



UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

October 1, 2011 — March 31, 2012



United States Capitol Police



History

Created by Congress in 1828 following the assault on a son of John Quincy Adams in the Capitol Rotunda, the original duty of the United States Capitol Police (USCP) was to provide security for the United States Capitol Building. Its mission has expanded to provide the Congressional community and its visitors with a variety of police services. These services are provided through a variety of specialty support units, network of foot and vehicular patrols, fixed posts, full-time Containment and Emergency Response Team, K-9 unit, Patrol/Mobile Response Division, and full-time Hazardous Devices and Hazardous Materials Sections. The agency has 2,129 sworn and civilian employees as of March 24, 2012.

Mission

Today's USCP officer has the primary responsibility of protecting life and property; preventing, detecting, and investigating criminal acts; and enforcing traffic regulations throughout a large complex of congressional buildings, parks, and thoroughfares. With the signing of Public Law 112-74, USCP was given jurisdiction over the Capitol Reflecting Pool and Union Square—adding to its concurrent jurisdiction with other police agencies, including the United States Park Police and Metropolitan (D.C.) Police, of an area approximately 200 blocks around the Capitol complex. USCP is also charged with the protection of Members of Congress, officers of Congress, and their families throughout the entire United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

Office of Inspector General



History

With Public Law 109-55 (August 2, 2005), Congress directed that the Capitol Police Board appoint an Inspector General (IG) for the Department. The IG was to be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of integrity and demonstrated ability in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, or investigations.

On July 12, 2006, the Chairman of the Capitol Police Board swore in the first IG for the Department at the Headquarters for the United States Capitol Police—the Eney, Chestnut, Gibson Memorial Building in Washington, D.C.

Mission

The IG is responsible for conducting and supervising audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of the Department. The Office of Inspector General (OIG) examines, evaluates and, where necessary, critiques the programs and operations, recommending ways to carry out departmental responsibilities in the most effective, efficient, and economical manner possible. OIG also audits, investigates, and oversees matters related to the Department's programs and operations, consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

MESSAGE FROM THE INSPECTOR GENERAL



**Inspector General
Carl W. Hoecker**

I am pleased to present the United States Capitol Police (USCP) Office of Inspector General (OIG) *Semiannual Report* for the period October 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012.

The audits, investigations, and other activities outlined within this report demonstrate OIG's ongoing commitment to ensure efficiency and integrity within USCP programs and operations.

During this period, Audits issued three reports: *Audit of the United States Capitol Police Enterprise Architecture* (Report Number OIG-2012-01), *Audit of USCP's FY 2011 Financial Statements*, (Report Number OIG-2011-02), and *Management Letter Related to the Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2011 Financial Statements* (Report Number OIG-2012-03). OIG also proceeded with agreed-upon procedures of the Department's time and attendance system.

Investigations continued to receive and evaluate numerous Hotline complaints and conduct outreach with USCP personnel including two recruit officer classes. Investigations served as a liaison for the Department during an audit of the House Child Care Center by coordinating with other OIGs. Also during this period, OIG received 38 complaints, initiated 4 investigations, and closed 6 cases.

During this reporting period, I was encouraged by the Department's significant progress of closing open recommendations older than 6 months. As of March 31, 2012, OIG made 189 recommendations to USCP and the Department took action to fully implement 151 recommendations, which OIG closed. For example, during the FY 2011 financial statement audit, auditors closed 27 open recommendations related to financial management and internal controls. Of the 38 remaining open recommendations, auditors noted that the Department progressed toward implementing those recommendations.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank our committees of jurisdiction, the Capitol Police Board, and the Department for the interest and support they have shown our office. We look forward to working closely with the Chief of Police and his leadership team, the Board, and Congress to increase efficiency and effectiveness in USCP programs and operations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Carl W. Hoecker".

**Carl W. Hoecker
Inspector General**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Legislation Monitored	3
Agent of Positive Change	4
Proactive Efforts	5
Audits	6
Investigations	10
Appendix 1 – Reports Issued	12
Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations	13
Appendix 3 – Peer Review Reporting	17
Table 1 – Reports Issued with Questioned Costs	18
Table 2 – Reports with Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use	19
Table 3 – Investigations Statistics	20
IG Act Reporting Requirements	21
Working Relationship Principles for Agencies and Offices of Inspectors General	22



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Semiannual Report is issued pursuant to the provisions of Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and summarizes the activities of the United States Capitol Police's (USCP or Department) Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the period October 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012. During this reporting period, OIG continued to direct its available resources toward those areas of greatest risk for the Department. We completed work to promote the economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity of the Department's programs and operations. The work of each of the OIG components is summarized below.

OIG Audits issued three reports: *Audit of the United States Capitol Police Enterprise Architecture* (Report Number OIG-2012-01), *Audit of USCP's Fiscal Year 2011 Financial Statements* (Report Number OIG-2011-02), and the *Management Letter Related to the Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2011 Financial Statements* (Report Number OIG-2012-03).

At the request of the Chief of Police (Chief) and the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), Audits continues an Agreed-Upon Procedures (AUP) of the Department's time and attendance (T&A) systems. The AUP will assist the Department in evaluating, to the extent possible, best practices other similar law enforcement organizations use, as well as additional procedures that are determined the most efficient and effective based on the results of the review.

OIG Investigations received and evaluated 38 complaints during this reporting period, of which 36 were hotline complaints and 2 were from other sources. In addition, OIG initiated four investigations and closed six cases. Investigative reports issued during this reporting period are in Appendix 1.

During this reporting period, OIG continued its active engagement with the Chief, Capitol Police Board, and Congress through meetings, briefings, and hearings. As an example of its active engagement, OIG met with the new Chairman of the Capitol Police Board, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, who was sworn in as the 36th Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. House of Representatives on January 17, 2012. OIG also provided an overview of the OIG mission to recruit officer classes preparing for their departure to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia.

OIG remains a contributing participant in the activities of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), which was statutorily established to enhance efforts to promote integrity and efficiency and to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse in Federal programs. The USCP IG continues to serve as the chairman of CIGIE's Investigations Committee. The IG is also a contributing member to several other committees, including the legislative branch OIGs.



LEGISLATION MONITORED

Legislation Monitored

OIG reviewed and monitored the following legislation:

H.R. 209 – *The Reducing Information Control Designations Act*

H.R. 2146 – *The Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2011*

H.R. 5815 – *The Inspector General Authority Improvement Act of 2011*

S. 241 – *The Non-Federal Employee Whistleblower Protection Act of 2011*

S. 300 – *The Government Charge Card Abuse Prevention Act of 2011*

S. 801 – *The Information Technology Investment Management Act of 2011*

S. 1212 – *The Geolocational Privacy and Surveillance Act*

S. 1246 – *A bill to reduce the number of non-essential new vehicles the Federal Government purchases and leases*

S. 1490 – *The Personal Data Privacy and Security Act of 2009*

P.L. 112-74 – *The USCP now has law enforcement authority over the Capitol Reflecting Pool/Union Square*





AGENT OF POSITIVE CHANGE

Resolution of Open Recommendations

During the last several years, OIG has made numerous recommendations to improve financial management and internal controls. The new Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) have worked to close open recommendations. As a result, during the Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 financial statements audit (Report Number OIG-2012-02), the independent auditors closed 27 recommendations that were older than 6 months.

Health Benefits

In October 2011, a retired employee notified OIG that the insurance carrier had cancelled the retiree's health benefits because of non-payment of premiums. The retired employee believed that the action was a failure on the part of the Department to transfer the proper documentation in a timely manner to the Department of Labor.

Our review showed that the National Finance Center (NFC) inadvertently contacted the insurance carrier and stated that the Department had terminated the employee. Although the Department of Labor was paying the health insurance premiums, the insurance carrier cancelled coverage based on the external entity's statement that the originating agency terminated the employee.

OIG officials worked with the Department to not only reinstate the retiree's health insurance but also ensure that the employee's benefits were retroactively covered.





PROACTIVE EFFORTS

Major Management Challenges

For FY 2012, OIG identified protection/security, information security, financial management, human capital, and resolution of audit recommendations as major management challenges for the Department. OIG continues to meet with senior Department officials in an effort to jointly focus on improving processes and internal controls using the management challenges as a roadmap.

Outreach Activities

As part of our continuing efforts to promote accountability through better awareness of our role, mission, and services, OIG continues to present information to recruit officer classes as well as legislative branch officials and committee staff members.



The Assistant Inspector General for Investigations conducts outreach with recruit officers.

Joint OIG Effort

To further assist the Department, OIG and the House of Representatives OIG coordinated on an audit of the House Day Care to ensure there was no duplication of effort or additional burdens placed on the Department.



AUDITS

Audit of USCP's Enterprise Architecture (OIG-2012-01)

In accordance with our FY 2011 annual plan, OIG conducted a performance audit that would determine whether the Department had (1) integrated its information technology (IT) strategy with the overall Department strategy and mission; (2) aligned IT resources and systems to support the Department's mission; (3) communicated and coordinated the business, mission-critical, and IT organizations within the Department; and (4) aligned IT investments in the budgeting and procurement processes. Our scope included Department information systems as of June 1, 2011.

We found that USCP has not yet integrated its IT strategy or aligned its IT resources and investments with the organization's overall strategy and mission or the budget and procurement processes. The Department also had not established IT governance over Enterprise Architecture (EA) or a "repeatable business process" that ensures IT initiatives throughout the Department are aligned with the strategic direction of the Department. For example, the Office of Information Systems (OIS) strategic plan has not been updated since 2004, and the OIS *Catalog of Information Technology*, which provides an inventory of Department information systems, was incomplete and did not reflect the "as is" configuration of the Department's technology. OIS cannot determine how its efforts and current technology support the mission and vision of USCP without a current strategic plan that identifies the OIS objectives and goals and an up-to-date inventory of systems that USCP uses.

Because IT resources are decentralized within USCP, resources among offices and bureaus are redundant. As the main technology office, OIS provides the majority of the technology resources within the Department. However, "pockets" of technology also exist throughout the organization. Such a lack of policies, processes, and governance over IT resources (general expenses and personnel) within the Department contributes to inefficiencies and duplication of resources.

The Force Development Process is a process by which bureaus/offices map strategic initiatives and required resources for general expenses. For the last few years, however, the Department has not used the Force Development Process when making IT purchases, and bureaus and offices throughout the Department have been independently procuring IT software and systems without the input of the Chief Information Officer or OIS. Prioritizing IT purchases through the procurement and budget process should be refined to reflect additional opportunities for cost savings and avoid redundancy to improve the Department's performance. OIG made five recommendations, which the Department agreed to implement.



Audit of USCP's FY 2011 Financial Statements (OIG-2012-02)

OIG contracted with Clifton Gunderson LLP (CG), an independent certified public accounting firm, to audit the Department's financial statements for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2011. The primary objective of the audit was to express an opinion on whether the financial statements were presented fairly, in all material respects, and in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. In addition, the independent auditor expressed an opinion on the effectiveness of the USCP's internal control over financial reporting based on the *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. CG also evaluated and reported on compliance with laws and regulations related to the financial statements.

In the *Independent Auditor's Reports*, CG rendered an unqualified opinion with reference to the FY 2010 auditor's opinion. The FY 2010 opinion qualification was related to scope limitation. CG was able to apply audit procedures and obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence on the two areas (Advances and Construction-in-Progress) with qualification and to the beginning balance as a basis for their FY 2011 opinion.

In the *Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Control*, CG rendered an adverse opinion, with two material weaknesses concerning payroll processing and construction-in-progress and two significant deficiencies regarding account management and accounts payable accrual for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

In the *Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance With Laws, Regulations, and Other Matters*, the independent auditors noted one instance of noncompliance with the *Fair Labor Standards Act* regarding compensatory time earned in lieu of overtime for balances in excess of 480 hours.

As a result of its audit procedures, CG identified material misstatements in the financial statements that it brought to the attention of management. Management adjusted the financial statements for the misstatements and agreed to take actions to implement all recommendations. CG also identified additional small misstatements that they brought to management's attention. Management considered the effects to be immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the financial statements taken as a whole. Therefore, the Department did not adjust the financial statements for these items. These misstatements did not affect CG's opinion on the 2011 financial statements. The auditors had numerous repeat recommendations and made two new recommendations, which the Department agreed to implement.



Management Letter Related to the Audit of the USCP's Fiscal Year 2011 Financial Statements (OIG-2012-03)

The management letter, which an independent external auditor prepared, discusses a number of internal control deficiencies identified during the audit of the FY 2011 financial statements. In the report, the external auditor noted the following control deficiencies:

1. Untimely Review of Fund Balance With Treasury Related Reconciliation and Reports
2. Untimely Vendor Payments
3. Incomplete Government Purchase Card Certification Form
4. Lack of Fleet Card Program Training
5. Lack of Justification for Vendor Additions and Modifications in [REDACTED]
6. Unsupported Cost Allocation Percentages
7. Lack of [REDACTED] Configuration Management Procedures

These control deficiencies, if addressed, should enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of internal controls. The external auditor stated that the deficiencies, although of concern, did not merit inclusion in the report on the financial statement audit.

The Department agreed to implement all recommendations.



ON-GOING AUDITS

Agreed-Upon Procedures of USCP's Time and Attendance System

At the request of the Chief and CAO, during this reporting period OIG began a survey of the Department's T&A system. Work will be conducted in three phases. The first phase will consist of obtaining an understanding of current policies and procedures and the environment. The second phase will include procedures for assisting in evaluating whether controls are operating effectively and efficiently. The final phase will consist of gathering information that will assist the Department in evaluating best practices used by other similar law enforcement organizations, analyses, and procedures as an outcome of previous phases and procedures. The scope will include T&A procedures and systems in place as of September 1, 2011.

On March 23, 2012, OIG provided an interim briefing of the tentative findings and recommendations to the Chief and CAO. OIG expects to issue the final report on or before May 31, 2012.





INVESTIGATIONS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



APPENDIX 1 – REPORTS ISSUED

OIG-2012-01	Audit of USCP's Enterprise Architecture
--------------------	--

OIG-2012-02	Audit of the United States Capitol Police's FY 2011 Financial Statements
--------------------	---

OIG-2012-03	Management Letter Related to the FY 2011 Financial Statements Audit
--------------------	--

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]



APPENDIX 2 – RESOLUTION OF REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Timely resolution of outstanding recommendations continues to be a priority of both OIG and the Department. As of March 31, 2012, OIG has made 189 recommendations to the Department. Of those 189 recommendations, the Department closed 151, with 38 still open, which require additional corrective action before they can be closed. The following table lists recommendations older than 6 months.

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2009-01 2011-01 2012-02	FY 2008 FS FYs 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 1.2 1.1 1.1	Payroll Processing – We recommended that USCP consistently implement T&A certification policies and procedures and that timekeepers review all certification reports to ensure that employees and supervisors sign and date reports. (1) USCP management needs to enforce the revised policies and procedures in Special Directive [REDACTED] (2) Because this condition has been in existence for many years, we also recommended that the supervisor/timekeeper procedures for monitoring of employees' T&A to include identifying habitual failures in submitting certification reports so that corrective actions can be targeted to those employees. (3) Lastly, we recommended that USCP evaluate the feasibility of using [REDACTED] a T&A system, to automate the T&A certification process. Consider [REDACTED] capability to allow manual certification by an employee/supervisor, and to allow remote access to the system for certification purposes.
2009-01 2011-01 2012-02	FY 2008 FS FYs 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 1.3 1.2 1.2	Payroll Processing – Recommendation same as above.
2009-01 2011-01 2012-02	FY 2008 FS FYs 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 1.6 1.4 1.3	Payroll Processing – As in the prior year's recommendation, USCP should perform monthly reconciliation between the National Finance Center (NFC) and [REDACTED] to ensure leave balance information is correctly reported in both systems. We also recommended that the Office of Human Resources (OHR) implement corrective actions in a timely manner.
2009-01 2011-01 2012-02	FY 2008 FS FYs 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 1.9 1.6 1.4	Payroll Processing – We recommended that USCP ensure that its employees comply with USCP Special Directive No. [REDACTED] addressing responsibility to record daily worked hours using the Department's [REDACTED] time clocks. We also recommend that USCP enhance its procedures for monitoring employees who show a pattern of not clocking in or out and verify if hours entered in [REDACTED] are actual hours worked by the employees.
2011-01 2012-02	FY 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 10 1.5	Payroll Processing – As in the prior year's recommendation, we recommended that USCP monitor timekeeper distribution and collection of certification reports to complete its T&A review procedures at the end of each pay period. We also recommended that USCP emphasize deadlines or include a deadline for T&A staff to complete the T&A confirmation of certification report.
2011-01 2012-02	FY 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 12 1.6	Payroll Processing – We recommended that USCP document the audits or tests performed and the supervisory review of the test results to include the name of the same tested (if less than 100 percent) in test workpapers. We also recommended that USCP develop a test worksheet that will include the test attributes (criteria), result, and corrective actions, if applicable.



United States Capitol Police Office of Inspector General

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations

Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2011-01 2012-02	FY 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 13 1.7	Payroll Processing – We recommended that USCP develop, document, and implement a segregation-of-duties matrix to identify incompatible functions across [REDACTED] and NFC. We also recommended that management review all user accounts and ensure that users are assigned appropriate roles within and across applications to prevent control over incompatible functions.
2009-01 2011-01 2012-02	FY 2008 FS FYs 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 2.2H 22 2.1	Financial Management – We recommended that USCP develop a formal monthly reporting process from the program offices overseeing construction-in-progress to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and provide signed confirmation that the financial reports from the partner agencies have been reviewed and accepted. We also recommended that OFM continue to work with the program offices in terms of requesting and maintaining additional documentation for the cost incurred from partner agencies.
2011-01 2012-02	FY 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 38 3.1	Financial Management – We recommended that USCP develop and implement a methodology that would ensure that user activity is routinely reviewed through logs generated by the [REDACTED] application.
2011-01 2012-02	FY 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 39 3.2	Financial Management – We recommended that USCP develop, document, and implement an OFM segregation-of-duties matrix to identify incompatible functions within [REDACTED]. We also recommended that USCP review all user accounts and ensure that users are assigned appropriate roles within and across financial applications to prevent control over incompatible functions.
2011-01 2012-02	FY 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS	Repeat Finding 40 3.3	Financial Management – We recommended that USCP implement account management controls within [REDACTED] to remove access of terminated individuals in a timely manner. We also recommended that USCP update the mechanism (user request form) to request and approve access to [REDACTED] to provide requestors with the ability to select specific access roles that agree to roles assigned within [REDACTED].
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	1	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP develop and implement a sound, effective method of accounting for each specialty assignment and proficiency pay program in the NFC and the [REDACTED] accounting systems. During the interim, the OHR should establish written procedures for processing and reconciling its cuff records with actual disbursements.
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	2	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP take action to collect questioned costs totaling \$196,420 and provide supporting documentation for \$30,600.
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	3	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP consider whether all the specialty assignment and proficiency pay programs are needed and, if so, determine the most efficient and effective method of implementation and allocate the necessary resources to effectively administrate the programs.
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	4	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP, in the interim, clarify Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Program Administrative Directives regarding: a. Exclusions or payments from multiple programs when using the same defining criteria such physical fitness, firearms proficiency, risk to self, and maintenance of certification or proficiencies, thereby avoiding costs of \$279,219 and putting funds to better use. b. The aggregate of 50 percent of the previous 6-month period for pay purposes for hazardous duty and plainclothes. c. The 45-calendar day requirement for specialty assignment pay.



United States Capitol Police Office of Inspector General

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations

Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	5	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP finalize its draft firearms and field officer training directives and enforce the consistent use of a standard [REDACTED] Form.
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	6	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP strengthen tracking and reconciliation procedures that ensure employees do not improperly receive payments within the same fiscal year or when ineligible for such pay.
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	8	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP take action to clarify its Maximum Annual Payable Rate in light of Public Law 108-7. In addition, we recommended that the Chief of Police request that the Office of the General Counsel provide a legal opinion regarding: (1) USCP authority to defer payments to the next calendar year when an employee may exceed the annual salary limitation; and, (2) appropriate options for collecting amounts from employees who received amounts in excess of the annual salary limitation.
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	9	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP consider whether certain specialty assignment and proficiency pay programs are needed to compete with other police forces and, if so, then the Department should link its goals and measures of these programs with retention and recruitment of Department personnel.
2008-08	Review of Compliance with USCP Hiring Standards and with Directive [REDACTED]	1	Triple III - We recommended that USCP, in coordination with the Capitol Police Board, update its hiring standards and establish a comprehensive hiring directive outlining the Department's vision and goals to create a talented and committed workforce, to support an effective organizational culture, and enhance the overall performance of the Department.
2009-02	Controls Over Travel Vouchers	2	Travel Vouchers – We recommended that USCP provide travel cardholders training or, at a minimum, require that all cardholders take the U.S. General Services Administration on-line training course for cardholders and document such training. Additionally, the Office of Financial Management (OFM) should review the questionable vouchers and determine if questioned costs should be collected from cardholders.
2009-02	Controls Over Travel Vouchers	3	Travel Vouchers – We recommended that USCP strengthen its controls surrounding voucher payment process. Specifically, we recommended that USCP require cardholders to mark duplicate travel vouchers clearly as "COPY" when resubmitting to OFM. Additionally, OFM should develop and implement a mandatory specialized training course for the approving, authorizing, and certifying officials reiterating their roles and responsibilities. Refresher courses should be provided on a periodic basis. Until a training course is developed and implemented, USCP should require that applicable officials review the Federal Travel Regulations and Department policies and procedures related to reviewing travel vouchers and approving travel expenditures.
2009-05	Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program	1	Purchase Card – We recommended that USCP communicate policies and procedures that address the identified internal control deficiencies noted for the Purchase Card Program culminating in a comprehensive purchase card management plan.
2009-05	Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program	2	Purchase Card – We recommended that USCP update its Purchase Card guidance.
2009-05	Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program	3	Purchase Card – We recommended that USCP require the Purchase Card Program Coordinator to conduct monthly monitoring of purchase cardholder statements and purchase log reconciliations to measure compliance.
2009-05	Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program	4	Purchase Card – We recommended that USCP review reported questionable transactions and make a determination as to their appropriateness and valid Government need.



United States Capitol Police Office of Inspector General

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2009-06	<i>Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments</i>	1	Off-site Deployments – We recommended that USCP in coordination with the Capitol Police Board and Committees of jurisdiction, establish a policy clearly defining terms such as deployment, “direct nexus” to the mission, and the three exceptions under 2 U.S.C. § 1978 and establish a complete listing of off campus activities that do not require formal notification.
2009-06	<i>Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments</i>	2	Off-site Deployments – We recommended that USCP immediately document its decision-making process as it relates to off campus activities.
2009-06	<i>Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments</i>	3	Off-site Deployments – We recommended that USCP implement procedures to capture and document estimated and actual costs in all off campus activities.
2009-06	<i>Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments</i>	4	Off-site Deployments – We recommended that USCP develop written measures and standards for off-campus activities.
2010-02	<i>Review of Hazardous Materials Response Team Procurement Process</i>	3	Procurement – We recommended that USCP safeguard Government contract records by establishing physical control over vulnerable assets. Access to records should be limited to authorized individuals, and accountability for their custody and use should be assigned and maintained.



APPENDIX 3 – Peer Review Reporting

Implementing Section 989C of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act Inspector General Peer Review Activity October 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012

Last Peer Review Conducted of USCP OIG Audit Organization

As part of the 3-year cycle of independent peer reviews, the last peer review report¹ covering USCP OIG Audit Organization was issued January 27, 2011, by OIG for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). USCP OIG received a peer review rating of pass for the year ended September 30, 2010. Furthermore, the NEH OIG had no comments or recommendations in its *System Review Report* of USCP OIG.

USCP OIG's next peer review of its Audit organization is scheduled for September 2013.

Last Peer Review Conducted by USCP OIG Audit Organization

USCP OIG was not involved in any peer review work during this reporting period. USCP OIG issued its last *Reviewing Inspector General Report* on March 12, 2010, to the Federal Maritime Commission Office of Inspector General.

USCP OIG is scheduled to conduct the peer review of Appalachian Regional Commission for the period ended March 2013.

¹ The Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) Audit Committee administers the external peer review program under generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) for Federal Offices of Inspectors General. GAGAS requires that audit organizations perform audits or attestation engagements in accordance with GAGAS to have an appropriate system of quality control and to undergo external peer reviews at least once every 3 years. GAGAS prescribes: (1) the elements of scope of the peer review, including performing a risk assessment to help determine the number and types of engagements to select; (2) the requirements for reporting on the results of the peer review; (3) the qualifications of review staff; and (4) the distribution of peer review reports. GAGAS also prescribes requirements for granting extensions of deadlines for submitting peer review reports.



Table 1

Reports Issued with Questioned Costs² October 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012

Category	(Dollars in Thousands)		
	No. of Reports	Questioned Costs	Unsupported Costs
For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period	4	\$2,701	\$1,341
Which were issued during the reporting period	0	\$0	\$0
Subtotals	4	\$2,701	\$1,341
For which a management decision was made during the reporting period			
• dollar value of disallowed costs	0	\$0	\$0
• dollar value of cost not disallowed	0	\$0	\$0
For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period	4	\$2,701	\$1,341
Reports for which no management decision was made within 6 months of issuance	4	\$2,701	\$1,341

² A "questioned cost" denotes that one or more of the following three situations exist: (1) an alleged violation of a provision of a law, regulation, contract, grant, cooperative agreement, other agreement, or document governing the expenditure of funds; (2) a finding that, at the time of the audit, such cost is not supported by adequate documentation; or (3) a finding that the expenditure of funds for the intended purpose is unnecessary or unreasonable.



Table 2

Reports Issued with Recommendations that Funds Be Put to Better Use³ October 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012

Category	Number of Reports	Dollar Value (in thousands)
For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period	1	\$282
Which were issued during the reporting period	0	\$0
Subtotals	1	\$282
For which management decision was made during the reporting period	0	0
- dollar value of recommendations that were agreed to by management - based on proposed management action - based on proposed legislative action	0	0
dollar value of recommendations that were not agreed to by management	0	0
For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period	1	\$282
Reports for which no management decision was made with 6 months of issuance	1	\$282

³ A recommendation that funds be put to better use is a recommendation by the OIG that funds could be used more efficiently if Department management took actions to implement and complete the recommendations, including: reductions in outlays, deobligation of funds from programs or operations; withdrawal of interest subsidy costs on loans or loan guarantees, insurance, or bonds; costs not incurred by implementing recommended improvements related to the operations of the Department, a contractor, or a grantee, avoidance of unnecessary expenditures noted in preaward reviews of contract or grant agreements; or any other savings which are specifically identified.



Table 3

INVESTIGATIONS STATISTICS October 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012

Recoveries	\$0
Fines and Restitutions	\$0
Investigative Cases Opened	4
Investigative Cases Closed	6
Internal Control Reviews Initiated	0
Arrests	0
Indictments	0
Convictions	0
Personnel Actions	0
Total Complaints Received	38
Hotline Complaints Received	36
Complaints from Other Sources	2
Complaints Referred (to Department or other agencies)	18
Inspector General Subpoenas	0



IG Act REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Section	Requirement	Page
Section 4(a)(2)	Review of Legislation	3
Section 5(a)(1)	Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies	6-11
Section 5(a)(2)	Recommendations with Respect to Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies	6-11
Section 5(a)(3)	Recommendations Included in Previous Reports on Which Corrective Action Has Not Been Completed	13-16
Section 5(a)(4)	Matters Referred to Prosecuting Authorities	None
Section 5(a)(5)	Summary of Instances Where Information Was Refused	None
Section 5 (a)(6)	Reports Issued During the Reporting Period	12
Section 5(a)(7)	Summary of Significant Reports	6-11
Section 5(a)(8)	Questioned and Unsupported Costs (Table 1)	18
Section 5(a)(9)	Recommendations that Funds be put to Better Use (Table 2)	19
Section 5(a)(10)	Summary of Reports Issued before the start of the Reporting Period for which no Management Decision has been made	N/A
Section 5(a)(11)	Significant Revised Management Decisions	N/A
Section 5(a)(12)	Management Decisions with which the Inspector General is in Disagreement	None
Section 5(a)(13)	Specifically excluded by Public Law 109-55	N/A
Section 5(a)(14-16)	Peer Review Reporting Requirements	17



Working Relationship Principles for Agencies and Offices of Inspectors General

The *Inspector General Act* establishes for most agencies an OIG and sets out its mission, responsibilities, and authority. The unique nature of the IG function can present a number of challenges for establishing and maintaining effective working relationships. To work most effectively together, the agency and its OIG need to clearly define what each considers a productive relationship and then consciously manage toward that goal in an atmosphere of mutual respect.

By providing objective information to promote Government management, decision making, and accountability, OIG contributes to the agency's success. OIG is an agent of positive change, focusing on eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse, and on identifying problems and recommendations for corrective actions by agency leadership. OIG provides the agency, Board, and Congress with objective assessments of opportunities to be more successful. OIG, although not under the direct supervision of the Chief, must keep the Board and Congress fully and currently informed of significant OIG activities. Given the complexity of management and policy issues, OIG and the agency may sometimes disagree on the extent of a problem and the need for and scope of corrective action. However, such disagreements should not cause the relationship between OIG and the agency to become unproductive. The following working relationship principles provide some guidance for agencies and OIGs. **To work together most effectively, OIG and the agency should strive to:**

Foster open communications at all levels.

The agency will promptly respond to OIG requests for information to facilitate OIG activities and acknowledge challenges that OIG can help address. Surprises are to be avoided. With very limited exceptions, primarily related to investigations, OIG should keep the agency advised of its work and its findings on a timely basis, and strive to provide information helpful to the agency at the earliest possible stage.

Interact with professionalism and mutual respect.

Each party should always act in good faith and presume the same from the other. Both parties share, as a common goal, the successful accomplishment of the agency's mission.

Recognize and respect the mission and priorities of the agency and OIG. The agency should recognize OIG's independent role in carrying out its mission within the agency, while recognizing the responsibility of OIG to report both to Congress and to the agency head. OIG should work to carry out its functions with a minimum of disruption to the primary work of the agency. The agency should allow OIG timely access to agency records and other materials.

Be thorough, objective, and fair. OIG must perform its work thoroughly, objectively, and with consideration to the agency's point of view. When responding, the agency will objectively consider differing opinions and means of improving operations. Both sides will recognize successes in addressing management challenges.

Be engaged. OIG and agency management will work cooperatively in identifying the most important areas for OIG work, as well as the best means of addressing the results of that work, while maintaining OIG's statutory independence of operation. In addition, agencies need to recognize that OIG also will need to carry out work that is congressionally requested, mandated by law, or self-initiated.

Be knowledgeable. OIG will continually strive to keep abreast of agency programs and operations, and agency management will be kept informed of OIG activities and concerns being raised in the course of OIG work. Agencies will help ensure that OIG is kept up to date on current matters and events.

Provide feedback. The agency and OIG should implement mechanisms, both formal and informal, to ensure prompt and regular feedback.

CONTACTING THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The success of OIG's mission to prevent fraud, waste, abuse, or mismanagement depends on the cooperation of employees and the public. There are several ways to report questionable activity.

Call us at 202-593-4201 or toll-free at 866-906-2446. A confidential or anonymous message can be left 24 hours a day/7 days a week.



Toll-Free
1-866-906-2446

Write or visit us – we are located at:



*United States Capitol Police
Attn: Office of Inspector General, Investigations
119 D Street, NE
Washington, DC 20510*

OIG staff members open mail addressed to the above address.

You can also contact us by email at: OIG@USCP.GOV

When making a report, convey as much information as possible such as: Who? What? Where? When? Why? Complaints may be made anonymously or you may request confidentiality.

Additional Information and Copies:

To obtain additional copies of this report, call the OIG at 202-593-4201.

