

Report Number 2025-017448 - Supplement - 5 Report

REPORT DATE / TIME

Oct 30, 2025 11:30

EVENT START DATE / TIME - EVENT END DATE / TIME

Sep 2, 2025 14:58

REPORT WRITER

Jay Alie #1205

SUPPLEMENT TYPE

Other - Follow up info/Contact with Gomes

NARRATIVE**Synopsis**

This supplement contains follow up information on details previously brought up, through Thursday, 10/30/25.

At this point, I will be referring this completed investigation to the Prosecutor's Office for review at their discretion. I recommend a review of the complainants' statements as delivered, in consideration with the District's responses, for an assessment of the merit of that complaint. Despite the complainants' interpretation, the issuer of the contract has confirmed this was authorized, the district confirmed the issuer was authorized to issue such a contract and such contracts are within policy, and the state auditor found no fault in the district's finances for the year in question.

Should the allegations made, publicly repeated, and used to attempt to influence the negotiations between the school district and employee union be determined to be without merit, I further recommend a consideration of any applicable charges related to that behavior. This complaint was specifically targeted to only one of four persons who received such contracts and, though the district had responded to this complaint over a year earlier, this complaint was brought and misrepresented in public pronouncements by the complainants at a time and with the intent to deride the targeted public figure and influence the contract negotiations.

Any additional information, emails, statements, or evidence may be included in subsequent reports.

Narrative

On Monday, 10/27/25, I called Alan Harvey to ask him whether he was involved in the creation of the reproduced declarations that were being handed out and signed by multiple persons who didn't know what they were signing or what the declarations contained or aware that these documents were being distributed and being offered as evidence. The declarations contained paragraphs that were fairly direct restatements of information that was in the email he sent to Bunda that she posted on her EPS Advocate page. Harvey advised that, as he'd previously told me, he provided Bunda and the others with the format for a declaration but he was not involved in the content.

Harvey offered that he professionally represents Thiemann and Bunda. Before I could ask if he thought it was appropriate that unwitting citizens were being encouraged to sign and send to the prosecutors statements that were not their independent knowledge, he launched in to advocating the case against Gomes. When I was able to mention what was happening with these documents, he scoffed that people were signing things they didn't read.

In his soliloquy on the case against Gomes, he mentioned that there had been a payroll employee who, subsequent to the original 2023 contract, had brought these up as unusual and that person was fired over bringing it up. He also spoke about the school district having paid for an extensive investigation into this matter. He said all of this evidence and testimony was heard by the school board and the complaint was "denied". I asked for any details he might have about this. He suggested Garrett Williams would know about this, also suggesting that Williams might have a profit incentive in protecting Gomes, indicating that managing complaints about Gomes was a large part of Williams' workload for the district.

I emailed Garrett Williams, the district's legal representative, about the claim that such a person was fired for bringing this up or that there was a prior investigation. Williams responded via email. he offered that, "This appears to be another instance of certain factions circulating fragments of information and attempting to string them together into a narrative."

Williams further described that, in 2023, a payroll department employee resigned after it was discovered they were photographing and sharing employee pay stubs, one of which was Gomes' pay stub. He said no investigation was made regarding the validity of the contracts in question and no investigator was hired.

On Thursday, 10/30/25, I had a phone conversation with DPA Anna Klein. I had emailed Klein previously on 10/15/25 asking if the PA's office was actually reviewing the initial report for charges. In that email, I noted that this would be surprising, given that the report was a General Information report and I was still working on supplementals. My email asked if the PA's office needed me to continue. The Hutton email advising of No Action by the PA, because the original report was not an investigation, followed soon after.

REPORTING OFFICER SIGNATURE / DATE

Jay Alie #1205 Dec 2, 2025 16:09 (e-signature)

PRINT NAME

Jay Alie #1205

SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE / DATE

Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:29 (e-signature)

PRINT NAME

Paul Benton #1541

In the 10/30 conversation, DPA Klein advised her knowledge of this case came from a clerk getting calls asking about it. The original report was reviewed and found not to be an investigation and the case was No Actioned. She mentioned an email in which VPD put out a response to media outlets regarding this case.

I checked with Kim Kapp, VPD's PIO. She advised she became aware of this case when she started receiving media emails on 9/9/25 that included Thiemann's initial packet of documents. She said the department responded, on 9/9/25, to these emails with the statement, "We took a general information report but there is no criminal investigation. The case was forwarded to the prosecutor's office for review."

I reviewed the emails, all of which came directly from various outlets with no cc'd addresses. The response was similarly directly addressed to the original sender.

I contacted **Jenae Gomes** by phone. I have traded a couple of emails with Gomes who originally (9/10) told me she learned of this investigation from talking to Off. Bauman who directed her to me. I originally advised Gomes that I had requests in to the district and school board for any information they had on this and that I would contact her when I had enough information to speak to her. Gomes later responded that Garrett Williams would be responding on behalf of the district.

Throughout this investigation, it is very apparent that the complainants have attempted to manipulate the manner in which this was reported and characterized, through their social media and in the manner it was presented to other citizens who were encouraged to sign and turn in declarations they had little understanding of, in an effort to discredit Gomes. This was reported in a very unusual manner, attempting to go through the Chief's office, then Sgt Devlin, and then having the original packet dropped off and being unwilling to answer any questions from Off. Bauman. The complainants then proceeded to publicly characterize this as a Vancouver Police investigation and that the Clark County PA's office was reviewing for felony charges. It was 'reported' to VPD, and that general information report was, at the request of Thiemann, sent to the PA's office, but no actual investigation was done originally and the product seen by the PA's office did not include a referral for charging by VPD and no action was taken by the PA's office on that product.

Even though three other persons received contracts in the same manner as Gomes, at the same time, for the same work, only Gomes was being targeted by these complainants.

When I did try to contact the original complainants to get any individual statements from them, Thiemann had his attorney call me, Bunda ended our interview when I started to question her statements, then mischaracterized our conversation in an email that she chose to widely publish, and Camille Lowman sent me an email indicating she was predetermining the answers to questions directed at me, clearly in an effort to try to limit a true and accurate description of how this case has unfolded.

In my conversation with Gomes, I advised her that I'd spoken with the school board chairman, John Boyd, and Garrett Williams and I was not seeing a basis on which to accuse her of a crime related to this complaint. Boyd, the superintendent at the time, stated he authorized these contracts, the school board chair advised this issue had been reviewed and closed, and Williams provided the policy basis and history indicating these contracts were valid and within policy. He further noted the state auditor was made aware of these contracts and found nothing questionable in the audit covering that time period. I reviewed the auditor's report available online and confirmed that conclusion.

It is clear from the timing and manner in which this complaint was made that it was done for political purposes with the goal and intention of impacting the negotiations between the district and labor union. This issue was known in late 2023, covered publicly in early 2024 with input from two of the complainants, and the district's finances reviewed and publicly reported on by the state auditor's office. This report was brought forward specifically in the middle of contentious labor negotiations, during a strike that delayed the opening of the school year, and was directed solely at Jenae Gomes, who was the district's primary representative involved in those negotiations. Without allowing any sort of due process, the complainants started to publicize over social media that this was a Vancouver Police investigation (not that any of them had made a report to VPD), that Gomes was being considered for felony charges by the prosecutor, and questioned why the school board wasn't removing her from the negotiating team or placing her on leave. The complainants repeatedly characterized Gomes as being uncooperative with the investigation on the basis of one sentence in Off. Bauman's report saying she called Gomes and no one answered.

The complainant's legal representative suggested that the misrepresentations of the process might be attributable to this group being unfamiliar with the reporting/referral/review process. Their legal representative, who they published emails from and directly copied from those emails into their carefully crafted and reproduced declarations, is a former Clark County prosecutor and has extensive experience with this process. Multiple copies of a declaration contain specific references to the various roles of the police and prosecutor and how any investigation moves to an actual referral. The information on how any case progresses had been researched and was certainly available. When I did have opportunity to communicate with the complainants to explain the process to them, they did not want to listen to or hear the truth.

REPORTING OFFICER SIGNATURE / DATE	SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE / DATE
Jay Alie #1205 Dec 2, 2025 16:09 (e-signature)	Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:29 (e-signature)
PRINT NAME	PRINT NAME
Jay Alie #1205	Paul Benton #1541

I see no basis from the information considered to allege a crime against Gomes. The complainants have offered their interpretation of the situation otherwise. Copies of the contracts involved and statements of the involved parties who authorized the contracts are included in this investigation. All of this information will be made available to the prosecutor to consider as it applies to any violation they see fit.

I advised Gomes that this case did not require any statement from her. Whether or not the contracts were legal could be readily assessed from the supplied documentation and the district's position is also documented. From my experience in the manner in which information has been misrepresented by the complainants, I advised her that I was extremely reluctant to use the authority of the Vancouver Police to illicit any interview of her from which the complainants could parse out or self interpret statements for their own gain. (Thiemann has an active tort claim with the district that he and his attorney have made efforts to connect to this complaint.) I acknowledged that it was likely she would want an opportunity to defend herself or respond to these allegations and I would take any statement she wanted to make. Gomes confirmed her understanding and agreed that the district's response was sufficient at this time.

Attachments

VPD media responses

Recommendation

Forward to the PA's office for consideration.

INVOLVED PERSONS		
INVOLVED PERSON-1 NAME (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE)		DOB / ESTIMATED AGE RANGE
P-1 BUNDA, ANGELA M		
SEX	RACE / ETHNICITY	PHONE NUMBER
		(primary, Mobile Phone)
HOME ADDRESS		
INVOLVEMENT TYPE		
Mentioned		

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 16:09 (e-signature)	Paul Benton #1541 Dec 2, 2025 18:29 (e-signature)
PRINT NAME	PRINT NAME
Jay Alie #1205	Paul Benton #1541