Q: Okay. So today’s May 23, 2016. And as I said my name is [b] (6) and I’m an investigator with the...

A: Mm-hm.

Q: ...CNIC, Inspector General Office, Commander Naval Installations Command.

A: Mm-hm.

Q: And, um, this is case number 201601079. And, um, can I have you state your name, please?

A: My name’s [b] (6) or [b] (6) - [b] (6).

Q: [b] (6). Okay. And, um, you have - are aware the tape recorder’s running and that’s...

A: I am.

Q: ...okay? No objections?

A: No.

Q: Okay. And, um, you’ve already signed the Privacy Act and Confidentiality Agreement.

A: I have.

Q: Correct? And now there’s one more form - is a, um, acknowledgement of the importance of being candid and truthful during an...

A: Mm-hm.

Q: ...IG interview.
A: Sure.

Q: And if I could have you raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm the information you’ll provide is true and correct to the best of your knowledge?

A: I do.

Q: M’Kay. Thank you.

A: Mm-hm. Here ya go.

Q: Okay. Thanks. M’Kay. So as I said I’m investigating this complaint that came into the DoD IG regarding, um, overtime being worked in security. And it’s not a full investigation right now. It’s a preliminary inquiry just to kinda get an idea of what’s going on and whether an investigation is really warranted or not.

A: Okay.

Q: So the - the reason I asked you to come is ‘cause I understand you’ve worked on this, um, subcommittee for an Operational Risk Management.

A: Right.

Q: When did you get assigned to do that?

A: Uh, I don’t know the exact date. With a little bit of luck you have a copy of the letter.

Q: I might - I might.

A: And that would be helpful because I don’t know the date.

Q: And also...

A: It’s quite a while back, you know. It’s probably sometime in March, I would think.

Q: Oh, yeah. Here it is.

A: Okay.

Q: February 10. There we go.
A: Oh, in February. There we go.

Q: That’s you - Mr...

A: So that was...

Q: ... , right?

A: Yes. So we must’ve gotten this just slightly after left the office.

Q: Okay. And - that’s ...

A: He’s - he was the director.

Q: Of safety?

A: Correct.

Q: You’re N35, is that right?

A: Correct.

Q: Okay. And, um, now tell me again who the acting is since he left.

A: That is .

Q: . Okay. All right. So, um, m- d- why were you - do you know why - what kind of background did they give you before they appointed you to this subcommittee?

A: They really didn’t give us any - any particular details. They just basically said that there was an issue that was going on with overtime. And they were looking to find out - uh, ya know, by - by the regulations - by the safety regulations when things of this nature occur the organization itself should be doing an ORM to try to find ways of mitigating the problem. And I think what happened was they didn’t do one or they didn’t document one. So, ya know, the command basically sent this letter down saying that we’re going to be a part of a committee. And there was another gentleman from the, um, security force who is also a part of the committee that was assigned. That was, um, .

Q: Oh, from security?

A: Right. So myself, from safety, and - I think it’s , right? Yeah, .
Q: And it also says [b][6]. Did she participate actually in this (unintelligible)?

A: She’s actually not at this base. She’s from HR down in, I believe, Virginia.

Q: Did she participate, to your knowledge, in this?

A: She didn’t. Uh, I believe Tim was the lead for the team. And I know that he reached out to her on a couple occasions. I don’t know if he ever spoke to her or not. I think there was an e-mail back and forth. Um, if I recall correctly, she was saying that she wasn’t a part of it. Somebody else from down in that division was. I don’t know all the details, though.

Q: Okay. Okay. Um, and who bre- did somebody brief you from the front office - the XO or the CO talk to you about this before...

A: Uh...

Q: ...you got started in the meeting ahead of...

A: Well...

Q: ...time or...

A: Yeah. I guess there was a meeting ahead of time. Um, I don’t know if I was involved in that, though. I think it might’ve just been [b] because he was the team lead. But at some point in time we talked with the XO. You know, I don’t know if that was before or after we got started.

Q: You personally talked to the XO, you mean?

A: Yeah - yeah. Well [b] and I.

Q: Yeah?

A: Yeah.

Q: And - okay. And, um, that was - you said you’re not sure before or after you wrote the report?

A: No. Sorry, I’m not.

Q: Do you remember what the conversation was about?
A: Oh, before the report itself was written?

Q: Yeah. I don’t know.

A: Or before we were...

Q: When did you meet with the...

A: ...assigned?

A: ...XO, um, is...

A: That’s what I’m tryin’ - I’m tryin’ to recall whether or not it was before - you know, we got this.

Q: Mm-hm. Oh, the appointment...

A: We were tasked to do somethin’.

Q: ...letter. Mm-hm.

A: And I think was reaching out to try to find out some additional information because this was very vague as to what exactly they were looking to accomplish. And, um, you know, there was somethin’ in here that was - in fact, you know, and I we kinda discussed it and we kinda felt as though it was a little bit, uh, out of our realm to - you know, basically, the thing was - and I don’t know if it’s in this or if it was in another letter. Let me see. Yeah.

To develop a formal process for assigning overtime. Uh, you know, in our opinion it was a little out of realm and that’s why we provided just the ORM part of it. Because, you know, we’re the safety office. We don’t dictate to other organizations what they do.

Q: Okay.

A: So - so, I mean, I don’t think we had any intentions of trying to that because that is just outside of our - as the Navy would say, our swimming lanes.

Q: Yeah, okay.

A: Yeah. But certainly we tried our best to come up with solutions and things that would ease the - the burden on folks. And I believe you probably have a copy of that (unintelligible) exercise...

Q: Yes.
A: ...that we did.

Q: I do. So let’s take a look at that.

A: Yeah.

Q: Okay. This was dated 10 March. So a month after you got the letter...

A: Right.

Q: ...Appointment Letter for the subcommittee. Then you...

A: I did.

Q: ...in that?

A: Yes.

Q: Okay.

A: Yeah. This is it.

Q: And so I felt - I read through this and it’s pretty clear that there are - are some risks associated with working double shifts.

A: Sure. Yeah.

Q: Um, is...

A: And, you know, the longer it goes on the more likely that it’s going to become an issue, you know, in our opinion. So we didn’t - we didn’t really get a sense for...

Q: When you say become an issue, like, w...

A: Well become an issue of tired - being - being tired and, you know, making mistakes and, you know, what - when you carry a firearm around, you know, you don’t know to what level that mistake’s gonna be. And, you know, you’re driving a vehicle. And how many hours are people driving that vehicle? You know, if they’re doing shift after shift after shift that becomes an issue. If they’re doing a back-to-back shift and there’s a little bit of, um, proper
management to where they’re movin’ the people around...

Q: Mm-hm.
A: ...so that they’re not focused solely on that one particular task of driving all day - ‘cause the regulations require a certain set level of driving that you don’t want to exceed.

Q: Mm-hm.
A: So if somebody were to come in and - two shifts in a row and they had to drive the entire time, they’re exceeding that. So those are types of things that we brought up during - you know, during this.

Q: In your - in your research to do that, did you find that there was any instructions similar to the driving instruction around the firearm?
A: No.

Q: E- ‘cause you would think that if the Navy establishes that you can’t operate a vehicle for m- more than 14 hours or whatever it is, they might say the same thing about being responsible for a weapon.
A: Sure.

Q: But I couldn’t...
A: It makes sense for...

Q: ...find anything like that.
A: I - we weren’t able to find anything like that either.

Q: Yeah, okay.
A: And, of course, you know, we are safety and we’re supposed to know the regulations as well as we possibly can. But, you know, um, the reality is that there are so many regulations that it would take a - a person who’s actually in the security department would have a better understanding for that. And that would be like, someone like Ken would be a part - that would be a benefit to him being on the - on the team.

Q: Oh.
A: Right.
316 Q: He was like a subject matter expert in that k- kinda thing?
318 A: That was the intent when they added him to the - to the team.
320 Q: I see. So, um, it seemed clear to me that there was, like I said, risks associated
322 with this level of overtime. But can...
323 A: Mm-hm.
325 Q: ...you kind of describe to me a little bit more, um, just from your own
327 perspective what you see as the potential risks? Um...
329 A: Well I mean, again, I mean, eh, when you look at there were no occurrences -
330 this had been an ongoing for a while. So we kind of - we felt as though it was
331 somehow or another being managed within security to a level to where...
332 Q: And when you say no...
334 A: So this was being...
336 Q: ...occurrences, you mean no terrible mishaps...
338 A: (Unintelligible).
340 Q: ...had heard...
342 A: Right - right.
344 Q: Okay. But the risk is increased.
346 A: Yeah, right.
348 Q: That’s kinda the gist of what I got of (unintelligible).
350 A: Right.
352 Q: Mm-hm. And you concurred with all of this - this was...
354 A: Mm-hm.
356 Q: Yeah.
358 A: Yeah.
Q: Okay.
A: And for the most part we - we talked with [redacted] for a while - kinda got a gist of it. [redacted] and I sat down and we - we...
Q: M’Kay. Did you talk...
A: ...to any of the other security folks besides [redacted]?
Q: No. Eventually talked to, um, [redacted] and [redacted] - not [redacted], um, [redacted]...
Q: Mm-hm.
A: ...to let them know that we had done this and we wanted to make sure that [redacted] was a part of it too.
Q: Okay.
A: And then...
Q: ...to any of the other security folks besides [redacted]?
A: No. Eventually talked to, um, [redacted] and [redacted] - not [redacted], um, [redacted]...
Q: Mm-hm.
A: ...to let them know that we had done this and we wanted to make sure that they knew that [redacted] was a part of it too.
Q: Okay.
A: And, um - but during the process of creating it we didn’t talk to them ahead of time.
Q: Okay.
A: Or I didn’t...
Q: Okay.
A: ...anyway.
Q: Yeah.
A: I don’t know whether or not [redacted] did...
Q: Okay.
A: ...to be honest.
Q: Okay.
A: As the lead, I think he took a little bit more of the - you know, he reached out to people. And I don’t know exactly who he reached out to. So...
Q: Do you know if [D], uh, reviewed the report before it was provided to the CO or XO - CO?

A: Um, yeah, I believe he did.

Q: Yeah.

A: Yeah.

Q: And to your knowledge...

A: Because when we were...

Q: Mm-hm.

A: ...we were discussing it and we were finalizing the report itself, I think we included [b] in the, um - the e-mail. You know, like, when I sent it over to [b] for him to review I’m pretty sure that I sent it to [b] so that he’d see what - where we were at.

Q: Right - right. Okay. Did [b] have any input at any time?

A: No. I think he was - he was content with the, uh - the way it was written.

Q: So he concurred with it and thought it was a good report?

A: You’d have to ask him.

Q: But you didn’t hear any...

A: As far as I know.

Q: ...negative feedback?

A: No - no.

Q: Yeah. Okay. And how was the report received when it was delivered? Did you go t- with [b] to bring this to...

A: I did. I...

Q: ...the XO?

A: Yep. [b] and I we met with the XO. And, you know, she reminded us that it wasn’t just this that they - they were looking for. They were looking for,
specifically, a formal process to be implemented.

Q: Mm-hm.

A: And - which we explained to her that, you know, that was outside of our - our realm of, uh, authority. In our opinion it was, anyway. You know?

Q: And did she accept that?

A: Well she wanted - no, not really. Um, she wanted us to get together with [b] (6) and, you know, explain to him that she wanted a result - the result that sh - was requested in the appointment letter. And...

Q: Did [b] ever talk to the XO about it and explain...

A: No.

Q: ...what safety’s role is or...

A: I don’t believe so.

Q: Okay. And...

A: And I, like - I don’t know is whether or not [b] talked to her prior to leaving. ‘Cause I know there was a lot of talk just as he was getting ready to leave.

Q: Mm-hm. Okay.

A: So, you know, he was in communication with her. And...

Q: Her being the XO, you mean?

A: The XO.

Q: Yeah.

A: Correct. I’m sorry. Yeah.

Q: That’s okay. So [b] may have talked to the XO.

A: He may have, yeah. He might...

Q: About what the...

A: ...he might’ve defined what, you know, our involvement should’ve been.
Q: Okay.
A: But - but, again, that’s speculation too. So I don’t know.

Q: Okay.
A: I wasn’t privy to his conversations with her or - or whatever conversations Joe would’ve had either.

Q: Right - right. Okay. Um, now what did you see as the, um, solution that would mitigate the risks here - the main...
A: Well the simplest thing would’ve been to increase the manning. But, honestly, that’s, you know, a wonderful thought until you try to put in practice. You can’t just hire people off the street and expect that they’re gonna be qualified. So there needed to be additional things that could be taken into account and potentially put in motion that would mitigate it, um, from within - you know, the manpower that they had. And that’s some of things that the report recommends as well. ‘Cause from a realistic standpoint you can’t just hire folks and expect they’re gonna be capable of performing those functions the next day. So there was no simple solution.

Q: D...
A: ...that would’ve resolved it immediately.

Q: Right. Okay. And so what were some of the other - I saw some of the other recommendations and were, like, to do safety briefs or, I mean, what - what other solution...
A: Yeah.

Q: ...could there be?
A: Well I think this - the ones that were - were written down here were the ones...

Q: Yeah.
A: ...that we came up with.

Q: Okay.
A: You know? We didn’t come up with anything additional to this or...
Q: Okay.  
A: ...or it would’ve been in the report.  
Q: And do you follow up on this to see if they’re really implementing what you recommended? Have you gone back there to see t- if things are any better now or...  
A: No, we haven’t. Um...  
Q: Okay.  
A: ...but at the same token, I don’t think that was a part of what we were supposed to do.  
Q: Okay. All right. I gotcha.  
A: You know, we - we provided this as a seein’ how you didn’t do one, here’s some things to consider.  
Q: Mm-hm.  
A: Think if you wanna try to implement it - anything that might - you know, you look here and see if there’s anything that you haven’t thought of.  
Q: Mm-hm - mm-hm.  
A: So that’s - in - in our developin’ this that was our intent.  
Q: M’Kay.  
A: Not to tell ‘em what they need to do but to provide them with possible, ya know, assistance so that...  
Q: Okay.  
A: ...the transition to becoming, you know, a bigger force or a more effective force. You know?  
Q: Do you know if they’ve taken any steps towards hi- uh, increasing the manning or...  
A: Well as it turns out I do know that only because I am the, uh, drug program coordinator as well.
Q: Oh, okay.

A: So I periodically have to take a look at rosters and things of that nature because, uh, those folks carry weapons.

Q: Mm-hm.

A: So they were on the drug, uh, program. So...

Q: Mm-hm.

A: ...because of that I periodically have to look at rosters to see if there are new Manning. And I can think of at least four people who’ve come on board since this process started. You know, they were down a director at the time. They now have a director and I think they’ve got, like, another three folks.

Q: The other three...

A: So I mean...

Q: ...folks, were they supervisory or non-supervisory?

A: Uh, I don’t...

Q: Do you know?

A: ...recall.

Q: Okay.

A: I think - I don’t believe they were. I think they were patrolmen. I think they were, like, at the lower levels. But, I mean, uh, my assumption would be that as more people get hired at the lower levels there’s probably some folks who are goin’ to move up in the ranks into those supervisory positions.

Q: Mm-hm.

A: But I’m not an HR folk. So I don’t know if that’s for sure. But it seems logical.

Q: Mm-hm. Okay.

A: And to be honest with you, when I looked at the lists I looked at looking for new manes. So if they changed a title on somebody I wouldn’t even notice that.
Q: Oh, right - right.
A: Yeah.
Q: You’re just lookin’ at new people you have to put in the drug...
A: Right.
Q: ...program.
A: Right.
Q: Yeah. Okay. Um, I think that - mainly that’s all I wanted to talk to you about was just your, um, role in - in this...
A: Okay.
Q: ...Operational Risk Management, um, and that you concur with what’s in the report. You did...
A: Oh, yeah.
Q: ...participate and, um...
A: Mm-hm.
Q: ...it seems clearly there is some risk associated with working 16-hour days and being responsible for the type of things security...
A: And - and again, it depends on how often that’s happening, how many...
Q: Yeah.
A: ...shifts it’s happening in a row, that kinda thing, I think.
Q: Yeah. Okay.
A: Certainly, you wouldn’t want it to happen more than two shifts in a row. And you wouldn’t want it be, like, two on, one off - two on, one off ‘cause after a while that’s become exhausting. So - and - and we never had a chance to look at who is getting the overtime and how frequently they were getting it. So we didn’t get a sense for that.
Q: And did you - oh, so you - did you ever look in (Socata) at the pay- timecards
and see...

Q: Did you have the sense that it’s both the supervisory and non-supervisory that were working overtime?

A: Eh, that’s what we were told.

Q: And we were told that the supervisory was taking the brunt of it because there are only so many supervisors.

A: At the time they were down a director. So they only had one person who would’ve normally been a supervisor at that level runnin’ around doin’ those types of, uh, job - that type of job, um, who is filling in for the director. So - and for whatever reason, I guess, you know, director has certain functions they perform. And then the person who was in this position was now in that position’s not doing the - the job that they used to do. So they looked at it as though they were man down there as well.

Q: Mm-hm.

A: ...as though they were man down there as well.

Q: Okay.

A: So when the new director came onboard I’m assumin’ that that person went back into his position and kinda improved things a little bit. But...

Q: Right - right. Okay. Well that was really the - the main - only thing I wanted to talk to you about was that, uh, Operational...

A: Okay.

Q: ...Risk Management Report. And, of course, if you h- k- should happen to be aware of any kind of safety mishaps or anything that happen in security, um...

A: Well that would’ve - you know, that certainly would have, uh, come into play.
We did take a look to see that. We did ask whether or not there were any, you know, increases and near-misses and things of that nature.

Q: Yeah.

A: So...

Q: And you didn’t have anything...

A: ...we...

Q: ...like that? Like your...

A: No.

Q: ...ESAMS data doesn’t show...

A: No.

Q: ...uh, mishaps in security?

A: Correct.

Q: Right. Okay. Okay. Well thank you for your time. I think we’re all...

A: All right.

Q: ...set with this.

A: Hopefully, it was helpful.

Q: Yes, very helpful.

A: M’Kay.

Q: Thank you.

A: All right. Thanks so much.
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