Highlights

Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations

**Impacts**

- **$461,939** Questioned Costs
- **$72,199** Unsupported Costs
- **182** Recommendations Closed
- **55** Recommendations Made

**Reports Issued**

- 6 Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations
- 5 Contract and Grant Audits
- 8 Other Assignment Types
**Investigations**

**Highlights**

**Criminal Prosecution Activities**

- Indictments/Informations: 6
- Convictions: 12
- Sentencings: 7
- Criminal Matters Referred for Prosecution: 26
- Criminal Declinations: 22

**Civil Activities**

- Civil Settlements: $6,175,172
- Civil Referrals: 8
- Civil Declinations: 4

**Administrative Investigative Activities**

- Personnel Actions: 15
- Debarments: 8
- Royalty Regulatory Penalty: $151,542.09
- General Policy Actions: 6
- Suspension: 1

**Investigative Activities**

- Complaints Received: 505
- Investigations Opened: 63
- Investigations Closed: 49
- Complaints Referred to the Department: 222
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OUR OPERATING PRINCIPLES

As the Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), we provide independent oversight and promote excellence, integrity, and accountability within the programs, operations, and management of the DOI by conducting audits, inspections, evaluations, and investigations.

We keep the Secretary and Congress informed of problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of DOI programs and operations. As a result of us fulfilling these responsibilities, Americans can expect greater accountability and integrity in Government program administration.

Our core values define a shared OIG way, guiding employee behavior and decisions at all levels. Adhering to these values—objectivity and independence, integrity, and getting results—we build a foundation to develop trustworthy information that improves the DOI.

- **Objectivity and independence** define us and are the bedrock of our credibility. These concepts are closely related. Independence impairments impact objectivity. The OIG and its employees must remain independent from undue outside influence and approach work with intellectual honesty.

- **Integrity** is a character trait as well as a way of doing business. By acting with integrity in all we do, we build trust and a reputation for producing actionable and accurate work.

- **Getting results** depends on individual and team efforts. We positively impact the DOI by detecting fraud and other wrongdoing; deterring unethical behavior and preventing deleterious outcomes; confirming that programs achieved intended results and were fiscally responsible; and highlighting effective practices.
A Message From Inspector General Mark L. Greenblatt

As the newly appointed Inspector General for the U.S. Department of the Interior, it is my pleasure to submit this semiannual report detailing the work we completed between April 1 and September 30, 2019.

Over my first few months with the DOI OIG, I have developed a deep appreciation for this office: the committed team, sophisticated work products, and valuable involvement in the IG community are inspiring. All of that, combined with the Department’s crucial and expansive mission, adds up to a remarkable opportunity to make significant, positive change for our country.

During this reporting period, our Office of Investigations has substantiated allegations of illegal bidding on Government contracts, theft, fraud, sexual harassment, mineral trespass, and violations of Government property policy. Our work has resulted in 214 months of imprisonment or probation and nearly $6.5 million in criminal fines, restitution, or special assessments and civil settlements.

In addition, our Office of Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations has overseen millions of American tax dollars in contracts and grants. Specifically, in performing five audits on States’ use of Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program grant funds, we identified $461,939 in questioned costs. The office also made 55 recommendations to the Department that, if implemented, will improve its programs and operations, including 11 recommendations to help the Department prevent and address sexual harassment.

I am personally committed to devoting our resources to help improve the Department’s efforts to combat sexual assault and sexual harassment.

With that in mind, I am gratified to see our investigative staff continue to help hold offenders responsible for their actions. I’m also proud that our audit team issued the first report in what will be a series of projects to identify ways the Department can improve its sexual harassment programs and its response to such complaints and further its commitment to a workplace that does not tolerate that behavior.

Other critical priorities in our broad and diverse docket include improving the Department’s efforts in Indian Country, uncovering misconduct related to oil, gas, and mineral royalties and returning those funds to the U.S. Treasury, and helping ensure our Nation’s production of energy is safe.

As the first Senate-confirmed inspector general to serve in the Department for more than a decade, I am committed to leading this organization’s excellent staff of auditors, investigators, evaluators, and mission support personnel in detecting and preventing fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement throughout the Department. I would be remiss if I did not recognize the superlative leadership of the former acting Inspector General, Mary Kendall, who guided this high-performing team for more than 10 years and laid the foundation for continued success in the future.

As always, the accomplishments reflected in this semiannual report are a credit to the talented and committed staff that I have the privilege to lead. Going forward, we will continue to focus on the critical issues facing the Department.

Inspector General
The FTEP Did Not Fail a Disproportionate Number of Women or Minorities

We evaluated the Bureau of Land Management’s (BLM’s) Law Enforcement Field Training and Evaluation Program (FTEP) to determine if a disproportionate number of women and minority trainees fail the program. During the survey phase of our evaluation, we found that the BLM did not have a disproportionate number of women and minority trainees fail.

Our review of BLM participant data from 2014 through 2018 found that the BLM had 89 FTEP trainees, 9 of which were women, during that time. In addition, 17 of the 89 trainees identified their ethnicity as "other than white." We found that during the time period we reviewed, two men failed the program, while no women failed.

We notified the BLM of our results in a memorandum and closed the evaluation without requiring a response.

Oil and Gas Company Committed Mineral Trespass Violations

We investigated SRC Energy’s self-reported disclosure that it drilled wells through a railroad right-of-way without obtaining a Federal lease or permit to drill. SRC, an oil and gas company based in Colorado, reported its activities to the BLM, which referred the matter to our office for investigation.

We determined that in 2014, SRC committed mineral trespass violations when it knowingly drilled two horizontal wells in Colorado and produced Federal minerals without a properly executed mineral lease, resulting in a loss of public revenue. On April 2, 2019, SRC signed a settlement agreement with the U.S. Department of Justice, agreeing to pay $723,236 to resolve the mineral trespass allegations.

We issued our report to the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Land and Minerals Management.
BLM Civil Engineer Wrongfully Mined Limestone

We investigated allegations that a BLM civil engineer sold limestone from a quarry on his property without BLM authorization. Pursuant to a homestead patent issued by the U.S. Government in 1925, the BLM retained the mineral rights on the privately owned property.

We substantiated the allegations. The civil engineer admitted that between 2011 and 2015, he sold 6,172.5 cubic yards of limestone for money and services totaling $13,909. He acknowledged he had not obtained approval from the BLM to sell the limestone but said he was not aware that he was required to do so, because his father had previously mined limestone from the quarry since at least the 1960s. After reviewing a copy of the mineral patent for the property, the civil engineer acknowledged the minerals on the property were held in reserve by the U.S. Government.

The United States Attorney’s Office for the District of Montana declined prosecution of this matter. The BLM issued a letter of suspected unauthorized use of mineral materials to the civil engineer in December 2018.

We issued our report to the BLM Deputy Director.

BLM Supervisor Violated Federal Law and Ethics Regulations for Outside Employment

We investigated an allegation that a BLM law enforcement supervisor was involved in an outside business venture in violation of Federal ethics regulations and DOI policies. We also investigated whether the law enforcement supervisor and a subordinate special agent participated in the business activity while on duty and whether the law enforcement supervisor showed preferential treatment toward the special agent.

We found the law enforcement supervisor participated in outside activity and employment with three entities, one of which was a prohibited source under Federal regulations, and did not seek prior approval from his supervisor and an ethics official as required. The law enforcement supervisor also received financial reimbursements and payments for training services he provided for two of the entities, which violated Federal law, and did not report any of that income on his financial disclosure forms as required by Federal ethics regulations. Finally, the law enforcement supervisor claimed official work hours from the BLM on days when he had been providing training to these entities in his personal capacity.
We found no evidence that the subordinate special agent participated in outside activity that violated Federal regulations or DOI policy, or that the law enforcement supervisor showed preferential treatment toward the special agent.

The law enforcement supervisor left the Department during our investigation. We referred this matter to the U.S. Attorney’s Office, which declined prosecution. We issued our report to the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management.

**BLM Law Enforcement Supervisor Violated Use of Government Property Policy**

We investigated allegations that a BLM Office of Law Enforcement and Security supervisor misused U.S. Government equipment and employee time in support of his personal business. It was also alleged that the supervisor made a wasteful purchase of a $3,250 mountain bike, misused a Government-owned vehicle and other Government-owned equipment for personal use, and inappropriately assigned himself to fire assignments where he earned overtime.

We determined that the supervisor violated DOI policy on the use of Government property and 5 C.F.R. 2635.704, “Use of Government Property,” when he used Government equipment and employee time to support his personal business. We also found that the mountain bike purchase, although authorized, was wasteful. We determined that the supervisor had not misused a Government-owned vehicle for personal use, nor had he inappropriately assigned himself fire assignments.

We issued our report to the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management.
Bureau of Reclamation Employee Misused His Travel Card

We investigated allegations that a U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) employee made personal purchases with his Government travel card while he was in an absent without leave employment status.

We confirmed the employee used his travel card to pay his rent and car insurance and attempted to use the travel card to withdraw cash and pay his cell phone bill while absent without leave. Our investigation also found the BOR did not have a policy to ensure suspension or cancelation of travel card accounts for employees who are absent without leave.

The BOR removed the employee from Federal service. The local District Attorney’s Office charged the employee with unauthorized use of a financial transaction device, and the county issued a warrant for his arrest.

We provided our report to the BOR Commissioner.
BSEE Has Opportunity To Reduce Safety Risks and Waste Related to Its Flight-Services Contract

We evaluated the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement’s (BSEE’s) $316 million flight-services contract in response to concerns regarding flight services in the Gulf of Mexico Region.

We found that contracting for helicopter flight services is the best mechanism to accomplish BSEE’s offshore inspections in the region. Although BSEE acted to reduce costs related to its helicopter flight services contract, we identified issues that BSEE should address to reduce safety risks to personnel and to reduce the risk of waste or abuse related to the contract.

Specifically, we found that a helicopter company has denied access to refuel at its stations in the region. BSEE relies on access to all refueling stations on operator facilities, as required by the Code of Federal Regulations, to conduct essential regulatory oversight. BSEE, therefore, should exercise its authority and require operators in the region to provide any BSEE-contracted helicopters access to refueling stations on their facilities. This would help reduce contract costs and safety risks from additional takeoffs and landings, which are the most dangerous parts of helicopter flights.

In addition, we found areas for improvement in BSEE’s internal controls regarding flight hours billed to the contract. Even though BSEE has implemented some internal controls for its flight-hour verification process, we found weaknesses that could increase the risk of misstated flight hours and lead to inflated costs. Even a small overstatement could have a large financial impact on the Government and taxpayers.

We made five recommendations to help BSEE address issues related to its helicopter flight-services contract. BSEE concurred with all five recommendations. We considered the recommendations resolved but not implemented.

Helicopter use is essential to fulfilling BSEE’s mission on the Outer Continental Shelf.
BIA Realty Specialist Allegedly Bribed Lessee in Exchange for Renewing Lease

We investigated an allegation that a Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) realty specialist solicited a $200 bribe from a longtime lessee of tribal land so the lessee could retain the lease.

We could not prove or disprove the bribery allegation. The lessee provided us a transaction receipt for a $200 check he wrote to a local store for cash, which he said he then paid to the BIA employee in exchange for assistance with renewing the lease. The lessee, however, could not provide any further evidence to corroborate his claim. The BIA employee denied soliciting or accepting money from the lessee.

During our investigation, we learned the lessee submitted a $57,000 lease renewal payment to the BIA but was not awarded the lease because he did not submit his bid in time. The former BIA employee erroneously sent the lessee an invoice and then accepted the payment and issued it to the Tribe. At the time of our report, neither the Tribe nor the BIA had reimbursed the lessee for the erroneous payment.

The employee left the Department during our investigation. We referred this matter to the U.S. Attorney’s Office, which declined prosecution. We issued our report to the BIA Acting Director.
National Park Service

The FTEP Did Not Fail a Disproportionate Number of Women or Minorities

We evaluated the National Park Service’s (NPS’) Law Enforcement Field Training and Evaluation Program (FTEP) to determine if a disproportionate number of women and minority trainees fail the program. During the survey phase of our evaluation, we found that the NPS did not have a disproportionate number of women or minority trainees fail.

We did, however, identify two concerns outside the scope of our evaluation that we brought to the attention of NPS management officials. First, we found it is an NPS practice for FTEP trainees to train at their home park as opposed to training at other parks. Some field training officers told us they believed that when training is completed at the trainee’s home park, evaluations are less objective and the quality of the training suffers, which is a disadvantage to the trainees. Second, we found that the NPS requires FTEP graduates to have 1 year of law enforcement experience before a graduate can become a field training officer. We learned that a prior NPS policy required 3 years of experience, and some training officers questioned whether officers with limited experience are qualified to serve as a training officer.

We notified the NPS of our results in a memorandum and asked the NPS to advise us on what, if any, actions it intended to take to address our concerns.

The NPS Needs To Improve Management of Commercial Cellular Facilities’ Right-of-Way Permits and Revenues

We evaluated the NPS’ right-of-way (ROW) permitting process and how it collects and accounts for revenues for commercial cellular facilities.

We found that the NPS was not properly collecting and accounting for revenues for commercial ROW permits, including the collection of land-use fees and cost recovery. Overall, the management of the commercial ROW program and the implementation of governing NPS policy need improvement.
Specifically, the NPS could improve its management of the permitting process, collect additional revenue, recover costs, and increase compliance with NPS policy by:

- Preparing and issuing accurate and timely bills for collection to ROW permit holders
- Documenting employee time and costs associated with ROW permits for cost recovery
- Completing and updating its cellular facilities inventory, including evaluating the appropriateness of currently unpermitted facilities
- Developing an action plan to ensure compliance with NPS policy

We made six recommendations to help the NPS improve its commercial ROW program. The NPS concurred with all six recommendations and has begun implementation.

**NPS Employee Made Inappropriate Sexual Advances Toward a Colleague**

We investigated allegations that an NPS employee sexually harassed a colleague during a trip to gather data from a weather station.

We found that the employee made unwanted sexual advances toward the colleague during an off-duty road trip including hugging, kissing, and making inappropriate comments.

We issued our report to the NPS Deputy Director.

**NPS Facility Manager Stole NPS Funds, Misused a GOV, and Concealed Criminal Convictions**

We investigated allegations that an NPS facility manager stole NPS funds, abused his purchase card authority, misused a Government owned vehicle (GOV), and concealed criminal convictions to gain NPS employment.
We confirmed the employee spent approximately $2,297 on his Government purchase card to purchase items that he later pawned. We also confirmed that the employee leased roll-away dumpsters with Federal funds, partially to discard personal items. The employee also regularly used a GOV for personal errands. Finally, we found that before his employment with the NPS, the employee falsified his application to the NPS by failing to disclose three criminal convictions.

The employee pleaded guilty to three counts of misdemeanor theft in county court, was sentenced to 1 day in jail, and was ordered to pay full restitution. He resigned from the NPS in lieu of termination.

We issued our report to the NPS Deputy Director.

**NPS Official Assisted Artist With Avoiding Tax Garnishment**

We investigated an allegation that an official at the Southern Campaign Parks Group (SOCA), an artist, and a park friends' group conspired to set up the purchase of one of the artist’s paintings via a 2015 transaction with the friends' group so that the artist could avoid a Federal tax garnishment. We also investigated the timing of the art purchase that seemed to coincide with a funding increase in the cooperative agreement between the friends' group and Kings Mountain National Military Park (KIMO), a park within SOCA.

We found that the SOCA official directed the NPS’ acquisition of a $39,000 painting by the artist in 2015 and structured the purchase using the friends’ group as a broker for the sale even though the friends’ group did not own the painting. This structure allowed the artist, the painting’s true owner, to avoid a Federal tax garnishment that would have been imposed on him had he sold the painting directly to the NPS. The SOCA official admitted to coordinating the transaction with both the artist and the friends' group, which included dictating that the friends' group receive a $4,000 fee for its role in the transaction.

In addition, we found that NPS contracting officials and KIMO staff did not follow Federal regulations and U.S. Department of the Interior procurement policies during the acquisition of the painting; specifically, the NPS and KIMO should have purchased the painting through a competitive bidding process rather than using sole source procedures.
We also found that KIMO increased the annual funding to the friends' group’s cooperative agreement by $25,000 around the same time the SOCA official began coordinating the purchase of the painting, but we found no direct connection between the friends' group’s role in acquiring the painting and the increase in funding. We did find, however, that KIMO staff improperly extended the period of performance of the cooperative agreement without authorization from contracting officials.

We issued our report to the NPS Deputy Director.

---

**NPS Prime Contractor in the U.S. Virgin Islands Pledged Guilty to False Statements**

We investigated allegations that Foster Construction of South Florida, Inc., an NPS prime contractor, did not fully compensate its subcontractor for construction services on two projects at the Virgin Islands National Park.

We found that Adrian Foster, the owner of Foster Construction, submitted false payment applications to the NPS on two construction contracts when she certified that Foster Construction had paid the subcontractor all monies due for work completed under the contracts when it had not.

Foster pleaded guilty in the U.S. District Court of the Virgin Islands to false statements. She was subsequently sentenced to 22 months in prison followed by 3 years of supervised release and was ordered to pay restitution totaling $135,507. Foster and Foster Construction were also debarred from participation in Federal procurement and nonprocurement programs until December 11, 2021.

We issued our report to the NPS Deputy Director.
Office of Natural Resources Revenue
Gas Producer Failed To Pay More Than $51,000 in Federal Royalties

We investigated allegations that a gas producer operating in New Mexico failed to properly submit royalty reports and remit royalty payments owed to the Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR).

We determined the producer failed to properly file ONRR-Form 2014s (Reports of Sales and Royalty Remittance) and pay royalties for gas produced from Federal leases located in New Mexico. Working closely with ONRR experts, we determined that the unpaid royalties totaled more than $51,000 plus late payment interest.

We consulted with both ONRR and the United States Attorney’s Office for the District of New Mexico. The producer cooperated with the investigation and ONRR officials determined they would pursue the unpaid royalties through ONRR’s administrative process.

We issued our report to the ONRR Director.
Office of the Secretary and Multi-Office Assignments
Opportunities Exist To Improve the DOI’s Efforts To Address Sexual Harassment

In response to sexual harassment investigations that raised awareness of problems in the workplace culture and handling of allegations, the DOI and its bureaus are in the process of implementing a series of measures to address and prevent sexual harassment, including bureau-specific action plans and a new antiharassment policy for the DOI.

We found that the DOI has taken steps to address sexual harassment by conducting surveys, issuing policy, conducting investigations into sexual harassment allegations, requiring training, establishing an advisory hotline, and developing a tracking system. All of these measures are directed at providing a safe work environment, encouraging victims to report incidents, and improving management’s preparation to address and investigate allegations brought to their attention.

In evaluating the DOI’s progress in implementing these measures, we have identified areas for the DOI to improve its efforts: (1) sexual harassment investigations, (2) misconduct tracking system, and (3) training. In addition to these three finding areas, we suggest two additional matters for the DOI to consider as it takes further steps to address sexual harassment.

The DOI has an opportunity to improve sexual harassment investigations. Specifically, (1) reports of investigation do not always contain the necessary information for decisionmakers and advisors to make comprehensive decisions about potential corrective action related to sexual harassment, (2) the DOI and its bureaus are not tracking the timeliness of investigations in a consistent manner, and (3) investigation costs may prevent employees from reporting an incident.

The DOI also has an opportunity to use its DOI-wide misconduct tracking system to monitor sexual harassment trends and costs. The DOI deployed the tracking system in April 2019.

Finally, the DOI has an opportunity to better coordinate anti-sexual-harassment training to ensure that all employees are provided consistent guidance and access to training.

In addition to our three finding areas, we identified two other matters for the DOI to consider: (1) including strategies to specifically address the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s organizational risk factors in bureau action plans and (2) formalizing the sharing of information about prior or pending allegations between bureaus.
We made 11 recommendations and suggest that the DOI consider 2 additional matters to help it prevent and address sexual harassment and further its commitment to a workplace that does not tolerate sexual harassment. The DOI concurred or partially concurred with all recommendations and stated it will explore the feasibility of the additional matters.

Verification Reviews Confirmed Closure of 25 Recommendations

Each fiscal year, our office of Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations completes a series of verification reviews to determine whether the DOI’s bureaus and offices have implemented our recommendations as reported to the DOI’s Office of Financial Management (PFM), Office of Policy, Management and Budget. We report all recommendations in our audit, inspection, and evaluation reports to the PFM to track resolution and implementation.

We review the supporting documentation provided to the PFM to support closing the recommendation, in addition to supporting documentation from the bureau or office to independently verify each recommendation’s implementation. These reviews provide assurances to the DOI that the bureaus and offices have implemented the recommendations as reported to the PFM; when we find that a recommendation has not been implemented as reported, the PFM reopens the recommendation and adds it back to the tracking list.

In this reporting period we completed 7 verification reviews. We made 52 recommendations in the originally issued reports. In these 7 reviews, we sought to verify implementation of 28 of the 52 recommendations. We confirmed that 25 recommendations had been implemented as reported. We did not concur with the closure of three recommendations; we found these recommendations had been resolved but not implemented. We requested the PFM reopen these recommendations and maintain them on the list for tracking resolution and implementation.

In accordance with guidance from the Office of Management and Budget, we reviewed the “Payment Integrity” section in the DOI’s Agency Financial Report Fiscal Year 2018 (AFR) to determine whether the DOI met the requirements of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010 (IPERA) and accurately and completely reported on improper payments in its AFR and accompanying materials.

We found the DOI complied with the first IPERA reporting requirement by publishing the AFR and posting it on its website. We also found the DOI complied with the second IPERA requirement by conducting a program-specific risk assessment for seven programs that met the reporting threshold for the fiscal year. We did not consider the four remaining IPERA reporting requirements applicable for this reporting period because the DOI did not identify any programs that were susceptible to significant improper payments.

Vendor Sentenced and Debarred After Illegally Bidding on Government Contracts

An OIG investigation found that contractor George Patton created several companies through family members and another associate and used these companies to improperly obtain U.S. Government contracts during the time he was excluded from U.S. Government procurement and nonprocurement programs. George Patton’s exclusion from 2013 to 2015 was based on his voluntary exclusion agreement with the DOI.

We found that George Patton’s ex-wife, Lindsey Patton; his brother, Henry Patton; and others created companies during George Patton’s debarment to allow him to continue bidding on and managing Government contracts, in violation of his exclusion agreement. While George Patton was debarred, the companies obtained multiple Government contracts valued at more than $10 million combined. We found that George Patton received a significant amount of the proceeds from these contracts and that the partners only participated nominally in their respective companies. During our investigation, we also uncovered evidence that George Patton and Lindsey Patton failed to report income to the Federal Government via individual tax returns.
In October 2018, George Patton pleaded guilty in the Middle District of North Carolina to one count of wire fraud, one count of conspiracy to defraud the United States, and one count of tax evasion. He was later sentenced to 10 months of confinement, 36 months of supervised release, and a $300 assessment. In October 2018, Henry Patton pleaded guilty to conspiracy to defraud the United States and was later sentenced to 36 months of probation and a $100 assessment. In November 2018, Lindsey Patton pleaded guilty to tax evasion and was later sentenced to 36 months of probation and a $100 assessment. George and Lindsey Patton were also ordered to jointly pay restitution to the Internal Revenue Service in the amount of $107,625.75.

Furthermore, based on the crimes George Patton committed in avoiding his exclusion agreement, we recommended a longer debarment period. To date, the DOI suspension and debarment official debarred four individuals—George Patton for 14 years, Lindsay Patton for 15 years, Lindsay Patton’s current spouse for 5 years, and Henry Patton for 3 years. In addition, the suspension and debarment official debarred seven companies for a period coterminous with George Patton’s debarment period.

No Evidence of Improper Influence by a Senior DOI Official in the Hiring of University Employee

We investigated whether a senior DOI official inappropriately influenced the hiring of a university employee at the DOI to work on a special project through an Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) agreement between the DOI and a public university. IPA agreements permit Federal agencies to temporarily hire employees from State and local governments and colleges and universities.

We investigated the use of the IPA agreement, including why the official wanted to use the university employee as a consultant on the project, and why the DOI paid for the university employee’s services during the lapse in appropriations while Federal employees were furloughed.

We found no evidence that the IPA agreement was used improperly or that the DOI official was inappropriately involved. We also found no evidence that any of the university employee’s compensation was improper.

We issued our report to the DOI Acting Chief of Staff.
Allegation of Reprisal by an Office of the Secretary Official

We investigated an allegation that a supervisor within the Office of the Secretary lowered a subordinate employee’s annual performance rating in reprisal for protected disclosures and activities made by the employee.

We found no evidence that the supervisor reprised against the employee. We confirmed that the employee made protected disclosures and engaged in protected activities. However, we found that the supervisor would have given the employee the same performance rating absent the protected disclosures and activities.
Former OSMRE Employee Convicted of Bank Fraud and Aggravated Identity Theft

In a joint investigation with the U.S. Department of Education OIG, we investigated allegations of suspected bank fraud and identity theft after discovering evidence that Sharon Hall obtained fraudulent student loans while employed as a surface mine specialist for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) in London, KY.

We found that Hall committed bank fraud and identity theft when she obtained nine student loans totaling more than $93,000 in the names of relatives using false representations and pretenses. She subsequently retired from the OSMRE.

On January 12, 2018, the Federal District Court in the Eastern District of Kentucky convicted Hall of 11 counts of bank fraud and 1 count of aggravated identity theft. She was sentenced to 36 months in prison followed by 36 months of supervised release and ordered to pay $128,273.54 in restitution.

We issued our report to the OSMRE Deputy Director.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Issues Identified With State Subaward Administration for WSFR Program Grants

Under the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration (WSFR) Program, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) provides grant funds to eligible States to conserve, restore, and manage wildlife and sport fish resources. States may provide Program funds to other non-Federal entities to accomplish or support grant-related activities. State officials must use judgment in determining whether these partnerships align more closely with the characteristics of a subaward of financial assistance to a subrecipient or of procurement from a contractor. Depending on the States’ determination, non-Federal entities are subject to differing criteria for accountability, profit taking, asset management, revenue management, and the treatment of indirect costs under Federal Uniform Grant Guidance.

During our Program grant audits, we found instances in which the States did not apply Federal Uniform Grant Guidance consistently and accurately when providing Program funds to non-Federal entities. We also found that a number of States had not conducted or documented risk assessments for subrecipients, nor publicly reported major subawards.

We made three recommendations to help the FWS promote consistency in how States administer Program funds and improve conformance with Federal regulations.

FWS Alleged Scientific Integrity Violation and Retaliation

The OIG investigated allegations that a former FWS assistant hatchery manager directed an FWS biologist to validate an inaccurate cause of death for an endangered fish species in a mortality report to cover up alleged neglect at an FWS fishery. It was also alleged that a culture of censorship existed within that FWS region’s management. We investigated this matter jointly with the DOI’s scientific integrity coordinators, Office of Quality and Science Integrity, U.S. Geological Survey.

We found no evidence to corroborate the allegation that the biologist was directed to falsify scientific records, nor did we find evidence to corroborate that she was censored. We determined that the biologist was disciplined for a pattern of discourteous behavior toward management and not, as was claimed, in retaliation for scientific findings that reflected poorly on the FWS.

We issued our report to the FWS Director.
Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Audits
Audits of Wildlife and Sport Fish Grants Covered More Than $329 Million in Claimed Costs and Identified Potential Program Improvements

Through its Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program (WSFR), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) awards grants to States and Territories to support conservation-related projects, such as the acquisition and management of natural habitats for game species or site development for boating access. Under a reimbursable agreement with the FWS, we audit all States over the course of a 5-year cycle authorized by Federal law.

In this semiannual period, we audited five agencies in four States.
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

In our audit of California’s Department of Fish and Wildlife, we questioned costs totaling $579,085 ($434,319 Federal share) due to an inaccurate indirect cost rate, unrecognized program income, unsupported and ineligible other direct costs, improperly calculated leave payouts, improper use of vehicles, improperly allocated leave pay, and improperly disposed equipment. In addition, we found that the Department used an unapproved methodology to count lifetime license holders, did not manage equipment adequately, did not properly allocate program income associated with its lands pass program, and did not properly classify its subawards.

Idaho Department of Fish and Game

In our audit of Idaho’s Department of Fish and Game, we found that because the FWS instructed States not to submit their methodologies for multiyear licenses, the Department used an unapproved methodology to count multiyear license holders. Without FWS approval of a State’s methodology for calculating multiyear license holders, those licenses are ineligible to be counted in the certification beyond the year purchased.

Illinois Department of Natural Resources

In our audit of Illinois’ Department of Natural Resources, we could not determine with any certainty whether the State ensured the grant funding and State hunting and fishing license revenue was used solely for allowable fish and wildlife activities. The scope of our review coincided with the State of Illinois budget impasse, which removed the Department’s budget authority, preventing the reimbursement of Program funds to the Department and to its subgrantees.

We identified unsupported costs of $36,346 related to grant expenditures ($27,260 Federal share) and $131,294 related to license revenue funded expenditures. In addition, we found that the Department: 1) potentially diverted its license revenues, 2) had not reported its barter agreements, and 3) had not adequately documented its in-kind hours. We also determined that the Department’s World Shooting and Recreation Complex did not have standard operating procedures for identifying eligible license revenue fund expenditures. We noted, however, that the State has enacted the Illinois Grant Accountability and Transparency Act, and codified related policies in the Illinois Administrative Code. These policies should help the Department and its subrecipients conform to Federal grant regulations.
North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Marine Fisheries

In our audit of North Carolina’s Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Marine Fisheries, we found the Department had not included the 3-percent limitation on the Statewide cost allocation plan in its indirect cost proposal, had no written policies and procedures related to drawdowns, and had not updated its policies and procedures related to equipment disposal.

North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission

In our audit of North Carolina’s Wildlife Resources Commission, we found the Commission may have overstated the number of licenses in its annual license certifications to the FWS for SFYs 2016 and 2017 because it did not have a process in place to remove some multiyear licenses. In addition, we identified, and the Commission corrected, an overstatement of in-kind contributions.

Overall, we made 30 recommendations for program improvements or cost recovery across the 5 audits published this semiannual period. The FWS is working with the recipient agencies to resolve the issues and to implement corrective actions.
Former USGS Employee Misused Government Charge Card

We investigated allegations that a U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) information technology specialist made personal purchases using his Government charge card.

We found that the employee charged more than $14,000 for personal items and services, including Airbnb rental fees, personal cellular phone service, and money transfers to his personal PayPal and Venmo accounts. The employee admitted he made the charges and that he knew the misuse was improper.

The employee resigned immediately after his supervisor confronted him about the charges, and the USGS has issued several bills of collection to collect the outstanding debt.

We issued our report to the USGS Director.
Appendices
STATISTICAL HIGHLIGHTS

Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations Activities

Reports Issued........................................................................................................... 19
  Performance Audits, Evaluations, and Inspections ............................................. 6
  Contract and Grant Audits................................................................................. 5
  Other Report Types1......................................................................................... 8

Total Monetary Impacts....................................................................................... $461,939
  Questioned Costs (includes unsupported costs)............................................... $461,939
  Funds To Be Put to Better Use ...................................................................... $0

Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations Recommendations Made..................... 55
Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations Recommendations Closed.................... 182

Investigative Activities

Complaints Received.............................................................................................. 505
Complaints Referred to the Department............................................................... 222
Investigations Opened........................................................................................... 63
Investigations Closed............................................................................................ 49

Criminal Prosecution Activities

Indictments/Informations....................................................................................... 6
Convictions................................................................................................................ 12
Sentencings.............................................................................................................. 7
  Jail ......................................................................................................................... 1: 10 months
  Probation............................................................................................................. 7: 204 months
  Community Service............................................................................................ 0: 0 hours
Criminal Restitution .............................................................................................. 3: $149,725.75
Criminal Fines ......................................................................................................... 1.2: $5,000
Criminal Special Assessments............................................................................... 7: $675
Criminal Asset Forfeiture...................................................................................... $0
Criminal Matters Referred for Prosecution......................................................... 26
Criminal Matters Declined This Period................................................................. 22

Civil Investigative Activities

Civil Referrals........................................................................................................ 8
Civil Declinations................................................................................................ 4
Civil Settlements or Recoveries......................................................................... 6: $6,175,172.00

1 Other report types include management advisories, special projects, and other types of reports that are not classified as audits, inspections, or evaluations. These types of reports generally do not contain recommendations.
Administrative Investigative Activities

Personnel Actions ........................................................................................................ 15
  Removals .................................................................................................................. 4
  Downgrade ................................................................................................................ 1
  Resignations .............................................................................................................. 1
  Reassignment/Transfer ............................................................................................. 2
  Retirements ................................................................................................................ 1
  Restitution .................................................................................................................. $0
  Suspensions ............................................................................................................ 1
  Counseling ................................................................................................................ 2
  Reprimands (Written/Oral) ....................................................................................... 3

Procurement and Nonprocurement Remedies ......................................................... 9
  Debarments .............................................................................................................. 8
  Suspensions ............................................................................................................. 1

Royalties - Regulatory Penalty ............................................................................... 1: $151,542.09

General Policy Actions ............................................................................................ 6
REPORTS ISSUED

This listing includes all reports issued by the Office of Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations during the 6-month reporting period that ended September 30, 2019. It provides the report number, title, issue date, and monetary amounts identified in each report.

* Funds To Be Put to Better Use
** Questioned Costs
*** Unsupported Costs

Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations

Bureau of Land Management

2019-WR-002-A
Evaluation of the BLM Law Enforcement Field Training and Evaluation Program (04/01/2019)
(page 3)

Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement

2018-EAU-034
The Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement’s Flight Services Contract (09/04/2019)
(page 9)

Multi-Office Assignments

2018-WR-006
Opportunities Exist To Improve the U.S. Department of the Interior’s Efforts to Address Sexual Harassment (07/31/2019)
(pages 20-21)

National Park Service

2018-WR-011
The NPS Needs To Improve Management of Commercial Cellular Facilities’ Right-of-Way Permits and Revenues (07/19/2019)
(page 13)

2019-WR-002
Evaluation of the NPS Law Enforcement Field Training and Evaluation Program (04/01/2019)
(pages 13-14)
Office of the Secretary

2019-FIN-030
U.S. Department of the Interior’s Compliance With the Improper Payments and Elimination and Recovery Act (05/30/2019)
(page 22)

Contract and Grant Audits

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

2017-WR-064
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of California, Department of Fish and Wildlife, From July 1, 2014, Through June 30, 2016 (04/15/2019)
**$389,740
***$44,579
(pages 30-32)

2018-CR-012
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Illinois, Department of Natural Resources, From July 1, 2015, Through June 30, 2017 (08/08/2019)
***$27,620
(pages 30-32)

2018-WR-053
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Idaho, Department of Fish and Game, From July 1, 2015, Through June 30, 2017 (09/04/2019)
(pages 30-32)

2019-ER-018
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Marine Fisheries, From July 1, 2016, Through June 30, 2018 (09/30/2019)
(pages 30-32)
2019-ER-019

Other Assignment Types

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

2019-CR-051

Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement

2019-CR-048

Indian Affairs

2019-WR-013

Interior Business Center

2019-WR-055
Office of Natural Resources Revenue

2019-ER-059

Office of the Secretary

2019-ER-054

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

2018-CR-064

2019-FIN-061
Verification Review – Recommendations for the Management Advisory Titled Issues Identified During Our Audit of Interim Costs Claimed by Coastal Environmental Group, Under Contract Nos. INF13PC00214 and INF13PC00195 With the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (09/30/2019) (page 22)
## MONETARY RESOLUTION ACTIVITIES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>Questioned Costs*</th>
<th>Unsupported Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,046,147</td>
<td>$217,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Which were issued during the reporting period</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$461,939</td>
<td>$72,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (A+B)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>$1,508,086</strong></td>
<td><strong>$289,395</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,508,086</td>
<td>$289,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Dollar value of costs disallowed</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,429,421</td>
<td>$261,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Dollar value of costs allowed</td>
<td></td>
<td>$78,665</td>
<td>$27,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. For which no management decision had been made by the end of the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include non-Federal funds. Unsupported costs are included in questioned costs.
## MONETARY RESOLUTION ACTIVITIES

Table 2: Inspector General Reports With Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</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>$50,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Which were issued during the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (A+B)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,366</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,366</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>$50,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. For which no management decision had been made by the end of the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include non-Federal funds.
REPORTS PENDING DECISION

This listing includes a summary of audit, inspection, and evaluation reports that were more than 6 months old on September 30, 2019, and still pending a final management decision. It includes recommendations with which the OIG and management have disagreed, and the disagreement has been referred to the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget for resolution. Also included are recommendations with which management did not provide sufficient information to determine if proposed actions will resolve the recommendation. It provides the report number, title, issue date, number of recommendations referred for resolution, and number of recommendations awaiting additional information.

Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations

**Indian Affairs**

2017-ER-018
Indian Affairs Offices’ Poor Recordkeeping and Coordination Threaten Impact of Tiwahe Initiative (09/28/2018) Referred for Resolution: 2

**National Park Service**

2017-WR-037
The National Park Service Misused Philanthropic Partner Donations (03/13/2019) Referred for Resolution: 2

**Office of the Secretary**

2017-ER-014
Inaccurate Data and an Absence of Specific Guidance Hinders the U.S. Department of the Interior’s Ability to Optimize Fleet Size and Composition (03/29/2019) Referred for Resolution: 1

2018-ITA-019
The Department of the Interior Generally Complied with Email and Web Security Mandates (07/26/2018) Referred for Resolution: 1

**Other Assignment Types**

**National Park Service**

2017-WR-037-A
Financial, Ethical, and Exclusive Use Concerns About the NPS’ Agreement With the Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts (09/04/2018) Referred for Resolution: 2
REPORTS WITH UNIMPLEMENTED RECOMMENDATIONS

This listing provides a summary of reports issued by the Office of Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations before April 1, 2019, that still had open (unimplemented) recommendations as of September 30, 2019. Unimplemented recommendations are divided into three categories: resolved, management disagreed, and awaiting management decision. Recommendations with which management has disagreed have been referred to the DOI for resolution. Recommendations are classified as awaiting management decision if either management did not respond or management’s response was not sufficiently detailed to consider the recommendation resolved. Because a single report may have both implemented and unimplemented recommendations, the number of recommendations listed as resolved may be less than the total number of recommendations in the report.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Open .................................................................393
Resolved ..........................................................384
Disagreed ...........................................................8
Awaiting Decision ..............................................1

Questioned Costs .................................................$152,166,958
Funds That Could Have Been Better Used ....................$258,935

Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations

Bureau of Land Management

2015-EAU-057
Resolved: 1

2015-ITA-072
Resolved: 1
2016-EAU-061
Bureau of Land Management’s Idle Well Program (01/17/2018)
Resolved: 11

2016-WR-027
The Bureau of Land Management’s Wild Horse and Burro Program is Not Maximizing Efficiencies or Complying With Federal Regulations (10/17/2016)
Resolved: 1

2018-CR-010
Bureau of Land Management Maintenance Fee Waivers for Small Miners (12/17/2018)
Resolved: 1

2018-ITA-043
Resolved: 5

C-IN-BLM-0002-2012
Bureau of Land Management’s Mineral Materials Program (03/31/2014)
Resolved: 1

C-IN-MOA-0013-2010
Resolved: 4

CR-EV-BLM-0004-2012
Bureau of Land Management’s Geothermal Resources Management (03/07/2013)
Resolved: 1

CR-IS-BLM-0004-2014
BLM Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Trespass and Drilling Without Approval (09/29/2014)
Resolved: 2
**Bureau of Ocean Energy Management**

**CR-EV-BOEM-0001-2013**  
U.S. Department of the Interior’s Offshore Renewable Energy Program  
(09/25/2013)  
Resolved: 2

**Bureau of Reclamation**

**2015-ITA-072**  
Independent Auditors’ Performance Audit Report on the U.S.  
Department of the Interior Federal Information Security Management  
Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (02/24/2016)  
Resolved: 1

**2018-ITA-043**  
Independent Auditors’ Performance Audit Report on the U.S.  
Department of the Interior Federal Information Security Modernization  
Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (03/13/2019)  
Resolved: 4

**ISD-IS-BOR-0004-2013**  
IT Security of the Glen Canyon Dam Supervisory Control and Data  
Acquisition System (03/26/2014)  
Resolved: 1

**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)  
Resolved: 1

**Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement**

**2017-EAU-043**  
BSEE Has Opportunities To Help Industry Improve Oil Spill  
Preparedness (10/22/2018)  
Resolved: 5
**Indian Affairs**

**2016-ITA-021**  
Information Technology Security Weaknesses at a Core Data Center Could Expose Sensitive Data (02/15/2017)  
Resolved: 1

**2017-ER-018**  
Indian Affairs Offices’ Poor Recordkeeping and Coordination Threaten Impact of Tiwahe Initiative (09/28/2018)  
Resolved: 2  
Disagreed: 2

**2017-WR-024**  
The Bureau of Indian Education Is Not Ensuring That Background Checks at Indian Education Facilities Are Complete (02/08/2018)  
Resolved: 7

**2018-ITA-043**  
Resolved: 1

**C-EV-BIE-0023-2014**  
Condition of Indian School Facilities (09/30/2016)  
Resolved: 4

**C-IS-BIE-0023-2014-A**  
Condition of Bureau of Indian Affairs Facilities at the Pine Hill Boarding School (01/11/2016)  
Resolved: 3

**CR-EV-BIA-0002-2013**  
BIA Needs Sweeping Changes to Manage the Osage Nation’s Energy Resources (10/20/2014)  
Resolved: 7  
Better Use: $97,000

**NM-EV-BIE-0003-2008**  
School Violence Prevention (02/03/2010)  
Resolved: 1
National Park Service

2017-ITA-052
Resolved: 1

2017-WR-037
The National Park Service Misused Philanthropic Partner Donations (03/13/2019)
Resolved: 3
Disagreed: 2

CR-EV-MOA-0006-2012
U.S. Department of the Interior’s Underground Injection Control Activities (03/31/2014)
Resolved: 1

Office of the Secretary

2016-ER-016
Evaluation of DOI’s Tracking of Data for Land Purchases Made With Grant Funds (09/25/2017)
Resolved: 2

2016-ITA-020
Interior Incident Response Program Calls for Improvement (03/12/2018)
Resolved: 14

2016-ITA-062
Resolved: 6

2017-ER-014
Inaccurate Data and an Absence of Specific Guidance Hinders the U.S. Department of the Interior’s Ability to Optimize Fleet Size and Composition (03/29/2019)
Resolved: 3
Disagreed: 1
2017-ER-015
Internal Controls for the U.S. Department of the Interior’s Purchase Card Program Need Improvement (03/29/2019)
Resolved: 5

2017-ER-015-A
Improvement Needed in Internal Controls for the Use of Convenience Checks at the U.S. Department of the Interior (03/26/2019)
Resolved: 1

2017-FIN-038
U.S. Department of the Interior DATA Act Submission for Second Quarter FY 2017 (11/02/2017)
Resolved: 3

2017-WR-012
Resolved: 12

2017-WR-056
The American Samoa Government’s Executive Branch Did Not Have Effective Internal Controls for Government-Owned and -Leased Vehicles (09/28/2018)
Resolved: 1

2018-CR-010
Bureau of Land Management Maintenance Fee Waivers for Small Miners (12/17/2018)
Resolved: 1

2018-ITA-019
The Department of the Interior Generally Complied with Email and Web Security Mandates (07/26/2018)
Resolved: 3
Disagreed: 1

2018-ITA-043
Resolved: 2
C-IN-MOA-0010-2008
Audit Report - Department of the Interior Museum Collections: Accountability and Preservation (12/16/2009)
Resolved: 2

C-IN-MOA-0049-2004
Department of the Interior Concessions Management (06/13/2005)
Resolved: 1

ER-IN-VIS-0015-2014
Resolved: 1

ISD-IN-MOA-0004-2014
Resolved: 3

ISD-IN-MOA-0004-2014-I
U.S. Department of the Interior’s Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation Program Not Yet Capable of Providing Complete Information for Enterprise Risk Determinations (10/19/2016)
Resolved: 4

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

WR-EV-OSS-0005-2009
Aviation Maintenance Tracking and Pilot Inspector Practices – Further Advances Needed (04/14/2009)
Resolved: 1

Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians

2016-ITA-062
Resolved: 1
2018-ITA-043
Resolved: 1

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

2016-EAU-007
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement’s Oversight of the Abandoned Mine Lands Program (03/30/2017)
Resolved: 10

2018-ITA-043
Resolved: 1

C-IN-OSM-0044-2014A
Oversight of Annual Fund Transfer for Miner Benefits Needs Improvement (03/29/2017)
Resolved: 7
Questioned Costs: $38,878,548

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)
Resolved: 3

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

2015-FIN-021
Performance Audit of Expenditures and Obligations Used by the Secretary of the Interior in Administering the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, Public Law 106-408 for Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014 (08/27/2015)
Resolved: 1
2015-ITA-072
Resolved: 1

2016-FIN-074
Resolved: 1

2016-ITA-062
Resolved: 1

2018-FIN-007
Issues Found With the Award and Monitoring of Financial Assistance Agreements Made by the FWS International Affairs Program (07/26/2018)
Resolved: 2

2018-ITA-043
Resolved: 1

CR-EV-MOA-0006-2012
U.S. Department of the Interior’s Underground Injection Control Activities (03/31/2014)
Resolved: 2

U.S. Geological Survey

2016-ITA-062
Resolved: 2
Contract and Grant Audits

Bureau of Land Management

**2015-WR-062**
Resolved: 2
Questioned Costs: $1,931,699

**2016-CG-006**
Audit of Bureau of Land Management Cooperative Agreement No. L10AC20002 With The Piney Woods School (02/14/2017)
Resolved: 3
Questioned Costs: $524,478

**2017-FIN-053**
The Chicago Horticultural Society Should Improve Its Financial Management System to Receive Federal Funds (03/13/2019)
Resolved: 8
Questioned Costs: $530,537

**WR-CA-BLM-0013-2013**
Cooperative Agreement No. JSA071001/L08AC13913 between the Utah Correctional Industries and the Bureau of Land Management (09/27/2013)
Resolved: 2
Questioned Costs: $2,004,553

Bureau of Reclamation

**2017-FIN-040**
Audit of Contract Nos. R11AV60120 and R12AV60002 Between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Crow Tribe (09/28/2018)
Resolved: 9
Questioned Costs: $12,808,434

**2017-FIN-066**
The Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department Claimed Higher Labor Rates Than Allowed on Contract No. R17PC00051 and Ignored Training Requirements for Contract No. R12PC20015 With the Bureau of Reclamation (03/26/2019)
Resolved: 7
Questioned Costs: $314,565
2017-WR-048
The Bureau of Reclamation’s Cooperative Agreement No. R16AC00087 With the Panoche Drainage District (07/12/2018)
Resolved: 18
Questioned Costs: $213,891

ER-CX-BOR-0010-2014
Crow Tribe Accounting System and Interim Costs Claimed Under Agreement Nos. R11AV60120 and R12AV60002 With the Bureau of Reclamation (06/24/2015)
Resolved: 12
Questioned Costs: $476,399

Indian Affairs

2016-CG-030
Audit of Incurred Costs of Contract Associated with Public Voucher No. PV08C55091 Between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Chippewa Cree Tribe (08/28/2017)
Resolved: 1
Questioned Costs: $2,000,000

2016-FIN-075
Audit of Agreement No. A13AP00009 Between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Chippewa Cree Tribe (08/21/2017)
Resolved: 4
Questioned Costs: $1,501,531

2017-FIN-039
Audit of the Bureau of Indian Affairs’ Agreement No. A12AV01171 with the Crow Tribe on the Methamphetamine Initiative Program (12/11/2018)
Resolved: 1
Questioned Costs: $150,000

2017-FIN-041
Audit of Agreement No. A13AP00043 Between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Crow Tribe (06/21/2018)
Resolved: 2
Awaiting Decision: 1
Questioned Costs: $14,492,813
2017-FIN-042
The Wind River Tribes Misapplied Federal Funds for the Tribal Transportation Program (07/12/2018)
Resolved: 6
Questioned Costs: $6,186,745

2017-FIN-065
The Blackfeet Tribe Generally Complied with Bureau of Indian Affairs Agreements (09/28/2018)
Resolved: 1

National Park Service

2015-ER-061
Audit of Task Agreement Nos. P13AC00279, P13AC01094, and P14AC00445 Between the National Park Service and the Student Conservation Association Under Cooperative Agreement No. P09AC00402 (02/03/2017)
Resolved: 7
Questioned Costs: $740,681

X-CX-NPS-0001-2014
Final Costs Claimed by NY Asphalt, Inc., Under Contract Nos. INPSANDY12003, INP13PX28237, and INP13PX22222 With the National Park Service (10/21/2014)
Resolved: 2
Questioned Costs: $988,203

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

2015-EXT-005
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Fish and Game, Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, From July 1, 2012, Through June 30, 2014 (01/07/2016)
Resolved: 1
2015-EXT-008
Resolved: 1
Questioned Costs: $621,351
Better Use: $131,435

2015-EXT-009
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Utah, Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife Resources, From July 1, 2012, Through June 30, 2014 (09/19/2016)
Resolved: 1

2015-EXT-043
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Alabama, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries, From October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2014 (09/07/2016)
Resolved: 1

2016-EXT-001
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Arizona, Arizona Game and Fish Department From July 1, 2013, Through June 30, 2015 (08/27/2018)
Resolved: 16
Questioned Costs: $3,970,237

2016-EXT-005
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the Government of the Virgin Islands, Department of Planning and Natural Resources, From October 1, 2012, Through September 30, 2014 (02/21/2017)
Resolved: 6
2016-EXT-046
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of North Dakota, Game and Fish Department, From July 1, 2013, Through June 30, 2015 (09/25/2017)
Resolved: 2
Questioned Costs: $380,142

2016-EXT-047
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Michigan, Department of Natural Resources from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2015 (09/18/2018)
Resolved: 12
Questioned Costs: $60,191,414

2016-EXT-048
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Missouri, Department of Conservation, From July 1, 2013, Through June 30, 2015 (09/18/2018)
Resolved: 14
Questioned Costs: $2,694,479
Better Use: $30,500

2017-EXT-006
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the Government of Guam, Department of Agriculture, From October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2016 (03/26/2018)
Resolved: 4

2017-EXT-020
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Ohio, Department of Natural Resources From July 1, 2014, Through June 30, 2016 (06/21/2018)
Resolved: 1

2017-EXT-049
Resolved: 3
Questioned Costs: $111,000
2017-EXT-051
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Fish and Wildlife, From April 1, 2014, Through March 31, 2016 (02/28/2018)
Resolved: 5

2017-EXT-058
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the New Jersey State Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Fish and Wildlife, From July 1, 2014, Through June 30, 2016 (07/18/2018)
Resolved: 1

2018-CR-001
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of South Dakota, Department of Game, Fish and Parks, From July 1, 2015, Through June 30, 2017 (03/29/2019)
Resolved: 3

2018-ER-002
Resolved: 2

2018-ER-017
Resolved: 6

2018-ER-018
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, 2015, Through June 30, 2017 (02/05/2019)
Resolved: 1
R-GR-FWS-0002-2014
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Minnesota, Department of Natural Resources, From July 1, 2011, Through June 30, 2013 (12/19/2014)
Resolved: 1

R-GR-FWS-0003-2013
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of South Dakota, Department of Game, Fish, and Parks, From July 1, 2010, Through June 30, 2012 (06/04/2013)
Resolved: 1

R-GR-FWS-0004-2009
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Minnesota, Department of Natural Resources, From July 1, 2005, Through June 30, 2007 (09/21/2009)
Resolved: 1

R-GR-FWS-0006-2011
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the Government of the Virgin Islands, Department of Planning and Natural Resources, From October 1, 2008, Through September 30, 2010 (11/03/2011)
Resolved: 3

R-GR-FWS-0006-2014
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Wisconsin, Department of Natural Resources, From July 1, 2011, Through June 30, 2013 (09/15/2014)
Resolved: 1

R-GR-FWS-0007-2011
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Maryland, Department of Natural Resources, From July 1, 2008, Through June 30, 2010 (11/30/2011)
Resolved: 2
R-GR-FWS-0008-2014
Resolved: 4

R-GR-FWS-0009-2004
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Federal Assistance Grants Administered by the State of New Hampshire, Fish and Game Department, From July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003 (03/31/2005)
Resolved: 1

R-GR-FWS-0010-2012
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Nebraska, Game and Parks Commission, From July 1, 2009, Through June 30, 2011 (11/30/2012)
Resolved: 2

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)
Resolved: 1

R-GR-FWS-0011-2009
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of Utah, Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife Resources, From July 1, 2006, Through June 30, 2008 (01/29/2010)
Resolved: 1

R-GR-FWS-0011-2010
Resolved: 1
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)
Resolved: 2

R-GR-FWS-0011-2014
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Game Commission From July 1, 2011, Through June 30, 2013 (05/05/2016)
Resolved: 1

R-GR-FWS-0012-2010
Resolved: 1

R-GR-FWS-0013-2014
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants Awarded to the State of West Virginia, Division of Natural Resources, From July 1, 2011, Through June 30, 2013 (12/17/2015)
Resolved: 1

R-GR-FWS-0014-2014
Resolved: 5
Questioned Costs: $455,258

Other Assignment Types

Bureau of Reclamation

2015-WR-080-B
Management Advisory – Operations and Maintenance Cost Allocation for the Klamath Project Reserved Works (09/27/2016)
Resolved: 1
2015-WR-080-C
Management Advisory – Reimbursement of A-Canal Head Gates and Fish Screens on the Klamath Project (09/27/2016)
Resolved: 2

2017-WR-048-A
Management Advisory – Proposed Modifications to USBR’s Cooperative Agreement No. R16AC00087 With the Panoche Drainage District (11/27/2017)
Resolved: 3

National Park Service

2017-FIN-032-A
Management Advisory – Issues Identified During Our Audit of Grant No. P13AF00113 Between the National Park Service and the Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development (01/08/2018)
Resolved: 1

2017-WR-037-A
Financial, Ethical, and Exclusive Use Concerns About the NPS’ Agreement With the Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts (09/04/2018)
Resolved: 4
Disagreed: 2

Office of the Secretary

2016-ER-016-A
Management Advisory – PAM’s Misinterpretation of Federal Regulations Resulted in PAM Disagreeing With Recommendations To Track Data for Land Purchases Made With Grant Funds (09/25/2017)
Resolved: 3

2016-WR-022
Management Advisory – Office of Aviation Services’ Maintenance System Presents a Threat to Public Health and Safety (06/29/2016)
Resolved: 2

ER-IN-VIS-0015-2014-A
Management Advisory – Major Procurement and Management Issues Concerning Bond Proceed Use in the U.S. Virgin Islands (09/29/2017)
Resolved: 1
PEER REVIEWS OF OIG OPERATIONS

Government auditing and investigative standards require each statutory OIG to receive an independent, comprehensive peer review of its audit and investigative operations once every 3 years, consistent with applicable standards and guidelines. In general, these peer reviews determine whether the OIG’s internal quality control system is adequate as designed and provides reasonable assurance that the OIG follows applicable standards, policies, and procedures. The Inspector General Act of 1978 requires that OIGs provide in their semiannual reports to Congress information about peer reviews of their respective organizations and their peer reviews of other OIGs.

Audit Peer Review

Peer reviews are conducted in accordance with the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency’s (CIGIE’s) “Guide for Conducting Peer Reviews of Inspection and Evaluation Organizations of Federal Offices of Inspector General,” based on requirements in the CIGIE “Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation.”

The CIGIE External Peer Review Team, led by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and assisted by the U.S. Department of Energy and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, issued its report on September 5, 2019. The review team, in accordance with CIGIE guidelines, accessed our systems of quality control, planning, data collection and analysis, evidence, records maintenance, reporting, and followup. We received a letter of comment, scope, and methodology, which included findings, recommendations, observations, suggestions, and best practices. We are currently updating our policies and standard operating procedures to address the recommendations.

Investigative Peer Reviews

During the October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017 reporting period, our Office of Investigations underwent a peer review by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency OIG, and peer reviewed the Amtrak OIG. Each review was conducted without incident or negative findings.
INVESTIGATIONS INVOLVING SENIOR GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

19-0085*
BSEE Official Did Not Improperly Communicate With Contractors

19-0185*
No Evidence of Post-Employment Violations by Former Park Superintendent

19-0267
No Evidence of Improper Influence by a Senior DOI Official in the Hiring of University Employee
(page 23)

19-0090
Allegation of Reprisal by an Office of the Secretary Official
(page 24)

18-0482
FWS Alleged Scientific Integrity Violation and Retaliation
(page 28)

19-0449*
USGS Staff Did Not Immediately Inform Their Supervisors About NRC Violations

* These cases are summarized on our website but not in this report.
INSTANCES OF AGENCY INTERFERENCE

There have been no instances during this reporting period in which the DOI or its bureaus or offices interfered with an audit, inspection, evaluation, investigation, or other OIG project.
INSTANCES OF NONREMEDIATION

There have been no major Federal Financial Management Improvement Act weaknesses reported during this period.
ALLEGED WHISTLEBLOWER RETALIATION

We submitted one report containing allegations of whistleblower retaliation to the Department to make a determination as to whether retaliation occurred based on the facts of the investigation.

19-0090
Allegation of Reprisal by an Office of the Secretary Official
(page 24)
## 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>1–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(2)</td>
<td>Recommendations for Corrective Action With Respect to Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies</td>
<td>1–34</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>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(4)</td>
<td>Matters Referred to Prosecutive Authorities and Resulting Convictions</td>
<td>36–37</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>38–41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(7)</td>
<td>Summary of Significant Reports</td>
<td>1–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(8)</td>
<td>Statistical Table: Questioned Costs</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(9)</td>
<td>Statistical Table: Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(10)</td>
<td>Summary of Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports Issued Before the Commencement of the Reporting Period—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(10)(A)</td>
<td>For Which No Management Decision Has Been Made</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(10)(B)</td>
<td>For Which No Establishment Comment Was Returned Within 60 Days of Providing the Report to the Establishment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(10)(C)</td>
<td>For Which There Are Any Outstanding Unimplemented Recommendations</td>
<td>45–63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N/A: Not applicable to this reporting period.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 5(a)(11)</th>
<th>Significant Revised Management Decisions Made During the Reporting Period</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(12)</td>
<td>Significant Management Decisions With Which the Inspector General is in Disagreement</td>
<td>N/A</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>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(14)(A)</td>
<td>Results of Peer Reviews Conducted by Another Office of Inspector General During the Reporting Period</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(14)(B)</td>
<td>Most Recent Peer Review Conducted by Another Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(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 5(a)(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>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(17)</td>
<td>Statistical Table: Investigations</td>
<td>36–37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(18)</td>
<td>Description of Statistics Used for Investigations</td>
<td>36–37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(19)</td>
<td>Investigations Involving Senior Government Officials</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(20)</td>
<td>Instances of Whistleblower Retaliation</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(21)</td>
<td>Instances of Interference With the Independence of the OIG</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(22)</td>
<td>Closed but Unpublished Reports Involving Senior Government Officials</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Inspector General
1849 C St., NW
Mail Stop 4428
Washington, DC 20240

www.doioig.gov

Phone: 202-208-5745
Fax: 202-219-3856