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

September 1, 2010

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

Dear Mr. Beschler:

The Office of the Inspector General has completed an investigation in Richmond Animal Care and Control. This letter informs you of the results of the investigation.

## Complaint

The Office of the Inspector General received a complaint alleging an Animal Care and Control Officer was using the City vehicle for non-City business.

## Legal Requirements

In accordance with the Code of Virginia, §15.2-2511.2, the City Auditor is required to investigate all allegations of fraud, waste and abuse. Accordingly an investigation was initiated by the Inspector General's Office.

## Methodology

- An investigator for the Inspector General's Office performed surveillance procedures and identified the employee as an Animal Care and Control Officer for the City of Richmond.
- The Inspector General's Office requested daily activity logs for the employee.
- Data gathered during this investigation was analyzed and compared to the employee's daily activity logs.
- The employee was interviewed.
- Other investigative procedures were followed, as deemed necessary.

## **Findings**

The investigator's surveillance data for 22 days was compared to locations listed on the employee's daily activity logs and found:

• Time documented on daily activity logs was greater than the amount of time the employee

spent at some of the locations.

There were some locations on the daily activity logs that were never visited.

• The employee was at her residence when the daily activity logs showed her at other

locations.

The comparison showed 46 discrepancies indicating that the employee was not visiting sites

recorded in her daily activity logs.

In addition, the information during the investigator's surveillances revealed:

• The employee was using the City of Richmond vehicle to transport non-City employees.

During the interview, the subject employee stated she understood the Richmond Animal Care and Control Division's policy not to allow persons other than animal control employees in their vehicles. She had acknowledged a memo dated June 7, 2010, notifying all animal control employees of the policy. The subject employee admitted to bringing a

male (non-City employee) in the City vehicle with her to the interview. The employee was vague in answering questions and not cooperative in answering all of the questions during

the interview.

• On numerous occasions, the employee visited a friend during work hours.

• The employee fabricated information on her daily activity logs.

The Inspector General's office finds the allegation to be substantiated and recommends

appropriate disciplinary action against the subject employee.

If you have any questions, please contact me at extension 5640.

Sincerely,

Umesh Dalal, CPA, CIA, CIG

City Auditor/Inspector General

Cc: Byron C. Marshall, Chief Administrative Officer

Jody Jones, Program Manager, Richmond Animal Care and Control