



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

Case Title Alleged Unprofessional Behavior by Former BIA (b) (7)(C)	Case Number OI-PI-18-0375-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date August 3, 2018
Report Subject Report of Investigation	

SYNOPSIS

We initiated this investigation after receiving multiple allegations that (b) (7)(C), at that time the (b) (7)(C) Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and (b) (7)(C), had demonstrated unprofessional behavior toward other U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) employees, including bullying, targeting, and threatening them. We also reviewed what (b) (7)(C) superiors knew about complaints concerning his behavior, and how they responded to them.

In our interviews of (b) (7)(C) current and former DOI employees who had interacted with (b) (7)(C) in some capacity while he was a DOI employee, we identified examples of (b) (7)(C) behaving unprofessionally and demonstrating questionable leadership when communicating with other employees. We ended our investigation after (b) (7)(C) resigned on (b) (7)(C).

We also found during our investigation that (b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (7)(C) and others upon learning that (b) (7)(C) had sworn and shouted at a DOI employee, but (b) (7)(C) did not document any corrective action.

We are providing this report to the Deputy Secretary of the Interior for any action deemed appropriate.

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
Approving Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /ASAC	Signature Digitally signed.

Authentication Number: 89955011E0AFC61FE904D99A2B279E26

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION

We initiated this investigation on February 2, 2018, after receiving allegations that (b) (7)(C), who at the time was the (b) (7)(C) Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and a (b) (7)(C) Department of the Interior's (DOI's) (b) (7)(C) had targeted, bullied, and physically threatened DOI employees while in his previous role as (b) (7)(C) of the (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) in which he served from (b) (7)(C). We also became aware of similar behavior that allegedly occurred after (b) (7)(C) became the (b) (7)(C), including allegations that he spoke in an unprofessional or threatening manner to senior DOI staff. As part of our investigation, we reviewed historical complaints against (b) (7)(C) what his superiors knew about the history of complaints concerning his behavior, and how they responded to the complaints.

(b) (7)(C) Unprofessional Conduct Had an Adverse Impact on DOI Employees

During our investigation, we reviewed four complaints against (b) (7)(C) that had been submitted to us between (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C). In (b) (7)(C) we received allegations of retaliation, which we referred to the DOI's Office of Civil Rights and which were (b) (7)(C). Two other allegations were deemed not to have enough investigative merit and were documented and closed without further action. (b) (7)(C) was asked to respond to one complaint, which we had referred to his supervisors to address in (b) (7)(C) he gave his superiors a statement, but the matter did not result in any action against him. Based on these recent complaints and those maintained in our records, we sought to determine whether a pattern of unprofessional behavior existed and whether (b) (7)(C) superiors took his present and past actions into account.

In addition to interviews related to the initial complaints, we interviewed DOI staff members with whom (b) (7)(C) had interacted at the DOI. Altogether, we spoke to (b) (7)(C) current and former DOI employees who had interacted with (b) (7)(C) in some capacity and identified (b) (7)(C) current employees, including (b) (7)(C) senior DOI staff members, who provided firsthand accounts of bullying, hostility, or inappropriate behavior by (b) (7)(C). We ended our investigation after (b) (7)(C) resigned on (b) (7)(C).

One of the interviewees, (b) (7)(C), told us that when (b) (7)(C) was selected as the (b) (7)(C), he was notified via email that his (b) (7)(C) email account would be suspended when he left the (b) (7)(C) for the BIA (**Attachments 1 and 2**). (b) (7)(C) was also notified that he could set up an "out of office" message on his (b) (7)(C) email to refer correspondents to his new BIA account, and that this message would be effective for 30 days; after the 30 days, according to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) emails could be made temporarily accessible by submitting a request to (b) (7)(C) office. On (b) (7)(C), after he had assumed his position as (b) (7)(C) emailed (b) (7)(C) stating that he needed access to both his (b) (7)(C) and BIA email accounts to do his work properly. He was granted an additional 30 days of access to his (b) (7)(C) account, but was locked out of it when the email system refreshed a few days later.

(b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) another DOI employee met with (b) (7)(C) on (b) (7)(C), to discuss (b) (7)(C) access to his (b) (7)(C) email, and he told them he was "going to be tough on [them]." (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) then launched into an angry tirade about how he was not able to do his job and respond to people who were emailing him because he did not have access to his (b) (7)(C) account (**Attachment 3**). He told (b) (7)(C) this situation was untenable and that he had raised the issue to (b) (7)(C) DOI (b) (7)(C) to get (b) (7)(C) address his concerns. According to (b) (7)(C) tried to explain to (b) (7)(C) why he could not have two active email accounts, but he did not seem to listen to or accept what (b) (7)(C) said.

(b) (7)(C) added that during the meeting (b) (7)(C) felt that (b) (7)(C) acted like a bully and cut (b) (7)(C) off while (b) (7)(C) was talking, which made (b) (7)(C) angry, and that when (b) (7)(C) did respond, (b) (7)(C) accused (b) (7)(C) being defensive. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) told him that (b) (7)(C) was being defensive because he was attacking (b) (7)(C) by not giving (b) (7)(C) a chance to talk and that (b) (7)(C) was so angry (b) (7)(C) wanted to leave the room. Afterward (b) (7)(C) said, (b) (7)(C) calmed down and they were able to finish their conversation.

(b) (7)(C) (OCIO), said (b) (7)(C) initially assisted (b) (7)(C) with his transition to (b) (7)(C) (Attachment 4). (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) met with (b) (7)(C) several times to discuss the transition and he seemed to understand that the process was set up to help the large number of (b) (7)(C) transfers and reassignments go smoothly. (b) (7)(C) said, however, that at one meeting (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) his email account would be suspended immediately upon assuming his new position. After asking a few questions, (b) (7)(C) said to (b) (7)(C) “This is all made up anyway—you are just making this up as you go.” (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) was taken aback by this comment. (b) (7)(C) said that he said this again during a subsequent meeting, and (b) (7)(C) felt he was trying to express dissatisfaction over having to leave behind all of his (b) (7)(C) emails and other files. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) felt that this was an attack on (b) (7)(C) and other OCIO personnel, and that (b) (7)(C) had an accusatory approach that was “disheartening” and made it difficult to work with the BIA.

(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) saw (b) (7)(C) in the basement of the Main Interior Building as (b) (7)(C) walked into the building (b) (7)(C) (Attachments 5 and 6). (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) called out to (b) (7)(C) and he glared at (b) (7)(C) and then yelled about how upset he was with the PMB, specifically (b) (7)(C) for “effing with his computers” and (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) for “effing with his space” (Attachment 7). (b) (7)(C) also said he wanted to “come up to the PMB hallway and rip the place apart” and that the PMB was “run by a bunch of cronies.” (b) (7)(C) said that (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) got into the elevator and (b) (7)(C) tried to defuse what (b) (7)(C) described as “a very tense encounter.”

(b) (7)(C) said that (b) (7)(C) got on the elevator on the (b) (7)(C) floor and tried to engage (b) (7)(C) in conversation. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) got off the elevator on the (b) (7)(C) floor, leaving (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) in the elevator, which was still going up. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) felt shaken and threatened by (b) (7)(C) encounter with (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) found his behavior odd because (b) (7)(C) had never experienced hostility from him before. She added that the incident was upsetting, and (b) (7)(C) thought it would affect (b) (7)(C) ability to meet with (b) (7)(C) by (b) (7)(C)

In addition, (b) (7)(C) PMB (b) (7)(C) told us that (b) (7)(C) was physically intimidating, and that the incident between (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) was “unnerving” for some PMB employees because they were concerned about a perceived threat by (b) (7)(C) (Attachment 8).

Four other DOI employees also described unprofessional behavior by (b) (7)(C) (Attachments 9 through 14). A senior employee with the Interior Business Center described (b) (7)(C) as quick to anger and to display frustration or a temper. A BIA employee described (b) (7)(C) as a demanding and forceful person who had yelled at and used profanity toward (b) (7)(C). An Indian Affairs (b) (7)(C) described similar behavior. Another BIA employee said that (b) (7)(C) pointed at (b) (7)(C) while discussing a work-related issue in the Main Interior Building hallway, and that his behavior was demeaning, condescending, and degrading. (b) (7)(C) felt it was inappropriate for (b) (7)(C) to have addressed (b) (7)(C) in such a manner; (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) had perceived his actions as threatening and that they had adversely affected (b) (7)(C) emotionally.

We tried multiple times to contact (b) (7)(C) through his attorney for an interview so that he could address these allegations, but we received no response.

(b) (7)(C) Superiors Were Aware of His Behavior, but No Corrective Action Was Documented

(b) (7)(C) said that he learned about the incident with (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) the day it happened and immediately sought guidance from the DOI Office of the Solicitor (Attachments 15 and 16). He said he informed (b) (7)(C) Employment and Labor Law Unit, about the incident, and was left with the impression that (b) (7)(C) knew this might not have been an isolated incident for (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) had indicated that (b) (7)(C) was going to take some sort of action, but he did not know whether (b) (7)(C) did. He said he later learned that several (b) (7)(C) staff members had written statements about their interactions with (b) (7)(C) and he collected copies of those. He said he also informed (b) (7)(C) about the incident, and (b) (7)(C) expressed concern.

(b) (7)(C) told us he spoke to (b) (7)(C) and later met with (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) supervisor, (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) – (b) (7)(C), about the matter (Attachments 17 and 18). (b) (7)(C) explained that the underlying issue was that (b) (7)(C) was dating (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), who worked with (b) (7)(C) in the (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) believed that “the (b) (7)(C) team . . . was not operating well together” and (b) (7)(C) was not being treated properly. (b) (7)(C) told us that (b) (7)(C) let his personal feelings “spill over” and had directed his frustration at (b) (7)(C) whom (b) (7)(C) considered to be a representative of the (b) (7)(C) also said that during this meeting, (b) (7)(C) told him that he and (b) (7)(C) were “ignorant novices” who did not know how to deal with their staff. (b) (7)(C) said he told (b) (7)(C) that his actions were unacceptable and not rational, and that while (b) (7)(C) should be tough if a situation required it, he should “just do it nicely.”

After (b) (7)(C) left the meeting, (b) (7)(C) said, he asked (b) (7)(C) to monitor (b) (7)(C) and reinforce to him the need to work as a team and be pleasant. (b) (7)(C) said he did not consider the meeting to be counseling and had not documented it. (b) (7)(C) also stated that he was not aware of a history of complaints against (b) (7)(C) and that he did not seek one, nor was he provided one, when considering (b) (7)(C) for the position of (b) (7)(C).

We were also told that after (b) (7)(C) learned of the incident with (b) (7)(C), he addressed (b) (7)(C) during a meeting and told them he had met with (b) (7)(C) about his behavior toward (b) (7)(C) employees (Attachments 19 through 25, and see Attachments 1 through 8). We interviewed (b) (7)(C) of the (b) (7)(C) employees who attended this meeting. (b) (7)(C) said they had not known about the incident with (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) before the meeting. (b) (7)(C) said the meeting made them uncomfortable and felt that a group setting was not an appropriate place to discuss these matters (see Attachments 5 through 9 and 19 through 25).

SUBJECTS

1. (b) (7)(C), former (b) (7)(C) BIA.
2. (b) (7)(C) DOI.

DISPOSITION

We are providing this report to the Deputy Secretary of the Interior for any action deemed appropriate.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Investigative Activity Report (IAR) – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 23, 2018.
2. Transcript of interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 23, 2018.
3. Statement provided by (b) (7)(C) dated December 18, 2017.
4. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on May 3, 2018.
5. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 23, 2018.
6. Transcript of interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 23, 2018.
7. Statement provided by (b) (7)(C) dated December 15, 2017.
8. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on April 2, 2018.
9. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on April 19, 2018.
10. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on April 13, 2018.
11. Transcript of interview of (b) (7)(C) on April 13, 2018.
12. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on April 16, 2018.
13. Transcript of interview of (b) (7)(C) on April 16, 2018.
14. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on April 3, 2018.
15. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on May 16, 2018.
16. Transcript of interview of (b) (7)(C) on May 16, 2018.
17. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on May 17, 2018.
18. Transcript of interview of (b) (7)(C) on May 17, 2018.
19. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on February 26, 2018.
20. Transcript of interview of (b) (7)(C) on February 26, 2018.
21. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 27, 2018.
22. Transcript of interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 27, 2018.
23. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on April 10, 2018.
24. Transcript of interview of (b) (7)(C) on April 10, 2018.
25. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on April 11, 2018.