

BEFORE THE SEATTLE ETHICS AND ELECTIONS COMMISSION

In the matter of) No. 11-1-0929
)
)
Ronald Allen) CHARGING DOCUMENT
)
_____)

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

I

Mr. Allen violated SMC 4.16.070.3.a, when, as an employee of Seattle City Light, he received nine bottles of alcohol which to a reasonable person would appear to have been received with the intent to give or obtain special consideration as to his actions in his official capacity as a Seattle City Light apprentice instructor.

In support of this charge, the Executive Director further states the following:

BACKGROUND

1. Allen completed his apprenticeship in 2003, and for the past nine years has worked as a journey-level lineworker with Seattle City Light.
2. In 2005, Allen became an instructor in Seattle City Light’s lineworker apprenticeship training program. Allen taught pole-climbing school and rescue in the pre-

apprentice qualification program¹ and taught “hot stick school,”² the last segment of the six-period training program.

3. Apprentices must pass a test at the end of every training segment in order to proceed to the next segment.

4. In 2007, Allen became a member of the Electrical Craft Apprenticeship Committee [ECAC].

ALLEN’S ACCEPTANCE OF NINE BOTTLES OF ALCOHOL

5. In February 2010, SCL Apprenticeship Class #17 [Class 17] started the second six-month training segment of the lineworker apprenticeship program, with Allen as the trainer. Between August 16 and 20, 2010, Allen tested Class 17 on second-segment skills.

6. On the first day of testing, Monday, August 16, 2010, Allen informed the nine apprentices they were taking an oral test on the safety regulations contained in Chapter 45 of the Washington Administrative Code [WAC].

7. The testing took place in a classroom at the SCL pole yard on the South Seattle Community College Campus. Allen called each of nine apprentices individually into the classroom and asked them questions regarding the WAC.

8. When all of the apprentices had finished the test, Allen came out of the classroom and announced to the apprentice group that some of them had done poorly and failed the test. Individual apprentices were not told if they had passed or failed. There is no record of the testing, what each apprentice was asked, or their responses.

9. Allen informed the group that he would give them another opportunity to take the test on Friday, the last day of the testing period.

10. When Allen announced the group’s failure and informed them they would all re-take the test on Friday, an unnamed apprentice yelled, “Would a bottle help?”

¹ This six month training is a second screening for those accepted into the apprenticeship program. It includes on-the-job training with lineworker crews during which pre-apprentices are job “helpers.”

² This segment is where apprentices are taught and mentored on working with energized high voltage electrical lines.

11. On the day the WAC was to be re-tested, eight of the nine apprentices arrived at the classroom with a bottle of liquor in hand.

12. One apprentice who had not brought a bottle asked his fellow apprentices if he really needed a bottle. The other apprentices assured him that he needed a bottle. An apprentice who was not scheduled to be tested until after the apprentice who had arrived without a bottle gave this apprentice a bottle of whiskey, left the testing site, and returned with a replacement bottle in time to have his test.

13. Each of the nine apprentices entered the classroom carrying a bottle of whiskey or liquor, and each gave a fifth of liquor to Allen. Allen accepted the bottles.

14. Allen acknowledges receiving the nine bottles.

15. Allen re-tested each of the apprentices and each passed. The test was again administered orally, and there is no record of the questions asked or the responses.

16. Allen as the sole tester had the authority to pass or fail each apprentice.

This notice is hereby given on this 7th day of November, 2012.

Wayne Barnett, Executive Director
Date: _____, 2012