

This is a complaint against Lt. John O'Neil for violating Seattle PD Policy Manual Section 5.001 Standards and Duties and Seattle Policy Manual Section 5.002, Responsibilities of Employees Concerning Alleged Policy Violations.

On 12.2.2023 I was working as the second watch west precinct watch commander (212). I was shadowing Lt. Raguso during a SPOC activation (during a demonstration) pending my transfer to SPOC on 12.20.2023.

LT O'Neil was working in SPOC as the public affairs representative for the event. Lt. O'Neil asked to speak to me privately. I've spoken with LT O'Neil privately on a few occasions about the general challenges with working as a PIO, as I'd served in that role in 2020. However, on this day we went into Lt. Raguso's office and LT O'Neil said he wanted to talk to me about Officer Jean Gulpan. Officer Gulpan had been augmenting (working overtime shifts) frequently during second watch while I was the watch commander.

LT O'Neil said Officer Gulpan was having issues with work performance that I should be aware of because she was working so often on second watch. He informed me:

- She had been burning sick time and then working overtime augmenting.
- She had been having a sexual relationship with a male officer, whom she typically partners with when she augments. This officer is assigned to second watch, west precinct.
- The officers and supervisors on second watch don't like Officer Gulpan.
- Gulpan has been causing a lot of problems in the Public Affairs Office and has been bullying the staff in the office.
- Officer Gulpan has been insubordinate.
- Lt. O'Neil has been documenting Officer Gulpan's deficiencies (pages and pages, he said) and working with Rebecca McKechnie in EEO on improving Gulpan's work performance.
- Lt. O'Neil commented something to the effect of how he'd moved Officer Gulpan out of patrol "too soon" and she didn't have adequate experience to be a supervisor.

I was surprised to hear this information. I'd never heard any negative feedback about Officer Gulpan's performance from anyone on the watch. To include the former watch commanders she'd worked for while assigned at the west precinct prior to going to the Public Affairs Office.

As my concerns about Officer Gulpan were limited, I simply relayed to Lt. O'Neil that it appeared Officer Gulpan, as well as Officer Shawn Weismiller in the Public Affairs Office, both appeared to be working on-call duties at times while also working patrol. I told Lt. O'Neil this might cause some conflict, divided attention, or concern if they needed to leave their shift to attend to a critical incident requiring the attention of Public Affairs. However, I hadn't mentioned this to Weismiller or Gulpan because I wasn't sure what they were permitted to do while assigned to the PAO.

After the 12.2.2023 meeting, I followed up on LT O'Neil's allegation of time theft and looked at Officer Gulpan's timesheets. I did not find any instances where she appeared to have burned sick time and worked overtime. Officer Gulpan's timesheets are attached. The few times she is marked sick, she did not have overtime hours documented on her timesheet.

I found it surprising Lt O'Neil would come to me with concerns about time theft, a major policy violation, without referring the matter to OPA. Because of the significance of the alleged violation, department policy would have required him to do so. While Lt.

I did not investigate the alleged sexual relationship between Officer Gulpan and the male officer. The alleged relationship was not a policy violation and it would have been inappropriate for me to look into the matter.

Regarding LT. O'Neil's allegation that Officer Gulpan was disliked by members of West second watch, I asked a few sergeants on the watch if there had been any issues with Officer Gulpan working with other officers, and whether there were any complaints or observations of friction. They said they were not aware of any issues between Officer Gulpan and others on the watch.

On 12.5.2023, LT O'Neil emailed me and asked me to notify him anytime PIOs were augmenting. I told him his request was unreasonable (I was supervising 40+ employees) and that he was able to monitor his employees' timesheets himself. Email is attached.

I am writing to OPA because, through this sequence of events, I believe LT. O'Neil committed several significant policy violations. LT O'Neil lied to me about Officer Gulpan's alleged time theft and failed to report this alleged policy violation to OPA. As it appears LT O'Neil's accusation of time theft by Officer Gulpan is false, this would be dishonesty in communications, a major violation of policy.

Additionally, LT O'Neil perpetuated a rumor that Officer Gulpan was having a sexual relationship with another officer. I did not investigate this allegation/rumor. However, the conversation was inappropriate and very troublesome. A civilian employee who worked in the public affairs office was recently fired for allegedly spreading rumors about an alleged affair between Chief Diaz and another employee. LT O'Neil replicated the very behavior that led to that employee's termination.

While reviewing Lt. O'Neil's allegations of dishonesty, it has come to my attention that he has a pattern and practice of sexual harassment and sexual discrimination of women under his supervision. I am outlining them below for OPA and will be sending this matter to EEO as well.

Shortly after the conversation with Lt. O'Neil, I learned Officer Gulpan was skipped on the sergeant promotional exam list. This was very concerning to me, as it appeared Lt. O'Neil may have fabricated or exaggerated "performance issues" with Officer Gulpan that Chief Diaz used to justify skipping her promotion.

It came to my attention Officer Gulpan had filed an EEO complaint against Lt. O'Neil, making her the third female police officer Lt. O'Neil supervised, who later filed an EEO and/or OPA complaint against him.

In hindsight, the conversation Lt. O'Neil had with me appeared to be his attempt to disparage Officer Gulpan's reputation and work ethic. Time theft is a very serious allegation, which has previously led to an SPD employee being charged with a theft.

As I researched the circumstances surrounding Lt. O'Neil's statements about Officer Gulpan, a disturbing pattern and practice of sexual harassment and sexual discrimination emerged. It appears Lt. O'Neil has weaponized the EEO and OPA complaint process to punish these subordinate female employees and to keep them quiet.

The women in question are Valarie Carson, Kame Spencer, and Judinna Gulpan.

With Officer Gulpan and Officer Spencer, Lt. O'Neil recruited these young female officers from patrol and placed them in specialty assignments. Lt. O'Neil would isolate these women and groom them. He isolated them by telling them their peers hated them.

If the women spoke up or questioned Lt. O'Neil, rather than counseling and mentoring these employees, he attacked them with frivolous OPA and EEO complaints. Lt. O'Neil frequently reminded them that "he brought them into the unit," intimating a threat to send them back to patrol if they continued speaking out.

According to her interview transcripts, Officer Spencer suffered unwanted touching (from Lt. O'Neil) during private meetings he'd scheduled. Lt. O'Neil offered to let Officer Kame stay at his house. Lt. O'Neil would GPS map Officer Spencer and show up to her location while she was working overtime assignments in patrol (that did not report to him). Per Officer Spencer's statements to an EEO investigator, Lt. O'Neil isolated her by telling her everyone hated her, and she had a target on her back.

If Officer Spencer spoke up to Lt. O'Neil about his behavior, he reminded her that he "brought her to the unit." Lt. O'Neil also told Officer Spencer she was "cute" and that she and Officer Gulpan would work well together and would have a "good vibe."

Lt. O'Neil filed an insubordination complaint against Officer Carson after she went out on medical leave, and later claimed she and two other employees in the public affairs office were insubordinate due to racism. As far as I am aware, EEO did not investigate his allegations of racism, but all three employees were effectively forced out of Public Affairs.

Lt. O'Neil made several entries into the officers' Performance Appraisal System documenting their alleged negative work performance. He did not discuss these entries with the employees. The employees were not aware of the documentation until much later when they checked their PAS at the suggestion of their co-workers. This is very problematic. The PAS entries are not

refutable, the employees were not aware of them, and the documentation could go toward progressive discipline of those employees. It has not been trained practice for supervisors to make entries (positive or negative) into employee's PAS without notifying them.

I would also like to file a complaint against Chief Diaz for sexual harassment and sexual discrimination on behalf of these three female officers. Chief Diaz was aware of Lt. O'Neil's behavior, these complaints, and investigations. If he was not aware, Chief Diaz should have been. Chief Diaz has been complicit in this behavior, skipping Officer Gulpan for promotion and complaining about Officer Carson's dress/attire during her workdays and having Lt. O'Neil file complaints on his behalf (per Lt. O'Neil's interview transcripts in an OPA complaint filed by Officer Carson).

These women have all been subjected to career damaging actions and allegations while working under Lt. O'Neil. Gulpan was skipped for promotion and demoted to patrol. Carson was demoted to patrol. Spencer remained in K9 but has had her reputation tarnished as rumors spread about her EEO with O'Neil, and he has disparaged her to other department employees. People have made horrific comments about her, calling her "Uncle Tom" and saying things like, "don't talk around her, she will send you to EEO."

This behavior has been allowed to continue for years and speaks to the toxic environment and endless challenges for women in the Seattle Police Department.

Chief Diaz has also had a role in some of this conduct, directing O'Neil to take actions against Officer Carson. I have little doubt he would have also been aware of O'Neil's allegations against Officer Gulpan and did nothing to prevent her demotion.

Women in this department often must keep quiet about behaviors such as those described in this complaint. It has gone on for too long. While this institution may not be ready for change, women, like me, are willing to put themselves at risk to support their peers in this department. This sort of behavior cannot be allowed to continue.

These investigations need to be conducted by a neutral organization outside the City of Seattle and reviewed with fresh, unbiased eyes. Any third party, paid for by the City, would be biased. I request this EEO and OPA complaint be elevated to the State Attorney General's Office for investigation.