



KATHLEEN M. FALK
County Executive

COUNTY OF DANE Public Safety Communications

City-County Building, Room 109
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Madison, Wisconsin 53703-3342
PH: 608/267-3911 • FAX: 608/266-9861

JOSEPH M. NORWICK
Director
608/267-1911

RICHARD D. McVICAR
Operations Manager
608/267-3912

TOM HANRAHAN
Support Services Manager
608/283-2914

To: Operations Manager Rich McVicar
From: Communications Supervisor Rick Lange
Date: April 15, 2008
Re: MPD 08-85855

INITIAL GAHAGAN INTERVIEW

On 04/08/08 (Tuesday) at about 1:30 p.m. I met with Communicator Rita Gahagan regarding a wireless 911 call (MPD 08-85855) she received during her work shift of 04/02/08 (Wednesday). Present at that meeting were Supervisor Gary Bell and AFSCME Local 720 Vice-President Laurie Lane. We met in Director Joe Norwick's office.

I began the meeting by playing the audio recording from the phone call Rita answered on 04/02/08 at 12:19:54. The call was presented to Rita at 12:19:49. Upon listening to the recording I asked Rita if she recalled receiving the phone call and she did. Rita said that she had listened to the recording of the call one time prior to our meeting and that was when she met with Supervisor Schultz on 04/03/08 (Thursday) prior to meeting with MPD Detective Flynn-Statz.

After listening to the call I asked Rita if she heard the initial 'scream' sound just after she answered the call. Rita said, "If I heard the initial 'scream' it didn't register as a scream." Rita said that she heard the subsequent background noise but it, "didn't register as anyone in obvious distress." I asked Rita if she recalled what she was doing at the time she answered this phone call and she said that she didn't. Rita couldn't immediately recall any significant room activity that would have caused interference during this call. Rita said that she was sitting at her console facing her console (DP1) at the time of this call. Rita does not recall having any issues with her equipment not working properly.

Rita said that she is in the habit of checking the class of wireless call she's answering and, unless the situation indicates, will not normally re-bid a wireless phase 2 call. She could not explain why she re-bid this WPH2 call. Rita said she didn't challenge the call with the TTY because she heard the subsequent voices which indicated to her that it wasn't a TTY call.

Upon recall Rita was satisfied with the response of the male subject who answered the telephone and, upon disconnecting, moved on to the next 911 call (approximately five seconds later). Rita said that she is in the habit of documenting 911 disconnects as closed incidents and could not offer an explanation for why she didn't this time.

Rita said that during her normal course of duty as a call taker she will have her New World, Spillman, and Outlook programs running but didn't believe she was actively using any of those programs during this incident. Rita said that she normally answers a lot of phone calls when she's call taking. After reviewing the call log for

Rita it appears that she answered several calls -911 and others- immediately prior to and following the wireless call in question.

Rita said that she doesn't normally select a main dispatch channel to monitor while she's call taking but does listen to tactical channels in the event an officer is on the wrong channel when they call dispatch.

Rita has not discussed this call with anyone as requested by MPD and will not discuss this call with anyone (other than Paul Kamps) at our request. Having said that, Paul K. has indicated that he's concerned that Rita is not discussing this incident with him which is something she would normally do. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Laurie Lane also clarified for her purposes that we would not only allow but encourage this type of discussion for Rita.

During our meeting Rita looked directly at me while answering my questions and did not hesitate with her answers.

PERSONNEL FILE CONTENTS

I have reviewed Rita's personnel file and find that her most recent performance evaluation (signed 10/07) indicates that Rita exceeds requirements in every category evaluated. Supervisor Bell noted Rita's excellent customer service skills and compassion when dealing with difficult situations. Rita received two coaching notes. The first was dated 07/18/07 and addressed a fire radio protocol issue; the second was dated 09/07/07 and addressed a violation of the Emergency Call Handling Procedure 5.2.

EMERGENCY CALL HANDLING PROCEDURE 5.2

In reviewing Emergency Call Handling Procedure 5.2 I find that Rita answered the phone promptly (within five seconds of its presentation to her) and properly. Rita did not challenge the call with the TTY because of the noise she heard in the background as described above. Rita indicates that she has handled many calls with similar background noise in the past without incident. To that end, Rita considered this to be a wireless 911 call without signs of a serious situation, also as indicated above. Upon being disconnected Rita called the phone back and identified our department to the man answering the phone. She told that man that the phone had called us, he provided a reasonable response that didn't raise her suspicion and she moved on to her next phone call. The call was not documented in our CAD.

SECOND GAHAGAN INTERVIEW

On 04/09/08 (Wednesday) at about 10:20 a.m. I met again with Rita and Laurie Lane. We met in Director Norwick's office. I requested the meeting in order to clarify some details of my previous investigation. I asked Rita how she would have reacted to the wireless 911 call in question had she heard a 'scream' or any background noise that

indicated signs of a serious situation. Rita said that she had received a wireless 911 call earlier in her shift today that involved her hearing the signs of a serious situation. That call resulted in a disconnect which Rita reacted to by entering a call for service which required action by the duty supervisor. Rita said that had she heard anything on the wireless 911 call she received on 4/2 that indicated signs of a serious situation she would have reacted the same way she did with the call she handled this morning.

Rita, Laurie, and I discussed the traumatic nature of the 4/2 call and its impact on Rita. Rita said that she is second-guessing herself and her actions and said that her self-confidence has been rocked. I asked Rita if there was any reason for our department to be concerned that she could not perform the functions of her job or meet departmental expectations and she said, "no." Prior to adjourning the meeting I asked Rita again if she could provide any additional insight into the question of how she missed the initial 'scream' sound. Rita shrugged her shoulders and indicated that she had no new or different recollection of the incident.

THIRD GAHAGAN INTERVIEW 04/15/08

On 04/15/08 (Tuesday) at about 12:50 p.m. I met with Rita and her union representative, Local 720 President Shannon Maier, in the 911 conference room (room 111). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss new information discovered within the last few days regarding the initial wireless phase 2 call received by Rita and the ensuing call back made by Rita. I asked Rita if she recalled anything new or different since the last time we spoke and she did not.

I told Rita that I had been made aware of some new information about the sequence of phone calls on 04/02/08 at around 12:19 p.m. Initially it was thought that the outgoing phone call Rita made immediately after being disconnected from the wireless call [REDACTED] was back to the [REDACTED] phone. It has since been determined, however, that the outgoing phone call was instead made to a 911 landline abandoned call [REDACTED] that was presented to Rita immediately after the wireless call was terminated.

I explained to Rita that the records generated by our department confirm that she received the wireless 911 call in question. The records further indicate that Rita had an open line with the wireless call for about one minute before the line was released. The next call Rita received was another 911 call, this one a land line call which was abandoned at the point of origination (busy signal upon Rita answering). It appeared that Rita called that land line number back and reached the two males who indicated that they called the wrong number. That land line 911 disconnect was documented and canceled. The confusion created by this land line 911 call was that it appeared initially that the wireless 911 call, abandoned landline 911 call, and callback were one in the same incident. Rita was under that impression, as were several others including me. It has since been confirmed that these are two separate incidents (wireless 911 and land line 911).

I asked Rita how she normally terminates phone connections with customers and she said she uses the 'F8' key (as opposed to using the mouse or touch screen). I asked Rita if she

could specifically remember dialing the wireless number upon being disconnected or if she remembered hitting the 'redial' button. Rita said that she couldn't have hit the 'redial' button if it was a wireless call because the call back number listed would not have been correct. I explained to Rita that there was no record generated by our department which indicated that she attempted to dial the wireless number upon being disconnected from it. Instead, our records indicate that immediately after the wireless 911 call was disconnected Rita was presented with another 911 call (this one a land line call which was abandoned by the caller). That abandoned 911 call was immediately called back and a male answered the phone. That male said there was no problem and that the call was made accidentally. That call was subsequently documented in the CAD by Rita. I asked Rita why DCSO wasn't dispatched to that 911 disconnect and she said that she simultaneously entered the call and canceled it when she made contact with the residence.

Rita said she didn't know why she didn't call back the wireless phone other than the fact that she was moving on to other 911 calls waiting to be answered.