

May 1, 2025

Senator Charles E. Grassley
135 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Grassley,

I am writing in response to your March 31 letter requesting additional information following our March 14 response. I am writing on behalf of the U.S. Center for SafeSport as General Counsel and Vice President of Response and Resolution because, as we have previously shared, Ju'Riese Colón is no longer serving as CEO for the Center. I joined the Center in August of 2023 and lead the Center's legal, intake, resolutions, and investigations teams.

The Center continues to be willing to respond to your questions and offered, and requested via email, the opportunity to brief you and your team following our March 14 response to your initial inquiry, particularly around our cooperation with law enforcement in this matter. We reiterate our request to meet directly with you and your staff to discuss this sensitive matter and respond to any remaining questions.

Below please find additional information in response to your follow-up questions.

1. You referenced a third-party recruitment firm that was involved in Mr. Krasley's hiring.

(a) Which third-party recruitment firm was SafeSport working with at the time of Mr. Krasley's hiring?

Diverse Talent ([Employment Agency | Denver, CO | Diverse Talent](#))

(b) What criteria were considered by SafeSport in its selection of this firm to carry out recruitment efforts?

Following the passage of the Empowering Olympic and Paralympic Athletes Act of 2020, which guaranteed the Center's annual funding, the Center identified a local, Denver-based firm to support recruiting candidates for investigator positions as reports of abuse and misconduct continued to increase. Diverse Talent is based in Denver, as is the Center, and has over 30 years of experience in the recruiting space.

(c) What criteria did the firm consider as it sought to recruit candidates for the role of investigator?

The following criteria were considered for the investigator position:

- Critical thinking/analysis
- Managing confidential information
- Experience with a case management database
- Written communication skills
- Number of years of sexual assault investigative experience
- Diverse mindset
- Case load per year
- Interview experience with victims, witnesses, and suspects

(d) Is this the same firm that conducted Mr. Krasley's reference checks?

Yes.

(e) Who were Mr. Krasley's references? Please include their titles and organizations.

The Center is providing you the names and organizations of Mr. Krasley's references, but asks that you do not disclose them publicly to protect the privacy of these individuals. If a determination is made to publish this letter, we request that the names are redacted.

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

2. You stated that a "reputable third-party provider" conducted background checks for prospective employees.

(a) Who was the "reputable third-party provider" with whom you contracted to perform criminal background checks on prospective employees at the time you hired Mr. Krasley?

[National Center for Safety Initiatives, LLC \(NCSI\).](#)

(b) Is this the same provider with whom you contract for this purpose currently?

Yes.

(c) If not, who is the current provider, and what prompted the change in providers?

N/A

3. On any application form for candidates seeking employment as SafeSport investigators, does SafeSport directly ask applicants if they have ever been the subject of any internal or external investigation in the context of any prior employment and the result of any such investigation?

The Center does not have this as a question on its application but will be adding it to the interview process going forward beginning May 2025.

4. Why didn't SafeSport apply additional scrutiny into Mr. Krasley's alleged conduct that was the topic of the police department's internal investigation regarding him? Why did SafeSport hire him despite the troubling information it did have at its disposal at that time?

There should have been additional scrutiny into the concerning statements by the reference, which would prompt additional scrutiny today. Unfortunately, we have been unable to find any evidence of further inquiry by the Center into the internal investigation. As explained in detail in the Center's March 14 letter, the Center has implemented stronger hiring policies and procedures going forward, including enhanced reference checks and accessing the [National Decertification Index \(NDI\)](#), a national registry of certificate or license revocation actions relating to officer misconduct, among other improvements.

5. You did not answer my question regarding how SafeSport became aware of the May 2019 and June 2024 allegations against Mr. Krasley. Please do so now.

The Center was initially contacted by a law enforcement official on September 4, 2024, inquiring about Mr. Krasley's whereabouts. The next day, the law enforcement official informed the Center of the May 2019 and

June 2024 allegations. In response to the inquiry by law enforcement about Mr. Krasley's whereabouts, the Center confirmed with law enforcement that Mr. Krasley worked remotely from his home in Pennsylvania.

6. You fired Mr. Krasley *more than two full months* after you became aware of the May 2019 and June 2024 allegations against Mr. Krasley.

(a) Why didn't SafeSport suspend Mr. Krasley immediately?

We were specifically asked by law enforcement not to take any actions that could alert Mr. Krasley to a criminal investigation.

(b) Why didn't SafeSport fire Mr. Krasley sooner?

We were specifically asked by law enforcement not to take any actions that could alert Mr. Krasley to a criminal investigation.

(c) Did law enforcement ask SafeSport to refrain from taking action against Mr. Krasley for any period of time?

Yes.

(d) What were the nature of SafeSport's internal deliberations about the allegations against him?

Our former CEO, head of Human Resources, head of investigations, and I communicated on a weekly basis about the matter and the Center was in weekly communications with the law enforcement source. See below for further information.

(e) What safeguards did SafeSport implement during the two months Mr. Krasley worked for SafeSport despite being the subject of criminal charges and a pending criminal investigation?

The Center closely monitored Krasley's work during this time, including advising his direct supervisor to closely monitor and report any identified irregularities; reviewing interview transcripts; ensuring no in-person investigative work was completed; and maintaining regular communication with the law enforcement source. Nothing of concern was observed during this period.

7. You shared that there were individuals who reached out to SafeSport to express concerns about Mr. Krasley as an investigator. (a) How many individuals reached out "expressing concerns about [Mr. Krasley's] communication style, professionalism, and investigation tactics"? To which specific employees at SafeSport were these concerns communicated initially and subsequently? (b) What was the status of the individuals who shared concerns about Mr. Krasley as an investigator? (I.e., victims, parents of victims, fellow SafeSport investigators or other colleagues) (c) What were the precise concerns regarding his communication style, professionalism, and investigation tactics? (d) How, if at all, did SafeSport respond to and address these concerns? Why didn't the concerns become grounds for a performance evaluation and corrective measures, suspension, and/or termination?

One individual expressed concern regarding Mr. Krasley prior to his dismissal. At the time of our March 14 response, four additional individuals had raised concerns related to Mr. Krasley with either the Center or Aleta Law, the firm conducting the audit of Mr. Krasley's matters. Since our March 14 response, four more concerns have been raised. Please see Appendix A for brief summaries of each complaint.

-
8. You commissioned Aleta Law, a third-party firm, to audit Mr. Krasley's cases "to ensure fairness and adherence to the Center's investigative protocol" and promised that "a report on the findings w[ould] be made publicly available upon completion." Please share the report directly with me as part of your response to this letter, or as soon as it is completed.

The audit is ongoing, and we will reply with the report upon completion.

Thank you again for your questions about this serious matter. This response is based on our current knowledge and understanding of the facts, as time has passed and staffing changes have occurred. Again, we welcome the opportunity to brief you and your staff.

Sincerely,

Jessica Perrill

Jessica Perrill
General Counsel and Vice President, Response & Resolution
U.S. Center for SafeSport

APPENDIX A

The Center has made every effort to protect the identity of those involved in our process in the below descriptions, omitting names and other identifying information from the narratives. These complaints are being considered in Aleta Law's ongoing review of cases.

Received prior to dismissal:

- Roughly a year prior to Mr. Krasley's arrest, a claimant expressed concern to a Center Resource and Process Advisor about the outcome of their case, which was not upheld in arbitration. The claimant mentioned feeling pressured by Mr. Krasley not to pursue some of the allegations related to grooming that allegedly occurred when they were a minor and also that Mr. Krasley had told the claimant that he had an amicable relationship with the respondent's attorney. After reviewing the case and evidence, Mr. Krasley's supervisor responded to the claimant to let them know that the grooming allegations were not pursued because there was neither criminal law nor national governing body policy in place, at the time (decades ago), that would have prohibited the alleged conduct, and the Center had no applicable policy to proceed with an investigation of the alleged conduct. After learning of Mr. Krasley's arrest, the same claimant reached out again to a Process Navigator (formerly called Resource and Process Advisors) about their interactions with Mr. Krasley.

Received after dismissal:

- A few months after Krasley's dismissal, a second claimant reached out to Aleta Law and stated that over a six-month period, Mr. Krasley repeatedly contacted them to participate in an interview, despite the claimant informing Mr. Krasley that they did not want to participate.
- A third individual, a parent and advisor to a minor claimant, expressed concern to Aleta Law that Mr. Krasley did not allow them to participate in an interview of their child, which was conducted by another investigator on the Center's Specialized Interview Team—a group of investigators with expertise in forensic interviewing of minors. Mr. Krasley did not attend in person or participate in the questioning, but was present on the Zoom interview. The parent was not permitted to participate because, per Center policy, they were identified as a witness and also a respondent in a cross-complaint, but the parent was permitted to be present at the beginning and conclusion of the interview.
- A fourth individual, a claimant, contacted the Center and Aleta Law concerning Mr. Krasley. The claimant's concerns have been reported in the media, available here: <https://apnews.com/article/safesport-arrested-investigator-85b08ef6395685c9ef75308f0d656c2e>
- A fifth individual, a claimant and parent of a minor claimant, contacted the Center and said that Mr. Krasley pressured them to put their case on hold, stating Mr. Krasley said he had allegations against the parent from the respondent's supporters. The claimant said that Mr. Krasley insisted on interviewing their child unsupervised. Mr. Krasley did not interview the minor, it was completed by a member of the Center's Specialized Interview Team although Mr. Krasley was present on the Zoom interview.
- A sixth individual, a parent and advisor of a minor claimant, contacted Aleta Law and reported that Mr. Krasley did not contact key individuals they identified and told the claimant before their

interview and that that respondent would see the interview recording. Mr. Krasley interviewed the minor claimant with the parent present.

- A seventh individual, a parent and advisor of a minor claimant, contacted the Center and reported concerns that they and their spouse were not allowed in the interview with their child, and that Mr. Krasley told them respondents would see the interview recording of the claimant before their interviews, causing the parents to ask for the investigation to be placed on hold. Mr. Krasley did not interview the minor claimant; it was completed by a member of the Center's Specialized Interview Team, although Mr. Krasley was present on the Zoom interview.
- An eighth individual, a parent and advisor of a minor claimant, contacted Aleta Law and expressed concerns about Mr. Krasley not reaching out to all involved parties and witnesses.
- A ninth individual, a parent and an advisor of a claimant, reached out to Aleta Law and expressed concern regarding how Mr. Krasley phrased interview questions.