

Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

Investigations of Improper Activities by State Employees, January 2006 Through June 2006

INVESTIGATION I2006-0663 (REPORT I2006-2), SEPTEMBER 2006

Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's response as of August 2007

We investigated and substantiated an allegation that Employee A, an employee of the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Forestry) submitted false time sheets and took time off without charging his leave balances.

Finding #1: Employee A fraudulently claimed hours he did not work.

Between January 2004 and December 2005, Employee A improperly claimed and received \$17,904 in wages for 672 hours he did not work. He submitted nine false claims over this two-year period. Because these false claims were submitted on numerous occasions over a significant period of time and under a variety of different circumstances, we believe it is reasonable to infer that this individual acted intentionally when submitting these false claims. Employee A's supervisor told us that having accurate staffing information is critical, and that he reviews daily staffing reports each morning to ensure that he has sufficient staff to respond to emergencies. We found numerous instances in which Employee A's time sheets conflicted with these reports.

For example, Employee A received \$9,884 by claiming he worked 372 hours when he was not present at work. During these hours, Employee B reported working to provide vacation coverage for Employee A. When questioned, Employee B stated that he worked all the hours he indicated for the purpose of covering for Employee A's vacation and that Employee A was not present during those hours. Furthermore, staffing reports confirm that Employee B was present for work and that Employee A was not.

Conversely, we identified 108 hours for which Employee A claimed he was providing vacation coverage for Employee B, even though Employee B's time sheet indicates he did not take leave and was at work during all these hours. Staffing reports confirm that Employee B was present for work and that Employee A was not present. When asked about these hours, Employee B asserted he did not charge his vacation balances because he was at work. He added that he did not know why Employee A claimed to work these hours because Employee A was not present during any of the hours claimed. Employee A received \$2,906 for claiming these hours.

Finally, Employee A claimed to work 192 hours for which he received \$5,114, but staffing reports indicate Employee A was not present during this time. Neither Employee A's nor Employee B's time sheet indicates that Employee A was providing vacation coverage during these hours. Employee A claimed that he worked his regular work schedule on his time sheet, but staffing reports indicate that he was not at work during any of these hours.

Investigative Highlights . . .

An employee with the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection:

- » *Submitted false claims to receive \$17,904 in wages for 672 hours he did not work.*
- » *Submitted a majority of his false claims to a supervisor with little or no knowledge of his actual attendance.*

Forestry's Action: Pending.

Forestry requested to review our work papers in August 2006 to pursue corrective action. In addition, Forestry reported in March 2007 that it agreed that Employee A collected wages to which he was not entitled and had conducted its own investigation. Forestry also reported that it was assessing the adequacy of the documentation of its investigation and planned to recover overpayments and determine disciplinary action once the assessment was complete.

Forestry had not provided any other update as of August 2007.

Finding #2: The employee took advantage of poor supervision and weak controls to receive payments for hours not worked.

By claiming wages for hours he did not work, Employee A took advantage of his supervisor's lack of effective oversight and communication among the various staff with the authority to sign time sheets. Simply comparing Employee A's time sheets and daily staffing reports with those of Employee B would have shown that Employee A was submitting inaccurate time sheets. Although we acknowledge that efficient and effective firefighting is one of Forestry's critical responsibilities, responding to emergency situations does not relieve Forestry of its responsibility to maintain adequate payroll controls or to keep complete and accurate attendance records, as required by state law.

The supervisor acknowledged that he had not been as diligent in verifying the authorization and hours worked for his employees as he should have been and when one employee claimed he was providing vacation coverage for the other, he did not always compare time sheets for both employees when approving them for payment.

The supervisor also pointed out that other supervisors may approve these time sheets. Because employees and supervisors may work in the field or at headquarters at any given time, Forestry's practice is to allow individuals other than an employee's direct supervisor to sign time sheets. Up to nine people have the authority to approve Employee A's and Employee B's time sheets. As a result, it is possible that the direct supervisor may sign one, both, or neither Employee A's or Employee B's time sheets for that month. Four individuals other than his direct supervisor signed a total of eight of Employee A's time sheets for the two-year period we reviewed. We believe Employee A was able to claim wages for hours not worked without being detected because he took advantage of a lack of oversight and communication among those with the authority to sign his time sheets. Additionally, it appears Employee A may have exploited this relaxed management practice by frequently having supervisors other than his direct supervisor sign his time sheets when he claimed hours he did not work.

For example, a battalion chief who rarely works in the field approved 240 of the 672 hours Employee A improperly claimed. With multiple approving authorities available, Employee A had the opportunity to have his time sheets approved by someone who, at best, would have limited firsthand knowledge of the hours he claimed. Most of the false claims Employee A submitted were signed by someone other than his direct supervisor.

Forestry's Action: Partial corrective action taken.

Forestry issued a memo on December 1, 2006, to all stations in the unit in which the employee worked, outlining several steps intended to address the findings in the investigative report.

Supervisors with direct supervisory responsibility over a given employee are the only supervisors authorized to sign time reports for that employee. Program managers will compare each employee's work time with the appropriate daily staffing report. Employee's requesting time off that is not part of their annual vacation request process will be required to forward their request to a Division Chief or Duty Chief for approval per the "Master Schedule" for the unit. The memo includes a reminder to Battalion Chiefs to ensure that station log books, which are legal documents used to record and verify personnel transactions at the station level, are complete, accurate, and secure.

Management will also have the ability to access the department's personnel database to review staffing and personnel transactions, as well as recorded phone lines and radio transmissions to review conversations related to staffing and personnel decisions.

Finally, the memo reminds recipients that Battalion Chiefs will have the primary oversight responsibility for all personnel in their Battalions, and that Division Chiefs will conduct audits to ensure that all policies and procedures are followed and report their findings to the Unit Chief.

Forestry did not provide any other updates as of August 2007.