

City of Detroit

Office of Inspector General

2021 2nd Quarterly Report

(April 1, 2021 – June 30, 2021)



Ellen Ha, Esq., CIG
Inspector General

July 12, 2021

A Message from the Inspector General



The Office of Inspector General (OIG or Office) is an agency of the City that requires the City, as a whole, to self-reflect and evaluate our actions so that we can improve where we can, and where necessary, to self-discipline in order to avoid abuse, waste, fraud, and corruption in the future. No one can change the past, but all of us have the ability to change the future for the better.

Despite the fact that our Office has been in existence for over eight years now, questions still remain about the role of our Office in City government. As such, I am taking this opportunity to further explain the duties and responsibilities of our office as required by the Charter and based on national standards.

National Association of Inspectors General (AIG)

The City of Detroit OIG was modeled on the Association of Inspectors General (AIG) Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspector General. In addition, the AIG sets the standard for members of the AIG nationwide, which includes the Detroit OIG. The standards require that offices of inspector general not only identify the causes of fraud, waste, corruption, and abuse, but that we engage in the prevention of such matters by making recommendations to appropriate officials. All recommendations have the goal of identifying and preventing fraud, waste, corruption, and abuse from occurring in the future.

Consistent with the standards established by the AIG, the 2012 Charter of City of Detroit (the Charter) requires the OIG to ensure honesty and integrity in our government by identifying and rooting out abuse, waste, fraud, and corruption. The Charter requires the OIG to operate as an independent agency so we may conduct our investigations and audits without any bias or influences from the City government or members of the public. In order to enable the OIG to operate independently, the Charter provides the OIG with jurisdiction to investigate all public servants, including elected and appointed officials and contractors who work in the City. In addition, in order to maintain integrity of our investigation, the Charter requires our investigation to be confidential.

With the exception of OIG administrative support staff and an Associate Attorney¹ in our Office, all OIG staff are certified members of the AIG in our respective field of expertise. Our membership with the AIG is important as we are one of the many inspectors general community in the United States and Canada.

¹ After being sworn-in to the State Bar, Norman Dotson was recently promoted to the position of an associate attorney in our Office. Therefore, Mr. Dotson will be attending a week-long AIG training session to be certified by the AIG sometime later this year.

OIG's Recommendations Questioned

I was recently made aware that some public servants are of the opinion that recommendations made by the OIG are “improper” and “unnecessary” when the OIG finds no abuse, waste, fraud or corruption. Moreover, some public servants would like for us to simplify our memorandum/report with a conclusion of whether the allegations in the complaint were substantiated or not. In short, they would have us not provide any details of our investigation or provide an explanation of how we reached certain findings or derived certain conclusions.

Our memorandums/reports would not be complete if we do not explain the rendering of our findings and conclusions, as recommendations are made based on our investigative findings. We do not and cannot simply render recommendations without any context.

More importantly, OIG memorandums and reports provide details of how our investigation was conducted. Because the Charter requires confidentiality during our investigation to protect the integrity of our investigation, it is all the more important in that we provide transparency after our investigation is closed. In short, we strive to draft our memorandums and reports in such a way that the reader would understand the bases of our conclusions and recommendations.

OIG Investigation and Final Memorandum/Report

Generally when we do not substantiate the allegations contained in the complaint, the investigation or the audit is closed with a memorandum or a report detailing the reasons we did not find any waste, abuse, waste, fraud, or corruption. However, in some instances when we are unable to substantiate any abuse, waste, fraud or corruption, we may nevertheless recommend changes in policies or processes to mitigate the risks we identify in our memorandum or report.

We make our recommendations in the best interest of the city and its residents to show what improvements can be made to prevent similar problems in the future. We also make recommendations to ensure honesty and integrity in our government. We cannot change the past, but looking into the past provides us with a meaningful ability to change the future for the better.

Purpose of OIG Recommendations in the Final Memorandum/Report

It is important to note we do not make recommendations without a purpose. We painstakingly provide the details of our investigations and audits in our memorandum or report so that the reader can fully understand what we investigated, how we drew our conclusions, and why we are making recommendations. In some instances, when public servants are wrongfully accused of abusing their authority, committing waste or engaging in fraudulent or corrupt conduct, the details in our closing memorandum or report can clear the erroneous allegations contained in the complaint. In such cases, the wrongfully accused public servant or contractor may be vindicated by the OIG investigation.

However, from time to time, while we do not substantiate the allegation that the public servant engaged in abuse, waste, fraud or corruption, we find their conduct to be inappropriate that may lead to or perpetuate abuse, waste, fraud or corruption in the future. In such circumstances, we identify the action or inaction which was improper or inappropriate. This is necessary, as there are times when the actions taken or not taken can have unintended consequences which may lead

to abuse, waste, fraud or corruption. To effectuate a change in the future that is in the best interest of the City, we must point out what was done incorrectly and/or what could have been avoided.

The national standards set by the AIG require OIG investigations to focus on obtaining factual evidence for use in determining whether any corrective actions should be initiated against specific parties for their actions or lack of actions. Corrective actions can only be made and taken by the public servant or the contractor. For the most part, the Charter limits the OIG to making recommendations based on our investigation, unless we are initiating debarment of a contractor based on our investigation.

The OIG does not have the authority to dictate or demand that City departments or agencies fully adopt all recommendations made by the OIG. However, my staff and I are members of the AIG who are certified in identifying and preventing abuse, waste, fraud and corruption in government settings. As such, the OIG makes recommendations, where deemed necessary, in the hopes that City departments and agencies will review our memorandum/report, consider our recommendations, and take reasonable action to improve the process or to effectuate a change that would lead to a better path.

Measure of Success

The OIG investigations help identify high-risk areas and determine where internal controls should be strengthened. As such, our success is measured by the affected person's response and commitment to consider the recommendations made by the OIG. Therefore, it would be detrimental to ensuring honesty and integrity in city government when the person disregards any recommendations made by the OIG without any review or consideration.

The success of our Office, and therefore the City, in preventing any future waste, abuse, fraud or corruption requires a partnership with all public servants, departments, agencies and City contractors. Without the willingness to accept or acknowledge our constructive critiques and consider our recommendations, vulnerabilities identified by the OIG will continue to exist and potentially perpetuate the abuse, waste, fraud and corruption in the operation of our government.

Nothing is perfect, but considering and making reasonable changes to improve our processes get us closer to perfection. As such, we ask that you continue to support and work with our Office in fulfilling our Charter-mandated purpose.

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 requires that every public servant, contractor, subcontractor, licensee, applicant for certification to 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 all investigative files to be confidential except where production is required by law; and 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. As

such, OIG investigators, auditors, attorneys, the deputy and the inspector general participated in AIG training and received their certification in their area of discipline. We are currently in the process of having our associate attorney to receive training and to obtain certification from the AIG.

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: 2nd Quarter of 2021

Between April 1, 2021 and June 30, 2021, the City of Detroit Office of the Inspector General (OIG) consisted of the following individuals:

Ellen Ha, Esq., CIG, **Inspector General**;
Kamau Marable, CIG, **Deputy Inspector General**;
Jennifer Bentley, Esq., CIGI, **OIG Attorney**;
Edyth D. Porter-Stanley, CIGA, CFE, **Forensic Auditor***;
Beverly L. Murray, CIGA, CFE, **Forensic Auditor***;
Jacqueline Hendricks-Moore, CIGI, CFE, **Investigator**;
Kelechi Akinbosede, Esq., CIGI, **Investigator**;
Norman Dotson, Esq., **Associate Attorney**;
Kasha Graves, **Administrative Assistant**; and
Tracey Neal, **Administrative Assistant**.

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

Office of Auditor General (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 OAG and 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 financial information is presented fairly 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's operational compliance with policies and procedures.

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 Inspector General
615 Griswold, Suite 1230
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Via Email: oig@detoig.org and/or Suggestions@detoig.org

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

Some complaints are received, via a referral, from various City departments and/or 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.

(For example, on occasion, two complainants with competing interests will file separate complaints with the OIG. If the OIG has a reasonable suspicion that criminal charges may result from a law enforcement investigation, the OIG will not notify either complainant before referring the case and closing it.)

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.

For example, in the first three quarters of 2018, the OIG received 204 complaints but only initiated 32 investigations. One of the primary reasons we did 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 initiate 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 memorandum/report. All formal/final reports have been and will continue to be published on-line. In addition, from time to time, we exercise our discretion to publish some of our internal memoranda through the City and the OIG's website at:

<https://detroitmi.gov/government/office-inspector-general> or www.detoig.org.

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." Therefore, when our draft findings are critical, we send a copy of our draft findings, either as a draft memorandum or as a draft report to the affected parties. Thereafter, pursuant to the OIG's Administrative Hearing Rules (Hearing Rules), the parties have 14 days to either provide a written response and/or seek an administrative hearing.

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. The purpose of the written response and the administration hearing is to provide the affected parties with an opportunity to point out to the OIG why the findings and the conclusions in the draft memorandum or report contain error(s). In support of their position, the affected parties can submit any new evidence or information, by way of providing additional documents or testimonies of additional witnesses. It is important to note that the OIG's proceedings are administrative and not adversarial in nature. Therefore, submission of additional record or testimony are not governed by the Michigan Rules of Evidence.

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.”

When Are OIG Investigative Summaries Published?

The information regarding what we publish may also be found on our website at <https://detroitmi.gov/government/office-inspector-general> under the FAQ section. The following is a short response to the inquiry the OIG submitted and presented to the Internal Operations Standing Committee of the Detroit City Council.

Section 75-306 (2) of the 2012 Charter of City of Detroit (the Charter) requires the OIG to “issue quarterly reports to the City Council and Mayor concerning results of investigations and audits undertaken by the OIG.” It further states “all reports shall be a public record and additionally published electronically on the World Wide Web.”

Therefore, ***all OIG’s quarterly reports and formal/final reports have been and will continue to be published on-line.*** In addition, from time to time, we exercise our discretion to publish some of our internal memoranda through the City and the OIG’s website at: <https://detroitmi.gov/government/office-inspector-general> or www.detoig.org.

The purpose of the formal report is to assist public servants, City agencies, contractors and all other bodies that fall under the jurisdiction of the OIG, as well as the public, in preventing waste, abuse, fraud, or corruption by providing a detailed analysis related to the recommendation made in the formal report.

Generally, after an OIG file manager (FM)² completes his/her/their investigation or audit, the FM seeks to close the investigation or initiate an action by submitting a memorandum to the Inspector General (IG), or when necessary, to the Deputy IG (DIG). After the IG or the DIG completes the review of the memorandum, the IG or the DIG must approve the FM’s Request To Close (RTC) or Request To Initiate (RTI) action. We typically do not publish our internal memoranda, unless we find that the publication of the RTC or the RTI may be of a significant public interest. Here are some of the reasons why we exercise such discretion:

1. We want to encourage FMs to be candid and frank with their analyses, interpretations, evaluations, assessments of their findings and recommendations, without any external pressure or influence;
2. Some of the allegations or complaints require our Office to seek and confirm certain information that are personal and private to an individual;
3. Some of the complaints we receive are politically or personally motivated between individuals that lack merit, and cannot be substantiated. However, the allegations by themselves, if published, can be prejudicial or harmful to an individual; and
4. Sometimes the allegations by themselves can identify the complainant even if the complainant wished to remain anonymous and, as such, publication of such memorandum could have a negative impact on submitting or filing any future complaint.

In order to maintain the integrity and the efficiency of our Office, we must maintain our independence. Our independence is dependent on our ability to exercise discretionary authority in the operation of the Office without any undue influence, bias or fear of reprisal. As such, we

² The FM is typically an OIG attorney, investigator, forensic auditor, law clerk or intern or a combination of OIG staff.

remain engaged and committed to the privilege and the opportunity that are provided to us through the Charter.

2021 2nd QUARTER OIG STATISTICS

(April 1, 2021 – June 30, 2021)

Sources of Complaints Received by the OIG in the 2nd Quarter

Complaint Source	Number Received
Internet (Website)	12
Telephone Hotline	18
OIG Telephone	5
Mail	0
Personal Visit	0
Email	6
OIG Initiation	5
Total	46

Categories of Complaints Received by the OIG in the 2nd Quarter

Categories of Complaints	Number Received
Waste	2
Abuse	19
Fraud	6
Corruption	0
Other	19

How Complaints Were Resolved by the OIG in the 2nd Quarter

Open investigative files	4
Decline investigation or Referral	31

Categories of OIG Investigations Initiated by the OIG in the 2nd Quarter

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

Status of OIG Investigations in the 2nd Quarter

Open	Closed
4	9

Short Summary of Investigations Closed in the 2nd Quarter of 2021

The following reflects nine (9) investigations the OIG closed in the 2nd Quarter of 2021 with an accompanying synopsis for each investigation.

17-0047-INV

The OIG received a complaint from a store owner that a City of Detroit employee committed fraud by cashing a check at the complainant's store that had previously been cashed at a banking institution. We learned through our investigation that the City employee resigned in 2017. As such, the OIG no longer had jurisdiction over the employee. Moreover, pursuant to Section 7.5-308 of the Charter, the OIG referred the matter to the Detroit Police Department (DPD) for further review and investigation. After its review and investigation, DPD closed its investigation. Therefore, the OIG investigation was closed with no further action.

19-0004-INV

The OIG received a complaint from the City of Detroit Treasury Department (Treasury) that multiple checks appearing to have been issued by the City of Detroit Income Tax Department were in fact fraudulent. Pursuant to Section 7.5-308 of the Charter, the OIG referred the matter involving alleged criminality to the Detroit Police Department (DPD) Public Corruption Unit for further review and investigation. After its review and investigation, DPD closed its investigation. Therefore, the OIG investigation was closed with no further action.

20-0009-INV

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) received an anonymous complaint alleging invoices from TSA and TSS (city contractors) participated in practices which resulted in waste and fraud. Specifically, the complainant alleged that TSA and TSS used the same business address located in Detroit, which was vacant. In addition, the complaint alleged that TSA and TSS submitted invoices to Housing and Revitalization Department (HRD) that appeared to be excessive.

The OIG found that TSA and TSS used the same Detroit building as their official business address for purposes of reporting to the HRD. However, based on our investigation, we found that in this instance, TSA and TSS did not commit any fraud by using the same address. However, we found the amounts HRD paid TSA and TSS for the Melbourne and the Manor projects were not in compliance with HRD's Procurement Policy, and therefore were not reasonable. Based on the OIG's review of HRD's written response to the OIG's draft memorandum, dated April 19, 2021, it is our understanding that HRD will consider and make reasonable changes, as recommended by the OIG.

20-0026-INV

The OIG received an allegation that the Detroit Board of Police Commissioner (Board or BOPC) Chairperson abused his authority by disregarding parliamentary procedures during several Board meetings. The OIG's investigation consisted of a review of the following: 1) Several videos of BOPC's meetings along with the corresponding meeting minutes; 2) BOPC bylaws and documents; and 3) Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised 12 Edition. In addition, the OIG

consulted with an expert parliamentarian concerning parliamentary procedures. The OIG found no evidence to substantiate the allegations that BOPC's Chairperson abused his authority during Board meetings. Nevertheless, the OIG reiterated its previous recommendation that the BOPC hire an experienced parliamentarian to ensure BOPC meetings are run more efficiently.

20-0023-INV

The OIG opened an investigation into allegations of bribery within the General Services Department (GSD) bidding process. Pursuant to Section 7.5-308 of the Charter, the OIG referred the matter involving alleged criminality to the Detroit Police Department (DPD) for further review and investigation. DPD found no evidence of bribery and closed its investigation without charges.

While investigating the bribery allegations, the OIG received additional information that alleged there were irregularities in the GSD procurement process. The OIG found no evidence to substantiate the allegations. Therefore, the investigation was closed with no further action.

21-0001-INV

The OIG initiated this investigation during its investigation into the Motor City Match (MCM) program, after it was discovered that four of the draws for the program did not have supporting documentation. Further investigation revealed the draws were not for the MCM program but were for another program.

The OIG conducted an investigation to determine if there was any fraud, abuse, waste or corruption in the improperly coded payment. The OIG requested and reviewed documentation from the City of Detroit Housing and Revitalization Department (HRD) to determine whether the draws submitted to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) involved fraud or whether the draws were coded incorrectly due to human error. Based on our review of the records, we found no evidence of fraud, but rather the incorrect submissions were due to clerical error. Therefore, the investigation was closed with no further action taken.

21-0003-INV

The OIG received a complaint alleging that the Detroit Water and Sewage Department (DWSD) abused its authority when it terminated a former DWSD employee. Specifically, it was alleged that the termination was in retaliation for complaints made regarding an unequal pay discrepancy. Based on our investigation, the OIG did not find DWSD abused its authority when terminating the complainant's employment. Therefore, the investigation was closed with no further action.

21-0006-INV

The OIG received a complaint regarding a boathouse located in the complainant's neighborhood. The complaint alleged that the Buildings, Safety Engineering and Environmental Department (BSEED) abused its authority by granting a permit for construction on the boathouse against a court order. The complainant further stated that the owner of the boathouse was a former City of Detroit employee who received preferential treatment. After a thorough investigation, including the review of the initial complaint, City ordinances, permit applications, and BSEED inspection

case notes, the OIG found that BSEED acted in accordance with its policies and ensured compliance with City codes. Moreover, the OIG found no evidence to substantiate the owner of the boathouse was given any preferential treatment. As such, the investigation was closed with no further action.

21-0007-INV

The City of Detroit Office of Inspector General (OIG) received an anonymous complaint alleging that the Law Department wasted money by initiating payments to Hanna Law, LLC. Among the checks in question were two (2) payroll checks made payable to a city employee. However, during the investigation, the OIG found that the payments were made in accordance with the state law and with authorization from the Law Department. We also learned that the employee was terminated for three (3) additional payroll checks that were also cashed twice. Because this matter involved legal issue and because the employee no longer worked for the City, we determined the OIG did not have jurisdiction over this matter. As such, we closed the investigation and notified the Law Department of two (2) additional checks which were cashed twice by the same former employee for further legal review and action, if any is warranted.