

Jean E. Wilcox, Attorney, P.L.L.C

292 Jacob Lane

Prescott AZ 86303

928-310-8206

Jw86004@gmail.com

TO: Samantha Blevins, Assistant General Counsel, MCCCC
Cc: Leslie Cooper, General Counsel, MCCCC
FROM: Jean Wilcox, Investigator
DATE: June 5, 2018
RE: Case No. 17-031 Expanded Investigation Report #3 (Paluzzi)

Scope of Investigation

This investigation began with an anonymous letter received on December 19, 2017 by District HR and Vice Chancellor LaCoya Shelton containing allegations of sexual harassment occurring at Rio Salado College, including in the Division of Public Service (KJZZ). The allegations concerning KJZZ were against Vice President Jim Paluzzi for sexually harassing [REDACTED] men that he is attracted to.

Witnesses Interviewed

For this report, the following witnesses were interviewed:

- 38 current and past KJZZ employees
- 2 NPR employees
- 1 media consultant

Current and past KJZZ employees expressed an extreme level of fear of retaliation or retribution by Paluzzi for participating in this investigation. Although they are protected from retaliation by District regulation, they said that forms of retaliation in the media sector are often subtle and difficult to prove. People are passed over for advancement opportunities or training, given different assignments, have their supervisory responsibility removed, or are not hired by other media employers for unstated reasons. Vice President Paluzzi has been on the board of directors of National Public Radio (NPR) and has many contacts throughout the industry. Public radio is a network of specialized employment. Employees who want to stay in public radio do not want to be identified in order to preserve their ability to seek other public radio opportunities in the future. Some employees said they believe that other complainants are Rio Salado College have been re-assigned to unfamiliar or undesirable jobs. At their request, I have

not identified current and past employees by name but have assigned a number to each employee witness. One NPR employee who works with member stations in the region, including KJZZ, said the fear of retaliation at KJZZ is greater than any other station he works with (including NPR) and greater than he has seen in his entire career. He has also observed that women recognize harassment, whereas men are not so sure when it is happening because it happens to men less often.

Documents Reviewed

Anonymous letter from a Concerned Citizen, received by District HR on December 19, 2017
Complaint sent via email dated March 2, 2018 to VP Paluzzi and Rio HR Dean Bellino
Receipt from Kona Grill dated January 9, 2018
Letter dated March 12, 2018 to VP Paluzzi and KJZZ HR, with copies of text messages
Email correspondence from witnesses
Facebook posts of VP Paluzzi
Incident report (undated) from an employee
Private email from a supervisor to herself documenting an incident with Paluzzi
Personnel file of Jim Paluzzi
Email dated August 6, 2015 from Greer to Shedd
KJZZ News Code of Ethic and Practices
Facebook message from Paluzzi to a young male employee (Employee #2)

Note: An email search was not conducted because almost all communications are through a rioradio.org address, Gchat, or private cell phones, none of which are retrievable through the Office of Public Stewardship.

Policies Reviewed

MCCCD A.R. 4.13 Alcoholic Beverages

11. Personal responsibility. The personal or individual purchase of alcoholic beverages by individuals attending District approved functions held in places serving alcoholic beverages is a personal and individual responsibility. Administrative discretion shall be exercised in the approval of the location of such activities, as such decision pertains to the nature of the group involved.

MCCCD Policy A-4 Employment Standards

Group One Offenses:

10. Engaging in sexual harassment...

11. Dishonesty or dishonest actions, including but not limited to lying, deceitfulness, or making false statements.

MCCCD A.R. 5.1.8 Sexual Harassment Policy for Employees

Sexual harassment is unwelcome, verbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature that is sufficiently severe, persistent, or pervasive that it alters working conditions and creates a hostile work environment for employees. The unwelcome behavior may be based on power differentials, the creation of a hostile work environment, or retaliation for sexual harassment complaints. Sexual harassment by and between, employees; employees and students; and campus visitors and employees, is prohibited by this policy.

MCCCD A.R. 5.1.9 Examples of Policy Violations

It shall be a violation of MCCCD's Sexual Harassment Policy for any employee, student or campus visitor to:

1. Make unwelcome sexual advances to another employee, student or campus visitor;

4. Engage in verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature that:

B. ...creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive work or academic environment.

7. Engage in other sexually harassing conduct in the workplace or academic environment, whether physical or verbal, including, but not limited to, commentary about an individual's body (or body parts), sexually degrading words to describe an individual, sexually offensive comments, sexually suggestive language or jokes, innuendoes, ...Other sexual misconduct may include sexual exploitation, stalking, and gender-based bullying.

8. Treat a complainant or witness of sexual harassment in a manner that could dissuade a reasonable person from pursuing or participating in the complaint and investigation.

MCCCD A.R. 5.1.11 Responsibility for Policy Enforcement

Employees and students must avoid offensive or inappropriate sexual and/or sexually harassing behavior at work or in the academic environment. Employees and students are encouraged (but not required) to inform perceived offenders of this policy that the commentary/conduct is offensive and unwelcome.

Findings and Conclusions

Allegations regarding Jim Paluzzi sexually harassing young men in his division

All employee witnesses, with the exception of a few newer employees, were aware that Paluzzi is attracted to young men. One employee (#16) stated that he is aware that Paluzzi's sexual preference is for men. Most described this awareness as an "open secret" around the station: they all know it but cannot talk about it outside the newsroom. Several newsroom employees (#18, 23) described seeing Paluzzi often giving tours of the newsroom to attractive young males and questioned the purpose of the tours because they didn't appear to be donors.

There were four men who described conduct that appeared to fall within the definition of sexual harassment. None of the conduct described was overtly sexual in nature, but Paluzzi's conduct and words made each of them feel very to extremely uncomfortable. [REDACTED]. A fifth [REDACTED] male employee has been on non-work related trips and on social outings, but denies that he has a sexual relationship with Paluzzi or that he feels uncomfortable around Paluzzi.

The most recent incident occurred in July 2017 with additional behavior in September 2017. The other incidents occurred earlier but are part of a pattern of the type of conduct that occurred within six months prior to the receipt of the anonymous letter in December 2017 alleging sexual harassment.

Employee #1: In mid-July 2017, Paluzzi invited a [REDACTED] male employee to go to a basketball game in Phoenix at the Talking Stick Resort Arena. At first the employee thought it was a nice overture to be invited. They met at the KJZZ station and traveled to Paluzzi's apartment downtown where Paluzzi made dinner and they had drinks. During the game, Paluzzi put his hand on the employee's thigh three or four times. The employee wasn't sure how to respond but considered it an invasion of his personal space. This kind of thing had never happened to him before, and he didn't know how to deal with it. After the game, the employee was getting ready to go back to his place when Paluzzi invited him back to his apartment for dessert. The employee didn't really want to go and declined at first, but Paluzzi insisted. They had a couple of drinks. All the while, the employee was very uncomfortable. He didn't know if Paluzzi was going to make physical advances toward him. It was difficult to say no because Paluzzi is his boss' boss' boss. The employee had not told anyone about this incident until this interview. He was too embarrassed to share it with anyone.

On a couple of occasions after that, Paluzzi would make physical contact by putting his hand on the employee's shoulder or on his lower back while they were talking. The employee stated it was certainly uninvited, but he didn't know how to tell him not to touch him, so he stepped away.

Then in September 2017, Paluzzi went to Mexico City with a group of donors. He brought with him two videographers, [REDACTED] men [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who he had hired to make a promotional video of the station. They all went to a soccer game and out to dinner. On a couple of occasions, Paluzzi put his hand on the employee's arm which was resting on the table. As soon as Paluzzi moved his hand, the employee would take his arm off the table. When he forgot and put his arm back on the table, Paluzzi again put his hand on the employee's arm. The employee saw him do the same thing to one of the videographers. A few times during dinner, the topic of gay sex was brought up by Paluzzi. The second time it was brought up by Paluzzi, the two videographers and the employee looked at each other and steered the conversation away from that topic. The third time, one of the videographers said, "really? we're talking about this again?"

During her interview, Employee #25 said she had asked why a certain reporter (referring to Employee #1 described above) was not being sent on the trip to the Dominican Republic and female reporters were being sent instead. She (#25) was told it was because of Paluzzi, but did not know what that meant.

It is more likely than not that Paluzzi's verbal and physical conduct toward this young male employee was of a sexual nature. The power differential between them by definition makes his conduct unwelcome. Further the employee tried to subtly remove himself out of physical reach on several occasions, and to steer away from the topic of gay sex, indicating his offense. Paluzzi's repeated touching and invitations to personal outings were pervasive and persistent. The employee remains uncomfortable in Paluzzi's presence but is able to continue his work because it is in a remote location where he is not in frequent contact with Paluzzi.

Employee #2: A second [REDACTED] male employee described an incident which occurred in March 2016 during a trip to Mexico City. He declined to be interviewed at first because he had been threatened by Paluzzi and was extremely fearful of losing his job, his reputation, and his career in public radio. He later changed his mind and he said that he was asked to go on the trip to Mexico City by [REDACTED], along with Paluzzi and three Spanish speaking female reporters. During the interview, he said the whole incident was so upsetting that he had repressed some of the details about dates and times from his memory, but he had reported the occurrences to his supervisor (#22) and to [REDACTED] shortly after returning. He told them he did not want to file a complaint with HR, and they respected his request, but his supervisor (#22) made a record on her personal email dated March 4, 2016 about their conversation.

Prior to the trip, Employee #3 showed two Gchat messages on his computer to the male employee's supervisor. The messages were from Paluzzi, asking Employee #3 about the sexual

orientation of the male employee who would be going on the Mexico City trip. The supervisor (#22) stated in her interview that she cautioned the three female employees to watch out for their male co-worker.

Employee #2 said Paluzzi asked him a lot of personal questions during the trip about his body, working out in the gym, and commented about his physique. Paluzzi called him “bro,” which surprised the employee, who had only been with the station for less than a year. Paluzzi talked to him more than twice about going on a trip with him, bringing up alcohol a fair amount. It wasn’t clear to the employee that the trips Paluzzi suggested they go on were personal or fundraising trips because Paluzzi never mentioned donors going on the trips. Paluzzi also invited the employee to his “crash pad downtown,” suggesting that he could teach him about cognac and they could do a tasting together. The female employee heard Paluzzi say to Employee #2 twice during their dinner that he would like to take a trip alone with him.

One night after a group dinner and drinking Mescal, Paluzzi, Employee #21 and Employee #2 returned to their hotel in a cab. Paluzzi told Employee #2 to wait for him while he paid for the cab. The female employee (#21) said Paluzzi was obviously annoyed that she was still waiting with Employee #2. Employee #2 said Paluzzi looked intoxicated and stumbled a bit. He asked both employees twice if they wanted to come up for a nightcap. They both declined. Employee #2 felt that Paluzzi paid him an inordinate amount of attention and was very interested in spending time with him, although he never said anything explicitly sexual to him. Paluzzi put his hand on the employee’s back and shoulder throughout the trip making him feel deeply uncomfortable during the entire trip. On the last day of the trip, both employees (#2, #21) were not feeling well. Paluzzi invited the male employee, but not the female employee, to come up to his room to get some zinc lozenges. Employee 32 later told the female employee that he had gone into Paluzzi’s room, Paluzzi gave him a hug, and handed him the zinc tablets. Paluzzi denied that the employee had come into his room, insisting that he waited in the lobby.

After the trip, Paluzzi sent a Facebook friends request to Employee #2 but the employee did not respond. Paluzzi also sent a message dated 3/3/2016 saying “Hope you can make it to San Diego this weekend! Looking forward to more good times of the malt variety in the near future...” The employee saved the message and provided this investigator a copy.

A month or two after the trip to Mexico City, Employee #2 was hosting the Korva Coleman Award event at Papago Park. At one point, he and Paluzzi were alone in conversation together, and Paluzzi said to him, “I wouldn’t want to see you come after me because I have tools or means at my disposal if that were to happen.” This comment was in reference to the employee’s investigation of Susan Bitter Smith’s conflict of interest and her resignation as a

result of his report. The Employee #2 told one or two people afterwards that he felt his boss had just threatened him. Employee #3 recalls this employee telling him about Paluzzi's implied threat and recalls being told that Paluzzi said, "I hope you wouldn't ever investigate me the way you did Susan Bitter Smith because if you did, I have tools at my disposal to do what I need to do." Paluzzi's statement clearly dissuaded the employee from filing a complaint or participating in this investigation.

Employee #2 has not been invited to other donor events since then.

Paluzzi had little to say about the trip to Mexico City and his interactions with the Employee #2. They all went out for dinner and drinks. He denied that he asked the employee to come up to his room, saying that the employee stayed in the lobby while he went to get the zinc lozenges.

It is more likely than not that Paluzzi's inordinate amount of attention, personal questions and invitations to go on trips and to his apartment were of a sexual nature. The employee was offended and afraid. Given the power differential between Paluzzi and the subordinate employee, Paluzzi's verbal and physical conduct was unwelcome. His repeated invitations, questions, and attention were persistent and pervasive. The employee has been able to do his work, but remains under a cloud of fear of retaliation after being threatened by Paluzzi, altering his working conditions.

Employee #3: A third male employee told this investigator in a second interview and in a written note that he has been touched by Paluzzi, who put his hand on his back, running it down his back too much. About five years ago, he and Paluzzi traveled to New York City. They had hotel rooms across the hall from each other. As they parted for the night, Employee #3 said he could tell by the look in Paluzzi's eyes that he wanted something sexual, and Paluzzi started coming toward him. The employee quickly gave him a hug and said something about what a great job they did that day, then went into his own room.

The same employee has been to Paluzzi's condo/apartment several times, although Paluzzi never did anything sexual. Paluzzi said this employee had only been to his condo one time when he invited him for lunch on the roof top to discuss moving Spot 127 under the Newsroom.

During one trip when hotel reservations were being made, Paluzzi said to this employee that they could just get one room. Employee #3 declined because he had to do some work, and it would keep Paluzzi awake. It was the only way the employee could think of saying that he wasn't interested in what Paluzzi was suggesting, which the employee believed to be sexual in nature.

Not long before Paluzzi moved Spot 127 to the News Department, Paluzzi asked Employee #3 to go to the arboretum near the zoo where they could talk out of the office. While they were walking to the café, Paluzzi said something like “one of the reasons I wanted to talk today was to say I’m not sure I can control myself when I’m around you.” The employee didn’t say a word, playing dumb and replying “I’m not sure what you mean.” Paluzzi replied “I think you *know* what I’m talking about.” Paluzzi did not explain or elaborate further. This conversation made the employee feel very uncomfortable, so he changed the subject back to Spot 127.

Employee #3 believes Paluzzi is keeping him from advancing to the level of a General Manager. Paluzzi has explanations for not making Employee #3 General Manager of News: his work ethic (which he described in his first interview as having improved); his time spent on personal phone calls during the work day; and the fact that Paluzzi is the General Manager of News, the job he was hired to do. Paluzzi said they don’t have general managers of departments, but then described [REDACTED]. His reasons are contradictory and may be a pretense for having been rejected by Employee #3 on earlier occasions when Paluzzi made subtle sexual suggestions. Recently, Paluzzi seems eager to find reasons to build a case against Employee #3--the March 2, 2018 complaint from another employee about Employee #3’s excessive drinking in Hermosillo, suspected abuse of alcohol, removal of his direct reports, not allowing him to travel, and the timely arrival of a letter from a former intern the day before Paluzzi’s interview for this investigation describing Employee #3’s sexual behavior toward her. Employee #3’s annual performance review of one year ago shows Paluzzi giving him ratings of Good and Outstanding, with an overall appraisal of Outstanding and no mention of behavioral or work ethic issues. Ironically, Paluzzi has been observed to be intoxicated on several occasions by multiple witnesses during work-related fundraising events (Employee #2, 31, and consultant Rick Lewis)

It is more likely than not that Paluzzi’s actions, verbally and physically, toward Employee #3 were of a sexual nature. The employee was offended and found ways to rebuff Paluzzi’s subtle suggestions. Regardless of the employee’s responses, Paluzzi’s conduct was unwelcome by definition because of the power differential between them. Although not severe, Paluzzi’s actions were pervasive and offensive. To some degree, Paluzzi’s conduct interferes with the employee’s ability to work comfortably around Paluzzi and to advance in his career. Paluzzi has removed all of this employee’s direct reports, in effect demoting him to a non-supervisory position.

Employee #4: This [REDACTED] male employee stated that he was the subject of Paluzzi’s attention to the point that it made him very uncomfortable. Paluzzi has a way of conducting himself in

conversations that gave him an uncomfortable vibe. Although Paluzzi never said anything actionable, Paluzzi creates an uncomfortable leering environment. The employee was not touched, and there were no words of a sexual nature, but Paluzzi would go out of his way to interact with him, compliment him, and pass by other colleagues in the newsroom. The employee considered his conduct pervasive, and went out of his way to avoid interacting with him or to be in a one on one conversation with him. He stated he was able to prevent Paluzzi's behavior from affecting his work output or his advancement in the organization.

While Paluzzi's behavior toward this [REDACTED] male was pervasive and offensive, it may not have been sexual and did not interfere with the employee's conditions of employment.

Employee #5: Several employees mentioned in their interviews that they believed Employee #5 was sought out by and hired by Paluzzi because he fit Paluzzi's favorite profile of an attractive [REDACTED] man. Paluzzi said in his interview that he found Employee #5 on-line when he was researching a trip to Spain to visit an olive oil mill. Employee #5 authored a blog on his website [REDACTED]. A couple years ago (2015), Paluzzi read his blog and learned that Employee #5 was planning to return to the U.S. He thought Employee #5 was a great travel writer and wanted to start a Travel Desk at KJZZ. Paluzzi said he went to Associate General Manager Mark Moran with the idea, suggesting they talk to him to see if he has any interest in working with KJZZ. He and Moran did a Skype session and they were both impressed. Moran agrees he was in on the Skype session and that Employee #5 is a good writer, but disagreed with Paluzzi that Employee #5 had the requisite journalism background or skills to work in the News Department.

Paluzzi was planning his next trip to Spain and decided to bring Employee #5 to Phoenix on a "recruiting trip" to meet them in person in August 2015. He also contracted with Employee #5 to have him work on the arrangements for the trip to Spain.

At first, Paluzzi said they do recruiting trips even before posting the job opening. The trips are paid for by the Friends. Later in the interview, Paluzzi said he has not taken other potential recruits on long distance trips, like he did with Employee #5. His reason for taking Employee #5 to Flagstaff, Sedona, and Rocky Point was to see how he handled traveling. Given that Employee #5 had been living in a foreign country and was viewed by Paluzzi as such a good travel writer, then Paluzzi's reason for these trips lacks credibility. It is more likely than not that Paluzzi's reason for taking Employee #5 on trips with him alone was a pretense for getting close to a [REDACTED] attractive male at Friends' expense.

██████ was asked by Paluzzi to go on the trip to Flagstaff to go hiking and to meet with Employee #21 in Flagstaff to talk about travel opportunities in Northern Arizona. ██████ said he was very uncomfortable and embarrassed about being with Paluzzi and Employee #5, a feeling confirmed by the observations of Employee #21 who met them for coffee in Flagstaff. ██████ and the Flagstaff reporter noticed that Paluzzi paid a lot of attention to Employee #5 on this trip.

After hiking in Flagstaff, Paluzzi and Employee #5 dropped ██████ off in Tempe and went on to Rocky Point, Mexico as part of the same recruiting trip. Paluzzi said he wanted to see how strong Employee #5's Spanish was, and he was impressed that Employee #5 could converse in the Mexican vernacular with a street vendor. Again, Paluzzi's reason lacks credibility. If Paluzzi wanted to hire him as a travel writer for an English speaking audience, why test his ability to speak vernacular Mexican Spanish by taking him all the way to Rocky Point?

At that point, in August 2015, Paluzzi was still thinking of hiring Employee #5 as a travel reporter even though there was no such position at KJZZ. The reporter in Flagstaff (Employee #21) had the impression that they were intentionally creating a job for ██████. The reporter found it strange that in the eight years she had been in Flagstaff, neither Paluzzi or ██████ had ever been to Flagstaff to meet her there. The first and only time they met with her in Flagstaff was to bring Employee #5 on a tour of Northern Arizona.

Paluzzi said that he and ██████ together decided to bring Employee #5 on a recruiting trip, and that they both decided he didn't have the qualifications to be a reporter but would be better suited to making travel arrangements. ██████ recalls that after the "recruiting trip" with Employee #5, Paluzzi told Linda Pastori that "News is hot and ready" to hire Employee #5. ██████ said no, News is not hot and ready. Paluzzi then asked Linda Pastori, the Associate General Manager of Development, to put him in the Development Department, according to ██████. A few months later, they posted a position for a ████████████████████ for the Development Department. Because Employee #5's scores on the rating sheet weren't high enough to make him the best candidate, another person was hired who scored better, according to ██████. Then Paluzzi decided they needed a second ████████████████████, and Employee #5 was hired.

Paluzzi states they used the full District process to hire Employee #5. The job was posted, advertised, a screening committee reviewed applications, Employee #5 applied, and three or four applicants were interviewed. While Paluzzi's statements are true, a review of the hiring records shows that Paluzzi requested one new position for a multi-medi specialist on 12/2/15. Three people were selected for in-person interviews, one of whom was Employee #5.

Employee #38 and Employee #5 had the same overall scores of 93, but Paluzzi's scores for Employee #5 were significantly higher for Employee #5 than those of the other interviewers (Linda Pastori, Bill Shedd, and Carmine Hill). Employee #38 was consistently given higher scores by the other interviewers as well. It appears as if Paluzzi manipulated the scoring so Employee #5 would at least come out even with Employee #38. After the interviews on 2/22/16, Paluzzi requested another Class/Comp Study Exception to create a second new position for a multi-media specialist. Both Employee #38 and #5 were hired, but their job duties are divided so that Employee #5 handles all the travel arrangement and "community experiences."

On paper, Employee #5's hiring may look legitimate, but the witness statements and the sequence of events indicate that Paluzzi had made up his mind even before a travel reporter position was created and the [REDACTED] job was posted. It is more likely than not that Paluzzi arranged for the posting of a job for which Employee #5 would be qualified in order to bring him into KJZZ, having been dissuaded from hiring him as a travel reporter as he originally intended. It is also more likely than not that Paluzzi manipulated the scoring and sought a second position for the purpose of hiring Employee #5.

When asked if he ever went on personal trips with Employee #5 or out to social or sporting events, Paluzzi said the only one he could think of was in Employee #5's first year when Employee #5 was having a challenge getting adjusted to the area and wanted to go to Bisbee. Paluzzi said he offered to go with him, they shared expenses, hiked, and went through the mine. Paluzzi stated that he and Employee #5 do "not hardly" go out on social occasions. Paluzzi would invite Employee #5 to his place for dinner, and once Employee #5 invited him to go to the opera (March 2018). They went to a sporting event only once when Paluzzi had Diamondbacks tickets obtained through the office pool for season tickets.

Employee #5's account is slightly different: Employee #5 said he has gone several times to Paluzzi's apartment, once or twice on social outings, and to sporting events (plural). They went to Bisbee as friends and do not have a sexual relationship. Employee #5's demeanor during his interview was that of a person who was very uncomfortable answering questions about his relationship with Paluzzi.

One employee (#20) reported that she saw Paluzzi and Employee #5 at a roller derby event in which she was participating. It seemed odd to her that the vice president would bring a new [REDACTED] male employee to watch a roller derby. Also, the roller derby is the second sporting event Paluzzi and Employee #5 attended. Paluzzi said they attended one, not two.

██████ also described an incident he thought was questionable. When MCCC board member Alfredo Gutierrez stepped off the board, he sent an email to all staff. Paluzzi was in Spain at the time, and ██████ thought the news was important enough to call Paluzzi, even though it was after midnight in Spain. Employee #5 answered Paluzzi's cell phone, sounded very drunk, and said Paluzzi would call ██████ back in five minutes.

Even though Employee #5 denies that he and Paluzzi have a sexual relationship and states he has never felt uncomfortable around Paluzzi, the social relationship between a 62-year old male vice president and a much ██████ male subordinate raises questions about Paluzzi's hidden agenda, his ability to be fair and impartial as a manager and to decide who is given the privilege of traveling with him at the expense of the Friends of Public Radio Arizona. The power differential between Paluzzi and Employee #5, by definition, is a form of unwelcome conduct. However, Employee #5 did not appear to be offended by Paluzzi's attention or touching of his shoulders or back. Rather, other employees are offended by Paluzzi's favoritism toward Employee #5 who enjoys nice accommodations, good cuisine, and generous amounts of alcohol on his trips with Paluzzi. No employees pointed to Paluzzi's relationship with Employee #5 as interfering with or altering their working conditions, except in the context of possible gender discrimination.

In general, Paluzzi's response to the allegation that he sexually harasses young men he is attracted to is: "I don't get it. I don't get it." He is a married man with a wonderful wife and two daughters. He stated that if there is something he does that people see, he needs to be aware of it. He disputes the allegation that he is attracted to ██████ men, says he has a happy life and does not need to get relationships from work.

However, the number of social invitations he extends to men under his supervision suggests that Paluzzi does seek out social relationships with employees outside of work, especially with Employees #1, #2, and #3.

Findings: The allegation that Paluzzi sexually harasses ██████ men he is attracted to is in part substantiated and in part not substantiated. Paluzzi sexually harassed Employee #1, #2, and #3. The allegation that he dissuaded Employee #2 from reporting harassment or participating in this investigation is substantiated. The special attention he pays to attractive ██████ men creates an uncomfortable and distrusting work environment for those who are not given that level of attention or privilege.