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About DOI and OIG

The U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) is a large, decentralized agency with about 70,000 employees serving in approximately 2,400 operating locations across the United States, Puerto Rico, U.S. territories, and freely associated states. DOI is responsible for 500 million acres of America’s public land, or about one-fifth of the land in the United States, and 56 million acres of Indian Trust lands. DOI is also responsible for a variety of water and underwater resources, including hundreds of dams and reservoirs and thousands of oil and gas leases on millions of acres of the Outer Continental Shelf. Approximately 30 percent of the Nation’s energy production comes from projects on DOI-managed lands and offshore areas. DOI scientists conduct a wide range of research on biology, geology, and water to provide land and resource managers with critical information for sound decisionmaking. DOI lands also provide outstanding recreational and cultural opportunities to numerous visitors worldwide.

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) promotes excellence, integrity, and accountability in these DOI programs. With fewer than 280 full-time employees, the organization is driven by a keen sense of mission and is dedicated to providing products and services that impact DOI mission results.
Message From the Deputy Inspector General

Glacier National Park, Montana

In this semiannual report, I am pleased to submit a summary highlighting the Office of Inspector General’s dedicated and successful work covering the 6-month period from October 1, 2013, through March 31, 2014.

In an effort to focus our attention on those matters in the Department that are of greatest importance, several years ago, OIG developed Key Focus Areas and Investigative Priorities. We developed these priority areas, in part, by reviewing the Department’s strategic plan, budget, and top management challenges. The priority areas provide us with an unscientific way to ensure that we dedicate our audit, inspection, evaluation, and investigative resources to considered areas of import to the Department.

The Key Focus Areas for audit, inspection, and evaluation are:

- Energy;
- Water;
- Climate Change;
- DOI Business Processes and Operations;
- Indian and Insular Affairs;
- Health, Safety, Security, and Maintenance; and
- Asset Protection and Preservation.

The areas of Investigative Priority are:

- Contract and Grant Fraud;
- Energy;
- Scientific Misconduct;
- Ethical Violations (Public Corruption, PAS/SES Misconduct, Standards of Conduct);
- Public Safety and Security; and
- Workers Compensation Fraud.
The summaries of our work for this semiannual reporting period reflect these areas of attention in a way that has become quite routine for us. There is nothing magical about these focus areas, but they do lend a certain discipline when we consider how to deploy our resources and to ensure our stakeholders that we are being the best stewards possible in providing oversight for the programs and operations of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Deputy Inspector General
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OIG Operating Principles

Mission
OIG’s mission is to provide independent oversight and promote excellence, integrity, and accountability within the programs, operations, and management of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Values
OIG operates as an independent oversight organization responsible to the American people, DOI, and Congress. We abide by the highest ethical standards and have the courage to tell our customers and stakeholders what they need to know, not what they wish to hear. Our core values help us fulfill our mission and include—

- placing highest value on objectivity and independence to ensure integrity in our workforce and products;
- striving for continuous improvement; and
- believing in the limitless potential of our employees.

Responsibilities
OIG is responsible for independently and objectively identifying risks and vulnerabilities that directly impact DOI’s ability to accomplish its mission. We are required to keep the Secretary and Congress informed of problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of DOI programs and operations. As a result of OIG fulfilling these responsibilities, Americans can expect greater accountability and integrity in Government program administration.

Activities
OIG accomplishes its mission by conducting audits, inspections, evaluations, and investigations relating to DOI programs and operations. Our activities are tied to major departmental responsibilities and assist DOI in developing solutions for its most serious management and program challenges. These activities are designed to ensure that we prioritize critical issues. Such prioritizing provides opportunities to influence key decisionmakers and increases the likelihood that we will achieve desired outcomes and results that benefit the public.
Summaries of Significant Reports and Investigations
Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations

BIA Exceeded GSA Requirements by More Than $32.7 Million in Real Property Lease Agreements

We conducted an inspection to determine whether the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) followed applicable policies and guidelines for property leased under the U.S. General Services Administration’s (GSA) “Can’t Beat GSA Leasing” program. We found that BIA had not followed GSA’s leasing requirements and that BIA had approved more than $32.7 million in lease agreements that exceeded GSA square footage and purchase approval limits. Our review of 14 BIA leases uncovered numerous issues ranging from noncompliance with GSA guidelines to insufficient BIA guidance and inadequate training.

GSA’s “Can’t Beat GSA Leasing” program allows Federal agencies to lease property on their own using delegated authority from GSA rather than use GSA to help with their property needs. This program enables agencies like BIA to lease office buildings and other real property without GSA input as long as the agency meets GSA guidelines. In a recent review, GSA found discrepancies with BIA’s leasing program and referred the issue to us.

The problem emerged when BIA failed to meet guidelines established by GSA’s Federal Management Regulation Bulletin 2008-B1, which states that—

- no agency can lease any property greater than 19,999 square feet;
- agencies must provide information supporting a request as well as an explanation of how the agency will lease either at or below GSA costs; and
- agency leasing personnel must use a warranted realty contracting officer.

During our inspection of the 14 BIA leases identified by GSA, we found leases that BIA extended without GSA approval, leases that exceeded GSA square footage limits, leases established by BIA employees without the qualifications to do so, and contracting officers who did not follow guidelines. In addition, BIA’s failure to accurately report all lease data back to GSA made it impossible for GSA to analyze post-lease performance data for the BIA leases that we reviewed.

We made three recommendations to BIA to improve oversight of its leases and leasing process. We recommended that BIA develop and implement policies and procedures that ensure compliance with GSA guidance, develop a database to accurately reflect the status of leases in BIA’s inventory, and ensure that BIA contracting officers receive appropriate training in lease administration and management.
Deficiencies Identified in BIA’s Records Management Practices

We inspected the records management practices at three Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) agencies after discovering deficiencies with records management during an unrelated evaluation regarding the application for permit to drill process for oil and gas wells. Overall, we identified instances of incomplete, inconsistent, and incorrect record filing systems at two of the three BIA agencies visited.

Royalty payments for oil and gas produced from Indian lands are held in trust, invested, and disbursed by BIA at the direction of the applicable tribe or individual mineral owner. BIA agencies must maintain an accurate system of property records showing the location and owner of each oil and gas lease, individual well data, and rights-of-way to ensure that royalties are correctly paid.

We visited the Southern Ute Agency in Ignacio, CO; the Fort Berthold Agency in New Town, ND; and the Uintah and Ouray Agency in Fort Duchesne, UT. At the Southern Ute and Fort Berthold agencies, we found several deficiencies in records management practices for oil and gas documents and files, including—

- inconsistent filing of real estate and general records;
- incorrect recording of new property records;
- uncontrolled or unrestricted access to property records;
- incomplete and outdated rights-of-way files;
- unrecorded oil well surface structures in BIA’s Trust Asset and Accounting Management System;
- incomplete or not uniformly filed well files;
- file boxes stacked haphazardly and not labeled with appropriate identification; and
- unlocked file cabinets.

We did not identify any records management issues at the Uintah & Ouray Agency.

We made three recommendations to BIA, to include expanding the scope of records management reviews to include all property records maintained at BIA agencies and for the Southern Ute and Fort Berthold agencies to correct the identified deficiencies and comply with management plans for safeguarding trust records. BIA concurred with all three recommendations.

OIG Suggests Additional Focus on Underground Injection Wells

After completing the survey phase of our evaluation into Class II underground injection control wells on DOI lands, we determined that further review of these wells was not warranted. While we did not issue a formal report with recommendations, we did identify three issues that merited DOI’s attention.
Class II underground injection control wells are injection wells associated with oil and gas production, disposal of fluids associated with oil and gas production, and hydrocarbon storage, but do not include hydraulic fracturing unless diesel fuel is used. We determined that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and the National Park Service (NPS) have Class II wells operating on lands they manage.

These wells operate under a variety of oversight methods, including memorandums of understanding between departmental bureaus and the States. During the survey phase of our evaluation, we reviewed the 2012 memorandum of understanding between the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources and BLM’s California State Office. We found the 2012 memorandum included significantly less detail than the memorandum issued in 2008. The 2012 document merely identified goals and instructed parties to “begin to develop specific plans” to implement these goals, while the 2008 document clearly defined responsibilities for each party. We suggested that the BLM California State Office and other departmental agencies pursue memorandums of understanding that have clear and enforceable responsibilities and that allow for streamlining processes.

In addition, when we visited an oil field managed by the BLM California State Office that contained Class II wells, we found that BLM misclassified several Class II wells in its database. We suggested that BLM confirm that these wells are correctly classified to ensure prompt collection of royalties and correct inclusion in annual inspections.

Lastly, when we visited the Deep Fork Wildlife Refuge in Okmulgee, OK, we found oil and gas equipment that had been left on the land by oil and gas operations prior to the refuge’s creation. This equipment, which included pump jacks, pipelines, and tank batteries, poses significant and immediate health and environmental risks. We suggested that FWS seek remedies for cleanup of these sites, and we have initiated a separate review of orphaned and abandoned oil and gas wells on wildlife refuges.

We encourage BLM, FWS, and NPS to review their policies and procedures regarding Class II underground injection wells and hope that additional focus on the identified issues will result in better management of our natural resources.

**DOI Does Not Comply With Regulations Regarding Management of Class V Wells**

We evaluated DOI’s underground injection control activities to determine DOI’s effectiveness in managing the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) six classes of underground injection control wells. We narrowed the scope of our review to focus mainly on Class V wells because of their ubiquity and possible impact on groundwater. We found that these wells may be putting underground sources of drinking water at risk.
The U.S. Geological Survey estimated in 2013 that more than 100 million people in the United States, about 35 percent of the population, received their drinking water from public groundwater systems. Class V wells inject nonhazardous fluids into or above underground sources of drinking water; these wells depend on gravity to drain the fluids into the ground and include such things as cesspools and drainage for storm water.

EPA estimates that there are 650,000 of these wells operating throughout the country on both public and private lands and considers these wells a major threat to groundwater quality due to their prevalence and lack of proper operation and maintenance.

We identified four issues with Class V injection wells managed on DOI lands. First, we found no specific departmental guidance to assist DOI and its bureaus in complying with EPA’s Class V regulations, which has led to a patchwork of inconsistent or nonexistent policies at the bureau level.

Second, we found that DOI did not know the scope of EPA’s definition of Class V wells, making it impossible for DOI to properly track, maintain, or identify all of the wells operating on public land. We received only a partial listing of these wells from the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Reclamation; the Bureau of Indian Affairs did not provide a listing.

Third, we found that since these bureaus do not maintain an accurate listing of Class V wells, they were unable to comply with EPA’s regulations to self-report their inventory of wells to EPA. Federal regulations require each owner or operator of Class V wells to provide an inventory report that contains the facility name and location, name and address of a legal contact, ownership of the facility, nature and type of injection wells, and operating status of the injection wells.

Lastly, we found several instances where banned wells were still operational on DOI lands. Because of their potential to pollute underground sources of drinking water, EPA banned large-capacity cesspools and motor vehicle waste disposal drains in 2000; owners and operators of these types of wells had until 2005 to permanently close large-capacity cesspools and until 2008 to close or obtain a permit for motor vehicle waste disposal wells.

While we could not determine the exact number of banned wells still in operation because the bureaus could not provide a comprehensive list of Class V wells, we identified at least 151 banned wells that are still in operation.

We offered seven recommendations to DOI and its bureaus focused on developing and implementing policies and procedures to comply with EPA’s regulations and provide education on the rules concerning Class V wells; identifying Class V wells and developing systems to track these wells; and closing all banned wells. We believe that, if implemented, these recommendations will help DOI and its bureaus comply with EPA’s regulations and help safeguard underground sources of drinking water.
BLM Cannot Ensure it Obtains Market Value for Mineral Materials

We audited the Bureau of Land Management’s (BLM) mineral materials program to determine whether BLM obtained market value for mineral materials. We could not conclude that the Federal Government receives the full value of revenues from this program.

BLM sells mineral materials under the authority of the Materials Act of 1947, as amended. These materials consist of common types of sand and gravel, stone, pumice, or other materials used primarily in construction and landscaping, and are mainly sold using competitive or noncompetitive contracts. In fiscal year 2011, sales were valued at approximately $17 million; we visited eight field offices in four States whose fiscal year 2011 sales totaled more than $14 million. We found little assurance that BLM obtained market value for mineral sales, recovered the processing cost for mineral contracts, verified sales production, or resolved issues of unauthorized mineral use.
Specifically, we identified four causes that contribute to the potential loss of revenue. First, we found that BLM has little assurance it obtained market value for mineral material sales. Outdated guidance and conflicting regulations make it difficult for BLM to determine fair market value. In addition, an independent review of appraisals conducted to determine the value of the materials rendered the appraisals disapproved for use because of several deficiencies, including inadequate content, detail, or analysis required to comply with professional appraisal standards. We also identified 16 contracts that should have included price adjustments for the value of materials that have not yet been removed and found that BLM lost more than $846,000 in potential revenues.

Second, we found that BLM made little effort to recover processing costs related to exclusive mineral sales and subsequent contract renewals. The authority to recover costs not only includes the costs to obtain an appraisal, but also staff labor costs incurred when assessing market conditions and establishing and renewing contracts. We found that despite this authority, none of the 30 exclusive-sales contracts we reviewed had associated cost recovery. Further, only two of the eight competitive contracts reviewed had some form of cost recovery. We could not develop an estimate of the total costs unrecovered due to incomplete data.

Third, we determined that BLM does not consistently verify the volume of mineral materials removed. BLM policy requires geologists to confirm mineral production by inspecting sites and verifying reported volumes. Production verification ensures accountability by independently monitoring and verifying reported production and payments. We identified 33 of 38 contract files that did not have any production verification documentation. Without this verification, BLM cannot ensure that contractors are removing only the quantities of mineral materials contracted for and that the Government is receiving proper compensation.

Lastly, we found that BLM may be losing revenues due to unauthorized use. BLM did not collect fees for mineral materials used on lands it sold to a private developer and informally valued the unpaid fees for these materials at more than $1 million. We are concerned that similar instances of unauthorized use could be occurring on other properties sold and that the Federal Government is potentially losing millions of dollars in revenues.

We offered 15 recommendations focused on updating and changing outdated or conflicting regulations, ensuring that BLM recovers contract-processing costs, verifying the volume of mineral materials removed from Federal lands, and limiting opportunities of unauthorized removal of mineral materials that, if implemented, should enhance BLM’s management of the mineral materials program. BLM agreed with 14 of our 15 recommendations.
Inspection Reveals Potential Problems With the Office of the Solicitor’s Equipment Accountability

We completed an inspection to determine whether DOI’s Office of the Solicitor (SOL) could account for all of the Dell thin client computers it purchased to facilitate Cloud-based computing for its employees. Overall, we identified several issues that could result in waste and mismanagement of the computers purchased.

Thin client computers are designed for Cloud-based interface. All data is stored in an external server, and the computers allow users to access shared data through a special network. Software is loaded onto the computers, but they have no capacity for data storage. These computers are significantly cheaper to purchase per unit than traditional desktops or laptops, but require more space on the storage-area network. Between 2009 and 2011, SOL purchased 140 thin client computers, at a cost of $51,363, to distribute to its staff.

We found that SOL could not locate 11 of the 140 computers and had issued only 8 computers to its staff. SOL has stored the remaining computers in a storage room in the Main Interior Building since they were purchased. In addition, SOL has not performed a complete physical inventory of the computers and did not attach inventory identification tags to them until 2 years after the purchase. Finally, we found that information about the computers on SOL’s inventory list was incomplete and inaccurate and that SOL is not following departmental procedures for equipment management and acquisition.

We made four recommendations to improve SOL’s equipment accountability. We recommended that SOL fully inventory the thin client computers, follow DOI procedures for equipment management and acquisition, appropriately record the loss of the missing computers, and decide whether to issue the remaining computers or to designate them as excess equipment.

Administrative Costs Associated With UMWAF Appear Reasonable

We inspected the United Mine Workers of America Health and Retirement Funds (UMWAF) to review concerns expressed by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) about increasing administrative costs associated with the funds. OSM also expressed concerns about its authority to provide programmatic oversight of the trusts related to UMWAF to ensure that funds are spent appropriately. Our inspection found that the administrative costs appear reasonable.

As of fiscal year 2012, UMWAF provided healthcare to 31,871 retired union coal-mine workers and their dependents for a total cost of $392,263,098. Three primary trusts provide coverage for health benefits: the Combined Benefit Fund, the 1992 Benefit Plan, and the 1993 Benefit Plan. UMWAF and OSM operate under a memorandum of understanding that outlines the responsibilities of both parties under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act.
The Act created the Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) fund, managed by OSM, to pay for the cleanup of mine lands and requires that interest from the AML fund be transferred to the three trusts to support healthcare benefits. At the beginning of each fiscal year, UMWAF submits a funding request that details projected costs to OSM. OSM then transfers interest earned from the AML fund to support UMWAF, and adjustments are made at the end of the year based on actual expenditures. In the event that interest generated does not cover expenses, the three trusts are entitled to payments from the U.S. Treasury, subject to a $490 million cap on all combined annual transfers from the Treasury and the AML fund.

Despite OSM's concern of increasing administrative costs associated with UMWAF, our inspection found that these administrative costs are at or below the 12 percent observed in private industry. Based on the data we reviewed, we concluded that the administrative costs appear reasonable.

We also found that the Act does not expressly require OSM to oversee management of UMWAF, including how the administrative costs are spent. The law only requires OSM to make payments to the three health trusts. The current memorandum of understanding between OSM and UMWAF, however, provides OSM some monitoring rights and allows OSM to receive and review audited annual financial statements and monthly unaudited statements, both provided by UMWAF.

Although the funding of UMWAF falls under the auspices of OSM, it has no direct programmatic oversight to ensure that money transferred from the AML fund is used for the intended purpose. We recommended that OSM negotiate more specific provisions for programmatic oversight when the current memorandum of understanding expires at the end of fiscal year 2014, or seek to adopt regulations under the Act that provide for additional oversight authority.

**OIG Disagrees That Certain CIAP Projects Provided Coastal Benefit**

In our October 2013 Semiannual Report to Congress, we reported the findings of our audit of the management of Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) grants awarded to the State of Mississippi. During the audit, we identified certain CIAP grants that did not meet requirements set forth by the Energy Policy Act of 2005.
The Act required grant recipients to use all grant funds for at least one of five authorized uses:

- Projects and activities for the conservation, protection, or restoration of coastal areas, including wetland (AU1);
- Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife, or natural resources (AU2);
- Planning assistance and the administrative costs of complying with CIAP requirements (AU3);
- Implementation of a federally approved marine, coastal, or comprehensive conservation plan (AU4); and
- Mitigation of the impact of Outer Continental Shelf activities through funding of onshore infrastructure projects and public service needs (AU5).

We found, however, that seven different grant projects should not have been approved because these projects had little or no relevance to the preservation of the coastal areas. Examples of these projects include the Ohr-O’Keefe Museum of Art, which received funding under AU1 to install six skylights and construct a living laboratory, where less than 4 percent of CIAP funds were used for conservation purposes; the Old Wire Road Trail, which received funding under AU1 for an asphalt trail with interpretive signs in a landlocked county, where only about 2 percent of the grant was budgeted for conservation purposes; and the Infinity Science Center, which received funding under AU1 to construct a general-purpose classroom at a NASA facility.

As a result, we questioned almost $5.9 million in ineligible costs and funds to be put to better use and recommended that DOI’s Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget (PMB) resolve the costs. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), which manages CIAP, did not concur with this recommendation.

FWS acknowledged that not all aspects of the projects we identified directly benefitted coastal resources, but it noted that each project contained components that clearly fulfilled the requirements of the authorized uses. FWS also stated that the completion of these projects provided a greater overall good than is quantified in the individual awards, which in many cases funded only a small portion of a larger construction project intended to benefit the public. Therefore, FWS stated that each of these projects met the authorized use for which grant money was awarded.

In January 2014, PMB’s Office of Financial Management reviewed documentation provided by FWS to close this recommendation and agreed with FWS that the seven projects we questioned did support one of the five authorized uses and provide either direct or indirect benefits to the natural coastal environment.
We disagree with the position of both FWS and PMB. While these projects may provide a public good and may deserve public funding, we do not believe there is sufficient justification for CIAP to provide that funding. We acknowledge that certain aspects of these projects do appear to meet the requirements under AU1, such as the planting of native vegetation or coastal conservation, but these aspects often represent a minor portion of the overall funding. The fact that a small portion of a project may serve for the conservation, protection, or restoration of coastal areas does not justify substantial additional funding that falls outside of those parameters, causing us to question whether any of these projects that we initially determined to provide little or no direct benefit to the natural coastal environment were designed or completed in the spirit of the Act.

The Gulf of Mexico from a beach near Biloxi, MS
Office of Investigations

Big Sandy Oil Company Settled Allegations Related to the False Claims Act

In conjunction with the Bureau of Land Management’s Special Investigations Group, we determined that Big Sandy Oil Company, an oil and gas operator based in Franklin, PA, only sporadically paid royalties from 1990 through 2005 and failed to pay any royalties from 2005 through 2013 for oil produced from two parcels of land in the Allegheny National Forest in Warren County, PA.

Big Sandy Oil Company agreed to pay the United States $73,606.75 to settle allegations that it violated the False Claims Act by knowingly failing to pay oil royalties it owed to the Federal Government. The settlement was fully executed on January 2, 2014.

Contractors Guilty of Defrauding Oil Lease Investors

OIG and the FBI conducted a joint investigation into allegations that Mike Alfons Campa, owner of Domestic Energy Solutions, engaged in a fraudulent oil lease investment scheme on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation. The Bureau of Indian Affairs provided us with a copy of a March 7, 2011 letter from Campa, acting under the alias Mike Heretel, to an investor in which Campa purported that a $4,000 investment entitled the investor to a 0.5 percent ownership in Domestic Energy Solutions and all income generated from three specific oil leases on the Reservation. Fort Peck Agency personnel confirmed that Campa did not own the oil leases referenced in the letter.

Our investigation determined that Campa and five others—Suzette Gulyas Gal, Andras Zoltan Gal, Steven William Carpenter, Krisztian Zoltan George Gal, and Dana Yvonne Kent—solicited approximately $675,406 from investors in connection with their fraudulent oil and gas leases on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation. On September 5, 2012, a Federal Grand Jury in the U.S. District Court for the District of Montana indicted the six individuals, charging each defendant with one count of conspiracy, one count of mail fraud, and one count of wire fraud.

Kent pleaded guilty on January 2, 2013, to one count of wire fraud. On April 2, 2013, she was sentenced to 18 months in Federal prison and 1 year of supervised release and ordered to pay $101,490 in restitution jointly and severally.

On April 22, 2013, Mike Campa pleaded guilty to all three counts of the indictment. On January 30, 2014, Campa was sentenced to 30 years in Federal prison, followed by 3 years of supervised release, and ordered to pay $5,175,406.62 in restitution jointly and severally with the other defendants in this case. The restitution amount was determined based on two frauds that Campa had perpetrated concurrently.
In the oil-lease scam we investigated, he took $675,406 from investors. During our investigation, we also uncovered a second fraud in which Campa had taken $4.5 million from an investor for a phony gold mine in Arizona. Campa was also sentenced to 6 months in Federal prison for contempt of court, which will be served concurrently with his 30-year sentence. On January 30, 2014, Campa filed his notice of appeal to the ninth circuit.

On May 1, 2013, a jury found Suzette Gulyas Gal, Andras Zoltan Gal, and Carpenter guilty of all three counts in the indictment. The jury found Krisztian Zoltan George Gal guilty of conspiracy but acquitted him of the mail and wire fraud charges.

On August 26, 2013, Suzette Gulyas Gal was sentenced to 10 years in Federal prison and 3 years of supervised release and ordered to pay $675,406 in restitution jointly and severally with the other defendants. She was also ordered to pay $4.5 million in restitution jointly and severally with Campa and Krisztian Zoltan George Gal.

Also on August 26, 2013, Carpenter was sentenced to 15 years and 8 months in Federal prison and 3 years of supervised release and ordered to pay $675,406 in restitution jointly and severally with the other defendants. On August 30, 2013, Andras Zoltan Gal was sentenced to 6 years in Federal prison and 2 years of supervised release and ordered to pay $675,406 in restitution jointly and severally with the other defendants. Carpenter and Andras Zoltan Gal both filed notices of appeal to the ninth circuit on August 30, 2013, and September 9, 2013, respectively.

On December 20, 2013, Krisztian Zoltan George Gal was sentenced to 5 years in Federal prison and 2 years of supervised release and ordered to pay $675,406 in restitution jointly and severally with the other defendants. Krisztian Zoltan George Gal also filed a notice of appeal to the ninth circuit on December 23, 2013.

**Drilling Company Sentenced for Making and Delivering False Writings**

We investigated Stone Energy Corporation (SEC) and Helmerich and Payne International Drilling Company (H&P) for falsifying blowout preventer tests. SEC operated a Federal lease, which authorized the company to produce minerals from the Outer Continental Shelf, and SEC contracted H&P to drill multiple oil wells within the Gulf of Mexico. Federal regulations required SEC and H&P to maintain well control at all times. In order to meet this mandate, the companies were specifically required to pressure test the blowout preventer system.

Our investigation determined that on at least six occasions between February 14, 2010, and May 8, 2010, H&P knowingly falsified blowout preventer system test results. On November 8, 2013, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana sentenced H&P to 3 years of probation and ordered it to pay a $6.4 million fine and a $125 assessment based on a plea agreement in which the company agreed to plead guilty to one count of knowingly making and delivering false writings.
Deepwater Horizon Task Force

As we have done for the past 4 years, we continue to provide resources to the Deepwater Horizon Task Force that was formed to investigate the worst environmental catastrophe in United States history. On the evening of April 20, 2010, the Deepwater Horizon offshore drilling rig exploded off the coast of Louisiana, killing 11 men. Shortly thereafter, the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) formed the task force, consisting of various law enforcement agencies, to investigate the disaster. DOJ asked us to join the task force because of our unique expertise in oil and gas exploration issues. During the peak of the investigation, we assigned 10 special agents, 2 auditors, and 2 computer forensic specialists to the task force.

As a result of the task force’s investigation, three companies—BP, Transocean, and Halliburton—have pleaded guilty and paid almost $4.5 billion in fines, penalties, and contributions. In November 2012, BP agreed to plead guilty to 11 counts of manslaughter, 1 count of obstruction of Congress, and 2 other charges. They also agreed to pay $1.26 billion in criminal fines and another $2.74 billion in penalties. Two months later, Transocean, the drilling contractor that owned the Deepwater Horizon, pleaded guilty to one criminal charge and agreed to pay $400 million in criminal fines and penalties. Lastly, in September 2013, Halliburton, which provided contract cementing services to BP, pleaded guilty to a charge concerning the destruction of evidence and paid the maximum statutory fine of $200,000. Halliburton also made a voluntary and unconditional contribution of $55 million to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

Cleanup efforts in the Gulf of Mexico following the Deepwater Horizon explosion and oil spill.
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Five individuals have also been charged in this case. On December 18, 2013, a jury in New Orleans, LA, convicted Kurt Mix, a former BP engineer, of intentionally destroying evidence related to the oil spill. In January 2014, Anthony Badalamenti, a former Halliburton manager, was sentenced to 1 year of probation after pleading guilty to destroying evidence related to the case. Obstruction and false statements charges are pending against former BP executive David Rainey, and manslaughter and other charges remain against former BP wellsite leaders Donald Vidrine and Robert Kaluza.

We will continue to provide resources to the task force until all of the pending cases have been adjudicated.

**Mississippi State Employees Indicted for Theft of Federal Funds**

Subsequent to our audit of Coastal Impact Assistance Program funds awarded to the State of Mississippi, OIG and the FBI initiated a joint investigation to determine if issues found during the audit violated Federal law.

We found that Mississippi Department of Marine Resources (DMR) employees, including DMR Executive Director William Walker; Chief of Staff Joseph Zeigler; Coastal Management and Planning Director Sheila “Tina” Shumate; and Walker’s son, Scott, conspired to deposit Federal funds into the bank account of the Mississippi Marine Resources Foundation—a private, nonprofit corporation created by William Walker—and then used those funds for personal gains, such as real estate transactions.

On November 5, 2013, a Southern District of Mississippi Grand Jury indicted William Walker, Scott Walker, and Shumate on one count of theft concerning programs receiving Federal funds and one count of conspiracy to commit such theft. William Walker, Scott Walker, and Zeigler were also indicted on multiple counts of mail fraud and conspiracy to commit mail fraud.

On February 20, 2014, Scott Walker pleaded guilty to one count of theft and one count of conspiracy. William Walker pleaded guilty on March 10, 2014, to one count of conspiracy. Sentencing dates will be scheduled.

**BIA Firefighters Indicted for Theft of Federal Funds, False Statements**

We investigated several Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) wildland firefighters at Pine Ridge Agency (PRA) in Pine Ridge, SD, for working unnecessary overtime hours and falsifying official records on firefighter physical fitness tests in 2009.

Our investigation found that PRA Deputy Superintendent Harold Compton was required to pass the arduous duty pack test—which requires firefighters to carry a 45-pound backpack and walk 3 miles in less than 45 minutes—in order to serve and collect pay in 2009 as a collateral duty wildland firefighter.
In an interview with OIG investigators, PRA Supervisory Wildland Fire Operations Specialist Michael Twiss knowingly provided false information when he said that he administered the test to Compton in 2009 when in fact he had not. We further determined that, at the request of PRA Fire Management Officer Daigre Douville, Twiss entered false test results for Compton in the Incident Qualification Certification System, an electronic system that shares firefighter training certification data with all Federal wildland firefighting agencies.

We also identified overtime hours claimed in 2009 by Twiss, Douville, and Compton in which they received $29,000, $56,000, and $30,000, respectively, and found that they did not need to work the overtime for which BIA paid them.


**BIA Firefighter Pledged Guilty to Theft of Federal Funds**

We investigated Christopher Menard, a Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) wildland firefighter at Rosebud Agency in Rosebud, SD, for using BIA-owned firefighting vehicle credit cards twice in December 2012 and once in January 2013. Menard purchased about $150 dollars in fuel for his personal vehicle and provided false answers when questioned by his supervisor about those transactions.

Menard was indicted on June 12, 2013, on one count of theft of Government property and one count of making false statements. We arrested Menard on June 25, 2013, and he was released the same day at the conclusion of his initial appearance. BIA issued Menard a written reprimand and suspended him without pay indefinitely, effective July 17, 2013. Menard pleaded guilty to the theft charge, and his plea agreement was filed in the U.S. District Court in Pierre, SD, on August 1, 2013. On November 1, 2013, Menard formally pleaded guilty to theft, and he was sentenced on the same date to pay $150.08 in restitution, $350 in fines, and a $25 special assessment. Menard resigned from his position with BIA on November 4, 2013, as a result of his conviction.

**Mining Company Owner Pledged Guilty to False Statements**

We investigated Kimberly Onuma, the owner of Sunset Valley Mining Company after receiving information from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) that Onuma submitted fraudulent waivers for the annual maintenance fee for mining claims filed with the Montana State Office.
According to BLM, Onuma sent copies of Limited Power of Attorney documents listing herself as the registered agent of various companies to the Montana State Office. Connie Schaff, a BLM Land Law Examiner, said BLM confirmed that at least one of the Limited Power of Attorney documents submitted by Onuma was a fraudulent document.

We substantiated the allegation that Onuma submitted at least one fraudulent Limited Power of Attorney document to the Montana State Office in connection with maintenance fee waiver certifications. In addition, we found that Onuma submitted nine of these fraudulent documents to the California State Office. In August 2010, Onuma filed waiver certifications totaling $6,720 to the Montana State Office and $6,860 to the California State Office; BLM denied all waivers.

We found that in 2011, Onuma submitted additional fraudulent documents to both the Montana and California State Offices and the Oregon State Office in connection with mining claim location notices. A Federal Grand Jury in Billings, MT, indicted Onuma on September 20, 2013, on seven counts of false statements and one count of aggravated identity theft for misrepresenting herself on the documents submitted. On January 21, 2014, Onuma pleaded guilty to one count of false statements, and pursuant to the agreement with the U.S. Attorney’s Office, all other counts were dismissed.
**Tribal CEO and Montana Contractor Indicted for Bribery and False Claims in Connection With Water Project**

We investigated a Chippewa Cree Tribe official and a Montana contractor in a bribery scheme to obtain subcontracts for the Rocky Boy’s/North Central Montana Rural Water System, a federally funded construction project awarded to the Tribe by the Bureau of Reclamation. This investigation resulted in two Federal Grand Jury indictments.

In the first indictment, handed down on September 20, 2013, the two owners of Hunter Burns Construction, LLC, Hunter Burns and James Eastlick Jr., were accused of paying $135,000 in bribes to Tony Belcourt, the Chief Executive Officer of the Chippewa Cree Construction Corporation (CCCC), in connection with the award of four construction contracts exceeding $700,000. Our investigation found that Hunter Burns Construction was created in June 2009, and in that same month, Tony Belcourt, who also served as the CCCC contracting officer, awarded a $361,000 contract to Hunter Burns Construction. The indictment alleged that in August 2009, Hunter Burns Construction paid Belcourt’s wife, Hailey Belcourt, $35,000 from proceeds of one of the progress payments remitted against this contract. Our investigation also found that between August and October 2009, Tony Belcourt awarded Hunter Burns Construction three more contracts worth $352,000. The indictment further alleged that within days of receiving another progress payment in November 2009, Hunter Burns Construction paid Hailey Belcourt $100,000.

On October 18, 2013, a Federal Grand Jury returned a second indictment against Tony Belcourt, Hunter Burns Construction, Hunter Burns, and James Eastlick Jr., alleging that they were involved in a criminal conspiracy to submit false claims in connection with a $100,000 claim related to the Rocky Boy’s/North Central Montana Regional Water System submitted by Hunter Burns Construction in April 2010.

**Montana Contractor Charged with Bribery Subsequently Charged with Bankruptcy Fraud**

We investigated Tammy Leischner, the owner of T Leischner Consulting; her husband, Mark Leischner; and her father, James H. Eastlick Sr., for their roles in bribing Chippewa Cree Tribe Contracting Officer Tony Belcourt and determined that the three bribed Belcourt with $163,000.

In January 2010, T Leischner Consulting received a $495,000 shipping contract to ship steel pipe from Denver, CO, to the Rocky Boy’s/North Central Montana Rural Water System job site in Montana. We found that Tony Belcourt authorized two payments against the shipping contract totaling $660,000, an overpayment of $165,000. We confirmed that the Bureau of Reclamation provided these funds to the Chippewa Cree Tribe through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.
On September 20, 2013, a Federal Grand Jury in Billings, MT, indicted Tammy Leischner and James Eastlick, Sr., citing that in March 2010, they wire transferred $101,000 to Tony Belcourt’s company, M T Waterworks. The indictment further alleged that in July 2010, Tammy Leischner, aided and abetted by Mark Leischner, provided a $62,000 cashier’s check to Tony Belcourt’s wife, Hailey.

On November 22, 2013, a Federal Grand Jury in Billings, MT, indicted Tammy and Mark Leischner on one count of bankruptcy fraud and one count of false bankruptcy declaration relating to their bankruptcy filing of October 2012. The trial for this matter has been scheduled for June 16, 2014, in Billings, MT.

**Tribal CEO and Wife Charged with Bank Fraud, Money Laundering, and Tax Fraud**

A Federal Grand Jury in the U.S. District Court for the District of Montana returned two indictments in March 2014 charging Tony Belcourt, the chief executive officer and contracting officer of the Chippewa Cree Construction Corporation (CCCC) and his wife, Hailey, with bank fraud, money laundering, and tax fraud in connection with a bribery scheme wherein they received cash kickbacks from two contractors who Tony Belcourt had awarded subcontracts.

As we noted in a prior investigative case report, Tony Belcourt awarded subcontracts to Hunter Burns Construction, LLC, and T Leischner Consulting in connection with the Rocky Boy’s/North Central Montana Rural Water System, a federally funded construction project managed by the Chippewa Cree Tribe pursuant to a Public Law 93-638 Indian Self Determination contract with the Bureau of Reclamation.

In the first indictment, on March 20, 2014, a Federal Grand Jury indicted the Belcourts on two counts, including Federal income tax fraud and filing false individual income tax returns for tax years 2009 and 2010. For the 2009 tax return, the indictment stated that the Belcourts failed to disclose $135,000 in direct payments that Hailey Belcourt received from Hunter Burns Construction in 2009. The couple is also charged with failing to disclose $62,062 that Hailey Belcourt received from T Leischner Consulting in tax year 2010.

In the second indictment, on March 20, 2014, the Grand Jury also indicted Tony and Hailey Belcourt on three counts, including conspiracy, bank fraud, and money laundering in October 2009 when they concealed their sale of 182 steer calves pledged as security for a series of bank loans provided to them in connection with their cattle-ranching operation. We determined that checks remitted toward the purchase of these livestock were issued payable to Hailey Belcourt’s father, Paul Hanson, in an effort to conceal the disposition of the livestock from the bank and prevent the bank from applying those funds toward the outstanding loans.
**Tribal CEO and Montana Contractor Indicted for Bribery and Wire Fraud**

We investigated Shad Huston and his two companies, K&N Consulting and TMP Services; Tony Belcourt, the chief executive officer and contracting officer for the Chippewa Cree Construction Corporation (CCCC); and Tony Belcourt’s wife, Hailey.

Our investigation resulted in a Federal Grand Jury indictment alleging various counts of criminal conspiracy to embezzle Federal and tribal funds from the Chippewa Cree Tribe. The indictment included 14 criminal violations, including conspiracy to defraud the Federal Government, theft of Federal and tribal funds, bribery, and wire fraud.

The indictment detailed a wire fraud and bribery scheme wherein Tony and Hailey Belcourt personally received $322,500 either directly from Shad Huston or from his companies between June and December 2011. During that same time frame, Tony Belcourt, in his capacity as chief executive officer and contracting officer for CCCC and incident commander for the Chippewa Cree Tribe, authorized contract payments to Shad Huston’s companies. We identified nine companies owned or operated by Huston that contracted with either the Chippewa Cree Tribe, CCCC, or both.

**Guam Contractor Sentenced for Wire Fraud**

We investigated Cynthia De Castro, an operations manager and responsible management employee at CHB International, Inc. (CHB). DOI contracted with CHB to supply and install emergency generators and shelters for five public schools in Guam.
De Castro held numerous contractor license classifications, including one covering the installation of generators and shelters. De Castro was responsible for ensuring compliance with the plans, specifications, building codes, and laws of Guam.

We determined that De Castro knew that the generators she supplied had to meet U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards. We found that De Castro devised a scheme to defraud the Government of Guam and DOI by charging and receiving money for generators that she knew were manufactured in China and did not meet the EPA standards.

On March 17, 2014, the U.S. District Court of Guam sentenced De Castro to 5 years of probation after she pleaded guilty to one count of wire fraud. She was also ordered to pay $70,738.33 in restitution to the Government of Guam.

**BIA Employee Suspended for Improperly Approving Contract Modifications**

We investigated a supervisory civil engineer in the Bureau of Indian Affairs’ (BIA) Division of Transportation after receiving allegations that he had approved modifications to road construction projects funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act on the Wind River Indian Reservation without proper approval.

In September 2009, BIA entered into 21 road construction projects funded by the Act with the Joint Business Council of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes valued at almost $5.5 million. By May 4, 2011, the civil engineer had approved 38 modifications to the projects; each of the 21 projects had at least one modification. He said he did this to reprogram funds from one contract to another to cover cost overruns, but he did not inform the awarding official of the cost overruns or of the modifications. The civil engineer, however, did not have authority to approve modifications to any Government contract. We also found that in August 2012, he submitted false inspection reports to the awarding official for 11 of the 21 road construction projects funded by the Act.

We referred our investigative findings to BIA for any actions deemed appropriate. In February 2014, BIA suspended the civil engineer for 14 days without pay for overstepping his authority, falsifying or misrepresenting official Government records, and carelessly performing his official duties.

**Former Director of Tribe Forestry Sentenced for Embezzlement**

OIG, with the FBI and the Del Norte County District Attorney’s Office in Crescent City, CA, jointly investigated Roland Raymond, the former director of the Yurok Tribe Forestry for embezzling from the Tribe by submitting false invoices through Mad River Biologists, a biological consulting firm contracted by the Tribe to conduct scientific assessments and environmental projects in support of Endangered Species Act projects.
The U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Northern District of California charged Raymond on January 11, 2013, with conspiracy to commit embezzlement and theft from an Indian tribal organization. On May 21, 2013, Raymond pleaded guilty to embezzling approximately $850,000 in funds that the Bureau of Indian Affairs had awarded to the Yurok Tribe for scientific and environmental contracts. Raymond admitted to conspiring with Mad River Biologists’ owner, Ronald LeValley, to steal the Tribe’s funds by creating false invoices for work that was unnecessary or never performed.

On January 13, 2014, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California sentenced Raymond to 37 months in prison and 3 years of supervision following his release. Raymond was also ordered to pay a $100 felony assessment, restitution in the amount of $752,000 to the Yurok Tribe, and $100,000 to the Great American Insurance Group Company, which insured Yurok Tribe’s fidelity and crime policy and its dishonesty claim as a result of Raymond’s negligence.

On February 11, 2014, LeValley pleaded guilty to one count of conspiracy to commit embezzlement and theft from Indian tribal organizations. LeValley admitted that he conspired with Raymond by inflating invoices submitted to the Yurok Tribe for his employees’ bonuses and billed the Tribe for biological fieldwork that his company never actually performed.

Employee Sentenced for Double-Payment Scheme

We investigated Kaylene Red Wolf, a former payroll clerk for Lodge Grass Public Schools, after receiving information alleging that Red Wolf paid herself double salary payments over a 6-month period in 2012.

We determined that from June 20, 2012, to August 21, 2012, Red Wolf issued herself double salary payments by advancing herself a portion of her normal paycheck between scheduled paydays and then paying herself her full salary on the scheduled payday. She paid herself an extra $3,848 through this scheme. Red Wolf admitted that she was not entitled to receive the full 80 hours of pay on the scheduled payday when she had already advanced herself pay for a portion of those hours.

We also found that between November 4, 2011, and June 12, 2012, Red Wolf paid herself an additional $6,154, which included pay for hours not worked and overpayments for holiday pay that she was not entitled to receive.

Former Tribal Chairman Sentenced for Theft

In January 2011, the FBI informed us of allegations concerning theft of tribal funds by members of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation after discovering that numerous credit card purchases appeared to have personally benefited individual Tribe members. In conjunction with the FBI, we investigated Michael Thomas, the former tribal chairman, and his brother, Steven Thomas, for theft from an Indian tribal organization.

On January 4, 2013, the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut indicted Michael Thomas on one count of theft from an Indian tribal organization and two counts of theft from an Indian tribal government receiving Federal funds. On July 24, 2013, a Federal jury found Michael Thomas guilty of all three counts. On November 19, 2013, Michael Thomas was sentenced to serve 18 months in prison and 36 months of probation and ordered to pay $108,342.02 in restitution and a special assessment of $300.

On October 3, 2013, Steven Thomas pleaded guilty to one count of theft from an Indian tribal government receiving Federal funds. Steven Thomas was sentenced on February 26, 2014, to 1 day in prison, which he had already served, and 2 years of supervised release. He was ordered to pay restitution in the amount of $177,604 and complete 200 hours of community service.

USBR Employee Plead Guilty to Receipt of Child Pornography

We investigated Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) employee Timothy Casey in response to a report that a DOI computer assigned to Casey had visited several sites suspected of hosting child pornography. Our investigation identified approximately 2,800 child pornography images and videos located in the network traffic and digital evidence associated with Casey’s Government-issued computer. We provided the images to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, which identified more than 80 known victims of sexual assault.

Casey admitted that he had used his Government computer to search for and view child pornography, which he knew was illegal. He provided a written statement and immediately resigned from USBR.

We referred this case to the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Eastern District of Washington for prosecution, which indicted Casey on charges of receipt and possession of child pornography on September 4, 2013. On November 7, 2013, Casey pleaded guilty to count one of the indictment for receipt of child pornography. On February 10, 2014, he was sentenced to 5 years in prison followed by 20 years of supervised release. He is also required to register as a sex offender.
NPS Volunteer Pleaded Guilty to Possession of Child Pornography

In a joint investigation with the National Park Service’s (NPS) Investigative Services Branch and the FBI, we investigated John Freitas for possessing child pornography. Freitas was an NPS volunteer through the Student Conservation Association at Kalaupapa National Historic Park on the island of Molokai, HI.

Using computer forensics evidence, we determined that Freitas had downloaded child pornography to his personal and Government-issued computers. On January 16, 2014, Freitas pleaded guilty to an indictment charging a single count of possession of child pornography.

BIE Employee Terminated After Stealing From Students

We investigated Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) employee Marcellina Tohonnie for embezzling account funds from Children Incorporated, an international nonprofit organization assisting needy children in the United States and abroad. As the school’s former Children Incorporated program coordinator, Tohonnie was entrusted with accepting and using donations to purchase basic necessities, such as clothing and school supplies, for the children enrolled in the program attending the Kaibeto Boarding School in Arizona.

Our investigation determined that Tohonnie stole $23,226 from accounts for 47 Native American students attending the school and used the funds to purchase clothing, salon visits, gifts, car repairs, and travel to Las Vegas, NV. On April 23, 2013, the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona convicted Tohonnie of one count of embezzlement from an Indian tribal organization and sentenced her to 5 years of supervised probation and ordered her to repay $23,226 in restitution to Children Incorporated. On January 27, 2014, BIE terminated Tohonnie’s employment.
**Former Professor Sentenced for Defrauding Federal Government**

We initiated a joint investigation with the Defense Criminal Investigative Service, an office within the U.S. Department of Defense Office of Inspector General, after receiving a complaint from the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) regarding a National Business Center contract awarded to the International Foundation for Science, Health, and the Environment. DCAA informed us of several allegations of false claims submitted by the foundation and its president, Dr. Alfred Y. Wong, a former University of California - Los Angeles (UCLA) physics professor.

The investigation substantiated that Wong submitted several false claims to the Government and UCLA. We also found that Wong defrauded the Federal Government of approximately $1.7 million on several Federal contracts between 2004 and 2008 by submitting false invoices, directing employees to work on his personal property, falsifying information provided to DCAA, defrauding UCLA, fraudulently billing the Government for work that was never performed, converting Government property to his own, and billing the Government for work unrelated to the contracts’ specifications.

We referred this case to the United States Attorney’s Office for the Central District of California for criminal and civil prosecution. On October 10, 2013, the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California sentenced Wong to 5 days in prison, 6 months of home confinement with electronic monitoring, 18 months of supervised probation, 300 hours of community service, a $150,000 fine, $136,000 in restitution to UCLA, and $1.4 million in civil fraud penalties and restitution to the Federal Government. Based on the conviction, Wong and the foundation were suspended and debarred from conducting business with the Government for a period of 5 years.
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Investigations Statistical Highlights
October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014

Investigative Activities
Cases Closed................................................................................................................................. 221
Cases Opened............................................................................................................................... 240
Complaints Received From All Sources....................................................................................... 296

Criminal Prosecution Activities
Indictments/Informations............................................................................................................... 25
Convictions.................................................................................................................................... 17
Sentencings.................................................................................................................................... 17
   Jail........................................................................................................................................... 547 months
   Community Service............................................................................................................... 403 hours
   Probation............................................................................................................................... 708 months
   Criminal Penalties........................................................................................................... $7,866,024
Criminal Matters Referred for Prosecution.................................................................................... 16
Criminal Matters Declined This Period............................................................................................ 9

Civil Investigative Activities
Civil Referrals................................................................................................................................... 1
Civil Declinations.............................................................................................................................. 5
Civil Settlements...................................................................................................................... 1: $1,400,000

Administrative Investigative Activities
Personnel Suspensions.............................................................................................................. 5: 62 days
Reprimands/Counseling................................................................................................................ 8
Removals.......................................................................................................................................... 3
Bill for Collection Issued......................................................................................................... 1: $866.22
Resignations/Retirements.......................................................................................................... 6
General Policy Actions............................................................................................................ 10
Contractor Suspensions............................................................................................................ 4
Contractor Debarments................................................................................................................ 19
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Statistical Highlights
October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014

Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Activities
Reports Issued.................................................................................................................................26
  Performance Audits, Financial Audits, Evaluations, Inspections, and Verifications..............17
  Contract and Grant Audits...........................................................................................................8
  Single Audit Quality Control Reviews........................................................................................1

Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Impacts
Total Monetary Impacts..................................................................................................$21,598,550
  Questioned Costs (includes unsupported costs)...............................................................$21,598,550
  Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use...........................................................$0

    Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Recommendations Made.................................103
    Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Recommendations Closed.............................46
Reports Issued During the 6-Month Reporting Period

This listing includes all audit, inspection, and evaluation reports issued during the 6-month period that ended March 31, 2014. It provides report number, title, issue date, and monetary amounts identified in each report (* Funds To Be Put to Better Use, ** Questioned Costs, and *** Unsupported Costs).

Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations

Bureau of Land Management

C-IN-BLM-0002-2012
Bureau of Land Management’s Mineral Materials Program (03/31/2014)

Bureau of Reclamation

ISD-IS-BOR-0004-2013
IT Security of the Glen Canyon Dam Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System (03/26/2014)

Indian Affairs

ER-IS-BIA-0011-2013
Bureau of Indian Affairs Real Property Leases (01/30/2014)

CR-IS-BIA-0001-2014
Records Management at Selected Bureau of Indian Affairs’ Agency Offices (01/31/2014)

ER-MA-BIA-0001-2014
Issues Identified During our Audit of Veteran Solutions, Inc., Under Contract No. SBK00080062 (02/26/2014)

Insular Areas

ER-EV-VIS-0004-2014
Verification of Watch Quota Data for Calendar Year 2013 Submitted by Belair Quartz, Inc., Located in the U.S. Virgin Islands (03/14/2014)
Multi-Office Assignments

**ER-SP-MOI-0012-2013**
Inspector General’s Statement Summarizing the Major Management and Performance Challenges Facing the U.S. Department of the Interior (12/03/2013)

**X-IN-MOA-0003-2013**

**X-IN-MOA-0005-2013**

**CR-EV-MOA-0004-2013**
Closeout Memo – Evaluation of the Department of the Interior’s Class II Underground Injection Well Activities (12/19/2013)

**ISD-IN-MOA-0001-2013**

**X-SP-MOI-0009-2014**
Progress Made by the U.S. Department of the Interior in Implementing Government Charge Card Recommendations (03/21/2014)

**CR-EV-MOA-0006-2012**
U.S. Department of the Interior’s Underground Injection Control Activities (03/31/2014)

Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians

**X-IN-OST-0007-2013**
Independent Auditors’ Reports on the Tribal and Other Trust Funds and Individual Indian Monies Trust Funds Financial Statements for FY2013 and FY2012 (11/18/2013)
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

ER-IS-OSM-0007-2013
United Mine Workers of America Health and Retirement Funds (Revised)
(12/13/2013)

Office of the Secretary

IU-IS-SOL-0004-2013
Thin Client ComputerInventory Verification at the Office of the Solicitor in the Main Interior Building (03/19/2014)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

X-IN-FWS-0004-2013
Independent Auditors’ Biennial Report on the Audit of Expenditures and Obligations Used by the Secretary of the Interior in the Administration of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000 for Fiscal Years 2011 Through 2012 (02/24/2014)

Contract and Grant Audits

Bureau of Reclamation

C-CX-BOR-0010-2013
Bureau of Reclamation Funding Agreements with Chippewa Cree Construction Corporation: R10AV60025 and 06NA602127 (12/16/2013)
***$1,174,801 ***$11,739,744

National Park Service

ZZ-CX-NPS-0004-2013
Audit of Interim Costs Claimed by Prizim, Inc., Under Contract No. P09PA60840 With the National Park Service (11/08/2013)
***$96,741 ***$3,553,606
**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**

**R-GR-FWS-0010-2013**
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program
Grants Awarded to the State of Wyoming, Game and Fish Department,
From July 1, 2010, Through June 30, 2012 (10/29/2013)

**R-GR-FWS-0008-2013**
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program
Grants Awarded to the State of Arkansas, Game and Fish Commission,
From July 1, 2010, Through June 30, 2012 (11/06/2013)
**$763,535 ** $33,949

**R-GR-FWS-0011-2013**
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program
Grants Awarded to the State of Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks
From July 1, 2010, Through June 30, 2012 (02/24/2014)
***$230,660

**R-GR-FWS-0003-2014**
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program
Grants Awarded to the State of North Carolina, Wildlife Resources Commission,
From July 1, 2011, Through June 30, 2013 (03/27/2014)

**R-GR-FWS-0013-2013**
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to
the State of North Carolina, Division of Marine Fisheries,
From July 1, 2010, Through June 30, 2012 (03/27/2014)

**U.S. Geological Survey**

**WR-CX-GSV-0023-2013**
Interim Costs Recorded by the Aerospace Corporation, Under Contract
No. G09PC00016 with the U.S. Geological Survey (12/27/2013)
**$91,372 ** $3,914,142

32
Single Audit Quality Control Review

Multi-Office Assignment

B-QC-MOA-0006-2013
Quality Control Review of Piltz, Williams, LaRosa & Company’s Single Audit of The Institute for Marine Mammal Studies, Inc., for the Fiscal Year Ending July 31, 2011 (03/31/2014)
# Monetary Resolution Activities

## Table 1: Inspector General Reports With Questioned Costs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>Questioned Costs*</th>
<th>Unsupported Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. For which no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,809,815</td>
<td>$1,350,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been made by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commencement of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reporting period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Which were issued</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$21,598,550</td>
<td>$19,472,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during the reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (A+B)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$24,408,365</td>
<td>$20,822,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For which a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,857,419</td>
<td>$969,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was made during the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reporting period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Dollar value of</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,205,619</td>
<td>$33,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>costs disallowed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Dollar value of</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,651,800</td>
<td>$935,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>costs allowed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. For which no</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$21,550,946</td>
<td>$19,852,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had been made by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of the reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Does not include non-Federal funds.
### Monetary Resolution Activities

#### Table II: Inspector General Reports With Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>Dollar Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Which were issued during the reporting period.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (A+B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Dollar value of recommendations that were agreed to by management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Dollar value of recommendations that were not agreed to by management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. For which no management decision had been made by the end of the reporting period.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Does not include non-Federal funds.
Summary of Reports More Than 6 Months Old Pending Management Decision

This listing includes a summary of audit, inspection, and evaluation reports that were more than 6 months old on March 31, 2014, and still pending a management decision. It provides report number, title, issue date, and number of unresolved recommendations.

Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations

Bureau of Reclamation

ISD-AT-BOR-0002-2012
IT Security of the Hoover Dam Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System (03/29/2013)
2 Recommendations

Indian Affairs

CR-EV-BIA-0001-2011
Oil and Gas Leasing in Indian Country: An Opportunity for Economic Development (09/24/2012)
1 Recommendation

WR-EV-BIA-0001-2012
Management of Social Services in BIA: Opportunity for Action (03/18/2013)
1 Recommendation

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

WR-EV-FWS-0003-2011
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Conservation Easement Monitoring and Enforcement (01/09/2012)
2 Recommendations
Contract and Grant Audits

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

K-CX-BOEM-0001-2013
Interim Cost Audit Claimed by Sonoma Technology, Inc., Under Contract No. M08PC20057 With the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (05/14/2013)
2 Recommendations; $238,915 unresolved

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

R-GR-FWS-0006-2013
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the District of Columbia, Department of the Environment, From October 1, 2009, Through September 30, 2011 (07/30/2013)
4 Recommendations; $6,000 unresolved

R-GR-FWS-0008-2004
15 Recommendations; $519,469 unresolved
Summary of Reports More Than 6 Months Old Pending Corrective Action

This is a listing of audit, inspection, and evaluation reports more than 6 months old with management decisions for which corrective action has not been completed. It provides report number, title, issue date, and the number of recommendations without final corrective action. These audits, inspections, and evaluations continue to be monitored by the Branch Chief for Internal Control and Audit Follow-up, Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, for completion of corrective action.

Bureau of Land Management

CR-EV-BLM-0001-2009
Evaluation Report of the Bureau of Land Management’s Oil and Gas Inspection and Enforcement Program (12/02/2010)
3 Recommendations

C-IS-BLM-0018-2010
Bureau of Land Management Wild Horse and Burro Program (12/13/2010)
3 Recommendations

CR-EV-BLM-0004-2010
2 Recommendations

ER-IS-BLM-0003-2012
Bureau of Land Management: Meadowood Equestrian Facility (09/27/2012)
2 Recommendations

CR-EV-BLM-0004-2012
Bureau of Land Management’s Geothermal Resources Management (03/07/2013)
4 Recommendations

CR-EV-BLM-0001-2012
13 Recommendations
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**WR-CA-BLM-0013-2013**
Cooperative Agreement No. JSA071001/L08AC13913 between the Utah Correctional Industries and the Bureau of Land Management (09/27/2013)
1 Recommendation

**Bureau of Ocean Energy Management**

**CR-EV-MMS-0015-2010**
15 Recommendations

**WR-IN-BOEM-0007-2013**
5 Recommendations

**CR-EV-BOEM-0001-2013**
3 Recommendations

**Bureau of Reclamation**

**C-IS-BOR-0006-2010**
Museum Collections: Preservation and Protection Issues with Collections Maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation (01/29/2010)
1 Recommendation

**WR-EV-BOR-0003-2012**
Central Valley Project, California: Repayment Status and Payoff (03/26/2013)
1 Recommendation

**ISD-AT-BOR-0002-2012**
IT Security of the Hoover Dam Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System (03/29/2013)
3 Recommendations
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**WR-IN-BOR-0004-2013**
GovTrip Use and Monitoring by the U.S. Department of the Interior – Bureau of Reclamation (09/09/2013)
9 Recommendations

**Indian Affairs**

**WR-EV-BIA-0002-2010**
Coordination of Efforts to Address Indian Land Fractionation (01/04/2011)
6 Recommendations

**ER-IS-BIA-0010-2011**
U.S. Department of the Interior Program Startup Inspection:
Bureau of Indian Affairs Youth Initiative Program (11/10/2011)
1 Recommendation

**WR-EV-BIA-0009-2012**
Indian Land Consolidation: Probate and Estate Planning Activities (08/16/2012)
2 Recommendations

**CR-IN-BIA-0001-2011**
Oil and Gas Leasing in Indian Country: An Opportunity for Economic Development (09/24/2012)
1 Recommendation

**WR-EV-BIA-0001-2012**
Management of Social Services in BIA: Opportunity for Action (03/18/2013)
6 Recommendations

**ER-CX-BIA-0005-2013**
Interim Cost Audit Claimed by Veteran Solutions, Inc., Under Contract No. SBK00080062 With the Bureau of Indian Affairs (09/12/2013)
1 Recommendation

**Multi-Office Assignments**

**2002-I-0045**
Recreational Fee Demonstration Program - National Park Service and Bureau of Land Management (08/19/2002)
1 Recommendation
C-IN-MOA-0049-2004
Department of the Interior Concessions Management (06/13/2005)
1 Recommendation

C-IN-MOA-0007-2005
U.S. Department of the Interior Radio Communications Program (01/30/2007)
5 Recommendations

W-IN-MOA-0086-2004
Proper Use of Cooperative Agreements Could Improve Interior’s Initiatives for Collaborative Partnerships (01/31/2007)
1 Recommendation

C-IN-MOA-0004-2007
Abandoned Mine Lands in the Department of the Interior (07/24/2008)
1 Recommendation

WR-EV-MOI-0008-2008
3 Recommendations

C-IN-MOA-0010-2008
Department of the Interior Museum Collections: Accountability and Preservation (12/16/2009)
7 Recommendations

CR-IS-MOA-0004-2009
BLM and MMS Beneficial Use Deductions (03/08/2010)
2 Recommendations

C-IN-MOA-0001-2009
Department of the Interior’s Management of Land Boundaries (07/16/2010)
1 Recommendation

ER-EV-MOA-0012-2009
Wildland Urban Interface: Community Assistance (07/30/2010)
3 Recommendations
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C-EV-MOA-0010-2010
Portable Nuclear Gauges (09/28/2011)
1 Recommendation

WR-EV-MOA-0004-2010
U.S. Department of the Interior’s Video Teleconferencing Usage (12/20/2011)
3 Recommendations

C-IN-MOA-0013-2010
16 Recommendations

C-EV-MOA-0009-2011
Controls over Check Writing (10/31/2012)
2 Recommendations

C-IN-MOA-0010-2011
Bureau of Land Management’s Helium Program (11/09/2012)
2 Recommendations

ISD-EV-MOA-0001-2012
13 Recommendations

X-IN-MOA-0002-2012
6 Recommendations

WR-EV-MOA-0015-2011
Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement’s Safety of Dams: Emergency Preparedness (12/27/2012)
5 Recommendations
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ER-IN-MOA-0013-2011
Management of the Coastal Impact Assistance Program, State of Mississippi
(06/27/2013)
14 Recommendations

ER-IN-MOA-0015-2011
U.S. Department of the Interior’s Landscape Conservation Cooperatives
(06/27/2013)
12 Recommendations

WR-IN-MOA-0006-2011
GovTrip Use and Monitoring by the U.S. Department of the Interior (09/09/2013)
13 Recommendations

WR-EV-MOA-0002-2013
Bureau of Indian Affairs and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Safety of Dams:
Emergency Preparedness (09/24/2013)
12 Recommendations

National Park Service

C-IN-NPS-0013-2004
The National Park Service’s Recording of Facility Maintenance Expenditures
(01/26/2005)
2 Recommendations

P-IN-NPS-0074-2004
Hawaii Volcanoes National Park: Improved Operations Should Enhance
Stewardship and Visitor Experience (03/31/2006)
3 Recommendations

WR-IS-NPS-0009-2013
NPS Contractor Oversight of Visitor Tent Cabins at Yosemite National Park
Involved in Hantavirus Outbreak (05/15/2013)
2 Recommendations

WR-IN-NPS-0008-2013
GovTrip Use and Monitoring by the U.S. Department of the Interior – National
Park Service (09/11/2013)
8 Recommendations
Office of Natural Resources Revenue

**CR-MA-ONRR-0003-2012**
Civil Penalty Sharing Provisions of 30 U.S.C. § 1736 for Federal Oil and Gas Leases (05/01/2012)
1 Recommendation

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

**ER-IS-OSM-0011-2011**
U.S. Department of the Interior Program Startup Inspection: Office of Surface Mining Appalachian Regional Reforestation Initiative (11/10/2011)
1 Recommendation

**WR-IN-OSM-0014-2012**
GovTrip Use and Monitoring by the U.S. Department of the Interior – Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (05/21/2013)
1 Recommendation

**IU-IS-OSM-0002-2013**
Enforcement of Approximate Original Contour in Oklahoma by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (08/05/2013)
3 Recommendations

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**C-IN-FWS-0009-2007**
Fish and Wildlife Service: Jackson National Fish Hatchery In Need of Immediate Action (05/08/2007)
1 Recommendation

**C-IS-FWS-0007-2010**
Museum Collections: Preservation and Protection Issues with Collections Maintained by the Fish and Wildlife Service (01/29/2010)
2 Recommendations

**NM-EV-FWS-0001-2010**
The National Bison Range (03/30/2011)
1 Recommendation
WR-EV-FWS-0003-2011
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Conservation Easement Monitoring and
Enforcement (01/09/2012)
2 Recommendations

U.S. Geological Survey

ER-CX-GSV-0002-2013
Interim Cost Audit Claimed by ASRC Research and Technology Under Contract
No. 08PC91508 With the U.S. Geological Survey (03/22/2013)
1 Recommendation
OIG Peer Reviews

Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations
The Amtrak OIG is currently conducting a peer review of our system of quality control for the year ending September 30, 2013. Amtrak OIG has not yet issued its final report, but it indicated in its draft report that we have received a rating of pass. Amtrak OIG did, however, make several preliminary recommendations to improve our system of quality control; we are considering these recommendations.

Investigations
The U.S. Department of the Treasury OIG conducted a peer review of our investigative function for the period ending November 19, 2010. The peer review found that the system of internal safeguards and management procedures for our investigative function complied with the quality standards established by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency and the “Attorney General’s Guidelines for Office of Inspectors General with Statutory Law Enforcement Authority.”
## Cross-References to the Inspector General Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4(a)(2)</th>
<th>Review of Legislation and Regulations</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(1)</td>
<td>Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies</td>
<td>2-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(2)</td>
<td>Recommendations for Corrective Action With Respect to Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies</td>
<td>2-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(3)</td>
<td>Significant Recommendations From Agency’s Previous Reports on Which Corrective Action Has Not Been Completed</td>
<td>38-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(4)</td>
<td>Matters Referred to Prosecutive Authorities and Resulting Convictions</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(5)</td>
<td>Matters Reported to the Head of the Agency</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(6)</td>
<td>Audit Reports Issued During the Reporting Period</td>
<td>29-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(7)</td>
<td>Summary of Significant Reports</td>
<td>2-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(8)</td>
<td>Statistical Table: Questioned Costs</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(9)</td>
<td>Statistical Table: Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(10)</td>
<td>Summary of Audit Reports Issued Before the Commencement of the Reporting Period for Which No Management Decision Has Been Made</td>
<td>36-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(11)</td>
<td>Significant Revised Management Decisions Made During the Reporting Period</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(12)</td>
<td>Significant Management Decisions With Which the Inspector General is in Disagreement</td>
<td>9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(13)</td>
<td>Information Described Under Section 804(b) of the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N/A: Not applicable to this reporting period.*
**Cross-References to the Inspector General Act**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 14(A)</th>
<th>Results of Peer Reviews Conducted by Another Office of Inspector General During the Reporting Period</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 14(B)</td>
<td>Most Recent Peer Review Conducted by Another Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 15</td>
<td>Outstanding Recommendations From Any Peer Review Conducted by Another Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 16</td>
<td>Peer Reviews Completed of Another Office of Inspector General During the Reporting Period or Previous Recommendations That Have Not Been Fully Implemented</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N/A: Not applicable to this reporting period.*