



CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
MEETING AGENDA

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

DATE: Monday, March 16, 2026

TIME: [2:00 p.m.](#)

LOCATION: In person **SMT Room 1679** and Remote Attendance via **Teams**

Directions to SMT 1679-Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 5th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104. At the 4th floor main building entry security desk, request elevator access to the 16th floor and follow the signs to 1679.

Teams Meeting Public Login:

[CSC Monthly Meeting \(Guest: Wayne Barnett, Executive Director, Ethics and Elections Commission\) | Meeting-Join | Microsoft Teams](#)

Commissioners, staff, and invited guests Login:

Please JOIN via the Teams presenter invitation please do not join the public login.

Notify staff if you'd like to log in early for a technical check of your audio and video.

Subscribe to receive CSC Meeting Agendas, Notices, and News: <https://www.seattle.gov/civil-service-commission/meeting-agendas-and-minutes>

Civil Service Commission
Monthly Meeting Agenda
March 16, 2026 @ 2:00 p.m.
 Seattle Municipal Tower Room 1679 and Teams

1.	CALL TO ORDER LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	Commission Chair (CSC 2.05)
2.	COMMISSIONER INTRODUCTIONS	
3.	ADOPTION OF AGENDA	
4.	WELCOME NEW COMMISSIONER	Mayoral Appointed Commissioner Steve Zwerin
5.	PUBLIC COMMENT	
6.	GUEST SPEAKER	Wayne Barnett, Executive Director, Ethics and Elections Commission
7.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	December 8, 2025, CSC Monthly Meeting
8.	UPDATES/DISCUSSION	A. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BUDGET & DEPARTMENTAL UPDATES 1. Budget Update 2. Department Update B. CASE STATUS REPORT/APPEAL UPDATES Franklin v. Parks-CSC No. 26-07-001A
9.	ACTION ITEMS DISCUSSION POTENTIAL VOTE	2026 REVISED MONTHLY MEETING DATES
10.	EXECUTIVE SESSION	May be cancelled if not needed
11.	OLD/NEW BUSINESS	Financial Interest Statements for Calendar Year 2025
12.	ADJOURNMENT	Next Monthly Meeting Date: TBD



**Civil Service Commission
Monthly Meeting Minutes
December 8, 2025 @ 2:00 p.m.
Seattle Municipal Tower Room 1679 and Teams**

1.	CALL TO ORDER LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	Commission Chair (CSC Rule 2.05) Commission Chair Ray Ceaser called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.
2.	COMMISSIONER INTRODUCTIONS STAFF, COUNSEL AND GUESTS	The Commissioners were present and introduced themselves. Commission Chair Ray Ceaser and Commissioners Denise Wells and Mary Wideman-Williams. Andrea Scheele, Executive Director; Commission Staff. Commission Counsel: Joe Levan, Assistant City Attorney
3.	PUBLIC COMMENT	There was no written comment, and no members of the public requested to give public comment.
4.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	November 10, 2025-CSC Monthly Meeting Commissioners reviewed the minutes of the November 10, 2025, CSC Monthly Meeting. Commissioner Ceaser moved to accept the minutes as written. The minutes were approved as read. November 20, 2025-Joint Meeting with PSCSC Commissioners reviewed the minutes of the November 20, 2025, Joint Meeting with PSCSC. Commissioner Ceaser moved to accept the minutes as written. The minutes were approved as read.
5.	UPDATES/DISCUSSION	A. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BUDGET & DEPARTMENTAL UPDATES 1. Budget Update 2. Department Update B. CASE STATUS REPORT/APPEAL UPDATES 3. Brown v. Parks-CSC No. 25-01-005A

6.	ACTION ITEMS	<p>2026 Chair Nomination and Vote: Commissioner Wideman-Williams moved to nominate Commissioner Wells. Commissioner Ceaser seconded the motion The motion was approved.</p> <p>2026 Commission Meeting Schedule Discussion and Potential Vote: The Commission reviewed the meeting schedule. Commissioner Ceaser moved to accept the meeting dates for 2026. The dates were approved as read.</p>
7.	HONORING THE SERVICE OF COMMISSIONER MARY WIDEMAN-WILLIAMS 2020-2025	The commission honored the service of outgoing commissioner Mary Wideman-Williams. Executive Director Scheele read a resolution and presented Commissioner Wideman-Williams with a plaque. The commission and staff thanked Commissioner Wideman-Williams for her six years of service.
8.	EXECUTIVE SESSION	The commission did not go into Executive Session.
9.	OLD/NEW BUSINESS	There was no Old/New Business.
10.	ADJOURNMENT	The meeting ended at 2:32 p.m.

Minutes submitted **March 16, 2026**, by: Teresa Jacobs

Minutes Approved Amended
March 16, 2026, by: PSCSC

Signed by CSC Commission Chair, Denise Wells

Monthly meetings are recorded; after January 1, 2024, they may be found at:
<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCLjvUwCTxoAH-cC4Vt1fMTA>

Previous recordings may be requested via the public records portal at
<https://www.seattle.gov/public-records>

Budget Summary

Business Unit ID

VC0

Year

2026

03/10/2026

Last Pay Period End Date

Wednesday, March 4, 2026 02:03 PM Pacific Standard Time (PST)

Last Refreshed Date

\$3,038,328.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,038,328.00	\$0.00	\$374,512.13	\$374,512.13	\$2,663,815.87
Adopted Budget	Carryforward	Budget Revisions	Budget Transfers	Revised Budget	Encumbrances	Total Expenses	Committments	Remaining Legal Bu...

2,663,815.87	2,663,815.87	12.33%	87.67%
Available Balance Before Encumbrances	Available Balance After Encumbrances	Percent Spent Before Encumbrances	Percent Available Before Encumbrances

BSL ID And Name	Adopted Budget	Carryforward	Budget Revisions	Budget Transfers	Revised Budget	Encumbrances	Total Expenses	Total Committments	Remaining Legal Budge
BO-VC-V1CIV - Civil Service Commissions	\$3,038,328.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,038,328.00	\$0.00	\$374,512.13	\$374,512.13	\$2,663,815.8
Revenue - Revenue	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0
Total	\$3,038,328.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,038,328.00	\$0.00	\$374,512.13	\$374,512.13	\$2,663,815.8

**CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
CASE STATUS REPORT (CSR)
March 2026**

FILED/OPEN

CASE NUMBER	APPELLANT	RESPONDENT DEPARTMENT	DATE FILED	RULE/CODE	ISSUE	STATUS	PRESIDING
26-07-001A	Franklin	Parks	1-5-2026	City of Seattle Personnel Rules Violations: PR 1.1 and PR 1.3	Whether Administrative Reassignment was justified.	Appeal filed. 1 st prehearing to be determined.	Executive Director

CLOSED

CASE NUMBER	APPELLANT	RESPONDENT DEPARTMENT	DATE FILED	RULE/CODE	ISSUE	STATUS	PRESIDING



February 27, 2026

André Franklin, Appellant
[REDACTED]

Michelle Finnegan, Seattle Parks & Recreation, Interim Superintendent
Michelle.Finnegan@seattle.gov

Dr. Kimberly Loving, Seattle Department of Human Resources, Director
Kimberly.Loving@seattle.gov

Re: Letter of Receipt and Initial Review
Franklin v. Parks-CSC No. 26-07-001A

Dear André Franklin and Interim Superintendent Finnegan:

On January 5, 2026, the Civil Service Commission (CSC) received André Franklin's appeal delivered via email. The Notice of Appeal and associated filings are attached. Additional supporting attachments were submitted; those are available on request.

In accordance with CSC Rule 5.03, the Executive Director reviewed the appeal and associated materials and determined the following:

- Mr. Franklin followed and exhausted the Employee Grievance Procedure as required by the City's Personnel Rule 1.4.
- Mr. Franklin's appeal was filed timely on the 14th day after the Step 3 grievance response.
- The subject matter of the appeal regarding Personnel Rule 1.1 and 1.3 as included in Mr. Franklin's grievance is within the jurisdiction of the CSC.¹

CSC received and reviewed all documents provided but is only forwarding to other parties those documents related to exhaustion of the grievance process, jurisdiction, and timeliness as listed at the bottom of this letter.

¹The Civil Service Commission does not have jurisdiction over Seattle's Whistleblower Protection Code (SMC 4.20.800). The Whistleblower Protection Code is overseen by the Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission. If Mr. Franklin intends to pursue a whistleblower complaint, he should approach the Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission.

PR 1.4.2(A) provides employees with a right to bring a timely grievance against their employing department, not other City departments.

In its own discretion, the CSC may delegate matters to the Seattle Office of Hearing Examiner for hearing. When this occurs, the CSC retains jurisdiction and conducts a final review of the record and decision. The CSC may affirm, modify, or remand a decision of a Presiding Officer. See [Civil Service Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, Rule 5](#), for more on process.

The Commission will receive a status update on this appeal at a future meeting. The Commission has not yet adopted a regular meeting schedule for 2026. Attendance at the meeting is welcome but not required. We will contact the parties separately to schedule a pre-hearing conference on this matter and inquire about whether the parties have attempted to resolve the matter.

We encourage parties to contact the Office of the Employee Ombud Ombud@seattle.gov for mediation services or engage in another form of conflict resolution. Please contact us for more information about alternative dispute resolution.

Parties may contact our office directly with questions or concerns. When parties contact our office, they are directed to also copy (cc) the other party to avoid *ex parte* communication².

Sincerely,

Andrea Scheele
Andrea Scheele
Executive Director

Encl:

Notice of Appeal (email), January 5, 2026 (without attachments)
Notice of Appeal (form), January 5, 2026
Step 3 Grievance Report, December 20, 2025
Step 3 Grievance Response, December 23, 2025

Cc:

Dr. Kimberly Loving, Director, Seattle Department of Human Resources
Josie Watanabe, Interim Policy and Legislation Advisor, Seattle Department of Human Resources

² *Ex parte* Communication- A communication with the Presiding Officer, Commissioners, or Executive Director and Civil Service Commission staff about the merits of an appeal outside of the hearing, or at a time when all parties are not present. *Ex parte* communication may include verbal communications, emails, and other written notes or correspondence. Parties are directed to cc each other on all correspondence with the Commission. *Ex parte* communication does not include questions to staff about hearing or appeal procedures or scheduling.

BEFORE THE CITY OF SEATTLE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the appeal of

André Franklin

Appellant

V.

Seattle Parks & Recreation Department

Respondent

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

CSC No. 26-07-001A

I, Sarah Butler, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that on the date below, I caused to be served upon the below-listed parties, via email, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document: **Appeal Acknowledgement**.

Party	Method of Service
Appellant: André Franklin [REDACTED]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E-Mail
Respondent: Seattle Parks & Recreation Department Michelle Finnegan, Interim Seattle Parks & Recreation, Superintendent Michelle.Finnegan@seattle.gov Dr. Kimberly Loving, Director, SDHR Kimberly.Loving@seattle.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E-Mail

DATED: February 27, 2026 at Seattle, Washington.

Sarah Butler

Civil Service Department
Operations and Policy Advisor

André Franklin
Seattle Parks and Recreation
Work email: andre.franklin@seattle.gov

[REDACTED]
Regular employee in classified service

Decision being appealed

I appeal the Seattle Parks and Recreation Step 3 Grievance Response signed by AP Diaz and delivered to me on 12/23/2025, and the underlying Step 3 Grievance record relied upon in that decision.

Timeliness and request for jurisdiction determination

This appeal is filed within 20 calendar days of delivery of the AP Diaz Step 3 Grievance Response. I understand the Civil Service Commission will determine whether it has jurisdiction after the appeal is filed.

Purpose and Basis of Appeal

I am not disputing that Seattle Parks and Recreation may have authority to place an employee on administrative reassignment if the employee is a subject of an investigation. The issue I am appealing is that I was placed on administrative reassignment on 10/6/2025 and was not made aware that I was a subject of an investigation until 10/21/2025, despite the City's internal awareness and despite my expressed concerns about the administrative reassignment. I am also appealing because the Step 3 record contains disputed factual characterizations that remain uncorrected and were relied upon in the Step 3 outcome.

In addition, the City's application of its practices regarding separation or reassignment has been inconsistent. After SPR was aware that I had filed a complaint that was being investigated by the Washington State Human Rights Commission and the EEOC, and after the issues and concerns I raised as part of the E3 annual review process that SPR HRBPs reviewed and signed off on, SPR did not separate or reassign either my supervisor or me. Later, the City relied on investigatory status as a basis for administrative reassignment. This inconsistency is relevant to whether SPR applied policies and practices fairly and consistently in my case.

Relevant Timeline

On 10/6/2025, I was placed on administrative reassignment. On 10/9/2025, I filed my Step 3 Grievance after SPR did not respond to my requests for clarification. I did not receive notice that I was a subject of an investigation until 10/21/2025.

After receiving the Seattle Human Resources Step 3 Grievance Memo dated 12/20/2025, I submitted a written request when I returned to work on 12/24/2025 to correct the Step 3 record for accuracy. On 12/26/2025, Seattle Human Resources confirmed it would make limited edits and would not change several other disputed items. These disputed items remain important because the Step 3 decision relies on the Step 3 record.

Issues Presented for Commission Review

Whether the City's Step 3 Grievance record and Step 3 Grievance Response should be corrected or formally annotated where the record contains disputed factual characterizations that remain unaddressed, including the timing and clarity of notice to me that I was a subject of an investigation.

Whether the City's handling of administrative reassignment and related restrictions complied with applicable personnel system requirements when the City relied on investigatory status as part of the justification for reassignment, but did not inform me that I was a subject until later in October.

Whether SPR applied its practices consistently when it did not separate or reassign my supervisor or me after it was aware of my WSHRC and EEOC complaint and investigation, and after the issues and concerns I raised as part of the E3 annual review process that SPR HRBPs reviewed and signed off on, but later relied on HRIU investigatory status as a basis for reassignment.

Relief requested

I request that the Civil Service Commission accept this filing, determine jurisdiction, and provide appropriate relief within its authority, including requiring correction or formal annotation of the Step 3 Grievance record and any other relief the Commission determines appropriate.

Attachments submitted with this appeal

- Step 3 Grievance filed 10/9/2025 and exhibits A through E
- Administrative reassignment notice dated 10/6/2025
- HRIU notice and related communications showing the timeline of notice to me
- Seattle Human Resources Step 3 Grievance Memo dated 12/20/2025
- Seattle Parks and Recreation Step 3 Grievance Response signed by AP Diaz delivered 12/23/2025
- Seattle Human Resources email dated 12/26/2025 confirming what was changed and what was not changed in the Step 3 Grievance Memo



City of Seattle
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

700 5th Avenue, Suite 1670
PO Box 94729
Seattle, WA 9124-4729
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.

APPEAL TO THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (DISCIPLINARY)

Appeal No. _____ Date Filed <u>1/5/2026</u>	
--	--

Full Name of Appellant	Work Address
André Franklin	100 Dexter Ave N Seattle, WA, 98109
Residence Address	Work Telephone
██████████	206-457-9526
City State Zip	Employee ID
██████████	██████████
Home/Cell Phone:	Department
██████████	Seattle Parks and Recreation
Email:	Job Title
██████████	Manager 1, Parks and Rec

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

What Personnel rule, regulation, or provision, do you believe was violated? _____
 Personnel Rule 1.4 and related civil service rules. See attached Notice of Appeal dated 1/5/2026

<p>Reason for this appeal _____</p> <p>See attached Notice of Appeal dated 1/5/2026</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Remedy Sought (What do you want?):</p> <p>_____</p> <p>See attached Notice of Appeal dated 1/5/2026</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>2. UNION:</p> <p>If you are a member of a union, what is the name of your union?</p> <p>YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO On 3/1/2026 Mr. Franklin notified CSC that he is now a member of:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Local Number: <u>Protec17</u></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> I HAVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I HAVE NOT</p> <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> IS NOT the subject of arbitration pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement.</p>
<p>3. EMPLOYEE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE:</p> <p>Did you receive notification of your right to a timely resolution of this grievance from your Department?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO (SMC 4.04.070)</p>	<p>If you filed a grievance through the Employee Grievance Procedure, what was the outcome?</p> <p><u>It was denied</u></p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I HAVE <input type="checkbox"/> I HAVE NOT</p> <p>filed a grievance on the issues that are identified in this appeal, through the Employee Grievance Procedure. (Personnel Rule 1.4.2)</p>	

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.**

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	DATE
<i>Andre Franklin</i>	1/5/2026
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.

Memo

Date: December 20, 2025
To: André Franklin, Teen Life Center Operations Manager, Seattle Parks and Recreation
AP Diaz, Superintendent, Seattle Parks and Recreation
From: Dr. Kimberly Loving, Director, Seattle Human Resources
Subject: Andre Franklin, Step Three Grievance Report

Seattle Parks and Recreation (PKS) employee André Franklin filed a Step 3 grievance under City Personnel Rule 1.4, alleging that PKS violated Personnel Rules and the Seattle Municipal Code when he was reassigned from his position three weeks after filing an HRIU complaint against his immediate supervisor. Mr. Franklin entered this grievance at Step Three.

This memo is my report of the grievance investigation required by Personnel Rule 1.4. It is based on a review of Mr. Franklin’s grievance materials, his personnel file, relevant City Policies, an interview with the PKS Employee Labor and Relations Manager, and a Step 3 meeting. I will provide PKS Superintendent AP Diaz with a separate, confidential recommendation for resolving the grievance, and he will make the decision to accept or deny the grievance.

BACKGROUND

PKS hired Mr. Franklin on October 19, 2005, as a Recreation Attendant. In his current position as a Teen Life Center Operations Manager, Manager 1, his job duties include overseeing the Seattle Teen Life Centers at Garfield, Meadowbrook, and Southwest, as well as Citywide teen and youth development programs.

REVIEW OF FACTS

This Step Three grievance alleges retaliation and disciplinary action stemming from the HRIU investigation. On September 18, 2025, Mr. Franklin was informed that the HRIU would investigate his claims that his supervisor, [REDACTED] retaliated against him for filing a complaint with the Washington Human Rights Commission on April 24, 2024. Shortly after, on October 6, 2025, Mr. Franklin was put on administrative reassignment.

Timeline:

- April 24, 2024, **The City of Seattle was notified that** André Franklin reported discrimination and retaliation within the PKS to the Washington State Human Rights Commission.
- On August 26, 2025, PKS notified the Human Resources Investigative Unit (HRIU) that Andre Franklin raised concerns about possible discrimination and retaliation.
- September 18, 2025, Mr. Franklin was informed that the HRIU would investigate his claims against his supervisor, [REDACTED]
- On October 6, 2025, Aphrodyi Antoine, Recreation Division Director, was made aware of two requests for intakes with HRIU for both [REDACTED] and Mr. Franklin. They had both become the subjects of investigations, and so Ms. Antoine sent Mr. Franklin and [REDACTED] an email notifying

Franklin, André Step Three Grievance Report

them that they had been put on Administrative Reassignment for 90 days. Both were assigned to work remotely and were instructed to return their keys and badges. Mr. Franklin states that he did not receive any other communication or explanation from PKS, except for the email. The email from Ms. Antoine stated that he was put on administrative reassignment because the Division received notice that he was the subject of or otherwise significantly affected by an active official investigatory process related to alleged violations of personnel rules.

- On October 9, 2025, I accepted Mr. Franklin’s submission of the grievance at Step Three, which I delegated to SDHR Policy and Legislative Advisor Josie Watanabe for processing.
- SDHR reported this to HRIU in accordance with Personnel Rule 1.1.6, and the case was placed on abeyance. HRIU replied that they were aware of the case and did not believe these two instances were related; therefore, the abeyance was lifted on Friday, November 14, 2025.

These are the Rules Mr. Franklin is Grieving:

Personnel Rule 1.1	Workplace Expectations and Retaliation
Personnel Rule 1.3	Progressive Discipline
Seattle Municipal Code 4.20.800	Whistleblower Protection Code

Mr. Franklin sought the following remedies for his grievance:

- Reinstatement of his full duties, authority, and worksite access consistent with his assigned managerial functions.
- Restoration of his keys, key card, and access to staff and meetings
- Remove all documentation or records suggesting disciplinary status or restriction
- Compensation for professional and reputational harm caused by a loss of duties, leadership opportunities, and visibility within the department.

THE STEP THREE GRIEVANCE MEETINGS

On November 24, 2025, Ms. Watanabe met with Ms. Rochelle Brown, PKS Employee Labor and Relations Manager, to learn more about the administrative reassignment. Ms. Brown stated that both Mr. Franklin and ██████████ were subjects of two different investigations. They each filed a complaint against the other, and so they were both put on administrative reassignment on October 6, 2025, in pursuance of Personnel Rule 1.3.4 A

“While investigating an employee’s alleged misconduct, the appointing authority may remove the employee or other employees who are the cause of or otherwise significantly affected by such investigation from the workplace. The employee(s) may be temporarily reassigned to another work unit, or may be placed on administrative reassignment.”

This decision was made by Ms. Antoine, and not by ██████████. PKS has a consistent practice of considering how closely individuals work together and the potential impacts. If individuals are unable to work in the unit, they will be assigned to work remotely or in a different location. Mr. Franklin was not demoted to a lower classification or pay during the 90-day administrative reassignment.

On November 25, 2025, Ms. Watanabe met with Mr. Franklin about his Step Three grievance. Present at the meeting were Ms. Smith, a personal representative of Mr. Franklin's, and Ms. Brown, PKS Employee Labor and Relations Manager. In the meeting, Mr. Franklin confirmed the violations and remedies as in his Step

Three grievance memo. Mr. Franklin stated that he was not given any communication about the administrative reassignment, except for the email, and was harmed by the abrupt removal of his authority, keys, and access to staff, buildings, and his computer files. He stated that he was already suffering mental health repercussions from the retaliatory behavior of his supervisor, ██████████, spanning back to April 24, 2024, when he filed the Washington State Human Rights Commission report.

Within the hours of Mr. Franklin's reassignment, he reached out to Jr. Salinas, PKS Human Resources Business Partner, but did not receive a response within two hours, so he followed up again. He stated that his new assignment is less desirable, and the proof is that no one has performed the work thus far. Additionally, he was informed that he needed to be fully remote but was not permitted to attend previously scheduled remote activities, such as a mentor program meeting. He received a notice that he had been removed from the mentor program. To Mr. Franklin, this appears to be a disciplinary action. Since he did not receive any communication apart from an email, he filed a complaint with the Washington State Commission and submitted a Whistleblower Report. He believes this situation [Step Three grievance] could have been avoided if someone from PKS had communicated with him by phone.

Ms. Brown followed up on the mentoring program via email. She stated that each year, PKS requires all APEX SAM employees to participate in the Mentorship program to ensure they have a high volume of mentors for potential mentees. Most years, they have more mentors than mentees, and mentors who are not matched are deactivated from the program and notified. This was the case for 2025; Mr. Franklin was not matched, and so his profile was deactivated for the 2025 cohort.

RELEVANT POLICY

Mr. Franklin cites the following Personnel Rules and Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) violations:

Personnel Rule 1.1 Discrimination, and Harassment Workplace Misconduct, and Retaliation.

1.1.2 Inclusive Workplace Policy

The City of Seattle is committed to respect, dignity, civility and equity. To achieve this, employees' actions shall support a positive and inclusive work environment. Discrimination, harassment, retaliation and Workplace Misconduct are prohibited. The City does not tolerate prohibited behavior against City employees by coworkers, supervisors, managers, officers of the City or by non-employees conducting business with the City.

Any employee who experiences or observes prohibited behavior should seek support or make a report pursuant to Personnel Rule 1.1.4. All reports will result in an intake and may be investigated subject to Personnel Rule 1.1.7 C. An employee found to have committed prohibited behavior may be subject to discipline under Personnel Rule 1.3, up to and including termination of employment.

1.1.4 Reporting Prohibited Behavior

A. Employees are encouraged to promptly report allegations of experienced or observed prohibited behavior to the Seattle Department of Human Resources Investigation Unit. Employees may also report prohibited behavior to any management representative. A management representative who learns of possible prohibited behavior must report it as outlined in Personnel Rule 1.1.6, which will result in an intake as provided in Personnel Rule 1.1.7 C 1.

1. The City will keep confidential any information it gathers in the course of responding to reported prohibited behavior to the extent allowable under public disclosure or other laws. The City may also be required to share information on a need-to-know basis to carry out the intent of this policy.

2. The appointing authority or designated management representative shall assess the need to separate the person experiencing the possible prohibited behavior and the subject to avoid further prohibited behavior during the investigation. Prompt, effective and remedial action will be made as required by the circumstances.

Personnel Rule 1.3 – Progressive Discipline

1.3.2 Order of Severity of Disciplinary Action

A. In order of increasing severity, an appointing authority or designated management representative may take the following disciplinary actions against an employee for misconduct or poor work performance:

1. A verbal warning, which shall be accompanied by a notation in the employee's personnel file. A verbal warning is appropriate only when the supervisor determines that there are sufficient mitigating factors related to the employee's conduct or performance that a written reprimand, suspension, demotion or discharge is unwarranted.

2. A written reprimand, a copy of which must be placed in the employee's personnel file. A written reprimand is appropriate only when the supervisor determines that there are sufficient mitigating factors related to the employee's conduct or performance that suspension, demotion or discharge is unwarranted.

3. Provided an employee has received no further or additional discipline in the intervening period, a verbal warning or written reprimand may not be used for progressive discipline after two (2) years other than to show notice of any rule or policy at issue.

4. Discipline that arises as a result of a violation of workplace policies of City Personnel Rules regarding harassment, discrimination, retaliation, or workplace violence, shall not be subject to Personnel Rule 1.3.

B. In order of increasing severity, the disciplinary actions which a supervisor may recommend and the appointing authority may approve against an employee include:

1. Suspension up to 30 calendar days.

a) Salaried employees shall be suspended in minimum increments of one workweek, except that suspensions for major safety violations may be imposed for at least 1 workday but less than 1 workweek.

2. Demotion

a) The appointing authority may demote an employee to a vacant position in a lower-paying classification or title in the same employing unit for disciplinary reasons. The employee must meet the minimum qualifications for the lower-paying classification or title. An employee who is demoted shall lose all rights to the higher class.

3. Discharge.

C. The disciplinary action imposed depends upon the seriousness of the employee's offense and such other considerations as the appointing authority or designated management representative deems relevant. In the absence of mitigating circumstances, a verbal warning or a written reprimand shall not be given for a major disciplinary offense.

D. A regular employee may be suspended, demoted or discharged only for justifiable cause. This standard requires that:

1. The employee was informed of or reasonably should have known the consequences of his or her conduct;

2. The rule, policy or procedure the employee has violated is reasonably related to the employing unit's safe and efficient operations;

3. A fair and objective investigation produced evidence of the employee's violation of the rule, policy or procedure;

4. The rule, policy or procedure and penalties for the violation thereof are applied consistently; and
5. The suspension or discharge is reasonably related to the seriousness of the employee's conduct and his or her previous disciplinary history.

E. The appointing authority may suspend, demote or discharge a probationary employee without just cause. A written statement of any such action shall be provided to the Seattle Human Resources Director and the Civil Service Commission.

CONCLUSION

After reviewing and considering Mr. Franklin's written Step Three grievance; an interview with Ms. Brown, the Step Three grievance meetings with Mr. Franklin, Ms. Smith, and Ms. Brown, and other documents and information received during the course of the Step Three grievance investigation, I have determined that Seattle Parks and Recreation did not violate Personnel Rules 1.1 and 1.3, by putting Mr. Franklin on Administrative Reassignment after the HRIU investigation was launched.

Personnel Rule 1.1 provides employees with resources to report and seek support in creating an inclusive workplace that is free from discrimination, retaliation, and harassment. I was unable to find any evidence indicating that Mr. Franklin's administrative reassignment was a result of retaliation. Mr. Franklin was placed on administrative reassignment because Ms. Antoine received HRIU requests for intakes and notifications that Mr. Franklin and ██████████ were subjects of separate HRIU complaints. The Seattle Parks and Recreation Department followed Personnel Rule 1.3.4 by issuing an administrative reassignment while the HRIU investigation was pending; therefore, there was no violation.

"While investigating an employee's alleged misconduct, the appointing authority may remove the employee or other employees who are the cause of or otherwise significantly affected by such investigation from the workplace. The employee(s) may be temporarily reassigned to another work unit, or may be placed on administrative reassignment."

Personnel Rule 1.3 limits disciplinary actions to verbal warnings, written reprimands, suspensions, demotions, and terminations. Mr. Franklin did not face any disciplinary actions, such as suspension, demotion, or discharge, as both he and ██████████ were placed on administrative reassignment without a demotion of pay or classification. He was not removed from the mentoring program as a form of discipline; rather, he was not assigned a mentee because there were too many mentors, which led to his profile being deactivated. Therefore, there is no violation.

Personnel Rule 1.4.2 A. limits grievances to alleged violations of the Personnel Rules and Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 4.04. Allegations of whistleblower retaliation fall under SMC Chapter 4.20 and therefore are not within the scope of Personnel Rule 1.4. Whistleblower retaliation complaints should be filed with the Executive Director of the Seattle Ethics and Election Commission as provided in SMC 4.20.860.

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEE

This is the grievance report, and not the final determination of the Step 3 grievance. Once I make a separate, confidential recommendation to the grievant's appointing authority, the appointing authority has seven days to communicate the final decision to the grievant.

The appointing authority's determination of this Step 3 Grievance is the final step in the Employee Grievance Procedure. If the grievant remains dissatisfied with the outcome of the grievance, they may appeal to the Civil Service Commission within 20 days of the final grievance decision issued by the appointing authority.

Cc: Desiree Tabares, Seattle Parks and Recreation, Director of Human Resources

Rochelle Brown, Seattle Parks and Recreation, Employee Labor Relations Manager



December 22, 2025

Sent Via Email Communication

Dear Mr. Franklin,

I am in receipt of the Step 3 grievance you filed on October 6, 2025, with Seattle Human Resources Director (SDHR), Dr. Kimberly Loving. You filed a Step Three grievance, alleging that Seattle Parks and Recreation (PKS) violated Personnel Rules and the Seattle Municipal Code when you faced retaliation and disciplinary action by your immediate supervisor stemming from your HRIU investigation that led to your administrative reassignment.

Regarding your allegation, Dr. Loving stated in her grievance report that she determined Seattle Parks and Recreation did not violate Personnel Rules 1.1 or 1.3 by placing you on administrative reassignment following the initiation of your HRIU investigation. Both you and Mr. Wilson were placed on administrative reassignment as you were both subjects of separate HRIU investigations.

Rule 1.3.4 A. specifies that "the appointing authority may remove the employee or other employees who are the cause or who are otherwise significantly affected by such an investigation from the workplace." After reviewing the incidents you cited in your grievance letter, I found that PKS did not violate any policies, leading me to deny your grievance.

For the reasons described above, I am respectfully denying your grievance. Please contact Rochelle Brown at 206-615-1814, Human Resources Manager at Seattle Parks and Recreation, who can answer any questions you may have about this decision.

Sincerely,


AP Diaz (12/22/2025 13:41:05 MST)

AP Diaz
Superintendent, Seattle Parks and Recreation

Notice: You may file an appeal of this decision with the Civil Service Commission in accordance with Seattle Municipal Code Section 4.04.260. In order to timely file such an appeal, you must do so within 20 calendar days of the delivery of this letter. The Civil Service Commission may or may not have jurisdiction over your appeal. The Commission has the authority to determine jurisdiction at the time an appeal is filed. I am enclosing additional information about the Civil Service appeal process for your reference.

[Civil Service Commission | seattle.gov](#) | [Appeals Process | seattle.gov](#)

Memo

To: Civil Service Commissioners
 From: Teresa Jacobs
 Date: March 2026
 Re: CSC Revised Meeting Dates

Commissioners,

Below please find the revised CSC meeting dates for your consideration.

- We have made every effort to schedule the meetings on the second Thursday of each month; however, alternate Thursdays may be used if the regular meeting date falls on a holiday, scheduled staff absence, or a PSCSC hearing is scheduled. Please accept both the regular meeting date and the alternate date. We will notify you of the confirmed meeting date.
- Meetings will begin at 2:00 p.m., unless an alternative time is mutually agreed upon. Location of the meeting is SMT 1679. If the hearing room is unavailable, the location will be shared prior to the meeting date.

April 23	May 14	June 18	July 9
Location: City Hall Room 370 OPMA Training	Location: City Hall Room 370 PRA Training		
Aug 13	Sep 10 Or Alternate Date: September 17	Oct 8	Regular CSC Meeting: Nov 12 Joint Meeting with PSCSC: November 19 In Person
Dec 10			