

City of Detroit

Office of the Inspector General

2019 3rd Quarterly Report

(July 1, 2019 – September 30, 2019)



Ellen Ha, Esq.
Inspector General

October 7, 2019

A Message from the Inspector General



As we begin our new fiscal year, I would like to thank my staff who continue to inspire and motivate me to do my best work. Without their assistance and support, we would not be able to generate this report which contains a summary of work performed by the OIG during the third (3rd) quarter of Calendar Year 2019.

OIG Personnel Changes and OIG News in the 3rd Quarter:

Sometime in mid-July, we lost one of our investigators to a federal agency. In August, we hired a law clerk, Norman Dotson, who just took the July Michigan Bar Exam.

Moreover, after almost a year into my current role as the City's Inspector General, I am finally certified. The certification was obtained through the Association of Inspectors General, after a week-long training sessions and an examination following the training.

I met many inspectors general from different federal, state and local entities, who are equally committed and devoted to the mission of their respective offices to combat abuse, waste, fraud and corruption within public bodies. The City of Detroit is not alone in fighting abuse, waste, fraud and corruption. In fact, the community of inspectors general is growing.

Noteworthy OIG Accomplishments in the 3rd Quarter:

During the 3rd quarter, in addition to having closed 23 investigations; we completed 5 administrative hearings; issued 8 interim suspensions against various contractors and individuals related to demolition asbestos abatement matters; debarred 1 IT company and 2 individuals with the IT company; and handled 1 OIG Appeal Hearing before City Council.

Lastly, in September 2019, our Office gave a presentation to the Association of Inspectors General conference pertaining to the City of Detroit Debarment Ordinance and how we have been utilizing the ordinance to fight fraud and corruption in the City. The conference was attended by inspectors general, investigators, attorneys, consultants and auditors from all over the country, including representatives from Montreal, Canada.

About the OIG:

Honesty and integrity are not just ideals or guiding principles of government. They are the ways in which we must govern and conduct our business in the City. Honesty garners trust and integrity yields respect. People must be able to trust and respect those who govern them. The OIG in the City of Detroit is the body created by the City Charter to ensure honesty and integrity in our government.

The following pages of this report contain a brief description of the duties and responsibilities of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) under the City Charter, including how the Office operates; how OIG complaints are processed and resolved; and relevant information pertaining to investigations initiated and resolved during the Third (3rd) Quarter of Calendar Year 2019 (July 1, 2019 – September 31, 2019).

Lastly, in order to finally reconcile all cases from our legacy case management system we are manually closing dated files which were not ported to the new case management system as we did not find waste, abuse, fraud or corruption during our investigations.

Introduction

Prior to filing for bankruptcy in 2013, the City of Detroit suffered another negative historic moment in 2008. At the request of the Detroit City Council, then Governor Jennifer Granholm presided over a forfeiture hearing of then Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick, who was criminally charged with public corruption and eventually sentenced to a lengthy prison term.

Shortly thereafter, the 2009 Charter Commission was created to review and recommend certain revisions to the Charter. The people of the City of Detroit later adopted the Commission's recommendations on November 8, 2011 to ensure such negative history does not repeat itself. The 2012 Detroit City Charter therefore contains lessons learned in 2008 and the prior years.

More specifically, the 2012 Charter of the City of Detroit created the Office of Inspector General (OIG); and provided the OIG with independent authority "to ensure honesty and integrity in City government."

Although the creation of the OIG appears to make the Inspector General (IG) omnipotent over all branches of City government and contractors, its powers are limited under the Charter.

Specifically, Section 7.5-305 of the Charter limits the jurisdiction of the IG to "the conduct of any Public servant and City agency, program or official act, contractors and subcontractors . . . business entities . . . and persons" seeking certification or who are participating in "any city programs."

Section 7.5-306 of the Charter further restricts the power and the authority of the IG to "investigate. . . in order to detect and prevent waste, abuse, fraud and corruption;" and to report such matters and/or recommend certain actions be taken in accordance with Sections 7.5-308 and 311.

To conduct such investigation, Section 7.5-307 of the Charter provides the IG with the power to subpoena witnesses and evidence; to administer oaths and take testimony of individuals; to enter and inspect premises; and to enforce the same.

The Charter further mandates that every public servant, contractor, subcontractor, licensee, applicant for certification to fully cooperate in the IG's investigation, as failure to do so would subject that person "to forfeiture of office, discipline, debarment or any other applicable penalty." See, Section 7.5-310.

To encourage individuals to report "waste, abuse, fraud and corruption," Section 7.5-313 requires confidentiality where all OIG investigative files are deemed confidential except where production is required by law. Moreover, Section 7.5-315 prohibits retaliation against any persons who participate in the IG's investigation.

In keeping with due process, Section 7.5-311 of the Charter requires that when issuing a report or making recommendations "that criticizes an official act," the affected party be allowed "a reasonable opportunity to be heard at a hearing with the aid of counsel."

Since all governmental bodies must be held accountable in their role, the Charter requires that the IG issue quarterly reports to the City Council and the Mayor, which shall be made public and published on the City's website. See, Section 7.5-306.

The Detroit Office of Inspector General is a proud and active member of the Association of Inspectors General (AIG). The Association is the professional organization for offices dedicated to government accountability and oversight. The Detroit Office of Inspector General was founded on the model principals of the Association. One of the most important roles the AIG plays is establishing and encouraging adherence to quality standards through its certification program. Each OIG staff member has participated in AIG training and received their certification in their area of discipline.

The Detroit Office of Inspector General joins a growing community of municipal Inspector General Offices across the country including Chicago, Baltimore, New Orleans, New York, and Philadelphia. What used to be a tool for good government for Federal and State Agencies is now making its way to local government.

Office of the Inspector General Organizational Structure:

Third Quarter of 2019

Between July 1, 2019 and September 30, 2019, the City of Detroit Office of the Inspector General (OIG) personnel consisted of:

Ellen Ha, Esq., **Inspector General (IG)**;
Kamau Marable, **Deputy IG**;
Jennifer Bentley, Esq., **OIG Attorney**;
Edyth D. Porter-Stanley, **Forensic Auditor***;
Beverly L. Murray, **Forensic Auditor***;
Jacqueline Hendricks-Moore, **Investigator**;
Kelechi Akinbosede, Esq., **Investigator**;
Derek Miller, **Investigator**;
Norman Dotson, **Law Clerk**;
Kasha Graves, **Executive Assistant**;
Tracey Neal, **Administrative Assistant; and**
Logan Cholody, **2019 Summer Intern** .

It is important to note the City of Detroit has three (3) different agencies which employ auditor(s) who perform unique function for each agency. With three (3) different types of auditors performing different functions, it is common to confuse their activities and purpose.

OAG Auditors

The OAG, like the OIG, is an independent agency pursuant to Article 7.5, Chapter 1 of the 2012 Charter of the City of Detroit (Charter). The Charter provides the OAG the authority to “make audits of the financial transactions, performance and operations of City agencies based on an annual risk-based audit plan prepared by the Auditor General, or as otherwise directed by the City Council. . . .” Therefore, the OAG provides internal audits of the City.

The OAG’s internal auditors conduct reviews of City of Detroit departments and programs, usually on regular time intervals. They report on internal control weaknesses,

lack of compliance with policies and procedures, laws and regulations that result in project inefficiencies, and financial abnormalities.

External Independent Auditors

The City of Detroit, through its Office of the Chief Financial Officer, is also required to perform an audit of the City by external auditors on an annual basis.

The external auditors perform the annual financial audit to certify the accuracy of the financial information presented in the City's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). They accomplish this with an approach similar to that of the OAG, but the external auditors examine the financial accuracy of the CAFR, rather than a specific program or department.

OIG Forensic Auditors*

The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and the Institute of Internal Auditor (IIA) both state that the primary purpose of external and internal audits is not to detect and identify fraud. However, ***detecting and identifying fraud is the primary purpose of the OIG forensic auditors.***

The OIG's forensic auditors are specially trained to examine various financial records, reveal fraudulent activities, and identify criminal suspects. They are able to use this expertise to identify missing funds, and the reasoning for these missing funds, in conjunction with fraud investigations. As such, the auditors from the OIG often work with the auditors from the OAG; and audits performed by respective agencies complement one another. Some of the OIG investigations which are assigned to the OIG auditors are referrals from the OAG.

The OIG is currently working on policies and procedures to proactively identify fraudulent trends that can help spawn additional OIG investigations and cases for criminal prosecution.

How OIG Complaints Are Received

The OIG receives complaints in the following manner:

Via Internet: www.detoig.org or www.detroitmi.gov/inspectorgeneral

(The website is on a secure server, which allows individuals to provide information on a secure electronic report form 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.)

Via Telephone Hotline: 313-964-TIPS or 313-964-8477

Via OIG Telephone Line: 313-628-2517 or 313-628-2114

Via Facsimile: 313-628-2793

Via Mail: City of Detroit Office of the Inspector General
65 Cadillac Square, Suite 3210
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Via Personal Visit to the OIG Office at the above address.

Some complaints are referrals from the City's various departments and agencies. The OIG is proud of the professional relationship it maintains with its fellow public servants.

How OIG Complaints Are Resolved

All complaints submitted via the website automatically generate an OIG File with a complaint number.

Most complaints, either audio or on paper will result in an OIG File with a complaint number.

Some complaints received over the telephone directly by OIG personnel may result in a referral to another City department or agency, or to another legal entity. For example, the OIG does not handle matters involving private parties, such as identity theft, land-lord tenant dispute, or personal injury. In these cases, the OIG will refer the complainant to the appropriate entity without creating an OIG File.

Based on initial review of the complaint, one or two of the following may occur:

- 1) An investigative file may be opened and a new file number will be assigned;
- 2) An OIG employee may follow up with the complainant to obtain additional information pertaining to the complaint;
- 3) The OIG will send a letter stating that we have decided not to investigate your complaint or that we have closed your complaint (*sometimes, we are not able to obtain additional information from the complainant which may assist us in determining whether we are able to investigate the allegations made in the complaint*);
- 4) A referral to another department, agency, or legal entity, such as the City's Ombudsman's Office, Detroit Police Department, City of Detroit Buildings, Safety Engineering, and Environmental Department, Wayne County Sheriff or Prosecutor's Office, FBI, Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, or a legal aid office; or
- 5) The OIG will close the complaint without notifying the complainant. This usually occurs when the complainant has not left contact information or if the OIG does not believe it is appropriate to contact the complainant.

Based on the OIG's historical data, the majority of complaints received by the OIG do not result in an investigation. However, all of the complaints are carefully reviewed before the complaint is rejected or referred to another agency.

One of the primary reasons we do not initiate investigations into all complaints is a common misunderstanding of the OIG's jurisdiction. People often mistake the OIG as an agency which performs inspection of buildings, or as an agency which enforces the law. Therefore, we typically receive an inordinate amount of requests for building inspections. Other common complaints involve parking ticket resolutions, identity theft, and property owner disputes. The OIG attempts to aid each complainant in finding the appropriate entity to resolve their problems.

In particular, our administrative support staff works tirelessly to ensure that each complaint is addressed appropriately in a professional manner. Therefore, the initiated investigations-to-complaints ratio should not be confused with the OIG's workload.

How OIG Investigations Are Conducted and Resolved

The OIG may initiate an investigation based on information received in the complaint or on its own initiative.

An investigation is initiated when an Investigative File is opened and an auditor(s) and/or investigator(s) is/are assigned to the file.

An investigation would generally involve one or more of the following:

- 1) Interview of complainant(s) and/or witness(es);
- 2) Acquisition of evidence and/or documents and review of the same; and
- 3) Analyses of the evidence and/or documents reviewed, including forensic audit or review.

An OIG investigation would result in findings by the OIG, which may substantiate the complainant's allegation of waste, abuse, fraud or corruption in the City's operation or personnel or that of its contractors and/or subcontractors.

In some instances, although the complainant's allegations do not equate to waste, abuse, fraud or corruption, during the investigation of the allegations, the OIG may find other instances of waste, abuse, fraud or corruption. In such instances, the OIG will launch a separate investigation on its own initiative.

Likewise, if the investigation reveals that criminal activity may be involved, pursuant to Section 7.5-308 of the 2012 Charter of the City of Detroit (the Charter), the Inspector General is required to "promptly refer the matter to the appropriate prosecuting authorities."

The OIG summarizes the findings of the investigation in the OIG's final report. However, pursuant to Section 7.5-311(1) of the Charter, "no report or recommendation that criticizes an official act shall be announced until every agency or person affected [by the report or recommendation] is allowed a reasonable opportunity to be heard at a hearing with the aid of counsel."

The Inspector General conducts the hearing pursuant to Sections 2-111 and 7.5-311 of the 2012 Charter, and in accordance with the OIG Administrative Rules for Hearings.

Lastly, Section 7.5-311(2) of the Charter requires "after the hearing, if the Inspector General believes it necessary to make a formal report, a copy of any statement made by an agency or person affected shall accompany the report."

2019 THIRD QUARTER OIG STATISTICS

(July 1, 2019 – September 30, 2019)

Sources of Complaints Received by the OIG in the 3rd Quarter

Complaint Source	Number Received
Internet (Website)	19
Telephone Hotline	10
OIG Telephone	2
Mail	0
Personal Visit	2
Email	13
Other	1
Total	47

Categories of Complaints Received by the OIG in the 3rd Quarter

Categories of Complaints	Number Received
Waste	0
Abuse	14
Fraud	9
Corruption	3
Other	21

How Complaints Were Resolved by the OIG in the 3rd Quarter

Open investigative files	4
Decline investigation or Referral	43

Categories of OIG Investigations Initiated by the OIG in the 3rd Quarter

Categories of Investigations	Number Initiated
Waste	0
Abuse	1
Fraud	2
Corruption	0
Other	1

Status of OIG Investigations in the 3rd Quarter

Opened	Closed
4	23

Short Summary of Investigations Closed in the 3rd Quarter of 2019

The following reflects the twenty-three (23) investigations the OIG closed in the 3rd Quarter of 2019 with an accompanying synopsis for each investigation.

2014-0386

A complainant alleged the Detroit Transportation Corporation (DTC aka Detroit People Mover) Director wasted millions of dollars on an overhaul project, to repair the system's existing trains. The OIG confirmed with the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) that the overhaul project was an acceptable use of DTC's grant funding. Furthermore, the OIG performed a benchmarking analysis regarding DTC's overhaul project. The OIG found that the DTC's overhaul project was conducted in a manner consistent with the overhaul project of a similarly sized system. Therefore, the OIG closed this case without further action.

2015-0151

A complainant alleged the Detroit Transportation Corporation (DTC aka Detroit People Mover) committed eight fraudulent activities, including; 1) Submitting falsified ridership numbers to the Federal Transit Authority (FTA); 2) Losing or misappropriating \$38 millions of dollars; 3) Losing \$1 million dollars in cash during relocation of the DTC office; 4) Using foreign steel in a renovation project; 5) Inappropriately increasing the DTC staff; 6) Inappropriately offering benefits to an employee; 7) Increasing an employee's salary in response to threats by the employee; and 8) Paying vendors for incomplete or substandard work.

Based on the OIG's investigation, we found: 1) DTC's ridership numbers were not falsified; 2) The FTA performs audits to ensure the financial integrity of the DTC. The OIG reviewed the FTA's audits and noted they have not identified any evidence of missing funds; 3) The fare box revenue is directly deposited into the DTC's bank account, not maintained in the DTC office; 4) DTC made the FTA aware of the foreign steel issue. The FTA opined that no action would be taken based on the insignificant value and quantity of steel used; 5) The DTC Director has the authority to hire staff under the authorization of the DTC Board of Directors; 6) The DTC director has the authority to offer benefits to employees under the authorization of the DTC Board of Directors; 7) The DTC director has the authority to increase and employee's salary under the authorization of the DTC Board of Directors; and 8) The complainant could not provide specific information about the alleged substandard work.

Therefore, the OIG was not able to confirm the validity of complainant's allegations. In addition, the OIG found no evidence of fraudulent activity related to these allegations and closed the case without further action.

17-0005-INV

A complainant alleged that two DPD administrators abused their authority/power in the scoring of the detectives exams by officiating the process in such a way to ensure only Caucasian POs were selected for promotion. The OIG reviewed the Umpire's rulings in response to the related complaint filed by the PO's union as well as the Environmental Audit report DPD issued. In addition, OIG interviewed several member DPD's administration, analyzed the original and revised scores POs received on the exam as well as their ranking and order of promotion. Based on our review of the interviews and data, the OIG found no evidence that DPD administration initiated the detective appointment process in a manner to ensure Caucasian POs were promoted. Furthermore, based on the recommendations included in the Environmental Audit report, DPD is making efforts to assuage the concerns amongst the rank and file related to discriminatory practices based on race, gender and sexual orientation. Therefore, the OIG closed this case without further actions.

17-0034-INV

A Detroit Police Officer alleged that a Commander abused her authority by carrying out discriminatory practices and making racially charged statements. In addition, the Officer alleged a Lieutenant abuse his authority by retaliating against the Officer for reporting the Commander to the Detroit Police Department Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO). In addition, the Officer alleged the Police Chief abused his authority by approving the EEOs denial of the Officer's complaint after the Chief recommended the Officer file the complaint with the EEO. The OIG found no evidence that the Commander or Lieutenant abused their authority based on racially charged statements or retaliatory behavior. Furthermore, the OIG found no evidence the Police Chief abused his authority by recommending the Officer submit his complaint to the EEO or by approving the EEOs denial of his claim. Therefore, the OIG closed the case without further investigation.

17-0048-INV

The complainant alleged the Detroit Land Bank Authority (DLBA) and the Mayor's Office provided preferential treatment to the Vanguard Community Development Corporation (Vanguard) by donating properties to Vanguard. The OIG interviewed several personnel from the DLBA and reviewed documents. The OIG's investigation found no evidence to substantiate this allegation. Accordingly, the OIG closed the case.

17-0064-INV

A Detroit Department of Transportation (DDOT) Transportation Equipment Operator (TEO) (aka bus driver) alleged Transportation Terminal Assistants (TTA)s were abusing their authority by requiring TEOs to drive busses that were unsafe. The OIG reviewed DDOT policies and procedures as well as documentation related to the deployment of coaches. The OIG found no

evidence TTAs abused their authority in assigning coaches to TEOs based on DDOTs policies and procedures. Therefore, the OIG closed this case without further action.

18-0002-INV

The OIG received an anonymous complaint alleging that a City of Detroit Firefighter was currently receiving duty disability retirement benefits from the City of Detroit when he did not appear to be suffering from any disability. The OIG confirmed from the Police and Fire Retirement Systems (PFRS) that the Firefighter was not disabled and was ordered to return to work in March 2016, however, there was confusion in processing his paperwork as he continued to submit documentation from his personal physician that he was fully disabled.

The OIG informed the City of Detroit Fire Department (DFD) of the financial liability that would result from failure to process the Firefighter's return to work from a duty-disability retirement in a timely manner. DFD and the Human Resources Department determined that PFRS' decision that the Firefighter could return to work outweighed the opinion of the Firefighter's personal physician. Therefore, the Firefighter was ordered to report to Human Resources in August 2019. Additionally, DFD implemented a process for all individuals returning to work from a duty disability status.

18-0010-INV

The Detroit Labor Relations Division forwarded a complaint they received to the OIG. The complaint alleged Kristel Group improperly invoiced the Detroit Department of Transportation (DDOT) for work which they did not perform at the Rosa Parks Transit Center. The OIG opened a case to investigate this allegation. The OIG's investigation found no evidence that Kristel Group had improperly invoice DDOT for work done at the Rosa Parks Transit Center. However, the OIG's investigation did reveal that Kristel Group improperly invoiced DDOT for services which they could not perform at the Shoemaker Terminal in Bay Area C due to the fire damage. On January 13, 2017, a fire occurred at the Shoemaker Terminal that damage Bay Area C. Although, DDOT resolved this matter several months later. The OIG concluded this incident might have been prevented if DDOT had a formal meeting with Kristel Group soon after the fire to discuss changes to their invoices that would have reflected the actual work being performed at the Shoemaker Terminal. The OIG recommended that, in the future, if such a circumstance should occur again that DDOT management take the appropriate actions to ensure its contractors are in compliance with their contracts and invoices. Accordingly, the OIG closed the case.

18-0020-INV

A Detroit Department of Transportation (DDOT) employee alleged that DDOT administrators abused their authority by awarding "out of class assignments" and promotions to their "friends." The OIG interviewed Human Resources (HR) regarding policies and procedures related to

assignment of positions and promotions. In addition, OIG reviewed the paperwork related to the assignments and promotions in questions. Based on our investigation, the assignments and promotions were initiated in compliance with department policies and procedures. OIG found no evidence the DDOT administrators abused their authority. Therefore, the OIG closed this case without further action.

16-0071-INV / 18-0031-INV

The OIG issued a ten (15) year debarment for FutureNet Group, Inc. (FutureNet), a twenty (20) year debarment for Parimal “Perry” Mehta, and a twenty (20) year debarment for Jignesh “Jay” Mehta. The debarment was based on an extensive investigation conducted by the OIG which determined that FutureNet, Perry Mehta, and Jay Mehta acted as responsible contractors who conducted business in the City of Detroit with honesty and integrity. The full report for Case No. 16-0071-INV and 18-0031-INV may be found at:

<https://detroitmi.gov/media/26106>

On September 28, 2016, the OIG received a complaint from the City of Detroit Law Department. The letter stated that on April 8, 2016, former Deputy Director of the City of Detroit’s Department of Information Technology Services (DoIT), Charles L. Dodd, Jr., entered into a plea agreement with the Public Integrity Section of the United States Department of Justice for the crime of Federal Program Bribery. He subsequently pled guilty on September 27, 2016. Mr. Dodd admitted to soliciting and accepting cash payments totaling more than \$15,000, a trip to North Carolina, and other things of value from FutureNet President and CEO Perry Mehta, a private contractor that provided information technology services and personnel to the City of Detroit. Perry Mehta pleaded guilty on May 30, 2018. It was requested that the OIG investigate both the conduct of Mr. Dodd as well as FutureNet.

The OIG investigation was placed on hold due to the ongoing criminal investigation. On September 14, 2018, the case was reopened after Charles Dodd was sentenced to twenty (20) months in US District Court. On September 17, 2018, the OIG issued its initial debarment determination for FutureNet, Perry Mehta, and Jay Mehta after completing the investigation. On November 5, 2018, the OIG decision for Jay Mehta became final after he did not appeal the initial decision to the Detroit City Council.

On June 27, 2019, FutureNet and Perry Mehta provided notice of their intent to appeal. On July 15, 2019, City Council held the debarment appeal hearing. During that hearing, legal counsel for FutureNet and Perry Mehta presented arguments as to why City Council should overturn and/or reduce the number of years for debarment. The OIG also presented their arguments regarding why City Council should affirm the OIG’s debarment. On July 23, 2019, City Council voted to affirm the debarment of FutureNet for a period of fifteen (15) years and Perry Mehta for a period of (20) years.

FutureNet’s fifteen (15) year debarment has an effective date of September 30, 2016 and an end date of September 30, 2031. Perry Mehta and Jay Mehta’s twenty (20) year debarments has an effective date of September 30, 2016 and an end date of September 30, 2036. This time

coincides with the date the Office of Contracting and Procurement notified FutureNet, Perry Mehta, and Jay Mehta that their contract with the City of Detroit would not be extended.

18-0055-INV

A Detroit Department of Transportation (DDOT) employee alleged that DDOT administrators abused their authority by subjecting the employee to unwarranted disciplinary action. The OIG determined that DDOT administrators acted within their official capacity and in compliance with DDOT policies and procedures. Therefore, the OIG closed this case without further action.

18-0057-INV

The complainant alleged her supervisor retaliated against her. The complainant had been interviewed by the OIG concerning an ongoing investigation into the hiring practices of the Secretary to the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC). The complainant was not the focus of the OIG's investigation, however, we interviewed the complainant as a witness to another OIG investigation concerning the BOPC. She was interviewed by the OIG so that she could provide background information. The complainant's cooperation was in compliance with the 2012 City of Detroit Charter Section 7.5-310.

When the complainant's supervisor was made aware the complainant was interviewed by the OIG, her supervisor requested a summary of her interview with the OIG. After several email exchanges between the complainant and her supervisor, the complainant refused to do so, as such action would be a violation of the Charter. The next day, the complainant's supervisor verbally told the complainant her position was being eliminated from the budget. The complainant was told that she would be laid-off effective January 2, 2019 or, in lieu of being laid-off, she could accept a demotion.

Based on our investigation, the OIG concluded that the supervisor retaliated against the complainant in violation of the 2012 City of Detroit Charter Section 7.5-315. The complainant's actions to maintain the confidentiality of her interview with the OIG was appropriate and in compliance with the 2012 City of Detroit Charter Section 7.5-313 and Section 7.5-310. In addition, pursuant to Section 7.5-315 the supervisor was fined \$300 for violation of Section 7.5-310 of the Charter. Accordingly, the OIG closed the case.

19-0003-INV

The complainant alleged now former Board of Police Commissioners Chairperson (BOPC-CP) abused his authority by removing the complainant as the Chairperson of the BOPC Budget Committee (the Committee). In addition, the complainant alleged the BOPC-CP's removal of him from the Committee was a retaliation, because the BOPC-CP believed he filed a complaint with the OIG that initiated an investigation into the BOPC's hiring practices.

The OIG interviewed the BOPC-CP and reviewed the BOPC's bylaws. The OIG's investigation found no evidence to substantiate the allegation that the former BOPC-CP abused his authority. Likewise, we found no evidence which would substantiate the complainant's allegation of retaliation. Article V, Section 5 of the BOPC's Bylaws grants the BOPC-CP the authority to appoint and remove a member of the committee if, in the Chairperson's judgment, the removal of a member would be in the best interest of the organization.

However, the OIG concluded that Article V, Section 5 of the BOPC's Bylaws is not best practice, as used by other cities with similar legislative bodies. Other similar legislative bodies require approval or consent of the full body to appoint and remove members of a standing committee, which is in contrast to the BOPC's Bylaws that delegates this authority solely to the Chairperson. Therefore, the OIG recommended that all members of the BOPC should have a say on how members are appointed and removed from committees. Accordingly, the OIG closed the case.

19-0008-INV

The OIG received an anonymous complaint alleging a business address with multiple building violations passed inspections. The complainant believes that the owner has bribed City inspectors. The OIG was not able to substantiate the complaint.

19-0009-INV

The OIG received several complaints which alleged a Buildings, Safety Engineering and Environmental Department (BSEED) Building Inspector solicited bribery from multiple business owners of properties he had inspected. The OIG Investigation sought to determine whether there was any evidence of abuse of authority or fraud in the Inspector's actions.

The OIG met with personnel from the Detroit Police Department (DPD), the Detroit Land Bank Authority (DLBA), and the BSEED to discuss the allegations. The OIG also interviewed several business owners who had complained about the Inspector, as well as the accused Inspector. However, we were unable to corroborate neither the complainant's allegation nor the Building Inspector's statements to the OIG. Because the OIG was unable to draw a definite conclusion from our investigation, the OIG referred the matter to BSEED and HR. Shortly after our referral, we learned the Building Inspector resigned from his employment.

19-0014-INV

The OIG received a complaint that the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) was allowing food and beverage purchases outside of the established Finance policy, which was outdated. The OIG was able to substantiate the allegation, finding that a number of the purchases were not in line with the policy regarding food/beverage purchases. However, the reimbursements in question were sought under the former CFO's tenure; and the new CFO was in the process of reviewing OCFO's directives during our investigation. The new CFO accepted

our findings and agreed to make revisions to the policy. The OIG is currently working with the OCFO in revising its outdated Finance Directive.

19-0016-INV

The OIG received a complaint alleging there may be a conflict with a board member on the City of Detroit Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) because he has a marijuana consulting business helping marijuana facilities get licensed. The OIG investigation sought to determine whether there was any evidence of abuse authority or fraud. The OIG concluded that there was no factual evidence to dispute the statements in the board member's Affidavit or to substantiate that the board member abused his authority or engaged in any fraud or wrongdoing. However, the OIG referred the matter to the City of Detroit Board of Ethics for any potential conflict of interest.

19-0020-INV

A former Detroit Department of Transportation (DDOT) General Automotive Mechanic (GMA) alleged that DDOT Foremen abused the authority afforded to them when they spoke to the employee in a disrespectful manner and wrote the employee up for low performance without a formal measurement against which to compare their performance. In addition, the employee alleged one of the Foremen and a Superintendent abused their authority by erasing surveillance video that would have substantiated his allegation that he was assaulted by one of the DDOT Foremen.

The OIG does not have jurisdiction over most of the employees' complaints which appeared to be related to Human Resources labor management issues. In regard to the allegation of employees tampering with surveillance video, our investigation found that DDOT security maintains all DDOT video recordings for 30 days under their record retention schedule. The alleged event occurred on March 18, 2017 and the complaint was filed with the OIG on January 10, 2019, almost two years later. Therefore, the OIG closed this case without further action.

2019-0021

A Detroit Department of Transportation (DDOT) employee alleged that DDOT administrative personnel abused their authority by suspending the employee based on false allegations. The Office of Inspector General (OIG) reviewed interviews conducted by the Civil Rights Inclusion Office (CRIO) and found no evidence DDOT administration's actions were in violation of DDOT policies and procedures. Therefore, the OIG closed the investigation without further action.

19-0022-INV

The OIG received a complaint alleging the Civil Rights, Inclusion and Opportunity Department (CRIO) did not properly investigate the harassment complaint she filed against her colleague at the Department of Transportation (DDOT). Complainant also claimed that CRIO wrongly agreed with the disciplinary action DDOT filed against her, which was based on the alleged harassment.

The OIG investigation sought to determine whether there was any evidence of abuse of authority in CRIO's investigation of the complaint. Based on our review of CRIO's records, the OIG found that CRIO conducted an investigation into both the complainant's and DDOT's complaints.

19-0025-INV

The OIG received a complaint alleging Department of Neighborhoods (DON) District Managers were participating in waste of city resources and fraud on the citizens of Detroit by not more frequently initiating blight removal. The OIG determined that the primary role of DON is to "improve the quality of life in every district" and is not limited to blight removal. The OIG investigation found no evidence that DON District Managers participated in waste or fraud. Therefore, the OIG closed the investigation without further action.

19-0026-INV

A citizen complained that a Detroit Fire Department employee (employee) was potentially committing disability fraud. The OIG contacted the City of Detroit's third party provider (TPP), contracted through the Risk Management Department, to assist with the investigation.

The TPP initiated surveillance of the employee. After several days of surveillance, the TPP did not find any evidence that the employee was participating in any activity that contradicted the injury documented in their claim. Based on this and the employee's compliance with the required doctor visits, the OIG closed this case without further action.