders in the class, you are assigned to these. So, myself and the instructor were assigned – we had a from a from, a from. And those were like our bonding group to help them."

(U// "So we kind of split up with some of the civilians where, okay, we will work with these, these, these, and make them feel comfortable until they joined and integrated the second week with either our group or their group or wherever they were."

(U// "So we were out just like some of the people where you build relationships within that week course, week course, however long it was."

(U// [REDACTED] **Conclusion.** The [REDACTED] investigation did not find that [REDACTED] had unduly familiar relationships with the [REDACTED] military officers attending [REDACTED]

(U) **Recommendation.** Close this case without further investigation.

(U) **ALLEGATION 3**

(U) **Facts**

(U// [REDACTED] We reviewed [REDACTED] 2011 W-2 Forms which revealed [REDACTED] claimed Illinois as [REDACTED] state of residency, not Texas.

(U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was asked about [REDACTED] state of residency. She stated:

(U// [REDACTED] "When I was active duty, my residency was [REDACTED] When I came here [REDACTED], my residency was [REDACTED]. When I moved [REDACTED] across the bridge to [REDACTED], my residency was [REDACTED] So it was [REDACTED] my time in the military. And it was [REDACTED] when I came aboard [REDACTED] And it has been [REDACTED] since I have been here and moved across the bridge [REDACTED]."

(U// [REDACTED] **Conclusion.** The [REDACTED] investigation found that [REDACTED] did not claim [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] state of residency while residing in [REDACTED] and paid taxes owed to [REDACTED]

(U) **Recommendation.** No further investigative work on this matter and that this investigation be closed.

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## REPORT OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

**CASE NUMBER:** 12-042

**(U) TITLE:** Alleged Conflict of Interest; Acceptance of a Gift from a Prohibited Source

**(U) SUBJECTS:**

(U// [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

(U// [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

(U// [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] (former [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**(U) ALLEGATIONS:** [REDACTED], while a contractor for [REDACTED] paid a \$200.00 bill for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] during a happy hour at [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] accepted this gratuity.

### **(U) BACKGROUND**

(U// [REDACTED] This office received [REDACTED] anonymous handwritten letters alleging possible misconduct by [REDACTED] government employees. The complainant provided the following information:

(U// [REDACTED] It is my duty to report several instances of employee and employer/contractor misconduct involving improper gifts solicited and received by the former and given by the latter. On Thursday 3 November 2011 at [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] paid a \$200 tab for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. This I personally witnesses. Questions about ethical implications were met with jokes then with a negative rebuke. Next it was strongly insinuated that I would be expected to pay for everyone at the next outing on 17 November. I did not attend this happy hour. The deputy task lead, [REDACTED] was in attendance. At this point the task lead, [REDACTED], was aware of the situation.

The occurrences between a government employer and employee give the appearance of impropriety particularly within the context of the elaborate baked goods prepared for government employee, the unusual personnel comfort levels

---

<sup>1</sup>(U) [REDACTED] was hired as a government employee in February 2012.

<sup>2</sup>(U) This office contacted [REDACTED] to get a copy of the receipt; however, due to the time which lapsed since the incident, there was no record of the transaction.

<sup>3</sup>(U) [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are no longer contractors at [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

and lack of physical boundaries between them". "There is a correlation in time between there activities becoming more frequent and praise for the government contractor, at the expense of others who do not participate". "This behavior appears to have resulted in resentment and rumors generated from contractors from other companies particularly given [REDACTED] surge support and contract decisions currently taking place. An expectation among [REDACTED] per similar treatment; The inability of executive leadership to convey exemplary offer policy due to unwitting association with offending individuals and giving the impression that the behavior is not only acceptable but encouraged; feelings of isolation among rank and file employees who are uncomfortable with the situation but feel obligated to play along; and the public humiliation and reprimand of a contractor suggested of making a complaint by purposefully exposing admin information pertaining to that individual.

#### **(U) SCOPE**

(U) [REDACTED] conducted this investigation in accordance with the standards set forth in [REDACTED] Instruction (NI) 7410.8R3, Inspector General Investigations and Ombudsman Intervention, 27 July 2007, and the "Quality Standards for Investigations," 15 November 2011, set forth by the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency. We obtained testimony from [REDACTED] employees believed to have information pertinent to the allegations and issues.

#### **(U) APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS**

(U) 18 USC § 208, subsection (a), Acts affecting a personal financial interest

(U) 5 CFR § 2635.101, 202(a), 204, 501(a) Basic obligation of public service

(U) 5 CFR § 2635.203 (d) (2), Prohibited Source

(U) NI 1000.7R1, Personal Relationships in the Workplace

#### **(U) Testimony**

(U) [REDACTED] was questioned about the 3 November happy hour. [REDACTED] testified:

"It was just again team building. [REDACTED] went out for happy hour: myself [REDACTED] [REDACTED] also joined us, [REDACTED] at that time. So [REDACTED] joined us as well".

"[REDACTED] picked up the tab that time."

"[REDACTED] just grabbed the bill before any of us could grab it so, and [REDACTED] wouldn't let us pay."

"I did not know [REDACTED] was going to do that. That's the first time I met [REDACTED] so that's, I did not know [REDACTED] was going to do that."

"After that we all paid our own." "I think we were just a little, we knew what to expect then after that, that [REDACTED] was going to try to get the receipt, so we got it before [REDACTED] did."

"During that time frame, no. I think we had a great working relationship with our contractors. Now the contract has switched. We have a different company working. And now there are circles forming where government people and contractors are maybe classified as having inappropriate relationships.<sup>4</sup>

(U) [REDACTED] testified:

"Honestly, I don't know. I don't know what happened. Basically we were all getting all of our money out. We were ready to start paying and the [REDACTED] brought the check and [REDACTED] grabbed it and just paid for it."

"[REDACTED] basically voluntarily did it. We were not thinking government/contracting. We weren't really thinking that. We were thinking friend."

(U) [REDACTED] testified:

"Often go to happy hours. We've been friends, personal friends for a while. A long time actually. We celebrate birthdays and anniversaries and, you know, graduations and things like that. But we had the happy hour at [REDACTED] which is one of the places that we went because it's midpoint between where we live and where [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] live."

"It was one of those where the wait staff is really slow. And my [REDACTED] just said, 'Look, we've got to go. Let me just grab the check. And [REDACTED] wasn't even thinking that, you know, we were thinking friends, not the government part. [REDACTED] just grabbed it and we paid it and left. So that was sort of all that happened.'"

"But I can say each of us had time for one drink and a couple of appetizers. So it wasn't like we were sitting down to this big dinner or anything like that with a few drinks or, you know, bottles of wine or anything. It was very simple because we didn't have a lot of time."

### (U) Conclusion

(U) [REDACTED] We did not find evidence to substantiate a conflict of interest or substantiate the allegation that [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] accepted of a gift from a prohibited source.

<sup>4</sup> (U) The allegation reported by [REDACTED] is being investigated in [REDACTED] Case 13-049.

Investigation determined that [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were friends prior to attending the happy hour. [REDACTED] testified that [REDACTED] husband is also a government employee, grabbed the tab and paid for the appetizers and drinks<sup>5</sup> before [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] could pay. [REDACTED] paid the tab because of their personal relationship and not because [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were government employees.

(U// [REDACTED] Additionally, there was no evidence of impropriety within the context of the elaborate baked goods reportedly prepared for government employees. There were occasions when government and contractors would bring in baked goods for everyone, no one was excluded. There was no evidence of a lack of physical boundaries or unusual personnel comfort levels between government and contractors.

### **(U) Recommendation**

(U) Close this investigation. No further investigative activity required.

---

<sup>5</sup>(U) None of the people involved could recall the actual cost of the drinks and appetizers due to the amount of time that passed since the happy hour.

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

14 February 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED] INSPECTOR GENERAL

(U) **SUBJECT:** Misuse of Government Information Technology

1. (U// [REDACTED]) **AUTHORITY:** A preliminary inquiry was conducted under the authority of: DCID 6/3 "Protecting Sensitive Compartmented Information within Information Systems"; ICD Number 503, "Intelligence Community Information Technology Systems Security risk Management, Certification, and Accreditation"; DOD Directive 5220.22-M, National Industrial Security Operating Manual (NISPOM); DOD Directive 8500.1, "Information Assurance"; DOD Directive 8520.1, "Protection of Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI)"; NI 5205.1R3, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Protection of Sensitive Compartmented Information"; NI 8010.11R5, "[REDACTED] Instruction for [REDACTED] Computer Network Connectivity at Contractor and Other Facilities"; NI 8010.15R7, "Access to Removable Media on Classified Networks"; NI 8010.16R2, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Managing Compartmented and Sub-Compartmented Information on Sensitive Compartmented Information Systems"; NI 8010.2R7, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Information System Security and Training"; NI 8100.1R13, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Portable Electronic Devices"; NI 8470.2R8, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Internet Usage."

2. (U// [REDACTED]) **MATTER INVESTIGATED:** Misuse of [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] network and computer system.

3. (U) **FACTS:** On 06 January 2012, the [REDACTED] received notification of a [REDACTED] user profile using offensive and inappropriate language via a web based Short Message Service (SMS) application. [REDACTED] investigated the notification and confirmed the SMS messages originated from the [REDACTED] profile, which is assigned to [REDACTED] according to the [REDACTED] Active Directory network management tool ([REDACTED]). [REDACTED] has opened an official investigation and found the following:

a. (U) 01 December-27 December 2012, multiple automated network auditing captures of the [REDACTED] profile revealed [REDACTED] utilized the SMS application, [REDACTED], to communicate and send sexually explicit messages via [REDACTED] computer system to an unknown cell phone recipient. [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

b. (U) A review of [REDACTED] email account and computer system did not reveal any additional evidence of misuse.

c. (U) NI8470.2R8, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Internet Usage" specifically states "Examples of prohibited uses include: 1) Accessing pornographic sites or downloading images from such sites using NGA-sponsored accounts or computer equipment. 2) Requesting, ordering, creating, downloading, viewing, storing, copying, or **transmitting sexually explicit or sexually oriented materials or services for personal recreation or entertainment while utilizing [REDACTED] sponsored Internet accesses.**"

4. (U// [REDACTED] CONCLUSION: Based on the evidence obtained to date, [REDACTED] concludes that an ongoing [REDACTED] Misuse case exists with regard to the use of the [REDACTED] profile. [REDACTED] has included evidence which supports the conclusion of misuse with regard to use of [REDACTED] systems to send sexually explicit and inappropriate communications.

5. (U// [REDACTED] ACTION: Following this report's review by [REDACTED] Inspector General, it is requested that [REDACTED] supervisor provide the [REDACTED] Inspector General [REDACTED] a written response to this investigation. The response should include a planned course of action regarding [REDACTED] within [REDACTED] days of receipt of this report.

6. (U) RECOMMENDATIONS:

a. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] should be cited for the unauthorized usage of [REDACTED].

b. (U// [REDACTED] A copy of this report should be forwarded by the supervisor for inclusion in the personnel file of [REDACTED] to facilitate official record keeping.

c. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] General Counsel considers legal action as appropriate.

d. (U// [REDACTED] All [REDACTED] employees must attend the required mandatory training prior to receiving access to any [REDACTED] resources. The mandatory training is accessible through the [REDACTED] web site on the [REDACTED]. The following training is required and must be attended annually: [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

7. (U) Questions regarding this investigation may be directed to the [REDACTED] at [REDACTED].

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Allegation: Hostile Work Environment

Subject: [REDACTED]

13 Feb 12: [REDACTED] heard [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] other employees talking about suicide. [REDACTED] made a comment about how [REDACTED] would commit suicide. [REDACTED] stated that if [REDACTED] used a bag, [REDACTED] would be tempted to pull it off. Another employee made a comment about using helium. After about 15/20 minutes, [REDACTED] said that the conversation was going wrong or [REDACTED] did not like the way the conversation was going (words to that affect). [REDACTED] said well I am not talking about doing anything to you; I'm talking about to myself (words to that affect). The conversation continued for about 5 or 10 minutes. [REDACTED] decided to report this information to [REDACTED] supervisor. [REDACTED] stated that, every morning the same group of employee, ([REDACTED]) would talk loudly about different topics and most of the time [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] tried to ignore them..

14 Feb 12: [REDACTED] made a comment "at least I didn't do a [REDACTED] After that comment, [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] did not listen to the rest of their conversation.

15 Feb 12: [REDACTED] notified [REDACTED] supervisor, [REDACTED], (first time [REDACTED] actually saw [REDACTED] since the conversation took place). [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] [REDACTED] division. Within ten minutes, [REDACTED] gathered everyone in the area and directed them to cease all conversation about suicide and inappropriate comments. [REDACTED] did not allow any questions or comments. [REDACTED] guidance was very clear. After the meeting, [REDACTED] and other employees made light of [REDACTED] guidance. The employee who made the comment about the helium said "I hope my helium comment didn't cause that".

16 Feb 12: [REDACTED] was interviewed by this office and reiterated the information aforementioned information. [REDACTED] concern was that the conversation was "grossly inappropriate". [REDACTED], who sits across the partition from them, [REDACTED] committed suicide [REDACTED] years ago. The group should not be talking about suicide, as it was very insensitive of them.

17 Feb 12: This office interviewed [REDACTED] (supervisor for the employees engaged in the conversation). On 15 Feb 12, [REDACTED] whose office is on the North side, went over for [REDACTED] daily visit to [REDACTED] area. [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had a meeting and instructed them to stop all inappropriate conversations. [REDACTED] was not sure of the cause for the meeting, but another employee came over and said it was probably because of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has known [REDACTED] for over seven years and has never had a performance issue, but [REDACTED] is aware of [REDACTED] demeanor and attitude. According to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and the other section members are "grumpy people", but very professional, knowledgeable and experienced in their duties. One of the members on the team was having medical problems which caused [REDACTED] to be in a lot of pain. [REDACTED] was not there during the conversation, but [REDACTED] thinks the conversation started because of the pain the one employee talked about. Perhaps, they made some comments which were inappropriate, but [REDACTED] did not think [REDACTED] or any of the other employees were serious when they made the comments or aware that someone may be offended by the comments.

2 Mar 12: [REDACTED] briefed [REDACTED] on the finding of this inquiry. The information was referred to Management for action deemed appropriate.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

24 February 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED] INSPECTOR GENERAL

**(U) SUBJECT:** Misuse of Government Information System

1. **(U) AUTHORITY:** A preliminary inquiry was conducted under the authority and guidance of: U.S.C. title 18 Part 1 Chapter 47 Section 1030, "Fraud and Related Activity in Connection with Computers"; "OMB A-130, Appendix III"; NI 8010.2R7, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Information System Security and Training"; NI 8470.3R8, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Use of Electronic Mail and other Electronic Communications"; NI 8470.2R8, "[REDACTED] Instruction for Internet Usage."

2. **(U) MATTER INVESTIGATED:** Misuse of [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] network and computer system.

**(U// [REDACTED] FACTS:** On 23 September 2011, the [REDACTED] received notification from [REDACTED] that profile [REDACTED] connected to the [REDACTED] network made multiple outbound traffic attempts to a [REDACTED] and "[REDACTED]". [REDACTED] investigated the notification and confirmed the multiple outbound traffic attempts [REDACTED] [REDACTED] opened an official investigation and found the following:

a. **(U// [REDACTED]** On 21 October 2011, [REDACTED] Investigator used a forensic software tool to review and confirm profile "[REDACTED]" was logged onto the [REDACTED] system(s) [REDACTED] during the unusual web traffic attempts dated 09/21/2011-11/15/2011. A network monitoring tool provided activity logs that were collected referencing the viewing of "[REDACTED]" and "[REDACTED]" during work hours for extended periods of time. ([REDACTED])

3. **(U// [REDACTED] CONCLUSION:** Based on the evidence obtained to date, [REDACTED] has included evidence which supports [REDACTED] has misused [REDACTED] computer system to access [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Policy (NI8470.2R6) references the personal obligations of [REDACTED] personnel for access to the Internet at work for personal use and official use. Personal use of electronic communication system must not adversely affect the performance of official duties by the individual or the individual's organization, result in added costs to the government, or overburden the system. An

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Policy (NI 8470.3R8) also reference the use of electronic communication is a privilege and misuse of these privileges is a violation of the Standards of Ethical Conduct.

4. (U// [REDACTED] ACTION: Following this report's review by [REDACTED] Inspector General, it is requested that [REDACTED] provide the [REDACTED] Inspector General ([REDACTED]) a written response to this investigation. The response should include a planned course of action regarding [REDACTED] within 30 days of receipt of this report.

5. (U// [REDACTED] RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] should be cited for the misuse of [REDACTED] [REDACTED].
- b. (U// [REDACTED] A copy of this report should be forwarded by the [REDACTED] for inclusion in the personnel file of [REDACTED] to facilitate official record keeping.
- c. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] General Counsel considers legal action as appropriate.
- d. (U// [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Inspector General investigates any relevant time and attendance issues associated with this investigation.
- e. (U// [REDACTED] All [REDACTED] employees must attend the required mandatory training prior to receiving access to any [REDACTED] resources. The mandatory training is accessible through the [REDACTED] web site on the [REDACTED]. The following training is required and must be attended annually: [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

6. (U) Questions regarding this investigation may be directed to the [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

MAY 14 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR

SUBJECT: (U) Alleged Contract Employee Time and Attendance Fraud  
( ) Case Number 12-061)

1. (U// ) The [ ] recently reviewed a complaint alleging that [ ] contractor employee, charged the government for time [ ] did not work. [ ] is employed by [ ] and assigned to the [ ]
2. (U// ) Our review consisted of comparing [ ] access control data for [ ] facilities in [ ] and [ ] with [ ] time sheets for the period 01 May – 31 October 2010. We counted only those days when access control records were available and reflected both an entry and an exit time showing that [ ] worked fewer hours than those [ ] claimed on [ ] time sheet records. We communicated with the [ ] contracting officers. We also communicated with [ ] . We determined that [ ] worked on [ ] and [ ] of the [ ]
3. (U// ) [ ] , stated that work will be performed within the [ ] metropolitan area. All work will occur within government facilities with government provided work area, computers and other routine office equipment and supplies.
4. (U// ) [ ] , stated that work will be performed within the [ ] and [ ] metropolitan areas. All work will occur within government facilities with government provided work area, computers and other routine office equipment and supplies.
5. (U// ) Enclosed for your review and action is our analysis of [ ]' time and attendance records. We found that from 1 May 2010 through 31 October 2010, [ ] claimed 22 hours and 35 minutes on [ ] time sheets, at a fully burdened cost of \$3,171.19, when the access control data showed that [ ] was not in an [ ] ; [ ] assigned duty station.
6. (U) We are forwarding this information for action as you deem appropriate. We request that you furnish the [ ] with a report of action taken within 30 days of receipt of this memorandum. Upon request, the [ ] will provide specific evidentiary documents as necessary. A tasking was established in [ ] to track the suspense.

UNCLASSIFIED//

**UNCLASSIFIED//~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~**

[REDACTED]  
SUBJECT: (U) Alleged Contract Employee Time and Attendance Fraud  
( [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Case Number 12-061)

7. (U) Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] or [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

MEMORANDUM FOR

SUBJECT: (U) Referral of Time and Attendance Analysis, Office of Inspector  
General Case Number 12-062

1. (U//) The [REDACTED] has completed a preliminary analysis of an allegation that [REDACTED] may have engaged in time and attendance (T&A) abuse from 27 February through 30 November 2011. [REDACTED] is a [REDACTED]

2. (U//) Our analysis of [REDACTED] access control records, T&A documents, and training and travel records for the period referenced above revealed a discrepancy of 114 hours and 35 minutes, worth \$4,467.40 ([REDACTED]). The analysis disclosed the amount of time that [REDACTED] claimed on [REDACTED] T&A records, compared with the amount of time we could confirm independently that [REDACTED] was present at [REDACTED] assigned duty location. The value of the hours that [REDACTED] did not work falls below the [REDACTED] \$5,000 threshold for pursuing a T&A fraud investigation.

3. (U//) We are providing this information for your review and action as you deem appropriate. We did not interview [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] supervisor or conduct any further inquiry regarding the T&A discrepancy. We recommend that you ensure that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] supervisor have the opportunity to provide input regarding the matter. Should you determine that disciplinary action is appropriate, we recommend that you coordinate the action with the [REDACTED]. Please consider recouping any funds paid to [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] was not present for duty.

4. (U) Please furnish us with a report of action taken or planned within [REDACTED] days of your receipt of this memorandum. A tasking was established in [REDACTED] to track the suspense.

5. (U//) Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact [REDACTED], at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] or [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] staff, at [REDACTED].

Enclosure as stated

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//



[REDACTED]

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

SUBJECT:

1. (U// ) The [REDACTED] has completed a preliminary analysis of an allegation that [REDACTED] may have engaged in time and attendance (T&A) abuse from 15 September 2011 through 10 March 2012. [REDACTED] is a [REDACTED]

2. (U// [REDACTED] Our analysis of [REDACTED] access control records, T&A documents, and training and travel records for the period referenced above revealed a discrepancy of 85 hours and 58 minutes, worth \$4154.39 [REDACTED] The analysis disclosed the amount of time that [REDACTED] claimed on [REDACTED] T&A records, compared with the amount of time we could confirm independently that [REDACTED] was present at [REDACTED] assigned duty location. The value of the hours that it appears [REDACTED] did not work falls below the [REDACTED] \$5,000 threshold for pursuing a T&A fraud investigation.

3. (U// [REDACTED]) We are providing this information for your review and action as you deem appropriate. We did not interview [REDACTED] or conduct any further inquiry regarding the T&A discrepancy. We recommend that you ensure that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] supervisor have the opportunity to provide input regarding the matter. Should you determine that disciplinary action is appropriate, we recommend that you coordinate the action with the [REDACTED]. Please consider recouping any funds paid to [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] was not present for duty.

4. (U) Please furnish us with a report of action taken or planned within [REDACTED] days of your receipt of this memorandum. A tasking was established in [REDACTED] to track the suspense.

5. (U// ) Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact [REDACTED], at [REDACTED]

or of staff, at

Enclosures as stated

(U) [REDACTED]

© 2006 The Authors  
Journal compilation © 2006 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

UNCLASSIFIED//

4 April 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Summary of Case #12-072

1. (U//FOUO) Background

The [REDACTED] uncovered a series of emails on 24 February 2012, as a result of data mining, that discussed the loss/theft of [REDACTED] vials of vaccines from the medical dispensary at [REDACTED]. The emails suggested a lack of controls that resulted in the loss of medical supplies. Subsequent inventory of the vaccines revealed the following missing items: [REDACTED] vials of [REDACTED] vaccine, [REDACTED] vials of [REDACTED] vaccine, and [REDACTED] vials of [REDACTED]. There is no lock on the refrigerator door; access to the room is controlled via badge reader.

The [REDACTED] alerted [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] staff and recommended an immediate inventory to confirm the lost/missing items. On 16 March 2012, [REDACTED] and the undersigned met with [REDACTED] and visited [REDACTED], who has oversight of the medical clinic. [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] administers the clinic and that [REDACTED] staffs it with contractors. [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] would need a police report to begin an investigation into the missing items. The issue of who would provide the report, [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] was pending at the end of the meeting.

On 20 March 2012, [REDACTED], called the undersigned and confirmed that [REDACTED] with responsibility for the dispensary at [REDACTED] would file the police report and that [REDACTED] would ensure they did so.

On 29 March 2012, [REDACTED] and the undersigned spoke with [REDACTED] to inquire on the status of the police report. [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] had filed a report with the [REDACTED] police. [REDACTED] further confirmed that the police officer had started [REDACTED] interviews. [REDACTED] coordination with [REDACTED] indicated that the loss was probably due to a lack of proper and routine administrative and accountability procedures. Since implementing checks [REDACTED] times a day, there have been no incidents. [REDACTED] called [REDACTED] to inquire about the status of the police investigation. [REDACTED] stated that the report was complete and awaiting review by [REDACTED] deputy.

On 30 March 2012, the undersigned picked up the police report from [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] review. The report revealed that the refrigerator that houses the

UNCLASSIFIED//

vaccines does not appear to have its own locking device. While it is located in a room with badge-only access, the witness statements revealed high traffic into the room for reasons unrelated to retrieving or administering vaccines, i.e., access to other supplies and reference books.

On 3 April 2012, [REDACTED] confirmed that there is a locking device on the top of the refrigerator, but he was not sure when it was installed or if it was being routinely utilized.

### Scope

2. (U// [REDACTED]) Our preliminary inquiry focused on monitoring the possible loss/theft of the vials of vaccines to ensure the issue was handled within the appropriate channels.

### Findings

3. (U// [REDACTED]) There were no routine accountability checks prior to the possible loss/theft. Since the inception of checks [REDACTED] times a day, there have been no incidents.

4. (U// [REDACTED]) The refrigerator in question is located in an area that is highly trafficked by the medical staff for reasons unrelated to the administration of vaccines.

### Conclusion

5. (U// [REDACTED]) The issue of the possible loss/theft of vaccines was handled in appropriate channels.

### Recommendation

6. (U) Recommend that no further investigative work be conducted on this case and that this matter be closed. Further recommend that [REDACTED] require the clinic to routinely utilize the locking device on the refrigerator as an additional security measure.

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** 12-074

**(U) TITLE:** Alleged Alteration of Official Records

### **(U) ALLEGATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) This investigation addressed an allegation referred to the [REDACTED] by a [REDACTED] in a memorandum dated 24 February 2012. According to the memorandum, the [REDACTED] obtained evidence "indicating that an [REDACTED] directed that the [REDACTED] be deleted for contractor personnel currently working in [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] requested that [REDACTED] identify the official who issued the directive and determine the rationale behind the decision to alter official government records. While gathering information in response to the [REDACTED] which began in July 2011, the [REDACTED] received an e-mail record in which an [REDACTED] official requested that some contractors be removed from [REDACTED]. That official was identified as [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] investigation focused on the allegation that [REDACTED] directed the removal of contractors' records from [REDACTED] for purposes of altering government records to impede a [REDACTED] audit of [REDACTED] compliance with the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) law.

### **(U) INVESTIGATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) Investigators did not find credible evidence that [REDACTED] directed the removal of contractors from [REDACTED] or alteration of government records with the specific intent of impeding the [REDACTED] audit of [REDACTED] compliance with BRAC law. The contractors were not removed from [REDACTED] but their records were altered to clarify their location and function as [REDACTED] who, therefore, were not subject to BRAC.

### **(U) RECOMMENDATION**

(U// [REDACTED]) Based on our investigative findings, we have no recommendation and are providing this report to the [REDACTED], for informational purposes.

(U) [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

APR 25 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR

SUBJECT: (U) Theft of Government Property, Case Number 12-075

1. (U// On 12 March 2012, the received an e-mail from the regarding theft by , a contractor with . The e-mail stated that on 19 December 2011, during a routine polygraph test, stated that in 2005, while working in the destruction facility in , took home computer hard drives, sticks of RAM, and PDAs.
2. (U// conducted a preliminary inquiry into the matter ( ). When interviewed by , changed his previous statement and said left with computer hard drives, sticks of RAM, and PDAs without authority. advised that these items were destroyed. said knew unauthorized removal of government property from an is prohibited. determined that there was "no evidence of compromise of classified information."
3. (U// We are forwarding the investigative report for your review and any action deemed necessary. We request that you inform the of any action taken or planned within days of your receipt of this package. An tasker was opened to track the suspense.
4. (U// Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact at or staff, at

Enclosure as stated

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

2 May 2012

SUBJECT: Case No. 12-076, Improper Time Charging

1. (U// [REDACTED] This case was opened on 21 March 2012 based upon a disclosure from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised they investigated [REDACTED], who was working on the [REDACTED], and found [REDACTED] had improperly billed 171 hours between July and October 2011.
2. (U// [REDACTED] On 2 May 2012, [REDACTED] provided a copy of a letter [REDACTED] provided to [REDACTED], titled "Notification of Time Charging Inconsistencies." In this letter [REDACTED] described how they had terminated [REDACTED] employment and they were processing a credit to [REDACTED] of \$22,242.72.
3. (U) On 2 May 2012, [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] was in receipt of the [REDACTED] Systems notification letter.
4. (U) No further [REDACTED] action on this matter is required. Recommend this case be closed.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(U) Concur/Noneconcur with recommendation.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

1 May 2012

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Summary of Case #12-080

## 1. (U// Background

The ) received a complaint from regarding a request from , for labor charges that believed to be unrealistic. The initial information indicated that was requesting labor charges for person to work hours, covering full time positions, over a period.

further indicated that the requested documentation from the contractor, , to substantiate the claim of hours by individual. On 15 March 2012, gave them a deadline of the following week to provide the documentation.

The contacted on 23 April 2012 to inquire whether , had provided the appropriate documentation. responded that the contractor did indeed provide the time sheets for the individual in question, . also provided an email that included the , Funding Response and a spreadsheet that shows approximately weeks of work vice as originally thought. confirmed that the information provided by , satisfied the concerns that brought to the

## Scope

2. (U// Our preliminary inquiry focused on determining whether , provided the appropriate documentation to justify the labor charges for .

## Findings

3. (U// responded to the contracting officer's request for appropriate documentation to substantiate the labor charges for providing timesheets and a spreadsheet.

4. (U// ) The complainant, , is also the of the contract in question. Once provided the documentation to justify the labor charges for , was satisfied.

#### Conclusion

5. (U// ) The issue of the unrealistic labor charges was resolved by documentation that showed that hours were worked over weeks, not weeks as originally believed.

#### Recommendation

6. (U) Recommend that no further investigative work be conducted on this case and that this matter be closed.



UNCLASSIFIED//

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

13 July 2012

SUBJECT: Case No. 12-087, Subcontractor Reporting Overpayment

1. (U// [REDACTED] This case was opened on 30 April 2012 based upon a disclosure from [REDACTED]. In a letter dated 25 January 2012, [REDACTED] reported an overpayment in the amount of \$43,859.00 on master subcontract agreement number [REDACTED] with [REDACTED], under the [REDACTED] for the [REDACTED] program. [REDACTED] had conducted an internal investigation and found that [REDACTED] employees ([REDACTED] and [REDACTED]) had misreported their mileage and travel time after their duty location changed in April 2011. [REDACTED] policy allows employees to charge time and mileage for traveling to a client site if the time and distance to the site exceeds the time and mileage for the employee to travel between their home and the [REDACTED] office to which the employee is assigned. When [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] assignment location changed in April 2011, the time and distance from their home was no longer more than it would be to their assigned [REDACTED] office. [REDACTED] did not determine definitively that either employee knowingly claimed mileage and travel time when they should not have done so.
2. (U// [REDACTED] On 10 July 2012, [REDACTED], provided an email titled "[REDACTED]." Attached to this email were [REDACTED] letters ([REDACTED] each for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]) from [REDACTED] describing how they had already processed a credit to [REDACTED] of \$44,482.21.
3. (U) On 12 July 2012, [REDACTED], confirmed that [REDACTED] had received the credit of \$44,482.21 from [REDACTED].
4. (U) No further [REDACTED] action on this matter is required. Recommend this case be closed.

[REDACTED]

(U) Concur/Nonconcur with recommendation.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

MAY 23 2012

[REDACTED]  
MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: [REDACTED] Case Number 12-091, SISC Computer Misuse Report,  
[REDACTED]

REFERENCES: a. (U) [REDACTED] Instruction 8470.2R8, Internet Usage, 9 December 2009  
b. (U) NI 8470.3R8, Use of Electronic Mail and Other Electronic Communications, 9 January 2006

1. (U// [REDACTED] Attached please find a copy of an [REDACTED] [REDACTED] investigative report, case number [REDACTED]. The report contains evidence of misuse of a government BlackBerry by [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

2. (U// [REDACTED] On 13 May 2011, an [REDACTED] [REDACTED] performed a routine audit of [REDACTED] BlackBerry server SMS (Short Message Service) logs. A log file contained [REDACTED] outgoing text messages from [REDACTED] containing sexual dialog. A further review of [REDACTED] BlackBerry records revealed multiple text messages containing inappropriate dialog.

3. (U) Reference a prohibits accessing pornographic sites, downloading pornographic images, or requesting, ordering, creating, viewing, storing, copying, or transmitting sexually explicit or sexually oriented materials or services for personal recreation or entertainment while using [REDACTED]-sponsored Internet access. Reference b prohibits inappropriate use of [REDACTED] electronic communications, to include disparaging or derogatory comments attacking someone's character or integrity, including profanity and other abusive language.

4. (U) We determined that this matter did not warrant criminal investigation or additional investigation by us. We enclosed the report to aid with your determination of appropriate action to take regarding [REDACTED]. Please provide us with a report of action taken or proposed within [REDACTED] days of receipt of this memorandum. This suspense will be tracked to completion through the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] will report overdue suspenses at the [REDACTED] key components meeting.

5. (U// [REDACTED] Please contact us if you need to view the entire [REDACTED] file, which includes the supporting exhibits. We ask that you limit access to this report to those who have

(U) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

~~UNCLASSIFIED//FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

[REDACTED]  
SUBJECT: [REDACTED] Case Number 12-091, [REDACTED] Computer Misuse Report,  
[REDACTED]

an official need to review it. These documents and materials should not be released or further disseminated without the prior approval of the [REDACTED] Inspector General.

6. (U// [REDACTED] Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact [REDACTED], at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] or [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Thank you for your cooperation and prompt attention to this matter.

Enclosures as stated

2  
UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

21 September 2012

SUBJECT: Case No. 12-098, Possible Time and Attendance Fraud

1. (U//) This case was opened based upon a request for assistance on 5 June 2012 from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] requested assistance in collecting the records ( [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] from 2 April to 1 June 2012.
2. (U) In response to the request, [REDACTED] undertook the following actions to resolve the matter:
  - (U) On 7 June 2012, [REDACTED] requested [REDACTED], obtain [REDACTED].
  - (U) On 18 June 2012, [REDACTED], provided the [REDACTED] data.
  - (U) On 19 June 2012, the requested records were provided to [REDACTED]
  - (U) On 21 September 2012, [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] had determined that [REDACTED] had legitimate work activities outside the [REDACTED] facilities during that time period and therefore they had no concerns about mischarging.
3. (U) No further [REDACTED] action on this matter is required. Recommend this case be closed.

(U) Concur/Nonconcur with recommendation.

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED//

JUL 13 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR

SUBJECT: (U) Misuse of Government Property, Case Number 12-110

1. (U//) The received a complaint on 04 June 2012, regarding

The complainant reported that may have used computer system privileges at to obtain personal information about an employee.

2. (U//) reportedly confronted in north parking lot on 30 May 2012, about running a red light located off the installation. subsequently sent an e-mail message via the network in which addressed about running the red light and demeanor in the parking lot; sent courtesy copies to supervisor, , and government point of contact (POC). The complainant opined that may have used computer privileges to look up license plate and/or parking "hang tag" in an database to identify and send the e-mail.

3. (U//) On 29 June 2012, government POC, talked to about using the computer system for personal reasons. Since started working in in May 2012, it was determined that actions were isolated due to lack of understanding of the parameters of newly acquired position at instructed to contact the if a similar situation occurred in the future. assured that would not confront employees in the future and would be more professional when working with customers.

4. (U//) We are forwarding this memorandum for your review and any action you deem necessary. We request that you inform the of any action taken or planned within days of your receipt of this memorandum. An tasker was opened to track the suspense.

5. (U//) Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact , at , or , at ,

CC:

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//

UNCLASSIFIED//

AUG 06 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR

SUBJECT:

Case Number 12-129,

REFERENCES:

- a. (U) Instruction 8470.2R8, Internet Usage, 9 December 2009
- b. (U) Instruction 8470.3R8, Use of Electronic Mail and Other Electronic Communications, 9 January 2006

1. (U//) Attached is an investigative report involving misuse of a government computer by an contractor. The contractor is
2. (U//) On 18 June 2012, the Forensics Branch received notification as a result of a random network audit that an user identified as was preparing and sending sexually explicit correspondence. Branch staff confirmed that the inappropriate behavior originated from that profile, which was assigned to
3. (U//) On 20 June 2012, found multiple automated network captures of the profile composing and sending sexually explicit e-mails using Hotmail account. A search of profile, e-mail account, and home directory found nothing else of interest.
4. (U) The references cited prohibit inappropriate use of -sponsored Internet accounts, including requesting, ordering, creating, downloading, viewing, storing copying, or transmitting sexually explicit or sexually oriented materials or services for personal recreation or entertainment.
5. (U//) This office maintains full report, including the supporting exhibits. Please contact us if you need to view it. We ask that you limit access to the file to those who have an official need to know. These documents and materials should not be released or further disseminated without the prior approval of the Inspector General.
6. (U) We determined that this matter did not warrant criminal investigation or additional investigation by us. We enclosed the report to aid with your determination of appropriate action to take regarding.

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//

~~UNCLASSIFIED//FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

[REDACTED]  
SUBJECT: [REDACTED] Case Number 12-129, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

7. (U) Please provide us with a report of action taken or proposed within [REDACTED] days of receipt of this memorandum. This suspense will be tracked to completion through the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] will report overdue suspenses at the [REDACTED] key components meeting.

8. (U// [REDACTED] Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Thank you for your cooperation and prompt attention to this matter.



Enclosure as stated

UNCLASSIFIED//

AUG 06 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR

SUBJECT:

Case Number 12-130,

REFERENCES:

- a. (U) Instruction 8470.2R8, Internet Usage, 9 December 2009
- b. (U) Instruction, Use of Electronic Mail and Other Electronic Communications, 9 January 2006

1. (U//) Attached is an investigative report involving misuse of a government computer by an contractor. The contractor is
2. (U//) On 24 April 2012, the Forensics Branch received notification as a result of a random network audit that an computer system identified as was being used to write and send foul and sexually explicit correspondence. The inappropriate behavior originated from the profile, which is assigned to
3. (U//) From 05 February through 14 June 2012, automated software captured the profile accessing YouTube, Gmail, Jabber, and Google Chat for personal use. The Gmail accounts were being used to compose and send sexually explicit e-mails and instant messages. Software also found that was using an computer system identified as to compose sexually explicit content.
4. (U) The references cited prohibit inappropriate use of -sponsored Internet accounts, including requesting, ordering, creating, downloading, viewing, storing copying, or transmitting sexually explicit or sexually oriented materials or services for personal recreation or entertainment.
5. (U//) This office maintains full report, including the supporting exhibits. Please contact us if you need to view it. We ask that you limit access to the file to those who have an official need to know. These documents and materials should not be released or further disseminated without the prior approval of the Inspector General.

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//



UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
SUBJECT: [REDACTED] Case Number 12-130, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

6. (U) We determined that this matter did not warrant criminal investigation or additional investigation by us. We have enclosed the [REDACTED] report to aid with your determination of appropriate action to take regarding [REDACTED]

7. (U) Please provide us with a report of action taken or proposed within [REDACTED] days of receipt of this memorandum. This suspense will be tracked to completion through the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] t. SI will report overdue suspenses at the [REDACTED] key components meeting.

8. (U//FOUO) Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]. Thank you for your cooperation and prompt attention to this matter.

[REDACTED]  
Enclosure as stated

UNCLASSIFIED// [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED//

JUL 29 2013

MEMORANDUM FOR

SUBJECT: (U) Referral of Time and Attendance Analysis, Case Number 13-132

1. (U//) The [REDACTED] has completed a preliminary analysis into an allegation that [REDACTED] engaged in time and attendance (T&A) abuse from June 2012 to June 2013. [REDACTED] is a [REDACTED].
2. (U//) Our assessment of [REDACTED] access control records, T&A documents, and training and travel records for the period referenced above revealed a discrepancy of [REDACTED] hours, worth \$4,307.37 (see enclosure). The analysis disclosed the time that [REDACTED] claimed on [REDACTED] T&A records, compared with the time we could confirm independently that [REDACTED] was present at [REDACTED] assigned duty location. The value of the hours that [REDACTED] did not work falls below the [REDACTED] \$10,000 threshold for pursuing a T&A fraud investigation.
3. (U//) Additionally, [REDACTED] submitted time during deployment averaging [REDACTED] hours per day for [REDACTED] days. This submitted time appears to be excessive, and therefore, we request management revisit the certified time for [REDACTED] during the deployment period and verify its accuracy.
4. (U//) We are providing this information for your review and action as you deem appropriate. We did not interview [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] supervisor or conduct any further inquiry regarding the T&A discrepancy and deployment period. We recommend that you ensure that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] supervisor have the opportunity to provide input regarding the matter. Additionally, in accordance with 31 USC § 3711, Federal agencies are required to attempt collection of debts owed to the U.S. Government. Please contact the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to pursue recovery of unearned income paid to [REDACTED].
5. (U) Please furnish us with a report of action taken or planned within [REDACTED] days of your receipt of this memorandum. A tasking was established in [REDACTED] to track the suspense.
6. (U//FOUO) Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]

Enclosure as stated

(U)

UNCLASSIFIED//