

~~SECRET//TK//NOFORN~~

# Closure Recommendation Memorandum

Case Number:	20-0002-1	Date of Entry:	6/15/2020
Primary Investigator:			(b)(3)

## Allegation Information

### Narrative:

A complaint was received alleging that multiple active duty members of the U.S. Air Force (USAF) stationed at an NRO facility in [redacted] fraudulently submitted travel vouchers with inflated taxi fare costs.

(b)(1)  
(b)(3)

### Last Investigative Step:

Review of documentation.

### Resolution:

Unresolved.

## Case Closure Recommendation Justification

### Additional Information:

(U//~~FOUO~~) Allegation brought forth by [redacted] NRO stating that he observed what he believed to be fraudulent reimbursement claims on travel vouchers submitted by active duty USAF members under his supervision.

(b)(3)

(S//~~TK//NF~~) Each of the individuals involved are active duty members of the USAF, whose duties centered on acting as couriers who travel in pairs every [redacted] from the [redacted] locations. Typically when traveling, these couriers will spend one night on the outbound trip and one night on the inbound trip in [redacted] stated that the individuals will occasionally take a taxi from [redacted] to the [redacted] for the night, and then back. As is standard practice, one individual will pay for the taxi fare on the outbound trip, and the other will pay for the return trip (to [redacted] observed that one individual, [redacted] claimed two \$70 taxi fares, while his traveling colleague charged less. As a result, of this apparent conflict in information, [redacted] reviewed previous vouchers submitted by [redacted] and claimed the vouchers reflected consistent \$70 taxi fare claim, adding that another of individual had also submitted vouchers claiming a \$70 for taxi fare.

(b)(1)

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

(b)(1)

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

(U//~~FOUO~~) During the review of the travel vouchers, it reflected that [redacted] travel reimbursements documented reoccurring annotations for \$70.00, for Taxi cab service in the [redacted] metro area. Other individuals mentioned either habitually claimed \$39.00 or reflected isolated instances of amounts greater than \$39.00.

(b)(3)

(b)(7)(c)

~~SECRET//TK//NOFORN~~

~~SECRET//TK//NOFORN~~

(U//~~FOUO~~) When confronted, [redacted] claimed that he requested his Taxis make stops (thus taking more time, (b)(3) | explaining the increased amount) in-between the beginning and ending points of his travel route, adding that the (b)(7)(c) additional amount claimed also reflected his inclusion of a gratuity.

(U//~~FOUO~~) [redacted] stated that administrative discipline to include letters of reprimand, removal of participation in (b)(3) travel for individuals involved and an alteration in USAF travel procedures has been completed.

(U//~~FOUO~~) No documentation exists to refute [redacted] assertion that the amount requested on reimbursement (b)(3) was not valid, or that his actions were fraudulent. (b)(7)(c)

(U//~~FOUO~~) The actions of each individual involved were addressed by the USAF in some capacity. The facts of the case do not reflect any damage incurred to the NRO that can be proven via associated documentation. As the case facts reflect, this was a matter to be addressed by the USAF for action.

(U//~~FOUO~~) The NRO, OIG has found that the specific allegation to be unresolved for the factors noted above. Any damage to NRO programs or the US Government not already addressed by the USAF cannot be measured or verified as having fraudulently occurred. Thus, the NRO, OIG does not require any further investigative measures to be taken.

~~SECRET//TK//NOFORN~~