

From: (b) (7)(C) @doioig.gov
To: (b) (7)(C) @doioig.gov; (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Fw: updated IG briefing sheet for Tuesday
Date: Sunday, August 26, 2012 8:13:22 PM
Attachments: [IG briefing 82412.docx](#)

(b) (7)(C)

Could you please print this for me. Thanks and I'll see you in the morning.

(b) (7)(C)

DOI-OIG - Office of Investigations, Eastern Region
381 Elden Street
Suite 1120
Herndon, VA 20170
O: (b) (7)(C) C: (b) (7)(C)

----- Forwarded by (b) (7)(C) /WDC/OIG/DOI on 08/26/2012 08:12 PM -----

From: (b) (7)(C) /WDC/OIG/DOI
To: (b) (7)(C) @doioig.gov
Cc: (b) (7)(C) @doioig.gov, (b) (7)(C) r@doioig.gov, (b) (7)(C) /WDC/OIG/DOI@OIG
Date: 08/24/2012 05:28 PM
Subject: updated IG briefing sheet for Tuesday

(b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C)

Department of the Interior
Office of Inspector General
1849 C Street NW

(b) (7)(C)
Washington, DC 20240

Phone: (b) (7)(C)

Fax: (b) (7)(C)

Department of the Interior Office of Inspector General

Regional Briefing Report
 Division: Office of Program Integrity
 Region: Program Integrity

REGIONAL BRIEFING

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0160-I	TEJON INDIAN TRIBE	(b) (7)(C)	01/17/2012	A.S. IA	No
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>(b) (7)(C), AS-IA, reported that (b) (7)(C) AS-IA, recently granted federal recognition to the Tejon Indian Tribe, Wasco, CA, without going through the federal recognition process set forth in 25 CFR Part 83.</p>			<p>Several Native American groups, including the Tejon Tribe, submitted petitions requesting direct acknowledgement by AS-IA. These petitions were outside the 25 CFR, Part 83, process administered by the Office of Federal Acknowledgment. Our investigation did not reveal any discernible process used by (b) (7)(C) and his staff in selecting the Tejon Tribe for consideration above the other groups. It appears their petition was considered based on the persistence of their tribal members (numerous emails and telephone calls to AS-IA staff) and the persistence and reputation of their attorney, (b) (7)(C). According to the (b) (7)(C), his staff, and solicitors, the acknowledgment was based on legal precedent set by earlier assistant secretaries. AS-IA did not consult with BIA leadership prior to this decision, causing budgeting and operational difficulties. The Tejon Tribe is financially backed by Cannery Casino Resorts, Las Vegas, NV, and has a financial agreement with the company to manage their future gaming activities. Our investigation did not reveal any financial, business, or personal connection between (b) (7)(C) or his staff and the Tejon Tribe or Cannery Casino Resorts.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
None.			<p>We have one or two ancillary interviews to complete and are in the process of writing the final report. Prepared ROI outline and had a meeting on Aug 8, 2012, with IG Mary Kendal, writer/editor (b) (7)(C), and SA (b) (7)(C) to discuss the final report. IG Kendal approved the outline and provided guidance for the final ROI.</p>		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0084-I	(b) (7)(C) ET AL	(b) (7)(C)	11/23/2011	BIE	Yes
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>The OIG was informed that (b) (7)(C), BIA (b) (7)(C), reported potential improprieties in BIA's procurement process in the awarding of contract #SBN00110010. (b) (7)(C) claims this contract was cancelled following a contract protest based on the assertion that BIE (b) (7)(C), was employed by the contract recipient, (b) (7)(C) within 12 months of employment at DOI. (b) (7)(C) claims she tried to initiate a new procurement to prevent (b) (7)(C) participation, but senior BIE officials would not sign the certification and reassigned the procurement to an inexperienced contract specialist who awarded the contract to a company called (b) (7)(C) with (b) (7)(C) as the subcontractor.</p>			<p>Senior BIE and BIA officials willfully disregarded explicit warnings from contracting official (b) (7)(C) that a conflict of interest existed with regard to the BIE Organizational Assessment. (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) admitted to ignoring or disregarding the content of numerous emails that (b) (7)(C) sent about the conflict of interest. Though (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) denied taking any overt actions to ensure that (b) (7)(C) was included in the BIE Org. Assessment, they admitted that they "may have" had conversations with other senior managers in BIA and AS-IA, as well as to All Native, Inc. officials, expressing support for (b) (7)(C) inclusion because they felt (b) (7)(C) initial contract award was unfairly terminated. (b) (7)(C) said she may have suggested that the contracting official (b) (7)(C) be replaced in order to help the procurement move forward.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
None.			<p>Received feedback on 1st draft of ROI from a colleague. Considering having draft ROI reviewed by (b) (7)(C) (Suspension and Debarment) for additional review from a subject matter expert. Goal is to determine if additional violations have occurred other than those noted in the ROI.</p>		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0518-I	(b) (7)(C) ET AL.	(b) (7)(C)	07/24/2012	BLM	No
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>Hotline Email E008267. Anonymous complainant alleged misuse of government time by BLM Boise, ID, employees (b) (7)(C) Staff LE (b) (7)(C); (b) (7)(C) Criminal Investigator); (b) (7)(C) Field Staff LE Ranger); (b) (7)(C) Sup'y Criminal Investigator (b) (7)(C); (b) (7)(C) IT Specialist); (b) (7)(C) Criminal Investigator); and (b) (7)(C) Criminal Investigator/SAC). Reportedly, on or about June 27, 2012, they went on a float trip on the Payette or Boise River on government time as "team building," and their respective supervisors may not have known about it. The anonymous complainant said to be aware of assigning this matter to BLM Internal Affairs for investigation, as (b) (7)(C) Internal Affairs) is close friends with all of them.</p>			<p>On June 27, 2011, (b) (7)(C), OLES, National Interagency Fire Center, BLM, DOI, Boise, ID, arranged and supervised a "Team Building" event in which OLES personnel boarded BLM river craft and assisted river rangers while they performed routine maintenance and trash collection around BLM campsites on the Payette River, ID. The event was approved by (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), Boise District, BLM; (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), OLES, BLM, DOI; and (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), OLES, BLM. A risk assessment was conducted, and there were no BLM funds expended during the event. (b) (7)(C), BLM, DOI, Boise, ID, was interviewed and stated that events such as this one are encouraged as a means of promoting understanding between the various departments within BLM and assisting river rangers with scheduled clean-up of inaccessible campsites along BLM maintained rivers.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
<p>Appears the complaint may have been made by (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) BLM, who was on (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C) when the event took place. (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), Boise, ID, she learned of the event and was displeased because it did not appear to involve formal training or classroom instruction, like team building events (b) (7)(C) from (b) (7)(C).</p>			<p>Final ROI is being prepared.</p>		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0364-I	(b) (7)(C) ET AL.	(b) (7)(C)	05/08/2012	BLM	No
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>Anonymous complainant (Hotline Email E008149) alleged that (b) (7)(C) BLM, Washington, DC facilitated political favors that violated Merit Systems principles and relocation restrictions. Reportedly, (b) (7)(C) went to (b) (7)(C) Information Resources Management, BLM, Washington, DC) and (b) (7)(C) BLM, Washington, DC) and colluded in finding a position for (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) BLM, Washington, DC) in the BLM Washington, DC office. (b) (7)(C) is allegedly (b) (7)(C) of a (b) (7)(C) in the Agriculture Department and a longtime friend of (b) (7)(C)</p>			<p>We conducted an initial interview with (b) (7)(C) on May 30, 2012, and the IAR has been written. From the review of the IAR interview, transcript, and the totality of the circumstances surrounding the (b) (7)(C) case, it appears that (b) (7)(C) was less-than candid with us during that interview.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
<p>(b) (7)(C) said he turned the issue over to HR to see if there was a position available for (b) (7)(C). He denied pulling any strings, but the timing and people involved are suspicious. (b) (7)(C) received a (b) (7)(C) award just prior to her (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) and after requesting that the government pay her moving expenses, which were denied.</p>			<p>Interviews to commence upon agents return from AL.</p>		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0426-I	(b) (7)(C)	(b) (7)(C)	05/24/2012	BLM	No
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>SAC (b) (7)(C), BLM Law Enforcement, became aware of a serious accident involving (b) (7)(C), Nevada State Office (b) (7)(C), who was operating a BLM vehicle while traveling to the 2011 Burning Man festival. Allegations have recently surfaced that (b) (7)(C) was under the influence of (b) (7)(C) at the time of the accident, and the Nevada (b) (7)(C) used his law enforcement position to convince the Nevada Highway Patrol not to arrest (b) (7)(C) for (b) (7)(C). It's further alleged that (b) (7)(C) interfered because of a (b) (7)(C) he had with (b) (7)(C)</p>			<p>We interviewed the complainant, (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) and other BLM employees with knowledge of (b) (7)(C) accident. We also interviewed the Nevada Highway Patrol Trooper who responded to (b) (7)(C) accident. At this time, we have found no evidence to suggest that (b) (7)(C) used his law enforcement authority to interfere with or compromise the NHP accident investigation. We obtained copies of (b) (7)(C) medical records and are unable to prove she was (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) at the time of the accident. At this time, we have found no evidence that BLM Nevada State Office managers covered up (b) (7)(C) accident or interfered with the subsequent Board of Survey.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
None.			<p>We anticipate conducting one final interview of an individual who was in the caravan heading to Burning Man to see if she has any information relevant to our investigation. We are working with CRU to draft the ROI.</p>		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0270-I	MONTEZUMA VALLEY IRRIGATION COMPANY	(b) (7)(C)	04/03/2012	BOR	No
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>A whistleblower complaint (under Section 1553 of ARRA) against former employer Montezuma Valley Irrigation Company is being renewed by (b) (7)(C) (related Cases: OI-AI-12-015-P; OI-CO-11-055-I). This retaliation case was originally presented before a Colorado State Unemployment Compensation Agency (removing jurisdiction from the OIG on the whistleblower issue); however, the agency made a decision on the complainant's unemployment compensation only and declined to consider the whistleblower complaint on the merits. (b) (7)(C) attorney has renewed a request that the OIG investigate the retaliation complaint.</p>			<p>Reviewed 37-page position statement from MVI attorney (b) (7)(C). Ultimately, (b) (7)(C) reiterated sentiments expressed by MVI witnesses: That (b) (7)(C) was terminated because of "his increasingly poor behavior." "MVI could not continue to employ a person who made repeated mistakes, who was disrespectful to his supervisor, and who refused to come to work as he was required, or otherwise comply with MVI's vacation and sick time policies," according to (b) (7)(C). The problem with MVI's position is that they have nothing to support their assertions, including no written reprimands, performance evaluations indicating poor performance, etc.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
(b) (7)(C) current attorney was the attorney for MVI at one time.			Writing IARs.		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0555-I	(b) (7)(C)	(b) (7)(C)	08/13/2012	BOR	No
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>(b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C), BOR Hoover Dam Police Department, Boulder City, NV) alleged reprisal by (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), BOR Hoover Dam Police Department, Boulder City, NV). Reportedly, (b) (7)(C) disclosed to his second-line supervisor that (b) (7)(C) gave an unfair advantage to a friend for a federal position by revealing the questions his friend would be asked during the interview panel. (b) (7)(C) alleged that (b) (7)(C) has threatened to end (b) (7)(C) career.</p>			<p>We are investigating a potential retaliation against (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) for making a complaint to his HR division and the OIG about (b) (7)(C) revealing questions to his friend applying for a position at Hoover Dam. Specifically, (b) (7)(C) is allegedly proposing changes to the PT test so that (b) (7)(C) won't be able to pass. (b) (7)(C) also received a letter of reprimand for not following an order by the facility manager at Hoover Dam.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
None.			Conduct an initial interview of complainant (b) (7)(C)		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0387-I	(b) (7)(C)	(b) (7)(C)	05/14/2012	FWS	No
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>(b) (7)(C) an (b) (7)(C) in Austin, TX, and (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Austin, TX, both complained that (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) FWS, used her position for the financial gain of close friends and the political gain for another friend. (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C), allegedly approved a conservation agreement that is legally insufficient, and the agreement benefits her close friends. (b) (7)(C) allegedly inserted language regarding conservation credits in another permit that would also benefit a close friend.</p>			<p>Interviewed (b) (7)(C), who reiterated his concerns over CCAA signed between FWS and Texas. (b) (7)(C) made allegations regarding (b) (7)(C) decision not to have SOL review CCAA and (b) (7)(C) direction to insert language in an Oncor permit allowing Oncor to purchase credits from Fort Hood. (b) (7)(C) consented to recording future conversations with parties involved in both CCAA and Oncor issues. (b) (7)(C) sent recording equipment to (b) (7)(C) and went over proper procedures with him.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
None.			(b) (7)(C) IAR being written. Discussion by management about referring case to Central region.		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-11-0629-I	(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)	(b) (7)(C)	09/21/2011	NPS	No
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>Hotline Email E007760 - CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED. Anonymous complainant, who provided his/her telephone number, alleged abuse of power by (b) (7)(C) BLM (b) (7)(C) Washington, DC); (b) (7)(C) Santa Fe, NM); (b) (7)(C) Albuquerque, NM); (b) (7)(C) Albuquerque, NM; and (b) (7)(C) Albuquerque, NM) by allowing (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) Albuquerque, NM) to work from home because (b) (7)(C) felt the office was a hostile work environment. Reportedly, (b) (7)(C) Santa Fe, NM) conducted the investigation of a hostile work environment.</p>			<p>To date we have found that (b) (7)(C) was giving (b) (7)(C) preferential treatment. Several BLM field managers we interviewed, to include two retired BLM managers, said (b) (7)(C) crossed the line repeatedly regarding (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) said she tried to tell (b) (7)(C) to back off but he would not. She also said she told the current (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) that he needed to talk to (b) (7)(C) tell him to stop interfering. Several other managers said they felt pressure and were concerned that if they gave (b) (7)(C) a poor performance evaluation, they might be subject to retaliation from (b) (7)(C) if (b) (7)(C) complained. Although we found no evidence that (b) (7)(C) ever retaliated against anyone, the totality of the circumstances surrounding this case indicate that their fears were probably valid. Regarding (b) (7)(C) telework agreement, it appears that (b) (7)(C) according to DOI and BLM policy, was not a legitimate candidate for telework, but (b) (7)(C) pushed at least one manager, (b) (7)(C) toward it.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
This is one of two cases being worked against (b) (7)(C) regarding similar circumstances.			All IARs have been completed and have been uploaded into CMS. A draft of the ROI is approximately 95% complete. Hope to have it to peer review by COB Friday if not earlier.		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0180-I	(b) (7)(C)	(b) (7)(C)	01/22/2012	NPS	Yes
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>NPS (b) (7)(C) reported his office was investigating (b) (7)(C) (NPS Park Ranger at (b) (7)(C)) for requisitioning excess military equipment from DOD and converting it to personal use and possibly selling sensitive Government equipment overseas.</p>			<p>Our investigation has shown (b) (7)(C) has sold numerous pieces of Government equipment, to include night vision devices, domestically and overseas. In an interview, (b) (7)(C) confessed to selling items he obtained through the park's participation in the DLA 1033 program and has subsequently resigned his position.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
None.			<p>(b) (7)(C) AUSA for the Western District of NC, agreed to prosecute the case, and we continue to work with his office. (b) (7)(C) AUSA (b) (7)(C) notified (b) (7)(C) attorney that the (b) (7)(C).</p>		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0095-I	OSMRE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW	(b) (7)(C)	12/06/2011	OSM	Yes
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>(b) (7)(C) forwarded news article entitled "Contractors Claim Administration Pressed to 'Soften' Job-Loss Estimates from Mining Rule." The news article reflected that the Obama Administration pressured analysts to change an environmental review to reflect few job losses from a proposed regulation regulating coal mining near streams and other waterways. Reportedly, the experts contracted to analyze the impact initially found that it would cost 7,000 coal jobs, but the contractors claimed they were subsequently pressured to not only keep the findings under wraps but "revisit" the study in order to show less of an impact on jobs.</p>			<p>OSM employees appear to have requested that contractors use new methods to calculate job losses after the contractor came up with high losses associated with the rule. We interviewed (b) (7)(C), the (b) (7)(C) who appears to have been the chief proponent behind wanting the contractors to change how the job losses were calculated. She said the contractors' EIS for the Stream Protection Rule was not compliant with the National Environmental Policy Act, which was why the method needed to be changed. She acknowledged that the contractors' baseline was not necessarily wrong, but other changes needed to be made to support it. We asked (b) (7)(C) if her intention in wanting the baseline for calculating the job losses changed was to lower the number, and she said, "I don't think it was." We also interviewed OSM employee (b) (7)(C) and he said both calculation methods were acceptable, but he now believes (b) (7)(C) has more support.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
None.			<p>We have drafted questions for OMB employee (b) (7)(C), which have been emailed to him and an OMB attorney. He is supposed to have (b) (7)(C) of these job calculation and NEPA issues, so we are hoping he can offer insight as to what baseline should be used for the analysis. We have reviewed regulatory documents provided by (b) (7)(C) which appear to support her decision on the baseline change. We are finalizing our email review and drafting the ROI.</p>		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0488-I	(b) (7)(C)	(b) (7)(C)	07/10/2012	OSM	No
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>On June 21, 2012, Investigator (b) (7)(C) received an anonymous complaint stating that (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation, and Enforcement (OSM), Alton, Illinois, had improperly delayed authorized regulatory violations issued by OSM inspectors against Farrell-Cooper Mining Co. The anonymous complainant said that (b) (7)(C) against department regulation, allegedly delayed the ratification of the citations for 8 months, which according to department regulations is required within 15 days.</p>			<p>It appears from initial document reviews that the OSM Tulsa office issued two "Ten Day Notices" to Farrell-Cooper Mining for violations of site reclamation standards. The state agency responded that it disagreed with the TDNs and requested a review. OSM was supposed to respond within 15 days and decide whether to uphold the decision. OSM did not do this for 8 months. It finally did uphold the TDNs and issued violations.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
None.			<p>After document and email reviews, will travel to Tulsa to interview OSM employees, state office employees, and Farrell-Cooper employees. (b) (7)(C) is constructing time lines and assisting with a Zantaz review.</p>		

Case #	Subject	Agent	Opened	Bureau	Sig.
PI-PI-12-0297-I	IMPROPRIETIES AT THE OSM KNOXVILLE FIELD OFFICE	(b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C)	03/30/2012	OSM	No
Summary			Findings to Date		
<p>CTS 2012-G-00068 - (b) (7)(C) OSMRE, hand delivered a copy of a letter from (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) Hydrologist, OSM, (b) (7)(C) with the subject, "Response to Proposed Notice of Suspension." (b) (7)(C) alleged a possible cover-up of "water quality problems" by (b) (7)(C) and by (b) (7)(C) Program Specialist). Further, (b) (7)(C) alleged (1) being pressured into getting bonds released and revisions approved quickly without more data collection; (2) a conflict of interest by (b) (7)(C) in asking a coal company about its land to purchase for himself to put up a hunting cabin; (3) (b) (7)(C) authorizing a coal company to go outside the permit area and fill in several alkaline recharge structures.</p>			<p>To date we have found no evidence to substantiate (b) (7)(C) allegations. In fact, it appears that he made these allegations because he was (b) (7)(C) because of inappropriate behavior in the work place. (b) (7)(C) swore at the director of the field office in (b) (7)(C) and intimidated his direct supervisor by pointing in his face and standing over top of him during a closed door meeting.</p>		
Unusual Issues/Circumstances			Anticipated Action		
<p>(b) (7)(C) has some serious issues, which were demonstrated during my visit to Knoxville when he exhibited some of the same behavior with me that he has showed toward his mangers. Attempts to enlighten (b) (7)(C) DOI/OSM, were unsuccessful; in fact, she was extremely unprofessional and unhelpful. A copy an IAR regarding one of my telephone conversations with (b) (7)(C) was taken from CMS, signed, scanned, and emailed to (b) (7)(C)</p>			<p>In the process of writing the ROI.</p>		