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Dear Citizens of Baltimore City,

The Mission of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) is to promote accountability, efficiency, and integrity in the City of Baltimore (City) government, as well as to investigate complaints of fraud, financial waste, and abuse. In August 2021, the OIG received a complaint alleging a Department of General Services (DGS) employee (DGS Employee) signed service reports of a vendor (DGS Vendor) before it completed the work. The DGS Vendor lists the work requested, work performed, materials utilized and the labor hours worked on the service reports. The complaint further alleged that this authorization of the DGS Vendor’s service reports circumvented DGS’s inspection process.

The investigation found that the DGS Employee did sign blank service reports for the DGS Vendor before the DGS Vendor completed the requested work. According to the DGS Employee, there was only one instance when they pre-signed 27 service reports for the DGS Vendor. However, the DGS Employee acknowledged multiple occasions when they signed completed service reports for the DGS Vendor without verifying the work. The OIG determined that from May 2019 to July 2021, the DGS Employee signed 210 service reports for work performed by the DGS Vendor and its subcontractor while the DGS Employee was on leave.

The DGS Vendor’s contract with the City appears to require the signing of service reports upon completing each day’s work. The DGS Employee’s supervisor (DGS Supervisor) stated that the service reports have to be signed by someone on-site to verify the work completed by the DGS vendor. The DGS Supervisor explained that it is rare for DGS employees to be on-site, and DGS will typically rely on on-site City employees to verify the work. The DGS Employee’s signing of service reports without verifying the reported work deviated from DGS’s normal work verification process. Additionally, the lack of an on-site signature confirming the DGS’s vendor’s work and labor hours in its service reports could result in fraud.

The investigation also uncovered a significant revenue and work assignment disparity between the DGS Vendor and other vendors on the same contract. The OIG determined that between July 2019 and October 2021, the DGS Vendor received approximately 80% of the contract’s revenue, equating to $5,808,839.27. The remaining four vendors on the contract received approximately 13%, 5%, 1%, and 1%, respectively.

Sincerely,

Isabel Mercedes Cumming
Inspector General

cc: Jim Shea, City Solicitor
    Michael Huber, Mayor’s Chief of Staff
    Christopher Shorter, City Administrator
    Henry Raymond, Director of Finance