CITY OF STOCKTON

Civil Service Commission

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPT.
2018 JUL 26 AM 8:17

Human Resources Department
Office of the Chief Examiner

Notice of Appeal of Non-Written Examination Component

Any applicant for a promotional examination in the Classified Service shall have a right to appeal to the Chief Examiner any non-written portion of a promotional examination upon a showing of a significant irregularity in the examination process; discrimination, as defined under federal or state law; or a violation of a Civil Service rule that adversely affected the examination process.

Name: MATTHEW SHORT Position: FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC

Address: 1164 VANDERBILT WAY SACRAMENTO CA 95825 Telephone: (916) 402-8989

Day Time Contact: SAME

Basis of Appeal: Exam Irregularity ☑ **Discrimination** ☐ **Violation of Rules** ☐

Name of Exam: FIREFIGHTER/ ENGINEER Exam Date: JULY 17, 2018

[Appeals must be filed within 10 City work days of the administration of the exam component giving rise to the appeal]

1. State the specific grounds upon which this appeal is based: THERE WAS A MALFUNCTIONING PRESSURE GAUGE FROM THE "PASSENGER-SIDE DISCHARGE" ON ENGINE 10 THAT MAY HAVE RESULTED IN POSSIBLY EXCEEDING THE ALLOWABLE TIME CAP FOR THE EVOLUTION

2. Cite the specific Civil Service Rule that was violated, if applicable: _____

3. Provide the facts that support your appeal (attach any documentation). Additional pages may be used. PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

4. What harm did you suffer as a result of the alleged violation? POSSIBLE FAILURE OF THE EXAM AND REMOVAL FROM THE ELIGIBILTY LIST

The Chief Examiner shall investigate the basis of the appeal and shall not unreasonably deny the appeal, but shall grant the appeal and correct the exam defect, if appropriate. The Chief Examiner and/or the Test Consultant shall submit a written report to the Commission detailing the final decision and the steps taken to correct or cure the exam defect or detailing the reasons for a denial of the appeal.

(Continued on next page)

Chief Examiner's Report

	Yes		No
Is the appeal timely filed?			
Is the subject matter appealable under the Civil Service Rules?			
Does the appeal meet the standards for review?			
Does the appeal relate solely to a management right?			

Decision

(Attach additional pages if necessary)

cc: (1) Appellant (2) Civil Service Commission

NOTICE TO APPELLANT: If you are not satisfied with the final decision of the Chief Examiner, you may file a further appeal with the Civil Service Commission within five (5) City work days of issuance of the decision. Submit your appeal to the City Clerk, using the regular appeal form available from the City Clerk's Office. ATTACH A COPY OF THIS REPORT.

NOTICE TO CITY CLERK: Upon receipt of a further appeal to the Civil Service Commission, forward a copy of the appeal to the Chief Examiner and direct the Agenda Coordinator to place the matter of the appeal on the agenda for the next regular meeting of the Commission.

This letter of appeal is regarding the recent Firefighter/Engineer manipulative examination which took place July 17, 2018 and a possible incident that may have occurred during an evolution of my testing process that could have resulted in going over the allowable time.

The incident occurred on my third of four testing evolutions consisting of placing a ground monitor into service, obtaining a 5" water supply from a fire hydrant, and placing a 2 ½" hoseline into service under a time cap. The evolution begins with a 3 minute "walk-around" of the apparatus in which the candidates are to familiarize with the apparatus prior to testing. Candidates are not made of aware of which apparatus will be used for testing prior to the day of the test. The engine being used for this evolution was Engine 10. Three distinct types of Engines were used for the testing process, each with their own unique pumping operation. Although Engine 10 is similar to only one other Engine (Engine 2) in our fleet, it is not identical. During my 3-minute "walk-around" I was able to place the pump in service, briefly orientate myself with the pump operation panel, and perform a brief external visual examination of the apparatus.

After completion of the "walk-around" the candidate and raters board the Engine and proceed to the drill ground where more instructions are given, and the layout of the evolution is presented. I was instructed to "lay-out" three-hundred feet of five-inch supply line, attached to a ground monitor, disconnect the hose, attach to the appropriate discharge on the engine, obtain a five-inch water supply using a pre-designated hydrant and a fifty foot length of five-inch supply, flow the ground monitor at 600 gallons per minute, then attach and place into service a two-hundred foot section of 2 ½ inch fire attack line with a flow of 250 gallons per minute. Once all hoselines and pump pressures are set the candidate is instructed to call time and the evolution is complete.

I believe my time issue may be due to several events, none of which on their own would cause a significant delay but compounded would definitely have its consequences.

I began by "laying-out" my 5" supply line from the apparatus which was attached to the ground monitor. Once the appropriate amount of hose was on the ground, I stopped the apparatus, disconnected the ground monitor hose from the remaining hose bed and connected the hoseline into the pump outlet, labeled "passenger side discharge". I then connected the supply line to the pump and hydrant. After hydrant water was supplying the pump I charged the ground monitor to the appropriate pressure and GPM, checked the compound gauge (which indicates the psi at which the engine is pumping) and verbally confirmed to the raters successful completion. I then connected the 2 ½" fire attack hoseline to the pump panel and signaled to the person on the nozzle I was ready to charge the line. This procedure is a standard operating guideline for this particular evolution. I right-away noticed neither of the 2 ½" discharges on the pump panel were labeled as they normally are on the Stockton Fire Department fire apparatus. Not wanting to charge the wrong discharge and risk critical failure, I disconnected the line from pump panel discharge, went to the back of the apparatus, and connected the line to discharge #5. I then returned to the pump panel and pulled the appropriate valve. This is recovery cost valuable time. I adjusted my #5 discharge pressure to the appropriate gallonage and verbalized its successful completion to the raters. I then re-confirmed my compound gauge and monitor gauge were pumping appropriately as they were previously. I immediately noticed the "passenger-side discharge" gauge was "jumping" back-and-forth, plus or minus 10-15 psi and would not maintain a constant pressure. This is not a common occurrence and not one I had encountered during my apparatus training drills. I verbalized to the raters this problem and then made an attempt to correct the issue by shutting the line

down and re-charging it, hoping the gauge would reset itself, essentially re-performing that part of the evolution costing even more valuable time. I pulled the appropriate valve, re-charging the monitor line, set it to the appropriate pressure, re-confirmed all other gauges were operating appropriately, and verbalized successful completion to the raters and called time. They confirmed completion and ended the evolution.

I would like to state that I have completed similar evolutions to the one stated above, as required by the SFD Engineer's handbook, without issue and within the allotted time.

Matthew Short