STATE OF NEVADA

LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT

RELATIONS BOARD

3

1

2

4

5

6

7 || vs.

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

24 25

23

26

27

28

11!

ITEM NO. 547

CASE NO. A1-045756

DECISION

Respondents.

Complainant,

CITY OF HENDERSON; HENDERSON

POLICE OFFICER'S ASSOCIATION,

For Complainant:

Richard I. Dreitzer, Esq.

For Respondents:

THOMAS E FRALEY, JR.,

David A. Hintzman, Esq.

Henderson City Attorney's Office

Thomas D. Beatty, Esq.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On January 24, 2003, a complaint was filed in this matter against the City of Henderson ("City"); and on February 10, 2003, Complainant Thomas Fraley ("Fraley") filed an Amended Complaint against the City and the Henderson Police Officers' Association ("Association"). In his Amended Complaint, Fraley alleged that the Henderson Police Department ("Department") had discriminated against him due to political or personal reasons or affiliations (NRS 288.270) and had promulgated a "Code of Conduct" without bargaining with the Association. Answers to the Amended Complaint were filed by the Respondents. The City filed a Motion to Dismiss Fraley's claim that the Department failed to bargain in good faith over the "Code of Conduct" and such motion was granted. Thereafter, this matter was noticed for hearing pursuant 15 Nevada's Open Meeting Laws, and during that hearing, the Board heard oral arguments from counsel, received evidence, and heard testimony from 26 witnesses. This case required approximately 10 days of hearings, beginning in June 2003 and concluding on January 7, 2004.

Prior to the commencement of the hearing, several verbal motions were made, including but not limited to a Motion to Defer the matter pending arbitration. Apparently, Fraley began with the Department in approximately 1990, was placed on administrative leave on July 2, 2002, with a pre-termination hearing held on February 3, 2003 (after the filing of Fraley's initial complaint), and was finally terminated in March 2003. The Board found special circumstances in this case, with extreme prejudice in light of the inaction of the Association, economic losses, as well as the potential to lose witnesses and evidence, and denied the deferment request. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Board ordered post-hearing briefs from the parties due to the voluminous record, numerous witnesses, and complexity of issues.

The Board's findings are set forth in the Discussion, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, which follow:

DISCUSSION OF THE TESTIMONY PRESENTED

There are ten volumes of hearing transcripts in this action. The following, however, is a brief discussion of the testimony offered by each witness with the Board's assessment of credibility.

Lieutenant Steve Kilgore has been with the Department since May 28, 1985. He was the first DARE officer, and started a peer support program. He was also a field training officer at d was promoted to Sergeant in 1991. In 1996, he was the treasurer for the Association and has held other positions, including president.

He states he was placed on administrative leave, with pay, commencing on February 12, 2003, due to allegations of leaving early/coming in late, but he believes it was due to his involvement with Fraley. He was not allowed to use the Department's computer when placed on leave, and not allowed to talk with other officers, so he had no option but to resign as the Association's president. He stated if you moved in the right circle within the Department, with the right people, as an officer, you would advance and get good assignments.

He stated Fraley was not a "favored" individual in the Department, and that hurt he chances of advancement, e.g., Fraley being passed over for Sergeant although he was first on the promotion list. He had even heard comments that Fraley was a loose cannon. His evaluations of

547 - 2

Fraley (e.g., Exhibit JJ), however, noted that Fraley was "head and shoulders" above the other officers, as well as other favorable comments. He also stated Fraley demanded that his officers be good at their job and aggressively fight crime.

He also testified that Sgt. Rob Hart warned him that (Captain) Vadasy wanted Fraley's "head on a platter" and that Kilgore would be next. Kilgore believed Hart as he was a close friend to the administration and took Hart's comments as a threat. Kilgore stated he knew of instances wherein police officers were drunk while driving, and never terminated, as well as officers fighting with other officers. He provided a number of other instances similar to the allegations against Fraley wherein the officers were not terminated. Kilgore felt the Association did not help Fraley and it considered Fraley a troublemaker. Concerning members of the Department disliking Fraley, Kilgore listed the following as having a negative influence on Fraley's career: Richard Perkins, Richard White, Chief Mike Mayberry, Monty Sparks, and Robert Vadasy. As to the Association, outgoing President Burns remarked to Kilgore that he should memorize Fraley's phone number, which Kilgore took as being mean spirited.

Officer Luke Vincent has been a police officer since 1996, and is currently in the narcotics division. He stated he did not "fear" testifying in the Fraley matter. He was on the bike team with Fraley. He felt Fraley was a good cop, and had no problems or lack of understanding of constitutional issues. Although he does not associate with Fraley after work, he does not believe that Fraley is a drinker. He stated he had heard that "they" were out for Fraley, and that Fraley was eventually promoted but under duress. He also stated he believed Fraley was a "targeted employee" and not a friend of the administration. Concerning the Association, he believes all officers are represented equally, but not at 100% of the Association's capabilities. He then testified that some officers may get better treatment or more aggressiveness on their behalf by the Association. The Association's closeness to the administration may be one reason for the disparate treatment of the officers by the Association.

On cross-examination, Vincent did admit that he does not know if Fraley contributed to his own problems. He also stated that different facts and circumstances can cause variations in the Association's representation of officers.

13[°]

Upon questioning by the Board, Vincent stated that Fraley was not liked by the administration due to non-job related issues and/or personality conflicts. He also replied to the Board that he knew of Fraley's lack of promotions prior to even meeting Fraley.

Investigator Lance Gibson has been with the Department since 1989. He stated he was investigated by fellow police officers, not Internal Affairs Bureau ("IAB"). He stated that ramifications may occur from testifying on behalf of Fraley, but he was not afraid. He stated Fraley does not think through his actions and their consequences; he does not think that Fraley was discriminated against. Upon further questioning, he did admit that it may be discrimination if Fraley was told to act a certain way for a period of time in order to be promoted, as other officers were not told likewise. He did offer that a conflict between Sparks and Fraley was clear, and that Sparks verbally noted his disappointment with Fraley and said he should be demoted. He also stated he was not aware of another officer who was passed over three times for promotions as was Fraley.

Gibson did admit that he associated with Sparks after work, i.e., went hunting and fishing. He also admitted that it is possible that Sparks stated Fraley should be fired. Eddie Newman of IAB also stated to him that Fraley did not have a future ("wasn't long") with the Department; and Newman was directly under Spark's command. Gibson also acknowledged that he told Fraley if he sued, he may win the battle, but not the war.

Sergeant Robert Hart has been with the Department since 1990, and was promoted to sergeant in 2000. Hart was on the bike team with Fraley, and has no "problems" with him. He actually has a high opinion of Fraley. He does not think Fraley is a drinker or hangs out in bars. He also considers himself to be friends with Sparks and Vadasy. As a matter of fact, Hart owned a "Post Net" store with Vadasy, which sold office supplies to the Department. Hart did tell Fraley to watch himself after Vadasy was moved to Fraley's substation and that Vadasy felt that the substation needed "cleaning up" and that included dealing with Fraley.

Hart gave several examples of incidents for which he was not disciplined, but also provided incidents for which he was disciplined, but never terminated, demoted, or suspended. Hart also admitted that both Sparks and Vadasy made disparaging remarks about Fraley.

Lieutenant Jeff Stillson started with the Department in 1991. He has worked with Fraley and believes Fraley is a good police officer. He stated Fraley was removed from the bike team because he had taken on too many assignments and needed to "get back to the basics." He wanted Fraley to concentrate on his patrol tasks. He stated Vadasy wanted Fraley off the bike team as well. Stillson was also assigned to IAB and did investigate Fraley. He was not aware of any revenge by the administration towards Fraley and was never told to "sustain" an investigation against Fraley.

Sergeant Norman Shane Richardson has been with the Department since 1991, and was made a sergeant in 2000. Interestingly, Richardson believes that an IAB investigation was initiated against him because of his testimony at this hearing; he was "scared" and thought the investigation against him was a personal attack. He thought his testimony at this hearing could be detrimental to his career. A couple of days after receipt of his subpoena to appear, he was called by the Chief and was asked, "whose side are you on." This was rare. He is Fraley's brother-in-law as well as a friend. Richardson felt both Sparks and Vadasy had something against Fraley, as did Hart. He bases this belief on things Fraley discussed with him.

Concerning the conflicting testimony of Richardson and Gibsono the Board commented, citing Gibson's testimony:

And his response was, No [he did not feel testifying at the Board's hearing would be detrimental to his career], ... and then he hesitated. And I noticed his hesitation. I didn't keep track of how long it waspbut then he went on and said, I think that any time you testify, people benefit and other people lose. And the ramifications of that might affect you somewhere in your life, and you really never know . . . And then he hesitated [again] and he went on to say . . . So you always wonder if I stand up here am I going to take hits for it later. That was his response (7-16-03 Tr., p. 144-45.)

Richardson stated, in his opinion, that meant he did not want to be up here "in front of the chief," in "front of the union," and in "front of you guys [the Board]." (7-16-03 Tr., p. 145.)

Richardson stated he contacted Lance Gibson and Gibson stated that their careers may be over (7-16-03 Tr., p. 115) and that people make mistakesobut the administration is now counting them, turning them into IAB investigations (7-16-03 Tr., p.116). Richardson felt the IAB

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

investigations were what Gibson had "predicted," with officers not liked by the administration (7-16-03 Tr., p.121).

Fraley does not drink and does not hang out in bars. Fraley is the only officer to his knowledge that placed in the top 5 for promotions and was not promoted to Sergeant. He believes the Association is dominated by the Department's administration and that the Association represents the employees differently.

Richardson was questioned by the Board concerning whether a conflict existed when the Association hired an attorney for a police officer; e.g., would the attorney's client be the Association or the officer. Richardson stated that is why he joined the "FOP" (Fraternal Order of Police).

Officer Tom Spath testified he has been with the Department since 1998. He not only worked with Fraley but believes Fraley provided more training to the officers than others did 4th Amendment issues. He felt Fraley kept current with cases and was a good investigator. He also claims Fraley does not hang out in bars or drinks.

He had heard Vadasy talk about "Team Kilgore" and "Team Mayberry." Supposedly, "Team Kilgore" meant individuals who complain or challenged the administration. replied that he was on his "own" team. He is not aware of anyone mentioning a "Team Fraley." He also remembered someone questioning officers whether they were still friends with Fraley of still talked with him. He believes Ryan Duncan asked that, as did others, including Vadasy. The officers were told not to talk with Fraley concerning the IAB investigations. He is aware of the rumors that Sparks and Vadasy simply did not like Fraley; and it is possible that other officers did not like Fraley as well. He is not aware of any complaints made to the Association concerning any possible animosity towards Fraley. Spath stated he does not think his testimo y at this hearing will affect his career.

He is aware that Officer Foster questioned why he had to express loyalty to any team (Team Kilgore versus Team Mayberry). This angered Vadasy. Spath was told to talk with Foster, which he did and during which he told Foster not to make waves.

28 111

Lieutenant Ronald Averett testified he was made a sergeant in 1989 and a lieutenantsin 1995. He is concerned "to a degree" about testifying at this hearing. He is aware that others are concerned about possible retaliation. As a matter of fact, Averett testified that Hart told him that he, Hart, is afraid of being transferred from SWAT if he (Hart) told the Board what he really linew.

Averett is familiar with the term "Fraley factor." That term was used by certain officers to mean that something is askewed in some way or fashion because of something Fraley did incorrectly. He has also heard comments that Fraley is an embarrassment to the Department, although he does not feel that way. He has also heard of the comment "Fra Leave" because of Fraley allegedly excessively utilizing his "comp" time, and is aware that other officers simply do not like Fraley. It has been alleged that Fraley and Kilgore are "anti-administration" and that Fraley is being painted with the same brush as Kilgore, i.e., being looked on disfavorably by the administration. He also stated that when you mentioned Fraley's name, eyes would roll, indicating that Fraley's name was associated with negativism.

He stated that Officer McCorckle called in sick but really attended a Super Bowl party with Vadasy. If Fraley had done that, in Averett's opinion, Fraley would have been discipling.

In his opinion, he is not a ware of anything Fraley did which was so horrendous that it requires his termination.

On cross-examination, Averett stated that he does not believe Chief Mayberry is "fair" all the time but does not think that Mayberry will retaliate against him for testifying. He is aware for two officers fearing retaliation/transfers for testifying at this hearing. Averett stated he himself has been passed over 6 times for promotion to captain.

Serveant Thomas Fraley was initially with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department ("LVMPD") for approximately 9 months. He started with the Department in 1990. He started he was certified as a gang expert for juvenile and district court cases.

In 1992, his problems with Sparks, Perkins, and White began, stemming from his roommate having an alleged affair with Sparks' live-in-girlfriend. Things were never "patched up" between these individuals.

Fraley was placed in the Detective Bureau, and in 1995, Sparks was moved to that Bureau. Fraley, at that time, was told to watch himself; and within two weeks of Sparks' transfer to that Bureau, Fraley was removed from that Bureau, resulting in a loss of pay. Fraley went to the Association on this matter, but the Association refused to do anything.

On his first test for promotion to Sergeant, he placed as #1. That time, the second, third, fourth, and fifth placed individuals were promoted, but not Fraley. Fraley again went to the Association, which informed him that they could do nothing. Several members on the Association's grievance committee wanted to pursue this matter, but James White refused to allow the Association to pursue the grievance. Thereafter, those members were removed from the committee mid-term. Responding to the Board's question, Fraley stated that the Association's president selected members for the grievance committee.

In 1997, Fraley tested again for Sergeant, and was #3 on the list. That year, according to Fraley, number one, two, four, five, and six were promoted. He again went to the Association and again the Association did nothing. At approximately this time, Fraley met with Jim White and Sparks, and they entered into a contract that if Fraley behaved a certain way for 2 years, he would finally be considered for promotion. (Exhibit K.) Fraley again was #1 on the test in 1998, and was again passed over; Fraley then informed Sparks that he was fed up and would hire an attorney concerning his lack of promotion. He was finally promoted in July 1999.

Fraley then gave several examples where investigations against him were sustained, but not as to other officers (e.g., Exhibits MM and NN; the charge against him was sustained concerning failure to follow policy and procedure when there were no such policy and procedure). Fraley joined the Honor Guard in 1995, and became its commander in 2000.

Concerning the incident at Discount Tire, someone told Fraley not to grieve the matter because it may provide the opportunity for Sparks to demote him. Concerning the Vadasy transfer to Fraley's substation, Fraley testified that he was immediately removed from the bike team by Vadasy after such transfer even though Vadasy was not yet his supervisor. One week after the removal from the bike team, Stillson gave Fraley an excellent evaluation. However, Vadasy returned the evaluation and instructed Stillson to revise it based on certain IAB

investigations. Fraley again sought assistance from the Association; and the Association informed him to file an appeal of the evaluation and argue the same before the City's Human Resources department. The appeal was denied; however, Vadasy returned Fraley to the bike team for a period of time.

0

Fraley testified that the Association did nothing on his behalf concerning the Department's instructions to officers not to talk with Fraley. Fraley further testified that the Association agreed to file the initial complaint in this administrative matter on behalf of Fraley, but then decided to withdraw the complaint. At that time, Fraley hired his presenteattorney and filed the Amended Complaint with this Board. On cross-examination, however, Fraley admitted that someone from the Association had previously been with him during interviews, that the Association had an attorney and a representative for Fraley at the pre-termination hearing, as well as had representatives for Fraley at two pre-disciplinary proceedings. On cross-examination, Fraley also admitted that the Association does not have to proceed with a grievance if it does not feel that it is meritorious.

Fraley testified that in 1996, Mayberry told him (Fraley) to make things right with Jim White if he wanted to be promoted. It was Mayberry who was ultimately involved in a sting operation of Fraley concerning the alleged exchange of sexual favors for "fixing" traffic tickets.

On cross-examination, the City offered Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4 (which is also Exhibit U), to illustrate the problems with Fraley and that there was no animosity involved. However, certain of those exhibits/evaluations also contain good evaluations for Fraley. Based on the City's belief that Fraley was stretched too thin, he/Fraley stepped down from the Honor Guard assignment.

It appears that the six IAB investigations leading to Fraley's termination concerned: (1) the domestic battery incident, wherein a female (Pastor) was released although she appeared to be the aggressor and the allegation made that Fraley personally knew her; (2) Miranda warning case, in which an arrestee on a drug charge offered information on a drive-by shooting without his rights being read again; (3) 4th Amendment issues and the alleged offer of improper advice to officers on the same; (4) Toys-R-Us and the warrantless search of a vehicle; (5) 1817 Cutlass

matter and a warrantless search of residence close to a vehicle; and (6) truthfulness about drinking and going to bars at Sunset Station.

In response to the Board's questioning, Fraley stated that a "group of friends" were running the Department and that the Association was "one with the administration." In further response to the Board's questions, Fraley identified the following, in his opinion, as having personal animosity towards him: Sparks, Mayberry, White, Vadasy, Perkins, Brooks, and Tommy Burns (Mayberry's brother-in-law).

Semeant Howard Scow has been with the Department since 1990. Prior to that, hetwas with the LVMPD for a short time. A Sergeant can be assigned to IAB after two years with the Department as a sergeant; although he did not meet this requirement, Scow was assigned to IAB. Prior to being assigned to IAB, Scow was in patrol and in the Detective Bureau, where he did "hundreds" of investigations.

Scow testified that it was the Assistant City Attorney Mark Calhoun who decided Fraley should be terminated. It was Scow's recommendation that Fraley be disciplined, although he did not specify what discipline. Scow did state that there should be "discretionary reactions" to the six IAB investigations mentioned above. He stated that no one ordered him to make any certain findings from his investigations. Scow was involved in 11 investigations of Fraley, but only investigated 10 incidents. He believes the lack of truthfulness allegation was the reason for Fraley's termination. The Board, however, questioned Scow in great length about his investigations. (Transcript of 9-24-03 hearing.)

Scow stated he is not a friend of Sparks, White, Perkins, or Mayberry, does not drive a motorcycle; and does not fear retaliation for testifying at this hearing. He stated he did not solicit cases against Fraley, and that he knows of no reason for anyone to "target" Fraley.

Scow admitted, upon cross-examination by the Association, that representatives from the Association were present during the Fraley interviews and that David Burns even raised his voice in objection. Scow believes David Burns is "serious" about his position with the Association and its representation of officers. Scow even admitted the "representation" of Fraley was "vigorous" at the interviews.

(

Upon further questioning by the Board, Scow stated that other forms of discipline (verbal warnings, suspensions) did not work with Fraley and, in his opinion, termination was proper. In his personal opinion, Scow believes Fraley is "over zealous" and may not want to follow the proper path of police work.

Bill Berrett, Chief Deputy District Attorney for Clark County, testified regarding the 4th and 5th Amendments issues. He passed the Nevada bar exam in 1981, and has also taught at the Las Vegas Police Academy, POST Academy, and for the Parole & Probation Department.

Concerning the Miranda warning case (Exhibit C), since the drug arrestee (Washington) was the victim in the drive-by shooting incident, the discussion was permissible without the Miranda warning. Concerning the search of a vehicle without a warrant (Exhibit B), Berrett stated he would, in all likelihood, take the case for prosecution. Concerning the residence search of 1817 Cutlass, he stated he needed additional information. After reviewing the same, he stated that he did not believe the search would have been upheld, although "reasonable minds can differ" regarding the female's consent to the search. He did state that the actions taken by Fraley in two of the incidents was "good policing."

Tim Hamilton is with the SafeNest Counseling Center as its Co-clinical director. He has a Master's degree in social work. Concerning the domestic battery incident with the release of the female, he stated the female may have had defensive wounds evidencing that the male, instead, was the aggressor; but admitted based on her remarks, she should have been arrested along with the male. Hamilton identified several factors for consideration when contemplating a domestic battery arrest.

Deputy Chief James White was the president of the Association from 1992 to 1996. He resigned from that position because he was not happy with the support of the members, and has held no other Association positions since 1996. He did state that the Association president cannot remove someone from the grievance committee.

He started with the Department in 1988. He stated Fraley was not "thrown" out of the Detective Bureau but was "transferred" because he/Fraley had made certain enemies within that Bureau. As a matter of fact, White claims to have recommended Fraley for the Detective

Bureau. As to why this transfer was not grieved, he stated the "committee" makes such a decision and he cannot remember the specifics on this incident. He also could not remember why Fraley was not promoted but believes the administration had reasons for not promoting him. He then offered that it would be unfair to never promote Fraley and that is why he set up a meeting with him. He stated Sparks promoted Fraley even though it was not a "favorable" thing to do. He has held similar meetings with other officers concerning their need for improvement. He believes Tommy Burns did not have much "confidence" in Fraley, resulting in Fraley being passed over for promotions.

б

His problems with Fraley included the dishonesty with Lieutenant Chambers over his misplaced weapon, bringing his children to court with him who interrupted the proceedings, and the car chase to North Las Vegas while off-duty, with a non-police officer in his car, with no weapon, and no means of communication.

Officer David C. Burns stated he is with IAB and is currently the Association's vice president. He recalls Fraley telling him that Sparks did not like him/Fraley, and that Molinaro stated if he grieved the Discount Tire matter, his "ass would be had" by Sparks. Burns checked with Molinaro to see if he had said that, and Molinaro denied the same. He also remembers Fraley telling him that the deck is stacked against him; and that he (Burns) referred Fraley to the City's Human Resources Department if he felt there was discrimination. He further offered, however, that Fraley had 27 investigations in approximately 3 years, and that was a lot for police officers; and in his opinion, counseling and/or further training would not help Fraley but that Fraley did not deserve to be terminated. He also stated that the Association participated in matters each time Fraley requested assistance.

Burns stated that he has been dealing with the City for some time to get Fraley's files for him. He also stated that he believes Fraley to be an honest man and that Fraley honestly believes he is being discriminated against; and that he has had numerous conversations with Fraley. He stated he had heard that Vadasy questioned officers about "Team Kilgore" versus "Team Mayberry" but no one filed a grievance concerning it. Burns did discuss this with the Chief who stated it was taken out of context but it was being dealt with. He did state that he/Burns felt

Mayberry was a fair man, would even reduce discipline, and would hear both sides of the story-Burns also stated he did not personally see any animosity between Mayberry and Fraley.

Burns stated that he will not run again for an Association position and is not aware of anyone else wishing to run for presidency or vice-presidency.

Sergeant Nick Robles has been with the Department since 1983, and has had over 200 domestic violence cases. He was involved in the domestic battery incident, wherein Fraley released the female. Robles determined that the female was the aggressor based on 1 s conversations with both the male and female involved and an eyewitness to the incident. He believed there was probable cause for the female's arrest; that it was a "solid arrest." He was "upset" that Fraley released her and that the release was improper.

He does not fear retaliation for testifying at this hearing, and believes that Mayberry is fair with him and other officers. He has not seen any animosity between Mayberry and Fraley, does not have a motorcycle, and does not feel that he is in the "in crowd."

Maxine Mendelsolm is the Senior Administrative Analyst for the City's Human Resources department, and conducts investigations. She saw Fraley in March 2002 but does not think there are Title 7 discrimination problems. Fraley was to provide her with additional information, but did not do so. Her office maintains all original evaluations for police officer. She stated she is not familiar with NRS Chapter 288. Although her notes are supposedly confidential, they were typed and provided to the Department.

The Board questioned her concerning the fact that her meeting with Fraley and resulting handwritten notes are dated March 25, 2002, but yet they were typed in October 2002. She stated that although they are confidential notes, there was some special meeting pertaining to Fraley, and she provided the typed notes to at least Mr. Guerre. (Transcript 10-9-03, p. 97-100.) The Department actually received a copy of the typed notes on approximately October 24, 2002.

The typed version of notes contained additional facts (Transcript 10-9-03, p. 102).

The Board also questioned her about a harassment scenario and appeared skeptical about her remarks (Transcript 10-9-03, p. 107-8), and even noted that they were "struggling" with her

28 1///

responses. The Board also questioned her about an upper level supervisor (Sparks) requiring a lower level supervisor (Stillson) to change an evaluation. (Transcript 10-9-03, p. 115-18.)

Lieutenant Eric Dennison has been with the Department for 13 years and is currently assigned to the SWAT team. Fraley contacted him concerning the domestic battery incident. He believes Fraley, at first, was looking for his opinion, but that later, Fraley was really looking for Dennison's approval of his actions. Dennison believes there was probable cause to arrest the female (Pastor); and that certain remarks by Fraley were inaccurate. However, Exhibit SS describes the facts about the incident and that they were not misrepresented to Dennison. Dennison also stated that he has recently investigated Officer Richardson (Fraley's brother-in-law) for false overtime claims.

Dennison was president of the Association but stepped down upon his promotion to Lieutenant, which in his opinion is closer to management than officers. He stated he tried to keep the Association and the administration separate, but the two have to have a good working relationship. He is not personally aware of any animosity towards Fraley by the Association, Mayberry, White, Perkins, Sparks, or Vadasy, and he has no animosity towards Fraley. He also does not drive a motorcycle. He was not afraid to testify at the hearing and believes Mayberry to be a fair man.

Captain Jutta Chambers has been with the Department for 20 years. She claims Fraley left his weapon unattended twice, in violation of Department policy; and she recovered the weapon without notifying Fraley of the same. Another officer (Halliday) allegedly was asked by Fraley to cover for him regarding the misplacement of his weapon. Chambers also testified that Fraley kept changing his story about the misplaced weapon, but he feels that he was only misunderstood. Although Fraley was disciplined over the misplaced weapon incidence, Chambers was not disciplined for concealing the fact that she lied to Fraley that she had Fraley's weapon. She also claims that she was not "setting up" Fraley for discipline.

She was the Department's expert on domestic battery cases, and believes there was probable cause to arrest the female/Pastor, and probably the male too. She does not think the

///

(

I

8

female should have been released. Chambers does agree that officers may disagree as to who should be arrested in the Pastor/domestic battery case.

She was not afraid to testify at the hearing and is not aware of any personal animosity towards Fraley. She stated she wanted to see Fraley "succeed" as he is a good officer, with a "remarkable" memory for details.

Officer Norman Halliday testified he has been with the Department for over 13 years, and was the firing range master who found Fraley's weapon. He gave it to Chambers. Later, Fraley allegedly asked him to tell Chambers that he (Fraley) came back looking for the weapon. Halliday believes it is important for an officer to maintain his integrity, and does not know if Chambers lied about possession of the weapon. The Board questioned him about the sequence of events; and Halliday believes Fraley saw Chambers prior to him/Fraley asking Halliday for assistance. However, Halliday worked on the swing shift, and Chambers worked on the later/graveyard shift.

He was not afraid to offer this testimony, and believes Mayberry to be a fair man. He is not aware of any animosity towards Fraley by the Association or by anyone.

He was on the grievance committee, which agreed to grieve Fraley's termination; however, he would not agree to grieve the termination based upon the six IAB investigations.

Officer Monique Panet-Swanson has been with the Department for 10 years, and has over 300 hours of domestic violence training. It is not unusual for officers to ask her opinion on cases. She believes that Fraley did not provide her with all of the pertinent facts; e.g., that the male was leaving, how long it took for the parties to be contacted, and the female's statement that she was not afraid of the male. She believes there was probable cause to arrest the female (Pastor).

She was not afraid to testify at this hearing and believes Mayberry to be a fair man. She is also not aware of any animosity towards Fraley by Mayberry, White, Sparks, Perkins, Vadasy, or the Association. Her husband, however, may dislike Fraley. She claims she is not in the "in crowd" but has still received good assignments. She has also been an Association trustee. While

with the Association, her philosophy was to take the person out of the situation and look at the issues.

Captain Robert Vadasy is in the Tech Support Services for the Department. He started with the Department in 1988. He claims to have told Tommy Burns to hire Fraley, who finished 3rd in his class. He believes he trained Fraley as a Sergeant in 1995/1996, and that he liked Fraley then and still likes him today.

Vadasy has gone fishing with Sparks 2-3 times and does ride a motorcycle. He claims that Sparks could not have transferred him to a substation to get rid of Fraley. Perkins was Deputy Chief at that time, in charge of patrol. He claims Fraley was transferred from the bike patrol to allow him/Fraley to focus on the rest of the patrol unit. Vadasy claims Stillson returned Fraley to the bike team, and he did not rescind that order to save face for Stillson. He further denies being told to put Fraley's head on a platter for Monty Sparks, but does claim that Fraley is not "constant" in his performance as a police officer. Vadasy claims that Sparks was disappointed with Fraley as Sparks had "gone to bat" for Fraley. Vadasy does not think that Sparks assisted his rise to Captain.

As to the term "Team Mayberry," he merely meant individuals who comply with the law and the constitution, and follows Department's policies, rather than individuals who push it to the limits. He does not, however, remember saying "Team Kilgore." He claims he did not "initiate" the IAB investigations of Fraley, and that Fraley should take responsibility for his actions.

(

<u>Deputy Chief Richard Perkins</u> has served in the patrol unit and the Detective Bureau. He was also President of the Association from 1987 to 1994. He was also elected to the State Assembly in 1992.

He testified he thought he had a good relationship with Fraley, and is not aware of any animosity towards Fraley. As a matter of fact, he has written a good report for Fraley (Exhibits GG and FF), and even recommended a lesser suspension for Fraley as a result of the Discount Tire incident because he appeared "remorseful." He also intervened on behalf of Fraley when problems arose between Fraley and White. (City Exhibit 3.) Perkins further stated that he

1

 agreed with Fraley's transfer from the Detective Bureau because of Fraley's lack of maturity, not because of personal animosity. He also described Fraley's approach to police work as "footloose," bending rules/laws to suit his need, moving too quickly, and not using good investigation methods. He also stated he was involved in transferring Vadasy to the substation where Fraley was assigned because Vadasy was a "strong performer" and Captain Moser was retiring. He further offered that Sparks was not involved in the transfer of Fraley from the bike team; and that he does not ride a motorcycle.

Monty Sparks is retired from the Department and lives in Texas. He was hired by the Department in 1976 and retired in 2003 as the Department's Deputy Chief. He was the Vice President of the Association in the late 1970s/early 1980s. He rides a motorcycle, but does not believe that helped his police career since Tommy Burns and Mike Mayberry do not ride motorcycles.

He claims he is not mad, nor was he mad, that Fraley's roommate dated his ex-girlfriend. He has even written positive evaluations of Fraley (e.g., Exhibit FF). He believes it was a joint decision between him, Perkins, and Gary Smith to remove Fraley from the Detective Bureau. As to the improvement plan discussed with Fraley (Exhibit K), he claims he merely wanted to put forth a path for Fraley to follow so he could be promoted; and in 1999, he did recommend that Fraley be promoted, although Tommy Burns was still hesitant to do so.

He does not deny being friends with Vadasy and Hart, and that Hart does ride a motorcycle. As a matter of fact, he once recommended 20 hours of suspension for Hart. He claims not to have been involved with Vadasy's transfer to Fraley's substation and he did not tell Vadasy to harm Fraley. He stated he, Vadasy, and Fraley meet in 2002 for about 1 ½ hours to show that there was no animosity between them, and he left the meeting on a high note.

He denied asserting any influence on the IAB investigations, but he was the reviewing authority on some of the Fraley investigations. He recalls that Fraley had 23 IAB investigations in 3 years. Because Fraley made the accusation that Sparks was biased, he was no longer the reviewing authority. He never said that Fraley was "garbage" and he denies disliking Fraley. He said it "tore him up" to recommend Fraley's termination. He said Fraley was terminated due to

4 5

> 6 7

9 10

8

12

13

11

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

23 24

22

25 26

27 28

111

the "totality of all" the IAB investigations, and that one investigation simply led to another. He also believes that certain of the charges could have been a cause of termination standing alone. He does not know if Fraley was counseled. He stated he did coin the phrase "Team Mayberry" but it has since been taken out of context.

He believes the Association argued aggressively on behalf of the members, and proceeded to discuss a number of incidents involving police officers and whether they were disciplined.

Mr. Mark Cathey has been a corrections officer for 21 ½ years and has been with the Association for 17 to 18 years. He is also of the Association philosophy that you should take the person out of the situation and look solely at the situation. He knows Fraley and recalls talking to him about his situation. Cathey stated some Association members appear to be displeased that Fraley sued the Association, while others felt that the Association did not do enough for Fraley He also believes that the Association is split as to whether Fraley should have been terminated. In response to a question by the Board, he stated termination was too harsh in his opinion and that Fraley had a viable grievance. In response to another question by the Board, he stated he not believe the Department's actions were to discourage membership in the Association, or that there was a grand conspiracy against Fraley, although Fraley may believe that. He also offered that Fraley is sometimes his own worse enemy, and that the City does not terminate m employees. He does not ride a motorcycle, but has gone hunting/fishing with Mayberry.

Segrent Tim O'Neill has been with the Department for the last 13 ½ years. He has been a trustee and vice president of the Association, and is currently the President. It is a volunteer organization, with no salaries being provided to the officers. He has no personal animosity towards Fraley and is not aware of any animosity by anyone. He acknowledged that Fraley was not progressively disciplined and that the Association still supports Fraley's arbitration. He does not believe Fraley was discriminated against. He also stated the Association members had discussed removing Fraley from the Association because of the amended complaint filed with this Board. Such removal can be accomplished by vote of the membership. He stated that if the

(

4 5

 Association obtained an attorney for a member, the Association is the client, not the police officer.

He stated he is on the negotiation team and the new CBA for the parties will require the City to produce more of the IAB files to the Association and to not skip around on the promotion's list, but to take the first officer and then proceed orderly to the second, third, fourth, and fifth. He stated the Association will also be involved in the testing procedures.

Although he never worked with Fraley, he understands he is a good police officer. He stated he himself has been passed over for promotions four times, however, two times he did not pass the test.

Lastly, Chief Michael Mayberry testified. In 1999, he became Acting Chief and was formally appointed Chief in May 2000. He started with the Department in 1976 as a reserve officer, and became full time in patrol in 1978. He became a Lieutenant in 1991 and a Captaintin 1995. He was president of the Association in approximately 1983/84 until 1987. At that time, the Department had approximately 30-40 officers. When he became Lieutenant, he started another bargaining unit for police supervisors. He does not believe the Department tells the Association what to do and believes the Association vigorously defended Fraley. Mayberry believes David Burns is a "ball of fire" and is a very good advocate for the Association members. Supposedly, Burns tried to get Mayberry to reinstate Fraley during discussions at the administrative hearing. Mayberry testified that the Association is not management dominated as is evident by the officers' pay scale. The Henderson police officers make more money than the Nevada Highway Patrol, LVMPD, and the City of North Las Vegas police officers.

He believes the IAB Division came into existence in 1996 because the supervisors were not following through with discipline of their officers. He stated in 2001, he had a heart attack, and had to have an angioplasty and two open heart surgeries with a triple bypass. During his recovery, Monty Sparks was in charge of the Department. He may have handled disciplinary problems differently than Sparks did during this recovery time. Mayberry believes that Sparks would recommend more discipline than he would; however, once he/Mayberry even reduced Fraley's recommended discipline. For instance, Fraley received a 10-hour suspension for the

Dis Dis frie but

 Discount Tire incident, when a 40-60 hour suspension was recommended. He claims he is friendlier with Sparks than he is with Vadasy, White, or Perkins. He went hunting with Sparks but does not really "hang out" with these individuals. Out of the 41-42 supervisors, he believes only 5 ride motorcycles.

He recommended Fraley be terminated based on the totality of the IAB cases and offered testimony concerning the investigations. The termination was not due to personal animosity, and he believes progressive discipline was utilized with Fraley. Mayberry stated he knows Fraley's wife and children, and it is hard to terminate someone but Fraley acts without first thinking of the ramifications or consequences. He also did not tell Vadasy to target Fraley; Vadasy requires strict compliance with the rules and regulations. He did reprimand Vadasy for the "Team Mayberry" remark and he is not aware of anyone having personal animosity towards Fraley.

As for his brother-in-law, former Chief Tommy Burns, he thinks Burns liked Fraley and that Burns did not promote Fraley due to Fraley's job performance. He himself has passed over Officers other than Fraley for promotions who were #1 on the list. He stated he wanted to see Jutta Chambers stay with the Honor Guard as a considerable amount of time was spent on her for that position. As for Fraley being on the bike team, Mayberry said he had a problem with the Sergeant being the most productive member of that team when he should be supervising officers. When Fraley was removed from the bike team, he was given other assignments, such as the City's 50th birthday-anniversary party.

Scow was placed in IAB because no one else wanted the position. IAB investigations are not only to investigate officers for disciplinary reasons, but also to determine whether policies and procedures should be revised. Fraley apparently told Mayberry that he had never been in Sunset Station, which Mayberry did not believe because of the numerous restaurants, movie theatre, hotel rooms, and arcade; and instructed Scow to investigate Fraley's insinuation. In fact, Fraley had gone to Sunset Station for personal and business reasons. Mayberry stated that lying is a ground for termination pursuant to Department policy.

Mayberry further offered that Fraley did not offer to resign rather than be terminated. He stated he has in the past allowed officers to resign. Upon questioning by the Board, Mayberry

said he would have allowed Fraley to resign. The Board believed Chief Mayberry was forthright in his testimony.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. That Fraley was a member of the Association.
- 2. That Fraley was employed by the Department since approximately 1990.
- 3. That Fraley testified he was certified as an expert on the subject of juvenile gangs.
- 4. That Fraley tested for promotion to Sergeant a number of times. On one test, Fraley placed number one but the Department promoted those officers who placed in the second, third, fourth and fifth places over him. On another test, Fraley placed third and the officers who placed first, second, fourth, fifth and sixth were promoted. On yet another test, he was again passed over although he placed first.
- 5. The City and the Department usually promote from the top five on the list but 1 at in any particular order.
- 6. That Fraley did go to the Association requesting the failure to promote be grieved but the Association refused to grieve the same.
 - 7. That Fraley did receive good evaluations.
- 8. That on one occasion Lieutenant Stillson was instructed by Vadasy to change his good evaluation on Fraley.
- 9. That Fraley, White, and Sparks did enter into an agreement that should Fraley act a certain way for a certain period of time, he would be promoted.
- That testimony was presented that such an agreement is unusual. However,
 Fraley complied with its terms and was subsequently promoted.
- 11. That the City's population has greatly increased recently as did the number of officers with the Department.
- 12. This Board recognizes that the management teams of the City and the Department had to change because of the City's growth.
- 13. That credible testimony was presented by a number of witnesses that certain individuals were more successful within the Department based on their association with certain

- 14. That certain witnesses testified that they believed appearing before the Board could affect their careers.
- 15. That testimony was offered that the Association treated members differently based on who the officer was.
- 16. That Lieutenant Gibson testified that he was not afraid to testify before the Board yet conflicting testimony was presented by Richardson that Gibson believed certain careers would be over because of testifying before the Board.
- 17. That testimony was presented that Fraley was not a favored officer; and examples are "Fra Leave," "Fraley Factoro" rolling of eyes upon the mention of Fraley oand that Kilgore should memoriae Fraley's phone number.
- 18. That cemarks were made at a briefing concerning "Team Mayberry" and "Team Kilgore."
- 19. Examples of misconduct were discussed by witnesses for which no discipline or minimal discipline was ordered. (See Kilgore's testimony; Hart's testimony and the testimony concerning the officer who called in sick but attended a Super Bowl party and an officer being repeatedly stopped while driving while intoxicated with no formal charges being filed.) (See also Scow's testimony that he would not have recommended Fraley's termination but would have recommended some form of discipline and the testimony concerning Chambers denying she had Fraley's weapon.)
- 20. No progressive discipline procedures were utilized with Fraley by the Department.
 - 21. That witness Berrett testified concerning certain "good policing" work by Fraley.
- 22. That although the Human Resource records are confidential witness Mendelsohn typed her notes and provided them to others and they were ultimately provided to the Department.

B

- 23. That testimony was presented that the officers with the Department earn more than other peace officers.
- 24. That Chief Mayberry called Richardson after Richardson had been subpoensed for this hearing, and asked him whose side he (Richardson) was on.
- 25. That Fraley had a large number of IAB investigations within the last three years; however, testimony was offered that the main six IAB complaints are (1) the domestic violence case involving Pastor, (2) the Miranda warning case, (3) the Fourth Amendment matter, (4) the "Toys R Us" warantless search of a vehicle, (5) the 1817 Cutlass matter, and (6) Fraley's truthfulness about drinking and going to bars at Sunset Station.
- 26. That the Association took no action concerning the continuing number of IAB charges filed against Fraley prior to 2002.
- 27. That testimony was presented that any one of the six investigations could result in termination.
- 28. That the Board initially ruled that testimony would be limited to events occurring within six months of the filing of the initial complaint; however, counsel for the City and Department, during Fraley's cross-examination, asked questions about ancient evidence causing the Chairman to call the matter to counsel's attention. Counsel then decided to waive the objection and proceed with his questioning. This caused the Board to order the City and the Department to produce all Fraley documents.
- 29. That the Board simply allowed in testimony concerning events prior to six months in support of Fraley's argument of continuing pattern of animosity; not that such ancient events are reviewed for purposes of establishing a prohibited labor practice. News Printing Co., 116 NLRB 210, 1956 WL 13970 (1956) (evidence of past conduct may be utilized as background evidence to evaluate a respondent's subsequent conduct); NLRB vs. MacMillan Ring-Tree Oil Co., 394 F.2d 26 (9th Cir. 1968) (past events may be used to shed light upon events taking place within the six month period.)
- 30. The evidence and testimony concerning past events confirm and/or shed light on the Respondents' dealings with Fraley; e.g., no counseling, no progressive discipline.

25

28

- That this Board, however, is not attempting to second guess management's 31. conduct towards Fraley, but finds sufficient evidence of personal and/or political animosity toward Fraley, and an aggressive effort to terminate Fraley.
- That Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (1987) defines animosity as all 32. will or resentment tending toward active hostility (pg. 87).
- **33**. The Board finds animosity in the present matter as credible testimony was offered, and witnesses' demeanor indicated, as evidence of such a disliking and/or antagonism by a number of supervisors with the intent to harm Fraley or his career.
- Should any finding of fact be more properly construed as a conclusion of law. 34. may it be so deemed.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matters of the complaint and amended complaint on file herein pursuant to the provisions of NRS Chapter 288.
 - 2. City of Henderson is a local government employer as defined in NRS 288.060.

(

(

- 3. The Henderson Police Officers Association is an employee organization as defined by NRS 288.040.
 - 4. Fraley is an employee as defined by NRS 288.050.
- NRS 288.270(1)(b) states it is a prohibited labor practice to willfully 5, "discriminate because of political or personal reasons or affiliations."
- 6. The Board concludes the City and the Department have discriminated against Fraley by their disparate treatment and discipline procedures, as set forth in the above findings in violation of NRS 288.270(1)(b).
- 7. That the acts of the City and the Department (with regards to the IAB charges) appear to be pretextual in nature, which establishes an inference of unlawful motivation. Remo Police Protective Association vs. Reno, 102 Nev. 98, 715 P.2d 1321 (1986). The Respondents did not overcome this inference and therefore the Board concludes they violated NRS 288.270 (1)(b).

8. Our Supreme Court has ruled that the failure of a union to fairly represent an employee interferes with that employee's rights guaranteed by NRS Chapter 288 and is a breach of the duty to fairly represent employees. Rosequist vs. International Association of Firefighters, 118 Nev. Adv Rep. 47, 49 P.3d 651 (2002).

- 9. That the Association acted arbitrarily, without a reasonable, rational basis; and in an unfair or inconsistent manner towards the various members.
- 10. The Board concludes that the Association has breached its duty of fair representation in this case as evidenced by its continued refusal to grieve Fraley's complaint and the findings set forth above.
- 11. Should any conclusion be more properly construed as a finding of fact, may it be so deemed.

DECISION AND ORDER

Based upon the above, the Board hereby orders as follows:

- IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the City and the Department cease and desist its
 practice of discrimination based on personal animosity and immediately reinstate Fraley to the
 position of Sergeant.
- 2) IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the City and the Department reimburse Fraley one-half of the salary he should have received from the date of his termination to the date. Fraley's reinstatement; the reason for ½ salary is due to the fact that the Board felt that Fraley was without clean hands in this matter and therefore contributed to the situation.
- 3) IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Fraley is hereby awarded attorney's fees and costs; such expense to be the shared liability of the three Respondents.

||///

24 || / / /

21

22

23

25 || ///

26 ||///

27 || / /

28 | ///

4) IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Fraley submit an accounting of fees and co^{sts} within twenty (20) days of date of this order. Should Respondents wish to oppose the same, suc^h opposition must be filed and served within ten (10) days after service of the accounting.

DATED this 2nd day of April, 2004.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-
MANAGEMENT RELAPIONS BOARD
() m
BY: M/U // U
JANE LANGST, ESQL, Chairman
BY: Jamara t. Barengo
BY: JOHN OUT OF STATE OF THE
TAMARA E. BARENGO, Vice-Chairman
DV. Sein 7 Vickage
BY: ASTONIC PSO Chairman
OHN E. DICKS, ESQ., Chairman
()