

City Council Questions

April 27, 2021 Council Meeting

ITEM 4.3 Professional Services Contract for Planning Services

1. For how long have the two limited-term Planning positions been vacant?

The dates below indicated when the positions were vacated.

- Senior Planner (Limited Term) – 3/2017
- Associate Planner (Limited Term) – 10/2015

However, staff has been able to fill this position with contract planners, at least partially, on a consistent basis in order to manager the workload.

2. This contract was first approved in March 2018 without an RFP because “Planning staff reached out to several contract planners at that time to gauge their interest and qualifications for contract planning work, and there was no other qualified contract planners/firms who replied with interest at that time.” Have staff reached out to gauge interest and qualifications recently, in anticipation of the expiration of this contract?

Yes, staff has reached out to contract planners since 2018 and interviewed a few who had the level of experience necessary to manage the projects we had identified for contract assistance. However, we did not ultimately select any. In addition to meeting the qualifications and experience levels, contract planners work with a number of agencies and it is preferable to work with one who is knowledgeable in the City’s review process. The level of training required is very extensive and takes the same time as it does permanent employees. As a result, it continues to be a challenge to continually recruit and train contract planners who are not only willing to work consistently with the City and train them.

3. In response to a Council question submitted May 5, 2020, staff indicated that “the City’s administrative policy requires an RFP for professional services agreements such as this one.” Can a contract be extended indefinitely without an RFP, or is there a limit to the number of extensions that could occur?

The City’s administrative policies are silent on renewal but best practices for ongoing projects and what most agencies typically do is contract for three years with an option to renew for additional two years’ term for a total of five years.

4. When the Council extended this contract in May 2020, a scope of work was provided and attached to the agenda packet. Can staff provide the proposed scope of work for this extension?

Please see [attached](#).

ITEM 6.1 Strategic Roadmap Action Plan for Fiscal Years 2021-22 and 2022-23

1. The staff report for the April 2019 CFC item regarding appointment of the City Auditor indicates that previous work plan items included “Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) compliance review” and “Gatekeeper time reporting review.” Can staff provide information about these “reviews,” including why they were conducted at the time?

For a number of years going back to 2009, the City performed a compliance review of Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) overtime calculations for various bargaining groups. The procedures included reviewing City MOUs with bargaining groups, interviewing City staff, selecting a sample of 30

employees that worked overtime from each group, recalculated the overtime rates and compared to the applicable FLSA rule to determine whether the calculations were correct. For the Gatekeeper project costs review, which was only done in 2008, the review was to determine how staffing costs were charged to these projects, that they were allowable costs per terms of developer agreements and that they were accurately charged through the timekeeping system.

2. What does equitable in the priority on access to housing, transportation, and other programs and services really mean? What actions would the city take to provide equitable access?

The Community for All strategic priority includes the sentence: "Engage and protect vulnerable populations through equitable access to housing, transportation, and other programs and services." This refers to the City engaging marginalized groups/vulnerable populations in decision making processes, considering how policy decisions impact different community members, and promoting efforts that mitigate any disparities/inequities.

3. What difference between subsidized and affordable housing is staff trying to convey?

Subsidized housing is a type of affordable housing. Subsidized housing is distinct in that subsidized units include City funding, whereas affordable housing is a broader set of strategies that may not include City funding.

4. Project 25 – How many councilmembers supported deferring any activity on the AGT at the March 16 council meeting? How many supported dropping this project?

Three councilmembers said to defer the project, two councilmembers wanted to remove the project and two said they would like the scope of the project to be clarified. Council may choose to take this project off the workplan.

5. Project 31 – Gas-powered landscape equipment – how does this project differ from that in the SAP-4? If it is similar, why is it broken out from other projects in the SAP-4?

Following Council input from the December 1, 2020 study session, this project was discussed as part of the Strategic Roadmap Action Plan as a project that would consider an ordinance prohibiting gas powered leafblowers. Council input on March 16, 2021 clarified that an ordinance is not desired, but the City should focus on incentives rather than an ordinance with prohibitions. Such a project is consistent with what is in the SAP-4. Sometimes specific SAP-4 projects are highlighted as part of the Council priority workplan (as are certain CIP projects, for example). However, this project could continue in SAP-4 and not be specifically called out in the Council workplan.

6. Does the Transit Center Master Plan project as proposed include ideas around the proposed parking structure, retail, office, housing, etc.? How would Urban Design experts be selected to get involved? Please provide more details on what staff is proposing.

The Transit Center Master Plan approved by the Council in 2017 described some preliminary concepts for parking, transit, and land use on the land owned by Caltrain. However, the City and Caltrain had previously agreed that a further planning effort is needed to better identify land use and transportation options, evaluate financial feasibility, and formally adopt a preferred plan for the development of their property. That study will be a major planning effort involving significant time from Community Development and Public Works as well as Caltrain as the property owner. It has been deferred for now due to workloads for both agencies and would not be addressed in this proposed Urban Design

study. The proposed Urban Design study would focus on the linkages between the existing Transit Center, the grade separation project, and the Downtown, looking primarily at the Castro Street/Evelyn Avenue intersection area as a gateway into Downtown. We expect to leverage and coordinate with the work already done by consultants working on the Grade Separation and Access Project and the Castro Pedestrian Mall project. The selection of the Urban Design consultant would follow the standard City RFP process for awarding consultant contracts.

7. Has the RHC addressed expenses related to a select number of capital investments in terms of new policies and/or procedures that enable recovery of some or all of the cost? If so, what actions did the RHC take?

On March 22, 2021, the RHC adopted amendments to Chapter 6 of the Regulations, introducing an expedited petition process for certain capital improvements, defined as Specified Capital Improvements. Specified Capital Improvements are generally major capital improvements that significantly extend the useful life of the property, and are necessary to bring or maintain the property into compliance with applicable codes and cannot include costs that could have been avoided by the exercise of reasonable diligence in maintaining the property. Landlords would be required to complete a petition that includes documentation on the type and cost of Specified Capital Improvement installed. Landlords would also be required to provide limited information regarding the property. Staff is currently implementing this new expedited petition process and further details, including forms and guidelines, are expected to be available in the fall.

8. What is our current "Vision Statement"?

The City does not have a Vision Statement, but does have a Mission Statement. The City's existing Mission Statement is: The City of Mountain View provides quality services and facilities that meet the needs of a caring and diverse community in a financially responsible manner.

9. The Salt Pond Project should be under Sustainability & Climate Resilience

Yes. The Salt Pond project was inadvertently placed under the Mobility and Connectivity strategic priority and should be categorized under the Sustainability and Climate Resilience strategic priority.

10. Moffett Plan- How will this impact other work? What about the need for a Precise Plan for TerraBella?

Based on the current workload, CDD is anticipating starting this project during the latter part of the FY 21-22 work plan period. Staff is currently working on several other large projects such as the Gateway Master Plan, Google Master Plans in East Whisman and North Bayshore, downtown Precise Plan, R3/Displacement Strategy, and will also begin the Housing Element during this period. Regarding a Precise Plan for Terra Bella, the City Council reviewed the Terra Bella Draft Vision Plan in 2019 but did not authorize moving forward with this following the visioning process. If Council desires to move forward with a Terra Bella Precise Plan, staff would need additional direction on the scope of the project and can come back with recommendations on the timing and resources required for the project.

11. "Expand access to broadband across communities" Please remind us about what happened with Google's plan about 5 yrs. ago. A community member wrote that Google would be willing to assist us with this. What do we know about their willingness to assist us at this time? Have we reached out to the Chamber about this? Silicon Valley Leadership Group? Joint Venture Silicon Valley?

The City was interested in Google's plan to distribute fiber throughout Mountain View. The City entered a "hut agreement" with Google, which allowed installation of several stations across the city where the fiber is distributed, which the City had to provide at very low rental rates. The City also offered the same programs to other carriers, like AT&T. The agreement did not lead to Google installing fiber. Google appears to have scaled back their plans.

There were several challenges to deploying fiber in Mountain View. California regulations require any broadband vendor to manage environmental impacts of deploying something as massive as fiber across the city. Also, the City doesn't own many utility poles (just street lights). AT&T owns most poles in Mountain View and negotiations would have to take place between AT&T and Google to hang fiber, which is the cheapest way to deploy it. Google also wanted to micro trench the buried fiber, which the City did not support.

Staff have not followed up with Google to gauge whether they have a renewed interest in deploying fiber nor engaged in conversations with other organizations at this point.

ITEM 7.1 Draft Fiscal Year 2021-22 Annual Action Plan and Funding Recommendations

1. If Council decided to supplement funding for the Eviction Prevention and Defense Program, would the Annual Action Plan need to be amendment? Or is the scope of the Annual Action Plan sufficient?

The Annual Action Plan (AAP) would typically include only the public services that applied through the NOFA process. However, staff can include information on the eviction prevention and defense program in the AAP if Council decides to provide supplemental funding. The AAP will need to be modified anyway, pending Council approval of staff's funding recommendations, so including the eviction prevention program can easily be included as part of the subsequent modifications to provide additional context regarding the multiple programs the City is supporting to address local needs and that support AAP goals.

2. When was the GF budget of \$171,000 adopted/implemented?

\$171,000 has been in the "base" budget since FY15-16, a combination of GOF and General Housing Funds (currently \$163,600 GOF and \$7,500 General Housing Funds). Additionally, Limited Period funding has been used to supplement this base budget amount over this timeframe to fund HRC recommendations.

3. For all of the applicants, what percent of their activity is in Mountain View? Is their funding request equal to the percent of their activity in Mountain View?

Staff does not have a breakdown of the percentage of activities in Mountain View relative to the overall geographies served by the applicants. However, all of the recommended funding will be only for activities that are provided in Mountain View.

4. The staff report says, “Unlike in the past, this NOFA cycle did not include capital projects. For various reasons, it has been difficult to find capital projects to fund.” Why have they been difficult to find recently and do you expect that to change with changing land use priorities post-pandemic?

Some of the primary reasons that capital projects have been difficult to find in the past include:

- Capital projects often need much larger amounts than what the City receives annually for both CDBG and HOME.
- CDBG/HOME reporting requirements can be an administrative impact for a sub-recipient, especially if the organization is not familiar with the requirements.
- The timing of projects does not always line up with the Annual Action Plan/NOFA timing.
- Projects might not meet the Consolidated Plan/Annual Action Plan goals.

Staff does not expect these reasons to change much if at all post-pandemic, and may continue to recommend to fund capital projects outside of the NOFA process in the future as appropriate or advantageous to do so.

ITEM 8.1 Fiscal Year 2020-21 Third Quarter Budget Status Report, Fiscal Year 2021-22 Preliminary General Operating Fund Forecast Update, and American Rescue Plan Act Funding Update

1. Can staff provide the list of the 79 vacant positions, as well as the length of time each position has been vacant?

Attached is the vacancy list as of today. We have 78 current vacancies and have underlined the positions in the attached document that are currently in some phase of recruitment.

- The City’s turnover statistics have been consistent since FY 2015-16 and have been below 10%.
 - Turnover for FY 20-21 is at 4.59% in the midyear reporting compared to 4% last year and we are below the average for the past 6 years.
 - The number of vacancy events in 2019 (101) and 2020 (100) were lower than in 2018 (142). Vacancy events include resignations, retirements, release from probation, positions vacated as a result of promotion or internal movement, etc.
 - Recruitment activity: From Jan-April this year compared to the prior 4 years, we are above the average in recruitments running and positions in recruitment, but also in vacancies.
 - Looking at the calendar year annuals, we filled fewer positions in 2020 than in prior years due to COVID (73 compared to a prior 3-year average of 122). Shelter in place and the decrease in recruitment activities in March 2020 to July/August 2020 may have been the largest contributing factor to the backlog of recruitments that we have not been able to eliminate as we restarted recruitments. HR also continues to focus staff resources to COVID related responses, regulations and recovery efforts.
2. Can staff provide more information about this proposed expenditure of ARP funds? “Technology equipment, hardware, and IT contracts to support online services/remote work/Zoom conference rooms/hybrid meetings.”

A number of technology needs have been identified related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Technology equipment, software applications, and consultant contracts are needed to support new methods of delivering service to the community and changing internal operations to more effectively and securely implement City processes. These changes will enable staff to work both onsite and remotely. These needs include: enabling hybrid public meetings, implementing a paperless permitting system, adding closed captioning for public meetings, adding "Zoom Room" capabilities for all City conference rooms,

migrating employees from desktop to laptop computers with additional IT support systems, continued deployment of enhanced cyber security, and back up virus scanning and malware protection.

3. Is the \$750,000 for “Unpaid utility bills for residents/small business” based on existing utility debt? If not, where does the \$750,000 figure come from?

This amount is based on 658 existing unpaid accounts and represents only that portion of the account balance that is delinquent (i.e., >90 days past due). It is a combination of residential and commercial accounts, however, not all of the commercial accounts are small businesses. Therefore, additional analysis is still needed on an account-by-account basis to further ascertain which of those accounts qualify as small businesses. In addition, depending upon if and when this is approved by Council, the final delinquency amount will depend on the date used for cutoff.

4. On page 32 in the discussion on the Ameswell Hotel and the Police/Fire Admin Building, is it possible to hold the funds in a reserve for the new building rather than use it for limited period expenditures?

The funds are transferred to the Budget Contingency Reserve (about \$4.5M thru 6/30/21), not currently being used for LP expenditures, but available for LP items if needed.

5. Wouldn't that reduce the amount of debt needed? What would be the downside of doing this?

Yes. Less funds in the Budget Contingency Reserve (would reduce balance to about \$5M).

6. The last few updates on the rent relief program at CSA seem to show that fewer funds are being expended. Is that the case? Is there a reason why?

CSA has expended the City funds it had already received from the City. However, it has not yet received a final round of funding that had been approved by Council. The CSA agreement needed to be amended to include these additional funding amounts. The agreement has been amended and the funds are being disbursed this week to CSA. In the meantime, CSA has been utilizing other rent relief funds it has raised to assist Mountain View residents.

7. How is CSA handling the state's rent relief effort in terms of paying 80% of the rent, conditioned on forgiveness of 20% of the rent?

The State launched a Rent Relief Program for landlords and tenants and it is accepting applications. This State program covers past-due rent and utility payments for tenants who qualify. There will also be a Program for our most vulnerable tenants through the County. At this time, the County is requesting all tenants go to the State website to start the application process through the State's portal at housingiskey.com. The website is available in Spanish. Questions regarding the State program should be directed to the Mountain View Rental Housing Helpline (Project Sentinel) by emailing mvrent@mountainview.gov or calling 650-282-2514. CSA is not handling the State rent relief program or any part of its implementation/administration. City of Mountain View Rent Stabilization Program staff have included this information in its outreach material to both tenants and landlords regarding rent relief programs.

8. The staff report says, “A study to update the impacts of Sea Level Rise is currently under way and is expected to be completed by fiscal year-end. It is anticipated additional reserves will be needed to provide for increased mitigation over that which was recommended by the initial study.” Why don’t the tech companies located in N Bayshore pay for some of this infrastructure given that they own a large portion of the land?

The City and/or Shoreline Community is responsible for maintaining and providing for the needs of the Community pursuant to the enabling legislation which includes Sea Level Rise. Although it is conceivable a portion of the cost could be passed through to property owners in the Community, it is presumed that such costs are primarily the responsibility of the Community and would be funded primarily from property tax revenues generated by the Community.

9. The staff report says, “The EPA water transfer agreement was approved in 2017, and this \$5.0 million is reserved to use toward future minimum water purchase penalties when insufficient water services charges are collected. A penalty of \$2.0 million is currently estimated for Fiscal Year 2020-21.” When the recycled water comes online will our penalty fees go up?

The “Penalty” is from the SFPUC because we have a minimum water purchase requirement in our agreement. Recycled water comes from the Palo Alto Treatment Plant. It is possible, all other things remaining the same, that once recycled water use expands to other parts of the City, less potable water will be used, thus, increasing the minimum usage penalty. However, the City is expecting significant population growth increasing demand for potable water. Staff currently projects that the City’s use of potable water will exceed the annual minimum water purchase volume in a few more years, at which time the penalty would no longer be a factor even with increases in recycled water users.

10. I understand that cutoffs of water have been suspended during the pandemic which is good. On the national level, I have heard that water cutoffs have been a serious problem for low income residents. Is this a problem in Mountain View? How many cut offs do we have in a normal year?

Yes, water shutoffs are a problem especially for lower income residents which is why none have been made for lack of payment since the pandemic began. The City does not have information regarding shutoffs by income levels. However, for the three years’ prior the pandemic (2017-2019), the number of shutoffs averaged 286 per year. Currently, there are approximately 658 delinquent residential and commercial accounts. Staff has recommended using approximately \$750,000 of the American Rescue Plan Act funding to offset the delinquent accounts.

Netto Planning LLC Scope of Work and Budget

Netto Planning LLC will continue to be responsible for providing project management on planning entitlement projects and environmental review process as requested by the City's Planning Manager. Services also include managing planning projects through the post entitlement building permit and inspection phases.

Current Development Projects Include:

Objective: Provide contract planning services.

Description:

- Provide contract staff support services for projects including but not limited to those identified below (see Development Project list for project description):

1920 Gamel Way
400 Logue Avenue
465 Fairchild Avenue
198 Easy Street
1555 Middlefield Road
881 Castro Street
756 California Street

Meetings:

Attendance at City staff meetings, Zoning Administrator Hearings, Design Review Committee Meetings, Environmental Planning Commission Meetings, and City Council Meetings, as deemed appropriate by the Planning Manager.

Deliverables:

Prepare staff reports and make presentations.

Environmental Compliance

Objective:

Provide environmental review in compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Description:

Compliance Assistance with CEQA Entitlement processing services may also include:

Conducting public scoping meetings as necessary.
Preparation and/or review of environmental documents
Reviewing technical studies to comply with CEQA.
Circulating the document for review.
Reviewing/preparing the mitigation monitoring program.

Meetings:

Attendance at City staff meetings, Zoning Administrator Hearings, Design Review Meetings, Environmental Planning Commission Meetings, and City Council Meetings, as deemed appropriate by the Planning Manager.

Deliverables:

Environmental document, as determined by the characteristics of the project and City policy.

Post Planning Entitlement

Objective:

Provide project management through post entitlement phase.

Description:

Building Plan Checks.
Planning Inspections.
Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval.
Compliance with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs.

Meetings:

Attendance at post entitlement meetings.

Deliverables:

Post entitlement management, as determined by the type of project and phase.

Budget Estimate

Fiscal year 2021-2022- \$150,000

Vacancy List
as of 4/26/21

Department	Job Code	#	Dept/Class	Vacant As Of (MONTH/YR)
CMO	<u>158</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>CHIEF SUSTAINABILITY & RESILIENCE OFFICER</u>	<u>SAP4, 2/2020</u>
CMO	<u>379</u>	<u>LP1</u>	<u>ANALYST II</u>	<u>SAP4, 2/2020</u>
ITD	<u>615</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>IT DESKTOP TECHNICIAN II</u>	<u>6/2020</u>
FASD	<u>70</u>	<u>OH1</u>	<u>ASST FINANCE & ADMIN SERVICES DIRECTOR</u>	<u>NEW, 2/2021</u>
FASD	247	001	PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL ANALYST	3/2021
FASD	<u>259</u>	<u>OH1</u>	<u>SENIOR PAYROLL ACCOUNTANT</u>	<u>NEW, 2/2021</u>
FASD	306	002	SENIOR MANAGEMENT ANALYST	3/2020
FASD	<u>306</u>	<u>003</u>	<u>SENIOR MANAGEMENT ANALYST</u>	<u>1/2021</u>
FASD	476	001	DOCUMENT PROCESSING SUPERVISOR	11/2020
FASD	590	001	DOCUMENT PROCESSING TECHNICIAN III	8/2020
FASD	675	501	DOCUMENT PROCESSING TECHNICIAN II	7/2019
CDD	<u>93</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>HOUSING & NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES MANAGER</u>	<u>10/2020</u>
CDD	TBD	001	DEPUTY BUILDING OFFICIAL	SAP4, 2/2020
CDD	256	LP1	SENIOR PLANNER	3/2017
CDD	266	001	DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COORDINATOR	11/2020
CDD	306	001	SENIOR MANAGEMENT ANALYST	NEW MIDYEAR 20-21
CDD	342	LP1	ASSOCIATE PLANNER	10/2015
CDD	357	003	BUILDING INSPECTOR II	4/2020
CDD	<u>357</u>	<u>006</u>	<u>BUILDING INSPECTOR II</u>	<u>NEW FY 19-20</u>
CDD	379	004	ANALYST I/II	SAP4, 2/2020
CDD	467	002	ASSISTANT BUILDING INSPECTOR	11/2020
CDD	650	LP1	SECRETARY (0.50 FTE)	6/2019

Vacancy List
as of 4/26/21

<u>CDD</u>	<u>650</u>	<u>003</u>	<u>SECRETARY</u>	<u>1/2020</u>
<u>PWD</u>	<u>157</u>	<u>002</u>	<u>TRANSPORTATION PLANNER</u>	<u>3/2020</u>
<u>PWD</u>	<u>157</u>	<u>003</u>	<u>TRANSPORTATION PLANNER</u>	<u>SAP4, 2/2020</u>
<u>PWD</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>SOLID WASTE PROGRAM MANAGER</u>	<u>4/2021</u>
PWD	250	010	ASSOCIATE CIVIL ENGINEER	4/2021
PWD	250	LP2	ASSOCIATE ENGINEER	6/2020
PWD	298	001	WATER QUALITY SUPERVISOR	2/2021
PWD	394	001	POSTCLOSURE ENVIRONMENTAL SYSTEMS SPECIALIST	6/2020
<u>PWD</u>	<u>447</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>SENIOR UTILITIES SYSTEMS TECH</u>	<u>12/2020</u>
<u>PWD</u>	<u>480</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>ENGINEERING ASSISTANT II</u>	<u>1/2020</u>
PWD	526	LP1	ADMINISTRATIVE AIDE	12/2020
PWD	585	002	HEAVY EQUIPMENT OPERATOR	12/2019
<u>PWD</u>	<u>607</u>	<u>LP1</u>	<u>FACILITIES MAINTENCE WORKER II</u>	<u>SAP4, 2/2020</u>
PWD	657	002	STREET MAINT. WORKER II	4/2021
PWD	657	004	STREET MAINT. WORKER II	5/2020
PWD	700	001	OFFICE ASSISTANT III	11/2020
<u>CSD</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>ASSISTANT COMMUNITY SERVICES DIRECTOR</u>	<u>8/2019</u>
<u>CSD</u>	<u>127</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>SHORELINE MANAGER</u>	<u>10/2019</u>
CSD	557	007	PARKS MAINTENANCE WORKER III	4/2020
CSD	613	002	TREE TRIMMER II	12/2020
<u>CSD</u>	<u>655</u>	<u>018</u>	<u>PARK MAINTENANCE WORKER II</u>	<u>12/2020</u>
CSD	745	001	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	3/2020
CSD	795	701	RECREATION LEADER II	7/2020
LSD	469	001	SENIOR LIBRARIAN	4/2020
LSD	469	002	SENIOR LIBRARIAN	3/2020

Vacancy List
as of 4/26/21

<u>LSD</u>	<u>533</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT</u>	<u>11/2020</u>
LSD	653	002	LIBRARY ASSISTANT III	6/2020
<u>LSD</u>	<u>695</u>	<u>701</u>	<u>LIBRARY ASSISTANT II</u>	<u>12/2020</u>
FD	212	009	FIRE CAPTAIN	4/2021
FD	202	003	HAZ MAT SPECIALIST NON-SAFETY	NEW FY 19-20
<u>FD</u>	<u>353</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC</u>	<u>1/2021</u>
<u>FD</u>	<u>353</u>	<u>005</u>	<u>FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC</u>	<u>2/2021</u>
<u>FD</u>	<u>353</u>	<u>011</u>	<u>FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC</u>	<u>1/2021</u>
<u>FD</u>	<u>353</u>	<u>017</u>	<u>FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC</u>	<u>4/2021</u>
FD	397	002	ENVIRONMENTAL AND SAFETY PROTECTION INSPECTOR	4/2020
FD	428	002	PUBLIC EDUCATION/FIRE SAFETY SPECIALIST	NEW FY 19-20
<u>PD</u>	<u>227</u>	<u>OH/LP</u>	<u>SENIOR SYSTEMS SPECIALIST</u>	<u>NEW FY 19-20</u>
PD	220	003	POLICE SERGEANT	12/2020
<u>PD</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>002</u>	<u>POLICE OFFICER</u>	<u>2/2021</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>005</u>	<u>POLICE OFFICER</u>	<u>1/2021</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>010</u>	<u>POLICE OFFICER</u>	<u>10/2020</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>011</u>	<u>POLICE OFFICER</u>	<u>2/2021</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>029</u>	<u>POLICE OFFICER</u>	<u>12/2020</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>032</u>	<u>POLICE OFFICER</u>	<u>1/2021</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>055</u>	<u>POLICE OFFICER</u>	<u>6/2020</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>OH2</u>	<u>POLICE OFFICER</u>	<u>1/2020</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>OH3</u>	<u>POLICE OFFICER</u>	<u>12/2012</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>LP1</u>	<u>POLICE OFFICER</u>	<u>11/2019</u>
PD	411	LP2	POLICE OFFICER TRAINEE	11/2019

Vacancy List
as of 4/26/21

<u>PD</u>	<u>374</u>	<u>001</u>	<u>PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCHER III</u>	<u>10/2020</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>437</u>	<u>005</u>	<u>PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCHER II</u>	<u>8/2020</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>437</u>	<u>008</u>	<u>PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCHER II</u>	<u>1/2021</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>437</u>	<u>009</u>	<u>PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCHER II</u>	<u>1/2021</u>
<u>PD</u>	<u>437</u>	<u>LP2</u>	<u>PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCHER II</u>	<u>NEW IN FY 18</u>
PD	670	OH1	COMMUNITY SERVICE OFFICER	11/2020
PD	673	003	POLICE RECORDS SPECIALIST	3/2021

78 Current Vacancy Count

Note: Classifications underlined are currently in the recruitment process.