

Official Statement by (b)(6)
22 April 2010

On (b)(6) I reported on orders for 365 days to the Human Terrain System. The (b)(6) I was assigned to the RRC (Regional Reach back Cell). However, the (b)(6) gave out incorrect information upon my agreeing to accept the order. She said the RRC was a 24 hour operation and I could choose the shift that worked best for me. This was not true and when I reported into the RRC, (b)(6) informed me of the shifts that were available. These hours did not work for me because of the distance I was driving to Fort Leavenworth and my family situation. (b)(6) because the person doing that job was taking another position. I assumed that role but soon found out that it was not very challenging and I made myself available to assist in other areas. The S-1 position became available 2 weeks after reporting there. The previous S-1 left without any notice and the position was vacant. The (b)(6) was running the section at the time. I informed (b)(6) He neither agreed too nor acknowledged my request. I was doing the work as best as possible without any backing from (b)(6). The reason I continued without their support was because a lot of personnel related issues were going unresolved because the section was overworked and under staffed.

At the time, I felt the distance between me and the current leadership staff was due to my being new to the organization but later learned that (b)(6) (b)(6) had a problem with females in positions of authority. He was very resistant to (b)(6) (b)(6) as his (b)(6) but did not express his dismay because of her relationship with (b)(6) (b)(6) bypassed me on several occasions and went directly to (b)(6) on personnel issues. Not once did (b)(6) direct him to use the chain of command but appeared to actually discouraged it. When I directly complained to him, he basically ignored my concerns. Also, (b)(6) shared (b)(6) view about the chain of command. Since she had a close relationship with (b)(6) I was the odd person out. It soon became apparent to me that (b)(6) (b)(6) had unhealthy relationships with their subordinates and that newcomers would have an uphill battle trying to break into the inner circle.

My first exposure to (b)(6) was at a memorial service in May 2008 for (b)(6) (b)(6) a HTS civilian killed in Iraq. My section was charged with handling the ceremony. Everything was set and ready to go. I was at the chapel tying up loose ends and in walks (b)(6) I quickly introduced myself and started to inform him how we had structured the ceremony. He basically ignored me. He turned around to my (b)(6) and started asking him about the ceremony. He acted as if I was not present. That was the start of a relationship that would go downhill from there. (b)(6) nor did he even know my name. He is a (b)(6) (b)(6) and should know proper military protocol. At the end of the day, I later learned that (b)(6) (b)(6) (b)(6)

FOR OFFICIAL
USE ONLY

(b)(6) (b)(6) (on a few occasions), and a few other NCOs in HTS routinely went to the High Noon Saloon for drinks. This was the routine every time (b)(6) visited Leavenworth. I was never invited nor would I have gone drinking with them. It was highly unprofessional and fostered the superior attitude in most of the NCOs in the program. There are pictures of fallen HTS civilian employees hanging in the High Noon Saloon. When I questioned them about the decision to put the photos in the saloon, I was told it was a symbolic place that reflected this organization. It is a bar, not a place to honor fallen comrades. I know for sure that (b)(6) (b)(6) would be appalled to learn their son's picture is hanging in a saloon. They were very against the program and refused to participate in the memorial service.

In August or September 2008, (b)(6) got a new position in DC with another government agency. (b)(6) was appointed as the (b)(6) HTS. Immediately, he appointed, (b)(6) and (b)(6) (b)(6) Both of these individuals were civilian contractors. The (b)(6) brought it to (b)(6) attention that contractors cannot supervisor or be in charge of military personnel. He informed (b)(6) (b)(6) that both he and (b)(6) were (b)(6) and were well able to supervise military as well as (b)(6). The situation was very strained and unusual. I fell under (b)(6) and he proceeded to badger me about issues within the S-1 section. I did acknowledge that there were a lot of procedures and processes that needed to be put in place. The organization was two (2) years old and there were no evaluations, reporting procedures, or personnel stats within the S-1 section or organization. However, these issues were just the tip of the iceberg. I had been there three (3) months trying to get a handle on the massive problems within the S-1 section. These problems were further intensified due to my NCOIC's perception that black women should not be in positions of leadership. He was resistant to me from the start. His language and inappropriate pictures in the office were the first thing I addressed when I took over. He was using language that would make a sailor blush. It was definitely not appropriate for a professional organization that was 80 percent civilian. He refused to change his language and I had to counsel him, which upset a lot of people in HTS, namely (b)(6) and (b)(6) were very supportive of my take-charge attitude. They used the change of command exclusively, which helped the process of getting the problems within HTS solved. They eventually lightened up on the military personnel and took their place as contractors and not government employees. The organization was moving ahead in a positive manner. They eliminated personnel that were working from home without any product to show for their efforts. One person in particular was (b)(6) He was working from home making over \$85,000/yr (maybe more than that) and no one knew what he was doing. He would come to the office maybe once a month and 'shoot the breeze.' When I asked (b)(6) why he was allowed to do this, she stated he was an invaluable asset to the HTS team and was doing productive work from home.

(b)(6) did not share (b)(6) view in regards to (b)(6) He called him into the office and relieved him of his duties. (b)(6) was also unsure of what role (b)(6) (b)(6) was playing in the organization. She was gone for long periods of time on vacation

**FOR OFFICIAL
USE ONLY**

but was not claiming leave hours on her time card because she was working on her laptop in the car while driving to vacation. She told me and (b)(6) that she did not have to claim leave if she was working while going to her vacation location. She said that is why she had her father drive and she answered emails on her laptop. When (b)(6) (b)(6) learned of this, he informed us that that was fraud and you cannot claim work hours. However, (b)(6) approved her to do so and he was the (b)(6) At that point, (b)(6) wanted (b)(6) fired for nonperformance of duty. She had no role in the organization once (b)(6) came on board as (b)(6) worked secretly with Mr. Gary Philips to get her fired. (b)(6) learned of their plan and informed (b)(6) who went to bat for her with Mr. Maxie McFarland. When all was said and done, (b)(6) was let go. (b)(6) went on leave and never returned back to the organization. I am certain that their desire to get rid of (b)(6) was not strictly because she was a female. It was more because she was getting paid a lot of money to do very little work. There were other females in leadership roles that they gave the respect that the position required. I was one of those females.

TIME CARD FRAUD

Prior to (b)(6) being let go, we were in the process of transferring all contract personnel to GG (General Government) employees. (b)(6) took over as (b)(6) and he appointed (b)(6) and (b)(6) (b)(6) respectively.

(b)(6) The conversion process was a mess. In March 2009, everyone was suppose to be converted or resigned. This did not happen. We had contractors who refused to convert to GG employees and we continued to pay them as contractors until their contract was up which was not the agreement. For those that did convert, the reporting process was severely flawed. The first set of timecards my section received were grossly fraudulent. Several employees reported 80 hours regular time (two week period), 40 hours Over Time (OT) and 30+ hours Comp Time (CT). It was not hard to figure out that the amount of hours reported was more than the amount in a 12 hour day and the personnel office at Fort Huachuca was reluctant to pay it. We later went back and worked with Fort Huachuca and came up with the maximum amount of OT and CT that an employee could claim within a two week work period. We put that information out to the teams in Iraq and Afghanistan. When the next set of time cards came back, the majority of personnel on all teams maxed out OT and CT. We were advised to pay the hours and we could go back and amend it later if need be. We never once amended anyone's timecard to collect for overpayment. We only amended when hours were missing. It was apparent that the employees were maxing out every pay period to get the maximum amount of money possible whether they worked the hours or not. Many of them did not go outside the wire and were on a regular 12 hours shift but were claiming the max. There was no system in place for checks and balances in-theater. Ultimately, (b)(6) did not want anyone to quit the program so he turned a blind eye to a lot of the fraud. In addition, several GG employees left theater without authorization and still received hazardous duty and danger pay. One employee in particular went to (b)(6) on vacation with his wife without approved leave. He turned in a regular time card with

**FOR OFFICIAL
USE ONLY**

no leave listed and did not understand why we were questioning him for leaving Iraq in an unauthorized status. He was a prior reservist and knew better, but he also knew others were defrauding the system as well.

SEXUAL HARRASSMENT

In June or July 2009, (b)(6) and several other personnel in the training department came to the current leadership under (b)(6) (b)(6) with allegations of sexual harassment complaints from female students in the course against (b)(6). The complaints came from a wide variety of women and were not a single, isolated event. The complaints from the females were written up and presented to the leadership for review and action. Nothing was every done before I left in Aug 2009. It was noted as "still under investigation". I personally felt that the leadership did not believe the allegations against (b)(6). If they did believe the allegations they would have assigned someone to do a 15-6 investigation, which to my knowledge, they never did. Additionally, as the (b)(6) I would and should have been involved in the investigation process. (b)(6) never spoke to or with me about the allegations or investigation. I got my information from the training department and I waited for guidance from (b)(6). However, in early June 2009, my position was changed and I got a boss, (b)(6) and all issues were relayed through her. She never mentioned anything about an investigation.

The worse case of sexual harassment I witnessed came from (b)(6) civilian HTS member assigned to a team in Iraq. She emailed us very upset because she was being harassed by her team leader (I cannot recall his name) and (b)(6). She stated in her complaint that (b)(6) posted a picture of a half naked plus size lady stratted over a motorcycle in his office. (b)(6) was a plus size lady also. He even went so far as to put her name on the photo. According to (b)(6) they constantly made inappropriate and lewd comments to her and the other female soldiers assigned to the team. She said she also witnessed (b)(6) viewing porn on his government computer while in theater. I immediate passed all this information to the leadership for action but nothing was done. She served out her time came back and I think she left the program. (b)(6) was recommended for a General Letter of Reprimand from the active duty commander. When he returned to Conus, I turned all this information over to (b)(6) (b)(6) for action. It was still pending when I left.

RACE DISCRIMINATION

I feel, in my case, it was race and gender discrimination. As stated earlier, (b)(6) (b)(6) and (b)(6) had it out for me from the beginning. I was disrespected at staff meetings. (b)(6) ignored me as much as possible and filtered everything through (b)(6) (b)(6) also had an unhealthy relationship with (b)(6) and (b)(6) (b)(6) came to Leavenworth to visit him and tour the area and stayed in her home. I was blamed and held accountable for a lot of issues that remained lacking with the previous (b)(6) who left the organization

**FOR OFFICIAL
USE ONLY**

without notice and left a lot of issues unresolved. It took months to get her to sign NCOERs for soldiers in her section. She even refused to review her OER and we had to forward it to HRC without a signature. I did not fit in. I could not figure out why these people had it out for me. When I went to Fort McCoy for the final Phase of the ILE course, (b)(6) accused me of forging his signature on my extension paperwork. Prior to me applying for an extension, I asked (b)(6) (they were in charge at the time) if it was ok to put in my paperwork. They both said they would be happy to endorse my extension and I proceeded to go through the proper channel. I never once handled my paperwork. (b)(6) said that (b)(6) came and pulled my file while I was in ILE and looked to see who signed my extension paperwork. He noted that (b)(6) signed the form for me to extend. (b)(6) later denied he signed it. When I learned of the plot to get rid of me from (b)(6) I pulled my file and made a copy of the extension packet to verify the signature. I also pulled files of other packets that were signed and compared the signature. They were one and the same. I brought this information to (b)(6) attention and she advised me to keep this information because, apparently, they were trying to cook up charges to get rid of me. They had gotten rid of (b)(6) using the same tactics.

There was an incident with the (b)(6) (b)(6) When he first got there, he was well liked and did an excellent job running his section under (b)(6) leadership. However, when (b)(6) (b)(6) took over, the mood switched. (b)(6) was having difficulty with one of his soldiers and he was trying to rectify the problem. However, this soldier dismissed all protocol and went directly to (b)(6) about the situation. (b)(6) reminded (b)(6) that he was the section leader and if anyone in his section came crying to her for justice that she should obey protocol and inform him. She took a different approach and refused to abide by his request. As a result, he was black listed and eventually his orders were not renewed. I think he too realized the handwriting on the wall and did not fight it.

GENDER DISCRIMINATION

There was a blatant case of gender discrimination with one of my civilian employees, (b)(6) She was hired at the same time as my male civilian employee to work in the personnel section. However, though they were doing the same job and hired at the same time, she was getting paid \$10,000 less than he was. We tried unsuccessfully on several occasions to get her a raise to no avail. In addition, (b)(6) came to work for HTS as a team member initially and later moved to training as an instructor. Rumor has it he was getting paid over \$100,000 with no college degree and very little responsibility. (b)(6) was paid \$15,000 less than he was being paid and (b)(6) When she complained about the unfairness, (b)(6) set out to fire her and was later successful in his efforts. (b)(6) also came to me in Jun 09 very upset because she said the leadership was trying to get her fired. They were refusing to extend her contract and she did not know why. She was an invaluable asset to the organization

**FOR OFFICIAL
USE ONLY**

when I got there. She held several lectures with students and told them about her role in Iraq as part of the initial team sent there by HTS. She was well liked by everyone. However, when (b)(6) and his team took over, they went on a rampage to get rid of all women in leadership or positions of authority. I was the first to go. I don't know about the faith of the rest of the women. I know (b)(6) and I think that has a lot to do with how he feels about women. (b)(6) is in the same boat. You can work there as a female as long as you know your place. When you start to question their authority, you are fired.

INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIOR

Upon my leaving this organization, I learned that (b)(6) Instructor/facilitator for HTS was cohabitating with one of the married civilian females in the class. (b)(6) Apparently, this information was made know to (b)(6) and the leadership and they turned a blind eye. I don't know what his status is with this female at present but moral behavior is not a trait that HTS holds in high esteem. Several male soldiers told me about the inappropriate behavior (b)(6) engaged in while drinking at the High Noon Saloon. One of them said she grabbed his private parts and he was highly offended. I did not witness this first hand but, the source had no reason to lie. He had nothing to gain from it. There were several accusation of an extra marital affair between (b)(6) and (b)(6) I don't know if this is true but that is the rumor throughout the organization.

I left HTS in (b)(6) after realizing that my progression was limited. I made a lot of enemies because I tried to do the right thing for the right reasons. This organization has a way of doing business that is foreign to me and the tax payers deserve a better return for their investment.

**FOR OFFICIAL
USE ONLY**