

The woman said the deputy's behavior upset her to the point that she was forced to leave the party. She compared it to being 'stalked.'

pubic area and for the 'A' she patted her buttocks." The female deputy said she "did not feel the gestures were inappropriate" and asked the investigator who had complained about them so she could apologize.

Investigators gave the male deputy accused of stalking, groping and the camera snatch punishment of two days leave without pay, a written reprimand and an "alcohol assessment." A supervisor reprimanded the deputy that his conduct was "unbecoming of a Lane County sheriff's deputy, and it brought disrepute to the Lane County Sheriff's Office." The deputy's treatment of women at the party "contradicts any acceptable standard of behavior for law enforcement professionals. Peace officers are expected ... to protect individuals from such acts of offensive contact." The reprimand warns that any future misconduct would result in more discipline "potentially including termination."

It's unclear whether the discipline imposed actually was carried out. Other disciplinary action from the party was modified or revoked during legal appeals. The deputy denied the allegations of stalking and harassing and said he didn't recall the camera snatch. He offered witness deputies who said he did not appear drunk to the point of losing control.

FIGHT

A fight allegedly broke out between deputies and a deputy's male relative invited to the party as a guest. A deputy told investigators that he and three other deputies went to the union president's hotel room and banged on the door. "When he answered the door he was nude." The group stood in the hall laughing and talking when the relative came out of an adjacent room and tackled one of the clothed deputies. The two men struggled and the deputy got the relative into a leg hold and after talking to him let him go. The relative then stood and looked at another deputy and "asked him what was funny, grabbed him around the waist, lifted him off the ground and beat him against the wall three times. [The deputy] got tired of being hit against the wall, so he punched [the relative] in the face once." The relative was wrestled to the ground and after some yelling at him, the man left the scene, according to investigators.

Later at an ERB hearing, county attorney Williams said, "There was a deputy naked in a hallway who participated in breaking up a wrestling match between a deputy and a guest at the party, when one of them got knocked into a wall. The evidence will support that."

Despite the alleged assault, the five

**The deputy said his wife
did take a picture of
him asleep naked in bed
with a naked sleeping
female deputy.**

deputies present took no apparent action to have the relative, or anyone else, arrested.

The relative was "later evicted" from the hotel by private security "for continued misbehavior and vandalism," according to investigators. That and "disorderly conduct at nearby dining establishments" resulted in a call to the Springfield police.

Williams also said "there was a challenge, maybe a fight" between a non-deputy guest at the party and youth hockey team members. "The police were called."

A female deputy told investigators that her husband worked as a Springfield officer and heard about the police call, supposedly from the relative's girlfriend who wanted the drunk man taken in for alcohol treatment. The Springfield officer heard "that Lane County had a party that had gotten out of control. Springfield had been called to respond." Springfield's on-duty sergeant "had his dispatcher call LCSO [Lane County Sheriff's Office] since it was their deputies who were involved and the Sheriff's Office should respond."

investigation. The three callers allegedly said that "malicious gossip" charges would be filed against him if he kept talking about the party and asked him to stop. Investigators reported the deputy told the three callers that he wouldn't remain quiet and "took pride in his association with the Sheriff's Office and resented the negative impact on public opinion of the Department."

The deputy told investigators that he "felt the message from the [union officials] was clearly, 'You are taking a stance we don't like and you need to chill out. If you don't, we will proceed with charges of malicious gossip, and you will be in deep trouble.' By trouble the implication was 'Is this worth your job?'"

Investigators reprimanded the union president and the board member for giving "misleading and erroneous" information about being punished for malicious gossip and not punished for conduct at the party and for trying to intimidate the complaining deputy.

The "intimidation of [the deputy] contradicts any acceptable standard of behavior for

ordered the two union officials to disclose what they had said to the complaining deputy. The ERB noted that the complaining deputy did not file an official complaint and found that neither union official "threatened" the complaining deputy "or otherwise engaged in misconduct." The calls and briefing were union business and "none of the county's business," the ERB ruled.

The ERB ordered the county not to compel union members to disclose union conversations without some evidence of misconduct. It's unclear if this order then resulted in the reprimands being actually withdrawn. County attorney Williams argued to ERB that the calls "had the appearance of strong-arming."

TENSION

The party and its aftermath created considerable tension within the sheriff's department.

"Everybody was tense, wondering what was going to happen," one female deputy told investigators. The ERB noted that before the party the union's relationship with manage-

'There was a deputy naked in a hallway who participated in breaking up a wrestling match between a deputy and a guest at the party.'
—Assistant County Counsel David Williams

COVER UP

After the party, when deputies began discussing the wild event at work, the leaders of the deputy union tried to intimidate other deputies from complaining about what happened, investigators alleged.

The union president was the brother of the drunk deputy accused of repeatedly spilling beer on a woman, groping a woman's breasts and cursing a bartender. The union president allegedly falsely warned a group of deputies gathered for a shift briefing that they could be punished for "malicious gossip" regarding the party. He also allegedly falsely told the deputies that they could not be punished for what happened at the party as it was an off-duty union function.

The union president, his deputy brother and another union board member called one deputy who had said he planned to ask for an

law enforcement professionals. Police officers are expected ... to protect individuals from such acts of intimidation," the reprimands state. The reprimand notes that law enforcement officers are sworn to protect against deception and intimidation. "Your conduct in placing another employee in fear of losing his job and career is in direct violation of the departmental guidelines."

The union officials appealed the discipline and union attorney Fenrich argued that the briefing and calls to the complaining deputy were protected by labor laws forbidding management interference with union communication with members. The union officials were informing members about department rules, not intimidating witnesses, according to Fenrich.

The state Employee Relations Board (ERB) agreed that the county illegally

ment was cordial but afterwards "the relationship was strained."

Sheriff Clements, who recently announced he is not running for re-election, tried to smooth relations with the union. Clements wrote to Fenrich that he wasn't trying to punish people for attending the party. Clements noted that he himself "was in attendance for a time." He said he was not singling out the union. "Had the same conduct been reported occurring at a football game or a church social, the response would have been the same."

Investigators faulted union officials for unnecessarily delaying the investigation. Union leaders objected when investigators refused to allow them to sit in on interviews with union members. Clements wrote that their attendance could have a "stifling" effect on testimony and was inappropriate because some of the same union leaders were being investigated for misconduct.

The ERB sided with the county on the matter, but the dispute resulted in several interviews having to be rescheduled. Another union board member unsuccessfully argued that he could refuse to answer questions because he was "acting as an agent" of the union attorney.

The union argued that investigators compelling union officials to talk about union business had a "chilling" effect on deputies seeking advice from their union and on union meetings. But the ERB was unconvinced, noting, "it could be argued that some [union] association members have chosen not to be involved in the association not because of the investigation conducted by the county but rather because of the type of activities that occurred in the party sponsored by the association."

ew