Boulder County Sheriff's Office

To: Sheriff Johnson
From: Division Chief Goetz
Date: July 1, 2026
Ref: IA2026-10 Disposition and Recommendation for Termination

On May 15th, an allegation of employee misconduct was initiated against Deputy Cecilia Salazar alleging she was having a relationship with an inmate currently in custody. The evidence gathered during the investigation includes: Documented inmate phone calls, inmate chirping devices, video visitation interactions, commissary account deposits, fake phone account initiation to create the phone account for the inmate devices and unauthorized monitoring of the Fusion inmate monitoring system and knowledge of a possible assault that occurred in one of the dorms which she did not report or act on. These interactions were documented with Inmate [redacted]

On May 14, 2026, Commanders Marostica and Vaughan were notified of the situation when an inmate, [redacted], made a statement to the effect that he couldn't get in trouble for an incident that had previously occurred on a work crew assignment. He stated that he had a deputy on night shift that was watching out for him and they would get him out of trouble. Both commanders immediately began to search through the Fusion inmate auditing system to look at inmate chirps and phone calls to attempt to locate any information to support his statement.

The documented interactions began on May 3, 2026, while inmate [redacted] was housed in dorm Charlie 2. As explained below, the investigation determined that the phone number [redacted] is likely from a burner phone and there is strong evidence linking Deputy Salazar to the phone. Communication with the phone ceased when Inmate [redacted] was ultimately removed from Charlie 2 for his actions during the work crew incident on the 14th. Below is an outline of events which occurred between May 3, 2026, and May 14, 2026, that includes documented interactions between [redacted] and Inmate [redacted]:

- 5/2 – Salazar calls from [redacted] and warns [redacted] that all calls and chirps are recorded. [redacted] asks you if he can call her phone and she states, "not yet."
- 5/2 – [redacted] has a video visit with his sister, [redacted] and asks her to look up a profile named [redacted] on Facebook. [redacted] confirms that the profile belongs to Salazar. [redacted] sends Salazar a friend request and Salazar immediately accepted it.
- 5/3 – At 1430hrs, in a chirp from [redacted] the sender told [redacted] she was going to call off at work. Timecard records show that Salazar called in sick later that day for that night shift.
- 5/4 – Phone call between [redacted] (Salazar) and [redacted] occurred to get to know each other better.

Boulder County Sheriff's Office

- 5/4 – [redacted] texts [redacted] stating that he slapped a "Tranny" inmate in the dorms. He asked the recipient if she knew who he was talking about and she answered yes. Later it was confirmed there was a transgender inmate in the same dorm as [redacted] during that time frame.
- 5/5 – Fusion shows Salazar loaded free time into [redacted] account on 5/5/2026. When the system was audited from 5/2 through 5/14, it reflects over 700 messages between [redacted] and [redacted].
- 5/6 – A chirp was sent from [redacted] questioning [redacted] why he was talking with another girl like they talk to each other. [redacted] questions why the sender can see his chirps and calls, but he can't see hers.
- 5/6 – They begin to have sexually explicit conversations with each other about what they are going to when he gets out of jail in June. There is a conversation around how [redacted] had a penile implant and couldn't wait to use it on Salazar when he got out.
- 5/7 – Chirp from [redacted] sent to [redacted] stating she was called into work. Shift logs show Salazar was called in that night as an on call.
- 5/7 – Salazar conducted a welfare check in Charlie 2, where [redacted] was housed, and she was not assigned to Building C that shift. Later that night, there is a chirp from [redacted] to Salazar stating that he was surprised she came into his housing unit.
- 5/11 – 5/14. Multiple chirps arguing over relationship issues, discussing his multiple children and his two-month-old newborn. At one point, both say "I love you."
- 5/14 – Final chirp happened on this date as [redacted] was moved from Building C due to his outburst with the Crew Bosses.

Commander Marostica utilized the assistance of Detective Analyst Dave Myers to ascertain the origin of the cell phone number [redacted]. It was determined that the phone was linked to a King Soopers off HWY 287 in Broomfield and was more than likely a burner phone purchased there. There was no direct evidence that Deputy Salazar owned the phone with number [redacted]. However, when Commander Marostica was reviewing the module camera footage of Salazar looking into [redacted] Fusion account, [redacted] account can be seen in the reflection of her screen on the window behind her. There is an audit log on 5/5/26 showing the deposit she made into Inmate [redacted] account.

Sergeant Trenka interviewed Deputy Salazar and asked specific questions regarding her involvement with inmate [redacted] His first question was a follow up to my question when I called her to place her on administrative leave. He asked her if she was in a relationship with [redacted] and she replied, "no". Sergeant Trenka asked her the following questions with her replies:

- Are you involved in a relationship with Inmate [redacted]? – "No".
- Have you been engaged in romantic conversations with Inmate [redacted] over the phone while he has been incarcerated in the Boulder County Jail? – "No".

- Have you communicated with Inmate [redacted] through the use of inmate chirps? – "No".
- Have you called or spoken with Inmate [redacted] while you were working? – "No".
- Has Inmate [redacted] communicated with you while you were working? – "No".
- Do you know Inmate [redacted] sister? – "No".
- Have you communicated with Inmate [redacted] sister? – "No".
- Have you accepted a Facebook friend request from Inmate [redacted] or his family? – "No".
- Have you given Inmate [redacted] your personal Facebook account information so that his family could look up or communicate with you? – "No".
- Sergeant Trenka showed Deputy Salazar a screenshot of Salazar's Facebook page and asked if that was hers. Salazar responded "Yes".
- Sergeant Trenka asked why Inmate [redacted] sister would show Inmate [redacted] her Facebook profile. Deputy Salazar replied, "I don't know".
- Asked if she gave money to Inmate [redacted] sister to put on his inmate account. – "No".
- Did you put money on Inmate [redacted] account? – "No".
- Have you been relaying messages to and from or between Inmate [redacted] sister, herself and him? – "No".
- Were you informed by Inmate [redacted] about an assault that took place between Inmate [redacted] and another inmate in which Inmate [redacted] mentioned that he had to "slap around a transgender inmate"? – "No".
- Do you own or possess a cell phone with the phone number [redacted]? – "No".
- Did you purchase a phone from Kings Soopers in Broomfield? – "No".
- Did you use your position as a deputy to look up Inmate [redacted] Fusion Activity log? – "No".
- Did you use the Fusion Activity log to see who Inmate [redacted] was communicating with? – "No".
- When asked why we had 80 pages of chirps between her and Inmate [redacted] she replied "They're not me".
- When asked to give Sergeant Trenka an overall impression of the allegations set forth against her, she replied "It doesn't look good".
- When asked why, she replied "Um, just looks like I did…I did it".
- When asked if she had anything to say on her behalf, she replied very quietly "no".

Regarding the allegation that Deputy Salazar did not report a possible assault, Commander Vaughan reported that he could not find any concrete evidence that an assault had taken place in Building C at the time Inmate [redacted] mentioned this. It is unclear if the inmate just did not come forward with information that they had been assaulted or if Inmate [redacted] had just made up the story to impress Deputy Salazar.

Boulder County Sheriff's Office

After careful review of the investigation, I find there is enough evidence to **Sustain** the policy violations listed below. Even though Deputy Salazar never admitted to any of these allegations, there is significant circumstantial evidence tying Deputy Salazar to the phone number [redacted] and showing that an improper relationship more than likely occurred with Inmate [redacted] This evidence includes: Deputy Salazar reviewing Inmate [redacted] Fusion account, adding money to his account, chirps indicating that the sender was going to be on or off of work that corresponded with changes in Salazar's schedule, chirps that corresponded to an unanticipated visit by Salazar to [redacted] housing dorm, and the sharing of Facebook information.

Below are the policy violations I find Deputy Salazar to be in violation of:

BCSO Policy – 310 – Code of Conduct

- I – Rules (A) – Sheriff's Office employees obey all federal, state and local laws, regulations or ordinances.
- II – (A)(7) – Using abusive, inappropriate, sexually suggestive, or belligerent language or conduct toward any person.
- II – (L)(1) – Truthfulness – Sheriff's employee are required to be honest and truthful in the execution of their duties. Employees shall not knowingly make an untrue statement concerning a material fact, knowingly omit a material fact, or knowingly commit a deceptive act, on any official report or record, in any conversation with a supervisor, while testifying under oath, during the disciplinary process, or during a criminal, internal affairs, or administrative investigation.
- III – (M)(2) – Employees are not to become romantically and/or sexually involved with any person in custody and are discouraged from becoming romantically or sexually involved with former inmates or convicted felons.
- III – (M)(3) – Employees are not to engage the services, borrow money or any type of property, or lend money or any type of property, to any inmate, arrestee, or detainee while that person is in the custody of the Boulder County Sherif's Office.

Because these policy violations are very serious, I am recommending the termination of Deputy Cecilia Salazar's employment with the Sheriff's Office.