

**THE FOURTH ANNUAL  
QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW  
OF THE  
JEFFERSON PARISH  
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL'S  
OIG 2021 REPORTS**

**BY  
THE JEFFERSON PARISH  
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**John E. Benz, Chair  
Duke McConnell  
Jim Letten**

**Presented to  
The Jefferson Parish Inspector General**

**May 13, 2022**

**CC: The Jefferson Parish President**

**The Members of the Jefferson Parish Council**

**The Jefferson Parish Ethics and Compliance Commission.**

# I

## **Introduction**

The three members of the Jefferson Parish Office of Inspector General’s Quality Assurance Review Committee (hereafter OIG Review Committee, Review Committee or Committee) are pleased to present to the Inspector General (hereafter OIG or IG), the Parish President, Council Members and the Ethics and Compliance Committee, this our Fourth Consecutive Annual Review of the OIG’s 2021 interim reports and that office’s 2021 Annual Report.

We remain grateful for the trust which the members of the Jefferson Parish Ethics and Compliance Committee, Parish Government, Inspector General’s Office, and the citizens of the parish have placed in each of us both initially and through our re-appointments, by continuing to rely upon the three members of this committee to provide an objective view of—and make constructive recommendations on—the IG’s 2021 reports.

Moreover, we value and appreciate this continuing opportunity to provide meaningful feedback and input in the form of findings, observations and where appropriate, recommendations to help contribute to and enhance the continued quality of future OIG reports, processes, work product and positive outcomes—all in service to the government and citizens of Jefferson Parish.

# II

## **The Review Committee’s Continuing Mission and Goals**

This is the fourth such report which the Review Committee has been tasked to produce. In 2019, the first year in which the Committee met and rendered a report, we had to *define* our mission and did so in the first OIG Annual Report which covered 2018. That is to say, the three members of the Review Committee felt—and continue to feel strongly— that in order to ensure that our service continues to have relevance and value, we are bound by the ongoing need and duty to understand and therefore define for the taxpayers what our continuing mission and goals consist of—and equally importantly, *what they do not*...and to remain consistent with those. Stated simply, we have unanimously determined—and both experience and responses have confirmed— that the contours of our

mission and goals as stated in our reviews of the 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021 OIG reports remain valid, useful and appropriate.

Our mission and goals remain unchanged.

It is therefore important to note that since the very formation of this Committee, we continue to recognize that our mission is not to re-investigate, analyze, evaluate or pass judgment on the OIG’s investigations, decisions, conclusions, findings or recommendations. To do so would, in our estimation, run afoul of both the intent of the Parish in establishing the Review Committee and the essential separation of powers — by potentially intruding on the function, judgment and authority of the OIG as an essential, *independent, non-political* component of the Jefferson Parish government. Stated simply, we the Committee, do not stand in the shoes of the Inspector General—nor do we seek to supplant or replace that office or any of its members or functions.

Rather, we have unanimously determined and continue to maintain that our focus should and does remain on carefully reviewing the OIG’s work product and additionally sharing practical observations, recommendations and possible options (collectively and at times individually) which could hopefully assist the Jefferson parish Inspector General’s Office in producing reports of its functions and conclusions in the clearest, simplest, most understandable and easy to address format available under the circumstances; and to further provide, when appropriate, various recommendations and options for the IG to consider with a view to improving future processes and reports issued by that office.

Moreover, and perhaps most critically, we continue to do so without regard to any external or self-serving personal interests, ideologies, opinions, philosophies or views.

### III

**The Passing of the Torch to the new IG, Kim Chatelain upon IG David McClintock’s Departure Following His Outstanding Leadership Over Nine Years as Jefferson Parish Inspector General:  
Thanks for a Job Well Done**

As IG David McClintock previously announced and as he confirmed in his official message with the publication of that office's 2021 Annual Report:

*As this reporting year draws to a close, I will be stepping down from the position of Inspector General. I am very proud of the work performed by this office and the wonderful team that we have. Over the course of my two terms I have had the honor and privilege to serve the citizens of Jefferson Parish. Together with the dedicated staff of the JPOIG the office has progressed from concept to a capable and proven independent oversight office that produces exceptionally well vetted audits, investigations, reviews, position papers, etc.*

We the members of the Review Committee, all agree. In fact, based on our in-depth reviews, personal observations and direct interaction with IG McClintock—in which he and his office have consistently produced exemplary dedication, efforts and results in providing the people of Jefferson Parish with effective, responsive, efficient and transparent government—we unanimously offer our deepest gratitude and commendation to him for his unexcelled service.

As he notes, during this time, the Office has issued 46 audit and investigative reports containing 233 recommendations questioning more than \$54 million in expenditures.

*We extend our congratulations, best wishes and thanks as well to an important, capable and experienced member of outgoing IG McClintock's tremendous team who has been selected to assume command of the office and take over responsibility for its critical mission—former First Assistant IG and now Inspector General Kim Chatelain.*

As stated by outgoing IG McClintock:

- *The JPOIG will be led moving forward by Inspector General Kim Chatelain, who was my very first hire in 2013 for the newly created office. I ask each of you to support her as she strives to move the office forward. We have developed very positive working relationships with the Parish*

*Administration and the Parish Council over the past several years. It is my hope that we can now turn towards the establishment and implementation of functional and transparent corrective action plans. The public deserves clarity and accountability in its local government. I am so thankful to the citizens of Jefferson Parish for their unwavering support of the JPOIG and to all those Parish employees and public officials that have embraced our mission in so many ways.*

#### IV

### **The Office of the Inspector General Has Continued to Remain Fully Engaged, Productive and Unhampered During the More Than Two Years of the Pandemic**

The Committee is happy to report that in spite of the continuing challenges presented by the Covid19 pandemic that severely limited contact among individuals and departments within all branches of government (save through varying types of emerging electronic communication platforms); unforeseen disruptions in many Parish and other services; associated personnel shortages due to the above; and myriad other disconnects between individuals—the IG and his staff of professionals worked diligently with undiminished focus and energy, as evidenced here in the OIG’s 2020 and 2021 Annual Reports.

#### V

### **The OIG’s 2022 Responses to the Committee’s 2021 Recommendations**

The OIG Review Committee notes that an essential component of the Quality Assurance Review Process is the goal of establishing and testing the consistent responsiveness of the Office of the Inspector General, in order to ensure that this important office is willing to listen and itself be responsive and accountable to the citizens it serves—even as it works to ensure that those governmental components it monitors are as well.

Inspector General McClintock, during his term in office, built an impressive record of responding positively to *every* recommendation made by the Review Committee—with an equally positive record of implementation.

It bears repeating that in our *2021 Report on the OIG's 2020 performance*, we noted that within just two weeks of the Review Committee's first report delivered on May 10, 2019, the IG had *responded to every one* of the 8 recommendations with a detailed response memorandum sent on May 24, 2019. In that response, the Inspector General recognized the Committee's suggestions as a "series of meaningful and valued recommendations." All of those recommendations were accepted—6 in total, 2 in part.

The OIG continues to build on a history and tradition of eager and effective responsiveness to the recommendations of the Committee in the pursuit of excellence and increased accountability of government.

A shining example of an enduring and highly productive innovation which the IG deems to be a valuable tool, in 2018 the QAR recommended that the JPOIG implement a "*Recommendation Tracker*."

The IG acted on that recommendation and generated a *Recommendation Tracker* that reflects each recommendation made by the JPOIG and the subsequent responses by the recipients in various Jefferson Parish departments and subdivisions. (The most recent version of the tracker may be found on [www.JPOIG.net](http://www.JPOIG.net) or via the following link: [JPOIG Recommendation Tracker](#).) (See Section IV, below.)

As reported by IG McClintock, that product remains highly useful and productive to this date and is used with excellent effect in this report. In fact, the IG stated in last year's report that "*...This product would not have been developed, but for the work of the QAR.*"

Now, in 2022, we in the Committee take great pleasure in reporting for the fourth consecutive year that outgoing Inspector General McClintock and the office itself have been and remain since the very inception of the review process, not only responsive but scrupulously so—indeed to the extent that the Committee's key

recommendations were followed-up on by the IG and his team and acted on by the Parish Administration as noted in this year's report.

## **The Review Committee's 2021 (3) Recommendations and (3) OIG Responses**

### ***2021 Committee Recommendation #1:***

The Review Committee recommended that the Parish Council and Administration work together in consultation with the IG to meet the requirements of the Parish Charter. To successfully accomplish this, the Inspector General asserts that the office needs resources to: a. Increase OIG FTE's to support a meaningfully-staffed Inspections and Performance Review function; b. Increase OIG FTE's to support at least one each: additional investigator, auditor, analyst; and c. Increase salaries and benefits for all existing OIG employees, in order to enhance retention and localized parity.

### ***IG 2022 Response #1:***

The Committee's assessment of funding levels as they relate to compliance with Parish Charter mandates, capacity to timely produce quality audits and investigations, and to maintain quality professional staff is spot on. This is an area in which the JPOIG has regularly reported on over many years and understands the solutions will require collaboration with Parish leadership. I (IG McClintock) am in agreement with the resulting "Committee Recommendation #1" directed to the Parish Council and Administration.

### ***2021 Committee Recommendation #2:***

The Review Committee recommended that Parish leadership require *written responses* to JPOIG findings/ recommendations through legislation.

***IG 2022 Response #2:***

A similar provision appears in the Jefferson Parish Code of Ordinances 2-165(b) for Internal Audit; however, none exists relevant to the JPOIG.

***2021 Committee Recommendation #3:***

The Review Committee suggested adding the numerical closing year to the existing case number. (Thus, a case originally numbered 2015-0029, could be referred to upon closure as 2015-0029/21 if the case was closed in 2021.)

***IG 2022 Response #3:***

We understand the added clarity and will implement the changes in public reporting moving forward. We appreciated the QARC's concerns regarding clarity on the timing of issued reports. After reflection it was determined that ensuring the issue date is clearly identified reports cover page in conjunction with the reports case number will accomplish the intended outcome. Should there remain any concerns the incoming Inspector General will most assuredly continue to work with the QARC to resolve any concerns.

We the members of the Review Committee note that this level and degree of transparency and responsiveness is exemplary and continues to resoundingly evidence an Inspector General and staff which are genuinely dedicated to the highest standards in terms of efficiency in responding to the needs of parish government and the citizens they serve.

As noted in the Annual Report for 2021, the most recent Review Committee report and JPOIG response may be found in totality on [www.JPOIG.net](http://www.JPOIG.net) via the following link: [2020 Quality Assurance Review and Response.](#)



VI  
**The Inspector General's 2021 Annual Report**  
**Summary/Overview**

Having read, reviewed, analyzed and discussed the aforementioned reports, the Review Committee unanimously agrees once again that former Inspector General David McClintock and his team of highly qualified specialists continue to serve the public in a highly professional, thorough, ethical, and effective manner in arriving at and presenting the results of their investigations, positions, recommendations and monitoring reports with the primary goals of providing genuine transparency, thereby deterring and reducing fraud, waste and abuse—as well as simply offering in some instances options and recommendations for more efficient and cost-effective expenditure of taxpayers' money.

In our fourth consecutive year of Quality Assurance Review, this Committee—aside from recommendations, suggestions and possible options offered herein—once again congratulates and thanks the Inspector General and his entire staff on a job well done.

The JPOIG in 2021 processed 67 complaints as well as other inquiries/tracking in which it published 7 reports and 2 follow-up reports—which in turn questioned the expenditure of a total of **\$9,776,547** in taxpayer funds—again exceeding the expenditures of **\$5,063,364** questioned in 2020—in spite of the continued challenges of Covid19.

Additionally, there were ongoing **monitoring efforts** which continued through 2021 involving **more than \$54 Million**; and that office additionally published one (1) Opinion Letter.

Considering further the 67 new complaints the report indicates that:

- 42 External complaints were initiated by those who are not part of JP Parish government.
- 16 Internal complaints were initiated by JP staff.
- 9 complaints were self-generated by JPOIG staff.; and

- According to the IG, “complainants remaining anonymous continue to be a significant source.”

The report also indicates that there were 52 closures:

- 34 were declined,
- 8 were moved to a case,
- 2 were “information only”,
- 8 resulted in 12 referrals, and
- 15 remain in a preliminary review status.

The JPOIG published the following reports during the reporting period that questioned the expenditure of the previously-referenced \$9,776,547.

Additionally, the JPOIG continues to monitor the expenditure of \$53.1 million in BP settlement funds.

The OIG cases questioning costs include the following:

Case 2020-0038 (Audit) Herbert Wallace Memorial VFC. Questioned: \$62,022

Case 2020-0033 (Investigation) Fire Extinguisher Certification. Questioned: \$5,012

Case 2020-0034 (Investigation) Sales tax Costs. Questioned: \$698,543

Case 2121-0006 (Audit) Terrytown VFC. Questioned: \$11,950

Case 2019-0004 (Audit) Council District Improvement Funds. Questioned: \$612,923

Case 2121-0026 (Audit) Grand Isle VFC. Questioned: \$2,782,295

Case 2121-0027 (Audit) Grand Isle Emergency Services. Questioned: \$5,603,802

Case 2013-0013 (Follow-up) Leased Property Audit. Questioned: N/A

Case 2014-0043 (Follow-up) Grand Isle VFC. Questioned: N/A

**Total Questioned Costs: \$9,776,547**

*\*The IG stresses that the work of the office does not focus solely upon financial impact.*

*Rather, “the JPOIG will pursue matters that bear on core principals of good government, fairness, ethics, and transparency. Improving government does not necessarily equate to fiscal impact.”*

**VII**

**The IG’s Recommendation Tracker:  
An ONGOING SUCCESS STORY at Work**

As we previously noted, the Review Committee continues to rely upon the IG’s effective utilization of the in its highly transparent, effective and *quick reference* summary matrix or “*Recommendation Tracker*” (Excel Spreadsheet Format), which was the product of shared Committee recommendations and IG responsiveness and ingenuity—and which sets forth with great clarity a number of key reporting results for each IG report.

Acting on the Committee’s 2018 recommendation, the IG has compiled a single “*Recommendation Tracker*”, which reflects each recommendation made and the subsequent responses (or absence thereof) of the recipients.

This *Recommendation Tracker* contains the following information, among other useful data:

- Questioned Costs;
- Post-Report Meeting (Y or N)
- The Total Number of *Potential* Responses (from relevant Parish officials)
- The Number of (*actual*) Written Response
- The Number of Recommendations Made
- The Number of Recommendations Accepted
- The Number of recommendations *Accepted in Part*
- The Number of Recommendations *Rejected*

- The Number of “No Positions” taken ...and...
- The Number of Corrections Implemented

(That report may be accessed via [www.JPOIG.net](http://www.JPOIG.net) or via the following link: JPOIG Recommendation Tracker.)

In the collective opinion of the Review Committee, this comprehensive reporting process—together with the other implemented improvements—contributes significantly to an already highly-efficient, effective, and valued OIG reporting and tracking product.

Moreover, this efficient, easy-to-understand, at-a-glance *Recommendation Tracker*, while containing a tremendous amount of information, is also highly useful to the press, taxpayers and government officials alike in following the responsiveness of public representatives, officials, employees and departments which have ethical and legal obligations to serve altruistically, honestly, efficiently and transparently—thereby enhancing the accountability of Parish officials.

According to the IG in the current 2021 Annual Report as captured by the *Recommendation Tracker*:

The 2021 Recommendation Tracker captures and reports on data based upon:

- the issuance of 46 reports;
- questioning more than \$54M to date;
- each report containing 233 recommendations provided to Parish leadership.

According to IG McClintock, the Parish Council structure presents unique issues for engagement:

- There are seven (7) elected Council positions. However, no one is specifically delegated the responsibility or authority to respond to any JPOIG recommendations.
- In cases where members of the Parish Council do respond to recommendations, it is common to receive responses from an individual Council member speaking for one council district.
- However, recently the JPOIG did receive a collective response from multiple Council District offices.
- Recommendations may be made across many different areas of government operations.
- Fiscal Controls dominate, representing 33% overall.
- The top four (4) categories of recommendations collectively represent 76%. These are Fiscal Controls, Contracting, Fiscal Waste, and Governance.

The JPOIG Recommendation Tracker reflects that of the 233 recommendations issued to date:

- 46% were accepted;
- 7% were accepted in-part;
- 14% were rejected; and
- there was no position was taken on the remaining 33%.

The IG reports that corrective action was implemented at some level in *86 of the 233 recommendations...*signifying that 37% of all recommendations resulted in some type of corrective action by the Parish.

*While this is, in the opinion of the Review Committee, a huge leap forward for the Parish government—a continued increase in responsive, corrective actions will be beneficial to both Parish efficiency and Jefferson’s citizens.*

Indeed, as observed by the IG, opportunities for corrective actions, even on previously issued recommendations, still exist. The IG indicates that “Fiscal Controls” is the largest area of concern because it is the area where corrective action is least implemented, with an implementation ratio of only 27%. The only area with a lower rate of corrective action is “Contracting,” with an implementation ratio of 30%.

## VIII

### **The OIG’s National Peer Review Evaluation**

As noted in the IG’s Annual Report for calendar year 2021, the duties and responsibilities of the JPOIG are extensive and encompass several areas which are subject to national professional standards and best practices addressing operational, investigative, and audit functions.

The JPOIG is required to comply with *the Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspectors General (the “Green Book”)* published by the *Association of Inspectors General (AIG)*, and other related standards.

Additionally, the office has adopted the *International Professional Practices Framework (IPPF)* which includes audit standards promulgated by the *Institute of Internal Auditors (the “Red Book”)*.

The JPOIG is thus required to undergo a “peer review” to ensure ongoing and continued compliance with applicable standards. Peer review is conducted every three years.

The JPOIG was last subject to peer review in 2021 and received a positive review—which was performed onsite by a team of qualified experts from the *Association of Inspectors General (AIG)*.

Such peer reviews measure compliance with national standards and is generally scheduled on a 3-year cycle.

The JPOIG's most recent review was conducted in October of 2021 and covered the period from 2017 through 2020. (This review covered 4 years as opposed to the desired 3 years to adjust for COVID-19 limitations.)

*Not surprisingly, the Peer Review team found without limitations or qualifications that the JPOIG was in compliance with all applicable standards.*

## IX

### **OIG Budget Considerations and Challenges—Present and Future**

As pointed out by the IG, funding for the JPOIG and the JPECC was established through the re-dedication of an existing millage (assessed at .5 mills) that was approved by the voters in 2011—which was approved for 10 years.

This generated \$1.36M in 2021.

In November of 2020, the citizens voted to renew the existing millage thus extending funding through 2032.

As the Parish Charter calls for the performance of *three separate functions*:

1. investigations;
2. audit; and
3. inspections and performance review...

Since inception of the office, the IG has consistently reported that the revenue generated by the dedicated millage funding is insufficient to *properly* create and staff an inspections and performance review function. These reports and related commentary on the issue can be seen in the JPOIG's Annual Reports since 2015.

*Without comment, the Review Committee notes that it was with this backdrop that outgoing Inspector General David McClintock separated from the position, resulting in the current leadership transition.*

Historically, there have been efforts to secure additional funding over the years.

And it bears noting that this Quality Assurance Review Committee has recognized the issue and recommended that the Parish Council and Administration work together in consultation with the JPOIG to meet the requirements set forth in the Parish Charter, which would include adequate funding for the full third function—without the need to reduce or truncate OIG manpower, compensation, or other functions or resources.

*We do not attempt to step outside our mission by suggesting to the Parish government how to comply with the Parish Charter...but we do continue to recommend and urge continued efforts by the OIG, Parish Administration and Parish Council to find or develop means to provide adequate funding to this very important office in identifying and preventing potential fraud, waste and abuse...and as critically, advancing efficiency and effective services to the citizens of the Parish.*

## X

### The Review Committee's 2022 Recommendations

1. Because the IG reports that corrective action was implemented at some level in *86 of the 233 recommendations*...signifying that 37% of all recommendations resulted in some type of corrective action by the Parish.;

And because this is, in the opinion of the Review Committee, a huge leap forward for the Parish government—we maintain that a continued increase in responsive, corrective actions will be beneficial to both Parish efficiency and Jefferson's citizens.

The Review Committee therefore strongly recommends that:

- a. The Office of Inspector General—under its new and capable leadership, continue its effective use of the proven Recommendation Tracker; and



- b. The Administration and Council consider taking steps to ensure continued and increased use of the Recommendation Tracker by all Parish departments and subdivisions—either through legislation, executive order, policy or other mechanism.
2. As noted herein, in Section V. addressing budget concerns and challenges-- this Quality Assurance Review Committee has previously recommended that the Parish Council and Administration work together in consultation with the JPOIG to meet the requirements set forth in the Parish Charter, which would include adequate funding for the third function—without the need to reduce or truncate OIG manpower, compensation, or other functions or resources.

We do not attempt to overstep our mission by suggesting to the Parish government *how* to comply with the Parish Charter. Indeed, our basis and rationale need not be repeated in detail here as it is a matter of public record in our 2021 Annual Report on the OIG’s 2021 performance...*But we do continue to strongly recommend and urge continued efforts by the OIG, Parish Administration and Parish Council to find or develop means to provide adequate funding to this very important office in identifying and preventing potential fraud, waste and abuse...and as critically, advancing efficiency and effective services to the people they serve.*

## XI

### **Going Forward: Views and Thoughts of Two Inspectors General**

From interviews with newly – installed Jefferson Parish Inspector General Kim Chatelain in the context of the OIG’s leadership transition.

The new IG indicated that she is currently, engaged in a job replacement search for her appointment to the office’s “Number 2” (First Assistant)—adding that she attends all council meetings and her goal is to ensure that all of her staff members fully understand Parish functions. Therefore, she assigns her staff members to

rotate attendance at council meetings where they are tasked with learning about parish government dynamics, processes, functions and relationships.

### **The Third IG Function: Evaluations**

IG Chatelain—having served effectively as the veteran First Assistant to outgoing IG McClintock for the past seven years, fully understands the financial challenges associated with that office’s very tight budget—has additionally launched elements of an evaluation function, by sending out notice and an evaluation memo on hiring practices for classified civil service employees. And, she indicated that she is currently planning a survey of employees and managers, in order to evaluate and determine whether position descriptions are aligning with actual jobs performed by employees.

The IG additionally indicated that she has responded to a request for a briefing to the Jefferson Parish Personnel Board regarding what a performance evaluation consists of.

In response to the Review Committee’s question to IG Chatelain’s statement that she is going to embark on carrying out performance evaluations – in terms of where the resources will come from—she responded that she met with Inspector General Dave McClintock prior to his departure, and as a result new evaluation policies and position description were approved. According to IG Chatelain, those and new policies have now been published.

Is important to note that IG Chatelain observed that because her office does not have the full funding to *completely* build out the *third* leg or function (i. e., evaluation function)—in order to carry out as much of the function as possible, she assigns evaluation functions as collateral duties to existing investigators. Additionally, in order to allow for the incorporation of evaluation functions into the two main investigation and audit components, the Deputy Inspector General for Audit (DIG Audit) has been simply changed to Deputy Inspector General (DIG, generally), to reflect additional duties beyond audits.

It is additionally important to note that Inspector General Chatelain, while acknowledging that there is still not enough funding to *fully* carry out the third (audit) function, she is attempting to stretch resources to accomplish more of the

evaluation functions. She is therefore additionally combining assets *by integrating requests for records into the performance of audits to additionally serve evaluation functions.*

**\*Quality Assurance Committee Note 1:**

- In both our exit interviews with departing/former Inspector General McClintock and our initial interviews with incoming Inspector General Chatelain, we observed – and both IG’s agreed – that in the course of investigations and audits, through the very process of examining the functions of Parish government subdivisions and agencies, *each audit in effect naturally contained and continues to contain important components of evaluations. Hence, the evaluation process to some extent has always existed, albeit under perhaps different nomenclature... and will continue to be increasingly integrated into investigations and audits to the extent possible.*
- Concomitant with that concept and consistent with that previously-articulated Review Committee observation, in order to leverage evaluation functions, the IG additionally indicated that she understands that with every audit/investigation, there is integrated into the process, some evaluation. *Also, she indicated that audits and investigations can additionally leverage one another in terms of information in order to assist in the evaluation process.*
- *In an effort to bolster the Office’s capabilities in terms of performing some evaluation functions to the extent possible, IG McClintock did in 2021 attend AIG training to become a certified Inspector General Evaluator.)*

**\*Quality Assurance Committee note 2:**

- These observations, philosophies and policies articulated by the new IG are entirely consistent with the aforementioned Review Committee’s observation regarding the inherently overlapping, integrated nature of evaluations and audits and investigations.

- IG Chatelain indicates that she has not yet seen whether the newly-integrated process of spreading around the evaluation function and staggering products projects to accommodate additional work as anticipated or will increase the number of hours worked by Inspector General personnel. According to the Inspector General, this remains to be seen, and she is paying close attention.
- As with previous Inspector General McClintock, she indicates that the office enjoys very good working relationships with JPSO, the JPDA, and FBI, to name a few agencies.
- Now, she intends to request the existing case tracking mechanism introduced by former IG McClintock to additionally keep track of interviews, informal communications and other productions of information. According to the IG, this would depend on enhanced communication in order to ensure that the OIG and Parish departments fully understand what each OIG request consists of, and additionally understands that they will need to satisfy those requests.
- The IG additionally indicated a good relationship and dynamics with the office of the Parish President Cynthia Lee Sheng, who (as also observed by IG McClintock) is positive, proactive, and who wants opportunities and information to enable her (the president) to address and fix any problems identified.
- IG Chatelain indicated that she does not intend to simply report on what problems existed or what did not work... but additionally on *how* Parish offices and departments in question can improve, including in what areas; and what the recommended efforts had produced.

## **XII**

### **Conclusion and Special Thanks**

For the for the fourth consecutive year of the Committee’s review, Jefferson parish Inspector General David McClintock and his staff of professionals were at all times accessible, responsive, candid, clear, helpful, and eager to provide

whatever information we requested in order to make our this our fourth review as complete, accurate and effective as possible.

More importantly and revealingly, the responsiveness of the IG and his entire office of outstanding professionals was once again amply demonstrated by his continued availability to respond to any questions at any time despite the seemingly unrelenting challenges of Covid19.

It is difficult if not impossible in this document to adequately recognize and thank Inspector General David McClintock for his impeccable record of exemplary service to Jefferson Parish government—and more importantly to the *people* who depend on the executive and legislative branches of their government for their safety, security, livelihoods and quality of life each and every day. As we have consistently noted in our four reports on that office under IG McClintock, he has built and led a team of professionals which—although modest in size and in need of additional resources—has unfailingly carried out the office’s mission and duty to the people first and has done so without any personal interest, political goals, favoritism or hidden agendas. Moreover, he understands what true transparency really means and has both *demande*d it and *demonstrate*d it, to the distinct benefit of the public that the JPOIG office serves. David McClintock’s loss as the Jefferson Parish Inspector General is a loss to the Parish and its citizens and has left behind big shoes to fill. He leaves both the JPOIG and the Parish better for his and his fine office’s hard work, integrity and dedication.

Having met and spoken at length with the new Inspector General—Kim Chatelain—who, as the First Assistant in that excellent office has considerable operational and management experience from her years of outstanding service on the McClintock watch, we welcome her as a respected, proven veteran with the experience, qualities and tools to take the helm and lead the OIG forward in its excellent tradition. We thank her for her warm welcome, her availability and time spent with us, and both her candor and enthusiasm in openly charting the course for the JPOIG in the coming year and beyond.

The citizens of the Parish must remember as well, that the tremendous dedication, innovation, integrity and success rightly attributed to—and earned by—outgoing IG McClintock, were also the product of the tireless work and commitments of the OIG *team*, of which the new IG, Kim Chatelain, was that

office's First Assistant. For that both she and the entire IG team she helped to lead have our deepest gratitude as well.

To the outgoing IG David McClintock—we wish all the best. And to the new Inspector General Chatelain—we wish and anticipate for her and her great team a highly successful mission.

According to IG McClintock in this his final official message:

- *Over the course of my two terms I have had the honor and privilege to serve the citizens of Jefferson Parish. Together with the dedicated staff of the JPOIG the office has progressed from concept to a capable and proven independent oversight office that produces exceptionally well vetted audits, investigations, reviews, position papers, etc. During this time, we have issued 46 audit and investigative reports containing 233 recommendations questioning more than \$54M in expenditures. In November of 2020, the citizens of Jefferson Parish voted to renew our dedicated revenue for another 10 years. I can think of no greater approval than that of the people. Simply put the JPOIG has been successful by every objective measure recognized in the community of Inspectors General. We have successfully passed national peer review twice and received very positive assessments from the Quality Assurance and Review Committee during all three prior reviews. I am confident that the JPOIG is well positioned to continue its important mission to preserve public trust. We do this by improving operations, deterring and identifying fraud, waste, abuse, illegal acts, and enhancing accountability across parish government.*

*The JPOIG will be led moving forward by Inspector General Kim Chatelain, who was my very first hire in 2013 for the newly created office. I ask each of you to support her as she strives to move the office forward. We have developed very positive working relationships with the Parish Administration and the Parish Council over the past several years. It is my hope that we can now turn towards the establishment and implementation of functional and transparent corrective action plans. The public deserves clarity and accountability in its local government.*

As citizens of Jefferson Parish, we the members of the Quality Assurance Review Committee have an interest—shared with all those who live and work here—in Parish government which is honest, efficient, transparent and responsive to the needs of all. The Office of the Inspector General continues to deliver accountability and oversight of government functions in positive, constructive ways by operating fairly and without political or personal agendas, thus maintaining productive dialogs with all branches with which it interacts. Moreover, it does so while maintaining adequate political, economic, social, personal and other distance and objectivity to enable it to effectively demand accountability and point out shortcomings in Parish government components and processes in need of repair whenever necessary.

We the Review Committee remain grateful for and humbled by the honor and privilege to have the trust of the Parish and citizens we serve in this role—and we thank Inspector General McClintock and his outstanding team for their work, cooperation and dedicated public service. We again commend and offer our gratitude to Inspector General McClintock and his entire staff for a job well done in service to us all, and we look forward to working closely with—and evaluating for the citizens of—that excellent office under the new leadership of a trusted, proven professional—Jefferson Parish Inspector General Kim Chatelain.



## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL JEFFERSON PARISH



KIM RAINES CHATELAIN  
INSPECTOR GENERAL

May 27, 2022

TO: Mr. John E. Benz, Chairman,  
Mr. Duke McConnell, Board Member  
Mr. Jim Letten, Board Member

RE: The Fourth Annual Quality Assurance Review of the Jefferson Parish  
Office of Inspector General

I am in receipt of the Quality Assurance Review Committee's (QARC) 2021 annual review of the Jefferson Parish Office of Inspector General (JPOIG). While the period of review falls under the tenure of Inspector General David McClintock ("IG McClintock"), I wish to express my sincere gratitude for the thoughtful consideration given to the transition from IG McClintock to myself as the newly appointed Inspector General.

We look forward to future quality assurance reviews and opportunities to receive feedback. I note that, in this year's annual report, several prior years' recommendations were given attention. Of these, I wish to specifically respond to the Committee's 2018 recommendation to establish a *Recommendation Tracker*. After much effort and thought, this recommendation was implemented by IG McClintock. It is my intention to continue reporting on prior recommendations outstanding, resolved, or resolved in part. Tracking and reporting on this data is an integral component to transparency in government and oversight.

I also note the attention given to the Committee's 2021 recommendation to require written responses to JPOIG findings/recommendations. This recommendation was directed toward Parish leadership and remains outstanding. I hope as the JPOIG continues to mature within Parish government that a greater understanding of the value-given by oversight will inform Parish leadership of the value-added by responding to JPOIG findings/recommendations.

Finally, and as noted in your most recent report, I have undertaken integrating the function of Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews into JPOIG operations through the implementation of policies. I was pleased to be a participant and instructor for the Association of Inspectors General's pilot course for the certification of Inspectors/Evaluators in 2019, and I am proud to have earned the certification at that time. Incorporating this new function is a significant undertaking, but one which I feel strongly will enhance the JPOIG's ability to deliver meaningful oversight to Parish government and bring about full compliance with its Chartered mandate.

Adequate funding to ensure the recruitment and retention of talented and qualified professionals remains an on-going challenge and concern. IG McClintock stood this office up, elevating oversight from a concept to a reality, and in the process the office withstood many challenges. I am thankful for the opportunity given to me to contribute to this process in my role as 1<sup>st</sup> Assistant Inspector General and General Counsel. There were many lessons learned. It is my



hope and goal that, as the JPOIG embarks upon this next chapter, it will see growth as it continues to strive toward excellence in oversight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kim Raines Chatelain". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kim" being particularly prominent.

Kim Raines Chatelain

Cc: Commissioner Howard G. Maestri, Chairman  
Commissioner Warren R. Bourgeois III, M.D.  
Commissioner Dolores C. Hall  
Commissioner Laura J. Donnaway  
Commissioner Cherie' Kay LaRocca, Ph.D.  
Jerry Sullivan, Attorney to the Ethics and Compliance Commission