



City of Seattle

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Public Safety Civil Service Commission

Commission Chair Joel A. Nark

Commissioner Stacy Connoles

Staff

Andrea Scheele, Executive Director

Teresa Jacobs, Administrative Staff Assistant

AGENDA*

PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Agenda is subject to change to address immediate Commission concerns.

DATE: Thursday, May 21, 2020

TIME: 10:00 am

LOCATION: In-person attendance is currently prohibited per the Washington Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28, until further notice. Meeting participation is limited to access by Skype link or call in numbers

Skype Link: <https://meet.seattle.gov/teresa.jacobs/YDZFQT9V>

206-386-1200,,8576750# (US)

English (United States)

844-386-1200,,8576750# (US)

English (United States)

Meeting ID: 8576750

206-684-5900,,8576750# (US)

English (United States)

Should you receive a busy signal when dialing 206-386-1200, you are encouraged to hang up and dial 206-684-5900. Regardless of which number is dialed, the conference ID within the meeting invite will remain the same.

Meeting documents will be posted to the commission website the morning of the meeting.

<http://www.seattle.gov/public-safety-civil-service-commission/monthly-meetings>

CALL TO ORDER-INTRODUCTIONS

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **April 23, 2020-Special Meeting**

City of Seattle Civil Service Commissions

Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1670 PO Box 94729 Seattle, WA 98124-4729

Tel: (206) 233-7118, Fax: (206) 684-0755, <http://www.seattle.gov/CivilServiceCommissions/>

An equal employment opportunity employer. Accommodations for people with disabilities provided upon request

2. **NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING/PUBLIC COMMENT:**

The commission will take public comment on the following proposed rules. The Chair will allot the time individuals will be given to speak.

- **2.01 COMMISSION-MEETINGS-QUORUM**

- **9.17 VETERANS' SCORING CRITERIA STATUS**

a. Initial Appointment; b. Promotional Examinations; c. Maximum number of preference points allowed; d. Veterans' scoring criteria may be applied any time during the life of the examination register.

- **18.02 VETERANS' PREFERENCE IN EXAMINATION**

3. **EXAM UNIT UPDATES**

- **Fire-Yoshiko Grace Matsui, Fire Exams Analyst**
- **Police-Rachael Schade, Police Exams Analyst**

4. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT**

- **COVID-19 Update**
- **Executive Director Council Confirmation Update**
- **Budget Update**
- **Financial Interest Statements Update**
- **Commission Meeting Dates**

5. **CASE STATUS REPORT**

- **Appeals Update/Exam Protest/Request for Decision**

6. **EXECUTIVE SESSION ON PROPOSED RULEMAKING**

ADJOURN

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

June 18, 2020, 10:00 am

*You may sign up at the PSCSC website <http://www.seattle.gov/public-safety-civil-service-commission> to receive regular and special meeting notices and agendas.

Request for public records can be made through the City Public Records Request Center:

<http://www.seattle.gov/public-records>



City of Seattle

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Public Safety Civil Service Commission

Commission Chair Joel A. Nark

Commissioner Stacy Connoles

Staff

Andrea Scheele, Executive Director

Teresa Jacobs, Administrative Staff Assistant

Public Safety Civil Service Commission

April 23, 2020-Special Meeting

Approved: May 21, 2020

Call to Order: Commission Chair Joel Nark called the Public Safety Civil Service Commission special meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. The meeting was held via Skype per the Washington Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28

In Attendance via Skype

Commission Chair Joel Nark

Commissioner Stacy Connoles

Teresa Chen, Assistant City Attorney

Andrea Scheele, Executive Director

Teresa R. Jacobs, Administrative Staff Assistant

1. Approval of Minutes-March 5, 2020-Special Meeting

The Commission reviewed the minutes of the March 5, 2020 Special Meeting. Commissioner Connoles moved to approve the minutes as written. Commissioner Nark seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by acclamation and will be signed by the chair.

2. 2020 Police Sergeant Written Exam Protest Appeals

- **Background info for Exam Protest Appeals - Rachael Schade, Police Exams Analyst**

Ms. Schade provided background on the development of the exams. 115 officers applied for the sergeant's exam; 73 officers sat for the three-day exam. The protest period was from March 9 through March 11.

The Commission reviewed the submitted protests.

- **Question #83-Request to Eliminate**
- **Question #154-Request to Eliminate-Development Committee Agreed; Question Eliminated**
- **Question #161-Give Credit for Answer B**

City of Seattle Civil Service Commissions

Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1670 PO Box 94729 Seattle, WA 98124-4729

Tel (206) 233-7118, Fax: (206) 684-0755, <http://www.seattle.gov/CivilServiceCommissions/>

An equal employment opportunity employer. Accommodations for people with disabilities provided upon request

3. Exam Unit Updates

- **Fire-Yoshiko Grace Matsui, Fire Exams Analyst**

Ms. Grace Matsui reported that the written exams for Battalion Chief and Captain are scheduled for June 1 & 2. The Oral Boards for Captain will take place the third week in June and the Battalion Chief will take place the second week in July. The Fireboat Pilot exam is currently scheduled for July 8 with the Practical Exam scheduled for September. Ms. Grace Matsui estimated that 57 signed up for the Captain exam, 14 for the Battalion Chief and 5 for Fireboat Pilot. Ms. Grace Matsui provided information on the steps the exams analysts would take to adhere to the Public Health guidelines

- **Police-Rachael Schade, Police Exams Analyst**

Ms. Schade reported that Entry level Police exams will be held on July 18 at UW Kane Hall. Ms. Schade reported the exams unit will follow the guidelines established to ensure proper sanitizing and distancing of candidates and assessors.

4. Executive Director Report: Andrea Scheele, Executive Director gave a report on the following:

- **COVID-19 response:** Ms. Scheele notified the commission that she continues in talks with the Exams Unit regarding administering entry level, lateral and promotional exams adhering to the Public Health and City HR Unit recommendations.
- **Executive Director Council Confirmation Update:** Ms. Scheele reported she is on standby to go before the Council Committee for her confirmation.
- **Veteran's preference rulemaking Update:** Ms. Scheele reported she sent a final draft of the proposed rule to the workgroup. There were no substantive changes. The proposed rule for open comment will be published in the Daily Journal of Commerce, the PSCSC website and sent to the Unions.
- **Budget Update:** Ms. Scheele reported there were no significant changes to the Budget.
- **Financial Interest Statements:** Ms. Scheele notified the Commission that the Financial Interest Statements (FIS) will be forwarded to Ethics and Elections as soon as all FIS are received.

5. Case Status Report

- **Appeals Update/Exam Protest/Request for Decision:** The Commission reviewed the current Case Status Report.

6. Executive Session: Written Exam Protests: The commission went into Executive Session at 10:40 am. The Executive Session ended at 11:02 am. The commissioners ruled on the following:

Question	Remedy	Commission Decision
83	Eliminate	Denied
154	Eliminate-Development Committee Agreed-Question Eliminated	Accepted
161	Give Credit for Answer B	Denied

Adjourn: All other business before the Commission having been considered, Commission Chair Nark adjourned the meeting at 11:03 am.

Respectfully Submitted by:

/s/ Teresa R. Jacobs 5/21/2020

/s/ Joel A. Nark 5/21/2020

Date:

Teresa R. Jacobs
Administrative Staff Assistant

Date:

Joel A. Nark
Commission Chair

*Request for public records, including audio recording of meetings can be made through the City Public Records Request Center <http://www.seattle.gov/public-records>

Proposed Amendments

- 2.01 COMMISSION – MEETINGS – QUORUM. In the necessary conduct of its work, the Commission shall meet as described on the calendar on its website, ~~on the third Friday of each month, at 10:00 a.m.,~~ in the Commission offices unless there is no pending business requiring Commission action. Commissioners may attend by electronic means. Notice of special meetings shall be provided as required by the Open Public Meetings Act (Chapter 42.30 RCW, as amended). The Commission shall conduct hearings as required. Notice of hearings shall be provided as required by the City's Administrative Code. Two members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. No action of the Commission shall be effective unless two members concur therein.
- 9.17 VETERANS' SCORING CRITERIA STATUS. ~~Anyone who is entitled to war veterans' scoring criteria status according to State of Washington law and who submits acceptable proof of release from active service in the armed forces under conditions other than dishonorable, shall have percentage points added to the grade of competitive City of Seattle examinations he or she passes after release from active service, as prescribed by law.~~
- a. INITIAL APPOINTMENT
 - 1. Reserved.
 - b. PROMOTIONAL EXAMINATIONS
 - 1. The appropriate percentage shall, upon the applicant's proper request, be added to the passing score for each promotional examination after the veteran returns from active military service until they successfully attain promotion by using the added percentage.
 - 2. During the veteran's career, the preference may be utilized for a promotion only once, even if they are called to active military service from employment more than once.
 - c. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF PREFERENCE POINTS ALLOWED- An applicant may have a maximum of ten (10) percentage points added to an examination score, even if they would otherwise qualify for additional points under other preference point programs in the City of Seattle.
 - d. Veteran's scoring criteria may be applied any time during the life of the examination register.

~~18.02 VETERANS' PREFERENCE IN EXAMINATION~~

- ~~a. Any person entitled to receive veteran's preference in an entry level or promotional exam (as outlined by state law) will be given such preference in accordance with the criteria established in RCW 41.04.010, or other applicable law.~~

From: [Scheele, Andrea](#)
To: [Boehmer, James C](#); [Jacobs, Teresa](#)
Subject: Re: Fire Department promotions change in Veteran's points
Date: Thursday, May 07, 2020 11:07:09 AM

Thank you for this public comment.

I will ensure that it is shared with the Public Safety Civil Service commissioners, and it will be read into the record at the next public PSCSC meeting.

Andrea Scheele



Andrea Scheele (she/her/hers)

Executive Director, Civil Service Commissions

City of Seattle | [Civil Service Commission](#) and [Public Safety Civil Service Commission](#)

Phone: 206-233-7118 | Cell: 206-437-5425 | Fax: 206-684-0755 |

andrea.scheele@seattle.gov

The City of Seattle is an equal employment opportunity employer. Accommodations for people with disabilities provided upon request.

From: Boehmer, James C <James.Boehmer@seattle.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 8:55 PM
To: Scheele, Andrea <Andrea.Scheele@seattle.gov>
Subject: Fire Department promotions change in Veteran's points


Ma'am,

I agree with the decision to not allow members to add additional veteran's points for each reactivation or deployment while serving as an employee of the City of Seattle. This seems appropriate.

In addition, I have heard there are members of Seattle Fire Department who have abused their position in the military to write their own orders, be reactivated, and gain veteran's preference points immediately prior to a promotional exam. I have also heard of members who have intentionally deployed themselves during the promotional exam, so that they can take the exam and look at the tested material (cheating). If there is even a shred of truth to these rumors, this system seems flawed.

I am a Navy Veteran and I agree with the interpretation of the change in veteran's preference points for promotional exams.

Best regards,
Chuck Boehmer
Seattle Fire Department
Rescue 1


work - 206-386-1414

email - james.boehmer@seattle.gov

May 8, 2020

TO: Public Safety Civil Service Commission

FR: Lt. Osmant Kelly Pyle III

SUBJ: Veteran's Preference Points Rules Change Opposition

This letter is in protest of the change in the Veteran's Preference Points rule draft that has been proposed to the PSCSC.

It is my strong opinion that the rules change process was not inclusive of all points of view from a veteran's perspective. I was at one of the meetings during the process of the writing of the new rules and feel that the concerns of the veteran's in the room were not addressed. We were consistently told to voice our opposition to the new rules change during this forum of public comment period. This does not seem like a fair and inclusive process to hear all interested parties and it seems like an attempt by only a few non-military members to change the rule in their favor. A fairer process would listen to all points of view so that all may come to an agreement. When ever we brought up a point it was dismissed, and we were told to address our concerns during the public comment period. This made us veterans feel as though the committee's minds were made up on the outcome and we were appeasing us. We veterans do not feel valued or appreciated for our service.

I do not feel that there was due diligence in researching the intent of the original law as it was written by the legislature. Veteran's have, in the past, gotten clarification and were ignored as to what that clarification was by the rules committee. The original intent was for a veteran to have a fair chance at being competitive for a promotion in the civil service promotions process. The interpretation of the veteran's points only being used once was meant to mean that a veteran can not carry over points earned for one promotion to another promotion. The legislature who wrote the law intended for a liberal application of the veteran's preference points and that a veteran who is promoted by using points earned from a qualifying military activation, and earns more points from another deployment may use those separate points once in the next promotional list. That is using the points once only and not carrying them over.

During one of the meetings of the rules draft process one of the representatives of the PSCSC stated that the veteran's preference points were meant to be an appreciation of the veteran for their service. This is true for the entry level civil service hiring list but not for the promotional preference points. The legislature intended to give veterans preference points to make the promotional process more competitive for the veterans who are deployed multiple times during the career of a reservist or guard member who is called away from their civil service job and not embedded in that particular job. I have since retired from the military in 2018 after a rewarding twenty-one-year career with thirteen of those years' as a reservist in the U.S. Air Force while employed with the Seattle Fire Department. I was deployed on average four to six months every two years during that thirteen-year period and was not able to commit to the fire lieutenant testing process enough to score high on the exam to get promoted until I was able to use veterans preference points in 2010 when I was promoted. This deployment cycle was mandated because of the size of my squadron and the job of Flight Medic.

The current deployment model of multiple deployments to multiple areas of operation is common and has been since September 11, 2001.

Being away from my job as a Seattle Firefighter four to six months in a two-year cycle made it extremely difficult to be competitive for a promotion to Lieutenant in a two-year promotional cycle. When a military member is away from their civil service job, they are embedded in the military mission and culture at hand thinking about their current mission with a focus of military tactics, policies, procedures, standard operating guidelines, and professional military education. The deployed military member does not have the luxury of staying focused on the civil service mission requirements and culture to be competitive for a promotion such as the tactics, policies, procedures, standard operating guidelines, and professional civil service education like our brothers and sisters who are not military members. This period preparing for the promotional test that a civil service member who is not a military member is crucial in being able to score high enough on the promotional test to rate high on the promotional register to get promoted. The competition for promotion is very tight as there is only a small percentage of the promotes on the register who get promoted. This makes it very difficult for a military member who is not able to be embedded in the ever-changing culture of the civil service job and be competitive with the civil service members who are not a military reservist or guard member for promotion.

A better clarification of what qualifies as veteran's preference points would be to allow members to use preference points earned for one promotion and allow them to use points earned after the first promotion on the next promotion. This would make the promotion process a more equally competitive system. The qualifying points could easily be tracked and documented with the submission of a qualifying DD214 or other appropriate documentation with the dates of service in a qualifying military activation.

The City of Seattle was recently lauded for their appreciation and work toward making the veteran members of Seattle transition from military life back to civil service life seamless. It is my strong opinion that this rule change erases all the hard work and appreciation for the City of Seattle veterans serving our country. I urge the PSCSC to consider not changing the rules so that military members can only use points once in their career for a promotion no matter how many times they deploy.

Respectfully

Lt. Osmant Kelly Pyle III

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Lt. Osmant Kelly Pyle III.

Osmant.Pyle@seattle.gov

From: [Scheele, Andrea](#)
To: [Jacobs, Teresa](#)
Subject: Fwd: Veteran's preference comments
Date: Monday, May 11, 2020 5:20:59 PM

Andrea Scheele (she/her/hers)
Executive Director, Civil Service Commissions
City of Seattle | Civil Service Commission and Public Safety Civil Service Commission
Cell: 206-437-5425 andrea.scheele@seattle.gov

From: Sasse, Charles <Charles.Sasse@seattle.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 5:19:10 PM
To: Scheele, Andrea <Andrea.Scheele@seattle.gov>
Subject: Veteran's preference comments

I disagree with the suggestion to extend veteran's preference to each promotional exam.

The Civil Service and Seattle Fire Department already recognize the individuals who have served their country by awarding them points on the entry exam, and on a promotional exam. This is appropriate. The SFD also makes up the difference in pay for personnel who are called back to active duty as a way to encourage their continued military service.

Individuals know the rules before promotional testing. It is their responsibility to manage the benefits given to them, rather than penalizing those for whom reserve military status is not emotionally, financially, or professionally possible.

Members who are in the military reserve do so for the various benefits associated with that continued service which non-reservists aren't able to take advantage of. This is a personal decision, and there is no right or wrong side to it. However, it is my opinion that reservists already have the appropriate benefits due them for their service and it is not advisable to extend preference beyond currently accepted guidelines.

Thank you,
Captain Charles Sasse
Seattle Fire Department

"Crossing your fingers is not the way an astronaut deals with risk. The more you know, the less you fear."
- Chris Hadfield, Masterclass

Charles Sasse
Captain of Support Services

Seattle Fire Department
206-386-1462 (office)
[REDACTED]
charles.sasse@seattle.gov

From: [Scheele, Andrea](#)
To: [Jacobs, Teresa](#)
Subject: Fw: PSCSC Rulemaking for Veteran's Preference in Promotion at City of Seattle
Date: Friday, May 15, 2020 11:02:54 AM
Attachments: [05012010 PSCSC notice to unions vet preference rulemaking encrypted.pdf](#)
[5-2020 PSCSC Public Notice of Proposed Rule.pdf](#)



Andrea Scheele (she/her/hers)

Executive Director, Civil Service Commissions

City of Seattle | [Civil Service Commission](#) and [Public Safety Civil Service Commission](#)

Phone: 206-233-7118 | Cell: 206-437-5425 | Fax: 206-684-0755 |

andrea.scheele@seattle.gov

The City of Seattle is an equal employment opportunity employer. Accommodations for people with disabilities provided upon request.

From: Branum, Byron <Byron.Branum@seattle.gov>
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2020 8:35 AM
To: Scheele, Andrea <Andrea.Scheele@seattle.gov>
Cc: Schulberg, Darren <Darren.Schulberg@seattle.gov>
Subject: Fw: PSCSC Rulemaking for Veteran's Preference in Promotion at City of Seattle

Good Afternoon Andrea,

Due to the interpretation and then reinterpretation of Military Preference points, an agreement was made to give the last 5 SFD promoted Captains the same promotional date of August 15th. This agreement has given these members an unfair advantage in future promotional exams. This decision to give them all the same promotional date of August 15th will give these members more seniority points that will increase their total on future promotional exams.

No one making this decision stepped back and looked down the road to see how this will skew future promotional lists or anything that has to do with time in grade seniority.

Is this issue being addressed at this meeting?

Thank You,
Schon

May 15, 2020

To Public Safety Civil Service Commission

Fm Lt. Shaun Schenkelberg Seattle Fire Dept

Subj: Objection to Civil Service Rules Change.

I disagree with the changes to SPSCS rules. You have proposed to change 9.17 and 18.02. Both of these rules are in alignment with the RCW. The RCW states that if a member is mobilized to active duty and then returns, they get 5% of their score towards their first promotional exam. The law states this to indicate that one mobilization to active duty does not give promotional points for multiple promotions. If a member is then mobilized again, they should get points for the next exam. I was mobilized in 2003 and served on a ship in the Persian Gulf during Operation Iraq Freedom. I utilized the points from this mobilization towards my promotion to Lt. In 2010 I was again mobilized to active duty to serve at Task Force Bravo in Honduras. I was activated for the third time in 2018 to serve as Senior Enlisted Leader on a ship operating off the coast of North Africa. I came back in February 2019 and had intended to use veterans preference to take the Capt's test, since I missed the 2018 exam. I found out too late that I needed to contact SPSCS within 30 days of my return to get accommodation afforded in 9.15. I sent in a request to waive the 30 days requirement, but was denied by the executive director. This was the wrong thing to do. It made no difference if I contacted the commission at day 29 or day 159. Since a test was not happening for another year, I had not realized I needed to contact the PSCSC within 30 days. As Reservists, we have volunteered to serve our country. We do face hardships and dangers in our duties. Since I was denied the accommodation allowed in 9.15 (my exam score to be compared to last list and if I were to score higher than last person promoted would move to #1 on new list), the only preference I had left was to get the 5% of my score, which you now propose to take away.

I have heard that some of these changes to the rules are due to a letter from a Former Supreme Court Justice written in the 1950's. This letter was not a ruling, but an opinion of one person. This should not apply. Also since that time what is allowed by the RCW (vote of the House, Senate, and signed by the Governor) has changed, which changes even the letter. What is allowed for veterans preference in 2020, is not the same as what was allowed in the 1950's. We are in a different time where Reservists are being called away from their civilian jobs to serve their country. Prior to 911, there was not a widespread use of the Reserve & National Guard. That has changed. Before 911 most Reservists had not been recalled to active duty. Now the majority have, and in my case three times. If you look at the RCW online you will find at the bottom there is the history of veterans preference laws. If you read from the oldest to the most current, you will see changes over time. <https://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=41.04.010>

I listened to some of the testimony given from last years PSCSC meetings. One person said that we can write our own orders, and made it seem like people were scamming the system. This person was making comments in reference to another Navy Sailor. For my last mobilization I

found out a bit more of how the process works (at least for the Navy). The gaining command puts forward a request for the person to fill the billet requirement. This goes to US Fleet Forces command who validates the billet and puts the requirement to either a active duty or reserve Sailor. In my case Commander Naval Reserve Forces Command was sourced the requirement and did a search to find Reserve Sailors who fit the billet requirements. CNRFC came back with only one mobilization eligible Sailor who fit the qualification for the requirement; Me. I was notified that I was to be mobilized. US Fleet Forces Command then had to forward this requirement to the Secretary of Defense's office for approval. They had to review my record and approve the request. After the SECDEF's office approved the request, it goes to the Navy Bureau of Personnel (BUPERS) to generate orders. This is not a fast process. If I recall correctly from time of my notification to me receiving orders was over 90 days. I was quite offended to hear of at least one of the people that testified to say that we can write our own orders to mobilize ourselves to game the system and get the points for mobilizing. I wish I would have known about this meeting so I could have been there to rebut the false information that was said.

I know of quite a few service members from all branches of the Armed Forces that have honorably served our country as Reservists/National Guard Members. We have answered our countries call and deserve to not go backwards.

I am writing this letter to bring up my concerns, and to support my Brothers and Sisters that are Seattle Firefighters/Police Officers and also serve our country in the Reserve/National Guard.

V/R

Lt Shaun Schenkelberg
Seattle Fire Department
Engine 36B
Marine Emergency Response Team.

V/R

CMDCM(SW/AW) Shaun Schenkelberg
Command Master Chief
NR Commander Naval Forces Korea HQ

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I write to you today to voice my vociferous opposition to the proposed changes to how the city of Seattle applies Veterans Preference to promotional exams. I believe the proposed changes (specifically limiting Veteran Preference points to one promotion only) are not rooted in legislative nor legal intent and provide a negative impact on the members of the Seattle Police Department and Seattle Fire Department who choose to serve in the Reserves or National Guard. Additionally, these proposed changes go against the historical precedence this very commission has supported in awarding veteran's preference for all promotions where a military activation occurred.

The Revised Code of Washington (RCW) has created two separate categories of veteran's preference: one for new appointments and one for promotions. The first category is to help provide jobs to veterans who honorably served their country. The second category recognizes that continued service in the guard or reserves brings with it certain disadvantages to the public safety members who serve. Quite plainly, when members of SPD and SFD are called to active duty, they are pulled away from their careers in SPD and SFD, and therefore at a disadvantage professionally with their peers who are not in the reserves or guard. They are also at a disadvantage to their peers who serve in the guard and reserves, who are not called to active duty. Opportunities such as professional development academies, administrative positions necessary for career development, developments in technologies, policies and tactics all leave the activated reserve and guard member behind their peers. Not to mention, they are gone for months at a time, in stressful conditions, and focused solely on their military mission, falling behind their peers in the fire and police departments. The legislature recognized this and created a category of veteran's preference to attempt to make the members whole when they return from their service. It defies logic, that the legislature recognized this need for already serving members to receive veteran's preference on one activation and promotion, but not future activations encompassing the exact same issues. In other words, why did the legislature feel it necessary to create a wholly separate veterans preference promotion percentage for one promotion, but not any future promotions that were impacted by activation to military service?

I sat in a PSCSC meeting several years ago on a case involving veteran's preference for an SPD officer and myself (and SFD member). Entered into the record at that meeting were comments by the Attorney General's office that liberal application of veteran service should be used by those applying veteran's preference policies. This very PSCSC concurred with that statement and went on the record that the PSCSC should attempt to be as liberal as possible in awarding veteran's preference with regards to promotion. Since that time numerous SFD members have received veteran's preference on promotions multiple times in accordance with that ruling. The Seattle Fire Department was recognized by the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve with the SecDef Employer Support Freedom Award for their support of their members serving in the guard and reserve; the highest award given to civilian organizations by the Secretary of Defense. I believe the proposed changes of limiting veterans promotion preference to one time only flies in the face of this recognition and previous support given to those who serve.

I highly encourage the city, the PSCSC and anyone who has a question about the intent of Veterans Preference to take the issue up with those who can clarify and make changes: the legislature and the courts. This proposed change essentially is an effort to go around the legislature and precedence. These proposed changes ignore precedence, what I feel is clear legislative intent, and negatively impact members of the Seattle Police Department and Seattle Fire Department who proudly serve in the Reserves and National Guard.

I was asked by Seattle Firefighters Union Local 27 to sit in on the committee that was crafting these rules, and was shocked to find that at my very first meeting the proposed changes in front of you had already been agreed upon by the committee I had been asked to join. At no point were any of the points I made even considered. I was told I had to address my comments to the PSCSC.

I do so, now imploring you to stand by your historical and unequivocal support of our members who serve in the Guard and Reserve forces. Thank you for your consideration of protecting veterans preference.





Respectfully,

TT

Tim Taylor, Lieutenant, Seattle Fire Department and 23 year veteran of the United States Air Force

WASHINGTON'S PHASED APPROACH

Reopening Business and Modifying Physical Distancing Measures

	 Phase 1	 Phase 2	 Phase 3	 Phase 4
High-Risk Populations*	Continue to Stay Home, Stay Healthy	Continue to Stay Home, Stay Healthy	Continue to Stay Home, Stay Healthy	Resume public interactions, with physical distancing
Recreation	Some outdoor recreation (hunting, fishing, golf, boating, hiking)	All outdoor recreation involving fewer than 5 people outside your household (camping, beaches, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outdoor group rec. sports activities (5-50 people) - Recreational facilities at <50% capacity (public pools, etc.) 	Resume all recreational activity
Gatherings (social, spiritual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None - Drive in spiritual service with one household per vehicle 	Gather with no more than 5 people outside your household per week	Allow gatherings with no more than 50 people	Allow gatherings with >50 people
Travel	Only essential travel	Limited non-essential travel within proximity of your home	Resume non-essential travel	Continue non-essential travel
Business/ Employers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Essential businesses open - Existing construction that meet agreed upon criteria - Landscaping - Automobile sales - Retail (curb-side pick-up orders only) - Car washes - Pet walkers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remaining manufacturing - New construction - In-home/domestic services (nannies, housecleaning, etc.) - Retail (in-store purchases allowed with restrictions) - Real estate - Professional services/office-based businesses (telework remains strongly encouraged) - Hair and nail salons/Barbers - Housecleaning - Restaurants <50% capacity table size no larger than 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restaurants <75% capacity/ table size no larger than 10 - Bars at <25% capacity - Indoor gyms at <50% capacity - Movie theaters at <50% capacity - Government (telework remains strongly encouraged) - Libraries - Museums - All other business activities not yet listed except for nightclubs and events with greater than 50 people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nightclubs - Concert venues - Large sporting events - Resume unrestricted staffing of worksites, but continue to practice physical distancing and good hygiene

* High-risk populations are currently defined by CDC as: persons 65 years of age and older; people of all ages with underlying medical conditions (particularly not well controlled) including people with chronic lung disease or moderate to severe asthma, people who have serious heart conditions, people who are immunocompromised, people with severe obesity, people with diabetes, people with chronic kidney disease undergoing dialysis, and people with liver disease; people who live in a nursing home or long-term care facility.

Civil Service Commissions (VC110)
Commissioners/Employees Required to File FIS for 2019

Last Name	First Name	Position	Email	Returned
Connole	Stacy	PSCSC Commissioner	Commissoner.Stacy.Connole@seattle.gov	✓
Nark	Joel	PSCSC Commissioner	Commissioner.Joel.Nark@seattle.gov	✓
Scheele	Andrea	Executive Director	Andrea.Scheele@seattle.gov	✓
Bonfrisco	Amy	CSC Commissioner	Amy.Bonfrisco@seattle.gov	✓
Davis	Angelique	CSC Commissioner	Commissioner.Angelique.Davis@seattle.gov	✓
Wideman-Williams	Mary	CSC Commissioner	Commissioner.Mary.Wideman-Williams	✓

100%
Compliance

PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
CASE STATUS REPORT
MAY 2020

OPEN APPEAL/EXAM PROTEST/REQUEST FOR DECISION:

Type	CASE NUMBER	APPELLANT	RESPONDENT DEPARTMENT	DATE FILED	ISSUE	Register/Exam/ Position	Issue/Requested Outcome	PRESIDING
A	20-01-011	Novisedlak	Police	2-21-2020	Discharge	Officer	Request to Return to Duty Awaiting Meeting with Union	PSCSC

DISMISSED/CLOSED:

Type	CASE NUMBER	APPELLANT	RESPONDENT DEPARTMENT	DATE FILED	APPEAL	ISSUE/REQUESTED OUTCOME	DECISION/DATE DISMISSED	PRESIDING
RFD	20-03-010	Holtman	Fire	3-24-2020	Veteran's Preference Points	Remove Lt. Pyle's VPP and Republish Fire Captain Register	Executive Director Denied RFD April 14, 2020	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
RFD	20-03-012	Geoghagan	Police	3-5-2020	Service Credit Miscalculation	2017 & 2019 Police Promotional Exam	Appellant Withdrew RFD. Dismissal Order Sent April 15, 2020	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
RFD	20-03-001	Adams	Fire	1-9-2020	Request for Decision/Veteran's Preference Points	Remove VPP from Lt. Pyle Fire Captain Register	Request denied by the Commission 1-16-2020	PSCSC

A=Appeal

E=Exam Protest

RFD=Request for Decision

PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE STATUS REPORT

MAY 2020

A	19-01-032	Goodman	Police	11-26-2019	Appellant Alleges Chief Changed OPA Reprimand to Termination	Termination	Appellant Withdrew Appeal Dismissed 1-31-2020	PSCSC
----------	------------------	----------------	---------------	-------------------	---	--------------------	--	--------------

A=Appeal

E=Exam Protest

RFD=Request for Decision