

To whom it may concern,

I would first like to point out that my decision to come forward with my allegations is not to impugn the integrity of my fellow line officers, whom I believe to be good and dedicated cadre of men and women. My decision was to bring about the issues concerning fraud, waste, and abuse in a mismanaged government system. I am satisfied that the allegations were investigated and have been substantiated.

As the initial report came out before in the media regarding allegations of AUO abuse within the Customs and Border Protection (CBP), I anticipated that ICE will eventually come to the realization that the whole agency's AUO policies do have issues and that ICE leadership will have to come forward. However, I was disappointed to hear from leadership "that ICE was not part" of the ongoing AUO investigation. I could not come to terms that there was no management engagement within ICE leadership questioning, or even bringing up the current ICE AUO policy. To my own observation from years in service, the AUO policy was unfairly applied, and was full of irregularities as noted in the report. But management chose to ignore the facts before them. I know that these issues come close to illegality as each single AUO claimed is "verified" to be true and correct account of actual hours worked. Managers should have been vigilant in the administration of premium pay at the expense of tax payer dollars. It is unacceptable that managers will claim ignorance and relegate "past practices" as an excuse because they lack "training" or that no updated guidance in ICE policy.

There are those that meet the definition or criteria for claiming AUO, due to long hours and unforeseen events in varying their work schedule. But then there are those that claim maximum allowed AUO without leaving the confines of their work-space. It is much easier to work and stay in the office and claim the full amount of AUO, without the "compelling reason that failure" in carrying-out "their duties will constitute negligence". The patterns of work-hours in an officer's schedule have become predictable at times. AUO hours accumulate to meet the 25% "average" before the end of the workweek, when most prefer to leave early. Then there are those that come earlier, so as to accommodate their personal schedules, and work the AUO hours by staying in without the "compelling" reason to justify AUO, other than intending to maintain their average AUO hours to remain at 25%.

I hope that the actions to be taken as a result of the investigation will bring changes and more accountability. The recommendation for position reviews and third party audits should bring about changes and integrity in a system that has failed us for so long and wasted so much money.