04/2/2015

ORIGINAL FILED

SEP 18 2015

SPOKANE COUNTY CLERK

SUPERIOR COURT, STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF SPOKANE

CHRISTINA MARTIN, ET. AL,)
*) Case No.: 14-2-00016-7
Plaintiffs,)
) PARTIES' JOINT MOTION AND
vs.) AGREED ORDER FOR
) CONDUCT OF CLASS ACTION
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,	AND APPROVAL OF NOTICE
ET AL,) TO CLASS MEMBERS
Defendants.)

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

COME NOW the parties, and move this court for an order pursuant to CR 23(d) which allows the Court to make appropriate orders in the conduct of the class action as follows:

- 1. Approve the notices to putative and absent class members that are attached to this motion as Exhibits 1 and 2
- 2. Appointment of the undersigned plaintiffs' counsel as interim counsel for the class;

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 1

COPY

....

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS CONCERNING CLASS BASED CLAIMS

In this action the plaintiff class representatives, Christina Martin, Jason Longoria, Charles Arnold, John Sager, Darrel Nash, Erik Thomas, Darin Foster, and Luis Gonzalez allege on their behalf, and on behalf of a class of similarly situated current and former Washington State Patrol ("WSP") trooper applicants and employees, that Defendants violated their rights under 38 U.S.C. §§ 4311, 4316, the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and RCW §§ 41.04.010, 73.16.010 and 38.40.060 as follows:

- a) the denial of state veterans' preference in hiring;
- b) the denial of state veterans' preference in promotion;
- c) failure to treat military-related absence from work as continuous employment;
- d) the denial of state paid military leave; and
- e) the individually named defendants acting under color or state law deprived the named plaintiffs and the class of substantive and procedural constitutional rights.

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This action was filed on January 3, 2014, in Spokane County Superior Court. An amended complaint was filed on January 13, 2014. On about January 23, 2014, Defendants moved to dismiss all claims asserted in the complaint based upon, *inter alia*, a failure to state a claim and lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 2

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Defendants accepted service of the First Amended Complaint on January 31, 2014. On March 19 2014, this court entered its order denying Defendants' motion to dismiss in its entirety. On April 7, 2014, Defendant's answered the First Amended Complaint. Thereafter, the parties began working collaboratively to resolve this litigation by collecting and exchanging pertinent information.

On December 22, 2014, the parties stipulated to a Second Amended Complaint, adding additional representative plaintiffs. On January 9, 2015, the Second Amended complaint was filed. Defendants answered the amended complaint on January 23, 2015.

On February 6, 2015, the parties stipulated to stay discovery and extend deadlines for the purpose of resolving this litigation through settlement.

On February 13, 2015, the parties met and agreed to outline steps to engage in a productive evaluation and negotiation of a potential class settlement.

The parties have agreed to seek court approval of proposed notices to putative class members, and orders directing the conduct of the class action.

IV. THE PROPOSED CLASSES

Pursuant to Civil Rule 23, the proposed class includes the following four sub-categories of persons:

a) applicants for a position of employment with the WSP, in the position of Trooper, who were eligible to receive a veteran preference pursuant to RCW

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 3

- 11

2043599.1

41.04.010(1)-(3) with respect to such application, and did not receive the same;

- b) current and former employees¹ of the WSP who applied for promotion to a higher ranking position of employment, including the rank of Sergeant, Lieutenant, and Captain, who were eligible to receive a veteran preference pursuant to RCW 41.04.010 (1)-(3) with respect to such application and did not receive the same;
- c) current and former employees of the WSP who were absent from employment at the WSP for military service, who were eligible to receive paid military leave pursuant to RCW 38.40.060, and did not receive all the benefits of that military leave; and
- d) current and former employees of the WSP who were absent from employment at the WSP for military service, who were eligible to receive the benefits of continuous employment pursuant to 38 U.S.C. § 4316 and did not receive the same.

V. STIPULATION OF THE PARTIES SUPPORTING THE MOTION

The parties are actively engaged in an effort to resolve this litigation efficiently, and in support of this motion state as follows:

Based on the representation below by Washington State concerning non-commissioned employees, the Parties the Parties expect that the term employee and applicant in the class eventually certified to include commissioned employees such as troopers, sergeants, and lieutenants, but not include noncommissioned or "civilian" employees of WSP. As a result, the above definition differs from the one in the Second Amended Complaint, and at this point, would likely be the definition that the Parties would likely seek to certify as a part of any settlement.

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 4.

- 1. The parties conducted several months of informal discovery to identify potential class members.
- 2. The parties identified four groups of persons (a d listed above) that are affected by this litigation, and agreed upon descriptions of the same. The members of the class will, broadly include, applicants, current and former employees of the WSP between the periods of January 1, 1994 and January 1, 2013.
- 3. The parties exchanged available information to identify additional affected members of the subclasses. While many potential absent class members have been identified, the identities and address information for all potential absent class members, in particular applicants who were not hired, is not known because The Washington State Patrol has represented that they did not collect or no longer maintain such information.
- 4. Based on its investigation, the State of Washington has represented to Plaintiff's counsel that for non-commissioned employees from 1994 to the present, veterans' preference points were generally made available to veterans who applied for competitive non-commissioned positions and that the points were applied unless the applicant specifically chose not to claim the veterans' preference points, although there may have been some isolated instances through

. 25

the years when points were not applied because of an error, miscommunication or some other circumstance.

- 5. The parties lack sufficient information about the identities and circumstances of all absent class members and information about this group in order to estimate damages for in aid of possible settlement. In an effort to obtain this information, the parties have agreed to a procedure utilizing electronic, print and direct mail notices and questionnaires to identify class members and determine whether they may be entitled to compensation. See §VI, infra.
- 6. The parties have agreed to the form and manner of the notice and have agreed to use a professional third party administrator to issue notices and secure responses. § VI, Infra.
- 7. The parties seek to ensure that notice to absent class members and putative class members will be substantially similar to the notice that the Court would require in the event that a settlement is reached and preliminary approval of settlement is granted. *See* attached Exhibits 1 and 2.
- 8. Counsel for the parties have found no Washington State cases addressing the contours of Rule 23(d)(2). See Newberg on Class Actions § 8:26 (5th ed.) (observing that courts have "rarely discussed" the similar federal provision so that "the precise contours of when notice may be provided under Rule 23(d)(1)(B) are unclear."). Nonetheless, commentators analyzing the

virtually identical provision under the Federal Rules have concluded that Rule 23(d)(1)(B) "provides a statutory mechanism for providing notice in a wide range of other circumstances." *E.g* Newberg on Class Actions § 8:26 (5th ed.); 7B Wright & Miller, Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 1793 (3d ed.) ("Notice under Rule 23(d)(2) [now Rule 23(d)(1)(B)] can be used for a variety of purposes."). The Manual for Complex Litigation expressly recognizes that "[t]here are a number of circumstances under which notice is appropriate to protect the class or proposed class or for the fair conduct of the action." Manual Complex Lit. § 21.313 (4th ed.)

- 9. A number of courts have concluded that the discretionary notice provisions of Rule 23 permits notice to putative class members. *Puffer v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 614 F. Supp. 2d 905, 915 (N.D. Ill. 2009) (citing and discussing cases).
- 10. Courts have the power to issue orders requiring a certain form of notice and creating a procedure for authoritative determination of class membership. Avery v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs., 762 F.2d 158, 164 (1st Cir. 1985); Sledge v. J. P. Stevens & Co., 585 F.2d 625, 652 (4th Cir. 1978) (affirming district court's imposition of the claim-filing requirement prefatory to the proceedings for backpay relief based on Rule 23(d)(2)); Biben v. Card, 789 F.Supp. 1001 (W.D. Mo. 1992) (concluding that absentee class members would

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 7

1

4

3

6

5

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25 11. Even when notice is mandated under Rule 23, "Rule 23(e) gives the

aid in the determining the true value of claims and to facilitate settlement).

be required to submit proof of damages prior to assessment of liability finding to

court 'virtually complete' discretion as to the manner of service of the settlement notice." Colesberry, 2006 WL 1875444, at *7; see Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) (requiring "the best notice practicable under the circumstances"). It is wellestablished that notice sent by first class mail is sufficient when the names and addresses of the class members are known. Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin, 417 U.S. 156, 173-77 (1974); *Manual for Complex Litigation* § 21.311 (4th ed. 2004) (explaining that individual notice via mail is preferred when names and addresses are known). In such circumstances, courts have authorized notice only by mail. E.g., Colesberry, 2006 WL 1875444, at *7; Aguilar, 2006 WL 3199074, at *5. In the last 10 to 15 years, courts have begun to approve of notice via electronic mail as an alternative to U.S. mail. E.g., Margulies v. Tri-Cnty, Metro. Transp. Dist. of Oregon, No. 3:13-cv-00475-PK, 2013 WL 5593040, at *21 (D. Or. Oct. 10, 2013) (approving notification by email and finding that "email is an efficient and nonintrusive method of communication."); Guy v. Casal Inst. of Nevada, LLC, No. 2:13-CV-02263-APG, 2014 WL 1899006, at *7 (D. Nev. May 12, 2014) (same); In re Netflix Privacy Litig., No. 5:11-CV-00379 EJD, 2012 WL 2598819, at *4 (N.D. Cal. July 5, 2012) (approving use of email notice).

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 8

2043599.1

- 12. To protect the interests of the class members, the parties have agreed that all communications with absentee putative class members about this action will be made by the third party administrator or by plaintiffs' counsel and that defendants' counsel will not interact with the absentee putative class members. See Manual Complex Lit. § 21.12 (4th ed.).
- the interests of the class during precertification activities." Brigiotta's Farmland Produce & Garden Center, Inc. v. United Potato Growers of Idaho, Inc., No. 4:10-CV-307-BLW, 2010 WL 3928544, *1 (D. Idaho Oct. 4, 2010). The Manual for Complex Litigation suggests that it is advisable for the Court to designate an interim lead class counsel. See Manual §§ 10.22, 40.22. Courts generally utilize the same factors used in appointing interim class counsel. Brigiotta's Farmland Produce & Garden Center, Inc., 2010 WL 3928544, at *1; Outten v. Wilmington Trust Corp., 281 F.R.D. 193, 197 (D. Del. 2012). An essential concomitant of adequate representation is that the class representative's attorneys be qualified, experienced, and generally able to conduct the litigation. Marquardt v. Fein, 25 Wn. App. 651, 656, 612 P.2d 378, 381 (1980). The experience and qualifications of Plaintiffs' counsel is demonstrated by attached declarations.

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 9

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 10

VI. PROPOSED NOTICE TO PUTATIVE CLASS MEMBERS, SCHEDULE AND PROVISIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING OF RESPONSES

The parties propose providing notice to and requesting information from absent and putative class members and processing information received as follows:

A. <u>INTERNET POSTING</u>: Targeted publication/posting of the Legal Notice (Exhibit 1, attached) on the Internet Websites listed below which are known to be frequented by military veterans. Publication will begin as soon as practicable after entry of this order and continue for 60 days.

www.yahoo.com; www.facebook.com

Additionally, A.B. Data, the Notice Administrator, will maintain a website about the litigation, <u>www.wspveteranlitigation.com</u>, where these notices and questionnaires will be posted.

B. NEWSPAPER PUBLICATION: Publication of the Legal Notice (Exhibit 1, Attached) in the following newspapers: Seattle Times, Spokane Spokesman-Review, Tacoma News-Tribune, the Olympian, Vancouver Columbian, Everett Daily Herald, Yakima Herald Republic, Kitsap Sun, Kennewick Tri-City News, Longview Daily News, Bellingham Herald, Port Angeles Peninsula Daily News, Walla Walla Bulletin, and Wenatchee

World. Publication will occur twice, the first near the beginning of the website posting and the second near the end of the website posting.

C. <u>DIRECT MAILING</u>: Mailing of the Washington State Patrol Veterans

Preference Litigation Questionnaire (Exhibit 2, attached) to all known

current and former veteran employees. Mailing of the questionnaire will be

preceded by a post card intended to confirm mailing addresses of

employees. Questionnaires to be mailed approximately two weeks later.

D. MONITORING AND ADMINISTRATION OF RESPONSES:

- Responses to questionnaires submitted to the website and/or returned by mail or electronic mail will be collected and processed by A.B. Data, Inc., an experienced firm that specializes in administration of class action litigation. Class Members will have at least 60 days from the date of mailing or publication to return the Questionnaires.
- Responses to questionnaires submitted to Interim Class Counsel (or to the State to Defendants' counsel) shall be supplied to A.B. Data, Inc. for processing.
- A.B.Data, Inc. will process all responses and provide counsel for both parties with responses together with a report summarizing responses, and upon request will provide the actual questionnaires to Interim Class Counsel. A.B.Data, Inc. will maintain copies of the

23

24

actual completed questionnaires for at least 3 years from the date of final judgment.

E. <u>COSTS</u>: The costs associated with the creation of the litigation website, mailings, internet postings, newspaper publication and administration by A.B. Data, Inc. are estimated to be approximately \$80,000 and will be borne by defendant State of Washington/Washington State Patrol with the understanding that by agreeing to undertake payment of these costs the defendants intend to assist the parties efforts to reach agreement to resolve claims and no admission of liability is intended.

VII. PROPOSED ORDER

A proposed order granting the relief requested accompanies this motion.

Dated September 17th, 2015

Law Office of Thomas G. Jarrard, PLLC ROBERT FERGUSON

Attorney General

By: <u>See attached</u>
Thomas G. Jarrard WSBA# 39774

Attorney for Plaintiff's

Jason Brown WSBA# 24249 Assistant Attorney General

Assistant Attorney General Attorney for Defendants

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 12

actual completed questionnaires for at least 3 years from the date of final judgment.

E. <u>COSTS</u>: The costs associated with the creation of the litigation website, mailings, internet postings, newspaper publication and administration by A.B. Data, Inc. are estimated to be approximately \$80,000 and will be borne by defendant State of Washington/Washington State Patrol with the understanding that by agreeing to undertake payment of these costs the defendants intend to assist the parties efforts to reach agreement to resolve claims and no admission of liability is intended.

VII. PROPOSED ORDER

A proposed order granting the relief requested accompanies this motion.

Central Son Law France, PL Law Office of Thomas G. Jarrard, PL	LC ROBERT FERGUSON
MACO	Attorney General
By: Multi-Cold 39282 Thomas G. Jarrard WSBA#39774 Attorney for Plaintiffs	By:

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

ORDER

This matter came before the Court on the parties' joint motion and stipulation for an order which provides for the conduct of the class action as follows:

- 1. Approve the notices to absent and putative class members that are attached to this motion as Exhibits 1 and 2: and
- 2. appointment of the plaintiffs' counsel as interim counsel for the class;

Having considered the relevant pleadings together with foregoing motion and stipulation, the court finds:

- This action was filed on January 3, 2014. a.
- The action has not been certified as a class action under CR 23(b). b.
- From March 19, 2014 to present, plaintiffs' counsel engaged in c. informal discovery on behalf of the class.
- d. Sufficient discovery has been undertaken by counsel to objectively assess the risks and benefits of further litigation and the relative merits of the class based claims, and the risk of establishing liability and damages at trial.
- The parties have engaged in a collaborative effort to obtain the data e. and information necessary to identify potential class members and construct a model to assist with the estimation of economic damages to which qualifying

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 13

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 14

class members may be entitled. However, the parties are in need of additional information in order to complete this assessment and proceed with the effort to reach a settlement agreement to be submitted to the court for approval.

- f. In addition, the parties wish to provide notice, by electronic publication, print publication and direct mailing so that putative class members are notified of the pending litigation, their potential right to compensation and the effect of the litigation on their right to compensation. The proposed notices will also assist the parties' effort to reach settlement by providing the parties with the opportunity to identify absent and putative class members and secure information that will assist in the estimation of damages.
- g. The proposed notices adequately apprise putative and absent class members of the information necessary to advise them of the pendency of this action, including the identity of the class representatives and class counsel, the nature of the action, and the claims asserted.
- h. The proposed form of notice to putative and absent class members is adequate and should be approved.
- i. The proposed manner of providing notice to putative and absent class members is the best notice practicable under the circumstances of the class and should be approved,

- 1	
1	j. Plaintiffs' counsel should be appointed as interim counsel for the
2	class.
3	NOW, THEREFORE, based on the above findings, IT IS HEREBY
4	ORDERED:
5	1. The parties' motion is granted.
6	2. Plaintiffs' counsel is appointed as interim class counsel.
7	
8 9	3. The court hereby adopts the parties' stipulation and directs that notice be
10	provided in the manner and form set forth in Section VI, Paragraphs A
11	through E, of the foregoing stipulation which is fully incorporated in this
12	order by this reference.
13	DONE IN OPEN COURT this day of SEPTEMBER, 2015.
14	JOHN O. COONEY
15	JOHN O. COONEY, Judge
16	Presented by:
17	
18	Law Office of Thomas G. Jarrard, PLLC
19	By: <u>See attached</u> Thomas G. Jarrard WSBA# 39774
20	Attorney for Plaintiff's
21	
22	*
23	ROBERT W. FERGUSON
4	
25	JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 15

2043599.1

j. Plaintiffs' counsel should be appointed as interim counsel for the class.

NOW, THEREFORE, based on the above findings, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. The parties' motion is granted.
- 2. Plaintiffs' counsel is appointed as interim class counsel.
- 3. The court hereby adopts the parties' stipulation and directs that notice be provided in the manner and form set forth in Section VI, Paragraphs A through E, of the foregoing stipulation which is fully incorporated in this order by this reference.

DONE IN OPEN COURT this day of SEPTEMBER, 2015.

JOHN O. COONEY, Judge

Presented by:

Law Office of Thomas G. Jarrard, PLLC

Ву:_{\А-/----}

mas G. Jarrard WSBA# 39774

Attorney for Plaintiff's

39284

ROBERT W. FERGUSON

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 15

Attorney General

By:

Jason Brown WSBA# 24249 Assistant Attorney General Attorneys for Defendants

JOINT MOTION AND AGREED ORDER - 16

2043599.1

LEGAL NOTICE

TO MILITARY VETERANS WHO APPLIED FOR EMPLOYMENT AS A TROOPER WITH THE WASHINGTON STATE PATROL BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 1994 AND JANUARY 1, 2013:

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT PENDING LITIGATION MAY AFFECT YOUR RIGHTS

If you meet the following criteria you may be a member of a potential class action and your rights may be affected by the lawsuit, entitled *Christina Martin, et. al. v. The State of Washington, et. al.* No. 14-2-00016-7 (the "Action"), which is pending before the Spokane County, Washington Superior Court (the "Court"):

All honorably discharged members of the U.S. Armed Services, including the military reserves and National Guard, who applied for employment as a trooper with the Washington State Patrol (WSP) from January 1, 1994, to January 1, 2013 but were not hired.¹

The Court has authorized this notice. This Notice is not an expression of any opinion by the Court with respect to the merits of the claims or the defenses asserted in the Action. This Notice is merely to advise you of the pendency of this Action.

If you believe you are a member, please complete the questionnaire and send the following information to the administrator identified below by no later than [INSERT DATE]:

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name	e:		<u> </u>	
Maili	ing Address:			
City:	II PO	State:	Zip Code:	
Telep	phone Number:	Ce	II Number:	i
E-ma	il address(es):		*	=======================================
1.	List the date(s) of	your military servi	ce.	al a
2.	Were you honoral	bly discharged from	the military?	
denie	*	gs, veteran preferen	ent or former WSP commisce points and veteran preferance notice.	
			ly .	EVLIDIT

- 3. List the year/month you applied for employment with the WSP. If you applied more than once than please list the year and month of each application.
- 4. Did the WSP inform you as to the reason for your non-hire? If "yes" then please describe the reason(s) given.
- 5. List the approximate yearly wages you earned for the three years following each attempt to get hired with the WSP.

Please complete questionnaire online at the website below or mail your completed application to the below address by no later than [INSERT DATE]:

www.wspveteranlitigation.com

Washington State Patrol Litigation c/o A.B. Data, Ltd. P.O. Box 170500 Milwaukee, WI 53217-8091 Telephone: (866) 963-9975

Any inquiries regarding this litigation may be addressed to Class Counsel at:

Counsel for the Putative Class:	Counsel for the Putative Class:
· COHEN MILSTEIN	CROTTY & SON LAW FIRM, PLLC
SELLERS & TOLL PLLC	Matthew Z. Crotty
R. Joseph Barton	905 W. Riverside Ave. Ste. 409
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.	Spokane, WA 99201
West Tower, Suite 500	Telephone: (509) 850-7011
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934	Email: matt@crottyandson.com
Telephone: (202) 408-4600	International in
Or Toll Free: 1-888-240-0775	
Email: washingtonpatrol@cohenmilstein.com	9 H W
WASHINGTON LAWYERS COMMITTEE FOR	LAW OFFICE OF THOMAS G. JARRARD
CIVIL RIGHTS & URBAN AFFAIRS	Thomas G. Jarrard
Peter Romer-Friedman	1020 N. Washington St
11 Dupont Circle, NW	Spokane, WA 99201-2237
Suite 400	Telephone: (425) 239-7290
Washington, DC 20036	Email: tjarrard@att.net
Telephone: (202) 319-1000	
Email: peter romerfriedman@washlaw.org	

PLEASE DO NOT CALL THE COURT REGARDING THIS NOTICE.

Dated: September ____, 2015

Washington State Patrol Veterans Preference Litigation

Christina Martin, et. al. v. The State of Washington, et. al. No. 14-2-00016-7 Spokane County Superior Court

If you meet the criteria set out below, you may be a member of a potential class action for which you may be entitled to monetary compensation:

All honorably discharged members of the U.S. Armed Services, including the military reserves and National Guard, who are or were employed as a trooper with the Washington State Patrol (WSP) from January 1, 1994, to January 1, 2013, who were eligible to receive, but did not receive veteran preference for a position of employment or promotion.¹

Your rights may be affected by the lawsuit entitled *Christina Martin, et. al. v. The State of Washington, et. al.* No. 14-2-00016-7 (the "Action") which is pending before the Spokane County, Washington, Superior Court (the "Court"). Completing the questionnaire will help determine whether you may be entitled to monetary compensation.

SUMMARY OF LAWSUIT

Washington law requires state agencies, like the Washington State Patrol (WSP), to give veteran preference points to eligible honorably discharged military veterans during the hiring process. Washington and federal law also require the WSP to (a) give veteran preference promotion points to eligible individuals who leave their employment with the WSP, serve in the military, and then return to the WSP; and, (b) adjust the service-member employee's probationary period start/end date to account for that military leave. Washington and federal law also prevent the WSP from adjusting a service-member employee's military leave in a manner contrary to the state leave law requirements.

The lawsuit alleges that the WSP failed to follow the above-referenced laws and seeks compensation for current and former WSP troopers, sergeants, and lieutenants (or their surviving spouse) who were harmed by the WSP's alleged violation of the laws. This questionnaire seeks to determine your eligibility for compensation. Please fill this questionnaire out as completely as possible as it will be used for settlement or litigation purposes and send to the following address by [date]:

Washington State Patrol Litigation c/o A.B. Data, Ltd. P.O. Box 170500 Milwaukee, WI 53217-8091 Telephone: (866) 963-9975

¹ The Action also provides for relief for trooper applicants who were denied, among other things, veteran preference points. Those individuals have a separate notice.



PROTECTION AGAINST RETALIATION

State and federal law bar the WSP from retaliating against you for completing this questionnaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _	ж	
Mailing .	Add	lress:
City:		State: Zip Code:
Telephor	ne N	Jumber: Cell Number:
		ess(es):
		<u>VETERAN STATUS</u>
l. Are	you	a veteran? Yes
2. Did y	ou s	serve:
± _M		As a member in any branch of the armed forces of the United States including the National Guard and armed forces reserves and fulfill your initial military service obligation? □ Yes □ No As a member of the women's air forces service pilots? □ Yes □ No
	c.	As a member of the armed forces reserves, National Guard, or coast guard and have been called into federal service by a presidential select reserve call up for at least 180 cumulative days? □ Yes □ No
	d.	As a civil service crewmember with service aboard a U.S. army transport service or U.S. naval transportation service vessel in oceangoing service from December 7, 1941, through December 31, 1946? □ Yes □ No
	e.	As a member of the Philippine armed forces/scouts during the period of armed conflict from December 7, 1941, through August 15, 1945?

			· ·	
x x				
			19	
				¥:
	AT VC			
e			f. As a United States documented merchant mariner with service aboard an oceangoing vessel operated by the department of defense, or its agents, from both June 25, 1950, through July 27, 1953, in Korean territorial waters from August 5, 1964, through May 7, 1975, in Vietnam territorial waters, and who received a military commendation?	
			□ Yes □ No	
		3,	If you are a veteran, but answered "no" to every question under question 2, please describe your service.	
		4.	Did you receive an honorable discharge from your military service? □ Yes □ No	
		5.	Did you receive a discharge for medical reasons with an honorable record from your military service? □ Yes □ No	¥
2		6.	Did you serve during the Korean conflict? □ Yes □ No	
		7.	Did you serve during the Vietnam era? The term Vietnam era means either the period beginning on February 28, 1961, and ending on May 7, 1975, in the case of a veteran who served in the Republic of Vietnam during that period or the period beginning August 5, 1964, and ending on May 7, 1975? □ Yes □ No	
		8.	Did you serve during the Persian Gulf War? □ Yes □ No	36
		9.	Did you serve in any of the following armed conflicts: The crisis in Lebanon; the invasion of Grenada; Panama, Operation Just Cause; Somalia, Operation Restore Hope; Haiti, Operation Uphold Democracy; Bosnia, Operation Joint Endeavor; Operation Noble Eagle; southern or central Asia, Operation Enduring Freedom; or	5 (a)
			Persian Gulf, Operation Iraqi Freedom? □ Yes □ No	
	345 32	10	If your answer to question 9 was "yes," were you awarded the respective campaign badge or medal? □ Yes □ No	
		11.	Are you the surviving spouse of a former WSP employee who was a veteran?	

If you answered "no," to all of the above questions, you don't need to answer any further questions. Please sign the form and return it.

If you answered "yes" to any of the above questions, then please answer the following questions. If you answered "yes" to question 11 but no to questions 1 through 10, then answer the below questions about your deceased spouse. If you answered yes to any of the questions from 1 through 10 and to question 11, submit two forms, one for you and one for your deceased spouse.

Please answer the below questions to the best of your ability. Please sign the form and return it.

MILITARY SERVICE

12. In which branch(es) of the armed forces, National Guard and/or reserves did you

serve?
What years did you serve in each branch of the military? Include your active and reserve military service.
From/ to/ (Active military service) From/ to/ (Reserve/National Guard military service)
Where and/or in which actions did you serve? ²
<u>VETERANS' PREFERENCE, OTHER PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT, MILITARY</u> <u>RETIREMENT BENEFITS</u>
Have you ever received veterans' preference points (addition of 5% or 10% to your passing score) in connection with a competitive examination to determine qualification for any public office, position or employment with the state, any city, town, county, school district, fire district or other government employer? □ Yes □ No □ Do Not Know
If your answer to question 15 was "yes," please give the name of the employer/prospective employer and the agency or department who gave the examination and provided the veterans' preference points, and the date(s) of employment with that employer.

² The term "actions" includes, but is not limited to, any foreign combat, contingency, peacekeeping, humanitarian, or other operation.

17	Are you receiving or have you ever received military retirement benefits?
18.	If your answer to question 17 was "yes," please state the date you began receiving military retirement benefits.
19.	Were you employed by the State of Washington in any position or capacity (other than military) before you applied for employment with the WSP? \Box Yes \Box No
20.	If your answer to question 19 was "yes," please state the name of the agency(ies) where you were employed, the date(s) of your employment and the position(s) you held.
	EMPLOYMENT WITH WASHINGTON STATE PATROL
21.	Please state the date of <u>each</u> application for employment with the WSP. Please note if you applied (took the entrance examination) more than once, please state the date for <u>each</u> application.
22.	Before you applied for employment with the WSP, were you aware that veterans were entitled to receive addition of either 5% or 10% veterans' preference points to their final score on competitive examinations? \Box Yes \Box No
23.	Please state whether you received veterans' preference points (addition of 5% or 10% to your passing score) on any examination you took in connection with your application(s) for employment with the WSP. \Box Yes \Box No \Box Don't Know
24.	Please state whether you requested veterans' preference points (addition of 5% or 10%) to be added to your passing score on any examination you took in connection with your application(s) for employment with the WSP. □ Yes □ No
25.	Please state the final score ³ you received on each examination you took in connection with application for employment with the WSP.
26.	Please state your rank/position on the hiring eligibility list after passing the entrance examination.

³ Final Score refers to the score you received at the end of Phase 3 and includes the aggregate score after adding the scores on the written exam, physical agility, oral board, and background investigation.

	27.	. Please state the date you were hired by the WSP and the position you were hired into on that date.
	28.	. Please state whether you believe your hiring was delayed because you did not receive veterans' preference points added to your passing score on the entrance examination. ☐ Yes ☐ No
	29.	If your answer to question 28 was "yes," please state how long you believe your hiring was delayed and include an explanation of why you believe your hiring was delayed (e.g., only the top 40 candidates (ranked by test score) were selected and I was number 45 and had to wait for the next class).
	30.	. Were you called to a period of military service of more than two consecutive days with the military while employed at the WSP? □ Yes □ No
	31.	. If your answer to question 30 was "yes," please set forth:
		a. The date(s) you were called up:
		b. Which branch of the armed forces, National Guard or reserves you were called to:
		c. Whether you were required to use any accrued sick leave or annual leave while on military leave and if so, the amount of sick leave or annual leave you were required to use:
		 d. While you were on military leave was your work schedule revised (e.g.,, changed from a 40 hour work week comprised of four ten hour shifts to a 40 hour work week comprised of five eight hour shifts)? □ Yes □ No □ Don't Know
5	32.	Did you receive credit for continued state service for purposes of seniorityeligibility for salary increase and eligibility for promotion (e.g., while you were on military leave)? □ Yes □ No □ Don't Know
	33.	. If you sought promotion to Sergeant, please state, for each Sergeants Exam taken:
		 a. The date(s) you took the exam:

	e. Whether you requested the addition of veterans' preference points to your final score: \Box Yes \Box No f. If you were promoted to Sergeant, the date your promotion became effective:
	g. If you believe your promotion to Sergeant was delayed because you did not receive veterans' preference points on the Sergeants' Exam, please state how long you believe your promotion was delayed and include a statement of why you believe your promotion was delayed.
34	If you sought promotion from Sergeant to Lieutenant, please state for each Lieutenants' exam taken:
	a. The date(s) you took the exam:
	b. Your final score(s):
	c. Your rank on the eligibility/promotion list:
	d. Whether you received 5% veterans' preference points added to your final score ☐ Yes ☐ No
	e. Whether you requested the addition of veterans' preference points to your final
	score: Yes No
	f. If you were promoted to Lieutenant, the date your promotion became effective:
	g. If you believe your promotion to Lieutenant was delayed because you did not receive veterans' preference points on the Lieutenants' Exam, please state how long you believe your promotion was delayed and include a statement of why you believe your promotion was delayed.
35.	Was your probationary status as a Trooper, Sergeant, or Lieutenant interrupted by any period of military service in excess of 30 days? □ Yes □ No
36.	If your answer to question 35 was "yes," then please state:
	 a. The date you began your probationary status (i.e., the date you were hired as a Trooper and/or the date you were promoted to Sergeant): b. The dates your probationary period was interrupted by military service (i.e., if you started probationary service on January 5, 2000 and were on military orders from June 5, 2000 to July 15, 2000 then you would enter "June 5, 2000 to July 15, 2000"):
	c. The date your probationary period ended:

RETIREMENT FROM WASHINGTON STATE PATROL

37. Are you retired from the WSP? \square Yes \square No

080		
w	38. If your answer to question 37 was "yes," then please state the date you began receiving pension benefits (month/year).	
*	39. If your answer to question 37 was "yes," then please state the retirement benefit option that you chose (WSPRS Plan 1 or WSPRS Plan 2).	
	40. Do you have a spouse or partner that is eligible to receive pension benefits after your death? If yes, please provide the eligible spouse or partner's date of birth.	
	41. If you are currently receiving survivor pension benefits, please provide your date of birth.	
	42. If you are currently receiving survivor pension benefits, please indicate the date (month/year) that you began receiving survivor pension benefits.	
s:	I certify, under penalty of perjury, this day of, 2015 that the foregoing answers are true and correct.	9
6.	[SIGNATURE]	
	[PRINTED NAME]	

e wee