



UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL



SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

October 1, 2015 – March 31, 2016



United States Capitol Police



History

Created by Congress in 1828 following an assault on a son of John Quincy Adams in the Capitol Rotunda, the original duty of the United States Capitol Police (USCP or the Department) was to provide security for the United States Capitol Building. Its mission has expanded to provide the congressional community and visitors with a variety of police services. With Public Law 110-178, Congress directed the merger of USCP and the Library of Congress (LOC) police. Hence, in October 2009, LOC buildings became part of the U.S. Capitol Building and grounds for which USCP provides security services. USCP provides those services through a variety of specialty support units, network of foot and vehicular patrols, fixed posts, full-time Containment and Emergency Response Team, Canine (K-9) Unit, Patrol/Mobile Response Division, and full-time Hazardous Devices and Hazardous Materials Sections. USCP had 1,723 sworn and 353 civilian employees as of March 28, 2016.

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 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 USCP Headquarters—the Eney, Chestnut, Gibson Memorial Building in Washington, D.C. On August 11, 2013, Fay F. Ropella began her tenure as the second IG for the Department.

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 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



I am pleased to present this Semiannual Report to Congress as Inspector General of the United States Capitol Police (USCP or the Department). This report summarizes work the USCP Office of Inspector General (OIG) initiated and completed for the period October 1, 2015, through March 31, 2016. The audits, evaluations, analyses, and investigations we describe illustrate OIG efforts in promoting the efficiency and effectiveness of USCP programs and operations. In October 2015, we issued our annual report identifying what OIG considers from our oversight perspective the major management challenges facing the Department in fiscal year (FY) 2016.

During this period, Audits issued four reports: *Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Financial Statements*, Report Number OIG-2016-01; *Management Letter Related to the Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Financial Statements*, Report Number OIG-2016-02; *Management Advisory Report: United States Capitol Police Garnishment Process*, Report Number OIG-2016-03; and a *Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police Public Web Site and Web Applications*, Report Number OIG-2016-05. At the end of the reporting period, Audits also was conducting a performance audit of the USCP Training Services Bureau as well as performance audit of the security of mobile devices.

Investigations continued to receive and evaluate Hotline complaints and conduct outreach with USCP personnel, including recruit officer classes. OIG received 45 complaints, initiated 5 investigations, and closed 4 cases during this reporting period. Investigations also conducted an *Evaluation of the United States Capitol Police Division of Intelligence and Information Analysis*, Report Number OIG-2016-04 and at the end of the reporting period, Investigations was performing an inspection of the Office of Professional Responsibility.

OIG prepared correspondence to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and to the Committee on the Judiciary related to

open and unimplemented recommendations; investigations involving GS-15 level or above employees; whistleblower retaliation; and attempts to interfere with the Inspector General's independence.

OIG staff members are fully committed to promoting the efficiency and effectiveness of the Department's programs and operations. I commend USCP, the Capitol Police Board (Board), and members of the oversight community for their professionalism and devotion to the USCP mission. We thank the officers whose service and sacrifice inspire our goal to achieve excellence through unity.

Additionally, OIG would like to thank the prior Chief, Kim C. Dine, for his support of our office during his tenure and wish him the best in all his future endeavors. Congratulations to the ninth Chief of Police, Matthew R. Verderosa! In closing, we look forward to the continued support of Congress, the Board, the new Chief of Police, and the Department as we strive to use our oversight functions to promote accountability, integrity, and efficiency; improve USCP programs and operations; and ensure the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

Fay F. Ropella, CPA, CFE
Inspector General

United States Capitol Police Change of Command

March 17, 2016, Farewell Reception



Figure 1: United States Secret Service Director Joseph Clancy presents a farewell gift to prior Chief Dine.
Source: USCP photograph.



Figure 2: United States Park Police Chief Robert D. MacLean congratulates prior Chief Dine on his retirement.
Source: USCP photograph.

March 21, 2016, Swearing-in Ceremony



Figure 3: The Honorable Paul D. Irving, USCP Board Chairman; along with Board Members, The Honorable Stephen T. Ayers; and The Honorable Frank J. Larkin; swore in Matthew R. Verderosa as the ninth USCP Chief.
Source: Architect of the Capitol photograph.



Figure 4: The Honorable Paul D. Irving, USCP Board Chairman; The Honorable Frank J. Larkin, Board Member; Chief Matthew R. Verderosa; and The Honorable Stephen T. Ayers, Board Member.
Source: Architect of the Capitol photograph.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations and Acronyms	2
Executive Summary	3
Legislation Reviewed	4
Value Added	5
Proactive Efforts	7
Audits	8
Investigations	12
Appendix 1 – Reports Issued	18
Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations	19
Appendix 3 – Peer Review Reporting	25
Table 1 – Reports Issued with Questioned Costs	26
Table 2 – Reports Issued with Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use	27
Table 3 – Investigations Statistics	28
IG Act Reporting Requirements	29
Working Relationship Principles for Agencies and Offices of Inspectors General	30

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Canine	K-9
Capitol Police Board	Board
Chief of Police	Chief
Commodity Futures Training Commission	CFTC
Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency	CIGIE
Division of Intelligence and Information Analysis	DIIA
Fiscal Year	FY
Government Publishing Office	GPO
Inspector General	IG
Library of Congress	LOC
National Institute of Standards and Technology	NIST
Office of Human Resources	OHR
Office of Information Systems	OIS
Office of Inspector General	OIG
Office of Professional Responsibility	OPR
Peace Officer Background Investigation Tracking System	POBITS
Protective Services Bureau	PSB
Risk Management Framework	RMF
Security Services Bureau	SSB
	
Standard Operating Procedures	SOPs
Training Services Bureau	TSB
United States Capitol Police	USCP or Department
Virtual Private Network	VPN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Semiannual Report is issued pursuant to the provisions of Section 5 of the Inspector General (IG) Act of 1978, as amended, and summarizes the activities of the United States Capitol Police (USCP or the Department) Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the period October 1, 2015, through March 31, 2016. During this reporting period, OIG continued to direct its available resources toward those areas of greatest risk for the Department. We completed work for promoting 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 four reports: *Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Financial Statements*, Report Number OIG-2016-01; *Management Letter Related to the Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Financial Statements*, Report Number OIG-2016-02; *Management Advisory Report: United States Capitol Police Garnishment Process*, Report Number OIG-2016-03; and *Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police Public Web Site and Web Applications*, Report Number OIG-2016-05. At the end of the reporting period, Audits had several active projects including a performance audit of the USCP Training Services Bureau (TSB) as well as performance audit of the security of mobile devices.

OIG Investigations received 45 complaints during this reporting period, of which 40 were Hotline complaints and 5 were from other sources. OIG initiated 5 investigations of senior management and closed 4 cases as shown in Table 3. Investigations also conducted an *Evaluation of the United States Capitol Police Division of Intelligence and Information Analysis*, Report Number OIG-2016-04 and at the end of the reporting period, Investigations was conducting an inspection of the USCP Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR).

Throughout this reporting period, OIG continued work with its stakeholders to maintain and foster open and effective relationships. As an example of its work with stakeholders, OIG continued active engagement with the Chief of Police (Chief), the Capitol Police Board (Board), and Congress through meetings, briefings, and dialogue with members and staff of the Department's authorizing and appropriation committees and subcommittees on a range of issues relating to the work of OIG and USCP. OIG also continued outreach activities by providing briefings to new employees and recruit officer classes. OIG additionally continues as a contributing participant in the activities of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), which was established to help promote integrity and efficiency as well as detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse in Federal programs. The IG continued participating in legislative branch OIG activities such as regular meetings with other Inspectors General.

LEGISLATION REVIEWED

OIG reviewed and monitored the following legislation:

H.R. 653, *FOIA Oversight and Implementation Act*

H.R. 1557, *Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2015*

H.R. 1938, *IG Transparency Act of 2015*

H.R. 2395, *Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2015*

H.R. 2995, *Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2016*

S. 579, *Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2015*

S. 754, *Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015*

S. 1378, *Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2015*

S. 2127, *Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblowers Protection Act of 2015*

S. 2128, *Inspector General Mandates Reporting Act of 2015*

S. 2133, *Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015*

S. 2450, *Administrative Leave Act*



VALUE ADDED

While working alongside the Department, during this reporting period OIG added significant value, which allowed the Department to continue its significant progress in closing open recommendations. We also received several notes from departing employees thanking OIG for our continued work in making USCP a better organization. One of the most noteworthy examples of our value was demonstrated by another Federal agency requesting to use several of our reports and recommendations to provide opportunities to its staff to make their agency more efficient and effective.

Continued Progress in Resolution of Open Recommendations

We also measure our value by tracking the outcomes of our report recommendations as codified in the IG Act of 1978, as amended. Since its inception in July 2006, OIG has made 310 recommendations for improving USCP programs and operations. During this reporting period, the Department continued making progress by ensuring that recommendations are fully implemented in a timely manner. As a result, OIG closed 12 recommendations that were previously open—some of those open recommendations were older than 6 months. The Department continues to work in fully implementing other recommendations, and OIG is optimistic that it will continue to close additional recommendations.

Report Title	Report Number	Recommendations Closed
<i>Independent Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture</i>	OIG-2012-01	1
<i>Agreed-Upon Procedures of USCP Time and Attendance System</i>	OIG-2012-04	6
<i>Performance Audit USCP Canine (K-9) Program</i>	OIG-2013-04	1
<i>Performance Audit of Hazardous Materials Response Team</i>	OIG-2014-05	1
<i>Performance Audit of USCP Controls Over Evidence</i>	OIG-2015-03	2
<i>Evaluation of the United States Capitol Police Division of Intelligence and Information Analysis</i>	OIG-2016-04	1
Total		<u>12</u>



VALUE ADDED (Cont'd)

OIG Work Adds Value to USCP

One measure of our value is by providing oversight to assist the Department in achieving results-oriented performance. During this reporting period, several departing employees (the prior Chief and the Chief Information Officer) thanked OIG for adding value to the Department through its professional team work as well as our integrity in working to make USCP a better organization.



OIG Work Adds Value to Others



A more noteworthy measure of USCP OIG value was demonstrated by another Federal agency requesting to take lessons learned from a couple of our audit reports “for learning opportunities and chance to improve” its organization. When another agency requests permission to use another OIG’s work, it is one of the greatest compliments an OIG can receive. Working together, both parties share as a common goal, the successful accomplishment of their respective agencies mission and the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

Together, these accomplishments are the result of the dedicated work of OIG’s professional staff and their commitment to ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of USCP programs and the Federal government. Our success, in large part, is due to the continued support of the Chief Matthew R. Verderosa and the Board, as well as our Oversight Committees and Members of Congress.

PROACTIVE EFFORTS

Major Management Challenges

In October 2015, OIG issued the FY 2016 major management challenges for the Department, which included interagency communication and program integration, information systems and cyber security, integrated internal control systems, financial and acquisition management, human capital, and resolution of recommendations.

OIG Annual Performance Plan

On October 15, 2015, OIG issued its *Annual Performance Plan for FY 2016*. OIG coordinated with its stakeholders in assessing the nature, scope, and inherent risks of the Department programs and operations. That assessment forms the basis for establishing our strategic and annual performance plan, including objectives and the scope of the work that OIG will accomplish throughout FY 2016.

Outreach Activities

As part of our continuing efforts for promoting accountability through increased awareness of the OIG role, mission, and services, we actively participated in presentations to Department managers and employees. We continue our proactive initiative for strengthening accountability by providing fraud prevention and awareness training to Department personnel, as shown in Figure 5.



Figure 5: The Assistant Inspector General for Investigations conducts outreach with recruit officers. Source: OIG photograph.

AUDITS

Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Financial Statements (OIG-2016-01)



OIG contracted with an independent public accounting firm to audit the Department's financial statements for the period ending September 30, 2015. Our 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 conducting the audit, the independent auditor also expressed an

opinion on the effectiveness of the USCP's internal controls over financial reporting based on the *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government* issued by the Comptroller General for the United States and conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. In addition, the independent auditor evaluated and reported on compliance with the laws and regulations related to the financial statements.

In its *Independent Auditor's Report*, the auditor rendered an unmodified opinion that the Department's financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Department as of September 30, 2015, and 2014, and its net costs, changes in net position, and budgetary resources for the years then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States.

For the *Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting*, the auditor rendered an adverse opinion with one material weakness concerning payroll controls and one significant deficiency related to controls over de-obligation of undelivered orders/open obligations.

In the *Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance with Laws, Regulations, and Other Matters*, the auditor did not identify any instances of noncompliance with selected provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements tested.

The Department agreed to implement the recommendations.

AUDITS

Management Letter Related to the Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Financial Statements (OIG-2016-02)

The management letter, prepared by an independent external auditor, discusses a number of internal control deficiencies identified during the audit of the FY 2015 financial statements. Those control deficiencies, if addressed, should enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of internal controls. In the view of the independent auditor, the deficiencies, although of concern, did not rise to the level necessary to be included in the report on the financial statement audit. In its response, the Department indicated that it concurred with the findings and recommendations. OIG will evaluate compliance during future audits of USCP's financial statements. The Department agreed to implement the recommendations.

Management Advisory Report: United States Capitol Police Garnishment Process (OIG-2016-03)



On December 21, 2015, OIG issued an advisory report in connection with an allegation received from an officer that USCP did not follow appropriate laws and regulations related to garnishment of wages. OIG limited its scope of work to focus on the specific aspect of the garnishment process, which included reviewing documents the officer provided as well as the Department's standard operating procedures (SOPs) and compliance with those SOPs. OIG did not conduct this review in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards because of the nature and brevity of the assessment precluded use of normal protocols.

The Department's Office of Human Resources (OHR) did not have written guidelines or SOPs related to properly handling garnishment of wages. In addition, OHR did not have a process for requesting legal review of garnishment documentation prior to issuing instructions to withhold funds from an employee's wages as the National Finance Center requires. OIG made two recommendations, which the Department agreed to implement.

AUDITS

Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police Public Web Site and Web Applications (OIG-2016-05)

OIG conducted a performance audit of the security of the USCP public Web site and the two public Web-based applications. Our objectives were to determine if USCP (1) established adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring Web site application security and efficient and effective operations, and (2) complied with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance pertaining to management and operation of its publicly accessible Web applications. Our scope included controls, processes, and operations during FYs 2014 and 2015.

The Government Publishing Office (GPO) provides Web hosting services for several agencies including USCP. In addition to the public Web site, the Department also maintained two other public Web applications—the Peace Officer Background Investigation Tracking System (POBITS) and a virtual private network (VPN) portal. POBITS is a Web-based application the Department uses for conducting background investigations during its hiring process. The VPN portal is a Web application that allows Department employees to remotely access the USCP network through a VPN.

Overall, the Department did not establish adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring Web site application security and efficient and effective operations. For example, the Department did not have evidence of a Memorandum of Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding between GPO and USCP regarding hosting of the Department Web site. Without such an agreement, USCP has no documented understanding of expectations and/or procedures for security controls of its public Web site. In a previous audit—*Performance Audit of USCP Fiscal Year 2015 Information Security Program*, Audit Report Number OIG-2015-10, dated September 2015—OIG recommended that the Department adopt the National Institute of Standards and Technology's (NIST) risk management framework (RMF) for its security controls. With an RMF, the Department would have prevented many of the internal control weaknesses identified during the audit. As of February 2016, the Office of Information Systems (OIS) continued its efforts to implement the NIST RMF.

The Department also did not have adequate written policies and procedures governing use of Web applications. Specifically, OIS did not have any policies or procedures addressing Web applications such as POBITS or the VPN portal. The Department also did not comply with USCP Directive [REDACTED], dated October 19, 2012, with respect to [REDACTED]. OIG made four recommendations, which the Department agreed to implement.

ON-GOING AUDITS

Performance Audit of USCP Training Services Bureau



In accordance with our FY 2016 annual plan, OIG began a performance audit of the USCP TSB. Our objectives include determining if TSB (1) established adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring the integrity of its program and efficient and effective program operations, and (2) complied with applicable policies and procedures as well as applicable laws, and regulations. Our scope includes controls, processes and operations during FYs 2011 through 2015. OIG expects to issue our report in July 2016.

Performance Audit of the Security of Mobile Devices

In accordance with our FY 2016 annual plan, OIG began a performance audit of the security of mobile devices. Our objectives include determining if the Department (1) established adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring security over Department-issued mobile devices, and (2) complied with applicable policies and procedures as well as applicable laws, regulations, and best practices. Our scope includes controls, processes, and operations in effect at the time of our fieldwork. OIG expects to issue the report in July 2016.



INVESTIGATIONS

Inquiry into Allegations of Violations of the Posted Captain and Inspector Promotion Processes (Investigative Number 2016-I-0001)

OIG conducted an inquiry into allegations of violations of the promotional processes for Captain and Inspector. An anonymous complainant alleged the Department deviated from its promotion process by not convening a panel comprising three Inspectors to review and score resumes and letters submitted by candidates for Captain. The complainant also alleged the Department deviated from its selection process by changing the composition of the interview panel from the three Deputy Chiefs, which was outlined in the promotion announcement dated May 28, 2015, [REDACTED]. The complaint continued to allege that the Department violated appropriations law by promoting five Lieutenants for only two Captain vacancies, and three Captains for one Inspector vacancy. Furthermore, the complainant alleged that a female member of the interview panel “would loudly applaud female candidates that they felt performed well in the interview” and “this was intimidating to some candidates and shows the fact that they were trying to influence the other panel members as they were completing their individual and objective scores.”

Other allegations in the complaint stated that after the interview panel certified the interview scores and the then Chief reviewed them, the Department advised the panel that they had scored the candidates incorrectly and needed to change their scores. The complaint alleged that the then Chief “favored” a Lieutenant that was a tenth of a point away from the top group, which made the Lieutenant eligible for promotion as one of the top two candidates. After the panel members declined to change their scores, the then Chief promoted “five candidates so it would not appear that he reached for this Lieutenant.”



Based on our inquiry, interviews conducted, and review of applicable laws and Department policies, OIG did not find any evidence or information, which substantiated that USCP violated policies in the Captain and Inspector promotional processes. OIG did, however, advise Department officials that behavior such as applauding female candidates reportedly occurred during the interviews was not appropriate. On November 6, 2015, OIG closed this inquiry.

INVESTIGATIONS

Evaluation of the United States Capitol Police Division of Intelligence and Information Analysis (OIG-2016-04) (Investigative Number 2016-I-0002)

As part of our oversight responsibility of the Department, we evaluated the Division of Intelligence and Information Analysis (DIIA) within the Protective Services Bureau (PSB). Our primary objectives were to determine if the Department (1) established adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring collection and dissemination of information that would enhance the ability of the Department to carry out its mandated mission, and (2) complied with applicable policies and procedures as well as applicable laws, regulations, and best practices. Our scope included internal controls, processes, and operations during FYs 2014 and 2015.

DIIA did not establish adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring the integrity of its program. The division did not maintain written procedures for many of its processes. Although DIIA used mechanisms for producing threat assessments for [REDACTED], special events, and terrorism, the division did not document the procedures or processes. And while the Department had SOPs for some controls, DIIA had not updated many to reflect changes in its processes. Of the 15 SOPs OIG reviewed, DIIA had not updated 13 since 2006. As a result of outdated procedures, the division did not comply with many of its SOPs. For example, SOP [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

DIIA also did not always comply with guidance related to several critical functions. Those functions included such things as [REDACTED] and on-call schedules. DIIA did not have an SOP concerning strategic goals for newsletters, which may have mitigated the risk of releasing inappropriate, misleading, or inflammatory information.

Although USCP established a framework for intelligence and information analysis, the Department did not integrate intelligence activities throughout USCP. DIIA is primarily

INVESTIGATIONS

Evaluation of the United States Capitol Police Division of Intelligence and Information Analysis (OIG-2016-04) (Investigative Number 2016-I-0002) (Cont'd)

responsible for intelligence and information analysis, yet similar activities took place throughout various bureaus, offices, and divisions not integrated or functioning as intended. For example, the Threat Assessment Section and Intelligence Section-Investigations within the Investigation Division of PSB regularly interact with DIIA on intelligence-related matters. The Threat Assessment Section investigates threats to Congress and the Intelligence Section-Investigations is responsible for surveillance detection, counter-surveillance activities, and suspicious-activity investigations. The Technical Countermeasures Division within the Security Services Bureau (SSB) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The framework did not provide for strategic departmental intelligence priorities that can be used to help with annual planning decisions, such as which analytic activities should be pursued and level of investment. As a result, the Department did not have reasonable assurance that analytic activities for components and resource investments successfully supported departmental priorities.

The Department partners with other intelligence and law enforcement agencies and provides liaisons at each agency. Those agencies are the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The Department did not, however, maintain Memorandums of Understanding with each agency with liaisons. Lack of an appropriate Memorandum of Understanding could have put the Department in a vulnerable position without reasonable assurance component analytic activities were producing products or resource investments aligned, which supported departmental priorities. We made six recommendations, all of which the Department agreed to implement.

INVESTIGATIONS

Inquiry into Allegations of Misconduct by a Senior Official (Investigative Number 2016-I-0003)

OIG conducted an inquiry into allegations that a senior member of the Department violated USCP Directive [REDACTED], dated November 19, 2012, by publishing an Open Source Newsletter without vetting the newsletter with senior officials and ensuring that articles from other sources contained a disclaimer alerting readers that commentaries did not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the Department. USCP Directive [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] states that supervisors will be responsible for subordinates' adherence to Department rules, regulations, policies and procedures, orders and Directives, and will take reasonable action to ensure compliance. The Department did not have any rules, regulations, policies, procedures, orders, or directives that specifically addressed the Open Source Newsletter or outlined the senior official's responsibilities. The Department failed to provide specific guidance related to the approval process of the newsletter to the official. Our review of the official's performance standards and evaluations did not discuss the newsletter approval process. OIG did not sustain the charge of misconduct because of a lack of supporting documentation. OIG closed the inquiry on February 26, 2016.

Allegation of Discrimination in the Discipline Process (Investigative Number 2016-I-0004)

OIG received a complaint alleging discrimination during the discipline process, which violated USCP Directive [REDACTED], dated May 28, 2012. According to the complaint of January 14, 2015, a supervisor requested discovery in order to file an appeal. The supervisor found multiple inconsistencies with the discovery packet and felt that the Department handled his case differently than others that "have acted in similar or even more egregious manners." OIG conducted interviews, reviewed documentation, and researched applicable Department policies and procedures, including USCP Directive [REDACTED], dated August 14, 1990, as well as interviewing the supervisor. The supervisor stated that after a morning roll call, he used his foot to "sweep" out the foot of another employee who was sitting in a chair. According to the supervisor, he was "horsing" around, but that it aggravated a previous injury sustained by the officer resulting in a light duty assignment. The supervisor acknowledged prior discipline for a similar situation. OIG did not find evidence or information substantiating discrimination in violation of the Department's discipline process. OIG closed the inquiry on February 26, 2016.

INVESTIGATIONS

Congressional Request for an Inquiry into a Personnel Issue (Investigative Number 2016-I-0006)

In response to a request from a Member of Congress dated March 16, 2016, OIG conducted an inquiry into an employee complaint. The complaint concerned a personnel issue. According to the employee, the issue was resolved and the complaint withdrawn. OIG closed the inquiry on March 24, 2016.



INVESTIGATIONS ON-GOING PROJECTS

Inspection of the United States Capitol Police Office of Professional Responsibility

In accordance with our FY 2016 annual plan, OIG began an inspection of the USCP OPR. Our objectives were to determine if OPR (1) established adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring the integrity of its program, and (2) complied with applicable policies and procedures as well as applicable laws, regulations and best practices. Our scope included internal controls, processes, and operations during Calendar Year 2015. OIG conducted an exit conference and provided a draft report to the Department for comment on April 4, 2016. We expect to issue the final report in April, 2016.

OIG Hotline (1-866-906-2446)

As part of its duties and responsibilities, OIG maintains a toll-free Hotline that provides employees and private citizens an opportunity to relay information regarding fraud, waste, and abuse.



APPENDIX 1 REPORTS ISSUED

**OIG-2016-01 Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year
2015 Financial Statements**

**OIG-2016-02 Management Letter Related to the Audit of the United
States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Financial
Statements**

**OIG-2016-03 Management Advisory Report: United States Capitol
Police Garnishment Process**

**OIG-2016-04 Evaluation of the United States Capitol Police Division
of Intelligence and Information Analysis
(Investigative Number 2016-I-0002)**

**OIG-2016-05 Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police
Public Web Site and Web Applications**

**2016-I-0001 Inquiry into Allegations of Violations of the Posted
Captain and Inspector Promotion Processes**

**2016-I-0003 Inquiry into Allegations of Misconduct by a
Senior Official**

2016-I-0004 Allegation of Discrimination in the Discipline Process

**2016-I-0006 Congressional Request for an Inquiry into Personnel
Issue**

APPENDIX 2

RESOLUTION OF REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Timely resolution of outstanding recommendations continues to be a priority for the Department as well as OIG. As of March 31, 2016, OIG has made a total of 310 recommendations to the Department since OIG's inception. Of those 310 recommendations, the Department has fully implemented 255 (closed), of the remaining 55 open unimplemented recommendations, 44 were older than 6 months as shown in the following table.

Appendix 2 – Unimplemented (Open) Recommendations Older Than 6 Months			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	Repeat Finding	Payroll Processing – We recommended USCP consistently implement T&A (time and attendance) 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) we also recommended that the supervisor/timekeeper procedures for monitoring T&A include identifying habitual failures in submitting certification reports so that corrective actions can be targeted to those employees, and (3) we recommended that USCP evaluate the feasibility of using [REDACTED], a T&A system, to automate the T&A Certification process.
2011-01	FYs 2010/2009 FS	1.2	
2012-02	FY 2011 FS	1.1	
2013-01	FY 2012 FS	1.1	
2014-01	FY 2013 FS	1.1	
2015-01	FY 2014 FS	1.1	
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	Repeat Finding	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.
2011-01	FYs 2010/2009 FS	1.6	
2012-02	FY 2011 FS	1.4	
2013-01	FY 2012 FS	1.3	
2014-01	FY 2013 FS	1.3	
2015-01	FY 2014 F	1.3	
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	Repeat Finding	Payroll Processing – We recommended that USCP ensure that its employees comply with USCP Special Directive [REDACTED] addressing responsibility to record daily worked hours using [REDACTED] time clocks. We also recommended 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 the employees worked.
2011-01	FYs 2010/2009 FS	1.9	
2012-02	FY 2011 FS	1.6	
2013-01	FY 2012 FS	1.4	
2014-01	FY 2013 FS	1.4	
2015-01	FY 2014 FS	1.4	
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	Repeat Finding	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.
2011-01	FYs 2010/2009 FS	2.2H	
2012-02	FY 2011 FS	22	
2013-01	FY 2012 FS	2.1	
2014-01	FY 2013 FS	2.1	
2015-01	FY 2014 FS	1.1	
2008-08	Review of Compliance with USCP Hiring Standards and with Directive [REDACTED]	1	Triple III – We recommended that USCP, in coordination with the 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 USCP workforce.

Appendix 2 – Unimplemented (Open) Recommendations Older Than 6 Months			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2012-01	Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture	1	Enterprise Architecture – We recommended that the USCP Office of Information Systems (OIS) immediately update its strategic plan to define objectives and goals that align with the short- and long-term goals and objectives of the Department. The plan also should incorporate goals on optimizing enterprise- wide information systems performance and accountability.
2012-04	AUP Time and Attendance System	6	Time and Attendance – We recommended that USCP continue its efforts to automate fully its labor management system, [REDACTED]. In addition, we recommended that USCP consider integrating the Scheduler, Shift Trading functionalities, Leave Approval Interface, Virtual Time Clock, Electronic Timesheet Certifications, and others that would make its labor management system more efficient and effective. Such integration of functions would allow the Department to understand fully costs associated with performing a duty, such as staffing a door or entrance/exit point.
2013-04	Performance Audit of USCP Canine Program	9	Canine Program – We recommended that USCP finalize its draft SOP [REDACTED] thereby using its scarce resources in a more efficient and effective manner.
2014-01 2015-01	FY 2013 FS FY 2014 FS	Repeat Finding 1.8 1.5	Payroll Processing – We recommended that USCP enforce its overtime policy. Lack of documentation to support overtime approval.
2014-03	USCP Controls Over Ammunition	6	Ammunition – We recommended that USCP immediately establish detailed procedures for Training Ammunition to use best practices such as keeping a perpetual inventory of ammunition, providing ammunition with only an approved lesson plan accompanied by the course of fire, not allowing ammunition to be removed from packing containers until required for use, documenting ammunition consumption in records such as ammunition and/or scoring logs, returning leftover ammunition at the end of a session, and adding it back into the overall inventory, and reconciling ammunition turn-ins with the original issue documents and consumption records.
2014-05	Performance Audit of Hazardous Materials Response Team	1	HMRT – We recommended that USCP evaluate the SOPs for the Hazardous Materials Response Team as well as add controls that will confirm that the annual review process was completed and the Hazardous Materials Response Team and the Office of Policy and Management Systems guidance is consistent.
2014-05	Performance Audit of Hazardous Materials Response Team	4	HMRT – We recommended that USCP take the following steps to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest: (1) Enforce current policies related to conflicts of interest regarding individuals involved in the procurement process, (2) Prohibit USCP employees from accepting employment with USCP vendors, and (3) Revise CP Form [REDACTED] to address the potential for conflict of interest.
2014-05	Performance Audit of Hazardous Materials Response Team	9	HMRT – We recommended that USCP evaluate coordination required from other USCP Bureaus and establish one responsible party to ensure compliance with the Respiratory Protection Program and Respirator Facepiece Fit Test SOPs. Additionally, a reconciliation of medical and inventory records related to the respirator protection program is needed to obtain an accurate count of equipment as well as an accurate assessment of employee medical status related to the respirators and face pieces. USCP should strengthen SOPs to allow more aggressive monitoring of compliance. USCP should also conduct a physical wall-to-wall inventory of equipment and records and reconcile the results with Property Asset Management Division records.

Appendix 2 – Unimplemented (Open) Recommendations Older Than 6 Months			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2014-05	Performance Audit of Hazardous Materials Response Team	11	HMRT – We recommend that USCP evaluate its documentation processes related to medical monitoring and incorporate into SOPs a requirement for document retention that will allow for inspection of historic documents or other mechanism for ensuring consistent compliance with procedures.
2014-05	Performance Audit of Hazardous Materials Response Team	13	HMRT – We recommended USCP develop procedures for preparing supplementary information that will ensure the accuracy and reliability of program performance data. The procedures should include the OFM working directly with those in charge of the supporting documentation that ensures accuracy of figures presented in the Management Decision and Analysis. The supplementary information will be clearly defined so that the criteria can be consistently applied at the data entry, data retrieval, and data reporting levels.
2015-01	FY 2014 FS	1.6	Database – We recommended that USCP OIS develop and implement a process for monitoring use of database accounts.
2015-03	Performance Audit of USCP Controls Over Evidence	2	Evidence – We recommended that USCP establish SOPs for conducting inspections and audits of items secured within the Crime Scene Search Safe Room to include inspections and audits conducted by other offices within the Department. Specifically, the Department should include control procedures provided in a November 2013 memorandum, which provides the frequency of inventory/inspections/audits of evidence, the scope of the count, and when reports are due. In addition, the Department should consider weighing drugs as part of the inspection process. Most importantly, the Department should require appropriate supporting documentation of the counts of physical evidence and the proper signatures to ensure the change of custody of evidence.
2015-03	Performance Audit of USCP Controls Over Evidence	3	Evidence – We recommended that USCP strengthen procedures for properly documenting transfer of ammunition from Crime Scene Search to the Department's Firing Range, ensuring that the Crime Scene Search Unit document the number and type of ammunition transferred when accepted by the USCP Firing Range and obtain signatures during this process.
2015-03	Performance Audit of USCP Controls Over Evidence	4	Evidence – We recommended that USCP reporting officers forward appropriate paperwork to the Crime Scene Search Unit when obtaining custody of crime scene evidence. In addition, the Department should update Directive [REDACTED] to provide the Crime Scene Search Unit with a mechanism for obtaining paperwork when the reporting officer does not forward the required paperwork to the Crime Scene Search Unit. Furthermore, the Crime Scene Search Unit Supervisor should be accountable for ensuring that any required paperwork is included in the drug evidence case jackets.
2015-03	Performance Audit of USCP Controls Over Evidence	5	Evidence – We recommended that USCP should review and update SOPs for the Crime Scene Search Unit. Specifically, update SOPs to (1) reflect changes in the Drug Enforcement Administration procedures for providing lab numbers [REDACTED] and (2) remove references to Polaroid film and include procedures for digital photography (SOP [REDACTED]).
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Appendix 2 – Unimplemented (Open) Recommendations Older Than 6 Months			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2015-05	Performance Audit of United States Capitol Police Controls Over Proximity Cards	1	Proximity Cards – We recommended that USCP update OHR policies and procedures related to proximity cards and require that the SSB remove access clearances for separated employees when notified by the OHR badging office. Policies should specifically state a required timeframe for OHR communication and SSB access removal.
2015-08	Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures: United States Capitol Police Restricted Duty Program	1	Restricted Duty – We recommended that USCP immediately update and implement its draft guidance for restricted duty to include updated information about organization elements and determine whether civilians should be beneficiaries of such a program in both <u>Performance of Duty and Non-Performance of Duty cases</u> .
2015-08	Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures: United States Capitol Police Restricted Duty Program	2	Restricted Duty – We recommended that USCP immediately implement its draft guidance for restricted duty to ensure more transparency and accountability of its program by requiring one individual to be held accountable for the controls and compliance of the restricted duty program, which will assist in ensuring compliance and the integrity of the program. The draft guidance should specifically provide the OHR, restricted duty program manager, the authority to monitor the restricted duty program, ensuring that employees submit complete forms and appropriate medical documentation, and coordinating employees return to full unrestricted duty in a timely manner.
2015-08	Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures: United States Capitol Police Restricted Duty Program	3	Restricted Duty – We recommended that USCP enforce the September 2011 draft interim time and attendance guidance to ensure that employees are using [REDACTED] time clocks; thereby, appropriately monitoring employees in a restricted duty status and ensuring individual time and attendance.
2015-08	Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures: United States Capitol Police Restricted Duty Program	4	Restricted Duty – We recommended that USCP consider leave balances, multiple restricted duty assignments, and outside employment when assigning employees to restricted duty status. Furthermore, the Department should ensure that OHR receive restricted duty documentation to support assignments and provides consistent monitoring and employee enforcement of compliance with the program, which would identify any abusers of the program.
2015-08	Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures: United States Capitol Police Restricted Duty Program	5	Restricted Duty – We recommended that USCP immediately identify restricted duty positions throughout the Department and document duties associated with such positions, ensuring that the number of employees in restricted duty status does not exceed the number of available positions/assignments and employees are held accountable for performing meaningful and constructive tasks for the organization.
2015-08	Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures: United States Capitol Police Restricted Duty Program	6	Restricted Duty – We recommended that USCP establish a consistent process, which includes supporting evidence for revoking and restoring police powers and that such documentation is placed in the employee's personnel file.

Appendix 2 – Unimplemented (Open) Recommendations Older Than 6 Months			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2015-08	<i>Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures: United States Capitol Police Restricted Duty Program</i>	7	Restricted Duty – We recommended that USCP consider reducing the maximum length of restricted duty assignments, ensuring compliance with established time requirements, and eliminating Non-Performance of Duty injury cases from the restricted duty program, which could potentially result in cost saving to the organization.
2015-08	<i>Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures: United States Capitol Police Restricted Duty Program</i>	8	Restricted Duty – We recommended that USCP implement consistent monitoring and enforcement of employee compliance with restricted duty guidance, which should assist in identifying potential misuse or abuse of the program.
2015-09	<i>Independent Accountants' Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures of United States Capitol Police Leave Restriction Status</i>	1	Leave Restriction Status – We recommended that USCP complete its review of guidance related to Leave Restriction Status, make necessary updates, and reissue in the proper format to provide adequate instructions for Leave Restriction Status as it relates to both employees and supervisors.
2015-09	<i>Independent Accountants' Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures of United States Capitol Police Leave Restriction Status</i>	2	Leave Restriction Status – We recommended that USCP reiterate the current requirement for Leave Restriction Status—six occurrences of unscheduled leave without documentation during a continuous 6-month period, looking at the previous 6-months from the date of the last infraction. In addition, supervisors should conduct regular (semi-annual) reviews of leave records across the Department so supervisors monitor unscheduled leave consistently.
2015-09	<i>Independent Accountants' Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures of United States Capitol Police Leave Restriction Status</i>	3	Leave Restriction Status – We recommended that USCP include a formal timeline requirement that OHR respond within 10 business days to a request for employee placement into a Leave Restriction Status.
2015-09	<i>Independent Accountants' Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures of United States Capitol Police Leave Restriction Status</i>	4	Leave Restriction Status – We recommended that USCP consider using a mechanized process as a tool for facilitating centralized monitoring of unscheduled and undocumented leave.
2015-09	<i>Independent Accountants' Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures of United States Capitol Police Leave Restriction Status</i>	5	Leave Restriction Status – We recommended that USCP consider adding progressive discipline for anyone with a continuing pattern of leave abuse such as when an employee or officer is in Leave Restriction Status, that individual is not eligible for promotion or officer-requested transfers. This would serve as a leave abuse deterrent and help avoid patterns going undetected, especially when officers request transfers.
2015-09	<i>Independent Accountants' Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures of United States Capitol Police Leave Restriction Status</i>	6	Leave Restriction Status – We recommended that USCP include a comprehensive discussion of leave procedures and the consequences of abusing leave in its new employee orientation. OHR should provide refresher training to supervisors upon promotion to supervisor, which should cover the topics of interacting with subordinates and monitoring leave. Training should be periodic, thus ensuring that all employees are aware of proper leave practices.

Appendix 2 – Unimplemented (Open) Recommendations Older Than 6 Months			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2015-09	<i>Independent Accountants' Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures of United States Capitol Police Leave Restriction Status</i>	7	Leave Restriction Status – We recommended that USCP consider requiring that supervisors issue a pre-Leave Restriction Status memorandum to employees on the instance of unscheduled leave prior to a formal request for Leave Restriction Status; this will serve as warning notice that leave restriction may be forthcoming and may assist in curtailing leave abuse problems.
2015-09	<i>Independent Accountants' Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures of United States Capitol Police Leave Restriction Status</i>	8	Leave Restriction Status – We recommended that USCP consider adding a requirement for officers or employees in Leave Restriction Status for more than 1 year to check-in with USCP attending physician or USCP-contracted physicians, ensuring that unscheduled absences are valid and physicians provide adequate documentation to support fitness for duty.
2015-10	<i>Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Information Security Program</i>	1	Information Security Program – We recommended that USCP assign an appropriate official to (1) identify an appropriate risk management framework to implement Department-wide and (2) develop policies and procedures to implement the chosen risk management framework.
2015-10	<i>Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Information Security Program</i>	2	Information Security Program – We recommended that USCP assign an appropriate official to (1) identify the information security policies and corresponding procedures necessary to support the information security program Department-wide, (2) develop the identified policies and corresponding procedures, and (3) implement the finalized policies and procedures.
2015-10	<i>Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Information Security Program</i>	3	Information Security Program – We recommended that USCP develop (1) a process to ensure that the Department senior management, including the Chief, is regularly informed about the status of the information security program and (2) measurable key security metrics to report to senior management on a regular basis.
2015-10	<i>Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police's Fiscal Year 2015 Information Security Program</i>	4	Information Security Program – We recommended that USCP assess whether it is viable and productive to place the Office of Information Services and SSB information security resources under a common management oversight.



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, 2015 – March 31, 2016

Last Peer Review Conducted of USCP OIG Audit Organization

As part of the 3-year cycle of independent peer reviews, on September 17, 2014, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) OIG issued the last peer review report covering the USCP OIG Audit Organization. USCP OIG received a peer review rating of pass for the year ended September 30, 2013. Furthermore, CFTC OIG had no comments or recommendations in its *System Review Report* of USCP OIG.

CIGIE has scheduled the Election Assistance Commission to conduct the next USCP OIG external peer review of its Audit organization for the period ended September 30, 2016.

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 June 30, 2015, to the Federal Trade Commission OIG.

Table 1

Reports Issued with Questioned Costs¹
October 1, 2015, through March 31, 2016

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	0	\$0	\$0
Which were issued during the reporting period	0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal	0	\$0	\$0
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	0	\$0	\$0
Reports for which no management decision was made within 6 months of issuance	0	\$0	\$0

¹ 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 Use²
October 1, 2015, through March 31, 2016

Category	Number of Reports	Dollar Value (in thousands)
For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period	1	\$2,000
Which were issued during the reporting period	0	\$0
Subtotal	1	\$2,000
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	1	\$0
For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period	1	\$2,000
Reports for which no management decision was made within 6 months of issuance	1	\$2,000

² A recommendation that funds be put to better use is a recommendation by 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, 2015, through March 31, 2016

	Dollar Value (in thousands)
Recoveries	\$0
Fines and Restitutions	\$0
Investigative Cases Opened	5
Investigative Cases Closed	4
Surveys, Analysis, Evaluations, Inspections, and Internal Control Reviews	2
Arrests	0
Indictments	0
Convictions	0
Personnel Actions	0
Total Complaints Received	45
Hotline Complaints Received	40
Complaints from Other Sources	5
Complaints Referred (to Department or other agencies)	4
Inspector General Subpoenas	0



OIG Hotline **(1-866-906-2446)**

As part of its duties and responsibilities, OIG maintains a toll-free Hotline that provides employees and private citizens an opportunity to relay information regarding fraud, waste, and abuse.

IG Act Reporting Requirements

IG Act Section	IG Act Requirement	Page
Section 4(a)(2)	Review of Legislation	4
Section 5(a)(2)	Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies	8-10 12-16
Section 5(a)(3)	Recommendations with Respect to Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies	8-10 12-16
Section 5(a)(4)	Recommendations Included in Previous Reports on Which Corrective Action Has Not Been Completed	19-24
Section 5(a)(5)	Matters Referred to Prosecuting Authorities	None
Section 5 (a)(6)	Summary of Instances Where Information Was Refused	None
Section 5(a)(7)	Reports Issued During the Reporting Period	18
Section 5(a)(8)	Summary of Significant Reports	8-10 12-16
Section 5(a)(9)	Questioned and Unsupported Costs (Table 1)	26
Section 5(a)(10)	Recommendations that Funds be put to Better Use (Table 2)	27
Section 5(a)(11)	Summary of Reports Issued before the start of the Reporting Period for which no Management Decision has been made	26-27
Section 5(a)(12)	Significant Revised Management Decisions	N/A
Section 5(a)(13)	Management Decisions with which the Inspector General is in Disagreement	None
Section 5(a)(14-16)	Specifically excluded by Public Law 109-55	N/A
Section 989C of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act	Peer Review Reporting Requirements	25

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 for promoting 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. Although not under the direct supervision of the Chief, OIG 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 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 keep OIG up to date on current matters and events.

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

CONTACTING THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Success of the OIG 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 202-593-3868 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 us – we are located at:
United States Capitol Police
Attn: Office of Inspector General, Investigations
119 D Street, NE
Washington, DC 20510



Or visit us – we are located at:
499 South Capitol Street, SW, Suite 345
Washington, DC 20003



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 OIG at 202-593-4201.

