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Automatic Email Updates
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To receive email notifications of additions to the OIG website, go to the OIG website at oig.justice.gov, click on “Sign Up For E-mail Updates,” and then click the link labeled “Start, Change, or Cancel Your Subscription.” You will be asked to provide the email address where you want the notifications to be sent. You may elect to receive notifications for all reports and documents when they are added to the OIG website or you can elect to receive notifications for only certain types of OIG reports and documents. At any time, you can change your email address, modify your password, add or delete subscriptions, or remove your email address from this service.
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MESSAGE FROM THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

It is my pleasure to submit this Semiannual Report on the operations of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), which covers the period from April 1, 2019, to September 30, 2019.

During this time, we completed several reports pertaining to the Department and its components, such as reviews of the Drug Enforcement Administration’s regulatory and enforcement efforts to control the diversion of opioids; cooperation between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Homeland Security Investigations on the Southwest Border; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives’ controls over cashier funds; and the Department’s use of immigration sponsorship programs.

In our ongoing commitment to identify whether federal funds are being used by the Department effectively and efficiently, we conducted dozens of audits and reviews to fulfill this mission, and we recommended improvements to the Department’s programs. In particular, we reviewed the Department’s efforts to address challenges in administering the Crime Victims Fund (CVF) programs and conducted 16 other audits of CVF-funded grant recipients.

Additionally, we reviewed the Federal Bureau of Prisons’ (BOP) management of electrical and heating issues at the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn and how these issues affected inmates’ conditions of confinement. We also audited a $65 million contract awarded by the BOP for comprehensive medical services at a BOP facility.

Further, the OIG’s Investigations Division closed 125 criminal or administrative misconduct cases, and its work resulted in 40 convictions or pleas and 87 administrative actions, which include terminations, administrative disciplinary actions, and resignations. The quality of the investigations described in this report demonstrates the importance of effective, fair, and objective investigative oversight conducted by our Office.

As always, the OIG remains committed to its mission to detect and deter waste, fraud, abuse, and misconduct related to DOJ programs, and to promote economy and efficiency in those programs—as is exemplified in our work over the past 6 months. As usual, the Semiannual Report reflects the exceptional work of OIG personnel and their dedication to the OIG’s important mission.

Michael E. Horowitz
Inspector General
October 31, 2019
HIGHLIGHTS

Statistical Highlights
The following summaries highlight some of the OIG’s audits, evaluations, inspections, special reviews, and investigations, which are discussed further in this report. As the highlights illustrate, the OIG continues to conduct wide-ranging oversight of Department of Justice (DOJ or Department) programs and operations.

Investigations Division

6,195
Allegations Received by the Investigations Division

127/125
Investigations Opened/Closed

42
Arrests

32/40
Indictments & Informations/Convictions & Pleas

87
Administrative Actions

$917,501.23
Monetary Recoveries
Audit Division

41
Audit Reports Issued

$4,577,633
Questioned Costs

$1,048,000
Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use

270
Recommendations for Management Improvements

30
Single Audit Act Reports Issued

12,682,652
Questioned Costs

77
Recommendations for Management Improvements

2
Other Audit Division Reports Issued
Audits, Evaluations, Inspections, and Special Reviews Highlights

Examples of OIG audits, evaluations, inspections, and special reviews completed during this semiannual reporting period are:

- **Review of the Office of Justice Programs' Efforts to Address Challenges in Administering the Crime Victims Fund Programs.** While funding increases in recent years supported underserved victims and new initiatives, many state recipients struggled to follow grant requirements. The OIG determined that the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) must better define and communicate grant rules, improve its grantee reporting processes, and enhance the guidance and oversight it provides for Crime Victims Fund (CVF) grant recipients, particularly in the areas of financial management, recordkeeping, and subaward monitoring.

- **Audit of the Department of Justice's Use of Immigration Sponsorship Programs.** DOJ components reported sponsoring over 5,000 foreign nationals between Fiscal Years (FY) 2015 and 2017. The OIG found that DOJ components must enhance their oversight of sponsorship activities to ensure they have adequate controls for managing and overseeing foreign nationals. The audit identified 62 sponsored foreign nationals who had absconded from DOJ control and found 18 instances in which DOJ components did not request sponsorship renewals or terminations in a timely manner.

- **Review of Facilities Issues at MDC Brooklyn and Related Impacts on Inmates.** The OIG issued a report assessing the Federal Bureau of Prisons' (BOP) management of electrical and heating issues that occurred during a January 27–February 3, 2019 partial power outage at the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn, New York (MDC Brooklyn), and how those issues affected inmates' conditions of confinement. While the power outage did not affect MDC Brooklyn's heating systems, the OIG identified long-standing temperature regulation issues that affected heating in certain housing units before, during, and after the outage.

- **Drug Enforcement Administration's Regulatory and Enforcement Efforts to Control the Diversion of Opioids.** The report examined the Drug Enforcement Administration’s (DEA) regulatory and enforcement efforts to control the diversion of opioids. The OIG found that the DEA was slow to respond to the significant increase in the use and diversion of opioids since 2000, did not use its data systems and strongest administrative enforcement tools to detect and regulate diversion effectively, and that DEA policies and regulations did not adequately hold registrants accountable or prevent the diversion of pharmaceutical opioids.

- **Report of Investigation of Former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey’s Disclosure of Sensitive Investigative Information and Handling of Certain Memoranda.** The OIG determined that Comey violated applicable policies and his Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Employment Agreement in several ways, including by providing one of the unclassified memos that contained official FBI information, including sensitive investigative information, to his friend with instructions for the friend to share the contents of the memorandum with a reporter; and providing copies of the four memoranda he had improperly kept in his home to his three private attorneys without FBI authorization. After
reviewing the OIG’s factual findings, DOJ declined prosecution. The OIG provided its report to the FBI and to the DOJ Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) for action as they deem appropriate.

**Investigative Highlights**

As shown in the statistics at the beginning of this section and in the chart below, the OIG investigates many allegations of misconduct involving DOJ employees or contractors and grantees who receive DOJ funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>Cases Opened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste, Mismanagement</td>
<td>4850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Prohibitions</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Misconduct</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty Violations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force, Abuse, Rights Violations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Violations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Violations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Investigations Data Management System

The following are examples of such investigations:

- **Procedural Reform Recommendation for the Department regarding the Circumstances under which an Employee May Accept an Offer from a Third Party to Purchase Tickets to a Special Event at Face Value.** As a result of a related investigation, the OIG has concerns that the Department does not provide sufficient guidance regarding the circumstances under which an employee may accept an offer from a third party to purchase tickets to a special event at face value. In some situations, such purchases can create the appearance that Department employees are benefiting from or misusing their official positions. The OIG recommended that the Department issue guidance regarding the circumstances under which it is permissible for an employee to accept an offer to purchase tickets from a third party at face value, when the offer is made to the employee solely because of the employee’s official position, and is not also available to the general public.

- **Findings of Misconduct by an FBI Deputy Assistant Director for Unauthorized Contacts with the Media, Disclosing Law Enforcement and Other Sensitive Information to the Media, and Accepting a Gift from the Media.** On May 23, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the FBI, alleging that a then FBI Deputy Assistant Director (DAD) had numerous contacts
with members of the media in violation of FBI policy. Additionally, it was alleged that the DAD may have disclosed law enforcement or other sensitive information to the media without authorization. The investigation was presented for prosecution on April 21, 2017, and declined on February 6, 2018. The OIG has provided its report to the FBI for appropriate action.

- **Former BOP Correctional Officer Sentenced for Solicitation to Commit a Crime of Violence and Possession of a Firearm and Ammunition by a Person Subject to a Protection Order.** On July 29, 2019, a former BOP Senior Correctional Officer assigned to the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn, New York, who resigned his position after his Indictment, was sentenced to 84 months of incarceration and 4 years of supervised release. According to the factual basis for the guilty plea, between November 2016 and January 2017, the Correctional Officer attempted to hire an undercover law enforcement officer to assault and seriously injure his former spouse and her current domestic partner. The investigation was conducted by the OIG’s New York Field Office and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) New York Division.

- **Former BOP Correctional Officer Sentenced for Sexual Abuse and Violations of Civil Rights.** On July 31, 2019, a former BOP Correctional Officer assigned to the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn, New York, who resigned his position from the BOP, was sentenced to 25 years of incarceration, ordered to pay a $20,000 fine, and required to register as a sex offender. On May 14, 2018, the Correctional Officer was convicted by a jury trial which established that between January 2013 and Sept 2016, the Correctional Officer used his position to engage in sexual acts and contact with five female inmates under his supervisory authority. The investigation was conducted by the OIG’s New York Field Office and the FBI’s New York Field Office.

- **Former USMS Contract Correctional Officer Sentenced for Introduction of Contraband.** On July 3, 2019, a former U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) contract Correctional Officer assigned to the Val Verde Correctional Facility in Del Rio, Texas, who was terminated from his position during the investigation, was sentenced to 12 months of incarceration, 3 years of supervised release, and ordered to pay a $1000 fine. According to the factual basis for the guilty plea, in July 2017, the Correctional Officer met with a confidential human source and was provided a half ounce of purported heroin and an $800 monetary bribe. He also agreed to smuggle the purported heroin into the facility to provide to an inmate. The investigation was conducted by the OIG’s Houston Area Office, FBI, and USMS.

- **Former DEA Task Force Officer Sentenced for Making a False Statement.** On April 30, 2019, a former DEA Task Force Officer previously assigned to the DEA’s McAllen District Office in Texas, who was terminated from the task force and subsequently resigned his position as a police officer following his OIG interview, was sentenced to 6 months of probation. According to the factual basis for the guilty plea, in May 2017, the Task Force Officer made a false statement to the OIG when he denied his participation in unlawfully acquiring a vehicle by falsely pretending to be a DEA Agent (after his removal from the task force) to induce the vehicle’s owner to provide consent. The investigation was conducted by the OIG’s Dallas Field Office, DEA’s McAllen District Office, and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) OIG’s McAllen Office.
• **Findings of Misconduct by an Assistant U.S. Attorney for Possessing, Transporting, and Consuming Marijuana Edibles; Falsely Denying Controlled Substance Use on a Security Form; and Lack of Candor.** On May 13, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation of an Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) based on that attorney’s self-report to the OIG that the AUSA had possessed, transported, and consumed marijuana edibles in August or September 2016, in an attempt to alleviate back pain. The AUSA additionally stated that in the SF-86 form that the AUSA submitted in February 2017 the AUSA had incorrectly denied using a controlled substance in the past 7 years. The investigation was presented for prosecution on August 1, 2017, and declined on September 10, 2018. The OIG has provided its report to the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys (EOUSA) and DOJ OPR for action they deem appropriate.

• **Findings of Misconduct by a Then Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Misuse of DOJ Issued Computers and for False Statements.** On August 8, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the employing DOJ division alleging that a then Deputy Assistant Attorney General (DAAG) had been observed viewing sexually explicit images on the DAAG’s government computer. Criminal prosecution of the DAAG was presented on August 28, 2018 and declined. The OIG has provided a report to the DOJ employing division and to the DOJ OPR for their information.
OIG PROFILE

The OIG is a statutorily created, independent entity whose mission is to detect and deter waste, fraud, abuse, and misconduct involving DOJ programs and personnel and promote economy and efficiency in DOJ operations. The OIG investigates alleged violations of criminal and civil laws, regulations, and ethical standards arising from the conduct of DOJ employees in their numerous and diverse activities. The OIG also audits and inspects DOJ programs and assists management in promoting integrity, economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. The OIG has jurisdiction to review the programs and personnel of the FBI, ATF, BOP, DEA, U.S. Attorneys’ Offices (USAO), USMS, and all other organizations within DOJ, as well as DOJ's contractors and grant recipients.

The OIG consists of the Immediate Office of the Inspector General and the following divisions and office:

- **Audit Division** is responsible for independent audits of DOJ programs, computer systems, and financial statements. The Audit Division has regional offices in the Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C., areas. Its Financial Statement Audit Office and Computer Security and Information Technology Audit Office are located in Washington, D.C., along with Audit Headquarters. Audit Headquarters consists of the immediate office of the Assistant Inspector General for Audit, Office of Operations, Office of Policy and Planning, and Office of Data Analytics.

- **Investigations Division** is responsible for investigating allegations of bribery, fraud, abuse, civil rights violations, and violations of other criminal laws and administrative procedures governing DOJ employees, contractors, and grantees. The Investigations Division has field offices in Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Los Angeles, Miami, New York, and Washington, D.C. The Investigations Division has smaller, area offices in Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, El Paso, Houston, New Jersey, San Francisco, and Tucson. The Fraud Detection Office and the Cyber Investigations Office are co-located with the Washington Field Office. The Cyber Investigations Office also includes personnel in the Dallas and Los Angeles Field Offices. Investigations Headquarters in Washington, D.C., consists of the immediate office of the Assistant Inspector General for Investigations and the following branches: Operations I, Operations II, Investigative Support, and Administrative Support.

The following map shows the locations for the Audit and Investigations Divisions.
• **Evaluation and Inspections Division** conducts program and management reviews that involve on-site inspection, statistical analysis, interviews, and other techniques to review DOJ programs and activities and makes recommendations for improvement.

• **Oversight and Review Division** blends the skills of Attorneys, Investigators, Program Analysts, and Paralegals to conduct special reviews and investigations of sensitive allegations involving DOJ employees and operations.

• **Management and Planning Division** provides the Inspector General with advice on administrative and fiscal policy and assists OIG components by providing services in the areas of planning, budget, finance, quality assurance, personnel, communications, procurement, facilities, telecommunications, security, and general support.

• **Information Technology Division** executes the OIG’s IT strategic vision and goals by directing technology and business process integration, network administration, implementation of computer hardware and software, cybersecurity, applications development, programming services, policy formulation, and other mission-support activities.
• **Office of General Counsel** provides legal advice to OIG management and staff. It also drafts memoranda on issues of law; prepares administrative subpoenas; represents the OIG in personnel, contractual, and legal matters; and responds to Freedom of Information Act requests.

The OIG has a nationwide workforce of more than 500 Special Agents, Auditors, Inspectors, Attorneys, and support staff. For FY 2019, the OIG direct appropriation is $101 million, and the OIG anticipates earning an additional $18 million in reimbursements.

As required by Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act), as amended, this Semiannual Report to Congress is reviewing the accomplishments of the OIG for the 6-month period of April 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019.

Additional information about the OIG and full-text versions of many of its reports are available at [oig.justice.gov](http://oig.justice.gov).
MULTICOMPONENT

While many of the OIG's activities are specific to a particular component of DOJ, other work covers more than one component and, in some instances, extends to DOJ contractors and grant recipients. The following describes OIG audits, evaluations, inspections, special reviews, and investigations that involve more than one DOJ component.

Reports Issued

**The Department's Use of Immigration Sponsorship Programs**

The OIG issued an audit report examining DOJ components' oversight of foreign national sponsorship activities, including information management and coordination within DOJ and with the DHS concerning sponsored foreign nationals. DOJ components reported sponsoring over 5,000 foreign nationals between FYs 2015 and 2017, the majority of whom were sponsored by the DEA or the FBI. Overall, the OIG believes DOJ components must establish effective management controls and sufficient oversight to fulfill their obligations to DHS, protect the public, and achieve their objectives of furthering investigation and prosecutions. The audit identified 62 sponsored foreign nationals who had absconded from DOJ control and found 18 instances in which DOJ components did not request sponsorship renewals or terminations in a timely manner, thereby allowing sponsorships to lapse. The OIG believes these deficiencies may have resulted from poor information management at a majority of the components. DOJ components should also improve monitoring policies to mitigate risks associated with sponsoring foreign nationals. While components implemented adequate controls over the vetting of foreign nationals whom they intended to sponsor, the OIG is concerned that the monitoring policies and practices currently executed by the components do not adequately mitigate the risks associated with bringing individuals into the United States who may have criminal backgrounds or who may be associated with such individuals. Finally, DOJ components should improve timely processing of long-term sponsorship applications.

The OIG made 10 recommendations to assist the DOJ and its components in the monitoring of sponsorship activities. The relevant DOJ components agreed with all of the recommendations.

The OIG released a [video message](#) to accompany this report.

**DOJ's Compliance under the Improper Payments and Elimination Recovery Act of 2010 for FY 2018**

The OIG's examination assessed the Department's compliance with the reporting requirements of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-123, Management's Responsibility for Internal Control, Appendix C, Requirements for Payment Integrity Improvement. The OIG concluded that the Department complied, in all material respects, with the aforementioned requirements for the FY ended September 30, 2018.
Federal Information Security Modernization Act Audits

The Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) requires the Inspector General for each agency to perform an annual independent evaluation of the agency’s information security programs and practices. The evaluation includes testing the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices of a representative subset of agency systems.

In this reporting period, the OIG reported on the FY 2018 FISMA compliance of the security programs and systems of six DOJ components: the FBI’s Operational Technology Division Administration Support Information System and Child Exploitation Tracking System; Justice Management Division’s (JMD) Justice Security Tracking and Adjudication Record System; Criminal Division’s Entellitrak System; DEA’s Aviation Division Office Internet System; Executive Office for Immigration Review’s (EOIR) Justice Consolidated Office Network/eWorld System; and EOUSA’s Victim Notification System. In these audits, the OIG identified weaknesses in seven of the eight domains and within three of the six control areas tested. These audit reports issued 74 recommendations for improving the information security programs, with which the components agreed.

The OIG is currently reviewing FY 2019 FISMA compliance at six DOJ components: the FBI, JMD, United States National Central Bureau, OJP, Tax Division, and BOP.

Single Audit Act Reports

The Single Audit Act of 1984, as amended, promotes sound financial management of federal financial assistance provided to state, local, and tribal governments, colleges, universities, and nonprofit organizations. Under 2 C.F.R. 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards, such entities that expend $750,000 or more in federal funds in 1 year must have a “single audit” performed annually covering all federal funds expended that year. Single audits are conducted by state and local government auditors, as well as independent public accounting firms. The OIG reviews these audit reports when they pertain to DOJ funds in order to determine whether the single audit reports meet federal requirements and generally accepted government auditing standards. In addition, the OIG reviews single audit reports to determine whether they contain audit findings related to DOJ funds. As a result of the OIG’s review of the single audits during this semiannual period, the OIG issued to OJP 30 single audit reports encompassing approximately 458 grants, and other agreements totaling more than $548 million. The OIG also monitors these audits through the resolution and closure process.

The single audits disclosed that costs charged to DOJ grants were not always related to the grant programs or properly allocated. In addition, some required financial and program reports were inaccurate or not filed in a timely manner, if at all. The state and local government auditors and independent public accounting firms who conducted the single audits also found examples of incomplete or missing records, inadequate segregation of duties, failure to conduct physical inventories of assets purchased with federal funds, failure to submit timely single audit reporting packages to the Federal Audit Clearinghouse (an office operating on behalf of OMB that facilitates federal oversight of entities expending federal money), and failure to adequately monitor their grant sub-recipients to ensure that the sub-grantees were properly accounting for the grant funds and ensuring compliance with the terms and conditions of the grant. To address these deficiencies, the auditors recommended 77 management improvements.
Civil Rights and Civil Liberties

Section 1001 of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act (Patriot Act) directs the OIG to receive and review complaints of civil rights and civil liberty violations by DOJ employees, to publicize how people can contact the OIG to file a complaint, and to send a semiannual report to Congress discussing the OIG’s implementation of these responsibilities. In August 2019, the OIG released its most recent report, which summarized the OIG’s Section 1001 activities from January 1 through June 30, 2019. The report described the number of complaints the OIG received under this section, the status of investigations conducted by the OIG and DOJ components in response to those complaints, and an estimate of the OIG’s expenses for conducting these activities. The report also describes other OIG reviews that are related to potential civil rights and civil liberty issues but not required by Section 1001.

Reports with Outstanding Unimplemented Recommendations

Every 6 months, the OIG publishes a list of recommendations from the OIG’s audits, evaluations, reviews, and other reports that the OIG had not closed as of the end of the semiannual reporting period, because it had not determined that DOJ had fully implemented them. The information omits recommendations that DOJ determined to be classified or sensitive, and therefore unsuitable for public release. This list includes the titles of reports with recommendations not closed and the status and descriptions of the not closed recommendations. Hyperlinks to each report are also included in this list.

The most recent report of recommendations not closed by the OIG as of September 30, 2019, is available on the OIG’s website. The recommendations in this report are associated with over $151 million in questioned costs and over $30 million in funds that the OIG recommends could be used more efficiently if repurposed by the agency. Although the Department may have taken steps to implement the recommendations listed in this report, including by partially remedying the questioned costs associated with a recommendation, a recommendation is not considered closed until it has been fully implemented.

Investigations

The following information about OIG investigations of allegations against senior governmental employees in several components in which the OIG determined the allegations were unsubstantiated is provided pursuant to the IG Act, Section 5, Paragraph (22)(B). The OIG closed these investigations without public disclosure during the reporting period:

• The OIG initiated six investigations of alleged misconduct by senior government employees that were ultimately unsubstantiated. These investigations included allegations of job performance failure, conflict of interest, threats or harassment, misuse of position, verbal abuse, impersonation, and false statements.
Procedural Reform Recommendation

Procedural Reform Recommendation for the Department regarding the Circumstances under which an Employee May Accept an Offer from a Third Party to Purchase Tickets to a Special Event at Face Value. As a result of a related investigation, the OIG has concerns that the Department does not provide sufficient guidance regarding the circumstances under which an employee may accept an offer from a third party to purchase tickets to a special event at face value. In some situations, such purchases can create the appearance that Department employees are benefiting from or misusing their official positions. The OIG recommended that the Department issue guidance regarding the circumstances under which it is permissible for an employee to accept an offer to purchase tickets from a third party at face value, when the offer is made to the employee solely because of the employee's official position, and is not also available to the general public.

Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available here.

The Department’s Planning and Implementation of Its Zero Tolerance Policy and Its Coordination with the Departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services

DOJ’s FY 2019 Compliance with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, as amended by the DATA Act of 2014

Audits of DOJ and Select Components’ Annual Financial Statements Fiscal Year 2019

Review of the Department’s Violent Crime Initiatives

DOJ’s Preparedness to Respond to Critical Incidents Under Emergency Support Function 13

DOJ’s Expansion of the Institutional Hearing and Removal Program

Reports Issued

Report of Investigation of Former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey's Disclosure of Sensitive Investigative Information and Handling of Certain Memoranda

The OIG released a report examining former FBI Director James B. Comey's retention, handling, and dissemination of certain memoranda memorializing seven one-on-one interactions that he had with President-elect and President Donald J. Trump between January 6, 2017, and April 11, 2017. The OIG determined that Comey violated applicable policies and his FBI Employment Agreement in several ways, including by providing one of the unclassified memos that contained official FBI information, including sensitive investigative information, to his friend with instructions for the friend to share the contents of the memorandum with a reporter; and providing copies of the four memoranda he had improperly kept in his home to his three private attorneys without FBI authorization. After reviewing the OIG's factual findings, DOJ declined prosecution. The OIG provided its report to the FBI and to the DOJ OPR for action they deem appropriate.

A Joint Review of Law Enforcement Cooperation on the Southwest Border between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Homeland Security Investigations

The DOJ and DHS OIGs released a joint report examining law enforcement cooperation on the Southwest border between the FBI and Immigration and Customs Enforcement's Homeland Security Investigations (HSI). These agencies share many of the same investigative authorities, underscoring the need for agents to deconflict, share information, and manage investigative overlap effectively.

Of 980 FBI/HSI agents who responded to a DOJ/DHS OIG survey, the majority reported that they did not encounter cooperation failures and that joint task forces improved deconfliction and information sharing. The respondents who did report cooperation failures cited negative effects including loss of trust, unnecessarily prolonged investigations, and failure to gather evidence. The factors that may have contributed to cooperation failures were inconsistent deconfliction practices, lack of specific policies, and many agents' unawareness of deconfliction requirements; misunderstanding and mistrust; and the absence of a department-level memorandum of understanding related to cooperation on the Southwest border.
Investigations

During this reporting period, the OIG received 642 complaints involving the FBI. The most common allegations made against FBI employees were Official Misconduct; Personnel Prohibitions; and Off-Duty Violations. Most of the complaints received during this period were considered management issues and were provided to FBI management for its review and appropriate action.

The OIG opened 12 investigations and referred 71 allegations to the FBI’s Inspection Division for action or investigation with a requirement that the Inspection Division report the results of its action or investigation to the OIG. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 104 open criminal or administrative investigations of alleged misconduct related to FBI employees. The criminal investigations involved serious allegations of Official Misconduct.

FBI Cases Opened by Offense Category
April 1, 2019 – September 30, 2019

The following are examples of cases involving the FBI that the OIG investigated during this reporting period:

• **Findings of Misconduct by an FBI Special Agent in Charge and Assistant Special Agent in Charge for Failing to Ensure Contact with a Known Drug Trafficker was Handled According to FBI Policy for Confidential Human Sources, and for Failing to Report and Preventing the Reporting of Misconduct Allegations.** On December 20, 2018, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the FBI alleging in substance that a known drug trafficker claimed to be corruptly involved with the FBI. This investigation was not reported in the last semiannual to allow for additional administrative review. The investigation was presented for prosecution on September 19, 2016, and declined on January 10, 2017. The OIG has provided its report to the FBI for appropriate action.

• **Findings of Misconduct by an FBI Special Agent in Charge for Using the Office for Private Gain and Dereliction of Supervisory Responsibility.** On May 31, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the FBI alleging use of FBI tools, equipment, and time to repair a personal
vehicle owned by an FBI Special Agent in Charge (SAC) in exchange for compensation. The investigation was presented for prosecution and declined on July 26, 2017. The OIG has provided its report to the FBI for appropriate action.

- **Findings of Misconduct by an FBI Deputy Assistant Director for Unauthorized Contacts with the Media, Disclosing Law Enforcement and Other Sensitive Information to the Media, and Accepting a Gift from the Media.** On May 23, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the FBI, alleging that a then FBI DAD had numerous contacts with members of the media in violation of FBI policy. Additionally, it was alleged that the DAD may have disclosed law enforcement or other sensitive information to the media without authorization. The investigation was presented for prosecution on April 21, 2017, and declined on February 6, 2018. The OIG has provided its report to the FBI for appropriate action.

- **Findings of Misconduct by an FBI Unit Chief for Misusing her Position by Attempting to Ensure her Daughter Received an FBI Offer of Employment.** On May 22, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the OIG email hotline, alleging that an FBI Unit Chief (UC) exploited her position to ensure her daughter received an offer of employment from the FBI, including within the UC's assigned division. It was further alleged that the UC had a financial interest in her daughter receiving an FBI offer of employment because the daughter lived in a residence owned by the UC. The investigation was presented for prosecution and declined on September 25, 2018. The OIG has provided its report to the FBI for appropriate action.

- **Findings of Misconduct by an FBI Attorney for Shoplifting at the United States Marine Corps Base Quantico Exchange.** On April 9, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation of an FBI attorney based on information that the attorney was arrested in February 2018 for shoplifting at the Marine Corps Base Quantico Exchange. Criminal prosecution was deferred pending the FBI attorney's completion of 125 hours of community service, after which all charges were dismissed. The OIG has provided its report to the FBI and the DOJ OPR for action they deem appropriate.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a FBI Special Agent in Charge for Failing to Report an Intimate Relationship with a Subordinate and for Taking Actions that Lacked Impartiality, Demonstrated Favoritism Toward the Subordinate, and Contributed to the Decline in Staff Morale.** On September 6, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation concerning allegations that an FBI SAC, now retired, committed misconduct by engaging in an intimate relationship with a subordinate and by taking various actions that lacked impartiality and favored the subordinate. The SAC admitted to the OIG to having engaged in an intimate relationship with the subordinate. The OIG found that the SAC committed misconduct because the SAC failed to report the relationship to appropriate personnel as required by FBI policy. The OIG also found that several of the SAC’s actions involving the subordinate lacked impartiality, demonstrated favoritism, and created an appearance of bias toward the subordinate. The OIG has provided its report to the FBI for appropriate action.
# Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available [here](#).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s Confidential Human Source Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination of the Department’s and the FBI’s Compliance with Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements and Policies in Applications Filed with the U.S. Foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Surveillance Court Relating to a certain U.S. Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s Contract Awarded to Tuva, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s Covert Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s Efforts to Address Homegrown Violent Extremists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s National Security Undercover Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s Strategy and Efforts to Disrupt Illegal Dark Web Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the DOJ’s and FBI’s Planning for a Future FBI Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s Efforts to Assist Child Pornography Victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s Controls over Weapons, Munitions, and Explosives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s Regional Computer Forensic Laboratory – Western New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s Regional Computer Forensic Laboratory – Intermountain West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI’s Adjudication of Misconduct Investigations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports Issued

**BOP’s Contract Awarded to Correct Care Solutions, LLC**
The OIG issued an audit report examining a $65 million BOP contract with Correct Care Solutions, LLC (CCS) for comprehensive medical services at the Federal Correctional Complex in Coleman, Florida. The OIG found that the BOP should ensure prices are properly approved before authorizing payment; CCS used improper billing rates; the BOP should define proper invoices and promptly return improper invoices; and the BOP should establish a Government Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan for use in Verification of Services Provided. The OIG made 13 recommendations to the BOP and the BOP agreed with all of them.

**Metropolitan Detention Center Brooklyn Facilities Issues and Related Impacts on Inmates**
The OIG issued a report assessing the BOP's management of electrical and heating issues that occurred during a January 27–February 3, 2019 partial power outage at MDC Brooklyn and how those issues affected inmates' conditions of confinement. While the power outage did not affect MDC Brooklyn's heating systems, the OIG identified long-standing temperature regulation issues that affected heating in certain housing units before, during, and after the outage. The OIG also found that although MDC Brooklyn and BOP management took steps to ensure the safety and security of inmates during the power outage, they failed to manage other critical aspects of the situation. Specifically, MDC Brooklyn and BOP management did not effectively address two medical issues and did not effectively communicate with stakeholders MDC Brooklyn's decision to suspend legal and social visiting during the power outage, as well the conditions of confinement within the facility.

The OIG released a [video message](#) to accompany this report.

Investigations

During this reporting period, the OIG received 3,985 complaints involving the BOP. The most common allegations made against BOP employees included Official Misconduct; and Force, Abuse, Rights Violations. The majority of complaints dealt with non-criminal issues that the OIG referred to the BOP's Office of Internal Affairs (OIA) for its review.

The OIG opened 76 investigations and referred 11 allegations to the BOP's OIA for action or investigation with a requirement that BOP OIA report the results of its action or investigation to the OIG. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 272 open cases of alleged misconduct against BOP employees. The criminal investigations covered a wide range of allegations, including Official Misconduct; Fraud; and Force, Abuse, Rights Violations.
The following are examples of cases involving the BOP that the OIG investigated during this reporting period:

- **Findings of Misconduct by a BOP Assistant Director for Engaging in Inappropriate Personal Relationships with a BOP Contractor and with a BOP Union Executive, for Misusing a BOP-issued Cell Phone, and for Lack of Candor; and by a BOP Union Executive for Engaging in an Inappropriate Personal Relationship with a BOP Assistant Director.** On September 24, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon the receipt of information from the BOP OIA alleging that a BOP Assistant Director engaged in an inappropriate personal relationship with a BOP contractor. Criminal prosecution of the BOP Assistant Director was declined. The OIG has completed its investigation and provided its report to the BOP for appropriate action. The OIG also referred this matter to the Department of Labor (DOL) OIG for its consideration and notified the BOP union of its findings.

- **Former BOP Correctional Officer Sentenced for Solicitation to Commit a Crime of Violence and Possession of a Firearm and Ammunition by a Person Subject to a Protection Order.** On July 29, 2019, a former BOP Senior Correctional Officer assigned to the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn, New York, who resigned his position after his Indictment, was sentenced to 84 months of incarceration and 4 years of supervised release. According to the factual basis for the guilty plea, between November 2016 and January 2017, the Correctional Officer attempted to hire an undercover law enforcement officer to assault and seriously injure his former spouse and her current domestic partner. The investigation was conducted by the OIG's New York Field Office and ATF New York Division.

- **Former BOP Human Resource Specialist Sentenced for Wire Fraud.** On July 19, 2019, a former BOP Human Resource (HR) Specialist assigned to the Federal Correctional Institution in Dublin, California, who medically retired from the BOP in 2013, was sentenced to 37 months of incarceration and ordered to pay $632,368 in restitution. According to the factual basis for the guilty plea, the HR Specialist repeatedly submitted fraudulent forms and letters to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), Social Security Administration (SSA), DOL, and Office of Personnel Management (OPM), to support his applications for disability benefits and workers’ compensation claims, and never disclosed to the DOL that he was
receiving disability benefits from the VA and SSA. The investigation was conducted jointly by the OIG’s Seattle Domicile Office, VA OIG, OPM OIG, DOL OIG, and SSA OIG.

- **Former BOP Chaplain Sentenced for Bribery of a Public Official and Introduction of Contraband.** On August 1, 2019, a former BOP Chaplain assigned to the Federal Correctional Institution Berlin in New Hampshire, who resigned his position with the BOP, was sentenced to 40 months of incarceration and ordered to forfeit $52,446 in received bribe payments. According to the factual statement read in court in support of his guilty plea and statements made in court, between April and November 2018, the Chaplain smuggled drugs, cellular telephones, tobacco, and other contraband into the prison in exchange for bribe payments. The investigation was conducted by the OIG’s Boston Area Office.

- **Former BOP Cook Foreman Sentenced for Conspiracy, Attempt to Possess with Intent to Distribute Drugs, and Bribery.** On August 12, 2019, a former BOP Cook Foreman assigned to the United States Penitentiary Atwater in California, who was terminated from his position with the BOP, was sentenced to 78 months of incarceration. The evidence presented at trial showed that between May and December 2015, the Foreman conspired with inmates and individuals outside the prison to introduce prohibited items into the prison and received at least $1,580 as payment. On December 15, 2015, the Foreman drove to meet an individual he believed would give him drugs to be smuggled into the prison, but was instead met by OIG agents. The investigation was conducted by the OIG’s San Francisco Area Office.

- **Former BOP Correctional Officer Sentenced for Sexual Abuse and Violations of Civil Rights.** On July 31, 2019, a former BOP Correctional Officer assigned to the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn, New York, who resigned his position from the BOP, was sentenced to 25 years of incarceration, ordered to pay a $20,000 fine, and required to register as a sex offender. On May 14, 2018, the Correctional Officer was convicted by a jury trial which established that between January 2013 and September 2016, the Correctional Officer used his position to engage in sexual acts and contact with five female inmates under his supervisory authority. The investigation was conducted by the OIG’s New York Field Office and the FBI’s New York Field Office.
## Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available [here](#).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOP’s Monitoring of Inmate Communication to Prevent Radicalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP’s Non-Lethal/Lethal Fence System Updates and Improvements Contract Awarded to DeTekion Security Systems, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP’s Efforts to Address Inmate Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Against BOP Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ’s Efforts to Protect BOP Facilities Against Threats Posed by Unmanned Aircraft Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the BOP’s Pharmaceutical Drug Costs and Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP’s Contracts Awarded to the University of Massachusetts Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP’s Efforts to Prevent Radicalization Through its Oversight of Religious Service Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP’s Compliance with the Government Charge Card Abuse Prevention Act of 2012 and OMB Circular A-123, Appendix B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE

Report Issued

USMS's Management of the Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System

The OIG issued an audit report examining the USMS's operations of the Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System (JPATS). JPATS schedules and transports prisoners and detainees across the United States and its territories. The OIG found that the USMS established adequate controls over JPATS flights to transport prisoners and detainees, as well as its billing process. However, the OIG identified several areas for improvement related to administrative management of JPATS, including updating its budget policy; implementing a data validation and retention policy to ensure Quarterly Performance Reviews are accurate; documenting how it sets specific performance targets to demonstrate that it transported detainees effectively and efficiently; continuing its efforts to engage federal, state, and local customers; and deploy a secure, cloud-based system to track custody of prisoners and detainees. The OIG made four recommendations to the USMS to improve administrative management of JPATS, and the USMS agreed with all of them.

Investigations

During this reporting period, the OIG received 211 complaints involving the USMS. The most common allegations made against USMS employees were Official Misconduct; and Force, Abuse, Rights Violations. The majority of the complaints were considered management issues and were provided to the USMS's OIA for its review and appropriate action.

The OIG opened 10 investigations and referred 12 allegations to the USMS's OIA for its review with a requirement that OIA report the results of its action or investigation to the OIG. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 49 open cases of alleged misconduct against USMS employees. The most common allegations were Official Misconduct; and Fraud.

![Bar chart showing USMS cases opened by offense category from April 1, 2019 to September 30, 2019.](chart.png)

Source: Investigations Data Management System
The following are examples of cases involving the USMS that the OIG investigated during this reporting period:

- **Former USMS Contract Correctional Officer Sentenced for Introduction of Contraband.** On July 3, 2019, a former USMS contract Correctional Officer assigned to the Val Verde Correctional Facility in Del Rio, Texas, who was terminated from his position during the investigation, was sentenced to 12 months of incarceration, 3 years of supervised release, and ordered to pay a $1000 fine. According to the factual basis for the guilty plea, in July 2017, the Correctional Officer met with a confidential human source and was provided a half ounce of purported heroin and an $800 monetary bribe. He also agreed to smuggle the purported heroin into the facility to provide to an inmate. The investigation was conducted by the OIG’s Houston Area Office, FBI, and USMS.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a United States Marshal for Making an Inappropriate Comment about Shooting a Judge and for Lack of Candor.** On May 13, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon the receipt of information from the USMS OPR alleging that during a USMS firearms use of force briefing, a United States Marshal (USM) made an inappropriate comment about shooting a judge. The investigation was presented for prosecution on July 26, 2018, and declined on February 14, 2019. The OIG has provided its report to the USMS for its information.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a USM for Entering into a Restricted Area of a Sheriff’s Office and a County Jail Without Authorization.** On September 16, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon the receipt of information from the USMS OPR-Internal Affairs alleging that a USM entered a restricted area of a county jail without authorization for the purpose of having a bond issued for an inmate who was a personal friend of the USM. State prosecution of the USM was declined on November 1, 2018. The OIG has completed its investigation and provided its report to the USMS for appropriate action.

### Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available here.

---

**Review of the USMS’s Pharmaceutical Drug Costs and Procurement**

**USMS’s Administration of Joint Law Enforcement Operations Funds**

**USMS’s Awarding and Administration of Sole-Source Contracts**

**USMS’s Tactical Training Officer Program**

**USMS’s Contract Awarded to the GEO Group, Incorporated to Operate the Robert A. Deyton Detention Center, Lovejoy, Georgia**
Reports Issued

**DEA’s Controls over Weapons, Munitions, and Explosives**

The OIG found that the DEA generally has strong physical controls over its own and seized weapons and munitions, but the OIG identified weaknesses related to tracking weapons, ammunition, and less lethal munitions, and noncompliance with certain policies. The DEA reported 26 instances of firearms being lost or stolen between FYs 2014 and 2018. The OIG found that the DEA’s monthly rate of lost and stolen firearms decreased by almost 69 percent, as compared to a prior 2008 OIG audit. However, the DEA does not track data on whether its lost or stolen firearms were used in a crime. Further, the DEA had an inadequate inventory system to track firearms, which was also identified in a prior OIG audit; 7 of the 16 DEA sites included in the audit had inaccurate ammunition tracking records, and 5 did not fully comply with the DEA’s ammunition tracking and inventory requirements; and the DEA had several issues with tracking of less lethal munitions. Finally, the OIG identified instances in which the DEA circumvented its policies for assigning firearms in order to permanently assign more weapons to individual Special Agents than permitted. The OIG made nine recommendations and the DEA agreed with all of them.

**DEA’s Regulatory and Enforcement Efforts to Control the Diversion of Opioids**

The report examined the DEA’s regulatory and enforcement efforts to control the diversion of opioids. The OIG found that the DEA was slow to respond to the significant increase in the use and diversion of opioids since 2000. For example, it was not until 2017 that the DEA significantly reduced the Aggregate Production Quota (APQ) for oxycodone, by 25 percent. In 2018, the DEA further reduced the APQ for oxycodone by 6 percent. The OIG also found that the DEA did not use its available resources, including its data systems and strongest administrative enforcement tools, to detect and regulate diversion effectively. Further, the OIG found that DEA policies and regulations did not adequately hold registrants accountable or prevent the diversion of pharmaceutical opioids. Lastly, the OIG found that while the Department and the DEA have recently taken steps to address the crisis, more work is needed. The report made nine recommendations, and the Department and DEA agreed with all of them.

The OIG released a video message to accompany this report.

Investigations

During this reporting period, the OIG received 251 complaints involving the DEA. The most common allegations made against DEA employees was Official Misconduct. The majority of the complaints were considered management issues and were provided to the DEA for its review and appropriate action.
The OIG opened 11 cases and referred 50 allegations to the DEA's OPR for action or investigation with a requirement that OPR report the results of its action or investigation to the OIG. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 55 open cases of alleged misconduct against DEA employees. The most common allegations were Official Misconduct.

The following are examples of cases involving the DEA that the OIG investigated during this reporting period:

- **Findings of Misconduct by Two DEA Special Agents and a DEA Supervisory Special Agent for Violations of the DEA's Confidential Source Policy.** On July 24, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon the receipt of information from an anonymous source alleging that a DEA Special Agent established a DHS Transportation Security Administration employee, who was a childhood friend, as a paid Confidential Source for the DEA. The OIG has completed its investigation and provided its report to the DEA for appropriate action.

- **Former DEA Task Force Officer Sentenced for Making a False Statement.** On April 30, 2019, a former DEA Task Force Officer previously assigned to the DEA's McAllen District Office in Texas, who was terminated from the task force and subsequently resigned his position as a police officer following his OIG interview, was sentenced to 6 months of probation. According to the factual basis for the guilty plea, in May 2017, the Task Force Officer made a false statement to the OIG when he denied his participation in unlawfully acquiring a vehicle by falsely pretending to be a DEA Agent (after his removal from the task force) to induce the vehicle's owner to provide consent. The investigation was conducted by the OIG's Dallas Field Office, DEA's McAllen District Office, and DHS OIG's McAllen Office.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a DEA ASAC for Failure to Act in a Professional Manner, and by a DEA SAC for Favoritism and Providing False Statements to the OIG Concerning the Allegations Involving the ASAC.** On November 1, 2018, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon the receipt of information alleging that a DEA ASAC, since retired, had contact with a local police officer after the officer observed the ASAC apparently engaged in sexual activity in a public park. The ASAC was on annual leave on
that date. This investigation was not reported in the last semiannual to allow for additional administrative review. The case was presented for prosecution on October 24, 2016, and declined on November 2, 2017. The OIG has provided its report to the DEA for appropriate action.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a Senior DEA Official for Violating Ethics Regulations, DEA Standards of Conduct, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and for Lack of Candor; by a Member of the DEA Senior Executive Service for Aiding and Abetting the Senior DEA Official’s Misconduct; and by a JMD Senior IT Manager for Violating DOJ Contractor Security Policy.** On May 10, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon the receipt of information alleging that a senior DEA official hired several former DEA employees as contractors. The investigation was presented for prosecution and declined on March 20, 2018. The senior DEA official retired from his position. The OIG has provided its report to DEA and JMD for appropriate action.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a DEA Group Supervisor for Actions Related to a Confidential Source Including Approving Payments to the Source without Proper Justification and Engaging in an Improper Personal Relationship; and by a DEA ASAC for Failing to Properly Supervise the Group Supervisor.** On May 13, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon the receipt of information from the DEA OPR, alleging that a DEA Group Supervisor made unjustified payments to DEA Confidential Sources (CS), caused false statements to be made to justify the payments, and made false statements on documents relating to the suitability of a CS. The investigation was present for prosecution on April 28, 2015, and declined on May 3, 2018. The OIG has provided its report to the DEA for appropriate action.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a then DEA ASAC for Failing to Report Misconduct Allegations.** On September 5, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon the receipt of information from the OIG hotline in 2018 alleging misconduct by a Special Agent of the DEA, now retired, involving solicitation of prostitutes in a major city in the United States in 2012 but that no action was taken by the DEA. During the course of the investigation, the OIG learned that the DEA Special Agent had self-reported this misconduct in 2012 to a then DEA ASAC, who allegedly failed to report the information about the DEA Special Agent's misconduct to an appropriate DEA supervisor or the DEA OPR. The investigation was not presented for prosecution. The OIG has completed its investigation and provided its report to the DEA for appropriate action.

**Ongoing Work**

The OIG's ongoing work is available [here](#).
Report Issued

**ATF's Controls over Agent Cashier Funds**

The OIG audit found that the ATF's controls over agent cashier funds were reasonably well designed to account for the funds and mitigate most risks, but several opportunities for improvement remained. Specifically, ATF guidance did not prohibit related parties (such as spouses) from signing as witnesses on an agent or task force officer's agent cashier transactions. The OIG found that this practice had occurred on at least one occasion and recommended that it should be prohibited. ATF guidance also did not address how agents should track and recover cashier funds that are used for refundable deposits, such as those made for temporary lodging. The OIG identified concerns with approximately 5 percent of the transactions tested. The OIG determined that the errors were predominantly minor in nature and, while such errors should not occur, they did not call into question the legitimacy of the transactions. The OIG also identified a risk related to separation of duties in the Special Operations Division's process for approving certain agent cashier fund expenditures. ATF Headquarters oversees several routine inspection processes designed to monitor agent cashier funds' usage by the divisions. However, there was no process in place to identify and communicate trends or common inspection findings among divisions. In response to this audit's results and the results of a prior OIG audit, ATF implemented a new procedure to more reliably identify potentially systemic issues. The OIG made five recommendations to ATF, and ATF agreed with all of them and has completed corrective action on four of the recommendations.

**Investigations**

During this reporting period, the OIG received 204 complaints involving ATF personnel. The most common allegations made against ATF employees were Official Misconduct; and Waste, Mismanagement. The majority of the complaints were considered management issues and were provided to ATF for its review and appropriate action.

The OIG opened 4 cases and referred 24 allegations to OPR for action or investigation with a requirement that OPR report the results of its action or investigation to the OIG. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 22 open criminal or administrative investigations of alleged misconduct related to ATF employees. The investigations included Off-Duty Violations; and Official Misconduct.
ATF Cases Opened by Offense Category
April 1, 2019 – September 30, 2019

Source: Investigations Data Management System

**Ongoing Work**

The OIG's ongoing work is available [here](#).

ATF Contracts Awarded to Shearwater Systems, LLC to Support Violent Gun Crime Reduction Intelligence Initiatives
Office of Justice Programs

Reports Issued

Audits of Grants to State and Local Entities

During this reporting period, the OIG audited 22 external OJP grant recipients, including recipients receiving funds from multiple DOJ components, as described by the following examples.

- The OIG issued a report on a grant totaling $3,680,000 to Central Falls School District (CFSD) in Central Falls, Rhode Island. OJP awarded this grant in September 2014 with the purpose of developing knowledge about the effects of personnel, programs, and activities on school safety in the United States. As of December 2018, CFSD had drawn down $3,131,713 of the available grant funds. The OIG found that CFSD demonstrated adequate progress towards achieving the grant's stated goals and objectives, but did not adhere to its grant budget or adequately support its grant costs and procurements. Specifically, the OIG identified $369,666 in personnel and fringe benefit costs that were both unsupported and unallowable. Further, CFSD could not demonstrate that all of its contractual costs were reasonable, resulting in $1,434,081 in unsupported contractual costs that lacked an adequate justification of price. As a result of these and other deficiencies, the OIG identified a total of $1,803,747 in questioned costs. The OIG also identified deficiencies with CFSD's processes for requesting drawdowns, financial reporting, and subrecipient monitoring. The OIG made 10 recommendations to OJP to improve CFSD's grant management and remedy questioned costs. OJP agreed with all of them. In its response to the draft report, CFSD did not entirely agree with one recommendation, but agreed with the other nine recommendations.

- The OIG issued an audit report on two grants totaling $1,250,000 to the International Institute of Buffalo (the Institute), in Buffalo, New York. OJP awarded these grants in 2013 and 2015 for the purpose of identifying and addressing the needs of victims of human trafficking. As of May 7, 2018, the Institute had drawn down $910,509. The OIG found that the Institute commingled grant funds and did not maintain adequate financial management system records. As a result, the OIG was unable to determine whether financial reports were accurate, the Institute adhered to its budgets, or the Institute complied with drawdown requirements. Additionally, the Institute lacked adequate source documentation for certain types of expenditures totaling $71,638. As a result of these deficiencies, the OIG identified a total of $864,606 in questioned costs. The OIG also identified areas for improvement in subrecipient monitoring procedures and documentation, and policies requiring background checks for award-funded staff working with children. The OIG made 16 recommendations to OJP to improve the Institute's grant management and remedy questioned costs and OJP agreed with all of them. In its response
The Institute did not agree with two recommendations, and agreed with the remaining 14 recommendations.

- The OIG issued a report on two grants totaling over $18 million awarded to Rocky Mountain Information Network (RMIN), in Phoenix, Arizona. OJP awarded the grants in 2015 and 2018 to facilitate information sharing, support criminal investigations, and promote law enforcement officer safety. As of May 2019, RMIN drew down a cumulative amount of $17 million. The OIG concluded that RMIN demonstrated adequate progress towards achieving the awards' stated goals and objectives. However, the OIG identified $233,293 in unallowable expenditures related to employee bonuses, equipment, training, software, leased vehicles, and professional dues; and $4,000 in unsupported expenditures related to professional dues. The OIG also found that the unallowable and unsupported professional dues paid to the RISS Directors Association were used for costs that are generally not allowable under federal awards, including gifts, lapel pins, and payments to an organization that, according to its website, provides lobbying services. The OIG made four recommendations to OJP to remedy questioned costs improving RMIN's management of grant funds. OJP agreed with all of them.

- The OIG issued a report on grant activities of the Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Police Department (Milwaukee PD). Through the OJP, the Milwaukee PD received a grant totaling $1 million to build the capacity of its existing Crime Gun Intelligence Center (CGIC) with the goal of reducing firearm-related violence through the identification, investigation, and arrest of those involved in violent crime. The OIG assessed how the Milwaukee PD accounted for and used these grant funds between October 2016 and April 2019. The OIG found that many of the stated award accomplishments had been completed prior to the award, and the Milwaukee PD had not demonstrated how over $549,000 in remaining award funds as of April 2019 would be spent in the approved timeframe to further implement award goals and objectives. The Milwaukee PD also could not readily provide source documentation to support all of its progress report metrics. This audit did not identify significant deficiencies regarding the Milwaukee PD's overall financial management of the grant. However, the OIG noted concerns related to the Milwaukee PD's selection, oversight, and monitoring of its subrecipient. As a result, we identified $89,412 in net questioned costs. The OIG made seven recommendations to OJP to address various weaknesses and to remedy $89,412 in questioned costs. OJP agreed with all the recommendations, while the MPD agreed with two recommendations, disagreed with four recommendations, and did not opine on one recommendation.

- The OIG issued an audit report on three grants totaling $1,298,101 made to Catholic Charities, Diocese of Trenton (CCT). Two grants were awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) to enhance services for women who are victims of abuse later in life. The third grant was awarded by OJP to enhance services for victims of human trafficking. As of August 2018, CCT had drawn down $555,118 of the total grant funds awarded. The OIG found that CCT did not maintain proper accounting of grant funds, lacked support for personnel expenditures, and had inadequate internal controls over budgets. Specifically, CCT did not establish an accounting system or written accounting policies and procedures in accordance with federal guidelines. Additionally, CCT did not maintain proper documentation for consultant rates charged to the awards, resulting in $17,440 in questioned costs. The OIG also found that CCT could not support other allocated costs such as travel and subrecipient activities. The OIG made seven recommendations to OJP to address various weaknesses and to remedy $19,884 in questioned costs. OJP agreed with all the recommendations, while the MPD agreed with two recommendations, disagreed with four recommendations, and did not opine on one recommendation.
as rent and utilities, resulting in an additional $44,753 in questioned costs. In total, the OIG identified $70,818 in questioned costs. The OIG made 11 recommendations to OVW and three recommendations to OJP. OVW agreed with its 11 recommendations, OJP agreed with its three recommendations, and CCT agreed with all 14 recommendations.

- The OIG issued an audit report on a $3 million grant and supplement award to American University (AU) in Washington, D.C. The grant was awarded in 2016 by OJP for the purpose of providing training and technical assistance to improve the functioning of OJP’s Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts and to improve the outcomes for adolescents whose drug use has contributed to their involvement in the juvenile justice system. As of June 2019, AU had drawn down $1.73 million of the award. The OIG concluded that AU demonstrated progress towards meeting the grant goals and objectives, but was not on schedule to complete all of the grant objectives by the award’s end date of September 30, 2019. AU requested a no-cost extension to the performance period, which the OIG believes demonstrates an awareness of the modest progress towards achieving the award goals and objectives. Additionally, the OIG found that AU charged to the award $8,867 in unallowable consultant fees, including associated travel, lodging and other costs; and AU did not adhere to its own policies and procedures to review consultant work annually. The OIG made four recommendations to OJP. OJP and AU agreed with all of them.

- The OIG issued an audit report on a grant totaling $4,506,566 awarded to MDRC in New York, New York. OJP awarded the grant in 2010 for the purpose of conducting offender reentry research. As of July 2018, MDRC had drawn down $1,852,932 of the total grant funds awarded. The OIG concluded that MDRC demonstrated adequate achievement of goals and objectives of the grant. However, the OIG found that in preparing its Federal Financial Reports, MDRC used the amount of money that it drew down, rather than actual funds spent, which resulted in inaccurate reports. The OIG made one recommendation to OJP. OJP and MDRC agreed with the recommendation.

Investigations

During this reporting period, the OIG received 30 complaints involving OJP. The most common allegation made against OJP employees, contractors, or grantees was Fraud; and Official Misconduct.

The OIG opened 6 fraud cases. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 28 open criminal or administrative investigations of alleged misconduct related to OJP employees, contractors, or grantees. The most common allegation was grantee fraud.
## Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available [here](#).

---

### OJP’s Corrective Actions to Resolve and Close Audit Reports during FYs 2015 through 2017

---

#### OJP Cases Opened by Offense Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>Cases Opened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty Violations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Investigations Data Management System*
CRIME VICTIMS FUND

The CVF was established by the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (VOCA) and serves as a major funding source for victim services throughout the country. Each year, millions of dollars are deposited into the CVF from criminal fines, forfeited bail bonds, penalty fees, and special assessments collected by USAOs, U.S. Courts, and the BOP. These dollars come from offenders convicted of federal crimes, not from taxpayers. OJP’s OVC administers the CVF. States receive the majority of CVF funds directly from OVC through the VOCA victim assistance and compensation formula grants. The OVC also awards discretionary grants to state and local governments, individuals, educational institutions, and private nonprofit organizations to support national-scope demonstration projects and training and technical assistance that enhance the professional expertise of victim service providers. Other CVF-funded program areas include USAO victim-witness coordinators who assist victims of federal crimes, and FBI victim specialists who help keep victims of federal crimes informed of case developments and appropriate resources. In FY 2018, OVC also announced grants specifically designated for tribal victim services.

Since FY 2015, Congress substantially increased the amount of funding available from the CVF for these Department programs. Specifically, Congress more than tripled, from $750 million to nearly $2.4 billion, the annual amount of CVF funds available for distribution to support crime victims in FY 2015. From FY 2016 through 2019, DOJ has awarded more than $13 billion in funding for CVF programs. The increases in available CVF funding have translated into commensurate increases in grants to states that manage and subaward the majority of the funds to public and nonprofit organizations that provide various victim services, such as counseling centers, domestic violence shelters, and rape crisis centers.

The OIG is committed to robust oversight of the Department’s administration of the CVF and of the victim services the Department supports. The OIG’s audits of victims of crime programs have resulted in more than 100 recommendations to improve recipients’ administration of CVF-funded grants, enhance program performance, improve monitoring of thousands of subrecipients, and help ensure accountability for billions of CVF dollars. During this semiannual reporting period, the Audit Division issued 17 reports and, at the end of the period, had 10 ongoing audits of OJP programs and grants that received CVF funds. Examples of the reports issued this period are described below.

Reports Issued

Efforts to Address Challenges in Administering CVF Programs

The OIG issued a report examining OJP’s administration of programs supported by the CVF. The review found that, in response to the substantial increase in funding since FY 2015, certain state recipients of CVF awards adapted their existing practices and sought new ways to reach
victims that had been historically underserved. However, some states struggled to strategically allocate their awards, resulting in large funding balances in the months just prior to award expiration deadlines and an increased risk of wasteful spending. The OIG determined OJP needed to enhance its oversight of state spending plans as well as other aspects of CVF grant implementation including recordkeeping and financial management. Additionally, OJP needs to help states better assess risk, design monitoring strategies, and achieve effective oversight of the service providers that receive much of the funding through subawards for victim assistance. The OIG also identified several improvements OJP should make in its performance reporting process to reduce the risk of inaccurate, misleading, or overstated performance data on the effect of the CVF grant programs. This review further found that standard grant resources and requirements were sometimes unclear, and would be improved by customized CVF materials or explanations from OJP to help the states better achieve compliance and effectively implement the CVF-funded programs that are intended to help victims of crime. The OIG made 14 recommendations and OJP agreed with all of them.

The OIG released a video message to accompany this report.

Audits of CVF Grants to State and Local Entities

During this reporting period, the OIG audited 16 CVF-funded grant recipients, as described by some of the following examples.

- The OIG issued an audit report on three grants totaling over $3.22 million to the West Virginia Legislative Claims Commission (the Commission) in Charleston, West Virginia. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2015 and 2017 to provide financial support through the payment of compensation benefits to crime victims throughout West Virginia. As of February 2019, the Commission drew down a cumulative amount of $1.159 million. The OIG concluded that the Commission established a compensation program that adequately compensated victims and survivors of criminal violence. However, the audit found there was a general lack of formal policies and procedures to guide the Commission’s victim compensation program and management of federal funds. As a result, the Commission submitted inaccurate certification reports to OJP. These inaccurate reports resulted in West Virginia receiving over $1 million in excess federal funds. The OIG also found internal control weaknesses with the Commission’s claims tracking system. The OIG made eight recommendations to OJP to improve the Commission’s administration of the crime victim compensation program and remedy the dollar-related finding. OJP and the Commission agreed with all of them.

- The OIG issued an audit report on a grant totaling over $9.99 million awarded by OJP to the Vera Institute of Justice (Vera) in New York, New York. The award was for the OVC Vision 21 National Resource Center for Reaching Victims, which was to establish a resource center to provide training and technical assistance to underserved communities. The project period for the award was from October 2016 through September 2019. As of August 2018, Vera drew down approximately $2.73 million. The OIG concluded that Vera demonstrated adequate progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the award. This audit did not identify significant concerns regarding Vera’s progress reports, indirect costs, and process for developing drawdown requests. However, the OIG identified issues related to expenditures made with award funds, including personnel and fringe benefits; travel;
supplies and other costs; consultants and contracts; and subawards, which resulted in $387,908 in questioned costs. Additionally, the OIG found issues with Vera's compliance with award special conditions, subrecipient monitoring, and required financial reporting. The OIG made 20 recommendations to OJP to assist Vera in improving its award management and administration and to remedy the questioned costs. OJP agreed with all of them. Vera agreed with 15 recommendations, partially agreed with 2, and disagreed with 3 of the recommendations.

- The OIG issued an audit report on three grants totaling more than $6.5 million awarded to the Missouri Department of Public Safety (Missouri DPS) in Jefferson City, Missouri. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2014 and 2016 to provide financial support through the payment of compensation benefits to crime victims throughout Missouri. As of December 2018, the Missouri DPS had drawn down a cumulative amount of nearly $4.7 million for all of the grants the OIG reviewed. The OIG found that overall, the Missouri DPS used its grant funds to enhance its victim compensation program. However, the OIG found that potential inaccuracies in its certification forms may have led the Missouri DPS to be awarded incorrect amounts of grant funds in the years under review. If not resolved, this could result in incorrect grant funds awarded for FY 2019. The OIG also found that the Missouri DPS lacked adequate documentation to support 22 of 90 approved victim compensation claims the OIG reviewed, resulting in $282,606 in unsupported questioned costs. The OIG also identified concerns with the Missouri DPS's policies and procedures related to public outreach and conflict of interest, and the OIG identified an inaccurate quarterly performance report. The OIG made eight recommendations to OJP to improve the Missouri DPS's management of grant funds and remedy questioned costs. OJP agreed with all of them. The Missouri DPS agreed with three, partially agreed with three, and disagreed with two recommendations.

- The OIG issued an audit report on three grants totaling over $107 million awarded to the Wisconsin Department of Justice (WI DOJ) in Madison, Wisconsin. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2015 and 2017 to enhance crime victim services throughout Wisconsin. As of January 2019, the WI DOJ drew down a cumulative amount of nearly $59.2 million. The OIG found that overall, the WI DOJ used its grant funds to enhance services for crime victims and planned for the increase in funding. However, the OIG found that the WI DOJ subaward cycle did not allow programs to receive additional, available funds to meet unanticipated opportunities to serve victims. The OIG also found that the WI DOJ did not adequately monitor subrecipients. The OIG identified $196,499 in unallowable or unsupported administrative expenditures, subrecipient expenditures, and subrecipient matching funds. Additionally, the OIG found issues with the WI DOJ's drawdowns, match requirement implementation, and Federal Financial Reports. The OIG made 20 recommendations to OJP. OJP and WI DOJ agreed with all of them.

- The OIG issued an audit report on four grants totaling over $93.5 million awarded to the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement (LCLE) in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2014 and 2017 to enhance crime victim services throughout Louisiana. As of January 2019, the LCLE drew down a cumulative amount of nearly $58.3 million. The OIG concluded that the LCLE used its funding to provide services to crime victims throughout the state. However, the audit found that the LCLE did not always ensure the accuracy of the information provided by subrecipients, which
is used to complete the annual performance reports. The OIG also identified $81,982 in unsupported payroll expenditures. In total, the audit identified $114,319 in questioned costs. The OIG made 13 recommendations to OJP to assist the LCLE in improving its grant management and administration and to remedy questioned costs. OJP and LCLE agreed with all of them. However, LCLE stated it did not agree with the dollar amount of three questioned cost recommendations and was working with its subrecipients to identify supporting documentation.

• The OIG issued an audit report on four grants totaling over $16.5 million awarded to the Colorado Department of Public Safety (CDPS) in Lakewood, Colorado. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2015 and 2018 to provide financial support through the payment of compensation benefits to crime victims throughout Colorado. As of December 2018, the CDPS drew down a cumulative amount of over $9.6 million. The OIG found that CDPS paid victims that were not supported by adequate documentation, and the OIG identified these $82,192 charges as unsupported costs. In addition, the OIG found that CDPS did not retain denied claim documentation as required by grant guidelines. The OIG made two recommendations to OJP, and OJP agreed with both. CDPS agreed with one recommendation and partially agreed with one recommendation.

• The OIG issued an audit report on four grants totaling nearly $1.5 million awarded to the Montana Office of Victim Services’ Crime Victim Compensation Program (CVCP) in Helena, Montana. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2014 and 2017 to provide financial support through the payment of compensation benefits to crime victims throughout Montana. As of October 2018, the CVCP drew down a cumulative amount of $1.07 million. The OIG concluded that the CVCP used its victim compensation grant funding to provide financial support for crime victims. However, the OIG recommended that the CVCP enhance its written policies and procedures to help address issues it identified related to program performance reports, grant expenditures, administrative costs, state certification, and other special conditions. Additionally, the OIG identified errors in the certification form for 1 year in the audit scope, which resulted in the under-awarding of compensation funding in FY 2018. The audit also identified $61,071 questioned costs. The OIG made nine recommendations to OJP to assist the CVCP in improving its grant management and administration of crime victim compensation funding and remedy questioned costs. OJP and CVCP agreed with all of them.

• The OIG issued an audit report on three grants totaling $39,223,106 to the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare’s Council on Domestic Violence and Victim Assistance (the Council) in Boise, Idaho. OJP awarded these grants between 2016 and 2018 to enhance crime victim services throughout Idaho. As of June 2019, the Council drew down a cumulative amount of $10,408,560 for all of the grants reviewed. The OIG concluded that the Council used the grant funds to provide services to crime victims. However, the Council did not adequately plan its funding distribution and did not comply with requirements to fund services for priority victim groups, potentially putting at risk its ability to meet the needs of crime victims. Additionally, the OIG identified aspects of the Council’s grant management that increased the risk that funds would be used inefficiently or inappropriately, such as undocumented decision making. The OIG also found issues with adherence to policies and procedures, and identified $36,843 in unallowable subrecipient and administrative costs as
well as $49,069 in unsupported subrecipient costs. The OIG made 17 recommendations to the OJP to improve the administration of the victim assistance grants provided to Idaho and remedy $56,414 in total questioned costs. The Council and OJP agreed with all of them.

- The OIG issued an audit report on three grants totaling over $1.6 million awarded to the Rhode Island Office of the General Treasurer (RIOGT) in Providence, Rhode Island. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2015 and 2017 to provide financial support through the payment of compensation benefits to crime victims throughout Rhode Island. As of November 2018, RIOGT drew down a cumulative amount of $1.4 million. The OIG concluded that RIOGT used its grant funds to enhance its crime victim compensation program. However, the OIG did find areas for improvement for RIOGT's programmatic policies and procedures, state certification forms, performance reporting, compliance with special conditions, and grant financial management. The OIG also identified $15,935 in unallowable or unsupported claim payments. The OIG made 10 recommendations to OJP. OJP and RIOGT agreed with all of them.

- The OIG issued an audit report on four grants totaling over $28.1 million awarded to the Maine Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in Augusta, Maine. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2014 and 2017 to provide financial support from the CVF to enhance crime victim services in Maine. As of January 2019, DHHS drew down a cumulative amount of nearly $25.2 million. The OIG found that DHHS did not meet all of the grants' requirements. The OIG determined that DHHS lacked a funding allocation and planning strategy; lacked certain written procedures and performance reporting requirements; inaccurately reported performance statistics; was not compliant with cash management requirements; and did not adequately monitor subrecipients or require subrecipients to maintain supporting documentation. DHHS also awarded a noncompetitive consultant contract with written justification and advance OJP approval. The OIG identified $9,644 in unsupported subrecipient matching costs. The OIG made 15 recommendations to OJP. OJP and DHHS agreed with all of them.

- The OIG issued an audit report on three grants totaling over $109 million awarded to the South Carolina Office of the Attorney General (SCAG) in Columbia, South Carolina. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2016 and 2018 to provide financial support from the Crime Victims Fund to enhance crime victim services in South Carolina. As of June 2019, SCAG drew down a cumulative amount of nearly $38.5 million. The OIG found that SCAG used funds to enhance crime victims services throughout the state and took appropriate steps to announce and award funding, identify victim services needs, track priority funding, and communicate Victims of Crime Act requirements to its subrecipients. However, the OIG found that SCAG had no written subrecipient policies and procedures and did not always meet monitoring targets. The OIG made four recommendations to OJP to improve SCAG's management of grant funds. OJP agreed with all of them. SCAG did not state whether it agreed or disagreed with the OIG's recommendations and made no additional comments.

- The OIG issued an audit report on four grants totaling over $131.3 million to the Tennessee Department of Finance and Administration's Office of Criminal Justice Programs (OCJP) in Nashville, Tennessee. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2014 and 2017 to enhance crime victim services throughout Tennessee. As of October 2018, the OCJP drew down a cumulative amount of $50.442 million. The OIG found that while the OCJP enhanced
its services to crime victims it identified concerns with grant planning and execution. Specifically, the OCJP’s allocation plan to distribute grant funds to subrecipients may not be sustainable for future years. The OCJP was able to distribute all available FY 2015 award funding, but as of December 31, 2018, the OCJP had spent only 22 percent of its FY 2016 award and none of its FY 2017 or FY 2018 awards. While the OCJP generally conducted subrecipient monitoring adequately, the OIG recommended the OCJP should improve monitoring to ensure subrecipients use funds for certain priority target areas. The OIG made two recommendations to OJP to improve OCJP’s administration of the crime victim assistance program. OJP and the OCJP agreed with both.

• The OIG issued an audit report on three grants totaling over $55.9 million awarded to the Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration (ADFA) in Little Rock, Arkansas. OJP awarded these grants between FYs 2015 and 2017 to enhance crime victim services throughout Arkansas. As of February 2019, the ADFA drew down a cumulative amount of nearly $28.4 million. The OIG concluded that ADFA used its funding to provide services to crime victims throughout the state. The OIG found that ADFA took appropriate steps to announce and distribute its funding to subrecipients to meet victim service needs. The OIG found that ADFA adequately planned and executed the grant program, adhered to performance monitoring and reporting, and complied with grant financial management requirements. The OIG also found ADFA adequately accounted for its expenditures and did not exceed the administrative expense threshold set by program guidelines. This audit did not identify concerns regarding subrecipients’ adherence to special conditions or match obligations. The OIG made no recommendations.
Investigations
The following are examples of cases that the OIG investigated during this reporting period:

- **Findings of Misconduct by a Then Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Misuse of DOJ Issued Computers and for False Statements.** On August 8, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the employing DOJ division alleging that a then DAAG had been observed viewing sexually explicit images on the DAAG's government computer. Criminal prosecution of the DAAG was presented on August 28, 2018 and declined. The OIG has provided a report to the DOJ employing division and to the DOJ OPR for their information.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a Former Deputy Assistant Attorney General (DAAG) for Falsely Representing that the Former DAAG was a High-Level DOJ Official.** On January 22, 2019, the OIG completed its abbreviated report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information alleging that a former DAAG falsely claimed, after leaving DOJ, that the former DAAG was still a high-level DOJ official in an effort to have a hospital relocate a relative, who was a patient at the hospital, to a private room. This investigation was not reported in the last semiannual to allow for additional administrative review. Criminal prosecution of the former DAAG was declined on May 3, 2018. Although the former DAAG’s actions occurred after the former DAAG departed the relevant DOJ Division, the OIG provided this report to the DOJ Division where the former DAAG worked and to the DOJ OPR.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a DOJ Trial Attorney for Misuse of DOJ Issued Computer and Cellular Telephone.** On May 23, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the employing DOJ division alleging that a trial attorney had sexually explicit images on the trial attorney's DOJ issued cellular telephone. The investigation was not presented for prosecution. The OIG has provided a report to the DOJ employing division and to the DOJ OPR for appropriate action.

Criminal Division
Report Issued
Equitable Sharing Audit
During this reporting period, the OIG audited the equitable sharing program activities of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport Police Department (MSP Airport PD). The OIG
concluded that the MSP Airport PD generally complied with the requirements of the DOJ Equitable Sharing Program. Specifically, the OIG found that the MSP Airport PD properly accounted for its DOJ equitable sharing resources and separately accounted for all receipts and expenditures, used equitable sharing funds for allowable purposes, submitted accurate and timely annual reports, and had formalized written procedures for managing its DOJ equitable sharing activities. However, the OIG noted that because the MSP Airport PD did not adhere to its established records retention schedule, it did not completely comply with DOJ Equitable Sharing Program guidelines, and some expenditure-related documentation had not been retained. The OIG made one recommendation to the DOJ Criminal Division. The Criminal Division and the MSP Airport PD agreed with the recommendation.

Environment and Natural Resources Division

Report Issued

Audit of FY 2017 Superfund Activities

The OIG issued an audit report examining the Environment and Natural Resources Division (ENRD) Superfund Activities for FY 2017. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (known as CERCLA or Superfund) established the Superfund program to clean up the nation’s worst hazardous waste sites. The OIG conducted the audit to determine if the cost allocation process used by the ENRD and its contractor provided an equitable distribution of total labor costs, other direct costs, and indirect costs to Superfund cases from FY 2017. To accomplish this objective, the OIG assessed Superfund case designation, costs distributed to these cases, and the adequacy of the internal controls over the recording of charges to Superfund cases. The OIG concluded that the ENRD provided an equitable distribution of costs to Superfund cases from FY 2017. The OIG did not have any recommendations.

Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available here.

Audit of FY 2018 Superfund Activities

Executive Office for Immigration Review

Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available here.

EOIR's Recognition and Accreditation Program

EOIR's Financial Management Practices
Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

Investigations

The following is an example of a case that the OIG investigated during this reporting period:

- **Findings of Misconduct by an Assistant U.S. Attorney for Possessing, Transporting, and Consuming Marijuana Edibles; Falsely Denying Controlled Substance Use on a Security Form; and Lack of Candor.** On May 13, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation of an AUSA based on that attorney’s self-report to the OIG that the AUSA had possessed, transported, and consumed marijuana edibles in August or September 2016, in an attempt to alleviate back pain. The AUSA additionally stated that in the SF-86 form that the AUSA submitted in February 2017 the AUSA had incorrectly denied using a controlled substance in the past 7 years. The investigation was presented for prosecution on August 1, 2017, and declined on September 10, 2018. The OIG has provided its report to EOUSA and DOJ OPR for action they deem appropriate.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a then AUSA for Improperly Disclosing Grand Jury Materials to an Unauthorized Individual.** On September 17, 2019, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia (USAO-DC) regarding allegations that an AUSA who is no longer employed by DOJ improperly disclosed District of Columbia Superior Court grand jury materials to an unauthorized individual. Criminal prosecution of this matter was declined on January 25, 2019. The OIG has provided its report to the EOUSA, OPR, and the USAO-DC for appropriate action.

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

Report Issued

The OIG issued a report on five grants totaling over $3 million awarded to the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma (CNO) in Durant, Oklahoma. The COPS Office awarded grants between 2013 and 2016 to proactively address the most serious needs of tribal law enforcement by increasing their community policing capacity. As of July 2019, the CNO drew down a cumulative amount of $2,297,273. The OIG concluded that the CNO used grant funds to increase its community policing capacity, and demonstrated adequate progress towards achieving most of the grants' stated goals and objectives. However, the OIG found that CNO has not yet purchased communication equipment needed to fill critical gaps in its communication systems. Additionally, the OIG identified $41,063 in unallowable personnel, fringe benefit, equipment, and travel costs and $11,503 in unsupported equipment, supply, and travel costs. Also, the OIG found that the CNO did not accurately report statistics in the grant applications, adequately document competition for small purchases, or accurately account for property. Further, the OIG determined that drawdown procedures could be improved. The OIG made 13 recommendations to the COPS Office to improve CNO’s management of grant funds. The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services agreed with all of the recommendations, and the CNO agreed with six recommendations, agreed in part with two recommendations, and neither agreed or disagreed with five recommendations.
Office on Violence Against Women

Reports Issued

Audits of OVW Grants

The OVW administers financial and technical assistance to communities across the country for the development of programs, policies, and practices aimed at ending domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The OVW recipients include state and local governments, universities, non-profit agencies, and for-profit agencies. During this reporting period, the OIG conducted seven audits of OVW grant recipients, as described by the examples below.

- The OIG issued two reports on seven grants awarded to the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma (CNO) in Durant, Oklahoma. Two grants totaling $898,972 were awarded by OJP for Comprehensive Tribal Victim Assistance. For these grants, the OIG concluded that the CNO demonstrated adequate progress towards achieving the awards’ stated goals and objectives. However, the CNO did not adequately track all performance measures in semi-annual progress reports and charged unsupported costs for travel and supplies totaling $8,089. Additionally, one grant had a special condition that prohibited CNO from expending funds until after certain staff completed training and OJP removed the condition, but CNO expended $11,125 before the special condition was removed, which the OIG identified as unallowable. Five grants totaling $3,445,405 were awarded by OVW to provide services of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence. For these grants, the OIG found that CNO could not demonstrate that all grant goals and objectives have been or are on track to be achieved. The OIG also found that the CNO did not adequately support or accurately report performance measurements and did not comply with all special conditions. Additionally, the CNO did not adequately document travel, supply, contract, and other direct cost transactions and charged unallowable personnel costs, travel, supplies, contract, and other costs. As a result, the OIG identified $181,740 in net questioned costs. As of August 2018, the CNO had drawn down $487,457 of the total OJP funds and $2,539,514 of the total OVW funds awarded. In total, the OIG identified $200,954 in net questioned costs. The OIG made 8 recommendations to OJP and 20 recommendations to OVW. OJP and OVW agreed with all of them. The CNO agreed with four recommendations and neither agreed nor disagreed with four recommendations related to OJP funds; and agreed with 11 recommendations, partially agreed with 2 recommendations, partially agreed and partially did not agree with 1 recommendation, and did not state whether it agreed with 6 recommendations related to OVW funds.

- The OIG issued an audit report on a grant totaling $550,000 awarded to the Omaha Nation Community Response Team (ONCRT) in Walthill, Nebraska. The OVW awarded the grant for ONCRT to partner with the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska to provide a holistic and coordinated response to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. Between March 15, 2016, and August 6, 2018, ONCRT drew down $434,173. The OIG concluded that ONCRT did not adhere to all the grant requirements tested, and found it is unlikely that ONCRT is on track to materially accomplish the grant goals and objectives. Further, ONCRT did not maintain auditable source documentation to verify the information it reported to OVW in progress reports and to demonstrate its compliance with certain grant requirements. The OIG identified $39,371 in unallowable and unsupported costs charged
to the grant, including fringe benefits and costs for individuals who did not work on the
grant. In addition, the audit found ONCRT inconsistently calculated worker’s compensation
expenses, and inconsistently allocated utilities expenses charged to the grant. The OIG
made 11 recommendations to OVW to address these deficiencies and remedy questioned
costs. OVW agreed with all of them. In its response to the draft report, ONCRT did not
specifically state its agreement with the recommendations, but it stated actions intended to
address each recommendation.

• The OIG issued an audit report on two grants totaling almost $2.8 million awarded to Lone
Star Legal Aid (LSLA) in Houston, Texas. OJP awarded a grant in 2012 to develop networks
that provide free legal assistance to victims. OVW awarded a grant in 2015 to provide
free legal services to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and
stalking. As of February 2019, LSLA drew down a cumulative amount of $2 million. The OIG
concluded that LSLA demonstrated adequate progress towards achieving the awards’ stated
goals and objectives. However, the OIG identified $30,500 in unsupported expenditures
related to contractor costs. The OIG also found that LSLA’s contract agreements do not
accurately reflect the contractor requirements. The OIG made one recommendation to OJP
and one recommendation to OVW. OJP and OVW agreed with both recommendations.

• The OIG issued an audit report on two grants totaling over $1.4 million to the DeKalb County
Magistrate Court (the Court) in Decatur, Georgia. OVW awarded these grants in FYs 2016
and 2017 to increase compliance with protective orders and strengthen legal advocacy
services for victims, and to improve the response of the justice system to families with a
history of violence, stalking, or allegations of child sexual abuse. As of June 2019, the Court
has expended $816,610 of the grant funds. The OIG found that the Court is providing
services in accordance with the grant objectives. However, the OIG found that, for seven of
the eight total performance reports, the number the Court reported did not always match
the number supported, which resulted in discrepancies for measures including victims and
families served, domestic violence/dating protection orders, people trained, respondents
coming to court, and individuals that completed the Family Intervention Program. The
OIG also identified $27,695 in unsupported subrecipient costs for travel, health insurance,
personnel, and fringe benefits, and $1,642 in unallowable subrecipient fringe benefit
costs. Additionally, the Court did not have a formal process to monitor subrecipient
performance and expenditure data, although it did maintain regular communication with
subrecipients. The OIG also found that the Court did not have a process to routinely
compare actual grant costs to budgeted costs, which could result in it expending more grant
funds in certain budget categories than approved in the grant budgets. The OIG made
seven recommendations to OVW. OVW agreed with all of them, and the Court has planned
corrective action in response to the recommendations.

• The OIG issued an audit report on four grants totaling almost $1.5 million awarded to the
Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CCASA) in Denver, Colorado. OVW awarded
these grants in 2015 and 2017 to increase the support and capacity for addressing sexual
assault in Colorado and nationally. As of February 11, 2019, CCASA drew down a cumulative
amount of $721,124. The OIG concluded that CCASA demonstrated adequate progress
towards achieving the grants’ stated goals and objectives. However, the OIG found that
CCASA did not consistently maintain accurate progress reports for its programs. Specifically,
the OIG found that for progress reports, 10 of 17 Coalitions Program activities and seven of
eight Rural Program activities the OIG sampled were inaccurate or unsupported. The OIG also identified $9,575 in unsupported expenditures for subrecipient reimbursements, rent, supply, accounting fee, and leased equipment costs. The OIG made five recommendations to OVW to improve CCASA’s management of grant funds and program performance and remedy questioned costs. OVW agreed with all of them and CCASA either agreed with or noted actions to address all of the recommendations.

• The OIG issued an audit report on four grants totaling $567,000 to the LIFT3 Support Group, Incorporated (LIFT3), in Fairfield, California. Two of the grants were awarded by OVW for the purpose of providing temporary housing and support services for victims. The other two grants originated from OJP, and were sub-grants awarded to LIFT3 by the State of California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services. The OIG concluded that LIFT3 engaged in fraudulent and suspicious activities using grant funds. Specifically, the OIG found that the family of LIFT3’s Executive Director filled key management and financial positions and other roles in the organization. The LIFT3 Executive Director and family used LIFT3’s funding to pay for personal items such as handbags, gasoline, groceries, clothing, and trips to Las Vegas, Nevada. Further, LIFT3 consistently transferred funds to other family-owned businesses and to family member bank accounts. The OIG found that LIFT3 had an unusual number of cash transactions totaling $255,998 and limited documentation for the use of this cash. The OIG Audit Division referred these findings to the OIG Investigations Division (the result of the investigation was the criminal prosecution of Lift3’s Executive Director, described immediately below). OVW has deobligated the remaining $237,135 in funds not drawn down, and LIFT3 and its Executive Director are presently suspended from contracting with or receiving grants from the federal government, and as of September 2019, proposed for debarment. Because of the court action described below, as well as LIFT3’s suspension and proposed debarment, and its cessation of operations, this report was issued closed.

Investigation
The following is an example of a case that the OIG investigated during this reporting period:

• Executive Director of Non-Profit Sentenced for Embezzlement and Falsification of Records in a Federal Investigation. In the Semiannual Report to Congress October 1, 2016 – March 31, 2017, the OIG reported on the Indictment of the Executive Director of a non-profit organization which received DOJ grant funds. The indictment stemmed from the OIG’s audit of that organization (the audit is described immediately above). On April 11, 2019, the Executive Director was sentenced to 6 months of incarceration and ordered to pay $71,423 in restitution. According to the factual basis for her guilty plea, from November 2011 through July 2013, the Executive Director misappropriated DOJ OVW grant funds by converting funds for personal travel, shopping, and payments to her family members, among other things. The investigation was conducted by the OIG’s Los Angeles Field Office with support provided by the OIG’s San Francisco Regional Audit Office.
TOP MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE CHALLENGES

The OIG has published a report on the top management and performance challenges facing DOJ annually since 1998. The report is based on the OIG’s oversight work, research, and judgment. By statute, this report is required to be included in DOJ’s annual Agency Financial Report.

This year’s report identifies eight challenges that the OIG believes represent the most pressing concerns for DOJ. While the challenges are not rank-ordered, the OIG believes that challenges in three critical areas—prisons, national security, and cybersecurity—will continue to occupy much of DOJ’s attention and require vigilance for the foreseeable future.

In addition, the OIG has identified one new challenge, the need for the Department to effectively manage and oversee its exercise of certain sensitive investigative authorities, such as the use of confidential sources and surveillance authorized under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, as an emerging issue that merits DOJ's continued attention. Meeting all of these challenges will require DOJ to develop innovative solutions and conduct careful monitoring of its efforts to achieve success.

Top Management and Performance Challenges for the Department of Justice – 2019

- Managing a Safe, Secure, and Humane Prison System
- Safeguarding National Security and Countering Domestic and International Terrorism
- Protecting the Nation and the Department against Cyber-Related Threats
- Management of Sensitive Investigative Authorities
- Law Enforcement Coordination and Community Engagement
- Administering and Overseeing Contracts and Grants
- Using Performance-Based Management
- Fostering a Diverse, Highly-Skilled Workforce

Detailed information about DOJ's management and performance challenges is available online [here](#).
TESTIMONY/LEGISLATION AND REGULATIONS

Congressional Testimony
During this reporting period, the Inspector General testified on one occasion:

“Overseeing the Overseers: Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency @ 10 Years” before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Reform Subcommittee on Government Operations on September 18, 2019.

Legislation and Regulations
The IG Act directs the OIG to review proposed legislation and regulations relating to the programs and operations of DOJ. Although DOJ's Office of Legislative Affairs reviews all proposed or enacted legislation that could affect DOJ's activities, the OIG independently reviews proposed legislation that could affect its operations and legislation that relate to waste, fraud, or abuse in DOJ's programs and operations. For example, during this period, the OIG reviewed legislation, including the Inspector General Access Act, Inspector General Protection Act, National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2020, and Whistleblower Expansion Act of 2019.
WHISTLEBLOWER OMBUDSPERSON PROGRAM

Whistleblowers perform a critical role when they bring forward evidence of wrongdoing and they should never suffer reprisal for doing so. The OIG Whistleblower Coordinator Program (the Whistleblower Program) works to ensure that whistleblowers are fully informed of their rights and protections from reprisal.

The DOJ OIG’s Whistleblower Program continues to play a leadership role in CIGIE’s efforts to educate and empower whistleblowers to come forward with lawful disclosures of misconduct. In July 2019, the Whistleblower Program helped to coordinate a CIGIE-wide effort to launch a new online tool and resource page for whistleblowers. The online tool allows users to respond to a few simple prompts, and they are then directed to the appropriate Inspector General, the Office of Special Counsel (OSC), or other entity to report wrongdoing or to file a retaliation complaint. CIGIE and OSC launched the tool during its BETA test to provide the public an opportunity to provide feedback before the tool is final. To further guide individuals who want to report waste, fraud, abuse, or retaliation, the site also provides specific information to individuals in various sectors, such as whistleblower protections for contractors and grantees, members of the military services, and intelligence community employees.

In connection with National Whistleblower Appreciation Day, which was July 30, 2019, CIGIE also released a new report to highlight whistleblowers’ impact. The report, titled “Whistleblowing Works: How Inspectors General Respond to and Protect Whistleblowers,” highlights OIG investigations, audits, and reviews that were initiated or advanced because of a whistleblower disclosure. All of those OIG reports, along with examples of OIG efforts to protect whistleblowers from retaliation, are available on Oversight.gov.

April 1, 2019 – September 30, 2019

- Employee complaints received: 199
- Employee complaints opened for investigation by the OIG: 64
- Employee complaints that were referred by the OIG to the components for investigation: 69
- Employee complaint cases closed by the OIG: 59
Audit Overview

During this reporting period, the OIG's Audit Division issued 41 internal, contract, and external audit reports, which contained more than $4.5 million in questioned costs, reported over $1 million in funds recommended to be put to better use, and made 270 recommendations for management improvement. Specifically, the Audit Division issued 11 internal audit reports of DOJ programs; 1 audit of a contract funded at more than $65 million; and 29 external audit reports of grants and other agreements funded at over $652 million. The Audit Division also issued 30 Single Audit Act audits of programs funded at more than $548 million and 2 other reports.

Questioned Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>Total Questioned Costs (including unsupported costs)</th>
<th>Unsupported Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No management decision made by beginning of period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued during period</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$17,260,285</td>
<td>$4,394,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needing management decision during period</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$17,260,285</td>
<td>$4,394,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management decisions made during period:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Amount of disallowed costs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$17,260,285</td>
<td>$4,394,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Amount of costs not disallowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No management decision at end of period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluations

Nothing to report from the Evaluation and Inspections Division.

Special Reviews

Nothing to report from the Oversight and Review Division.
# Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use\(^{13}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>Unsupported Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No management decision made by beginning of period(^{14})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued during period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,048,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needing management decision during period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,048,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management decisions made during period:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Amount of disallowed costs(^{15})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,048,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Amount of costs not disallowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No management decision at end of period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluations**

Nothing to report from the Evaluation and Inspections Division.

**Special Reviews**

Nothing to report from the Oversight and Review Division.
## Significant Recommendations for Which Corrective Actions Have Not Been Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-23 (March 2019)</td>
<td>Audit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Cyber Victim Notification Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that the FBI ensure there are appropriate logic controls for data that is manually input into Cyber Guardian and CyNERGY, and that CyNERGY's data input is as automated as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-14 (March 2019)</td>
<td>Audit of Efforts to Safeguard Minors in Department of Justice Youth-Centered Programs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that DOJ implement policies and procedures to enhance its monitoring of grantee background screening processes for all DOJ awards that may involve direct contact with minors in order to ensure that grantees and subgrantees conduct a minimum level of due diligence for individuals in direct contact with minors under funded programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-05 (July 2017)</td>
<td>Review of the Federal Bureau of Prisons’ Use of Restrictive Housing for Inmates with Mental Illness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The OIG recommends that the BOP establish in policy the circumstances that warrant the placement of inmates in single-cell confinement while maintaining institutional and inmate safety and security and ensuring appropriate, meaningful human contact and out-of-cell opportunities to mitigate mental health concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Number</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
<td>Task Number</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-05 (June 2016)</td>
<td>Review of the BOP’s Contraband Interdiction Efforts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The OIG recommends that the BOP develop uniform guidelines and criteria for conducting random staff pat searches across all institutions that require a minimum frequency and duration for search events to ensure that appropriate numbers of staff on each shift are searched with appropriate frequency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-3 (January 2015)</td>
<td>Review of the DEA's Use of Cold Consent Encounters at Mass Transportation Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The OIG recommends that the DEA consider how to determine if cold consent encounters are being conducted in an impartial manner, including reinstituting the collection of racial and other demographic data and how it could be used to make that assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-01 (December 2018)</td>
<td>Review of the Department of Justice’s Implementation of the Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The OIG recommends that the Department conduct a study on data collected under the Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2013 as described in the statute and submit a report on the study to Congress as soon as practicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-05 (October 2019)</td>
<td>Review of the Drug Enforcement Administration’s Regulatory and Enforcement Efforts to Control the Diversion of Opioids</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The OIG recommends that the DEA develop a national prescription opioid enforcement strategy that encompasses the work of all DEA field divisions tasked with combating the diversion of controlled substances, and establish performance metrics to measure the strategy’s progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR-18-03 06-14-2018</td>
<td>A Review of Various Actions by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice in Advance of the 2016 Election</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>The OIG recommends that the Department consider developing practice guidance that would assist investigators and prosecutors in identifying the general risks with and alternatives to permitting a witness to attend a voluntary interview of another witness, in particular when the witness is serving as counsel for the other witness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report ID</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR-18-03</td>
<td>A Review of Various Actions by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice in Advance of the 2016 Election</td>
<td>1b The OIG recommends that the FBI consider developing practice guidance that would assist investigators and prosecutors in identifying the general risks with and alternatives to permitting a witness to attend a voluntary interview of another witness, in particular when the witness is serving as counsel for the other witness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-14-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR-18-03</td>
<td>A Review of Various Actions by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice in Advance of the 2016 Election</td>
<td>2 The OIG recommends that the Department consider making explicit that, except in situations where the law requires or permits disclosure, an investigating agency cannot publicly announce its recommended charging decision prior to consulting with the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Attorney, or his or her designee, and cannot proceed without the approval of one of these officials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-14-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR-18-03</td>
<td>A Review of Various Actions by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice in Advance of the 2016 Election</td>
<td>3a The OIG recommends that the Department consider adopting a policy addressing the appropriateness of Department employees discussing the conduct of uncharged individuals in public statements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-14-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR-18-03</td>
<td>A Review of Various Actions by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice in Advance of the 2016 Election</td>
<td>3b The OIG recommends that the FBI consider adopting a policy addressing the appropriateness of Department employees discussing the conduct of uncharged individuals in public statements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-14-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR-18-03</td>
<td>A Review of Various Actions by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice in Advance of the 2016 Election</td>
<td>4 The OIG recommends that the Department consider providing guidance to agents and prosecutors concerning the taking of overt investigative steps, indictments, public announcements, or other actions that could impact an election.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-14-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reports Without Management Decisions for More than 6 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number and Date</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Report Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Audits**

Nothing to report from the Audit Division.

**Evaluations**

Nothing to report from the Evaluation and Inspections Division.

**Special Reviews**

Nothing to report from the Oversight and Review Division.

---

**Description and Explanation of the Reasons for Any Significant Revised Management Decision Made During the Reporting Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number and Date</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Audits**

Nothing to report from the Audit Division.

**Evaluations**

Nothing to report from the Evaluation and Inspections Division.

**Special Reviews**

Nothing to report from the Oversight and Review Division.
Significant Recommendations in Disagreement for More than 6 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number and Date</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Audits**
Nothing to report from the Audit Division.

**Evaluations**
Nothing to report from the Evaluation and Inspections Division.

**Special Reviews**
Nothing to report from the Oversight and Review Division.

**Audit Follow-up**

**OMB Circular A-50**

OMB Circular A-50, *Audit Follow-up*, requires audit reports to be resolved within 6 months of the audit report issuance date. The Audit Division monitors the status of open audit reports to track the audit resolution and closure process. As of September 30, 2019, the Audit Division was monitoring the resolution process of 193 open reports and closed 63 reports this reporting period.

**Evaluation and Inspections Workload and Accomplishments**

The following chart summarizes the workload and accomplishments of the Evaluation and Inspections Division during the 6-month reporting period ending September 30, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload and Accomplishments</th>
<th>Number of Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviews active at beginning of period</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews cancelled</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews initiated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final reports issued</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews active at end of reporting period</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investigations Statistics

The following chart summarizes the workload and accomplishments of the Investigations Division during the 6-month period ending September 30, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Allegations</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotline (telephone, mail, and email)</td>
<td>2,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>3,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allegations Received</td>
<td>6,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigative Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigations opened this period</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations closed and reports of investigation issued this period</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations in progress as of 9/30/19</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prosecutive Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Indictments/Informations</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions/Pleas</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutions referred to the Department of Justice</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutions referred to State and Local</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminations</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignations</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary action</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monetary Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fines/Restitutions/Recoveries/Assessments/Forfeitures</td>
<td>$861,708.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Fines/Restitutions/Recoveries/Penalties/Damages/Forfeitures</td>
<td>$55,793.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigations Division Briefing Programs

OIG investigators conducted 92 Integrity Awareness Briefings for DOJ employees and other stakeholders throughout the country. These briefings are designed to educate employees and other stakeholders about the misuse of a public official's position for personal gain and to deter employees and other stakeholders from committing such offenses. The briefings reached 3,850 employees.
OIG Hotline

During FY 2019, the OIG received the majority of its Hotline complaints through its electronic complaint form located [here](#).

In addition, DOJ employees and citizens are able to file complaints by telephone, fax, and postal mail. The online access, fax, and postal mail all provide the ability to file a complaint in writing to the OIG.

From all Hotline sources during the second half of FY 2019, 2,930 new complaints related to DOJ operations or other federal agencies were entered into the OIG’s complaint tracking system. Of the new complaints, 1,764 were forwarded to various DOJ components for their review and appropriate action; 305 were filed for information; 663 were forwarded to other federal agencies; and 7 were opened by the OIG for investigation.

![Complaint Sources Graph](#)

Source: Investigations Data Management System

Approximately, 25,000 additional Hotline email and phone contacts were processed and deemed non-jurisdictional and outside the purview of the federal government and therefore were not entered into the OIG’s complaint tracking system.
## Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APQ</td>
<td>Aggregate Production Quota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATF</td>
<td>Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIGIE</td>
<td>Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Office of Community Oriented Policing Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVF</td>
<td>Crime Victims Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ or Department</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISA</td>
<td>Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISMA</td>
<td>Federal Information Security Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG Act</td>
<td>Inspector General Act of 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMD</td>
<td>Justice Management Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Detention Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>Office of the Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJP</td>
<td>Office of Justice Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>Office of Management and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>Office of Professional Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>U.S. Office of Special Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVC</td>
<td>Office for Victims of Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVW</td>
<td>Office on Violence Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriot Act</td>
<td>Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Social Security Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAO</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USM</td>
<td>United States Marshal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMS</td>
<td>U.S. Marshals Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCA</td>
<td>Victims of Crime Act of 1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Glossary of Terms

The following are definitions of specific terms as they are used in this report.

**Aggregate Production Quota:** The total combined amount of quotas set by the DEA for all manufacturers producing basic classes of controlled substances. See 21 C.F.R. § 1303.21.

**Cooperative Agreement:** Term used to describe when the awarding agency expects to be substantially involved with the award’s activities; often used interchangeably with “grant.”

**Deconfliction:** The law enforcement community generally defines deconfliction as the sharing of limited investigative information between federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement entities to identify a common investigative interest or activity.

**Disallowed Cost:** The IG Act defines “disallowed cost” as a questioned cost that management, in a management decision, has sustained or agreed should not be charged to the government.

**Diversion:** When controlled substance transactions fall outside the congressionally mandated closed system of distribution, the activity constitutes diversion.

**Drawdown:** The process by which a grantee requests and receives federal funds.

**Emergency Support Function 13:** DOJ is designated responsibility for federal public safety and security assistance to local, state, tribal, territorial, and other governmental organizations overwhelmed by the results of an actual or anticipated natural or manmade disaster. In October 2008, DOJ assigned ATF as the lead coordinating agency for ESF-13.

**External Audit Report:** The results of audits and related reviews of expenditures made under DOJ contracts, grants, and other agreements. External audits are conducted in accordance with the Comptroller General’s Government Auditing Standards and related professional auditing standards.

**Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use:** Recommendation by the OIG that funds could be used more efficiently if management of an entity took actions to start and complete the recommendation, including: (1) reductions in outlays; (2) deobligation of funds from programs or operations; (3) withdrawal of interest subsidy costs on loans or loan guarantees, insurance, or bonds; (4) costs not incurred by implementing recommended improvements related to the operations of the entity, a contractor, or grantee; (5) avoidance of unnecessary expenditures noted in pre-award reviews of contract or grant agreements; or (6) any other savings that specifically are identified.

**Internal Audit Report:** The results of audits and related reviews of DOJ organizations, programs, functions, computer security and information technology, and financial statements. Internal audits are conducted in accordance with the Comptroller General’s Government Auditing Standards and related professional auditing standards.

**Management Decision:** The IG Act defines “management decision” as the evaluation by the management of an establishment of the findings and recommendations included in an audit
report and the issuance of a final decision by management concerning its response to such findings and recommendations, including actions concluded to be necessary.

**Questioned Cost:** A cost that is questioned by the OIG because of: (1) an alleged violation of a provision of a law, regulation, contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or 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.

**Single Audit Act Audits:** Single Audit Act audits are performed by public accountants or a federal, state or local government audit organization in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. They are intended to determine whether the financial statements and schedule of expenditures of federal awards are presented fairly, to test internal controls over major programs, to determine whether the grant recipient is in compliance with requirements that may have a direct and material effect on each of its major programs, and to follow up on prior audit findings. These audits are required to be performed for organizations that expend $750,000 or more in federal awards in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984, as amended, and OMB Circular A-133.

**Supervised Release:** Court-monitored supervision upon release from incarceration.

**Unsupported Cost:** A cost that is questioned by the OIG because the OIG found that, at the time of the audit, the cost was not supported by adequate documentation.
3 Audit Division Reports

Internal Audit Reports

Multi-Component
Audit of the Department of Justice's Use of Immigration Sponsorship Programs

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives
Audit of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives' Controls over Agent Cashier Funds

Drug Enforcement Administration
Audit of the Drug Enforcement Administration's Controls over Weapons and Munitions

United States Marshals Service
Audit of the United States Marshals Service's Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System

Other Department Components
Audit of the Criminal Division's Entellitrak System Pursuant to the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 Fiscal Year 2018
Audit of the Criminal Division's Information Security Program Pursuant to the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 Fiscal Year 2018
Audit of the Superfund Activities in the Environment and Natural Resources Division for FY 2017
Audit of the Executive Office for Immigration Review's Information Security Program Pursuant to the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 Fiscal Year 2018
Audit of the Executive Office for Immigration Review's Justice Consolidated Office Network/eWorld System Pursuant to the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 Fiscal Year 2018
Audit of the Executive Office for United States Attorneys' Information Security Program Pursuant to the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 Fiscal Year 2018
Audit of the Executive Office for United States Attorney's Victim Notification System Pursuant to the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 Fiscal Year 2018

Contract Audit Reports

Federal Bureau of Prisons
Audit of the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Contract Awarded to Correct Care Solutions, LLC for the Federal Correctional Complex in Coleman, Florida

External Audit Reports

Arizona
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Regional Information Sharing Systems Grants Awarded to Rocky Mountain Information Network, Phoenix, Arizona

Arkansas
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration, Little Rock, Arkansas
California
Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women and California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services Awards to the LIFT3 Support Group, Incorporated, Fairfield, California

Colorado
Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women Grants Awarded to the Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault, Denver, Colorado
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Colorado Department of Public Safety, Lakewood, Colorado

District of Columbia
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts Training and Technical Assistance Award to American University, Washington, D.C.

Georgia
Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women Grants Awarded to the DeKalb County Magistrate Court, Decatur, Georgia

Idaho
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Boise, Idaho

Louisiana
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Maine
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Augusta, Maine

Minnesota
Audit of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport Police Department’s Equitable Sharing Program Activities, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Missouri
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Missouri Department of Public Safety, Jefferson City, Missouri

Montana
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Montana Office of Victim Services’ Crime Victim Compensation Program, Helena, Montana

Nebraska
Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women Grant Awarded to the Omaha Nation Community Response Team, Walthill, Nebraska

New Jersey
Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women and Office of Justice Programs Grants Awarded to Catholic Charities, Diocese of Trenton, New Jersey
New York
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Cooperative Agreements Awarded to International Institute of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs National Institute of Justice Reentry Research Grant Awarded to MDRC, New York, New York
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Cooperative Agreement Awarded to the Vera Institute of Justice, New York, New York

Oklahoma
Audit of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services Tribal Resource Grant Program Awards to the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, Durant, Oklahoma
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Comprehensive Tribal Victim Assistance Program Cooperative Agreements Awarded to the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, Durant, Oklahoma
Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women Grants Awarded to the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, Durant, Oklahoma

Rhode Island
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Comprehensive School Safety Initiative Grant Awarded to Central Falls School District, Central Falls, Rhode Island
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Rhode Island Office of the General Treasurer, Providence, Rhode Island

South Carolina
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the South Carolina Office of the Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina

Tennessee
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Tennessee Department of Finance and Administration, Nashville, Tennessee

Texas
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Cooperative Agreement and the Office on Violence Against Women Grant Awarded to Lone Star Legal Aid, Houston, Texas

West Virginia
Audit of Office of Justice Programs Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the West Virginia Legislative Claims Commission, Charleston, West Virginia

Wisconsin
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Assistance National Crime Gun Intelligence Center Initiative Grant Awarded to the Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Wisconsin Department of Justice, Madison, Wisconsin
Single Audit Act Reports of Department Activities

City of Alhambra, California FY 2018
City of Beverly Hills, California FY 2018
City of El Monte, California FY 2018
City of Elizabeth, New Jersey FY 2018
City of Murrieta, California FY 2018
City of Oak Ridge, Tennessee FY 2018
City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania FY 2017
City of Pomona, California FY 2018
City of South San Francisco, California FY 2018
City of Tulsa, Oklahoma FY 2018
County of Orange, California FY 2018
Legal Services of Eastern Missouri, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri FY 2018
Oneida Indian Nation, Oneida, New York FY 2018
Phelps County, Missouri FYs 2015 and 2016
Sedgwick County, Kansas FY 2018
South Dakota Network Against Family Violence and Sexual Assault, Inc., Sioux Falls, South Dakota FY 2018
South Peninsula Haven House, Homer, Alaska FY 2018
State of Florida FY 2018
State of Louisiana FY 2018
State of Maine FY 2018
State of Michigan FY 2017
State of Nebraska FY 2018
State of Nevada FY 2018
State of North Carolina FY 2018
State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations FY 2018
State of South Carolina FY 2018
State of Utah FY 2018
State of Washington FY 2018
Stoney Forensic, Inc., Chantilly, Virginia FY 2018
Town of North Providence, Rhode Island FY 2018

Other Reports

Examination of the U.S. Department of Justice's Fiscal Year 2018 Compliance under the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010

Review of the Office of Justice Programs’ Efforts to Address Challenges in Administering the Crime Victims Fund Programs
### Quantifiable Potential Monetary Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Report</th>
<th>Questioned Costs</th>
<th>Unsupported Costs</th>
<th>Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Regional Information Sharing Systems Grants Awarded to Rocky Mountain Information Network, Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td>$233,293</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Colorado Department of Public Safety, Lakewood, Colorado</td>
<td>$82,192</td>
<td>$82,192</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women Grants Awarded to the Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault, Denver, Colorado</td>
<td>$9,575</td>
<td>$9,575</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts Training and Technical Assistance Award to American University, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>$8,867</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women Grants Awarded to the DeKalb County Magistrate Court, Decatur, Georgia</td>
<td>$29,337</td>
<td>$27,695</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Boise, Idaho</td>
<td>$56,414</td>
<td>$49,069</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement, Baton Rouge, Louisiana</td>
<td>$114,319</td>
<td>$113,098</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Augusta, Maine</td>
<td>$9,644</td>
<td>$9,644</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Missouri Department of Public Safety, Jefferson City, Missouri</td>
<td>$282,606</td>
<td>$282,606</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs</td>
<td>Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Montana Office of Victim Services’ Crime Victim Compensation Program, Helena, Montana</td>
<td>$61,071</td>
<td>$61,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women Grant Awarded to the Omaha Nation Community Response Team, Walthill, Nebraska</td>
<td>$39,371</td>
<td>$29,479</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women and Office of Justice Programs Grants Awarded to Catholic Charities, Diocese of Trenton, New Jersey</td>
<td>$70,818</td>
<td>$62,193</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Cooperative Agreement Awarded to the Vera Institute of Justice, New York, New York</td>
<td>$325,907</td>
<td>$259,225</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Cooperative Agreements Awarded to International Institute of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York</td>
<td>$864,606</td>
<td>$864,606</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services Tribal Resource Grant Program Awards to the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, Durant, Oklahoma</td>
<td>$52,566</td>
<td>$11,503</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Comprehensive Tribal Victim Assistance Program Cooperative Agreements Awarded to the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, Durant, Oklahoma</td>
<td>$19,214</td>
<td>$8,089</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women Grants Awarded to the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, Durant, Oklahoma</td>
<td>$181,740</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Comprehensive School Safety Initiative Grant Awarded to Central Falls School District, Central Falls, Rhode Island</td>
<td>$1,803,747</td>
<td>$1,803,747</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Rhode Island Office of the General Treasurer, Providence, Rhode Island</td>
<td>$15,935</td>
<td>$12,218</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Cooperative Agreement and the Office on Violence Against Women Grant Awarded to Lone Star Legal Aid, Houston, Texas</td>
<td>$30,500</td>
<td>$30,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,048,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of Office of Justice Programs Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the West Virginia Legislative Claims Commission, Charleston, West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Assistance National</td>
<td></td>
<td>$89,412</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Gun Intelligence Center Initiative Grant Awarded to the Milwaukee Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department, Milwaukee, Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Justice Programs Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to</td>
<td></td>
<td>$196,499</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Wisconsin Department of Justice, Madison, Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (Audits Performed by the DOJ OIG)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,577,633</td>
<td>$4,061,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audits Performed by State/Local Auditors and Independent Public Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firms Under the Single Audit Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oak Ridge, Tennessee FY 2018</td>
<td>$1,044,662</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania FY 2017</td>
<td>$8,610,562</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pomona, California FY 2018</td>
<td>$27,553</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South San Francisco, California FY 2018</td>
<td>$2,236,224</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Nebraska FY 2018</td>
<td>$41,783</td>
<td>$41,783</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Nevada FY 2018</td>
<td>$412,181</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of North Carolina FY 2018</td>
<td>$291,507</td>
<td>$291,507</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of South Carolina FY 2018</td>
<td>$5,956</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Utah FY 2018</td>
<td>$12,224</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (Audits Performed by State/Local Auditors and Independent Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,682,652</td>
<td>$333,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Firms Under the Single Audit Act)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,260,285</td>
<td>$4,394,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation and Investigations/Oversight and Review Division Reports

### Evaluation and Inspections Division Reports

- A Joint Review of Law Enforcement Cooperation on the Southwest Border between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Homeland Security Investigations
- Review and Inspection of Metropolitan Detention Center Brooklyn Facilities Issues and Related Impacts on Inmates
- Review of the Drug Enforcement Administration’s Regulatory and Enforcement Efforts to Control the Diversion of Opioids

### Oversight and Review Division Reports

- Report of Investigation of Former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey’s Disclosure of Sensitive Investigative Information and Handling of Certain Memoranda
6. Peer Reviews

Peer Reviews Conducted by another OIG

Audit Division
The most recent peer review of the Audit Division was performed by the DOL OIG. In its report issued March 27, 2019, the DOJ OIG received a peer review rating of pass for its system of quality control in effect for the year ended September 30, 2018. The DOL OIG did not make any recommendations.

Evaluation and Inspections Division
The Evaluation and Inspections Division did not undergo a peer review this reporting period. The most recent peer review was performed by a team of staff from the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation OIG, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection Bureau OIG. In the report issued on August 8, 2018, the team determined that the Evaluation and Inspections Division generally met seven of the CIGIE's Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation (Blue Book standards) and generally complied with its own internal policies and procedures. There are no outstanding recommendations.

Investigations Division
The Investigations Division did not undergo a peer review this reporting period. The most recent peer review was performed by the Department of Defense (DOD) OIG in February 2017. The DOD OIG found that the DOJ OIG is in compliance with the quality standards established by the CIGIE and the Attorney General Guidelines for Inspectors General with Statutory Law Enforcement Authority. In an accompanying letter of observation, the DOD OIG suggested: 1) that the DOJ OIG monitor field office implementation of policy issued during the review requiring placement of FBI case notification letters in the official case files and 2) that DOJ OIG develop a standard method for recording when management case reviews have been performed. The DOJ OIG agreed with these suggestions and implemented corrective action. There are no outstanding recommendations.

Peer Reviews Conducted by the OIG

Audit Division
The OIG initiated a peer review of the Department of Interior OIG on October 4, 2019.

Investigations Division
The DOJ OIG last conducted a peer review of the SSA for the period ending June 2016, and the compliance letter was issued on September 12, 2016.
# Reporting Requirements

The IG Act specifies reporting requirements for semiannual reports. The requirements are listed below and indexed to the applicable pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IG Act References</th>
<th>Reporting Requirements</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(1)</td>
<td>Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies</td>
<td>10-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(2)</td>
<td>Significant Recommendations for Corrective Actions</td>
<td>10-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(3)</td>
<td>Significant Recommendations for Which Corrective Actions Have Not Been Completed</td>
<td>50-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(4)</td>
<td>Matters Referred to Prosecutive Authorities</td>
<td>15-16, 18-20, 22-27, 39, 41, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(5)</td>
<td>Refusal to Provide Information</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(6)</td>
<td>Listing of Audit Reports</td>
<td>60-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(7)</td>
<td>Summary of Significant Reports</td>
<td>10-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(8)</td>
<td>Questioned Costs</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(9)</td>
<td>Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(10)</td>
<td>Prior OIG Reports Unresolved, Uncommented Upon, or Recommendations Not Yet Implemented</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(11)</td>
<td>Description and Explanation of the Reasons for Any Significant Revised Management Decision Made During the Reporting Period</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(12)</td>
<td>Significant Management Decisions with Which the Inspector General Disagreed</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(14)</td>
<td>Peer Reviews Conducted by Another OIG</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(15)</td>
<td>Outstanding Recommendations from Peer Reviews of the OIG</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(16)</td>
<td>Outstanding Recommendations from Peer Reviews Conducted by the OIG</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(17)</td>
<td>Statistical Table Pertaining to OIG Investigations</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(18)</td>
<td>Description of Metrics for OIG Investigative Table</td>
<td>70-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(19)</td>
<td>Reports Involving Senior Government Employees Meeting Certain Criteria</td>
<td>15-16, 19, 23, 25-26, 39, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(20)</td>
<td>Instance of Whistleblower Retaliation</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(21)</td>
<td>Attempts to Interfere with OIG Independence</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(22)</td>
<td>Inspections, Evaluations, Audits, and Investigations of Senior Government Employees Undisclosed to the Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENDNOTES

1 These figures represent allegations entered into the OIG’s complaint tracking system. They do not include the approximate 25,000 additional Hotline, email, and phone contacts that were processed and deemed non-jurisdictional and outside the purview of the federal government.

2 Includes civil, criminal and non-judicial fines, restitutions, recoveries, assessments, penalties, and forfeitures.

3 These non-audit reports are the result of examinations and reviews of DOJ programs and functions.

4 Employee complaint is defined as an allegation received from whistleblowers, defined broadly as complaints received from employees and applicants with the Department, or its contractors, subcontractors, or grantees, either received directly from the complainant by the OIG Hotline, the field offices, or others in the OIG, or from a Department component if the complaint otherwise qualifies and is opened as an investigation.

5 This number reflects cases closed during the reporting period regardless of when they were opened.

6 See glossary for definition of “Questioned Costs” and “Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use.”

7 “Other Reports” are identified in Appendix 3.

8 See glossary for definition of “Questioned Costs.”

9 See glossary for definition of “Unsupported Costs.”

10 Includes reports previously issued for which no management decision has been made. See glossary for definition of “Management Decision.”

11 Of the audit reports issued during this period with questioned costs, nine were Single Audit Act reports.

12 Includes instances in which management has taken action to resolve the issue and/or the matter is being closed because remedial action was taken. See glossary for definition of “Disallowed Costs.”

13 See glossary for definition of “Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use.”

14 Reports previously issued for which no management decision has been made.

15 Includes instances in which management has taken action to resolve the issue and/or the matter is being closed because remedial action was taken.

16 These figures represent allegations entered into the OIG’s complaint tracking system. They do not include the approximate 25,000 additional Hotline, email and phone contacts that were processed and deemed non-jurisdictional and outside the purview of the federal government.
At the conclusion of an investigation, one or more type of report is prepared. The prepared report may be an abbreviated report of investigation or a full report of investigation. In addition, an investigative summary for public posting on the OIG public website may be prepared for investigations involving senior government employees. The number of reports issued represents one report for each investigation.

The number of indictments reported include both sealed and not sealed.

This number includes all criminal and civil referrals to the Department of Justice for a prosecutorial decision whether they were ultimately accepted or declined with the caveat that if an investigation was referred to more than one Department of Justice office for a prosecutorial decision, the referral to the Department of Justice was only counted once. The number reported as referred represents referrals for both individuals and or other legal entities.

The number reported as referred represents referrals for both individuals and or other legal entities.

These audits are reviewed by the OIG to assess the quality and the adequacy of the entity's management of federal funds. The OIG issues these audits to the responsible component and performs follow-up on the audit reports' findings and recommendations.
REPORT WASTE, FRAUD, ABUSE, OR MISCONDUCT

To report allegations of waste, fraud, abuse, or misconduct regarding Department of Justice programs, employees, contractors, or grants, please go to the DOJ OIG website at oig.justice.gov or call the OIG’s Hotline at (800) 869-4499.

The OIG website has complaint forms that allow you to report the following to the OIG:

- General allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse in Department programs or by Department employees;
- Contract fraud, including mandatory disclosures required by contractors when they have credible evidence of violations of the civil False Claims Act or certain violations of criminal law;
- Grant fraud, including fraud, waste, or abuse related to the Department’s award of Recovery Act funds; and
- Violations of civil rights or civil liberties by Department employees.

To give information by mail or facsimile, please send to:

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of the Inspector General
Investigations Division
ATTN: OIG Hotline
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C., 20530
Fax: (202) 616-9881

For further information on how to report a complaint to the OIG, please call (800) 869-4499.