



**UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE**  
**OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**  
**SEMIANNUAL REPORT**  
**TO THE CONGRESS**

**April 1, 2012 — September 30, 2012**



## United States Capitol Police



### History

Created by Congress in 1828 following the assault on a son of John Quincy Adams in the Capitol Rotunda, the original duty of the United States Capitol Police (USCP) was to provide security for the United States Capitol Building. Its mission has expanded to provide the Congressional community and its visitors with a variety of police services. These services are provided through a variety of specialty support units, network of foot and vehicular patrols, fixed posts, full-time Containment and Emergency Response Team, K-9 unit, Patrol/Mobile Response Division, and full-time Hazardous Devices and Hazardous Materials Sections. The agency has 2,129 sworn and civilian employees as of September 22, 2012.

### Mission

Today's USCP officer has the primary responsibility of protecting life and property; preventing, detecting, and investigating criminal acts; and enforcing traffic regulations throughout a large complex of congressional buildings, parks, and thoroughfares. With the signing of Public Law 112-74, USCP was given jurisdiction over the Capitol Reflecting Pool and Union Square—adding to its concurrent jurisdiction with other police agencies, including the United States Park Police and Metropolitan (D.C.) Police, of an area approximately 200 blocks around the Capitol complex. USCP is also charged with the protection of Members of Congress, officers of Congress, and their families throughout the entire United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

## Office of Inspector General



### History

With Public Law 109-55 (August 2, 2005), Congress directed that the Capitol Police Board appoint an Inspector General (IG) for the Department. The IG was to be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of integrity and demonstrated ability in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, or investigations.

On July 12, 2006, the Chairman of the Capitol Police Board swore in the first IG for the Department at the Headquarters for the United States Capitol Police—the Eney, Chestnut, Gibson Memorial Building in Washington, D.C.

### Mission

The IG is responsible for conducting and supervising audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of the Department. The Office of Inspector General (OIG) examines, evaluates and, where necessary, critiques the programs and operations, recommending ways to carry out departmental responsibilities in the most effective, efficient, and economical manner possible. OIG also audits, investigates, and oversees matters related to the Department's programs and operations, consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

## MESSAGE FROM THE INSPECTOR GENERAL



**Inspector General  
Carl W. Hoecker**

I am pleased to present the United States Capitol Police (USCP) Office of Inspector General (OIG) *Semianual Report* for the period April 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012.

The audits, investigations, and other activities outlined within this report demonstrate OIG's ongoing commitment to ensure efficiency and integrity within USCP programs and operations.

During this period, Audits issued the *Agreed-Upon Procedures of USCP's Time and Attendance [REDACTED] System* (Report Number OIG-2012-04). Audits also initiated three projects: the audit of the Department's Fiscal Year 2012 Financial Statements, a performance audit of the

Department's Canine Program, and a performance audit of the USCP Building Access Card Process.

Investigations continues to receive and work Hotline complaints and cases from other sources. During this reporting period, OIG received 26 complaints, initiated 7 investigations, and closed 5 cases. Investigations also conducted several outreach sessions with USCP personnel that included several recruit officer classes as well as newly hired civilian personnel. Investigations also conducted a proactive evaluation of the Department's Office of Professional Responsibility.

In working with our stakeholders to maintain and foster an open and effective relationship, I have continued to meet regularly with the Acting Chief of Police and Chief Administrative Officer. By providing objective information that helps promote Government management, decision making, and accountability, OIG contributes to the success of the agency.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank our committees of jurisdiction, the Capitol Police Board, and the Department for the interest and support they continually show our office. We look forward to working closely with the Acting Chief of Police and his leadership team during this time of transition, the Board, and Congress to increase efficiency and effectiveness in USCP programs and operations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Carl W. Hoecker". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**Carl W. Hoecker  
Inspector General**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Executive Summary                                                                 | 2  |
| Legislation Monitored                                                             | 3  |
| Agent of Positive Change                                                          | 4  |
| Proactive Efforts                                                                 | 5  |
| Audits                                                                            | 6  |
| Investigations                                                                    | 9  |
| Appendix 1 – Reports Issued                                                       | 10 |
| Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations                                 | 11 |
| Appendix 3 – Peer Review Reporting                                                | 15 |
| Table 1 – Reports Issued with Questioned Costs                                    | 16 |
| Table 2 – Reports with Recommendations<br>That Funds Be Put to Better Use         | 17 |
| Table 3 – Investigations Statistics                                               | 18 |
| IG Act Reporting Requirements                                                     | 19 |
| Working Relationship Principles for Agencies and<br>Offices of Inspectors General | 20 |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**T**his Semiannual Report is issued pursuant to the provisions of Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and summarizes the activities of the United States Capitol Police's (USCP or Department) Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the period April 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012. During this reporting period, OIG continued to direct its available resources toward those areas of greatest risk for the Department. We completed work designed to promote the economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity of the Department's programs and operations. The work of each of the OIG components is summarized below.

**OIG Audits** conducted Agreed-Upon Procedures (AUP) requested by the then Chief of Police (Chief) and the Chief Administrative Officer. In July, Audits issued the report, *Agreed-Upon Procedures of USCP's Time and Attendance [REDACTED] System* (Report Number OIG-2012-04). In August, Audits initiated the audit of the Department's Fiscal Year 2012 financial statements. Audits also began an audit of the Department's Canine (K-9) program as well as an audit of the USCP's Building Access Card Process.

**OIG Investigations** received and evaluated 26 complaints during this reporting period, of which 21 were Hotline complaints and five were from other sources. In addition, OIG initiated seven investigations and closed five cases. Investigations also conducted a proactive review of the Office of Professional Responsibility (ICR-2012-0001). Investigations closed during this reporting period are shown in Appendix 1.

During this reporting period, OIG continued its active engagement with the Chief, Capitol Police Board, and Congress through meetings, briefings, and hearings. As an example of its active engagement, OIG, through a new cooperative program with the Department's Office of Administration (OA), now provides an overview of the OIG mission to new civilian employees. OIG also continues to provide outreach to recruit officer classes preparing for their departure to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia.

OIG remains a contributing participant in the activities of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), which was statutorily established to enhance efforts to promote integrity and efficiency and to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse in Federal programs. The USCP IG continues to serve as the chairman of CIGIE's Investigations Committee. The IG is also a contributing member to several other committees, including the legislative branch OIGs.



## LEGISLATION MONITORED

### Legislation Monitored

OIG reviewed and monitored the following legislation:

**H.R. 209** – *The Reducing Information Control Designations Act*

**H.R. 2146** – *The Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2011*

**H.R. 4472** – *Government Spending Accountability Act*

**S. 241** – *The Non-Federal Employee Whistleblower Protection Act of 2011*

**S. 300** – *The Government Charge Card Abuse Prevention Act of 2011*

**S. 743** – *The Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012*

**S. 801** – *The Information Technology Investment Management Act of 2011*

**S. 1212** – *The Geolocational Privacy and Surveillance Act*

**S. 1246** – *A bill to reduce the number of non-essential new vehicles the Federal Government purchases and leases*





## **AGENT OF POSITIVE CHANGE**

### **E-Verify Used in Contracts**

During the last several years, OIG has made numerous recommendations for improving financial management and internal controls. OIG notified the Department's Procurement Division that USCP contracts did not have a clause requiring that contractors use a system called "E-Verify." This system electronically verifies employment eligibility of employees work under Federal contracts. The order (Executive Order 13465 of June 6, 2008, amending Executive Order 12989) and the E-Verify contractor rule reinforce Federal government policy that the Federal government must do business only with organizations with a legal workforce. Although USCP is not subject to executive ranch orders, OIG considers it a best practice because requiring that contractors use E-Verify should help reduce the risk of unauthorized employees on-site within the Capitol Complex. The Department is in the process of updating its regulations and contract clause to incorporate E-Verify.

### **Audit Liaison**

In 2007, USCP established the Audit Liaison role and developed a Directive that defines the USCP process for responding to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and OIG. This year, the Department is establishing a standard action plan template that should improve reporting and monitoring of recommendation status. The Audit Liaison is a member of the Department's newly established Performance Improvement Team (PIT).

### **Planning Working Group**

The USCP Planning Working Group (PWG) represents the entire organization rather than merely a sub-unit. The PWG acts in the capacity of a quality control group, reviews and validates the overall development of force development submissions, program assessments, evaluation action plans, and Business Cases. The working group consists of representatives from all Bureaus, Offices, and other select units. PWG members are planners, advisors, subject matter experts, quality control reviewers, and performance monitors. The group will participate in the full range of strategic planning, Force Development, performance measures, and other planning and program management initiatives as well as all major planning activities coordinated by the PIT.



## PROACTIVE EFFORTS

### OIG Strategic Planning

In April, OIG conducted a strategic planning conference designed to improve its efficiency, enhance its productivity, and better align its strategic plan and organizational goals with the Department. This exercise consisted of strategy sessions for enhancing methods of gathering key events and material as well as methods for presenting OIG's semiannual report, and building a sound collaborative foundation that would enable us to produce high-quality and timely products.

OIG staff also discussed strengthening OIG's strategic plan and performance goals, major management challenges for the Department, and priorities for its FY 2013 annual plan. As a result of that planning session, OIG validated its annual performance metrics.

### Outreach Activities

As part of our continuing efforts to promote accountability through better awareness of our role, mission, and services, OIG continues providing outreach information to new employees and recruit officer classes.



The Assistant Inspector General for Investigations conducts outreach with recruit officers.

### OIG Hotline

As part of its duties and responsibilities, OIG maintains a toll-free hotline that provides employees and private citizens a way of relaying to OIG information regarding allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse. As a result of our Hotline, in May 2012 OIG received information from a concerned citizen that a family member may have been involved in the theft of property from various offices within the Capitol Complex. Our review of the reported information indicated that an Architect of the Capitol employee was involved. OIG subsequently provided the information to the Department's Investigation Division. Based on the information, the suspect was arrested and the case forwarded to the Assistant U.S. Attorney for prosecutorial consideration.



## AUDITS

### **Agreed-Upon Procedures of USCP's Time and Attendance [REDACTED] System (OIG-2012-04)**

In prior year financial statement audits,<sup>1</sup> auditors reported payroll processing as a material weakness. As a result of findings related to USCP's time and attendance (T&A) process, the then Chief and the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) requested OIG assistance. OIG performed procedures for determining the adequacy, effectiveness, and efficiency of the Department's policies, procedures, and internal controls over the Department's T&A [REDACTED] system. Our scope included T&A policies and procedures in effect as of December 1, 2011. Data from FY 2011 and the first and second quarters of FY 2012 were used to test whether controls were operating as designed.

While the Department has issued T&A policies and procedures, Bureaus, Divisions, and Offices did not consistently interpret or follow the T&A process. We noted in our report that some T&A management reports were not always used and might be more useful to supervisors and timekeepers if the Office of Human Resources (OHR) provided summary data by category and employee.

In addition, the [REDACTED] application is a fully integrated workforce management application. However, the Department does not use two key pieces of functionality within [REDACTED]. Using a series of organizationally defined rules established within the application similar to the rules sets that handle the T&A functionality, the Scheduler and Shift Trading functionality could replace the need to manage the workforce manually and create work assignments to optimize costs based on rank, salary, training completed, and other factors built into the rules. The Scheduler function also would allow the Department to fully understand in advance costs associated with performing specific duties. An example of a duty is manning a specific door or entrance/exit point.

The lack of compliance and accountability as well as inconsistent interpretation of the Department policies and processes over T&A resources contributed to inefficiencies and consumption of limited resources. Reliable data are important to accurately account for the expenditure of resources attributable to pay, leave, and/or allowances. Thus, OIG made nine recommendations for improving the effectiveness and efficiencies of T&A. The Department concurred with each of the nine recommendations.

---

<sup>1</sup> FYs 2006 through 2011 Financial Statement Audits identified payroll processing as a material weakness. A material weakness is a reportable condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that misstatements caused by error or fraud in amounts that would be material in relation to the financial statements being audited may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions.



---

## ON-GOING AUDITS

---

### **Audit of USCP's FY 2012 Financial Statements**

In accordance with our *FY 2012 Annual Plan*, OIG began the Department's 2012 principal financial statements in August 2012. The primary objective of the audit is to express an opinion on whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, and in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Auditors will also opine on the effectiveness of the USCP's internal control over financial reporting based on the *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and will be conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Further, the financial auditors will evaluate and report on compliance with laws and regulations related to the financial statements.

OIG expects to issue a report about December 15, 2012.

---

### **Audit of the USCP Canine Program**

Based on an anonymous allegation, in August 2012 OIG began a performance audit of the Department's Canine Program (K-9). The objectives of this audit are to determine if USCP's K-9 Unit: (1) established adequate internal controls and processes, and (2) complied with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance pertaining to the management and operation of the Canine Unit. Our scope will include controls, processes, and operations from FY 2010 through FY 2012.

OIG expects to issue a report in December 2012.





---

## ON-GOING AUDITS

---

### **Audit of USCP's Building Access Card Process**

At the request of the CAO, OIG began a performance audit of the Department's Building Access Card Process. The objectives of the performance audit are to determine if the Department: (1) established adequate internal controls and processes over USCP's badging and fingerprinting process to ensure that the risk of unauthorized personnel on the U. S. Capitol Complex is reduced to an acceptable level, and (2) complied with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance pertaining to the management and operation of the Building Access Card Process. Our scope includes controls, processes, and operations in place at USCP as of August 1, 2012.

OIG expects to issue a report in January 2013.





---

## INVESTIGATIONS

---

### **Oversight Review of the USCP, Office of Professional Responsibility (ICR-2012-0001)**

In furtherance of its annual plan, OIG conducted a quality assessment review of the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR). Overall, OIG found that OPR conducted investigations in a fair and impartial manner. Although we did not make any recommendations as a result of the review, we did offer suggestions for improving documentation, allegation tracking, allegation reporting, and division training.

---

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



## **APPENDIX 1 – REPORTS ISSUED**

---

|                    |                                                                               |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>OIG-2012-04</b> | <b>Agreed-Upon Procedures of USCP's Time and Attendance [REDACTED] System</b> |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

---

|                      |                                                                                                    |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>ICR-2012-0001</b> | <b>Oversight Review of the United States Capitol Police, Office of Professional Responsibility</b> |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

---

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



## APPENDIX 2 – RESOLUTION OF REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Timely resolution of outstanding recommendations continues to be a priority of both OIG and the Department. As of September 30, 2012, OIG has made a total of 198 recommendations to the Department. Of those 198 recommendations, the Department closed 151, with 47 still open and requiring additional corrective action before closing. The following table lists recommendations older than 6 months.

| Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations |                                              |                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Report Number                                     | Report Title                                 | Recommendation Number               | Recommendation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 2009-01<br>2011-01<br>2012-02                     | FY 2008 FS<br>FYs 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS | Repeat Finding<br>1.2<br>1.1<br>1.1 | <b>Payroll Processing</b> – We recommended that USCP consistently implement T&A certification policies and procedures and that timekeepers review all certification reports to ensure that employees and supervisors sign and date reports. (1) USCP management needs to enforce the revised policies and procedures in Special Directive [REDACTED]; (2) because the condition has been in existence for many years, we also recommended that the supervisor/timekeeper procedures for monitoring of T&A include identifying habitual failures in submitting certification reports so that corrective actions can be targeted to those employees, and (3) we recommended that USCP evaluate the feasibility of using [REDACTED], a T&A system, to automate the T&A certification process. |
| 2009-01<br>2011-01<br>2012-02                     | FY 2008 FS<br>FYs 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS | Repeat Finding<br>1.3<br>1.2<br>1.2 | <b>Payroll Processing</b> – Recommendation same as above.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 2009-01<br>2011-01<br>2012-02                     | FY 2008 FS<br>FYs 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS | Repeat Finding<br>1.6<br>1.4<br>1.3 | <b>Payroll Processing</b> – As in the prior year's recommendation, USCP should perform monthly reconciliation between the National Finance Center (NFC) and [REDACTED] to ensure leave balance information is correctly reported in both systems. We also recommended that the OHR implement corrective actions in a timely manner.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 2009-01<br>2011-01<br>2012-02                     | FY 2008 FS<br>FYs 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS | Repeat Finding<br>1.9<br>1.6<br>1.4 | <b>Payroll Processing</b> – We recommended that USCP ensure that its employees comply with USCP Special Directive No. [REDACTED] addressing responsibility to record daily worked hours using [REDACTED] time clocks. We also recommend that USCP enhance its procedures for monitoring employees who show a pattern of not clocking in or out and verify if hours entered in [REDACTED] are actual hours worked by the employees.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 2011-01<br>2012-02                                | FY 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS                | Repeat Finding<br>10<br>1.5         | <b>Payroll Processing</b> – As in the prior year's recommendation, we recommended that USCP monitor timekeeper distribution and collection of certification reports to complete its T&A review procedures at the end of each pay period. We also recommended that USCP emphasize deadlines or include a deadline for T&A staff to complete the T&A confirmation of certification report.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 2011-01<br>2012-02                                | FY 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS                | Repeat Finding<br>12<br>1.6         | <b>Payroll Processing</b> – We recommended that USCP document the audits or tests performed and the supervisory review of the test results to include the name of the same tested (if less than 100 percent) in test workpapers. We also recommended that USCP develop a test worksheet that will include the test attributes (criteria), result, and corrective actions, if applicable.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |



# United States Capitol Police Office of Inspector General

## Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations

| Report Number                 | Report Title                                                | Recommendation Number               | Recommendation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2011-01<br>2012-02            | FY 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS                               | Repeat Finding<br>13<br>1.7         | <b>Payroll Processing</b> – We recommended that USCP develop, document, and implement a segregation-of-duties matrix to identify incompatible functions across [REDACTED] and NFC. We also recommended that management review all user accounts and ensure that users are assigned appropriate roles within and across applications to prevent control over incompatible functions.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2009-01<br>2011-01<br>2012-02 | FY 2008 FS<br>FYs 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS                | Repeat Finding<br>2.2H<br>22<br>2.1 | <b>Financial Management</b> – We recommended that USCP develop a formal monthly reporting process from the program offices overseeing construction-in-progress to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and provide signed confirmation that the financial reports from the partner agencies have been reviewed and accepted.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2011-01<br>2012-02            | FY 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS                               | Repeat Finding<br>38<br>3.1         | <b>Financial Management</b> – We recommended that USCP develop and implement a methodology that would ensure that user activity is routinely reviewed through logs generated by the [REDACTED] application.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 2011-01<br>2012-02            | FY 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS                               | Repeat Finding<br>39<br>3.2         | <b>Financial Management</b> – We recommended that USCP develop, document, and implement an OFM segregation-of-duties matrix to identify incompatible functions within [REDACTED]. We also recommended that USCP review all user accounts and ensure that users are assigned appropriate roles within and across financial applications to prevent control over incompatible functions.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 2011-01<br>2012-02            | FY 2010/2009 FS<br>FY 2011 FS                               | Repeat Finding<br>40<br>3.3         | <b>Financial Management</b> – We recommended that USCP implement account management controls within [REDACTED] to remove access of terminated individuals in a timely manner. We also recommended that USCP update the mechanism to request and approve access to [REDACTED] to provide requestors with the ability to select specific access roles that agree to roles assigned within [REDACTED].                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2008-06                       | Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs | 1                                   | <b>Specialty Pay</b> – We recommended that USCP develop and implement a sound, effective method of accounting for each specialty assignment and proficiency pay program in the NFC and the [REDACTED] accounting systems. During the interim, OHR should establish written procedures for processing and reconciling its cuff records with actual disbursements.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2008-06                       | Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs | 2                                   | <b>Specialty Pay</b> – We recommended that USCP take action to collect questioned costs totaling \$196,420 and provide supporting documentation for \$30,600.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 2008-06                       | Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs | 3                                   | <b>Specialty Pay</b> – We recommended that USCP consider whether all the specialty assignment and proficiency pay programs are needed and, if so, determine the most efficient and effective method of implementation and allocate the necessary resources to effectively administrate the programs.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 2008-06                       | Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs | 4                                   | <b>Specialty Pay</b> – We recommended that USCP, in the interim, clarify Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Program Administrative Directives regarding:<br>a. Exclusions or payments from multiple programs when using the same defining criteria such as physical fitness, firearms proficiency, risk to self, and maintenance of certification or proficiencies, thereby avoiding costs of \$279,219 and putting funds to better use.<br>b. The aggregate of 50 percent of the previous 6-month period for pay purposes for hazardous duty and plainclothes.<br>c. The 45-calendar day requirement for specialty assignment pay. |
| 2008-06                       | Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs | 5                                   | <b>Specialty Pay</b> – We recommended that USCP finalize its draft firearms and field officer training directives and enforce the consistent use of a standard [REDACTED] Form.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |



## United States Capitol Police Office of Inspector General

### Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations

| Report Number | Report Title                                                                  | Recommendation Number | Recommendation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2008-06       | Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs                   | 6                     | <b>Specialty Pay</b> – We recommended that USCP strengthen tracking and reconciliation procedures that ensure employees do not improperly receive payments within the same fiscal year or when ineligible for such pay.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 2008-06       | Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs                   | 8                     | <b>Specialty Pay</b> – We recommended that USCP take action to clarify its Maximum Annual Payable Rate in light of Public Law 108-7. In addition, we recommended that the Chief request the Office of the General Counsel provide a legal opinion regarding: (1) USCP authority to defer payments to the next calendar year when an employee may exceed the annual salary limitation; and (2) appropriate options for collecting amounts from employees who received amounts in excess of the annual salary limitation.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 2008-06       | Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs                   | 9                     | <b>Specialty Pay</b> – We recommended that USCP consider whether certain specialty assignment and proficiency pay programs are needed to compete with other police forces and, if so, then the Department should link its goals and measures of these programs with retention and recruitment of Department personnel.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 2008-08       | Review of Compliance with USCP Hiring Standards and with Directive [REDACTED] | 1                     | <b>Triple III</b> – We recommended that USCP, in coordination with the Capitol Police Board, update its hiring standards and establish a comprehensive hiring directive outlining the Department's vision and goals to create a talented and committed workforce, to support an effective organizational culture, and enhance the overall performance of the USCP workforce.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2009-02       | Controls Over Travel Vouchers                                                 | 2                     | <b>Travel Vouchers</b> – We recommended that USCP provide travel cardholders training or, at a minimum, require that all cardholders take the GSA on-line training course for cardholders and document such training. Additionally, OFM should review the questionable vouchers and determine if questioned costs should be collected from cardholders.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 2009-02       | Controls Over Travel Vouchers                                                 | 3                     | <b>Travel Vouchers</b> – We recommended that USCP strengthen its controls surrounding voucher payment process. Specifically, we recommended that USCP require cardholders to mark duplicate travel vouchers clearly as "COPY" when resubmitting to OFM. Additionally, OFM should develop and implement a mandatory specialized training course for the approving, authorizing, and certifying officials reiterating their roles and responsibilities. Refresher courses should be provided on a periodic basis. Until a training course is developed and implemented, USCP should require that applicable officials review the Federal Travel Regulations and USCP policies and procedures related to reviewing travel vouchers and approving travel expenditures. |
| 2009-05       | Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program                                           | 1                     | <b>Purchase Card</b> – We recommended that USCP communicate policies and procedures that address the identified internal control deficiencies noted for the Purchase Card Program culminating in a comprehensive purchase card plan.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 2009-05       | Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program                                           | 2                     | <b>Purchase Card</b> – We recommended that USCP update its Purchase Card guidance.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 2009-05       | Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program                                           | 3                     | <b>Purchase Card</b> – We recommended that USCP require the Purchase Card Program Coordinator to conduct monthly monitoring of purchase cardholder statements and purchase log reconciliations to measure compliance.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 2009-05       | Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program                                           | 4                     | <b>Purchase Card</b> – We recommended that USCP review reported questionable transactions and make a determination as to their appropriateness and valid Government need.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2009-06       | Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments                                            | 1                     | <b>Off-site Deployments</b> – We recommended that USCP in coordination with the CPB and Committees of jurisdiction, establish a policy clearly defining terms such as deployment, "direct nexus" to the mission, and the three exceptions under 2 U.S.C. § 1978 and establish a complete listing of off campus activities that do not require formal notification.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |



## United States Capitol Police Office of Inspector General

### Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations

| Report Number | Report Title                                                    | Recommendation Number | Recommendation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2009-06       | Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments                              | 2                     | <b>Off-site Deployments</b> – We recommended that USCP immediately document its decision-making process as it relates to off-campus activities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 2009-06       | Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments                              | 3                     | <b>Off-site Deployments</b> – We recommended that USCP implement procedures to capture and document estimated and actual costs in all off-campus activities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 2009-06       | Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments                              | 4                     | <b>Off-site Deployments</b> – We recommended that USCP develop written measures and standards for off-campus activities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 2010-02       | Review of Hazardous Materials Response Team Procurement Process | 3                     | <b>Procurement</b> – We recommended that USCP safeguard Government contract records by establishing physical control over vulnerable assets. Access to records should be limited to authorized individuals, and accountability for their custody and use should be assigned and maintained.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 2012-01       | Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture                           | 1                     | <b>Enterprise Architecture</b> – We recommended that the USCP Office of Information Systems (OIS) immediately update its strategic plan to define objectives and goals that align with the short- and long-term goals and objectives of the Department. The plan also should incorporate goals on optimizing enterprise-wide information systems performance and accountability.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 2012-01       | Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture                           | 2                     | <b>Enterprise Architecture</b> – We recommended that OIS immediately update its strategic plan to define objectives and goals that align with the short- and long-term goals and objectives of USCP.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2012-01       | Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture                           | 3                     | <b>Enterprise Architecture</b> – We recommended that USCP management evaluate the distinct organizations with significant information technology investments and operations. As part of this evaluation, all individuals within the organization, either within OIS or other bureaus and offices that have any information technology support responsibilities should be identified. Once identified, an analysis should be performed to determine how those individuals can be aligned within OIS. If re-alignment is not feasible, information technology responsibilities of the individuals should be transitioned to appropriate individuals within OIS. |
| 2012-01       | Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture                           | 4                     | <b>Enterprise Architecture</b> – We recommended that USCP immediately complete a full inventory of systems in use by the Department to identify its "as is" configuration. Once developed and validated, OIS should develop the Department's "to be" configuration and its transition plan to achieve this configuration.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 2012-01       | Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture                           | 5                     | <b>Enterprise Architecture</b> – We recommended that the USCP Enterprise Architecture Review Board's decisions and recommendations be incorporated into the decision-making process that aligns its information technology investments with the budgeting and procurement processes (Force Development Process).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 2012-02       | FY 2012 FS                                                      | 1                     | <b>Payroll Processing</b> – We recommended that OFM review the nature of accrued liabilities to determine proper classification as to an asset or expense. We also recommended that OFM perform periodic comparison of actual to estimated accrued liability to ensure accrual methodology procedures result in a reasonable estimate of goods and services received but not paid.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 2012-02       | FY 2012 FS                                                      | 1.8                   | <b>Financial Management</b> – We recommended that USCP OHR obtain a waiver, if appropriate, from the Chief of Police within 2 pay periods before or after the end of the leave year so that excess hours can be reinstated or carried over timely.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |



## ***APPENDIX 3 – Peer Review Reporting***

### **Implementing Section 989C of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act Inspector General Peer Review Activity April 1, 2012 – September 30, 2012**

#### **Last Peer Review Conducted of the USCP OIG Audit Organization**

As part of the 3-year cycle of independent peer reviews, the last peer review report<sup>2</sup> covering the USCP OIG Audit organization was issued January 27, 2011, by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) OIG. USCP OIG received a peer review rating of pass for the year ended September 30, 2010. Furthermore, NEH OIG had no comments or recommendations in its *System Review Report* of USCP OIG.

The next peer review of the USCP OIG's Audit organization is scheduled for September 2013.

#### **Last Peer Review Conducted by the USCP OIG Audit Organization**

USCP OIG was not involved in any peer review work during this reporting period. USCP OIG issued its last *Reviewing Inspector General Report* on March 12, 2010, to the Federal Maritime Commission OIG.

USCP OIG is scheduled to conduct the peer review of Appalachian Regional Commission for the period ended March 2013.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) Audit Committee administers the external peer review program under generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) for Federal Offices of Inspectors General. GAGAS requires that audit organizations perform audits or attestation engagements in accordance with GAGAS to have an appropriate system of quality control and to undergo external peer reviews at least once every 3 years. GAGAS prescribes: (1) the elements of scope of the peer review, including performing a risk assessment to help determine the number and types of engagements to select; (2) the requirements for reporting on the results of the peer review; (3) the qualifications of review staff; and (4) the distribution of peer review reports. GAGAS also prescribes requirements for granting extensions of deadlines for submitting peer review reports.



## Table 1

### Reports Issued with Questioned Costs<sup>3</sup> April 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012

| Category                                                                                   | (Dollars in Thousands) |                  |                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
|                                                                                            | No. of Reports         | Questioned Costs | Unsupported Costs |
| For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period | 4                      | \$2,701          | \$1,341           |
| Which were issued during the reporting period                                              | 0                      | \$0              | \$0               |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                                                                            | 4                      | \$2,701          | \$1,341           |
| For which a management decision was made during the reporting period                       |                        |                  |                   |
| • dollar value of disallowed costs                                                         | 0                      | \$0              | \$0               |
| • dollar value of cost not disallowed                                                      | 0                      | \$0              | \$0               |
| For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period          | 4                      | \$2,701          | \$1,341           |
| Reports for which no management decision was made within 6 months of issuance              | 4                      | \$2,701          | \$1,341           |

<sup>3</sup> A "questioned cost" denotes that one or more of the following three situations exist: (1) an alleged violation of a provision of a law, regulation, contract, grant, cooperative agreement, other agreement, or document governing the expenditure of funds; (2) a finding that, at the time of the audit, such cost is not supported by adequate documentation; or (3) a finding that the expenditure of funds for the intended purpose is unnecessary or unreasonable.



## Table 2

### **Reports Issued with Recommendations that Funds Be Put to Better Use<sup>4</sup> October 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012**

| Category                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Number of Reports | Dollar Value (in thousands) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period                                                                                                                                                        | 1                 | \$282                       |
| Which were issued during the reporting period                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 0                 | \$0                         |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 1                 | \$282                       |
| For which management decision was made during the reporting period                                                                                                                                                                                | 0                 | 0                           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>dollar value of recommendations that were agreed to by management<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>based on proposed management action</li><li>based on proposed legislative action</li></ul></li></ul> | 0                 | 0                           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>dollar value of recommendations that were not agreed to by management</li></ul>                                                                                                                             | 0                 | 0                           |
| For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period                                                                                                                                                                 | 1                 | \$282                       |
| Reports for which no management decision was made with 6 months of issuance                                                                                                                                                                       | 1                 | \$282                       |

<sup>4</sup> A recommendation that funds be put to better use is a recommendation by the OIG that funds could be used more efficiently if Department management took actions to implement and complete the recommendations, including: reductions in outlays, deobligation of funds from programs or operations; withdrawal of interest subsidy costs on loans or loan guarantees, insurance, or bonds; costs not incurred by implementing recommended improvements related to the operations of the Department, a contractor, or a grantee, avoidance of unnecessary expenditures noted in preaward reviews of contract or grant agreements; or any other savings which are specifically identified.



## **Table 3**

---

### **INVESTIGATIONS STATISTICS** **April 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012**

|                                                       |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Recoveries                                            | \$0 |
| Fines and Restitutions                                | \$0 |
| Investigative Cases Opened                            | 7   |
| Investigative Cases Closed                            | 5   |
| Internal Control Reviews                              | 1   |
| Arrests                                               | 0   |
| Indictments                                           | 0   |
| Convictions                                           | 0   |
| Personnel Actions                                     | 1   |
| Total Complaints Received                             | 26  |
| Hotline Complaints Received                           | 21  |
| Complaints from Other Sources                         | 0   |
| Complaints Referred (to Department or other agencies) | 11  |
| Inspector General Subpoenas                           | 0   |



## IG Act REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

| Section             | Requirement                                                                                                       | Page  |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Section 4(a)(2)     | Review of Legislation                                                                                             | 3     |
| Section 5(a)(1)     | Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies                                                                    | 6-9   |
| Section 5(a)(2)     | Recommendations with Respect to Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies                                    | 6-9   |
| Section 5(a)(3)     | Recommendations Included in Previous Reports on Which Corrective Action Has Not Been Completed                    | 11-14 |
| Section 5(a)(4)     | Matters Referred to Prosecuting Authorities                                                                       | None  |
| Section 5(a)(5)     | Summary of Instances Where Information Was Refused                                                                | None  |
| Section 5 (a)(6)    | Reports Issued During the Reporting Period                                                                        | 10    |
| Section 5(a)(7)     | Summary of Significant Reports                                                                                    | 6-9   |
| Section 5(a)(8)     | Questioned and Unsupported Costs (Table 1)                                                                        | 16    |
| Section 5(a)(9)     | Recommendations that Funds be put to Better Use (Table 2)                                                         | 17    |
| Section 5(a)(10)    | Summary of Reports Issued before the start of the Reporting Period for which no Management Decision has been made | N/A   |
| Section 5(a)(11)    | Significant Revised Management Decisions                                                                          | N/A   |
| Section 5(a)(12)    | Management Decisions with which the Inspector General is in Disagreement                                          | None  |
| Section 5(a)(13)    | Specifically excluded by Public Law 109-55                                                                        | N/A   |
| Section 5(a)(14-16) | Peer Review Reporting Requirements                                                                                | 15    |



## Working Relationship Principles for Agencies and Offices of Inspectors General

The *Inspector General Act* establishes for most agencies an OIG and sets out its mission, responsibilities, and authority. The unique nature of the IG function can present a number of challenges for establishing and maintaining effective working relationships. To work most effectively together, the agency and its OIG need to clearly define what each considers a productive relationship and then consciously manage toward that goal in an atmosphere of mutual respect.

By providing objective information to promote Government management, decision making, and accountability, OIG contributes to the agency's success. OIG is an agent of positive change, focusing on eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse, and on identifying problems and recommendations for corrective actions by agency leadership. OIG provides the agency, Board, and Congress with objective assessments of opportunities to be more successful. OIG, although not under the direct supervision of the Chief, must keep the Board and Congress fully and currently informed of significant OIG activities. Given the complexity of management and policy issues, OIG and the agency may sometimes disagree on the extent of a problem and the need for and scope of corrective action. However, such disagreements should not cause the relationship between OIG and the agency to become unproductive. The following working relationship principles provide some guidance for agencies and OIGs. **To work together most effectively, OIG and the agency should strive to:**

### **Foster open communications at all levels.**

The agency will promptly respond to OIG requests for information to facilitate OIG activities and acknowledge challenges that OIG can help address. Surprises are to be avoided. With very limited exceptions, primarily related to investigations, OIG should keep the agency advised of its work and its findings on a timely basis, and strive to provide information helpful to the agency at the earliest possible stage.

### **Interact with professionalism and mutual respect.**

Each party should always act in good faith and presume the same from the other. Both parties share, as a common goal, the successful accomplishment of the agency's mission.

**Recognize and respect the mission and priorities of the agency and OIG.** The agency should recognize OIG's independent role in carrying out its mission within the agency, while recognizing the responsibility of OIG to report both to Congress and to the agency head. OIG should work to carry out its functions with a minimum of disruption to the primary work of the agency. The agency should allow OIG timely access to agency records and other materials.

**Be thorough, objective, and fair.** OIG must perform its work thoroughly, objectively, and with consideration to the agency's point of view. When responding, the agency will objectively consider differing opinions and means of improving operations. Both sides will recognize successes in addressing management challenges.

**Be engaged.** OIG and agency management will work cooperatively in identifying the most important areas for OIG work, as well as the best means of addressing the results of that work, while maintaining OIG's statutory independence of operation. In addition, agencies need to recognize that OIG also will need to carry out work that is congressionally requested, mandated by law, or self-initiated.

**Be knowledgeable.** OIG will continually strive to keep abreast of agency programs and operations, and agency management will be kept informed of OIG activities and concerns being raised in the course of OIG work. Agencies will help ensure that OIG is kept up to date on current matters and events.

**Provide feedback.** The agency and OIG should implement mechanisms, both formal and informal, to ensure prompt and regular feedback.

## This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

## This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.



## **CONTACTING THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

The success of OIG's mission to prevent fraud, waste, abuse, or mismanagement depends on the cooperation of employees and the public. There are several ways to report questionable activity.

---

**Call us at 202-593-4201 or toll-free at 866-906-2446. A confidential or anonymous message can be left 24 hours a day/7 days a week.**



Toll-Free  
1-866-906-2446

---

**Write or visit us – we are located at:**



*United States Capitol Police  
Attn: Office of Inspector General, Investigations  
119 D Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20510*

**OIG staff members open mail addressed to the above address.**

---

**You can also contact us by email at: [OIG@USCP.GOV](mailto:OIG@USCP.GOV)**

---

**When making a report, convey as much information as possible such as: Who? What? Where? When? Why? Complaints may be made anonymously or you may request confidentiality.**

---

### **Additional Information and Copies:**

To obtain additional copies of this report, call the OIG at 202-593-4201.

---

