

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Indianapolis, IN, 46241



Transportation
Security
Administration

Date: July 31, 2014
To: (b)(6)
Lead Behavior Detection Officer
Indianapolis International Airport
From: Scott Gordon *W3 Gordon*
DAFSD - Screening
Indianapolis International Airport
Subject: Decision on Proposed Discipline
Reference: (b)(6)

This is notice that I have decided to issue you a Letter of Reprimand based on the proposal you received on June 25, 2014. This decision is made to promote the efficiency of the service and is based on the following reasons:

Charge: Failure to follow Standard Operating Procedures

Specification: On May 24th, 2014 you initiated a SPOT Referral (b)(3)(49) U.S.C. § 114(a) on Checkpoint B at 1740 hours. During the referral process, you made the decision to take one of the referred passengers from lane six (6) over to Lane three (3) and conducted the SPOT Referral Screening without a partner as required per the SPOT SOP.

On June 25, 2014 you were issued a written Notice of Proposed Three (3) Day Suspension from (b)(6) BDA Transportation Security Manager, based on the above Charge and Specification. The written notice also advised you of your right to make an oral and/or written reply. You did provide to me an email reply to the Notice of Proposed Suspension on July 13, 2014.

I have considered all of the evidence of record, including your response. In your response you state, "I did not, have not and never will deliberately and willfully do

Transportation Security Administration
8303 West Southern Avenue • Indianapolis, IN 46241
317-612-9000 • <http://www.tsa.gov>

something against the SOP...." You also state, "I did use critical thinking and made the right call to expedite this screening to get the passengers on their way because their daughter was in a coma." I find the evidence supports the charge and specification as stated above. However, after reviewing the CCTV footage, I find the circumstances that surround the incident to be a combination of things you could control and things you couldn't control. I do not understand why your partner did not join you for the bag search and casual conversation but I feel you were the lead and still should have called for assistance or had one of the other officers that came down stay with you. I do understand that you got the resolution needed without having to ask a question and I also note that there was no security breach associated with this incident.

In determining the appropriateness of this penalty, I have considered as mitigating factors your employment by the Federal government since September 2002 and your otherwise satisfactory performance record. That said, as aggravating factors, you knew the SOP requirement to have someone present when you were conducting the search, while not defiant or with any malice it was still deliberate and you should have exercised better judgment. I realize you may have got caught up in the your empathy for the passenger and their situation but believe that your misconduct needs to be addressed and I believe that this Letter of Reprimand serves the efficiency of the Federal service.

It is hoped that this Reprimand will impress upon you the seriousness of your actions and that future discipline will not be necessary. As you also said in your response to me that I know you to act better than that, while that is very true and I have great respect for you, I also know you can be a little hard headed, like me, in some situations. I hope this gives you reason to pause and think about when that kind of action is appropriate. Future misconduct may lead to further and more severe disciplinary action, up to and including removal from Federal service.

This Letter of Reprimand will be placed in your electronic Official Personnel Folder (eOPF) for up to a two-year period, during which time it may be cited as a prior formal disciplinary action in any future disciplinary matter. At the end of that two-year period it will be removed from your eOPF. However, even after it is removed from your eOPF, your supervisor may retain a copy of the letter in the local supervisory file as documentation that you have been placed on notice regarding the performance or conduct referenced above.

You have the right to file a grievance under the grievance procedure established by Human Capital Management Policy 771-4, *National Resolution Center*, and its accompanying Handbook. If you choose to file a grievance, you must submit it in writing to the National Resolution Center within fifteen (15) calendar days of your receipt of this letter. Any grievance must include a copy of the action you are grieving, the reasons you are grieving, any supporting documentation for the grievance, the remedy you seek, and whether you have raised the matter in another forum. You must file your written grievance by email at ResolutionCenter@tsa.dhs.gov; or facsimile at (703) 603-4057 using TSA Form 1115-1, *Grievance/Mediation Request*. A copy of TSA Form 1115-1 is attached.

Transportation Security Administration
8303 West Southern Avenue • Indianapolis, IN 46241
317-612-9000 • <http://www.tsa.gov>

The Designated Grievance Official (DGO) is Aaron Batt, AFSD-Screening, 8303 W Southern Ave, Indianapolis, IN 46241 or his phone number is 317-612-(b)(6). If you are interested in participating in mediation of this action, you can initiate the mediation process by calling the National Resolution Center at (571)227-5097 or emailing Resolutioncenter@tsa.dhs.gov to discuss whether your case is eligible for mediation. You should not file a written request for mediation with the NRC until after this discussion has occurred.

The Employee Assistance Program (EAP) is available to you to provide counseling services and/or assistance and may be contacted at 1-800-222-0364. The EAP is a confidential resource designed to help employees address a wide range of personal or family issues.

Please sign the acknowledgement of receipt below. Your signature does not indicate agreement with this action; it only represents receipt of this notice on the date signed.

Attachment(s):
HCM 771-4 Grievance Procedures

Acknowledgement of Receipt

(b)(6)

Employee's Signature

Date

08/04/2014

Delivery Information:

Mailed By

Date

Transportation Security Administration
8303 West Southern Avenue • Indianapolis, IN 46241
317-612-9000 • <http://www.tsa.gov>

Gordon, Scott <IND>

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Sunday, July 13, 2014 7:28 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Response to proposal reference (b)(6)

July 13, 2014

This is (b)(6) response to proposed 3 day suspension.

Reference: (b)(6)

Mr. (b)(6)

I hope you have not already made up your mind on this proposal to suspend me for three days.

I will not go into all the personal attacks like the ones leveled against me in this proposal at this time. I am not the officer that is described in the proposal for a three day suspension.

There are major differences in the witness statements by BDO (b)(6) and myself. In addition, I do not see any fact finding to try to find out which statement is more factual. I know that the complete video of the referral from the first contact with the passenger will show which witness statement is more factual. I would still like to see the complete video and compare it to BDO (b)(6) statements and my own. On June 13, 2014 I asked detailed BDA TSM (b)(6) to make sure he had all the video of the referral from start to finish and he said it would not make any difference. I have this conversation noted in my BDO note book.

I was not provided the original copy of BDO (b)(6) original witness statement that was written before he had more memory recall. I find this memory recall very suspicious in and of itself.

I did admit to starting the bag search by myself. If you read my statement carefully it is easy to see that I got the resolution for the referral without even asking one question. I do not even remember BDO (b)(6) coming down and helping me by doing a little casual conversation. This part of BDO (b)(6) statement shows that I did not conduct the referral entirely by myself. No additional behaviors were reported for either passenger and their trip stories were confirmed at the end. Several of the statements make this connection.

There is no proof of my intent to do this referral alone. In addition there was no security incident or breach associated with this referral. In fact if I had not been there at the time BDO (b)(6) made contact with the passenger I do not believe any screening would have taken place at all. He can be seen on the video looking around trying to figure out a way to get rid of the situation altogether. The evidence does not support the charges in this case. If anything BDO (b)(6) should have been charged with insubordination for not following my instructions to conduct casual conversation with the passenger.

In the following order please ask detailed BDA TSM (b)(6) the following questions and note his responses to these questions.

- 1) Why did he not include the entire video from the first contact with the passengers?
- 2) Did LBDO (b)(6) ask detailed BDA TSM (b)(6) for the inclusion of all the video?

(b)(6) I do not care if I am allowed to see the statistics on how many referrals BDOs (b)(6) and myself have been a part of. I do believe those statistics will show experience and I know they are available for your decision making in this matter. Please compare these numbers and also compare BDO (b)(6) witness statement with mine as they relate to the entire video and it will be easy to see that BDO (b)(6) left me hanging out to dry. The video just before what was provided by detailed BDA TSM (b)(6) will show two very different stories just like the very different witness statements provided by BDO (b)(6) and myself. The video clips listed sound like a movie editor just showing what they want to show to just paint a certain picture. Let us look at all the video and make a decision from there.

I did not, have not and never will deliberately and willfully do something against the SOP and you know me better than that Mr. (b)(6) I did use critical thinking and made the right call to expedite this screening to get the passengers

on their way because their daughter was in a coma. if I made a mistake it was to have empathy for the passenger and getting caught up in that empathy caused me to expedite the screening process.

Respectfully

(b)(6)

EBDO - IND

LaForte, Lisa

From: Kielkopf, Charles
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:12 AM
To: LaForte, Lisa
Subject: RE: Suspension to LOR

Sounds bad. This is ok to Issue – I think that Scott sent it to me.
Chuck

Charles P. Kielkopf
Field Counsel
614-470-1(b) (CMH desk)
(b)(6) (cell)

From: LaForte, Lisa
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 4:53 PM
To: Kielkopf, Charles
Subject: FW: Suspension to LOR

Another reminder. (b)(6) has been out anyway, he has 4 bulging disks in his back.

Lisa LaForte
Human Resource Specialist
TSA
IND-FWA-SBN-EVV
317-612-(b)(6)

From: LaForte, Lisa
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2014 9:40 AM
To: Kielkopf, Charles
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: Suspension to LOR

Chuck,

I am not sure you need to see this as it is an LOR. But since it started as a suspension I am sending anyway.

<< File (b)(6) LOR Notice of Decision 7-22-14.doc >>

Lisa LaForte
Human Resource Specialist
TSA

IND-FWA-SBN-EVV
317-612-(b)(6)

Gordon, Scott <IND>

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2014 4:07 PM
To: (b)(6)
Cc:
Subject: RE: Discipline

(b)(6)

Yes you may review the CCTV and I can get you a copy tomorrow. Thus, I am going to grant an extension until next Monday, July 14th. What time would be good for you both to meet with me? Thanks, (b)(6)

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2014 11:55 AM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Discipline

(b)(6)

I have the paperwork stating I am representing (b)(6) (b)(6) wanted to review the tape and was requesting a copy from the start of the referral to the end. I told him I was not sure if that would be possible, but wanted to let you know.

(b)(6)

LaForte, Lisa

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2014 5:13 PM
To: (b)(6)
Cc:
Subject: FW: Report

FYI.

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2014 5:12 PM
To: (b)(6)
Cc:
Subject: RE: Report

(b)(6)

Thanks for contacting me. I will grant an extension for Pat until 1200, noon, on 9 July 2014. Any questions please feel free to contact me. Thanks (b)(6)

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2014 4:56 PM
To: (b)(6)
Cc:
Subject: Report

(b)(6)

I am representing (b)(6) in a pending disciplinary case (b)(6) has until Wed July 2, 2014 to respond to the letter. I would like to ask for an extension on this date to give (b)(6) more time to properly prepare his response. Is this an avenue we can use?

Thank You

(b)(6)

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
Transportation Security Administration

PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE DESIGNATION

INSTRUCTIONS: TSA employees may use this form to designate a personal representative in accordance with TSA MD 1100.63-3, *Employee Representation, Interim Guidance on Employees' Rights to Personal Representation During Examination or Investigation*, and *Interim Guidance on Official Time*. The employee designating a personal representative should complete Sections I and II. The employee, representative and management official associated with the representational activity should complete Section III. Submit designations to the management official associated with the representational activity. The management official will provide copies of the completed designation to both the employee and the representative. Representatives who are TSA employees should provide a copy of the designation to his/her supervisor if requesting official time for the representational activity. Place original in the appropriate file for the specific matter in accordance with TSA Records Disposition Schedule. **NOTE:** Either the employee or representative may cancel/terminate the designation at any time by notifying the management official in writing.

SECTION I. Employee Information

Name (b)(6)	Phone No. 317-519 (b)(6)	E-mail (b)(6)
Duty Location (e.g., terminal/shift, if applicable) PM Shift	Airport Code or Office Location IND	
Position Title LBDO		
Date and Description of Specific Representational Activity Prepare response to proposal for three day suspension. Various dates, one half hour to one and one half hour at a time.		

SECTION II. Personal Representative Information (to be completed by employee)

Name (b)(6)	Phone No. 317-532 (b)(6)	E-mail (b)(6)
Duty Location (if TSA employee) B Checkpoint PM	Airport Code or Office Location (if TSA employee) IND	
Position Title (if TSA employee) LTSO	Union Affiliation (if any) AFGE 618	

SECTION III. Acknowledgements and Certifications

I authorize the person named above to serve as my personal representative during the aforementioned matter. This designation will remain in effect until I am notified by the management official that the matter has been resolved or I submit a new representative designation.

(b)(6) _____
Employee Signature
Date 7-6-14

- I acknowledge that I am required to adhere to TSA instructions for the proper handling and safeguarding of Sensitive Security Information (SSI), if applicable, and that I may not disclose SSI to persons without a need-to-know.
- A TSA employee must request approval from his/her supervisor for any absence from duty that is related to the representational activity noted above and must comply with all TSA requirements regarding the activity.

(b)(6) _____
Date 7-6-14

To the best of my knowledge there are no conflicts of interest or position with the requested designation.

☒ Agree ☐ Disagree (explain)

(b)(6) _____ (b)(6) _____
Management Official Name Signature Date 7-6-14

SECTION IV. Management Official Use ONLY (select one)

☐ Grievance and/or Appeal ☐ EEO Process ☒ Discipline and/or Adverse Action ☐ Investigatory Interview
☐ Other (explain):

PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT: AUTHORITY: 49 U.S.C. § 114(n) authorizes the collection of this information. **PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S):** This record will document your designation of personal representative. **ROUTINE USE(S):** The information collected on this form may be disclosed to any individual within DHS who has a need for the information in the performance of their official duties, or for additional routine uses identified in DHS/TSA-000 General Legal Records (GLR), DHS/ALL-018 Grievances, Appeals, and Disciplinary Action Records, and EEOC/GOVT-1 EEO in the Federal Government Complaint and Appeals, and any other applicable system of records notice. **DISCLOSURE:** Disclosure of this information is voluntary; refusing to provide the requested information may result in a delay in the sharing of information with your designated representative.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Indianapolis, IN, 46241



Transportation
Security
Administration

Date: June 25, 2014

To: (b)(6)
Lead Behavior Detection Officer
Indianapolis International Airport / BDA

From: (b)(6)
BDA Transportation Security Manager
Indianapolis International Airport

Subject: Notice of Proposed Three (3) Day Suspension

Reference: (b)(6)

This is notice that I am proposing to suspend you from duty without pay for (3) three calendar days in order to promote the efficiency of the service. If a decision is made to suspend you, it will not be made or affected earlier than your reply. If you do not reply, a decision will be made no earlier than seven (7) calendar days from the date you receive this letter. This proposal is based on the following:

Charge: Failure to follow Standard Operating Procedures

Specification: On May 24th, 2014 you initiated a SPOT Referral (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114 on Checkpoint B at 1740 hours. During the referral process, you made the decision to take (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r) passengers from lane six (6) over to Lane three (3) and conducted the SPOT Referral Screening without a partner as required per the SPOT SOP.

Your actions violated SPOT SOP under 3.2.
(b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r)

(b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r)

On May 29, 2014 at 1645, I held a Pre-Disciplinary Discussion with you in which I explained the accusation and offered you an opportunity to respond verbally and/or in writing. You were

immediately offended and stated that you did nothing wrong and that BDO Robinson was at fault and blamed his inexperience with SPOT Referrals as the reason. You made several other statements, deflecting any ownership and fault back to the rest of the BDO team.

On Friday, May 30, 2014 I received your written statement via email at 1306 hours. You continued to deflect the blame away from yourself and placed it on your co-workers. I expect that as a Lead BDO you would know the proper SOP procedures. I have considered all of the evidence of record, including your response(s). I find the evidence supports the charges and specifications as stated above.

In determining the appropriateness of the penalty to propose, I have considered a number of factors to include the fact that you willfully conducted the SPOT Referral alone, (b)(3):49 U.S.C. § (b)(3):49 U.S.C. § 114(r) with the BDO Team that were conducting the SPOT Referral (b)(3):49 U.S.C. § 114 prior to clearing the passenger. You also refused help from your BDO Team when they offered to assist you. These facts demonstrate that you deliberately and willfully failed to follow Standard Operating Procedures per the SPOT SOP.

I also considered mitigating factors, such as your being employed by the Federal government since September of 2002 and your otherwise satisfactory performance record along with the fact that no security incident resulted from your misconduct. I find the nature and seriousness of the misconduct described above along with the mitigating factors warrants proposing this action. Therefore, it is my decision to propose a three (3) day suspension.

This penalty falls within the range of penalties in the TSA's Table of Offenses and Penalties. Specifically, section M #1 mitigated penalty range LOR to 4 day suspension on page 24.

This notice is a proposal and not a decision. You have the right to reply to this proposal orally and/or in writing and furnish any evidence in support of your reply within seven (7) calendar days after the date you receive this proposal. Consideration may be given to extending this time limit if you submit a written request stating your reasons for needing more time to the Deciding Official, Scott Gordon, D-AFSD of Screening. In the event your request for an extension is denied or granted only in part, you may request a reconsideration of your original request. Your request for reconsideration may be presented to the Deciding Official orally, and/or in writing. Your written reply and any evidence should be sent to the Deciding Official at 8303 W. Southern Avenue Indianapolis, IN. 46241. You may make arrangements for an oral reply by contacting the Deciding Official at (317) 612 (b)(6). A decision will not be made until after your reply has been received and considered, or if no timely reply is received, until after the time specified for the reply has passed.

You have the right to be represented by an individual of your choice in preparing and presenting any reply. As a bargaining unit employee you may select a representative from the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) to serve as your personal representative, but you

are not required to do so. You may designate any individual, whether or not that person is affiliated with AFGE, to serve as your personal representative. However, you may not select an individual employed by any union other than AFGE to serve as your personal representative.

If you choose to have a representative, you must provide your representative's name in writing to the Deciding Official before the expiration of the reply period and you must provide written notice of any change in representation. Management has the right to disallow your representative if the representation creates a conflict of interest or position or, where the representative is a TSA employee, if he or she cannot be spared because of critical TSA work. You are responsible for all costs associated with your representation, including any travel expenses. You may refer to TSA MD 1100.63-3, *Employee Representation*, for additional information.

You and your representative, if an agency employee, will be allowed a reasonable amount of official time to assist you in your reply, to review the material relied upon to support the reason for the proposed action, and to prepare and present your written and/or oral reply. You and your representative, if a TSA employee, must contact your immediate supervisor to make advance arrangements for the use of official time.

With the exception of the CCTV footage, I have attached the material relied upon to support this proposed suspension. This material will only be released to you and/or your designated representative. You have the right to review the CCTV footage relied upon to support this proposed suspension. The CCTV footage will be made available for review by you and/or your designated representative, if any, by contacting the Deciding Official to arrange a mutually convenient time.

The Employee Assistance Program (EAP) is available to you to provide counseling services and/or assistance and may be contacted at 1-800-222-0364.

The EAP is a confidential resource designed to help employees address a wide range of personal or family issues.

You will be notified in writing of the final decision.

Please sign the acknowledgement of receipt below. Your signature does not indicate agreement with this action; it only represents receipt of this notice on the date signed.

- Attachment(s):
1. BDO (b)(6) Witness Statement
 2. BDO (b)(6) Witness Statement
 3. BDO (b)(6) Witness Statement
 4. BDO (b)(6) Witness Statement
 5. I, BDO (b)(6) Witness Statement
 6. (b)(6) Summary

Acknowledgement of Receipt

(b)(6)

Patrick Avelis

6-25-14
Date

Delivery Information:

(b)(6)

Hand Delivered By

(b)(6)

6/25/14
Date

Discipline Investigation of LBDO (b)(6) by BDA TSM (b)(6)

Failure to follow Standard Operating Procedures per SPOT SOP -- 05/24/2014

On 05/24/2014 a BDO Referral (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(n) was conducted and cleared. The process started at 1735 and was completed at 1753:55. LBDO (b)(6) and BDOs (b)(6) and (b)(6) were all present for the event.

On 05/25/2014 during PM Shift In-Brief, BDOs (b)(6) and (b)(6) initiated discussion regarding (b)(6) (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(n). After the briefing, I was returning to the Manager's Office when I was stopped by BDOs (b)(6) and (b)(6). It was brought to my attention that they were unhappy with the way in which the events unfolded the day prior regarding the referral. Accusations were made against Avelis that he, without communicating to anyone, took one tub and one bag (it was stated that the passenger had more baggage than what was taken) from the Lane six search tables and proceeded with the male passenger over to Lane three and began conducting the referral without the required assistance from another BDO. BDOs (b)(6) and (b)(6) relayed the same version of the story. BDO (b)(6) stated that he had to run a belt through the x-ray machine and when he returned with the belt, he noticed LBDO was no longer on lane six and as he visually scanned the area, he observed LBDO (b)(6) over on lane three with the male passenger, conducting the referral on his own. He further stated that at that time, BDO (b)(6) arrived on lane six asking if his assistance was needed and that he went over to lane three when he noticed LBDO (b)(6) working alone. It was at this time that I asked for all of the names involved. I then instructed each BDO involved to write a statement about the event and to discontinue talking about the topic with anyone.

Emailed statements were received by:

1. BDO (b)(6) on May 25th, 2014 and an updated statement on May 26th, 2014 due to failing to note all the details as described verbally. Both statements are attached.
2. BDO (b)(6) on May 25th, 2014.
3. BDO (b)(6) on May 25th, 2014.
4. BDO (b)(6) on May 28th, 2014 and an updated statement on May 29th, 2014 due to failing to note all the details as described verbally. Both statements are attached.

After receiving the last statement, I then reviewed the CCTV. The CCTV appeared to back the statements of the four BDOs listed above. Camera numbers and timelines were noted.

On May 29th, 2014 at 1645, I brought LBDO (b)(6) into the Manager's office and conducted a Pre-Disciplinary Discussion in which I explained the accusation and offered him to respond verbally or in writing. LBDO (b)(6) was immediately offended and stated that he did nothing wrong and that BDO (b)(6) was at fault and blamed his inexperience with SPOT Referrals as the reason. LBDO (b)(6) made several other statements, deflecting any ownership and fault back to the rest of the team. He also stated that once BDO (b)(6) did a referral by herself and didn't receive any discipline. LBDO (b)(6) then asked what could come out of this and as I started to talk, he talked over me, again directing all blame at BDO (b)(6). He then talked about how long he has been employed with TSA and how he always does everything by the book and it is only because he is an LBDO that we want him to take the fall for this. I asked him to provide me detail of the events. He spoke about the process and up to the point where he goes to lane three, he states that BDO (b)(6) wouldn't go with him and began blaming him again. I then asked LBDO (b)(6) while at lane three alone, did BDO (b)(6) arrive and ask him if he needed assistance. At this point, LBDO (b)(6) pauses, his eyelids open up then return to normal and he states that he has already had a night's sleep after it and doesn't remember. I then asked if any other BDO came to offer him assistance and he stated that he didn't remember. At this point I ask LBDO (b)(6) again whether he wants me to write down his statement for him or would he prefer to type his own. He stated that he would provide me with a written statement. Being that he was due to end his duty, I asked when he would have it back to me, he stated when I returned to work on Wednesday (June 4th). I stated that sooner would be better for him to remember the timeline of events. He stated he was scheduled for overtime the next day (Friday May 30th, 2014) but that he didn't want to type it up while on overtime. I

Discipline Investigation of LBDO (b)(6) by BDA TSM (b)(6)
Failure to follow Standard Operating Procedures per SPOT SOP - 05/24/2014

then stated that I would ensure that he gets the time to write it and that it shouldn't matter whether he is writing it on overtime or regular time and that what was important was that he tries to remember how the events unfolded and is honest in his statement and he agreed. He asked what would happen next and I stated that I would have to review all the statements and the CCTV footage of the event. I also directed him to not talk to his teammates about the investigation and he said that he would not. LBDO (b)(6) was visually and verbally unhappy with the situation and departed the office and clocked out for the day.

I returned to the TSA Coordination Center to review film again as not all of the cameras were available on my previous attempt. This time all cameras were available and from what I could gather, again, the four statements received were corroborated by the CCTV footage. After this, I sent a request to the Assistant Federal Security Director to request that recorded CCTV footage from cameras 120, 121, 124, 127, 310 and 322 be burned to disc starting at 17:35:00 and ending at 17:53:55 and made available to me to continue forward with this investigation. This request was approved at 1914 on May 29th, 2014.

On 5/30/2014 at 1306 I received LBDO (b)(6) statement via email. LBDO (b)(6) refuses to take any ownership of any fault from this event as noted during the Pre-Disciplinary discussion and in his written statement.

On 6/04/2014 I received the CD of video footage.

CCTV Timeline: Camera - C120, B Checkpoint, Lane Six (6)

17:35:00 - The referral process begins in front of lane six (6).

17:36:20 - BDO (b)(6) walks to the back of the checkpoint to observe the screening of the referred passengers. LBDO (b)(6) waits near the X-ray operator to collect the passengers' property.

17:37:02 - Avelis puts on gloves and waits with property next to the lane six (6) ETD.

17:37:28 - Robinson approaches and communicates with Avelis.

17:37:32 - BDO (b)(6) arrives at the lane six (6) ETD to assist.

17:39:12 - BDO (b)(6) arrives at the lane six (6) ETD to assist.

17:39:50 - (b)(6) places one bag on top of a bin and carries it away from the lane six (6) ETD area towards the back of the checkpoint. (b) and (b)(6) remain at the lane six (6) ETD and confer.

17:39:55 - (b)(6) walks to the entrance tunnel of the lane six (6) X-Ray, places an item inside the X-Ray and walks back in to wait for it to be screened by the X-Ray operator.

17:40:30 - (b)(6) collects the item, now verified to be a belt. He then returns to the lane six (6) ETD area and appears to look right to left whilst holding the belt.

17:40:30 - (b)(6) is no longer in view of this camera.

17:41:15 - (b)(6) and (b)(6) walk out of the camera view.

17:43:28 - BDO (b)(6) walks into view by the lane six (6) ETD, walks to the X-Ray operator and stands there talking while observing the checkpoint.

17:44:42 - (b)(6) walks back towards the lane six (6) ETD and then out of view.

17:53:59 - End of recording

CCTV Timeline: Camera - C121, B Checkpoint, Table View

17:35:00 - Begin recording.

17:37:14 - (b)(6) appears near the lane six (6) ETD.

17:37:19 - (b)(6) walks out of view.

17:38:33 - (b)(6) appears on camera at the lane six (6) ETD then is out of view.

17:40:30 - (b)(6) carries a bag in a bin and leads the referred passenger towards lane three (3).

17:40:51 - (b)(6) arrives at the lane three (3) ETD, places the items on the lane three (3) screening table and begins to screen the passenger's property.

Discipline Investigation of LBDO (b)(6) by BDA TSM (b)(6)
Failure to follow Standard Operating Procedures per SPOT SOP – 05/24/2014

17:41:02 – (b)(6) appears on camera at the lane six (6) ETD area and appears to be conferring with someone who cannot be viewed on this camera.
17:41:31 – (b)(6) holding a bin, walks towards lane three (3).
17:41:42 – (b)(6) arrives at the lane three (3) ETD area.
17:42:00 – (b)(6) leaves lane three (3), without the bin and walks towards Lane six (6) and then out of the view of this camera.
17:42:51 – (b)(6) Walks from lane six (6) towards Lane three (3).
17:43:02 – (b)(6) arrives at the lane 3 ETD area, appears to observe the property and begins to talk to the referred passenger.
17:43:36 – (b)(6) walks around to stand near the passenger and continues talking to the passenger.
17:45:27 – (b)(6) walks away from lane three (3) and positions himself next to the glass dividing wall next to the supervisors' podium next to 3 members of the VIPR Team. (b)(6) writes in his notebook and talks with the VIPR Team members. Duffy remains at Lane three (3) talking with the referred passenger.
17:46:10 – (b)(6) and the passenger leave lane three (3) towards lane six (6) and then out of view. (b)(6) continues talking to the VIPR Team.
17:48:09 – (b)(6) walks towards (b)(6) from Lane six (6).
17:48:16 – (b)(6) talks with (b)(6).
17:48:25 – (b)(6) walks back towards lane six (6). (b)(6) begins to follow, stops, appears to talk on the radio and then begins to write in his notebook.
17:48:58 – (b)(6) looks over at the VIPR Team and then repositions himself back near them.
17:49:04 – (b)(6) walk from Lane 6 towards (b)(6). All of them appear to confer and write in their notebooks.
17:53:24 – (b)(6) walks away from (b)(6) and (b)(6) towards Lane 6 and then out of view of this camera.
17:53:59 – End of recording.

CCTV Timeline: Camera – C322, B Checkpoint, Lane Three (3) Overhead ETD/Screening Tables

17:40:51 – (b)(6) arrives at lane 3, places the referred passenger's property on the screening table, begins screening with his head down facing the property and it cannot be determined if he is talking with the passenger.
17:41:42 – (b)(6) arrives at lane three (3) with a bin in his hands, gives the passenger's belt to (b)(6) while appearing to talk to him. He returns the empty bin to the stack of bins next to the screening table.
17:42:00 – (b)(6) leaves lane three (3).
17:43:02 – (b)(6) arrives at lane three (3), observes passengers property, begins to talk with the passenger.
17:43:30 – (b)(6) walks around the table to where the passenger is and continues talking with the passenger.
17:45:21 – (b)(6) walks out of the view of this camera.
17:46:09 – (b)(6) walks out of the view of this camera.
17:53:59 – End of recording.

After reviewing this CCTV footage, I have determined that it corroborates with the statements submitted by:

- BDO (b)(6)
- BDO
- BDO
- BDO

During the referral process, at 17:40:30 on May 24th, 2014, LBDO (b)(6) made the decision to take (b)(3):49 U.S.C. § 114(r) from lane six (6) over to Lane three (3) and conducted the SPOT Referral Screening without a partner as required per the SPOT SOP. At 17:41:42,

Discipline Investigation of LBDO (b)(6) by BDA TSM (b)(6)
Failure to follow Standard Operating Procedures per SPOT SOP - 05/24/2014

BDO (b)(6) arrived at lane three (3) and asked LBDO (b)(6) if he needed assistance and was informed by LBDO (b)(6) that he did not need assistance and that he was just about finished with the process. During the entire screening process, LBDO (b)(6) is observed looking down while screening the property (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(r). At no point during this screening is LBDO (b)(6) observed (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(r). At 17:43:02, BDO (b)(6) (b)(6) arrived at lane three (3) to assist (b)(6) (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(r). At 17:45:21, LBDO (b)(6) is observed walking away from lane three (3) and positions himself next to three TSA VIPR members and while taking notes in his notebook, talks to the three men.

Proper procedures for this event would have been:

1. LBDO (b)(6) and partner take the passenger to lane three (3) and conduct (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(r) screening.
2. While one BDO screens the property, (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(r) (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(r)
3. Before releasing the passenger, LBDO (b)(6) or partner should have walked over to the other BDO team to confer about the process and confirm the trip story of the referred passenger (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(r)

Other disciplinary factors include:

1. AIM NOTE: On 06/04/2014 at approximately 1442, I approached LBDO (b)(6) at Checkpoint B to ask questions about an injury he reported at 1140 that day. Previous to this I had called him to the office to ask him about the injury and asked who was in the room when it occurred. He stated he didn't know. I was surprised that he wouldn't know and asked him again when at the checkpoint. LBDO (b)(6) told me that he was uncomfortable with my questions and told me to ask the team. I told him that I was trying to gather all of the necessary information in order to complete the OWCP paperwork. He stated that he felt with my line of questioning that I didn't believe his story and that as a manager he thought it was my job to make it look like it didn't happen. I told him that was not the case and asked if we should start this conversation over because clearly there is some miscommunication. He then stated that we could never start over, that he couldn't trust me as far as he could throw me and that I was just trying to make a name for myself off of his back and he walked away from me. A few hours later, I called LBDO (b)(6) into the manager's office to sign the medical forms so that I could turn them in. When we were done with the forms, he stated that he wanted to apologize for what he said earlier and that what he said had nothing to do with the disciplinary investigation and that it was over some confusion he had with TOPS. I informed him that I appreciated this gesture but stated that I wasn't sure that it wasn't about the disciplinary investigation but that anytime there was confusion; he should talk to me about it as I thought we were clear regarding the TOPS discussions. The remainder of this conversation only covered competencies under TOPS.
2. AIM NOTE: Disrespectful with STSO and Management Counseling/Discussion. On 02/05/2013 BDO (b)(6) was accusatory with several of his teammates, demanding to know who printed out an email that was written by BDO (b)(6) and placed on the national IShare site. Counseling/Discussion in the manager's office on 2/5/13, STSM (b)(6) advised BDO (b)(6) that he should stop the questioning of other BDOs and remain professional in dealing with his teammates.
3. AIM NOTE: BDO (b)(6) was aware that a leave slot was available for 11/30/2013, but was occupied by an employee who should have been removed due to a schedule change but still had her name on the calendar. When STSM Anderson looked at the calendar he saw both slots taken and disapproved BDO (b)(6) leave. Instead of pointing out the error, BDO (b)(6) initiated an

Discipline Investigation of LBDO (b)(6) by BDA TSM (b)(6)
Failure to follow Standard Operating Procedures per SPOT SOP -- 05/24/2014

email requesting assistance from the APSP of Screening rather than pointing out the error to STSM Anderson. A Letter of Counseling was issued to BDO (b)(6) and he refused to sign it.

4. AIM NOTE: On 5/9/2013 BDO (b)(6) requested to speak with STSM (b)(6) and STSM (b)(6) with regards to some confusion that he was having regarding his SF71 time off request and reading of the newspaper while on duty in the public area. There were several managers in the office (STSMs (b)(6)). During this conversation, BDO (b)(6) made reference to him reading the newspaper while on duty on concourse B, which STSM (b)(6) witnessed on Tuesday afternoon while on concourse B near Southwest Airlines gates. (b)(6) also said that he did not see a problem with reading the paper when there were no passengers around. (b)(6)'s concern was that STSM (b)(6) didn't address the matter as it occurred. The public perception would not be positive if any passengers or stakeholders observed an Officer in uniform from TSA reading the newspaper on the concourse. His second concern was that he had not received his SF 71 back for time off that he requested, the time off was denied due to the calendar being full (2 BDOs off). When I returned the SF 71 to (b)(6) he stated "just shred it". I advised that's not the correct procedure and that he was to receive the SF71 back if it was denied.

Other relevant information would include:

1. On 4/30/14 I sat with LBDO (b)(6) and went over his Midyear Review. During this discussion I stressed to him that he needed to familiarize himself with the descriptions of all of the competencies that he and the other BDOs were rated on so that he would know how to help his team as well as how to document occurrences where he may be exceeding the expectations of a competency. Following this discussion, on numerous occasions, LBDO (b)(6) has sent me generalized emails where he thought he was exceeding expectations and it was clear that he did not follow the instructions to familiarize himself. When I spoke to him about it, he became frustrated and suggested that he wouldn't send me the emails anymore.
2. BDO (b)(6) statement pertaining to this investigation stated that, "LBDO (b)(6) made the comment that he was going to go to the BDO office to type the referral and that he didn't need any help, he could do it alone. He also said that he wants to get all 5 ratings on his competencies".
3. BDO (b)(6) statement pertaining to this investigation stated that, "We conferred and confirmed what had transpired. (b)(6) then mentioned that he just accomplished one of the competencies required, being decisive. (b)(6) then walked off to do the paperwork".
4. BDO (b)(6) statement pertaining to this investigation stated that, "After the referral we were in the back by FAMS (VIPR Team) discussing the referral. (b)(6) was enthusiastic, commenting that he was going to use the referral for his competencies to show his decisiveness several times".

Romanowski, William

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2014 1:06 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Witness statement for 05/24/2014

On Saturday May 24, 2014 at approximately 1735 hours on checkpoint B, divest area lane 6 the following did occur. I observed a passenger hold out a pocket knife and extend it towards BDO (b)(6) in an effort to get rid of the knife before entering the screening process. I would say the pocket knife was within two feet of BDO (b)(6) blade closed but pointing directly at him which left no doubt in my mind that it was an attempt to surrender the pocket knife to BDO (b)(6). As soon as the passenger attempted to surrender the pocket knife to BDO (b)(6) I noticed him hesitate as he began to look around for a divest officer or another TSO to pass the situation off to. This told me that BDO (b)(6) did not know the proper procedure for this situation or was unwilling to do the proper procedure (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r). At that point I knew it was my responsibility as a lead BDO to step in and inform BDO (b)(6) of the proper procedure so I immediately informed BDO (b)(6) that he should give the passenger their options per our SOP. The passenger declined to take BDO (b)(6) up on any of the options and it still appeared like BDO (b)(6) wanted to just put the knife in a bowl and let the passenger surrender it to the checkpoint without following SOP procedure again (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r). At this point I called the coordination center and informed them of a (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r) on checkpoint B at lane 6. I received a confirmation from the coordination center as well as from several other BDOs that were on their way to checkpoint B to help out (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r). I then turned to BDO (b)(6) to inform him that I would secure the passengers' property and he would wait for them to process through the advanced imaging technology unit before he entered the sterile area to perform casual conversation with me (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r). I had told BDO (b)(6) that he had the (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r) to him to begin with. Had BDO (b)(6) followed SOP procedure he would have had the casual conversation anyway (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r). BDOs (b)(6) and (b)(6) joined me with the property and the passenger that had surrendered the knife was getting his pat down so I asked his wife who was waiting for her pat down if the laptop was hers and she responded "yes". I left her personal effects, laptop and laptop bag with BDOs (b)(6) and (b)(6) and asked the passenger that had attempted to surrender the pocket knife to follow BDO (b)(6) and myself to another lane on the checkpoint in order to separate the passengers (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r). I am not sure but it must have been at this point when BDO (b)(6) got lost in the referral process. He must have just watched and/or helped BDOs (b)(6) and (b)(6) or just stood there doing nothing, I do not know. I believe I took the passenger that surrendered the pocket knife to the search table on lane three with the intention (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r). When the passenger and I were on opposite sides of the search table on lane three I informed the passenger of the need to do some additional screening while I was waiting on BDO (b)(6) to show up. The passenger immediately stated "I fly all the time, just do what you have to do. My wife and I came to Indianapolis for the Indianapolis 500 mile race weekend and now we have to go back to Florida the day before the race. Our daughter had an allergic reaction to some medication while in the hospital and is now in a coma." At this point I had made no attempt to start casual conversation (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r). All I was doing was trying to buy a little time so my partner could show up by informing the passenger of the need for some additional screening. The passenger just gave me the entire resolution without me having asked any questions at all. In addition, at this point I also became very empathetic towards the passenger because of the unfortunate situation in Florida. By this time I had no thoughts about where my partner was and I just wanted to get the passenger and his wife on their way. The passenger had not shown any behaviors to make me believe they were not telling me the truth. Having gotten the resolution quite by accident and having a distraught

passenger in front of me I proceeded to do the bag check without a partner present because there was no need for casual conversation and also because I felt sorry for the passenger because of their problems at home.

TSA has provided training to all of us to use critical thinking skills and make decisions through the coach and engage classes and its principles of "see, feel, think and do". I make decisions every day while performing my duties at TSA and I have always taken responsibility for my own actions. Did I do this referral by myself? Yes. Was it justifiable? Yes. Did my partner let me down? Yes. BDOs (b)(6) and (b)(6) knew the referral teams were (b)(6) and (b)(6) so I also question why (b)(6) or (b)(6) did not notice or correct the situation. My guess is they were not happy about doing a referral (b)(6) on a surrendered pocket knife.

The next day on Sunday May 25, 2014 during the in-brief there was a lengthy discussion about a passenger (b)(6) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r) and it was stated by BDA TSM (b)(6) that it does not matter if one likes the rule because all we have to do is follow the SOP not question it. In addition BDA TSM (b)(6) agreed that it sounded like the referral from the day before was the right thing to do. I just wonder if I am being investigated for not following SOP procedures is because the F-bands involved did not want to do the referral. BDOs (b)(6) and especially (b)(6) argued to point for at least fifteen or twenty minutes during that next days in-brief. This makes me wonder how many referrals they have avoided by not following SOP procedure? I am one of a few BDOs at Indianapolis that will pull the trigger on a referral instead of trying to figure a way to get out of one.

In addition, the fact that I am now a lead BDO carries no weight with the F-band BDOs because they are allowed to be shift POC and give lead BDOs their assignments. F-band BDOs for the most part have resented the G-band BDOs since the start of the program. It is not the G-band BDOs fault that they are still F-bands and not automatically promoted to G-band after six months. That being said I do not believe I should be singled out for not following the SOP. The entire team has not been sat down and told that we are now going to start approaching the process a different way. If management does this it will go a long way towards holding all BDOs accountable every day. If the lead BDOs do not have management's support we can never turn the program around. The problem we are looking at now is systemic and has been since rollout in 2002. I have copied an email below that I sent in 2007 that shows the same basic problem management is trying to hold me accountable for now. I have tried to coach and mentor since making LTSO in November of 2003 and BDO in February of 2008. The email below stems from my having asked two TSOs to focus on the X-ray and walk through metal detector positions while the checkpoint was very busy instead of talking back and forth during the screening process. In this case I was accused of creating a hostile work environment and I did not receive any backing from TSA management. The end result was sitting down with my accuser and an ICMS coordinator and my accuser was allowed to walk out before I said my part.

In closing I did not knowingly or intentionally do a BDO referral by myself. Please give the shift POC responsibilities back to the lead BDOs like it should be. Have it the same on both shifts and then I would like to see management take a different approach and let the F-bands and G-bands know how the new system of accountability is going to work. This way there will be no surprises when a manager informs any BDO they are being investigated for not following the SOP. Thank you for your time and consideration.

I sent the email below on the summer of 2007.

Folks, please talk about this letter at the town hall meeting for leads.

I am writing this letter because I am concerned about how day to day operations are being taken care of at IND especially on BC checkpoint. Three years ago we talked about documentation and LTSOs stepping up to the plate. I believe that most LTSOs at IND do step up on a daily basis but when we try to correct behavior we do not see results. LTSOs at IND have no credibility, all we can do is coach we cannot counsel. In addition we get no feedback as to what action was taken on a particular issue because of privacy issues. I do not disagree with the privacy issue but we need to see a change in behavior when we try to coach. I remember when I was being trained by TSM D'Aquila, I would never even think about talking or turning around while on the MAG or X-Ray. When I did I was corrected and I understood that I had made a mistake, I understood that I had made a mistake because I knew what my responsibilities were. Once again how are leads to have credibility

if we do not see a change in behavior? Please let the leads know what we can do to correct officers who do not pay attention while PAX are coming through the checkpoint. In addition, what can we do about officers that put little to no effort into their jobs? What specifically do we put on a witness statement for "lazy" or "no work ethic"? On BC checkpoint there is a woman in her sixties and a couple ladies in their fifties, one with metal screws in her back that work harder and pay more attention than some very capable, TSOs. On my way to this deployment at WYS I went through Dallas and Salt Lake City. I had time to observe the screening at three different checkpoints and for the first time I do not believe that the officers at IND are the best I have seen. What I saw in Dallas and Salt Lake was teams of officers paying attention and working together towards a common goal. This is ALL officers in ALL pay grades, young, older, male, female and all races and I'm sure backgrounds (b)(6) do you want ALL OFFICERS (TSO,LTSO,STSO) to be gainfully employed while on the clock? That is paying attention or looking for something to do or someone to help? David, at the town hall meetings for the IND STSOs and LTSOs please express what you expect your supervisors and leads to do. Would you like us to be active in all aspects of the security screening process? I think LTSOs should do more because we get paid more. LTSOs are in effect part TSO and part STSO as well as LTSO. Should leads always be on the lookout for something to do or someone to help? Is it OK for leads (and supervisors) to take it easy by the supervisors desk when not working on the computer or actually doing paperwork? Should leads and supervisors be actively involved in, or observing the security screening process when they have everything else caught up? I believe leads and supervisors must lead by example. When does IND get back to where we were before? When will someone else see what myself and several others see? Do the people we are trying to stop see what many responsible officers at IND see? Will they try to get through IND? I have given my all for five years and will continue to give my all, so help me God. I have said it before and I will say it again, I do not want anyone to lose their job, I just want them to DO their job.

Thank each and every one of you for taking the time to read this letter.

(b)(6)
LTSO NDF/IND
(317) 910-(b)(6)

Romanowski, William

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, May 26, 2014 6:43 PM
To: (b)(6)

On 5/24/14 at 1735, on Checkpoint B Lane 6, a male passenger (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(n) approached the divesture tables. The male passenger shows me a small pocket knife that he had and wanted to know what to do with it. I and LBDO (b)(6) were partnered up at that time. I approach the passenger to give him his options and LBDO (b)(6) radios me and tells me to do the same. I nod to him to let him know that I was in the process of doing just that. I give the passenger the option of taking the item and putting it in his car, the passenger states that he is not from here. I give the passenger the option to mail it to himself and he doesn't want that. I give the passenger the option to send it thru the x-ray and that a checkpoint Supervisor would dispose of it if that's what he chooses. LBDO (b)(6) queues the radio and contacts the Coordination Center and informs them that we would be conducting a referral. LBDO (b)(6) proceeds thru the gate on lane 6 and gathers up the passenger (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(n) property. No communication was had after LBDO (b)(6) makes the call to proceed with the referral process. I assume that he will be doing the bag checks and I will conduct the Casual Conversation with the passengers. I divest the passenger (b)(3)49 (b)(3)49 completely before proceeding thru the gate. BDO (b)(6) and BDO (b)(6) arrive to the Checkpoint just as the passengers divest and go thru the AIT. They ask what they could do to help because they heard over the radio that we would be conducting a referral (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(n) I standby and observe the passenger while he receives a full pat down. The TSO has the passenger remove his belt during the screening and completes the patdown. At this time TSO's (b)(6) and (b)(6) are asking what can they do to help with the referral and I suggest that they do the bag check and me and LBDO (b)(6) have Casual Conversations with the passenger. After the TSO finishes the pat down they hand me the tub with the belt to send thru the x-ray for screening. I walk to the front and place the belt in the x-ray. When I return I seen that LBDO (b)(6) had took control of the male passenger and some of his property and took him to Lane 2 or 3, TSO (b)(6) comes to the Checkpoint and asks if he can do anything to help out. He notices also that LBDO (b)(6) is working alone. He says that he will go assist LBDO (b)(6) I proceed by having (b)(3)49 the female companion while BDO (b)(6) does the (b)(3)49 BDO (b)(6) comes back a few minutes later and says that LBDO (b)(6) said that he didn't need any assistance. I and BDO (b)(6) finish up with the (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(n) and look to confer and concur with LBDO (b)(6) I ask LBDO (b)(6) if he was able to get all of the flight info on the passengers he says no so I approach the male passenger and get the info for the report. I approach LBDO (b)(6) and relay the info to him. Myself and LBDO (b)(6) did (b)(3)49 U.S.C. § 114(n) LBDO (b)(6) makes the comment that he was going to go to the BDO office to type of the referral and that he didn't need any help he could do it alone. He also said in so many words that he wants to get all 5 ratings on his competencies.

Romanowski, William

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2014 7:23 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Referral May 24, 2014

Mr. (b)(6)

On 05/24/2014 at about 1735 I heard Officer (b)(6) announce a BDO referral on B Checkpoint over the radio. I confirmed that it was a referral (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r). I said I was on my way to assist, as did Officer (b)(6). When I got to the checkpoint I went to the back of Lane six to collect property. Officer (b)(6) was in position to watch the pat down, (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r) and Office (b)(6) was in front of the table collecting property. Officer (b)(6) arrived at the checkpoint and came to lane six as well.

Officer (b)(6) said that he would go to another lane and picked up two tubs and went to lane two. I realized after a moment that he was with the referral, alone; I joined him so he would not be working alone. (b)(6) was doing a bag check while talking to the passenger; I came into position next to the passenger and joined the conversation.

After the referral we were in the back by the FAMS, discussing the referral (b)(6) was enthusiastic, commenting that he was going to use the referral for his competencies to "show his decisiveness" several times.

He then dashed off to the office to complete the paperwork.

(b)(6)

Romanowski, William

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2014 3:01 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Referral Statement

Bill, I am going to be brief and to the point on what occurred yesterday.

On Saturday, May 24th at 17:35, LBDO (b)(6) made a broadcast transmission to Coordination Center about a BDO Referral on Checkpoint B. (b)(6) mentioned (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r). BDO (b)(6) and myself, made a beeline to Checkpoint B. I arrived on the backside of Checkpoint B, at the end of Lane 6, where I met with BDO (b)(6) who was observing the (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r) pat down. (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(r) I decided to get with (b)(6) to find out about the referral. He mentioned that a knife was involved. At this point (b)(6) was already at the end of Lane 2, with two trays belonging to the couple.

I decided to help (b)(6) on Lane 6 with the bag check while he conducted the casual conversation. As soon as we were done, we stepped back by the supervisor's cubicle since (b)(6) was there writing his notes in the notebook. We conferred and confirmed what had transpired. (b)(6) then mentioned that he just accomplished one of the competencies' required...., "being decisive." (b)(6) then walked off to do the paperwork.

Romanowski, William

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2014 9:24 AM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: 5-28-14 witness statment
Attachments: 5-28-14 witness statment.doc



Transportation
Security
Administration

Last Page of Statement

Statement of _____ ... Continued

Name:

(b)(6)

Date: 5/28/14

DHS/TSA - IND

7800 Col H. Weir

Indianapolis, Indiana 46241

Telephone No.:

317-383 (b)(6)

Current Position: BDO

I, _____

(b)(6)

make the following statement voluntarily. I make this

statement with the full knowledge that it may be used in any administrative or criminal proceedings.

On Sunday May 25, 2014 at approximately 1745, I was in training and heard BDO (b)(6) communicate on the radio that they had a SPOT referral on Checkpoint B. I quickly logged out to go and see how I could assist. After arriving at Checkpoint B, lane 6, I engaged BDO (b)(6) to see if they needed help. BDO (b)(6) said he didn't need any help because BDO (b)(6) was already assisting him. I also noticed it appeared they were working on a referral (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(f). I observed LBDO (b)(6) taking an individual over to lane 3. I went over to LBDO (b)(6) to see if I could assist him, because I noticed that he was working alone, but was told "We are just about good here". After checking with everyone and seeing that I was not needed, I returned to the BDO office to continue my training.

Page _____ of _____ Pages

~~WARNING: THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS SECURITY SENSITIVE INFORMATION THAT IS CONTROLLED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 49 CFR PART 1520. NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE RELEASED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE UNDERSECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON, DC 20590. UNAUTHORIZED RELEASE MAY RESULT IN CIVIL PENALTY OR OTHER ACTION. FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, PUBLIC AVAILABILITY TO BE DETERMINED UNDER 5 U.S.C. 552.~~



Transportation
Security
Administration

Last Page of Statement

Statement of _____ ... Continued

I have read this entire statement consisting of _____ pages. I have been given the opportunity to make any additions, deletions, or corrections. I have initialed each page and all corrections. This statement is the truth to the best of my knowledge and recollections.

Signature

Date

Page _____ of _____ Pages

Warning: THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS SECURITY SENSITIVE INFORMATION THAT IS CONTROLLED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 49 CFR PART 1520. NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE RELEASED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE UNDERSECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON, DC 20590. UNAUTHORIZED RELEASE MAY RESULT IN CIVIL PENALTY OR OTHER ACTION. FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, PUBLIC AVAILABILITY TO BE DETERMINED UNDER 5 U.S.C. 552.