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June 27, 2012

Peter Corroon, Mayor
Salt Lake County
2001 South State Street N3300
PO Box 144575
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4575
Re: Solid Waste Management Embezzlement Investigation
Dear Mayor Corroon:
The Salt Lake County Auditor's Office recently completed an investigation consisting of a formal analysis regarding the compliance with certain internal controls of Solid Waste Management (SWM) Point-of-Sale (POS) transactions for the period of January 2, 2010 to June 9, 2012. The Auditor conducted the investigation based on evidence that two or more SWM scale house operators were stealing SWM revenue through a duplicate receipt scheme. The evidence indicated that these operators were reprinting receipts for cash transactions, issuing the reprinted receipts to new customers, and then misappropriating customer payments for personal use. Our investigation was limited to analysis of transactions recorded in the POS system involving cash payments and reprinted receipts and interviews with SWM's Fiscal Manager. This report does not address any other data analysis or investigative techniques.

The data analyzed were adequate and the analyses performed were appropriate to meet the objectives stated above. There is a risk that additional misuse or theft of County assets is not identified in this report because they may have occurred with respect to assets or transactions not selected for review. Additionally, the Auditor does not release information that would tend to compromise an ongoing investigation.

## Data Analysis

SWM's POS system creates a back up file of each day's transactions, including the number of times the receipt for each transaction was printed. We analyzed the number and dollar value of cash transactions with reprinted receipts by operator, and over time, for the period examined. Based on that analysis, and on evidence provided by the SWM Fiscal Manager, we found that:

## $>$ The evidence reviewed supports the allegations of embezzlement made against certain scale house operators.

Facts supporting a finding of embezzlement include the following:

- The volume of cash transactions with reprinted receipts increased dramatically over the prior two-and-a-half years.
- During the period, the number and value of cash transactions with reprinted receipts increased at a significantly greater rate than cash revenue.
- A legitimate business need to reprint receipts is rare and could not reasonably account for the high volume of reprinted transactions.

The data demonstrated an increased volume of reprinted transactions over the period, with the accused operators having the highest number of reprinted transactions. See Figure 1 below. More detailed analysis and graphs by operator are included as Appendices A and B.

| Analysis of Reprinted Transactions by Year |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTALS |  |  |  |
| YEAR |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 555 | \$ 12,228 | 120,545 | \$1,779,826 |
| 2011 | 3,604 | \$ 58,293 | 124,943 | \$1,861,492 |
| 2012* | 5,652 | \$ 78,359 | 49,346 | \$ 807,639 |
| Totals | 9,811 | \$148,880 | 294,834 | \$4,448,957 |

*2012 through June $9^{\text {th }}$
Figure 1. The number and value of transactions with reprinted receipts has increased dramatically over past two and one-half years.

It is important to note that an increase in transactions with reprinted receipts occurred for all of the current operators. During the period examined, each operator had the ability to reprint receipts associated with transactions entered by other operators that day; however, SWM's POS system did not record who reprinted the receipt, but only who recorded the original transaction.

In order to identify which operators were reprinting receipts, the ability to reprint receipts was removed from all operators except those suspected in the embezzlement. This change was made on June $9^{\text {th }}$ at approximately 11:00 a.m. Despite this action, receipts for all operators continued to be reprinted. This indicates that the operators suspected of conducting the scheme were reprinting cash receipts for transactions that were originally entered by other operators. A report documenting this pattern is attached as Appendix C.

A legitimate business need to reprint receipts is rare and could not reasonably account for the high volume of transactions with reprinted receipts observed during the period. Nor can they account for the observed trend of the increasing number of reprinted transactions. According to SWM's Fiscal Manager there are valid reasons for reprinting transactions, including:

- The customer requests a duplicate copy. This situation may occur where the driver is working as a subcontractor and needs a copy in order to bill the contractor.
- The operator suspects they made a mistake and reprints a receipt for research purposes.

These situations should be rare, and should not have increased over time. In fact, SWM's Fiscal Manager reported that between June 9, 2012, when most operator's ability to print receipts was disabled, and June 26, 2012, only one operator whose ability to reprint receipts had been disabled approached him with the need to reprint a receipt. This demonstrates that the legitimate need for reprinted receipts is low. The trend cannot be explained by a legitimate business need to print receipts.

Nor can the trend cannot be explained by increased cash receipts at the Landfill. In fact, our analysis demonstrates an inverse relationship between the value of reprints and cash transaction revenue. See Figure 2, below.

*2012 through June $9^{\text {th }}$
Figure 2. The value of cash transactions entered into Wasteworks has not increased at the same rate as the value of cash transactions with reprinted receipts. An inverse relationship exists for 2011 and 2012.

## RECOMMENDATION:

We recommend that SWM disable all operators' ability to reprint receipts.

## ACTION TAKEN:

## The Salt Lake City Police Department and the Salt Lake County District Attorney have been notified of the embezzlement.

We appreciate SWM management for their cooperation in this matter, including answering our questions, providing information, and allowing us access to records during our investigation. This investigation is limited to the scope stated above. Additional fraud, waste, or abuse may have occurred that is outside the scope of the investigation reported in this letter.

Very Truly Yours,
Gregory P. Hawkins
Salt Lake County Auditor

[^0]Reprinted and Original Cash Transactions, Solid Waste Management, January 2, 2010 to June 9, 2012
Source: Daily POS Software Waste Works Backup Files, copied by Larry Hansen on 6/11/12. Analyzed using Audit Command Language Software (ACL)
Filters: Account numbers 120 and 100 (cash accounts), transaction was not voided (PH5="A"), total charged was not equal to 0.00

|  | Operator 1 |  |  |  | Operator 2 |  |  |  | Operator 3 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month/ Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan-10 | 0 | \$ | 202 | \$ 3,786 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 4 | \$ 80 | 1,132 | \$ 16,681 |
| Feb-10 | 6 | \$ 176 | 973 | \$ 16,334 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 2 | \$ 15 | 1,211 | \$ 17,794 |
| Mar-10 | 8 | \$ 204 | 2,152 | \$ 32,204 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 3 | \$ 94 | 1,979 | \$ 31,257 |
| Apr-10 | 4 | \$ 40 | 2,622 | \$ 41,945 | 0 | \$ | 97 | \$ 1,838 | 2 | \$ 40 | 2,325 | \$ 32,357 |
| May-10 | 15 | \$ 242 | 1,743 | \$ 26,732 | 13 | \$ 198 | 2,557 | \$ 38,485 | 9 | \$ 135 | 2,313 | \$ 32,616 |
| Jun-10 | 13 | \$ 240 | 2,627 | \$ 40,285 | 23 | \$ 561 | 2,877 | \$ 42,736 | 3 | \$ 80 | 2,376 | \$ 37,412 |
| Jul-10 | 4 | \$ 468 | 1,733 | \$ 26,817 | 5 | \$ 70 | 2,252 | \$ 31,928 | 5 | \$ 75 | 2,212 | \$ 31,867 |
| Aug-10 | 3 | \$ 129 | 1,753 | \$ 28,743 | 3 | \$ 84 | 2,391 | \$ 34,505 | 2 | \$ 40 | 1,713 | \$ 24,975 |
| Sep-10 | 4 | \$ 126 | 1,216 | \$ 18,674 | 4 | \$ 73 | 1,522 | \$ 23,518 | 2 | \$ 38 | 1,673 | \$ 24,307 |
| Oct-10 | 6 | \$ 65 | 1,249 | \$ 19,942 | 6 | \$ 58 | 1,748 | \$ 24,119 | 8 | \$ 436 | 2,037 | \$ 27,671 |
| Nov-10 | 6 | \$ 133 | 1,012 | \$ 16,625 | 42 | \$ 720 | 1,510 | \$ 20,343 | 16 | \$ 175 | 1,860 | \$ 24,682 |
| Dec-10 | 1 | \$ 10 | 1,251 | \$ 24,949 | 24 | \$ 305 | 291 | \$ 5,088 | 8 | \$ 120 | 983 | \$ 17,914 |
| Jan-11 | 3 | \$ 82 | 804 | \$ 13,756 | 40 | \$ 470 | 365 | \$ 4,605 | 53 | \$ 590 | 941 | \$ 17,336 |
| Feb-11 | 2 | \$ 105 | 954 | \$ 15,670 | 47 | \$ 530 | 283 | \$ 3,319 | 28 | \$ 380 | 816 | \$ 12,061 |
| Mar-11 | 6 | \$ 131 | 1,951 | \$ 30,499 | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 9 | \$ 139 | 2,593 | \$ 37,978 |
| Apr-11 | 1 | \$ 5 | 1,373 | \$ 20,027 | 144 | \$ 1,915 | 985 | \$ 12,362 | 27 | \$ 609 | 1,925 | \$ 28,161 |
| May-11 | 5 | \$ 150 | 1,929 | \$ 29,903 | 30 | \$ 490 | 196 | \$ 2,414 | 38 | \$ 529 | 2,319 | \$ 33,390 |
| Jun-11 | 9 | \$ 303 | 2,049 | \$ 33,872 | 72 | \$ 923 | 259 | \$ 3,356 | 7 | \$ 225 | 2,519 | \$ 37,876 |
| Jul-11 | 9 | \$ 115 | 1,755 | \$ 26,815 | 282 | \$ 3,720 | 1,204 | \$ 14,484 | 57 | \$ 680 | 2,190 | \$ 30,797 |
| Aug-11 | 8 | \$ 324 | 1,718 | \$ 27,348 | 98 | \$ 1,420 | 378 | \$ 4,644 | 14 | \$ 170 | 1,481 | \$ 21,080 |
| Sep-11 | 3 | \$ 2,312 | 1,360 | \$ 22,959 | 61 | \$ 945 | 332 | \$ 4,598 | 11 | \$ 857 | 1,813 | \$ 26,361 |
| Oct-11 | 5 | \$ 75 | 1,407 | \$ 22,186 | 201 | \$ 2,451 | 898 | \$ 10,559 | 107 | \$ 1,360 | 1,564 | \$ 23,234 |
| Nov-11 | 3 | \$ 30 | 1,343 | \$ 21,627 | 83 | \$ 950 | 380 | \$ 4,285 | 36 | \$ 480 | 1,674 | \$ 23,660 |
| Dec-11 | 24 | \$ 545 | 1,088 | \$ 20,179 | 118 | \$ 1,555 | 422 | \$ 6,633 | 126 | \$ 1,600 | 1,289 | \$ 21,571 |
| Jan-12 | 59 | \$ 855 | 947 | \$ 19,851 | 117 | \$ 1,550 | 195 | \$ 2,836 | 23 | \$ 380 | 713 | \$ 13,205 |
| Feb-12 | 16 | \$ 195 | 539 | \$ 9,651 | 257 | \$ 3,230 | 409 | \$ 5,801 | 78 | \$ 989 | 1,245 | \$ 20,325 |

Reprinted and Original Cash Transactions, Solid Waste Management, January 2, 2010 to June 9, 2012
Source: Daily POS Software Waste Works Backup Files, copied by Larry Hansen on 6/11/12. Analyzed using Audit Command Language Software (ACL)
Filters: Account numbers 120 and 100 (cash accounts), transaction was not voided (PH5="A"), total charged was not equal to 0.00

|  | Operator 1 |  |  |  | Operator 2 |  |  |  | Operator 3 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month/ Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mar-12 | 50 | \$ 610 | 1,594 | \$ 27,262 | 306 | \$ 3,590 | 877 | \$ 12,190 | 259 | \$ 3,126 | 2,112 | \$ 34,509 |
| Apr-12 | 126 | \$ 1,529 | 1,765 | \$ 28,549 | 248 | \$ 3,265 | 663 | \$ 9,711 | 38 | \$ 455 | 501 | \$ 6,897 |
| May-12 | 64 | \$ 1,549 | 2,063 | \$ 33,792 | 402 | \$ 5,396 | 995 | \$ 14,785 | 109 | \$ 2,282 | 2,256 | \$ 35,340 |
| Jun-12 | 5 | \$ 45 | 477 | \$ 7,935 | 151 | \$ 2,095 | 389 | \$ 5,560 | 38 | \$ 697 | 771 | \$ 10,967 |
| Totals | 468 | \$ 10,793 | 43,649 | \$ 708,917 | 2,777 | \$ 36,564 | 24,475 | \$ 344,702 | 1,122 | \$ 16,876 | 50,536 | \$ 754,281 |

*Operators Julie, Dfontana, Jaime, Daniel, Coralee removed due to low volume
Totals by Year

|  | Operator 1 |  |  |  |  | Operator 2 |  |  |  | Operator 3 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 70 | \$ 1,833 | 18,533 | \$ | 297,036 | 120 | \$ 2,069 | 15,245 | \$ 222,560 | 64 | \$ 1,328 | 21,814 | \$ 319,533 |
| 2011 | 78 | \$ 4,177 | 17,731 | \$ | 284,841 | 1,176 | \$ 15,369 | 5,702 | \$ 71,259 | 513 | \$ 7,619 | 21,124 | \$ 313,505 |
| 2012 | 320 | \$ 4,783 | 7,385 | \$ | 127,040 | 1,481 | \$ 19,126 | 3,528 | \$ 50,883 | 545 | \$ 7,929 | 7,598 | \$ 121,243 |
| Totals | 468 | \$ 10,793 | 43,649 | \$ | 708,917 | 2,777 | \$ 36,564 | 24,475 | \$ 344,702 | 1,122 | \$ 16,876 | 50,536 | \$ 754,281 |

*Operators Julie, Dfontana, Jaime, Daniel, Coralee removed due to low volume

|  | Operator 4 |  |  |  | Operator 5 |  |  |  | Operator 6 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month/ Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan-10 | 0 | \$ | 1,031 | \$ 17,041 | 6 | \$ 163 | 1,385 | \$ 20,995 | 2 | \$ 23 | 1,364 | \$ 20,256 |
| Feb-10 | 1 | \$ 30 | 1,074 | \$ 16,408 | 2 | \$ 60 | 1,387 | \$ 20,939 | 1 | \$ 29 | 1,794 | \$ 28,056 |
| Mar-10 | 2 | \$ 174 | 2,155 | \$ 31,370 | 4 | \$ 115 | 2,456 | \$ 35,085 | 2 | \$ 156 | 1,522 | \$ 22,401 |
| Apr-10 | 6 | \$ 70 | 2,405 | \$ 34,867 | 12 | \$ 280 | 2,492 | \$ 34,366 | 4 | \$ 80 | 2,509 | \$ 36,423 |
| May-10 | 10 | \$ 155 | 2,848 | \$ 41,668 | 24 | \$ 679 | 2,343 | \$ 34,204 | 16 | \$ 230 | 1,900 | \$ 28,099 |
| Jun-10 | 13 | \$ 166 | 2,045 | \$ 28,416 | 11 | \$ 295 | 2,302 | \$ 32,456 | 4 | \$ 42 | 1,691 | \$ 25,232 |
| Jul-10 | 0 | \$ | 2,612 | \$ 35,497 | 9 | \$ 223 | 1,945 | \$ 26,967 | 6 | \$ 62 | 1,594 | \$ 23,611 |
| Aug-10 | 1 | \$ 10 | 1,830 | \$ 25,866 | 15 | \$ 635 | 2,033 | \$ 28,072 | 1 | \$ 18 | 1,181 | \$ 17,664 |
| Sep-10 | 3 | \$ 74 | 1,947 | \$ 27,675 | 11 | \$ 243 | 2,332 | \$ 32,354 | 6 | \$ 184 | 1,878 | \$ 27,235 |
| Oct-10 | 7 | \$ 127 | 1,963 | \$ 26,261 | 15 | \$ 1,192 | 1,937 | \$ 27,356 | 7 | \$ 93 | 1,373 | \$ 22,555 |
| Nov-10 | 10 | \$ 135 | 1,158 | \$ 15,007 | 24 | \$ 375 | 1,943 | \$ 25,670 | 9 | \$ 115 | 1,367 | \$ 19,138 |
| Dec-10 | 11 | \$ 110 | 635 | \$ 9,114 | 45 | \$ 645 | 1,274 | \$ 20,967 | 1 | \$ 10 | 1,172 | \$ 20,298 |
| Jan-11 | 7 | \$ 110 | 398 | \$ 5,924 | 45 | \$ 709 | 1,245 | \$ 19,097 | 1 | \$ 5 | 1,084 | \$ 18,330 |
| Feb-11 | 6 | \$ 80 | 636 | \$ 9,192 | 45 | \$ 787 | 1,266 | \$ 19,241 | 1 | \$ 10 | 1,378 | \$ 23,737 |
| Mar-11 | 11 | \$ 135 | 2,087 | \$ 26,346 | 4 | \$ 70 | 2,036 | \$ 27,049 | 1 | \$ 30 | 1,885 | \$ 28,335 |
| Apr-11 | 73 | \$ 930 | 2,253 | \$ 30,766 | 76 | \$ 1,051 | 2,470 | \$ 32,958 | 1 | \$ 143 | 2,042 | \$ 31,560 |
| May-11 | 9 | \$ 195 | 3,023 | \$ 42,936 | 29 | \$ 625 | 2,720 | \$ 41,744 | 2 | \$ 35 | 1,627 | \$ 25,445 |
| Jun-11 | 35 | \$ 472 | 2,868 | \$ 39,101 | 62 | \$ 942 | 2,937 | \$ 42,158 | 9 | \$ 224 | 2,208 | \$ 34,443 |
| Jul-11 | 71 | \$ 1,117 | 2,260 | \$ 30,554 | 67 | \$ 897 | 1,786 | \$ 24,066 | 3 | \$ 30 | 1,453 | \$ 22,861 |
| Aug-11 | 28 | \$ 380 | 2,188 | \$ 30,432 | 45 | \$ 752 | 1,740 | \$ 24,666 | 5 | \$ 65 | 2,068 | \$ 32,113 |
| Sep-11 | 66 | \$ 755 | 2,065 | \$ 28,667 | 46 | \$ 685 | 1,872 | \$ 30,055 | 2 | \$ 493 | 1,676 | \$ 28,867 |
| Oct-11 | 68 | \$ 841 | 1,663 | \$ 21,574 | 166 | \$ 1,945 | 1,858 | \$ 28,287 | 4 | \$ 76 | 1,606 | \$ 25,924 |
| Nov-11 | 132 | \$ 1,685 | 1,905 | \$ 27,046 | 41 | \$ 620 | 1,630 | \$ 23,638 | 13 | \$ 520 | 1,859 | \$ 32,842 |
| Dec-11 | 108 | \$ 6,207 | 1,113 | \$ 21,833 | 145 | \$ 1,965 | 1,523 | \$ 25,853 | 23 | \$ 330 | 1,291 | \$ 23,226 |
| Jan-12 | 176 | \$ 2,246 | 987 | \$ 17,519 | 121 | \$ 1,732 | 1,159 | \$ 19,398 | 57 | \$ 990 | 1,187 | \$ 24,704 |
| Feb-12 | 222 | \$ 2,685 | 1,018 | \$ 20,787 | 170 | \$ 2,181 | 1,041 | \$ 18,017 | 24 | \$ 275 | 1,030 | \$ 18,705 |


|  | Operator 4 |  |  |  | Operator 5 |  |  |  | Operator 6 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month/ Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mar-12 | 279 | \$ 3,708 | 1,680 | \$ 26,122 | 284 | \$ 3,520 | 1,606 | \$ 24,317 | 76 | \$ 990 | 1,607 | \$ 29,055 |
| Apr-12 | 305 | \$ 4,084 | 2,054 | \$ 34,161 | 309 | \$ 4,815 | 2,607 | \$ 40,724 | 163 | \$ 2,175 | 2,116 | \$ 33,635 |
| May-12 | 253 | \$ 3,866 | 1,857 | \$ 31,318 | 78 | \$ 1,085 | 2,086 | \$ 33,138 | 87 | \$ 1,810 | 2,387 | \$ 39,517 |
| Jun-12 | 152 | \$ 2,465 | 714 | \$ 10,220 | 51 | \$ 820 | 707 | \$ 9,847 | 2 | \$ 40 | 529 | \$ 8,577 |
| Totals | 2,065 | \$ 33,012 | 52,472 | \$ 763,688 | 1,962 | \$ 30,106 | 56,118 | \$ 823,684 | 533 | \$ 9,283 | 48,378 | \$ 772,844 |

*Operators Julie, Dfontana, Jaime, Daniel, Coralee removed due to low volume
Totals by Year

|  | Operator 4 |  |  |  | Operator 5 |  |  |  | Operator 6 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 64 | \$ 1,051 | 21,703 | \$ 309,190 | 178 | \$ 4,905 | 23,829 | \$ 339,431 | 59 | \$ 1,042 | 19,345 | \$ 290,968 |
| 2011 | 614 | \$ 12,907 | 22,459 | \$ 314,371 | 771 | \$ 11,048 | 23,083 | \$ 338,812 | 65 | \$ 1,961 | 20,177 | \$ 327,683 |
| 2012 | 1,387 | \$ 19,054 | 8,310 | \$ 140,127 | 1,013 | \$ 14,153 | 9,206 | \$ 145,441 | 409 | \$ 6,280 | 8,856 | \$ 154,193 |
| Totals | 2,065 | \$ 33,012 | 52,472 | \$ 763,688 | 1,962 | \$ 30,106 | 56,118 | \$ 823,684 | 533 | \$ 9,283 | 48,378 | \$ 772,844 |

Reprinted Cash Transactions from SWM Point of Sale (POS) System for the Period of January 2, 2010 to June 9, 2012

|  | Operator 1 Number of Reprinted Transactions |
| :---: | :---: |
| 500 |  |
| 400 |  |
| 300 |  |
|  |  |
| 100 |  |
| 0 |  |
|  |  |









|  | Operator 6 Number of Reprinted Transactions |
| :---: | :---: |
| 500 |  |
| 400 |  |
| 300 |  |
| 200 |  |
| 100 |  |
| 0 |  |


Operator 5 Value of Reprinted Transactions

| \$6,000 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| \$5,000 |  |
| \$4,000 | 4 |
| \$3,000 | , |
| \$2,000 \$1,000 | $\cdots$ |
| \$- |  |
|  |  |

$$
6 / 18 / 12
$$

Row Labels Sum of Duplicate Sum of Lost $\$ \$$

> | Alleged perpetrators, Operators 1, 2 and 4, names redacted below. |
| :--- |



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { * no legitimate heed to print } \\
& \text { depplecte tickets for ochers }
\end{aligned}
$$

Auditor note: This analysis was prepared and provided by the SWM Fiscal Manager. The report shows that duplicate tickets were printed for transactions created by scale house operators that did not have the ability to reprint transactions. The only operator on duty at the time that could print duplicate transactions was one of the suspected operators. Report has not been audited.

Operator numbers correspond with operator numbers found in Appendices $A$ and $B$.


[^0]:    By Brenda K. Nelson, ISA, CISA, MBA
    Senior Deputy Auditor

