

---

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

---

**DATE:** 7/16/07  
**TO:** LORI HEALY, MARA GEORGES, JACQUELINE KING, JOE GAGLIARDO,  
**CC:** DAVID HOFFMAN  
**FROM:** NOELLE BRENNAN  
**RE:** PLANNING DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION

---

During the regular course of monitoring interviews, our office identified a problem regarding the Department of Planning's filling of a Senior Research Assistant position, A Form 07-08.

This position was originally "bid out" and resulted in interviews of two candidates on March 13, 2007. One candidate was rated as a "3.0" and the other was rated as a "2.5". Neither candidate was offered a position due to a purported lack of qualifications. Subsequently, Planning requested a new referral list from outside applicants, and received a referral list of four candidates. One of the candidates withdrew from the process for personal reasons, and another did not respond to attempts to contact him. The remaining candidates, \_\_\_\_\_, were interviewed on May 10, 2007, and \_\_\_\_\_ was rated the highest. A monitor was present for these interviews and had some concerns about the fairness of the process. Specifically, based on the answers to the questions, the predetermined qualifications and the work product that the interviewees brought to the interview, the selection of \_\_\_\_\_ appeared suspect. Our office requested that the sequence be repeated with different interviewers. On May 25 and 29, 2007 Planning repeated the interviews and the outcome was the same, except this time received a perfect rating of 5. Once again, the monitor present for the interviews had concerns about the fairness of the process. *See Resumes attached hereto for comparison.*

Our investigation of this hiring sequence uncovered the following. \_\_\_\_\_ had been a student intern in Planning from 11/04 to 1/07. He was forced to vacate the intern position because he was no longer a student and had not been enrolled in courses since February of 2006. Because \_\_\_\_\_ was no longer eligible for the intern position, the department decided to outsource the position to an outside contractor, GIS Solutions. GIS Solutions hired (at the departments instruction) \_\_\_\_\_ and he continued to do the duties he had previously had as a student intern, which were the same duties as the Research Assistant. At the time of the interviews and continuing to the present, \_\_\_\_\_ was/is performing the duties of the Senior Research Assistant position for GIS Solutions.

As part of this investigation, interviews were scheduled with Paul Imparl and Josephine Raya, interviewers for the first sequence of interviews with bid applicants and the first sequence of interviews with outside applicants. Each interview was conducted

**EXHIBIT****B**

separately and lasted anywhere from an hour to an hour-and-a-half. Each of these individuals indicated that they had supervised [redacted] previously. Thereafter, interviews were scheduled with Nikki Bravo, Deputy Commissioner of Administrative Services and Deputy Commissioner John Karnuth.

The interviews established the following. [redacted] became a student intern in November of 2004. He graduated from Robert Morris College in February of 2006. Notwithstanding his graduation, he continued to fill the intern position until January of 2007. At that time, DHR began insisting that those individuals filling "intern" slots actually be students and thus, [redacted] was forced out of the intern slot. During [redacted] tenure as an intern, there was no open Senior Research Assistant slot in Planning. There was, however, a City Planner V slot that was open and that had remained unfilled for most of 2006. Planning requested that the City Planner V slot be reclassified to a Senior Research Assistant position. The duties of the newly created Senior Research Assistant position were the exact duties that [redacted] performed as an intern.

At the time [redacted] left the intern position, the job duties that he had previously performed were outsourced to GIS Solutions. Planning had never previously used GIS Solutions, but was able to piggy-back on a BIS contract. Planning sent [redacted] to work at GIS Solutions and [redacted] continued to perform the duties of the Senior Research Assistant. Specifically, the Planning Department employees interviewed confirmed that with [redacted] having to leave his position as intern, there was work that needed to be done so they used the contract as a way to keep [redacted] around until they could fill the position permanently. As expected, when Planning was able to fill the position, [redacted] was selected.

Based on the above, it is apparent that [redacted] was pre-selected to fill the Senior Research Assistant position. In addition, the use of the outside contractor to manipulate the employment rules of the City is disturbing. During the course of this office's investigation, it was discovered that Planning has used the same outside contractor arrangement to keep another intern by the name of [redacted] employed.

Please advise what action the City intends to take in response to the above.