

**CORAL SPRINGS POLICE DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS
FINAL REPORT OF INVESTIGATION**

Case Number: IA19-04

Allegations: #1 Untruthfulness – G.O. 4.3.16(R)
#2 Failure to Supervise – G.O. 4.3.30(A)

Involved Members: Julie Vidaud, ID 1046

Date of Occurrence: June 9, 2019

Summary:

On July 4, 2019, I received a Complaint Control Form from Communications Center Manager Kathy Liriano. The complaint is against Communications Supervisor Julie Vidaud and is related to CSPD case number 19-6082. In summary, Liriano states that Vidaud was the shift supervisor on June 9, 2019. At approximately 1858 hours, a call came into dispatch regarding a shooting however, it was entered into the CAD as a suspicious incident. There was a 30 minute delay in the call being dispatched to an officer.

Liriano asked Vidaud what she was doing at the time the call was held. Vidaud said that she was working on evaluations for her subordinates. Liriano began to look into the matter and could not verify that Vidaud was logged into any program used to prepare evaluations. Liriano contacted the City's IT Department for assistance. The IT employee discovered that during the time of the incident, Vidaud's workstation was logged on to Netflix. Liriano was concerned about the possible untruthfulness from Vidaud and Vidaud's possible dereliction of duty by her lack of supervision during the incident. Liriano provided numerous documents that she obtained from IT. Refer to **Tab 1** for CCF.

On July 8, 2019, Chief Parry assigned the case to me for investigation under OPS file number IA19-04 with the following allegations:

1. Untruthfulness – G.O. 4.3.16(R) which states, "Members shall be truthful at all times and under all circumstances".
2. Failure to Supervise – G.O. 4.3.30(A) which states, "Each managerial and supervisory member is responsible for: Ensuring that all work performed under his authority conforms to the policies, procedures and standards set

forth in the Administrative Policy Manual and Police Department written directives”.

Refer to **Tab 1** for assignment form.

I obtained copies of all event reports, police reports, phone calls, and dispatch tapes related to the incident.

On 6/9/19 at 1856 hours, a 911 call was received and the caller told the call taker that something just blew through her car and she said that she wasn't sure if it was a bullet or something. The caller said that something shot through the back window and hit the front windshield and almost hit her head. The caller said that there is a hot metal piece still inside of the car that landed on her lap. The caller specifically said that somebody shot at her car. The call taker said that officers are on the way. The call taker was Henry Cantor.

At 1913 hours, the caller called 911 again and said that she had recently called the police and that she “got shot at in the car”. The caller was very upset and concerned that they may shoot again. The call taker said that an officer will be out there as soon as someone is available. The caller said that she does not feel safe where she is and that someone was shooting at her head. The call taker was Christina Joseph.

At 1917 hours, the caller called 911 again and said that she is going to drive to the police station. The call taker acknowledged the caller and said that she'll let the officers know. The call taker was Christina Joseph.

At 1929 hours, the caller's sister called 911 and told the call taker that she is at the police department and that her sister was shot at and had already called 911 twice and nobody came out. The call taker said that they are aware of the incident and they're waiting for an officer to clear. The call taker was Christina Joseph.

The call was entered as a “Suspicious Incident” when it should have been entered as a “Shooting”. The time between when the first call came in to the time it was dispatched to officers is 34 minutes. Both Henry Cantor and Christina Joseph missed the fact that this was a shooting call and not a suspicious incident. Note: The perpetrator in this case was ultimately arrested and charged with premeditated attempted murder. Refer to **Tab 3** for event report and **Tab 4** for 911 calls and dispatch recordings.

I began to review the documents provided by Liriano that she obtained from IT. I also had IT provided a USB drive containing the results of their research. Refer to **Tab 5** for USB drive. Contained in **Tab 6** are documents titled “User Activity Report for csad\PDJRV”. A page titled “Application Usage” shows a report that was run from May 19, 2019 at 10:00:27 to June 18, 2019 at 10:00:26.

The report shows the most used application under Vidaud's network login for the 30-day time frame. The top three on the list are:

1. Netflix at 3.7 gigabytes
2. Hulu at 3.4 gigabytes
3. Xfinity TV at 1.8 gigabytes

On average, 1 gigabyte of data lets you browse the internet for about twenty hours or watch a standard definition streaming video for one hour.

Contained in **Tab 7** is a page listing various URL's from 6/9/19 at 18:14:36.295 to 6/9/19 at 20:12:35.115 (approximately 1 hour 58 minutes). It should be noted that the incident in question occurred on 6/9/19 from 18:58:13 to 23:56:57 with the 911 calls coming in between 18:58:13 to 19:30:32. The first three URL's are for Redbox.com for on-demand movies. The following three are for Netflix.com. At 18:16:01, a Netflix URL was selected. I entered the URL in a web search and it came up with a Netflix movie titled "I Am Mother" with a duration of 1 hour 53 minutes. The last URL was for Netflix.com at 20:12:35.

An analysis for this information suggests that the movie "I Am Mother" played for 1 hour 53 minutes at Vidaud's workstation while the incident in question was occurring. Vidaud told Liriano that she was working on performance evaluations during that time frame.

Contained in **Tab 8** are documents titled "Call Taker Call Activity" for Julie Vidaud on 6/9/19 from 18:00:00 to 20:59:59. A review of the documents did not reveal any beneficial information.

Contained in **Tab 9** are documents titled "repport" [sic]. These documents list various documents, files, and directories that were accessed by user PDJRV (Julie Vidaud). I searched for entries from 6/9/19 and found on page 1 that on 6/9/19 at 15:22:43 (reported as 19:22:43 UTC which is EST - 4 hours), several pdf documents were accessed, one of which was labeled "Evaluation verbiage". On pages 55 and 60 are various Word documents that were accessed June 10 at 02:25:14 UTC which is actually 22:25:14 on June 9. These document titles are consistent with personnel files, discipline files, and goals and objectives.

An analysis of this information suggests that Vidaud accessed pdf and Word documents that would be consistent with working on performance evaluations. The information also suggests that the documents were accessed at 15:22:43 and 22:25:14 and not between 18:58:13 and 19:30:32 when the 911 calls were occurring.

Contained in **Tab 10** are documents titled "Chrome Browser Report". This data was obtained from the Communications Supervisor Workstation computer. An analysis of this data shows numerous site clicks for websites related to shopping,

news stories, streaming TV, movies, vacation planning, and fewer that could be considered work related.

The data for 6/9/19 shows the following:

- 1530 hours – CNN
- 1538 hours – Investigation Discovery
- 1541 hours – Netflix
- 1628 hours – Xfinity Stream
- 1727 hours – Google search US phone book
- 1728 hours – TLO login
- 1746 hours – Google maps
- 1812 hours – Xfinity Stream
- 1813 hours – Redbox
- 1814 hours – Netflix
- 2012 hours – Netflix
- 2136 hours – CNN
- 2232 hours – Google

On July 24, 2019, I took a sworn statement from Glauber Riberio, IT Analyst for the City of Coral Springs. Riberio was responsible for compiling all of the data for Kathy Liriano. I showed Riberio the documentation contained within this investigation and he authenticated the documents as the same ones as he provided to Liriano. Refer to **Tab 11** for Glauber Riberio's entire statement.

On August 16, 2019, I took a sworn statement from Kathy Liriano. Liriano said that she was initially made aware of this incident by Communications Supervisor Patrick Thurman. Liriano said that she was looking at the MIS server call log report and she listened to the recordings and looked at the CAD reports. Liriano discovered that the call takers for the incident were Henry Cantor and Christina Joseph and the supervisor was Julie Vidaud.

Liriano said that, while she was home, she received a phone call from Vidaud. Vidaud called to see if Liriano had seen an email she sent earlier about the incident. During the conversation, Vidaud explained what occurred during the incident and Liriano asked Vidaud what she was doing at the time of the call. Liriano said that Vidaud told her she was working on probationary employee evaluations.

Liriano said that the following day when she came to work, she looked at the probationary evaluations that were pending and that supervisors were reviewing. Liriano said that she checked the properties of the document which revealed a list of supervisors that had logged into the document and Vidaud's name was not listed. Liriano said that she then contacted Glauber Riberio and requested that he check Vidaud's activity level and report the findings back to her.

I asked Liriano what Vidaud should have done when this call came in:

KL: When this call came in—if— When this call came in, even if she didn't hear the call taker, take the call, um, she still should have at least opened the call to see, Hey, this is holding or what it's about. Um, so, that we can at least—she can ask the call taker, Hey, what's going on? What exactly um, do you mean by your narrative in the call, because there was narrative in there that there was a possible bullet. Um, and that the caller, you know, had a hot piece of metal fall on her. So that was documented in the call. However, you know, the only person that questioned the call taker, was the dispatcher. Later on. But, based on the call taker's response, he never—she never dispatched the call either. Um, so I would have expected Julie to have pulled up the call and see. Question it more and me being a shift supervisor in the past, if I wasn't content with the answer I was given, either I myself would call the caller back or I would have the call taker call back and listen in a see exactly what information they're being given.

I asked Liriano if employees are permitted to conduct personal business on the computer to include watching TV and movies. Liriano said that if there's downtime and they're not busy working an incident, then yes but work comes first. I explained to Liriano that it appears a movie was playing for 1 hour and 53 minutes at Vidaud's workstation during the incident. I asked Liriano if she considered Vidaud to be derelict in her duties and Liriano said, yes.

Refer to **Tab 12** for Kathy Liriano's entire statement.

I asked Liriano to provide a printout of all calls for service that came into dispatch for the time that Vidaud worked on 6/9. A review of the printout revealed that between 1500 on 6/9 and 0656 on 6/10, 214 calls for service came into dispatch. Refer to **Tab 13** for printout.

On August 26, 2019, I took a sworn subject statement from Julie Vidaud. I was able to establish that Vidaud worked the shift in question and that she worked at the supervisor's console. Vidaud also verified that she logged in at the beginning of her shift and logged out at the end. I asked Vidaud if she was allowed to use the internet for personal business, watch TV, and watch movies. Vidaud said that it was okay when there is downtime. Vidaud said that the supervisor console has five monitors.

I asked Vidaud if she remembered calling Liriano at home about the incident and she remembered making the call. I asked Vidaud if she remembered Liriano asking her what she was doing during the incident. Vidaud said that she did not remember and that it was a short conversation. I asked Vidaud what she was doing during the incident and she said that she didn't know and that they were very busy in the evening.

I told Vidaud what Liriano said during her statement and asked if she remembered telling Liriano that she was working on performance evaluations. Vidaud said, *"No. I mean, I'm not saying that I wasn't working on that. I just don't know. I don't remember saying that, because I don't know what I was*

doing. *I really have no idea*". I again asked Vidaud if she may have told Liriano that she was working on evaluations and Vidaud said, *"I mean, God, it's been so long. I don't—I may have been. I don't know"*.

I asked Vidaud when she realized that there was an issue with the incident in question. Vidaud said that she realized it was an issue when the female came to the station. Vidaud said that Lt. Neese also came up to dispatch and asked about the incident. I asked Vidaud if, after learning what happened, she thought the call was handled properly. Vidaud said, *"Absolutely not. Which is why I pulled them that night, immediately. Cause when I heard the calls, I was literally just appalled. Like-- and that's what I was telling Neese. I'm like—I don't even—like, I was speechless"*.

I asked Vidaud if she thought the actions of her employees conformed to all of our policies, practices, and standards and she said, absolutely not. I then read General Order 4.3.30 where it talks about supervisory responsibilities: *"And it states in here that each managerial and supervisory member is responsible for insuring that all the work performed under his or her authority conforms to the policies, procedures and standards set forth in the administrative policy manual and the Police Department written directives"*.

After reading the General Order, I asked Vidaud if her employees' actions conformed with policy and she said, no. I then told Vidaud that she is also bound by the same policy and she said, right. I asked Vidaud if she thought that she failed as a supervisor. Vidaud said, *"And I wish I would have caught it right then, you know, but unfortunately I didn't. As soon as I, you know, as soon as I was made aware, I immediately jumped in. I—you know, I did everything that I was supposed to do"*.

At one point, Vidaud stated, *"And it's hard to supervise a room when you're on the phone a lot"*. Based on the data in Tab 8, Vidaud handled 8 phone calls totaling just over 8 minutes between 1800 and 2100 hours.

I asked Vidaud how she would rate her performance as a supervisor during the incident. Vidaud said, *"So, how would I rate myself? You know, yeah, I-- because I think I would give myself a five out of ten only because as soon as I was made aware, I dove straight in, but-- obviously, I wish it was different"*. Vidaud went on to say, *"I just—unfortunately I don't know what I was doing. I was probably doing another supervisor duty. It doesn't change the fact, that I wish I would have caught it. So, I mean I failed at that particular call and I hate that"*.

I asked Vidaud if she has a Netflix account and she said, yes. I asked if it was possible that she was watching a movie and that's why she didn't see the call. Vidaud said that there was a good chance that Netflix was running but that she

would not have been watching during that period of time. Vidaud said that there are all kinds of programs running all night long.

I told Vidaud that we had IT pull data from her computer and that the data revealed that there was a lot of browsing for on demand movies and Netflix during the time the incident occurred. I asked Vidaud if she remembered watching a movie during that time. Vidaud said, *"It just stays running. You don't watch a whole movie at work. It's not even possible. So, I mean, I'm not disputing that, that's probably—obviously it's accurate, but that doesn't mean I was watching a movie for two hours"*.

I showed Vidaud the movie that corresponded with the Netflix link, I Am Mother, and asked her if she remembered the movie. Vidaud said, *"Yeah. I don't know, to be honest with you. I Am Mother? I don't know. Not right off. I mean, it's Hillary Swank and I don't know"*.

I explained to Vidaud that the evidence is conclusive and that the movie was playing at her console during the incident. Vidaud said that there is no way that she could have been sitting there watching a movie for two hours unless it was 3 o'clock in the morning. Vidaud said, *"-- but it doesn't mean I'm, like, watching a movie. I just don't stop it"*.

I confronted Vidaud with the data usage for Netflix, Hulu, and Xfinity and told her that it appears that she spends a lot of time watching movies and TV. Vidaud reiterated that it's constantly running in the background but she's not constantly watching movies. I told Vidaud that the fact that the call was handled so badly, I would classify it as a catastrophic failure. I asked Vidaud if catastrophic was a good word for it and she said, absolutely.

I explained to Vidaud that the data does confirm that she accessed both Word and PDF documents during her shift that appear to be consistent with employee evaluations. The documents were accessed at 1522 hours and again at 2225 hours which is nowhere near the incident time. I further explained that at the most critical time, when the incident occurred, she wasn't doing evaluations and a movie was playing at her workstation. I again asked Vidaud if she failed as a supervisor:

DK: So, you know, there's a requirement to supervise as outlined in the General Order. And the question that we have to ask is, did you fail in your duties as a supervisor? And that's the question that I'm asking you.

JV: Um—I don't know. I mean, again, like there's one supervisor and you're taking care of a whole room full of things going on. You know, did I fail as a supervisor, I don't know. Was I

spread out so thin that I missed something? That's what I think happened. But you know—
am I a failure as a supervisor. I don't think so. I mean--

DK: Did you fail in that particular instance? I'm not saying are you a failure as a supervisor. But
did you fail in that moment in time?

JV: I mean, I --- yeah, I guess. Cause I did miss it at—at that time. You know, even though I
immediately addressed it afterwards. I did miss it.

I asked Vidaud if she will now do anything differently and she said, Oh, God
yeah. Vidaud said, *"... my number one thing now is literally checking every single
call that is being on that held screen. And reading and you know, it's literally, like
that's actually my number one now"*. Vidaud also promised that Netflix won't be
running in the background.

I told Vidaud that there is still an issue of her being untruthful that has to be
addressed. I told Vidaud that Liriano was adamant about what she heard on the
phone. So much so, that she went into the office the following day and checked
the Word document properties to see if it was modified. Vidaud said that she is
not disputing what Liriano said she heard. Vidaud said if she told Liriano that she
was working on evaluations, she was but maybe she confused the times. Vidaud
said, *"--so, don't—I don't know. But I've never looked at anyone here at all, ever,
and just told them a bare face lie. -- at least not knowingly"*.

I summed up the allegations with Vidaud:

DK: OK. Alright, so those are the two allegations that we're looking at. Did you lie to Kathy?
And did you fail as a supervisor, during this incident? So, what would those two answers
be?

JV: Honestly, did I lie to Kathy? I don't -- if I told her I was working on evaluations, I had to be
doing evaluations or at least I'm trying to get my paragraphs together. You know what I
mean? Like my mind was on evaluations at that point. Whether I actually went in and was
able to plug in all my stuff that I come up with? I don't know, you know. But, I was
definitely—cause I would never have said that if I wasn't.

DK: OK.

JV: So honestly, if your asking me did I lie to Kathy? No, I don't feel like I did.

DK: Alright.

JV: Um, did miss that call? Absolutely. I mean it's without saying. Like, I did.

Refer to **Tab 14** for Julie Vidaud's entire statement.

Subsequent to Vidaud's statement, I requested copies of the various pdf, docx, and doc files that seem to indicate that Vidaud was working on performance evaluation related material. I requested these documents from Glauber Riberio in IT as well as Julie Vidaud. On 9/19/19, I received 41 documents from Riberio and Vidaud. Several documents are directly related to employee performance and evaluation verbiage and support Vidaud's assertion that she was working on evaluations at some point during her shift. Refer to **Tab 15** for CD containing the various documents.

Conclusion:

General Order 4.3.16(R) states: Members shall be truthful at all times and under all circumstances.

There is no evidence of the conversation that took place between Liriano and Vidaud on the date in question. Based on Liriano's testimony and the lengths that she took immediately after the call, there is a greater likelihood than not that Liriano's recollection of the conversation is accurate. Vidaud stated that she would never intentionally lie to Liriano but may have confused some times. There is evidence to support that Vidaud had accessed documents at 1522 and 2225 hours that relate to employee performance evaluations. I cannot rule out the possibility that Vidaud confused the time frames that she was working on evaluations and there is no evidence to show that Vidaud intentionally lied to Liriano. The evidence is insufficient to either prove or disprove that Vidaud was untruthful and the allegation of Untruthfulness is **Not Sustained**.

General Order 4.3.30 states: Each managerial and supervisory member is responsible for ensuring that all work performed under his authority conforms to the policies, procedures and standards set forth in the Administrative Policy Manual and Police Department written directives.

The investigation has established beyond a reasonable doubt that Vidaud missed a critical incident that was mishandled by the call taker and dispatcher. Vidaud acknowledged that the call taker and dispatcher's performance did not conform to policy and acknowledged that she is ultimately responsible for their performance. Vidaud further acknowledged that she failed as a supervisor during the handling of the call. The evidence conclusively shows that Vidaud spends an inordinate amount of time conducting personal business on the computer to include playing streaming TV and movies.

The allegation of Failure to Supervise is **Sustained**.

Allegation #1 Untruthfulness – Not Sustained

Allegation #2 Failure to Supervise – Sustained

Status Date: September 20, 2019

Report by: Sergeant David Kirkland, ID 635
Office of Professional Standards
Coral Springs Police Department
2801 Coral Springs Drive
Coral Springs, Florida 33065

I, the undersigned, do hereby swear, under penalty of perjury, that I have read the foregoing document and, to the best of my personal knowledge, information and belief, the facts stated therein are true and accurate and that, to the best of my personal knowledge, information and belief, I have not knowingly or willfully deprived, or allowed another to deprive, the subject of the investigation of any of the rights contained in ss. 112.532 and 112.533, Florida Statutes.


Affiant Signature

635
ID #

Sworn to and subscribed before me on you day of October 2019.


Officer/Notary Signature

886
ID #

