



Oregon Department of Corrections
Human Resources

Investigative Report

Code of Conduct

12-HR-0193

INVESTIGATOR: Shauneen Scott, Human Resource Manager
2605 State St. SE
Salem, OR 97302
(503) 373-1602

LOCATION: Coffee Creek Correctional Facility (CCCF)

DATE: Occurred: June 2012
Reported: June, 2012
Completed: July 2012

SUBJECTS: Brandon Kelly, Assistant Superintendent of Security
CCCF

Kim Brockamp, Superintendent
CCCF

COMPLAINT: [REDACTED] **Employee A** and **Employee B** allege Asst. Superintendent of Security Brandon Kelly was inappropriate in an [REDACTED] meeting on June 20, 2012 and a meeting that followed. They also allege Superintendent Kim Brockamp made inappropriate statements when they went to her to regarding Brandon Kelly's behavior.

INTERVIEWED: [REDACTED] **Employee A**
[REDACTED] **Employee B**
[REDACTED] **Employee C**
[REDACTED] **Employee D**
[REDACTED] **Employee E**
Andrea Paola, HR Manager
Brandon Kelly, Assistant Superintendent of Security
Kim Brockamp, Superintendent

ATTACHMENTS: Memos from [REDACTED] **Employee A** and [REDACTED] **Employee B**

SUMMARY:

During the June 20, 2012 [redacted] meeting, Mr. Kelly used the F-word to get his point across. Staff in the meeting was consistent in describing Mr. Kelly's behavior and use of F-word ("fuck"). Mr. Kelly admits to using the F-word ("fuck") during the meeting. Mr. Kelly's recollection of the meeting with Employee A and Employee B is different than that of Employee A and Employee B. Mr. Kelly does admit to using the word "penis" but in response to a question. Ms. Brockamp admits to making statements similar to the ones alleged by Employee A and Employee B. Witnesses to both meetings have similar recollection of events.

INTERVIEWS:

Statement of Employee A

On July 3, 2012 I interviewed Employee A at the Coffee Creek Correctional Facility. The interview was recorded and Amanda Rasmussen was present as union representative. (Also, see Employee A memo)

Employee A said on Wednesday June 20, 2012 [redacted] attended the [redacted] meeting. Employee A said the meeting had just started when Employee B had a question about granting a phone call to an inmate as an incentive. Employee A said the group had quite a bit of dialog regarding the phone call and whether to allow the inmate the phone call. Employee A said Mr. Kelly stated IMU inmates don't get phone calls per the rule. Employee A said Mr. Kelly was very animated and started telling the group they were not going to do this and this is not how they do things in a male facility. Employee A said Mr. Kelly was using the F-word ("fuck") during his comments. Employee A said Mr. Kelly informed the group he is in charge and the rules were black and white and he was sent to CCCF to enforce the rules. Employee A said at one point they were discussing an MDT plan when Mr. Kelly said, "To do your fucking job, you need a plan to tell you how to do that? Security doesn't need a fucking plan to do a tier check and you should not need a plan to do your job." Employee A said [redacted] was stunned and felt shut down by Mr. Kelly's behavior. Employee A said Mr. Kelly also informed the group CCCF has gone way too far and things are coming down the pike to fix the elephant in the room. Employee A said Employee E asked what the elephant was in the room. Employee A said Mr. Kelly responded by saying, "Well, I will tell you what the fucking elephant in the room is, BHS and Counselors aren't going to be running the show anymore and there are rules here and that is not going to happen anymore." Employee A said the meeting was so intense and unproductive it ended a few minutes later.

Employee A said [redacted] went back to [redacted] office and tried to compose [redacted] because [redacted] was so angry [redacted] was in tears. Employee A said Employee B walked into [redacted] office and [redacted] told Employee B [redacted] wasn't ready to talk yet. Employee A said Employee B just sat down as [redacted] was upset as well. Employee A said they sat there not talking and Mr. Kelly walked in with a grin on his face and asked, "So what's up?" Employee A said Employee B told Mr. Kelly, "You really have to ask that question?" Mr. Kelly sat down and then replied, "Yeah, so what's going on?" Employee A said [redacted] asked Mr. Kelly for permission to speak freely and he nodded yes. Employee A said [redacted] told Mr. Kelly [redacted] was pissed off at him and [redacted] thought he was disrespectful, inappropriate and unprofessional with how he addressed BHS and the Counselors in the meeting. Employee A said Mr. Kelly responding by asking how else he was going to get his point across. Mr. Kelly said he can sometimes be "cocky" but he really isn't like

that. Mr. Kelly also said, "I'll be honest, it's the penis factor, sometimes you just have to throw your penis on the table."

Employee A said **Employee A** and **Employee B** met with Superintendent Brockamp and HR Manager Andrea Paola on June 26, 2012 along with their union representative Amanda Rasmussen. **Employee A** said they started to explain to Superintendent Brockamp the details of what transpired on June 20, 2012. **Employee A** said Ms. Brockamp told them Mr. Kelly was "raised" with this mentality by people like Nick Armenakis and Brian Belleque. **Employee A** said as **Employee A** was explaining to Ms. Brockamp how appalled **Employee A** was by Mr. Kelly's comment regarding his penis, Ms. Brockamp stated, although Mr. Kelly was brought up with that mentality by Nick Armenakis and Brian Belleque, they never spoke of their penis. **Employee A** said a few minutes later in the conversation Ms. Brockamp put her hands up, smiled and said, "OK, this is only a joke, but at least it was not an erect penis." **Employee A** said **Employee A** was shocked to hear, for a second time, a comment of that magnitude coming out of an Executive Manager's mouth.

Statement of **Employee B**

On July 3, 2012 I interviewed **Employee B** at the Coffee Creek Correctional Facility. The interview was recorded and Amanda Rasmussen was present as union representative. (Also, see **Employee B** memo)

Employee B relayed the information provided in **Employee B** memo and the information is consistent with the information received from **Employee A**. For more detail see attached memo.

Statement of **Employee C**

On July 3, 2012 I interviewed **Employee C** at the Coffee Creek Correctional Facility. The interview was recorded.

I asked **Employee C** to tell me what happened during the June 20, 2012 meeting. **Employee C** said during the round table **Employee B** asked if one of the inmates could make a phone call. **Employee C** said Mr. Kelly said it was not appropriate and they had to follow the IMU rules. **Employee C** said during the round table when Mr. Kelly was talking several staff got the impression the conversation was being shut down regarding the process. **Employee C** said **Employee A** stated the message needed to be heard but the way the message was presented was not appropriate. **Employee C** said **Employee C** stated **Employee C** felt it shut down the collaboration of the group. **Employee C** said when Mr. Kelly was speaking he became very compassionate and his voice was elevated and told the group they were way out of compliance with the rules. **Employee C** said **Employee D** supported **Employee A** by saying they needed to work collaborative and when an idea comes up that isn't supported by the rule it should be acknowledged and then they should move on in a respectful manner. **Employee C** said Mr. Kelly was using swear words and saying, "Fuck this and fuck that." **Employee C** stated he said they were out of compliance and BHS had full rein of the process and security was not taken serious and he was there to make sure what they do falls within the foundation of security. **Employee C** said when it was **Employee E** turn to speak he said BHS has always been collaborative with security and have been told "no" many times by security and did not go out of their way to buck security. Then it went back to Mr. Kelly and he said he wanted to talk about the white elephant in the room and how BHS had been driving the pendulum and over ruling security concerns. **Employee C** said **Employee B** couldn't recall if Mr. Kelly used the F-word when he was talking

about the elephant but he was using the F-word during the conversation. Employee C said Employee E asked what the elephant in the room was and several people, including Employee C in the meeting didn't know what the elephant was and they asked Mr. Kelly to elaborate. Employee C said Mr. Kelly explained the white elephant is BHS trumping security and security is falling to the way side. Employee C said a couple of people said they wanted to work collaboratively and they appreciated the message but didn't like the way Mr. Kelly delivered the message. Employee C said folks in the meeting tried to ignore Mr. Kelly's swearing and tried to focus on the issue. Employee C said no one told Mr. Kelly he was out of line during the meeting. Employee C said they tried to focus on what BHS needed to do to try to correct the issues. Employee C said a number of people (Employee A, Employee B and Employee E) told Employee C after the fact they were offended by what happened in the meeting. Employee C said Employee E told Employee C was going to circle back and talk with Mr. Kelly about the meeting. Employee C said Employee C's new to CCCF so Employee C doesn't have the history and Employee C was caught off guard by what happened in the meeting. Employee C said Employee C didn't know security felt that way about how BHS was dealing with the inmates in regards to security. Employee C said Employee C felt an executive manager using swear words was unprofessional. Employee C said Employee C agreed with the content of the message but not how it was delivered.

I asked if Employee C recalled Mr. Kelly making the statement that rules are black and white and he was sent to CCCF to enforce them. Employee C said yes. I asked if he said, "To do your fucking job you need a plan to do that, security doesn't need a fucking plan to do a tier check and you should not need one to do your job." Employee C said Employee C didn't recall that exact statement but something along those lines and he was using the F-word. I asked if Mr. Kelly said, "Well I will tell you what the fucking elephant in the room is, BHS and Counselors aren't going to be running the show anymore, there are rules here and that is not going to happen anymore." Employee C said yes, Mr. Kelly made the statement. Employee C said Employee C was caught off guard in the meeting and Employee C had no idea Mr. Kelly felt that way. Employee C said Employee C briefly spoke with Kim Brockamp the next day. Employee C said Kim Brockamp told her Mr. Kelly had self disclosed. Employee C said they didn't go into detail about the meeting.

Statement of Employee D

On July 3, 2012 I interviewed Employee D at the Coffee Creek Correctional Facility. The interview was recorded.

I asked Employee D to tell me about the meeting held on June 20, 2012. Employee D stated they discussed level changes and the group had a pretty intense conversation around the philosophy and the rules regarding moving inmates to different levels. Employee D said it was a very tense conversation but that was mainly Mr. Brandon Kelly. Employee D said it wasn't what Mr. Kelly said but how he said it and it didn't foster communication or collaboration. Employee D said Mr. Kelly was saying, "This is the rule and you will follow it." Employee D said how Mr. Kelly presented the information closed people off because he was using the F-word. Employee D said Mr. Kelly made the statement, "So we are going to start following the fucking rule." Employee D said Mr. Kelly made some statements about when he worked for the "fucking male institutions". Employee D said at the end of the meeting Employee C asked Employee A if Employee C was okay. Employee D said Employee A responded, "Yep, I'm good." Employee D said the way Employee A responded, it didn't sound sincere.

Employee D said he tried to support Employee A by saying they needed to dialog and share together. Employee D said that is when Mr. Kelly started addressing the group about following the rules and he was using the F-word. Employee D said Mr. Kelly said the male institutions follow the rules and they work through the system.

I asked Employee D if Employee D remembered Mr. Kelly saying he was in charge and the rules were black and white and he was sent to CCCF to enforce the rules. Employee D said Employee D recalled Mr. Kelly saying he was Assistant Superintendent of Security and part of his responsibility was to enforce the rules and not everyone likes that.

I asked Employee D if he heard Mr. Kelly say, "Do you need a fucking plan to do your job? Security doesn't need a fucking plan to do a tier check; you shouldn't need one to do your job." Employee D said he recalled Mr. Kelly making that type of statement but not the exact words.

I asked Employee D if Employee D recalled Mr. Kelly saying Coffee Creek has gone too far and there was something coming down the pike and he is there to fix the elephant in the room. Employee D said Employee D recalled Mr. Kelly making a statement like that but doesn't recall his saying he was there to fix the elephant in the room. Employee D said Employee D recalls someone saying they needed to discuss the elephant in the room. Employee D said Employee D said if there is an elephant in the room let's talk about it. Employee D said Employee E was trying to pin Mr. Kelly down to specifics. I asked Employee D if Employee D heard Mr. Kelly state, "Well, I will tell you what the fucking elephant in the room is, BHS and Counselors aren't going to be running the show anymore, there are rules here and that is not going to happen anymore." Employee D said Employee D didn't recall Mr. Kelly making that type of statement but Employee D may have missed it.

Employee D spoke with Employee A and Employee D said she spoke with Mr. Kelly about the meeting and it went well and he apologized.

Employee D spoke with Mr. Kelly following the meeting. Employee D said Mr. Kelly told him it wasn't what he said but how he said. Employee D said Mr. Kelly was agreeable and didn't take offense and it was an easy and quick conversation with him.

Statement of Employee E

On July 3, 2012 I interviewed Employee E at the Coffee Creek Correctional Facility. The interview was recorded.

I asked Employee E to tell me about the meeting on June 20, 2012. Employee E said they were talking during round table about allowing an inmate to have a phone call as a behavioral incentive. Employee E said it sparked a lot of conversation and the most notable response came from Mr. Kelly. Employee E said Mr. Kelly was taking issue with providing an inmate with incentives when getting out of IMU should be incentive enough. Employee E said Mr. Kelly was rather insistent on a significant philosophy change and referred to an elephant in the room. Employee E said Employee E asked Mr. Kelly what the elephant was and he said security and security has taken a minor role at CCCF. Employee E said Mr. Kelly said he was there to say no to departments. Employee E said Mr. Kelly was pretty forceful and the attitude was,

“here is how we are going to do this and if you don’t like it you can write you own rule or law and take it to the DOME building and see what they want to do with it.”

I asked Employee E if Employee E heard Mr. Kelly say he was in charge, the rules are black and white, and he was sent to CCCF to enforce them. Employee E said yes Employee E recalls Mr. Kelly making a statement like that.

I asked Employee E if Employee E heard Mr. Kelly say, “To do your fucking job, you need a plan to tell you how to do that? Security doesn’t need a fucking plan to do a tier check and you should not need a plan to do your job.” Employee E said yes he said something like that.

I asked Employee E if Employee E heard Mr. Kelly say, “CCCF has gone way too far and things are coming down the pike to fix the elephant in the room.” Employee E said yes.

I asked Employee E if Mr. Kelly said, “Well I will tell you what the fucking elephant in the room is, BHS and Counselors aren’t going to be running the show anymore, there are rules here and that is not going to happen anymore.” Employee E said yes.

Employee E said Mr. Kelly was using foul language to get his point across and he felt it was inappropriate for a manager to use that type of language. Employee E said Employee E spoke with Mr. Kelly after the meeting and told him Employee E thought Mr. Kelly should have spoken with the other managers prior to the meeting otherwise he was undermining them in the meeting. Employee E said Employee E told Mr. Kelly management should disagree in private and support each other publicly and Employee E didn’t feel that happened because Mr. Kelly didn’t talk with them before hand. Employee E said Employee E told Mr. Kelly using that type of language sets him up for problems because many people in the meeting saw it as offensive. Employee E said Mr. Kelly agreed and said they needed to support each other publicly. Employee E said Mr. Kelly did share with Employee E he thought he was under investigation.

I asked Employee E if Employee E spoke with anyone other than Mr. Kelly about the meeting. Employee E said Employee E reported what happened to Jana Russell but didn’t report it to anyone at CCCF.

Statement of Brandon Kelly, Assistant Superintendent of Security CCCF:

On July 9, 2012 I interviewed Mr. Kelly in his office at CCCF. The interview was recorded.

I asked Mr. Kelly to tell me about the Employee E meeting on June 20, 2012. Mr. Kelly said the group reviews inmate’s levels and had discussions on incentives and programming. Mr. Kelly said there was some discussion about giving an inmate a phone call as an incentive. Mr. Kelly said he told them no, there is an IMU rule that dictates what type of privileges inmates get and other inmates across the state do not get phone calls. Mr. Kelly said he told them they had to treat inmates the same whether male or female. Mr. Kelly said someone spoke up and said they needed to be nicer to the female inmates. Mr. Kelly said he told them during his years of experience he spent over 10 of them in special housing and he has saw inmates with far more severe mental health issues been able to transition out of special housing. Mr. Kelly said not everyone liked that stance. Mr. Kelly said Employee E asked if everyone was okay and Employee A spoke up and said Employee A was not okay and felt they were being shut down and they couldn’t have an opinion and everything is black and white. Mr. Kelly said Employee D tried to support Employee E Mr. Kelly said when it came to him he apologized if they didn’t like his decision but he

was Assistant Superintendent of Security and that is his job and sometimes things are going to be black and white and if they don't like it they can go downtown and change the rules. Mr. Kelly said he told them his job was Assistant Superintendent of Security and sometimes he has to be an asshole and he apologize to them if they didn't like him being an asshole. Mr. Kelly said if they weren't aware of the elephant in the room but things were changing at CCCF. Mr. Kelly said he told them BHS and Counselors think they continue to drive the inmates and Security doesn't have a place. Mr. Kelly said Security actually runs the institution. Mr. Kelly said he told them they continue to focus on when he tells them no and doesn't acknowledge when he tells them yes. Mr. Kelly said as an example there is an inmate who is having a visit with [REDACTED] daughter and [REDACTED] parents to sign over custody and he was the driving force to get Ms. Brockamp to approve. Mr. Kelly said Employee E asked about the elephant in the room and they had some more discussion. Mr. Kelly said at the end of the meeting he apologizes if he offended anyone. I asked Mr. Kelly if it was a heated conversation. Mr. Kelly said there was lots of emotion and he spoke louder than normal and wasn't completely calm.

I asked Mr. Kelly if he told the group he was sent to CCCF to enforce the rules. Mr. Kelly said he told the group part of his job was to abide by the rules and that was expressed.

I asked Mr. Kelly if he said, "To do your fucking job, you need a plan to tell you how to do that? Security doesn't need a fucking plan to do a tier check and you should not need a plan to do your job." Mr. Kelly said he could have said that but not verbatim.

I asked Mr. Kelly if he told the group, "CCCF has gone way too far and things are coming down the pike to fix the elephant in the room. Well I will tell you what the fucking elephant in the room is, BHS and Counselors aren't going to be running the show anymore, there are rules here and that is not going to happen anymore." Mr. Kelly said he probably said something like that. Mr. Kelly said the F-word is part of his vocabulary.

I asked Mr. Kelly to tell me what happened after the meeting. Mr. Kelly said he knew the [REDACTED] were upset so he went to talk to them. Mr. Kelly said he went to Employee A office and Employee B was in there so he walked in and asked, "You okay?" Mr. Kelly said Employee A told him Employee A was fucking pissed and didn't like how he delivered the message. Mr. Kelly said Employee A agreed with his message but didn't like how he delivered the message and felt he shut them down. Mr. Kelly said they had a conversation about their frustration with BHS and they agreed things were getting out of control. Mr. Kelly said he told them they needed to understand what he was doing in the meeting, some of it was acting and for shock value, to show BHS is not the driver and he was trying to support them. Mr. Kelly said he thought they had a very good conversation.

I asked if he told them he can sometimes be cocky but he really isn't like that. Mr. Kelly said he does not refer to himself as cocky because that is what others have used to describe him.

I asked Mr. Kelly if he told them, "It's the penis factor, sometimes you just have to throw your penis on the table." Mr. Kelly said not exactly like that. Mr. Kelly said when he was telling them it was an act; they asked why men do that. Mr. Kelly said he told them it was the penis principal but he never said anything about throwing his penis on the table. I asked Mr. Kelly why he thought it was a good idea to make a comment involving the word penis to [REDACTED] Mr. Kelly said because Employee B had asked why men act that way and they were having an open and honest conversation and he didn't

think there was anything offensive. Mr. Kelly said he thought the meeting went well and both ^{Employee A} and **Employee B** thanked him for coming and talking to him and being honest and open and allowing them to be honest and open.

I asked Mr. Kelly about his comment about needing to talk with **Employee B** about the other issue. Mr. Kelly said **Employee B** brought up the issue with the Pathfinder and he said ^{Employee B} got played. Mr. Kelly said **Employee B** then stated they should talk about it later so he told ^{Employee B} to come on down to his office later. Mr. Kelly said when **Employee B** came to his office they discussed cross fit as ^{Employee B} has been asking him about the cross fit. Mr. Kelly said **Employee B** told him Carrie Casper took ^{Employee B} up to Andrea's office and they made ^{Employee B} write the memo about the Pathfinder issue even though ^{Employee B} didn't want to. He said he told ^{Employee B} not to worry about it.

I asked Mr. Kelly if he had any conversations with **Employee D** or **Employee E** after the June 20, 2012 meeting. Mr. Kelly said he asked ^{Employee D} if ^{Employee D} was offended and ^{Employee D} said ^{Employee D} wasn't. Mr. Kelly said **Employee D** used an example of a football coach giving a motivational speech during half time. Mr. Kelly said there was no discussion about the delivery of the message.

Mr. Kelly said **Employee E** told him the message could have been delivered better but said ^{Employee E} understood they had challenges at CCCF. I asked Mr. Kelly if **Employee E** told him he should have brought the managers up to speed prior to the meeting. Mr. Kelly said the conversation was about him, **Employee C**, **Employee E** and **Employee D** being on the same sheet of music. Mr. Kelly said **Employee E** told him they weren't that far off.

Statement of Andrea Paola, HR Manager:

On July 9, 2012 I interviewed Ms. Paola in her office at CCCF. The interview was recorded.

I asked Ms. Paola to tell me about the meeting with Superintendent Brockamp, **Employee A**, **Employee B** and Ms. Rasmussen. Ms. Paola said ^{Employee A} met with ^{Employee A} and **Employee B** the day before regarding their concerns with Mr. Kelly. Ms. Paola said **Employee B** had to leave so ^{Employee B} scheduled a time to meet with them the next day at 11am to discuss next steps. Ms. Paola said she was in Ms. Brockamp's office at 9:30 the next morning when Laurene came in and said **Employee A**, **Employee B** and Ms. Rasmussen were waiting. Ms. Paola said she went and spoke with them and they said they wanted to talk with Ms. Brockamp as well.

Ms. Paola said they relayed their concerns to Ms. Brockamp regarding Mr. Kelly and his interactions on June 20, 2012. Ms. Paola said Ms. Brockamp was receptive to what they were saying. Ms. Paola said Ms. Brockamp did say, "at least this time it isn't an erect penis." I asked Ms. Paola if Ms. Brockamp made a comment about Mr. Kelly not getting along with Nancy Howton and this left her with a "turd." Ms. Paola said yes, Ms. Brockamp did use the word "turd" and she made light of it by saying, "how do you spell that?" I asked if Ms. Brockamp said Nick Armenakis and Brian Belleque weren't the best role models for Mr. Kelly. Ms. Paola said she didn't recall. I asked if she recalled Ms. Brockamp saying she was sure Brian Belleque wouldn't mention his penis. Ms. Paola said she was just back from vacation and she doesn't recall all the details from the meeting.

I asked if **Employee B** brought up **Employee** concerns to Ms. Brockamp about a memo **Employee** wrote regarding Mr. Kelly. Ms. Paola said **Employee B** brought forth a concern from a contractor that an inmate was referring to Mr. Kelly as Brandon. Ms. Paola said **Employee B** and the contractor went to Mr. Kelly and he wasn't receptive to their concerns. Ms. Paola said **Employee B** wrote a memo and Ms. Paola gave the memo to Ms. Brockamp and she had a conversation with Mr. Kelly. Ms. Paola said **Employee B** stated **Employee B** was concerned Ms. Brockamp let Mr. Kelly read the letter and spoke with **Employee B** about the memo. Ms. Paola said Ms. Brockamp did say she owned it and she did share the memo with Mr. Kelly. Ms. Paola said **Employee B** told Ms. Brockamp **Employee B** just didn't expect Mr. Kelly to come to **Employee B** about the memo.

Ms. Paola said later in the day **Employee B** told her **Employee B** had concerns that they reported an issue with Mr. Kelly making a statement about a penis and then Ms. Brockamp makes a similar statement.

Statement of Kim Brockamp, Superintendent:

On July 9, 2012 I interviewed Ms. Brockamp in her office at CCCF. The interview was recorded.

I asked Ms. Brockamp to tell me about the meeting she had with **Employee A** **Employee B** Ms. Rasmussen and Ms. Paola regarding the concerns about Mr. Kelly. Ms. Brockamp said they met on June 26, 2012. Ms. Brockamp said she thought the issue was they were upset about how Mr. Kelly acted in the **Employee B** meeting. Ms. Brockamp said then they started talking about a meeting after the **Employee B** Ms. Brockamp said Mr. Kelly had reported he had offended some people in the **Employee B** meeting and she was a little confused. Ms. Brockamp said she knew about Mr. Kelly meeting with **Employee A** after but didn't know **Employee B** was also in the room when Mr. Kelly apologized to **Employee A** Ms. Brockamp said they told her Mr. Kelly had made a comment about putting a penis on the table and she told them she would get a fact finder from outside CCCF to do an investigation. Ms. Brockamp said she told them once she found out who would be the fact finder she would get back to **Employee B** but reminded **Employee A** would not know the outcome of the investigation. Ms. Brockamp said she asked **Employee A** what they were looking for and **Employee A** told her a meeting with Mr. Kelly so **Employee A** doesn't feel awkward.

Ms. Brockamp said she didn't feel she was trying to defend Mr. Kelly but she was trying to find out what happened. Ms. Brockamp said **Employee A** said at first **Employee A** thought **Employee A** was okay when Mr. Kelly came and apologized to **Employee A** but the more **Employee A** thought about it the more upset **Employee A** got.

I asked Ms. Brockamp if she made any comments about Nick Armenakis and Brian Belleque weren't the best role models for Mr. Kelly when they were telling her about the penis comment made by Mr. Kelly. Ms. Brockamp said she didn't think it was during the conversation about the penis. Ms. Brockamp said she doesn't recall saying Nick Armenakis and Brian Belleque weren't the best role models but she does recall saying it was the style Mr. Kelly grew up with. I asked if she said Brian Belleque wouldn't use the penis word. Ms. Brockamp said she could have said that but it doesn't sound like something that would roll off her brain. I asked Ms. Brockamp if she recalled saying, "At least it wasn't an erect penis." Ms. Brockamp said yes she did make the statement in a joking manner. Ms. Brockamp said it had been a long day and she said it was just a joke.

I asked Ms. Brockamp if she recalled telling them about Mr. Kelly and Ms. Howton not getting along and it left her a "turd" to clean up. Ms. Brockamp said they made a comment if they didn't know she was Superintendent that they would think Mr. Kelly was running the institution. Ms. Brockamp said she told them it wasn't a secret Mr. Kelly and Ms. Howton didn't get along and Mr. Kelly has some style issues he can work on. Ms. Brockamp said she didn't recall making a comment or using the word "turd." I told Ms. Brockamp everyone recalls her making the comment. Ms. Brockamp said then she probably did make the comment she was just having trouble remembering everything.

I asked Ms. Brockamp about the memo **Employee B** wrote regarding Mr. Kelly and the pathfinder concerns. Ms. Brockamp said yes she did forward the memo to Mr. Kelly because it was a PREA complaint and she asked him what was going on. Ms. Brockamp said she was taught with these types of issues you talk to the employee. I asked if Ms. Brockamp told Mr. Kelly not to go back and talk with **Employee B** about the concerns. Ms. Brockamp said she didn't believe so.

Disposition: Michael Gower, Assistant Director of Operations

Investigator: Shauneen Scott



Office: HR Manager

Date: 7/25/2012

Approved by Jacy Gamble: _____ **Date:** _____

Employee A Memo



COFFEE CREEK CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
24499 SW Grahams Ferry Rd
Wilsonville, OR 97070
M E M O R A N D U M

To: Human Resources

From: **Employee A**

Subject: Respectful workplace

Date: 06/25/2012

On the above date, I reported an incident to Andrea Paola, regarding Mr. B. Kelly, Assistant Superintendent of Security, myself, **Employee B** and attendees of the meeting (Brandon Kelly, **Employee B**, **Employee E**, **Employee D**, **Employee C** and myself) on 6/20/2012.

During the meeting, 6/20/2012, a question was raised by **Employee B** for clarification regarding an agenda item from a previous meeting. Jeannie asked whether or not one of the inmates or **Employee B** caseload was going to be receiving an "incentive phone call", as **Employee B** has yet to receive an answer and was following up as directed to do so at the last meeting. A brief discussion ensued about the pros and cons of allowing this phone call as an incentive for good behavior. Assistant Superintendent, Brandon Kelly, interrupted the discussion. In a raised and aggressive tone, Mr. Kelly informed the entire group that he is in charge, rules are black and white, and he was sent to CCCF to enforce them. As a compromise to Mr. Kelly's concern with regard to rules, policies and procedure, and to be pro-active, it was recommended that we place the inmate on an MDT plan. "To do your fucking job, you need a plan to tell you how to do that?" Mr. Kelly stated. He continued by saying, "Security doesn't need a fucking plan to do a tier check and you should not need a plan to do your job". I then raised my hand and addressed the group, specifically Mr. Kelly, stating, "I would like to speak and share my opinion." I said that I thought that these meetings were held to discuss issues regarding IMU inmates, as a team. I went further, stating that we are here to effect positive change with the inmate population and to reduce the risk of recidivism. I said that I felt like Mr. Kelly "shut everyone down", which defeats the original intentions of this meeting. In addition I thought we were all at the table to collaborate and give input, regardless of personal feelings. Mr. Kelly responded by saying, "we just started having this meeting". Stunned, most of the group was immediately silenced. I personally felt bullied, demeaned and demoralized by Mr. Kelly's remarks and the aggressive manner in which he spoke to the staff in the meeting. Mr. Kelly then informed the meeting attendees

that CCCF has gone way too far and that things are "coming down the pike" to fix the "elephant in the room". **Employee E** then asked, "So I am clear, because I do not know, what is the elephant in the room?" Mr. Kelly responded, "Well, I will tell you what the fucking elephant in the room is, BHS and Counselors aren't going to be running the show anymore, there are rules here and that is not going to happen anymore". At this point, the meeting was so tense and unproductive; it was concluded a few minutes later. I went straight to my office, as I was so disgusted, disrespected and appalled that I needed to remove myself from the situation.

Once I got back to my office, I tried to compose myself, as I was so angry I was in tears and shaking from adrenaline. Moments later, **Employee B** walks into my office, at which point I expressed that I was not ready to talk yet. **Employee B** simply sat down, as **Employee B** was extremely upset **Employee B** **Employee B** and I were just getting ready to talk about what had just occurred, when Mr. Kelly walked in my office with a grin on his face. He asked, "So what's up?" **Employee B** responded, "You really have to ask that question?" He replied "yeah, what going on?" He casually grabbed an extra chair in my office and nonchalantly drug the chair directly next to **Employee B** and right in front of me, blocking the entrance to my cubicle, then sat down. Mr. Kelly asked, for a second time, "So, what's going on?" I asked Mr. Kelly permission to speak freely, which he nodded yes said he would allow. I informed Mr. Kelly that I was "pissed off" at him. I thought he was disrespectful, inappropriate, and unprofessional, with regard to how he addressed BHS and Counselors in the meeting. Mr. Kelly wanted to know how else he was going to get his point across and informed me that CCCF has gone too far and sometimes you have to get people's attention. He went on to say that most of it is an act, but that sometimes you have to get your point across in this manner. He did apologize to **Employee B** and I, but seemed to have many reasons and excuses for his behavior. I informed Mr. Kelly that as the Assistant Superintendent of Security, I do not feel he can speak to a group of people in the manner that he did, as he shut everyone down and no one heard a word he said after that. He said that he can be "cocky" sometimes but he's not really like that. I felt it necessary to let Mr. Kelly know (as we do not know each other and have not had any previous communication) that I was not new to the Department of Corrections and that most of my career was spent in **Employee B** the last few years being a **Employee B**. I wanted him to understand that I am very familiar with safety and security and with the "black and white" point of view, but that I would never have gotten away with speaking to subordinate staff this way. He responded with, "Then you know how it is. I have to give the power back to the Captains and Lieutenants." He went on to say, "They don't know how to make decisions anymore and are afraid to make a call." Mr. Kelly then informed **Employee B** and I, as he slouched in his chair casually, I'll be honest, "it's the penis factor, sometimes you just have to throw your penis on the table." At this point, both **Employee B** and I laughed, nervously, as we were caught off guard and did not know how to respond to such a statement. We listened to Mr. Kelly speak for a few minutes about the pendulum of the Department and how it has gone too far to one extreme. Mr. Kelly expressed that the only way to get it balanced again, is

to go all the way to the other extreme. I did agree with Mr. Kelly, that sometimes the department does tend to swing from one side to the other, but that this was not the forum or communication style that is effective when speaking to staff, to solve any problems we may be having.

During the course of our conversation, Mr. Kelly said that he did not want me to feel like I could not share my opinion or feel bullied. I informed him that I would always share my opinion and never let someone bully me. I feel that Mr. Kelly took advantage of his power and authority. He cornered Employee B and I, two [REDACTED] staff, did not offer representation and proceeded to make us feel like it was our fault he acted the way he did. Because I was not comfortable addressing Mr. Kelly for the above reason, I shook his hand and thanked him for his time and apology.

After I shook his hand, Mr. Kelly then looked at Employee B and said, "So what's up with that other thing?" Employee B responded, "Do you really want to discuss this right now?" Mr. Kelly then said, "Yeah, what was the deal?" Employee B then said, "can we discuss this at another time?" I could tell Employee B was nervous and did not want to speak to him about this in front of me, at which point Mr. Kelly asked if Employee B would come and speak to him in his office.

I had no intentions of coming forward with this information, initially. From my understanding, this information was going to be brought forward if I did not do it myself. The reason I did not originally intend on bringing it forward was that incidents like this tend to cause friction and tense interactions in the work place, which I did not feel I was ready to deal with. That being said, I do believe and stand by the fact that Mr. Kelly was completely out of line and inappropriate. Whether I thought Mr. Kelly was being funny, crude, comfortable, charming or sexist, is not the issue (although I feel he was showing his dominance, was intimidating and sexist). The issue is he made inappropriate comments to subordinate staff, even in the course of apologizing for his communication style. He assumed that we would be ok with his comments and had no regard for policy dictating how he should act in the workplace (Policy 20.6.1 Promotion and Maintenance of a Respectful Workplace). This is on the heels of having very aggressive and animated conversations in [REDACTED] about following policy with regard to inmates. Because we laughed off his comment (regarding his penis) and acted as if it was no big deal (for fear of being bullied further), Mr. Kelly felt everything was dealt with. In reality, I felt as if I was obligated to look "tough" and laugh along with him. I was uncomfortable, disgusted and intimidated with my entire encounter with Mr. Kelly on 6/20/2012.

On 6/26/2012, I spoke with Superintendent Brockamp, Andrea Paola, and Employee B represented by Amanda Rasmussen. Supt. Brockamp welcomed us into her office and asked what it was we wanted to talk to her about. I asked her if she knew anything about the situation with Mr. Kelly. Supt. Brockamp informed me that she was given a brief overview by Human

Resources Manager, Andrea Paola. I then began to explain, in detail, the events that transpired on 6/20/2012, from the [redacted] Meeting to the meeting in my office with me, Mr. Kelly and Employee B. Supt. Brockamp asked a few clarifying questions regarding the incident with Mr. Kelly. She informed us that Mr. Kelly was "raised" with this mentality, by people like Nick Armenakis and Brian Belleque, his role-models. She went on to say that Mr. Kelly "self-reported" our interaction (only referring to me) and he thought it went very well. Sgt. Rasmussen then asked if she would explain what he self-reported. She said that he self-reported the conversation in the [redacted] meeting and that he came down to speak with me (not acknowledging that Employee B was also there) to apologize, and that everything went well. I informed Supt. Brockamp that I had asked Mr. Kelly if I had permission to speak freely, and he said yes. Supt. Brockamp stated, "Yeah, he told me you asked that." I told her I take full responsibility for leading him to believe that I was ok with the interaction, when in fact, I was very disturbed and distraught. I explained to Supt. Brockamp, that I was appalled at the comment made by Mr. Kelly, regarding his penis and placing it on the table. Supt. Brockamp said that although he was brought up with this mentality, they (referring to his role models Nick Armenakis and Brian Belleque), never spoke of their penis. A few minutes later, during the course of our conversation, Supt. Brockamp put her hands up, smiled and said, "OK, this is only a joke, but at least it was not an erect penis." Again, I was shocked to hear, for the second time, a comment of this magnitude come out of an Executive Managers mouth. At a loss for words, I again said nothing and laughed nervously. I found Supt. Brockamp to be dismissive, minimizing, unprofessional and encouraging (based on her own comment) of Mr. Kelly's encounter with us. In addition, Supt. Brockamp stated, "Just so you know, this was pre-planned, Mr. Kelly will be the Acting Superintendent for the next few days." I asked when this investigation was going to start, at which she replied, "Well, I will be out of the office and Andrea is going on vacation." She explained that this would be assigned to another Human Resources Manager due to conflict of interest (she felt that it would not be comfortable to have A. Paola investigate an Asst. Superintendent).

Due to the nature of the comments above, I feel it extremely important and vital that I add a piece of personal information. [redacted]

[redacted] Unfortunately, because of the authority Mr. Kelly and Supt. Brockamp have over me, and because of their position, I feel an overwhelming sense of sadness, distrust, bullying, disrespect, and harassment based on their words and actions.

Employee B Memo

[See memo dated 6/03/12; HR file: boundary concern]

On Wednesday, 6/20/12, I was present during an [redacted] meeting which was held in the large classroom, located on [redacted]. Those present: Employee E [redacted] Employee A Employee D Employee C [redacted] Mr. Brian Kelly and myself.

Toward the end of this meeting, I brought up a question regarding a previously noted agenda item for an inmate on my caseload (an incentive item). Although past [redacted] had been influenced by MH concern over this particular inmate, it was discussed that implementing an immediate 'incentive/reward' would serve influential in promoting a positive change in behavior...

My inquiry, resulted in immediate concern and several comments were made, in particular, by Employee C and Mr. Brandon Kelly, Asst. Superintendent of Security. Both asked 'why we would allow that'? Although I attempted to reference my notes of prior [redacted] discussions, a discussion ensued about the pro's and con's of allowing 'incentives' to our IMU inmates. Shortly after, Mr. Kelly interrupted in what appeared to be a very agitated tone. Although I understood his message and much of it made complete sense, it was completely lost in his delivery. He began by saying that he is 'the Assistant Superintendent of Security, was sent to Coffee Creek to enforce the rules. . . and wanted to make that perfectly clear'... 'the rules are black and white and something else to the effect of. . .'not understanding why that's so confusing for everyone'.

A comment was made by an [redacted] member, about implementing an MDT plan for an inmate, which appeared to be in compromise to what Mr. Kelly was saying, especially as he had stated something about being pro-active in our roles. Mr. Kelly immediately interjected, "Do you need a fucking plan to do your job? Security doesn't need a plan to do a tier check, you shouldn't need one to do yours! The problem is, no one wants to address the fucking white elephant in the room!". Mr. Kelly continued to remind us of his title, intent and motivation to 'get things back to running like a correctional facility again'. [redacted] interjected at some point, "Ok, I think I'm personally confused. . . I'd like to know what the white elephant in the room is, as I do not know?" Mr. Kelly replied, "I'll tell you what the fucking white elephant is, BHS and counselors aren't gonna be fucking running things around here anymore! I interjected at this point, stating my opposition. "I'd just like to say, that I really don't understand what that means. Until Heidi Steward came to Coffee Creek, counselors didn't really have a say in anything. We weren't asked for input. So I'm just not sure how we were or are, running the show?". Employee D then attempted to provide input, however was immediately interrupted by Mr. Kelly. It should be noted, that Mr. Kelly (who was sitting to Employee D left), turned to face Employee D and speak at Employee D in a raised voice. His tone, affect and presence alluded to that of frustrated drill instructor. This intimidating action, caused Employee D to turn Employee D head forward (away from Mr.

Kelly) and turn red in the face. **Employee D** made no further comment. After several minutes of hearing Mr. Kelly clarify his position of authority, direction and irritation with the lack of mindfulness to security practices, **Employee A** raised ^{Employee} hand and stated that ^{Employee A} like to say something. ^{Employee A} continued to share ^{Employee A} feelings in regard to ^{Employee A} and ^{Employee A} understanding in regard to why we all meet for ^{Employee A}

^{Employee A} stated that ^{Employee A} felt we all meet for ^{Employee A} to collaborate and discuss issues relative to our IMU population and provide input on issues and concerns relative to caseload management, as a team. ^{Employee A} also spoke of motivating inmates toward positive change and reduce the risk of recidivism. ^{Employee A} then looked over at Mr. Kelly and stated that ^{Employee A} felt like he (Mr. Kelly) shut everyone down, which defeats the intentions of everyone coming together in a collaborative effort.

Several other ^{Employee A} made brief statements, including ^{Employee A} and ^{Employee A} Mr. Kelly made it clear again that, "these meetings have only just started". Which I took for, [you've not seen anything yet]. 'I am the 'Assistant Superintendent of Security and things will be run with security in mind. That said, you may not like the way things are said or done, so if that bothers anyone, I'm sorry, but that is how it's going to be.'

At no time was Mr. Kelly confronted on his behavior or unprofessional, inappropriate volatile speech. At closing however, **Employee C** thanked Mr. Kelly and reiterated his 'tough position' to the committee. ^{Employee C} also stated that ^{Employee C} respected the difficult job he had as the Assistant Superintendent of Security. . . '. In closing, ^{Employee C} looked directly at **Employee A** and asked, 'are you okay ^{Employee A}? ^{Employee A} replied, 'yes, fine'. The meeting was quietly adjourned and we all exited the ^{Employee A} classroom.

June 25th, 2012 at approximately 11:10 a.m.

Employee A and I were sitting in ^{Employee A} office ^{Employee A} shortly after our ^{Employee A} meeting, when Mr. Brandon Kelly came into the office. I believe it's important to note that Mr. Kelly was smiling and his affect was almost condescending and arrogant. He grabbed a nearby chair and while sitting down asked, 'what's up?'. I responded, "do you really have to ask?" Mr. Kelly continued to smile and said, "yeah, what's going on?". ^{Employee A} looked at him and asked, "permission to speak freely?". Mr. Kelly agreed and ^{Employee A} continued by expressing how ^{Employee A} was 'pissed off' at how disrespectful and unprofessional Mr. Kelly was during the ^{Employee A} meeting. Very professionally, she continued by telling him that ^{Employee A} understood his 'message'; yet told him that the way he went about it was completely disrespectful and 'shut everyone down'. Very nonchalant like, Mr. Kelly simply said he knew he had taken a very strong approach, then asked, "how else am I supposed to get everyone's attention? Here's the thing, things have gone to crap and sometimes you have to get people's attention. Most of it is an act. I guess I shouldn't have included ^{Employee A} in what I said today'. I then asked, "Is that your apology?" and he replied, "yeah, I guess".

Employee A shared Employee A background in [redacted] and how Employee A was probably more security minded than not. Employee A also explained that Employee A would never have talked to staff, especially subordinates, in the manner in which he did. Mr. Kelly talked more about his position and how he's here to 'clean things up' and put the reins back in the hands of the Captain's and Lieutenants. . .because they don't know how to make decision's anymore'. I may have to say things and do things to get people's attention sometimes. "Here's the thing. . . you know what it was right? It was the penis factor. . . I was just throwing my penis out on the table". I clearly had no response to Mr. Kelly, yet am quite certain that my affect presented surprise and disbelief at what he had just said. Mr. Kelly then utilized an analogy to how things will be done for now on. He referenced a 'pendulum' and how he intends to bring it way out here (motioning a 45 degree turn with his hand), then slowly bring it back down ...you know what I'm saying? It's much easier to bring it too far out and slowly back, then to not bring it far enough and then try to repair things". Mr. Kelly and Employee A then discussed having an open line of communication. I don't want you to feel like you can't share your opinion with me, Mr. Kelly said. "You're never going to hurt my feelings". Employee A stated, don't worry, I won't. I'll always say what think, just know it will be much more professional than how it was done this morning'. After Mr. Kelly shook Employee A hand, he sat back down briefly and said to me, "so what's with this other thing"? Already assuming he was referencing a memo I had submitted several weeks earlier with regard to his position. I simply said, "what, right now"? Mr. Kelly replied, yeah, what was the deal with that?...you know you got played right"? I again requested that we address it later, so we agreed to go to his office to discuss the situation further.

Approximately 12:00 p.m. on 6/25/2012:

Mr. Kelly and I met his office and he immediately asked what the 'whole Pathfinder's memo was about'. I feel it's necessary to say that this was a light hearted conversation and in no way, did I find Mr. Kelly threatening. I spoke freely and again relayed that when [redacted] met with him on 6/11, I didn't feel he was hearing us clearly. Mr. Kelly continued to joke with me, stating several times, "you know you got played right? You know what this is about right? You got played". When I told him I didn't know to what he was referring to, he replied, "[redacted] doesn't like me". I clarified that this was simply about boundaries. "I accompanied [redacted] to your office, due to legitimate concerns over the boundaries between yourself and [redacted]. We are constantly drilled and taught to be aware and report 'anything' that seems out of the ordinary. I've been in corrections for 20 years, so that's a lot of training with regard to boundaries. I accompanied [redacted] to support [redacted] and also to give you a heads up as to what was being observed by several people, including other inmates. [redacted] needed assistance and support with [redacted] program expectations and I wanted to make sure you understood what this inmate was capable of.

I told him again that he kept reiterating his support of holding this particular inmate accountable for leaving [redacted] Pathfinders class, yet was not acknowledging that he made that difficult by letting [redacted] run out of class and go talk to him when he walked down the corridor and past the classroom in the morning. I further explained, that this inmate in particular has the ability to set him up. . .that [redacted] calls him 'Brandon' and tells everyone how 'Brandon' always calls [redacted] down to his office and will fix things

when everyone screws it up'. Mr. Kelly then said, 'Ok, but I still don't understand what you were trying to accomplish with this thing'. My response was, 'how does a teacher hold an inmate accountable to the rules, if they are not enforced by someone in your position, not to mention, the Superintendent of Security'? The teacher can't really write a DR for an inmate that leaves class or is in an unauthorized area, if [REDACTED] talking to you". Mr. Kelly then said that understood. He did inquire as to how "you guys invited me to be the guest Speaker for upcoming Pathfinders graduation, so I reiterated that I had nothing to do with obtaining guest speakers for our COG programs. I did however, ask him if he'd like to know how he was selected and he replied yes. I then shared that several inmates in this particular Pathfinders class, had been approached by [REDACTED] asking them to vote for Mr. Kelly. I asked him if he understood this a little better and he replied, 'well, I'm not going to do it then'.

To have Mr. Kelly confront me on this, felt like I blindsided. His presence and mode of confrontation, appeared intimidating and challenging. For him to say, "you got played", clearly appeared like another deflection of the original incident (6/3/12). His reference was clearly pointed at Cari Casper/Diversity Coordinator; Union Rep, who accompanied me to HR on 6/3/12. The discomfort in this, stems from a feeling that any further issues/concerns will be shared with Mr. Kelly and not taken seriously.

On Sunday, 6/23/12, I discussed the outcome of the [REDACTED] meeting when two close friends, who both happen to be employed by the Department of Corrections. After relaying the conversation with them about Mr. Kelly's sexual comments, one of my friends reminded me of her position as a manager and that it was mandatory that she would need to report what she had heard. I agreed to discuss the situation with Employee A the following morning at work, followed by a discussion with HR. Up until this point (discussion), I hadn't actually concluded how I was going to approach this incident. I was now emotionally affected by the thought of not only reporting a fellow employee, yet someone in an administrative position . . . regarding ethics, boundaries and inappropriate behavior in the workplace.

On Tuesday, 6/26/2012, I met with Employee A Amanda Rasmussen/Union Rep, Andrea Paola/HR and Kim Brockamp, Superintendent of Coffee Creek. Supt. Brockamp welcomed us to her office and explained she was aware that we wanted to talk with her. Employee A inquired as to whether Supt. Brockamp was aware of what had occurred during the [REDACTED] meeting the week prior, or the discussion that followed, between Mr. Kelly, Employee A and I. Supt. Brockamp explained that Andrea had filled her in and that Mr. Kelly had also 'self-reported' to her soon after our talk with him. She continued by saying that he went and spoke to everyone individually, yet said he had a good talk with you and things had gone well. She then looked at me and said, "now Employee B he didn't mention talking to you. . . you were there

too"? I replied, "yes, I was there the whole time". Amanda Rasmussen then asked Supt. Brockamp if she would be willing to clarify what she meant by "self-reported" (referring to Mr. Kelly). In reply, she said he reported his behavior from SNIEC and also how he went to apologize to you Employee A and that everything went well. Supt. Brockamp reiterated that 'he only mentioned Employee A so she was not aware that I was present in the room'. I told her that I thought that was 'very interesting, as we both confronted him on his behavior'.

Employee A asked if she knew of Employee inquiry to him, to speak freely to him? Supt. Brockamp confirmed that he did mention that to her. Further, Employee A said Employee wanted to take full responsibility for letting Mr. Kelly believe that 'our' talk concluded on a positive note. Employee explained that Employee was embarrassed and shocked, in reference to Mr. Kelly's sexually explicit comments. It was evident at this point, that Supt. Brockamp was not aware of everything Mr. Kelly had said to us. I believe it was then Amanda Rasmussen said, "so he didn't actually self-report then"? Supt. Brockamp explained that she had not heard that from him. She then explained that 'Mr. Kelly has a lot to learn. . . he's been here what, nine (9) months now? A good chunk of time longer than me. We're working with him. From what I understand, he had a rough start here. He and Nancy Howton did not get along at all, especially during the last few weeks she was here, so that left a big turd on my desk when she left". [Andrea Paola/HR, who was sitting adjacent to me, seemed as surprised as I did, then said aloud, "um, wow, how do you spell that?" Supt. Brockamp then introduced Nick Armenakis and Brian Belleque into the conversation.

[I am not familiar with Mr. Armenakis, however I do know that Mr. Belleque is Mr. Kelly's immediate supervisor and administrator]. Supt. Brockamp spoke of how both, Mr. Belleque and Mr. Armenakis were not the best role-models for Mr. Kelly. She continued with, "he really was 'brought up this way. . . although, I'm sure Brian never would've mentioned his penis'. At some point in her explanation, Supt. Brockamp interjected, "ok, this is just a joke. . . but. . . at least it wasn't an erect penis".

Without speculating to how the conversation ended, I can only acknowledge that Supt. Brockamp addressed Employee A and inquired as to what Employee A like to see happen with all of this. Employee A then reiterated Employee disappointment in his behavior and how a simple apology would not do. Supt. Brockamp explained that Employee A would not know the result or the outcome of how the situation would be handled with Mr. Kelly.

At some point in our discussion, I explained to her also, that I was frustrated over the previous situation with Mr. Kelly, in regard to him reading the memo I wrote (6/11/12 Memo; Employee A and I) with regard to a boundary concern Employee A and I both explained the way Mr. Kelly confronted me on that same memo, at the conclusion of our talk last week. Supt. Brockamp quickly offered an apology: Employee B I am so sorry about that. He was up here one day, so I pulled the memo out to talk to him about it. I asked him if there was going to be a problem with this (memo content) and he told me no. I'm sorry you didn't know about that before it happened". I thanked her and explained that it has put me in an awkward position with him, evidenced by his need to joke about it to me, in front of a peer/co-worker, "then I went to his office to discuss it with him and he tried to justify and minimize his actions based on his obvious contention with another staff member" [you got played; Employee A doesn't like me].

After we all agreed that an investigation was warranted, Supt. Brockamp concluded the meeting by clarifying that they would need to identify a new HR representative, as Andrea works too closely with Mr. Kelly and other Administrators of CCCF.

Over the past nine yearsstaff at CCCF has worked on building a culture of respect and teamwork at Coffee Creek, while still putting best security practices first. Furthermore, our facility has worked diligently to implement and carry CCM forward. It's been made quite clear in the past few months (as evidenced via behavior, statements and actions) that CCM is being discouraged and almost mocked. We are constantly coached and trained under guidelines of which to instill respect and negate discrimination, sexual harassment and any other prohibited conduct (DOC Policy 20.6.1).

I've observed staff being verbally shut down, bullied and ridiculed for simply having an opinion, which I believe has been part of the culture we've worked to implement at CCCF. Although we have very clear Rules (Administrative; ORS...), I feel like there is now a lack of trust, respect and an underlying tone of hostility in our working environment, not to mention an attempt to break our 'Team' apart.

Under our current policy, 'Supervisors and managers shall serve as role models for subordinates, educate staff and respond to and investigate actions that may be discriminatory or harassing in nature'. This clearly does not include, dictating "sexual innuendoes, teasing and other sexual talk such as jokes, intimate inquiries, persistent unwanted courting and sexist put-downs or insults;" most importantly, by an administrator self 'reporting' his intent to throw his sex and power out in front of [REDACTED]

Nothing Follows.

Employee B

Cc: Amanda Rasmussen;