BEFORE THE SEATTLE ETHICS AND ELECTIONS COMMISSION

In The Matter Of	)	Case No. 10-WBI-0210-1
TERI WOODS	)	**CHARGING DOCUMENT**

To: Ms. Teri Woods and
The Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission

Pursuant to Seattle Municipal Code ("SMC") §§ 4.16.090.F and 3.70.100.D, and Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission Administrative Rule 3.H, NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Executive Director of the Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission has reasonable cause to believe that Ms. Teri Woods has committed material violations of the Seattle Ethics Code. The Executive Director hereby charges as follows:

I. Ms. Woods violated SMC 4.16.070.1.a [prior to the July, 2009 amendment] when she approved awards of Project Share funds to Mr. Paul Howie in May of 2007, May of 2008 and March of 2009. At the time of these awards, Mr. Howie was Ms. Woods's boyfriend.

II. Ms. Woods violated SMC 4.16.070.1.c [as amended in July, 2009] when she approved awards of Project Share funds to Mr. Paul Howie in September of 2009, only five months after they ended their relationship.

III. Ms. Woods violated SMC 4.16.070.2.a when she used her City position for other than a City purpose by approving payments for Mr. Howie despite the fact that his income substantially exceeded the allowable limit for the disbursement of Project Share funds.

IV. Ms. Woods violated SMC 4.163.070.1.a [prior to the 2009 amendment] when she approved awards of Project Share funds on two occasions to Mr. Anthony Ross, her ex-husband and the father of her children.

V. Ms. Woods violated SMC 4.16.070.1.c [as amended July 2009] when she approved awards of Project Share funds to Mr. Anthony Ross, who was her ex-husband and the father of her children, in September 2009.

In support of these charges, the Executive Director further states the following:

1. Ms. Woods at all times between 2006 and December 2010 was a full-time employee of the City of Seattle and therefore a Covered Individual, subject to the City's Ethics Code.

2. Ms. Woods was involved in a romantic relationship with Mr. Paul Howie from 2005 until April, 2009.

3. Mr. Howie has been a King County employee since 1992. King County records show Mr. Howie's annual income, including overtime, to have been $64,163 in 2007, $63,308 in 2008 and $65,677 in 2009.

4. Ms. Woods authorized Project Share assistance for Mr. Howie on four occasions between May 2007 and August 2009. Ms. Woods completed intake forms in each instance which list Mr. Howie's household income as $3,000 per month, and his household size as two.

- In May 2007, Ms. Woods approved a Project Share payment to Mr. Howie's electric bill totaling $186.
- In May, 2008, Ms. Woods approved a Project Share payment to Mr. Howie's electric bill totaling $334. There is no record of Mr. Howie making a $168 co-payment within 60 days of May 2008, nor any record of an exception being approved by the Utility Assistance Program supervisor.
- In March 2009, Ms. Woods approved a Project Share payment to Mr. Howie's electric bill totaling $400. There is no indication that the required customer co-payment was made, and the payment together with the May 2008 exceeded the $500 per 12-month period limit by $234. There is no record of exceptions being approved by the Utility Assistance Program supervisor.
- In August, 2009, Ms. Woods approved a Project Share payment to Mr. Howie's electric bill totaling $100. There is no UDP application on file or documentation

verifying income, as required under the May 2009 Guidelines, nor any record of an exception being approved by the Utility Assistance Program supervisor.

At all times, Mr. Howie's income disqualified him from receiving Project Share funds.

5. Ms. Woods authorized Project Share funds to be disbursed for the benefit of Mr. Anthony Ross. Mr. Ross is Ms. Woods's ex-husband and the father of her children. On two occasions, Ms. Woods made the determination that Mr. Ross was eligible for Project Share funds and authorized funds to be paid toward his electric bill.

- In July 2008, Ms. Woods approved a Project Share payment to Mr. Ross's electric bill totaling $312. Mr. Ross paid $100 of the $142 required for him to receive the amount of the pledge over $250. There is no record of an exception being approved by the Utility Assistance Program supervisor.

- On September 4, 2009, Ms. Woods approved a Project Share payment to Mr. Ross's electric bill totaling $397. Although Mr. Ross should have made a $294 matching payment, SCL records do not confirm a payment. Ms. Woods noted on the file that the customer had paid $160 on July 11, 2009, but Mr. Ross actually made a $100 payment in April and a $60 payment in June, well outside the window for qualifying as a match. There is no UDP Application on file or documentation verifying income and no record of an exception being approved by the Utility Assistance Program supervisor.

This notice is hereby given on this 2nd day of February, 2011.

Wayne Barnett, Executive Director
Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission

APPENDIX A

1. Effective July 21, 2009, the Seattle Ethics Code, SMC 4.16.070.1.c, provides that a Covered Individual may not "[p]erform any official duties when it could appear to a reasonable person, having knowledge of the relevant circumstances, that the Covered Individual's judgment is impaired because of (1) a personal or business relationship not covered under subsection [4.16.070.1.a] or [4.16.0701.b] or (2) a transaction or activity engaged in by the Covered Individual."

2. Prior to July 21, 2009, the Seattle Ethics Code, SMC 4.16.070.1.a provided that no City officer or employee shall "[e]ngage in any transaction or activity, which is, or would to a reasonable person appear to be, in conflict with or incompatible with the proper discharge of official duties, or which impairs, or would to a reasonable person appear to impair, the officer's or employee's independence of judgment or action in the performance of official duties and fail to disqualify him or herself from official action in those instances where the conflict occurs."

3. The Seattle Ethics Code, SMC 4.16.070.2.a states that no Covered Individual may "use or attempt to use his or her official position for a purpose that is, or would to a reasonable person appear to be primarily for the private benefit of the Covered Individual or any other person, rather than primarily for the benefit of the City."