



Inspector General Insights

Background: The Office of Inspector General (OIG) received a request from the Collier County Parks & Recreation Senior Management staff (Management) to conduct an investigation into allegations made against two Parks & Recreation employees, a Supervisor and a Maintenance Worker.

During their initial preliminary review of the documentary evidence and worksite visits, Management retrieved and confiscated County-owned equipment from the private residence of the Supervisor's family member. Management also conducted preliminary interviews with the complainant and the two subjects, and Management located the remaining equipment in question at one of the work sites.

Objective: The OIG initiated a formal investigation to determine if either the Supervisor or the Maintenance Worker violated associated Florida Statutes and the County Manager Agency Administrative Practices and Procedures (CMAs) while on duty.

Scope: The OIG's initial scope was as follows:

- Determine if the Supervisor and/or Maintenance Worker violated associated Florida Statutes and CMAs when they allegedly stole County-owned equipment and sold it to another.
- Determine if the Supervisor and/or Maintenance Worker violated associated Florida Statutes and CMAs when they allegedly used County-owned equipment for their personal use and benefit.
- Determine if the Supervisor violated associated Florida Statutes and CMAs when he allegedly conducted personal business/activities while on duty, without requesting permission from his supervisory staff, and/or without submitting a leave request.

Observations: The three allegations against the Supervisor were all substantiated.

- Based on the documentary evidence (video footage) reviewed, research conducted, and sworn testimony provided, there was sufficient evidence/information to support that the Supervisor violated **CMA 5311.1 – Standards of Conduct, 5311.1-2 Concept, Sections M, T and U** when he conducted personal business at a relative's home while on duty without requesting permission or taking leave.
- Based on the documentary evidence (photos), research conducted, work site inspections, and sworn testimony provided, there was sufficient evidence to support that the Supervisor violated **CMA 5311.1–Standards of Conduct, 5311.1-2 Concept, Sections B, C, and M** when County-owned property was photographed at his relative's home.
- The Supervisor initiated the purchase of two identical assets and authorized receipt of those assets in 2019. Later, a relative of the Supervisor was found to be in possession of one of the assets at the relative's private residence. Therefore, the OIG found evidence that the

Supervisor was at least partially responsible for his relative being in possession of County-owned equipment.

Additionally, the Supervisor did not deliver the assets to be entered into the County fixed asset system and to be properly tagged as per policy. When the OIG inspected the asset that was confiscated from the residence of the Supervisor's relative, we compared it to the second identical asset ordered at the same time. The OIG noted that the serial number decal attached to the engine of the asset was removed from the one that was in the possession of the Supervisor's relative. The above-mentioned facts make it evident that there was never an intention to register or tag these assets as County-owned property, or to return the altered equipment to the County.

Based on the facts, documentary evidence (photos), research conducted, worksite inspections, and sworn testimony provided, there was sufficient evidence to support that the Supervisor violated **CMA 5204 Fleet Management System, 5204-4 – Practices and Procedures Section E. (5) Vehicle and Equipment Receipt, Commissioning and Decommissioning**, which applies to all County-owned equipment with an engine which could require maintenance or repair. The Supervisor was found to have violated **CMA – 5809 Managing Personal Property and Consumable Supplies, 5809-4 Procedure C. Assets and Tangibles (6) Missing or Stolen Property**. Further, the Supervisor also violated **CMA 5311.1 – Standards of Conduct, 5311.1-2 Concept, Section M**, which states that section, division, or department work rules will be followed.

The OIG found no documentary evidence to prove or disprove that the Maintenance Worker stole County equipment, transferred it to another, or violated work rules or policies.

Recommendations & Actions: Initially, both employees were suspended on paid leave. The OIG periodically informed Management and County HR of the status of the investigation. Based on the OIG's initial report, the Maintenance Worker was allowed to return to work, and the Supervisor was moved to an unpaid leave status.

Upon issuance of the OIG's final report, the Supervisor was terminated. The Supervisor appealed the termination twice, and the County denied those appeals. The County asked the OIG to refer the matter to law enforcement, which law enforcement declined to pursue.

Total # Transactions	Amounts Reviewed	Questioned Costs	Taxpayer Savings/Recovery	# Allegations/Findings
15	\$ 8,587.40	\$ 5,345.96	\$ 1,336.57	26