

Tiffany Kay Anderson  
2 North Avena Street  
Lodi, CA 95242

Christopher K. Eley  
343 East Main  
Suite 710  
Stockton, CA 95202

November 30, 2009

Dear Mr. Eley,

I am responding to the correspondence I received on November 17, 2009 from your office. After careful consideration, this is my conclusion.

- 1) I question the board's choice regarding your services. You are the same resource used during bargaining negotiations, and you sit on the opposite side of the table. I do not trust your office or authority to be unbiased or unsympathetic to my employer as he retains your services. Until I see evidence of a serious investigation of my allegations I will continue my efforts seeking outside resources for a concrete resolve.
- 2) Since you have informed me that an investigation is under way, I am requesting all time sheets extending from my date of hire in April of 2004 to the present time, as well as all blue sheets in the same time-span be released to me. This is evidence I require to defend against the allegations made in my evaluations.
- 3) I will not reveal my journals and documentation without evidence that an even, measured investigation is in progress. For me to be satisfied with any investigation, I feel it must meet several standards of action. I desire full transparency in these investigations; it is my opinion the board feigns distance and ignorance to absolve them selves of responsibility for the progressive misconduct leading to this investigation. I feel that as their names support decisions made by management, the board is obligated to know what they are backing, and the taxpayer has the right for the board to do their job. They can then choose to support management or to look at their failed practices with a plan of correction.

To be satisfied with the Board's actions, I require a full investigation including:

1. Interviews of all current staff, plus any additional witnesses I'd like to use to confirm my character.
2. An expunged employee work file.
3. A rehire status in my file if I chose to leave at some time in the future.
4. Full immunity, given in writing, to employees, retired personnel and property owners who testify during this investigation.
5. Discipline for all employees who broke MOU, state and federal laws, based on participation and severity.

In short, I require nothing more than should be granted in compliance with state and federal laws and our own MOU guidelines that the district is required to follow. Until such evidence exists that this investigation is actively pursuing the above course, I retain my right to keep my journals and documentation private.

I also want to make it clear that I feel that all my fellow mosquito control technicians have been compromised under Bob Durham's failure to fulfill the obligations of his job description.

After an investigation is complete, I am also requesting training for all the mosquito control technicians to verify that none of them need to suffer any of the complications that I have because lack of proper training has led to toxic exposures.

I also feel that human resource workshops are essential for repairing the fractured work environment. The lack of cohesion existing within daily field operations is not only harmful to the employees work environment, but to the community as well.

In your correspondence, you requested I enclose more information pertinent to your investigation. I must preface my providing this information with a fear that a simple cursory glance will not reveal the problem in its entirety. All issues need to be pulled from the roots; the surface level is not acceptable.

What provoked me to pursue outside resources was the decision of management to transfer me to the most labor-intensive zone, one that required the use of pesticides I had very little experience with. I believe vital information necessary for my safety and ability to perform was withheld. A conscious choice was made to break protocol by sending me, without any training, into a region unfamiliar to me. I was forced to try to do my job in an environment where staff were unwilling to communicate with me when I asked questions. I can only reach the conclusion that two things were happening. Either some staff expected perks by aligning themselves with Mr. Durham and Ms. Finley, or feared retribution from both.

In January of 2008, John Stroh gave Bob Durham and Keith Neinhuis full

authority to assault my credibility and professional competence through my semi-annual evaluations in which passive removal was represented as my only option. Bob Durham did not give my evaluation to me personally but sat nearby and listened to me be humiliated.

Keith's misconduct as my supervisor was contentious at best. Keith knew his actions were not appropriate. (Mr. Neinhuis asked me what girl at work I would like to beat up) I was instructed during my evaluation by Keith to follow the chain of command, so I wrote down all the injustices and have been waiting for someone who is willing to do something besides punish the messenger.

I am not the first person to bring forward complaints. If the manager and board would have taken a no tolerance, firm approach to the complaints brought to their attention by Ed Greenmeyer, Supervisor; Steve Azavedo, field technician; Duane Bridgewater, Supervisor; Don Meidinger, Assistant Supervisor; Mary Iverson & Mark Iverson, lab technician; and myself, then perhaps, there would be no need for deflecting and redirecting character assaults on those who are acting as ambassadors for the common good of the work environment.

I encourage you to acknowledge and advise your board at the severity of the situation and the possible repercussions of not taking this seriously. In your investigation, you will certainly uncover allegations that I've attempted to jump the chain of command by going straight to the board. Attached is a detailed account of my history attempting to report this misconduct, following up the appropriate chain of command.

*The chain of Command*

Janine Esau Finley

Duane Bridgewater

Bob Durham

Keith Neinhuis

Eddie Luchessi

John Stroh

John Stroh using in house resource Gerry Preciado

Mid-2006, with the knowledge of Bob Durham's relocation as supervisor to the Central Region, Janine Esau Finley's behavior towards me became negative, humiliating, intimidating, and malevolent. From that time in 2006 through 2007, I followed the chain of command listed above, requesting relief from Bob Durham and Janine Esau Finley's behaviors that exceeded the definition of being "pervasive enough to alter the workplace environment" and entered into innocent employees homes and lives. Prior to January 2007 and Bob Durham's relocation to the Central region, I went to Eddie Luchessi and requested mediation for Janine and myself due to her ongoing unresolved hostility. Eddie denied my request,

informing me he did not think it was a good idea.

Initially, I had already approached Duane Bridgewater in July of 2006 to report the hostility I had felt from Janine Esau following the announcement of Bob Durham's relocation. This observed the proper chain of command. In response to my concerns, and after personally witnessing Bob's misconduct, he took his concerns to Assistant Manager Eddie Luchessi in January of 2007. Rather than suggest methods for diffusing the tension, his only response was indignation that I had inappropriately come to Duane with these complaints. No solutions or advice for further action (such as who I should approach) were offered.

In October 13 of 2006, Bob Durham approached me to let me know, verbatim, "I took care of the problem," in direct reference to Don Meidinger. I later learned that the event he was alluding to would result in a long legal battle that is ongoing today. Not knowing the significance of his comment then, I shifted the conversation to the fact that he would soon be my supervisor, and expressed concerns that his relationship with Janine could get in the way of his duties as my supervisor. He denied the relationship. This action increased the anxieties I was trying to relieve due to the fact that Bob's southern region staff were sharing incidents of Bob personally intimidating them when they had witnessed signs of the affair in the field. These events were expressed outwardly amongst the field technicians. Bob Durham became my supervisor January 1 of 2007, making him the next link in the chain of command. This complicated the issue, because my complaints revolved around altercations with his romantic interest—an issue that should not have entered into the workplace, and the extent to which it did speaks to the lack of professionalism and competency of all involved.

In the latter part of December, AIMS sent a mediator to record testimony from staff who witnessed the incident between Assistant Supervisor Don Meidinger and Supervisor Bob Durham. I was required to give a recorded account to what I witnessed. After my testimony, I went to Manager John Stroh and confided my anxiety about the situation. Janine and I were the only female field technicians and spent every morning and afternoon isolated in the locker room after months of her being abusive to me through rumors, innuendos, and public discrediting. While in the locker room, she inquired about my testimony in the investigation, breaking legal conduct amid exhibitions of intimidation.

That day I submitted a request for my accrued vacation time to begin immediately as I needed to remove myself from this toxic environment. Six months into Bob Durham's relocation as my supervisor, after repeated concern on my part, Eddie Luchessi made Bob do his job and directed him to accompany me into the field on June 6 of 2007. Although he did not follow protocol by riding in the same vehicle with me, Ms. Finley lashed out

at me when we returned at the day's end. Her verbal attack was vicious, and I feared the repercussions. Keith Neinhuis (Ms. Finley's supervisor) witnessed the fear on my face after an unsuccessful attempt to humor me and asked me what was wrong. I immediately started to relay the altercation. Keith decided he did not want to know, and when he noticed Bob Durham (my supervisor) coming our direction, I was redirected to Bob. Bob directed me to Eddie, who heard my side and gave me some kind words. Regardless, no counseling was brought in, and Janine and I did not speak for months. Silence and hostility was the only communication.

On July 9, 2007, repeatedly being sent to do field operations without the ability to communicate, and being made to look incompetent for requesting a supervisor (a resource every technician was afforded except for myself), I confronted Bob about a property that I believed to be dangerous because it lacked safe access and was contributing to the spread of West Nile Virus and high mosquito counts. Bob was insensitive to my concerns and put me in a dangerous position against my better judgment. This incident was later counted against me on an evaluation. (This same site was later treated with proper care for the concerns I had expressed.) I left that day and started to weigh my options.

On July 13, 2007, Bob and Mary Iverson had an argument in the break room. Bob Durham humiliated Mary and provoked her enough that she threw her soda bottle at him. Afterwards Bob brought management's attention to a prank Mary had once initiated by placing stinkbugs under Bob's truck seat. Mary was forced to clean Bob's truck while she was watched and belittled by multiple technicians, management, and supervisors.

July 25, 2007, I met with John Stroh and Gerry Preciado, RISK Management counselor for ERMA, in answer to my personally communicated request. They attempted to mediate a situation no-one was willing to talk about because instructions had been communicated by their supervisor Bob Durham and fellow technician Janine Esau (Finley) that to do so would not be wise. In this mediation effort, I was the only person interviewed, and two days following it, I was immediately and permanently transferred under Keith Neinhuis. I felt that the source of the problem had been singled out, identified and removed—me.

In this new zone, I faced increased hostility and further retaliation for action that was legally protected under specific categories of law. At times I have felt like every possible obstacle that could be presented to make it impossible for me to fulfill my job description has been presented. Training that is necessary for performing my job has been denied. Problems have not gotten better, but rather worse.

It is for this reason that I am resolved to continue seeking a full and impartial investigation not only of my case, but into the practices that are

prevalent in the workplace which have resulted in my raising these concerns.

I believe that the law has been violated on many fronts. Not only has this had a negative impact on the workplace. It has extended into impacting our community negatively as well.

Signed,

Tiffany Anderson

CC: Frank DeBenedetti; Allan R Fetters; Jack V. Fiori; Mario Gravina; Francis Groen; Alvin C. Inman; Micheal Manna; Chester C. Miller; Gerald Schilbler; Jack Snyder; Marc Warmerdam