



Tamara B. Starks
Director

OPA@ChicagoParkDistrict.com (Email)

312-742-5672 (Hotline)

2 N. Lasalle Suite M550

Chicago IL 60602

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

First Quarter 2026 Report

To General Superintendent Carlos Ramirez-Rosa, President Marlon Everett and the Chicago Park District Board of Commissioners,

Attached please find the First Quarter 2026 Report from the Office of Prevention and Accountability (OPA). This report summarizes the work OPA has done to start 2026 with a continued focus on ensuring that the Park District is an equitable and respectful recreation and work environment.

As the report outlines, OPA's work in the areas of training, policy and accountability is ongoing as it remains dedicated to administering and enforcing the Park District's Human Rights Ordinance.

Throughout this year, the OPA team will continue its efforts to uphold the mission of Chapter 4 of the Park District Code. As always, thank you for your support and assistance on this vital task.

Sincerely,

Tamara B. Starks

Tamara B. Starks
Director
Office of Prevention and Accountability

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Mission

The Office of Prevention and Accountability (OPA) works to ensure that the Chicago Park District provides all employees, patrons and visitors with a recreation and work environment that is free from discrimination, harassment, sexual misconduct, workplace violence, abuse and neglect of children and vulnerable adults, and retaliation.

Information regarding OPA's mission and operations is available to Park District staff and patrons online at <https://ChicagoParkDistrict.com/OPA>. Complaints related to the concerns enumerated above can be submitted to OPA in the following ways:

- By phone: 312-742-5OPA (312-742-5672)
- By email: OPA@ChicagoParkDistrict.com
- Online: Via a form linked on www.ChicagoParkDistrict.com/OPA
- In writing: Chicago Park District
Office of Prevention and Accountability
4830 S. Western Avenue
Chicago, IL 60609

Personnel

OPA began the First Quarter of 2026 staffed as follows: a Director, a Senior Investigator, three Investigators and a Case Intake Specialist. During the First Quarter, OPA received the required approvals to convert the Senior Investigator position to a Deputy Director position going forward. In the Park District's 2026 Budget, OPA also received approval to hire an additional investigator in the Second Quarter of 2026; that job was posted in the First Quarter.

OPA is committed to conducting thorough, fair, impartial and independent investigations regarding any alleged violations of the Human Rights Ordinance. To accomplish that, OPA has assembled a team of individuals with experience in investigations, law, Title IX, Title VII, child protection and human rights issues.

A key focus for the OPA team is remaining up to date on best practices related to the specialized areas that fall under the Office's purview. To ensure that, OPA staff members regularly seek out educational opportunities and bring information back to share with their co-workers. During the First Quarter of 2026, a member of the OPA team attended the Chicago Children's Advocacy Center initiative Chicago Advocacy Network for Hope (CAN Hope), a day-long Annual Symposium focused on strategies to prevent child sexual abuse. Additionally, another OPA team

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

member attended a continuing education session that included legal updates related to Title VII cases and the standard used to establish harassment and discrimination.

Emphasis on Training, Prevention and Collaboration

OPA has been meeting regularly with colleagues from Workforce Development, Community Recreation and other departments to collaborate on training plans for 2026. The focus has been on the Harassment Prevention and Bystander Intervention trainings that are at the heart of OPA's mission and are required by Illinois law and the City of Chicago Municipal Code. These trainings enhance employees' knowledge of the Park District's Sexual Harassment Prevention Policy, as well as the Equal Employment Opportunity Policy, with an emphasis on ensuring that employees know how and when to report misconduct to OPA.

OPA began its in-person training efforts by facilitating two in-person training sessions in February for year-round employees in the Department of Cultural and Natural Resources (DCNR). Doing these sessions in-person allowed DCNR employees – who do not regularly spend significant time in front of computers, due to the nature of their positions – the opportunity to complete the trainings in an interactive setting with ample opportunity for questions and discussion. Roughly 280 employees attended the February trainings.

Additionally, during the First Quarter, OPA began planning and preparing for the training of more than 2,000 seasonal employees slated to be hired for Summer 2026. As part of that, OPA has scheduled 12 in-person sessions to provide both Harassment Prevention and Bystander trainings to seasonal employees and interns in DCNR, Aquatics, Gymnastics, Wellness, Law, and Outdoor & Environmental Education. OPA also has been working with Workforce Development and Community Recreation on plans to provide a recorded version of both trainings for use the summer orientation for Day Camp and other employees at 18 locations across Chicago in June.

Additionally, OPA has worked with our training vendor to update and customize the online versions of the Harassment Prevention and Bystander Intervention trainings that will be rolled out to the rest of the year-round staff during the Second Quarter. Taken together, these training efforts are designed to keep the Park District in compliance with the legal requirements. But, even more importantly, these trainings are part of a concerted effort to ensure that the Park District takes all steps possible to protect employees, patrons and all park visitors from situation involving harassment, discrimination and sexual harassment/misconduct.

Also in the First Quarter, OPA's training efforts included a presentation to Park District leadership on confidentiality and the importance of safeguarding sensitive information related to

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

complaints, especially those involving sexual harassment, sexual assault and/or the abuse or neglect of children and vulnerable adults.

As part of ongoing work on collaboration, OPA also met separately during the First Quarter with the teams from Labor Relations and Crisis Support to exchange information regarding how our offices can better communicate and assist each other with our distinct but complementary missions.

Outreach, Policies and Best Practices

Throughout the First Quarter of 2026, OPA continued its efforts to ensure that the Park District's policies and procedures are up-to-date and consistent with best practices related to issues involving the safety, education and development of staff and patrons. This involves working closely with the Policy Director and Law Department to update and create policies, as well as to provide additional resources.

One of those resources was the creation of the Emergency & Crisis Procedures Checklist, which grew out of a meeting OPA attended with Area Managers in the South Region. Those Area Managers asked for a resource to provide to staff that would clearly and simply give them a checklist of steps required in emergency situations. Finalized in March 2026, the Emergency & Crisis Procedures Checklist enumerates which calls/steps are needed in a variety of emergency situations, from a patron injury to a violent incident to suspected abuse or neglect of a child or vulnerable adult.

Additional work in this area will continue in the Second Quarter, including: efforts to consolidate the Park District's incident reports into one comprehensive and user-friendly form; and planned revisions to the Guidelines for Protecting Minors and Vulnerable Adults to cover some additional concerns and respond to feedback from staff.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Complaints, Reports and Investigations

In the First Quarter of 2026, OPA received 137 complaints/inquiries.¹ In the First Quarter, OPA opened 19 investigations and closed 159 cases.² At the conclusion of the First Quarter, OPA had a total of 177 open investigations.³

Of the complaints/inquiries received in the First Quarter 2026, the most common complaints/inquiries received were: Discrimination (14), Harassment (11), Concerning Behavior Involving a Minor (10), Sexual Misconduct/Harassment (8), and Workplace Violence (5). The remaining complaints/inquiries were in less common categories, were determined to not fall under OPA's jurisdiction, or remain under investigation.

Of the 137 complaints/inquiries received in the First Quarter, OPA determined that 63 did not fall under OPA's jurisdiction or require investigation. These included: general complaints about staff rudeness or unprofessional behavior; flooding, playground maintenance and other infrastructure issues related to park property; safety concerns regarding conduct during swim classes/practices; questions related to Park District programming; an inquiry involving permits to DJ on a beach; complaints related to unhoused individuals on Park District property; and inquiries related to the hiring/employment process. In several instances, OPA conducted intake interviews with the complainants to determine how their concerns should most appropriately be addressed and shared that information as part of OPA's referral process. In several cases, OPA's initial review of the complaints determined that an investigation was not feasible or required; those matters were administratively closed.

In the First Quarter 2026, 14 cases were closed after the completion of formal investigations and/or the issuance of an OPA Summary Report. Below are summaries of those matters:

23-0202

An OPA investigation established that a former Monthly Natatorium Instructor (Subject) violated the Park District's Sexual Harassment Policy, Chapter 4 of the Park District Code (Code) and the

¹ The Q1 2026 total compares to: 89 received in Q1 2025, 123 received in Q2 2025, 263 received in Q3 2025, and 120 received in Q4 2025.

² In addition to the cases closed after investigation or referral, OPA conducted a thorough review of its open files during Q1 2026 and closed several matters that had been held open for monitoring and to ensure that any outstanding issues were resolved.

³ Complaints/inquiries submitted to OPA are initially logged as cases. After an initial review, a case is either opened as an investigation, referred to another department/agency or otherwise closed.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Park District's Code of Conduct by engaging in sexual misconduct involving a minor, sexual harassment, hazing, and unapproved dual employment. Additionally, Subject failed to provide truthful information during his compelled subject interview in violation of Chapter 4, Section A(4)(h) of the Code.

During its investigation, OPA also uncovered several other concerning allegations related to Subject's hiring, promotion, and prior investigative outcomes and recommendations. These matters were referred to the Park District's Office of Inspector General and therefore are not detailed in this report.

It is important to note that Subject's Park District employment was terminated in 2014 for a substantiated investigation regarding Subject abusing sick time and providing a falsified doctor's note. Despite terminating Subject as a result of this substantiated investigation, the Park District rehired Subject in October 2022 and promoted him to a supervisory position in September 2023. After being placed on emergency suspension due to OPA's investigation into allegations of sexual assault against a minor, Subject was terminated a second time in October 2024 and designated as "Disciplinary Do Not Rehire Permanent" for another, unrelated substantiated investigation.

RECOMMENDATION

Subject was terminated for causes unrelated to OPA's investigation while on emergency suspension and just days after his compelled administrative interview with OPA regarding the serious allegations summarized above. Had he not been terminated during the pendency of OPA's investigation, OPA would have issued a recommendation for termination of his Park District employment based on the information detailed in this Summary Report. As a result of its investigation and in accordance with the Park District's Ineligible for Rehire Policy, OPA strongly recommends that a permanent ineligible for rehire designation remain in Subject's personnel file.

INVESTIGATION

A. COMPLAINT

OPA received an email from a Park District employee (Witness 1) who stated that they received a report from another Park District employee (Complainant) who felt nervous to come forward due to fear of retaliation. According to Witness 1, Complainant "was pale, hands were fidgeting

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

and her eyes were full of tears” when she disclosed to Witness 1 that, when Complainant was 16 years old, Subject sexually assaulted her at a Park District beach.

According to Witness 1’s email, Complainant disclosed that on an unknown date in 2013 or 2014, Subject texted her to come to the beach house in the morning. “She had confided in him in personal things happening to her and he said it would be safe at the beach house. She said she was getting dressed and ... [Subject] locked the beach house and stood behind her. As he stood behind her he was touching her. He then proceeded and lifted her and placed her on a table near by [sic]. At this point she was in shock she said and no words were able to come out of her mouth. He continued to touch her all over and ‘went down on her’... And also mentioned he whispered ‘Bonita’ in her ear.”

Complainant informed Witness 1 that she found it difficult to report the incident to her manager at the time because the manager was Subject’s friend.

B. REVIEW OF PERSONNEL AND DISCIPLINARY FILES

According to Park District Records, Subject’s employment began in June 2002 and ended in November 2014. Subject was rehired in October 2022 and promoted to monthly natatorium instructor in September 2023. Subject was terminated and designated as “Disciplinary Do Not Rehire Permanent” in October 2024.

Subject’s personnel file did not contain any dual employment forms.

OPA requested Subject’s disciplinary file; however, Human Resources informed OPA “The Candle Factory does not have files for him.” Human Resources did provide OPA with the notes they had available related to Subject’s 2014 termination and 2015 hearing.

OPA reviewed records regarding a prior investigation against Subject for improper use of sick time and falsification of a medical note, which was substantiated. As a result, Subject was terminated in November 2014. The written decision from a December 2015 appeal hearing stated: “I find that the Chicago Park District has established by a preponderance of the evidence that [Subject] violated sections I(A), I(H) and VII(E) of the Chicago Park District’s Code of Conduct. Based on these findings, I recommend that the termination be affirmed.”

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

C. ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES (DCFS)

OPA contacted the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) in October 2023 to report the allegations it received against Subject for sexual assault of a minor. DCFS determined that it would not open an investigation because the alleged victim, who was a minor at the time, is now an adult. In November 2023, following OPA's interview with Complainant, OPA contacted DCFS a second time to provide them with additional details, which they recorded for informational purposes.

D. INTERVIEWS OF CURRENT AND FORMER EMPLOYEES

1. *Interview with Complainant*

During OPA's interview with Complainant, she stated that she began working for the Park District as a seasonal lifeguard when she was 16 years old. She reported to Subject who was an hourly natatorium instructor at the time. Complainant did not know how old Subject was at the time but stated that he was definitely an adult and she was sure that he was well over the age of 18. It was Complainant's first job, and she took pride in being professional and wanting to do her best.

Complainant informed OPA that everything was fine until the end of the summer. Subject texted Complainant and told her to come to work early the next day, which she did. She was surprised to see Subject because he never showed up to work that early before. When Complainant arrived, Subject was at the front desk and Complainant went to the locker room. She heard the latch close, and Subject walked over to her. He began touching her arms with his hands and then began touching her neck and face. Subject started removing Complainant's clothes, picked her up, and placed her on the table in the room.

Complainant said that everything started to get "fuzzy" for her and she froze. Subject began touching her body including her breasts and vagina with his hands and mouth. She informed OPA that for a very long time she was upset because she couldn't speak or stop what was happening. Complainant said she now realizes that what happened was sexual assault. Subject was wearing his uniform shorts and shirt, but he did remove his shirt at one point. Complainant recalled that Subject said the word "Bonita" over and over to her, and she can still hear his voice saying that to this day. Complainant was not sure how or why the incident ended; he just stopped, and she got dressed. They never discussed what happened; however, he would leave her

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

comments that said “Bonita” on Facebook and occasionally in-person and she felt it was his way of reminding her what happened. Complainant blocked Subject’s account on Facebook, and Subject then began following her on other social media platforms including Instagram and TikTok. Complainant has blocked Subject on all social media platforms that she has identified him on.

Complainant did not want to file a police report or relive the trauma through the court system.

Complainant said that she had not previously disclosed the details about what happened to her, but beginning in approximately March or April of 2023, Complainant did inform her former supervisor that Subject made her uncomfortable and said “something happened to me when I was 16, when he was in a supervisory role.” Complainant said she did not use the term sexual assault but did say Subject “touched me,” which was the first time she said that phrase out loud. The manager told Complainant “I’m sorry that happened and I will definitely keep an eye out for it.” At one point, the manager asked Complainant if this was something that she wanted to report and told her that she could. Complainant said that she was fine at the time. Complainant did not feel comfortable sharing any details because the manager was very good friends with Subject. Complainant confirmed to OPA that the manager was absolutely aware that the uncomfortable “touching” that Subject engaged in with Complainant occurred when she was 16 and Subject was an adult.

2. Interview with Witness 2

Witness 2 described to OPA having heard that Former Supervisor, Subject, and another former employee used to “prey on the girls.” Witness 2 referred to them as “The Trio.”

Witness 2 had never worked with Subject but got “bad vibes” about him. Subject was Former Supervisor’s “best friend,” and they were part of the group of Aquatics staff who hung out and drank alcohol at the beaches after work.

When Witness 2 was a seasonal employee at a Park District pool (Location 1) in approximately 2017 or 2018, Witness 2 and some other lifeguards were in the lifeguard office and the door was closed. A man suddenly kicked the door open. Witness 2 had no idea who he was but later learned that the man was Subject. Subject was wearing a plain white T-shirt; he was not wearing any item of clothing with the Park District logo on it. Former Supervisor was with Subject, and Former Supervisor was Witness 2’s boss at the time. Witness 2 had assumed that if he was with Former

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Supervisor, then Subject was supposed to be there. Witness 2 later learned that Subject was not a Park District employee at the time.

Subject walked into the room “very stern” and “big shouldered.” He asked the lifeguards what they were doing in there and yelled at them that there was only one lifeguard out on duty. Subject snatched the Aquatics board and had all of the lifeguards line up. One of the lifeguards had their cell phone on the lifeguard perch, which was not permitted, and Subject was yelling at him. Witness 2 did not know who the lifeguard was.

Witness 2 was confused, scared and had no idea what was going on. Former Supervisor was recording the whole thing on his cell phone, from the point when Subject had kicked the door in. On their way out, Former Supervisor was laughing. Again, Witness 2 was confused.

Later, when Witness 2 was assigned to another location, Witness 1 was Witness 2’s monthly instructor. Witness 1 told Witness 2 that someone was going to come in and coach their family members. It turned out to be Subject, which is how Witness 2 found out who Subject was. Witness 2 mentioned the Location 1 incident; Witness 1 had seen the video on Snapchat and said “that is so messed up.” Witness 2 learned that Former Supervisor had posted to his Snapchat account the video that he had recorded of Subject at Location 1 that day.

When Subject came in to coach his family, Witness 1 told Subject to apologize to Witness 2. Subject said to Witness 2, “[Witness 1] told me you were the one that we went to the park ...” and “I’m so sorry.” Subject said that he and Former Supervisor were best friends and they had thought the Location 1 incident was funny. Subject then took out his phone and showed Witness 2 a video of Former Supervisor sitting on a toilet. In the video, Former Supervisor stood up to try and stop Subject from recording him. Former Supervisor’s buttocks were nude and fully visible in the video. Witness 2 did not see any other naked part of Former Supervisor’s body.

Former Supervisor brought Subject onto Park District property and into a staff-only area without authorization. Witness 2 also learned that Former Supervisor and Subject had done the same thing to other lifeguards at other pool locations. According to Witness 2, no one gave Former Supervisor permission to video record them and no one gave Former Supervisor permission to post any video or images on Snapchat or social media. In 2023, Witness 2 brought the incident up to Former Supervisor, who remembered it. Former Supervisor told Witness 2 that it was a “seasonal test.” He then apologized to Witness 2.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

3. *Witness 3*

OPA conducted a phone interview of a former Park District employee (Witness 3), who stated that inappropriate behavior as prevalent within the Aquatics Department. It was part of the culture, not just isolated incidents, and Witness 3 explained: "It wasn't a one-person thing. That's just what it was. It was part of the culture. As a woman obviously you are going to feel more targeted." She added that inappropriate behaviors were normalized. She said both men and women observed these behaviors, but "so many people talked about things, but not once did they do anything to stop anything."

Witness 3 stated that some female employees tolerated or went along with such conduct in order to receive favorable treatment or easier schedules. She noted that older monthly instructors were somewhat more vigilant, but that many women in positions of leadership "would not step in at all."

Witness 3 informed OPA that she had a sexual relationship with Former Supervisor for most of the time she was an hourly natatorium instructor. Witness 3 was approximately 20 and stated that she did not recall how old Former Supervisor was at the time but stated: "He was way older than me." Former Supervisor was Witness 3's direct supervisor during their relationship. Their "sexual interactions" ended when Witness 3 was approximately 22 or 23. She ended it because it was "so messy." Witness 3 explained that she felt like other employees "harassed [her] indirectly" due to her relationship with Former Supervisor, because Former Supervisor was a supervisor and was married at the time.

Witness 3 said she was familiar with Subject through Former Supervisor, as they were friends. She said she never worked with Subject directly, but that Former Supervisor and others told her to be careful with him. Witness 3 recalled Former Supervisor telling her "Be careful with [Subject] because next thing you know he is going to get in your pants." She said Former Supervisor warned her that Subject drank heavily but could appear sober, saying "[Subject]'s my guy but if [Subject] ever gets a chance he will go for it. Don't take too many drinks because [Subject] can outdrink anyone. [Subject] will be totally sober and who's to say what could happen from there."

Witness 3 said she never saw Former Supervisor give favorable treatment to Subject, but she believed Former Supervisor's concerns about Subject's drinking were accurate. She said Subject never acted inappropriately toward her, but she described his "tactics" as concerning.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

4. Interview with Witness 4

Another Park District employee (Witness 4) was familiar with Subject and used to work with him outside of the Park District. Witness 4 described Subject as “cool” and said he had never done anything to make her feel uncomfortable.

Witness 4 does not really talk to Subject because she does not think he is funny. Witness 4 described Subject’s jokes as “recycled.” Subject and Former Supervisor are "good friends" and spend time together outside of work. Witness 4 knows this because Former Supervisor would tell her about his weekend, which included hanging out with Subject.

5. Interview with Witness 5

OPA conducted a compelled administrative subject interview of an Hourly Natatorium Instructor (Witness 5) for OPA Case #23-0253.⁴ Prior to the interview, OPA provided Witness 5 with an administrative rights form. Witness 5 reviewed and signed the form. Witness 5 was advised of his right to legal or union representation and signed the waiver of representation.

Witness 5 had heard that people were upset that Former Supervisor re-hired and promoted Subject to monthly natatorium instructor after Subject had been suspended and terminated.

Witness 5 worked with Subject when Subject was an hourly natatorium instructor. Witness 5 heard that Subject got fired because he provided a fake doctor’s note to the Park District and went to Paris. When asked who Witness 5 heard that from, he explained that Subject told him directly after he was terminated. When Subject returned to the Park District, Witness 5 only saw Subject in passing.

When asked if he has ever heard Subject make sexually inappropriate comments, Witness 5 said yes about patrons at the Park District as well as females at the bar. Witness 5 said they would joke around all the time. Witness 5 was unable to recall any specific examples; he explained that it was a really long time ago. Subject may have said something like “wow that girl is hot,” someone “has a nice butt,” or “you should go and talk to her.”

⁴ Witness 5 was a subject in OPA Case 23-0253, which was substantiated for sexual misconduct and other unethical behavior.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

6. *Interview with Former Supervisor*

On October 2, 2025, OPA interviewed Former Supervisor. His attorney was also present for the interview.⁵ Prior to the interview, OPA provided Former Supervisor and his attorney with an administrative rights form, which they reviewed and signed acknowledging that the interview was compelled. Former Supervisor provided the following information relevant to Subject:

a. Background

Former Supervisor began seasonal employment as a lifeguard with the Park District in 1998. He became a year-round lifeguard in May 2000. Former Supervisor was promoted to an hourly natatorium instructor in approximately January 2003 and received additional promotions after that.

b. Subject

Former Supervisor informed OPA that he used to be good friends with Subject, but they were no longer as close. Former Supervisor said they grew apart because they both have families and jobs. Additionally, Former Supervisor stated that he does not agree with some of Subject's behaviors. When asked to explain, Former Supervisor said that Subject makes "off-color" jokes about women, women have said they don't feel comfortable around him, and Subject has lied about several things including having cancer. Former Supervisor said that, in approximately 2022, Subject informed him that he had cancer, had to have surgery, and underwent radiation; however, Subject did not have a scar, and Former Supervisor did not believe him.

When asked to explain what knowledge Former Supervisor had about Subject making women feel uncomfortable, he said that a Park District employee had complained about Subject. The incident was reported to OPA, and Subject was emergency suspended.

When asked if Former Supervisor ever warned an individual to be careful with Subject because he would try to get into their pants, Former Supervisor said that he may have told people that Subject is the type of guy who tries to sleep with women. Former Supervisor denied ever having knowledge of Former Supervisor taking advantage of an individual who was intoxicated.

⁵ Former Supervisor was the subject of OPA case 24-0243, which was substantiated for sexual misconduct, hazing, and other unethical behavior.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

c. Location 1

When asked whether an incident ever occurred with him and Subject at Location 1, Former Supervisor said no. When asked if Former Supervisor ever witnessed Subject or any other individual access a staff only area on Park District property and question staff, Former Supervisor said he did not recall. Former Supervisor then said that he was made aware of Subject questioning staff, but he did not learn about the incident until after the fact. When asked why employees would inform OPA that they witnessed Former Supervisor being present and recording the incident, Former Supervisor said that he did not recall recording the incident. He did recall that he was swimming with Subject and Subject began questioning staff about policy and procedure because Subject was a former employee. Former Supervisor was unable to recall when this occurred but stated that it occurred after Subject's first round of employment with the Park District and before he was rehired. The interaction took place on the pool deck, which is not a staff only area. When asked if Former Supervisor has witnessed Subject enter a staff only area, Former Supervisor said "Probably. He knows a lot of employees."

Former Supervisor then informed OPA that he was made aware of an incident involving Subject kicking a door in and entering a staff only area, but Former Supervisor did not recall who informed him of the incident. Former Supervisor spoke with Subject and Subject admitted to the conduct. Former Supervisor did not recall exactly when he found out about the incident but said it may have been after the COVID-19 pandemic.

Former Supervisor confirmed that Subject did record Former Supervisor on the toilet while they were at Former Supervisor's home. Former Supervisor believed Subject posted the video on social media.

E. SUBJECT INTERVIEW OF SUBJECT

OPA conducted a compelled administrative subject interview of Subject on October 8, 2024. An SEIU representative was also present for the interview. Prior to the interview, OPA provided Subject and the SEIU representative with an administrative rights form, which they reviewed and signed acknowledging that the interview was compelled.

During the interview, Subject made several inconsistent statements and was reminded of his duty to cooperate.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Subject explained that he began working for the Chicago Park District in June 2002 as a seasonal lifeguard and was promoted to a year-round lifeguard in 2005. In approximately 2008 or 2009, Subject was promoted to an hourly natatorium instructor, and he held the position until 2014 when his Park District employment ended. When asked why his employment ended in 2014, Subject said "We were having a child. I was a stay-at-home dad." When asked if there were any other reasons that his employment ended including if he was under investigation, Subject said "no other reason."

Subject stated that he held secondary employment with the City of Chicago as a full-time Laborer. Subject had held this position since May 2023. Subject stated that he worked 80 hours per pay period as a Laborer and also works 80 hours per pay period for the Park District. Subject did not complete a secondary employment form for the Park District but did complete one for the City of Chicago. When asked why, Subject said he believed he only needed to have one form on file.

When asked if Subject has ever been disciplined for his conduct he said yes. Subject explained that in 2013, a female employee filed a report against him and said that he choked her on the pool deck. Subject was on an unpaid suspension and a corrective action meeting was held. Eventually, the then Assistant Director of Recreation called him and told him that he could return to work. Subject believed there were cameras on the pool deck that helped Human Resources determine that the allegation against him was false.

When Subject was questioned about his current emergency suspension and the conversations that took place leading up to the suspension, Subject informed OPA that Former Supervisor had called him and informed him that Complainant had filed a complaint against Subject but that Complainant had only stated that he made her feel uncomfortable. Former Supervisor informed Subject that Complainant had been asked by Beaches and Pools management three different times, but she refused to provide details about what occurred. Additionally, Former Supervisor informed Subject that he asked Witness 1 to speak with Complainant.

Subject described his relationship with Complainant as "pleasant" and said that he never had any issues with her. Subject denied ever engaging in or attempting to engage in any sexual conduct with Complainant and acknowledged that he knew Complainant was a minor in high school when she reported to him, and he was approximately 22 years old. Subject said that Complainant had a lot going on in her personal life and he tried to be there for her as a friend. Subject said one day Complainant was crying hard at work because of her home life. Subject stated, "I remember

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

this because I have never seen anyone crying or balling like this.” When asked if Subject contacted DCFS or reported his concerns about Complainant’s home life since she was a minor, Subject said no. Subject said Complainant did not want him to tell anyone. Subject denied ever asking Complainant to arrive to work early and said that he offered for her to come to work early if she needed to be out of her house. Subject denied ever being alone with Complainant.

Subject also denied ever engaging in any sexual activity with any district employee as well as engaging in sexual activity on Park District property with any individual.

When asked whether an incident had occurred at Location 1, Subject first denied any involvement or knowledge of the incident. When asked if video evidence would show otherwise, Subject informed OPA that he had gone around to different parks and “playfully kicked in a door” and questioned staff in approximately 2017 or 2018, after he was terminated from Park District employment and before he was rehired. After kicking in the door, Subject made the guards line up and asked them a series of questions. Subject said he was bored and thought it was funny. Subject did not recall Former Supervisor being present but said it was possible. Subject denied that anyone encouraged him to engage in the conduct. Subject admitted that the conduct was inappropriate and against Park District policy.

CONCLUSION

Complainant provided a detailed and credible account of the sexual assault she experienced while a minor. The information provided by Complainant and the other witnesses interviewed by OPA all painted a consistent picture of Subject as an individual who repeatedly violated Park District policy, the Code and the Code of Conduct by engaging in sexual misconduct, sexual harassment, hazing, and unapproved dual employment. Additionally, Subject was repeatedly not truthful during his compelled interview with OPA, despite being reminded of his duty to cooperate.

For these reasons, OPA strongly recommends that a permanent ineligible for rehire designation remain in Subject’s personnel file.

25-0104

OPA received a complaint from an employee (Complainant) who alleged they were harassed by a member of management (Subject) based on race, ethnicity and/or age.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

During interviews with OPA, Complainant related they were invited to a Park District event recognizing outstanding employees. Complainant stated that Subject mentioned not knowing any talented Latino employees. No one else was present for this discussion.

Complainant also described Subject as a “bully.” Complainant gave examples of how Subject treated another employee better than Complainant. Complainant said the other employee was the same race and gender as Complainant, and then said “maybe” Subject’s behavior was because of Complainant’s age. Complainant, however, failed to articulate any relevant conduct.

Complainant further alleged that Subject retaliated against Complainant by preventing Complainant from working from home while another employee, who had been injured, was allowed to work from home. According to Park District records, the other employee in question identified as the same race and/or ethnicity as Complainant and was older than Complainant.

Additionally, Complainant stated that they feared for their safety because Subject was not “compassionate” and one now-former employee said Subject was aggressive. Subject never said or did anything threatening or aggressive to Complainant or in front of Complainant.

OPA’s investigation found that Complainant failed to articulate any conduct that met the legal definition of harassment or discrimination; the reported conduct also did not constitute retaliation under Chapter 4 of the Park District Code. Furthermore, no actual examples of threatening behavior were reported.

For these reasons, OPA found insufficient evidence to support the allegations and closed the matter as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**.

25-0133

OPA received a complaint from a Park District employee (Complainant), who alleged they were experiencing religious bias and insensitivity from a supervisory employee (Subject).

On one occasion, Complainant stated they were quietly praying at their desk when Subject approached and interrupted the prayer. Complainant stated that they acknowledged Subject’s presence but did not stop praying immediately. Complainant said Subject’s decision to interrupt Complainant’s prayers was a sign of disrespect. Complainant further said that Subject remarked that every time Subject tries to speak to Complainant, Complainant is always praying. Complainant described Subject’s actions as dismissive of Complainant’s religious practice.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Separately, Subject reached out to Labor Relations staff to report that the religious messaging posted near Complainant's desk appeared to be targeted toward Subject. Labor Relations staff reviewed the situation and explained to Subject that the quotes were passages from the Bible.

OPA's investigation found that both complaints stemmed from ongoing workplace issues involving Complainant and Subject that were later addressed. OPA also found additional concerns alleged by Complainant did not fall under OPA's purview and were referred to Human Resources to be addressed.

For these reasons, OPA closed this investigation as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**.

25-0178

OPA received a complaint from a Park Supervisor of Recreation (Supervisor), who alleged several staff members were making false statements about Supervisor in retaliation for changes Supervisor was making within the park.

OPA conducted several interviews to gather additional information related to the allegations. Based on the facts gathered, OPA found that the situations described appeared to be personality conflicts exacerbated by workplace gossip.

Supervisor was later relocated to another park. Additionally, Park District management stepped in to address the personality conflicts in an attempt to create a welcoming and inclusive work environment at the park.

For these reasons, OPA closed this case as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**.

25-0183

OPA received a complaint from an individual (Anonymous), who alleged that a playground supervisor (Supervisor) had sexual relationships with female employees, gave those female employees preferential treatment, acted maliciously towards other employees via the disciplinary process, and recruited teenage girls to work at the park location. Anonymous provided the name of Supervisor and the relevant park location but declined to provide their contact information, employee/witness names, dates, examples, or any other crucial information. OPA conducted an investigation based on the limited information available.

Park District records showed that, at the time Anonymous made the complaint, Supervisor had not worked at the relevant location for nearly three months. Supervisor had no disciplinary records relevant to the allegations.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

During an interview with OPA, an employee who had worked with Supervisor at the relevant location described Supervisor as “professional.” Supervisor had never said or done anything inappropriate and the employee was not aware of – and had not even heard any rumors of – Supervisor having sexual or romantic relationships with any employees. Supervisor issued discipline fairly and did not favor any employees. In 2025, the employee said there was one situation in which another employee was upset because Supervisor had disciplined them.

During an interview with OPA, the relevant area manager related that they had never received any complaints or concerns about any supervisor, including Supervisor specifically, at the relevant location. Specifically, the area manager was unaware of even rumors of a supervisor at the relevant location ever having sexual or romantic relationships with employees or giving any employee preferential treatment.

Because OPA’s initial investigative steps failed to reveal any information or leads regarding Anonymous’ allegations and because Anonymous failed to provide pertinent details, OPA has closed the matter as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**. If additional information should become available in the future, OPA can reopen the matter.

25-0388

OPA received a complaint from a Laborer (Complainant), who alleged they were being harassed by a supervisory employee (Subject) by being forced to transfer to a different location.

OPA interviewed Complainant, who stated that Subject informed them that the Park District was in the process of conducting transfers and that there was a spot open for Complainant at a different location. Complainant stated Subject told Complainant to prepare to go to the other location because there were people injured and Subject needed someone to do a few different jobs there.

Complainant failed to provide any information or documentation that would support a claim of harassment. Complainant also failed to show that Subject’s decisions were not based on operational needs. Complainant ultimately was not transferred due to seniority.

OPA found no evidence to show that Complainant was harassed by Subject and, therefore, closed this matter as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

25-0429

During the course of an unrelated investigation, OPA became aware of an allegation that an employee was harassed based on gender identity.

Specifically, a Park District recreation leader (Recreation Leader 1) related to an OPA investigator that another recreation leader (Recreation Leader 2) said that a seasonal attendant (Subject) had called Recreation Leader 2 “boy.” According to Recreation Leader 1, Recreation Leader 2 was upset and crying.

OPA interviewed the Park Supervisor of Recreation (Supervisor), who related that there were multiple employee and seasonal employee witnesses, who provided Supervisor with oral statements. According to what the employee witnesses relayed to Supervisor, Subject and Recreation Leader 2 had a disagreement and Recreation Leader 2 called Subject a “bitch.” Subject said to Recreation Leader 2 “boy stop” and “boy get outta my face.” Supervisor heard yelling. Not long after, Subject appeared and told Supervisor that Recreation Leader 2 was yelling and disrespecting/insulting him.

OPA also interviewed another seasonal attendant (Seasonal Attendant) who was present during the incident. Seasonal Attendant related to OPA that Subject often used the slang phrase “boy/girl stop” and that it was not gender specific.

According to the employee witnesses, Subject’s comments were slang and were not gender-based; the gender was not intentional or personal. Subject told Supervisor they had said “boy,” it was slang, and they did not intend it in any way based on gender.

There had been on-going concerns about Recreation Leader 2’s professionalism and inappropriate conduct, including yelling, using curse words, and engaging in verbal arguments with employees while patrons and minors were present. Prior to this incident, Supervisor had submitted several written narratives to Recreation Leader 2’s direct supervisor. Supervisor also sent a narrative about the incident with Subject.

Based on the foregoing, OPA found that Subject’s comments did not meet the legal definition of harassment based on gender identity. Moreover, Supervisor handled the situation appropriately given the evidence. OPA has closed the matter as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

25-0439

OPA received a complaint from a job applicant (Complainant) who alleged unfair hiring practices based on race due to the Park District's withdrawal of a job offer.

Complainant applied for the position and was contacted to participate in an in-person interview. After the interview, Complainant was extended an offer to fill the role. Complainant described being contacted via email and instructed to complete required paperwork for onboarding purposes, including a background check and drug testing.

Complainant, however, stated the Park District rescinded the offer of employment and cited a discrepancy in the work history document Complainant provided. The Park District said it did not align with the official version issued by Complainant's former employer.

OPA reviewed the candidate's resume as well as the document received from the candidate's former employer and noted the dates did not align.

As the offer of employment extended to Complainant was conditional, OPA found that the Park District was within its rights to rescind the offer as long as its reason was not discriminatory. OPA found no substantial, credible, and corroborated testimonial or documented evidence to show Complainant was discriminated against based on race or any protected category, in violation of any Chicago Park District policies.

OPA found Complainant appeared in person for the interview and the interviewers would have known Complainant's race at the time of the in-person interview and the subsequent job offer. The facts of the situation did not support an allegation that the Park District's rescinding of the offer was motivated by animus towards the Complainant based on their race.

This investigation was, therefore, closed as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**.

25-0443

OPA conducted an investigation into a complaint from a Park District patron (Patron), who alleged that a Park District employee (Employee) harassed them based on race and made them feel unsafe.

Based on OPA's review of documents and pictures, as well as interviews, OPA determined Employee did not engage in behavior that met the legal definition of harassment based on race or any other protected category or any acts of workplace violence.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Instead, OPA found that Patron was violating multiple Park District rules and threatening and antagonizing Employee and other Park District employees, which the park supervisor, using relevant resources, has been addressing.

OPA, therefore, has closed the matter as **UNSUBSTANTIATED** and deferred the matter to Community Recreation to handle as it deems appropriate.

25-0446

An OPA investigation found insufficient evidence to support allegations that a Seasonal Attendant (Subject) engaged in acts of sexual harassment and workplace violence against another employee (Complainant).

OPA received a report that Subject repeatedly asked out Complainant romantically, followed Complainant around work, ignored Complainant's requests for Subject not to speak to Complainant, would physically block Complainant's path, and told Complainant he felt he wanted to hit her. Based on the seriousness of the allegations made during OPA's interviews of the Complainant and the reporting supervisor, OPA initially recommended Human Resources (HR) take immediate action. On September 22, 2025, HR terminated Subject's seasonal Park District employment.

Because OPA found insufficient evidence to support the allegations, OPA now recommends that Subject be eligible for future employment.

INVESTIGATION OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

A. REVIEW OF PARK DISTRICT RECORDS

According to OPA's review of Park District records, neither Subject nor Complaint had any disciplinary records and both were in compliance with the relevant mandatory training. Subject worked as a seasonal attendant in 2024 and 2025 and as a seasonal recreation leader in 2016. Complainant worked as a seasonal employee in 2023 and became a year-round employee in 2024.

B. REPORT FROM AND INTERVIEW OF SUPERVISOR

OPA received a report from the Park Supervisor of Recreation (Supervisor) relating that Complainant told Supervisor that Subject was acting inappropriately and Complainant had told Subject that "his advances were not welcomed." Supervisor related that she then met with both

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

parties to mediate the situation. Supervisor discussed harassment and sexual harassment with Subject, who said his behavior was not intentional and he would no longer speak to Complainant. Complainant told Supervisor that Subject was not being truthful.

On the same day, during an interview with OPA, Supervisor related the following:

Supervisor consistently relayed the details in her written report, noting that Complainant was “visibly uncomfortable and frustrated.” Additionally, Supervisor noticed that Subject did not seem to fully understand how his behavior was harassment, noting that he never contacted Complainant outside of work. Following the meeting, Supervisor did check-ins with Complainant and there had been no other reported incidents or issues between Complainant and Subject.

Supervisor never had any issues or concerns regarding Subject nor had she ever received any complaints about Subject or his behavior.

C. INTAKE INTERVIEW OF COMPLAINANT

During an initial intake interview with OPA, Complainant related the following, in summary:

Complainant met Subject in Summer 2024 when they both worked at the same park. They became close friends, they would give each other side hugs, which Complainant was fine with, and she gave Subject her phone number as “friends.” At some point, Subject said he was interested in a romantic relationship with Complainant and would “flirt” with her, such as complimenting her shoes and saying she was “beautiful.” Subject said Complainant should be “his girl.” Subject would step in front of Complainant in a “playful aggressive manner.” Complainant repeatedly told Subject that she wasn’t interested in a relationship and that they were just friends. At one point, she stopped hugging Subject, and he would comment that she used to hug him.

In 2025, Complainant and Subject talked about the prior season and Subject said he didn’t understand why Complainant wouldn’t give him a chance (romantically) and said he thought Complainant would give into him. Complainant started to ignore Subject at work but Subject kept trying to talk to Complainant. Complainant would ask what he had to do for her to forgive him, offering to buy her lunch and a teddy bear. Complainant told Subject not to talk to her. Subject said there was just something about Complainant; he couldn’t not talk to her. Subject started standing in front of Complainant to block her path and talk. One time, he stood in the doorway of a supply closet Complainant was in, touched her arm, and wouldn’t let her out.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Subject would physically touch her arm to get her attention, and he would follow Complainant around the field house while she was trying to work. Complainant would reroute or make excuses to avoid Subject.

On approximately four occasions, Subject told Complainant that he sometimes felt aggressive towards her and he wanted to hit Complainant. Subject then said he was kidding and he would never do that.

Subject did not text, call or otherwise contact Complainant between the end of Season 2024 and Season 2025 nor did he ever say or text her anything of a sexual nature.

D. INTERVIEW OF SEASONAL EMPLOYEE

During an interview with OPA, Seasonal Employee related the following, in summary:

Seasonal Employee had worked with Subject and Complainant during the 2024 and 2025 seasons. During both seasons, Seasonal Employee was partnered with Subject and therefore spent the majority of his working hours with Subject.

In 2024, Subject and Complainant were always together, talking and joking around. Seasonal Employee thought Complainant was flirtatious with Subject. In 2025, interactions between Subject and Complainant changed; they weren't always together or talking like they did in 2024.

Subject never talked to Seasonal Employee about Complainant. Specifically, Subject never indicated to Seasonal Employee that he was romantically interested in Complainant. Seasonal Employee never saw Subject physically block Complainant's path or step in front of her nor did he ever hear Subject say anything inappropriate or sexual to or about Complainant. Seasonal Employee never noticed Complainant avoiding Subject.

E. INTERVIEW OF EMPLOYEE 1

During an interview with OPA, Employee 1 related the following, in summary:

Employee 1 worked with Subject and Complainant in 2024 and 2025, although Employee 1 had more interactions with Subject. In 2024, Employee 1 always saw Subject and Complainant together and Employee 1 thought they were dating. Employee 1 worked on Sundays with Subject; Complainant did not work on Sundays. However, when Employee 1 would tell Subject it was

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

time to close up, Complainant would be with Subject and had been there with Subject during his shift.

Employee 1 never saw or heard Subject act inappropriately with Complainant nor had Subject or Complainant talked to Employee 1 about the other. Employee 1 had no concerns or complaints about Subject.

F. INTERVIEW OF EMPLOYEE 2

During an interview with OPA, Employee 2 related the following, in summary:

Employee 2 worked more closely with Complainant than Subject. Employee 2 never saw Subject bothering Complainant or physically blocking or stepping in front of Complainant. Complainant never said anything about Subject to Employee 2. Complainant never appeared to be avoiding Subject. Employee 2 noticed that in 2025, Complainant and Subject did not seem to be as close as they were in 2024, when Employee 2 witnessed Complainant and Subject talk and joke around like friends, or possibly more. Employee 2 was not aware of any concerns or complaints of any kind about either Complainant or Subject.

G. INTERVIEW OF SUBJECT

During an interview with OPA, Subject was represented by Krystyna Rozwadowski of SEIU Local 73. Subject related the following, in summary:

Subject confirmed his employment history with the Park District and his close friendship with Complainant in Summer 2024.

In September 2025, Supervisor had a meeting with Subject and Complainant. Complainant was “chuckling” and making a face. Complainant told Subject she did not want him coming to talk to her. Subject said it would be the last day he talked to Complainant. Supervisor never told Subject she was going to report him; only if Complainant complained again.

Subject was “so shocked.” Subject had not walked up to Complainant “in weeks.” The first time he did, it was because of a situation with a recreation leader. The recreation leader had found an object belonging to a member of management and Subject wanted to return the object. The recreation leader asked if the object was valuable, and she and Subject got into an argument about returning it to the manager. The recreation leader called Subject out of his name, physically pushed him, and tried to grab the item from Subject. Complainant was present and was “egging”

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

the recreation leader on. Since that time, Complainant had not talked to Subject, not even for work-related matters, such as retrieving a minor participant for pick-up. Subject told Complainant that her behavior was “unprofessional.”

Subject believed he was interviewing with OPA because of the situation with the recreation leader and thought none of it would have happened if he had given the object back to the recreation leader.

Subject did not remember telling Complainant he wanted to date her and Complainant never said she wasn’t interested in dating Subject. Complainant never told Subject they were just friends nor did she need to because “we were only friends; we were just close friends.”

When asked if he ever asked Complainant to hang out outside of work, Subject explained that in Summer 2024, Complainant would come to the park on Sundays. They would talk and play games and Complainant would stay until closing.

Subject never bought Complainant anything; he never bought/gave Complainant a teddy bear or lunch nor did he ever ask Complainant if she would forgive him if he bought her a teddy bear, lunch, or anything else. In 2024, Complainant gave Subject a teddy bear and a card when one of his parents passed away. Subject felt Complainant’s gift was given as a friend who had “strong feelings” for someone. In 2025, Complainant bought Subject lunch.

Subject denied he told Complainant she should be his girl nor had he ever said he thought she would “give in” to him (date him).

Complainant never told Subject not to talk to her. The two times Subject approached Complainant, she did not say anything. Both times were after the situation with the recreation leader. The two times Subject approached Complainant, it was “only a couple of words – I have never touched her or blocked her off from walking away.” Subject denied following Complainant around work.

Subject did not recall ever speaking to Complainant while Complainant was in a supply closet nor did he recall ever standing in the doorway of a supply closet or otherwise blocking Complainant from leaving a supply closet.

Complainant never made Subject feel upset or angry nor did he ever feel aggressive or frustrated towards Complainant. Subject never told Complainant that she made him feel aggressive or that

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

he wanted to hit her. Complainant once hit Subject on the back of his head in front of Supervisor and no one said anything.

Subject had never been in trouble before and he had never been accused of sexual harassment before. Subject was “still in shock” that this happened. Subject grew up in the Park District and working for the Park District was extremely important to Subject.

H. SECOND INTERVIEW OF COMPLAINANT

During a subsequent interview with OPA, Complainant related the following in summary:

In 2025, on approximately two or three occasions, Subject tried to talk to Complainant and told Complainant she was being unprofessional; Complainant ignored him. She ignored Subject because of their interactions in 2024.

Complainant noted she previously told OPA that there were no romantic text messages between her and Subject but there were. Subject sent Complainant a text in 2024 saying “I’m not gonna lie I really like you I think you’re mad cool – give me a chance.” Complainant texted back that she thought Subject was “cool” but she didn’t want to be in a relationship and she didn’t want to date a coworker. She did not have the messages.

In 2024, Subject “flirted with” Complainant by telling her, “You look good today” and complimented her outfit and shoes. Subject was “smirking” and was “playful.” He said “I can’t leave you alone” and “[there’s] something about you.”

Complainant admitted that in 2024, she went to the park on Sundays to see Subject on approximately two occasions and stayed for an hour or so, until his shift ended. Complainant denied she went to the park every Sunday to see Subject.

At the end of Summer 2024, Complainant gave Subject a stuffed animal and a card because he had a death in the family. Complainant once bought colleagues, including Subject, lunch. Complainant didn’t buy or give Subject any other gifts nor had Subject ever given her any gifts.

In 2024, Complainant reached out to Subject while he was on leave and Subject did not respond. When Subject returned from leave, Complainant tried to speak to Subject but he was distant. Not long after, Subject brought up their relationship for the third time, saying “I don’t understand why you won’t give me a chance.” Around the same time, Subject made “little jokes” saying Complainant was “difficult,” “a lot to handle,” and her attitude was “out of control.”

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Complainant admitted she put her hands on Subject. They would play around and hit each other, such as on the back, and nudge each other with their arms. Complainant admitted she hit Subject on the back of his neck - not on the back of his head - after he had smacked her on the hand and back; they were playing around with each other. Subject “playfully” told Complainant he sometimes wanted to smack or hit her. All of this behavior was while Subject and Complainant were working.

In 2025, Subject called Complainant “evil” and “rude” when she told him not to touch her stuff. Subject asked why he used to be able to touch her stuff but now he wasn’t, and Complainant told him she was a different person in 2025 than in 2024.

Complainant confirmed she was present during the argument between the recreation leader and Subject.

Complainant had no animosity towards Subject and did not think he should have been “reported;” she just didn’t want to work with him.

ANALYSIS

OPA found insufficient evidence to support the allegation that Subject created an intimidating, hostile or offensive working environment, that his conduct substantially interfered with Complainant’s work performance, or that he otherwise violated the Sexual Harassment Prevention Policy. Further, OPA found no evidence that Subject threatened Complainant or created a reasonable fear of injury in violation of the Violence in the Workplace Policy.

Both Complainant and Subject related, and employee witnesses corroborated, that Complainant and Subject had a close personal relationship and would often talk and joke around with each other, including “hitting” or otherwise putting their hands on each other. OPA found no corroborating evidence that Subject said he wanted to hit Complainant, and if he did say such, per Complainant’s own testimony, it was a playful if inappropriate jest by Subject, consistent with Complainant and Subject’s mutually flirtatious interactions in 2024.

Furthermore, other employees also engaged in similar behavior, calling each other out of their names and grabbing at and physically touching each other both in play and during personal arguments. The testimonies by all employees painted a picture of immature and unprofessional

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

conduct by Subject, Complainant, and other employees that appeared to have continued unchecked.

Therefore, OPA recommends that HR remove any designations from Subject's employment records that would designate him as being ineligible for rehire. Finally, OPA recommends that HR and/or Community Recreation take any other actions deemed appropriate – including additional coaching, training, support and/or employee location transfers – to address the reported unprofessional employee behavior.

OPA is closing this matter as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**.

25-0467

An OPA investigation established that a Park District employee (Subject) violated Chapter 4, Section A(4)(a) of the Park District Code by engaging in sexual misconduct with a minor. The Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) indicated multiple findings against Subject for "9-Sexual Penetration and 22b-Substantial Risk of Sexual Abuse - Sibling of sex abuse victim." As a result of these findings, Subject has been placed on the DCFS Illinois State Central Register for 50 years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

OPA recommends termination of Subject's Chicago Park District employment and that the Park District place a permanent Ineligible for Rehire designation in Subject's personnel file.

INVESTIGATION OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

A. CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT EMPLOYMENT

Subject began employment with the Park District in 2022. On September 29, 2025, in response to an OPA request, Park District Human Resources informed OPA that Subject did not have a disciplinary record. Human Resources also provided what appeared to be an excerpt from a spreadsheet indicating that Subject had a hit on their background check for "AGGRAVATED DISCHARGE OF FIRARM." On the same date, OPA requested the official background check report from Human Resources. To date, OPA has not received any additional documentation related to the background check or the determination process to proceed with hiring Subject.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

B. EMERGENCY SUSPENSION

On September 26, 2025, at OPA's recommendation, Subject was placed on emergency suspension.

While Subject's position did not require regular contact with minors as part of their job, OPA's recommendation was made out of an abundance of caution due to the serious nature of these allegations. In addition to barring Subject from Park District property, OPA also recommend that they be directed not to have contact with any Park District employees or Park District participants/patrons.

To date, Subject remains on emergency suspension.

C. CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT

On January 30, 2026, OPA sent a FOIA request to the Chicago Police Department for a copy of any and all original, supplemental, arrest records and felony file for the case.

On February 5, 2026, the Chicago Police Department provided four responsive documents, which were largely redacted. The documents confirmed that Subject was the named offender and had been under investigation for "720 ILCS 5.0/11-1.40-A-1 PRED CRIM SEX ASLT/VICTIM <13."

The reports indicate that at the time of Subject's arrest on September 23, 2025, the victim was 16 years old. The reports also indicate that a forensic interview was conducted at the Chicago Children's Advocacy Center, the minor victim made a disclosure of criminal sexual abuse which occurred "on multiple occasions" between the dates of June 29, 2009, and June 28, 2022, while Subject was over the age of 17 years old and while the victim was under the age of 13 years old. The report listed weapons used as "hands" and "penis."

According to the report, at the time of their arrest, Subject was read his Miranda Rights. Subject stated that they understood their rights and invoked their right not to speak.

On the same date, the Assistant State's Attorney (ASA) issued a Continued Investigation. According to the report, the ASA wanted another individual(s) to participate in forensic interviews. The ASA also requested LEADS to see if Subject was previously arrested for similar charges in another state. The LEADS results did not indicate any similar arrests had occurred out-of-state. Additionally, the guardian of the additional individual(s) did not consent to their participation in a forensic interview.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

After reviewing the facts of the case, the ASA rejected felony charges for Predatory Criminal Sexual Assault due to “no corroboration on 25-SEP-2025 at 1457hrs.” The report states that the assigned detective “does not concur.” The assigned detective requested for the case to be considered “CLEAR CLOSED, OTHER EXCEPTIONS: Cook County State's Attorney's Office denied charges. Prosecution declined for reasons other than lack of probable cause.”

A. ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

On September 26, 2025, OPA spoke with the assigned DCFS regarding the DCFS case against Subject.

The DCFS investigator informed OPA that the victim’s family reported the allegations to the Chicago Police Department and a Special Investigations Unit Detective was assigned to the investigation.

According to the DCFS investigator, to the best of their knowledge, the alleged victims were familial only. Interviews, including a forensic interview, had been conducted to understand the scope of the abuse and no minors were known to be connected to the Park District.

As a result of the disclosure made by the minor victim during the forensic interview, the detective determined that an arrest should be made. Ultimately, the Assistant State’s Attorney decided not to move forward due to the delayed outcry and lack of additional evidence.

DCFS informed OPA that DCFS found the allegations to be credible, and that it was their belief that placing Subject on emergency suspension, even if Subject does not regularly interact with youth, would be the safest option. DCFS stated that their investigation was still open and ongoing, and they requested that OPA refrain from conducting interviews. DCFS agreed to provide OPA with an update once the case had closed.

From October 2025 until February 11, 2026, OPA was unable to reach the assigned DCFS investigator, or any other DCFS employee with information related to the case, by phone or email. OPA attempted to identify and contact an alternate individual who could provide an update on the DCFS investigation. On January 30, 2026, OPA sent a FOIA request to the Chicago Police Department for case reports. OPA received responsive redacted documents on February 5, 2026. The reports stated that DCFS had made an “indicated” finding against Subject.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

On February 11, 2026, OPA spoke with the assigned DCFS investigator's supervisor, a DCFS Public Service Administrator.⁶ The DCFS Public Service Administrator informed OPA by phone and later in writing that DCFS had made indicated findings against Subject for "9-Sexual Penetration and 22b-Substantial Risk of Sexual Abuse - Sibling of sex abuse victim."

Additionally, in a follow up email to OPA, DCFS reiterated "on October 7th [Subject] was informed by the investigator that the case would be INDICATED and discussed with [Subject] [their] right to appeal. [Subject] was mailed a final finding letter from Springfield on October 13th. As of today, DCFS has not received any request from [Subject] appeal that decision."

DCFS provided OPA with a copy of the DCFS final finding letter.

Based on the indicated findings, Subject will remain on the DCFS Illinois State Central Register for 50 years.⁷

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

On January 21, 2026, OPA spoke with an attorney, whose information was provided by Subject to Park District Human Resources. During OPA's phone call with the attorney, who stated that they were not representing Subject in the administrative investigation being conducted by the Park District. In a follow-up email on the same date, the attorney informed OPA "[w]e are not at liberty to discuss the DCFS case with you. With respect to any law enforcement investigations, there are no pending criminal charges against my client."

On January 30, 2026, OPA contacted Subject in an attempt to schedule an administrative subject interview. Subject was informed that they had the right to a legal representative or union representative. OPA explained that they had contacted the attorney and had been informed that Subject was not currently being represented in the administrative investigation. Subject began attempting to provide information related to the allegations at which time OPA informed Subject that they would discuss the allegations and outcomes during their interview. Subject stated that they were not familiar with OPA and that they would be unable to answer questions because there were no outcomes.

⁶ During the conversation, OPA was informed that the assigned DCFS investigator had been out of the office since shortly after they spoke to OPA in October 2025 and was out until further notice.

⁷ It should be noted that DCFS indicated findings result in an individual being listed on the DCFS Illinois State Central Register for a timeframe of 5 to 50 years depending on the particular findings.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

During the phone call, Subject was offered the opportunity to provide OPA with a copy of the DCFS letter or any documentation showing that the DCFS case had been unfounded. Subject stated that the case was still open and ongoing, so they were unable to provide any documentation. Subject also stated that they had never discussed findings or the potential of findings with anyone from DCFS, but that their criminal case was “thrown out” because they proved “everything was a lie.”

CONCLUSION

As a result of the evidence detailed above, OPA is closing this case as **SUBSTANTIATED**.

OPA recommends termination of Subject’s Chicago Park District employment and that the Park District place a permanent Ineligible for Rehire designation in Subject’s personnel file.

25-0524

OPA received a complaint from a Laborer (Complainant) who described being made to feel uncomfortable by a co-worker (Subject). Complainant reported the incident to management. After that report, management took steps to minimize contact between Complainant and Subject.

Every time Complainant would ask a question or try to have a discussion, Subject would get physically close to Complainant, making Complainant feel very uncomfortable. Complainant told Subject numerous times to move back and get out of Complainant’s personal space. Complainant stated Subject did not take Complainant’s request seriously.

OPA opened an investigation and reached out to Complainant to conduct a follow-up interview. At that time, Complainant stated that, since Subject’s conduct was reported to OPA and management, there were no further incidents.

Complainant stated that management handled the situation effectively, and the two of them have not been riding in the same vehicle. Complainant further stated that the two have been working together and it has been professional.

Because the matter was resolved by management’s efforts, OPA is closing its investigation as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

25-0558

OPA received a complaint from a floriculturist (Complainant) that a managerial employee (Subject) had falsely accused a colleague (Employee) of stealing plants based on Employee's ethnicity.

OPA conducted an interview of Employee, whose account of the incident was factually consistent with Complaint's report to OPA. Employee related to OPA that while they were distraught over being accused of stealing, they directly discussed the matter with Subject. Employee had followed proper procedure for providing volunteers with unused plants meant for composting and had permission to do so. Employee said they believed that the incident was an example of ongoing concerns about Subject's management style and that the accusation was not because of Employee's race, ethnicity, or gender.

Employee further related that they believed that Subject favored some employees over others based on personal preference and denied that the favoritism and management style concerns were based on race, ethnicity, gender or any other protected category.

OPA, therefore, found no evidence that the incident met the legal definition of harassment or discrimination and has closed the matter as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**.

25-0570

An OPA investigation found insufficient evidence to support the allegations of sexual and physical assault made against a Park District employee (Subject).

RECOMMENDATION

OPA's investigation found insufficient evidence to support the allegations made against Subject. Because there is no actionable finding, OPA recommends no disciplinary or personnel action for Subject.

COMPLAINT AND EMERGENCY SUSPENSION

The Park District's Office of the Inspector General received a call from a woman (Complainant), who reported that she was raped and assaulted by Subject on November 28, 2025. Complainant stated that she had been living with Subject for two months after entering a relationship with

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

him. She said on November 28th, Subject's colleague (Witness 1), came to Subject's apartment and witnessed the sexual and physical assault. Complainant stated that she was inebriated and did not consent to the sexual act and that the entire incident was recorded, with Subject distributing the video. Complainant said she and Subject began to argue, the situation became physical, and Subject punched her ribs, breaking some. She said Witness 1 drove her to Northwestern Memorial Hospital to seek medical help.

Subject was ultimately arrested and charged with Domestic Battery. On January 7, 2026, after his arrest, OPA recommended that Subject be placed on an emergency suspension due to the serious safety concerns raised by the allegations against him. On February 4, 2026, OPA informed the Park District's Labor Relations Supervisor that the investigation would be closed as unsubstantiated and that OPA recommended Subject be returned to work.

OPA's Attempts to Interview Complainant

After receiving the initial complaint, OPA called Complainant in an effort to gather additional information related to the allegations. Complainant answered the call and acknowledged she had contacted the Park District to file a complaint against Subject. OPA asked if Complainant had filed a report with the Chicago Police Department, and she said she did. OPA asked if she could share the Records Division Number from the report. The Complainant said she would have to look through her paperwork and would return OPA's call. The call was not returned.

OPA made several attempts to make contact with Complainant in the weeks following the initial call with no success.

INVESTIGATION

Interview with the Chicago Police Department Detective

In an effort not to interfere with the police department's case, OPA reached out to the Chicago Police Detective handling Subject's case. The detective confirmed that Subject was first arrested and charged with Domestic Battery and then was arrested a second time for violating the No Contact Order related to the initial arrest.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The detective said the assigned prosecutor spoke with Complainant. After this meeting, it was determined there would be no additional charges filed against Subject; only the misdemeanor charge of the No Contact Order violation would move forward in court.

The detective said he had nothing further to complete on his end, and OPA could move forward with its investigation.

Interview with Subject's Supervisor

Subject's supervisor (Supervisor) met Subject three years ago and had supervised him for the past year. She did not know much about his personal life, only that he has a daughter and two grandkids. Subject used to be a teacher and is very popular with many of the seasonal staff that know him from different schools.

Supervisor has never heard any complaints about Subject, nor has she had to discipline him. Subject goes above and beyond his duties, which include overseeing recreation staff involved with different programs. Subject does not have direct interaction with minors as part of his job. While Subject could be at events where minors are present, he would never be one-on-one with them.

Supervisor learned of Subject's Emergency Suspension from the Labor Relations Supervisor. Supervisor knew that Subject was arrested, which she learned from social media, saying it went viral. She was very disheartened seeing his personal life displayed all over social media.

Interview with Witness 1

Witness 1 has been with the Park District for just over a year and is also supervised by Supervisor.

Witness 1 and Subject met when Witness 1 started with the Park District. They only have a working relationship and do not socialize outside of work. Witness 1 has been to Subject's apartment. Subject does not drive, so Witness 1 often would pick him up and drop him off.

The last time Witness 1 was at Subject's apartment was the day after Thanksgiving to pick him up for work. Witness 1 messaged Subject after arriving. Subject responded that he couldn't leave the apartment because he had some things going on. Witness 1 needed to get a work key from Subject and went up to the apartment. When Witness 1 was in the hallway, there was an audible commotion and yelling. A woman, who Witness 1 identified as Complainant, answered the door. Witness 1 stood in the doorway. Subject came to the door, he had a black eye, was bleeding from

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

his mouth and looked very disheveled. Subject repeatedly said he needed to get Complainant out of his apartment. Complainant kept yelling about her phone and that Subject wouldn't give it to her. Subject kept telling Complainant that she left her phone somewhere else, at a friend's house. Complainant continued yelling, throwing food around and throwing a jar of mayonnaise against the wall.

Witness 1 tried to deescalate the situation and offered to take Complainant where she needed to go to get her phone. Complainant finally agreed. They left the apartment, went down to his car, and he drove her to another residence. Complainant exited the car, and Witness 1 drove away.

Witness 1 has not seen or spoken to Complainant since. That was the first and last time Witness 1 saw Complainant. When Witness 1 and Complainant left the apartment, Subject stayed.

Witness 1 was emotionally and physically exhausted after the incident and went home. After hearing about the incident, Witness 1's spouse couldn't believe Witness 1 was put in such a bad situation.

When asked if Complainant had any bruises, black eyes or was bleeding, Witness 1 said no. When asked if Complainant showed any signs of being injured, Witness 1 said no. When asked if, during the car ride Complainant said anything related to Subject harming her in anyway, Witness 1 said no. When asked if Complainant needed any assistance walking to the car, Witness 1 said no.

Witness 1 said during the car ride Complainant said Subject told her she could stay with him but now wanted her out of his apartment. She kept saying things about how she could destroy him, get him arrested and put him in jail. Witness 1 said she was ranting the entire ride and Witness 1 just wanted to get her out of the car.

When asked if Complainant was dropped off at Northwestern Hospital, Witness 1 said no. When asked if Complainant said she needed medical assistance, Witness 1 said no. When asked if Complainant said anything about Subject sexually assaulting her or videotaping a sexual encounter, Witness 1 said no.

Witness 1 learned about Subject being arrested on social media and saw Subject's mugshot. Witness 1 did not know the exact reason for the arrest or the charges.

Witness 1 had not spoken with Subject since the arrest and Emergency Suspension. Witness 1 had not been contacted by the police, the State's Attorney Office or an attorney.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Interview with Subject

Subject has been with the District for over 20 years and has been in his current role for the past eight years. He reports to Supervisor and works Monday through Friday 11:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Subject explained his hours may fluctuate depending on events happening throughout the District. Subject said he does not have direct interactions with minors as part of his duties. There are minors at events he attends, but he does not have one-on-one interactions.

Subject said he was put on Emergency Suspension on January 7, 2026. The Park District's Labor Relations Supervisor notified him of his suspension and told him he would be contacted by OPA for an interview. Subject said he was only told there were credible allegations made against him but was not given any specifics. He assumed it had to do with his arrest.

Subject said he was taken into custody on January 1, 2026, by the Chicago Police Department at his apartment. He was charged with Domestic Battery and remained in custody for approximately 24 hours. He appeared in court prior to being released. The judge told him he had permission to return to his apartment because Complainant did not live at the location and had no lease. The judge did invoke a No Contact Order.

Subject said he has known Complainant for many years but hadn't seen her in a long time. When she resurfaced, he had no idea how bad off she was. Subject's sister, who works for a social service agency, tried helping Complainant out a few times with resources. His sister was removed from her office and relocated because Complainant showed up acting erratically several times.

After being released from custody, Subject and his sister went to his apartment. He attempted to unlock the door, and it wouldn't open; he then realized Complainant was in the apartment. Subject went down to the management office and called the police, requesting an officer escort him into his apartment. When the police arrived, they went up to the apartment and spoke with Complainant, who told them Subject had entered the apartment. Subject tried to explain the situation to the police, but they would not listen and arrested him for violating the No Contact Order issued by the judge. Subject said that, within 48 hours, he had been arrested twice.

Complainant had filed a police report accusing Subject of assaulting her and breaking her ribs; she said this occurred on November 28, 2025. Subject said the allegations are absolutely false.

Subject explained that on November 28, 2025, he was asleep on the couch when he was woken up by Complainant punching him in the face. She was flipping out asking where her phone was.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Subject said he didn't even know she was in the apartment. When he arrived home the night before, he fell asleep on the couch without going in the bedroom where she must have been sleeping. He said Complainant was throwing food and hit him with a bottle that broke on his head. Subject had a busted lip, which was bleeding, a black eye and a knot on the side of his face. Complainant kept clawing at him, making disrespectful remarks. She had also put bleach on all of his clothes. She was angry that she couldn't find her Adderall pills.

Subject was supposed to work that day and be picked up by Witness 1. When Witness 1 arrived, Subject said he couldn't leave the apartment and asked Witness 1 to come upstairs to retrieve a work key that Witness 1 would need for the day. When Witness 1 came to the door, Complainant opened it and was still yelling and being erratic. Witness 1 seemed to be in shock by what was happening. Subject said he was in a fog and was looking for help removing Complainant from his apartment. Subject finally convinced Complainant that she left her phone either in a friend's car or at the friend's house. Witness 1 offered to drive Complainant to where she thought she may have left her phone, and Complainant agreed. She and Witness 1 left the apartment.

When asked if Complainant was injured in any way when she left the apartment with Witness 1, Subject said she wasn't. Subject said Complainant is a drug addict and takes prescription medication; when she doesn't take the medication, she becomes violent and erratic. He does not know if she was on drugs that morning. When asked if Complainant ever said she was injured or that she wanted to go to the hospital, Subject said no.

Subject had not had any communication with Complainant since she left on November 28th with Witness 1, until December 30th when he received a call from her. She said she was at a hospital in Skokie and had nowhere to go. She said she had been staying with her child's father, and then he pulled her hair and someone else jumped her and kicked her out. She was taken to the hospital by police when she threatened suicide. Subject told her he didn't think it was a good idea for her to stay with him and hung up. Within a few hours, Complainant was knocking on his door.

Subject explained he has been a mentor and teacher for over 20 years and has empathy, so he couldn't turn her away. He told Complainant she could stay the night until she could be picked up by a relative. The following day, December 31, 2025, Complainant seemed relaxed, speaking normally about wanting to better herself and going back to school. She wanted to go to church, which Subject thought was a good idea, so he ordered her a ride via Uber.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Later in the day, Complainant returned and started acting erratically again after Subject told her she would need to leave. Subject said, on a previous occasion when he told her she had to leave, Complainant broke out the window screen, threw his phone out the window and was threatening to jump out and commit suicide.

The next day, January 1, 2026, Subject left the apartment to meet up with friends. When he arrived back home, Complainant was yelling and saying she wanted him to sign a contract that she could stay with him for six months and said he owed her \$10,000. Subject said Complainant was acting crazy. The next thing he knew the police were knocking at his door to tell him he was being charged with assault and battery and said something about him breaking Complainant's ribs. Subject said he was in shock by what was occurring.

Subject said he knows that Complainant was trying to extort him. She made up numerous lies about him and even told him she was going to ruin his life and get him fired. Subject learned from a friend that in Complainant's phone contacts, he is listed as "Last Resort."

When asked if he ever sexually assaulted Complainant, Subject said no. When asked if he ever physically assaulted Complainant, Subject said no. When asked if he had ever videotaped sexual encounters with Complainant, Subject said no.

Subject said he has an Instagram and Facebook account that he occasionally uses. He never posted any photos of Complainant on social media. Adding, he doesn't think he ever took a picture of her.

Subject said the entire situation hurt him personally, financially and professionally. He is embarrassed and humiliated by what occurred, and still cannot believe what he has been put through. Subject was also extremely apologetic to Witness 1. He said he wants to get the court cases resolved, so he can move on with his life.

ANALYSIS

Complainant's initial complaint lodged serious accusations that Subject had committed sexual and physical assault. These concerns resulted in Subject being placed on an Emergency Suspension in the interest of safety, while OPA continued its investigation.

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT

OFFICE OF PREVENTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Complainant repeatedly failed to respond to OPA's efforts to obtain additional information regarding her allegations. Ultimately, OPA moved forward with interviews based on the limited information Complainant provided during her initial complaint.

During OPA's interview with Witness 1, serious questions were raised about the truthfulness of the information provided by Complainant. The inconsistencies were vast enough to call the truthfulness of the allegations into question. OPA found Witness 1 to be credible.

During OPA's interview with Subject, serious questions and further inconsistencies were raised related to the information provided by Complainant. Subject was able to provide a detailed and thorough explanation, which led OPA to question the veracity of Complainant's allegations of sexual and physical assault. Throughout his interview with OPA, Subject was found to be forthcoming and credible.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, OPA has closed this case as **UNSUBSTANTIATED**.