

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Investigations of Improper Activities by State Employees, July 2005 Through December 2005

INVESTIGATION I2004-1057 (REPORT I2006-1), MARCH 2006

Department of Fish and Game's response as of February 2006

Investigative Highlights . . .

The Department of Fish and Game:

- Provided gifts of free rent of more than \$87,000 to employees and volunteers.***
- Failed to report housing fringe benefits totaling almost \$3.5 million over a four-year period.***
- Deprived state and federal taxing authorities of as much as \$1.3 million in potential tax revenues for tax years 2002 through 2005.***

Other state departments:

- May have failed to report housing fringe benefits of as much as \$7.7 million.***
 - May have failed to capture as much as \$8.3 million in potential rental revenue.***
-

We investigated and substantiated the allegation, as well as other improper acts. The Department of Fish and Game (Fish and Game) allowed several state employees and volunteers to reside in state-owned homes without charging them rent. Consequently, Fish and Game violated the state law prohibiting state officials from providing gifts of public funds.

Finding #1: Fish and Game provided free housing to employees and volunteers and failed to report housing fringe benefits.

Fish and Game allowed several state employees and volunteers to reside in state-owned homes without charging them rent. Consequently, Fish and Game violated the state law prohibiting state officials from providing gifts of public funds. We identified seven volunteers and six employees who resided in state-owned homes in Fish and Game's North Coast Region but were not required to pay rent for a total of 718 months between January 1984 and December 2005. Because Fish and Game provided free rent to some employees and volunteers, the State did not receive more than \$87,000 in rental revenue to which it was entitled between January 1984 and December 2005.¹ Therefore, that amount represents a gift of state funds to the employees and volunteers residing in the state-owned homes and a loss in revenue to the State. State regulations provide that departments shall review the monthly rental and utility rates of state-owned housing every year and report those rates to the Department of Personnel Administration (DPA).

Based on a review of state-owned housing conducted by DPA, as well as on information provided by the departments to DPA, it appears that Fish and Game understated its employees' wages by more than \$867,000 each year from 2002 through 2005 because it did not report any fringe benefits for its employees who reside on state property at below-market rates. As a result, over the four-year period, state and federal tax authorities were unaware of the potential \$1.3 million in taxes associated with a total of nearly \$3.5 million in potential housing fringe benefits.

¹ This conservative amount is based on the nominal rents Fish and Game charges when it requires its employees to pay rent. However, if fair market value, as determined by the Department of Personnel Administration, were applied to the 718 months of free rent, this figure could be greater.

Fish and Game's Action: None.

Fish and Game reported that it disagrees with the amount we show as being reportable housing fringe benefits and the associated potential tax revenues. Specifically, Fish and Game believes our report overstates the alleged taxable fringe benefits and associated potential tax revenues because it has determined that a majority of its resident employees meet the condition-of-employment test, and that the fair market values used in the DPA review do not accurately reflect the values of its properties.²

Based on our review of applicable tax law and the records we reviewed at Fish and Game's North Coast Region, we determined Fish and Game did not properly document and demonstrate that a majority of its employees met the condition-of-employment test. Further, although we acknowledge that the fair market values used in DPA's review may not reflect the actual value of all department holdings, DPA was unable to use actual fair market values because Fish and Game failed to determine and report to DPA the fair market value rates for any of its properties—rates it also needed to fulfill its responsibility to accurately report the housing fringe benefits realized by its employees. Fish and Game also reported that current budget constraints prohibit it from obtaining appraisals to determine the most accurate fair market values, but that it is considering requesting funding to do so. However, Fish and Game charges its employees rent at less than 25 percent of the fair market rates used by DPA. If current appraisals were to value the properties at half the values used by DPA, and if it were to raise rental rates to those fair market values, it appears that Fish and Game could recover the cost of such appraisals within one or two months.

In addition, Fish and Game reported that it disagrees with our conclusion that certain personnel received gifts of state funds because our report incorrectly presumes that Fish and Game is obligated to charge fair market rates for all of its housing and it is Fish and Game's understanding that rental rates are fixed and limited by state law, regulations, and employee collective bargaining agreements.

Our conclusion in the report that Fish and Game provided gifts of state funds of over \$87,000 to specific personnel is not based on a comparison to fair market values as Fish and Game asserts. Rather, the amount we report is based on a comparison of free rent, versus the nominal rate Fish and Game charges when it requires its employees to pay rent, which appears to be well below fair market value. Additionally, we disagree with Fish and Game's assertion that rental rates are fixed by state law, regulations, and employee collective bargaining agreements. DPA is the agency responsible for administering state housing regulations, and state law provides that the director of DPA shall determine the fair and reasonable value of state housing. Using information reported by Fish and Game for DPA's 2003 survey, DPA directed Fish and Game to raise rental rates to fair market value and acknowledged that it should do so in accordance with employee collective bargaining agreements, which allow Fish and Game to raise rental rates by 25 percent annually. Additionally, our review of records in the North Coast Region found that Fish and Game has in fact adjusted the amount of rent it charges residents on numerous occasions in the past, thus demonstrating that the rates it charges its residents are not "fixed."

Finally, Fish and Game reported that it has been working with DPA for several years as part of its commitment to ensure that it is in compliance with laws and regulations applicable to its properties and is committed to continuing to do so. Fish and Game added that part of this commitment included providing updated information regarding housing-related reporting and withholding requirements to its employees and administrative personnel in July 2002 and again in August 2003. However, as we previously mentioned, Fish and Game has not reported a state-housing fringe benefit for any of its employees since 2001 and it appears it is not in compliance with IRS regulations governing reportable housing fringe benefits despite Fish and Game's assertion that it is committed to doing so.

² The difference between the fair market value and the rental amount paid by the resident represents a taxable fringe benefit to the resident unless residing on state property is a condition of employment. To meet the conditions of employment test, Internal Revenue Service guidelines provide that the employee's residence must be the same place in which he or she conducts a significant portion of his or her workday. The guidelines add that the employee must be required to accept on-site lodgings to perform their duties because the housing is indispensable to the proper discharge of their assigned duties.

Finding #2: Other state departments have also failed to report housing fringe benefits.

Although we focus on Fish and Game’s management of state-owned housing in this report, the housing review conducted by DPA shows that all 13 state departments that own employee housing may be underreporting or failing to report housing fringe benefits. For example, the Table shows that in 2003 state departments may have failed to report housing fringe benefits totaling as much as \$7.7 million, depriving state and federal tax authorities of as much as \$3 million annually in potential tax revenues. Additionally, because state departments have chosen to charge employees rent that is well below market rates, the State may have lost as much as \$8.3 million in potential rental revenue in that year.³

TABLE

**Potential Income and Benefits Related to Rental Housing
Units Held by State Departments, 2003**

Department	Rental Units	Annual Income If Rented at Fair Market Value (FMV)	Annual Rent Charged	Lost State Revenue (Difference Between FMV and Rent Charged)*	Taxable Fringe Benefit Reported	Unreported Taxable Fringe Benefits†
Department of Parks and Recreation	487	\$ 4,778,496	\$ 763,488	\$4,015,008	\$373,198	\$3,641,810
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation	176	2,139,972	909,732	1,230,240	0	1,230,240
Department of Developmental Services	99	1,254,360	309,240	945,120	5,728	939,392
Department of Fish and Game	168	1,124,532	257,316	867,216	0	867,216
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection	72	559,332	218,400	340,932	53,078	287,854
Department of Mental Health	40	366,720	125,472	241,248	34,031	207,217
Division of Juvenile Justice	51	371,760	136,740	235,020	69,152	165,868
Department of Transportation	42	294,984	144,324	150,660	17,300	133,360
Department of Veterans Affairs	22	235,224	97,512	137,712	9,240	128,472
Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy‡	9	82,512	0	82,512	0	82,512
California Highway Patrol	6	41,184	12,732	28,452	0	28,452
Department of Food and Agriculture	5	29,18	5,844	23,340	0	23,340
California Conservation Corps	4	36,888	20,748	16,140	3,058	13,082
Totals	1,181	\$11,315,148	\$3,001,548	\$8,313,600	\$564,785	\$7,748,815

Source: 2003 Department of Personnel Administration Departmental Housing Survey.

* This amount represents what should have been reported to taxing authorities as a taxable fringe benefit.

† Taxable housing fringe benefits exist when the rental rate charged is less than the fair market rate. Thus, no taxable fringe benefit exists when employees pay fair market rates.

‡ No rent was charged for any department properties.

³ Taxable fringe benefits exist when the rental rate charged is less than the fair market rate. Thus, no fringe benefit exists when employees pay fair market rates.

Department of Parks and Recreation's Action: None.

The Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks and Recreation) believes that the state regulations relevant to state-owned housing for employees not represented by collective bargaining agreements (non-represented employees) do not allow it to raise rental rates beyond those listed in the regulations and stated that non-represented employees reside in approximately one-third of its properties. However, after reviewing the information Parks and Recreation submitted to DPA, it appears that non-represented employees reside in less than one-tenth of its inhabited properties. Regardless, Parks and Recreation believes that in order for it to raise rental rates for its non-represented employees and not violate state regulations, DPA must update the rates listed in state regulations. Parks and Recreation added that many of the collective bargaining agreements, under which most of its remaining employee residents work, limit its ability to raise rental rates. However, DPA, the agency responsible for administering state housing regulations, has specifically given Parks and Recreation direction to raise rental rates to fair market value and acknowledges that it should do so in accordance with employee collective bargaining agreements. These agreements generally allow Parks and Recreation to raise rental rates by 25 percent annually up to fair market value. After receiving this direction, Parks and Recreation responded to DPA, requesting that DPA provide clear authority and policy direction to departments, and inform employee unions of this direction; however, DPA has not responded to this request.

Parks and Recreation also reported that it believes the fair market values used in DPA's review do not fairly represent the true value of its homes. We acknowledge that the fair market values used in DPA's review may not reflect the actual value of all department holdings; however, DPA was unable to use the actual fair market values because Parks and Recreation failed to determine and report to DPA accurate fair market value rates for all of its properties—rates it also needed to fulfill its responsibility to accurately report the housing fringe benefits realized by its employees. After reviewing the information it submitted to DPA, it appears that it provided fair market determinations for only 298 of the 817 properties it owns. Moreover, Parks and Recreation failed to indicate when the last appraisal was conducted for all but 90 of the 298 properties and had conducted appraisals on only 14 of those properties in the previous 10 years, thus demonstrating that it did not report accurate, up-to-date fair market rates to DPA.

Parks and Recreation also takes issue with the amounts identified by DPA as losses in state revenue and underreported fringe benefits because many of its employees live on state property as a condition of employment and therefore, there is no loss in rental revenue to the State or fringe benefit to report. However, after reviewing the information provided to DPA, it appears that Parks and Recreation did not clearly indicate which, if any, of its residents resided on state property as a condition of employment. Specifically, even though the survey guidelines instructed Parks and Recreation to indicate the reason for occupancy for each of its properties, it did not list as a reason condition of employment for any of its properties.

Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Action: Pending.

The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (Corrections) reported that it last established fair market value rates for all its properties in 1999 and that it subsequently raised rents to the 1999 fair market value rates for properties at all but one of its institutions. Corrections added that it has since raised rates at the remaining institution and is committed to hiring a consultant within six months to begin obtaining current fair market value appraisals.

Corrections reported that it attempted to obtain the services of a consultant to perform fair market appraisals for its properties through the state procurement process; however, Corrections decided not to contract with the lone responsive bidder because it believes that the consultant's fees were too high. Corrections added that it plans to use housing appraisal services through a master services agreement initiated by DPA that is projected to be in place in April 2007.

Department of Developmental Services' Action: Pending.

The Department of Developmental Services (Developmental Services) reported that it believes the fair market rates used by DPA do not accurately reflect the true value of its properties because many of its units are single rooms without kitchens and in some cases residents share bathrooms. We acknowledge that the fair market rates used in the DPA review may not reflect the actual value of all department holdings; however, DPA was unable to use the actual fair market rates because Developmental Services failed to determine and report to DPA the fair market value rates for any of its properties—rates it also needed to fulfill its responsibility to accurately report the housing fringe benefits realized by its employees.

Developmental Services also reported that it has initiated steps to obtain fair market appraisals for all its properties and will follow provisions in applicable collective bargaining agreements to increase rental rates commensurate with the fair market appraisals once they are established.

Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's Action: Partial corrective action taken.

The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Forestry) reported that it has taken several steps to resolve state housing issues since it reported information to DPA for its review in 2003. Specifically, Forestry reported that it now reviews rental rates each year and rents that are below fair market value will be raised by 25 percent annually in accordance with applicable collective bargaining agreements. It also reported that it currently reports taxable fringe benefits for residents in Forestry housing on a monthly basis. In addition, Forestry reported that the fair market rates used by DPA do not accurately reflect the true values of its properties because most are located within the boundaries of conservation camps primarily occupied by prison inmates; however, it acknowledged that annual appraisals are necessary to document the accurate value of each unit. Finally, due to increased rental rates and additional vacancies, Forestry reported that the difference between fair market value and actual rental income for all of its properties in 2005 was \$32,805 and that by increasing rents 25 percent each year, the difference will continue to decline.

Department of Mental Health's Action: Partial corrective action taken.

The Department of Mental Health (Mental Health) reported that it believes the fair market rates used in DPA's review do not accurately represent the values of its properties but acknowledged that many, if not all, of its state hospitals have been using outdated fair market values. Mental Health also reported that it will update its special order concerning employee housing to include performing annual fair market value determinations and promptly reporting housing fringe benefits. The special order will be distributed to each of its four state hospitals and Mental Health will monitor the hospitals for ongoing compliance. Mental Health added that for certain purposes, such as the recruitment and retention of interns, its state hospitals charge less than fair market value and in these instances Mental Health will ensure that the hospitals report the housing fringe benefits in accordance with state and federal regulations.

Division of Juvenile Justice's Action: None.



The Division of Juvenile Justice reported that it last obtained fair market value appraisals for all of its properties in 1995 and that it subsequently raised rental rates to the 1995 fair market value rates.

Department of Transportation's Action: Corrective action taken.

The Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reported that it believes the fair market rates used by DPA do not accurately reflect the true value of its properties because all of its properties are located in remote areas situated within Caltrans maintenance facilities. Caltrans also reported that its policies require that it charge fair market value for all employee housing and that it update fair market values annually; however, Caltrans was unable to explain why it did not report fair market values to DPA. Although we did not validate its analysis, Caltrans reported that based on its most recent fair market value determinations, the loss of state revenue in 2003 was only \$19,356 and the amount of underreported fringe benefits was much less than what DPA identified in its review.

Department of Veterans Affairs' Action: Corrective action taken.

The Department of Veterans Affairs (Veterans Affairs) reported that it conducted fair market assessments of its properties in September 2005 and that it submitted its corrected housing information to DPA in October 2005. Veterans Affairs also reported that it established new rental rates based on the assessments and informed its residents that the new rates would take effect March 1, 2006.

Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy's Action: Corrective action taken.

The Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy reported that it has only six employees, none of whom live on state property. It added that in lieu of rent, it currently allows non-state employees to reside on eight of its properties to provide and ensure resource protection, site management, facilities security and maintenance, and park visitor services.

California Highway Patrol's Action: Partial corrective action taken.

The California Highway Patrol (Highway Patrol) reported that it determines rental rates in accordance with applicable state regulations and that because all of its employees reside on state property as a condition of employment, it has not underreported housing fringe benefits. The Highway Patrol added that it is in the process of obtaining appraisal reviews for its properties and is updating its policies and procedures to reflect that assignments to its resident posts are classified as "condition of employment."

Department of Food and Agriculture's Action: Corrective action taken.

The Department of Food and Agriculture (Food and Agriculture) reported that its employees currently reside on two state properties as a condition of employment. As a result, there is no fringe benefit to report for those residents. Food and Agriculture added that because these properties are located near popular resort areas, fair market values are not comparable to values of homes in surrounding communities.

California Conservation Corps' Action: Pending.

The California Conservation Corps (Conservation) reported that it will be conducting new appraisals to determine updated fair market values for its properties and that rental rates will be increased to the extent allowed by law and applicable collective bargaining units. Conservation also stated it would report on the fringe benefit amount—the difference between the rent charged and the fair market value determined by these new appraisals—for employees residing on its properties, and has informed affected employees of this fact.