

From: (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00
To: (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00; (b) (6) CNIC, N00G; (b) (6) CNIC, HQ N00G; (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00; (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00G
Subject: FW: [Non-DoD Source] NAVSTA Newport Joint Supervisory Police Officer Complaint Supplement (22JAN2017)
Date: Sunday, January 22, 2017 21:31:37

Just for information and record.

Vr (b) (6)

(b) (6)
Inspector General, Navy Installations Command (CNIC)

Work: (b) (6) Cell: (b) (6)
Work DSN: (b) (6) Fax: (202) 433-2096

~~**OFFICIAL USE ONLY-PRIVACY SENSITIVE**~~

~~This e-mail is intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain Inspector General work product or otherwise privileged, confidential, Privacy Act. If you are not an intended recipient, reviewing, copying, distributing or otherwise disseminating this message or its attachments is not authorized and may result in a violation of the Privacy Act and/or the Inspector General Act. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by replying to this e-mail and delete the original message from your computer.~~

From: Smith, Dixon R VADM CNIC HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, January 22, 2017 2:53:04 PM
To: (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00; (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00; (b) (6) CNIC HQ, 00; (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N3; (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00; (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00; (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N13
Cc: Scorby, John C RADM CNRMA, N00
Subject: FW: [Non-DoD Source] NAVSTA Newport Joint Supervisory Police Officer Complaint Supplement (22JAN2017)

FYI

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Sunday, January 22, 2017 10:44:51 PM
To: (b) (6), N00
Cc: (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) USFF, N00; (b) (6); Mabus, Ray HON SECNAV; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N37D; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6); Smith, Dixon R VADM CNIC HQ, N00
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] NAVSTA Newport Joint Supervisory Police Officer Complaint Supplement (22JAN2017)

To:

RADM John C. Scorby, Jr.
Commander, Navy Region Mid-Atlantic (CNRMA)

From:

(b) (6)
(b) (6), Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6),
(b) (6), Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6),
(b) (6), Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6),
(b) (6), Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6),
(b) (6), Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

Subj:

NAVSTA Newport Joint Supervisory Police Officer Complaint Supplement (22JAN2017)

Date:

January 22, 2017

Rear Admiral Scorby,

Congratulations. We truly believed that you were genuine in wanting to address our issues and underestimated your skill for deception. You claimed to be reviewing our concerns and staffing our 23-DEC-2016 interim proposed solutions with CNIC, but in reality you have been conspiring with your staff and strong arming the NAVSTA Newport Command to further retaliate against us. We cannot believe that you take us for fools, to make your lies so transparent.

We suggested ceasing recruitment actions for Job Announcement No. SE70083-08-1840346PMNV52100 / Control No. 455421500, which unfairly omitted the GS-0083-09 position and excluded personnel employed at Naval Station (NAVSTA) Newport from competition. We also proposed cost saving, perationally beneficial and morale enhancing alternatives.

* However, we learned last week that (b) (6) (b) (6), Naval Installations) personally ordered that the recruitment action for Job Announcement No. SE70083-08-1840346PMNV52100 be accelerated and concluded.

* For the first time in the history of the Naval Station (NAVSTA) Newport Law Enforcement and Security Department the recruitment process for supervisory police officer promotions was changed. The traditional in-person interview, before a five member panel, with ten job related questions rated on the CNRMA Supervisory Police Officer Promotion Board Evaluation Sheet was abandoned. The NAVSTA Newport (b) (6) made it clear that (b) (6) personally ordered that no extensions would be granted and selections had to be made by MOnday, 23-JAN-2017.

* All interviews on Friday, 20-JAN-2017 were completed by telephone in the office of the NAVSTA Newport (b) (6), (b) (6). Before the interviews even started (b) (6) exclaimed that the were being directed

to get this done
and no matter what, two selections would be made and three alternates would be selected. Once (b) (6) reviewed the ten interview questions and required CNRMA Supervisory Police Officer Promotion Board Evaluation sheets he became enraged and ejected the NAVSTA Newport Security Director, Deputy Security Director and Senior Police Watch Commander from his office. Several minutes later they were summoned back in to begin the telephone interviews. (b) (6) rejected the interview questions, personally spoke with each applicant, asking of a few questions, then directed the panel members to only use portions of the CNRMA evaluations sheet.

* The CNRMA (b) (6), (b) (6) made the Navy's opinion of civilian police officers quite clear during his 10-13 JAN 2017 visit to NAVSTA Newport. If any civilian police officer at NAVSTA Newport doesn't like the way promotions are now being done or the way the Region decides to do business, they have the option of going online to USAJOBS to find another job! This virtually mirrors previous comments made by Captain Dennis Boyer, Commanding Officer, NAVSTA Newport, when questioned about the disparity in treatment of civilian police officers at NAVSTA Newport.

On Wednesday, 18-JAN-2017 the NAVSTA Newport (b) (6) met with all supervisory and non-supervisory police officers and told them that he was ordered to implement annual physical agility testing (PAT) for all police officers at NAVSTA Newport. We were told that we had until the week of 16-FEB-2017 to comply. When asked when and from whom he received this order he said that he ordered to implement the directive in Mid-December 2016 and that the order was given by Captain Dennis Boyer, Commanding Officer, NAVSTA Newport.

* Annual physical agility testing (PAT) is not enforced at all CNIC installations in the United States and is not even being enforced at all CNRMA installations. But there seems to be an urgency to implement at NAVSTA Newport? The Security Director received the order to implement in December 2016, but waited until 18-JAN-2017 to issue that order? The Navy Master-at-Arms perform their physical performance qualifications in the Spring and Fall, yet the Navy waited until the middle of Winter to finally impose agility testing for civilian police officers at NAVSTA Newport. It should also be noted that the agility testing requirement has been under dispute since first proposed in CNIC Instruction 5530.14, which dates back to 07-JUL-2011 and the current CNIC Instruction 3502.2, which is currently under revision.

* NAVSTA Newport and CNRMA officials support physical agility testing (PAT) as an instructional requirement, in accordance with DoD Instruction 5525.15 and CNIC Instruction 3502.2. However, they ignore the 400 hour requirement of Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation (FLETA) certified Minimum Law Enforcement Training for Navy Master-at-Arms. This is yet another issue that we have raised and been vilified for.

In closing, we have been informed that your visit to NAVSTA Newport to meet with us is tentatively scheduled for 22-FEB-2017.

Coincidentally and conveniently after the recruitment action for Job Announcement No. SE70083-08-1840346PMNV52100 will be finished and the physical agility testing (PAT) for all police officers at NAVSTA Newport will have been completed. So, our question to you is WHAT IS THE POINT? We have consistently made professional, good faith, exhaustive attempts to resolve wrongdoings at NAVSTA Newport and rectify violations of law, directive, instruction and regulation. We have presented evidentiary facts to support each claim and in return we are ignored, lied to, threatened and mocked for our efforts. We know that you will not rest until we are gone, i.e., fired or pressured to the point of resignation. You will make life and working conditions so unbearable at NAVSTA Newport that it will eventually take its toll. We know that the ultimate goal is that the arrogant, entitled and closed minded incompetence of both CNIC and CNRMA will prevail and their subjective interpretation and application of law and policy will continue. The "Do as I Say, Not as I Do" attitude, "Gundecking" and "white-washing" will continue to be the norm at NAVSTA Newport, despite the detriment to law enforcement and security operations, even if it is contrary to law enforcement standards/ethics and the Navy Core Values, which you claim to uphold.

Respectfully,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

cc:

Congressman David Cicilline
Rhode Island (D) 1st District

Congressman James Langevin
Rhode Island (D) 2nd District

Senator Jack Reed
Rhode Island (D)

Senator Sheldon Whitehouse
Rhode Island (D)

Ray Mabus
Secretary of the Navy

ADM Phil Davidson
Commander U.S. Fleet Forces

VADM Dixon Smith
Commander Naval Installations Command

-----Original Message-----

From: Scorby, John C RADM CNRMA, N00
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2016 8:49
To: (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6)
NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT;
(b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6); (b) (6)
NAVSTA Newport, N37D
Cc: Smith, Dixon R VADM CNIC HQ, N00; Boyer, Dennis R CO NAVSTA Newport,
N00; (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00G; Dristy, (b) (6)
(b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00; (b) (6) CNRMA, N00L
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] NAVSTA Newport Supervisory Police Complaint
Reply_23 DEC 2016
Signed By: (b) (6)

Security Supervisors,

This response acknowledges receipt of your message below, which sets forth interim proposed solutions. CNRMA will consider and staff these with CNIC during our review of your concerns. My POC for this will be (b) (6), cc'd above. I look forward to meeting with you.

Thank you and Happy New Year to you and your families.

Sincerely,

RADM Jack Scorby
Commander, Navy Region Mid-Atlantic
1510 Gilbert Street
Norfolk, VA 23511
(b) (6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 10:30 PM
To: (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT;
(b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6)
(b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N37D; (b) (6) CNRMA, N00
Cc: Smith, Dixon R VADM CNIC HQ, N00; Boyer, Dennis R CO NAVSTA Newport, N00; (b) (6)
CNIC HQ, N00G; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) NAVSTA
Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) A CIV NAVSTA Newport, N37D; (b) (6) NAVSTA
Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) USFF, N00; Mabus,
Ray HON SECNAV
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] NAVSTA Newport Supervisory Police Complaint Reply_23 DEC 2016

To:

(b) (6)

From:

(b) (6)

, Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6)

, Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6)

, Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6)

, Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6)

, Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

Subj:

JOINT SUPERVISORY CIVILIAN POLICE OFFICER COMPLAINT FOLLOW-UP

Date:

December 23, 2016

Rear Admiral Scorby,

Once again, We would like to thank you for your valuable time and response to our December 20, 2016 rebuttal letter.

We collectively look forward to meeting with you in person, with the ultimate hope of resolving the issues we have repeatedly raised over the past year and beyond.

In the interim if CNRMA and CNIC leadership are truly sincere in discussing or concerns and proposed solutions, perhaps your could consider the following as an act of good faith and commitment to the issues at hand:

- 1) Immediately cease all further recruitment actions for Job Announcement No. SE70083-08-1840346PMNV52100 / Control No. 455421500, i.e., the GS-0083-08 Supervisory Police Officer positons, that unfairly omitted the GS-0083-09 position and excluded personnel employed at Naval Station (NAVSTA) Newport from competition.
- 2) Promote one (1) Temporary, not to exceed 120 days, GS-0083-09 supervisory Police Officer position and two (2) Temporary, not to exceed 120 days, GS-0083-07 supervisory Police Officer positions at NAVSTA Newport.
- 3) Delay any further targeted implementation of Ex Post Facto conditions of employment and/or other aspects of CNICINST 5530.14 (seies) or CNICINST 3502.2, until they are fully and uniformly instituted at NAVSTA Newport and all other naval bases within CNIC.

At a minimum, CNIC, CNRMA and the NAVSTA Newport Command must agree that aforementioned

proposals (1) and (2) would be the ideal 'temporary' solution for all affected parties. Financially, it is the most fiscally responsible decision. Operationally, it would be the optimum solution to our dangerously unsafe and immediate supervisory staffing deficiencies. Lastly, it would be the first step toward healing the morale situation for both supervisory and non-supervisory police officers at NAVSTA Newport.

In closing, we would like to wish you and your family a very Merry Christmas and thank you again for this optimistic olive branch of cooperation and understanding. Our only hope is to put these matters behind us, so we can protect and serve our defender's of freedom at NAVSTA Newport in the most professional and productive manner possible.

Respectfully,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

cc:

Congressman David Cicilline
Rhode Island (D) 1st District

Congressman James Langevin
Rhode Island (D) 2nd District

Senator Jack Reed
Rhode Island (D)

Senator Sheldon Whitehouse
Rhode Island (D)

Ray Mabus
Secretary of the Navy

ADM Phil Davidson
Commander U.S. Fleet Forces

VADM Dixon Smith
Commander Naval Installations Command

(b) (6)

On Wed, 12/21/16, (b) (6) CNRMA, N00 <john.c.scorby@navy.mil> wrote:

Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] NAVSTA Newport Supervisory Police Complaint Rebuttal_20 DEC 2016
To: (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT" (b) (6)], (b) (6)
(b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT" (b) (6) >, (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport,
N3AT" (b) (6) >, (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT"
(b) (6) >, (b) (6) " (b) (6) , (b) (6)
(b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N37D" (b) (6) >
Cc: "Smith, Dixon R VADM CNIC HQ, N00" <dixon.smith@navy.mil>, "Boyer, Dennis R CO NAVSTA
Newport, N00" <dennis.r.boyer@navy.mil>, (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00G"
(b) (6)

Date: Wednesday, December 21, 2016, 2:33 PM

Security Supervisors,

I am in receipt of your 20 Dec 2016 memo/reply to my letter of 9 Dec 2016. We are reviewing your stated concerns and the solutions you propose for staffing and training at NAVSTA Newport. Reviewing the issues will involve work by both CNRMA and CNIC leadership. Early in the new year, I would like to meet with you to discuss your concerns. My staff will be contacting you to arrange the meeting.

Sincerely,

RADM Jack Scorby
Commander,
Navy Region Mid-Atlantic
1510 Gilbert
Street
Norfolk, VA 23511
(b) (6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6)]

Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 8:09 PM
To: (b) (6) CNRMA, N00
Cc: (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00G; (b) (6)
(b) (6) CNIC HQ, N00; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) CIV
NAVSTA Newport, N37D; (b) (6) NAVSTA Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) NAVSTA
Newport, N3AT; (b) (6) USFF, N00; Mabus, Ray HON SECNAV
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] NAVSTA
Newport Supervisory Police Complaint Rebuttal_20 DEC 2016

To:

RADM John C. Scorby, Jr.
Commander, Navy Region Mid-Atlantic (CNRMA)

From:

(b) (6)

(b) (6), Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6), Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6), Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6),
Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

(b) (6), Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island

Subj:

JOINT
SUPERVISORY CIVILIAN POLICE OFFICER COMPLAINT

Date:

December 20, 2016

Ref:

(a) NAVSTA Newport Supervisory
Civilian Police Officer Complaint to Secretary of the Navy, dated November 29, 2016.

(b) Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request for CNIC Inspector General Case No. 201601079 to
(b) (6), Office of the Inspector General, CNIC, dated August 10, 2016

(c)
Complaint Supplement to Reference (c) to Rhode Island, U.S.
Senate and Congressional Representatives, dated June 19,
2016

(d) Supplemental
Supervisory Civilian Employee Complaint of Ongoing Harassment, Retaliation, Fraud, Waste & Abuse at
Naval Station Newport to Rhode Island, U.S. Senate and Congressional Representatives, dated June 9,
2016

(e) Department of Defense
(DoD) Inspector General Fraud, Waste & Abuse and Whistleblower Reprisal Complaint, Case 20160303-
036145, dated March 18, 2016.

(f)
Supplemental Supervisory Civilian Employee Complaint of Ongoing Harassment and Retaliation at
Naval Station Newport to Rhode Island, U.S. Senate and Congressional Representatives, dated March
16, 2016

(g) Supervisory Civilian Employee Complaint to the Secretary of the Navy (SECNAV), dated February 18,
2016

(h) Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request Appeal for Additional Documents, i.e. 87 pages missing from Command Investigation into the Operations and Manning of Naval Station (NAVSTA) Newport, Security Department, 5830 Ser 00J/042, dated February 18, 2016

(i) Command Investigation into the Operations and Manning of Naval Station (NAVSTA) Newport, Security Department, 5830 Ser 00J/042, dated January 22, 2016 (551 pages)

(j) Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request for investigative findings with regard to references (j), (k) and (m), dated November, 2015

(k) Supervisory Civilian Employee Complaint to Commander, U. S. Fleet Forces Command (COMFLTFORCOM) and Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC), dated October 20, 2015

(l) Supervisory Civilian Employee Complaint to Commander, Navy Region Mid-Atlantic (CNRMA), dated September 17, 2015

(m) Department of Defense (DoD) Hotline Complaint, dated September 11, 2015

(n) Supervisory Civilian Police Officer's Complaint to Security Director, Naval Station (NAVSTA) Newport regarding the Commanding Officer, NAVSTA Newport, RI, dated July 28, 2015

Rear Admiral Scorby,

We would like to thank you for your response to reference (a). Unlike your predecessor or the other Commands we have reached out to, after all this time you are the only Flag Officer who has bothered to personally respond to our complaints. Regrettably, your letter lacks any evidentiary support and only reinforces our position.

Your reference to the Command Investigation into the Operations and Manning of Naval Station (NAVSTA) Newport, Security Department, 5830 Ser 00J/042, dated January 22, 2016 is irrelevant at this point. In addition to being denied access to the 87 pages extracted from the investigation, these latest transgression by the Navy occurred after (b) (6) investigation closed. The actions and threats by the former NAVSTA Newport (b) (6), continued to be ignored and despite (b) (6) findings, CAPT Boyer, CNRMA and CNIC failed to correct any of the issues we raised.

As for the decision to recruit GS-0083-08 and GS-0083-09 TERM supervisors at NAVSTA Newport, any reasonable and prudent person can deduce that this decision was both malicious and retaliatory on the part of a CNRMA.

- Based on your own account, that recruitment decision was subjectively made by CNRMA, not NAVSTA Newport. It was doomed for failure, from the start.
- CNRMA knew or should have known that no employee, i.e., NAVSTA Newport Police Officer would forfeit their career federal civil service status for a TERM appointment, only to lose their job in three years or less.

- Contrary to past recruitment actions, CNRMA deliberately sought to recruit a GS-0083-08, in lieu of the traditional GS-0083-07 / 08. This excludes all police officers at NAVSTA Newport from competition, regardless of TERM appointment or permanent position status.

- Based on the aforementioned, CNRMA knew or should have known that their attempt to recruit TERM appointments to fill supervisory police vacancies at NAVSTA Newport would fail. As a result this process needlessly wasted government funds and resources.

- If CNRMA truly intended to “accelerate the recruiting process and bridge the gap until the supervisory billets could be officially re-validated” TEMPORARY promotions should have been utilized, which was recommended by and obviously rejected by CNRMA. This would have been the most expedient remedy to our supervisory vacancies. TEMPORARY promotions, not to exceed 120 days or 1 year were the preferred and proven solutions at NAVSTA Newport for years following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks.

- In addition to providing police officers at NAVSTA Newport with career building supervisory opportunities, TEMPORARY not to exceed 120 days or 1 year positions enabled NAVSTA Newport management to evaluate and cultivate its future successful leaders.

Following the unsuccessful recruitment drive to hire a GS-0083-08 and GS-0083-09 TERM supervisor(s) at NAVSTA Newport you indicate that Commander Naval Installation Command (CNIC) granted authority to recruit two ‘permanent’ supervisory positions. Once again, any reasonable and prudent person can easily deduce that CNRMA’s actions were once again both malicious and retaliatory:

- The recruitment initiative for the TERM appointments was (1) GS-0083-09 and (1) GS-0083-08, but the recruitment parameters for the ‘permanent’ positions was changed to hire (2) GS-0083-08 (Sergeants)? Recruiting a permanent GS-0083-09 (Lieutenant) position at NAVSTA Newport would have made the current GS-0083-08 (Sergeants) eligible to apply and compete for promotion. Changing the recruitment parameters to only hire two GS-0083-08 (Sergeants) unfairly excluded the currently employed police Sergeants from any chance for advancement to the rank of Lieutenant (GS-9) within the department.

- Once again CNRMA intentionally sought to recruit a GS-0083-08, in lieu of the traditional GS-0083-07 / 08. This unfairly excluded all GS-0083-05 police officers at NAVSTA Newport from any chance for advancement to the rank of Sergeant within the department.

- It is your contention that CNRMA Human Resources (HR) staff confirmed that this recruitment was open to all qualified personnel, but you conveniently neglected to mention that job announcement requirements were tailored to exclude NAVSTA Newport police personnel, by strictly recruiting at the GS-8 level.

- This is another classic case of fraud, waste and abuse by the Navy. Previous TERM recruitment attempts, excluding NAVSTA Newport Police Officers from competition, were unsuccessful, needlessly wasting government funds, resources and man hours. Repeating a failed process, which is doomed to meet the same results, undoubtedly illustrates incompetent leadership. The fact that this is clearly being undertaken in retaliation for our collective complaints is also inexcusable malfeasance and misfeasance.

-

While permanent GS-0083-07 and GS-0083-09 positions are being recruited and filled at other installations, CNRMA willfully and maliciously blocks currently serving police officers at NAVSTA Newport from being able to compete for promotion within our own department.

You assert that “after the recruitment is completed, the appointment of two (2) new supervisors will result in a total of eight (8) supervisors on board NAVSTA Newport to address the staffing shortfall raised in our original complaints”.

- If these promotions included competition from within we would agree. However, personnel from outside the NAVSTA Newport Police Department will require initial law enforcement training, field training and supervisory familiarization/training. At a minimum, these ‘new’ supervisors would not be able to assume their duties for nearly a year. This does nothing to address the immediate staffing shortfall.
- Experienced and qualified veteran police officers at NAVSTA Newport could easily and immediately transition, i.e., Police officer promotions to the rank of Sergeant. Likewise, experienced and qualified veteran police patrol supervisors (Sergeants) at NAVSTA Newport could easily and immediately transition, i.e., promote to the rank of Lieutenant.
- If what you say in your letter is true and your intent is to actually “address the supervisory staffing shortfall at NAVSTA Newport”, why do all such positions remain invalidated and eliminated through FY 2018? A few weeks ago we became aware of the updated Manpower Requirement / Funded (Authorization) billet structure documents for FY2018 that were released by (b) (6) (CNRMA) in September 2016. We have seen your true intentions with our own eyes, the progressive phase out of all GS-0083 (series) police officers at NAVSTA Newport:

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

With regard to the different training requirements for GS-0083 (series) civilian police officers and Navy Master at Arms (MAA) personnel, you clearly misinterpreted our complaint or are intentionally circumventing the issue. Regardless of Command N3 reviews, the law enforcement training debacle is undeniable.

- The issue is not training civilian police officers beyond current requirements. The training deficiency rests with lack of law enforcement training provided to Navy MAAs.
- CNRMA is fully aware that civilian GS-0083 (series) police officers must complete the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center – Uniform Police Training Program (FLETC-UPTP), consisting of 60 Days / 485+ Hours of law enforcement training. Following FLETC-UPTP graduation another 46.5 Hours of Navy specific training,

IAW CNIC is required. In total, initial law enforcement training for GS-0083 (series) police officers equates to 66 Days / 531.5 + Hours. On the contrary, Navy MAAs are only required to complete Master-At-Arms "A"

School A-830-0011C, consisting of 31 Days / 260 Hours? "A" School A-830-0011C is a military course of instruction with virtually no 'law enforcement' specific training and is in no way comparable with the law enforcement training provided to civilian police officers.

- The Navy sends

MAAs serving at select medical facilities to the U.S.

Department of Veteran Affairs, Law Enforcement Training Center (LETC), along with their GS-0083 (series) Department of Veteran Affairs Police Officer counterparts. As with the FLETC-UPTP, the Department of Veteran Affairs LETC is accredited by the Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation (FLETA) Board. Why are CNIC shore installation MAAs not being provided with the same accredited, minimum, initial law enforcement training as their GS-0083 (series) police officer counterparts?

As for CNIC Office of

Inspector General (OIG) Case No. 201601079, we have absolutely no confidence in the investigator, the OIG or faith in Navy's ability to investigate or police itself.

- The fact that

this case remains open and absolutely nothing has been done to address or correct the allegations raised is absurd. This is also the same investigator and organization that proverbially stonewalled and whitewashed a previous fraud, waste and abuse complaint at NAVSTA Newport.

- CNRMA OIG Case No.

06-035, filed in October 2006, alleged that the former Security Director at NAVSTA Newport mismanaged civilian award funds. Then, CNRMA OIG (b) (6) conveniently looked the other way until Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI) began making inquiries. Finally, almost two years later in March 2008 the CNRMA OIG finally sustained the complaint allegation, asserting that civilian award funds had been mismanaged. After enduring toxic and hostile working conditions and persistent Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests this victory seemed as bitter as defeat.

Regardless, corrective action was taken by CNRMA against the

GS-0080-13 NAVSTA Newport Security Director. What was the corrective action? Believe it or not, in conjunction with his removal from the Security Director position at NAVSTA Newport, he was given a higher paying position at Navy OIG Headquarters, the very organization that investigated and found him guilty! In a different reality this would be laughable, if it was not so disgustingly corrupt and unfair.

- How can

you realistically expect us to trust the Navy to do right by us at NAVSTA Newport?

o References (a) through (n) constitute overwhelming evidence of the Navy's continuous refusal to address the issues we have raised.

o References (a) through (n) and our own personal accounts of hostile working conditions, threats of and actual acts of retaliation and Whistleblower reprisal continued to be condoned by the Navy at all levels. You may casually dismiss our collective assertions and complaints, but the "facts" tell a much different story.

- It may

interest you to know that the NAVSTA Newport Security Director has already revealed that copies of reference (a) were jokingly distributed to Security Directors at Virginia Naval bases. In fact, he even read the copy that was sent to the NAVSTA Norfolk Sewells Point Police Precinct, while he was in Virginia. Who was responsible for releasing our complaint? What was the purpose of releasing it? Why are our issues jokingly discussed by installation level personnel, outside NAVSTA Newport, who have no

involvement or need to know?

- Following your response to reference (a) the NAVSTA Newport Security Director also revealed that he has been ordered to immediately implement annual physical agility testing for supervisory police officers. We have until month ending January 2017 to comply and successfully complete or face termination from employment.

In closing, you are absolutely correct in your statement that CNRMA has cognizance to address our concerns but, like your predecessor, you have not taken any 'reasonable' actions on our behalf. Instead, we are faced with continued ridicule, contempt, retaliation and reprisal. Now, on top of everything else, we face immediate implementation of Ex Post Facto conditions of employment, in the Navy's final attempt to discard us like old trash.

Respectfully,

(b) [Redacted]
(6) [Redacted]

(b) (6) [Redacted]

(b) (6) [Redacted]

(b) (6) [Redacted]

(b) (6) [Redacted]

cc:

Congressman David Cicilline
Rhode Island (D) 1st District

Congressman
James Langevin
Rhode Island (D) 2nd
District

Senator Jack Reed

Rhode Island
(D)

Senator Sheldon
Whitehouse
Rhode Island (D)

Ray Mabus
Secretary of the Navy

ADM Phil Davidson
Commander U.S. Fleet Forces

VADM Dixon Smith
Commander Naval Installations Command

(b) (6) [Redacted]