

Report Number 2025-017448 - Supplement - 3 Report

REPORT DATE / TIME	EVENT START DATE / TIME - EVENT END DATE / TIME	REPORT WRITER
Oct 23, 2025 16:00	Oct 23, 2025 00:00	Jay Alie #1205

SUPPLEMENT TYPE

Other - Contact with declaration providers

NARRATIVE**Synopsis**

Contact with various persons who provided declarations that included a perjury attestation.

Most of the declarations were word for word copies of each other and not individual statements of any particular person's knowledge of these incidents. The persons I spoke to all indicated they were provided with these statements, they did not write them, and none of these persons had actual independent knowledge of this situation. Some advised they thought they were signing a petition. Some offering they thought it was related to the labor strike.

One person, an EPS parent, advised she was provided a copy of this statement to sign by Angie Bunda.

Two persons who signed declarations attesting to content they didn't fully read, understand, or have independent knowledge of, were provided copies to sign at their place of work at the EPS bus barn. Three other contributors said they got the documents from their spouse/parent, who works at the bus barn, and they signed the documents self admitting that didn't know what the statement contained.

Narrative

On Thursday, 10/23/25, I received and reviewed a collection of "Declarations" that had been sent to me from the PA's office. These documents had been delivered directly to the PA's office in a folder titled, "Clark County PA's Office, Attn: Anna Cline, Case #25-17448". A post-it note attached dated 10/16/25 from Anna Klein asked, "Kim, please send this to VPD Attn Jay Alie".

There were 11 declarations in the folder, all of them four pages long and word for word exactly the same. There were all signed by different persons and ranged in dates from 9/17/25 to 10/3/25. The declarations were written in the same type of tone and language as the originally received statements from Thieman, Bunda, and Lowman.

The statements were written in first person perspective but, being word for word the same, clearly were not individual statements.

Much like the follow up posts made online by the complainants, the declarations repeatedly reference that the Vancouver Police report is making allegations against Gomes. The first full paragraph starts, "It appears that the allegations set out in the attached police report are thatCOO Jenae Gomes violated the law...." The second paragraph starts, "It appears from the police report that the allegation is that Jenae Gomes signed a Supplemental Contract on September 4, 2023 which allowed...."

The last page includes a line, "It was set out on a face book page that the criminal allegations as to COO Jenae Gomes are related to a crime of public trust."

The last page contains a reference to a Columbian article about the conviction of attorney Josephine Townsend, attempting to present the current complaint as commensurate with that case. The connection of this reference to this situation, and the language used, reflects the content of an email from Alan Harvey to Angie Bunda (EPS Advocate) (cc'd to various school officials and multiple news agencies) dated 9/11/25 and posted on the EPS advocate facebook page on that same date (See EPS Advocate 9-11 with Harvey email attachments).

I started attempting to contact a sampling of persons who had signed the declarations in an effort to get their individual knowledge and perspective. None of the statements (in the second collection) had any contact information so I started with unique names I was most likely to find information for.

I contacted **Shimea Potter**. I told her why I was calling and advised her that, like all VPD officers, I had a body worn camera that records audio. I asked if she minded if I recorded this interview and she said, "That's fine."

I asked if she was aware of the declaration I was referring to. She said she knew it was about "Jenae Gomes and the payments and all that". Potter said she did not write this declaration. She said she follows an Evergreen Public Schools facebook group that was talking about this situation. The host of that site posted this declaration. Potter said she read it, then messaged that poster and agreed to sign the declaration. She clarified that the poster was Angie Bunda.

REPORTING OFFICER SIGNATURE / DATE	SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE / DATE
Jay Alie #1205 Dec 2, 2025 16:08 (e-signature)	Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:31 (e-signature)
PRINT NAME	PRINT NAME
Jay Alie #1205	Paul Benton #1541

Potter said none of the language in the declaration was her own words. I asked if she had any first hand knowledge of this situation. Potter said she was not involved in any way in conducting the contracts and she hasn't read the contracts. I asked if she'd read the police report (as the declarations make references to the content thereof). She said she's read, "whatever was in the declaration and the Columbian article". She clarified that she was talking about the March, 2024 article, though she said she didn't pay much attention to it at the time. She then added that she's read the Columbian article about the Josephine Townsend situation as well.

I asked if Potter felt like there was anything in the Townsend article that made her think that it had anything to do with the current Evergreen Schools complaint. She said, "Not directly, but I feel like foundationally it was similar." She explained, "As far as someone saying, basically, saying one thing and then doing something else, or signing papers saying that...this person approved this and not going through all of the proper channels or disclosing everything." Potter explained it was her understanding Gomes signed a contract intended only for certificated employees.

I asked what Potter's knowledge of the school system was, if she worked for the schools or had first hand knowledge of the contracts. She said she doesn't work for the schools and she hasn't read the contract. She said she knew, "...she signed something about bonuses", referencing that her knowledge was based on what was written in the declaration. She said she read through the declaration but it was about a month ago.

Potter told me she'd read the police report. Her primary comment on the report was that "...there was an attempt to reach out to Ms. Gomez but no one had answered....so just off of what....evidence they could collect, they just based the report off of that."

We got into a conversation about whether the fact someone didn't answer a phone call was indicative of anything, in her opinion. She answered, "Not necessarily...." offering that there would be other factors that would come into play.

I asked if she had an opinion on whether someone making an allegation to the police and without further investigation, would be sufficient evidence of a crime. She said, "No, I there definitely should be, it should be looked into, but no, not automatically you're being charged with this thing."

I pointed out the perjury statement on the first page of the declaration signed by Potter. I asked if she was confident that what is in the document is true and correct, at the expense of potentially being charged with perjury. She said she agrees that the issue, the contract question, should be looked into. I asked if she was confident that the four page declaration contained information that she personally knows to be true. She repeated the question to herself and contemplated it. She offered, "I know that I agreed to what was in there, which is why I signed it." I asked if she was agreeing to the specific content or the concept of the issue. She concurred that it was the latter.

As we talked about whether she understood the specific content of the declaration, I asked if she had any knowledge of RCW 9.94A.411 2b, which is listed and quoted in the declaration. She said, "Not without googling it." She said she recognizes how it might be problematic for a person to sign a perjury statement for a document for which they didn't have a complete understanding.

Potter said this declaration was posted to the EPS Advocate facebook page and others were encouraged to review it and send in a copy. She said, in her particular case, she emailed Bunda and Bunda sent her a copy to sign. She said she signed and emailed it back to Bunda.

Potter said she'd seen the article in the Columbian in 2024 but, with her life circumstances at the time, she was too busy with other things to consider the situation. She said she was not aware that the state auditor had found nothing wrong in their audit.

I talked to Potter about the manner in which this was reported, primarily just to get a random citizen's perspective. I asked how she would go about making any kind of police report, asking specifically if she would go to the Chief of Police. She said she would go to a police station or call 911. I asked if she'd expect a general information report would be sufficient for a prosecutor to decide whether or not a crime occurred. In clarifying, I confirmed she had read Off. Bauman's report and asked if she felt that was sufficient to make a charging decision. She said, "I feel like it needs more information."

I described the manner in which this was reported, and then how it was being publicly portrayed by the same people making the report. I asked Potter if she felt that was fair. Potter said, "No, for everyone to say she was charged, I guess, no, because that's not what happened, and I don't think the police bring charges. I think that's the DA's office."

Potter said it was her understanding that four people were paid via the contracts in question. I asked if she felt it was fair that Gomes would be singled out. She said she didn't know the background of the other persons. Potter said the payment to Gomes was concerning because of her position with the district as COO. I pointed out that the CFO was also paid in this manner. Potter agreed that everyone who received such contracts should have been mentioned in this complaint, "because they all did the same thing."

REPORTING OFFICER SIGNATURE / DATE

Jay Alie #1205 Dec 2, 2025 16:08 (e-signature)

PRINT NAME

Jay Alie #1205

SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE / DATE

Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:31 (e-signature)

PRINT NAME

Paul Benton #1541

I asked if she felt it was curious that Gomes was specifically targeted. Potter said, "Yes, the more information I'm getting, I do think it's interesting. Like why just the one person, when other people were also a part of the school district and getting paid as well?"

I asked Potter if she felt it was odd that this complaint was made on 9/4/25, in the middle of the negotiations, when the incident occurred two years earlier. She said, "Yeah, the timing's definitely interesting." She noted she didn't become aware of the complaint until after the negotiations were settled.

Potter asked about the potential implications to her for signing this declaration. We discussed what the perjury declaration means and how it could be used, but it is apparent in our conversation that she might agree with the concepts offered in the declaration but the details were not her factual knowledge and she couldn't actually attest to the veracity of all the details included. I told her I suspected all of the other persons who signed these were in the same position and likely didn't understand what they were signing. I noted it is inappropriate for someone to write a statement, offering it as facts, and ask someone else to sign it as their own knowledge. I pointed out that it's also a bad idea to sign something attesting to it as true that isn't your own words and without full understanding of what's in the statement. Potter confirmed she was taking this as a life lesson.

I asked Potter if she knew Alan Harvey. She said she does not know him.

I called **Jodi Cowell**. Cowell agreed to a recorded interview. Cowell is a bus driver for the district and a parent. Cowell said she is not a direct witness to any of the contested circumstances in this report. She said her primary knowledge of this incident comes from what she's seen and read on the facebook page of EPS Advocate. Cowell said she remembered signing what she thought was just a two page statement that she did not write, or particularly read through very carefully. She said she knew it was about Gomes getting paid during the last teacher's union contract dispute, which she suggested was three years ago.

Cowell said she showed up at work one day to find this statement in her work mailbox. She reviewed it and signed it and gave it to another co-worker who was collecting these to turn in. (She offered that she didn't recall who that was.) Cowell said it was her understanding that this was a request to have this issue investigated, described as more like a petition than an individual statement of her knowledge of any facts.

We discussed some of the highlights in the declaration and Cowell said she had no direct knowledge of those things, even though she signed the form certifying that she knew these things were true. She conceded that she was unaware of what she was actually signing.

I asked Cowell if she was aware that the school district had already addressed this issue, back in March of 2024, as reported in the paper, and that the state auditor had also approved the district's financial reporting over this period. She said she was not aware of any of this.

I spoke with **David Kerney**, who signed a declaration on 9/27/25. David agreed to a recorded interview. Kerney advised he is a police officer in another Washington county. At the outset of our conversation, Kerney indicated he didn't know what I was talking about. I sent him images of the first page of the declaration, that has the perjury statement and his signature, and the final page that also has his signature. The first page starts with the statement that the declarant is a parent of a student in the Evergreen School District.

Kerney told me that he is not a parent of anyone at Evergreen Schools. His mother in law is a bus driver for EPS. (The bus drivers belong to the union that was on strike during the most recent negotiations in September, 2025.) Kerney confirmed that the handwriting and signatures on both pages are his.

Kerney had no personal knowledge of this situation. He doesn't know Jenae Gomes, hadn't read any Vancouver Police reports about this situation, doesn't know Josephine Townsend, (who is referenced in the statement), and doesn't know Alan Harvey.

Kerney said he thought he signed some kind of petition asking that this matter be looked into further. He said his mother-in-law brought it up to him and he recalled possibly seeing some comments or news about this online.

Kerney was reading what I sent while he was talking to me. It was clear he had no understanding of what the document said or what the purpose of this document was. I read a couple of the minor points in the statement and he confirmed those were not true statements for him. I asked if he was aware this document was delivered directly to the Clark Co PA's office and he said he was not aware of that. He said he couldn't recall who he gave the document to after signing it.

Kerney said he would have to talk to his mother in law about how, when, and why he was asked to sign this and where it went after being signed.

REPORTING OFFICER SIGNATURE / DATE	SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE / DATE
Jay Alie #1205 Dec 2, 2025 16:08 (e-signature)	Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:31 (e-signature)
PRINT NAME	PRINT NAME
Jay Alie #1205	Paul Benton #1541

I called and talked to **Corey Sutcliffe**, who agreed to a recorded interview. Mr. Sutcliffe told me his wife is a bus driver with the school district and he recalled signing the declaration, which he referred to as, "something for the school district". He said he has no personal knowledge of the situation and he was presented with this document from his wife, who he believed got it from someone at her work. Mr. Sutcliffe said he no longer has kids in the Evergreen Schools.

Asked if he had any independent, personal knowledge about this situation, Mr. Sutcliffe said his only knowledge was "about the strike", saying he knew basically what has been on the news and online. He said he does not know Jenae Gomes directly, He offered that he knew she wasn't the superintendent and guessed that she is "...on the school board council or something like that...."

I asked what he intended this declaration to do. He said, "I thought they would look into her about the whole strike thing. That she didn't want to agree to....the bus drivers and the paraeducators...." He clarified he was talking about the most recent strike that had just been resolved.

I explained that I was looking at a four page document. Mr. Sutcliffe said that sounded right, adding, "I guess I didn't read it thoroughly, did I?" I started to ask about the perjury statement, reading part of it. Mr. Sutcliffe told me he works in private industry and isn't a lawyer or police officer. I offered that my impression was that, while he may have read this statement, he wasn't really clear on what it actually says. He confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Sutcliffe said he's never read any Vancouver Police Reports on this topic, he's never read Gomes' supplemental contract or her normal work contract.

Mr. Sutcliffe said he was given this document by his wife and he signed it because, "I just thought this is gonna help the strike."

I described to Mr. Sutcliffe that I had multiple such statements, all word for word the same from multiple different persons, and all the persons I'd talked to thus far were in a position similar to his, where the signed the document but didn't really have an understanding of what was in it. I pointed out that the allegations being made were serious and asked if he felt it was problematic that people were offering signed statements containing allegations and information that they didn't know were true or not. He concurred this was problematic.

Mr. Sutcliffe offered that he thought he was signing something more like a petition than a witness statement. He added, "I thought it was something to help do with the strike and how she fought against it and things like that." I asked if he thought Gomes should be charged with a crime for the way she handled the strike. He said, "I have no idea....I don't understand strikes, I don't get unions.....I know nothing of that." I asked what he was hoping she would get looked into for and he reiterated, "...How she handled the strike."

I asked his opinion about someone turning in a signed declaration, under penalty of perjury, to the PA's office, claiming that a person should be charged with a crime when the claimant had no idea who the "suspect" was or what they do. He said, "I didn't know this was for a crime." I read to him the line in the second paragraph on page 1 of his signed declaration that says, "....I have set out concerns about what appears to be a crime of public trust by a public officer relating to RCW 40.16.020. I have set these concerns out in the below declaration." I noted that this particular RCW is a B felony crime. He reiterated, "I didn't know this was for a crime.....that's not fair whatsoever."

As we closed the conversation, Mr. Sutcliffe added, "I ...honestly did not know this was about some criminal claim against her. I had no idea. I thought this was more about the way the whole strike was handled and all that kind of stuff."

I spoke to **Cortney Kerney**, the wife of David Kerney and daughter of Corey and Karyn Sutcliffe. Cortney said she had spoken with her husband and father and knew what declaration I wanted to talk about. Cortney agreed to a recorded interview. Cortney advised that, similar to her husband and father, she had no independent information about this situation beyond what she's heard in the news or social media and she had not read through the declaration or had specific knowledge of the information in it. All of the declarations are written in first person.

Cortney said she recalled signing this at her mother's house. She said her Mom was always talking about the strike to the point that Cortney found it frustrating. She offered that, at the time she signed it, she was trying to appease her mother and signed without considering any implications about what she was signing. She conceded that she didn't actually read the document.

Cortney made several partial statements as to what she thought the document was about. She said she thought she was signing, "something for ...the strike...or pay." She offered she thought it was about the employees trying to get paid for the time they missed while on strike and she thought it was some kind of petition. She said, "I didn't honestly realize it was like a legal thing..."

I asked if she realized this document was essentially accusing a person of a felony crime. She said she was not aware of this and apologized.

Cortney said she believed her mother was getting these statements from somebody at work (at the bus barn).

REPORTING OFFICER SIGNATURE / DATE

Jay Alie #1205 Dec 2, 2025 16:08 (e-signature)

PRINT NAME

Jay Alie #1205

SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE / DATE

Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:31 (e-signature)

PRINT NAME

Paul Benton #1541

Cortney put David back on the phone. I reminded him this was being recorded and he acknowledged that.

David said he recalled seeing "stuff was getting shared" on facebook. He couldn't recall exactly what but he said it was "along the lines" of something he agreed to put his name to. He said his mother in law sent him links to certain posts on facebook but he didn't know the name of Angie Bunda, hadn't seen a Vancouver Police report that was posted, and couldn't recall other details. I asked if he realized the declaration was essentially accusing a person of a felony crime, reading the sentence in the second paragraph. He said the document, "wasn't something that I fully understood...", adding again that he thought it was some kind of signature gathering petition.

I asked if he thought, reading it now (to my knowledge, he only had the first and last pages that I'd sent him) that someone committed a crime. He said he would need "more context". He noted that, at the time he was hearing about this, it raised his concerns about what was going on the Evergreen School District.

I asked what his experience was with online commentary being truthful. He said, "depending on the source....if it's coming from a board member or a concerned parent that is at all the meetings, they're part of the administration...". This appeared to be a reference to Angie Bunda but David said he does not know her. I asked if he was aware of anybody he found to be a credible source of information on this matter and he referred back to his mother in law and what he's seen on facebook.

I called and left messages for Crystal Stader, Karyn Sutcliffe, and Arlene Miro.

I called **Alan Harvey** to inquire if he had prepared these declarations and if he was aware of the manner in which they were being used. He said he only assisted the original complainants by providing them with the declaration forms. He was unaware of these statements and unaware that they contained specific references he'd made in an email published on her facebook page by Angie Bunda.

In this conversation, Mr. Harvey asked if I was aware of a previously conducted investigation that included this matter paid for by the district. He said a private investigator was paid to look into this and testimony was provided in a closed Board session attended by Garrett Williams and Jenae Gomes and the Board. Though he spoke in generalities, he indicated someone in the HR/payroll department had raised a concern that these contracts were improperly transacted. Mr. Harvey insinuated that this same person had an ongoing complaint about retaliatory treatment by Gomes. He offered that testimony on these issues was heard by the Board and they "denied" the complaint.

Throughout this conversation, Mr. Harvey repeatedly commented on how he and the other complainants in this case had been told early on that this case had been referred to the prosecutor and it was "on the desk" of DPA Anna Klein. He made references to me telling Angie Bunda that this case had not been referred as a crime to be considered. (At the time of this statement, I was actively working on my first supplemental report and the only other report on this topic was the General Information original by Off. Bauman. While a copy of the original report may have been sent to the PA intake, that report was not a sufficient investigation to support consideration of a crime. A subsequent email from Gayle Hutton of the PA's office, of which Harvey commented on, indicates this same information. With my reports open, there was no functionally sufficient report or investigation from which the PA could make a consideration of charges.) Mr. Harvey commented that the citizens inquiring about the status of the case likely wouldn't have experience or context to understand these distinctions. Mr. Harvey said he represents Thiemann and Bunda, he told me he has been in communication with both, he said he provided Bunda with the declaration forms (not content), and he's clearly offered opinion on this situation to Bunda in that she has posted emails from him that reference specific points listed in this second round of declarations. Mr. Harvey is a former Clark County prosecutor. It is highly likely he would recognize a report viable for actual consideration of charges at the prosecutor level and would have opportunity to explain these distinctions. He offered that the time between when Sgt Taylor said the report was referred to the prosecutor and the email from Gayle Hutton saying the matter was closed with no decision was suggestive of how long this particular case was being considered by DPA Anna Klein.

This second round of declarations, all dated between 9/17/25 and 10/3/25 (I talked to Bunda for the first time on 10/15/25) have references indicative of an understanding that the case is still under investigation. The opening line of the second page is, "To the assigned Prosecuting Attorney and/or the assigned investigative agency:" The second to last paragraph of page three references Off. Bauman's report saying, "....the investigation has no notation in her report where there was any effort to contact anyone who is on the Evergreen School Board to verify the facts..."

The last paragraph of page three starts, "It would appear that this is information that would need to be investigated...." It then goes on to cite RCW 9.94A.411 (2)(b) saying, in part, "A prosecuting attorney is dependent upon law enforcement agencies to conduct the necessary factual investigation which must precede the decision to prosecute."

These declarations were clearly written before 9/17/25, well before I first spoke to Bunda. The content clearly recognizes the original report was insufficient as an investigation and that no prosecutorial decision could be made until an investigation is complete. The person who wrote this declaration, that was copied and signed by additional persons who admitted they did not know its contents, did have, and provided, context to understand what constitutes a viable case for consideration of criminal behavior.

REPORTING OFFICER SIGNATURE / DATE

Jay Alie #1205 Dec 2, 2025 16:08 (e-signature)

PRINT NAME

Jay Alie #1205

SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE / DATE

Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:31 (e-signature)

PRINT NAME

Paul Benton #1541

I emailed Garrett Williams requesting any information or documentation he might have regarding the investigation suggested by Mr. Harvey.

I went back and reviewed the second set of declarations that was routed from the PA's office to Cmdr Whitney and entered in a report by PST Bellamy. The content of each of those nine declarations was word for word the same and matched the same content of the third set described above.

I called and left messages for the following contributors of those declarations:

Kathryn Fertik, Malia Silverthorne, Rachael Campbell, Corrie Young, Jeff Zhao, Rebecca Goldman, and Nicholas Gates.

I was able to reach **Angela Gates** who made a few comments but offered that she could provide more information later when she had access to her notes. I gave Gates the standard advisement regarding this call being recorded by my BWC. She did not give a specific answer regarding consent to record but instead continued to ask me questions. Gates told me that she did not write this statement and these declarations were prepared by a group of persons that she chose not to identify. She said she was aware of the content of the declarations and understood what she signed.

Gates asked me why the police would be calling her since these declarations were sent to the prosecutor's office. This issue is a repetitive theme in the manner in which this issue has been reported. Thiemann, after trying the Chief of Police and the Sergeant of the Crime Reduction Unit, handed in his packet of info, represented as an investigation, to the desk office but didn't want to answer any questions about what it was. There were multiple calls to the PA's office following the initial report to determine whether this had been "referred" to the prosecutor. The original General Information report was forwarded to the prosecution. That report, as it stood, with no other investigation, was insufficient to be reviewed for any kind of charges. That important detail has not seemed to matter to any of the contributors. References to this issue being a Vancouver Police investigation and that the PA was reviewing for charges were used in social media posts in a manner appearing to be an attempt to influence what was then the ongoing negotiations between the school and the union. (See quotes and images from social media in my first supp.) The PA's office, in an email from Gayle Hutton dated 10/16/25 sent to Angie Bunda, clarified this, noting that there was no actual investigation included in that initial report, that the PA's office does not do investigations, that no action was taken on that report, and any follow up should be directed to the Vancouver Police.

It was suggested by Alan Harvey, the attorney for complainants Thiemann and Bunda, that the citizens offering these declarations may not understand the reporting/referral process. Page three of the declaration that Gates, and all others who offered this particular declaration, signed and claimed she read and understood specifically mentions that Off. Bauman's police report was not a complete investigation - "....the investigation has no notation in her report where there was any effort to contact anyone who is on the Evergreen School Board...." and then offers an entire paragraph quoting and positing an opinion on RCW 9.94A.411 2b, which outlines that the prosecuting attorney relies on law enforcement agencies to conduct investigations and that a thorough investigation needs to be done prior to a prosecutorial decision. With this much effort offered to explain the process, it doesn't seem like it should be a surprise that, first, these types of documents should be turned in to the police and not the PA's office, and second, that an officer would follow up on such statements to conduct an investigation.

I explained to Gates that in any kind of criminal complaint, persons who want to be witnesses are questioned by the police as to what their knowledge is and what information they have to contribute to the case. I asked Gates if she had any independent knowledge of this case. Gates offered that she was aware that Gomes refused to cooperate with the investigation. I asked what made her think that and she said, "...because we were told by the first officer that investigated that she refused to answer the phone or answer questions." Not only has this not been the actual case (Gomes has been in communication since she became aware of this complaint) but it has never been reported by the Vancouver Police that she refused to cooperate. Off. Bauman's report mentioned she called Gomes and no one answered. It would be extremely presumptuous to assume Gomes knew it was an officer calling and "refused" to answer the phone. The first email I received from Gomes acknowledged she got my contact information from speaking with Off. Bauman. Angie Bunda made a post on the EPS Advocate page in which she attempted to portray this unanswered call as an intentional effort to duck the investigation by Gomes. She further posted an email from attorney Alan Harvey who also made a point to suggest Gomes was a "felony suspect" but added, in specific response to Bunda, that Gomes has every right under the Fifth Amendment not to respond. He further added that there is no indication in Off. Bauman's report that Off. Bauman's message to Gomes mentioned anything about the reason for the call. That email was from 9/10/25. Gates' declaration was signed 9/21/25.

Gates offered that she has a collection of notes and she could share that information in a subsequent call. We arranged for a time to speak on 10/29.

On 10/29/25, I received an email from Camille Lowman titled, "Re: Jenae Gomes suspect for charging review at the Clark County Prosecuting Attorney's Office". The email started, "After your contact with Angie Bunda, and in line with my previous email, I have a few follow up questions. It is understood that the answer is 'yes' to all of the questions stated below in the body of this email, 1 through 17. If

REPORTING OFFICER SIGNATURE / DATE	SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE / DATE
Jay Alie #1205 Dec 2, 2025 16:08 (e-signature)	Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:31 (e-signature)
PRINT NAME	PRINT NAME
Jay Alie #1205	Paul Benton #1541

the answer to any of the questions is "No", please respond. If you don't respond to a question, all of the questions, or to the email, then you are indicating that all of the answers are 'Yes'." It continued, in bold print, **"If a response is necessary, please respond by 6:00 today, 10/19/2025, otherwise I will assume you are indicating that all of the answers are "Yes"."**

Lowman had previously emailed that she received my voice mail on 10/15.

The complete email and response are attached (Lowman email string).

The first six questions are at least related to this investigation and reflect this group's, at best, misunderstanding of the reporting and investigation process. Based on the attempt to pre-answer the questions in a manner most suitable to her interests, I'd offer these questions were more of an effort to continue to intentionally misrepresent the nature of this process.

The last 10 questions are about my personal resume and qualifications to investigate this case, including whether I have a law degree, or accounting degree, whether I've been a part of the Major Crime Unit, Domestic Violence Unit, of Children's Justice Unit, whether I've ever investigated crimes involving RCWs 42.20.070, .100, or 40.16.020, and whether I have authority to arrest persons for felony crimes.

The last question appears to suggest potential implications, asking if I have the "legal authority to place someone on the Brady List and /or Potential Impeachment Discovery list..."

I emailed a response offering to explain the reporting, investigation, and referral process, to clarify for all involved how the process works. I explained in detail what has occurred with this report to date. None of this should be a surprise, though, as multiple of the signed declarations have their own paragraphs explaining this same thing. I offered Lowman the opportunity to call or come meet with me.

I called Angela Gates back and left a voice mail.

Attachments

Images of received declarations.

Copies of referenced emails.

Recommendation

Attach to case.

VEHICLE / PROPERTY & ITEMS SUMMARY				
DESCRIPTION / MAKE / MODEL / COLOR	STATUS / DATE / REASON FOR CUSTODY	VIN # / SERIAL #	QTY.	TOTAL (\$) VALUE
Second round declarations (see attached images)	Property, Evidence/Seized / Oct 28, 2025 / Evidence			

PROPERTY & ITEMS ADDENDUM		
2025-017448-1 OTHER ITEM - SECOND ROUND DECLARATIONS (SEE ATTACHED IMAGES)		
ITEM CATEGORY		
DOCUMENT (PERSONAL/BUSINESS)		
DESCRIPTION		
Second round declarations (see attached images)		
STATUS	STATUS DATE	SUBMIT TO EVIDENCE
Property, Evidence/Seized	Oct 28, 2025	Yes
REASON FOR POLICE CUSTODY		
Evidence		
RECOVERING OFFICER / ID # / PERSON		
Jay Alie #1205		
STORAGE LOCATION / PERSON / DESTINATION / INTAKE PERSON		
WEST PRECINCT > WEST EVID LOCKER		
RECOVERED LOCATION		
2800 NE STAPLETON RD, VANCOUVER, WA 98661		

REPORTING OFFICER SIGNATURE / DATE	SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE / DATE
Jay Alie #1205 Dec 2, 2025 16:08 (e-signature)	Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:31 (e-signature)
PRINT NAME	PRINT NAME
Jay Alie #1205	Paul Benton #1541

This report was generated in Mark43 and the e-signature was affixed using the undersigned officer's unique login and password. I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

ELECTRONICALLY SIGNED	DATE	PLACE
Jay Alie	12/02/2025	Vancouver Police Department, WA

REPORTING OFFICER SIGNATURE / DATE	SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE / DATE
Jay Alie #1205 Dec 2, 2025 16:08 (e-signature)	Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:31 (e-signature)
PRINT NAME	PRINT NAME
Jay Alie #1205	Paul Benton #1541