DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Investigations of Improper Activities by State Employees, August 2002 Through January 2003

ALLEGATIONS I2002-636, I2002-725, AND I2002-947 (I2003-1), APRIL 2003

Department of Fish and Game's response as of February 2003[1]

Investigative Highlights . . .

Employees of the Department of Fish and Game (department) engaged in the following improper governmental activities:

- ☑ ***Improperly claimed 479 hours of leave balances, a benefit worth approximately $20,322, to which he was not entitled.***
- ☑ ***Circumvented competitive-bidding requirements.***
- ☑ ***Violated conflict-of-interest prohibitions.***
- ☑ ***Mistreated subordinates and breached other norms of good behavior in a way that brought discredit to the department.***

We asked the Department of Fish and Game (department) to investigate on our behalf allegations that a regional manager claimed vacation and sick leave hours he was not entitled to receive, engaged in various contracting improprieties, and mistreated employees.

Finding #1: The department mismanaged its leave-accounting system.

A manager of one of the department's regions failed to ensure his region made monthly updates to the State's leave-accounting system for more than two years, and even after the region took steps to bring the system up to date, the manager improperly claimed 479 hours of leave balances to which he was not entitled.

The State's leave-accounting system tracks vacation, sick leave, and annual leave as well as other employee leave balances, such as compensatory time off and personal holidays. The leave-accounting system automatically posts credits to the employees' monthly leave balances, but regional staff must account for any leave its employees have taken—which it had not done for more than two years. Thus, for the 180 regional employees the manager oversaw, the region reported leave balances that were greater than the employees' actual balances. In doing so, the region exposed the State to undue liability in that employees might have taken more leave than they were entitled to. Also, employees may have found planning vacations difficult, given

---

[1] Since we report the results of our investigative audits only twice a year, we may receive the status of an auditee's corrective action prior to a report being issued. However, the auditee should report to us monthly until its corrective action has been implemented. As of January 2004, this is the date of the auditee's latest response.

that they did not receive an accurate accounting of their leave balances. To correct this problem, regional staff, under the manager's direction, began reconciling each employee's leave balances. In most cases, staff assigned to perform the reconciliation easily resolved cases in which individuals identified discrepancies. In some instances regional staff were unable to locate employees' time sheets. In such cases, their only recourse was to grant those employees the automatic leave accrual, even though the employees might already have taken time off, because the region lacked supporting documentation by which to reduce the employee's leave balances. However, some controversy remained involving the manager's leave balances. The manager disputed his staff's recalculation and rather than provide documentation to support his dispute, he supplied staff with amounts he believed were correct. When the department's investigators questioned him, the manager stated that he had support for these adjustments; however, after reviewing the information the manager provided, the department concluded that the support was inadequate. The department concluded that the manager received a combined 479 hours of sick leave and annual leave that he was not entitled to, a benefit worth approximately $20,322.

Finding #2: The manager and other employees violated contracting and conflict-of-interest laws.

Contrary to state laws, regional staff split various transactions into smaller ones enabling them to circumvent competitive bidding requirements. These transactions related to the purchase of equipment or services provided by companies that a seasonal employee of the department owned or was affiliated with. For example, from February through June 2001, two companies—the employee owned one and founded the other—invoiced the department a total of $62,000 for five underground storage tanks used to provide water for sheep and deer. Instead of treating this as one transaction, regional staff spread these costs among five purchase orders, thereby circumventing competitive-bidding requirements. In addition, supporting documents associated with the purchase of the five underground storage tanks lacked evidence that the department actually obtained competitive bids. The manager and regional staff also allowed one of the companies to begin work related to the underground storage tanks before the department had established contracts for the work, thereby exposing the State to additional liabilities. The department concluded that the seasonal employee violated conflict-of-interest prohibitions because one of his companies submitted a $10,667 invoice for one underground storage tank at the time he was a state employee.

Finding #3: The manager mistreated subordinates.

The department investigated several complaints concerning the manager's conduct and concluded that the manager made sexually suggestive comments or jokes in the presence of female staff members (who found his comments offensive), made inappropriate gestures to a staff member on several occasions, repeatedly cursed in staff members' presence, and intimidated staff by yelling at them to an extent that they perceived as unprofessional.

Department Action: Corrective action taken.

The department initiated an administrative action against the manager for violating provisions of the Government Code: inexcusably neglecting his duty; treating the public or other employees inappropriately; and breaching other norms of good behavior, either during or after duty hours, in a way that discredited the department. A subsequent May 2002 agreement between the department and the manager called for a reduction in the manager's pay by 5 percent for five months, a reduction in his leave balances by 479 hours; and required the manager to complete department-specified training, including topics on management techniques, equal employment opportunity, conflicts of interest, and contracting. However, the department did not reduce the manager's leave balances by the agreed-upon amounts until February 4, 2003, after we made further inquiries into the matter.