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INSPECTOR GENERAL’S OVERVIEW

We are committed to carrying out our mission under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (as amended) as a high-performing Office of Inspector General (OIG)—delivering timely, high-quality, and value-added work to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of Amtrak’s (the company’s) programs and operations. We exercise independent oversight to provide the company, its customers, the public, and Congress with unbiased assessments—conducting audits and investigations.

Our Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 budget request of $23.274 million is consistent with guidance from the Office of Management and Budget; it is five percent below the level provided for FY 2017 in the President’s budget for FY 2016. This funding level would allow us to continue actions taken since FY 2014 to improve our oversight of the company’s programs and operations. This includes our commitment to staff and equip the organization with highly qualified personnel and cutting-edge technology such as data analytics and computer forensics tools, which have proven particularly effective in identifying fraud, waste, and abuse. Moreover, this funding would enhance our ability to identify opportunities to help the company achieve its strategic goals of safety, financial excellence, and customer service.

We are committed to the highest standards of excellence in achieving our mission and vision. The steps we have taken to increase our skills and capabilities and our attention to high-risk/high-impact issues that can have the largest positive impact on the company’s programs and operations have led to significant improvements in the company’s economy, efficiency, and effectiveness—and will continue to do so.

STRATEGIC PLAN

In October 2012, we completed a Strategic Plan for FY 2013–2017 that established goals, strategies, and performance indicators to fulfill our vision of operating as a model OIG. The plan supports the company’s Strategic Plan (FY 2014–2018), particularly the goal of attaining a standard of financial excellence.
We are using the "Balanced Scorecard" framework to manage our strategic planning and execution. The Balanced Scorecard framework is a multidimensional approach to strategic planning and execution that focuses on defining and assessing how four performance perspectives—stakeholder expectations; internal processes; people; learning, and development; and use of resources—contribute to the accomplishment of strategic goals and objectives. The framework’s strategy management system provides a structured way for continually assessing where we are, what we need to work on, and whether our goals, objectives, and supporting initiatives are the right ones to help us achieve our mission and vision.

To help us achieve our vision of operating as a model OIG, we are pursuing five strategic goals.

- Add value by producing objective, accurate, relevant, and timely products that address high-risk/high-impact issues.
- Consistently follow efficient, disciplined processes for audits and investigations that meet the standards of the accountability community.
- Employ a highly qualified, motivated, and diverse workforce.
- Communicate openly and work professionally with, but independently from company management.
- Create and maintain effective mission-support systems.

**SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

We seek to ensure that the company spends its funds wisely and receives appropriate value for its expenditures. To do this, our audits are centered on seven focus areas:

- governance
- acquisition and procurement
- information technology
- train operations and business management
- human capital management
- safety and security
- asset management

Since the beginning of FY 2015, we have issued 16 reports, identifying more than $148.4 million in questioned costs and funds to be put to better use. The reports included numerous recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the company’s operations and programs.
Issues we have reported on since the beginning of FY 2015, include the following:

Alignment with Best Practices Could Improve Project Management Office Implementation - In FY 2015, the company spent nearly $1.3 billion for capital projects intended to improve infrastructure and equipment. In July 2014 we reported that the company’s management controls for capital projects were weak from project inception through completion. We recommended that management develop company-wide policies and procedures for project management. Management agreed and noted it was in the process of developing a Project Management Office (PMO) to better manage capital projects.

In a December 2015 report, we discussed the company’s limited progress in establishing a company-wide PMO and identified significant opportunities to improve the company’s project management practices and procedures by implementing best practices including: developing clear governance rules, providing the PMO sufficient authority and independence, staffing the office with skilled, experienced, and well-trained personnel, developing and maintaining project management methodologies, and proactively reviewing and reporting on project and portfolio performance.

The company hired an individual, who arrived in January 2016, to establish a company-wide PMO. In the interim some departments were implementing or improving their own department-level PMOs. These efforts create the risk of duplication and waste if the departments’ policies are inconsistent with those eventually developed by the company-wide PMO.

We recommend that the Executive Vice President and Chief Operations Officer (1) incorporate best practices into the company-wide PMO policies and procedures, and (2) ensure department-level PMO initiatives are consistent with company-wide initiatives, to avoid waste while company-wide PMO policies are being developed. The Executive Vice President concurred with our recommendations and the proposed actions meet the intent of our recommendations.

Asset Management: Observations on Vehicle Fleet Management - The company has a fleet of about 2,500 vehicles to support its operations. These vehicles range from standard sedans, sport utility vehicles, and pickup trucks to railroad-specific vehicles, such as vehicles fitted with steel wheels for use on railroad tracks. In FY 2014, the company spent about $3.1 million to acquire vehicles and about $25 million to operate the fleet.
We reported that data trends on the use and management of the vehicle fleet raise questions about the adequacy of vehicle fleet management controls in certain areas. For example:

- **The fleet has grown while some vehicles appear underutilized.** From April 2008 through June 2015, the size of the fleet increased by 28 percent. At the same time, 153 vehicles appear to be underutilized as evidenced by fuel purchase records.

- **Take-home vehicles have increased.** Since 2012, the number of vehicles employees take home has increased by about 20 percent.

- **Some vehicle costs appear high.** The company has entered into commercial leases for some vehicles that appear to be available for lease from the General Services Administration (GSA) at a lower cost. For example, the company leased nine stake trucks from a commercial vendor at a monthly cost of $3,215 per vehicle; GSA had what appeared to be identical trucks available at a monthly cost of $314.

- **Lease decisions are not always based on cost-benefit analysis.** The company does not require that a cost-benefit analysis be performed as part of the decision-making process on whether to lease or purchase a new vehicle. In some cases, the company used operating funds to lease a vehicle even though purchasing it would be more cost-effective.

- **Lack of action on internal reviews.** The company has taken little action in response to a 2013 Finance department review that identified significant control weaknesses in the processes for vehicle requisitioning, fleet utilization, fuel card oversight, and leasing.

Recognizing some of the recent trends and recurring management control weaknesses, Procurement and Logistics is evaluating alternatives to improve program controls and oversight. We recommended, and management agreed, to consider the need to address the weaknesses discussed in this report as they consider alternatives to improve the vehicle fleet management program.
Progress Made Implementing Positive Train Control, but Significant Challenges Remain – The Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008 required the company and each railroad hosting intercity or commuter rail passenger service to install and operate an approved Positive Train Control (PTC) safety system by December 31, 2015. We reviewed the company’s progress in implementing its PTC plan and noted that since December 2012, when we last reported, the company made progress in implementing its FRA-approved plan. Nonetheless, the company continued to face significant challenges in fully implementing its plan on the Northeast Corridor by the December 2015 deadline. The challenges we identified included a schedule for installing and testing equipment that allows for little or no delays, and ensuring equipment interoperability with freight and commuter railroads.

We also identified several opportunities to improve program management processes and practices and recommended that actions be taken in a number of areas. The company generally agreed with our recommendations.

New Jersey High-Speed Rail Improvement Program Has Cost and Schedule Risks - The New Jersey High-Speed Rail Improvement Program was initially planned to upgrade rail infrastructure to support higher maximum train speeds, increase capacity, and improve service reliability over a 23 mile section of track between Trenton and New Brunswick, New Jersey. A $449.95 million Federal Railroad Administration grant funds the program. Our review of program progress showed some progress had been made. However, we noted that significant unmitigated risks could jeopardize the company’s ability to complete the program’s initial scope within the grant amount.

We estimated that the cost to complete the program will exceed the grant amount by $83.14 million. We also noted that the program’s schedule for completing planned work was highly optimistic even after its scope was reduced and it may not be achievable by June 2017 when the grant funding expires. If the program is not completed by that date, the company will have to identify other funding sources to complete the program regardless of whether all the grant funds have been expended.

We concluded that the program’s cost and schedule problems were directly attributable to weaknesses in program management and oversight. We recommended and the company agreed to finalize a risk mitigation plan and to provide senior management with information on variances from the project’s cost and schedule estimates.

Profile of Timesheet Data of Agreement Employees for Calendar Year 2014 - One of the company’s major expenses is labor. In Calendar Year (CY) 2014, the company paid $829 million in regular wages and $199 million in overtime wages. Our analysis of
CY 2014 timesheet data revealed trends and patterns that indicate potential fraud, waste, and abuse in the reporting of overtime and regular time, including:

- Employees reported working 2,381 weeks with at least 40 overtime hours in addition to their 40 regular hours.
- Employees reported working 957 weeks with overtime hours but no regular hours.
- Employees reported 1,357 days in which they worked more than 24 regular and overtime hours.
- Employees reported 280 instances in which they worked 31 or more consecutive days.

Moreover, although 57 percent of union agreement-covered employees earned $40,000 to $80,000, 46 employees earned more than $160,000 in 2014 compared to 32 employees in 2013. This includes 18 employees who earned more than $160,000 in both 2013 and 2014. The company is using the data to identify the causes for the anomalies, and we are actively pursuing instances of potential fraud.

**Opportunities Exist to Improve the Safe-2-Safer Program** - In response to the Railroad Safety Improvement Act of 2008 the company initiated its Safe-2-Safer program. The program’s goals were to transform the company’s safety culture, reduce employee injuries, and achieve financial benefits. The company has invested about $70 million in the program since 2009. Our work showed that although the company had demonstrated a strong commitment to its Safe-2-Safer program, results were mixed and opportunities for improvement existed. Specifically, while the company’s safety culture and working conditions had improved, the goals of reducing employee injuries and injury-claim costs had not been achieved.

Our work identified areas that likely contributed to the lack of progress in reducing employee injuries. We recommended several actions to improve the effectiveness of the program, including ensuring that employees are fully engaged in achieving program goals and are accountable for reducing injuries at all levels, and that the Safe-2-Safer program is fully integrated into the company’s overall safety plans and programs. The company agreed with our recommendations and established timelines for implementing them.

**Improved Management Will Lead to Acela Parts Contract Cost Savings** – In 2007, the company entered into a contract for spare parts support and routine maintenance for
the Acel fleet. Through May 2014 the company purchased $236 million in spare parts through the contract, which was extended through September 2016. We reviewed the Procurement department’s management of the Acel parts contract. We found the contract had not been effectively or efficiently managed because the company paid too little attention to costs and associated management and oversight controls.

As a result, there was a significant waste of funds. For example, the prices paid for 9 of 10 repaired parts we sampled were 118 percent to 2,377 percent greater than the contractor’s repair costs. About $85,000 in unreasonably high prices were paid for these repaired parts. Also, penalties were not assessed for late parts delivery and train annulments, partly because there were no formal procedures for tracking the delivery of parts and assessing penalties. For example, as much as $19 million in penalties had not been assessed for late part deliveries that occurred since 2013, based on company estimates.

If the company had effectively managed the contract, it could have reduced contract costs and freed up funds that could have been put to better use. The company agreed with our recommendations to improve contract management.

**Acquisition and Procurement: Gateway Program Projects Have Certain Cost and Schedule Risks** – The company’s Gateway Program is a planned but not fully funded set of projects intended to double rail capacity between New Jersey and New York City, including adding two new rail tunnels under the Hudson River. The company estimated that the program will cost about $14.7 billion and be completed in 2025. We reviewed progress toward completing the two initial projects that have been funded. The projects are to construct concrete box tunnels in New York City:

- project one: beneath the eastern rail yard of Hudson Yards
- project two: beneath 11th Avenue

We reported that good progress has been made toward completing project one on schedule. Since our February 2014 report, the estimated cost had increased by about $7.7 million (4.15 percent) from $185 million to about $192.7 million. The company’s share of the cost for rebuilding the Long Island Rail Road maintenance of equipment facility was uncertain.

Risks we identified for project two related to funding and environmental risk had largely been resolved by the time of our report. However, a new funding risk related to the construction contract cost had arisen and that delayed the planned December 8, 2014 start date for the project. This delay had the potential to impact the project’s
schedule and increase its costs. Project officials acted on our earlier recommendations and had largely resolved the risks we identified for project two in a draft report. Consequently, we did not make any recommendations in our final report.

**Police Department Workforce Planning** – The Amtrak Police Department (APD) reported spending about $69 million, of which $62 million was spent on personnel. Our review of APD’s workforce planning process found that there was no formal process in place to determine the number and type of police officers needed to support its mission. Opportunities also existed to improve the department’s practices in areas such as establishing goals and performance metrics; identifying risks and allocating resources to mitigate them; using crime and workload data to allocate resources; and using video surveillance systems to supplement the existing workforce.

The Chief of Police was aware of these weaknesses and had taken a number of actions, and also planned other actions to address them. To complement and facilitate APD’s actions, we recommended, and the Chief of Police agreed, to develop a formal process for workforce planning.

**Reservation System Infrastructure Updated, but Future System Sustainability Remains an Issue** – In FY 2009 the company initiated a program to modernize its reservation system - Reservation System – Next Generation (Res-NG). The program was estimated to cost about $74.4 million and be completed by 2014. Our review showed the Res-NG program had achieved mixed results and would terminated in FY 2015 without fully achieving its modernization objective.

The Res-NG program completed projects to update the reservation system’s mainframe hardware, operating system, and network protocols, but did not complete 38 percent of its planned projects. The completed projects ensured the reservation system can continue to handle the current reservation volume. However, because other projects were not undertaken, certain significant system improvements remained to be made. We concluded that weak program management such as inadequate tracking of costs and poor communication between the Information Technology department and other departments within the company adversely affected completion of the program’s projects.

In addition, the company did not have a strategy to replace or significantly upgrade the reservation system to ensure its future sustainability and growth. We recommended and the company agreed to develop a comprehensive reservation system strategy to ensure performance sustainability and efficient integration with other company-wide IT modernization efforts.
Opportunities Exist to Improve the Efficiency of Procurement Practices for Goods and Services - The company annually procures about $2.3 billion in goods and services from about 17,000 vendors. We reviewed procurement practices to determine whether there are opportunities to procure goods and services more economically.

Our work showed that there were weaknesses in vendor prices, discounts, and payment terms practices. We estimated procurement costs could be reduced by about $3.4 million annually by using lowest-price vendors and $6 million annually by negotiating early payment discounts. We recommended, and the company agreed that where possible and practical, it will implement the use of best purchasing practices.

Detecting and Deterring Fraud - We have continued to work with management and federal, state, and local prosecutors to address potentially fraudulent activities. Our investigations resulted in 9 indictments, 9 convictions, and $1,019,911 in cost savings and recoveries. We opened 64 investigative cases, closed 45 cases, processed 549 complaints from the OIG Hotline, and issued 21 management information reports identifying opportunities to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the company’s operations and programs.

The following are examples are the types of investigative cases we have addressed:

**Fraud and Forgery** – On October 22, 2015, Korey K. Sloan, a former company employee pled guilty in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, to Wire Fraud and Forgery, and was sentenced to 24 months incarceration in federal prison. The former employee is serving the 24 month sentence in concurrence with a 42 month federal sentence for tax evasion. Our investigation revealed that the former employee submitted numerous medical forms to the company and the U.S. Department of Labor reflecting forged signatures of his personal physician. Additionally, the investigation found that the former employee and his wife, obtained U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 8 housing benefits through making false representations to HUD. On August 5, 2015, the former employee’s spouse pled guilty to Wire Fraud and was sentenced to a 24 month period of probation. We investigated this case with assistance of the HUD OIG.

**Larceny** – Our investigation revealed that an individual, Louis A. Giangola purchased an Amtrak facility in North Haven, Connecticut on August 15, 1997, but failed to change the electrical service into his name and continued using the electricity that was being paid for by Amtrak until 2014. On December 4, 2015, the individual pled guilty in Connecticut Superior Court to one count of Larceny, First Degree, and one count of Failure to Appear, and was sentenced to 5 years suspended sentence, with 5 years of
probation for each count, to run concurrently. The individual was ordered to also pay $28,000 in restitution.

Executive Dismissed for Nepotism and Improper Hiring Practices - Our investigation confirmed that a company executive engaged in improper hiring, conflicts of interest, and gross mismanagement of company resources. In one instance, we found that the executive hired his friend’s son, who was wholly unqualified for the position. He then directed this new employee to help him with a personal book-writing project that involved editing and copying draft book manuscripts during regular business hours. Inexplicably, the executive also directed the hiring of a foreign national sub-contractor by a primary contractor at a cost of over $520,000 to provide certain expertise on a rail project. However, our investigation disclosed that the sub-contractor lacked adequate knowledge of safety, construction, and regulatory issues for domestic railroads, and there was no statement of work for the contracted services.

Finally, the executive directed and subsequently mismanaged the construction of passenger platforms for the company and another rail entity. Not only were the platforms delivered late, but their construction may have been unnecessary from the outset. Consequently, management dismissed the executive, the employee involved in the book-writing project, and the foreign national sub-contractor.

Arrests and Guilty Plea for Staged Car Crash with Amtrak Train - On April 15, 2015, the United States Attorney for the District of South Carolina announced the indictment and arrest of James Love and Deon Roberts for conspiracy to commit mail and wire fraud, causing a train wreck, and unlawful interference with a train operator. The indictment and arrest resulted from an investigation that determined in the early morning hours of September 6, 2013, the two men parked a car in the path of an oncoming Amtrak train, got out of the car prior to the collision, and then returned to the car after the collision, feigning injury, all for the purposes of submitting bogus claims for personal injuries and other losses. We investigated this case with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, the Allendale County Sheriff’s Department and the Fairfax Police Department. On June 17, 2015, Love pled guilty to count 1 of the indictment and on November 2, 2015, Roberts pled guilty to the same charge. In pleading guilty, both individuals accepted responsibility for causing the train accident. Sentencing for Love and Roberts is pending.

Contractor Agrees to Settlement for Failure to Authenticate an Employee’s Educational Credentials and Professional Certification - On June 29, 2015, the United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut, and Attorney General for the State of Connecticut, announced that GARG Consulting Services, Inc. ("GARG") entered into a
civil settlement agreement with the federal government and the State of Connecticut in which GARG will pay $390,000 to resolve allegations that it failed to authenticate an employee’s purported educational credentials and a professional certification before hiring and assigning him to work on various U.S. Department of Transportation-funded and state-funded highway projects, and on a bridge reconstruction project funded by the company.

Our joint investigation with the Department of Transportation’s OIG found that GARG had provided construction management and inspection services on these projects but had used an unqualified employee for engineering consulting and professional services related to the replacement of the movable span on the Thames River Bridge. Specifically, the individual had falsely represented that he was a college graduate with a degree in civil engineering management and with Engineer-in-Training (“EIT”) certification from the State of Connecticut. If appropriate employee screening had been done, GARG would have learned that the employee had not graduated from college and had never sought or obtained EIT certification.

**Fuel Card Misuse** - Over the past six years, we received a number of allegations involving the fraudulent use of company cards for unauthorized fuel expenditures. Our investigations identified over $95,000.00 in fraudulent fuel card transactions; $37,877.13 by company employees; and $57,424.70 by an individual not employed by the company.

To date, these investigations have resulted in criminal charges pursued against five (including one individual not employed by the company), three employee resignations, one employee dismissal and $92,615.38 ordered in restitution to the company. For the most part, a number of the fraudulent purchases went undetected by the company, indicating systemic weaknesses in the internal controls over the fuel purchase cards. In February 2015, we recommended that management review the adequacy of its policy for the use, control and accountability of fuel cards to prevent further misuse.

Management informed us in June 2015 that it agreed with our recommendations and intended to conduct a preliminary assessment to review policy and procedures to better manage and control the use of the fuel cards.

**Executive Ethics Violation** – We conducted an investigation of an executive based on an allegation that he did not disclose his ownership interest in an outside entity to company procurement officials when he recommended hiring a contractor from the entity. This initial allegation led to an additional inquiry regarding the executive’s use of company resources to conduct personal business on company time.
Our investigation determined that the executive did not properly notify procurement officials of his ownership in the outside entity during the selection process of the contractor. Additionally, despite an initial denial by the executive, we confirmed that he repeatedly worked on personal business with company resources during work hours. In sum, we found that the executive clearly violated the standards of ethical conduct pertaining to his employment, management agreed, and the executive was dismissed.

**Theft of Property by Employee** – We found that a machinist ordered goods from the company’s Work Management System that he did not need to fulfill his job duties. When confronted, the machinist admitted to ordering goods that he took home for personal use, gave away or sold. A consensual search resulted in the recovery of $1,400 in company equipment. He was arrested and charged with felony theft in Cook County, Illinois.

The employee pleaded guilty on November 19, 2014, and was sentenced to one year supervised probation. He was ordered to make restitution in the amount of $5,000 to the company. The employee voluntarily resigned.

**Train 188 Derailment** – During May 2015, Amtrak Train 188 derailed near the Frankfurt Junction in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, killing 8 passengers and injuring over 100 others. Our investigators continue to provide investigative support to relevant Federal and State authorities examining the matter.

**OIG Briefings Program** – We developed a customizable briefing to help company executives, staff and outside stakeholders understand our mission and operations, and since the beginning of FY 2015, we delivered fraud awareness briefings to more than 436 company employees.
SUMMARY OF FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

For FY 2017, we are requesting $23.274 million, consistent with the Office of Management and Budget guidance; it is five percent below the level provided for FY 2017 in the President’s budget for FY 2016. This level of funding would allow us to continue efforts to increase our onboard staff. It would also ensure that we have adequate resources for travel, training, and other mission-support activities such as technology acquisition and enhancements.

Budget Requests, FY 2015 to FY 2017
National Railroad Passenger Corporation
Office of Inspector General
(dollars in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President's Request</td>
<td>$24.499</td>
<td>$24.499</td>
<td>$23.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>$23.999</td>
<td>$24.499</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We entered FY 2015 operating under a continuing resolution funding level of $23.5 million—the same level of funding available during FY 2014. In December 2014, the Omnibus Appropriations Bill provided us $23.999 million for FY 2015. During FY2015, we increased our onboard staff from 79 to 87. This was short of our goal of 97 staff but we experienced several issues such as unforeseen attrition and difficulties in identifying qualified candidates, particularly for vacancies in the Office of Audits that slowed the pace of our growth. However, we have used contractors to augment our audit staff and have been effectively operating at a level of 97 fulltime equivalents.

During FY 2016, we will continue our efforts to increase our permanent staff and adjust our use of contractors to accomplish our mission. The FY 2017 funding request would help us sustain the improvements we made to operate as a model OIG and to continue delivering high-quality work that identifies cost savings and improves the company’s operations and programs.

In particular, it would allow us to sustain a very successful forensic auditing effort using data analytics tools. We are using, and plan to continue to use, our data analytics capabilities to audit and monitor internal control effectiveness of critical business processes. Since April 2014, we have issued six reports using data analytics techniques to assess controls and data in procurement card, travel card, employee injury claims, time and attendance programs and incentive awards. We have also used data analytics to help support a number of other audit reports such as our review of the Americans
with Disabilities Act program and both proactive and reactive investigations of potentially fraudulent activities. We have ongoing and planned data analytics efforts that will support FY 2016 and 2017 audit and investigative work in the areas of healthcare claims and payments, employee injury claims and payments and employee overtime charges, and passenger train on time performance reporting.

The FY 2017 funding request would also help us maintain and expand our use of cutting edge technology, particularly for investigations. During FY 2015 we completed the development of a basic computer forensics lab and plan to increase the capabilities and capacity of the lab during FY 2016 and in FY 20017, subject to available resources, consistent with our vision of operating as a model OIG.

Our FY 2017 budget request is broken down as follows:

- $18.4 million for personnel and related costs.
- $2.4 million for operational and equipment expenses, including funding for office space, special equipment for criminal investigators, staff training, and information technology equipment and support services.
- $2.5 million for consultants and contracted services.

The request includes $440,000 for staff training requirements, and $75,000 to support the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency. The Inspector General certifies that the $440,000 for staff training satisfies all known training requirements for FY 2017, in accordance with Public Law 110-409, the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008.

**KEY FOCUS AREAS FOR FY 2017**

During FY 2017 we will continue to focus our audit and investigation efforts in the areas of Governance, Acquisition and Procurement, Information Technology, Train Operations and Business Management, Human Capital Management, Safety and Security, and Asset Management, subject to available resources. Our overall goal will be to identify ways to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the company’s programs and operations, while continuing to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse. Our investigative work will continue to emphasize and leverage cutting-edge investigative tools such as digital forensics, data analysis, and surveillance technology. Our audit work will be guided by audit plans for FY 2016 and FY 2017.
## APPROPRIATION
(dollars in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT NAME</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>23.999</td>
<td>24.499</td>
<td>23.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB ACCOUNT ID: 575-00-2996</td>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>FY 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>REQUEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Compensation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1 Full-time permanent</td>
<td>11.156</td>
<td>12.992</td>
<td>12.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 Other personnel compensation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9 Total Personnel Compensation</td>
<td>11.156</td>
<td>12.992</td>
<td>12.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 Personnel benefits</td>
<td>6.250</td>
<td>6.465</td>
<td>6.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.0 Travel and transportation (persons)</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.0 Transportation (things)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.2 Rental payments to others</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.3 Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.0 Printing and reproduction</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1 Advisory and assistance services</td>
<td>2.953</td>
<td>3.034</td>
<td>2.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.3 Other purchases of goods and services from government accounts</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.0 Supplies and materials</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.0 Equipment</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.0 Subtotal, direct obligations</td>
<td>22.396</td>
<td>24.499</td>
<td>23.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.9 Total obligations</td>
<td>22.396</td>
<td>24.499</td>
<td>23.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNT NAME</td>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>FY 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalents</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>