

Brown, Kara

From: Garrett Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:59 PM
To: Alie, Jay
Subject: Re: Report #2025-017448
Attachments: BSR-4 Authority Of The Superintendent.pdf; 5311 -Payroll Disbursement.pdf; Contracts Policy 5050.pdf

Sergeant Alie,

Some of your questions are answerable at a District level. Others concern specific people's knowledge. To the latter, I would recommend reaching out to former superintendent John Boyd, who was involved in the issuance of these contracts. His email is [REDACTED] and his phone number is [REDACTED]

As for your specific questions:

We know that the auditor reviewed these four contracts because they did generate publicity and because District staff spoke with the SAO about them. However, we don't know what was included in the final report documents that the SAO produced. We would defer to their public records. That said, it was a clean audit.

Supplemental contracts are a common practice in school districts. They are governed by EPS Board Policy No. 5050, which states: "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." Supplemental contracts serve various purposes, such as ensuring bus drivers are available to transport students for special events, compensating coaches for teams and activities, or recognizing staff for work beyond their job descriptions. The District has millions of dollars of supplemental contract.

Policy 5050 granted the superintendent the authority to offer supplemental contracts to the district bargaining team, including Ms. Gomes. By way of further support, attached is Policy B/SR 4 – (Board/Superintendent Relationship) – Authority of the Superintendent. Number 3 specifically grants the Superintendent authority to 'develop any activities the Superintendent deems appropriate to achieve the Board's Results policies'.

Most supplemental contracts (including the one in question) are paid based on per diem (employee's hourly rate) times the number of extra hours worked. Regarding the account code used, the contract was paid out of the Districtwide (9700)- Human Resources (14)- Extra Hours Salary (3131) account.

At Board meetings, the Board approves a total estimated payroll amount monthly, not each individual supplemental contract.

Special payrolls are run almost every month and are not unusual. I've attached Policy 5311 that details Payroll Disbursement and Special Payroll policy.

As a final thought, part of the District's concern with these allegations is that it is being asked to, essentially, prove a negative. Supplemental contracts, like the ones issued to Ms. Gomes and other bargaining team members are common and specifically authorized by District policy. For that reason, there isn't a "body of evidence" or "investigation records" to show how these weren't illegal as Ms. Bunda and other community members have demanded (including by way of this police report). Instead, we have documentation showing that they are legal—namely, the above-cited policies and procedures. Said otherwise, we don't have "any other kind of document that

shows the board specifically looked at these particular contracts, had any issue with the manner in which they were produced, confronted any of the involveds for details, and collected statements and information that led to the board being satisfied with the response" because this wasn't a policy violation to begin with. It has only become a problem because some community members don't like that it occurred.

I hope this helps,
Garrett

From: Alie, Jay <jay.alie@cityofvancouver.us>

Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 7:23 PM

To: Garrett Williams [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Report #2025-017448

Garrett –

I have some additional questions, and I suspect those may raise more. To the extent that you are aware, and have any documentation thereof, can you address these?

I reviewed the auditor's report you sent me and went through their documents on their public facing web site. While they report they found nothing out of the norm, those reports are pretty general and they don't address any specific documents they reviewed. Is there any documentation that these four contracts were specifically reviewed, for what content and concerns, and any notes made specifically about those contracts?

It is alleged that John Boyd rubber stamped and pre-signed most, if not all, supplemental contracts. Are you aware of this or have any response to that contention? Do you know what the standard procedure would have been at that time? Was anyone other than Boyd and the four persons who received the supp contracts aware that they were being paid in that manner? Any record of agreement or authorization to that pay from anyone else?

On the contract to Gomes, how was that amount of pay determined and what account is represented by that account code on the document?

One of the issues raised by the complaint is the timing of this pay, that the money was delivered not on a regularly scheduled pay date or check run, that it was done hastily to avoid a board meeting that was scheduled within days, and that could only have been accomplished by Gomes overriding protocol through her supervision of the payroll department. What is the district's response to that assertion?

I'm hearing that there was an issue in which someone in payroll 'found' these contracts some time after they were transacted and brought up a question about them and there was some kind of internal investigation and that person was fired. Is there any documentation of such an investigation and can I get those details?

Clearly this issue was brought up in March, 2024 and reported in the Columbian. Most of these questions were likely already raised and, I anticipate, were reviewed and addressed by the board. I can see the

responses in the news article but are there any minutes, meeting notes, or any other kind of document that shows the board specifically looked at these particular contracts, had any issue with the manner in which they were produced, confronted any of the involveds for details, and collected statements and information that led to the board being satisfied with the response?

I'll be in training tomorrow from about 8-Noon but I'll be available in the afternoon at my cell, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] If we don't connect tomorrow, I'm back on Monday morning.

Thank you –

Sgt. Jay Alie
Vancouver PD
[REDACTED]

From: Garrett Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 8:56 AM
To: Alie, Jay <jay.alie@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: Re: Report #2025-017448

Good morning,

Attached is a copy of the SAO's audit report for fiscal year 2023-2024. On page 4, it specifies that the SAO examined, "Compliance with supplemental contracts for enrichment activities." The four supplemental contracts issued to administrators for the 2023 labor strike were included in the samples of supplemental contracts examined by the SAO.

The SAO found no issues, as reflected on page 4, "This report describes the overall results and conclusions for the areas we examined. In those selected areas, District operations complied, in all material respects, with applicable state laws, regulations, and its own policies, and provided adequate controls over the safeguarding of public resources."

Thank you,
Garrett



Confidentiality Notice: The information in this email and any attachment(s) is intended only for use by the intended recipient and may be confidential or privileged. If any reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, unauthorized use, disclosure, or copying is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender with an immediate return email, delete the original message, and delete all copies from your system.

From: Alie, Jay <jay.alie@cityofvancouver.us>

Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:47 AM

To: Garrett Williams [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Report #2025-017448

Thank you. 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.

I do see and believe there is an intentional effort to try to legitimize these complaints by representing it as a "VPD investigation" and references to it being referred as a crime to the PA's office. If there is any information available to show that this issue was brought up and publicly resolved previously (I did see the Columbian article from 2024), that might further allude that bringing it up again, at this particular time, has motivations beyond the original question of whether the extra duty contract was appropriate, I'll take any of that you might have.

I appreciate it.

Sgt Jay Alie, VPD
[REDACTED]

From: Garrett Williams [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 9:29 AM

To: Alie, Jay <jay.alie@cityofvancouver.us>

Cc: Jenae N Gomes <jenae.gomes@evergreenps.org>

Subject: Re: Report #2025-017448

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

Sergeant Alie,

Below is a copy of the email that I sent on September 8. I will also forward it to you.

Thank you,

Garrett

Sergeant Alie,

Our office represents Evergreen Public Schools and its COO, Jenae Gomes. We have been asked to respond to your request given the sensitivity of this matter for both the District and Ms. Gomes. The letter and police report at issue appear plainly designed to damage Ms. Gomes' reputation and career, and to pressure the District to remove her from her role as bargaining lead during a contentious strike.

I would be happy to speak with you at your convenience, but some background may be useful in the meantime.

The District first became aware of the letter last week when PSE union president, Mindy Troffer-Cooper, began posting it online for public consumption. Shortly afterward, a public records request was submitted