



Richmond Office of the City Auditor

Office of the Inspector General

Fighting government waste, fraud and abuse

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

September 8, 2010

Mr. Christopher Beschler
DCAO, Operations
730 E. Broad Street, 6th Floor
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Mr. Beschler:

The Office of the Inspector General has completed an investigation in the Department of Public Works. This letter informs you of the results of the investigation.

Complaint

The Office of the Inspector General received a complaint alleging that employees of the Traffic Division within the Department of Public Works were abusing time.

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. Accordingly, an investigation was initiated by the Inspector General's Office.

Methodology

- An investigator for the Inspector General's Office performed surveillance procedures and identified the employees as Traffic Signal Specialists assigned to the Department of Public Works.
- Data gathered during this investigation was analyzed.
- The employees were interviewed.
- Other investigative procedures were followed, as necessary.

Findings

The investigator's surveillance data revealed that over a period of 30 work days a Traffic Signal Specialist III (TSS III) visited his home or the home of his subordinate, a Traffic Signal Specialist II (TSS II), 27 times. The data further showed on 8 different dates that both homes located in Henrico County were visited on the same day.

The TSS III and TSS II were spending time during work hours at one of their homes rather than performing their assigned duties. The TSS III went home on 14 different occasions and went to his subordinate's home on 13 different occasions. After being confronted with data, the supervisor admitted to going both home and to his subordinate's home during work hours several times a week.

During the interview, the TSS III stated a similar allegation was made last year but his supervisor found it unsubstantiated. He also admitted that he was going home when the original complaint came out last year but stopped for a while; he then resumed his behavior as soon as the supervisor's scrutiny ended. The TSS III was eventually forthcoming and very remorseful about what he did. He understood that he was not authorized to take the city vehicle into Henrico County.

During the interview, the TSS II was non-cooperative. He eventually admitted to going home or to the supervisor's home a few times a week. He admitted to doing this for the past few months. He understood that he was not authorized to take the city vehicle into Henrico County.

The following table depicts the value of lost time due to the aforementioned unauthorized behavior, had the same ratio of abuse continued throughout the year.

<i>Employee</i>	<i>Annual Salary with Benefits</i>	<i>Cost of Lost time</i>
TSS III	\$77,372	\$5,416
TSS II	\$64,208	\$4,495
Estimated Travel Time		\$1,513
Total Loss		\$11,424

The Inspector General's office finds the allegation to be substantiated and recommends appropriate disciplinary action be taken against the subject employees.

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
Letitia Shelton, Interim Director, Department of Public Works