

John R. Crane
PO Box 7185
McLean, VA 22106-7185

August 7, 2013

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
Ranking Member
Committee on the Judiciary
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510-6275

Dear Senator Grassley,

As noted in my letter to you of May 29, 2013, I am the former Assistant Inspector General for Communications and Congressional Liaison for the Department of Defense Inspector General (DoD IG). In that letter I requested your assistance as Ranking Member of the Senate Judiciary Committee to initiate a review to examine the validity of findings made against me by Special Agents of the Department of Transportation, Inspector General (DoT IG) in a report dated November 6, 2012. In addition, I requested your assistance to review the validity of the findings contained in a Settlement Agreement between my former agency and complainants against me mediated by the Office of Special Counsel (OSC) that relied on misinformation contained in the same report by the Department of Transportation. (See attached.)

I want to thank you for sending a letter to Ms. Lynne M. Halbrooks on March 21, 2013, to have investigative materials provided to your office for review to include: "1) The report issued by the DoT OIG, and all related materials; 2) The report issued by the U.S. Office of Special Counsel (OSC), and all related materials; and 3) all relevant DoD IG documents pertaining to this matter, which are not included in the DoT OIG and OSC materials requested in items (1) and (2) above, including polygraph results, post-polygraph interviews, Kalkines warnings and procedures, and legal sufficiency determinations. You also posed the two following questions: "1) if a criminal referral was made to the U.S. Justice Department based on the DoT report, please provide that referral and all supporting documentation, as well as applicable policy guidelines and standards used by the special agents in making that referral? And 2) Provide a list of all DoD OIG criminal referrals to the U.S. Attorneys for the past 12 months, showing the reasons for each such referral."

As you know, in regard to my responsibilities and obligations to ensure the integrity of the DoD IG in responding to Congress, I met my obligation under Executive Order 12674 to report corruption by disclosing to your office on September 14, 2012, the following matters:

- Lynne Halbrooks --- despite having been provided information by me outlining failures in the Front Office that resulted in the starvation death of a young Afghan allied military veteran at Dawood Military Hospital--- refused to report that information to you during the course of an IG investigation that was designed to respond to your oversight of DoD IG actions regarding Dawood.
- Lynne Halbrooks and Henry Shelley intending to delay the issuance of a report in response to a request from Chairman King in regard to the disclosure of classified information to Hollywood movie producers regarding the film *Zero Dark Thirty*. I disclosed the intent of Ms. Halbrooks and Mr. Shelley to delay issuance of the report until the departure of the then Secretary of Defense, who was a subject of the report, from office.
- Lynne Halbrooks and the DOD IG Office of Professional Responsibility refusing to act on my request to initiate an investigation into the actions and conduct of my Deputy toward a female employee that the female employee described as “angry and aggressive” to include her feelings that her “personal space was being invaded” and that the actions of the male manager led to a situation where the female employee “felt scared and uncomfortable.”

I want to take this opportunity to state that I am willing to again provide testimony under oath or take a polygraph to refute the charges against me.

Specifically:

I challenge the findings in the OSC report. I state for the record that the findings in the report are based on a conspiracy theory that I, as second level approving official, approved “Fully Successful” ratings to two employees because I suspected them of being the source of allegations against me and another supervisor in a report prepared by the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR). In fact, I had never read the report nor knew the precise contents of the report nor were there any administrative actions reflected in my rating or official record. During the course of the OSC interview I could not even remember being interviewed by OPR for the report. At no time did I ever give consideration to the speculative origins of the allegations that initiated the report. The charge is false and I will take a polygraph to refute that charge.

I challenge the findings in the DoT report. I state for the record that Deputy did ask if “Dan Meyer is queer” and the Deputy did state that people like Dan Meyer we not in “my Army” and expressed discomfort with the sexuality of Mr. Meyer. I state for the record that my Deputy did make “unwanted physical contact” with me in an “effort to physically intimidate.” The charges to the contrary are false and I will take a polygraph to refute those charges.

I challenge the findings in the DoT report in regard to the selection of my Deputy. I state for the record the Ms. Halbrooks and Mr. Shelley provided false and misleading testimony in regards to their efforts to select a Deputy for me, and their sworn transcribed statements can be incontrovertibly proved to be false. The charges to the contrary are false and I will take a polygraph to refute those charges.

I am willing to take a polygraph in response to every charge made in the OSC and DoT reports, and request an opportunity to take a polygraph.

In addition, I believe that your office can make no evaluation of the validity of the DoT and OSC reports without the benefit of the underlying transcripts. In particular, I point to the sworn testimony my Deputy gave to the DoT IG on Friday, August 24, 2012. That testimony is a reaffirmation of many of the charges that I made in my letter to you of May 29, 2013.

I am available to speak with you or your senior staff to discuss these issues, and hope you will give your personal attention to these serious issues.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John R. Crane". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "John" being more prominent and the last name "Crane" following in a similar style.

John R. Crane

Attachment:

cc: The Honorable Carl Levin