



City of Seattle

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Public Safety Civil Service Commission

Commissioner Stacy Connoles, Chair

Commissioner Richard Greene

Commissioner Joel A. Nark

Staff

Andrea Scheele, Executive Director

Sarah Butler, Operations & Policy Advisor

Teresa Jacobs, Executive Assistant

CITY OF SEATTLE PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA

The agenda is subject to change to address immediate Commission concerns.

DATE: Thursday, November 16, 2023

TIME: 11:15 a.m.

LOCATION: Hybrid meeting- In person or via Webex

In Person: Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 5th Ave #1679, Seattle, WA 98104. At the 4th floor main building entry security desk, request elevator access to 16th floor and follow the signs to Public Safety Civil Service Commission at Suite 1679.

Join from the meeting link

<https://seattle.webex.com/seattle/j.php?MTID=mc04c649bf4014cf7a129d679b9d3102d>

Join by meeting number

Meeting number (access code): 2489 170 8279 **Meeting password:** FixfQhNh342

Tap to join from a mobile device (attendees only)

+1-206-207-1700,,24891708279## United States Toll (Seattle)

+1-408-418-9388,,24891708279## United States Toll

Join by phone

+1-206-207-1700 United States Toll (Seattle) +1-408-418-9388 United States Toll

Join from a video system or application: Dial [24891708279@seattle.webex.com](https://seattle.webex.com)

You can also dial 173.243.2.68 and enter your meeting number.

Need help? Go to <https://help.webex.com>

City of Seattle Civil Service Commissions Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1670 PO Box 94729 Seattle, WA 98124-4729

Tel (206) 437-5425, Fax: (206) 684-0755 <http://www.seattle.gov/CivilServiceCommissions/>

An equal employment opportunity employer. To request accommodation, please contact us.

**PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA
November 16, 2023 @ 11:15 a.m.**

Meeting materials will be posted to the PSCSC website prior to the scheduled meeting time.

AUDIO/VIDEO TECH CHECK

CHAIR (PSCSC 2.04)

1. CALL TO ORDER 2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 3. INTRODUCTIONS 4. PUBLIC COMMENT

ACTION ITEMS

5. PSCSC RULEMAKING-10.03 RETURN TO ELIGIBLE REGISTER AFTER SEPARATION –
REINSTATEMENT REGISTER

- Proposed Changes- Process and Highlights (Executive Director) [Pages 3-9](#)
- Executive Director's Public Comment [Pages 10-13](#)
- Public Comment on Proposed Changes [Page 14](#) (*No written comments as of 11-13-23*)
- Discussion
- Executive Session
- Commission Vote on Proposed Rule Changes

6. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES [Pages 15-18](#)

- October 19, 2023-Special Meeting

DISCUSSION ITEMS

7. 42ND ANNUAL CIVIL SERVICE CONFERENCE-*Recap*

8. NOVEMBER 2023 CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEE ELECTION-*Update*

9. FIRE AND POLICE EXAM UNIT

- Police Exams Update- Rachael Schade, Police Exams Administrator
- Fire Exams Update- Yoshiko Grace Matsui, Fire Exams Administrator

10. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DEPARTMENTAL AND BUDGET UPDATE [Page 19-Budget](#)

11. CASE STATUS REPORT [Page 20-26](#)

- Willis v. SPD-PSCSC #23-01-004A-*New Appeal* [Pages 27-41](#)

12. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

13. EXECUTIVE SESSION- To discuss pending, potential, or actual litigation
(*May be cancelled if not needed*)

14. ADJOURN

**NEXT PSCSC MEETING: December 14, 2023 @ 10:00 a.m.
END OF AGENDA**

PSCSC RULEMAKING-10.03 RETURN TO ELIGIBLE REGISTER
AFTER SEPARATION – REINSTATEMENT REGISTER

- Notice of Publication (Daily Journal of Commerce
- Proposed Changes (Redline)
- Proposed Changes Accepted
- Current Rules of Practice and Procedure (Approved
11-16-2022-Rule 10.03 only)

City of Seattle

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING

The Seattle Public Safety Civil Service Commission ("PSCSC" or "Commission") is proposing amendments to the PSCSC Rules of Practice and Procedure under the authority granted to the Commission by law, including Seattle Municipal Code Sections 3.02.030 and 3.02.020.

Public comment will be heard, and discussion and final action may occur, at the Commission's meeting on November 16, 2023, at 11:15 a.m. The Commission requests the public's review and comment.

The amendments are proposed to clarify and revise PSCSC Rule 10.03. The proposed amendments would modify criteria for former employees of the public safety civil service system to submit a request to be considered for reinstatement to the eligible register after separation and would make other related changes.

The full text of the current rule can be found at: https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/PSCSC/PSCSC%20Meeting%20recordings/Rules%202022/2022_PSCSC_Rules_Process_%26_Procedure_Clerk_Filing.pdf.

The public may view a redline version of the proposed changes and a clean copy on the Commission's website: <https://www.seattle.gov/public-safety-civil-service-commission>. See the news sidebar for links or click on Laws, Rules & Policies.

Public comment must be received by 5:00 pm, November 15th for consideration at the Commission's meeting on November 16, 2023, at 11:15 a.m. Written public comment can be provided to the Commission via this email address <mailto:PublicSafety@seattle.gov>.

Dates of publication in the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce, November 1 and 2, 2023.

11/2(422150)

10.03 RETURN TO ELIGIBLE REGISTER AFTER SEPARATION ~~DUE TO RESIGNATION, RETIREMENT, OR SEPARATION FOR MEDICAL OR DISABILITY (NOT RETIREMENT);~~ REINSTATEMENT REGISTER

[PROPOSED CHANGES- REDLINE]

a. Request submittal, criteria, and PSCSC verification – A former employee who ~~resigned, retired, or was separated for medical or disability reasons but not granted disability retirement~~ any reason other than for cause may ~~submit a request return of their name to be added to a supplemental/reinstatement register to be considered with the open graded eligible register for the classification or rank. Such request must be within one year from date of resignation, retirement, or separation due to disability; provided, the Executive Director may extend the above time limitation for not to exceed an additional four years upon satisfactory showing that such extension would be to the best interests of the City;~~

b. Any request for return to register under this rule ~~1. Such separated employees must be supported by written recommendations~~ submit their requests to the Executive Director of the PSCSC.

2. Such separated employees must submit their requests within one year from the date of separation; provided, the Executive Director may extend the above time limitation up to an additional four years upon satisfactory showing, as determined by the Executive Director, that such extension would be to the best interests of the City.

3. The Executive Director shall verify that the request was timely, and that City records reflect the requestor's separation was not for cause.

b. Former employing department decision on request – The Executive Director shall submit requests verified as meeting the criteria of Rule 10.a to the former employing department's appointing authority; for written approval or denial of the former employee's request to be added to the reinstatement register.

c. Certification to former employing department – A former employee whose eligibility is reinstated under this rule shall be certified according to civil service rules. However, the name of such an eligible need be considered only by the department which recommends the return of the name to the register, and the person will remain eligible until appointed and/or the register expires.

d. Promotional eligibility for reinstated employees– The name of a ~~former~~reinstated employee who seeks reinstatement under this rule may not be returned to was listed on a promotional register, unless recommended by at the headtime of the former employing department and approved by the Public Safety Civil Service Commission within one year from the date of resignation, their separation shall be returned to that promotional register if such register has not expired.

e. Except as provided in 10.02, 10.03 and 10.04, any return to the City service shall be by examination only.

Scheele, Andrea

Formatted: Indent First line: 0.5"

10.03 RETURN TO ELIGIBLE REGISTER AFTER SEPARATION – REINSTATEMENT REGISTER

[CHANGES ACCEPTED VERSION]

a. Request submittal, criteria, and PSCSC verification – A former employee who separated for any reason other than for cause may request to be added to a reinstatement register to be considered with the open graded eligible register for the classification or rank.

1. Such separated employees must submit their requests to the Executive Director of the PSCSC.

2. Such separated employees must submit their requests within one year from the date of separation; provided, the Executive Director may extend the above time limitation up to an additional four years upon satisfactory showing, as determined by the Executive Director, that such extension would be to the best interests of the City.

3. The Executive Director shall verify that the request was timely, and that City records reflect the requestor's separation was not for cause.

b. Former employing department decision on request – The Executive Director shall submit requests verified as meeting the criteria of Rule 10.a to the former employing department's appointing authority for written approval or denial of the former employee's request to be added to the reinstatement register.

c. Certification to former employing department – A former employee whose eligibility is reinstated under this rule shall be certified according to civil service rules. However, the name of such an eligible need be considered only by the department which recommends the return of the name to the register, and the person will remain eligible until appointed and/or the register expires.

d. Promotional eligibility for reinstated employees – The name of a reinstated employee who was listed on a promotional register at the time of their separation shall be returned to that promotional register if such register has not expired.

e. Except as provided in 10.02, 10.03 and 10.04, any return to the City service shall be by examination only.



**CITY OF SEATTLE
PUBLIC SAFETY
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

**RULES OF PRACTICE AND
PROCEDURE**

Approved November 16, 2022

10.03 RETURN TO ELIGIBLE REGISTER AFTER SEPARATION DUE TO RESIGNATION, RETIREMENT, OR SEPARATION FOR MEDICAL OR DISABILITY (NOT RETIREMENT):

- a. A former employee who resigned, retired, or was separated for medical or disability reasons but not granted disability retirement may request return of their name to a supplemental register to be considered with the open graded eligible register for the classification or rank. Such request must be made within one year from date of resignation, retirement, or separation due to disability; provided, the Executive Director may extend the above time limitation for not to exceed an additional four years upon satisfactory showing that such extension would be to the best interests of the City;
- b. Any request for return to register under this rule must be supported by written recommendation of the former employing department's appointing authority;
- c. A former employee whose eligibility is reinstated under this rule shall be certified according to civil service rules. However, the name of such an eligible need be considered only by the department which recommends the return of the name to the register, and the person will remain eligible until appointed and/or the register expires.
- d. The name of a former employee who seeks reinstatement under this rule may not be returned to a promotional register, unless recommended by the head of the former employing department and approved by the Public Safety Civil Service Commission within one year from the date of resignation.
- e. Except as provided in 10.02 and 10.04 any return to the City service shall be by examination only.

10.04 ESTABLISHMENT OF REINSTATEMENT REGISTERS:

- a. The names of regular employees and, when requested in writing by the appointing authority, probationary employees who have been laid off or who have been reduced, in grade, in lieu of layoff, shall be placed upon a reinstatement register for the same class and for the department from which laid off or reduced, in grade, for a period which will last for the length of the affected employee's career in that department.
- b. Upon the request of an appointing authority, the Executive Director may approve the certification of anyone on such a reinstatement register as eligible for appointment on an open competitive basis in the department requesting certification.
- c. Anyone on a reinstatement register who becomes a regular employee in the same class in another department shall lose reinstatement rights in their former department.
- d. Anyone accepting a regular appointment in the class from which laid off and in a department other than that from which laid off is not to be certified to their former department unless eligibility for that department is restored.

- (3) The date of notice for purposes of these rules shall be the date on which notice of an action is posted in the Commission's office or is mailed to a party to a proceeding.

PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE


APPROVED: _____

Commissioners

Stacy Connole, Chair

Joel A. Nark

Dorothy Y. Leggett




Commissioner Stacy Connole (Dec 5, 2022 10:36 PST)

/s/ Stacy Connole, Chair



Joel Nark (Dec 5, 2022 12:30 MST)

/s/ Joel A. Nark, Commissioner



Dorothy Leggett (Dec 7, 2022 13:00 MST)

/s/ Dorothy Y. Leggett, Commissioner

Filed:

City of Seattle, City Clerk

- Proposed Changes-Process and Highlights (Executive Director)
 - Executive Director's Public Comment
 - 11-13 Redline Proposed Changes
 - 11-13 Redline Changes Accepted

From: [Scheele, Andrea](#)
To: [CSC PublicSafety](#)
Cc: [Scheele, Andrea](#)
Subject: Executive Director's public comment re Rule 10.03 rulemaking, re 10.03.a only
Date: Monday, November 13, 2023 2:38:15 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Rule 10.03 proposed changes redline \(updated recommendation 11-13\).pdf](#)
[Rule 10.03 proposed changes ACCEPTED \(updated recommendation 11-13\).pdf](#)

Hello PSCSC commissioners,

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration during this rulemaking process, regarding PSCSC Rule 10.03. I have received several inquiries in the past week for the definition of “separated for reasons other than for cause,” from the recommended changes to 10.03.a. To reduce or eliminate any confusion, please consider this updated recommendation regarding of PSCSC 10.03.a only. I am not requesting to modify any other recommended changes.

The underlined modification provides a more accurate and clearer description of separations that will not qualify under Rule 10.03.a, if the changes are adopted.

- a. Request submittal, criteria, and PSCSC verification – A former employee who was not disciplinarily discharged may request to be added to a reinstatement register to be considered with the open graded eligible register for the classification or rank.

The original recommendation stated, “a former employee who separated for any reason other than for cause...”.

Please find attached a new redline and “changes accepted” version including the modified recommendation.

This email and attachments will be added to the 11/16 meeting packet. Thank you.

Andrea Scheele she/her

Executive Director, Civil Service Commissions

City of Seattle | [Civil Service Commission](#) and [Public Safety Civil Service Commission](#)

Phone: 206-233-7118 | Cell: 206-437-5425 | Fax: 206-684-0755 | andrea.scheele@seattle.gov

The City of Seattle is an equal employment opportunity employer. Accommodations for people with disabilities provided upon request.

10.03 RETURN TO ELIGIBLE REGISTER AFTER SEPARATION ~~DUE TO RESIGNATION, RETIREMENT, OR SEPARATION FOR MEDICAL OR DISABILITY (NOT RETIREMENT);~~ REINSTATEMENT REGISTER

[PROPOSED CHANGES- REDLINE – UPDATED 11/13/2023]

a. Request submittal, criteria, and PSCSC verification – A former employee who ~~resigned, retired, or was separated for medical or disability reasons but not granted disability retirement~~ was not disciplinarily discharged ~~may submit a request return of their name to~~ be added to a supplemental/reinstatement register to be considered with the open graded eligible register for the classification or rank. Such request must be within one year from date of resignation, retirement, or separation due to disability; provided, the Executive Director may extend the above time limitation for not to exceed an additional four years upon satisfactory showing that such extension would be to the best interests of the City;

b. ~~Any request for return to register under this rule~~ 1. Such separated employees must be supported by written recommendations ~~submit their requests to the Executive Director of the PSCSC.~~

2. Such separated employees must submit their requests within one year from the date of separation; provided, the Executive Director may extend the above time limitation up to an additional four years upon satisfactory showing, as determined by the Executive Director, that such extension would be to the best interests of the City.

3. The Executive Director shall verify that the request was timely, and that City records reflect the requestor's separation was not ~~for cause~~ disciplinary discharge.

b. Former employing department decision on request – The Executive Director shall submit requests verified as meeting the criteria of Rule 10.a to the former employing department's appointing authority; for written approval or denial of the former employee's request to be added to the reinstatement register.

~~e-c.~~ Certification to former employing department – A former employee whose eligibility is reinstated under this rule shall be certified according to civil service rules. However, the name of such an eligible need be considered only by the department which recommends the return of the name to the register, and the person will remain eligible until appointed and/or the register expires.

~~D-d.~~ Promotional eligibility for reinstated employees– The name of a ~~former~~ reinstated employee who ~~seeks reinstatement under this rule may not be returned to~~ was listed on a promotional register, ~~unless recommended by at the headtime of the former employing department and approved by the Public Safety Civil Service Commission within one year from the date of resignation, their separation shall be returned to that promotional register if such register has not expired.~~

e. Except as provided in 10.02, 10.03 and 10.04, any return to the City service shall be by examination only.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.5"

10.03 RETURN TO ELIGIBLE REGISTER AFTER SEPARATION – REINSTATEMENT REGISTER

[CHANGES ACCEPTED VERSION - UPDATED 11/13/2023]

a. Request submittal, criteria, and PSCSC verification – A former employee who was not disciplinarily discharged may request to be added to a reinstatement register to be considered with the open graded eligible register for the classification or rank.

1. Such separated employees must submit their requests to the Executive Director of the PSCSC.

2. Such separated employees must submit their requests within one year from the date of separation; provided, the Executive Director may extend the above time limitation up to an additional four years upon satisfactory showing, as determined by the Executive Director, that such extension would be to the best interests of the City.

3. The Executive Director shall verify that the request was timely, and that City records reflect the requestor's separation was not disciplinary discharge.

b. Former employing department decision on request – The Executive Director shall submit requests verified as meeting the criteria of Rule 10.a to the former employing department's appointing authority for written approval or denial of the former employee's request to be added to the reinstatement register.

c. Certification to former employing department – A former employee whose eligibility is reinstated under this rule shall be certified according to civil service rules. However, the name of such an eligible need be considered only by the department which recommends the return of the name to the register, and the person will remain eligible until appointed and/or the register expires.

d. Promotional eligibility for reinstated employees– The name of a reinstated employee who was listed on a promotional register at the time of their separation shall be returned to that promotional register if such register has not expired.

e. Except as provided in 10.02, 10.03 and 10.04, any return to the City service shall be by examination only.

- Public Comment on Proposed Changes
 - *No public comment as of 11-13*



City of Seattle

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Public Safety Civil Service Commission

Commissioners

Commission Chair Stacy Connoles
Commissioner Richard Greene
Commissioner Joel A. Nark

Staff

Andrea Scheele, Executive Director
Sarah Butler, Operations & Policy Advisor
Teresa Jacobs, Executive Assistant

PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION October 19, 2023, MEETING MINUTES APPROVED: November 16, 2023

CHAIR (PSCSC 2.04)

1. CALL TO ORDER: Commission Chair Stacy Connoles called the monthly meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.
2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: Commission Chair Connoles read the land acknowledgement.
3. INTRODUCTIONS: Commission Chair Connoles gave attendees an opportunity to introduce themselves.

PSCSC: Commissioner Richard Greene. Commission Staff and Counsel: Andrea Scheele Executive Director, Sarah Butler, Operations & Policy Advisor, Teresa Jacobs, Executive Assistant. Commission Counsel: Joe Levan, Assistant City Attorney; Anne Vold, Assistant City Attorney. Not Present: Commissioner Joel Nark,
Exams Unit: Yoshiko Grace Matsui, Fire Exams Analyst, Amy Jo Chamberlain and Adelaide Alderks, Fire and Police Exams Analysts. SFD HR: Sarah Lee, Director, Helen Fitzpatrick, Executive Director Administration, Hannah Kosten, Personnel Specialist, Sr. SPD HR: Alyssa Pulliam, SPD, HR Deputy Director. Exam Committee Member (Fire Boat): Brian Bauer, Fireboat Engineer Exam Appellants: Ben Bergstrom & Mark Starll Guests: Firefighter Tom Applegate, Fire Lt. Deborah Williams

4. PUBLIC COMMENT: Sarah Lee, Director of SFD HR commented on the proposed rulemaking of PSCSC Rule 10.03. Ms. Lee stated the proposed language could potentially impact a lawsuit in which she and others are personally named. Ms. Lee stated her concern that it may be a remedial action if the proposed change were to be adopted and if it were retroactive. Ms. Lee stated she wanted to get ahead of it before things got cemented and she wanted to state there were specific concerns. The commission thanked Ms. Lee for her comment.

Chair Connoles announced there would be a building earthquake drill during the meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES-September 21, 2023, Monthly Meeting: The commission reviewed the September 21, 2023, monthly meeting. Chair Connole moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Greene seconded the motion. The motion passed and the minutes were approved.
6. SAVE THE DATE: 42ND ANNUAL CIVIL SERVICE CONFERENCE: Ms. Scheele announced the Civil Service Conference will be held in October. Commissioner Greene requested registration information. Chair Connole gave information on the CLE credit days.
7. NOVEMBER 2023 CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEE ELECTION UPDATE: Operations and Policy Advisor Sarah Butler gave an update on the employee elections being held November 6-13. Chair Connole asked when the term for the newly elected commissioner begins. Ms. Scheele stated January 1, 2024.
8. FIREBOAT ENGINEER PRACTICAL EXAM APPEALS: • PSCSC #23-04-001E (Task 5) • PSCSC #23-04-002E (Task 1) • PSCSC #23-04-003E Task 2): Chair Connole gave guidelines to the appellants on presenting their appeals. Chair Connole stated the commission would deliberate in a closed session after hearing from the appellants. The Commission heard three Fireboat Engineer Practical Exam Appeals. The exam was held September 12 & 13. Yoshiko Grace Matsui, Fire Exams Analyst gave background on the practical exam and introduced Development Committee member and Fireboat Engineer Brian Bauer. *The commission went off the record for 10 seconds for the building earthquake drill.* Chair Connole asked whether the candidates were provided with the Development Committee response. Ms. Grace Matsui stated she believed they were provided with the packet. Ms. Grace Matsui stated there were three protests, all three were denied, and the Development Committee's recommendation to the commission is to deny the appeals.
 - PSCSC #23-04-001E (Leschi, Task 5): Ben Bergstrom stated his appeal for Task 5. Commissioners Connole and Greene asked questions about the task of the exam being appealed. The appellant gave his explanation. Ms. Grace Matsui provided the position of the Development Committee. Commissioner Greene made a comment on the testing process.
 - PSCSC #23-04-002E (Fireboat 1, Task 1) Mark Starll stated his appeal for Task 1. Commissioners Connole and Greene asked questions about the task of the exam being appealed. The appellant gave his explanation. Ms. Grace Matsui provided the position of the Development Committee.
 - PSCSC #23-04-003E (Fireboat 1, Task 2) Mark Starll stated his appeal for Task 2. Commissioners Connole and Greene asked questions about the task of the exam being

appealed. The appellant gave his explanation. Ms. Grace Matsui provided the position of the Development Committee. Fireboat Engineer Brian Bauer provided an explanation regarding a question asked about Task 2.

The commission went into closed session at 11:32 a.m. The closed session ended at 11:51 a.m.

- **Appeal 1-Leschi, Task 5:** The requested remedy was to remove rating. The Development Committee's recommendation was to deny the request. The request was denied by a unanimous vote of the commission.
- **Appeal 2-Fireboat 1, Task 1:** The requested remedy was to remove rating. The Development Committee's recommendation was to deny the request. The request was denied by a unanimous vote of the commission.
- **Appeal 3-Fireboat 1, Task 2:** The requested remedy was to remove rating. The Development Committee's recommendation was to deny the request. The request was denied by a unanimous vote of the commission.

9. FIRE AND POLICE EXAM UNIT:

Police Exams Update- Rachael Schade, F&P Exams Analyst was present to provide an update on current and future SPD exams. Ms. Schade reported the current exam cycle closes October 23rd. There are currently 221 applicants. Ms. Schade reported the written lateral exam process closed this last week. Four individuals participated in part one of the test. Three passed and are preparing for lateral oral boards. Part two of the exam is being held October 28th. The Police Sergeant development is underway, in preparation for the Police Sergeant written exam to be administered March 2, 2024.

Fire and Police Separation and Hires: Ms. Scheele reported the following:

SPD: YTD separations: 79 YTD hires: 52

SFD: YTD separations: 82 YTD hires: 94 hires. SFD is 66 individuals away from being at fully authorized staffing.

Fire Exams Update- Yoshiko Grace Matsui, Fire Exams Administrator provided an update on fire exams. Ms. Grace Matsui reported the Fireboat Engineer register will be published December 15th. The combined Battalion Chief and Captain development committee and the Fireboat Pilot development committee are underway. In October 2024 there will be an open application and testing process for Firefighter. Chair Connole asked Ms. Grace Matsui the last exams for Firefighter occurred. Ms. Grace Matsui stated there was an emergency off-cycle firefighter exam in 2022 and the most recent exam that included an oral board was in 2019.

10. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Commission Work: Ms. Scheele reported on the work of staff for PSCSC and CSC.

Budget: The commission reviewed the budget documents.

11. CASE STATUS REPORT: The commission reviewed the October Case Status Report.

12. OPMA TRAINING (*Tentative*)-Joe Levan, ACA/Commission Counsel: The Commission will reschedule this training at the beginning of the year, when the newly elected commissioner is onboarded.

13. OLD/NEW BUSINESS: Ms. Scheele reported that the commission will propose rulemaking and changes to PSCSC Rule 10.03. Ms. Scheele will circulate information to the Fire and Police departments, unions, and stakeholders. Public comment will be at the November 16th special meeting at 11:15 am.

14. EXECUTIVE SESSION-CLOSED SESSION To discuss Pending, Potential, or Actual Litigation (May be cancelled if not needed): The commission went into Executive Session at 12:15 am. The Executive Session ended at 12:25 am. There was no action taken.

15. ADJOURN: All other business before the Commission having been considered, Commission Chair Connoles adjourned the meeting at 12:25 am.

Respectfully Submitted on November 16, 2023, for the PSCSC,

Teresa Jacobs. Executive Assistant

Approved for Publishing: _____
Stacy Connoles, Chair

NEXT PSCSC MEETING: December 14, 2023 @ 10:00 a.m.

**Request for public records, including audio recording of meetings can be made through the City Public Records Request Center <http://www.seattle.gov/public-records>.*

CIV Expenditures by Account and Month

Year 2023
City Department ID : VC000 - Civil Service Commissions Dept
BSL - Budget Program All
Fund ID And Name All

Version 8.0

Values																		
Account Grouping Level One	Account Grouping Level Two	Adopted Budget	Revised Budget	01 - Expenses	02 - Expenses	03 - Expenses	04 - Expenses	05 - Expenses	06 - Expenses	07 - Expenses	08 - Expenses	09 - Expenses	10 - Expenses	11 - Expenses	12 - Expenses	YTD Expenses	Available Balance	Percent Used
Expenditures	Labor	636,080	636,080	37,694	34,871	34,860	34,848	35,064	47,593	47,990	69,028	47,774	47,768	5,506	-	442,997	193,083	69.6%
	Non-Labor	258,941	356,613	16,547	22,911	22,218	21,520	21,024	20,558	22,683	22,340	22,022	23,483	16,861	-	232,167	124,445	65.1%
Grand Total		895,020	992,692	54,241	57,783	57,077	56,368	56,087	68,152	70,674	91,368	69,797	71,252	22,367	-	675,164	317,528	68.0%

Year 2022
City Department ID : VC000 - Civil Service Commissions Dept
BSL - Budget Program All
Fund ID And Name All

0

Values																		
Account Grouping Level One	Account Grouping Level Two	Adopted Budget	Revised Budget	01 - Expenses	02 - Expenses	03 - Expenses	04 - Expenses	05 - Expenses	06 - Expenses	07 - Expenses	08 - Expenses	09 - Expenses	10 - Expenses	11 - Expenses	12 - Expenses	YTD Expenses	Available Balance	Percent Used
Expenditures	Labor	406,411	445,399	25,001	38,538	52,304	32,405	32,409	29,278	25,653	47,605	32,836	32,829	32,474	43,255	424,588	20,811	95.3%
	Non-Labor	195,146	310,146	11,295	15,051	17,626	14,930	15,700	14,834	16,672	15,515	14,245	14,711	14,908	19,336	184,823	125,323	59.6%
Grand Total		601,557	755,545	36,296	53,590	69,930	47,335	48,109	44,112	42,325	63,119	47,081	47,540	47,382	62,592	609,411	146,134	80.7%

PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
CASE STATUS REPORT
November 16, 2023

OPEN APPEAL/EXAM PROTEST/REQUEST FOR DECISION								
Type	CASE NUMBER	APPELLANT	RESPONDENT DEPARTMENT	DATE FILED	ISSUE	Register/Exam/ Position	Issue/Requested Outcome/Status	PRESIDING
A	23-01-004A	Willis	SPD	11-13-2023	Suspension		Appellant alleges the length of suspension is excessive. Requests shorter suspension.	PSCSC

CLOSED APPEAL/EXAM PROTEST/REQUEST FOR DECISION								
Type	CASE NUMBER	APPELLANT/ REQUESTOR	RESPONDENT DEPARTMENT	DATE FILED	ISSUE	Register/Exam/ Position	Issue/Requested Outcome/Status	PRESIDED
E	23-04-001E	Bergstrom	Fire	10-12-2023	Leschi Task 5	FB Eng. Practical	At 10-19-23 Meeting the Commission Denied Request for Removal of Rating.	PSCSC
E	23-04-002E	Starll	Fire	10-13-2023	FB 1 Task 1	FB Eng. Practical	At 10-19-23 Meeting the Commission Denied Request for Removal of Rating.	PSCSC
E	23-04-003E	Starll	Fire	10-13-2023	FB 1 Task 2	FB Eng. Practical	At 10-19-23 Meeting the Commission Denied	PSCSC

							Request for Removal of Rating.	
RRM	23-05-011RFR	Mattila	Fire	5-3-2023	Request for Review/Reconsideration of PSCSC Rule 10.03 denial – Whether request met criteria of the rule.	Requestor seeking reinstatement to Firefighter eligible register.	Order Denying Request for Reconsideration of an Action of the Executive Director, 7-27-2023.	PSCSC
A	22-01-003	Constantin	Police	10-3-2022	Discharge	Reversal/ removal of discipline, reinstatement.	Appellant did not appear at the hearing. Dismissed 6-27-2023.	PSCSC
RRM	23-05-010RFR	Condon	Fire	4-21-2023	Request for Review/Reconsideration of PSCSC Rule 10.03 denial – Whether request met criteria of the rule.	Requestor sought reinstatement to Firefighter eligible register.	Order Denying Request for Reconsideration of an Action of the Executive Director, 6-30-2023.	PSCSC
RRM	23-05-006RFR	Pittman	Fire	4-13-2023	Request for Review/Reconsideration of PSCSC Rule 10.03 denial – Whether request met	Requestor sought reinstatement to Firefighter eligible register.	Order Denying Request for Reconsideration of an Action of the Executive Director, 6-30-2023.	PSCSC

					criteria of the rule.			
RRM	23-05002RFR	Vale	Fire	4-3-2023	Request for Review/Reconsideration of PSCSC Rule 10.03 denial – Whether request met criteria of the rule.	Requestor sought reinstatement to Lieutenant eligible register.	Order Denying Request for Reconsideration of an Action of the Executive Director, 6-30-2023.	PSCSC

A=Appeal (PSCSC 6)

E=Exam Protest (PSCSC 9.22)

RRM=Request to Review or Modify (PSCSC 2.13.b)

REQUESTS FOR REINSTATEMENT RFR=Request for Reinstatement (PSCSC 10.03)					
CASE NUMBER	DEPT	DATE REQUESTED	POSITION	ED DECISION	CHIEF RECOMMENDATION
23-05-001RFR	SFD	2-9-2023	LIEUTENANT		APPROVED
23-05-002RFR	SFD	2-19-2023	LIEUTENANT	DENIED 10.03	
23-05-003RFR	SFD	3-17-2023	LIEUTENANT	DENIED 10.03	
23-05-004RFR	SFD	3-17-2023	FIREFIGHTER	DENIED 10.03	
23-05-005RFR	SFD	3-27-2023	FIREFIGHTER		DENIED
23-05-006RFR	SFD	3-22-2023	FIREFIGHTER	DENIED 10.03	
23-05-007RFR	SFD	3-24-2023	FIREFIGHTER		DENIED
23-05-008RFR	SPD	4-10-2023	OFFICER		APPROVED
23-05-009RFR	SFD	4-13-2023	FIREFIGHTER	DENIED 10.03	
23-05-010RFR	SFD	4-13-2023	FIREFIGHTER	DENIED 10.03	
23-05-011RFR	SFD	4-3-2023	LIEUTENANT	DENIED 10.03	
23-05-012RFR	SPD	5-10-2023	OFFICER		APPROVED
23-05-013RFR	SFD	5-22-2023	FIREFIGHTER		APPROVED
23-05-014RFR	SFD	5-23-2023	FIREFIGHTER		DENIED
23-05-015RFR	SPD	8-21-2023	OFFICER		RECOMMENDED
23-05-016RFR	SFD	9-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER		NOT RECOMMENDED
23-05-017RFR	SFD	8-21-2023	FIREFIGHTER		RECOMMENDED
23-05-018RFR	SFD	8-31-2023	FIREFIGHTER		RECOMMENDED
23-05-019RFR	SFD	9-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER		RECOMMENDED
23-05-020RFR	SFD	9-29-2023	FIREFIGHTER		NOT RECOMMENDED
23-05-021RFR	SFD	9-28-2023	FIREFIGHTER		NOT RECOMMENDED
23-05-022RFR	SFD	9-29-2023	FIREFIGHTER		NOT RECOMMENDED
23-05-023RFR	SPD	10-10-2023	SERGEANT	DENIED 10.03	
23-05-025RFR	SFD	9-7-2023	FIREFIGHTER		NOT RECOMMENDED
23-05-026RFR	SFD	10-27-2023	FIREFIGHTER		RECOMMENDED

REQUESTS FOR REINSTATEMENT RFR=Request for Reinstatement (PSCSC 10.03)					
CASE NUMBER	DEPT	DATE REQUESTED	POSITION	ED DECISION	CHIEF RECOMMENDATION
23-05-027RFR	SFD	10-31-2023	FIREFIGHTER		RECOMMENDED
23-05-028RFR	SFD	10-19-2023	FIREFIGHTER		NOT RECOMMENDED
23-05-029RFR	SFD	10-18-2023	FIREFIGHTER		RECOMMENDED
23-05-030RFR	SFD	11-8-2023	FIREFIGHTER		TBD

REQUESTS FOR PROBATIONARY EXTENSION

RPE= Request for Probationary Extension (PSCSC 12.0)

CASE NUMBER	DEPT	DATE REQUESTED	POSITION/RANK	APPROVED/DENIED
23-05-001RPE	FIRE	1-13-2023	LIEUTENANT	APPROVED
23-05-002RPE -1	FIRE	1-30-2023	LIEUTENANT	APPROVED
23-05-002RPE -2	FIRE	3-29-2023	LIEUTENANT	APPROVED
23-05-002RPE -3	FIRE	9-8-2023	LIEUTENANT	APPROVED
23-05-003RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-004RPE	POLICE	3-8-2023	OFFICER	APPROVED
23-05-005RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-006RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-007RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-008RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-009RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-010RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-011RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-012RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-013RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-014RPE	FIRE	3-6-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-015RPE	POLICE	4-6-2023	OFFICER	APPROVED
23-05-016RPE	POLICE	4-12-2023	OFFICER	APPROVED
23-05-017RPE	POLICE	4-12-2023	OFFICER	APPROVED
23-05-018RPE	POLICE	4-13-2023	OFFICER	APPROVED
23-05-019RPE	FIRE	5-30-2023	LIEUTENANT	APPROVED
23-05-020RPE	FIRE	6-15-2023	FIRE	APPROVED
23-05-021RPE	FIRE	7-11-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-022RPE	FIRE	7-11-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-023RPE	FIRE	7-11-2023	FIREFIGHTER	APPROVED
23-05-024RPE	FIRE	8-22-2023	LIEUTENANT	APPROVED
23-05-025RPE	FIRE	8-22-2023	LIEUTENANT	APPROVED

REQUESTS FOR PROBATIONARY EXTENSION

RPE= Request for Probationary Extension (PSCSC 12.0)

CASE NUMBER	DEPT	DATE REQUESTED	POSITION/RANK	APPROVED/DENIED
23-05-026RPE	POLICE	8-30-2023	OFFICER	APPROVED
23-05-027RPE	POLICE	9-13-2023	OFFICER	APPROVED
23-05-030RPE	POLICE	10-31-2023	OFFICER	APPROVED

APPEAL TO THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (DISCIPLINARY)

Appeal No.	<u>PSCSC # 23-01-004A</u>	
Date Filed	<u>November 13, 2023</u>	

Full Name of Appellant			Work Address	
Ron Morgan Willis			10049 College Way N Seattle, WA 98133	
Residence Address			Work Telephone	
[REDACTED]				
City	State	Zip	Employee ID	
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
Home/Cell Phone:			Department	
[REDACTED]			Seattle Police Dept	
Email:			Job Title	
[REDACTED]			Police Officer	

1. WHAT ACTION IS BEING APPEALED? (CHECK ONE)	<input type="checkbox"/> Demotion (5.01A)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Suspension <input type="checkbox"/> Probation <input type="checkbox"/> Discharge (5.01B)
	<input type="checkbox"/> City of Seattle Personnel Ordinance or Rule(s) Violation (5.01C):

What Personnel rule, regulation, or provision, do you believe was violated? _____



City of Seattle
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

700 5th Avenue, Suite 1670

PO Box 94729

Seattle, WA 98124-4729

Office: 206-233-7118

Fax: 206-684-0755

APPEAL TO THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (DISCIPLINARY)
INSTRUCTIONS

Disciplinary appeals to the Commission must be filed within twenty (20) calendar days of delivery of the Step Three grievance response. See **Personnel Rule 1.4-Employee Grievance Procedure**.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Complete all three pages and attach any related documents or correspondence that is related to your appeal. **Commission staff is teleworking until further notice and temporarily unable to accept appeals in person or through the commission mail slot at SMT.** We will accept a signed .pdf sent via email to the Executive Director Andrea.Scheele@seattle.gov and Cc: Executive Assistant Teresa.Jacobs@seattle.gov. If you are unable to email a .pdf, please send your appeal via US Postal or fax and notify staff by email that you mailed your appeal to the commission office.

Upon receipt of your appeal, the Executive Director will review the appeal. If the appeal is deemed to be timely and within the Commission's jurisdiction, it will be reviewed at the Commission's next regularly scheduled meeting. You and the employing department will be notified of the time and date of the meeting. If your appeal is accepted, staff will follow up with both parties to schedule the first prehearing conference. If you intend to be represented by an attorney, please have the attorney submit a Notice of Appearance. **If you are appealing a disciplinary decision, you are required to complete the Employee Grievance Process before your appeal will be accepted by the Civil Service Commission. See Personnel Rule 1.4 for more information about this exhaustion requirement.** For more information about appeal rights and deadlines, please review the Civil Service Rules of Practice and Procedure Rules of Practice and Procedure

Use additional page(s) if necessary.

4. **ATTORNEY/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:**

An attorney or a representative is NOT required for the appeal process.

Do you have an attorney or another person representing you for this appeal? ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, please have your attorney submit a **NOTICE OF APPEARANCE** to the Commission Office and the Department.

All documents and information related to the appeal will go to the attorney or representative.

Name: _____ Firm: _____

Address: _____ Email: _____

5. **APPELLANT:**

If you do not have an attorney or a representative, please enter the address where documents related to this appeal should be sent:

Mailing Address:

Personal Email:

Home/Cell Phone:

SIGNATURE OF APPELLANT

Ron M. Willis



DATE

Nov 13, 2023

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OR REPRESENTATIVE:
(IF FILLING OUT THIS FORM):

DATE

City of Seattle Civil Service Commissions

Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1670 PO Box 94729 Seattle, WA 98124-4729

Tel (206) 437-5425, Fax: (206) 684-0755, <http://www.seattle.gov/CivilServiceCommissions/>

An equal employment opportunity employer. Accommodations for people with disabilities provided upon request.

Reason for this appeal <u>Length of suspension</u> <u>is excessive</u> 	Remedy Sought (What do you want?): <u>Shorter suspension</u>
2. UNION: If you are a member of a union, what is the name of your union? <u>Seattle Police Officers Guild</u> Local Number: _____	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <input type="checkbox"/> I HAVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I HAVE NOT </div> <p>filed a grievance on the same issues that I identified in this appeal, with my union or bargaining unit.</p> <p>This matter <input type="checkbox"/> IS <input type="checkbox"/> IS NOT the subject of arbitration pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement.</p>
3. EMPLOYEE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE: Did you receive notification of your right to a timely resolution of this grievance from your Department? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO (SMC 4.04.070)	If you filed a grievance through the Employee Grievance Procedure, what was the outcome?
<input type="checkbox"/> I HAVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I HAVE NOT filed a grievance on the issues that are identified in this appeal, through the Employee Grievance Procedure. (Personnel Rule 1.4.2)	

Please include with your appeal form the Step 3 Grievance decision of your employing department and Investigatory Report from SDHR, and any documents or correspondence that you have received from the Department related to your appeal. To meet timely filing of your appeal, these documents can be sent after filing this document.

SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM

TO: Chain of Command
Unit B123B

DATE: November 2, 2023

FROM: Mike Fields
Executive Director of Human Resources

SUBJECT: Final Discipline-Ron Willis-23-0024

Attached are the Cover Letter and Final DAR to be given to Officer Willis via his chain of command. Officer Willis should receive a copy of the Cover Letter and of the Final DAR.

Please have Officer Willis sign in the appropriate place below.

My signature below indicates that I have received the Cover Letter and Final DAR regarding 23-0024.

By signature below I confirm that I understand and agree that the entirety of my disciplinary suspension must be completed within two pay periods absent written approval by the Executive Director of Human Resources; that I may not use vacation days in lieu of suspension without prior written permission from the Executive Director of Human Resources; and that I may not work any overtime for any reason during any of the days I am to serve my suspension.

Ron Willis, #6801

Date

After providing Officer Willis with the document, please complete the information below as appropriate.

Served by: _____

Rank/Printed Name

Date: _____

Date(s) Employee will serve suspension: _____

If not served within three days of issuance, provide explanation:

Signature: _____

**On the day of service, scan the completed, signed receipt and send it to
SPD_EmploymentCounsel@seattle.gov
Original receipt should be returned within 7 days to SPD HR Unit**



City of Seattle

Seattle Police Department

November 2, 2023

Officer Ron Willis, #6801
(Hand-delivered)

RE: OPA 23-0024

Dear Officer Ron Willis:

I want to thank you and your representatives for meeting with the Chief of Police on September 25, 2023, to discuss the recommended discipline arising from the investigation of OPA 23-0024. Based upon the information presented at the meeting, and a review of relevant materials, the Chief has sustained the following allegations:

Violation of Seattle Police Manual, Sections:

- **5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional**
- **12.010 - Communications 6. Field Units Will Remain Available Until 30 Minutes Prior to the end of their Shift**
- **5.100 - Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities I. Patrol Officers A. Responsibilities 2. Monitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in their assigned area**

A description of the sustained allegations of misconduct and the final disciplinary action is set forth in the enclosed Disciplinary Action Report.

If you have any questions regarding this notice, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Adrian Z. Diaz
Chief of Police

/s/ Mike Fields

Mike Fields
Executive Director of Human Resources

Enclosure

Seattle Police Department		FILE NUMBER	
DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT		OPA 23-0024	
RANK/TITLE	NAME	SERIAL NUMBER	UNIT
Officer	Ron Willis	6801	B123B

SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS:

Violation of Seattle Police Department Policy & Procedure Manual Sections:

- **5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional**
- **12.010- Communications 6. Field Units Will Remain Available Until 30 Minutes Prior to the end of their Shift**
- **5.100- Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities I. Patrol Officers A. Responsibilities 2. Monitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in their assigned area**

Specification:

On January 13, 2023, at 2:15 a.m., a 9-1-1 dispatcher received a domestic violence ("DV") call in your sector that was originally designated as a priority three.¹ However, beginning at 2:51 a.m., the dispatcher noted the following updates:

2:51 a.m.: "[THE] FEMALE HALF IS SCREAMING FOR ASSISTANCE AND SOULDS LIKE [THE] MALE IS BEING PHYSICAL. NO [WEAPONS] MENTIONED."

2:53 a.m.: "[THE CALLER] IS [A VICTIM] OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, [BUT] REFUSED [TO PROVIDE THE SUSPECT'S INFORMATION], [THE CALLER ADVISED THAT] SHE WAS BLOODY FROM THE [ASSAULT], [BUT] DECLINED MEDICS."

2:54 a.m.: "[THE CALLER ADVISED] THAT [THE SUSPECT] HAS LEFT, BUT [SHE] DID NOT WANT TO PROVIDE FURTHER [INFORMATION] ON [THE SUSPECT]."

Those updates led to the call changing to a priority one. At 2:56 a.m., an update indicated that all units were unavailable in your sector, so the dispatcher broadcasted their intent to cross-dispatch the call (i.e., request officers from a different precent to respond).

You and your partner had arrived back at the North Precinct at approximately 2:27 a.m., where you and your partner remained for the remainder of your shift that ended at 3:30 a.m. At 2:57 a.m., you and your partner accepted the call. At 3:05 a.m., one of you messaged the dispatcher the following: "Since an update says the suspect has left, can this wait for 1st watch? We got a [burglary] report to still write. Just wondering." The dispatcher replied, "[OFFICERS' CALL SIGNS], I AM NOT ABLE TO DOWNGRADE IT SINCE ITS DV AND WAS IN PROGRESS." At 3:07, the dispatcher further messaged: "[OFFICERS' CALL SIGNS], IF I SEE ANY FIRST WATCH LOGGING IN SOON I WILL SEND THEM THAT WAY THO [sic] TO TAKE PAPER ON IT." You and your partner replied: "[NORTH DISPATCHER], THAT WOULD BE APPRECIATED. THANK YOU." At 3:19 a.m., you and your partner messaged: "[NORTH DISPATCHER], FYI, SEVERAL 1st WATCHERS ARE WALKING IN THE PARKING LOT." At 3:29 a.m., you and your

¹ The Priority Code designates the relative urgency of an event, with one indicating the highest urgency, which include in-progress DV-related incidents. See Seattle Community Safety and Communications Center Policies and Procedures 4.065-POL-06.



City of Seattle

Seattle Police Department

cc: Adrian Z. Diaz, Chief of Police
Eric Barden, Deputy Chief
Todd Kibbee, Assistant Chief
Lori Aagard, Captain
Gino Betts, Director of OPA
Mike Solan, Union President
Allen McKenzie, Employment Services Advisor

partner cleared the DV assault call.

During your interview with the Office of Police Accountability ("OPA"), you stated that on January 13, 2023, you and your partner had returned to the North Precinct for you to write a report for an unrelated burglary call. You acknowledged that you heard the initial dispatch for the priority one DV assault call and that nobody answered, and that when the dispatcher mentioned cross-dispatching, you accepted the call. You stated that because the call updates indicated that the victim had declined medical aid, that the offender had left, and that the victim had refused to describe the offender, you concluded that the call "no longer warranted an emergency response," and therefore asked the dispatcher to hold it for first watch officers. You stated that, in hindsight, you should have asked your sergeant how to handle the call.

Policies:

Seattle Police Department Policy ("SPD") Manual Section 5.001-POL 10 states that "employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers," whether on or off duty.

Here, a community member ("CM") called 9-1-1 to report an in-progress DV assault. The dispatcher noted hearing a man being physical with CM, that CM was screaming for help, and that CM was bloody from the assault. The dispatcher requested assistance from your sector but was informed no units were available despite you and your partner being at the North Precinct. Although you were preparing a police report for an unrelated burglary, responding to a priority one DV assault call constituted a higher priority. Nevertheless, you and your partner waited to accept the call until after the dispatcher indicated that they were going to cross-dispatch the call. Moreover, rather than immediately responding to the incident location, you and your partner went back and forth with the dispatcher about whether the call could wait for the next shift. Despite that SPD aims to respond to priority one calls in no more than seven minutes, no one arrived at the incident location until 3:40 a.m., 44 minutes from when the dispatcher requested a unit from your sector at 2:56 a.m.

Your prioritizing completing paperwork over responding to a priority one in-progress DV assault call undermined the public trust in the Department, you, and in other officers. Therefore, your actions violated SPD Policy Manual 5.001-POL 10.

SPD Policy Manual 12.010-POL-2(6) requires that "field units will remain available until 30 minutes prior to the end of their shift," except when "handling an arrest or completing a report."

Here, the dispatcher requested a unit from your sector at 2:56 a.m., 34 minutes before your shift ended at 3:30 a.m. Because the time of the dispatch was still beyond the 30 minutes prior to the end of your shift, you were required to be available and respond to the call. Your failure to respond to the call therefore violated SPD Policy Manual 12.010-POL-2(6).

SPD Policy Manual 5.100 I.A.2 requires that patrol officers "[m]onitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in assigned area." For the same reasons given for SPD Policy Manual 5.001-POL 10, your failure to respond to the priority one DV assault call violated SPD Policy Manual 5.100 I.A.2.

Employee Response:

At your *Loudermill* meeting you took responsibility for your and your partner's actions described above. You said you were "leading the show" and that you were the one who decided it would not be unreasonable to wait for First Watch to take the call. You explained that you were not trying to be defiant against the dispatcher, you just thought it was something that could wait. You admitted you made a "gigantic mistake" and said that what you should have done was start driving to the call and contacted your Sergeant for guidance.

Determination of The Chief:

It is critical that Officers respond to Domestic Violence calls – particularly priority one DV calls – with due seriousness and rapidity. Once you accepted the call, you should have gone to it immediately, as you recognize. I appreciate you taking responsibility for your mistake and wanting to take your partner's share of the blame as well. You demonstrated integrity at your *Loudermill* meeting. You have been with the Department for over 28 years, and you have little prior disciplinary history. I have taken all of this information into account and decided that three days is appropriate level of discipline in this case.

FINAL DISPOSITION

Thirty-Six (36) Hours Suspension

DATE

10/31/2023

BY ORDER OF

CHIEF OF POLICE

APPEAL OF FINAL DISPOSITION

Appeals to a Commission:

SWORN EMPLOYEES: Public Safety Civil Service Commission

See Seattle Municipal Code 4.08.100. Employee must file written demand within ten (10) days of a suspension, demotion or discharge for a hearing to determine whether the decision to suspend, demote or discharge was made in good faith for cause. Information on the process for filing a claim with the Public Safety Civil Service Commission may be found on the Commission's website.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES: Civil Service Commission

Before filing an appeal with the Civil Service Commission regarding suspension, demotion, or termination an employee must first go through the Employee Grievance Procedure provided by Personnel Rule 1.4. In order to comply with Rule 1.4, the employee must file the grievance within 20 calendar days of receiving the notice of the appointing authority's decision to impose discipline. After exhausting the Employee Grievance Procedure, if the employee is still dissatisfied, the employee must file his/her appeal with the Civil Service Commission within 20 calendar days of the delivery of the Step Three grievance response. See also SMC 4.04.240, 4.04.260, and Personnel Rules 1.4.

PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES: Pursuant to SMC 4.04.030 and 4.04.290, employees who have been appointed to a position within the classified service but who has not completed a one (1) year period of probationary employment are "probationary employees" and are subject to dismissal without just cause. An employee dismissed during their probationary period shall not have the right to appeal the dismissal. SMC 4.04.290 and City of Seattle Personnel Rule 1.3.2E.

Alternative Appeal Options for Represented Employees:

SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM

TO: Chain of Command
Unit B123B

DATE: November 8, 2023

FROM: Mike Fields
Executive Director of Human Resources

SUBJECT: Amended Final DAR -Ron Willis-23-0024

Attached is the Amended Final DAR to be given to Officer Willis via his chain of command. Officer Willis should receive a copy of the Amended Final DAR.

Please have Officer Willis sign in the appropriate place below.

My signature below indicates that I have received the Amended Final DAR regarding 23-0024.

By signature below I confirm that I understand and agree that the entirety of my disciplinary suspension must be completed within two pay periods absent written approval by the Executive Director of Human Resources; that I may not use vacation days in lieu of suspension without prior written permission from the Executive Director of Human Resources; and that I may not work any overtime for any reason during any of the days I am to serve my suspension.

Ron Willis, #6801

Date

After providing Officer Willis with the document, please complete the information below as appropriate.

Served by: _____ Date: _____
Rank/Printed Name

Date(s) Employee will serve suspension: _____.

If not served within three days of issuance, provide explanation:

Signature:

On the day of service, scan the completed, signed receipt and send it to
SPD_EmploymentCounsel@seattle.gov
Original receipt should be returned within 7 days to SPD HR Unit

Seattle Police Department DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT (AMENDED)		FILE NUMBER OPA 23-0024	
RANK/TITLE Officer	NAME Ron Willis	SERIAL NUMBER 6801	UNIT B123B
SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS:			
Violation of Seattle Police Department Policy & Procedure Manual Sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional • 12.010 - Communications 6. Field Units Will Remain Available Until 30 Minutes Prior to the end of their Shift • 5.100 - Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities I. Patrol Officers A. Responsibilities 2. Monitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in their assigned area 			
<u>Specification:</u>			
<p>On January 13, 2023, at 2:15 a.m., a 9-1-1 dispatcher received a domestic violence ("DV") call in your sector that was originally designated as a priority three.¹ However, beginning at 2:51 a.m., the dispatcher noted the following updates:</p> <p>2:51 a.m.: "[THE] FEMALE HALF IS SCREAMING FOR ASSISTANCE AND SOUNDS LIKE [THE] MALE IS BEING PHYSICAL. NO [WEAPONS] MENTIONED."</p> <p>2:53 a.m.: "[THE CALLER] IS [A VICTIM] OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, [BUT] REFUSED [TO PROVIDE THE SUSPECT'S INFORMATION], [THE CALLER ADVISED THAT] SHE WAS BLOODY FROM THE [ASSAULT], [BUT] DECLINED MEDICS."</p> <p>2:54 a.m.: "[THE CALLER ADVISED] THAT [THE SUSPECT] HAS LEFT, BUT [SHE] DID NOT WANT TO PROVIDE FURTHER [INFORMATION] ON [THE SUSPECT]."</p> <p>Those updates led to the call changing to a priority one. At 2:56 a.m., an update indicated that all units were unavailable in your sector, so the dispatcher broadcasted their intent to cross-dispatch the call (i.e., request officers from a different precinct to respond).</p> <p>You and your partner had arrived back at the North Precinct at approximately 2:27 a.m., where you and your partner remained for the remainder of your shift that ended at 3:30 a.m. At 2:57 a.m., you and your partner accepted the call. At 3:05 a.m., one of you messaged the dispatcher the following: "Since an update says the suspect has left, can this wait for 1st watch? We got a [burglary] report to still write. Just wondering." The dispatcher replied, "[OFFICERS' CALL SIGNS], I AM NOT ABLE TO DOWNGRADE IT SINCE ITS DV AND WAS IN PROGRESS." At 3:07, the dispatcher further messaged: "[OFFICERS' CALL SIGNS], IF I SEE ANY FIRST WATCH LOGGING IN SOON I WILL SEND THEM THAT WAY THO [sic] TO TAKE PAPER ON IT." You and your partner replied: "[NORTH DISPATCHER], THAT WOULD BE</p>			

¹ The Priority Code designates the relative urgency of an event, with one indicating the highest urgency, which include in-progress DV-related incidents. See Seattle Community Safety and Communications Center Policies and Procedures 4.065-POL-06.

APPRECIATED. THANK YOU.” At 3:19 a.m., you and your partner messaged: “[NORTH DISPATCHER], FYI, SEVERAL 1ST WATCHERS ARE WALKING IN THE PARKING LOT.” At 3:29 a.m., you and your partner cleared the DV assault call.

During your interview with the Office of Police Accountability (“OPA”), you stated that on January 13, 2023, you and your partner had returned to the North Precinct for you to write a report for an unrelated burglary call. You acknowledged that you heard the initial dispatch for the priority one DV assault call and that nobody answered, and that when the dispatcher mentioned cross-dispatching, you accepted the call. You stated that because the call updates indicated that the victim had declined medical aid, that the offender had left, and that the victim had refused to describe the offender, you concluded that the call “no longer warranted an emergency response,” and therefore asked the dispatcher to hold it for first watch officers. You stated that, in hindsight, you should have asked your sergeant how to handle the call.

Policies:

Seattle Police Department Policy (“SPD”) Manual Section 5.001-POL 10 states that “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers,” whether on or off duty.

Here, a community member (“CM”) called 9-1-1 to report an in-progress DV assault. The dispatcher noted hearing a man being physical with CM, that CM was screaming for help, and that CM was bloody from the assault. The dispatcher requested assistance from your sector but was informed no units were available despite you and your partner being at the North Precinct. Although you were preparing a police report for an unrelated burglary, responding to a priority one DV assault call constituted a higher priority. Nevertheless, you and your partner waited to accept the call until after the dispatcher indicated that they were going to cross-dispatch the call. Moreover, rather than immediately responding to the incident location, you and your partner went back and forth with the dispatcher about whether the call could wait for the next shift. Despite that SPD aims to respond to priority one calls in no more than seven minutes, no one arrived at the incident location until 3:40 a.m., 44 minutes from when the dispatcher requested a unit from your sector at 2:56 a.m.

Your prioritizing completing paperwork over responding to a priority one in-progress DV assault call undermined the public trust in the Department, you, and in other officers. Therefore, your actions violated SPD Policy Manual 5.001-POL 10.

SPD Policy Manual 12.010-POL-2(6) requires that “field units will remain available until 30 minutes prior to the end of their shift,” except when “handling an arrest or completing a report.”

Here, the dispatcher requested a unit from your sector at 2:56 a.m., 34 minutes before your shift ended at 3:30 a.m. Because the time of the dispatch was still beyond the 30 minutes prior to the end of your shift, you were required to be available and respond to the call. Your failure to respond to the call therefore violated SPD Policy Manual 12.010-POL-2(6).

SPD Policy Manual 5.100 I.A.2 requires that patrol officers “[m]onitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in assigned area.” For the same reasons given for SPD Policy Manual 5.001-POL 10, your failure to respond to the priority one DV assault call violated SPD Policy Manual 5.100 I.A.2.

Employee Response:

At your *Loudermill* meeting you took responsibility for your and your partner's actions described above. You said you were "leading the show" and that you were the one who decided it would not be unreasonable to wait for First Watch to take the call. You explained that you were not trying to be defiant against the dispatcher, you just thought it was something that could wait. You admitted you made a "gigantic mistake" and said that what you should have done was start driving to the call and contacted your Sergeant for guidance.

Determination of The Chief:

It is critical that Officers respond to Domestic Violence calls – particularly priority one DV calls – with due seriousness and rapidity. Once you accepted the call, you should have gone to it immediately, as you recognize. I appreciate you taking responsibility for your mistake and wanting to take your partner's share of the blame as well. You demonstrated integrity at your *Loudermill* meeting. You have been with the Department for over 28 years, and you have little prior disciplinary history. I have taken all of this information into account and decided that four* days is the appropriate level of discipline in this case.

FINAL DISPOSITION

Thirty-Six (36) Hours Suspension

DATE:

*The Disciplinary Action Report signed on October 31, 2023, erroneously stated "three" days is appropriate, where it should have stated "four" days is the appropriate level of discipline. This Amended Report corrects that error.

BY ORDER OF

CHIEF OF POLICE

APPEAL OF FINAL DISPOSITION

Appeals to a Commission:

SWORN EMPLOYEES: Public Safety Civil Service Commission

See Seattle Municipal Code 4.08.100. Employee must file written demand within ten (10) days of a suspension, demotion or discharge for a hearing to determine whether the decision to suspend, demote or discharge was made in good faith for cause. Information on the process for filing a claim with the Public Safety Civil Service Commission may be found on the Commission's website.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES: Civil Service Commission

Before filing an appeal with the Civil Service Commission regarding suspension, demotion, or termination an employee must first go through the Employee Grievance Procedure provided by Personnel Rule 1.4. In order to comply with Rule 1.4, the employee must file the grievance within 20 calendar days of receiving the notice of the appointing authority's decision to impose discipline. After exhausting the Employee Grievance Procedure, if the employee is still dissatisfied, the employee must file his/her appeal with the Civil Service Commission within 20 calendar days of the delivery of the Step Three grievance response. See also SMC 4.04.240, 4.04.260, and Personnel Rules 1.4.

PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES: Pursuant to SMC 4.04.030 and 4.04.290, employees who have been appointed to a position within the classified service but who has not completed a one (1) year period of probationary employment are "probationary employees" and are subject to dismissal without just cause. An employee dismissed during their probationary period shall not have the right to appeal the dismissal. SMC 4.04.290 and City of Seattle Personnel Rule 1.3.2E.

Alternative Appeal Options for Represented Employees:

Consult your collective bargaining agreement or union representative to determine eligibility, notice periods, and details of the disciplinary grievance process. Any remedy available through a collective bargaining agreement is an alternative remedy and not in addition to an appeal to the Public Safety Civil Service Commission or Civil Service Commission.