## ALEJANDRINA BASQUEZ

DIRECTOR

May 7, 2019

## HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

City of Long Beach
California

## RECOMMENDATION:

Receive and file the 2018 City of Long Beach Workforce Demographics Report. (Citywide)

## DISCUSSION

On February 7, 2017, the City Council requested the City Manager to report back on workforce and applicant diversity data, on an annual basis, until such time an online dashboard is implemented. The 2018 City of Long Beach Workforce Demographics Report (Report) was transmitted to the City Council via memorandum on March 18, 2018 (Attachment). The Report provides an overview of the City's workforce by age, gender, ethnicity, salary, and EEO job categories, both by department and citywide. The Report also provides recruitment data for classified applicants, including Police Officer and Firefighter recruits.

## Workforce Demographics and Hiring

Since the release of the 2017 Gender, Age, and Racial/Ethnic Diversity Report, the City has:

- Increased staffing levels by 8 percent through strategic succession planning and streamlined efforts to decrease timelines for filling a vacancy;
- Increased total ethnic minority representation in the workforce from 59 percent to 62 percent;
- Increased total ethnic minority representation in Police Recruits from 60 percent to 70 percent;
- Increased representation of female applicants for Police Recruit by 6 percent;
- Since 2017, increased ethnic minority representation in top management from 28 percent to 46 percent; and,
- Decreased the pay gap between women and men for permanent full-time employment from 81 cents to 85 cents, a 4-cent increase.

Overall, the City workforce is becoming younger, with representation in the 20-29 age bracket increasing from 17 percent to 22 percent. In 2018, 38 percent of the City's workforce was considered millennials (those born between 1981 and 1996). With 16 percent of the City's workforce at, or near, retirement eligibility, there are unique opportunities to continue increasing diversity.

## Status of Online Dashboard

Priority projects such as LB COAST, City Hall move preparations, hiring improvements, audits, and department workload have impacted the timeline for this project. The Technology and Innovation Department is diligently working with OpenGov, the vendor used for BudgetLB, to build an online dashboard that will allow data on employee demographics to be easily visualized through interactive charts and graphs (similar to those on the City of Portland's and City of Boston's websites). Staff anticipates going live with the dashboard no later than January 1, 2020.

This matter was reviewed by Principal Deputy City Attorney Gary J. Anderson on April 22, 2019 and by Budget Analysis Officer Julissa Jose-Murray on April 19, 2019.

## TIMING CONSIDERATIONS

City Council action on this matter is not time critical.

## FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal or local job impact associated with this recommendation.

## SUGGESTED ACTION:

Approve recommendation.
Respectfully submitted,



PATRICK H. WEST
CITY MANAGER
$\mathrm{AB}:$
$\mathrm{R}: \mathrm{A} /$
R:AdministrationICITY COUNCIL LETTERSL201015-7-181 Demographics Report.docx
Attachment

Date: March 28, 2019
To:
From: Alejandrina Basquez, Director Human Resources Department
For: $\quad$ Mayor and Members of the City Council
Subject: 2018 City of Long Beach Workforce Demographics Report

At its February 7, 2017 meeting, the City Council requested the City Manager to report on workforce and applicant diversity data, on an annual basis, until such time an online dashboard is implemented.

## Workforce Demographics and Hiring

The attached 2018 City of Long Beach Workforce Demographics Report provides an overview of the City's workforce by age, gender, ethnicity, salary, and EEO job categories, both by department and citywide. The report also provides recruitment data for classified applicants to include Police Officer and Firefighter recruits.

Since the release of the 2017 Gender, Age, and Racial/Ethnic Diversity Report, the City has:

- Increased staffing levels by 8 percent through strategic succession planning and streamlined efforts to decrease timelines for filling a vacancy;
- Increased total ethnic minority representation in the workforce from 59 percent to 62 percent;
- Increased total ethnic minority representation in Police Recruits from 60 percent to 70 percent;
- Increased representation of female applicants for Police Recruit by 6 percent;
- Since 2017, increased ethnic minority representation in top management from 28 percent to 46 percent; and,
- Decreased the pay gap between women and men for permanent full-time employment from 81 cents to 85 cents, a 4 -cent increase.

Overall, the City workforce is becoming younger, with representation in the 20-29 age bracket increasing from 17 percent to 22 percent. In 2018, 38 percent of the City's workforce was considered millennials (those born between 1981 and 1996). With 16 percent of the City's workforce at, or near, retirement eligibility, there are unique opportunities to continue increasing diversity.

## Status of Online Dashboard

Priority projects such as LB COAST, City Hall move preparations, hiring improvements, audits, and department workload have impacted the timeline for this project. The Technology and Innovation Department is diligently working with OpenGov, the vendor used for BudgetLB, to build an online dashboard that will allow data on employee demographics to be easily visualized through interactive charts and graphs (similar to those on the City of Portland's and City of Boston's websites). Staff anticipates going live with the dashboard no later than January 1, 2020.

If you have any questions regarding this memorandum, please contact Khristina Coston, Human Resources Officer, at (562) 570-6440.

ATtachment: 2018 City of LONg Beach Workforce Demographics Report

cc: Charles Parkin, CITY Attorney<br>Laura L. DOUd, CITY Auditor<br>tom Modica, Assistant City Manager<br>Kevin Jackson, Deputy City Manager<br>Rebecca Garner, Administrative Deputy to the City Manager<br>Monique De la Garza, City Clerk (Ref. File \#17-0061)<br>Department Heads

## 2018

City of Long Beach Workforce Demographics Report
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 step in creating an equitable and diverse workforce. Prepared in partnership with our City Manager, Pat West. the Department of Human Resources, and the Civil Service Department, this report examines the workforce composition of the City of Long Beach's municipal government as of December 31, 2018.

Generated based on existing employee demographic information available through the City's current Human Resources Management System (HRMS), this report includes part-time and full-time employees, as well as both classified and unclassified employees. This report does NOT include data on contractors, consultants, unpaid interns or volunteers.

The findings of this report play a role in succession planning as the City prepares for the upcoming transition of an aging workforce. Given the City's commitment to open data, we will continue to publish this report on an annual basis until a public portal displaying employee demographics is made available.

## ABOUT THE CITY

The City of Long Beach is a Charter City governed by a Mayor who is elected at-large, and nine City Council members who are elected by their respective council districts. The City Manager for the City of Long Beach is an appointed position that serves as the Chief Administrative Officer and implements policy set by the City Council in 15 of the 23 city departments. The remaining departments are elected offices (i.e., City Attorney, City Auditor, City Prosecutor, and Legislative), appointed (i.e., City Clerk), or governed by a board/commission (i.e., Harbor, Civil Service, and Water).

One of the few full-service cities in California, Long Beach has its own police and fire department, municipal water supply, sewer service, gas service, crude oil infrastructure, health services, sanitation, and animal control. These services are supported by a budget of \$3 billion- a great majority which is invested in the City's workforce.

The City remains one of the largest employers in Long Beach with 6,104 employees.

Currently, the City maintains labor contracts with 11 employee associations which altogether represent approximately $96 \%$ of Long Beach employees. Elected officials, as well as members of City Boards and Commissions remain unrepresented.

Effective March 29, 2018, the Long Beach Gas \& Oil Department was renamed the Energy Resources Department.

## OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

This report was generated based on existing employee demographic data that is gathered for reporting purposes and submitted to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission on a biannual basis. The data presented in this report is complimentary to the EEO Plan, but encompasses a larger workforce demographic (includes part-time and full-time employees as well as both classified and unclassified employees City-wide). Unclassified Service, as defined by the Civil Service Rules and Regulations, includes:

1. All officers elected by the people and all employees of such elected officers;
2. Members of all appointive commissions;
3. The City Manager and all employees in the City Manager's department;
4. The City Clerk and all employees in the City Clerk's department;
5. Department heads, one assistant department head in each department, bureau heads, division heads, and one clerical position each;
6. Any classification which, at the discretion of the Civil Service Commission, is of such a nature as to require unique and special flexibility for administration;
7. The executive Secretary of the Board of Harbor Commissions and Harbor Department sales, traffic and promotion personnel, the Chief Wharfinger and all personnel intermittently employed in handling cargo and freight: and
8. All personnel serving in non-career positions as defined by the Civil Service Rules and Regulations.

The classified service is comprised of all positions not specifically included in the City Charter as being in the unclassified service. Currently, the City service is $60 \%$ classified and $40 \%$ unclassified.

This report, like the EEO Plan does not include data on contractors, consultants, unpaid interns or volunteers.

## DIVERSITY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS



Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, requires all state and local governments that have 15 or more employees to keep records that prove compliance with the act, and to make reports to the EEOC required by federal regulations. An employer may acquire the ethnic information necessary to comply with the federal reporting requirements by visual surveys of the work force, or from postemployment records. Because visual surveys are permitted, the absence of ethnic identifications on agency records does not excuse the employer from reporting the requested information.

In addition to biennial EEO-4 survey reporting, the Human Resources Department of the City of Long Beach also develops an EEO Plan, the last of which covers the period from 2013 through 2017.

For the purposes of the EEO plan, only permanent full-time employees are counted. The EEO plan report does not include data on part-time employees, temporary employees, contractors, unpaid interns or volunteers.

## GENDER CATEGORY

In accordance with Federal reporting requirements, the City permits employees to a male or female gender designation. Effective 2019, the State of California revised gender to include 'nonbinary' as third gender marker. The City anticipates incorporating this new category after launch of LB COAST (an Enterprise Resource Planning system scheduled to replace our current payroll/Human Resources Management System).

## OCCUPATIONAL JOB CATEGORIES

The City's workforce is divided into the following eight occupational job categories, as defined by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission:

- 01- Officials/Administrators: Occupations in which employees set broad policies, exercise overall responsibility for execution of these policies, or direct individual departments or special phases of the agency's operations, or provide specialized consultation on a regional, district or area basis.
- 02 - Professionals: Occupations which require specialized and theoretical knowledge which is usually acquired through college training or through work experience and other training which provides comparable knowledge.
- 03-Technicians: Occupations which require a combination of basic scientific or technical knowledge and manual skill which can be obtained through specialized post-secondary school education or through equivalent on-thejob training.
- 04 - Protective Services: Occupations in which workers are entrusted with public safety, security and protection from destructive forces.
- 05 - Paraprofessionals: Occupations in which workers perform some of the duties of a professional or technician in a supportive role, which usually require less formal training and/or experience normally required for professional or technical status.
- 06 - Office/Clerical: Occupations in which workers are responsible for internal and external communication, recording and retrieval of data and/or information and other paperwork required in an office.
- 07 - Skilled Craft: Occupations in which workers perform jobs which require special manual skill and a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of the process involved in the work which is acquired through on-the-job training and experience or through apprenticeship or other formal training programs.
- 08 - Service/Maintenance: Occupations in which workers perform duties which result in or contribute to the comfort, convenience, hygiene or safety of the general public or which contribute to the upkeep and care of buildings, facilities or grounds of public property.


## RACE/ETHNICITY CATEGORY

Race/ethnic designations as defined by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission do not denote scientific definitions of anthropological origins. For the purposes of this report, an employee is included in the group to which he or she self-identifies with. No employee is counted in more than one race group. The ethnic categories used by the City are similar to those defined by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC):

- White (Not of Hispanic Origin): All persons having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.
- Black (Not of Hispanic Origin): All persons having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.
- Asian (Not of Hispanic Origin): All persons having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands. This area includes for example, China, India, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa.
- Native American or Alaska Native (Not of Hispanic Origin): All persons having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintain cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.
- Latinx (Hispanic): All persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race.

Note: For purposes of this report, Latinx is used as a gender-neutral or nonbinary alternative to Latino or Latina.
The EEOC recently revised racial categories to include Two or More Races. The City anticipates incorporating this new category after the launch of LB Coast (an Enterprise Resource Planning system scheduled to replace our current Human Resources Management System).


The following set of charts represent an overview of the entire City's workforce demographics:

1. Part-Time \& Full Time Workforce Population

- by Department

2. Occupational Job Categories - by Department
3. Citywide Gender, Age, and Race/Ethnic Diversity
4. Long Beach vs.
Comparable Agencies

## 1. PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME WORKFORCE POPULATION - BY DEPARTMENT



## 2. OCCUPATIONAL JOB CATEGORIES - BY DEPARTMENT




## 3. GENDER, AGE, AND RACIAL/ETHNIC DIVERSITY - CITYWIDE

Since release of the 2017 Gender, Age, and Racial/Ethnic Diversity Report, staffing levels have increased by $8 \%$. This is partly due to the passing of Measure $A$ which funded new positions in Police and Fire Departments, strategic succession planning, and streamlined efforts from Human Resources and Civil Service Departments to decrease timelines for filling a vacancy.

Female representation in the workforce is at $38 \%$. This is largely due to the City having several male-dominated job categories such as protective services, technicians, skilled craft and service maintenance. In 2018, these categories accounted for nearly $59 \%$ of permanent full-time hiring.

The pay gap between women and men for permanent full-time employment is 85 cents to the dollar; a 4-cent increase since the 2017 report.

NOTE: For comparison purposes, annual salaries are based on an individuals' hourly base rate times 2087.1429 hours (total number of work hours in a year at full-time status). As such. board members, commissioners, and part-time employees' annual salary may appear inflated compared to their total earned salary in a year. since they are paid a flat meeting rate, or work less hours in a year. Salaries do not include overtime, skill pays, or any other compensation/benefits.



The City's workforce in terms of age remains balanced between the different age brackets. As of December 31, 2018, the youngest employee was 16 years old, while the oldest was 93 years old.

Since 2017, representation in the 20-29 age bracket has increased from $17 \%$ to $22 \%$ of total workforce population.

Currently, nearly $38 \%$ of the City's workforce are considered millennials (those born between 1981 and 1996).

This aligns with the projected decline in $60^{+}$ age bracket ( $9 \%$ to $7 \%$ ) and 50-59 age bracket ( $22 \%$ to $20 \%$ ) as eligible employees retire.

As of December 31, 2018, 16\% of the City's workforce continues to be at or near retirement eligibility. This creates unique opportunities for the City to increase diversity.

As expected, younger employees continue to make less than older employees, who tend to have higher education and/or experience levels.

In 2018, the City increased ethnic minority representation from $59 \%$ to $62 \%$.

From January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018, $64 \%$ of permanent full-time hires were ethnic minorities. In line with the labor market trends, the greatest growth was seen in the Latinx employee population, which experienced a $4 \%$ increase.

While other ethnic minority groups held steady or increased, Blacks seen relatively slow growth with a nearly $2 \%$ decline in overall employee representation. This may be attributed to the overall decline of black populations in large urban communities, such as those found throughout Los Angeles County.*

Since 2017, ethnic minority representation in the highest income bracket (\$180,000+) increased from 28\% to 46\%.

This is largely due to several City Manager appointments of ethnic minorities to top City positions such as Deputy City Manager, Fire Chief, Director of Development Services, Assistant Fire Chief, and City Health Officer.
"Source: USC Program for Environmental \& Regional Equity, Changing Demographics of South LA
httes://dornsife.usc edu/assets/sites/242/docs/SLA_ COCO_Demo graphics web.pdf

Race / Ethnicity


Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket


## 4. GENDER AND RACIAL/ETHNIC DIVERSITY - COMPARABLE AGENCIES

Highlights
A set of comparable cities have been selected to identify how Long Beach compares in terms of workforce demographics.

The following charts demonstrate that the City of Long Beach compares favorably in terms of gender demographics to Oakland, Sacramento, \& Los Angeles and fall between those agencies in terms of White to Non-white employee populations.


Race / Ethnicity Breakdown



The following set of charts provide Gender, Age, and Racial/Ethnic Demographics by Department.
Note: Officials/Administrators category includes Elected Officials and Commissioners
> 5. Gender by Salary Bracket for Officials/Administrators and Non-Management
6. Age by Salary Bracket for Officials/Administrators and Non-Management
7. Race/Ethnicity by Salary for Officials/Administrators and Non-Management

## 5. GENDER BREAKDOWN - BY DEPARTMENT

## A) AIRPORT

## Officials/Administrators

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Gender by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators

| $100 \%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $90 \%$ |  |  |
| $80 \%$ |  |  |
| $70 \%$ |  |  |
| $60 \%$ |  |  |
| $50 \%$ |  |  |
| $40 \%$ |  |  |
| $30 \%$ |  |  |
| $20 \%$ |  |  |
| $10 \%$ |  |  |
| $0 \%$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Male |  |  |
| Female |  |  |

B) CITY ATTORNEY

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Gender by Salary Bracket

C) CITY AUDITOR

## Gender Breakdown

## Officials/Administrators



## Non-Management

Male, 1,8\%


Gender by Salary Bracket

| Officials/Administrators |  |  |  | Non-Management |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100\% | - | - | $\square$ | 100\% |  |  |  |
| 90\% |  |  |  | 90\% |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  | 60\% |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  | 40\% |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  | 20\% |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  | 10\% |  |  |  |
|  | \$90,000-\$119,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ | 0\% | \$0-\$59,999 | \$60,000-\$89,999 | \$90,000-\$119,999 |
| - Male |  |  | 1 | - Male | 1 |  |  |
| - Female | 2 | 1 | 1 | - Female | 5 | 4 | 3 |

D) CITY CLERK

## Gender Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management

Gender by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators



Non-Management

| Officials/Administrators |  |  |  | Non-Management |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100\% | $\square$ | - |  | 100\% |  |  |
| 90\% |  |  |  | 90\% |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  | 80\% |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  | 60\% |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  | 50\% |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  | 40\% |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  | 30\% |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  | 30\% |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  | 20\% |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  | 10\% |  |  |
|  | \$90,000-\$119,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | 0\% | \$0-559,999 | \$60,000-589,999 |
| - Male |  |  |  | - Male | 1 | 3 |
| - Female | 1 | 2 | 1 | - Female | 4 | 4 |

E) CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

## Gender Breakdown

## Officials/Administrators



Non-Management

Gender by Salary Bracket
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F) CITY PROSECUTOR

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Gender by Salary Bracket

|  | Officials/Administrators |  | Non-Management |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100\% |  |  | 100\% | = | - | - |  |  |
| 90\% |  |  | 90\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  | 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  | 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  | 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  | 10\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | \$120,000-\$149,999 | \$180,000+ | 0\% | \$0-\$59,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 60,000- \\ & \$ 89,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ |
| - Male |  | 2 | 1 Male |  | 6 | 2 |  | 1 |
| - Female | 1 |  | - Female | 3 | 17 | 4 | 3 |  |

G) CIVIL SERVICE

H) DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Gender Breakdown
Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Gender by Salary Bracket
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Gender Breakdown - By Department
I) DISASTER PREPAREDNESS \& EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS


## J) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

## Gender Breakdown

Officials/Administrators
Non-Management
Female, 1,

Gender by Salary Bracket

K) ENERGY RESOURCES

## Gender Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Gender by Salary Bracket

| Officials/Administrators |  |  |  |  | Non-Management |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90\% |  |  |  |  | 90\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  | 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  | 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  | 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  | 10\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ | 0\% | \$0-559,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S60,000- } \\ & \$ 89,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 120,000- \\ 5149,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ |
| - Male | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | - Male | 66 | 54 | 10 | 5 | 3 |
| - Female | 4 |  | 1 |  | - Female | 39 | 10 | 4 | 1 |  |

L) FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Gender by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators
$100 \%$
$90 \%$
$80 \%$
$70 \%$
$60 \%$
$50 \%$
$40 \%$
$30 \%$
$20 \%$
$10 \%$
$0 \%$

Male 1

- Female 1




1

Non-Management

M) FIRE

Gender Breakdown

Officials/Administrators

## Female, 1,



Non-Management
Female, 74, 11\%

Gender by Salary Bracket


## N) HARBOR

## Gender Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Gender by Salary Bracket
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O) HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

## Gender Breakdown

## Officials/Administrators

Non-Management



Gender by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators

P) HUMAN RESOURCES

## Gender Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Gender by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators



Non-Management

Q) LEGISLATIVE

## Gender Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Gender by Salary Bracket

| Officials/Administrators |  |  |  |  | Non-Management |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% | - |  |  |  |
| 90\% |  |  |  |  | 90\% |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  | 60\% |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  | 40\% |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  | 20\% |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  | 10\% |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | \$0-\$59,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 60,000- \\ & \$ 89,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000 \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | 0\% | \$0-\$59,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 60,000- \\ & \$ 89,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ |
| - Male | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | - Male | 11 | 2 | 1 |  |
| - Female | 4 | 2 | 4 |  | - Female | 16 | 1 |  | 1 |

## R) LIBRARY SERVICES

Gender Breakdown

| Officials/Administrators |  |  |  | Non-Management |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5, | Gen | acket |  | 1, <br> Female, 127,76\% |  |
| Officials/Administrators |  |  |  | Non-Management |  |  |  |
| 100\% |  |  | - | 100\% |  |  |  |
| 90\% |  |  |  | 90\% |  | = |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  | $60 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  | $15$ |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  | 30\% | $x=$ |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  | $=$ |  | 31 |
| 10\% |  |  |  | 20\% |  | - |  |
| 0\% |  |  | - | 10\% |  |  |  |
|  | \$90,000-\$119,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ | 0\% | 50-559,999 | \$60,000-\$89,999 | \$90,000-\$119,999 |
| - Male |  |  |  | - Male | 39 | 2 |  |
| - Female | 1 | 3 | 1 | - Female | 85 | 28 | 14 |

S) PARKS, RECREATION \& MARINE

## Gender Breakdown

## Officials/Administrators



## Non-Management



Gender by Salary Bracket

| Officials/Administrators |  |  |  |  |  | Non-Management |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100\% |  |  | - | $\square$ |  | 100\% | - |  |  |
| 90\% |  |  |  |  |  | 90\% |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  | 60\% |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  | 40\% |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  | 20\% |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | 50-\$59,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ | 10\% | \$0-559,999 | \$60,000-\$89,999 | \$90,000-\$119,999 |
| - Male | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - Male | 487 | 26 | 72 |
| - Female | 4 | 7 | 3 |  |  | - Female | 549 | 20 | 22 |

## T) POLICE

## Gender Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management

Gender by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators

| 100\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90\% |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |
| $0 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ |
| - Male | 1 | 3 |
| - Female | 3 | 3 |



11
Female
3
3
$5180,(\mathrm{KM})+$
4
Non-Management



U) PUBLIC WORKS

## Gender Breakdown

| Gender Breakdown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Officials/Administrators |  |  |  |  | Non-Management |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mate <br> 17 <br> 81\% | Female 4 19\% | Gende | acket |  | Male 295 <br> $76 \%$ | Femal 91 $24 \%$ |  |
| Officials/Administrators |  |  |  |  | Non-Management |  |  |  |  |
| 100\% |  |  | - |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  |
| 90\% |  |  |  |  | 90\% |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  | 60\% |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  | 40\% |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  | 20\% |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  | 10\% |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \$150,000- } \\ & \text { S179,999 } \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ | 0\% | S0-\$59,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 60,000- \\ & \$ 89,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ |
| - Male | 4 | 7 | 5 | 1 | - Male | 198 | 63 | 26 | 8 |
| - Female | 4 |  |  |  | - Female | 68 | 14 | 9 |  |

## V) TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

## Gender Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management

Gender by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators


- Female


$100 \%$
$90 \%$
$80 \%$
$70 \%$
$60 \%$
$50 \%$
$40 \%$
$30 \%$
$20 \%$
$10 \%$
$0 \%$


Non-Management

## W) WATER

Non-Management

Gender by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators


## Gender Breakdown

Officials/Administrators



Non-Management
6. AGE BREAKDOWN - BY DEPARTMENT

40

## A) AIRPORT

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators

## Non-Management



Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


## B) CITY ATTORNEY

## Age Breakdown



Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators

| $100 \%$$90 \%$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ |
| - $60+$ |  |  | 4 |
| - 50-59 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| -40-49 |  | 1 |  |
| - 30-39 |  |  |  |
| - 20-29 |  |  |  |
| - 16-19 |  |  |  |

Non-Management


## C) CITY AUDITOR

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management

D) CITY CLERK

Age Breakdown
Officiais/Administrators


Non-Management


Age by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators


Age Breakdown - By Department
E) CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management

| $100 \%$$90 \%$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  | - |
| 60\% |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |
|  | \$0-\$59,999 | \$60,000-\$89,999 | \$90,000-\$119,999 |
| [1] 60+ |  | 1 |  |
| - 50-59 | 1 | 2 |  |
| - 40-49 |  | 3 | 1 |
| -170-39 | 4 | 9 | 1 |
| - 20-29 | 10 | 2 |  |
| -16-19 |  |  |  |

F) CITY PROSECUTOR

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


## Non-Management

Age by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators


Non-Management

G) CIVIL SERVICE

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Age by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators


| $-60+$ | 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $50-59$ | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |
| $40-49$ | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| $30-39$ |  | 1 |  |  |
| $20-29$ |  |  |  |  |
| $16-19$ |  |  |  |  |


| $\square 60+$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\square 50-59$ | 1 | 1 |  |
| $40-49$ |  | 2 | 1 |
| $30-39$ | 1 | 1 |  |
| $20-29$ | 2 | 2 |  |
| $16-19$ |  |  |  |
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## H) DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management

I) DISASTER PREPAREDNESS \& EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS


## J) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Age by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators

| $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ 90 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 90\% $80 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |
| 0\% | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ |
| - $60+$ | 1 |  |  |
| -50-59 |  |  |  |
| -40-49 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| -30-39 |  |  |  |
| - 20-29 |  |  |  |
| -16-19 |  |  |  |

K) ENERGY RESOURCES

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators

Non-Management


Age by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators

|  | 100\% |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 90\% |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ |
| \# $60+$ | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |
| - 50-59 | 3 | 1 | 2 |  |
| 40-49 | 4 | 1 |  | 1 |
| -1730-39 | 1 |  |  |  |
| - 20-29 |  |  |  |  |
| -16-19 |  |  |  |  |

Non-Management

L) FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management
$60+\quad$ 20-29
 23
$11 \%$

Age by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators


M) FIRE

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


## Non-Management



Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators

| 100\% |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90\% |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ |
| - $60+$ |  |  |  |
| -50-59 |  |  | 6 |
| 40-49 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -30-39 | 1 |  |  |
| = 20-29 |  |  |  |
| -16-19 |  |  |  |

Non-Management


## N) HARBOR

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


## Non-Management



Age by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators
Non-Management

| 100\% - - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ 90 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | - | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ 90 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  | $\square$ | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  |  | 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  | - | 50\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  | 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  | - | 30\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  | 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  |  | 10\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 0- \\ \$ 59,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000 \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 0- \\ \$ 59,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 60,000- \\ & \$ 89,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ |
| -60+ | 3 |  | 5 | 2 | 4 | - $60+$ | 8 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 1 |
| -50-59 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 3 | -50-59 | 21 | 36 | 27 | 18 | 2 |
| 40-49 | 1 |  | 16 | 10 | 4 | -40-49 | 38 | 34 | 34 | 26 | 1 |
| $\square 30-39$ |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | -30-39 | 31 | 58 | 32 | 12 | 1 |
| - 20-29 |  |  |  |  |  | -20-29 | 36 | 8 | 1 |  |  |
| -16-19 |  |  |  |  |  | -16-19 | 1 |  |  |  |  |

O) HEALTH \& HUMAN SERVICES

Age Breakdown
Officials/Administrators


## Non-Management

$60+$
22
7

Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management

| $100 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$0-\$59,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 60,000- \\ & \$ 89,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ |
| - 60+ | 9 | 12 | 1 |  |
| -50-59 | 30 | 37 | 6 | 1 |
| 40-49 | 37 | 35 | 5 |  |
| -30-39 | 57 | 37 | 1 |  |
| - 20-29 | 39 | 14 |  |  |
| -16-19 |  |  |  |  |

P) HUMAN RESOURCES

## Age Breakdown



## Q) LEGISLATIVE

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management

| 100\% | $\square$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | 2 |  |  |  |
|  | \$0-\$59,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 60,000- \\ & \$ 89,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ |
| = $60+$ |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| - 50-59 | 3 |  | 1 |  |
| 40-49 | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| 130-39 | 4 | 1 |  |  |
| - 20-29 | 18 |  |  |  |
| -16-19 | 1 |  |  |  |

R) LIBRARY SERVICES

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


## Non-Management



Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


## S) PARKS, RECREATION \& MARINE

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 0- \\ \$ 59,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ |
| [ ${ }^{\text {6 }}$ 60+ | 3 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| -50-59 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| 40-49 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 |  |
| - 30-39 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |
| - ${ }^{\text {20-29 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| -16-19 |  |  |  |  |  |

Non-Management


## T) POLICE

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


## Non-Management

60+

$50-59$
197
$17 \%$


Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


## U) PUBLIC WORKS

## Age Breakdown

## Officials/Administrators



## Non-Management



Age by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90\% |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 90,000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000- \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ |
| $=60+$ | 1 |  |  |  |
| - 50-59 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| - 40-49 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| $=30-39$ | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |
| - 20-29 |  |  |  |  |
| \| 16-19 |  |  |  |  |



## V) TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


## Non-Management

- 20-29


50-59
45
$39 \%$

Age by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


## Age Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Age by Salary Bracket
Officials/Administrators

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 0 \\ 559,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 60,000- \\ & \$ 89,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 9 C, 000- \\ & \$ 119,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 120,000- \\ & \$ 149: 999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150,000 \\ & \$ 179,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$180,000+ |
| - $60+$ | 4 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| -50-59 | 1 |  |  | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| 40-49 |  |  | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| -30-39 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| - $20-29$ |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| - 16-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Non-Management

7. RACE/ETHNICITY BREAKDOWN - BY DEPARTMENT

## A) AIRPORT

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown
Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket


## B) CITY ATTORNEY

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown
Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket


- Native American

Non-Management


## C) CITY AUDITOR

## Race/Ethnicity Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket

D) CITY CLERK

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown

E) CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown

F) CITY PROSECUTOR

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown

G) CIVIL SERVICE

H) DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown


## I) DISASTER PREPAREDNESS \& EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS



Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket

| Officials/Administrators |  |  | Non-Management |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100\% |  |  | 100\% |  |  |  |
| 90\% |  |  | 90\% |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |
| 70\% | - |  | 70\% |  |  |  |
| 60\% | . |  | 60\% |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  | 40\% |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  | 20\% |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  | 10\% |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  | \$0-\$59,999 | $\$ 60,000-$ | $\$ 90,000-$ |
|  | \$90,000-\$119,999 | \$180,000+ |  | \$0-\$5, | \$89,999 | \$119,999 |
| - White | 1 |  | - White | 10 | 31 | 4 |
| - Asian |  |  | - Asian | 1 | 5 |  |
| - Black | 1 | 1 | - Black | 2 | 3 |  |
| - Latinx |  |  | Latinx | 4 | 19 |  |
| - Native American |  |  | - Native American |  |  |  |

## J) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown
Officials/Administrators
Non-Management


Asian, 16, 22\%

Black, 13,18\%

Latinx, 22, 31\%
Native American, 1,

1\%
Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management

K) ENERGY RESOURCES

## Race/Ethnicity Breakdown


L) FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown


## M) FIRE

## Race/Ethnicity Breakdown

## Officials/Administrators



Non-Management


Asian, 63, 10\% Black, 43,6\% Latinx, 152

23\%
Native American, 5,
$1 \%$

Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket


## N) HARBOR

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown
Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Black, 45, 10\%

Latinx, 148,
$33 \%$

Native American, 1, 0\%

Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket

O) HEALTH \& HUMAN SERVICES

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown
Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket

P) HUMAN RESOURCES

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown


## Q) LEGISLATIVE

## Race/Ethnicity Breakdown

Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket

R) LIBRARY SERVICES

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown


## S) PARKS, RECREATION \& MARINE

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown

T) POLICE

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown
Officials/Administrators


Non-Management


Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket


## U) PUBLIC WORKS

## Race/Ethnicity Breakdown



## V) TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Race/Ethnicity Breakdown
Officials/Administrators


Asian, 1,9\%

Black, 1, 9\%

Latinx, 1, 9\%

Non-Management


Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket


## Race/Ethnicity Breakdown

## Officials/Administrators



Non-Management


Race/Ethnicity by Salary Bracket



This section of the report discusses Civil Service recruiting efforts and presents the demographic composition of job applicants at each stage of the hiring process by:

1. All Job Categories
2. Fire Recruit
3. Police Recruit
4. Specific Job Categories

## 8. CIVIL SERVICE RECRUITMENT DATA

Under the authority of the Civil Service Commission, the Civil Service Department provides an employment selection system designed to attract high-quality, diverse individuals who are reflective of our community. The Department is responsible for managing the recruitment and testing process for all applicants for classified positions. This section of the report presents the demographic composition of applicants for classified positions at each stage of the hiring process: all applicants; individuals who successfully complete testing and are placed on eligible lists; and individuals who are hired by the City.

In 2018, the Civil Service Department received a total of 20,191 applications for employment. After establishing eligible lists, City departments hired 656 applicants, resulting in a $3.25 \%$ probability of being hired when applying for a classified position.


## 3

## Step 1: Application

Individuals who submit an application for employment with the City of Long Beach.

## Step 2: Eligible List

Individuals who, after screening for minimum qualifications and successful completion of job specific tests, were placed on an eligible list.

## Step 3: Hiring Decision

Individuals who are selected for employment.


Follow Long Beach Civil Service @LBCityJobs


Long Beach Police Officers recruiting at the Women in Law Enforcement Symposium displays demographic data on classifications, separately.

Note: Data is derived from applicants who self-reported their race/ethnicity and gender. Some applicants either selected "Other" or race/ethnicity and gender. Some applicants either selected "Other" or sections reflect those who specified a race/ethnicity or gender as a percentage of total applicants. the Officials/Administrators category.

The Protective Services category includes data on Police Recruit and Fire Recruit. Additionally, to maintain consistency with prior reports, this report recruitments for these two

Recruitment efforts for 2018 include attending job fairs, advertising in publications that reach specific demographics and interests, and posting job information on the City's website and social media platforms.

Additionally, recruitment efforts for Fire Recruit and Police Recruit focused on attending job fairs in partnership with Police and Fire staff. This includes events that were designed for women, veterans, and potential applicants from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups.

In the accompanying set of charts, data is displayed by job categories defined by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Professionals, Technicians, Protective Services, Paraprofessionals, Office/Clerical, Skilled Craft, and Service/Maintenance. The Civil Service Department does not recruit for positions classified under


City of Long Beach recruitment table at Women in Tech Conference

## A) ALL JOB CATEGORIES

## Highlights - Compared to 2017 Report

- Representation of Female applicants increased by $2 \%$, while representation of Females hired decreased by $2 \%$
- Ethnic minorities comprised $70 \%$ of applicants in 2018, an increase of $4 \%$
- Representation of Latinx applicants hired increased by $10 \%$, while hiring of Black applicants decreased by $4 \%$.

Gender Breakdown


Race / Ethnicity Breakdown


## B) FIRE RECRUIT

## Highlights - Compared to 2017 Report

- Gender distribution of applicants was $92 \%$ Male
- The number of Female applicants increased from 126 to 185
- Representation of ethnic minority applicants increased by $3 \%$
- Ethnic minorities comprised $38 \%$ of hires, decreasing from 60\%

Gender Breakdown


Race / Ethnicity Breakdown


## C) POLICE RECRUIT

## Highlights - Compared to 2017 Report

- Representation for Female applicants increased by $6 \%$ while Female hires increased by $2 \%$
- Ethnic minority representation in applicant pool increased by $3 \%$
- Latinx representation in the hiring phase rose by $13 \%$, helping to reach a $50 \%$ representation in hiring of Latinx police recruits

Cender Breakdown


Race / Ethnicity Breakdown


## D) PROFESSIONALS

## Highlights

- Females represented $41 \%$ of all applicants and $54 \%$ of those hired
- Ethnic minorities represented $68 \%$ of applicants and $72 \%$ of hires
- Latinx had the largest representation of hires (35\%)
- Asians comprised $28 \%$ of applicants and $30 \%$ of hires

Gender Breakdown


Race / Ethnicity Breakdown

| Hired | 28\% |  | 30\% |  |  | 7\% | 35\% |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eligible Lists | 24\% |  | 32\% |  |  | 9\% | 23\% |  | 1\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Applicants | 22\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% | 6\% | 4\% |
| 0\% | 10\% | 20\% | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | 90\% |  | 100\% |
|  | Applicants |  |  | Eligible Lists |  |  | Hired |  |  |  |  |
| - White | 1079 |  |  | 435 |  |  | 31 |  |  |  |  |
| - Asian | 1369 |  |  | 584 |  |  | 34 |  |  |  |  |
| - Black | 653 |  |  | 166 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| - Latinx | 1331 |  |  | 422 |  |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |
| - Native American | 24 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| - Other | 298 |  |  | 95 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| -mid Not Specify | 211 |  |  | 89 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 4965 |  |  | 1800 |  |  | 112 |  |  |  |  |

## Civil Service Recruitment Data

## E) TECHNICIANS

Highlights

- Gender distribution of applicants was majority male (63\%)
- Females represented $21 \%$ of hires
- Latinx had the largest representation of applicants (36\%) and hires (42\%)

Gender Breakdown


Race / Ethnicity Breakdown


## F) PROTECTIVE SERVICES

## Highlights

- Gender distribution of applicants was majority male (81\%) and stayed proportionately constant throughout the various stages of the process
- Females represented $17 \%$ of applicants and $15 \%$ of those hired
- Latinx had the largest representation of applicants (42\%) and hires (43\%)

| Cender Breakdown |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hired | 15\% |  | 85\% |  |  |
| Eligible Lists | 17\% |  | 82\% |  | 2\% |
| Applicants | 17\% |  | 81\% |  | 2\% |
|  | 20\% | 40\% | 60\% | 80\% | 100\% |
|  | Applirants |  | Fligitle lists | Hired |  |
| - remale | 1340 |  | 627 | 41 |  |
| - Male | 6472 |  | 3116 | 239 |  |
| - Did Not Soecity | 171 |  | 57 | 0 |  |
| Total | 7983 |  | 3800 | 280 |  |

Race / Ethnicity Breakdown


## Civil Service Recruitment Data

## G) PARAPROFESSIONALS

## Highlights

- Females represented $46 \%$ of all applicants and $72 \%$ of hires
- Latinx had the largest representation of applicants (34\%) and hires (40\%)
- Asians had the second largest representation of hires (28\%)

| Gender Breakdown |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hired | 72\% |  | 28\% | 3\% |
| Fligible lists | 33\% | 64 |  |  |
| Applicants | 46\% |  |  | 2\% |
| 0\% | 20\% | 40\% 60\% | 80\% | $100 \%$ |
|  | Applicants | Eligible Lists | Hired |  |
| - Female | 222 | 79 | 18 |  |
| = Male | 251 | 153 | 7 |  |
| - Did Not Specity | 11 | 6 | 0 |  |
| Total | 484 | 238 | 25 |  |



## H) OFFICE/CLERICAL

## Highlights

- Gender distribution of applicants is majority Female (62\%) and stayed proportionately constant throughout the various stages of the process
- Ethnic minorities represented $77 \%$ of those hired
- Latinx had the largest representation of applicants (39\%) and hires (57\%)

| Cender Breakdown |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hired | 64\% |  |  | 36\% | 3\% |
| Fligihle lists | 60\% |  |  | 37\% |  |
| Applicants |  |  |  | 35\% | 3\% |
| n\% | 20\% | 40\% | 60\% | 80\% | 100\% |
|  | Applirants |  | Fligible \| ists | Hires |  |
| - Female | 2147 |  | 293 | 30 |  |
| - Male | 1199 |  | 183 | 17 |  |
| - Did Not Sperity | 97 |  | 13 | 0 |  |
| Total | 3443 |  | 489 | 47 |  |

Race / Ethnicity Breakdown


## I) SKILLED CRAFT

## Highlights

- Gender distribution of applicants was majority Male ( $90 \%$ )
- Latinx accounted for over half (51\%) of hires
- Ethnic minorities represented $71 \%$ of applicants and 64\% of hires


Race / Ethnicity Breakdown

| Hired | 36\% |  |  | 3\% 9\% |  | 51\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eligible Lists | 36\% |  |  | 10\% | 7\% | 37\% |  |  | 10\% |  |  |
| Applicants | 21\% |  | 11\% | 15\% |  |  | 44\% |  |  | 7\% | 2\% |
| 0\% | 10\% | 20\% | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | 90\% |  | 100\% |
|  | Applicants |  |  | Eligible Lists |  |  | Hired |  |  |  |  |
| - White | 195 |  |  | 81 |  |  | 27 |  |  |  |  |
| \# Asian | 105 |  |  | 22 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| - Black | 137 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| - Latinx | 402 |  |  | 83 |  |  | 38 |  |  |  |  |
| - Native American | 7 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Other | 57 |  |  | 23 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| - Did Not Specify | 15 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 918 |  |  | 225 |  |  | 74 |  |  |  |  |

## J) SERVICE/MAINTENANCE

## Highlights

- Gender distribution of applicants was majority Male (88\%)
- $95 \%$ of those hired were Male
- Blacks comprised $30 \%$ of all applicants and $30 \%$ of applicants on eligible lists
- Latinx had the largest representation of applicants ( $43 \%$ ) and hires ( $51 \%$ )

Gender Breakdown


Race / Ethnicity Breakdown

| Hired | 31\% |  | 2\% 16\% |  |  | 51\% |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eligible Lists | 15\% | 6\% | 30\% |  |  | 41\% |  |  | 3\% |  |
| Applicants | 12\% | 8\% |  | 30\% |  |  | 43\% |  |  | 2\% |
| 0\% | 10\% | 20\% | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | 90\% | 100\% |
|  |  | Applicants |  |  | Eligible Lists |  |  |  |  |  |
| - White |  | 175 |  |  | 56 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Asian |  | 114 |  |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Black |  | 418 |  |  | 112 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Latinx |  | 604 |  |  | 156 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Native American |  | 14 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Other |  | 55 |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\square$ Did Not Specify |  | 26 |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 1406 |  |  | 377 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Visit us at www.longbeach.gov

This information is available in alternative format by request to HumanResources@longbeach.gov

