

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ARTIS OLIVER,

Appellant,

vs.

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
DEPARTMENT,

Respondent.

CASE NO. R-DEMO-08-006

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS
OF LAW AND ORDER OF THE BOARD

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 **Hearing.** This matter came before the Personnel Resources Board, JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair, and LAURA ANDERSON, Member. The hearing was held on December 16, and 17, 2008, January 27, 2009, and March 17, 18 and 19, 2009, in the Personnel Resources Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington. Closing arguments were submitted in writing on April 17, 2009. Subsequent to this hearing but prior to issuing this decision, the Board's titles changed. The signatures on this document reflect the Board's current titles.

1.2 **Appearances.** Appellant Artis Oliver was present and was represented by Artis Grant, Attorney at Law. Cathleen Carpenter, Assistant Attorney General, represented Respondent Employment Security Department.

1.3 **Nature of Appeal.** This is an appeal from a demotion. Respondent alleged that Appellant's management style intimidated and alienated staff, caused staff to lose respect for her and created a hostile work environment.

II. PRELIMINARY MATTER

2.1 At the outset of the hearing, we heard argument on Respondent's Motion to Quash the subpoenas for four of Appellant's witnesses: ESD Commissioner Lee, Deputy Commissioner Trause, Area Director Goranson-Salas, and Supervisor Mersereau.

1
2 2.2 Respondent argued that the witnesses had no personal knowledge of the matter before the
3 Board in this appeal. Appellant argued that the witnesses were relevant to the underlying foundation of
4 her case particularly in regard to training, just cause and retaliation and asked that the motion be held in
5 abeyance until the witnesses would otherwise be called.
6

7 2.3 The Board reviewed the written motion, considered the oral arguments of the parties and orally
8 granted the motion. We now confirm our oral ruling on Respondent's Motion to Quash.
9

10 **III. FINDINGS OF FACT**

11 3.1 Appellant Artis Oliver was a permanent employee for Respondent Employment Security
12 Department (ESD). Appellant and Respondent are subject to Chapter 41.06 RCW and the rules
13 promulgated thereunder, Title 357 WAC. Appellant filed a timely appeal with the Personnel
14 Resources Board on July 21, 2008.
15

16 3.2 Appellant began her employment with ESD in 1979. She worked in various positions,
17 including management positions, prior to her October 2005 appointment to a Washington
18 Management System (WMS) Band 2 WorkSource Administrator position in ESD's Lynnwood
19 WorkSource Office.
20

21 3.3 Prior to the action giving rise to this appeal, Appellant had no history of receiving
22 disciplinary action.
23

24 3.4 Appellant's training record shows that she was provide with extensive training while
25 employed at ESD. In part, Appellant received training covering management skills, performance
26 management and discipline, reasonable accommodation, leadership, and creating and sustaining a
27 respectful workplace. In addition, Appellant was aware of ESD's Policies and Procedures and of
28 her responsibility to adhere to them. Most recently, on August 21, 2007, Appellant signed the
29 form acknowledging and agreeing to adhere to ESD policies, including Policy 1016 Employee

1 Conduct. By signing the form, Appellant acknowledged that she read, understood and agreed to
2 adhere to the standards set forth in the policies. Also, as an ESD Manager, Appellant was
3 responsible for reviewing the policies with her subordinates and assuring that they understood the
4 policies.

5
6 3.5 ESD Policy 1016 – Employee Conduct states, in relevant part:

7 1. Courtesy and Positive Work Attitude

8 a. Employees are expected to be courteous and helpful in their contact
9 with the public and with each other, whether in person, over the phone or
10 through correspondence. They are to display a cooperative and positive
11 work attitude and be tactful in dealing with difficult situations. They are
12 expected to exercise sound judgment in hostile situations by maintaining
self-control and seeking appropriate assistance when necessary to defuse
the situation.

13 b. Inappropriate behavior or abusive language will not be tolerated.
14 Abusive language is defined by (or may include) any remark that can be
15 construed as unreasonable or derogatory, such as shouting, or demeaning
16 remarks. Bullying or aggressive behavior for the sole purpose of
17 intimidating are also a violation of this policy. This policy encompasses
remarks made either to or about a customer or coworker. For this
particular portion of this policy, failure to comply will be grounds for
nothing less than disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal.

18 . . .

19 3. Teamwork

20 Teamwork is critical to the agency's success. Employees are expected to
21 constructively participate in their work teams, and display communication and
listening skills that encourage full participation by all team members.

22
23 3.6 Matt Bench became Appellant's direct supervisor when she began working in the
24 Lynnwood WorkSource Office. Mr. Bench credibly testified that after Appellant started working
25 in the office, he had numerous discussions with her about her approach to staff, tone of voice, and
26 word usage, and how she was perceived by staff. Appellant seemed to be receptive to Mr.
27 Bench's counseling and it appeared to Mr. Bench that her communication with staff had
28 improved. In Appellant's June 19, 2006 performance evaluation form, Mr. Bench gave Appellant
29

1 a low rating in communication but also recognized her growth in this area and commented that
2 she had established excellent working relationships.

3
4 3.7 Following the evaluation, Mr. Bench continued to believe that Appellant's communication
5 skills had improved because he did not receive any complaints from staff or partners. However,
6 after a September 2007 staff meeting in the Lynnwood office, staff members approached Mr.
7 Bench and told him that Appellant "dressed down" staff during the meeting and was disrespectful
8 to staff. Between September and December 2007, Mr. Bench spoke with Appellant about the
9 complaints. Initially, Appellant was defensive but then their conversation turned to how she could
10 handle things differently at staff meetings. After Mr. Bench spoke with Appellant about the
11 complaints, Mr. Bench received three additional complaints about Appellant.

12
13 3.8 After receiving the additional complaints, Mr. Bench talked to his supervisor, Anthony
14 Wright, Assistant Commissioner, and to Michelle Castanedo, Deputy Assistant Commissioner for
15 Human Resources. Ms. Castanedo suggested that a worksite team building and climate survey be
16 conducted in the Lynnwood office.

17
18 3.9 Kay Christy was assigned responsibility to conduct the survey. On January 17 and 18,
19 2008, she interviewed staff members and Appellant. After the interviews, Ms. Christy told Mr.
20 Wright that she believed the office had serious problems and that the problems needed more than
21 team building for resolution. Nonetheless, on February 22, 2008, Ms. Christy conducted a
22 teambuilding follow-up meeting with staff.

23
24 3.10 The information provided by Ms. Christy revealed multiple allegations that Appellant
25 engaged in inappropriate behavior towards staff over a period of time. As a result of this new
26 information, Mr. Wright contacted ESD's Human Resources office for assistance in conducting
27 an investigation. In mid-January, Appellant was reassigned to the Auburn WorkSource Office
28 pending completion of the investigation.

1 3.11 The investigation was conducted by Tanna Christensen, Assistant Human Resources
2 Manager. Ms. Christensen interviewed thirteen of Appellant's subordinates in the Lynnwood
3 office. She did not speak to all of the employees in the office, but she spoke to those with direct
4 knowledge of the allegations. Prior to being assigned to conduct the investigation, Ms.
5 Christensen was not aware of Ms. Christy's report. But, before she set up her interviews with
6 staff, Ms. Christensen reviewed Ms. Christy's report to identify the allegations she was
7 investigating and to formulate the questions she would use for the investigation.

8
9 3.12 One of the allegations that Ms. Christensen investigated was that Appellant's behavior had
10 damaged the relationships between ESD and its partners in the Lynnwood office. ESD engages
11 with partners who are outside agencies and contractors, to provide services to clients. Some of
12 the partners share office space with ESD in the Lynnwood WorkSource Office.

13
14 3.13 Ms. Christensen interviewed Appellant as part of the investigation. And in addition,
15 Appellant provided her with an extensive written response to the interview. Ms. Christensen
16 credibly testified that her investigation was fair and thorough and that her questions were
17 impartial. In addition, we find that Appellant was given a full and fair opportunity to provide her
18 responses to the allegations both orally and in writing.

19
20 3.14 Ms. Christensen compiled the results of her investigation into an April 11, 2008 report to
21 Mr. Wright. She found that Appellant created an environment inside the ESD WorkSource office
22 in which staff felt bullied and harassed and that Appellant poorly managed the office. Ms.
23 Christensen also found that Appellant's actions violated ESD Policy 1016.

24
25 3.15 On April 21, 2008, a pre-disciplinary letter was sent to Appellant. The letter included a
26 copy of Ms. Christensen's investigation report. The letter also notified Appellant of a pre-
27 disciplinary meeting. The letter listed four allegations of misconduct and stated that the allegations
28 were in direct violation of ESD Policy 1016.

1 3.16 At the request of Appellant's attorney, the pre-disciplinary meeting was rescheduled to
2 May 23, 2008. The pre-disciplinary meeting was conducted by Mr. Wright's designee, Bruce
3 Dempsey, Deputy Assistant Commissioner. Mr. Dempsey credibly testified that his role was to
4 make an assessment of the allegations and Appellant's response and to make a recommendation to
5 Mr. Wright. Appellant and her attorney attended the meeting during which Appellant's written
6 response to the allegations in the pre-disciplinary letter was reviewed. After the meeting, Mr.
7 Dempsey considered all the information provided at the meeting, including Appellant's 64 page
8 written response, sought clarifying information from Ms. Christy and Mr. Bench, and fully
9 reviewed the investigation report. Mr. Dempsey created a summary and recommendation dated
10 June 23, 2008, which he provided to Mr. Wright.

11
12 3.17 Mr. Dempsey determined that Appellant was not successful in managing the day-to-day
13 business of the Lynnwood office. He found that:

- 14 • Appellant created a hostile work environment, her behavior was unpredictable, and staff
15 was always on edge.
- 16 • Appellant's communication style could be characterized as negative and aggressive and
17 her body language, facial expressions, tone, intensity and condescending attitude toward
18 staff did not promote a team atmosphere.
- 19 • Appellant was orally abusive to staff and berated staff.
- 20 • Appellant raised her voice toward supervisors and while on the phone.
- 21 • Appellant routinely assumed that any problem was rooted in staff being lazy.

22 3.18 In his summary and recommendation, Mr. Dempsey gave credit to Appellant for taking on
23 challenges to improve the performance of the Lynnwood office and noted that she had some
24 noteworthy accomplishments. However, he concluded that in pursuing her goal to create a high
25 performing culture, Appellant had a detrimental impact to the overall work environment because
26 of her abrasive, unapproachable and unpredictable leadership style. As a result, Mr. Dempsey
27 recommended that Appellant be demoted to a position that did not manage people but that would
28 allow her to serve in a capacity where her strengths, such as project management, could best serve
29 ESD.

1
2 3.19 Anthony Wright was Appellant's Appointing Authority and as such, was the sole decision-
3 maker for disciplinary actions. In 2007, Mr. Wright was aware of the concerns about Appellant's
4 communication style and he spoke with Mr. Bench about counseling Appellant about the
5 concerns. He participated in the decision to have Ms. Christy do some team building work in the
6 office and try to find out what was causing the problems in the office. Ms. Christy reported back
7 to him that she believed the office had serious problems and she believed the Human Resources
8 office should conduct an investigation.

9
10 3.20 Due to the multiple reports and concerns about Appellant's behavior, Mr. Wright decided
11 to relocate Appellant to another office and to proceed with an investigation into the allegations. In
12 January 2008, he asked the Human Resources office to conduct an investigation to determine
13 whether there was inappropriate conduct in the Lynnwood office and to verify whether the
14 complaints made against Appellant were real.

15
16 3.21 After Mr. Wright received Ms. Christensen's investigative report, including Appellant's
17 response, he reviewed the report, asked some clarifying questions, and then proceeded with the
18 pre-disciplinary process. At Mr. Wright's direction, Mr. Dempsey conducted the pre-disciplinary
19 meeting with Appellant and her attorney and reported the results of the meeting, including
20 Appellant's response, to Mr. Wright.

21
22 3.22 Prior to making the decision to discipline Appellant, Mr. Wright reviewed the entire
23 investigation report and Mr. Dempsey's recommendation from the pre-disciplinary meeting. He
24 also considered Appellant's history with the agency including her extensive training history and
25 the fact that she had no prior discipline.

26
27 3.23 Numerous allegations of misconduct were revealed during the investigation. However,
28 Mr. Wright did not find that they all carried weight. He recognized that problems existed in the
29 Lynnwood office before Appellant's arrival there. Still, Mr. Wright felt that as a WMS Manager,

Appellant had a responsibility to conduct herself appropriately, to respond to staff professionally and to abide by agency policies. After reviewing Appellant's responses to the allegations, Mr. Wright felt that Appellant failed to take ownership of or responsibility for any of the issues in the Lynnwood office and instead, she felt that staff in the office had problems and that they were responsible for the environment.

3.24 Mr. Wright concluded that Appellant was aware of the ESD policy and expectations for professional behavior, she had been counseled and warned that her communication with staff needed to improve, she had been given an opportunity to improve, the investigation into the allegations was fair and thorough, and she was given an opportunity to respond to the allegations. After considering all of the information, Mr. Wright determined that Appellant violated ESD Policy 1016, that her actions rose to the level of gross misconduct because she acted inappropriately on several different occasions, and that discipline was warranted.

3.25 Given what he felt was the egregious nature of Appellant's misconduct, Mr. Wright considered termination as the disciplinary sanction. But after considering Appellant's history with the agency, he felt she should be placed in a position that would utilize her skill set and allow her to be successful. Mr. Wright did not believe Appellant should be placed in a position in which she managed other staff. Therefore, he demoted her to a Work Source Specialist 4 position, the highest position available without management or supervisory responsibility.

3.26 Mr. Wright notified Appellant of his decision by letter dated June 30, 2008. In the letter, Mr. Wright concluded that between October 2005 and 2007 Appellant consistently mistreated the staff under her supervision by:

- berating staff in front of others on multiple occasions
- telling one of her subordinates that there were evil people in the office and then naming them
- continually calling staff insubordinate and disrespectful
- discussing her religion in the office and alluding to an evil spirit in the workplace that she would pray about.

1
2 3.27 Throughout the course of the hearing on this appeal, the Board heard testimony from
3 many of Appellant's subordinates. Some of them directly observed Appellant's behaviors, others
4 did not. We believe that the witnesses were forthright in their testimony and were credible. As a
5 result, we find that a preponderance of the credible testimony establishes that in spite of the fact
6 that the overall performance of the office improved under Appellant's leadership, she engaged in
7 demeaning behavior toward staff in meetings and in front of other staff, she engaged in negative
8 interactions with staff, and her actions resulted in the alienation and loss of respect of many of the
9 staff in the office. We further find that Appellant's behavior created a workplace environment that
10 was oppressive and hostile.

11
12 3.28 We also heard testimony about Appellant's employment history with the agency and her
13 skills as a project manager. As a result, we find that Appellant historically had a good employment
14 record with the agency and that she could have continued to be a productive employee in a
15 different and non-supervisory position. Witnesses credibly testified that Appellant made attempts
16 to recognize good performance, that she worked hard, and that she was committed to achieving
17 results. However, a preponderance of the credible testimony establishes that Appellant did not
18 have the supervisory skills needed to successfully manage people.

19 20 **IV. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES**

21 4.1 In summary, Respondent argues that as a WMS supervisor, Appellant was given responsibility
22 to manage the Lynnwood office in a respectful and cooperative manner, but instead created
23 atmosphere of alienation and lack of trust. Respondent asserts that Appellant mistreated staff and in
24 describing her behavior, Appellant's staff used words like irrational, disrespectful, berate, mistreat,
25 attack, afraid, she'll bite your head off, unsafe, verbal abuse, fear of retaliation, belittle, defenselessness,
26 demeaning, humiliate, bullying, hostile environment and going into a rage. Respondent asserts that
27 Appellant was not effective as a manager or leader in the Lynnwood office and her behavior was
28 inappropriate and abusive.
29

Respondent argues that Appellant was aware of ESD Policy 1016 but that her behavior towards staff was a direct violation of the policy. Respondent further argues that Appellant's supervisor met with her and told her that her "directness" was creating a problem and that he counseled her more than 10 times about her approach, tone of voice, word usage, and how she came across to others. However, Respondent contends that Appellant continued to engage in behavior that violated the policy. In addition, Respondent argues that Appellant failed to meet the higher standard of conduct required of WMS employees.

Respondent argues that Appellant failed to fulfill her responsibilities to exercise good judgment, conduct herself appropriately, and treat subordinates in a respectful manner. Given Appellant's higher duty to perform as a WMS manager, Respondent asserts that demotion out of a supervisory role was appropriate and that the decision to demote Appellant should be upheld.

4.2 In summary, Appellant argues that RCW 41.06.070(3) provides her the right to revert and that she raised this claim during the Loudermill process. Appellant contends that Respondent denied her this guaranteed right.

Appellant argues that the Lynnwood office was responsible for meeting the performance goals put in place by ESD and that she was responsible for ensuring strategic processes and procedures were in place to produce quality services to ESD clients. Appellant contends that she did not establish the performance goals. Appellant asserts that the expectations she placed on staff in the Lynnwood office to meet those goals were reasonable and attainable. She concedes that staff may have had hurt feelings when she held them accountable but she asserts that there was not a hostile environment in the office.

Appellant argues that Respondent failed to apply the just cause standard in making its decision. Appellant asserts that Respondent should have determined if substantial evidence existed for the demotion rather than considering whether a preponderance of evidence existed. Appellant further argues that the investigation by Ms. Christensen and the subsequent demotion letter were flawed, shabby and shoddy. Appellant contends she was railroaded into a demotion and that the demotion was

1 based on an unfair, incomplete investigation, subordinate gossip and hearsay. Appellant further
2 contends that the demotion was a smoke screen to cover for the deficiencies of upper management's
3 failure to address fiscal, facility, partner relations, and personnel issues effectively. Appellant also
4 contends that Respondent arbitrarily applied the term gross misconduct outside of the rule of law.

5
6 Appellant argues that during the Loudermill process, Mr. Dempsey failed to investigate her claims of
7 the investigation being a sham and that he failed to consider her reversion rights when making his
8 recommendation that she be demoted. Appellant contends that her input was not considered during the
9 Loudermill process.

10
11 Appellant argues that she followed the law and policies in every aspect of her management style but
12 asserts that Respondent failed to follow the law of personnel administration best standards in regard to
13 her demotion. Appellant contends that this case represents a systemic series of failures on behalf of
14 Respondent and that the evidence submitted did not support a demotion. Appellant asks that she be
15 restored and made whole.

16 **V. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

17 5.1 The Personnel Resources Board has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter.
18

19 5.2 In a hearing on appeal from a disciplinary action, Respondent has the burden of supporting the
20 charges upon which the action was initiated by proving by a preponderance of the credible evidence
21 that Appellant committed the offenses set forth in the disciplinary letter and that the sanction was
22 appropriate under the facts and circumstances. WAC 357-52-110.
23

24 5.3 In presenting her case, Appellant cited a number of rules, laws and procedures that are not
25 within the jurisdiction of this Board. This Board's jurisdiction is found in Chapter 41.06 RCW and the
26 rules promulgated thereunder, Title 357 WAC.
27
28
29

1 5.4 RCW 41.06.070 exempts certain positions from coverage of the civil services law and rules. In
2 the event an exempt employee is terminated, the law allows reversion rights for most persons who
3 previously held status in a classified position. Appellant was not terminated; she was demoted from in a
4 Washington Management System (WMS) position. WAC 357-58-025 provides that WMS employees
5 are part of the classified service. Appellant was not in an exempt position. Because Appellant was
6 demoted from a classified position, the provisions of RCW 41.06.070 do not apply to her.

7
8 5.5 One of the results of the Personnel System Reform Act of 2002 was to allow certain classified
9 employees to form bargaining units. The exclusive bargaining representatives for those units could then
10 enter into the collective bargaining process with the state. Part of the agreements that came out of the
11 collective bargaining process was the use of just cause in the discipline of covered employees.
12 Disciplinary actions for covered employees are outside of this Board's jurisdiction and this Board is not
13 bound by the standards or provisions of a collective bargaining agreement. Appellant argued that the
14 just cause standards applicable to collective bargaining agreements should be applied in her case.
15 However, Appellant's position was not covered by a collective bargaining agreement. In fact, RCW
16 41.06.022 prohibits WMS employees from inclusion in a collective bargaining unit established under
17 RCW 41.80.001 and 41.80.010 through 41.80.130.

18
19 5.6 As stated above, this Board's jurisdiction is found in RCW 41.06 and the rules promulgated
20 thereunder, Chapter 357 WAC. WAC 357-58-120 provides that a demotion of a WMS employee for
21 cause is a disciplinary demotion. In addition, WAC 357-40-010 provides that an appointing authority
22 may demote a permanent employee under his/her jurisdiction for just cause. Neither the law nor the
23 rules define the elements of just cause. However, this Board and its predecessor, the Personnel Appeals
24 Board, have historically applied the commonly used expression of just cause to all disciplinary cases.
25 When considering whether there was just cause for a disciplinary action, we consider factors such as
26 whether the employee was aware of the expectations, rules, or policies allegedly violated, whether the
27 employee was aware of the need to comply with the rule or policy or to improve performance, whether
28 the employee had an opportunity to demonstrate compliance or improvement, whether the discipline
29 was imposed for good reason, whether the disciplinary process and procedures followed were

1 appropriate, and whether the sanction imposed was sufficient to prevent recurrence, to deter others
2 from similar misconduct, and to maintain the integrity of the program. In addition, this Board and
3 its predecessor have historically held employers to a preponderance of evidence standard. Under
4 the facts and circumstances of this case, Appellant's argument in regard to the just cause and
5 preponderance of evidence standards is unfounded and not based on the history or jurisdiction of
6 this Board or its predecessor.

7
8 5.7 Appellant also challenges the investigative process and the recommendation made by the
9 Appointing Authority's designee. We have carefully reviewed the record and find that the investigation
10 was fair, thorough and complete. The majority of Appellant's subordinate employees in the Lynnwood
11 office were interviewed and clarifying information was sought. In addition, Appellant was reassigned
12 from the office while the investigation took place which sheltered Appellant and created a safe
13 environment in which she and her subordinates could participate in the process. Further, Appellant was
14 provided with the complete investigative report and the allegations and she was provided multiple
15 opportunities to respond to the charges. On each occasion, Appellant provided extensive responses;
16 however her responses did not address or mitigate the seriousness of her actions and did not show that
17 she recognized or took ownership of her responsibility to be an effective manager of people. In her
18 testimony before the Board, Appellant did not directly address the allegations and gave no indication
19 that as the manager of the Lynnwood office she had a responsibility to exercise good judgment,
20 conduct herself appropriately, and treat subordinates in a respectful manner.

21
22 5.8 This Board and its predecessor, the Personnel Appeals Board, have previously ruled on
23 disciplinary actions for WMS employees. For example, in Mayhew v. Dept. of Corrections, PRB Case
24 No. R-DEMO-06-002 (2006), the Board upheld the sanction of demotion and concluded that the
25 employee, who was a WMS employee with 17 years of experience and no history of corrective or
26 disciplinary actions, should have been aware of his obligation to comply with the department's Code of
27 Ethics and policies. In Ahearn v. Dept. of Corrections, PAB Case No. DEMO-02-0015 (2003), the
28 Personnel Appeals Board upheld the sanction of demotion and concluded that a WMS employee is
29 held to a higher standard of conduct and professionalism and has a duty to act as a role model.

1
2 5.9 Here, Appellant was a WMS employee with many years of experience and no history of
3 corrective or disciplinary actions. In addition, she was aware of her obligation to comply with ESD's
4 policies. As a WMS employee, she should have been held to a higher standard of conduct and
5 professionalism and expected to act as a role model for subordinate staff. A preponderance of the
6 credible testimony proved that Appellant failed to meet the behavioral expectations and obligations of a
7 WSM employee.

8
9 5.10 In addition, a preponderance of the credible testimony, including testimony from some of
10 Appellant's witnesses, clearly established that Appellant was not effective as a manager or leader for
11 the staff in the Lynnwood office and that her behavior was inappropriate and at times, abusive. While
12 Appellant may have skills and abilities as a project manager, a preponderance of credible testimony
13 established that she did not demonstrate the skills to needed to manage people.

14
15 5.11 Under the totality of the proven facts and circumstances, the disciplinary sanction of
16 demotion is appropriate. The appeal should be denied.

17
18 **VI. ORDER**

19 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Artis Oliver is denied.

20 DATED this ____ day of _____, 2009.

21 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

22
23 _____
24 JOSEPH PINZONE, Chair

25 _____
26 LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair
27
28
29