RECEIVED

AUG 2 6 2009

PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

CITY OF SEATTLE PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

IN RE THE APPEAL OF:

B.T. ROBERT MAHONEY,

Appellant,

VS.

CITY OF SEATTLE, SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Respondent/Employer.

No. 09-001

AMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER

I. INTRODUCTION

The Commission heard this matter pursuant to a Notice of Appeal filed by Officer Bernard T. Robert Mahoney appealing disciplinary action imposed by the Seattle Police Department (Department). Chief Kerlikowske suspended Officer Mahoney for 30 days and transferred him out of the Training Unit of the Department.

The Commission held a full evidentiary hearing on May 1, 4, and 5, 2009, before Commissioners Joel Nark, Herb Johnson and Terry Carroll, with Commissioner Nark acting as Presiding Officer. The parties submitted briefs on May 29, 2009, which is therefore the date the Commission record closed. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XVI, Section 3 of the Seattle City Charter and Chapter 4.08 of the Seattle Municipal Code. The Commission may affirm, reverse or modify the department's decision. SMC 4.08.100.

MAHONEY v. SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT PSCSC No. 09-001 Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Page | 1

2

3

4

5

6

0

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The standard of review is found in SMC 4.08.100 and Commission Rule 6.21. The Department has the burden of showing by a preponderance of evidence that the discipline was "in good faith for cause." The Commission has the authority to affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the employing department pursuant to SMC 4.08.100.A.

The Commission has utilized several factors in analyzing whether the Department has met its burden. The factors are not exclusive - nor are they elements that each must be proven. As the Commission has repeatedly said in prior decisions, the factors are just that - factors it considers in its analysis.

The factors include whether: (1) the employee had notice that his or her conduct would result in disciplinary consequences; (2) the rule was reasonable; (3) the employer investigated to determine whether the rule was in fact violated; (4) the investigation was fair; (5) the employer's decision-maker had substantial evidence that the employee violated the rule as charged; (6) the employer applies its rules even-handedly; and (7) the discipline administered was fair in relation to the nature of the offense and imposed with regard to the employee's past work record.¹

The Commission analyzes each of the two charges in light of the factors to determine whether the Department had just cause to impose the disciplinary action. After considering the evidence in this case, including testimony, documentary evidence, and arguments of the parties and their representatives, the Commission entered Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, as provided in SMC 4.08.100.²

The Department and Officer Mahoney each moved for reconsideration of the Commission's decision. The Commission considered those motions and enters these Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order, which replace the original Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order dated July 29, 2009.

II. FINDINGS OF FACT

MAHONEY v. SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT PSCSC No. 09-001
Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Page | 2

¹ See PSCSC #07-005 Marcia Kinder v. SFD; PSCSC #06-006 Richard Roberson v. SPD; and PSCSC # 07-007 Felton J. Miles III v. SPD

² Unless noted otherwise, individual findings of fact and conclusions of law are unanimously adopted by the Commission

23

- 1. The Appellant, Officer B.T. Robert Mahoney, has been employed as a Seattle Police Officer for 10 years. At the time of his suspension, Officer Mahoney was assigned to the Department's Training Unit.
- 2. Prior to the suspension, Officer Mahoney had no disciplinary record during his 10 years of service.
- 3. In 2007, Officer Mahoney became acquainted with Heather Newstrom, a senior at Holy Names Academy. She was a leader in the Department's Explorer program and was often at the Department's training facility.
- 4. On April 7, 2008, Ms. Newstrom reported that Officer Mahoney kissed her on the lips earlier that evening after all the other SPD employees left the training unit, and that the kiss was both uninvited and unwelcome. She reported the details of the incident to Explorer Advisor Azrielle Johnson, who documented Ms. Newstrom's complaint and drafted a memo to Assistant Chief Nick Metz.
- 5. On April 10, 2008, the Department's Office of Professional Accountability (OPA) began investigating the allegation.
- 6. The Department concluded that Ms. Newstrom was credible and charged Officer Mahoney with misconduct. SPD later added the dishonesty charge based on official statements Officer Mahoney made during the OPA investigation. Chief Kerlikowske reviewed the investigation and imposed a 30-day suspension and a disciplinary transfer.
- 7. In the hearing before the Commission, Officer Mahoney denied the allegations and further alleged the OPA investigation was biased against him.

III. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Misconduct Charge - Inappropriate Contact with Ms. Newstrom

- 8. <u>Notice</u> Officers are responsible for knowing the Department manual. Officer Mahoney had proper notice and knowledge that inappropriate contact with an Explorer would result in disciplinary action against him and that an uninvited and unwelcome kiss was an inappropriate contact.
- 9. <u>Reasonableness of Rule</u> Officer Mahoney was in a position of trust in the Training Unit and relative to the Explorer program. A prohibition against inappropriate contact (such as an uninvited and unwelcome kiss) with program Explorers is eminently reasonable.

- 10. <u>Fairness of Investigation</u> The OPA conducted an investigation which included interviews with Officer Mahoney, Ms. Newstrom and others associated with the Explorer Program, the Training Unit and the Department. The Commission majority concludes that Officer Mahoney did not introduce evidence to support a nexus between the alleged bias against him in the Department and the investigation the Department conducted in this case. The Commission majority also concludes there is no substantial evidence to support Officer Mahoney's claim that the investigation of the misconduct charge was either improperly motivated or biased against him. The Commission unanimously concludes that the investigation of the misconduct charge was conducted fairly.
- Chief had Substantial Evidence The Commission unanimously concludes that Chief Kerlikowske had substantial evidence that Officer Mahoney had inappropriate contact with Ms. Newstrom. The Chief found Ms. Newstrom's allegation to be credible regarding this incident. Officer Mahoney and Ms. Newstrom told diametrically opposing stories. Based on the investigation and reports, the Chief of Police found there was substantial evidence to support Ms. Newstrom's version of events and to conclude that Officer Mahoney had engaged in misconduct by subjecting her to an uninvited and unwelcome kiss. The Commission also heard testimony from Ms. Newstrom and Officer Mahoney and concludes that the Chief of Police had ample evidence to believe Ms. Newstrom's version of the events, based on her immediate and later consistently similar descriptions of the incident and her complete lack of any demonstrated motivation to falsely make such an allegation.
- 12. Evenhandedness of Discipline –The Commission unanimously concludes that Officer Mahoney did not introduce evidence to support a nexus between the alleged bias against him in the Department and the disciplinary decision the Chief of Police made regarding the misconduct. The Commission majority also concludes that Officer Mahoney did not introduce any substantial evidence to support his claim that the misconduct discipline was imposed in an inconsistent or unfair manner.
- 13. <u>Proportionality</u> The Commission majority concludes that a 30-day suspension and disciplinary transfer was fair because of the serious nature of the misconduct. Although Officer Mahoney had a good record previous to this incident, he was in a special position trust. His mentoring role with Ms. Newstrom and his authoritative role in the program made her

especially vulnerable to his misconduct. The Commission majority also concludes that Officer Mahoney did not introduce any substantial evidence to support his claim that the degree of discipline for misconduct was disproportional in light of his record and the discipline imposed in other cases.

14. The Commission unanimously concludes that the Department had just cause to discipline Officer Mahoney by transferring and suspending him for misconduct. The Commission majority also concludes that the Department had met its burden of showing it had just cause to impose a suspension of 30 days for the misconduct.

The Dishonesty Charge - Lying in the OPA Investigation

- 15. However, a unanimous Commission has concerns about the application of a dishonesty charge in this case.
- 16. <u>Notice</u>. First, the Commission unanimously concludes that the Department may discipline employees for dishonesty. The SPD manual has for the entire time applicable in this case prohibited dishonesty and therefore put officers on notice that dishonesty may result in discipline.³
- 17. <u>Reasonableness</u>. A rule against dishonesty is also reasonable. The credibility of the Department depends upon the honesty of individual officers, particularly in an OPA investigation.
- 18. <u>Fairness of Investigation.</u> However, the Commission is concerned about the application of the dishonesty charges under these circumstances. The dishonesty charge was added during the pendency of the OPA investigation based solely on Officer Mahoney's statements to the investigators.
- 19. <u>Evenhandedness of Discipline</u> The Commission is unanimously concerned that the Department has not charged dishonesty in a consistent manner. Rather, the evidence shows that Department did not charge dishonesty in other misconduct cases in which the Chief resolved credibility differences against the officer and in favor of another witness.

³ A new version of the applicable collective bargaining agreement (CBA) was adopted during the pendency of the OPA investigation of this case. It included new language regarding terminations in dishonesty cases and the level of proof required in such cases. The parties disagree about the importance of those changes to this appeal. The Commission does not have authority to construe ambiguity in a CBA, but also concludes that it need not construe the CBA, since by its plain language it applies to termination cases. This is a suspension and transfer case – not a termination case.

2	
3	
4	
5	
200	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

20. The potential exists for inconsistent application of a dishonestly charge. The preponderance of the evidence in this case showed that Department has not applied the charge consistently. The Commission unanimously concludes that the Department did not in this particular case have just cause to discipline Officer Mahoney for dishonesty.

IV. DECISION

- 1. The Commission unanimously concludes that the Department met its burden of proving that it transferred Officer Mahoney out of the Training Unit in good faith for cause based upon his misconduct toward Ms. Newstrom.
- 2. The Commission majority also concludes that the Department met its burden of proving that it suspended Officer Mahoney for 30 days in good faith for cause based upon his misconduct toward Ms. Newstrom.
- The Commission unanimously concludes that the preponderance of the evidence shows that the Department did not discipline Officer Mahoney for dishonesty in good faith for cause.

V. ORDER

- 1. The Commission affirms the Department's disciplinary transfer and 30-day suspension of Officer Mahoney for misconduct.
 - 2. The Commission dismisses the charge of dishonesty.

Dated this ___ day of August, 2009.

PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE

Commissioner Herbert V. Johnson

Tem Coull (by set)

ommissioner Terry Carroll

8/26/09 Date

8/26/09

MAHONEY v. SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT

PSCSC No. 09-001

Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order

Page | 6

PARTIAL DISSENT

I agree with the Commission majority that the Department has shown that Officer Mahoney engaged in serious misconduct. I also agree that the Department had just cause to transfer Officer Mahoney from the Training Unit, and to suspend him for that misconduct.

I also agree with the Commission majority that the circumstances surrounding the dishonesty charge are troubling. I am concerned that every case of conflicting statements that the Chief of Police resolves in favor of another witness, whether SPD or civilian, not become a separate dishonesty charge.

I do not agree, however, that the Department had just cause to suspend Officer Mahoney for 30 days for this offense. Given his good record before this incident, I would find that the Department had just cause to suspend him for no more than 15 days for this incident of misconduct which, although serious, does not in my opinion justify a 30 day suspension.

Commissioner Joel Nark

(byget) 8/26/09 Date

MAHONEY v. SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT PSCSC No. 09-001
Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Page | 7