



**Civil Service Commission Meeting Agenda**  
**Wednesday, February 08, 2023, 5:00 PM**  
**Fire Station 42, 4321 NW Parker ST**

---

*NOTE: The City welcomes public meeting citizen participation. TTY Relay Service: 711. In compliance with the ADA, if you need special assistance to participate in a meeting, contact the City Clerk's office at (360) 834-6864, 72 hours prior to the meeting so reasonable accommodations can be made (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title 1)*

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

CALL TO ORDER

**MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

1. January 11, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes

**MEETING ITEMS**

2. Captain Promotion List

Presenter: Kacie Jones

3. Rule Review Memo

Presenter: Rich Rodgers

**OTHER ITEMS**

**REPORTS**

**CLOSE OF MEETING**



**Civil Service Commission Special Meeting Minutes**  
**Wednesday, January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2023, 5:00 PM**  
**Fire Station 42, 4321 NW Parker ST**

---

*NOTE: Please see the published Agenda Packet for all item file attachments*

---

## **CALL TO ORDER**

*The meeting was called to order at 5:04 PM*

Commissioner Martin Burrows was nominated for and accepted the position of Chairman.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

## **ROLL CALL**

Present: Martin Burrows, Gary Perman, Richard Rodgers

Staff: Chief Mitch Lackey, Kacie Jones

## **MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

1. November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Special Meeting Minutes  
**Burrows noted the date in the header was inaccurate and requires amendment. It was moved by Burrows, seconded by Rodgers, that the November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2022 regular meeting minutes be approved with the date amendment.**

## **MEETING ITEMS**

2. Division Chief of EMS Hiring Eligibility List

Presenter: Kacie Jones

*Secretary Jones gave an overview of the candidates and testing process and proffered the list for approval.*

**It was moved by Burrows, seconded by Rodgers, that the list be approved. The motion carried unanimously.**

2. Police Department Request to Test

Presenter: Chief Lackey

*Chief Lackey described the impending hiring needs of the department and reviewed the processes for entry level and lateral hiring, as well as the status of current lists.*

*These materials are archived electronically by the City of Camas. DESTROY AFTER USE.*

*There was discussion about the potential for continuous testing to better engage available candidates.*

**It was moved by Rodgers, seconded by Perman, that the requests be approved. The motion carried unanimously.**

## **OTHER ITEMS**

**Police Department Employee list 2023**

**Fire Department Employee list 2023**

## **CLOSE OF MEETING**

*The meeting was closed at 5:42 PM*



# Camas Civil Service Commission

4321 NW Parker Street, Camas, WA 98607

Item 2.

Martin Burrows	Chairman
Rich Rodgers	Commissioner
Gary Permann	Commissioner

Kacie Jones	Secretary / Chief Examiner
-------------	----------------------------

## Fire Captain Promotional List

1. Chris Ruddell
2. Matt Peterson
3. Trevor Guay
4. Chris Kassel

---

Martin Burrows

---

Rich Rodgers

---

Gary Permann

Expiration Date: February 2, 2025

**Date:** January 30, 2023  
**To:** Martin Burrows; Chair, Civil Service Commission  
 Gary Perman; Commissioner; Camas Civil Service Commission  
 Kacie Jones; Senior Administrative Support Assistant  
**From:** Rich Rogers; Commissioner; Camas Civil Service Commission  
**Subject:** Review & Update of Camas Civil Service Commission Rules

The purpose of this memo is to propose a review and update of the “Camas Civil Service Rules” based on conversations the commission and Kacie have had during the past two meetings about an update.

To better familiarize myself with this subject, I researched current applicable RCW (Revised Code of Washington), Camas City Code, past Civil Service (CS) minutes, several other city (WA) websites, and relevant sources of information including the non-profit Municipal Research and Services Center ([www.mrsc.org](http://www.mrsc.org)) which provides research and guidance on Washington city policies & procedures.

The Camas CS Rules were last reviewed and updated in **May 2015**. From the meeting minutes, the update then was a single item changing our commission’s meeting day. As I could not find any meeting minutes older than 2014, I am unsure when the last actual significant review of the rules was made but my best guess would be at least 15 years, if not longer.

I was unable to find any state or local statutory requirement for periodic reviewing of the CS rules, yet we are empowered and expected to maintain a set of rules at our discretion as shown below.

**CAMAS CITY CODE 2.36.030**  
*To make suitable rules and regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter and which are not in conflict with the purposes of the State Civil Service laws codified as RCW Chapters 41.08 and 41.12. Such rules and regulations shall provide in detail the manner in which examinations shall be administered, and appointments, promotions, transfers, reinstatements, demotions, suspensions and discharges shall be made, and may also provide for other matters connected with the general subject of personnel administration, and which may be considered desirable to further carry out the general purposes of this chapter*

In the absence of any “best practices” for how often this type of update is done by Washington cities, I did a quick review of WA cities close in population to Camas and cities in Clark County to see how often they handle reviews and updates to their CS rules.

Pop Rank (2022)	City	Last Revision	Civil Service Oversight
04	Vancouver	2021	Police & Fire
34	Wenatchee	2022	Police
37	Walla Walla	2018	Police
38	Des Moines	2015	Police & Fire
43	Tumwater	2021	Police & Fire
44	<b>Camas</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Police &amp; Fire</b>
45	Mercer Island	2022	Police & Fire
52	Battle Ground	2023	Police
63	Washougal	Not Clear	Code says “Police & Fire” -?
79	Kelso	2019	Police

As indicated above, and by many other cities data I didn’t include on the chart for the sake of space, we well behind other Washington cities in updating the rules. By itself, this isn’t necessarily a “bad” thing as maybe our current rule set continues to be sufficient. And personally, I am not a fan of “fixing things that aren’t broke” or just adding rules and regulations for the sake of having more rules and regulations. In

fact, I strongly support removing unneeded rules as well as ensuring existing rules are as clear to all stakeholders as possible, especially the commission and city staff entrusted with applying the rules.

Other reasons for conducting a review and update:

- Confirm we're in compliance with RCW, city code and any collective bargaining contracts (if applicable) including any changes that have occurred since last update
- Confirm our rules make sense and any unnecessary/redundant rules are updated/removed
- Clarifying any unclear rules now rather than later when we're trying to enforce them
- Consider a rule or guidance for the commission to review the rules on a regular basis (e.g., every 3 years, or appointment of a new commissioner, or whatever makes sense);
- Consider a document format that includes tracking of all rule changes (when occurred & why);
- For commissioners, the process provides a valuable education & clearer understanding of the rules we're entrusted by the public to oversee
- And given the current national situation with extreme behavior by some police, we would be more adequately prepared to perform our duties quickly, fairly and transparently should our local police or fire department experience any similar issues that would require our involvement as the CS Commission. To be clear, **I don't expect our local police & fire to have these issues**, but better to be prepared than not in the unlikely occurrence.

I came up with a draft outline of how we might accomplish a review. This is just a starting point and I'm looking forward to input from the other commissioners and Kacie ato come up with a viable schedule.

Task	Description	Timeline
1	-Set schedule and work plan -Identify & notify Stakeholders of our intention and ask for input within 30 days (or other)	Mtg #1
2	-Provide commissioners with applicable RCW, City Code, and our current Rules plus any other relevant documents & links and time to review	Between Mtg #1 and #2
3	-Allow public input and submission of stakeholder input on current Rules	Mtg #2 or #3
4	-Commission to review input from commissioners and stakeholders -Identify which potential changes and updates we agree are necessary -Finalize amended rules document for final review by Commission -Any legal review if necessary	Mtg #3 or #4
5	-Vote on new rules document, and post on website and all necessary notifications	Mtg #4-5

It's hard to estimate an exact timeline for a project until we've finalized a task list. But I think depending on the final task list and schedule, we could be done in 6 months or less depending on different factors.

I couldn't find any state or city law requiring city council approval for CS rules changes. The only involvement or expenses I can foresee at this moment from the city (besides Kacie and both chiefs time) might be the city attorney for advice or legal sign off on anything we feel may need legal review.

I look forward to input from the other commissioners and Kacie at the next meeting and hopefully we can decide on if, and how to move forward.

Thank You,  
Rich Rogers