



**COLUMBIA COUNTY
SHERIFF'S OFFICE**
Jeffrey M. Dickerson, Sheriff

Address: 901 Port Ave. St. Helens, OR 97051
Phone: (503) 366-4611 Fax: (503) 366-4644
Web Address: www.co.columbia.or.us/sheriff

December 8, 2015

Todd Dugdale
230 Strand Street
St. Helens OR 97051

Re: Security Escort Requirement for Casey Garrett and Misconduct Complaint

Todd,

I have learned of allegations against Casey by jail staff that he has knowingly violated our security policies by encouraging one of the contractors to violate one of our contraband prohibitions. Additionally, it is alleged that Casey lied to the jail commander when confronted with this information.

On Monday, November 23, 2015, in a meeting with the Jail Commander (Captain Weaver) and Casey, Casey was advised that on the previous Saturday the contract worker installing the tile on the inmate showers was discovered to be in possession of contraband, specifically chewing tobacco. During that conversation Casey advised the jail commander that a corrections deputy had noticed the same worker in possession of chewing tobacco on an earlier date and the deputy told the worker to just keep the chew in his pocket. This was a clear violation of our security policies and a violation of Oregon law. In order to track down the reason for this violation, we conducted an investigation.

We have since learned that four different deputies spoke to the contract worker about not bringing tobacco into the jail. One of those deputies was the deputy Casey told Captain Weaver about during their initial meeting regarding the contraband. However, that deputy advised that when he informed Casey and the contract worker that possessing tobacco products in the jail was a felony crime, it was Casey, not the deputy, who told the worker to just put the tobacco in his pocket.

During that initial meeting, Captain Weaver advised that he found Casey's attitude towards any security issues to be "very cavalier." Our investigation seems to bear this out. The introduction of contraband is not only a violation of Oregon Law, but it can literally put lives in danger. Our rules, while they may seem "silly" to those without a jail security mindset, exist to make sure we are in compliance with federal, state and local law, and to protect lives.

Before anyone is granted unescorted access to this facility we must be able to trust that he or she will follow all policies, rules and procedures without question. As of now, we do not believe we can trust Casey to do so. Therefore, effective immediately Casey will be escorted by a Columbia County Sheriff's Office employee anytime he enters a secured area of the Sheriff's Office. As this would be a tremendous strain on our staff, I am asking that Casey enter the jail only as absolutely necessary and to remain only as long as to carry out the necessary function. Mostly, I would like for him to communicate with his staff outside the confines of the facility whenever possible and to delegate to them and to jail staff the oversight of contractors while they are actually working inside the secure facility.

Additionally, I am requesting a formal employee investigation be conducted in this matter to see if Casey has violated any County personnel rules.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jeffrey M. Dickerson".

Jeffrey M. Dickerson
Sheriff

cc: Jean Ripa, HR

Columbia County

Department of Human Resources/Information Technology

230 Strand Street, St. Helens, Oregon 97051

(503)397-3874 Human Resources

(503)397-7231 Information Technology

Fax: (503)366-3906

www.co.columbia.or.us

MEMO

To: Todd Dugdale, Land Development Services Director
From: Jean Ripa, Director
Re: Analysis and Conclusion of Investigation into CCSO Complaint regarding Casey Garrett
Date: January 7, 2016

On December 8, 2015, Columbia County Sheriff Jeff Dickerson filed a written complaint with you against Casey Garrett, Facilities Services Manager, related to an incident with a contractor working in the Jail and a later interaction between Garrett and Jail Commander Tony Weaver.

The allegations to consider are as follows:

1. Did Garrett knowingly violate SO security policies by encouraging one of the contractors to violate one of the contraband prohibitions?
2. Did Garrett lie about this to the Jail Commander?

Overall Analysis:

I have interviewed the following County employees with notes on file:
Casey Garrett (who also provided a written response to the allegations)
Captain Tony Weaver
Lieutenant Brian Pixley
Corrections Deputy [REDACTED]

There was no need to interview the contractor involved as there is no apparent dispute regarding the relevant events which occurred directly with this person and given that Garrett spoke to the contractor about the investigation, any testimony from him would be considered biased.

In summary, on November 17 or 18, 2015, [REDACTED] checked K Pod on his rounds. The contractor was working on the shower floor and Garrett was in the Pod at the time. Both [REDACTED] and Garrett state that [REDACTED] saw a can of chewing tobacco, which is considered contraband and is, according to the Sheriff, considered a felony crime if brought into a security correctional facility. Both [REDACTED] and Garrett state that Garrett tossed the can to the contractor and told him to put it in his pocket until he left. [REDACTED] states that he allowed this because he knew the contractor was leaving within a very short period of time (approximately 30 minutes) and he knew the project was a priority for completion so didn't want to have to require the contractor to take 10 minutes out of that 30 to go to his truck and come back.

There were additional points where this contractor apparently brought chewing tobacco into the facility after this event. The final event was caught by Corrections Deputy [REDACTED] who had the contractor spit the tobacco out in a toilet. Garrett was not involved in any other of these other events.

According to the statement of Garrett, Weaver and Pixley, on November 23, 2015, Weaver asked to see Garrett in his office at the Jail. Weaver told Garrett that the contractor was caught again with tobacco. When Weaver had been informed by other deputies of the incident wherein ██████████ had the contractor spit the tobacco out, ██████████ brought up the incident which had occurred on 11/17 or 11/18. ██████████ prepared a report on this incident and a copy of that report is on file.

Because of the repeated violation by the contractor, even after being warned not to bring tobacco into the facility, Weaver, reasonably, wanted to talk to Garrett about the issue. Weaver admits that he lost his temper due to his frustration over Garrett not hearing and recognizing that, regardless of what Deputy ██████████ may have done, Cpt. Weaver, as Commander of the Jail, did not find that acceptable. This was not a long conversation, and given tempers involved may be better defined as a confrontation.

Both Weaver and Pixley clearly heard Garrett state that the Deputy involved (Garrett does not know his name but it was ██████████), told the contractor to put the chew in his pocket. They knew this not to be true and felt that Garrett was lying to them.

While Weaver may have been angry, Pixley was not. He clearly heard the same statement from Garrett which Weaver heard. Both Pixley and Weaver are known to be credible and truthful with no doubts as to their integrity. Garrett himself admits that he was flustered due to the level of Weaver's temper and he freely admits that it was him who told the contractor to put the chew in his pocket.

Findings regarding Allegation #1. Did Garrett knowingly violate SO security policies by encouraging one of the contractors to violate one of the contraband prohibitions?

I find this allegation to be not sustained. While Garrett did indeed tell the contractor to put the chew in his pocket until he left the facility on 11/17 or 11/18, the fact that a Corrections Deputy agreed with this at the time would have logically led Garrett to believe that this was an acceptable action. Garrett had no involvement in the subsequent incidences with the same contractor and the chewing tobacco and cannot be held accountable for that.

Findings regarding Allegation #2. Did Garrett lie about this to the Jail Commander?

I find this allegation to be sustained. Two witnesses clearly heard Garrett make the same statement. I will give Garrett the benefit of the doubt and believe that this statement was not an intentional lie. When tempers are flaring, it is easy for people to get flustered and defensive. This does not excuse Garrett not being able to clearly articulate to Weaver what happened. Nor does it excuse the level of defensiveness in which Garrett engaged rather than hearing and understanding Weaver's position that his position on the tobacco, as Jail Commander, is what prevails, not what a Deputy may say or do.

Recommendation:

There are several layers to this issue.

There appears to be some basic confusion and lack of consistency in how contractors are informed and monitored in terms of what is appropriate when working in the secure facility. This confusion appears to

include who is responsible for informing and monitoring the contractors. I highly recommend that the Sheriff's Office develop a procedure, perhaps including a form for individual contractors to read and sign before entry, which can be used by any department or contractor who does work in the secure facility. I can use IT as an example. We bring in contractors from time to time to perform work in the secure facility. The only item of which I am aware that we must warn these contractors about is weapons. Once the procedure is developed, it should be shared with those of us who work closely within the secure facility and, then becomes our responsibility as well to know the procedure, to follow it ourselves without question and to assist in ensuring that any contractors are informed and compliant as well.

I do not believe that Garrett has yet learned and accepted his own responsibility in terms of maintaining the rigid security required of working within the secure facility. Because of this, the trust that must develop in order for the Facilities Manager to be an effective resource to the Sheriff's Office has not developed either. It is vital to the County's interest, as well as the Sheriff's Office and Facilities, that this occur.

I choose to call the "lie" regarding the statement made a mis-statement in order to give Garrett the benefit of the doubt regarding his intentions. However, re-defining that statement does not take away the fact that it happened. When Weaver and Pixley heard the statement (and later the Sheriff when he heard of the incident), they knew it to be untrue and, therefore, very naturally and logically believe that Garrett lied to them. Truthfulness is vital and expected in all County employees. In the Sheriff's Office, and all the law enforcement offices, truthfulness is the bedrock of the integrity that allows them to conduct the basic functions which they perform. Lying, very literally, will cost an employee his or her job. This is not theoretical, it is absolute fact with more than one employee recently dismissed from County employment due to untruthfulness. Garrett, as well as everyone involved in working with the Sheriff's Office, must understand this basic and intrinsic concept and go beyond understanding it to respect it and live by that same value. The response by the Sheriff's Office to Garrett, given this foundation, is very understandable and, indeed, the normal reaction they would have to untruthfulness in any situation.

My overall recommendation is:

- The Sheriff's Office accept that Garrett did not knowingly violate their policies and that he did not intentionally lie to Weaver.
- That Garrett let go of his understandable defensiveness over this issue and recognize his own responsibility to take the necessary steps to fully understand the working needs of the Sheriff's Office and his role in building the trust in him that will be needed for him to have effective working relations with the Sheriff's Office.
- That Garrett and Weaver meet and outline a training program to give Garrett this level of knowledge as well as to collaborate on the most effective procedure for ensuring that all contractors (and staff) comply with security policies.

Submitted by,



Jean Ripa
Human Resources Director

