

**Seattle Police Department  
DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT**

FILE NUMBER  
**OPA 19-1064**

RANK/TITLE  
**Officer**

NAME  
**Duane Goodman**

SERIAL NUMBER  
**7455**

UNIT  
**A810X**

SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS:

**Violation of Seattle Police Department Policy & Procedure Manual Sections:**

- **5.125 - Social Media 1. Employees Shall Not Post Speech That Negatively Impacts the Department's Ability to Serve the Public**
- **5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional**

Specification:

In October and November 2018, you posted to your publicly available Instagram account content that included violent language, offensive imagery, and content that expressed contempt towards groups of individuals. Your Instagram name was officerdgd, a nod to your role as a police officer. In one post, which was available to the public at the time this investigation was initiated, you included a photograph of a mail package bomb with this text underneath: "I don't condone sending package bombs but god it would be nice for Killary and Anti cop Obama to finally STFU! Maybe Obama will stop lying and claiming the good economy is from him. #maga #trump2020 #trump." Your post was made at the time that numerous packages containing pipe bombs were mailed to several public figures, including former President Obama and former U.S. Secretary of State Clinton. The U.S. Secret Service had intercepted a package bomb directed to the former President on the day of your post; a bomb directed to Secretary Clinton was intercepted the day before your post. Additionally, you made public comments disparaging of immigrant community members and those who support them, including a picture of you with your middle finger expressing your feelings.

The Department notified the U.S. Secret Service of your postings. The Secret Service found your post regarding package bombs to be of a threatening nature and directed towards individuals under federal protection. They deemed the threat worthy of review, opened a criminal investigation, and interviewed you. The Department was later informed that the U.S. Attorney's Office declined to file charges against you.

Policies at Issue:

Department Manual Policy 5.125-POL-2 (1) prohibits Department employees from posting anything that negatively impacts the Department's ability to fulfill its public mission. Employees shall not post speech that negatively impacts the Department's ability to serve the public, including any communication that "ridicules, maligns, disparages, expresses bias, or disrespect toward any race, religion, sex, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, or any other protected class of individuals." The policy also prohibits employees from making comments on social media that support harassment, threats of violence, or similar conduct. Employees are further barred from any communication that "suggests that Department personnel are engaged in behavior reasonably considered to be unlawful or reckless towards public safety." You made one post that appeared to endorse violence against political figures and another that engaged in a profanity laced critique both of "illegal immigration" and of those individuals who may support a different political position on this issue than you hold. Those statements violated the Department's policy on social media.

Per Department Policy 5.001 (10), “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers.” The policy states: “Any time employees represent the Department or identify themselves as police officers or Department employees, they will not use profanity directed as an insult or any language that is derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful toward any person.” The Instagram postings described above violated the Department’s professionalism policy. Notably, you identified yourself on the social media site as an officer through your account’s name, and you included multiple law enforcement hashtags with your postings. You also used profanity directed as an insult and derogatory, contemptuous, and disrespectful language. Your posts served to undermine public trust in yourself, fellow officers, and the Department as a whole.

#### Employee Response:

When interviewed by OPA, you acknowledged making the posts described above. You stated that you intended to criticize “illegal immigration” as a practice, not undocumented individuals specifically. You acknowledged that your postings negatively impacted the Department’s ability to serve the public and that they were unprofessional.

During your Loudermill meeting with me, you acknowledged that your posts were a mistake, noted that you had deactivated your social media accounts, and vowed to not make a similar mistake in the future. You explained that you have used social media, at times, as a means of stress relief, and that you did not intend to attack any group of people. You also stated that, through your career, you have sought to treat people fairly.

#### Determination of the Chief:

You made two posts to social media that are deeply concerning. One was made contemporaneously with a series of pipe bombs that were sent to high-profile political figures. You posted a picture of a package containing a bomb and expressed that “god it would be nice” if the former president and a former secretary of state would “shut up.” Your social media name identified you as an officer and stated that a bomb could end the former president’s “lying” about who should receive credit for the economy. You are a police officer, sworn to uphold laws and ensure the safety of the public. For you to instead embrace violence as a “solution” for public figures with whom you disagree is a betrayal of the values of our profession. It is entirely inappropriate for a police officer to suggest violence and to encourage the violent actions of others. Your post constituted a threat to former federal officials. While the U.S. Attorney’s Office has thus far declined to file charges against you, the fact that the Secret Service viewed your post as warranting a review bolsters my view that your post was an unacceptable threat, potentially criminal, and evidenced judgment that is far outside the acceptable bounds for a police officer.

Your post containing profane commentary on “illegal immigration” is deeply troubling. The Seattle Police Department is one that serves all members of the community, regardless of immigration status or beliefs. This police department works hard to build trust with all communities we serve and to ensure all that we do not target anyone due to their immigration status. Your comments have the potential to undermine the Department’s relationship with immigrant communities. The Department’s ability to fulfill its public safety duties depends on communities believing that officers will treat them equally and with dignity, regardless of their immigration status. Your comments suggest that you will not do so.

Your posts were malicious and threatening. They could have substantial negative consequences to the

relationship between members of the Department and those that we serve and showed exceedingly poor judgment. Police officers are expected to exercise good judgment on and off duty, in social media posts, and elsewhere. Police officers are often under stress and may seek different outlets to relieve that stress, however, as I said during your Loudermill meeting, there is no excuse for an officer utilizing social media in a way that harms our entire department by undermining the public's trust in officers' ability to police all communities fairly.

I recognize the significance of the decision before me and the impact it will have on your career. You stated during your Loudermill that you were committed to learning from this incident and not repeating your mistakes. I cannot, and will not, take the risk of subjecting the public we serve to another lapse in judgment that could further impact members of the community and the Department. Public safety and public trust remain at the forefront of my decisions as Chief, and this decision is not an exception. I do not have confidence in your ability to effectively function as a member of this police department. Earlier this year, you received a suspension for unnecessarily escalating an incident, using threatening and inappropriate language, and behaving in a manner that made another officer concerned for his safety.

For the reasons noted above and after full and fair consideration of your employment history and all of the facts before me, I have determined that your employment with the Department should be terminated.

Final Discipline

### Termination of Employment

DATE

11-6-2019

BY ORDER OF

*Cameron Best*

CHIEF OF POLICE

#### APPEAL OF FINAL DISPOSITION

##### Appeals to a Commission:

**SWORN EMPLOYEES:** Public Safety Civil Service Commission

See Seattle Municipal Code 4.08.100. Employee must file written demand within ten (10) days of a suspension, demotion or discharge for a hearing to determine whether the decision to suspend, demote or discharge was made in good faith for cause. Information on the process for filing a claim with the Public Safety Civil Service Commission may be found on the Commission's website.

**CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES:** Civil Service Commission

Before filing an appeal with the Civil Service Commission regarding suspension, demotion, or termination an employee must first go through the Employee Grievance Procedure provided by Personnel Rule 1.4. In order to comply with Rule 1.4, the employee must file the grievance within 20 calendar days of receiving the notice of the appointing authority's decision to impose discipline. After exhausting the Employee Grievance Procedure, if the employee is still dissatisfied, the employee must file his/her appeal with the Civil Service Commission within 20 calendar days of the delivery of the Step Three grievance response. See also SMC 4.04.240, 4.04.260, and Personnel Rules 1.4.

**PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES:** Pursuant to SMC 4.04.030 and 4.04.290, employees who have been appointed to a position within the classified service but who has not completed a one (1) year period of probationary employment are "probationary employees" and are subject to dismissal without just cause. An employee dismissed during their probationary period shall not have the right to appeal the dismissal. SMC 4.04.290 and City of Seattle Personnel Rule 1.3.2E.

Alternative Appeal Options for Represented Employees:

Consult your collective bargaining agreement or union representative to determine eligibility, notice periods, and details of the disciplinary grievance process. Any remedy available through a collective bargaining agreement is an alternative remedy and not in addition to an appeal to the Public Safety Civil Service Commission or Civil Service Commission.