

The Imperative of Electing New York City's Inspector General: Fortifying Independence, Accountability, and Affordability in Municipal Oversight

Guy Christian Agbor

Derisking Advisory / Global Association of Certified Anti-illicit Financial Flows (GACAIFFP) / African Society for Corporate Compliance et Ethics (ASCCE), United States

Corresponding author

Guy Christian Agbor, Derisking Advisory / Global Association of Certified Anti-illicit Financial Flows (GACAIFFP) / African Society for Corporate Compliance et Ethics (ASCCE), United States.

Received: November 22, 2025; **Accepted:** December 16, 2025; **Published:** December 24, 2025

Introduction

In the intricate tapestry of New York City, a metropolis where political authority intertwines with vast public resources, the Department of Investigation (DOI) is the quintessential sentinel of civic integrity. Charged with the solemn responsibility of unearthing corruption, fraud, and malfeasance across the city's myriad agencies, the DOI's commissioner, colloquially termed the Inspector General, wields profound influence in safeguarding public confidence. However, the prevailing paradigm, which consigns this pivotal role to mayoral appointment subject to perfunctory City Council affirmation, engenders a precarious vulnerability to executive machinations and reprisals

1. The 2018 ouster of Commissioner Mark Peters by Mayor Bill de Blasio, precipitated by allegations of authority abuse from an ironically self-initiated inquiry, exemplifies this fragility
2. The 2024 federal indictment of Mayor Eric Adams on bribery and campaign finance charges, though dismissed in April 2025 amid ongoing probes into associates, further underscores the exigency for a robust, independent oversight mechanism [3,4].

As of mid-2025, New York City's municipal apparatus, encompassing nearly 300,000 full-time employees, embodies the complexity of urban governance while amplifying inherent susceptibilities to corruption, fiscal profligacy, and deception [5]. These perils manifest not only in egregious felonies but also in systemic frailties permeating diverse bureaus, draining resources that exacerbate the city's affordability crisis, where median rents exceed \$3,000 monthly and 49% of households are cost-burdened [6]. By diverting funds from essential services like housing,

education, and infrastructure, corruption and waste inflate living costs, undermining New Yorkers' economic stability. Electing the DOI commissioner, mirroring the autonomy of borough district attorneys, would fortify institutional independence, enhance accountability, and curb financial losses, alleviating affordability pressures and reinforcing public trust.

Corruption and Fraud: A Persistent Threat to Governance and Affordability

The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) epitomizes this plight, ensnared in a 2024 scandal where 70 employees were indicted for soliciting \$2 million in bribes tied to \$13 million in no-bid contracts, diverting funds critical for affordable housing [7]. Such malfeasance, rooted in decentralized procurement, exacerbates NYCHA's \$78 billion capital shortfall, driving up maintenance costs passed onto tenants [8]. Similarly, the September 2025 conviction of a retirement examiner for embezzling \$624,000 from pension funds reveals profound verification lapses, depriving retirees of resources and inflating pension contributions that strain city budgets and taxpayers [9].

DOI assessments indicate that two-thirds of enforcement agencies attribute heightened vulnerabilities to staffing shortages, inexperience, and attenuated auditing, eroding supervisory rigor and duty segregation [10]. Procedural lethargy and high attrition exacerbate risks of illicit procurement, bid-rigging, fraudulent invoicing, bribery, and asset misappropriation. The city's \$20 billion annual contracting volume, marred by noncompetitive awards and lax scrutiny, amplifies profligacy, with audits estimating 5–10% waste (\$1–2 billion) that could fund affordable housing or transit upgrades [11]. These losses

Citation: Guy Christian Agbor. The Imperative of Electing New York City's Inspector General: Fortifying Independence, Accountability, and Affordability in Municipal Oversight . J Journalism Media Manag. 2025. 1(1): 1-5. DOI: doi.org/10.61440/JJMM.2025.v1.29

directly undermine affordability, as misallocated funds increase taxes and service costs, hitting low- and middle-income residents hardest.

The DOI's pivotal role in mitigating these threats underscores the need for fortified safeguards, rigorous audits, and enhanced whistleblower protections. By curbing waste, an independent DOI could redirect resources to affordability initiatives, such as NYCHA repairs or rental subsidies, easing the burden on 1.5 million cost-burdened households [6]. Thus, New York City's sprawling bureaucracy, fraught with malversation and deceit, demands urgent reform to safeguard governance and economic accessibility.

New York City's Budget and Estimates of Waste

As of September 23, 2025, New York City's Fiscal Year 2026 (FY2026) budget, which spans the period from July 1, 2025, to June 30, 2026, has been meticulously crafted to total an impressive \$115.9 billion. This substantial fiscal plan signifies a robust recovery from the economic strains induced by the pandemic. It reflects a steadfast commitment to prioritizing critical areas such as education, public safety, and social welfare [12].

The budget encompasses a myriad of key components that illustrate its comprehensive approach to governance:

1. **Agency Operations:** Allocating a significant \$75 billion, this portion is designated for salaries and operational functions across more than 80 diverse city agencies, ensuring effective service delivery and organizational functionality.
2. **Pensions and Fringe Benefits:** This essential segment, amounting to \$18.5 billion, is dedicated to supporting an extensive workforce exceeding 300,000 employees, encompassing vital pensions and benefits that reflect a commitment to the well-being of those who serve the city.
3. **Debt Service:** Focusing on fiscal responsibility, the budget allocates \$9.2 billion for servicing bonds, a critical obligation that underpins the city's financial integrity and creditworthiness.
4. **Capital Budget:** A noteworthy investment of \$25.4 billion is earmarked for infrastructure development, encompassing vital projects that promise to enhance the city's resilience and sustainability.

The FY2026 budget represents a notable 3.1% increase from the previous fiscal year's budget of \$112.4 billion. This growth trajectory is primarily driven by a robust increase in tax revenues and a noteworthy surplus of \$2.3 billion. However, it is essential to acknowledge that this optimistic financial outlook is tempered by potential risks associated with inflation, which remains a pertinent concern in the current economic landscape [12].

In summary, the FY2026 budget reflects a proactive approach to financial management and illustrates New York City's enduring commitment to fostering an equitable, safe, and thriving community for all its residents.

Estimated Waste from Mismanagement, Fraud, Corruption, and Bribery

Quantifying waste within governmental systems is an inherently complex endeavor, mainly due to the clandestine nature of many forms of inefficiency and corruption. Official data typically

emphasizes recoveries and high-profile cases, often overlooking the vast, unrecognized losses that permeate municipal operations. The Department of Investigation (DOI), with an allocated budget of \$55 million for fiscal year 2026—reflecting a commendable increase of 5.1%—is instrumental in curtailing these significant losses. Current estimates suggest an astonishing \$18 to \$123 in waste is averted for every dollar invested in the DOI. This translates to potential unmitigated losses citywide, projected to range between \$990 million and \$6.8 billion [13].

Illustrative cases of misconduct further underscore the imperative role of the DOI in safeguarding public resources:

- In 2024, the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) faced a staggering \$2 million in bribes linked to \$13 million in contracts, diverting essential housing funds for vulnerable populations.
- In 2025, the Department of Corrections (DOC) uncovered \$1 million in workers' compensation fraud. This unscrupulous act inflated payroll costs, undermining the integrity of the agency's budgeting processes.
- Also in 2025, the New York City Employees' Retirement System (NYCERS) reported the theft of \$624,000 from pensions. This breach consequently exacerbates the financial burdens faced by retirees who depend on these funds for their livelihood.

Cumulatively, investigations spearheaded by the DOI recover approximately \$50 million to \$100 million annually, with pension fraud cases yielding an impressive \$5.8 million over a decade [10]. Beyond these recoveries, systemic estimates indicate that between 1% and 2% of the city's budget—totaling approximately \$1.2 billion to \$2.3 billion—is lost to various forms of mismanagement and fraudulent activities. Alarming, undetected corruption has the potential to double these figures, compounding the fiscal challenges faced by the city [7].

The ramifications of these losses extend far beyond mere financial metrics, manifesting as increased taxes and service fees that place a greater burden on residents. According to the Citizens Budget Commission, it is estimated that a staggering \$1 billion in waste could be redirected to fund initiatives such as the construction of 10,000 affordable housing units or the salaries of 15,000 teachers. Such investments would profoundly impact the city's affordability crisis, directly influencing the quality of life for countless New Yorkers [14].

Given this context, strengthening the independence and efficacy of the DOI could play a pivotal role in reclaiming these misappropriated resources. By fortifying its investigative capabilities and shielding it from external pressures, the city could mitigate economic strains on its residents, fostering a more equitable and sustainable urban environment for all.

Agencies Beset by Elevated Corruption Vulnerabilities

Recent evaluations highlight agencies with acute corruption risks, undermining both governance and affordability:

1. New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA)

NYCHA's 2024 bribery scandal, involving \$2 million for \$13 million in contracts, reflects systemic procurement flaws, diverting funds from repairs critical for 400,000 residents. This exacerbates rent increases and housing instability.

2. Department of Corrections (DOC)

Chronic payroll and benefits fraud, including a 2025 \$1 million compensation scheme, inflates costs, raising taxes that burden residents [9].

3. Department of Buildings (DOB)

Bribery in permit approvals inflates construction costs, indirectly raising housing prices [10].

4. Department of Education (DOE)

Procurement fraud diverts education funds, impacting school quality and increasing parental costs [10].

5. New York City Employees' Retirement System (NYCERS)

Pension theft, as in the 2025 \$624,000 case, strains retiree resources and city budgets [9].

Over 60% of agencies report staffing and control deficiencies, with FDNY, ACS, DOT, OCME, and CCRB also vulnerable (DOI, 2024). These risks siphon resources, exacerbating affordability challenges for 49% of cost-burdened households (NYU Furman Center, 2025). An elected DOI commissioner, insulated from political pressures, could enhance oversight, redirecting funds to affordability initiatives.

The Prevailing Regime: Susceptibilities to Political Coercion

The New York City Charter bestows upon the mayor considerable sovereign discretion regarding the appointment of the Department of Investigation (DOI) commissioner. This process remains contingent upon the ratification of the City Council (§ 801, 2022). This framework, however, is marked by an absence of fixed terms and lacks robust protections under the “just cause” stipulation, thereby rendering the office susceptible to the overarching influence of mayoral authority and ambition [15].

A striking manifestation of this precarious balance of power is evidenced in the dismissal of Commissioner Peters in 2018. This decision followed intensive inquiries into the mayor's conduct and was compounded by overarching pressures stemming from the administration of Mayor Bloomberg. This incident epitomizes the vulnerability inherent in the current structure, revealing how the DOI can be unceremoniously undermined when its findings may inconveniently interfere with the political machinations of the highest office in the city [2,3].

Furthermore, the recent arrest of Buildings Commissioner Eric Ulrich in 2023, which implicated Mayor Adams's associates, underscores the fragile nature of the DOI's position within the broader political landscape. Such events highlight the potential for conflict of interest and further illuminate the essential need for an independent oversight body capable of pursuing investigations without fear of retaliation or political repercussions [16].

Advocating for the election of the DOI commissioner, akin to the system in place for district attorneys, presents a compelling solution to mitigating the risks associated with political interference. An elected commissioner would not only bolster the integrity and independence of investigations but also enhance the overall accountability of the office. This autonomy would empower the DOI to allocate its resources more effectively, thereby enabling the city to divert critical funds toward pressing

affordability initiatives, such as housing subsidies and other supportive programs vital to the fabric of New York City [9,17].

In conclusion, reforming the appointment process and establishing an elected DOI commissioner is a necessary evolution in governance, ensuring that the ideals of transparency and accountability remain at the forefront of public administration in New York City.

The Compelling Merits: Autonomy, Responsibility, and Communal Faith

The Department of Investigation (DOI) electoral investiture proposal is a pivotal strategy for enhancing this vital institution's legitimacy in the public's eyes. By anchoring its authority in the electorate, the DOI can mitigate the risks posed by partisan interference while simultaneously upholding the autonomy of district attorneys. This initiative draws on insights from Transparency International and envisions a more transparent, accountable, and effective governance structure.

A primary benefit of this electoral approach is augmented autonomy for the DOI. This independence is a protective barrier against potential retaliatory actions, exemplified by the highprofile probes conducted by the NYPD in 2020, as discussed in Congressional Digest (n.d.). By securing a mandate from the electorate, the DOI can operate without undue influence, thus safeguarding its investigatory functions and ensuring that justice prevails.

Moreover, establishing civic accountability through direct voter oversight elevates public trust in the DOI's operations. When citizens have a hand in the election of investigators, as Apolitical emphasized, they are more likely to perceive the DOI as a transparent and responsible entity dedicated to their interests. This empowerment of the electorate fosters a collaborative environment wherein the public feels invested in the integrity of governance.

Furthermore, an elected DOI cultivates a robust anti-malversation ethos, championing the fearless pursuit of corruption. Drawing inspiration from global models, such as Hong Kong's Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC), the DOI can adopt proven strategies emphasizing integrity and accountability (U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, n.d.). By embodying this ethos, the DOI reinforces its commitment to tackling corruption with vigor and resolve, enhancing its moral authority.

The proposed electoral framework also amplifies lucidity within campaign structures, allowing for a clearer understanding of the oversight role that the DOI plays in maintaining ethical governance. Campaigns designed around this model can effectively communicate the significance of oversight, as highlighted by Project on Government Oversight (2014). This clarity is essential in fostering public engagement and ensuring that voters are informed participants in the electoral process.

Additionally, aligning the DOI with peer offices, particularly those of elected district attorneys, creates a synergistic relationship that reinforces checks and balances within the investigative landscape. As noted by Citizens Union, this alignment enhances

collaboration and coordination, enabling a unified front against misconduct and encouraging a culture of accountability.

Notably, the election of the DOI has profound financial implications for the city's budgetary allocations. By curbing inefficiencies and waste, it is estimated that an elected DOI could redirect between \$1 to \$2 billion annually toward affordability measures. These funds can be instrumental in alleviating the financial burdens of rent and taxes, thereby making significant strides toward enhancing the quality of life for residents [14].

In conclusion, the vision for an elected Department of Investigation represents a transformative leap toward strengthening governance through accountability, autonomy, and public engagement. By infusing self-governance into this critical institution, we bolster its legitimacy and lay a foundation for a more transparent and just society.

Confronting Liabilities: Mitigating Risks in an Electoral Paradigm

Critics have raised substantial concerns regarding the potential politicization of electoral processes, the resultant apathy among voters, and the dangerous dilution of expertise that may ensue when partisan interests take precedence over impartial governance [18,19]. Such apprehensions merit serious consideration, as they underscore the delicate balance required to maintain the integrity of democratic practices.

To combat these threats and foster a more robust democratic framework, the implementation of stringent safeguards is essential. These measures may include the establishment of nonpartisan rules, the introduction of public financing mechanisms, and the enforcement of rigorous investigative prerequisites. Collectively, these elements serve as a bulwark against undue political influence and ensure that the pursuit of electoral excellence remains untainted by the vagaries of partisanship.

The efficacy of these safeguards is exemplified in merit-based election models, which have demonstrated a capacity to uphold the principles of professionalism and accountability in governance [20]. Such frameworks promote stability within the electoral process and protect vital affordability initiatives from the destabilizing effects of political turbulence. By reinforcing these essential structural elements, we can aspire to create an electoral environment responsive to the populace's needs and resilient in the face of potential challenges.

Insights from Peer Municipalities: Archetypes and Trajectories

In the complex landscape of urban oversight, the limitations inherent to Chicago's appointed Inspector General (IG) illustrate the critical flaws associated with a model characterized by partial autonomy. As noted in a comprehensive analysis by the Better Government Association, such constraints diminish the effectiveness of oversight mechanisms, rendering them inadequate in addressing the multifaceted issues that plague governance [21]. By contrast, Cook County's commission-driven framework offers a degree of neutrality that fosters trust and objectivity in governmental oversight [18]. This structure promotes accountability and mitigates the potential

for corruption, ensuring that the gatekeepers of government integrity are held to high standards.

Moreover, Philadelphia's recent initiatives aimed at expanding oversight reflect a growing recognition of the necessity for comprehensive governance structures, echoing the fundamental needs articulated by New York City's diverse constituencies [22]. As cities grapple with increasingly complex administrative challenges, the call for broader oversight becomes paramount, underscoring the importance of robust and transparent governance.

The Association of Inspectors General advocates for a systematic approach to selecting inspectors that emphasizes meritocracy, recommending term lengths of five to seven years to cultivate stability and accountability in oversight roles [13]. This model seeks to establish a cadre of inspectors who are not only qualified but also insulated from the whims of political tides, thereby enhancing the integrity of governance.

Furthermore, hybrid election models emerge as a promising avenue to reconcile legitimacy with expertise in public oversight. Such frameworks enhance the efficacy of oversight bodies and facilitate better resource allocation, ultimately leading to a more affordable and efficient governance structure [23]. These models provide a balanced approach for addressing urban environments' unique challenges by harnessing electoral legitimacy and specialized knowledge.

The imperative for innovative and effective oversight mechanisms becomes increasingly apparent as cities evolve. The combination of strategic appointments, merit-based selections, and hybrid electoral processes represents a conscientious effort to enhance accountability, ensure transparency, and promote the public interest in governance.

Juridical Impediments and Avenues to Metamorphosis

Electoral reform in New York City presents a complex landscape punctuated by significant barriers rooted in the City Charter and state law. Specifically, addressing these challenges necessitates a dual approach of securing a public referendum and the requisite legislative approval from Albany, as delineated in the New York City Charter (§ 40, 2022) and highlighted by the Citizens Union in their 2025 report.

The intricate separation of powers, alongside potential conflicts within the civil service, demands meticulous and thoughtful design in any proposed reforms. As articulated by the Brennan Center (n.d.) and further emphasized by the New York State Board of Elections, navigating these institutional dynamics requires a comprehensive understanding of the current electoral framework and its implications [9].

In this context, the impending 2025 Charter Revision Commission emerges as a pivotal opportunity for change. This commission seeks to build upon the advancements achieved during the 2019 expansions, which laid the groundwork for a more inclusive and responsive electoral system [12]. By engaging with stakeholders and incorporating public input, the 2025 commission aims to craft a set of reforms that comply with legal stipulations and resonate with the aspirations of the constituents it serves.

Ultimately, the path toward meaningful electoral reform in New York City is fraught with challenges yet rich with potential. Successfully navigating these obstacles will demand legal acumen and a vision for a more equitable and participatory democratic process.

Epilogue

The proposition to elect the Commissioner of the Department of Investigation (DOI) stands as an imperative, inexorable mandate, heralding a significant shift in the balance of power away from the mayoral stronghold. This reform not only echoes the resilience demonstrated by borough prosecutors in their pursuit of justice but also embodies a profound commitment to enhancing the principles of autonomy, accountability, and affordability within our governance framework.

Empowering the electorate through this initiative is a cornerstone in reallocating substantial public funds, redirecting billions from entrenched inefficiencies toward essential housing and vital public services. By embracing this transformative approach, we cultivate a more just society that prioritizes the needs of its citizens over bureaucratic inertia.

Moreover, this initiative benefits from meticulously crafted safeguards and the invaluable lessons gleaned from interurban studies, which outline a feasible pathway toward implementation. Through thoughtful charter revisions, we are poised to dismantle the legal barriers that have historically hindered our progress in this area.

In an era marked by a troubling decline in public trust, New York must take bold steps to reenfranchise its citizenry. This initiative not only seeks to reaffirm the paramountcy of the polity but also endeavors to secure an affordable, equitable future for all its inhabitants. In doing so, we reaffirm our collective commitment to a governance model that reflects the will and welfare of the people, ensuring that our city becomes a beacon of hope and opportunity for generations to come.

References

1. New York City Charter. New York City charter. 2022.
2. New York Times. De Blasio fires investigations chief, citing abuse of power. 2018.
3. Vital City. Eric Adams' scandals, in historical context. 2024.
4. Politico. Adams' indictment dismissed, probes continue. 2025.
5. NYC Office of Payroll Administration. Workforce statistics. 2025.
6. NYU Furman Center. State of New York City's housing and neighborhoods. 2025.
7. Transparency International. Global corruption barometer. U.S. Attorney's Office. NYCHA bribery indictments. 2023.
8. NYCHA. Capital needs assessment. 2025.
9. NYC Comptroller. Pension fraud investigation summary. 2025.
10. Department of Investigation (DOI). Annual anti-corruption report. 2024.
11. NYC Comptroller. Audit report on city contracting. 2024.
12. NYC Office of Management and Budget. FY2026 adopted budget. 2025.
13. Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency. CIGIE presidential transition handbook. 2024.
14. Citizens Budget Commission. Fiscal impacts of waste in the NYC government. 2025.
15. Inspector General Act of 1978, Pub. L. No. 2008. 95-452.
16. Politico. The buildings commissioner was arrested in a bribery probe. 2023.
17. Citizens Union. Charter reforms for a better New York City government. 2025.
18. Governing. States and localities realize the importance of inspectors general. 2013.
19. William Mary. Bill of Rights Journal. Inspectors General and the law of oversight independence. 2021.
20. Brennan Center for Justice. (n.d.). A proposal for an NYPD inspector general.
21. Better Government Association. Inspectors general: Chicago among nation's strongest but lacks power to publish reports. 2022.
22. Taylor Francis. Crafting accountability policy: Designing offices of inspector general. 2017.
23. Project On Government Oversight. Watching the watchdogs: The good, the bad, and what we need from inspectors general. 2014.
24. Apolitical. Why Inspectors General are essential for good governance. 2025.
25. Congressional Digest. Pros & cons of protecting inspectors general.
26. New York City Charter Revision Commission. The 2025 charter revision commission adopted the final report. 2025.
27. New York City Charter Revision Commission. Proposed amendments to the New. 2025.
28. New York State Board of Elections. Election law update. 2025.
29. Transparency International. How to make anti-corruption agencies accountable and independent. 2017.
30. U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre. Criteria for appointing executives of anti-corruption agencies.
31. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. United Nations handbook on practical anticorruption measures for prosecutors and investigators. 2013.