

Civil Service Commission

1055 MONTEREY STREET, SUITE D250 ♦ SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA 93408 ♦ (805) 781-5959



MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION
Robert Bergman, President
Arthur Chapman, Vice President
Jeannie Nix
Jay Salter
Bill Tappan

The San Luis Obispo County **Civil Service Commission** **Regular Session Meeting Action¹ Minutes** **Wednesday, June 28, 2006, 9:00 a.m.**

County Government Center, 1055 Monterey Street, Suite D271, San Luis Obispo, CA

MINUTES

Present: Commissioner Jeannie Nix, Commissioner Jay Salter, Commissioner Bill Tappan and President Robert Bergman

Absent: Commissioner Arthur Chapman

Staff present: Commission Secretary Richard Greek and Clerk Susan Carvalho

Counsel: Commission Attorney Deputy County Counsel Ann Duggan

1. **Call To Order:**

President Bergman called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. and led the flag salute.

2. **Public Comment Period:**

President Bergman addressed the audience asking for anyone wishing to speak to the Commission during the Public Comment Period.

David Edge, Chief Administrative Officer, read the following statement for the record. (A copy of this statement was provided to Clerk Carvalho by David Edge.)

“Based upon inappropriate and prejudicial remarks by 2 members of this commission in relation to Principal Administrative Analyst Deb Hossli, I am obliged to suspend our current proposal for a Human Resources re-organization. The actions and comments of Commissioners Nix and Bergman have created a significant exposure to liability for the county and themselves as individuals if we move from here on the position of Deputy Director Human Resources.”

“Let me specify the actions and comments that have placed us in this position. In advance of the Commission’s May 23rd meeting, Ms. Nix e-mailed Mr. Greek wanting a copy of Ms. Hossli’s personnel history to “see what her qualifying experience is”. Mr. Greek rightly declined the request pointing out there was not recruitment underway and no applications because there are no adopted MQ’s or job description.”

Civil Service Commission

“Following that meeting, Mr. Bergman went to Auditor-Controller Gere Sibbach and demanded Ms. Hossli’s personnel details telling Mr. Sibbach “I have found out that she has been working out of class for 4 years” and that she is not qualified for the job she is performing.”

“At your June 8th meeting, Ms. Nix indicated she had looked at the job descriptions of Principal Admin Analyst and the obsolete Risk Manager position. She declared that she did not “see any way, shape or form that the Principal Admin Analyst job could fit into that of Risk Manager”. She went on to say “in the CAO’s office we had a Principal Admin Analyst working out of class”. Of course the PAA [Principal Administrative Analyst] does not fit into the Risk Manager description – it’s a much broader spec.”

“If the phrase “violation of due process rights” comes to mind here – it should.”

“2 members of this commission have declared Ms. Hossli not competent or qualified to perform the duties of either her current position or a position for which she is not an applicant. Mr. Bergman went so far as to indicate he would remove her from that position if she was appointed to it”.

“They have done this without a grievance on the matter, without a review of Ms. Hossli’s professional background or qualifications, without a job classification review of the position by a qualified person and without any discussion of the matter with Ms. Hossli, her supervisor, her department head, the Personnel Director or the relevant personnel analyst.”

“This is clearly a witch hunt of the worst kind. Why are they doing it? Well, Mr. Bergman’s biases against my office precede me and are well known. From him this kind of outrageous behavior is no surprise. Ms. Nix – I don’t know what led you down this path but the unwarranted harm you have already caused to a truly outstanding employee, and one of the Board’s next generation of county leaders, will not be easily forgotten nor easily dismissed.”

Richard Carsel, Attorney for Bruce West – Mr. Carsel asked the Commission for an estimated time frame for agenda item 11 – hearing of appeal A06-72. President Bergman responded the Commission would be prepared for that item in approximately two (2) hours or 11:15 a.m.

Being no further public comment, President Bergman closed the Public Comment Period.

3. Minutes: (Action)

A. Wednesday, May 24, 2006

B. Thursday, June 8, 2006

Richard Greek clarified that Jeannie Nix made a suggested change to the Thursday, June 8, 2006 meeting minutes and a revised copy, identified as draft #2, is provided to the Commission.

Motion made by Commissioner Tappan and second by Commissioner Salter to approve the minutes of the Thursday, May 24, 2006 as presented and Thursday, June 8, 2006 as amended. Motion passed. 4-0-1.

4. Future Agendas:

Richard Greek distributed the monthly confidential meeting calendars to the Commissioners for July, August, September and October 2006. Mr. Greek stated no additional special meeting dates are needed.

Civil Service Commission

Richard Greek provided the Commission with a brief overview of the 12 pending grievances and appeals; 4 grievances and 8 appeals. Six (6) of the appeals name the Personnel Department as the respondent. The majority of the pending issues have been in process between 1 – 6 months.

5. Time Reserved for Commission President:

A. Unclassified Service Position Report – Commissioner Jay Salter

No report.

6. Time Reserved for Commission Counsel:

No report.

7. Time Reserved for Commission Secretary:

A. Requested Item from 5/24/06 meeting, CSC changes to Approved New Specification Deputy Director – Human Resources AND

B. Requested Item from 5/24/06 meeting, CSC changes to Approved Revised Specification Principal Human Resources Analyst

At the request of the Commission, staff provided the final changes, indicated in red and shading, on exhibits 7A and 7B. These changes were made by the Commission at the May 24, 2006 CSC meeting.

Mr. Greek stated Commissioner Chapman sent an email and suggested four (4) minor editorial changes to the documents; two changes on exhibit 7A and two on exhibit 7B. Staff agrees with these editorial changes and will make them as suggested by Commissioner Chapman's email dated 6/25/06. Mr. Greek confirmed that Mr. Chapman sent his email to all commissioners, the clerk and deputy county counsel Ann Duggan also. The Commissioners agreed.

Motion made by Commissioner Salter and second by Commissioner Nix to approve the Deputy Director – Human Resources and Principal Human Resources Analyst specifications as presented with suggested editorial changes (made by Commissioner Chapman). Motion passed. 4-0-1.

C. Request for Proposal – Update

Richard Greek said the RFP for outside counsel for the Commission will close on Friday, July 7, 2006 at 5:00 p.m. One (1) proposal has been received by Central Services – General Services.

D. Additional

1. Richard Greek reported that Susan Carvalho has completed a project that included the posting of all **unclassified positions** on the Lotus Notes Bulletin Board and on the Internet's JobAps. The following statement has been added to each job title for reference:

Civil Service Commission

- This is an unclassified service position. See County Code 2.40.060 or contact the Human Resources Department for more information.

2. Richard Greek added that yesterday was the Personnel Department's one-year celebration of when the EC system was switched to the new JobAps program and quiz testing (for entry-level clerical positions) was added. Staff is now moving into the 2nd year of skills testing and, at the end of this year, will be looking at the return on investment and evaluating opportunities for further improvement.

8. Closed Session - (Closed Session per Gov. Code, section 54957.6 -- Conference with County Labor Negotiator): 2005 Civil Service Rule Changes (Action)

The Commission recessed for a five-minute break.

The Commission reconvened and adjourned into closed session for item 8. No action was taken.

The Commission reconvened in open session at 10:30 a.m. President Bergman announced item 9 will be postponed; absence of legal counsel.

9. Closed Session – (Closed Session per Gov. Code, section 54956.9 – Conference with Legal Counsel, Pending Litigation):

San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, State of California, Case No. CV 050945, County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Social Services (Petitioner) vs. County of San Luis Obispo, Civil Service Commission (Respondent), Cesar Bedroni (Real Party in Interest) (Action)

(No Action.)

10. Findings and Decision – Open/Closed Session (Closed Session for Deliberations per Gov. Code, section 54957): Grievance G05-56, dated December 12, 2005 (Action)

The Commission adjourned into closed session for deliberations.

The Commission reconvened in open session.

President Bergman read, “Based on the foregoing Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law, the grievance is denied in its entirety.” Motion by Commissioner Salter and second by Commissioner Tappan to adopt this decision. Motion passed.

Roll call:

Commissioner Nix	Yes
Commissioner Salter	Yes
Commissioner Tappan	Yes
Commissioner Chapman	Absent
President Bergman	Yes

11. Hearing - Open Session: Appeal A06-72, dated April 26, 2006 (Action)

President Bergman announced this item will begin after the lunch break.

Civil Service Commission

12. Consideration of Commission to amend action of May 2004 meeting abolishing the classification of Risk Manager: (Action)

For reference by the Commission, Commissioner Nix distributed a copy of the Risk Manager job specification (effective: 2/24/93) and the Principal Administrative Analyst job spec (revised: 10/27/99).

David Edge, Chief Administrative Officer requested to make public comment. Mr. Edge clarified that as the department head it doesn't matter whether the spec is deleted or undeleted as the spec (Risk Manager) will not be used. Mr. Edge added the spec has been vacant for two years and has not been used since the last incumbent left. Mr. Edge added that Deb Hossli, Principal Admin Analyst, continues to supervise the Risk Management staff and the County has a contract oversight position, a third party administrator, who does the technical work comp investigations; an insurance authority overseeing the insurance aspects and contract attorneys for the legal side of the business.

A motion made by Commissioner Nix and second by Commissioner Salter to amend its May 2004 decision to delete the Risk Manager job specification and re-instate the Risk Manager job specification. Motion passed. 4-0-1.

Roll call:

Commissioner Nix	Yes
Commissioner Salter	Yes
Commissioner Tappan	Yes
Commissioner Chapman	Absent
President Bergman	Yes

13. Consideration of letter to Personnel Director and Secretary of Commission regarding issues involving the reorganization of the Personnel Department: (Action)

Commissioner Nix asked to comment on the remarks made earlier by David Edge. Commissioner Nix read the following into the record. (A copy of this statement was provided to Clerk Carvalho by Commissioner Nix.)

“Before we consider item 13 on the agenda, I wish to briefly comment on remarks made by Mr. Edge regarding his allegations that Mr. Bergman and I engaged in improper conduct. His comments directly relate to this item.”

“The inquires made of Ms. Hossli’s qualifications and the matters relating to the Risk Management specification were made in our official capacity as Commissioners. We have been delegated the authority of administering and enforcing the Civil Service Rules. All inquiries were made due to matters before us at our public meetings. We have never made a claim that Ms. Hossli is not qualified to perform the job duties set forth in her classification. Mr. Edge’s claim to the contrary is patently false.”

“I am surprised that a public official, indeed the one official who should set the example for all County employees, would publicly make such slanted and disparaging remarks about Commissioners who perform civic duties and are only attempting to ensure that County Civil Service Rules, Ordinances and Merit principals are followed.”

Civil Service Commission

“I invite any formal inquiry into how I have conducted myself and believe that if the reorganization issues that have been brought before us were all done in accordance with the Civil Service policies, rules and ordinances the CAO would have no cause to suspend the reorganization. I am confident that any inquiry into the allegations, made by Mr. Edge, will reveal that Commissioners have, at all times, conducted themselves properly.”

Commissioner Nix stated she has copies of a letter for the Commissioners regarding (the re-organization) issue and asked that it be distributed. President Bergman stated that following the reading of the letter into the record by Ms. Nix, Ms. Nix is to provide the Clerk of the Commission with the original. At that time the Clerk will make (photo) copies of the letter for distribution to any individuals present requesting one.

Commissioner Nix asked that she be permitted to read the letter (content) into the record.

“The letter is addressed to Richard Greek, Personnel Department Manager and it says”...

“Dear Mr. Greek, The Civil Service Commission (Commission) takes its responsibility to oversee the County’s Civil Service System very seriously. The Commissioners donate many hours of time outside the actual meetings to study issues and materials in order to make informed decisions. You are designated by County Code and Civil Service Rule as Secretary for the Commission and are charged with administering the civil service system under the general direction of the Commission. Therefore, we are writing to express concerns about certain information that has come before the Commission at its last few regular and special meetings. We are also conveying our concerns to the members of the Board of Supervisors by a copy of this letter because the Board has authority over the proposed reorganization of the Personnel Department.”

“During the last several public meetings of the Commission, Civil Service Commissioners have been informed of matters that appear to be very serious irregularities in the proposed reorganization of the Personnel Department. Since we are charged with the duty of enforcing the civil service rules and ordinance that govern the County’s Civil Service System, we believe it is incumbent upon us to express our concern over the matters addressed below.”

“A few months ago, you informed the Commission that the Personnel Department was being reorganized. You stated that a Deputy Director position was being added to the Personnel Department; the Employee University would move from Personnel to Administration and that the Risk Management Division would move down from the Administrative Office to the Personnel Department.”

“Prior to being officially informed at the Commission meeting of the proposed reorganization, individual Commissioners had been told by Administrative staff that Deb Hossli, who was referred to as the Risk Manager for the County, would become the Personnel Department’s Deputy Director. The reorganization proposal -- as it was presented with a specific person already identified to fill a proposed newly created civil service position -- raised serious concerns for the Commission. We dispute the propriety of predetermining the individual who would be appointed to the position.”

“When the new job specification for the proposed Deputy Director of Human Resources came to the Commission at its regular meeting in May, the Commission prevailed, over your objections, to include significant Human Resources experience and education in the job specification. Indeed at the staff’s agenda preparation meeting for the pending Civil Service Commission meeting set to consider this proposed new classification, no human resource experience at all was originally listed in the job specification for the proposed Deputy Director of Human Resources. After this was brought to your attention, the proposed specification was modified to include some human resource experience.”

Civil Service Commission

“The Commission strongly believes that the Deputy Director Human Resources position needs to be filled by an individual with significant Human Resources experience. We believe this for two reasons: (1) in most organizations, whether public or private, those at the top level are expected to possess the greatest experience, skills, and knowledge in the particular field of expertise; (2) in the case of the Personnel Department, in 2000, the position of Personnel Director was recommended by the County Administrative Officer for removal from the classified service. Then the job specification for Personnel Director was significantly downgraded and omitted any requirement of public human resources or personnel experience. In addition, in recent matters that have come before the Commission, and by your representations to us, the Commission has learned that currently no Personnel Analyst in your department has any significant public personnel or human resources experience, except your Principal Personnel Analyst, Antonia Marshall. All of these factors necessitate that the job specifications for Deputy Director of Human Resources include minimum requirements for significant public human resource experience.”

“At the Commission’s May 2006 regular meeting, you presented your proposal for the department’s reorganization. Gail Wilcox and Deb Hossli were present at that meeting and both addressed the Commission on the item. During the discussions about the reorganization, the Commission discovered that Ms. Hossli is not classified as the Risk Manager. Instead she is classified as a Principal Administrative Analyst. She has been working as the Risk Manager since 2002. We also learned that the Risk Manager classification had been deleted among approximately 50 other classifications in May 2004 based on your recommendation and your representation that the positions were vacant and obsolete. When questioned by the Commission about this irregularity, Ms. Wilcox and Ms. Hossli simply explained to the Commission that Ms Hossli -- while classified as a Principal Administrative Analyst – holds the “working title” of Risk Manager. In addition, she is commonly known and referred to as Risk Manager by county officers and employees.”

“After a review of the “obsolete” Risk Manager job specification and the Principal Administrative Analyst job specification, the Commission discerns no relevant similarities between the two specifications. When questioned about the matter of an employee classified as a Principal Administrative Analyst working as a Risk Manager, both you and Ms. Wilcox said that the Principal Administrative Analyst could supervise “a division” of the Administrative Office. While we concede that the job specification for Principal Administrative Analyst could permit an incumbent in that classification “to supervise a division of the Administrative Office,” we do not agree that this provision could encompass directly performing on a permanent basis the very specialized duties of Risk Manager. The specific duties, minimum educational and experience requirements described in the job specification for Risk Manger are quite different from the job specification for Principal Administrative Analyst.”

“You also said that you wished to interpret job specifications in the broadest fashion to allow for the ease of movement of talented staff. Your interpretation disregards the merit principles of civil service. Rather than recognizing “talent,” the merit principles of civil service require that individuals possess the minimum qualifications for appointment to a position and that they perform duties according to their job specification. Moreover, the County Civil Service System has specific processes to ensure that all qualified employees receive opportunities to compete for open positions. On this point, the Commission has also learned that the Risk Manager position was never opened for recruitment. Ms. Hossli was placed in that position without a change in classification and has been working as Risk Manager for over four years.”

“We find it significant that the job specifications from comparable counties, which you brought to the Commission at the last CSC meeting, reflect that each of those counties have a position of “Risk Manager”. The Commission questioned the lack of a “Risk Manager” in your proposed reorganization.”

Civil Service Commission

“You responded to questions by Commissioners about the lack of a Risk Manager to oversee the risk management operations, which are ostensibly moving into your department, by explaining that the Principal Administrative Analyst (Ms. Hossli) would retain her current classification. However, as part of the reorganization, she would move from the Administration Office into the Personnel Department and would thus be eligible to “compete” in the “departmental promotion” for the Personnel Department Deputy Director position. We are unaware of any mechanism or process that would allow this “transfer” of a position with a classification uniquely titled for the Administrative Office into an entirely different department. The job duties and functions of the Principal Administrative Analyst are prescribed by the job specification to carry out the distinct functions and duties of the Administrative Office, and those tasks do not relate to the duties and functions of the Personnel Department.”

“At this early stage of your reorganization, it seems that the primary purpose to be accomplished by the reorganization is to move Ms. Hossli into your department in order to appoint her to the Deputy Director position, an appointment which could not be accomplished absent the reorganization. We presume this because: (1) although you represented to the Commission at our March meeting that the Risk Management Division would be coming “down” to the Personnel Department, at the May meeting we learned that only Ms. Hossli is contemplated to physically move down to your department; and (2) certain Commissioners were told by you and Ms. Hossli, several weeks prior to the reorganization proposal coming before the Commission, that Ms. Hossli was going to become the “Deputy Director” of Personnel. By setting up the reorganization to move Ms. Hossli into the Personnel Department, she would appear on paper as Personnel Department staff and be eligible for a “departmental promotion.” This process, in all its nuances, appears improper in light of the civil service rules, ordinances, and policies regarding appointment, appropriate classification of employees, competitive recruitment, and the rules governing the temporary performance of out-of-class work.”

“Your claim that it is common practice to coordinate reorganizations in this manner is inconsistent with the actual practice. Other departmental reorganizations have vacant position(s) to be recruited within the existing department from an employee pool already working in the department in their proper classifications.”

“The avoidance of a “spoils system” is the primary purpose of having a Civil Service System governing the appointment of public servants. By requiring open and competitive recruitment, tenure, and discharge for cause, the Civil Service System is intended to protect employees from adverse actions during political power changes and is also intended to prevent favoritism. The Commission is concerned that the entire scheme to move Ms. Hossli into the Personnel Department as the Deputy Director violates basic principles of the Civil Service System. To engineer such a move is clearly a violation of the standards that the Personnel Department requires other employees and departments to follow. Most importantly the plan undermines multiple principles of the civil service system.”

“Because your position as the Personnel Director is currently an “at will” position -- serving on the one hand, under the direct supervision of the County Administrative Officer, and on the other hand, under the general supervision of the Civil Service Commission for purposes of administering and enforcing the county’s civil service system -- the Commission believes that a conflict of interest exists. We believe this conflict is evident by the various and sometimes conflicting representations made to the Commission regarding the proposed “reorganization” of the Personnel Department, as well as direction you have taken from the CAO regarding the window classification study period, which is a matter that falls within the authority of the Commission by County Code section 2.40.080(1) and the CSC Rules. Therefore we are requesting that the Board of Supervisors, which has been copied on this letter, give serious consideration to placing the position of Personnel Director back in the classified service to ensure that you, and those that follow you in appointment to the position, can exercise independence and discretion in overseeing and enforcing the rules and laws which govern the civil service system.”

Civil Service Commission

“We note that the “removal” of a position from the classified service may be accomplished by the Board of Supervisors by way of an amendment to the voter approved County Civil Service Ordinance, but only if it is justified for reasons of economy and efficiency. In 2000, when the Personnel Director classification was removed from the classified service by Board amendment of the ordinance, the stated reason for removal was explained as follows:”

“The Personnel Director, in particular, is appropriate for contractual status because of this position’s role in interpreting and implementing the county’s civil service system. As a member of the system, the Personnel Director has a significant vested interest in interpreting rules in a manner which best protects his/her position.”

“Ironically, in connection with the proposed reorganization of your department, it appears that certain civil service rules and policies that govern out-of-class work, the appropriate classification and description of job specifications, and competitive recruitment, have been largely ignored. In regard to the above-quoted reasons for removing the Personnel Director from the classified service, we believe that anyone appointed to hold a public office, whether one which is classified or unclassified, ought to possess the requisite honesty and integrity to carry out his or her duties without self-interest”.

“Based on the concerns expressed above, we are directing you to take every course of action necessary to ensure that the integrity of the civil service ordinance and rules are not undermined, but instead are strictly followed in connection with “the recruitment” of an individual to fill the proposed position of “Deputy Director of Human Resources.” In addition, we believe it would be prudent to conduct an open recruitment to ensure that all qualified individuals, including county employees, are provided the opportunity to compete for the position in question.”

“Sincerely, Bob Bergman, Chairman, Civil Service Commission. Cc: Supervisor Katcho Achadjian, Supervisor Shirley Bianchi, Supervisor Jerry Lenthal, Supervisor Harry Ovitt, Supervisor Jim Patterson, County Administrative Officer, David Edge.”

President Bergman asked Commissioner Nix to give the original (copy) of the letter to the Clerk Susan Carvalho. President Bergman clarified for the Clerk that the letter will not be signed until after the Commission takes action. The Commission meeting paused for 10 minutes pending the return of Clerk Carvalho. Upon her return with the copies of the letter, each member of the public and the Commissioners were provided a copy of the letter at their request.

President Bergman invited public comment.

David Edge, County Administrative Officer. Mr. Edge objected to any action to be taken on this letter and stated the letter clearly violates the intent of the Brown Act as the 6-plus page letter has not been seen by anyone before today and added that the letter was not included in the packet. Mr. Edge stated the letter includes an enormous amount of information and allegations that requires significant response. Mr. Edge continued that the comments made by Commissioner Nix are on the official tape (cassette) recordings and suggested she listen to the recording of the June 8th meeting. Mr. Edge commented on the Risk Management and the PAA (Principal Administrative Analyst) referenced in the letter and quoted sections of the job specification to demonstrate the comparison of typical tasks. Mr. Edge advised the Commission that if the Commission adopts the letter that it will expose all Commission members to liability; acting without due process.

Civil Service Commission

Deputy County Counsel Ann Duggan. Ms. Duggan stated she was asked by Richard Greek about the Commission's duty to provide written information in advance of the meeting. Ms. Duggan commented that she was not able to find any provision in the Brown Act requiring (written) notice and asked Mr. Edge if he was aware of that provision so a time-out could be called by the Commission for further review. Ms. Duggan added that she consulted with her supervisors and they too were unable to locate any provision.

David Edge, County Administrative Officer. David Edge responded that he believes there is certain case law that discusses it. Mr. Edge added that to adequately respond to a 6-page letter, that raises multiple issues of technical content and significant legal issues, would require more time (to respond). Mr. Edge stated that he believes the letter makes certain conclusory assertions that are done without due process rights for the impacted person and this exposes the County and the Commission members to liability.

President Bergman re-stated for the record that the letter was read into the record and a copy of the letter was disseminated to all present at this meeting and asked for any additional comment from the public. Being no further comment, President Bergman closed the public comment portion of this item.

It was determined, following a recommendation from Ms. Duggan, that the Commission will adjourn for lunch and re-call this issue for possible action following the lunch break. It was agreed.

The Commission recessed for a lunch break and will reconvene at 1:40 p.m.

President Bergman called the meeting into open session at 1:52 p.m. The Commission has decided to defer this item to the CSC meeting scheduled for tomorrow, Thursday, June 29, 2006. This item will be called prior to the continuance of the hearing that is also scheduled for tomorrow.

Deputy County Counsel Ann Duggan recommended to the Commission, pursuant to government code section 54954.2 of the Brown Act, sub-division (b-2), that the Commission vote to add a closed session item, for Anticipated or Threatened Litigation, to the Thursday, June 29, 2006 meeting agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nix and second by Commissioner Tappan to add a Closed Session pursuant to government code section 54952.2 for Anticipated or Threatened Litigation to the CSC Special Meeting agenda dated Thursday, June 29, 2006. Motion passed. 4-0-1.

Roll call:

Commissioner Nix	Yes
Commissioner Salter	Yes
Commissioner Tappan	Yes
Commissioner Chapman	Absent
President Bergman	Yes

14. Hearing - Open Session: Appeal A06-72, dated April 26, 2006 (Action)

Let the record show Commissioner Nix is now absent.

Civil Service Commission

President Bergman called for agenda item #11

Christina Wong served as the respondent, representing the Personnel Department.

Richard Carlson served as Bruce West's representative in this appeal.

The appellant added two exhibits, upon the approval of the respondent and Commission:

A1 Photos, Vietnam, B. West Service Period

A2 Chart by Attorney R. Carsel (Handwritten) titled West Gets To Interview

A3 Chart by Attorney R. Carsel (Handwritten) titled West Does Not Get To Interview

Note: A complete record of the hearing packet is on file with the Personnel Department.

13. Adjournment

Being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

The Commission will reconvene in open session at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, June 29, 2006 to continue the hearing of appeal A06-72.

¹ Note: These minutes reflect official action of the Civil Service Commission in open session. A taped record exists and will remain as the official, complete record of all proceedings by the Civil Service Commission. Language in italics and quotes reflects specific words used by the speaker, recorded on the record and transcribed by the Clerk of the Commission or typed from a written statement for accuracy.

P:\CSC\MINUTES\2006\June 28, 2006 Regular Meeting.doc