



Seattle Civil Service Department

PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

UPDATED

MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA

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

DATE: Thursday, December 18, 2025

TIME: [10:00 a.m.](#)

LOCATION: In person [SMT Room 1679](#)

Directions to SMT 1679-Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 5th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104.

In person attendance: Call (206) 233-7118 or (206) 586-1991 to be escorted to the 16th floor from the 4th floor lobby.

Teams Meeting Public Login:

[PSCSC Monthly Meeting | Meeting-Join | Microsoft Teams](#)

Commissioners, staff, and invited guests Login:

Please JOIN via the Teams presenter invitation please do not join the public login.

Notify staff if you'd like to log in early for a technical check of your audio and video.

Subscribe to receive PSCSC Meeting Agendas, Notices, and News:

<https://www.seattle.gov/public-safety-civil-service-commission/meeting-agendas-and-minutes>

Public Safety Civil Service Commission
Updated
Monthly Meeting Agenda
December 18, 2025 @ 10:00 a.m.
 Seattle Municipal Tower Room 1679 and Teams

1.	CALL TO ORDER LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	Commission Chair (PSCSC 2.04)
2.	COMMISSIONER INTRODUCTIONS	
3.	PUBLIC COMMENT	
4.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	November 20, 2025, Joint Meeting with CSC November 20, 2025, PSCSC Monthly Meeting (Pages 1-4)
5.	EXECUTIVE SESSION	May be cancelled if not needed
6.	ACTION ITEMS	<p>Action Item 1: Vote on Request by Captain Johnson to <i>Revise or Modify a Decision of the Executive Director under PSCSC Rule 2.13.b.</i> (Updated Agenda Item) (Pages 5-28)</p> <p>Action Item 2: 2026 Commission Chair Nomination and Vote</p> <p>Action Item 3: Commission Vote on proposed January Meeting Date and Time: Date: Wednesday, January 14, 2026 Time: TBD</p> <p>Action Deferred: 2026 PSCSC Monthly Meeting Dates-Commission review and adoption of the 2026 monthly meeting schedule. Action postponed until the January meeting.</p>

7.	UPDATES/DISCUSSION	<p>A. FIRE AND POLICE EXAM UNIT UPDATES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Police Exams (Rachael Schade, Police Exams Administrator) 2. Fire Exams (Yoshiko Grace Matsui, Fire Exams Administrator) 3. Fire and Police Staffing (Hiring/Attrition Numbers) 4. Staffing Update (Andrea Scheele, Executive Director) <p>B. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BUDGET & DEPARTMENTAL UPDATES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Reappointment of Richard Greene 6. Department Update 7. Budget Update (Page 29) <p>C. CASE STATUS REPORT/APPEAL UPDATES (Pages 30-34)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Hill v. SPD-PSCSC No. 24-01-004A 9. Rigon v. SPD-PSCSC No. 25-01-032A 10. Johnson v. PSCSC-PSCSC No. 25-07-046A (see Action Item #1)
8.	OLD/NEW BUSINESS	
9.	ADJOURNMENT	<p>Next Meeting Date: TBD</p>



CITY OF SEATTLE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING

November 20, 2025 @ 10:00 AM

Location: Teams and SMT 1679

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Civil Service Commission Chair Ray Ceaser called the joint meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Chair Ceaser read the Land Acknowledgement.

2. COMMISSIONER INTRODUCTIONS

The Commissioners of CSC and PSCSC were present and introduced themselves: CSC Commissioners: Ray Ceaser, Mary Wideman-Williams and Denise Wells. PSCSC Commissioners: Richard Greene, Queniya Mays and Tom Applegate.

STAFF COUNSEL AND GUESTS

Executive Director Andrea Scheele. Commission Staff, Public Safety Exams Staff and Commission Counsel.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no written comment, and no members of the public requested to give public comment.

4. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Purpose: *To review the performance of a public employee.*

Executive Session Start: 10:06 a.m.

Executive Session End: 10:36.

The commission went back on record to announce an extension to the Executive Session.

Executive Session Start: 10:36 a.m.

Executive Session End: 10:51 a.m.

5. UPDATES/DISCUSSION

There were no updates/discussion.

6. ACTION ITEMS

- a) Reappointment of the Executive Director for a three-year term to begin January 1, 2026

Commissioner Greene moved to reappoint Executive Director Andrea Scheele for a three-year term. Commissioner Wideman-Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- b) Executive Director Salary Increase

Commissioner Greene moved to increase the salary of the Executive Director. Commissioner Tom Applegate seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

-
- c) 2026 Annual Wage Increase (AWI) Executive Director (yes or no)

Commissioner Greene moved to approve the Annual Wage Increase of 3.6% for Executive Director Andrea Scheele. Commissioner Tom Applegate seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- d) 2026 Merit Days Award for Executive Director Scheele (6 days maximum)

Commissioner Greene moved to award the Executive Director the maximum of 6 Merit Days for 2026. Commissioner Wideman-Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Boards & Commission Appreciation Reception-City Hall
December 5, 2025

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting ended at 10:59 a.m.

Minutes submitted **December 8, 2025**, by: Teresa Jacobs

Minutes ☐ Approved ☐ Amended
December 8, 2025, by: CSC

Signed by CSC Commission Chair, Ray Ceaser

Minutes submitted **December 18, 2025**, by: Teresa Jacobs

Minutes ☐ Approved ☐ Amended
December 18, 2025, by: PSCSC

Signed by PSCSC Commission Chair, Richard Greene

Monthly meetings are recorded; after January 1, 2024, they may be found at:

[Seattle Civil Service Commission - YouTube](#)

[Seattle Public Safety Civil Service Commission - YouTube](#)

**Public Safety Civil Service Commission
Monthly Meeting Minutes**

November 20, 2025 @ 11:30 a.m.

Seattle Municipal Tower Room 1679 and Teams

1.	CALL TO ORDER Commission Chair (PSCSC 2.04) LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	Commissioner Greene called the meeting to order at 11:31 am.
2.	COMMISSIONER INTRODUCTIONS STAFF, COUNSEL AND GUESTS	The Commissioners were present and introduced themselves: Commission Chair Richard Greene, and Commissioners Tom Applegate and Queniya Mays. Andrea Scheele, Executive Director; Commission Staff and Public Safety Exams Staff; Joe Levan, Assistant City Attorney/Commission Counsel and Anne Vold, Assistant City Attorney; Representatives of Seattle Fire HR and Seattle Police HR.
3.	PUBLIC COMMENT (GENERAL)	The commission received one written public comment and no verbal comments; the written comment was taken under advisement
4.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	October 9, 2025, PSCSC Monthly Meeting Commissioner Greene moved to accept the minutes of October 9, 2025, as written. Commissioner Applegate seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.
5.	EXECUTIVE SESSION	The commission did not go into Executive Session.
6.	ACTION ITEMS	There were no action items.
7.	UPDATES/DISCUSSION	A. FIRE AND POLICE EXAM UNIT UPDATES <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Police Exams (Rachael Schade, Police Exams Administrator) 2. Fire Exams (Yoshiko Grace Matsui, Fire Exams Administrator) 3. Fire and Police Staffing (Hiring/Attrition Numbers) 4. Staffing Update (Andrea Scheele, Executive Director)

		B. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BUDGET & DEPARTMENTAL UPDATES 5. Department Update 6. Budget Update C. CASE STATUS REPORT/APPEAL UPDATES 7. Hill v. SPD-PSCSC No. 24-01-004A 8. Rigon v. SPD-PSCSC No. 25-01-032A 9. Johnson v. PSCSC-PSCSC No. 25-07-046A
8.	PSCSC 2025 LOOKBACK	Andrea Scheele, Executive Director Sarah Butler, CIV Operations & Policy Advisor
9.	RECAP -44 th Annual Civil Service Conference October 21 and 22, 2025	
10.	OLD/NEW BUSINESS	No Old/New Business.
11.	ADJOURNMENT	The meeting adjourned at 12:14 p.m.

Minutes submitted **December 18, 2025**, by: Teresa Jacobs

Minutes ☐ Approved ☐ Amended
December 18, 2025, by: PSCSC

Signed by PSCSC Commission Chair, Richard Greene

Monthly meetings are recorded, they can be found at:
<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCgIMkgpm-XFGWnnYfMRL4tQ>

Previous recordings may be requested via the public records portal at
<https://www.seattle.gov/public-records>

November 24, 2025

Captain Douglas Johnson, SFD
Douglas.Johnson@seattle.gov

Re: PSCSC No. 25-07-046A
Douglas Johnson v. Public Safety Civil Service Commission

Dear Captain Johnson;

On November 19, 2025, the Public Safety Civil Service Commission (“Commission”) received your document entitled, “Motion for Reconsideration,” regarding the Dismissal Order issued by Executive Director Scheele on November 17, 2025 (“Dismissal Order”). This letter is to acknowledge that your Motion for Reconsideration has been received and to notify the Commission of your request.

Nature of Action: “Any person adversely affected by any action or decision of the Executive Director may request the Commission to revise or modify such action or decision.” PSCSC Rule 2.13.b. In accordance with PSCSC Rule 2.13.b., your Motion for Reconsideration will be regarded as a request to revise or modify the Dismissal Order (“Request to Revise or Modify”).

Timeliness: To be timely, “Such request shall be in writing setting forth with reasonable certainty the action objected to, the grounds supporting the request, and the relief sought, and must be made within 10 days from the date of notice of such action unless established otherwise by City Charter or elsewhere in these Rules.” PSCSC Rule 2.13.b. (emphasis in original). Your Request to Revise or Modify was submitted to the PSCSC within ten days of notice, so it is timely.

Through this acknowledgement letter, the Commission is also being notified of your Request to Revise or Modify. As stated in PSCSC Rule 2.13.b., “The Commission shall thereupon, if in its opinion good cause is shown, conduct a hearing thereon.” We will contact you if additional information is needed.

Please notify our office if your contact information changes, or if something changes about the status of your request.

When corresponding with the PSCSC regarding your Request to Revise or Modify, it is important to avoid improper ex parte communications. “Ex parte” communications are generally communications with parties outside of the proceeding at issue related to the proceedings. Here, the parties related to your Request to Revise or Modify are you and all three Commissioners.

Sincerely,

Teresa Jacobs

Executive Assistant

Enclosure: 11-19-2025 Johnson Reconsideration, Exhibit B-Scheele Response; Exhibit C-Nelson Reply; Exhibit D-Dismissal Order w/ Mogan Email

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Teresa R. Jacobs, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that on the date below, I caused to be served upon the below-listed parties, via the method of service listed below, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document: **Request to Revise or Modify the Dismissal Order Issued by the Executive Director.**

Party	Method of Service
Appellant: Douglas Johnson Douglas.Johnson@seattle.gov [REDACTED]	E-Mail
Respondent: Public Safety Civil Service Commission	E-Mail

Dated this 24th day of November, 2025, at Seattle, Washington.

Teresa Jacobs

Teresa R. Jacobs, Executive Assistant
Public Safety Civil Service Commission

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

PSCSC No. 25 07 046A

Filed by:

Captain Douglas Johnson
Seattle Fire Department

To:

Public Safety Civil Service Commission
City of Seattle

Date: November 19, 2025

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the Commission authority to correct errors in its own orders and the procedural principles governing administrative decision making in Washington, I respectfully request reconsideration of the Dismissal Order dated November 17, 2025. The Order dismissed my appeal with prejudice, asserting untimeliness under PSCSC Rules 6.19 and 6.02.

Reconsideration is warranted because the Order relies on an incorrect determination of what action was being appealed, and because the agency's own communications provided conflicting and misleading procedural guidance, preventing timely filing and defeating due process.

II. BASIS FOR RECONSIDERATION

A. The Order Misidentifies the Action Being Appealed

The Order concludes that the "foundational action" occurred on August 14, 2025, when Thivia Mogan emailed notice that I "was not selected" for the Battalion Chief Captain Promotional Development Committee (Exhibit A).

However, my appeal did not challenge the August 14 non-selection.

The appeal challenged new and materially distinct actions taken in September 2025, specifically:

- **September 11, 2025** — I was informed by PSCSC staff that I was excluded from committee participation due to unspecified "behavior."
- **September 15, 2025** — Executive Director Scheele stated in writing that the exclusion "is not appealable." (Exhibit B)
- **September 24, 2025** — I was notified of a Rule 9.29 investigation regarding June 2024 events, without prior notice.

The August 14 email from Ms. Mogan contained no allegation of behavior, no notice of exclusion, and no reference to any investigation. I had no knowledge nor any reason to know of any "ban," adverse

action, or Rule 9.29 inquiry until the Commission communicated the new allegations in September 2025.

B. The Commission Provided Contradictory Instructions (“Not Appealable” → “Untimely”)

On September 15, Executive Director Scheele informed me in writing that the exclusion “is not appealable.” (Exhibit B)

When the agency states an action is not appealable, an employee cannot file under Rule 6.19 or 6.02. A ten day window cannot begin when the agency has expressly prohibited appeal.

The November 17 Order reverses course, asserting that:

- the matter was appealable,
- but is now untimely,
- because I did not file a prohibited appeal.

This contradiction constitutes a procedural defect that requires reconsideration.

E. A Ten Day Appeal Window Cannot Begin While the Agency States the Matter Is Not Appealable

At no point prior to the November 17 Dismissal Order did the Commission identify the action at issue as appealable. To the contrary, on September 15, Executive Director Scheele expressly stated in writing that the matter “is not appealable.” This instruction prevented any filing under Rule 6.19 or Rule 6.02. A ten day deadline cannot begin running for an action that an employee has been told cannot be appealed.

The first time the agency stated that the matter was appealable was in the November 17 Dismissal Order itself. Because appealability was not established until that date, no earlier deadline could legally apply. Any ten day calculation must therefore begin on November 17. My motion for reconsideration is timely within that period.

Because the agency affirmatively barred the use of internal appellate procedures until the Dismissal Order, applying a retroactive filing deadline violates fundamental procedural fairness and requires correction under the Commission authority to address procedural errors.

C. The September 11 and September 24 Actions Each Triggered New Appeal Deadlines

The Order does not analyze whether:

- the September 11 exclusion based on alleged behavior,
- the September 15 “not appealable” declaration, or
- the September 24 Rule 9.29 investigation notice

constituted new “actions” under Rule 6.19.

Each of these was a new adverse action that restarted any appeal timeline. Failing to analyze those dates is an error of law.

D. Lack of Notice Before September 24 Prevented Any Timely Filing

The Order acknowledges:

“At no point prior to September 24, 2025, was [the Appellant] provided notice of any pending investigation...”

A ten day deadline cannot apply to an action for which no notice was provided.

III. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

I respectfully request that the Commission:

1. Vacate the Dismissal Order dated November 17, 2025.
2. Recognize that the September 2025 actions, not the August 14 email, are the operative actions under Rule 6.19 and Rule 6.02.
3. Allow the appeal to proceed on the merits.
4. Alternatively, issue a clarified order identifying:
 - the specific action deemed appealable,
 - the specific date the ten day period began,
 - and the written notice that triggered the deadline.

IV. EXHIBITS

Exhibit A — August 14, 2025 Non Selection Email (Mogan)

Exhibit B — September 15, 2025 Email Stating Matter “Not Appealable” (Scheele)

Exhibit C — September 5, 2025 Behavior Allegation Emails (Nelson)

Exhibit D — November 17, 2025 Dismissal Order

All exhibits already exist in the PSCSC record and are attached to this email.

V. CONCLUSION

The Commission should reconsider its dismissal because:

- The wrong date was identified as the “action.”
- The August 14 email contained no notice of exclusion.
- September actions were separate and adverse.
- Agency communications directly conflicted.
- The resulting dismissal deprived me of due process.

ADDITIONAL NOTE REGARDING PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

This motion is submitted to ensure full exhaustion of available administrative remedies and to allow the Commission an opportunity to correct procedural inconsistencies that would otherwise remain unresolved in the record. Washington administrative standards require clarity regarding the operative action at issue, the triggering date for any filing deadline, and the availability of a meaningful avenue for review.

Addressing these matters now will promote accuracy, fairness, and administrative economy.

Respectfully submitted,
Captain Douglas Johnson
Seattle Fire Department

Fw: Follow up to request - Follow-Up on Committee Selection Inquiry

From Johnson, Douglas <Douglas.Johnson@seattle.gov>

Date Mon 9/15/2025 4:13 PM

To Doug Johnson [REDACTED]

Capt. Doug RA Johnson

From: Scheele, Andrea <Andrea.Scheele@seattle.gov>

Sent: Monday, September 15, 2025 4:12 PM

To: Johnson, Douglas <Douglas.Johnson@seattle.gov>

Cc: Fitzpatrick, Helen <Helen.Fitzpatrick@seattle.gov>; Stuart, Kenneth <kstuart@iaff27.org>; Nelson, Mike (CIV) <Mike.Nelson2@seattle.gov>

Subject: RE: Follow up to request - Follow-Up on Committee Selection Inquiry

Hello Captain Johnson,

You recently asked Public Safety Exams Manager Mike Nelson why you were not invited to serve on the PSCSC development committee for the 2026 BC/Fire Captain exam, how to appeal your non-selection, and other questions about our selection process. As Mr. Nelson shared, you were not invited due to concerns regarding your conduct during the 2024 BC oral boards process. CIV/PSCSC staff routinely assemble committees to aid in development of civil service exams, and they may consider past or ongoing conduct in selection, including conduct currently under investigation. Committee member selections are part of their regular duties and are not subject to appeal.

To provide context, immediately after the June 2024 BC oral boards concluded, CIV leadership received complaints regarding your conduct during the process. Because you are an SFD employee, CIV consulted with SFD Human Resources about appropriate next steps. At that time, SFD requested to conduct an internal investigation rather than having CIV do so, and CIV agreed. It appears, however, that no investigation was conducted and you were not notified of the complaints. For questions about why neither notice nor investigation occurred, I recommend following up directly with your department.

To ensure the concerns about your conduct are investigated, CIV is retaining an outside investigator. In the coming days, you will receive a formal notice of investigation, with a copy provided to your union and department.



Andrea Scheele she/her

Executive Director, Civil Service Department

From: Johnson, Douglas <Douglas.Johnson@seattle.gov>

Sent: Friday, September 12, 2025 6:21 AM

To: Nelson, Mike (CIV) <Mike.Nelson2@seattle.gov>
Cc: Fitzpatrick, Helen <Helen.Fitzpatrick@seattle.gov>
Subject: Follow up to request

Mike Nelson,

I'm writing to follow up on my earlier request for documentation regarding my eligibility to serve on Civil Service committees. Chief Branum has directed me to refer all questions to you and the Civil Service Commission. I have not received written notice or explanation from PSCSC about my reported ban from committee service.

For transparency and to protect the integrity of the Battalion Chief Committee process scheduled to have its first meeting on September 19, please provide written clarity on the following:

1. Decision & Notice

- Has Civil Service *formally* decided to bar me from serving on committees?
- If yes, when was that decision made, by whom, and under what authority? I am respectfully requesting copies of any documentation related to this decision.
- Why was no written notice provided to me, and who was responsible for communicating it?

2. Basis & Scope

- What policy, rule, or precedent governs the decision? Please cite any applicable section(s).
- Does the decision apply only to the BC and Entry Level committees, or to all Civil Service committees?
- What is the duration of the restriction and what is the appeal or review process?

3. Investigation Status (if applicable)

- Has Civil Service initiated or authorized any investigation related to my committee eligibility or conduct?
- If so, what is the scope and expected timeline?

4. Liaison Role & Process Integrity

- What is the defined role of the Fire Department liaison in Civil Service committee matters?
- When did the liaison become aware of any decision affecting my eligibility, and what communications occurred between Civil Service and the liaison concerning this issue?

5.

Given the September 19 start date, I respectfully request a written response by **5:00 PM PT on September 16, 2025** so that any necessary process adjustments can be made without further

disruption of commissioners, committee members, the policy or procedural standards that guided the determination, and clarification on the process that was followed in reaching this outcome.

My goal is to ensure transparency, policy compliance, and confidence in this process for everyone. If additional context would be helpful, I'm available to discuss. These questions are made a little more clear than my last e-mail. I also had to add the questions from DC Branum. The effort is to make it easy for you to follow and answer.

Thank you for your attention

Capt. Doug RA Johnson

Fw: Committees

From Johnson, Douglas <Douglas.Johnson@seattle.gov>

Date Sun 9/7/2025 7:52 PM

To Doug Johnson 

Capt. Doug RA Johnson

From: Nelson, Mike (CIV) <Mike.Nelson2@seattle.gov>

Sent: Friday, September 5, 2025 10:22 AM

To: Johnson, Douglas <Douglas.Johnson@seattle.gov>

Subject: RE: Committees

Captain Johnson,

Thank you for contacting the Civil Service Department. You requested to be informed of the reason you were not selected to participate in the PSCSC 2026 Battalion Chief/Captain promotional development committee. Although CIV's general past practice is to notify candidates only of whether they were or were not selected, we can provide a brief response to your request for information.

You were not selected because of your inappropriate treatment of CIV staff members at the June 2024 Battalion Chief oral boards.

Thank you,

Mike



Mike Nelson (he/him)

Public Safety Exam Manager, [Public Safety Civil Service Commission](#)

City of Seattle | Civil Service Department

From: Mogan, Thivia <Thivia.Mogan@seattle.gov>

Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 5:09 PM

To: Nelson, Mike (CIV) <Mike.Nelson2@seattle.gov>; Matsui, Yoshiko <Yoshiko.GraceMatsui@seattle.gov>

Subject: FW: Committees

From: Johnson, Douglas <Douglas.Johnson@seattle.gov>

Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 3:08 PM

To: Mogan, Thivia <Thivia.Mogan@seattle.gov>

Subject: Committees

Good afternoon,

After going over my answers to the applications and looking at the desired experience, I am curious why I was not selected for either committee. Can you please share why I was not selected by Wednesday, Sept 3, 2025? Thank you.

Capt. Doug RA Johnson

1 **BEFORE THE CITY OF SEATTLE**
2 **PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

3 **In the matter of**

4 **Douglas Johnson,**
Appellant

5 v.

6 **Public Safety Civil Service Commission,**
Respondent

DISMISSAL ORDER

PSCSC No. 25-07-046A

7
8 **BACKGROUND**

9 This matter was initiated by a Notice of Appeal (“Appeal”) letter by Seattle Fire Department
10 employee Fire Captain Douglas Johnson (“Appellant”) received by the Public Safety Civil Service
11 Commission (“PSCSC”) on October 10, 2025¹. The Appeal states that the action appealed is: “This
12 Notice of Appeal is timely for appropriate reasons. The procedural harm and exclusion are
13 continuing in effect, and I was not provided written notice or confirmation of the decision’s non-
14 appealability until September 2025. The appeal is therefore filed promptly upon receipt of that
15 confirmation.” Appeal, at p. 1.

16 Regarding specific dates of alleged PSCSC actions, one date referenced by the Appellant is
17 September 11, 2025. In part, the Appellant states: “On September 11, 2025, I was notified by
18 PSCSC staff that I was excluded from participation on PSCSC committees based on unspecified
19 “behavior.”” Appeal, at p. 1. Another specific date to which the Appellant refers related to alleged
20 PSCSC actions is September 24, 2025. In part, the Appellant states: “... I was later informed on
21 September 24, 2025, that a PSCSC investigation had been initiated under Rule 9.29 regarding
22 events from June 2024, over fourteen months earlier.” Appeal, at p. 1. The Appellant also states, in
23 part: “... At no point prior to September 24, 2025, was I provided notice of any pending
24 investigation, complaint, or referral.” Appeal, at p. 1.

25
¹ The appeal letter from the Appellant is dated “Sept. 10, 2025” but events it describes occurred subsequent to that date, and the letter was received by the PSCSC via email dated October 10, 2025.

1 August 14, 2025, which is not referenced by the Appellant, is the material date at issue in
2 this Appeal. On that date, an email was sent to the Appellant by Thivia Mogan, Senior Fire Exams
3 Analyst for the Public Safety Exams Unit. In that email, Senior Fire Exams Analyst Mogan, on
4 behalf of the Exam Development Committee, stated:

5 Thank you for your application to the Battalion Chief/Captain Promotional
6 Development Committee. At this time, you have not been selected as a member
7 of this committee. We sincerely appreciate your interest to participate in this very
8 important process and continued dedication to serving the Seattle community.

8 Exhibit 1.

9 Regarding references to alleged specific rule or law violations, the Appellant refers to
10 PSCSC Rule 3.03 and Rule 9.29. Rule 3.03 does not exist. Rule 9.29 states:

11 9.29 PROHIBITED EMPLOYEE CONDUCT IN EXAMINATIONS.

12 a. Any person who by themselves or in collusion with another person does or
13 attempts to cheat, obstruct any other person's right of examination, disclose the
14 content of an exam or aid in doing so, or make a false representation regarding
15 an examination, will be disqualified from the civil service exam process, and may
16 also be subject to investigation for possible policy violations by their appointing
17 authority.

18 b. Departmental members of a promotional exam development committee who
19 engage in prohibited conduct such as discussing or disclosing exam related
20 information with individuals not on the committee, will be disqualified from exam
21 development processes, and may also be subject to investigation for possible
22 policy violations by their appointing authority.

23 c. Exam participants are notified of and required to follow instructions related to
24 conduct while participating in an exam and/or at the exam site. Failure to follow
25 instructions related to conduct at the exam may result in a candidate being
disqualified from the exam process.

21 Regarding specific reference to Rule 9.29, the Appellant indicates, in part (emphasis added):

22 On September 11, 2025, I was notified by PSCSC staff that I was excluded from
23 participation on PSCSC committees based on unspecified "behavior." No rule
24 citation, written notice, or opportunity to respond was provided. I was later
25 informed on September 24, 2025, that a PSCSC investigation had been initiated
**under Rule 9.29 regarding events from June 2024, over fourteen months
earlier.**

1 I understand Executive Director Scheele has indicated that this exclusion “is not
2 appealable.” However, because these actions resulted in the loss of access to
3 PSCSC duties, privileges, and opportunities without notice, cause, or opportunity
4 to be heard, they are effectively adverse employment actions and thus subject to
5 appeal under PSCSC Rule 3.03 (Appeals by Employees) and **Rule 9.29**
6 **(Disciplinary Investigations)**.

7 Appeal, at p. 1.

8 **LEGAL AUTHORITY**

9 Such appeals submitted to the PSCSC are governed by the PSCSC Rules of Practice and
10 Procedure above referenced, including PSCSC Rule 6.19, which states:

11 a. Any employee or department who is adversely affected by an alleged violation
12 of Article XVI of the Charter of The City of Seattle, the Public Safety Civil Service
13 Ordinance or the Public Safety Civil Service Commission Rules of Process and
14 Procedure which does not fall under Rules 6.01(a) or (b), may within ten (10)
15 days of the alleged violation, submit a written complaint to the Executive Director
16 requesting review.

17 b. The complaint shall follow the same as Appeals, described in Rule 6.02. The
18 Executive Director will review the complaint and determine appropriate action.
19 Such action may include investigation into the alleged violation, decision by the
20 Executive Director, and/or referral of the matter to the Commission for decision or
21 a hearing subject to the same rules as an appeal.

22 The Appeal is untimely as a matter of law. Pursuant to PSCSC Rule 6.19.a., the Appellant
23 was required to submit a written complaint “within ten (10) days of the alleged violation.” See also,
24 Rule 6.02, which is referenced in Rule 6.19.b., and which requires a notice of appeal to be filed
25 “within ten (10) days of the action that is the subject of the appeal.”

Based on the Appeal and associated documents submitted by the Appellant, as well as
other communications material to this matter, the action or decision that is the basis for the Appeal
is the decision by the Promotional Exam Committee to not select the Appellant to serve on the
Battalion Chief/Captain Promotional Development Committee. As above described, the Appellant
was informed of this decision on August 14, 2025, which is more than ten days from when the
Appellant filed his Appeal on October 10, 2025.

1 The other dates to which the Appellant refers relate back to the foundational action at issue
2 here, which is described in the August 14, 2025 email. For the sake of argument, and without
3 agreeing that other dates described by the Appellant are material to the timeliness issue here, this
4 Order will consider such other dates as well in reaching the conclusion that this Appeal is untimely.

5 Regarding such other dates, and for the sake of argument, the Appellant asserts, in part,
6 that on or around September 11, 2025 he “was notified by PSCSC staff that I was excluded from
7 participation on PSCSC committees based on unspecified “behavior.”” Appeal, at p. 1. One of the
8 two documents Appellant submitted along with his Appeal is an email chain that includes an email
9 message dated September 5, 2025 from PSCSC Public Safety Exams Manager Mike Nelson to
10 Appellant communicating the decision not to select the Appellant to participate on the promotional
11 exam development committee at issue, and stating: “You were not selected because of your
12 inappropriate treatment of CIV staff members at the June 2024 Battalion Chief oral boards.” That
13 email chain also includes a response from Appellant dated September 9, 2025 to Mike Nelson
14 regarding, as described in part by the Appellant, the “decision to deny me a committee seat based
15 on a finding of inappropriate behavior.” That email chain also includes an email dated September
16 11, 2025 from Douglas Johnson to Doug Johnson.

17 For the sake of argument regarding another date referenced by the Appellant, the other
18 document the Appellant submitted with his Appeal is an email chain that begins with an email
19 message from him to Mike Nelson (cc’ing Helen Fitzpatrick, Seattle Fire Department, Executive
20 Director of Administration) dated September 12, 2025 with the subject, “Follow up to request.” That
21 email chain also includes a response dated September 15, 2025 from Andrea Scheele, PSCSC
22 Executive Director, to the Appellant with the subject, “RE: Follow up request – Follow-Up on
23 Committee Selection Inquiry.” In that email message and in response to the Appellant’s inquiry
24 about why he was not invited to serve on the PSCSC development committee for the 2026 Battalion
25 Chief/Fire Captain exam, Executive Director Scheele stated, in part:

1 ... As Mr. Nelson shared, you were not invited due to concerns regarding your
2 conduct during the 2024 BC oral boards process. CIV/PSCSC staff routinely
3 assemble committees to aid in development of civil service exams, and they may
4 consider past or ongoing conduct in selection, including conduct currently under
5 investigation. Committee member selections are part of their regular duties and
6 are not subject to appeal.

7 That email chain also includes an email dated September 15, 2025 from Douglas Johnson
8 to Doug Johnson.

9 As described above, the Appeal states that the action appealed is: "This Notice of Appeal is
10 timely for appropriate reasons. The procedural harm and exclusion are continuing in effect, and I
11 was not provided written notice or confirmation of the decision's non-appealability until September
12 2025. The appeal is therefore filed promptly upon receipt of that confirmation." Appeal, at p. 1.
13 Presumably, the "receipt of that confirmation" is in reference to the email message described above
14 from Executive Director Scheele dated September 15, 2025. As also described above, the
15 Appellant refers as well to a date of September 24, 2025 in relation to receiving notice that an
16 investigation had been initiated related to the Appellant's conduct.

17 The Appeal is untimely as a matter of law because, as above described, the Appellant has
18 failed to establish that the Appeal was brought, as required by Rule 6.19.a., within ten days of the
19 alleged violation. See also, Rule 6.02 (requiring appeals to be filed within ten days of the action that
20 is the subject of the appeal). The alleged violation or action occurred more than ten days before the
21 filing of the Appeal, which was filed on October 10, 2025. Therefore, the Appeal related to the
22 alleged violation or action is untimely. See, e.g., *Pleuss v. City of Seattle*, 8 Wn.App. 133 (1972).

23 The material action at issue here which is foundational to the alleged violation is the
24 decision by the Civil Service Department staff to not select the Appellant to serve on the Battalion
25 Chief/Captain Promotional Development Committee. The Appellant was informed of this decision
on August 14, 2025, which is more than ten days from when the Appellant filed his Appeal on
October 10, 2025.

1 Regarding one of the other dates that is included in the Appeal, based on the emails
2 provided by the Appellant he was also informed about not being invited to participate in the PSCSC
3 development committee for the 2026 Battalion Chief/Fire Captain exam via email from Executive
4 Director Scheele on September 15, 2025. However, as above described, the Appellant was initially
5 informed about this decision on August 14, 2025. For the sake of argument, and not agreeing that
6 the September 15, 2025 date is the date of the alleged action or alleged violation at issue, the
7 Appeal would still be untimely because the October 10, 2025 date of filing is more than ten days
8 from September 15, 2025.

9 The Appellant refers as well to a date of September 24, 2025 and he describes that date in
10 relation to receiving notice that an investigation had been initiated regarding his conduct related to
11 events in June 2024. The September 24, 2025 date is immaterial to the timeliness of the Appeal
12 because it relates to a notice of investigation and not to the alleged violation or action at issue,
13 which is the decision not to invite the Appellant to participate on the PSCSC development
14 committee for the 2026 Battalion Chief/Fire Captain exam. However, even if, for the sake of
15 argument, that date is material to the timeliness issue, which it is not, the Appeal would still be
16 untimely because the October 10, 2025 date of filing is more than ten days from September 24,
17 2025.

18 In *Pleuss*, the plaintiff, who was a firefighter, resigned from the fire department and later
19 contended to the Firemen's Pension Board that his resignation was not voluntary. The city
20 contended that the resignation was voluntary, and the court agreed. In so doing, the court referred
21 to a provision in the Charter of the City of Seattle as it existed at that time which stated, in relevant
22 part: "... one who is removed must demand investigation within ten days after his removal and, in
23 the absence of such a demand, the removal is complete and, of course, will not be interfered with."
24 *Id.* at 136. In agreeing with the city's decision, the court stated, in part: "The review must be
25 demanded 'within ten days after his removal.'" *Id.* at 136. The court explained further that the

1 plaintiff “knew the facts when he resigned,” “he was aware of his remedies,” and “[i]nstead, 9
2 months later he brought the action below.” Id. at 136-37.

3 Similarly, here Rule 6.19.a., as well as Rule 6.02, provide that the complaint or appeal at
4 issue must be brought within ten days of the alleged violation or within ten days of the action that is
5 the subject of the appeal. The Appellant has failed to establish compliance with Rule 6.19.a. or Rule
6 6.02 and, therefore, the Appeal is untimely as a matter of law.

7 Pursuant to Rule 6.05, in relevant part: “... Upon a determination that the appeal is not
8 timely, the Executive Director may issue a written order of dismissal with prejudice (“with prejudice”
9 meaning ineligible for refiling), setting forth the basis of the dismissal.”

10 This Appeal is dismissed because it is untimely as a matter of law, so this Order does not
11 reach other issues, such as whether the Appellant has stated a claim upon which relief can be
12 granted.

1 **ORDER**

2 Pursuant to PSCSC Rules 6.19, 6.02, and 6.05, the Executive Director has reviewed and
3 considered the Appeal and documents filed and related therewith and determined appropriate
4 action. It is hereby ordered, pursuant to PSCSC Rules 6.19, 6.02, and 6.05, that the Appeal is
5 untimely as a matter of law and this matter is dismissed, with prejudice.
6

7 Dated this 17th day of November, 2025.
8

9 FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

10 *Andrea Scheele*

11 Andrea Scheele
12 Executive Director, Public Safety Civil Service Commission
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Teresa R. Jacobs, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that on the date below, I caused to be served upon the below-listed parties, via the method of service listed below, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document: **DISMISSAL ORDER**.

Party	Method of Service
Appellant: Douglas Johnson Douglas.Johnson@seattle.gov [REDACTED]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E-Mail
Respondent: Public Safety Civil Service Commission Andrea Scheele, PSCSC Executive Director andrea.scheele@seattle.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E-Mail

Dated this 17th day of November, 2025, at Seattle, Washington.

Teresa Jacobs

Teresa R. Jacobs, Executive Assistant
Public Safety Civil Service Commission

Sept. 10, 2025

Dear Commissioners,

I respectfully submit this Notice of Appeal under PSCSC Rules, seeking review of actions that have affected my civil service status and participation rights. This appeal concerns procedural and jurisdictional issues, not the underlying allegations under review.

On September 11, 2025, I was notified by PSCSC staff that I was excluded from participation on PSCSC committees based on unspecified “behavior.” No rule citation, written notice, or opportunity to respond was provided. I was later informed on September 24, 2025, that a PSCSC investigation had been initiated under Rule 9.29 regarding events from June 2024, over fourteen months earlier.

During this period, I was also denied participation in at least two PSCSC committees, including the Captain and Battalion Chief Promotional Development Committee. These exclusions materially affected my professional standing and opportunities for civil service involvement. Historically, committee selection has been a **joint process between the Seattle Fire Department and the PSCSC**, involving collaborative input rather than a unilateral decision by one party. The absence of consultation or notice from either entity represents a significant departure from established practice. At no point prior to September 24, 2025, was I provided notice of any pending investigation, complaint, or referral.

I understand Executive Director Scheele has indicated that this exclusion “is not appealable.” However, because these actions resulted in the loss of access to PSCSC duties, privileges, and opportunities without notice, cause, or opportunity to be heard, they are effectively adverse employment actions and thus subject to appeal under PSCSC Rule 3.03 (Appeals by Employees) and Rule 9.29 (Disciplinary Investigations).

This Notice of Appeal is timely for appropriate reasons. The procedural harm and exclusion are continuing in effect, and I was not provided written notice or confirmation of the decision’s non-appealability until September 2025. The appeal is therefore filed promptly upon receipt of that confirmation.

I request that the Commission:

1. Assert jurisdiction over this matter to review the procedural fairness of my exclusion and the denial of appeal rights.
2. Require production of the July 3, 2024 referral and any documentation authorizing or supporting the committee exclusions.
3. Clarify that “under investigation” status alone does not justify exclusion from committee participation absent written notice and due process.
4. Affirm that decisions labeled “not appealable” cannot be used to insulate potentially retaliatory or procedurally improper actions from Commission oversight.

This appeal is submitted in good faith to protect both the integrity of PSCSC processes and my right to fair treatment under City and Civil Service policies. All statements herein are supported by contemporaneous correspondence and documentation in my possession.

Sincerely,
Captain Douglas Johnson
Seattle Fire Department

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Captain Douglas Johnson.

Scheele, Andrea

From: Mogan, Thivia
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2025 2:05 PM
To: Scheele, Andrea
Subject: FW: 2026 BC/Captain Promotional Exam Development Committee

From: Mogan, Thivia <Thivia.Mogan@seattle.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2025 4:04 PM
To: Andrews, Drew <Drew.Andrews2@seattle.gov>; Johnson, Douglas <Douglas.Johnson@seattle.gov>
Cc: Matsui, Yoshiko <Yoshiko.GraceMatsui@seattle.gov>; Snowberger, Amy Jo <AmyJo.Snowberger@seattle.gov>; Nelson, Mike (CIV) <Mike.Nelson2@seattle.gov>; Branum, Byron <Byron.Branum@seattle.gov>
Subject: 2026 BC/Captain Promotional Exam Development Committee

Hello,

Thank you for your application to the Battalion Chief/Captain Promotional Development Committee. At this time, you have not been selected as a member of this committee. We sincerely appreciate your interest to participate in this very important process and continued dedication to serving the Seattle community.

Best,
Thivia



Thivia Mogan (she/her)
Fire Exams Analyst, Senior
Public Safety Exams Unit | Civil Service Commission
thivia.mogan@seattle.gov
206-947-4868

**CITY OF SEATTLE
PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE**

Most Recently Amended: April 18, 2025

Commissioners
Richard Greene, Chair
Tom Applegate
Queniya Mays

2.03 SELECTION OF CHAIR. The Chair shall be elected from among the Commissioners by majority vote for a one- year term. If the Chair is unable to serve, the Commission shall elect a new Chair from its members.

2.04 DUTIES OF THE CHAIR - The Chair:

- a. Shall preside over Commission meetings.
- b. Shall rule on matters of parliamentary procedure.
- c. Shall act as hiring authority and primary supervisor for the Executive Director.
- d. May sign correspondence on behalf of the Commission.

2.05 ACTIONS OF THE CHAIR

The Chair's actions are subject to review and modification by a majority vote of the full Commission. They may be removed from the Chair position by a majority vote of the Commissioners.

2.06 DELEGATION OF CHAIR'S DUTIES

In the absence of the Chair, the Chair's authority shall be delegated to another member of the Commission.

Budget Summary

Business Unit ID

VC0

Year

2025

12/02/2025

Last Pay Period End Date

Wednesday, December 10, 2025 11:00 AM Pacific Standard Time (PST)

Last Refreshed Date

\$2,817,650.00	\$0.00	\$67,211.00	\$0.00	\$2,884,861.00	\$133,798.44	\$2,264,589.32	\$2,398,387.76	\$620,271.68
Adopted Budget	Carryforward	Budget Revisions	Budget Transfers	Revised Budget	Encumbrances	Total Expenses	Committments	Remaining Legal Bu...

620,271.68	486,473.24	78.50%	21.50%
Available Balance Before Encumbrances	Available Balance After Encumbrances	Percent Spent Before Encumbrances	Percent Available Before Encumbrances

BSL ID And Name	Adopted Budget	Carryforward	Budget Revisions	Budget Transfers	Revised Budget	Encumbrances	Total Expenses	Total Committments	Rem	Remaining Legal Budget
BO-VC-V1CIV - Civil Service Commissions	\$2,817,650.00	\$0.00	\$67,211.00	\$0.00	\$2,884,861.00	\$133,798.44	\$2,264,589.32	\$2,398,387.76		\$620,271.68
MO-VC-V1CIV - Civil Service Commissions	\$2,817,650.00	\$0.00	\$67,211.00	\$0.00	\$2,884,861.00	\$133,798.44	\$2,264,589.32	\$2,398,387.76		\$620,271.68
00100 - General Fund	\$2,817,650.00	\$0.00	\$67,211.00	\$0.00	\$2,884,861.00	\$133,798.44	\$2,264,589.32	\$2,398,387.76		\$620,271.68
VCADMIN - Leadership and Administration	\$964,071.68	\$0.00	\$67,211.00	\$0.00	\$1,031,282.68	\$61,338.44	\$690,946.93	\$752,285.37		\$340,335.75
VCCIV-FIREEXAMS - PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SVC EXAMS	\$907,412.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$907,412.34	\$30,555.00	\$465,784.12	\$496,339.12		\$441,628.22
VCCIVILSV - Civil Service Commissions	\$38,753.52	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$38,753.52	\$0.00	\$511,572.28	\$511,572.28		(\$472,818.76)
VCCIV-POLEXAMS - Police Civil Service Exams	\$907,412.46	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$907,412.46	\$41,905.00	\$596,285.99	\$638,190.99		\$311,126.47
Revenue - Revenue	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
Total	\$2,817,650.00	\$0.00	\$67,211.00	\$0.00	\$2,884,861.00	\$133,798.44	\$2,264,589.32	\$2,398,387.76		\$620,271.68

**PUBLIC SAFETY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
CASE STATUS REPORT
December 2025**

			OPEN APPEAL/EXAM PROTEST/REQUEST FOR DECISION/COMPLAINT					
Type	CASE NUMBER	APPELLANT	RESPONDENT DEPARTMENT	DATE FILED	ISSUE	Register/Exam/ Position	Issue/Requested Outcome/Status	PRESIDING
A	25-01-032A	Rigon	SPD	9-29-2025	Discharge		Appellant will move forward with the PSCSC appeal hearing process. Prehearing TBD	Executive Director
A	24-01-004A	Hill	SPD	5-21-2024	Discharge		1 st Prehearing was held October 24, 2024. 9-3-2025 The parties were granted a Joint Motion for Continuance. The hearing scheduled for September is cancelled. New hearing dates: February 9-13, 2026.	PSCSC
A	25-07-046A	Johnson	SFD	10-10-2025	Committee		Appellant filed an appeal regarding committee selection. Dismissed 11-7-2025. Appeal was untimely. 11-19-	Executive Director

							2025 Appellant filed a Motion for Reconsideration.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Type	CASE NUMBER	APPELLANT/REQUESTOR	CLOSED APPEAL/EXAM PROTEST/REQUEST FOR DECISION				Issue/Requested Outcome/Status	PRESIDED
			RESPONDENT DEPARTMENT	DATE FILED	ISSUE	Register/Exam/Position		
A	25-01-024A	Englund	SPD	8-28-2025	Suspension		Appellant requested to withdraw the appeal. SPOG will move forward with grievance. Dismissal Order issued October 31, 2025.	Executive Director
A	24-01-006A	Englund	SPD	9-23-2024	Suspension		Appellant requested to withdraw the appeal, because the parties reached a settlement. A dismissal order was issued 8-26-2025	Executive Director
A	25-01-004A	Allen	SPD	2-11-2025	Suspension		Appellant requested to withdraw the appeal on 3-5-2025.	Executive Director
A	25-01-001A	Dave	SPD	1-10-2025	Discharge		Appellant requested to withdraw the appeal on 3-11-2025.	Executive Director

RPro	25-05-002RPro	Schenkelberg	Fire	1-31-2025	Eligible Register Expired	Fire Captain	Dismissed for lack of timeliness. Dismissal Order issued 2-21-2025	Executive Director
A	24-01-007A	Willis	SPD	10-1-2024	Suspension		Appellant requested to withdraw the appeal, because the parties reached a settlement. A dismissal order was issued 1-4-2025.	Executive Director

REQUESTS FOR REINSTATEMENT TO ELIGIBLE REGISTER RFR=Request for Reinstatement (PSCSC 10.03)				
CASE NUMBER	DEPT	DATE REQUESTED	POSITION/RANK	DECISION
25-05-002RFR	Police	1-30-2025	Officer	Request Withdrawn
25-05-004RFR	Police	3-7-2025	Officer	Approved
25-05-008RFR	Police	3-11-2025	Officer	Approved
25-05-010RFR	Police	3-27-2025	Officer	Approved
25-05-011RFR	Fire	4-2-2025	Firefighter	Approved
25-05-012RFR	Fire	4-11-2025	Firefighter	Approved
25-05-013RFR	Police	4-16-2025	Lieutenant	Approved at Rank of Police Officer
25-05-015RFR	Police	4-28-2025	Sergeant	Approved at Rank of Police Officer
25-05-016RFR	Police	4-30-2025	Officer	Approved
25-05-017RFR	Fire	4-29-2025	Firefighter	Not Recommended
25-05-022RFR	Police	8-18-2025	Officer	Request Withdrawn
25-05-023RFR	Fire	8-19-2025	Firefighter	Request Withdrawn
25-05-028RFR	Fire	9-18-2025	Firefighter	Approved
25-05-029RFR	Fire	9-19-2025	Firefighter	Approved

25-05-030RFR	Fire	9-20-2025	Firefighter	Approved
25-05-031RFR	Fire	9-20-2025	Firefighter	Approved
25-05-033RFR	Fire	10-4-2025		Approved
25-05-034RFR	Fire	10-10-2025		Approved
25-05-035RFR	Fire	10-9-2025		Approved
25-05-036RFR	Fire	10-11-2025		Not Separated/On Leave
25-05-037RFR	Police	10-7-2025		Approved
25-05-039RFR	Fire	10-17-2025		Approved
25-05-040RFR	Fire	10-20-2025		Approved
25-05-041RFR	Fire	10-17-2025		Approved
25-05-042RFR	Fire	10-17-2025		Approved
25-05-043RFR	Fire	10-17-2025		Not Recommended
25-05-044RFR	Fire	9-30-2025		Approved
25-05-045RFR	Police	10-31-2025		Approved
25-05-048RFR	Fire	12-2-2025		Approved
25-05-049RFR	Police	12-2-2025		TBD
25-05-050RFR	Police	12-4-2025		TBD

	REQUESTS FOR PROBATIONARY EXTENSION RPE= Request for Probationary Extension (PSCSC Rule 12.0)		
DEPT	DATE REQUESTED	POSITION/RANK	APPROVED/DENIED
Fire	1-10-2025	Battalion Chief	Approved
Fire	1-10-2025	Lieutenant	Approved
Fire	1-10-2025	Firefighter	Approved
Fire	2-3-2025	Firefighter	Approved
Police	2-18-2025	Officer	Approved

Police	2-24-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	4-14-2025	Officer	Approved
Fire	4-27-2025	Firefighter	Approved
Police	4-29-2025	Sergeant	Approved
Police	5-5-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	5-29-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	6-17-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	8-1-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	8-11-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	8-15-2025	Officer	Approved
Fire	8-21-2025	Firefighter	Approved
Fire	8-21-2025	Firefighter	Approved
Police	8-29-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	9-2-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	9-2-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	9-3-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	9-15-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	9-21-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	11-1-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	11-8-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	11-10-2025	Officer	Approved
Police	11-25-2025	Officer	Approved