Umesh Dalal, CPA,CIA,CIG Richmond City Auditor/Inspector General

December 9, 2013

Mr. Christopher Beschler, DCAO, Operations Mr. James Jackson, Director of Public Works

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) has completed an investigation in the Department of Public Works (DPW) regarding a DPW employee's abuse of time. This letter informs you of the results of the investigation.

Complaint

The OIG received a complaint alleging an Engineer II in DPW that was taking leave without submitting it on a timecard.

Legal Requirements

In accordance with the Code of Virginia, §15.2-2511.2, the City Auditor is required to investigate all allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse. Also, the City Code section 2-231 requires the Office of the Inspector General to conduct investigations of alleged wrongdoing.

Background

DPW has an employee who was suspected of not recording leave time accurately. The employee was requesting leave from the supervisor, but failed to submit the leave unto a timecard. The employee was trained in properly using the RAPIDS time reporting system.

Findings

The investigation revealed that the subject employee was taking days off without properly submitting leave on a timesheet. In addition, the employee was arriving late to work. The investigator conducted surveillance and observed the subject employee was tardy on several days during the surveillance period. Also, the subject employee did not inform the supervisor in a timely manner about the late arrival and subsequently failed to report to work. The employee did not report the leave on a timesheet for the missed day as required.

The employee could not explain the continuing tardiness. The investigator interviewed the subject employee who admitted to being counseled in regards to absence and tardiness. The employee claimed that the department's timekeeper agreed to report the time on the employee's behalf. When interviewed, the timekeeper disagreed with the subject employee's claim. The subject employee further stated that management was notified of the dislike of the assigned duties. The DPW management had rejected the subject employee's objections.

The table below depicts the dates, hours, and leave types used, which were not reported by the subject employee on the timesheet:

Date	Leave Type	
	Sick Hours	Vacation Hours
June 12, 2013	3	0
June 13, 2013	8	0
August 30, 2013	0	8
September 5, 2013	8	0
September 11, 2013	0	2
September 19, 2013	0	8
September 20, 2013	0	8
October 4, 2013	0	8*
October 14, 2013	8	0
October 15, 2013	8	0
October 18, 2013	0	8
October 28, 2013	0	8*
Subtotal:	35	50
Total:	85	

*Note: Unknown Leave Type

Conclusion

The OIG finds the allegation to be substantiated. The subject employee has sick and vacation leave balances that exceed the total hours used and not recorded on the timesheet in each of the respective leave categories.

The OIG recommends that the City recoup the used, but unrecorded 85 total hours of appropriate leave from the subject employee's available leave balances. In addition, appropriate disciplinary action needs to be taken against the subject employee.

If you have any questions, please contact me at extension 5640.

Sincerely

Umesh Dalal, CPA, CIA, CIG City Auditor/Inspector General

cc: Byron Marshall, Chief Administrative Officer

City Council Members
City Audit Committee