

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINT FINDINGS OF FACT, AND CONCLUSIONS

I. Introduction

This executive summary is the result of an investigation into allegations of misconduct in the Medfield Police Department (“Department”). The Town of Medfield (“Town”) engaged this Investigator to determine whether any employees violated Town or Department policies.

II. Background, Summary of Allegations, and Scope of Investigation

In 2021, multiple businesses and Town community members raised complaints and concerns to Chief of Police Michelle Guerette (“Chief Guerette”) regarding the visibility of the Town’s police officers during the midnight shift, 11PM to 7AM. After conducting her own preliminary inquiry into the visibility of the Town’s police officers during the midnight shift, Chief Guerette was able to corroborate the complaints and concerns brought to her attention. Accordingly, this Investigator was retained by the Town to investigate whether certain members of the Department working the midnight shift were consistently engaged in the proper performance of their official duties, as required by the Department’s Job Descriptions, Rules and Regulations, Policies, and the expectations of the community.

The scope of this investigation was limited to the issue of whether certain Medfield Police Department Patrol Officers and Sergeants, while working the midnight shift, deliberately and willfully engaged in prohibited conduct by actively refraining from performing their required job duties. In addition to conducting interviews with the witnesses identified below, this investigation included a review of pertinent Department Rules, Regulations, Policies, Memoranda, and documents, as well as randomly selected surveillance video recordings for sixty-four (64) tours of duty, which is equivalent to five hundred and twelve (512) hours, from the midnight shift.

III. Witnesses Interviewed

1. Michelle Guerette, Chief of Police, Medfield Police Department
2. Conor Ashe, Sergeant, Medfield Police Department
3. Garrott Ledbetter, Police Officer, Medfield Police Department
4. Paul Treggiari, Police Officer, Medfield Police Department
5. Francis Thisse, Police Officer, Medfield Police Department
6. Joshua Souza, Police Officer, Medfield Police Department
7. William Bento, Police Officer, Medfield Police Department
8. Robert Meaney, Retired Chief of Police, Medfield Police Department
9. Attorney Justin Hanrahan, Hanrahan Consulting Services

10. Stephen A. Morreale, D.P.A., Tenured Professor of Criminal Justice at Worcester State University
11. Christopher Kamborian, Lieutenant, UMass Boston Campus Police and Boylston Police Academy Instructor

In addition to the above witnesses interviewed, this Investigator requested to interview Sergeant Ryan Maxfield, Officer Terrance Teehan, and Officer Michael Stanley, all of whom were members of the Medfield Police Department at the outset of this investigation. All three (3) individuals resigned prior an investigatory interview.

IV. Documents and Evidence Reviewed

1. Video Surveillance Recordings of the Medfield Police Department, dated between September 12, 2021, and March 21, 2022;¹

a. **Primary Cameras**

1. Outside Sally Port Camera – View of rear parking lot for Sally Port and Vehicle Processing Bays;
2. Corridor 123-Facing Evidence Camera – View of Staff Entry and Locker Room Entry;
3. Corridor 143 Camera – View of Entries to Dispatch, Sergeant Office, and Patrol Room;
4. Outside Patrol Camera – View of Parking Lot;
5. Outside Staff Entry Camera – View of Police Station Staff Entry from Exterior of Police Station;
6. Police Department Staff Entry Camera – View of Police Staff Entry into Interior Vestibule; and
7. Staff Entry 120 Camera – View of Rear Staff Entry into Interior Vestibule.

b. **Secondary Cameras**

1. Vehicle Processing Bay Camera – View of Interior of Vehicle Processing Bay;
2. Sally Port Bay Camera – View of Interior of Vehicle Processing Pay;
3. Booking Room 123 Camera;

¹ The method used to audit the video surveillance consisted of viewing recordings as captured by the “FLIR Control Center” program, which was stored on a computer in the Investigations Office of the Medfield Police Department, and by documenting observations.

4. Booking Process Camera;
 5. Police Department Lobby to EOC Camera – View of Corridor Outside EOC;
 6. Rear of Building/Radio Tower Camera – View of Police Parking Lot;
 7. Soft Interview Room Camera – View of Interior of Interview Room at End of Corridor 143; and
 8. Vestibule Camera – View of Main Lobby of Police Station.
2. Letter from Chief Guerette to Town Residents RE: COVID-19 Protocols
 3. MPTC Syllabus for Five Day Front-Line Leadership Training
 4. Photo of Sergeant Ryan Maxfield and Officer Paul Treggiari
 5. Letter to Officer Paul Treggiari from Chief Guerette, dated January 22, 2020
 6. Written Complaints submitted by Officer Chris Bonadies and Officer Michael Stanley
 7. Diagram of Locker Room prepared by Officer William Bento
 8. Curriculum Vitae and Biography of Dr. Stephen Morreale
 9. Report of Deputy Police Chief Larz Anderson
 10. Photos of Items Retrieved from Men’s Locker Room Lockers
 11. Signed Acknowledgement Form for Department Issued Policy Book
 12. Law Enforcement Code of Ethics
 13. Town of Medfield COVID-19 Response Memorandum
 14. Multiple Emails from Chief Guerette
 15. Certificates of Training, Field Training and Evaluation Program
- V. Relevant Medfield Police Department Policies and Regulations
1. Police Department, Police Officer Required Conduct
 2. Police Department, Police Officer Prohibited Conduct
 3. Town’s COVID-19 Coronavirus Response Memorandum

4. Police Department Mission and Goals, Department Policy #4.15b
5. Police Department Job Description, Officer in Charge
6. Police Department Job Description, Sergeant
7. Police Department Job Description, Patrol Supervisor
8. Police Department Job Description, Patrol Officer
9. Police Department Job Description, Training Officer

VI. Conclusions

Summary of Video Surveillance Audit

Based on the review of the Video Surveillance evidence and the totality of the sufficient credible evidence presented during the investigation, this Investigator makes the following conclusions:

1. Sergeant Conor Ashe worked twelve (12) midnight tours of duty, which is equivalent to ninety-six (96) hours of work. Sergeant Ashe spent thirty-nine (39) hours inside the Sergeant's Office, with the door closed and lights off, and twelve (12) hours inside his police cruiser, which was parked in the parking lot behind the generator, with the police cruiser lights off. In total, Sergeant Ashe spent approximately fifty percent (50%) of his twelve (12) tours of duty concealed from public view within the Sergeant's Office and/or in his police cruiser, which was parked in the Department parking lot. As a point of reference, Sgt. Ashe spent approximately four (4) hours of his eight (8) hour shift not patrolling, not performing any property checks, and not actively engaged in any police work.
2. Sergeant Ryan Maxfield worked thirty (30) midnight tours of duty, which is equivalent to two hundred and forty (240) hours of work. Sergeant Maxfield spent one hundred and ten (110) hours inside the locker room, and thirty-two (32) hours in and around the police station, including being inside his cruiser parked in the parking lot behind the generator, with the police cruiser lights off. In total, Sergeant Maxfield spent more than approximately fifty percent (50%) of his thirty (30) tours of duty concealed from public view within the men's locker room and/or in the Department parking lot. Attached to this report are videos depicting a search of the locker room which revealed cots and bedding concealed in a locker. Sergeant Maxfield's name is engraved on the bag containing bedding. This report also contains pictures of Sergeant Maxfield walking around the station with a pillow under his arm. Sergeant Maxfield resigned prior to the conclusion of this investigation.
3. Officer Terrance Teehan worked thirty (30) midnight tours of duty, which is equivalent to two hundred and forty (240) hours of work. Officer Teehan spent sixty-two (62) hours in the locker room and sixty-seven (67) hours in and around the police station, including in the men's locker room and parked in his police cruiser behind the police station. In total, Officer Teehan spent more than approximately fifty percent (50%) of his thirty (30) tours of duty concealed from public view while inside his police cruiser parked in the Department's parking lot and/or

inside the men's locker room in the Department. Officer Teehan transferred prior to the conclusion of this investigation.

4. Officer William Bento worked four (4) midnight tours of duty, which is equivalent to thirty-two (32) hours of work. Officer Bento spent eighteen (18) hours in and around the police station, including in the men's locker room and in the soft interview room inside of the police station. In total, Officer Bento spent more than fifty percent (50%) of his four (4) tours of duty concealed from public view while in and around the Department police station. Officer Bento transferred prior to the conclusion of this investigation.
5. Officer Paul Treggiari worked two (2) midnight tours of duty, which is equivalent to sixteen (16) hours of work. Officer Treggiari spent eight (8) hours in his police cruiser, parked inside of the police vehicle processing bay, with the door closed in complete darkness. In total, Officer Treggiari spent more than approximately fifty percent (50%) of his two (2) tours of duty concealed from public view while inside his police cruiser parked in the Department's vehicle processing bay, which was completely dark. Officer Treggiari resigned prior to the conclusion of this investigation.
6. Officer Michael Stanley worked thirteen (13) midnight tours of duty, which is equivalent to one hundred and four (104) hours of work. Officer Stanley spent fifty-five (55) hours inside and around the police station. In total, Officer Stanley spent more than approximately fifty percent (50%) of his thirteen (13) tours of duty concealed from public view while inside of his police cruiser, which was parked in the rear parking lot of the Department, inches away from the Department's vehicle processing bay. Officer Stanley resigned prior to the conclusion of this investigation.
7. Officer Garrott Ledbetter worked three (3) midnight tours of duty, which is equivalent to twenty-four (24) hours of work. Officer Ledbetter spent eight (8) hours and forty-six (46) minutes in the men's locker room inside of the Department. In total, Officer Ledbetter spent approximately thirty-six percent (36%) of his three (3) tours of duty concealed from public view while in the men's locker room inside of the Department.
8. Officer Francis Thisse worked two (2) midnight tours of duty, which is equivalent to sixteen (16) hours of work. Officer Thisse spent three (3) hours and forty-six (46) minutes in the locker room. In total, Officer Thisse spent approximately twenty-four percent (24%) of his two (2) tours of duty concealed from public view while in the men's locker room inside of the Department.

This Investigator, therefore, concludes there is sufficient credible evidence that members of the Department were not engaged in the proper performance of their duties as required by Department Job Descriptions, Rules and Regulations, and Policies. Specifically, this is established by the fact that members of the Department concealed themselves from public view while in the Sergeant's Office, men's locker room, vehicle processing bay, and/or in the rear parking lot of the police station for extended periods.² This Investigator stresses that members of the Department cannot protect the

² This Investigator notes that in accordance with Department practice, members of the Department typically spent approximately sixty (60) to ninety (90) minutes at the beginning of each shift within the police station, during which time the Officers' locations could not be monitored with the video surveillance system.

community and engage in the proper performance of their duties, as required, from within or behind the police station.

Additionally, based on the witness interviews conducted and the evidence reviewed, the purported rationalization for members of the Department retreating to the police station for extended periods focused on two (2) primary themes: officer safety and the reactive culture of the Department.

Officer Safety

1. There is insufficient credible evidence that the Department's Sergeants and Officers were justified in regularly retreating to the protection and security of the police station to enhance their own personal safety.
2. There is insufficient credible evidence that the Town or the Department ever received any threats against the Department's Sergeants or Officers.
3. There is insufficient credible evidence that Chief Guerette received any complaints or concerns from the Department's Sergeants or Officers regarding their fatigue or stress, which could have affected their health, performance, or safety prior to the initiation of this investigation. In fact, although Chief Guerette proposed several changes to the schedule and the distribution of overtime to alleviate staffing shortages, each of the proposed changes were rejected by the Union.
4. There is sufficient credible evidence that the most prevalent and concerning safety issue affecting the Department's Sergeants and Officers is the delayed and/or non-existent back-up provided by Sergeants and Officers who continuously removed themselves from their patrol duties to conceal themselves from public view at the police station for extended periods.

Reactive Police Culture

1. There is sufficient credible evidence that the Department is a modern public safety agency that consistently promotes proactivity from its members as a core and essential value.
2. There is sufficient credible evidence that the Department promotes and expects proactive and professional performance from its members.
3. There is no credible evidence that the unprofessional and unauthorized conduct of the Department's Sergeants and Officers is the result of a reactive culture within the Town's Police Department.

The remainder of this executive summary focuses on employees who were employed by the Medfield Police Department as of the date when investigatory interviews were initially scheduled. This Investigator notes at the outset that the lack of job performance and "hiding" in the locker rooms (where there were cots, pillows, and bedding found) and the police station was condoned by supervisors holding the rank of Sergeant. Note that the employees were, at times, spending up to four

(4) hours of an eight (8) hour shift either in the locker room or in the station not performing any patrol or other police duties.

Sergeant Conor Ashe

1. There is sufficient credible evidence that Sergeant Conor Ashe knowingly and willingly engaged in a continued pattern of unprofessional behavior not condoned, supported, or authorized by Department Rules and Regulations, Policies, Job Descriptions, or the Office of the Chief of Police.
2. There is sufficient credible evidence that Sergeant Conor Ashe failed to consistently engage in the core and essential supervisory responsibilities of a Police Sergeant and the Officer in Charge. Sergeant Ashe's failure to properly discharge his duties as a supervisor directly resulted in the unsatisfactory performance of Officers under his command and an unauthorized reduction of police services delivered to the community.
3. There is sufficient credible evidence that Sergeant Conor Ashe failed to comply with his professional obligation as a Sergeant to mentor, train, and develop Patrol Officers. Sergeant Ashe modeled and encouraged behavior, which was contrary to the expectations of the Chief of Police, the governing body of the Town, the community, and the Department's Rules and Regulations, and Policies.
4. There is sufficient credible evidence that Sergeant Conor Ashe exercised unprofessional and poor judgment as a Sergeant by implementing his unauthorized standards of performance, which required Officers only to answer their radio and go on calls.
5. There is sufficient credible evidence that Sergeant Conor Ashe deliberately failed to supervise the Officers under his command by failing to ensure they performed their official duties in a manner that brought honor and respect to the Department.

Officer Garrett Ledbetter

1. There is sufficient credible evidence that Officer Garrett Ledbetter engaged in conduct that violated the Department's Rules and Regulations.
2. There is sufficient credible evidence that Officer Garrett Ledbetter knowingly and willingly engaged in a continued pattern of unprofessional behavior not condoned, supported, or authorized by the Department's Rules and Regulations, Policies, Job Descriptions, of the Office of the Chief of Police.
3. There is sufficient credible evidence that Officer Garrett Ledbetter failed to engage in the core and essential tasks of a police officer during his tours of duty, as described in his Job Description.

Officer Paul Treggiari

1. There is sufficient credible evidence that Officer Paul Treggiari engaged in conduct that violated the Department's Rules and Regulations.

2. There is sufficient credible evidence that Officer Paul Treggiari knew or should have known that his conduct did not comply with the Department's Job Description for Patrol Officers and fell short of the minimum standards expected of a police officer.

Officer Francis Thisse

1. There is sufficient credible evidence that Officer Francis Thisse engaged in conduct that violated the Department's Rules and Regulations.
2. There is sufficient credible evidence that Officer Francis Thisse knew or should have known that his conduct did not comply with the Department's Job Description for Patrol Officers and fell short of the minimum standards expected of a police officer.