



# governmentattic.org

*"Rummaging in the government's attic"*

Description of document: Department of Transportation (DOT) Office of Inspector General (OIG) Closed Investigation Regarding Bag of Money 2017

Requested date: 31-October-2021

Release date: 11-April-2022

Posted date: 23-January-2023

Source of document: FOIA request  
DOT OIG  
FOIA Requester Service Center  
1200 New Jersey Avenue, S.E., 7th Floor  
Washington, DC 20590  
[Online FOIA Request Form](#)  
[FOIA.gov](#)

The governmentattic.org web site ("the site") is a First Amendment free speech web site and 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.



U. S. Department of Transportation  
**Office of Inspector General**

April 11, 2022

RE: FOIA Request, Control No.: OIG-2022-0015

This letter is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, dated October 31, 2021, sent to the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) Office of Inspector General (OIG). You requested the following records:

“A copy of each report of investigation, final report, closing memo, referral memo, referral letter, etc. for each investigation closed during FY2021 regarding an NTSB employee matter or internal NTSB matter. You may limit the scope of this request to substantiated investigations.”

Enclosed are eight (8) pages of documents responsive to your request. Some information was redacted or withheld pursuant to exemptions provided by the FOIA (5 U.S.C. §552 (b)(6) and (b)(7)c)<sup>1</sup>. We are producing the 8 pages of documents with redactions.

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. See 5 U.S.C. 552(c) (2006 & Supp. IV 2010). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist.

---

<sup>1</sup> Exemption 6 protects names and any data identifying individuals if public disclosure would be a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy. Exemption 7(C) protects personal information in law enforcement records. It prevents the disclosure of law enforcement information that could reasonably constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

For any further assistance, you may contact Attorney-Advisor/FOIA Officer Barbara Hines at (202) 680-3084, [Barbara.Hines@oig.dot.gov](mailto:Barbara.Hines@oig.dot.gov). You may also contact our FOIA Public Liaison, Amy Berks at (202)-657-7116, [Amy.Berks@oig.dot.gov](mailto:Amy.Berks@oig.dot.gov).

Barbara Hines, Attorney Advisor/FOIA Officer, is the person responsible for this determination. If you are not satisfied with the DOT OIG's determination in response to this request, you may administratively appeal by writing to the Chief Counsel for the Office of Inspector General, Department of Transportation, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor West (JL), 1200 New Jersey Avenue, S.E. Washington, DC 20590. Appeals to the Chief Counsel should be prominently marked as a "FOIA Appeal." If you prefer, your appeal may be sent via electronic mail to [FOIAAPPEALS@oig.dot.gov](mailto:FOIAAPPEALS@oig.dot.gov). An appeal must be received within 90 days of the date of this letter and should contain any information and arguments you wish to rely on. The Chief Counsel's determination will be administratively final.

You also have the right to seek dispute resolution services from the FOIA Public Liaison (contact information shown above) or the Office of Government Information Services (<https://ogis.archives.gov>) via phone—202-741-5770 / toll free—1-877-684-6448; fax—202-741-5769; or email— [ogis@nara.gov](mailto:ogis@nara.gov).

Please be advised, due to the COVID-19 pandemic the DOT OIG FOIA Office is currently operating on a remote basis only. Therefore, there may be significant delays in the processing of current and future FOIA requests received via postal mail. Likewise, the delivery of printed copies will be impacted and experience significant delays.

Until further notice, we recommend (when possible) that FOIA requests be submitted using our online portal at <https://www.oig.dot.gov/FOIA> or the National FOIA portal at <https://www.foia.gov/>. We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause. Thank you for your patience.

Sincerely,

*Kimberly Hylan*  
Student Trainee (Government Information Specialist)

Enclosure

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

# REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

~~This document is loaned to you  
For Official Use Only.  
For handling instructions, see inside cover.~~

~~**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
(Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552)~~

117E0090300

CASE NUMBER

**REDACTED FOR DISCLOSURE**





OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION	INVESTIGATION NUMBER I17E0090300	DATE 9/14/2017
TITLE  (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)  National Transportation Safety Board	PREPARED BY SPECIAL AGENT  (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)	STATUS Final
Violation(s): Violation of Policy and/or Regulation; 18 U.S. Code § 1505 - Obstruction of proceedings before departments, agencies, and committees	DISTRIBUTION  File	1/4  APPROVED FDS (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

**SYNOPSIS:**

The U.S. Department of Transportation, Office of Inspector General (DOT OIG) initiated this investigation based upon a referral from the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) alleging (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) NTSB, offered (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subordinate, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a monetary loan/gift as incentive for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to leave NTSB, during a routine staff meeting. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) It is further alleged (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) also regularly pressured (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to leave NTSB, and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may have changed procedures for the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

During the course of this investigation, numerous interviews were conducted to include (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) During the interview of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) denied all the allegations; however, the interviews of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) revealed (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) did offer (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a monetary loan/gift which (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) declined. A forensic examination of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) NTSB-issued laptop was conducted by the DOT OIG Computer Crimes Unit, which revealed (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) used (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) NTSB-issued laptop to access USAJobs.com on multiple occasions, a fact (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) denied during (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) interview with DOT OIG.

**DETAILS:**

On March 7, 2017, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was interviewed and denied ever displaying cash to either (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) or (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and further denied offering a cash loan or gift to either (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) or (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) denied berating, being unprofessional, and/or inappropriate with either (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) also denied

conducting an impromptu staff meeting with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) on (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Lastly, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) denied providing (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) with position openings from other agencies or searching USAJOBS website for open (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) positions for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to apply to.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) changed the procedures (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and this change was approved by both NTSB (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C).

On March 16, 2017, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was interviewed and recalled a staff meeting held in (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) office in approximately October or November 2016. Present during the staff meeting were (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) estimated the meeting lasted approximately 30 minutes. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) recalled being directed by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to complete (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). At one point, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) entered (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) office, gathered documents and left. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) then told (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) easily and placed a large amount of cash on (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) desk. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) then offered the cash as a loan to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) declined to borrow the money from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). In (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) opinion, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) believes (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was "showing off" by displaying the cash.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) recalled (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) encouraging (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to apply for jobs that would be a promotion and on one occasion provided her a copy of an open job announcement. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) never requested that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) leave or resign from NTSB.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) recalled (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) made procedural changes to the way in which (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). These changes caused errors in the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), however, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) does not feel (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) benefited personally as a result.

On March 16 & 21, 2017, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was interviewed and recalled an impromptu staff meeting held in (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) office in approximately August or September 2016. In attendance at the staff meeting were (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) could not recall the exact date or time of the staff meeting, but reported that the meeting occurred during normal business hours between Monday and Thursday.

At some point during the meeting, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) went to a filing cabinet in (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) office and removed approximately twelve inch zippered vinyl bank bag full of cash. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) estimated the cash to be in the thousands of dollars though (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) could not see the exact denominations of the bills. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) placed the cash on (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) desk in front of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and continued the meeting. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) then offered the cash on (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) desk to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) as a loan. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) did not know whether the offer of money was a loan or a gift. The loan offer was only made to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and not offered to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) believed (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) offered the large amount of cash to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) as an incentive for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to leave NTSB.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) encouraged (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to leave NTSB as their work styles conflicted, according to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) also told (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) could leave NTSB if (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) did not like the way (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) ran (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) department.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) reported that errors were made in (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and these errors were caught (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in October 2016. The procedures for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) have since been corrected.

On March 21, 2017, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was interviewed and recalled an office outing in June or July 2016, in which (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) attended a Washington Nationals game in Washington, DC. The group had lunch at Buffalo Wild Wings just before the game and during lunch, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) opened (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) purse and called (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) attention to a zippered bank bag within (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) purse containing a large amount of cash at least three inches thick. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) estimated the cash was approximately \$20,000 or more. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) recalled (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) explaining (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) carries that amount of cash regularly as "cash can solve a lot of problems."

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) told (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) about a staff meeting (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) attended with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) reported to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) that during the staff meeting, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) offered (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a large sum of cash as a loan as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is aware (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has financial concerns due to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) believes this money offer was made as an incentive for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to leave NTSB.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has encouraged (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to leave NTSB in the past by providing open job announcements to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and encouraging (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to transfer to an agency where former (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is now employed.

The following five former (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) have left the agency in the past 24 months while working for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) added that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was inappropriate with all of these former employees.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) met approximately four months ago to discuss (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) concerns relative to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was reluctant to discuss these issues as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) are close friends and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was (b)(6); (b)(7)(C).

On April 24, 2017, the forensic analysis of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) NTSB laptop was completed by the DOT OIG Computer Crimes Unit, which disclosed (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) visited USAJobs.com on numerous occasions between June 21, 2016 and October 3, 2016. Further results indicated that on September 14, 2016 a USAJobs search was conducted for the keyword of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) with the location of "Washington District of Columbia."

DOT OIG presented all aspects of this investigation to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia (USAO-DC) for prosecutorial consideration; however, USAO-DC declined criminal prosecution of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C).



This interim Report of Investigation was forwarded to NTSB on April 28, 2017 for action. On August 18, 2017, OIG was notified (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) from NTSB on July 17, 2017 and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) NTSB no later than October 12, 2017.



U.S. Department of Transportation  
Office of Inspector General

# EVIDENCE CUSTODY DOCUMENT

Office of Investigations

CASE TITLE <b>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) - Bribery/Gratuities</b>		PROJECT NUMBER <b>C17E0090300</b>	DATE AND TIME OF SEIZURE <b>3/23/2017</b>	LOG NO. <b>pg 133 8E</b>
NAME OF PERSON FROM WHOM PROPERTY SEIZED <b>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</b>		LOCATION WHERE PROPERTY SEIZED <b>NTSB HQ - 490 L'Enfant Plaza SW, Washington DC, 20594</b>		
TO BE RETURNED <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		GRAND JURY MATERIAL - DISSEMINATE ONLY UNDER RULE 6(e), F.R.C.P. <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		
ITEM	QUANTITY	DISPOSAL ACTION	DESCRIPTION OF ARTICLE - MODEL NUMBER, SERIAL NUMBER, IDENTIFYING MARKS, CONDITION, AND VALUE WHEN APPROPRIATE	
1	1		Hard drive containing forensic evidence files. Western Digital 160GB HDD SN: <b>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</b>	
NAME AND SIGNATURE OF WITNESS (IF AVAILABLE)			NAME AND SIGNATURE OF RECEIVING SPECIAL AGENT <b>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</b>	

# CHAIN OF CUSTODY

ITEM	DATE & TIME	RELEASED BY	RECEIVED	PURPOSE
1	03/30/2017	PRINT NAME AND TITLE (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) <hr/> ORGANIZATION (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) <hr/> SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME AND NAME AND TITLE (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) <hr/> ORGANIZATION (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) <hr/> SIGNATURE	Enter into evidence
1	11/8/2017 OSJH	PRINT NAME AND TITLE (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) <hr/> ORGANIZATION (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) <hr/> SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME AND NAME AND TITLE <hr/> ORGANIZATION <hr/> SIGNATURE	REMOVED FOR DESTRUCTION
		PRINT NAME AND TITLE <hr/> ORGANIZATION <hr/> SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME AND NAME AND TITLE <hr/> ORGANIZATION <hr/> SIGNATURE	
		PRINT NAME AND TITLE <hr/> ORGANIZATION <hr/> SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME AND NAME AND TITLE <hr/> ORGANIZATION <hr/> SIGNATURE	
		PRINT NAME AND TITLE <hr/> ORGANIZATION <hr/> SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME AND NAME AND TITLE <hr/> ORGANIZATION <hr/> SIGNATURE	

REMARKS: ON 11/2/2017, CASE ADVISED THIS CASE WAS CLOSED AND ALL EVIDENCE RETURNED FOR THE CCU COULD BE DESTROYED. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

## FINAL DISPOSAL ACTION

FINAL DISPOSAL AUTHORITY

NAME (PRINTED) \_\_\_\_\_ RANK/TITLE \_\_\_\_\_ ORGANIZATION \_\_\_\_\_

PERSON(S) RECEIVING ITEM(S)/WITNESSING DISPOSAL ACTION

1 (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)	ORGANIZATION US DOT OIG	SIGNATURE/DATE (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

INDICATE IN DISPOSAL ACTION COLUMN (ON FRONT) BY NUMBER AND LETTER CODE PERSON(S) RECEIVING OR WITNESSING ACTION AND TYPE OF ACTION: RETURNED TO INDIVIDUAL OWNER(I), TURNED INTO SUPPLY(S), TO ANOTHER AGENCY (A), DESTROYED (D), OTHER METHOD (M) (EXPLAIN IN REMARKS ABOVE).