

2017-0636 A.I. Report

January 21, 2018

To Major Robert S. Hicks

Attention Command

From: Sergeant Kenneth E. Findlay, Internal Affairs Investigation Unit

Administrative Investigation # 2107-0636- Lieutenant Tyler A. Campbell, Unit 812, Sergeant Alan L. Hall Unit 1807, Secretary Emma L. Loisel Unit 4213, Hammond Barracks.

Background:

On November 14, 2017, Staff Lieutenant Charles S. Voyt spoke to me regarding an incident which occurred at the Hammond Barracks. On November 2, 2107, it was discovered during a Quality Review Audit (QRA) that Secretary Emma L. Loisel had not been entering vehicle service records into the FleetLE module as required; furthermore, Sergeant Alan L. Hall and Lieutenant Tyler A. Campbell had not been properly keeping track of the system to ensure the records were being updated.

Investigative Action:

On November 2, 2017, I interviewed Staff Lieutenant Anthony C. Foster as a witness to this internal affairs investigation. Prior to the interview, I showed him the Quality Review Audit Recap for November 2, 2017, (Attachment A), the Quality Review Audit Recap for March 13, 2017, (Attachment B), the Hammond Barracks Summary dated November 2, 2017 (Attachment C), a tow bill dated April 11, 2017 (Attachment D), and the fire extinguisher bill dated May 9, 2016 (Attachment E). Foster acknowledged he reviewed these items prior to the start of the interview.

Foster said the Hammond Barracks had a QRA scheduled for November 2, 2017. As part of the process to prepare for the audit, Foster said he reviewed the previous QRA from March 13, 2017 (Attachment B). Foster said the vehicles had not been inspected in March 2017 due to Loisel being off duty on that date, coupled with the fact the Hammond Barracks had previously had a biennial inspection in December 2016.

Foster said he ran the FleetLE report (Attachment C), in order to review the services were being properly recorded every 7,500 miles. Foster said he immediately noticed there were

several services not being entered into the system. Foster said the current mileages displayed on the FleetLE report were "kind of an identifier" to indicate whether or not a cruiser was scheduled for service. I asked Foster if the oil changes were getting entered into this system and he said no.

I asked Foster if he noticed there were problems with the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report, and he answered yes. Foster said the majority of the problems focused on oil services not being entered into the system. He explained this caused concerns as to whether or not the cruisers were being properly serviced; Sergeant Hall, the supervisor assigned vehicles, provided him the local spreadsheet which indicated the vehicles had been serviced as scheduled. Foster said Hall did not know why the services were not being entered into the FleetLE database.

After finding the vehicles had been serviced, Foster said he went "to the car file" to find the paperwork from the oil change services and was unable to find several of the service orders from the local garage. Foster said he did not know where the service orders were located. He discussed this situation with the supervisors at the Hammond Barracks, and nobody knew where the service orders would be. Foster said the service orders were ultimately discovered in the "right hand" desk drawer of the desk in the office assigned to Secretary Loisel.

I asked Foster where the car file was located, and he said it was located in Loisel' office. I asked if it was unusual for service orders to be kept in a desk drawer, and he responded, "I have not seen it." Foster said there were enough problems during the QRA to merit an additional follow-up audit in December 2017. He explained Secretary Rose Morris from the Jefferson Barracks had been assigned to assist Hammond at least twice a week to better prepare them for the upcoming audit.

Foster said Fleet Supervisor Dianna Langley has provided tremendous assistance in correcting the errors contained within the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report. Langley told him this process took her a couple of days to correct. Langley also told him she has previously explained the process to Loisel on how to correctly enter the services into the FleetLE report.

Foster said Langley also told him there had been some discussion regarding how Fowler's Automotive sent their bills to the Hammond Barracks. Foster explained Fowler's sent their bills to Hammond at the end of the month, which is outside of normal parameters. He said the bills should be paid by the Galaxy card immediately upon the service order being completed, but it appeared this was the arrangement set up with Fowler's Automotive with Loisel. I asked Foster if there had been a directive indicating the use of the Galaxy card, and he answered yes. Foster commented the directive came out in 2016 or 2017. He explained there was also a "credit card option" the vendors could use to avoid the Galaxy card fees.

I asked Foster if the Galaxy cards were being used to pay the vehicle services, and he said yes. Foster indicated his concern with the method used by Hammond to pay for vehicle services left questions as to how the Galaxy card was being used on each cruiser, as there was a Galaxy card assigned to each vehicle. Foster explained the Galaxy card was intended to be used for payment as soon as the services were completed.

I asked Foster if Langley and Morris were able to successfully correct the problems associated with FleetLE report, and he stated the QRA scheduled for December would verify this, but it appeared so. I asked if Langley would be considered an expert on the FleetLE system, and he answered yes. I asked if it appeared Loisel was not heeding her advice, and he said, "That is my understanding, correct."

I asked Foster if Hall was the supervisor assigned keeping track of vehicles, and he said yes. I asked if Hall was not verifying the services he kept track of with the FleetLE report, and he answered yes. Foster explained Hall used a local system to keep track of the services on each vehicle, and it appeared the services were being completed; however, since the service records were not being entered into the FleetLE report by Loisel, there was no way to verify the services as being completed. He further said since the service records were not being kept in the car file, this also caused a problem in verifying the service records.

I asked Foster if Hall had recently passed his probationary period in September 2017, and he said yes. I asked if the FleetLE report would be a system in which a newly promoted sergeant would have a working knowledge, and he answered, "Normally, no" Foster explained the Secretary at each Barracks are the ones who have a "working knowledge" of the system. Foster said if there are any problems they could contact Langley to help them through any issues.

Foster said both FleetLE and the Galaxy cards have been around for quite a while, and this should not be an issue at this point. I asked Foster if it appeared Loisel was the person most responsible for these issues, and he said yes. Foster said it appears the FleetLE report is not being updated correctly by Loisel, and the service records are being kept in her desk drawer. I asked Foster why the service records were being kept in a desk drawer, and he said he thought it looked like "an attempt" was going to be made to enter the records at some time in the future, as Loisel had previously completed the service records in the past, at least through March 2017.

I asked Foster if there was a problem with the method used by Fowler's Automotive, and he said the service manager at Fowler's Automotive spoke to Langley regarding the method of bill payment at the Hammond Barracks. He said Fowler's did not have a problem utilizing the Galaxy card, but for some reason Loisel had previously set this system up to pay the bills at the end of the month.

I asked Foster if there were some issues with bills not being paid, and he said he discovered the fire extinguisher service had not been paid since 2016 (Attachment E). He said the company did not take credit cards, but this bill could have been paid through alternate methods. Foster said he is currently working with Morris to ensure this bill is being paid in a timely manner.

I asked Foster if Loisel was not completing part of her job duties, and she said yes. I asked if Hall bore some responsibility for this issue since his method of tracking service entries did not verify the official FleetLE report, and he said yes. I asked Foster if any other sergeants would be responsible for this issue, and he said he did not think so. He said he did not know what type of follow-up system Lieutenant Campbell had in place, but it appeared the system was not being checked to ensure compliance.

I asked Foster if there were issues discovered during the QRA with the Hammond Barracks overtime opportunities being entered incorrectly by Loisel, and he said yes. I asked if this issue was previously resolved at the District Level by Captain Lamberth, and he replied, "It very well could have been, yes." Foster explained he did not know the resolution to this matter but was aware an issue had been discovered and resolved. I told him it was my understanding this issue had been already taken care of, and he agreed with my analysis.

I asked Foster if there was anything else he wished to add to his statement, and he said no. Foster said everything in his statement was true and factual. On behalf of the Office of Personnel, I ordered Foster not to discuss this internal affairs investigation with anybody else, and he indicated he understood my order. The interview concluded at 1207 hours.

On November 29, 2017, I interviewed Secretary Rose Morris as a witness to this internal affairs investigation. Prior to the interview, I showed Morris the Quality Review Audit Recap for November 2, 2017 (Attachment A) the Quality Review Audit Recap for March 13, 2017 (Attachment B), the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report dated November 2, 2017 (Attachment C), a tow bill dated April 11, 2017 (Attachment D), and the fire extinguisher bill dated May 9, 2016 (Attachment E). Morris acknowledged she reviewed these items prior to the start of the interview.

Morris said she has been going to the Hammond Barracks twice per week for the past four weeks to assist in taking care of the problems uncovered during a QRA. I asked Morris if she could explain the unpaid bill from Bob's Towing (Attachment D), and she said the bill was from a service call on April 11, 2017, and the vendor had been going to the Hammond Barracks monthly, but the bill was not getting paid. Morris said she contacted the vendor and discovered they did not accept the Galaxy card at this time. Morris said during her conversation with the service manager, she "walked her through" the process, and was able to get the bill paid in less than 10 minutes.

I asked Morris if the vendor had been delivering the bill to Loisel, and she answered yes. Morris explained Loisel was "just not paying it." I asked her to explain how the bill would have been paid prior to the implementation of the Galaxy card system, and she said the vendors would previously have sent the Barracks an invoice for their service charges, and if the bill was over \$500, a requisition would have been ordered, and Fiscal services would have paid them by a check. Morris said the bills would normally be paid within a month. I asked Morris how long the current Galaxy procedure took to complete, and she said it was taken care of while she was at Bob's Towing on November 14, 2017.

Morris explained the "virtual pay" procedure involves a process where the vendor would call the bank, and the bank would issue a single use pay code; the bill would then be processed as a credit card. Morris said the transaction will appear on the Barracks credit card statement as a Galaxy card transaction, but this is a method utilized for vendors who do not currently use the Galaxy card.

I asked Morris to explain the unpaid fire extinguisher bill (Attachment E), and she said this bill was from the Township Firefighters' Association. Morris said this bill was due on June 8, 2016, and when she arrived at the Hammond Barracks on November 7, 2017, she called the vendor and asked if they used credit cards. Morris said they did not accept credit cards; contacted the fiscal department, and the bill would be paid with a check due to the length of time it had been overdue. Morris explained she sent the bill for payment on November 15, 2017.

I asked Morris where the unpaid bill had been found, and she said this was one of the unpaid bills delivered to her when she arrived at the Barracks. Morris said this bill was inside a stack of current unpaid bills; she said she did not think anybody knew this bill was overdue for over a year. I asked Morris if she was able to take care of this unpaid bill, and she answered yes.

I asked Morris if she was sent to Hammond to provide assistance because Loisel had not been performing essential aspects of her job, and she answered yes. I asked Morris to explain who is responsible for paying the bill at each Barracks, and she answered, "It's the secretary's job." I asked Morris if the secretary at each Barracks is required to work with the Barracks commander or another supervisor, and she said yes. Morris said bills are supposed to be paid within 10 days. "It's odd that a bill would not be paid for a year and a half."

I asked Morris if the Secretary would ever be required to pay the bills from her personal finances, and she said no. Morris said Ms. Andrea Worthington was very helpful when she contacted Fiscal Services to provide assistance. I asked Morris to explain who would bear the most responsibility for the unpaid bills, and she said it would be Loisel. I asked if she worked with Campbell closely while assigned to Hammond, and she answered yes.

I asked Morris if the Secretary is the person who actually pays the bills, and she said yes. Morris said each Barracks has a credit card in the name of the Barracks secretary. I asked if the Hammond Barracks credit card was issued to Loisel, and she answered yes. I asked if this fact places more responsibility on Loisel for the unpaid bills, and she said yes. Morris stated, "She would be the only person who would be able to pay those bills." Morris said Campbell would only approve paying the bills as a means of checks and balances.

I asked Morris if there was anything else she wished to add to her statement, and she said no. Morris said everything in her statement was true and factual. I ordered Morris not to discuss this internal affairs investigation with anybody else, and she indicated she understood my order. The interview concluded at 1409 hours.

On December 6, 2017, I interviewed Fleet Supervisor Dianna Langley as a witness to this internal affairs investigation. Prior to the interview, I showed Langley the Quality Review Audit Recap for November 2, 2017 (Attachment A), the Quality Review Audit Recap for March 13, 2017 (Attachment B), the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report dated November 2, 2017 (Attachment C), a tow bill dated April 11, 2017 (Attachment D), the fire extinguisher bill dated May 9, 2016 (Attachment E), the Galaxy Card Mandate emails dated May 18, 2016 (Attachment F), and the Process for Modifying Galaxy Work Order emails dated September 29, 2017 (Attachment G). Langley acknowledged she reviewed these items prior to the start of the interview.

I asked Langley to explain how she provided assistance to District Staff, and she said there were entries made into the Hammond FleetLE report (Attachment C), but these entries were not the result of a Secretary making these entries. Langley explained the problem with Hammond was due to the fact that entries were incorrectly made, not made at all, or had been duplicated. Langley said she made 43 corrections to the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report.

Langley said over the past "couple of years," she has sent out directives for making entries into the FleetLE system (Attachment F, G). Langley said this process has been modified over time, but these modifications have been sent out with specific directions on how to handle the service records. Langley said "it appears" Hammond was not complying with the current protocols. She explained how the service records are "perceived" in the FleetLE system depends upon how the service is "coded by the vendor."

Langley said she has asked all of the Secretaries to put the upcoming bills into a two-week file to make sure the bills correctly appear in the FleetLE system. Langley explained if the service records do not show up within two weeks, the secretary should "do some research" and find out if the service record was entered correctly. Langley said in this case, Loisel was either doing nothing or was entering the service records manually instead of waiting to make sure the service records were coded correctly, which resulted in duplicate entries.

I asked Langley if the Division's main focus in the FleetLE report was to keep track of oil changes, and she said yes. Langley remarked the main thing checked in this report is the 7,500-mile oil change. I asked Langley if Loisel would be most responsible for the failures to update the FleetLE system, and she said yes. Langley said most Secretary 's will schedule the FleetLE report to update "like every week." Langley said in almost every Barracks she has worked with; the Secretary will have the FleetLE report sent to the equipment sergeant to ensure someone else also has access to this report in the event the Secretary would be out of the office. She remarked she did not know if Loisel had this set up, or if she was aware of how to do this.

I asked Langley if the equipment sergeant would normally work closely with the Secretary to keep track of the service records, and she said it depends on the situation. Langley explained most Secretary 's will do "so much on their own." She added, the Secretary 's will "get the equipment sergeant involved when necessary." Langley said most equipment sergeants are aware of what is going on with the vehicles. I asked if Hall was aware of what was going on at Hammond, and she said she did not think so. She explained she had to grant him access to FleetLE once these issues were discovered.

I asked Langley if Campbell would have the ultimate responsibility to ensure the service records are being entered correctly, and she said she "would assume so." I asked if this was not being done due to the complex situation at the Hammond Barracks, and she smiled and said, "I've dealt with the secretary, so I'm aware of the dynamic there."

I asked Langley if she has previously heard that Loisel does not care for the Galaxy card system, and she replied, "Correct." Langley said she received a call from Fowler's Automotive asking for assistance because Loisel apparently told them she was not going to utilize their services anymore because she did not want to use the Galaxy card. According to Fowler's Automotive, Loisel wanted them to use an invoice. Langley explained using an invoice is very complicated and under the new protocols Barracks are required to use the Galaxy card to pay for services rendered. Langley said the Fowler's Automotive spokesperson told her Loisel told them she was not going to use their garage anymore because she did not like Galaxy.

I asked Langley when she received the telephone call from Fowler's Automotive, and she said it occurred six to eight months ago. She stated she reassured the vendor they were still utilizing the system correctly by using Galaxy. She said she later spoke to Campbell, who

"smoothed out" the issue because "vendors mean everything to us." I asked if Secretaries are required to use the Galaxy card, and she answered everybody is required to use the Galaxy card. Langley explained the Secretary is required to reconcile the monthly Galaxy statements and send them to District.

Langley said she did not know if Loisel was reconciling the monthly statements or not but added she did not know how this would be done correctly since Loisel was not updating the FleetLE report. Langley explained Loisel could have possibly used the monthly service and car wash bills to keep track of the reconciliation process, but it did not appear she was making any corrections in the FleetLE system.

Langley remarked it took her two days to make the 43 corrections. She said in order for her to make the corrections, she was required to have the service records in hand to ensure her corrections were accurate reversals of mistakes which had been made. Langley explained there were so many transactions which had not been updated in FleetLE, she had to "narrow down" the entries which were important, and those which were superfluous. Langley said if this had been taken care of weekly by Loisel as the service records were currently being processed, it should have only taken Loisel approximately 15 minutes a week to monitor the system.

I asked Langley if the 15-minute timeframe would be an accurate assessment for the total number of transactions at the Barracks, and she said yes. Langley said it would have been very easy for Loisel to make corrections or modifications because she would have the invoices on her desk, and she would also have direct knowledge of each vehicle which had been serviced. She indicated it would have required minimal effort to ensure the Hammond Barracks records would have been updated correctly.

I asked Langley if Loisel was updating the FleetLE system, and she answered, "It appears not." Langley referred to the first page of the FleetLE report (Attachment C). and explained there were entries in the report which had a mileage entry of one. She said a vehicle which had been in service would not have a current mileage of only one mile; she said this was an incorrect mileage entered by vendors, but Loisel was required to modify the work order to reflect the current mileage. If Loisel had made the necessary changes to the service records the FleetLE report would have shown the work orders in consecutive order instead of haphazardly, as they were discovered.

I asked Langley how long it would have taken Loisel to make the corrections to enter the correct mileage for the erroneous work orders, and she said, "Thirty seconds." Langley explained the hardest part of the system is finding the work order number, and this would only take 10 to 15 seconds. I asked if any of the incorrect mileage entries were corrected by Loisel, and she said no. She explained she was the person who made the necessary corrections to the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report.

I asked Langley if she has a working knowledge of the cruisers assigned to the Hammond Barracks, and she said yes. I asked if it appeared the vehicles were getting serviced every 7,500 miles as required, and she answered, "Yes, absolutely." I asked Langley if Hall would have focused on the fact that the cars were getting properly serviced to keep track of the vehicles, and she said yes. Langley explained she did not want to speak for Hall because she did not know if he ever looked at FleetLE. She stated most equipment sergeants use the car file to keep track of the service records, and most sergeants have a good enough relationship with their Secretary to ensure the vehicles are being serviced correctly.

I asked Langley if Hall told her anything about his relationship with Loisel, and she said she knew it was a "strained relationship." Langley said it didn't not appear Loisel only had a problem with him, but also Campbell and others. Langley added, "Nobody's safe. "She said Loisel "is not friendly with anyone over there." Langley said this would create difficulties in working with Loisel. I asked if the lack of work Loisel put into the FleetLE report showed her refusing to perform essential work functions, and she said, "I would say that's a refusal to do anything." Langley explained it would not be possible for a report to contain this many errors and omissions if any attempts were being made by Loisel to keep track of the service records.

Langley said she figured Loisel either did not want to do this part of her job or did not know how to do it and refused to seek assistance. Langley insisted she and her assistant, Sandra Harrison, have previously provided assistance to Loisel. She said, "This appears to be a deliberate act of doing nothing."

I asked Langley if the majority of the responsibility for the FleetLE report mistakes rested with Loisel, and she said yes. She "would assume" Hall did not see the FleetLE report, or this issue might have been discovered much earlier. Langley explained she did not know if he was aware of the FleetLE report prior to her investigation. Langley said since she had to grant Hall access to FleetLE, she would guess he never saw the FleetLE report. Langley

remarked there was not a single instance of vehicle not being serviced at the Hammond Barracks.

I asked Langley if Campbell would bear any responsibility for these issues, and she said, "It's his Barracks, It's unfortunate." Langley said this issue sounded like a lack of communication, but she thought people had been trying to make things better. Langley said it was unfortunate Campbell and Hall were "caught in the pinwheel," but explained the vehicles were actually getting serviced as required. The problem lies with the fact the FleetLE report was not being updated correctly. She finished making all the necessary corrections to the FleetLE report on November 9, 2017.

I asked Langley if there was anything else she wished to add to her statement, and she said no. She said everything in her statement was true and factual. I ordered Langley not to discuss this internal affairs investigation with anybody else, and she indicated she understood my order. the interview concluded at 1128 hours.

During an interview on December 18, 2017, Lieutenant Tyler A. Campbell answered questions regarding this internal affairs investigation. The 0036 form was read to Campbell, and he indicated he understood the content of the form and the allegation against him. Campbell declined to receive a signed copy of this form at the conclusion of the interview. He also elected to participate in the interview without legal representation.

Prior to the interview, I showed Campbell the Quality Review Audit Recap for November 2, 2017, ...same as Langley. Campbell acknowledged he reviewed these items prior to the start of the interview.

I asked Campbell if the issues with the FleetLE report were discovered on November 2, 2017, and he said yes. Campbell explained the Hammond Barracks had a biennial inspection in December 2016, and no issues had been found. He said the next QRA was scheduled for March 13, 2017, and the FleetLE report was not checked because the Barracks had just completed a biennial inspection and Loisel was also not at work March 13th. Campbell explained the FleetLE report had not been checked since December 2016. I asked Campbell if the FleetLE report had been checked on March 13, 2017, the issues would have been discovered, and he said yes. I asked if he was previously aware of the issues involving the FleetLE report, and he said no.

I asked Campbell if he and Morris used the Galaxy card to pay the bill, and he said yes. Campbell and Morris walked them through the process and had the bill paid in "maybe thirty seconds." I asked Campbell if he was aware of the virtual pay system prior to this encounter, and he said no. I asked if he ever spoke to Loisel about the unpaid bills, and he said no. He explained he did not know the bills were not being paid until Morris came to Hammond to provide assistance.

I asked Campbell if he could explain how some of the bills were discovered in one of the desk drawers in Loisel's office. Campbell said on November 2, 2017, Foster told him the FleetLE report was not being updated, and it appeared the cars were not being serviced. He told Foster this was not possible as he Hall was keeping track of the vehicle service records. Campbell said he offered to take Foster to the car files which were kept in Loisel's office; upon opening the files for each cruiser, he discovered the service records were not in the car files.

At this time, Campbell said he realized something was wrong. He asked Maintenance Worker Nancy Weiss to explain to Foster how she kept track of the bills whenever she took a car to get serviced. Campbell said Weiss told them she went to Fowler's Automotive on a weekly basis, picked up the bills whenever she dropped off a car for service, and brought these bills back to Loisel whenever she brought the vehicle back to the Barracks. Campbell said he told Weiss the cruisers were getting serviced as required, and she agreed with him.

Campbell said he asked Weiss if she knew where the service orders could be located since they were not in the car files as required, and she told him she did not know. He asked Weiss to call Fowler's to have them reprint the service records for each car. Campbell said Weiss told him she would do this; a few minutes later, Weiss walked up to him and told him she recalled one time when she handed a service order to Loisel, and Loisel put it in a desk drawer. Campbell said Weiss told him the desk drawer was "just a mess."

Campbell said he asked Weiss to show him which desk drawer it was, and Weiss showed him the drawer in Loisel's office. When he opened the drawer, Campbell said he found multiple months of car receipts which were never put in the car file or entered into the FleetLE report. Campbell commented his sergeant was keeping track of the service records, but Loisel "dropped the ball" and did not file the records and did not enter the work orders as required.

I asked Campbell if he was aware of an incident where Loisel had an argument with Fowler's Automotive and he said yes. Campbell said he explained he once spoke with the owner's daughter, Beth, who is the service manager. He said "Beth" told him Loisel does not treat her very well whenever she talks to her.

I asked Campbell if he was aware of the unpaid fire extinguisher bill, and he indicated he was made aware of this whenever Morris came to the Hammond Barracks. I asked if he could explain what the Secretary is responsible for at the Hammond Barracks, and he said Loisel would be responsible to pay bills on time, and he listed several other job duties which would be the same as any other Secretary in the Division, according to his analysis.

Campbell explained the main problem with Loisel revolves around a "total lack of communication" with himself and the other supervisors at the Barracks. Campbell said he would have offered to assist Loisel if she did not know how to make entries. Campbell paused and remarked about the FleetLE report, "Prior to this, in December, she had been there for years and they were spot on." Campbell continued with his observations by stating, "I don't think this is a lack of communication, I think it is pure sabotage."

I asked Campbell if Loisel ever spoke to him about needing assistance in paying bills or making entries into the FleetLE report, and he answered, "Not once." He said he asked the sergeants at the Barracks, and none of them ever heard Loisel asking for assistance. Campbell explained he would not have thought to check for problems because the Hammond Barracks had completed their biennial inspection successfully in 2016. Campbell said he did not know of any problems with the FleetLE report during their biennial inspection.

I asked Campbell how long the FleetLE system has been active, and he said it has been in place for years. I asked if it is a difficult process, and he said no. Campbell said most issues arise from vendors making incorrect "codes" for service orders, which might result in an oil change showing up as "a headlight bulb being replaced." Campbell added this process would only take a few minutes to correct.

I asked Campbell if he was aware of the duties assigned to the equipment sergeant, and he said yes. He said he was the equipment sergeant at Hammond for three years. I asked if Loisel was the Secretary during this time, and he said yes. Campbell said, at the time, they

were able to communicate effectively with one another. I asked him how long Hall has had vehicles assigned to him, and he said Hall has only been the equipment sergeant for a short time. He said, "I don't blame Hall for this at all." He indicated Hall did not know the receipts were being placed into the car file. He said he had not had a chance to explain how the service receipts were filed in the car file with each car because Hall only received the equipment assignment a couple of months before the QRA.

Campbell said once these issues were discovered, they were corrected as soon as possible. He said the FleetLE report was in such disarray they had to speak to Langley to provide expert assistance. Campbell acknowledged the problems with FleetLE report were beyond his understanding of the system. He said it took Langley a couple of days to make the corrections, and once these were made their system has been "fine ever since." I asked Campbell if he asked for assistance, and he answered yes.

I asked Campbell to explain his comments regarding the sabotage of the FleetLE report, and he said this is not a complex system. Campbell said the only part of FleetLE which the Division is concerned with is the oil changes for each cruiser. He remarked it is essential for the FleetLE report to reflect the services rendered upon each vehicle, and for the service paperwork to be properly filed in the folder assigned to each vehicle.

Campbell noted for the past 10 years Loisel has been a Secretary at Hammond and there have been no issues at all previously uncovered regarding her not performing essential job functions. He said it seemed odd for these issues to only come to light after the internal affairs investigation I completed regarding the inappropriate comments concerning the November 2016 election results. Campbell stated, "For this system to have this major breakdown from that point until now, I'm sorry, I'm not going to call it anything else other than sabotage."

I asked Campbell if he felt Loisel was deliberately avoiding making corrections in the FleetLE report, and he answered yes. Campbell said the atmosphere created by Loisel at the Barracks made it impossible for anybody to have a normal conversation with her. Campbell said he had had four conversations with Loisel since the day after the election in November 2016. As a result of these brief conversations, he had had two internal affair investigations completed upon him, and another EEO complaint filed against him by Loisel. Campbell stated he has been asked previously if he has failed to supervise Loisel, and he said he is only able to supervise somebody so much, but whenever he talks to Loisel he

gets in trouble for it. Campbell provided an example of Fowler's Automotive storing the tires for the Hammond Barracks, which is a great service because Hammond does not have the ability to store 50 tires at a time. He said "Bob" asked him if they could have the tires drop shipped; he checked into this matter and found out the tires could be shipped directly to the vendor. Campbell said he made all the necessary arrangements for this to take place, but Loisel would not agree to it. He said he ultimately had to contact Captain Cobel (retired) to advise him of the situation.

A meeting was held at his office, and after he made arrangement with District Staff he was giving permission to have the tires shipped to Fowler's Automotive. Campbell said he ordered Loisel to have the new tire shipment sent to Fowler's, but she refused. He had a meeting with her scheduled in his office, but Loisel walked out. Campbell said the situation was only ultimately resolved when Loisel was ordered to report to District Headquarters. I asked when this incident took place, and he said it happened in November 2016 after the original internal affairs investigation. I asked if there was an internal affairs investigation conducted on Loisel for insubordination., and he said the issue was resolved "in house" and no internal affairs investigation was conducted.

Campbell continued by saying before the tire order could be completed, Loisel told them a new policy came out which said Barracks were not permitted to place bulk orders for tires. Campbell said he did not get a chance to look into the matter because he was busy. As a result, this caused a great deal of inconvenience whenever vehicles were serviced because it required two separate trips to the service garage and the tire store. He said it was his fault this never got looked into further because he only recently found out the message being sent by Loisel concerning the prohibition on bulk tire orders was not accurate. Campbell said Loisel "fabricated this rule" regarding the tire orders. He stated this was yet another example of how Loisel "pulled one over" on them.

Campbell apologized for the lengthy examples of how difficult it has been to work with Loisel the past year; he said he had another example he wished to get on record. Campbell said in January 2017 he had a conversation with District Command, and he was told to learn how to perform some of the job duties performed by Loisel. Campbell said he told Cobel and others it would be a difficult situation, but he was told to figure it out. Campbell said he and Weiss met with Loisel, and Loisel showed him the process she utilized to order tires and other equipment. After the meeting, Campbell said he found out Loisel apparently told Weiss he made her uncomfortable because he was standing so close to her while she

was explaining the process. As a result of this false comment, Campbell said he would never be in a room with Loisel again. He denied any wrongdoing but insisted he would never be placed in such a situation again.

I asked Campbell if an internal affairs investigation was initiated as a result of this incident, and she said no. He commented there was an internal affairs investigation in 2-17 when he asked Loisel if she threw away some soap which she had incorrectly ordered. I asked when this internal affairs investigation took place, and he responded he could not remember.

I asked Campbell if Hall bore any responsibility for the FleetLE report issues uncovered, and he said Hall knew the cars were being serviced and had a follow-up system in place. Campbell indicated Hall would have figured out Loisel was not doing her part if they would have had the opportunity to review the vehicles prior to the QRA, but "we had not gotten there yet." I asked Campbell if the circumstances and lack of knowledge lessened the responsibility for Hall, and he answered yes.

I asked Campbell if he bore any responsibility for the FleetLE report issues, and he said he should have shown Hall how to look into the FleetLE system sooner or taken more responsibility to check into the system to make sure the FleetLE report was being updated and completed correctly. Campbell said he thought Loisel would have done her job, and he never thought she would have done something like this because she had performed her job functions correctly on previous occasions. Campbell stated, "I'm going to take some responsibility because I was the boss there."

I asked Campbell if the daily operations at a field Barracks require a certain amount of trust between supervisors and the secretary, and he answered yes. Campbell said he never thought this was going done because of the circumstances surrounding the successful biennial inspection. He insisted the vehicles were being serviced correctly. I asked Campbell if he had a difficult time in even speaking to Loisel, and he recounted a story about Loisel closing her office door whenever he come onto the Barracks. Campbell said he only found out Loisel closed her door after Trooper Valerie Landt told him Loisel only closed her door to show him she did not have to answer to him and only closed her door to "fuck with" him. Campbell said he told Landt to remember this conversation because he might need it one day.

Campbell explained he gave these examples to provide an illustration of exactly how uncomfortable the climate had become at the Hammond Barracks since November 2016. Campbell said, as a result of the behavior exhibited by Loisel, he chose to direct and supervise her through the sergeants. It was not possible for him to even have a brief exchange of words with Loisel without being accused of some type of wrongdoing. He said he felt as if he had to endure "these bogus accusations" every time he spoke to Loisel, and it was very stressful to have these accusations hanging over his head all the time. I asked if Loisel created a toxic environment at the Barracks, and he replied yes.

I asked Campbell if there was anything else he wished to add to his statement, and he said when Morris came to assist him in November 2017, she asked him about his signature on bills. Campbell said he found out his signature was being "forged" to pay bills. I asked him who forged his signature, and he said he assumed it would have been Loisel. Campbell then recalled yet another instance of Loisel's misbehavior when she made Weiss sign a paper every time she asked Loisel to order supplies. Campbell said this was yet another example of how difficult it was working with Loisel. He signed, and added, "I could be here all day." Campbell insisted he was trying to do the best he could with the resources he had available at the time he was the Hammond Barracks Commander.

I asked Campbell if there was anything else he wished to add to his statement, and he said no. Campbell said everything in his statement was true and factual. On behalf of the Office of Personnel, I ordered Campbell not to discuss this internal affairs investigation with anybody else, and he indicated he understood my order. The interview concluded at 1052 hours.

During an interview on December 21, 2017, Sergeant Alan L. Hall answered questions regarding this internal affairs investigation. The 0036 form was read to Hall, and he indicated he understood the content of the form and the allegations against him. Hall received a signed copy of this form at the conclusion of the interview. Hall elected to participate in the interview without union representation.

Prior to the interview, I showed Hall the Quality Review Audit Recap for November 2, 2017...same as Langley, the Sergeant Training Officer Guide (Attachment H), and the Hammond Barracks Car Service Log (Attachment I). Hall acknowledged he reviewed these items prior to the start of the interview.

Hall is a newly promoted supervisor at the Hammond Barracks. He was promoted on April 27, 2017. I asked if he was present during the QRA on November 2, 2017, and he answered yes. I showed Hall the QRA Recap (Attachment A) from November 2, 2017, and asked if he was aware of the discrepancies discovered during the QRA on this date, and he said yes. I showed Hall the QRA Recap (Attachment B) from March 13, 2017, and asked if he was aware the FleetLE report was not reviewed, and he said no. Hall said he was present during the March 13, 2017, QRA; however, he recalled he was shadowing a sergeant at the time since this took place prior to his promotion.

I showed Hall the FleetLE report (Attachment C) and asked him if there were multiple errors on this form. Hall answered yes. I asked Hall how long he had been in charge of equipment, and he estimated he took charge of equipment in the middle of May 2017, after he completed his Sergeant Training Officer period during his first two weeks as a supervisor.

I showed Hall the Sergeant Training Officer Guide he provided at the start of the interview (Attachment H) and referred him to page 24 of this document. I told Hall this page showed he reviewed equipment and car services, and he agreed with my analysis of the document. I asked Hall to explain how he was shown the FleetLE system as part of his STO period. Hall said this was a topic of discussion, but he did not go into detail of how this system functioned. Hall stated, "I'm not aware of anything I really had to do as part of it." He said he thought Loisel was in charge of FleetLE. I asked Hall if he has received FleetLE training, and he answered no.

I showed Hall the Hammond Barracks Car Service Log (Attachment I) and asked him to explain this document. Hall said he updated this document weekly by monitoring the mileage of the cruisers on the gas logs at the start of each shift. He reviewed the spreadsheet which showed the date of the last oil change for each cruiser. When the vehicles got to within 1,000 miles of their next oil change according to the gas logs, he sent a reminder to the unit assigned to the cruiser (Attachment I, Page 2). Hall said the units would return this reminder to him after their vehicle had been serviced. He said he would then update the spreadsheet after the reminders were turned in.

Hall explained the asterisks shown on the spreadsheet indicated a vehicle was approaching a 7,500-mile service (Attachment I, Page 1). For vehicles which were within the oil service mileage, he would put a "D" on the spreadsheet to remind him these vehicles were in need of service. Hall indicated this was his follow-up system. He insisted this

follow-up was performed every week. I asked if he was currently in charge of equipment, and he said no. Hall said he is now in charge of cases.

I asked Hall if any of the Hammond Barracks cruisers ever missed a 7,500-mile service while he was in charge of equipment, and he replied, "Not one." I asked if Campbell provided him assistance in keeping track of equipment, and he said her received this information from the other sergeants, but he could not recall if Campbell explicitly provided an explanation. Hall said he would ask Campbell questions if he ever had any issues.

I asked Hall if he met with Campbell and Loisel prior to the QRA on November 2, 2017, and he said no. I asked him to clarify his comment about his awareness of FleetLE. Hall said he was not aware of the FleetLE report or how the invoices are logged. He insisted he did not know how the vehicle service entries were tracked. I asked Hall if he had adequate training in this field, and he said no.

I asked Hall who is primarily responsible for the FleetLE report, and he said this would be the responsibility of Loisel. I asked if he ever ran this report, and he said no. Hall remarked if he "was educated" on how to do it, he would have. I asked if Loisel played a vital role in monitoring the FleetLE system, and he said yes. I asked him if Loisel was the person who was primarily responsible for the upkeep of this system, and he answered, "Absolutely, yes."

I asked Hall if there was ever an issue with the FleetLE report not being updated prior to 2017, and he said no. Hall commented the Hammond Barracks successfully passed their last biennial inspection in December 2016. I asked Hall if the interpersonal relationships at the Hammond Barracks had taken a downward turn by the end of 2016, and he said, "I think that's a fair statement." Hall indicated things had turned sour the day after the election in November 2016.

I asked Hall to describe the relationship between Loisel and Campbell, and he said he knew "from hearsay" it was not good, but he did not personally witness any of the harsh encounters between the two of them. Hall indicated this was a "toxic" relationship, and it "was never getting better." I asked if the animosity between Loisel and Campbell might be the catalyst for Loisel deliberately not updating the FleetLE report, and he said he felt this

was the case, but he did not have "anything to back this up." Hall said the problems discovered on the FleetLE report during the November 2, 2017, QRA did not surprise him.

I asked Hall if it seemed odd for Loisel to suddenly have problems with correctly updating the FleetLE report after November 2016, and he agreed with my analysis. I told him the work "sabotage" had been used to describe what Loisel created when she failed to correctly update the FleetLE report, and he replied, "I think it's possible." I asked if there were any other reasons why Loisel was not updating the FleetLE report correctly, and he said he did not know if these problems were caused by "her mental state" during the past year. He explained he could not answer if the problems on the FleetLE report were due to the problems Loisel was having with Campbell, or if there were other reasons.

I asked Hall who he thought was ultimately responsible for correctly updating the FleetLE report, and he answered, "If it should have been on me, then I would say it should be on me, but I wasn't trained. I didn't know." Hall said he was aware Loisel previously took care of this system and said this was out of his hands. I asked Hall if Loisel was the person who was ultimately responsible, and he said yes. Hall explained Loisel dealt with the vendors and was "well aware" of the codes used in the FleetLE database.

I asked Hall to provide a percentage amount to describe how much fault lies with Loisel, and he said, "At least ninety percent." I asked him to provide a percentage of how much fault belonged to Campbell, and he responded, "Five to him, and five to me." Hall added, "I'll take that." Hall said he would not point fingers at other people if he was responsible for the system, but he reiterated he did not know about the intricacies of FleetLE. I asked if monitoring FleetLE would be categorized as an essential job function for Loisel, and he said yes.

I asked Hall if he was aware of bills not being paid, and he said he found this out during the QRA. Hall said he always thought bills were paid by Loisel. I asked if it was odd for bills not to be paid for several months, and he said yes. I asked Hall if the unpaid bills would be categorized as part of an overall "sabotage theory" described by Campbell, and he said, "I think you can all loop it in together because obviously there's been some things dropped."

Hall said these problems coming to light now seemed odd because Loisel has worked at Hammond a very long time, and no problems were previously discovered on their

inspections. I asked if it was unlikely for these problems to suddenly appear out of thin air, and he said yes. I asked Hall if he was aware Langley had to fix the mistakes found in the FleetLE report, and he answered yes. Hall said he knew it took Langley “all day” to fix all of the incorrect entries.

Hall indicated Langley assisted them greatly in fixing all the mistakes. I asked Hall if it was Langley’s job to fix these mistakes, and he said no. Hall said Langley fixed “a lot of things.” I asked him if corrective action has been undertaken to prevent this from happening again, and he answered yes.

I asked Hall if there was anything else he wished to add to his statement, and he said no. Hall said everything in his statement was true and factual. I ordered Hall not to discuss this internal affairs investigation with anybody else, and he indicated he understood my order. The interview was concluded at 0708 hours.

At 0709 hours on December 21, 2017, I restarted the interview with Hall. I told him the rules of interview still applied, and he agreed with my instructions. I asked him if some of the vehicle invoices were found in Loisel’s office in a desk drawer, and he said yes. Hall said these items would normally be kept in the car files for each cruiser. He did not know what type of follow-up system Loisel maintained, but the service records, “were kind of all over.” I asked Hall if the manner in which the receipts and service records were found would be described as disorganized, and he answered yes.

I asked Hall if there was anything else he wished to add to his statement, and he said no. Hall said everything in his statement was true and factual. I ordered Hall not to discuss this internal affair investigation with anybody else, and he indicated he understood my order. The interview concluded at 0711 hours.

During an interview on December 21, 2018, Secretary Emma L. Loisel answered questions regarding this internal affairs investigation. The Division 0036 form was read to Loisel, and she indicated she understood the content of the form and the allegations against her. Loisel received a signed copy of this form at the conclusion of the interview. Loisel participated in the interview with Ms. Wendy Bishop as her union representative.

(List of all exhibits)

Loisel was hired in October 2004 and has been the Secretary at the Hammond Barracks since 2011. I asked Loisel if she was present during the QRA on November 2, 2017, and she said no. I referred Loisel to the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report and asked her how often she reviews this report. Loisel said when Fowler's Automotive was required to use the Galaxy card for billing they advised they would send their invoices only once a month. Loisel said she informed Sergeant Gregory Martin of this because of the time it took to have the FleetLE report updated. Loisel said Martin ordered her "not to run the FleetLE report" because it "wouldn't reflect what they needed" to ensure the 7500-mile services were being completed.

Loisel said Martin ordered her to use a spreadsheet instead, and she indicated she tracked every type of service on the vehicles assigned to Hammond. Loisel added, "On both accounts, I followed orders." I asked Loisel again to clarify her past practice of updating the FleetLE report, and she indicated she used to perform this task monthly. I asked her when she stopped updating the FleetLE report, and she it was during the summer of 2016.

I asked Loisel if the fact that Fowler's Automotive submitted their bills monthly reduced her necessity to update the FleetLE report, and she answered, "There has been a lot of lack of training from Fleet." Loisel then referred to the litany of FleetLE reports from other Barracks In this District. Loisel said the other Barracks in this District also had "the same discrepancies." I asked her to focus on the issue at hand, and she continued to read off the list of Barracks contained within the various attachments.

Loisel indicated she was able to access the other Barracks because she had access to the FleetLE database. I asked her again if she was updating the FleetLE report monthly, and she answered yes. Loisel referred to her spreadsheet and indicated this report started in the middle of 2016. Loisel insisted this spreadsheet was supposed to "replace the FleetLE report." I asked Loisel if the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report was not updated by her since the middle of 2017, and she spoke at length about training she received from Foster, Langley and others. At times, Loisel was stammering and some of her dialogue was indiscernible.

After Loisel concluded, I asked if Martin told her not to update the FleetLE report in October 2016, and she said this took place in June or July 2016. I referred her to the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report and showed her there were some entries contained in this document from September and October 2016, which was after she receive the alleged

order from Martin. Loisel responded some of the entries appear “after the fact.” She explained she could not make any changes until December 2017.

Loisel referred to page two of the FleetLE for District and showed where she highlighted several “duplicate” entries on SP-513. I asked if there could be multiple entries on the same date because one entry would be coded as an oil change, and another entry could be for tires or wiper blades, and she responded, “Right.” I asked if this was uncommon for multiple entries to appear with the same mileage on an extended service, and Loisel started to speak about checking within the system. I interrupted her and asked her to answer the question. Again, I used the illustration of an oil change, a tire, and a wiper blade to appear on the same date with the same mileage, and she finally agreed with my analysis.

I referred to the various documents Loisel provided and asked if all the duplicate entries she found were all mistakes, and she said, “Some of them are.” I asked Loisel if there were accurate and correct duplicate entries also contained within the mistakes due to the aforementioned examples I provided and she said yes. Loisel commented about several reversals being made and indicated she was never told how to make corrections.

I showed Loisel the emails dated May 18, 2016, and September 29, 2017, and asked if she had seen these forms before this interview. Loisel admitted she had seen both of these documents before and said there have been many changes to these instructions since the date the emails were created. Loisel said she felt she “understood” these forms and asked for assistance “a couple of times” in modifying work orders. Loisel advised she did this to the best of her abilities while taking care of off-duty details, which she insisted were not her job, and added, “That’s a fact.”

Loisel remarked she performed her duties to the best of her abilities because Martin ordered not to print out the FleetLE report. Loisel said she went online and “looked at the FleetLE database.” She said whenever an invoice came in she would include it in her spreadsheet. Loisel said she showed all of the sergeants and Weiss the location of this folder in her desk drawer. She acknowledged she was required to keep all of the invoice invoices until they showed up in the FleetLE report.

I asked Loisel why Martin told her not to use the FleetLE report, and she said because some of the vehicles get driven quite a bit, the records would not be updated since Fowler’s

Automotive only sent in their bills once a month. I told Loisel I had been an equipment sergeant while FleetLE was implemented and explained the only thing the Division was concerned with when it came to FleetLE were the 7500-mile oil changes, and she agreed with my analysis. I told Loisel the Division is completely aware there will be a lag in the records appearing on the FleetLE reports, and she agreed. I explained the invoices would normally be kept in a pending folder and placed in the car file once the work order appeared on the FleetLE report, and she again agreed with my analysis.

I asked Loisel if she made any entries on her FleetLE report to correct any mistakes, such as erroneous codes, and she stated, "I was under the impression that the FleetLE reports no longer mattered for oil changes." Loisel said she would check "once a week" for all vehicle entries. She insisted she was following orders from Martin and claimed she spoke to him about questions she had, and he allegedly always told her she was doing it right. I told Loisel I would be speaking to Martin as a result of her claims, and she indicated she understood.

I told Loisel the main concern was the tracking of oil changes and explained the FleetLE report was an important document. Loisel responded, "I was following a sergeant's orders." Loisel indicated she kept track of oil changes on her spreadsheet. I asked if any vehicles at the Hammond Barracks ever missed a scheduled oil change, and she answered she did not know. I asked if she spoke to Fowler's Automotive about sending their bills more frequently, and she said she did not know. I asked Loisel if she ever spoke to Campbell about the issues caused by the frequency of Fowler's Automotive sending their bills in monthly, and she started to provide an answer, but she referred to "policies" which indicated the times of when work orders were required. I again asked Loisel if she spoke to Campbell about the billing cycle causing her problems, and she said, "It was never an issue with me."

I told Loisel keeping track of FleetLE was a large part of her job, and she disagreed. Loisel indicated it was not important because she replaced FleetLE with her spreadsheet. I asked Loisel how long Fowler's Automotive sent the bills in monthly, and she admitted she spoke about the issues to Lieutenant Keller on December 11, 2017, on his first day at the Hammond Barracks. Loisel acknowledged Fowler's Automotive agreed to update their work orders as soon as the services were completed.

I asked Loisel when Fowler's Automotive started the monthly billing process, and she said they always sent all their bills in once a month. When the switch was made to the Galaxy

card, Loisel said she told Martin this might create issues with the FleetLE database. She claimed Martin gave her the order to keep Fowler's Automotive on a monthly billing cycle and to replace the FleetLE report with her spreadsheet.

I asked Loisel if FleetLE went online in 2013, and she said yes. I asked if she still continued to update the FleetLE report in 2014, and 2015 without any issues, and she said yes. I asked her if Fowler's Automotive was still utilizing their monthly billing cycle during this time frame, and she again answered yes. I told Loisel her rationalizations for not updating the FleetLE report were difficult to follow, and she indicated she did not see it that way.

Loisel started speaking incessantly and sometimes inaudibly at length. She said all of the secretaries were "doing it the same way." Further along in her monologue, Loisel indicated she was following the orders of District secretaries who had communications with Fleet. I told Loisel it seemed odd for the Fowler's Automotive billing cycle to suddenly be the cause for her problems in 2016 when she had previously updated the FleetLE report without any issues, and she said, "I'm unsure." Loisel insisted the rest of the secretaries were updating the FleetLE report in the same way. She again referred to the alleged mistakes on the other FleetLE reports she previously provided.

I asked Loisel when she first received FleetLE training, and she said she received training in 2012. She noted she has received additional training from Langley. She also said the system previously was much easier to work through compared to today. Loisel said she believed she was following "directives" and claimed, "these directives contradicted policy." I asked if she had any policy which was directly contradicted by another directive. Loisel shuffled through several stacks of paper and brought forth policy 303.03 Handling Invoices. She insisted the nature of this policy seemingly contradicted the directives set forth in the memo dated April 14, 2016.

Loisel insisted there were mistakes found on the FleetLE reports she brought forth and said she had never received the proper training. I asked if she now considered herself an expert because she allegedly found mistakes on other FleetLE reports. Loisel began to respond, stammered, paused, and stated, "I'm given an order by a sergeant. I assume that the sergeant understands FleetLE." She said she thought Martin understood what she was talking about, and no one told her to make corrections. Loisel said she believed she was doing her job based upon what she was ordered to do.

Loisel brought forth policies INV 100.20 Conflicting or Illegal Orders – Insubordination and Work Rules-Sworn Personnel to substantiate her claims. She stated, “I followed orders.” Loisel said she believed since Martin never asked her any questions for clarification, she assumed he knew what she was talking about. Loisel insisted she was never asked questions concerning the complicated FleetLE system. Loisel said Martin ordered her to use a spreadsheet and not to “pull up” the FleetLE report; she said she looked at FleetLE every week to verify the work orders. Loisel said, “Everything worked out.” She stopped in mid-sentence, paused, and said she believed she was doing her job the way she was supposed to be doing it.

I asked Loisel if two-way communication is important in the daily operations for a Division Barracks and she answered yes. I asked if this ingredient was missing at the Hammond Barracks, and she replied, “On the side of the supervisors, yes.” Loisel explained numerous times she kept the supervisors informed of her duties. She insisted she thought the supervisors were trained and knew what they were talking about. I asked Loisel if she ever spoke to Hall about any equipment issues, and she answered she told him not to pull the FleetLE reports. Loisel listed off various supervisors, both past and present, whom she allegedly informed of the whereabouts of her spreadsheet.

I asked Loisel where her personal spreadsheet was located, and she said it was kept on the bookshelf in her office. Loisel said the spreadsheet was “easily noticed” as to what it was. I asked if she kept the invoices in her desk drawer, and she said yes. I asked her if these invoices were normally kept in the care files, and she said, “Not right away.” Loisel explained she would first send a report to District every month. Loisel claimed her “spreadsheet was excellent.” She said nobody questioned it. I asked her if the spreadsheet took the place of the FleetLE report, and she said yes. I asked Loisel if she placed the invoices in the car file after the report was sent out each month, and she said this was not always the case. At this time, I permitted Loisel to take a break from the interview. The interview was paused at 0950 hours.

At 0959 hours, the interview was restarted with Loise. I referred Loisel to the unpaid bill from April 11, 2017, and asked why the bill was not paid until November 14, 2017, when Morris come to the Hammond Barracks. Loisel said she paid the bill according to policy and thought it had been paid. Loisel said the vendor came into the Barracks to tell her the bill was not paid; she contacted District Headquarters and was told the bills were now paid

with a Galaxy card. Loisel claimed she provide the vendor with the necessary information to pay the bill. She said she assumed the bill went through.

Loisel said when the vendor came to the Hammond Barracks, she contacted the vendor's secretary and walked her through the process. Again, Loisel insisted she thought the bill had been paid. Loisel said the vendor brought the bill to the Barracks at a later date, and due to her workload with off-duty details and reading emails he need to address, she placed the bill in her "to-do-folder." Loisel insisted she was going to pay the bill on October 31, 2017, but due to an incident which took place with Campbell, she was temporarily assigned to District Headquarters and was unable to pay the bill.

Loisel said the bill was in her "in box" for anybody to handle. She stated she was told her duties would be transferred to the Hammond Barracks during her temporary assignment. Loisel claimed the information on the virtual payments did not state what to do and had no instructions. Incidentally, the instruction for submitting virtual payments was clearly shown on two documents Loisel agreed she had seen previously. I asked Loisel if she tried to pay the bill, and she said, "I assumed it was being paid." I asked how many times the vendor appeared at the Barracks because of the unpaid bill, and she said he arrived at the Barracks four times. Loisel insisted every time she would handle it right away. Loisel said she also spoke about this with Martin.

I asked Loisel why she did not pay the bill dated May 9, 2016, and she said she has never seen this bill. I told Loisel this bill was found in her desk drawer, and she replied "did not recall" ever seeing this bill. Loisel said she worked through her in-box every day and insisted the bill must have appeared in her desk drawer after she was temporarily assigned to District Headquarters.

I asked Loisel if she followed the order reportedly given by Mardin, and she said yes. I referred Loisel to the accusation brought forth and told her it appeared she was not following orders dictated by Campbell when it came to the tire order. Loisel replied she was trying to point out problems because of where the tires were to be shipped and had not been instructed by the union to obtain documentation of orders given to her by Campbell.

I asked Loisel if there was anything else she wished to add to her statement, and she said no. Loisel said everything her statement was true and factual. I ordered Loisel not to

discuss this internal affairs investigation with anybody else, and she indicated she understood my order. The interview concluded at 1030 hours.

On December 26, 2017, I interviewed Sergeant Gregory S. Martin as a witness to this internal affairs investigation. (Listing all the exhibits.)

I referred Martin to the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report, and the Work Order Spreadsheet created by Loisel. I asked if he ever told Loisel not to update the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report, and he responded, "I don't recall ever telling her that." Martin explained the reason he would not have said anything like this to Loisel was because he is not in charge of equipment or vehicles and has not been in charge of equipment for a long time. I asked if he has seen the spreadsheet created by Loisel previously, and he said this document seemed familiar, and he thought this spreadsheet was her method of keeping track of the services which were paid or had not been paid.

I asked Martin if he told Loisel to create the Work Order Spreadsheet, and he replied, "I'm pretty sure she came up with this on her own." Martin said he never told Loisel to quit updating the FleetLE report. He insisted this was because vehicles were not his duty. Martin commented each sergeant at Hammond ensures things are done correctly; however, he would not make a change on another supervisor's duty simply because they might have a different approach than him. Martin explained telling Loisel not to update the FleetLE report, "does not seem like something" he would say when taking charge of the equipment was not his assigned duty.

I asked Martin if there was anything else he wished to add to his statement, and he reiterated he did not recall telling Loisel not to update the FleetLE report. He also did not recall telling her to update the FleetLE report. I asked Martin why Loisel would say he told her not to update the FleetLE report, and he said, "I have no idea."

I asked Martin if there was anything else he wished to add to his statement, and he said no. Martin said everything in his statement was true and factual. I ordered Martin not to discuss this internal affairs investigation with anybody else, and he indicated he understood my order. The interview conclude at 0965 hours.

On December 26, 2017, I re-interviewed Fleet Supervisor Dianna Langley as a witness to this internal affairs investigation. Prior to the interview, I showed Langley the Hammond Barracks FleetLE report dated November 2, 2017 (and other exhibits)

I asked Langley if she could explain how the FleetLE database has changed over the years, and she said the supervisors and inspection teams have given latitude for any mistakes found on the older entries. Langley explained the inspectors were not “dinging” Barracks for problems or mistakes from 2014 because this was prior to the full implementation of the Galaxy system.

I asked Langley if there were any issues with the FleetLE reports submitted by Loisel. Langley said she observed duplicate entries, which were not the main thing she immediately noticed; she saw where the service records on each of the other seven Barracks indicated that each vehicle had received the required services. Langley explained “just by glancing” she could instantly recognize the vehicles had been received according to policies.

As a means of illustrating the differences, Langley pointed out the first page of the Hammond Barracks report. He showed where vehicle SP280 showed the last service at 22,102 miles on June 13, 2017, but the current mileage as of October 29, 2017, was 32,201 miles. She said this was a 10,000-mile difference, and the 7,500 miles service at 30,000 miles was missing. Langley said the duplications are not the major issue. Since Loisel was not updating the FleetLE report, it appeared the vehicles at Hammond were not getting their required services.

Langley explained Loisel was not performing the updates at all or was doing them incorrectly. She stated she was able to verify the Hammond cruisers were indeed being serviced after she provided assistance to them, but there was no way to verify this upon first inspection. Langley bluntly remarked the secretary has the responsibility to ensure the FleetLE report is being updated correctly. I asked if the main issue she observed with the Hammond FleetLE report was the failure to update the system with oil changes, and she said yes.

Langley said the duplicate entries would only become an issue if they were not oil changes. She stated there were multiple examples of missing information on the Hammond Barracks

report. I asked who was responsible of the FleetLE report at Hammond, and she said it would be Loisel. Langley explained there would be no reason for any discipline if the oil changes were being properly entered into the system.

I asked Langley if Loisel had receive FleetLE training prior to this incident coming to light, and she answered, "Everybody has had training of some degree at the In-Service." Langley provided examples of using the test barracks. She said anytime there are changes to the system the secretaries receive updated training. Langley said she has provided additional training to Loisel since these issues have come to light. She remarked. Loisel has the most detailed training in FleetLE next to hers.

I asked Langley if there was anything else she wished to add to her statement, and she said no. Langley said everything in her statement was true and factual. I ordered Langley not to discuss this internal affairs investigation with anybody else, and she indicated she understood my order. The interview concluded at 1152 hours.

On February 12, 2018, I re-interviewed Lieutenant Tyler Campbell as a subject to this internal affairs investigation. The 0036 form was read to Campbell, and he indicated he understood the content of the form and the allegations against him. Campbell declined to receive a signed copy of this form at the conclusion of the interview. He also elected to participate in the interview without legal representation.

I asked Campbell if he recalled making a comment in a previous interview regarding his signature being "forged" on certain documents without his permission, and he replied yes. I referred him to the receipts for the bills paid by Morris while she was assigned to the Hammond Barracks in November 2017. I asked Campbell if the initial "TC" were made by his hand, and he answered yes.

Campbell said Morris discovered Loisel had apparently singed his name to documents because "his signature changed drastically" in 2-17. Campbell indicated he would provide me with these additional documents at the conclusion of the interview as he did not have them in his possession since he transferred to Capital Operations.

I asked Campbell if the secretary at each facility is tasked with paying the monthly bills, and he said yes. I asked if the Barracks Commander's signature on each receipt approves

the payment, and he said yes. I asked Campbell if he gave permission for Loisel to sign his name, and he replied no. I asked him if there were any problems with Loisel signing his name to documents prior to the decline of their interpersonal working relationship in late 2016, and he said no.

I asked Campbell if Loisel ever told him she was going to sign his name or initial documents, and he answered, "Absolutely not." I asked if there was anything else he wished to add to his statement, and he said Morris told him there might be "requisitions or other things signed" during this time frame but he could not remember all of them.

Campbell explained by the end of 2016, Loisel would not communicate with or be in the same room with him. He recalled when he first arrived at Hammond, Loisel would bring him papers to sign, and he would sign them. Campbell said he understood this to be the normal process for a new lieutenant, and as time progressed he noticed he was signing less bills each month; he attributed this to becoming more acquainted with the daily operations at Hammond, and he thought he did not need to see every bill as it arrived. Campbell said he "had no idea" Loisel was "forging" his signature.

Campbell said he supervised Loisel to the best of his ability, but during the course of 2017 he was subject of several internal affairs investigations because Loisel filed complaints against him. Campbell described their relationship as "hostile and not normal." Campbell said he had "zero control" over Loisel because he did not have the ability to speak to her without her filing some type of grievance against him.

Campbell referred to Hall and said he was very engaged in supervising him. He felt Hall was "doing a great job." Campbell said there were no problems with the vehicles being serviced at the Hammond Barrack under Hall's direction. Had he'd known the FleetLE report was not being completed Campbell said he would have taken over this task himself because he could not interact with Loisel. Campbell referred to some of the previously resolved issues with the Hammond Barracks overtime logbook to show another example of how far his relationship with Loisel had deteriorated; Campbell could not have a conversation with Loisel to take corrective action in this area because she continued to file repeated grievances and allegations against him at every turn.

Campbell insisted he did the best he could in the situation with Loisel, but his options were extremely limited due to her behavior. He stated, "I never lost my cool with her. I never yelled at her. I never blocked her out of Barracks programs." Campbell indicated he even got into an internal affairs investigation at the end of 2017 because he tried to include Loisel in the function at Hammond.

I asked Campbell if he would have granted permission to Loisel to sign his name if their relationship had been normal, and he said yes. Due to the fact there was no element of trust, Campbell said he had no ability to "micro-manage" Loisel. Campbell apologized for getting upset, and replied, "It pisses me off."

I asked Campbell if there was anything else he wished to add to his statement, and he answered no. Campbell said everything in his statement was true and factual. On behalf of the Office of Personnel, I ordered Campbell not to discuss this internal affairs investigation with anybody else, and he indicated he understood my order. The interview concluded at 1023 hours.

At the end of the interview Campbell reviewed the receipts from the Hammond Barracks via email. He indicated Loisel signed each and every one of those receipts without his permission. These documents have been included with this report.

On February 16, 2018, I re-interviewed Secretary Emma L. Loisel as the subject of this internal affairs investigation. The 0036 form was read to her, and she indicated she understood the content of the form and the allegations against her. Loisel received a signed copy of this form at the conclusion of the interview. She participated in the interview with Ms. Wendy Bishop as her union representative.

Prior to the interview, I showed Loisel the tow bill dated April 11, 2017, the fire extinguisher bill dated May 9, 2016, and the Hammond Barracks receipts provided by Campbell. Loisel acknowledged she reviewed the items prior to the start of the interview.

I showed Loisel the bills paid by Morris and told her Campbell already acknowledged he initialed each of these documents. I referred her to the receipts provided by Campbell and asked if she signed each of these bills. Loisel said she was ordered to sign the bills by Campbell and previous Barracks Commanders while she worked at Hammond. She

explained Campbell told her to continue signed the receipts for him when he first became the Hammond Barracks Commander in 2015.

I asked Loisel if she spoke to Cambell regarding signing the bills in 2017, and she said he told her to sign the receipt for him in 2015. I asked again if she spoke to Campbell regarding her using his signature in 2017, and she answered no. I asked Loisel if she signed or initialed every one of the documents in question, and she said yes. I asked if any of the other supervisors told her to continue signing the bills for Cambell in 2017, and she answered no. Loisel stated, "It was standard practice." I asked if Campbell's signature provided the approval for the bills to be paid, and she replied yes. I told Loise Campbell said he did not give her permission to sign his name, and she again said he gave her permission in 2015. I asked if Campbell told her to sign his name in 2017, and she replied no. Loisel asked for an additional document signed by Maintenance Worker Weiss to be include in this report.

I asked Losel if there was anything else she wished to add to her statement, and she said no. Loisel said everything in her statement was true and factual. I ordered her not to discuss this internal affairs investigation with anybody else, and she indicated she understood my order. The interview concluded at 0904 hours.