

Inspector General for the City of Springfield

Phone: 217.391.1630 email: spfldoig@gmail.com

P.O. Box 2459 Springfield, IL 62705

DATE: November 19, 2019

# INSPECTOR GENERAL'S REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

2019-OIG-3

I was contacted by Complainant and asked to investigate his CWLP billing, which had drastically increased before he made contact with me. I offered a face-to-face meeting with Complainant, but before that happened Complainant contacted me to advise that his landlord had admitted using his utilities.

I responded that since his landlord is not a City employee, I did not have jurisdiction over him, but advised Complainant that he could file a Police Report and follow up with the Sangamon County States Attorney's Office regarding theft of services. I also provided contact information for the Springfield Housing Department. Complainant thanked me for that assistance and this matter was closed with no further action being taken.

Respectfully submitted,



Inspector General for the City of Springfield

Phone: 217.391.1630 email: spfldoig@gmail.com

P.O. Box 2459 Springfield, IL 62705

DATE: November 19, 2019

#### INSPECTOR GENERAL'S REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

#### 2019-OIG-4

I was contacted by email by a Complainant regarding unfilled positions on the Springfield Tree Commission. Complainant stated that no one had been appointed to the Tree Commission for a number of years.

Upon investigation, I was advised that the Tree Commission Ordinance was updated to include the Springfield Green Initiative, which was implemented in 2005 and that the Tree Commission was thereafter discontinued.

My last contact by Complainant in a lengthy email chain was that the City Council was discussing a new Urban Forestry Commission Ordinance and that Complainant would monitor that Commissioners were appointed and that if they were not, she would contact me again.

The Urban Forestry Commission now appears on the City of Springfield's website, which indicates that 7 of the 10 Commissioners have been appointed and the City website further indicates that the Urban Forestry Commission has been meeting monthly since September of 2019.

It has now been approximately 5 months from that last communication and this matter is closed with no findings or action being taken.

Respectfully submitted,



Inspector General for the City of Springfield

Phone: 217.391.1630 email: spfldoig@gmail.com

P.O. Box 2459 Springfield, IL 62705

DATE: November 19, 2019

# INSPECTOR GENERAL'S REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

2019-OIG-5

I was asked to interview a probationary City employee who was dismissed prior to the end of the 12 month probationary period as that is defined in Springfield City Code Section 36.11. I met face-to-face on two occasions with the dismissed employee who raised questions about the sufficiency of training to perform Complainant's job functions. Complainant also pointed out instances of other employees who Complainant felt had also made mistakes in their job performance and were not disciplined.

Ultimately, Complainant terminated our second interview and indicated that she would seek private legal advice. Section 36.11 states that "Probationary employees may be summarily dismissed and are not entitled to the protection afforded to certified employees." The employee in question had at least 3 months remaining on this probationary period set by the Section and as such, the City could and did summarily dismiss Complainant.

Based upon the foregoing, no further action was taken and the case has been closed.

Respectfully submitted,



Inspector General for the City of Springfield

Phone: 217.391.1630 email: spfldoig@gmail.com

P.O. Box 2459 Springfield, IL 62705

DATE: November 19, 2019

### INSPECTOR GENERAL'S REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

#### 2019-OIG-6

In late September, 2019, I was contacted by a Lake Springfield resident who complained of Lake Services providing preferential treatment to Complainant's neighbor to the detriment of Complainant.

A face-to-face interview was conducted and Complainant followed up with some photographs.

Complainant and his contiguous neighbor are in a dispute as to land boundary lines and at the time of my meeting, a professional survey was being conducted. Complainant is being represented by a local attorney in the dispute over the boundary line.

In the face-to-face interview, Complainant stated that he did not wish for me to open a formal investigation regarding his allegations of favoritism by certain Lake Services employees, but that Complainant wanted me to remember this incident in the event that I received similar future complaints.

Inasmuch as Complainant has private counsel in the boundary dispute and in light of Complainant's statement that he did not wish for me to open a formal investigation, this matter is closed without any findings or recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,