



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

24433
120741

ACCOUNTING AND FINANCIAL
MANAGEMENT DIVISION

MARCH 4, 1983

B-210517

The Honorable Anne M. Burford
Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency



120741

Dear Mrs. Burford:

Subject: Inquiry into Allegations Concerning
Matthew N. Novick, former Inspector General,
Environmental Protection Agency (GAO/AFMD-83-49)

The General Accounting Office has received anonymous allegations regarding abuse of authority by the Environmental Protection Agency's former Inspector General, Matthew N. Novick. It was alleged that the Inspector General had not been working full days, had his driver and secretary conduct unofficial business on Government time, and had ordered improper investigations and provided protective services in return for influencing the hiring of a friend by EPA.

We can draw no conclusions about the Inspector General's alleged work hour abuse because the statements we obtained are contradictory, the individuals with whom we spoke lacked first-hand knowledge, and the Inspector General's time and attendance records do not specify working times.

We did find that the Inspector General made several trips from his residence to the airport, apparently for official travel. On at least one of these trips, he used a Government vehicle and driver when more economical transportation was readily available. Also, the evidence shows that the Inspector General was picked up at home and driven to work on at least one occasion, which is contrary to the provisions of an appropriations act restriction against the use of funds for the transportation of an agency official between his domicile (residence) and his place of employment.

Also, the evidence shows that one of the Inspector General's secretaries, who worked for him from February to May, 1982, spent about 10-1/2 hours typing personal papers for him on Government time. However, the Inspector General told us the work was performed during off-duty hours. Both the secretary and a former assistant inspector general for investigations told us that the Inspector General wanted the typing done on Government time.

(911558)

120741 024790

Finally, we found no evidence supporting the allegations that the Inspector General had ordered an investigation or provided protective services in return for influencing the hiring of a friend by EPA.

Our inquiry focused on whether the investigation and protective services were ordered in return for the hiring of a friend, not whether the Inspector General acted properly in ordering them. The latter issue is being covered in an ongoing GAO evaluation of the EPA Inspector General organization.

Details about each allegation and our inquiry are enclosed.

A copy of this letter and the enclosure are being sent to the Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget.

Sincerely yours,



W. D. Campbell
Acting Director

Enclosure

RESULTS OF INQUIRY

This enclosure provides details on the allegations we received, the work we did to evaluate the merits of each, and the results of our inquiry.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Our objective was to evaluate allegations of abuse of authority by the former Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Matthew N. Novick. The allegations came from two sources: (1) an undated copy of an anonymous letter received on October 18, 1982, and addressed to Joseph R. Wright, Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget and (2) a telephone call to the GAO Fraud Hotline on September 30, 1982. On October 29, 1982, we advised the EPA Inspector General that allegations had been made about him and that we intended to evaluate their merits.

In the course of our evaluation we interviewed EPA employees in the offices of personnel, facilities, inspector general, solid waste and emergency response (OSWER), and several regional EPA offices. We also questioned former employees of the Inspector General's office. We obtained personnel records, statements and/or affidavits from key individuals, vehicle utilization reports, and time and attendance records.

We conducted the review in accordance with generally accepted government audit standards.

ALLEGATION OF WORK HOUR ABUSE

The allegation states that Mr. Novick rarely comes into the office before 9:30 a.m., but manages to leave early except when he must remain to confer with the Administrator or members of her staff.

To evaluate the validity of this allegation we examined Mr. Novick's time and attendance records and interviewed past and present staff working in his immediate office. We also questioned Mr. Novick.

Because the statements we obtained are contradictory and made by persons who had no firsthand knowledge, and because time and attendance records do not specify working times, we can draw no conclusions about the merits of this allegation.

Mr. Novick's daily time and attendance records indicate 8-hour days worked except for periods when annual or sick leave was taken. The records do not indicate when Mr. Novick arrived at work or when he left. Their purpose is to allow paychecks to be prepared by the standard payroll processing system, and they indicate only whether Mr. Novick was at work or on leave on any given day.

Our interviews with staff members in positions that might make them aware of Mr. Novick's working hours were inconclusive. Some said Mr. Novick began work as early as 8:00 a.m. and was still at work when they left at 4:30 or 5:00 p.m. Others said he came in as late as 9:00 or 9:30 a.m. and they had no idea when he left at night. The assistant inspector general for audits and the current assistant inspector general for investigations refuted the allegation while the former assistant inspector general for investigations concurred with it. All individuals interviewed stated they had no firsthand knowledge of Mr. Novick's actual work hours other than casual observation of his arrival at and departure from the immediate office.

Mr. Novick told us that his usual work hours are from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. He also said that he often comes in at 8:30 a.m. and attends meetings during the evening called by the EPA Administrator. He said that at a minimum he works 8 hours daily unless he takes annual or sick leave. He added that he sometimes goes directly to meetings before he goes to his office in the morning.

ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING MISUSE
OF A GOVERNMENT DRIVER

It was alleged that the Inspector General used his assigned driver to

- run his personal errands such as depositing his paycheck in the bank,
- pick up his personal mail from a post office box,
- pick him up at home and at the airport when he traveled,
- drive him home from the airport when he arrived late,
- drive him to and from 2-hour lunches,
- meet him and a friend at the airport when they returned from a vacation, and
- drive him and the friend on many occasions.

In addition, it was alleged that the driver was paid overtime that was not advantageous to the Government.

To evaluate the merits of the allegation concerning misuse of the driver, we (1) examined the current driver's vehicle utilization reports, which are designed to account for vehicle use, for the period March 23, 1982, through October 28, 1982; (2) interviewed the Inspector General, a former driver and the current driver, and other EPA personnel; (3) reviewed the current driver's time and attendance records for the period in which he was assigned

to the Inspector General in fiscal 1982; (4) examined laws and regulations regarding the use of Government drivers and vehicles; and (5) compared the cost of taxis with that of the Government driver and vehicle.

The vehicle utilization reports maintained by Mr. Novick's driver were of limited value in our evaluation because they are imprecise and incomplete. For 3 of the 7 months (March 29 through June 22, 1982) we examined, the reports do not list trip destinations as required by EPA instructions. The driver told us he decided to stop listing the destinations to simplify the reports. He told us that the Inspector General later learned of his omissions and told him to complete the reports in the future as required, which he did. Also, the vehicle utilization reports rarely listed passengers and never specified the purpose of trips.

The evidence supports the portion of the allegation that says the Inspector General made several trips from his residence to the airport and back for official travel using a Government vehicle and driver. More economical transportation, such as a taxi, was readily available for at least one of these trips. Also, the evidence shows that on at least one occasion the Inspector General was picked up at home and driven to work which is contrary to an appropriation act restriction prohibiting the transportation of EPA officers and employees between their domiciles (residences) and places of employment.

The information we gathered on each of the specific actions mentioned in the allegation is discussed below.

Use of assigned driver to run personal errands

We asked the Inspector General if he had used his assigned driver to run personal errands. In a written reply, he answered, "Never to my knowledge." He also stated that he had not asked his driver "to undertake official trips in government cars for personal business."

We asked the two drivers who have worked for the Inspector General if they have run his personal errands. They told us they drive where they are told and do not know whether the trips are for official business or personal errands.

We discussed the allegations with other office of inspector general personnel who might have knowledge of the Inspector General's use of the drivers. No one told us of any misuses. The Inspector General's assistants for audits and investigations, whose offices are adjacent to the Inspector General's office, told us that to the best of their knowledge the drivers were used only for official business. We also talked to several of the past and current secretaries in the office and none of them told us of any use of the drivers to run personal errands.

We talked with the former assistant inspector general for investigations who retired in September 1982. He told us the current driver has been misused and told to run personal errands by the Inspector General; however, he said he did not know the "specifics." He also alleged that the driver once had to take the Inspector General to the dentist in Arlington, Virginia. On this occasion the former assistant inspector general stated he saw the Inspector General and the driver walk out of the office together, and the Inspector General said he was going to the dentist; however, he did not see the two get into a car together.

We asked the Inspector General whether he had ever had the driver take him to the dentist. He told us he had not--that his dentist has an office in downtown Washington near the Office of Management and Budget.

The Inspector General's current driver told us that he does not know if he has ever taken the Inspector General to the dentist.

We visited the only Arlington address listed in the vehicle utilization reports to determine if it was a dentist's office. It was an office supply store.

The former assistant inspector general for investigations also alleged that the driver deposited the Inspector General's paycheck when the Inspector General was away on vacation. The former assistant said he heard discussions in the office about whether or not someone should first endorse the check. This allegation was also made anonymously over the GAO Fraud Hotline.

We asked the Inspector General about this allegation. He said his paycheck is deposited directly into a bank account, and has been for as long as he has worked at EPA. He also said that on one occasion, when he was on official travel and had not yet received a Government travel advance, he left instructions to have the check for the advance deposited in a bank located in the EPA office building.

We attempted to verify with EPA's payroll office the Inspector General's statement that he has had his paycheck directly deposited during the period he has worked at EPA. An official in the payroll office informed us that the Inspector General began having his paycheck sent to the bank after July 16, 1982. For all earlier pay periods, the Inspector General's paycheck was sent directly to his office.

When we again asked the Inspector General how his paycheck is handled, he explained that it has not always gone directly to the bank. He said that the direct bank deposits began last summer and previously his paycheck was delivered to his EPA office. He apologized for giving us a mistaken impression. He added that once when he was on official travel and had not received a travel advance, he left instructions to have either the paycheck or the travel advance

deposited in his bank by a member of the Inspector General's staff. He told us that he could not recall the person whom he instructed to make the deposit.

We also discussed this allegation with the two people who the former assistant inspector general for investigations said were discussing whether someone should endorse the check. One of them told us he had no recollection about endorsing or depositing a check for the Inspector General or discussing the matter. The other stated she vaguely remembers a discussion about what to do with a check, but she could not remember any details. Both said they were not aware of the Inspector General having the driver deposit checks for him.

Use of the driver to pick up
the Inspector General's personal
mail from a post office box

We asked the Inspector General if he had the driver pick up personal mail at a post office box. He stated he had not sent the driver to pick up personal mail. He stated there were a couple of times when the driver was going to the post office to take office mail and asked the Inspector General if he wanted anything done. According to the Inspector General, on one occasion he asked the driver to check his personal post office box because he was expecting some applications from individuals seeking employment. He told us he had these individuals mail their applications to him personally because correspondence coming through EPA's mail system inevitably gets lost or is inordinately delayed. He also said that on another occasion he may have asked the driver to get a book of stamps for him while the driver was at the post office.

We discussed this allegation with both drivers. They acknowledged that they have picked up mail at the Inspector General's post office box but did not know if the mail pertained to official or personal business. Both drivers said that trips to the post office took place when they were in the vicinity on other business.

During the 4 months when the current driver's utilization reports included trip destinations, 12 trips to the post office at 2118 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW. are listed. This is the post office where the Inspector General maintains his personal mailbox. Six of the 12 trips were in conjunction with other trips to the Pentagon, the White House, the Navy Yard, the Rayburn Office Building, an office building in Maryland, and a car wash (following a White House visit).

We asked the Inspector General to explain the purpose of the 12 trips. He replied that the driver frequently makes trips to the post office to take office mail. He said the driver normally used the post office at 2118 Pennsylvania Avenue because it is a main post office and is relatively close to the major Government buildings among which the driver travels. Though the office maintains

no specific mail log, the Inspector General found other records of mail possibly being sent out on 7 of the 12 days on which trips to the post office are reported.

Use of the driver to transport
the Inspector General
between his residence and the airport

The Inspector General acknowledged to us that the driver had taken him from his residence to the airport and back several times when he was traveling on official business. He said he uses the driver for these trips only when his arrival and departure is close to the driver's normal working hours. He told us he had never used the driver after 6:30 or 7:00 p.m.

The vehicle utilization reports we examined documented one of these trips. The reports show a 5:00 a.m. trip to the airport on July 21, 1982, and a pickup at 6:00 p.m. the same day. The Inspector General acknowledged that he had been picked up at his residence and driven to the airport so he could fly to Chicago to interview candidates for a divisional audit inspector general position. The driver was paid 4 hours of overtime on this day, according to the driver's time and attendance record. When we asked the Inspector General why he did not use public transportation for the trips to and from the airport on this day, he replied that he was following the practice of other EPA officials in using a Government driver and car for such a trip. He also stated that, in any event, the cost of using the Government car for such purposes is at least partially offset by savings in taxi fares or parking fees which the Government would bear if he did not use the car.

The Inspector General said that as far as he knows, his use of the car and driver to travel from his residence to the airport and back is correct. He stated that he knows of nothing in EPA or Government regulations or policies that prohibits such trips.

We also are not aware of any statute or regulation that specifically addresses the use of a Government car and driver for transportation from a residence to the airport and return.

Use of the driver
to take the Inspector General
from a residence to his office

The former driver told us he was once directed to pick up Mr. Novick at a residence and bring him to the office in the morning. The driver recalled the residence to be in Northeast Washington. When the driver arrived, both the Inspector General and another person, whom the driver did not recognize, got into the car to be driven to EPA's Waterside Mall offices.

The Inspector General told us the only trip from a residence to the office that he could recall was when he was picked up at his

mother's residence in Northwest Washington to be driven to work. Nobody else rode with him, according to the Inspector General. He stated that at the time he was preparing for his Senate confirmation and had some boxes of papers to bring to his EPA office.

The use of the Government vehicle for the trip from the residence to the Inspector General's office is prohibited by an appropriations act restriction against the use of funds for the transportation of an agency official between his domicile (residence) and his place of employment.

Use of the driver to take
the Inspector General
to and from 2-hour lunches

The vehicle utilization reports show an August 16, 1982, trip to the "Market Inn" restaurant, but we could not determine whether any other reported destinations were to restaurants.

The Inspector General told us he remembered using the Government driver and vehicle on August 16, 1982, and on one other day to pick up and take to lunch a person whom he was recommending for several Government jobs. According to the Inspector General, the EPA Administrator asked her top staff members for recommendations of people who might be considered to fill top-level positions in the administration. The Inspector General said he regarded the two lunches as business lunches. He also gave us a copy of a memorandum he wrote to the EPA Administrator recommending that person for three high-level positions with the administration.

One of the drivers also remembers either the trip described by the Inspector General or a similar one.

Use of the driver to meet
the Inspector General
at the airport after his vacation

The Inspector General told us the Government driver once took him and a friend to the airport when they left for a vacation and picked them up when they returned. The Inspector General said the driver was acting as a friend, not as a Government employee. He said they were driven to the airport after working hours and were picked up at the airport on a Sunday, both times in the driver's personal car, not in the Government car. The Inspector General said he paid the driver \$20 from his own funds. The driver told us the same.

Use of the driver to drive
the Inspector General and a friend
on many occasions

As previously mentioned, vehicle utilization reports do not list passengers so were of no use in determining when and for what purposes an individual may have been a passenger.

The drivers could give us no specific statements regarding this allegation. As mentioned earlier, the former driver for the Inspector General stated that he picked up the Inspector General and another person, whom he could not identify, at a residence one morning and drove them both to EPA's Waterside Mall offices. The Inspector General disputed the driver's statement and said he was alone and at a different residence when he was picked up.

The friend mentioned in the allegation is also an EPA employee, and conceivably could have been a passenger in the Government vehicle for official purposes at one time or another.

The Inspector General told us he remembered only one trip in which the driver did drive his friend, but the trip was made to conduct EPA business related to official duties. As recalled by the Inspector General, the driver once took his friend to pick up some paintings which were purchased for EPA as part of the remodeling of EPA offices.

Paying the driver overtime
that was not advantageous
to the Government

The current driver's time and attendance records show that in fiscal 1982 he was paid 32 hours of overtime in the 32 weeks during which he worked in the Office of the Inspector General, or an average of 1 hour of overtime per week.

Because we regard this overtime as minimal, we did not further pursue the allegation that it was not advantageous. However, the 4 hours of overtime we previously discussed, paid for work done on July 21, 1982, to take the Inspector General to and from the airport, does not appear to be a prudent use of funds considering the availability of comparatively inexpensive public transportation in Washington, D.C. Using GSA's estimated cost of using a Government-owned vehicle and calculating the driver's wages and overtime, we estimate that the Inspector General's travel to and from the airport on July 21, 1982, cost \$49.58. Taxi fares for the trips, including a 15 percent gratuity, would have amounted to \$16.73, or \$32.85 less.

ALLEGATION CONCERNING MISUSE
OF A GOVERNMENT SECRETARY

It was alleged that the Inspector General assigned his secretary tasks unrelated to EPA work. Specifically, it was alleged that these tasks included

- typing term papers for his son,
- typing employment forms for his son and a friend,
- addressing envelopes and typing letters to creditors,

--typing letters pertaining to his divorce, and

--acting as a buffer to avoid creditors and those serving legal papers related to a civil suit.

To evaluate the merits of the allegations concerning misuse of the secretary, we interviewed past and current secretaries, the Inspector General, and other personnel who worked in the vicinity of the Inspector General and his secretaries.

The weight of the evidence suggests that one of the Inspector General's secretaries spent about 10-1/2 hours typing personal papers for him on Government time. The Inspector General acknowledged that some typing was done, but he told us that his understanding was that the work would be performed during off-duty hours. Both the secretary and a former assistant inspector general for investigations told us the Inspector General wanted the typing done on Government time.

The Inspector General's current secretary, who has worked for him since May 1982, told us she has never performed any unofficial tasks for Mr. Novick during her work hours. She says that on one occasion she typed something that was personal, but she cannot remember what it was and she did the work during her lunch period. She also said she refused the payment Mr. Novick offered.

The Inspector General's previous secretary, who worked for him from February to May 1982, told us that Mr. Novick asked her to do certain tasks for him during her regular work hours that were not official business. She stated that she once typed his son's term paper and Standard Form 171, the Government's employment application. She said she also typed a resume for a friend of Mr. Novick's. She said she typed letters to companies to inform them that Mr. Novick would no longer be responsible for charges made with his credit cards, and she addressed the envelopes for these letters. The secretary estimated she spent 10-1/2 hours during the period that she worked for Mr. Novick doing these unofficial tasks. She stated that Mr. Novick directed her to do this work on Government time, and that she received no pay other than her Government salary for doing these tasks.

The former assistant inspector general for investigations also told us he had heard Mr. Novick ask the secretary to type his son's term paper. He said the secretary told the Inspector General that she had other work to do, but the Inspector General told her the other work could wait while she typed the term paper.

Another secretary, who worked for the Inspector General from October 1981 to February 1982, told us she was never asked by Mr. Novick to do personal work for him, his friends, or his son.

Yet another secretary told us she once screened a visitor who was attempting to serve some sort of legal papers on Mr. Novick,

and typed a note for him related to that incident. Other than this, she was never asked by Mr. Novick to do personal work for him, his friends, or his son.

We asked the Inspector General about the allegations that he assigned his secretaries tasks that were unrelated to EPA work, and he provided us with a written statement. He stated that he had never assigned secretaries to do personal tasks. He added that he has on several occasions, however, asked them if they would like to do some typing for him outside of regular business hours.

The Inspector General stated that he asked a former secretary if she would type his son's term paper. He said she answered affirmatively, typed the paper outside normal working hours, and was paid for doing so.

The Inspector General also stated that he asked his current secretary if she would mind typing Standard Forms 171 for his son and a friend. He said they were typed at times when his secretary was off duty, he believes it was during the lunch break, and compensation was offered.

The Inspector General further stated that he could remember asking his secretary one time if she would type a letter to his creditors and send it to them. He said he believed this work was done at night after regular working hours and he paid the secretary for her efforts.

Finally, the Inspector General stated, "There are and never have been any standing instructions given secretaries to screen office visitors so that I can avoid creditors or those serving legal papers."

ALLEGATION THAT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
IMPROPERLY INFLUENCED THE HIRING
OF A FRIEND BY EPA

It was alleged that the Inspector General improperly influenced the hiring of a friend by the assistant administrator, OSWER and, further, that this was "the quid pro quo" for ordering an improper investigation and for providing inappropriate protective services.

In examining the validity of the allegation, we interviewed EPA personnel in the offices of personnel, facilities, inspector general, and OSWER. We examined personnel records, employment applications for the position in question, documents related to previous employment, educational qualifications, and hiring recommendations for the individual in question.

We were unable to find any evidence that would indicate that the Inspector General improperly influenced the hiring of his

friend by the EPA. The individual in question is currently employed by EPA as an interior decorator, GS-1001-9, and the proper personnel practices appear to have been followed in the appointment.

The individual was an employee of EPA on a temporary (not to exceed one year) appointment as a GS-1001-7 from May 25, 1980, to May 24, 1981, which was before the appointment of either the Inspector General or the assistant administrator, OSWER to positions at EPA. The fact that the original appointment was not extended beyond May 24, 1981, appears to have been the result of budget limitations rather than a lack of ability on the part of the individual. For example, the chief of EPA's general services branch stated in a letter to the individual at time of duty termination that:

"In the year you have worked for the Environmental Protection Agency you have proven to be an interior designer of high capability, a willing and interested worker, and an outstanding representative of this office to our clients. Your briefing of the EPA Deputy Administrator and other senior executives on your conference designs and your independent work with our New York regional office have proven that you can be trusted with sensitive and far-ranging projects. Additionally, you have been highly productive in your daily work and have shown great versatility in handling a variety of designs and layouts.

"I am distressed that severe EPA budget limitations make it unlikely that you can continue with the General Services Branch after the expiration of your temporary appointment. I recommend you for any job requiring interior design skills, and believe your ability to deal with clients is unusual."

On July 14, 1981, approximately 7 weeks after leaving Government service, the individual was hired as a consultant. An official of the office of general services, EPA, entered into a contract with the individual to provide interior design services as a consultant. The contract called for preparation and implementation of interior design packages for parts of the EPA Waterside Mall office complex.

The assistant administrator, OSWER indicates that she first met the individual as a result of this contract with the EPA office of general services. The assistant administrator indicated that she was impressed with the work being performed and requested that her administrative staff attempt to hire the individual. The assistant administrator also said she intended to use the individual to help sort out OSWER space requirements as the office staff expanded, and also to prepare graphics for congressional and press briefings.

Subsequently, the individual was hired on a 30-day special needs appointment as a GS-11. EPA's personnel office advised the individual to request a reinstatement on the Office of Personnel Management's (OPM's) interior design employment register and requested a reevaluation of the grade level. OPM reinstated the individual, who thus qualified for full-time employment at EPA. However, the OPM certification allowed eligibility for only a GS-9 position. EPA then rehired the individual for the GS-9 interior decorator position currently held--an appointment that, again, is not to exceed one year.

Allegation that the Inspector General ordered the improper use of the protective detail as a favor

The allegation states that, in July 1982, as a favor, the Inspector General ordered a member of the office of inspector general protective detail to travel to Buffalo, New York, and protect the assistant administrator, OSWER, during emotional hearings related to relocation of people in the Love Canal area.

To evaluate the validity of the allegation we interviewed the Inspector General, former assistant inspector general for investigations, current assistant inspector general for investigations, the assistant administrator, OSWER and members of her staff, and the deputy regional administrator of Region II. We obtained copies of travel claims and correspondence which related to the protective service assignment in question.

We found no substance to this allegation. The assistant administrator, OSWER did not attend the hearings and was, to the best of the interviewees' knowledge, not in Buffalo during the period in question.

We did find that a member of the protective detail was sent to Buffalo on July 11, 1982, to help local law enforcement personnel provide security for EPA personnel at the Love Canal hearing. The request that a member of the protective detail be sent to the hearings was made by Dr. Richard Dewling, Love Canal Task Force chairman and deputy regional administrator, EPA Region II. The request was concurred in by the assistant administrator, OSWER. We found no evidence to support the allegation that the provision of protective services and/or liaison with local law enforcement was ordered as a favor to the assistant administrator, OSWER. The propriety of using the detail to protect anyone other than the Administrator is being considered in an ongoing GAO evaluation of EPA's inspector general organization.

ALLEGATION THAT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL ORDERED AN IMPROPER INVESTIGATION AT THE REQUEST OF AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR

It was alleged that, to honor a request from the assistant administrator, OSWER, Mr. Novick ordered a surveillance of an EPA employee for a timecard violation in the spring of 1982.

We did not evaluate, as part of this review, how this surveillance was begun, or the propriety of the Inspector General's actions in conducting it. These issues are being covered in an ongoing GAO evaluation of the EPA inspector general organization.

ALLEGATIONS REGARDING SPENDING AND PERSONNEL
LEVELS ON THE PROTECTIVE DETAIL

Additional allegations were made concerning the level of spending and authorized personnel for the EPA protective detail, which was set up in the Inspector General's office to protect EPA's Administrator and Deputy Administrator.

We did not evaluate the merits of the additional allegations as part of this inquiry. An evaluation of the spending and the authorized personnel level for the protective detail is included in an ongoing GAO review of the overall operation of the EPA Inspector General's office. The results will be presented in another report.