NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
PRELIMINARY INQUIRY REPORT
NIGHTS #201202552
6 MARCH 2013

1. Investigator and Identifying Information and Location of Working Papers.

a. Investigator and Identifying Information.

(b)(6), (b)(7)c

(b)(6), (b)(7)c

b. Location of working papers. Naval Postgraduate School Inspector General Office, 281 Stone Road, Quarters C, Monterey, CA 93943.

2. Background and Summary.

a. Hotline Control Number, Date of Receipt and Tasking Dates.

(1) On 5 July 2012, (b)(6), (b)(7)c identified a possible overtime issue in ITACS during work on NIGHTS 201202137 (appearance of a Hatch Act violation). The ITACS overtime case information was entered into the Naval Inspector General Hotline Information System (NIGHTS) as number 201202552.

(2) During a document review for NIGHTS 201202137 regarding the appearance of a Hatch Act violation, (b)(6), (b)(7)c identified Information Technology and Communications Services (ITACS) overtime anomalies with time and attendance records in Standard Labor Data Collection and Distribution Application (SLDCADA). We conducted a preliminary analysis (PA) and determined there appeared to be credible evidence of overtime (OT) abuse or fraud by employees involved in supporting ITACS labs & classrooms. The PA showed missing OT support documentation and frequent OT by a few employees.

c. Summary of Preliminary Inquiry. The preliminary inquiry (PI) determined four minor time and attendance OT issues requiring ITACS management action.

(1) Lack of OT oversight. Some supervisors did not always review OT requirements or enforce accountability in the management of employee OT work and the requirement to obtain OT documentation.

(2) Some employees who performed OT for labs and classrooms did not always provide supervisors with OT support documentation (NAVCOMPT Form 2282) or had missing documentation in their timekeeping files.

(3) ITACS employees generally did not verify their time by using the employee verified time (EVT) function in SLDCADA.

(4) Supervisors did not have a good process for directing overtime, and relied on employees to determine lab and classroom maintenance and cleaning requirements.

3. Issue 1. Lack of OT oversight. Some supervisors did not always review OT requirements or enforce accountability in the management of employee OT work and support documentation.

a. Discussion.

(1) Department of Defense (DOD) Financial Management Regulation (FMR) Volume 8, Chapter 2(1), states in part, "An authorized official (preferably the official most knowledgeable of the time worked) shall approve any overtime...approval shall be documented in writing or electronically...approval shall be granted before the hours are worked whenever feasible and, when not feasible, as soon as possible after the work has been performed."

(2) NAVPGSCOL Instruction 7410.3T, paragraph 4c, states in part, "Supervisors/Certifying Officials...(4) Ensure overtime or compensatory time is worked only when properly approved. (5) Ensure employees/timekeepers record time and attendance data, and protect and retain all supporting documentation...(8) Ensure that employees are familiar with requirements of this instruction and they input or provide their departmental timekeeper with their required bi-weekly timesheet prior to certification...(10) When certifying time and attendance reports, supervisors...review and approval shall be made by the official, normally the immediate supervisor, most knowledgeable of the time worked."

(3) There is an ITACS requirement to clean and maintain the labs and classrooms. Cleaning the labs started a few years ago during school breaks, but needed to be done more frequently because it was affecting the lifecycle of the computers and presenting an unprofessional appearance to the students. There are certain labs and classrooms that get dirtier than others because of usage and chalk dust. While there is a contract for general cleaning at NPS, the Hope janitorial staff doesn't clean computer equipment or the chalk dust off walls.

(4) According to (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c of educational technologies (includes labs and classrooms), historically, (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c and previous (b)(6) specialist, had been doing a lot of lab cleaning on the weekends. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)c presented a valid case to him that the work could not be done while students were using the labs. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he inherited the lab cleaning group, and allowed (b)(6), (b)(7)c to continue what he was doing. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he trusted (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c judgment on what needed to get done because (b)(6), (b)(7)c would visit the labs to see what needed to be done, and had been cleaning the labs for years.

(5) Besides (b)(6), (b)(7)c there were two other (b)(6), (b)(7)c specialists that primarily supported lab and classroom cleaning: (b)(6), (b)(7)c and (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c supports the help desk, and is supervised by (b)(6), (b)(7)c manager for the technology center help desk. (b)(7)c, (b)(6) supports high performance computing, and is supervised by (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c research computing.

(6) Although OT was approved in SLDCADA, (b)(6), (b)(7)c performed 135 OT hours totaling $8,986.95 that were unsupported by documentation (NAVCOMPT form 2282) between October 2011 and July 2012. (b)(6), (b)(7)c performed 63 OT hours totaling $4,399.92 unsupported by documentation (NAVCOMPT form 2282) between October 2011 and March 2012.

(7) (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated he was responsible for lab and classroom oversight, and shared responsibility with (b)(6), (b)(7)c for certifying employee payroll. He recalled being notified “every once and awhile” by the timekeepers that someone was missing paperwork, but they did not always notify him of missing documentation. Of the three primary employees who supported lab and classroom cleaning and maintenance, (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he supervised only one employee, (b)(6), (b)(7)c who also worked full-time as the (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that employees sometimes forgot to turn-in OT sheets, and that (b)(6), (b)(7)c was not good at getting OT paperwork in on time. Further, (b)(6), (b)(7)c admitted that he didn’t always ask for paperwork to support the OT from (b)(6), (b)(7)c He also acknowledged that he wasn’t the best at physically verifying if OT work was done, but was confident the employees performed the work because at least (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c would call him from NPS on Saturdays. (b)(6), (b)(7)c believed the SLDCADA timesheets and overtime forms were true, correct, and accurate.

(8) (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he shared responsibility with (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c for certifying employee payroll if one or the other was on vacation or in training. (b)(6), (b)(7)c recalled signing overtime sheets

for employees of (b)(6), (b)(7)c and recalled there were times that he signed SLDCADA and OT forms for (b)(6), (b)(7)c wasn't available. (b)(6), (b)(7)c recalled that (b)(6), (b)(7)c would tell him that (b)(6), (b)(7)c asked him to do work in support of the extra hours. (b)(6), recalled certifying SLDCADA, but could not account for missing OT support documentation. stated that is responsible for verifying performed the OT, and he would tell him what did. stated timekeepers did not always notify him of missing documentation to support overtime claimed by employees. believed the SLDCADA timesheets and overtime forms were true, correct, and accurate.

(9) supervisor for stated performed OT for ITACS, and he was informed by of the OT need. Although approves OT, he admitted that he did not inspect the OT work. recalled being verbally informed about OT and the schedule from would verbally verify with that performed OT, and the written verification was the overtime sheet. had no missing OT support documentation. believed the SLDCADA timesheets and overtime forms were true, correct, and accurate.

(10) stated that he usually performs between four to eight hours of OT in the evening during the week doing lab maintenance for ITACS. He described lab maintenance as cleaning, cabling, physical improvements, and making sure the computers are functioning properly. The labs get dirty from chalk dust and trash. said he did not know if tasked with lab work, but stated is the project lead for cleaning. He said he sometimes works together with and and sometimes he works independently. stated that he knows what needs to be done, and sometimes cleaned the labs in the evenings by himself. would generally inform what lab he cleaned, but stated he did not routinely communicate with them. believed informed and updated on the work. He stated that would go around and see what needed to be done. During the breaks, would do extra maintenance as determined by

(11) stated he works in ITACS occasionally performing OT in the labs and classrooms. He stated that was responsible for labs and classrooms oversight, and there was some trust with the seasoned employees that they were doing the work. stated that he would direct and assign the work that needed to be done in the labs and classrooms. stated that he

would decide what work needed to be done because he visited the labs and classrooms and noticed what needed to be done. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated he would tell (b)(6), (b)(7)c what he wanted to do or "what's going to be done." He believed (b)(6), (b)(7)c was kept informed because he would hear from him if something was missed. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he is responsible for some of the same kind of things (lifecycle maintenance of labs and classrooms) he did before becoming the (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he continued to clean and maintain the labs when he became the (b)(7)c, (b)(6) and noted that most IT people don't want to clean computers.

(12) (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he is supervised by (b)(6), (b)(7)c, but had supported lab and classroom cleaning for the past couple of years. (b)(6), (b)(7)c also performed OT to make sure classroom equipment was operational before the school day started. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated there wasn't a set schedule for working OT on the weekends for cleaning and maintenance. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)c usually puts the plan together on what to do. He believed that (b)(6), (b)(7)c sometimes told (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c things that needed to get done, but (b)(6), (b)(7)c basically let them make their own schedule. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)c would email (b)(6), (b)(7)c after the fact to tell him what they did, sometimes showed (b)(6), (b)(7)c what was done, and what needed to be done. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that they did the cleaning consistently enough that they could determine which rooms needed to be cleaned more often. (b)(6), (b)(7)c was confident that he had a copy of every OT sheet he filled out on his computer.

(13) (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c ITACS, stated he wasn't sure how well (b)(6), (b)(7)c was tracking the lab cleaning.

b. Analysis.

(1) There is a reasonable requirement to keep the labs and classrooms cleaned and maintained. This work is best done after hours because the work cannot be accomplished during regular class hours. We found no indication management seriously considered developing a staggered work schedule or alternative work schedule to cover weekend cleaning requirements to reduce OT.

(2) It was well known within ITACS that (b)(6), (b)(7)c was the primary individual in charge of lab and classroom cleaning and maintenance, despite the fact that he worked full time as the union (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c performed the management function of directing OT requirements and led the cleaning and maintenance effort. (b)(6), (b)(7)c inherited this situation when he inherited the lab and classroom cleaning function. (b)(6), (b)(7)c admitted that he placed a certain level of trust in (b)(6), (b)(7)c that the work was being

performed. We noted spotty physical checks and enforcement of documentation to support OT.

(3) Most supervisors had a reasonable assurance that the OT was performed, but did not realize the extent of missing OT support documentation. Both (b)(6), (b)(7)c and (b)(6), (b)(7)c relied on (b)(6), (b)(7)c oversight for approving the OT requests from their employees for lab and classroom support. (b)(6), (b)(7)c were mostly unaware that (b)(6), (b)(7)c had missing NAVCOMPT Form 2282 (overtime form) to document OT requests and approvals. Although (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated he had copies of all his OT documentation, his SLDCADA file showed missing documentation for 63 OT hours between October 2011 and March 2012. (b)(6), (b)(7)c admitted that he didn't always ask for paperwork to support the OT from (b)(6), (b)(7)c and acknowledged that he wasn't the best at physically verifying if OT work was done.

(4) Assigning, approving, and certifying overtime all require an active management role. Lab and classroom OT is assigned and essentially approved by (b)(6), (b)(7)c a non-management employee. (b)(6), (b)(7)c has been the individual in charge (by default) of lab and classroom cleaning, and has served as the point of contact for work needing to be done. No one has outlined his duties and responsibilities within ITACS since he became the full time NPS (b)(6), (b)(7)c. By his own admission, (b)(6), (b)(7)c does not track/record overtime work completed by himself or other members of the team.

c. Recommendations.

(1) ITACS managers regain the management function to direct overtime, and reinforce the requirement to employees to provide OT support documentation before certifying time and attendance in SLDCADA. ITACS supervisors should not allow OT in SLDCADA until they receive support documentation.

(2) Supervisors for (b)(6), (b)(7)c query NPS timekeepers to verify missing OT documentation, and have (b)(6), (b)(7)c and (b)(6), (b)(7)c submit approved NAVCOMPT Form 2282s for the missing documentation.

(3) Supervisors reevaluate employee OT requirements/requests, and conduct spot checks to verify OT is supported and completed.

(4) ITACS management evaluate the lab/class cleaning requirement, and then determine a solution that minimizes overtime while achieving clean labs and classrooms.

d. Disposition. TDB.

4. Issue 2. Some employees who performed OT for labs and classrooms did not always provide supervisors with OT support documentation (NAVCOMPT Form 2282) or had missing documentation in their timekeeping file.

a. **Discussion**.

(1) NAVPGSCOL Instruction 7410.3T, paragraph e, states in part, Employees...(2) Provide departmental timekeeper with bi-weekly timesheet and any supporting documentation on the day designated by certifying official to allow adequate time for certification...(4) Work overtime or compensatory time only after receiving proper supervisory approval."

(2) Although OT was approved in SLDCADA, (b)(6), (b)(7)c performed 135 OT hours totaling $8,986.95 that were unsupported by documentation (NAVCOMPT form 2282) between October 2011 and July 2012. (b)(6), (b)(7)c claimed a total of 18 hours of overtime totaling ($1,198.26) for union duties while on travel on 24 March 2012 (8 hours), 30 March (8 hours) and 24 May (2 hours). Though (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he had a copy of every OT sheet he filled out on his computer, we found (b)(6), (b)(7)c performed 63 OT hours totaling $4,399.92 that were unsupported by documentation (NAVCOMPT form 2282) between October 2011 and March 2012.

(3) (b)(6), (b)(7)c was unaware that (b)(6), (b)(7)c was performing (b)(6), (b)(7)c duties when he approved (b)(6), (b)(7)c SLDCADA reflecting OT for 30 March 2012. (b)(6), (b)(7)c recalled certifying (b)(6), (b)(7)c SLDCADA, but could not account for missing OT support documentation.

(4) Email from NPS timekeeper's office to the ITACS timekeeper and (b)(6), (b)(7)c showed multiple requests for OT support documentation for current and past pay periods.

(5) (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)c would usually tell him verbally beforehand that he was going to work OT. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that employees sometimes forgot to turn-in OT sheets, and (b)(6), (b)(7)c was not good at getting OT paperwork in on time. (b)(6), (b)(7)c admitted that he didn't always ask for paperwork to support the OT from (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c

(6) (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he would print a hardcopy of an overtime sheet from his desktop, and then get it to his supervisor for signature. (b)(6), (b)(7)c recalled being notified by (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c NPS Timekeeper, that he was missing overtime sheets before he could get paid, and he turned those in. (b)(6), (b)(7)c admitted that

there were probably times when he didn't get OT sheets to (b)(6), (b)(7)c at all.

(7) Despite the missing documentation, ITACS supervisors believed the SLDCADA timesheets and overtime forms were true, correct, and accurate.

(8) (b)(6), (b)(7)c ITACS admin management specialist, was the primary ITACS timekeeper until May 2012. She said she maintained an OT folder and employees were supposed to submit the OT forms to the admin office. Once supervisors certify SLDCADA, the OT documentation is picked up by the timekeeper for their records and matched to what is in the system. (b)(6), (b)(7)c tried to match everyone's time, but sometimes she didn't have all the documentation. She would get notified by (b)(6), (b)(7)c financial technician, if something was missing after (b)(6), (b)(7)c ran a report. (b)(6), (b)(7)c said she usually sent an email to the employee and the supervisor in an attempt to get the support documentation, and recalled that most employees were good at getting documentation to her after she sent an email. She could not specifically recall any employee she had issues with getting documentation.

(9) (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c in the payroll department, stated that she contacts department timekeepers for assistance in resolving any discrepancies after running the certification report and matching OT requests. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated employees did not always provide support documentation even after she requested it. Her process was to put a "sticky" note in the file for the missing paperwork. She stated that employees get paid for OT if it's put in SLDCADA. If OT is not paid, then it would require additional work to adjust SLDCADA to get the employee paid once they received the paperwork. She assumes an OT form is correct if signed. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that scheduled overtime (OS) and unscheduled overtime (OU) are treated the same for identifying overtime. OU is used when an employee is called back because the employees would be automatically paid two hours for OU. The supervisor should approve which code is used.

b. **Analysis.**

(1) SLDCADA and NAVCOMP 2282 function as fiduciary documents obligating NPS to pay employees based on the accuracy of the data input and supervisor's approval. ITACS supervisors did not ensure employees completed NAVCOMPT Form 2282 resulting in $13,386.87 paid to (b)(6), (b)(7)c without supporting documentation. There was also an inconsistent understanding and use of scheduled overtime (OS) and unscheduled overtime (OU) SLDCADA codes.

~~**For Official Use Only – Privacy Sensitive**~~
~~**Any misuse or unauthorized disclosure may result in both civil and criminal penalties**~~

(2) (b)(6), (b)(7)c admitted that he didn't always ask for paperwork to support the OT from (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c admitted that there were probably times when he didn't get OT sheets to (b)(6), (b)(7)c at all. (b)(6), (b)(7)c was confident he had a copy of every OT sheet he filled out on his computer. (b)(6), (b)(7)c could not account for missing OT support documentation.

(3) (b)(6), (b)(7)c should not have claimed OT while traveling for union duties. Since he was traveling for union business, any premium time should have been coded as travel compensatory time.

c. **Recommendation**.

(1) Same as recommendation 3.c(1) and 3.c(2).

(2) ITACS management consult with HRO and timekeeping to correct (b)(6), (b)(7)c SLDCADA for overtime claimed in support of union duties for 24 March (8 hours), 30 March (8 hours) and 24 May (2 hours).

(3) ITACS supervisors obtain guidance from NPS timekeeping on the correct use of OT codes for SLDCADA.

d. **Disposition**. TDB.

5. Issue 3. ITACS employees generally did not verify their time by using the employee verified time function in SLDCADA.

a. Discussion.

(1) A review of ITACS SLDCADA records and employees statements showed inconsistent use, awareness, and understanding of the employee verified time (EVT) function.

(2) Most employees recalled receiving basic SLDCADA training when it was introduced to NPS about two years ago. Several employees interviewed stated they were not familiar with the EVT function.

(3) Interviewees commented that there was recent guidance enforcing the use of the EVT function in SLDCADA.

b. Analysis. The SLDCADA EVT function holds employees responsible and accountable for attesting to the accuracy of their time and attendance to the supervisor/certifying official.

c. Recommendation.

(1) Supervisors cease certifying time without first seeing that employees have verified their time and provided OT support documentation.

(2) Supervisors should train and require employees to use the EVT function in SLDCADA to hold them accountable for accurate time and attendance entries.

d. Disposition. TDB.

6. Issue 4. Supervisors did not have a good process for directing overtime, and relied on employees to determine lab and classroom maintenance and cleaning requirements.

a. Discussion.

(1) (b)(6), (b)(7)c described lab maintenance as cleaning, cabling, physical improvements, and making sure the computers are functioning properly, and cleaning computer equipment, projectors, and printers. (b)(6), (b)(7)c routinely performed OT on Tuesdays and Thursdays. He would generally inform (b)(6), (b)(7)c what lab he cleaned, but stated he did not routinely communicate with them. He believed the work was tracked using a spreadsheet. (b)(6), (b)(7)c believed (b)(6), (b)(7)c informed and updated (b)(6), (b)(7)c on the work. He stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)c would go around and see what needed to be done. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated there is a schedule that they kept and they talked to each other about what needs to be done. During the school breaks, (b)(6), (b)(7)c would do extra maintenance as determined by (b)(6), (b)(7)c.

(2) (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he would direct and assign the work that needed to be done in the labs and classrooms. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he would decide what work needed to be done because he visited the labs and classroom and noticed what needed to be done. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)c maintained a spreadsheet for tracking, but acknowledged that it wasn't an area they did their best in. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that they kept a lot of information in their heads. (b)(6), (b)(7)c believed (b)(7)c, (b)(6) IT specialist, was recently put in charge of labs and classrooms maintenance, but he didn't know if (b)(6), (b)(7)c would be responsible for cleaning. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated (b)(6), (b)(7)c recently started using a maintenance tracking process called JIRA (a web-based process management system), but (b)(6), wasn't familiar with JIRA.

(3) stated there wasn't a set schedule for working OT on the weekends for cleaning and maintenance. stated he and did the cleaning consistently enough that they could

determine which rooms needed to be cleaned more often. They created a spreadsheet to track what was cleaned and how often. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he maintained the spreadsheet and would try to keep the sheet updated with information from (b)(6), (b)(7)c He noted it had been "a while" since he had updated it. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)c usually puts the plan together on what to do, and stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)c used to work for IT department and did all the scheduling and planning for lab cleaning and maintenance over the breaks. (b)(6), (b)(7)c usually emails him on what he worked on or cleaned, but a lot of times he forgets to remind him. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that there are certain labs that need to be cleaned on a regular basis because they are used more frequently than others. He stated that you can tell if a lab needs to be cleaned when you see it. (b)(6), (b)(7)c recalled (b)(6), (b)(7)c mentioned that there was a JIRA site about the labs, but he wasn't familiar with it. He was aware of a discussion about creating a wiki page to keep track of everything rather than a spreadsheet.

(4) (b)(6), (b)(7)c labs and classrooms (b)(6), (b)(7)c and (b)(7)c, (b)(6) (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated since August 2012 he had the responsibility for cleanliness and physical appearance, remote imaging, hardware renewal, and building customer relationships with faculty that use the 6 labs and 130 classrooms. (b)(6), (b)(7)c provided (b)(6), (b)(7)c a project management system called JIRA for managing requirements for the labs and classrooms. (b)(6), (b)(7)c was not aware of any previous documentation tracking maintenance, or the level of tracking by (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c did not see himself as coordinating the activities or assigning work to (b)(6), (b)(7)c because the employees are senior to him.

b. Analysis.

(1) Although the employees who supported the labs and classroom cleaning indicated they informed each other what was done, our interviews showed this was not always accurate. There was little to no tracking of lab and classroom requirements or completed work.

(2) There were inconsistencies in employee statements about maintaining a spreadsheet on what was done or needed to be done. (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c maintained a spreadsheet, but admitted it was not updated. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that he would update (b)(6), (b)(7)c on what he did, but admitted he didn't communicate with them frequently. (b)(6), (b)(7)c stated that maintaining the spreadsheet wasn't their best area, and they kept a lot of information in their heads. (b)(6), (b)(7)c was not aware that (b)(6), (b)(7)c routinely performed OT on Tuesday and Thursday for lab cleaning and maintenance.

(3) (b)(6), (b)(7)c has been the individual in charge (by default) of lab and classroom cleaning, served as the point of contact for work needing to be done, and directed and assigned the work that needed to be done in the labs and classrooms.

c. Recommendation.

(1) Same as 3.c(4).

(2) (b)(6), (b)(7)c verify the requirement of (b)(6), (b)(7)c routine Tuesday and Thursday OT in support of labs and classrooms.

(3) ITACS management determine the lead for lab and classroom cleaning and maintenance

(4) ITACS management maintain a mechanism such as JIRA for tracking cleaning and maintenance requirements of labs and classrooms.

d. Disposition. TDB.

6. Interviews and Documents.

a. Interviews conducted.

(b)(6), (b)(7)c

[redacted]

(b)(6), (b)(7)c

b. Documents Reviewed.

(1) Department of Defense (DOD) Financial Management Regulation (FMR)Volume 8

(2) NAVPGSCOL Instruction 7410.3T.

(3) NAVCOMPT Form 2282 (overtime form).

(4) SLDCADA time and attendance records.

(5) 2210-09 Position description for (b)(6), (b)(7)c

(6) Overtime spreadsheet provided by

(7) ITACS FY 12 overtime matrix provided by (b)(6), (b)(7)c

(8) Emails from (b)(6), (b)(7)c (b)(6), (b)(7)c