

Bailey, Rachel - VETS

From: [REDACTED] 7c
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 10:01 AM
To: Bailey, Rachel - VETS
Subject: Brett Gailey
Attachments: brettgailey.pdf

Hello Rachel,

[REDACTED] 7c

[REDACTED] 7c

Please review the attached emails/correspondence with Brett's chain of command and Human Resources. It may shed some light on how Brett is being treated differently due to his military service; and this is just not a performance issue as the City is trying to portray it.

Thanks

[REDACTED] 7c

To whom it may concern,

This memo is in addition the original Officer Gailey pre-grievance notification memo the below referenced "shed more light" on this potential grievance.

On April 8th 2016, at 0645 hrs, I accompanied Officer Gailey to a meeting to receive a "documented coaching and counseling" and to discuss questions he may have about his performance evaluation.

[REDACTED]

Officer Gailey and [REDACTED] failed to qualify for the 1st quarter of firearms qualifications. Officer Gailey accepted that the failure to attend qualifications in the time required was on him. Officer Gailey felt that he did in fact qualify in the 1st quarter, but forgot to sign the "sign in sheet". Regardless, he stated the omission is his responsibility.

Lt Goetz concurred with Officer Gailey's explanation; however felt the failure to sign the log was a very egregious violation. Lt Goetz throughout the conversation physically referred to Officer Gailey's June 2015 evaluation by "tapping" and placing his hand on the document; making reference to attention to detail. Officer Gailey is a member of the EPD SWAT/SNIPER team, and maintains a level of skill above and beyond that of a regular patrol officer and qualifies in a timely manner more often than not. This is a great example of how regular constant performance is completely wiped out with a minor oversight.

The meeting moved on from the documented coaching and counseling to another matter. Lt Goetz asked Officer Gailey if he had any questions about his June 2015 evaluation (the document on his desk he often refers to in the conversation); as he has heard "grumbings". Officer Gailey stated he did not have any questions, but was confused as to why he was barred from A/Sgt assignments.

Lt Goetz went into great detail about the impounding of a chainsaw containing gas and oil and his failure to qualify as MAJOR violations of policy and attention to detail. Lt Goetz documents this into Trakstar as follows:

"I spoke with Officer Gailey today regarding performance issues noted in his last two evaluations. Officer Gailey expressed concerns that he didn't have a clear understanding of the expectations and when any restrictions on training would be lifted. We talked about two recent major performance issues (impound of a chain saw and failure to qualify with his handgun) and how that has affected his progress in addressing the issues raised in his evaluation. He expressed concern that he was not being allowed to

work as an acting sergeant and that he was never advised of that restriction. I explained that this was directly related to the performance issues noted in his evaluations."

We DO NOT concur with Lt Goetz's inflated and inaccurate description of the two events as being MAJOR PERFORMANCE ISSUES. We also believe this is an attempt to create an atmosphere of poor performance without substantial or actual ongoing documented major deficiencies.

If in fact the deficiencies were at the level of MAJOR; one would assume a written reprimand and corrective action taken by leadership. One would expect clear and concise corrective plans, training, and documentation of such. Also since the corrective action taken directly effects Officer Gailey financially, due process is expected and essential, but was not afforded to him.

It was not until it was pointed out to Lt Goetz that policy was not followed in the areas of the June 2015 evaluation, he announced a plan to meet with Officer Gailey [REDACTED] 7c to discuss progress and set goals. Lt Goetz made a Trakstar entry as follows:

"I will meet with Officer Gailey, [REDACTED] 7c on April 19th to discuss Officer Gailey's progress and set goals."

Conducting a meeting 10 months after first receiving his evaluation that allegedly contains MAJOR VIOLATIONS is not appropriate and does not abide by the Mission and Values of the Everett Police Department.

Lt Goetz did not make reference to the more recent evaluation dated 01-12-2016 (although it is dated 2006 in the actual evaluation) through 04-01-2016; and the improvements noted therein.

Lt Goetz was not aware if there was sufficient improvement or under what timeline Officer Gailey's sanctions were, he stated he needed to speak with [REDACTED] 7c Lt Goetz repeatedly stated he needs to see constant performance before Officer Gailey can be assigned as an A/Sgt or attend training.

The EPOA feels the meeting slated for 04-19-2016, as it is an attempt to cover up a failure in the process and unfairly reset the clock in areas they feel need improvement after the fact of instituting sanctions against Officer Gailey.

We request all financial sanctions against Officer Gailey be lifted. The sanctions against Officer Gailey in the areas of training that benefit and support his career be lifted. We also request the retaliation cease and the evaluation of the use of his contractual benefits in the areas of sick leave, vacation, holiday time off and protected military leave.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED] 7c