

**Olson, Jeff**

---

**From:** Camille Lowman <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 23, 2025 9:08 PM  
**To:** Olson, Jeff; Price, Troy; Schaffer, Brian  
**Cc:** Angie Bunda  
**Subject:** Re: Requesting response for status update re: Jenae Gomes

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**Lt. Olsen,**

Thank you for confirming receipt of my emails. I really appreciate your confirmation of my email.

**Chief Price,**

Angie Bunda actually worked for a police chief here in the area a few years ago and shared with me that the police chief had a saying, "No call too small." I understood that to mean that no one reaching out to law enforcement should be ignored.

Unfortunately, it appears that Angie and I have a "call" that you consider to be "too small."

I say this as it appears that a request for a status on a matter where we have engaged in reporting of public corruption and of a subsequent action by a speaking agent of the Evergreen School District has engaged in providing false statements to a public servant...and this apparently doesn't merit a response.

There are many taxpayers in the City of Vancouver (including myself) who I sincerely believe will be surprised (and disappointed) by this reality.

And unfortunately, I imagine there are others who sadly won't be suprused (but will be equally as disappointed).

Given that we are going to be ignored, we will move on to interact with those who are more directly accountable to the voters. We do also sincerely hope that you are not neglecting to respond to the "calls" of others in the way you have been choosing to ignore ours.

Happy Holidays,  
 Camille Lowman

On Tue, Dec 23, 2025 at 4:48 PM Olson, Jeff <[jeff.olson@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:jeff.olson@cityofvancouver.us)> wrote:

Good afternoon,

The Professional Standards Unit has received this email.

Take care,  
 Jeff

**From:** Camille Lowman <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 23, 2025 12:59 PM  
**To:** Price, Troy <[Troy.Price@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:Troy.Price@cityofvancouver.us)>; Schaffer, Brian <[Brian.Schaffer@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:Brian.Schaffer@cityofvancouver.us)>; Olson, Jeff <[jeff.olson@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:jeff.olson@cityofvancouver.us)>  
**Cc:** Angie Bunda <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Requesting response for status update re: Jenae Gomes

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I ask that you please confirm receipt of this email today. I have not received any bounce-back or out-of-office notifications, so I am operating under the premise based on educated deduction (e.g.; Angie Bunda, also on this email thread, confirmed she received it) that you have received it as well.

Looking forward to receiving confirmation of receipt of this email today.

Thank you,

Camille Lowman

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Camille Lowman <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** Mon, Dec 22, 2025 at 3:48 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Jenae Gomes, suspect for charging review at the Clark County Prosecuting Attorney's Office  
**To:** <[troy.price@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:troy.price@cityofvancouver.us)>  
**Cc:** <[Brian.Schaffer@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:Brian.Schaffer@cityofvancouver.us)>, <[jeff.olson@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:jeff.olson@cityofvancouver.us)>, Angie Bunda <[REDACTED]>

Chief Price,

Good afternoon -- I ask that you **please respond with an update as to the status of the investigation referenced below, by noon on Tuesday December 23, 2025.**

***In the event that I don't receive an email response by that time, I will seek interactions with those who are directly accountable, and others.***

Thank you in advance for your time and attention to this matter of public concern.

On December 12, 2022, *ten days ago*, I provided you with the declarations of Adam Aguilera, Tim Siess, Katie Rich and Danny Stevenson. I have not heard from anyone at VPD regarding their concerns and mine which were laid out in the email. The specific concern being that Garrett Williams, a designated speaking agent for the Evergreen School District (ESD) School Board, and ESD Superintendent Moloney, provided multiple emails to a public servant, here Vancouver Police Sergeant Jay Alie, that contained materially false and/or misleading statements.

The declarations I provided to you ten days ago also included documentation related to part of the known history of past complaints about the September 4, 2023, supplemental contracts and the ESD related efforts at a sham investigation in 2024 relating to the September 4, 2023, Supplemental Contracts. In that sham investigation, the third-

party investigator only interviewed Jenae Gomes, who was only one of the four recipients of the money from the four September 4, 2023, Supplemental Contracts.

I used the term “sham” for a number of reasons. The third-party investigator failed to ask simple relevant questions relating to the matter, and the ESD third-party investigator was paid \$350.00/hour by the ESD, an investigation which cost the ESD over \$29,000.00. He did not interview a number of witnesses who had information that was material. Further, “sham” is used as the well-paid third-party investigator never made efforts to inquire about prior complainants and never attempted to contact Danny Stevenson, Tim Siess or Katie Rich. This was also in part due to the failure by Jenae Gomes or Rob Perkins to disclose information relating to Danny Stevenson, Tim Siess, and or Katie Rich, when Ms. Gomes and Mr. Perkins were interviewed by the third-party investigator.

Additionally, it is apparent the ESD third-party investigator never asked the question that Jay Alie asked of the ESD and/or the ESD speaking agent, Garrett Williams repeatedly from September 8, 2025, i.e. (See: Attachment A, page 010, page A-006, page A-005, A-004, A-002 ), until October 27, 2025, namely could the ESD provide any information regarding the investigation of prior complaints as to the Supplemental Contracts.

On September 8, 2025, at approximately 11:56 AM, Jay Alie wrote an email to the ESB School board email address in part as follows:

“In just an initial review of the complaint, ***I get a sense of what is afoot here***, but I’m wondering ***if you can provide me with any information regarding the Board’s consideration of these complaints and how it was investigated (if necessary) and resolved on your end...***” (See: Attachment #A, page A-010).

It is apparent that the third-party investigator never asked any board member, the Superintendent, or Ms. Gomes to provide any “information regarding the Board’s consideration of these complaints” (i.e. complaints relating to the September 4, 2023, Supplemental Contracts) and how or why these complaints were not investigated in 2023.

If the question had been asked of Ms. Gomes, and she provided a truthful answer, she would have disclosed that Danny Stevenson and/or Tim Siess complained. If the question had been asked of Mr. Perkins and he provided a truthful answer, i.e. Rob Perkins would have disclosed that Tim Siess complained by email on September 22, 2023 and Rob Perkins spoke to Tim Siess about the same subject matter over the phone. There is no mention of Danny Stevenson or Tim Siess in the third-party investigator’s investigative summary document. It is actually unknown if these questions were asked, it is clear that they are not documented. Unfortunately, it is entirely possible that the third-party investigator asked these questions, and that the answers were edited out of the final summary provided by the third-party investigator. As it was covered in the declarations of Mr. Aguilera and Mr. Stevenson, Ms. Gomes has a documented history (See: *Exhibit 1A in Mr. Aguilera and Mr. Steveson’s declarations: the United States Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision in Dodge v. ESD, Jenae Gomes, and Caroline Garrett*) of editing the findings of third-party investigations before they are provided to ESD board members. At this time it is unknown what her role or Mr. Clay’s role was interacting with the third-party investigator in the 2024 investigation.

Last Friday, I provided you with documentation relating to Danny Stevenson’s and Tim Siess’ efforts in September 2023 for requests to have the Supplemental Contract matter investigated. You were also provided with evidence that no investigation occurred in 2023, even after multiple requests were made. You were also provided with documented evidence that in the spring of 2024, the ESD paid for a third party “investigator” to address complaints about Jenae Gomes’ September 4, 2023, Supplemental Contract. The documents included the third-party investigator’s invoices and relevant portions of the third-party investigators report.

You were provided with documented evidence that ESD Board President, Jackie Weatherspoon, and Superintendent, Christine Moloney were present on October 10, 2024, at Adam Aguilera’s appeal proceeding, a proceeding that directly related to him challenging the fact that the third-party investigation on the September 4, 2023, Supplemental Contracts was substandard. The key fact being ESD Board President Weatherspoon and ESD Superintendent Moloney were present for a lengthy process where the specific facts of the third-party investigation as to the September 4, 2023, Supplemental Contracts was the primary subject being addressed in that proceeding. Four of the five people who presented statements at the appellate proceeding, gave information that related to the Supplemental Contract issue. It has also been heavily documented that not only were ESD Board President Ms. Weatherspoon and ESD Superintendent Moloney present, but so were the following ESD Board members: Mr. Wilson, Ms. Bocanegra, Ms. Ginny Gronwoldt, and Mr. Perkins, along with Stevens/Clay legal counsel Mr. Garrett Williams and ESD COO Jenae Gomes, who were also present at the October 10, 2024, ESD appellate proceeding.

**A. September 4, 2025, to October 15, 2025: Confusion on the Status of the investigation by the complainants and Jay Alie's initial opinions related to an early negative bias towards the complainants.**

When examining Jay Alie's actions through his emails sent out in September and October of 2025 with respect to this case it is also possible to observe his related bias when examining the content of his statements. It appears that Jay Alie was assigned the matter to investigate sometime after September 4, 2025, and before September 8, 2025. From September 8, 2025, until the morning of October 15, 2025, approximately 37 days passed before Jay Alie attempted to contact any of those who were the original complainants.

The reference to the conclusion about Jay Alie's bias is derived from the following examples written before he has prior to ever attempting to make contact with any of the complainants:

- On September 8, 2025 at 11:56 a.m. Jay Alie wrote to the ESD Board and wrote the following:  
*"I get a sense of what is afoot here...There seems to be a curious motivation behind the complaint* and I'm hoping to get some perspective on that, if available." (See: Attachment #A, page A-010)
- On October 7, 2025, Jay Alie writing to Jenae Gomes:  
*"My impression is the issue being complained about was long ago reviewed and resolved so it's not a particular priority against my other cases* but I'm sure you personally have an interest in the questions being resolved. (See: Attachment # A , page A-12).
- On October 14, 2025, Jay Alie writing to Rachael Rogers, (former ESD board member (February 2019 to January 2022) during the Dodge lawsuit) the currently a Chief Deputy at the Clark County Prosecuting Attorneys office (italics for emphasis):  
*"Rachael,*  
*I'm working a situation in which some parents/self appointed watch dogs* are making a complaint about an issue with Evergreen School Board from 2023".....  
 (See: Attachment #A, page C -001).
- On October 14, 2025, Jay Alie writing to Garrett Williams:  
*"Would it be possible to get the auditors official ruling on this to have some kind of definitive answer? I can see the likely response to be that the school district/school board "is just covering for itself".* I'd like to be able to have documentation that this was looked at 2 years ago and clearly resolved. ((See: Attachment #A, page A - 006)
- On October 15, 2025 Jay Alie writing to Anna Klein:  
*"The timing of the complaint and follow up statements have a flavor of trying to use references to VPD and the PA's office involvement to amplify the nature of a two year old incident* at a time when the target of that complaint is in a politically charged negotiation. *There's a lot at play in this dynamic interpersonally and professionally for most of the involveds...."*  
*"One of the accusers repeated to me today that she has been told by the PA's office that charges were referred and you are reviewing the case."*  
 (See: Attachment #C, page C-002-C-003)

Between September 4, 2025 and October 15 2025, it is clear that Jay Alie has already formed an opinion about those who reported the crime and defines the "self appointed watch dog", "accusers" as having a "curious motivation" and he apparently knew on September 8, 2025 what was "afoot here" before he even attempted to speak to any of the complainants. There appears to be a great deal of assumption tied to those who are involved interpersonally and professionally in this matter. Angie Bunda and I are mothers of Evergreen School District students and benefit in no way "professionally" or monetarily.

It is important to note that those who reported the crime were, from September 4, 2025, until October 15, 2025, relying on the Clark County Prosecuting Attorney to make a charging decision or refer the matter back to an agency to conduct more investigation. In the first week of September 2025, Officer Bauman and Sgt. Taylor informed at least one of the complainants that the report and investigation had been sent to the Clark County PA's Office. The Clark County PA's office also confirmed by September 9, 2025, that they had the case for review. It is additionally curious that Ms. Gomes wrote on September 10, 2025, at 11:00 AM, that Officer Bauman told Ms. Gomes on September 9, 2025, that Jay Alie had been assigned to the matter. Again, none of the complaining/reporting parties were ever informed by

anyone that the case was still being investigated. The complainants relied upon two entities, the Clark County PA's office and VPD, and believed what these two entities had informed them, i.e. that the case was being reviewed for charging.

On October 15, 2025, Jay Alie wrote in his email to Anna Klein that "One of the accusers repeated to me today that she has been told by the PA's office that charges were referred and you are reviewing the case." Jay Alie didn't indicate to Ms. Klein that this was Angie Bunda. Jay Alie didn't indicate that he had repeatedly told Angie Bunda that the case had not been referred to the PA's Office for review and that she was wrong.

On September 16, 2025, Gayle Hutton, Office Manager for the Clark County PA's Office, confirmed in an email which included Jay Alie, that the PA's office had in fact had Officer Bauman's report sent to them to review. Jay Alie made no attempt to contact Angie Bunda to correct his repeated erroneous statement that the PA's office was not reviewing the matter. This failure to make an effort to rebuild a connection of trust was taken as a clear message that Jay Alie had formed a preconceived bias about those who had reported the matter.

The above section has been shared with you to illustrate that when a member of law enforcement starts an investigation with an incorrect and biased premise, that member will damage public trust and run the risk of conducting an unfair and incomplete investigation of the given matter.

Although Jay Alie's written statements give clear impression to any reasonable taxpayer of his bias relating to those who reported the matter, some of his unfortunately misguided actions created more opportunities for the ESD and/or the ESD representatives to engage in the lack of candor and/or just outright dishonesty and continue to try to cover-up what occurred.

**B. September 8, 2025, to October 28, 2025: Garrett Williams designated speaking agent for the ESD Board, Superintendent Moloney and ESD COO Jenae Gomes, provides multiple material statements to a public servant which were misleading and or false.**

Circling back to Jay Alie's first attempt to contact the ESD, which is understood to have been on September 8, 2025, Lori Strohl responded to him approximately nineteen (19) minutes later at 12:17pm (*See: Attachment #A, page A-009 to A-0100*).

Lori Strohl responded to Jay Alie and specifically included a board member in the email providing Jay Alie's email to ESD Board President Board President, Jackie Weatherspoon, and Superintendent/Board Secretary, Christine Moloney.

Jay Alie's question on September 8, 2025, was clear: "I'm wondering if you can provide me with any information regarding the Board's consideration of these complaints and how it was investigated" ....(*See: Attachment #A, page A-010*).

This question was directed at the board and specifically ESB President Weatherspoon. It is important to highlight that ESB President Weatherspoon was present on October 10, 2024, for the ESD appellate proceeding on the investigation of the September 4, 2023, Supplemental Contracts. There is no known record of ESD President Weatherspoon responding to Jay Alie's question/ inquiry. Additionally, Superintendent Moloney was included in the September 8, 2025, email and currently there is no known record of ESD Superintendent Moloney responding to Jay Alie's question/ inquiry.

Currently, the only known record of any follow-up on this inquiry occurred after approximately a month had passed and Jay Alie sent an email to Jenae Gomes on October 7, 2025, at 3:04 p.m. and stated the following:

"I'm circling back to you on this. When this was first reported to us, I emailed the Evergreen School Board as there was an implication in the original documents that this had already been looked into.

**I was anticipating a call from the board President but we have yet to connect.**

I suspect the strike, resolution, and school year in general are very pressing on Evergreen's side and I have my own pile of work to deal with.

**I am hoping to talk with her (Weatherspoon) soon and bring this to a conclusion."**

(*See: Attachment #A page A-012*)

Again, ESB President Weatherspoon was present at the October 10, 2024, appellate proceeding, where multiple documents and witnesses provided testimony on their concerns about Ms. Gome's Supplemental Contract and the related substandard investigation. President Weatherspoon's silence is deafening.

Superintendent Moloney was also present at the October 10, 2024 ESD appellate proceeding on the September 4, 2023, Supplemental Contracts and the related substandard investigation. Superintendent Moloney's silence is

deafening. Ms. Gomes was also asked questions by Jay Alie and she directed Jay Alie to Garrett Williams for responses. It is apparent that the ESD Board, Superintendent Moloney and Ms. Gomes chose Garrett Williams as the speaking agent for Ms. Gomes, President Weatherspoon and Superintendent Moloney.

(See: Attachment #A, page A-011, page A-012)

It is also important to note that Garrett Williams' first apparent response came on September 8, 2025. (See: Attachment #A, page A-007 to A-009)

Although Jay Alie indicated on October 7, 2025, and again on October 13, 2025 that he didn't receive this response. After Ms. Gomes received these emails, Garrett Williams sent Jay Alie his September 8, 2025, email again to Jay Alie on October 14, 2025.

(See: Attachment #A, page A-007 to A-009).

As it can be seen below and in the September 8, 2025, email that Garrett Williams sent to Jay Alie, there is a statement that was the first misrepresentation provided to Jay Alie. This misrepresentation has not been previously specified in the prior emails or declarations. Mr. Williams wrote to Jay Alie on September 8, 2025 as follows:

**"Each of these *stipends* was approved by the superintendent and school board."**

(See: Attachment #A, page A-009).

It is important to note that Ms. Gomes, on October 7, 2025 and on October 10, 2025, indicated that Mr. Williams' was the ESD speaking agent and the speaking agent for Superintendent Moloney.

(See: Attachment #A, page A-011 page-012 BS)

Mr. Williams' statement on September 8, 2025, that the ESD board approved the "stipends" with respect to the use of Supplemental Contracts to pay income for services as "Bargaining lead" or "Bargaining team" member, is not supported by any known recorded action by the ESD board, which would have occurred by the ESD board having a record of putting this to a vote in a public hearing. Additionally, use of the specific legal term "stipend" is a term of art and has its own significance. Mr. Williams is responding to Jay Alie as an attorney representing the ESD School Board and Superintendent Moloney, it is understood and reasonably expected Garrett Williams understood this fact on September 8, 2025.

First, a "stipend" has a specific definition, Webster's Definition is as follows: **"a fixed sum of money paid periodically for services or to defray expenses."** Second, there is no evidence to support Mr. Williams' claim that the ESD Board approved a "stipend" for "bargaining lead" in prior to September 4, 2023, or after, i.e.; there is no record that the ESD has approved a fixed sum or money be paid periodically for the service of a "bargaining lead" position. Third, On October 22, 2025, Mr. Williams sent an email where he indicates that actually Ms. Gomes was paid on her hourly rate times the number of "extra hours worked", and that Ms. Gomes was paid out under an "extra hours salary (3131) account", which is completely counter to the definition of pay by or through a "stipend."

(See: Attachment #A, page A-003).

To summarize, Mr. Williams "stipend" explanation on September 8, 2025, contradicts his extra hours pay explanation on October 22, 2025, for more than one reason. Ms. Gomes is receiving overtime pay to do a job she is already contracted to perform, Chief negotiator/ bargaining lead. This type of pay does not fit the definition of a stipend. Additionally, if Ms. Gomes' was actually receiving overtime pay, there is no indication on the Supplemental contract form in the appropriate box on the lower left side of the form which delineates the number of hours worked. It would appear that Mr. Williams' provided an inaccurate and misleading statement on September 8, 2025, in his very first email to Jay Alie regarding the money being a stipend. Additionally, it also appears in the October 22, 2025 that Mr. Williams contradicted himself about the ESD Board having "approved" the supplemental contract as was indicated by Mr. Williams on September 8, 2025. On October 22, 2025, Garrett Williams wrote the following statement: "At Board meetings, the Board approves a total estimated payroll amount monthly, not each Individual supplemental contract."

(See attachment #A, page A-003)

It is important to note that it was in this October 22, 2025, email that Garrett Williams was trying to convince Jay Alie that Superintendent John Boyd had the authority to unilaterally create a position for pay through the supplemental contract process. Garrett Williams provided Jay Alie with copies of ESD Policy 5050 and ESD policy B/SR-4 #3 as Attachments to his October 2 2025 email (See: Attachment #A, page A-003).

Garrett Williams stated that ESD policy 5050 gave the Superintendent this authority when writing as follows:

"Policy 5050 granted the superintendent the authority to offer supplemental contracts to the district bargaining team,

including Ms. Gomes.”

(See: Attachment #A, page A-003).

ESD policy 5050 reads as follows as to Supplemental Contracts:

#### **Policy 5050**

##### **Supplemental Contracts**

*The **district** may issue supplemental contracts, which are not subject to the continuing contract statute, **for services to be rendered in addition to a staff member's normal "full-time" assignment.** Supplemental contracts will not exceed one year and, if not renewed, will not constitute an adverse change in contract status.*

There is nothing in Policy 5050 that gives the Superintendent unilateral authority to pay anything. The term “district” is used. This term is understood to be action by the elected board members as the legislative entity and then the Superintendent can engage in authorized action. Policy 5050 specifically indicates that the issuance of a supplemental contract is to be for “services to be rendered in addition to a staff member’s normal full-time assignment. Ms. Gomes regular full-time assignment includes the service of Chief negotiator/ bargaining lead. Therefore, a Supplemental Contract would not be appropriate or authorized under policy 5050. In summary, Mr. Williams’ explanation to Jay Alie is again misleading and inaccurate.

In the same October 22, 2025, email, Mr. Williams then goes on to rely upon ESD policy B/SR-4 #3 for the proposition that this section gives the Superintendent to create a position of bargaining lead and assign pay through a supplemental contract.

(See: Attachment #A, page A-003).

This section states as follows:

As long as the Superintendent uses any reasonable interpretation of the Board’s **Results** and **Operational Expectations** policies, the Superintendent is authorized to establish any additional district policies, procedures or regulations, make any decisions, establish any practices and develop any activities the Superintendent deems appropriate to achieve the Board’s **Results** policies.

Again, Mr. Williams’ reference to B/SR-4 is misleading, as this policy does not give the Superintendent unilateral power to create positions and unilaterally delineate funding for those positions.

Mr. Williams’ misleading statements set out above occur on September 8, 2025, and again on October 22, 2025. In my email below, sent out to you on Friday December 12, 2025, detailed the multiple misleading statements made by Mr. Williams to Jay Alie on October 28, 2025. It is noteworthy that Jay Alie never provides Mr. Williams with any questions relating or challenging the inconsistent positions that Mr. Williams has put forward when comparing the content of the September 8, 2025 email to the October 22, 2025 email.

Additionally, there are some concerns related to Ms. Gomes’ initial response to Jay Alie on September 10, 2025. Ms. Gomes indicated that she had an “impeccable record”. It is assumed she may be referencing her lack of a criminal record. However, given the context of the complaints and the facts referenced in the document provided to the Vancouver P.D., she had already reviewed the allegations. In the body of the main complainant’s document, there is a reference to a fear of retaliation. This fear was based upon knowledge that other individuals have been the subject of Jenae Gomes retaliation.

In 2022, Steven Davis, a ESD paraeducator, reported mistreatment of children with disabilities to his principal and up the chain. The reports resulted in a subpar investigation. Steven Davis then reported it to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). Their report findings later made it into the press.

In late 2022, Steven Davis was terminated. Steven Davis, through his union, filed grievances related to the termination. Just prior to arbitration proceedings were to occur the ESD settled with Mr. Davis for approximately two years salary, \$85,000.00. Mr. Davis’ time frame runs parallel to Danny Stevenson’s involuntary retaliatory termination. The common denominator between Danny Stevenson and Steven Davis, was Ms. Gomes’ actions with respect to each of them. Steven Davis’ actions of reporting to OSPI were reported on in the Columbian.

Finally, I have to circle back to provide accurate context to what occurred for myself, Angie Bunda, and the other reporting party.

On September 2, 2025, a report was made relating to a violation of RCW 40.16.020, a class B felony. The information reported was specifically focused on the facts surrounding a Supplemental Contract created on September 4, 2023, where an employee at the Evergreen School District, Jenae Gomes, had signed a document, a supplemental contract, that contained false information. The false information contained within the record, (a Supplemental Contract) specifically was that the Evergreen School District Board had created a position "bargaining lead" which would allow for her to receive payment for services. The false language in the contract was as follows in (bold):

**"The supplemental compensation stipulated herein is paid on the basis of certificated employee salary schedules or provisions for *special and extended service payments* adopted and approved by the Board of Directors."**

As you can see from Exhibit # 11 (sent with my previous email) in Adam Aguilera's declaration, fiscal 2024-2025 Stevens/Clay invoices, Ms. Jenae Gomes has significant duties regarding the authorization of invoices, as she is the supervisor over the payroll department. In summary, the 2024-2025 Steven/Clay are all approved by COO Jenae Gomes.

On September 2, 2025, Ms. Bunda, myself, and the other reporting party provided your department with the information because after a closer examination of the known records of the ESD Board it appeared clear that the Evergreen School District (ESD) Board had not adopted or approved service payments for a "bargaining lead". Additionally, it was clear that Ms. Gomes was already being paid \$253,000 for the 2023 to 2024 school year to perform as the "Chief Negotiator." As there is no known difference between the position of Chief Negotiator and the apparently made-up position of "bargaining lead" it appeared that Ms. Gomes had created a false record in the content of the Supplemental Contract. Ms. Gomes signed a record indicating facts which were untrue.

From the end of the first week in September of 2025 until October 16, 2025, Ms. Bunda, myself, and the other reporting party, had been relying on the information provided by VPD and the Clark County Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PA's Office) that the case was being reviewed by the PA's office. This was confirmed by September 9, 2025, it was confirmed by phone and email by the PA's office that Vancouver Police Department (VPD, Officer Bauman's) report # 2025-017448, had been provided to them for review of charging. This was also confirmed in early September by VPD by Sgt. Taylor.

Angie Bunda, relying on this information, followed up later in September of 2025, with the PA's office and she spoke with Gayle Hutton. Ms. Hutton confirmed (again) that the PA's Office had the case for review of charging. In September, Ms. Hutton also indicated that the case was assigned to the Chief Criminal Deputy, Anna Klein. Ms. Bunda followed up with some emails to Ms. Hutton and Ms. Klein. Ms. Bunda also made a Public Records Request and received Officer Bauman's report from the Clark County PA's Office during September 2025. No one informed any of us, (Ms. Bunda, myself, or the other complainant), that the investigation was also assigned to Jay Alie and still an open investigation. It is my recollection that the first time any of us knew of the existence of Jay Alie was on October 15, 2025, was when we each received a phone call, voicemail, and/or text message.

After reviewing approximately 200 pages of emails from between Jay Alie, the PA's Office, and the ESD members / Mr. Garrett, it appears that Jay Alie decided early that Angie Bunda's, myself, and the other complainant's information, was somehow not reliable. This conclusion by Jay Alie was made prior to even attempting to contact any of us. It is apparent from the email that this occurred early in the process.

On October 15, 2025, Jay Alie contacted Angie Bunda out of the blue. On more than one occasion, she informed him that she had been informed by the PA's Office that they had the investigation relating to VPD under review for charging. During the call, Jay Alie indicated that she was wrong and that the PA's office didn't have the case for review. As it can be seen by Jay Alie's October 15, 2025, email to Anna Klein, he had verified by the early evening on October 15, 2025, that Angie Bunda had provided him with accurate information. Jay Alie made no effort to contact Angie Bunda afterwards to indicate, explain, or clarify that the information she was provided by the Prosecutors office had been accurate. **This failure to communicate by Jay Alie deteriorated the fabric of trust that myself, Angie Bunda, and the original complainant had with respect to Jay Alie.**

Additionally, during his phone call with Angie Bunda on October 15, 2025, Jay Alie addresses content that is not

included in Angie Bunda's declaration, but content that Jay Alie was concerned about which was on a Facebook page associated with Angie Bunda.

Anyone listening to the tape of the October 15, 2025, phone interview of Ms. Bunda would conclude that Jay Alie left her with the clear impression that she had done something wrong as to her providing information through the Facebook entries. When considering Jay Alie's statements relating to Angie Bunda being a "self appointed watch dog" and his incorrect premise and focus on the timing of the reporting, it is easy to demonstrate the clear difference in his treatment of Ms. Bunda when compared to his treatment of Mr. Williams, Ms. Gomes and the ESD board during the same time period.

Again this is referenced for the purpose of highlight that this matter should be assigned to a detective that is not Jay Alie or supervised by Jay Alie.

It is hoped that at this point this matter could be assigned to a different law enforcement agency. Especially, given the fact that a member of the Washington State Bar, representing 5 ESD board members, Superintendent Moloney, and COO Jenae Gomes provided Jay Alie with multiple materially false statements on multiple occasions.

Finally, it is clear from the written communications that Jay Alie has a lot of other work that he deems more important and that he perhaps has a better handle on.

In September of 2025, Jay Alie really was focused on timing and motivation of reporting with respect to the strike that was in progress in late August and early September of 2025. For context, the only relevance the 2025 strike had as to the timing of the reporting was the revisitation on the facts from 2023, i.e. the first and only known time the ESD has ever issued supplemental contracts for doing work that the individual was already being compensated by the tax payers to perform, and the fact that there were new perspectives on that issue.

The strike has been over for a long time. In fact, it was over long before Jay Alie made an effort to contact Angie Bunda. However, the ESD made a decision in 2024 and again in 2025, to attempt to ignore the fact that Danny Stevenson, Tim Siess, and Katie Rich raised concerns in September and October of 2023 about the Supplemental Contracts. When looking at the concerns Rob Perkins' voiced to the third-party investigator, (*See: Adam Aguilera's declaration exhibit # 7*) that being it was clear the ESD was worried about the unauthorized Supplemental Contracts would be weaponized against the district by Unions. The intent of the ESD to cover up what occurred is exemplified in the 2024 third-party investigation and in response to direct questions from Jay Alie. These actions with respect to Jay Alie are not just a simple attempt to cover something up, but appear to be a calculated decision by the ESD to allow their speaking agent to provide false and/or misleading information to a public servant constitute criminal actions. It is hard to conceive what possible defense could or has been put forward by Garrett Williams. He was paid to appear on October 10, 2024, and address an appeal on the ESD third party investigation on Jenae Gomes (and others) supplemental contracts and 4 out of 5 of the people who provided statements a or argument during Adam Aguilera's presentation related to the supplemental contract third party investigation issue.

I sent the four (4) declarations to you as I understood you were the head of your department and would be the principal person regarding accountability.

It is understood that you are not an elected official and you are not directly accountable to voters.

It is understood that this is different from a Sheriff, who is an elected official.

The people who are most directly in this position, meaning accountable to voters, in the City of Vancouver are the Mayor and City Council members.

It has been ten (10) days since I sent out the four declarations that clearly demonstrate dishonesty by the speaking agent for the Evergreen School District. Unfortunately, I have not received any response.

I am sending this today as it shows a pattern of dishonesty by the speaking agent for the Evergreen School District and is clear evidence of an intent to gas light, cover up, and/or obfuscate the truth surrounding the unilateral action of Jenae Gomes and John Boyd with respect to the creation of a supplemental contract and/or contracts that do not contain truthful information.

**Please respond with an update as to the status of the investigation by noon on Tuesday December 23, 2025.**

As stated at the beginning of this email, **in the event that I don't receive an email response from you by that time, I will seek interactions with those who are directly accountable, and others.**

At this point, for those who reported in September of 2025 and December of 2025, who engaged in the stressful decision relating to making a decision to rely on the integrity of the Vancouver Police Department to report what was believed to be criminal activity and public corruption, we have had an unfortunate dose of reality.

We exercised patience in reliance upon two institutions, VPD and the Clark County PA's office, both institutions informed us that the investigation was in the hands of the prosecutor. Specifically, those who exercised patience have encountered less than positive responses from your department and unfortunately an investigation that was delayed by a detective who decided on September 8, 2025 (or earlier) that the facts were less important than when the crime was reported. The message received, whether it was intended or not, is don't report criminal activity, be silent, go away, pay your taxes and shut up.

It is my understanding that Danny Stevenson, Tim Siess, Katie Rich, Angie Bunda, and many, many parents in the Evergreen School District don't intend on being silent. These people already encountered efforts to silence them. In addition, they have experienced the added experience of being marginalized in the investigative process due to an incorrect premise.

It is my understanding that none of us are interested in action being taken from within your department's "professional responsibility" unit. At this point, based upon the content of Jay Alie's emails, and his lax attitude and approach to the matter, are all facts that would have been observed by your "professional responsibility" unit already. As far as we understand it, nothing has been done, which speaks volumes.

**It is also understood that as of December 15, 2025, no action has been taken.**

Therefore, it is fair for us to conclude that any of us complaining would result in the complaints being reduced to being viewed as a group of "self-appointed watch dogs" complaining again. No one has any desire of your "Professional Responsibility" unit being turned loose on them as another offensive weapon. Additionally, those involved in reporting have no desire to see an internal effort to check boxes and complete an internal review with a predetermined conclusion. Respectfully, it is a waste of your resources and will not result in restoring any real measure of public confidence.

In summary, there is no one that holds the illusion that Jay Alie's actions will be addressed...and frankly, it is understood that he has been doing this too long to hope for any correction that would have a meaningful impact. Perhaps the matter was given to him for this exact reason, or perhaps not...but it is immaterial at this point, as those involved have no confidence in efforts by your department as to Jay Alie.

Respectfully,  
Camille Lowman

On Fri, Dec 12, 2025 at 9:33 PM Camille Lowman <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Sergeant Alie,

In early September of this year, I provided a declaration in support of a request for an investigation into the potential violation of RCW 40.16.020 as to the language of the supplemental contracts issued on September 4, 2023. There were four (4) supplemental contracts issued. However, the only clear job description and separate employment contract I was familiar with was related to Evergreen School District COO Jenae Gomes. COO Gomes had a year-long employment contract from July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024. In her job duties as to her 2023-2024 employment contract was to serve as the Evergreen School District's "chief negotiator with all collective bargaining." and COO Gomes was to work "directly with and/or oversee the administration of the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreements with Evergreen Education Association. In the 2023 to 2024 School year COO Gomes was to be paid \$253,963 for that year's time period for the performance of these duties and others.

In September 2023, COO Gomes facilitated payment to herself in a supplemental contract to be paid \$13,980.00 for providing services of a “bargaining lead” for the period of August 1, 2023, to September 5, 2023. It is apparent that there is no difference between the duties of a “chief negotiator”, a service which COO Gomes was already contracted to perform, and the service of “bargaining lead”. Therefore, it would appear that the payment received from the supplemental contract would equate to paying COO Gomes for a service that had not been approved by the board, “bargaining lead”. This also appears to be payment of extra money to COO Gomes, an exempt employee, for duties she was already contracted to perform in her employment contract. Referring to C.O.O. Gomes’ 2023-2024 Employment Contract, which I provided in my original declaration, COO Gomes’ contract reads as follows:

**Employee shall perform all duties as assigned by the District Superintendent or designee and shall devote his/her time, skills, labor, and attention to the duties of Chief Operations Officer of the District.** Employee shall be subject to assignment, re-assignment, or transfer at the discretion of the District Superintendent or designee during the term of this agreement. **Employee’s typical work week will consist of five (5) eight-hour days, although Employee may be required to work more based on need.**

It appears that COO Gomes’ employment contract indicates clearly that she may have to work over a 40-hour work week to perform her assigned duty as a “Chief Negotiator.”

It is understood that you were provided with Evergreen School District Policy 5050 as some sort of justification that COO Gomes’ supplemental contract was somehow valid. Actually, Evergreen School District Policy 5050 states contradicts the position taken by the District’s Attorney Garrett J. Williams.

**Evergreen School District Policy 5050 indicates as follows:**

#### **Supplemental Contracts:**

The district may issue supplemental contracts, which are not subject to the continuing contract statute, *for services to be rendered in addition to a staff member’s normal “full-time” assignment.* Supplemental contracts will not exceed one year and, if not renewed, will not constitute an adverse change in contract status.

COO Gomes’ services were not in addition to her normal “full time” assignment. Again, her 2023-2024 employment contract COO Gomes was provided payment through a supplemental contract for services that were within her already defined contract duties.

On September 4, 2023, Ms. Gomes signed a supplemental contract with the intent to be paid for a service (or for duties) she was already contracted to perform and for a job title "Bargaining lead" that the ESD board had not individually and separately approved. In addition to the above issue, it is understood that COO Gomes is an exempt employee and as such generally was (and is) not entitled to receive overtime pay in August and September of 2023. These facts are addressed by former ESD payroll Department Employee Danny Stevenson and ESD teacher Adam Aguilera.

In September of 2025, after coming to a better understanding of the supplemental contract language and other aspects of the circumstances surrounding the issuance of the supplemental contracts, Angie Bunda and I provided our declarations in the hope your department would examine the issue.

Neither of us expected to be viewed by you as having anything "in play" either "interpersonally and/or professionally." Although, you appear to believe this is the case as you wrote this to Ms. Klein on October 15, 2025, 6:57 PM. Additionally, I don't believe we considered ourselves as "*self-appointed watch dogs*" in line with the way you have labeled us.

As you will see from the **attached declarations and exhibits from the following people:**

1. Adam Aguilera, an Evergreen School District teacher and EEA member,
2. Katie Rich, an Evergreen School District teacher and EEA member,
3. Tim Siess, an Evergreen School District teacher and EEA member, and
4. Daniel (Danny) Stevenson, a former Evergreen School District payroll employee and PSE member,

And there is a significant amount of new information, supported by documentation, to consider regarding COO Gomes.

As you will see it has been documented in depositions under oath and incorporated into a Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision, demonstrating that COO Gomes has a past history of editing an investigation where she was a suspect employee of that investigation. This history is also addressed in Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Aguilera's declarations.

You will see from the declarations that in September of 2023, Danny Stevenson, a payroll employee in the Evergreen School District did raise concerns and complain about the September 4, 2023, supplemental contracts. You will also see in late September of 2023, Union High School teacher Tim Siess complained to Rob Perkins about COO Gomes' receipt of money. This complaint was directed at the money received through September 4, 2023, supplemental contract. Tim Siess wrote to Rob Perkins referencing the need for an investigation. Instead of an investigation, Danny Stevenson was almost immediately placed on administrative leave and compelled to either resign in lieu of termination or be terminated. You will have been provided with documentation that demonstrates that Danny Stevenson did not voluntarily separate from his position, and that this was due to Jenae Gomes' actions. You will also see that Danny Stevenson took no photographs of any pay stubs. You will see that Danny Stevenson did not provide any photographs of pay stubs to a relative who worked in the district.

Documentation has also been provided to you that in the spring of 2024, Adam Aguilera filed a complaint within the Evergreen School District relating in part to COO Gomes inappropriate use of the September 4, 2023, supplemental contracts to unjustly received payment. The documentation provided to you demonstrates without a doubt that a third-party investigator was retained by the Evergreen School District and issued a document relating to that investigation on August 23, 2024. You have been provided with documentation that the Evergreen School District paid over \$29,000.00 for this third-party investigation.

In the fall of 2024, Adam Aguilera appealed the results of the third-party investigation due to a number of factors, principal among them was the fact that the investigation was substandard at best and contained material omissions of relevant facts. A chief deficiency in the investigation being that the third-party investigator was never provided with the fact that Daniel Stevenson had complained, that Tim Siess had complained, and/or that they even existed.

You have been provided with the multiple documents which show that an appellate proceeding occurred before the ESD Board on October 10, 2024. You have also been provided with multiple documents showing that the above referenced third-party investigation was the subject of multiple witnesses who gave in person statements. Finally, you have been provided with multiple documents showing that Garrett J. Williams was present at the October 10, 2024 appellate proceeding and received documents and heard statements relating to the third-party investigation.

It is understood that on October 28, 2025, you were provided with multiple levels of false and/or misleading information by Garrett J. Williams relating to an inquiry you made on October 27, 2025, relating to the exact subject matter addressed immediately above.

**On October 27, 2025 you wrote to Garrett J. Williams** and indicated in part as follows:

“I’m hearing about an investigation that may have been conducted by the district, through a paid investigator, that was brought to the board at or after the initial concerns were raised about these contracts and further consideration of these concerns was “denied”. This would have been a complaint brought by persons in the HR/payroll department who brought up concerns at the time of these contracts about their validity. I’m hearing that one of these persons was eventually fired for bringing this up. (Possibly a Clay Stevens?)

Is there is a record of such an investigation that has already dug into this issue, and any subsequent hearing, testimony, or written decision by the board that specifically addresses any allegations about these contracts that I can have as documentation that this was brought up, looked into, and addressed? I recognize what you’re saying about proving a negative, but this seems like a big enough question that there is likely to have been some collection of facts and decision making documentation at the time it was originally brought up.

**Garrett J. Williams replied to you on October 28, 2025** and indicated in part as follows:

There was no investigation involving an employee named Clay Stevens. For context, the law firm I work for is Stevens Clay.

This appears to be another instance of certain factions circulating fragments of information and attempting to string them together into a narrative.

In 2023, a payroll department employee voluntarily resigned after it was discovered they had breached confidentiality by photographing employee pay stubs and sharing them with a family relative. One of those pay stubs belonged to Jenae Gomes. However, no complaint was made regarding the validity of her contract (or those of the three other bargaining team members), nor was an investigator retained.

The suggestion that there was a separate investigation concerning these supplemental contracts is likewise incorrect.

You have been provided with documentation that **Garrett J. Williams billed over 10 hours to the Evergreen School District to appear on October 10, 2024 to attend Adam Aguilera’s appeal relating to the third-party investigation as to, in part, COO Jenae Gomes September 4, 2023 supplemental contracts.**

It is clear that **Garrett J. Williams provided multiple false or misleading statements to you** which were material information provided to you while you were engaged in your duties as the assigned detective.

**As you are one of the victims of this action I am asking that Chief Price or your immediate supervisor assign someone else the task of completing the investigation into Ms. Gomes and the related new potential criminal investigation of Mr. Garrett J. Williams.**

I provided this summary to you as I care about my community. Just as Tim Siess cares about his community. Katie Rich also has provided her declaration for the same reason. Daniel Stevenson cared enough to risk suffering a retaliatory termination. Daniel Stevenson was able to secure employment and has been able to continue on with his life. However, he continues to have hope that there is someone who works in a position of trust that is honest and will do the right thing for the right reason. None of us benefit personally or professionally from providing this information.

Thank you very much for your time,

Camille Lowman

On Wed, Oct 29, 2025 at 5:28 PM Alie, Jay <[jay.alie@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:jay.alie@cityofvancouver.us)> wrote:

I'll provide a response, but it is just not true, in any circumstance, that you can ask any person a legitimate question, hoping to gain actual understanding, and assume an answer. It's absolutely not true that a non-answer to any particular question, from anybody, constitutes a "yes" answer. Frankly, your arbitrarily imposed timeline is no obligation to me and some of these questions are either nonsense or have nothing to do with this case. I'm a professional police officer, if you want to have a meaningful conversation with me you can always just call, or pick up the phone when I call you, or come into the station. I suspect you're choosing this form of communication because you don't want to answer any questions from me and you want to try to limit my responses within your desired narrative. I have nothing to hide, and I'd like to continue to try to clarify for the multiple persons who have either misunderstood or intentionally attempted to misrepresent the reporting process, so I'll address the questions that might help your perspective.