

1 **BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD**

2 **STATE OF WASHINGTON**

3 NATHAN CHASE, )  
4 Appellant, )  
5 v. )  
6 DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS )  
7 Respondent. )  
8 )

PRB Case No. R-JUR-15-002

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

9 This matter came before the Personnel Resources Board, SUSAN MILLER, Member and VICKY  
10 BOWDISH, Member, for dismissal pursuant to WAC 357-52-215 and WAC 357-52-220.

11 WAC 357-52-215 provides, in relevant part:

12 The board may dismiss an appeal on its own motion when:

13 . . . .

14 (3) An appeal is not filed on time . . . .

15  
16 On March 16, 2015, the Personnel Resources Board received Mr. Chase's appeal taking exception  
17 to the director's determination regarding the allocation of his Grounds and Nursery Specialist 2  
18 position. The director's determination was dated February 11, 2015.

19 Mr. Chase's appeal was received thirty-four (34) days after service of the director's determination.  
20 Therefore, the appeal appeared to be untimely.

21  
22 In accordance with WAC 357-52-045, by letter dated March 18, 2015, Board staff directed the  
23 parties to provided affidavits and/or written argument addressing the issue of timeliness.

1 Affidavits and/or written argument were to be submitted within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the  
2 date of the letter. Neither party submitted affidavits or written argument.

3  
4 RCW 41.06.170(4) establishes the timeframe for filing allocation appeals to the Personnel  
5 Resources Board. The RCW states, “[a]n employee incumbent in a position at the time of its  
6 allocation or reallocation, or the agency utilizing the position, may appeal the allocation or  
7 reallocation to the Washington personnel resources board. Notice of such appeal must be filed in  
8 writing within thirty days of the action from which appeal is taken.”

9 In addition, WAC 357-52-015 provides, in relevant part: “[i]n order to be considered timely, an  
10 appeal must be received in writing at the office of the board within thirty calendar days after: . . . (2)  
11 Service of the director's determination unless the rules specifically state that the director's  
12 determination is final . . . .”

13  
14 WAC 357-04-105 discusses how service is accomplished. The rule provides, in relevant part,  
15 “[e]xcept as provided in chapters 357-40 and 357-52 WAC, service . . . upon parties will be  
16 regarded as completed when personal delivery has been accomplished; or upon deposit in the United  
17 States mail, properly stamped and addressed . . . .”

18 Neither the RCW nor the civil service rules allow the Board to waive the jurisdictional requirements  
19 for filing appeals. The rules require that allocation appeals must be received by the Board within  
20 thirty days after service of the director’s determination.

21  
22 On April 9, 2015, the Board served Mr. Chase and DVA with a Notice of Potential Dismissal. The  
23 Notice of Potential Dismissal notified the parties that the appeal would be dismissed unless, within  
24 fifteen calendar days following the date of service of the notice, the Board received a written request  
25 showing good cause why the appeal should not be dismissed.

1 The notice also discussed a number of the Board's past decisions regarding the issue of timeliness.  
2 For example, in Harris v. Seattle Central Community College, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-08-019  
3 (2008) the director's determination was served on July 8, 2008. On August 8, 2008, appellant filed  
4 an appeal of the director's determination. The appeal was filed thirty-one days after service of the  
5 director's determination. Therefore, the Board determined the appeal was untimely and the appeal  
6 was dismissed.

7 In Yialelis v. Dept. of Transportation, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-08-016 (2008), the director  
8 determined that the employee's request for a director's review was untimely. The employee filed  
9 exceptions to the Board. The employee argued that his thirty-day filing period to request a director's  
10 review should start from the date that he received the letter, not from the date that DOT allegedly  
11 placed the letter in the mail. The employee further argued that the Board should apply the same  
12 standard of service for both employers and employees and that the Board should hold that service of  
13 his request for review was completed when he placed his request for review in the mail rather than  
14 when it was received by the director. However, the Board determined that RCW 41.06.170 and the  
15 civil service rules prevailed. The Board concluded that under the provisions of the statute and the  
16 rules, the request for review, which was filed thirty-one days after service of the agency's  
17 determination, was untimely and denied the appeal.

18 In Bello v. Dept. of Social and Health Services, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-08-003 (2008), the  
19 employee filed exceptions to a director's determination. The employee argued that the appeal was  
20 filed consistent with Article 41.2D of the collective bargaining agreement between the State of  
21 Washington and the Washington Federation of State Employees and was timely. However, the  
22 Board determined that consistent with RCW 41.80.020(6), RCW 41.06.170 prevailed. The Board  
23 concluded that under the provisions of the statute, the appeal, which was filed thirty-four days after  
24 service of the director's determination, was untimely and dismissed the appeal.  
25  
26

1 In Bushey v. Washington State University, PRB No. R-RULE-10-002 (2010), Mr. Bushey mailed  
2 his appeal by overnight delivery on January 28, 2010, with the understanding that it would be  
3 delivered on January 29, 2010. However, the appeal was delivered on February 1, 2010. Mr. Bushey  
4 argued that he exercised due diligence to pursue his appeal and the fact that Federal Express failed  
5 to deliver his appeal until February 1, 2010 was beyond his control. The Board dismissed the appeal  
6 as untimely and confirmed that, “[n]either the RCW nor the civil service rules allow the Board to  
7 waive the jurisdictional requirements for filing appeals.”

8 In Daniels v. Department of Corrections, PRB Case No. R-DEMO-09-007 (2009), Mr. Daniels  
9 argued that when he mailed his appeal on September 18, 2009, he was told by the US Postal staff  
10 that the letter should reach the Board by Monday, September 21, 2009. However, the Board did not  
11 receive the appeal until September 22, 2009, thirty-two (32) days after the effective date of Mr.  
12 Daniels’ demotion. The Board found that it was unfortunate that Mr. Daniels was given misleading  
13 information by United States postal staff regarding the delivery time for mail from Lacey,  
14 Washington, to the Board’s office in Olympia. The Board referenced a history of cases in which the  
15 Board and the Personnel Appeals Board (predecessor to the Board) held that an appeal is untimely  
16 even when the affected employee had been unintentionally misled by an agency or given erroneous  
17 information about a process. See for example, Lapp v. Washington State Patrol, PAB No. V94-079  
18 (1995) and Yialelis v. Dept. of Transportation, PRB No. R-ALLO-08-016 (2008).

19 Neither party filed a response to the Notice of Potential Dismissal.

20  
21 As stated above, the Board has addressed the issue of timeliness on numerous occasions. The  
22 director’s determination clearly notified Mr. Chase and his Washington Federation of State  
23 Employees (WFSE) representative of the thirty day deadline for filing his appeal. In this case, the  
24 director’s determination was served on February 11, 2015, by deposit in the United States mail. Mr.  
25 Chase’s appeal was received by the Board on March 16, 2015. Therefore, Mr. Chase’s appeal was  
26

1 filed thirty-four (34) days after service of the director's determination. The appeal is untimely and  
2 should be dismissed.

3  
4 The Board having reviewed the file and records herein and being fully advised in the premises, now  
5 enters the following:

6 **ORDER**

7 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Nathan Chase vs. Department of  
8 Veterans Affairs, PRB Case No. R-JUR-15-002, is dismissed.

9 DATED AND MAILED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2015.  
10

11 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

12  
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
SUSAN MILLER, Member

14  
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
VICKY BOWDISH, Member