

# 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 Action<sup>1</sup> Minutes  
Wednesday, December 13, 2006, 9:00 a.m.**

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

## MINUTES

Present: President Robert Bergman, Vice President Arthur Chapman, Commissioner Jay Salter and Commissioner Bill Tappan

Staff present: Acting Commission Secretary Antonia Marshall and Acting Clerk Heather Gunderlock

Counsel: Commission Attorney Deputy County Counsel Ann Duggan

Absent: Commissioner Jeannie Nix

**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. Being no public comment, President Bergman closed the Public Comment period.

**3. Minutes: (Action)**

**Wednesday, November 15, 2006 (Regular Meeting)**

Motion to approve the meeting minutes was made by Commissioner Salter. Second by Commissioner Tappan. President Bergman asked for a roll call vote. Motion passed 4-0-1.

# Civil Service Commission

## Roll Call – Wednesday, November 15, 2006 (Regular Meeting):

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

### 4. Future Agendas:

- a. Calendar review (*Information*): Acting Clerk Heather Gunderlock provided Commission members with calendars for January, February and March 2007.
- b. Grievance and appeal status overview (*Information*): Ms. Marshall stated that Personnel currently has 12 grievances and that staff is making the older ones a priority. She requested that the Commission provide March dates for tentative hearing.
- c. Establish special meeting dates for March 2007 (*Action*): The Commission offered March 14 and 15, 2007 as special meeting dates if needed.

### 5. Revised Specification: (Action)

Division Manager – Road Maintenance - Public Works Department by Christina Wong, Personnel Analyst

Ms. Wong presented the revised specification. Mr. Glen Priddy, Public Works, was present to answer questions from the Commission.

Ms. Wong stated that recently, a reorganization of a Public Works division occurred and the revised specification reflects the responsibilities of the Division Manager, formerly Road Maintenance Superintendent. She indicated that supervising duties were added as well as "preparation of the Road Maintenance budget." In addition, Ms. Wong stated that the Minimum Qualifications were changed to allow three options for employees to meet such qualifications and all three require supervisory experience.

Regarding page 5(6), line 24, Mr. Chapman suggested changing "maintains" to "maintain."

Regarding page 5(7) lines 3 through 6, Mr. Chapman suggested that "years experience" be changed to "years of experience" or "year's experience."

Regarding page 5(7) line 7 "three years of experience as a construction manager," Mr. Chapman asked if the minimum qualification language should include "road construction experience." Mr. Priddy responded that it was assumed that the candidates that they would be considering would be only those that have the appropriate type of experience. Mr. Chapman recommended the specification should be changed from "experience as a construction manager" to "experience as a road construction manager." Mr. Priddy agreed that the change makes sense. Mr. Chapman asked if the minimum qualification needs to include "bridge experience." Mr. Priddy stated that although the current incumbent in the position possesses bridge construction experience, the road experience is a more essential component of the minimum qualification. Mr. Bergman asked if Mr. Priddy wanted to refer to the individual as a "manager," or if the term should be changed to "superintendent," since most non-County jobs refer to this individual as "superintendent."

# Civil Service Commission

Mr. Priddy responded that the term "resident engineer" has been included and that this language should address President Bergman's concern.

Ms. Wong will make the suggested changes and will bring the specification back for final review at the January 24, 2007 meeting.

President Bergman asked for a motion to approve the specification as amended. Mr. Tappan made a motion to approve as amended, second by Mr. Salter. Motion passed 4-0-1.

## **6. Report by Commission Representatives – Open Session: Planning for the Next Generation Committee (Action/Information)**

Vice President Chapman reported that the meeting scheduled for last week was cancelled and rescheduled for Wednesday, December 20, 2006.

## **7. Time Reserved for Commission President**

No report.

## **8. Time Reserved for Commission Counsel**

No report.

## **9. Time Reserved for Commission Secretary**

a. 2006 Findings & Decisions – Employee awareness of the impact of Open versus Closed Session Decisions (*Information*) Ms. Marshall responded to a question asked by Mr. Chapman at the October 25, 2006 regular meeting. She assured Mr. Chapman and the Commission that, in the pre-hearing stage, the Personnel Analysts do advise appellants that if they choose to have their hearing in Open Session, the Findings and Decision would be disclosable and would become public record.

Mr. Chapman thanked Ms. Marshall for her response and expressed that he had been concerned that unrepresented employees might not be aware of the ramifications of an Open Session hearing. Mr. Bergman asked Ms. Duggan if the final decision regarding whether or not a hearing is Open or Closed lies with the Commission. She stated that it does; the only exception is when complaints or charges are going to be heard. In that case, the employee has the right to demand that it be heard in Open Session.

b. Annual Report (July 2005 – June 2006) (*Update*): Ms. Marshall informed the Commission that the filing of the Annual Report has been placed on the Board of Supervisor's agenda for their January 9, 2007 meeting.

c. Item d. Personnel Workload/Staffing Update (*Information*): Ms. Marshall informed the Commission that Mr. Greek has been working on the update with Ms. Nix. Ms. Marshall was directed by Mr. Greek to ask Ms. Nix if she had any information to share but Ms. Nix was absent from the meeting.

d. Item e: Reallocation of duties – Classification Manual and Process Review (*Information*): Ms. Marshall addressed Mr. Chapman's question regarding if, when a classification is deleted, and the duties remain, it is a good classification practice to reallocate such duties and to include them in the class specification that is receiving those duties. She stated that she found that the classification manual did not contain specific instruction regarding the issue, however she stated that in her experience, the destination of reallocated duties are discussed as positions are changed.

# Civil Service Commission

Mr. Chapman stated that he had asked the question in regard to the Risk Manager classification. He stated that the Risk Manager duties did not "go away;" they remained, but the position was deleted. He stated that he wanted to ensure there was a process in place to ensure that duties are reallocated to the relevant positions. Ms. Marshall agreed and that Personnel can add such language to the classification manual.

e. Item f. SLOCEA's Records Request (*Action*): Kimberly Daniels, SLOCEA, offered Public Comment regarding this item. Ms. Daniels stated that she appreciated the Commission's consideration of the item. She stated that it is SLOCEA's goal to compile a law library of Commission Findings and Decisions. She stated that SLOCEA tries very hard to bring cases before the Commission that have merit and that it would assist them to have past decisions for their review. She stated SLOCEA could cover the cost of copying if necessary. Ms. Marshall stated that Personnel staff recommends that the Commission approve providing employee bargaining unions Findings and Decision documents upon request where the union is representing the employee. With regard to the ten-year request, she stated it will have to be done as time permits since Personnel is currently missing its full complement of administrative support staff. Mr. Bergman asked if Personnel staff could provide a time frame. Ms. Marshall responded that she wasn't able to currently, but would check into the matter further. Mr. Chapman asked if SLOCEA needs signed copies or if electronic copies would be sufficient; Ms. Daniels answered that electronic would be suitable. Ms. Duggan stated that County Counsel will attempt to assist SLOCEA. In addition, she stated that such documents are subject to the Public Records Act request. Ms. Duggan stated that Counsel maintains a Findings and Decision file which is organized chronologically and by subject matter, though the file contains about five years of Findings and Decisions, which have been accumulated since she became Commission Counsel. Ms. Duggan stated she would be happy to work with SLOCEA regarding their request. Mr. Salter stated that the California State Personnel Board maintains a website which contains all administrative appeals and decisions since the Board has been in existence and expressed surprise that the Personnel and County Counsel Departments aren't able to provide these records in a "more expeditious manner." Ms. Duggan responded by stating that the California State Personnel Board decisions are published; the State contracts with a publisher to publish the decisions while the County does not have this service. Ms. Duggan stated that she can work with SLOCEA, that Counsel and Personnel may not be able to provide the full ten years of data, but that the departments will do their best.

f. Item g: Additional: Ms. Marshall informed the Commission that the final filing date for the Human Resources Director recruitment was December 8, 2006. The Personnel Department received 21 applications. She reported that Personnel Analyst, Mark McKibben, is currently working with County Administrative Officer, David Edge, to review the applications.

g. Item c. Introduction of:

Maricela Havard, Human Resources Analyst Aide, Personnel Department

Acting Clerk, Heather Gunderlock, introduced Ms. Havard to the Commission. Ms. Havard stated she has been working in the Personnel Department for approximately two months, and that she assists analysts with the recruitment and testing processes by scheduling exams, distributing notices, certification of eligibility lists as well as working on special projects. She stated that she has resided in the County for 20 years, that she graduated from Morro Bay High School and has one son, Christopher, who is eight years old. Most recently, she stated that she has worked with UPS and Cellular One. She expressed that she is "very pleased" to be working for the County and that she has always wanted to work in Human Resources. The Commission welcomed her and thanked her for attending.

# Civil Service Commission

## 10. **Draft Conclusion by Commissioner Salter: Response to "Report & Response Regarding Reorganization Proposal" and Possible Consideration of the Consideration of the Proposed Human Resources Reorganization**

Mr. Salter stated that he wished to make a statement before distributing copies of his final draft. He thanked everyone for their "indulgence," that he realized this matter has taken up a good deal of time and he expressed that he thought it was important to conclude the matter as soon as possible, hopefully prior to January 1, 2007. He stated that at the Commission's last meeting, the Commission requested that he meet with Commissioner Tappan and Mr. Greek to "review the letter for content and tone to ensure that the draft reflect all Commissioner's viewpoints and that the document be brought back to the Commission's December 13 meeting." Mr. Salter stated that he attended a meeting with Mr. Tappan and Mr. Greek and scheduled a meeting with David Edge, "in an effort to launch a hopefully productive dialogue" regarding the matter. Mr. Salter characterized the meeting with Mr. Tappan and Mr. Greek as "quite productive," that they identified a number of areas in the draft that would benefit from revision, and since the meeting, he stated that he has "worked hard to incorporate all of Mr. Tappan and Mr. Greek's suggested changes." Mr. Salter added that he subsequently met with Mr. Edge, that he enjoyed their "lengthy exchange of views," and felt that "it was a productive step in improved relations between his office and this Commission." He stated that the meeting prompted him to propose the addition of one paragraph to his draft letter. Mr. Salter distributed copies of the paragraph to Commissioners and interested parties. He proceeded to read the proposed paragraph aloud. Mr. Salter requested that the document be amended to include the additional paragraph and requested that the Commission vote to approve the document as soon as possible. President Bergman stated that he was in receipt of requests for public comment on this subject.

Mr. Tony Krause, SLOCEA, addressed the Commission on the matter. Mr. Krause encouraged the Commission to "continue to be diligent in these classification and promotion matters." He stated that the Civil Service Rules and related ordinances are "the Commission's jurisdiction and nobody else's." He read a quote aloud from Mr. Chapman, that "the draft included just the facts." He opined that the question as to whether the Personnel Director should be a classified or unclassified position is another important issue. He referenced Ms. Marshall's status report regarding the Human Resources/Personnel Director recruitment and noted the fact that Personnel received 21 applications for a position that "pays pretty well and requires only a year of experience." He stated that he thought this indicates "there is something flawed about the process." He concluded by once again, encouraging the Commission to be "diligent."

Ms. Daniels, SLOCEA, addressed the Commission regarding Item 10. She thanked the Commission for their "unwavering commitment to the merit system principles" and their "commitment as guardians of the Civil Service System." She concluded by wishing the Commissioners Happy Holidays.

President Bergman asked for Commissioners' response to Mr. Salter's revised draft. Mr. Chapman suggested the format of the draft be changed from a memo format to a letter to Mr. Greek. President Bergman agreed. In regard to page 11(12), Mr. Chapman suggested "filtered out" be deleted and replaced with "identified." Mr. Salter agreed to the change. Regarding pages 11(13) and (14), Mr. Chapman stated that he had difficulty with Mr. Salter's disagreement with staff being physically situated in one location with a manager being located in a different location. Mr. Chapman opined that this fact is "irrelevant," and suggested removing language related to this issue. Mr. Salter responded that he thought it was important to mention that much of the problem was a result of "perception" and further stated that it was this perception that caused the Commission to be "additionally concerned and suspicious."

# Civil Service Commission

President Bergman asked Mr. Tappan for his opinion. Mr. Tappan stated that he would keep the language because he agreed with Mr. Salter's point regarding perception. Regarding page 11(15), Mr. Chapman suggested changing "public sector experience" to "public sector HR experience." The Commission agreed to the change. On the same page, he suggested correcting "downstairs one floor" to "downstairs two floors." Regarding page 11(17), Mr. Chapman suggested changing "...a person required to essentially "serve two masters' may ~~de~~ have difficulty doing so with independent discretion so with independent discretion..." In addition, he suggested deleting "was a willing accomplice," on page 17, paragraph 3, and replacing it with "participated." The Commission agreed to these suggested changes. President Bergman stated that the changes would be made and Mr. Salter's additional paragraph would be added to the end of the document.

A motion to approve this matter was held in abeyance and the Commission continued with other scheduled agenda items until the changes could be made.

## 11. **Item 9 c. Introduction of Shannon Matuszewicz, Deputy County Counsel**

Ms. Matuszewicz introduced herself to the Commission. She stated that she has been with County Counsel for approximately six months. She stated that she has lived in the County for nine years. She thanked the Commission for the opportunity to meet them. Mr. Chapman asked her about her areas of expertise; she responded that she deals with employment, general business and litigation issues. Ms. Matuszewicz indicated that she is currently assisting Patricia Gomez on Personnel matters.

The Commission took a brief recess from 9:55 a.m. to 10:27 a.m.

## 12. **Item 11 – Closed Session – (Closed Session per Gov. Code, section 54957.6 – Conference with County Labor Negotiator): 2005-2006 Civil Service Rule (Action)**

President Bergman reminded the Commission that this item was deferred to the January 24, 2007 regular meeting.

## 13. **Item 12: Open/Closed Session (Closed Session per Gov. Code, Section 54957): Selection and direction to staff for hiring legal counsel to provide legal services on a contractual basis to the Civil Service Commission (Action)**

The Commission adjourned into Closed Session to discuss Item 12. Upon reconvening, President Bergman stated that there was no reportable action.

## 14. **Item 10 – Continued: Draft Conclusion by Commissioner Salter: Response to "Report and Response Regarding Reorganization Proposal" and Possible Consideration of the Proposed Human Resources Reorganization**

A draft on the document was redistributed to Commissioners, which included the proposed modifications discussed earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Salter stated that during the recess he spoke with Mr. Edge who indicated an interest in addressing the Commission regarding this item. Mr. Salter invited Mr. Edge to address the Commission. Mr. Edge offered the following statement:

# Civil Service Commission

*"Thank you. And thanks to Mr. Salter...we did have some crossed signals and I think we left our meeting on the same track...separated and now we've had this chance to come back together and I appreciate that. I'll make a couple of general comments and then make some suggestions that I think we may all be able to agree on. I'd like to start by thanking*

*Mr. Salter for meeting with me. I'd agree with him; I think it was a productive exchange. We certainly didn't agree on everything, nor would we expect to, but I think we also identified areas that we do all agree on. And I also appreciate him making the effort to...he said he had to work hard and get the paper out ahead of time which gives us an opportunity for a more considered review than a spur of the moment response and so I appreciate that and also I would like to acknowledge the expressions that he included in the paper in relation to any harm that may have resulted for Ms. Hossli from the issue and you'll agree that she was simply an unintended, involved party...and that's a step in the right direction. For my part, with the benefits of 20/20 hindsight, I regret choosing to air my concerns through the Commission's public comment period earlier this year. There were alternative approaches to address my issues and I should have taken one of those approaches. Now to Jay's material...my first response...I think he and I perhaps think in similar fashions which is not always a good thing. And my first response was to deal with his commentary on a page-by-page basis and perhaps no surprise to him, I would've been disagreeing with assumptions, challenging inferences, refuting conclusions and overall, offering a different interpretation, or if you like, a different perception of events and one that I obviously would view as more accurate than that presented by Jay, but upon reflection, I think that would achieve little...it would be of little value in moving us forward because as your Commission commented amongst yourselves earlier...it is primarily about perceptions and obviously one's perception is what it is; there's no right or wrong in that. The controversy now, has been going on for the best part of nine months and has taken up a great deal of time...staff time, of your time, time which I spent...which I think could have been spent more fruitfully. We've got a lot of challenges facing the organization currently, in which this Commission is a useful resource and an important player...planning for the next generation being most important, so rather than deal with the details of Jay's paper and get into that dialogue, I've got an alternative suggestion: that the Commission considers initiating a dialogue with us about respective roles and responsibilities. It's something that hasn't happened in the eight plus years that I've been here and to my knowledge, it hadn't happened for some period of time prior to that...Commissioner Bergman has been around longer than I have so he may be able to speak to that, prior to my arrival, but no one on my staff remembers that happening. There are two...from the current controversy...there are a lot of items that we can dialogue about but there's two that I would suggest are "hot-button" issues for us right now: the first being the concept of general supervision versus direct supervision and this goes specifically to Section 2.40.070 of the County ordinance of which you are familiar...at least you will be as soon as I read the relevant sentence. This is the one that begins "The Personnel Director under the general supervision of the Commission shall..." and it goes on with the details...and how that general supervision concept fits and overlaps and potentially conflicts with the Board's authority or their delegates' authority, in this case, me, to directly supervise an employee...in this case, the Personnel Director, hired by and reporting to and responsible for performing adequately in the job...to either the Board or the County Administrator. I've just been sent correspondence to the Chair reiterating the Board has confirmed that it is, while I respect your perspective, it's not interested in making any change in the status of the Personnel Director, in terms of classified versus unclassified...the Board continues unanimously to view the Department Head level as most appropriately unclassified service. The second area that I think we have...is what I termed a "hot-button" issue...we have differences on that have created problems and without offering a particular interpretation one way or the other...is*

# Civil Service Commission

*the...is Rule 5.02 of the Civil Service Rules, your rules. This one is the one titled "Class Specifications" and, in particular, the portion of that rule that reads...two elements to this..."The Class Specifications are not to be considered restrictive nor construed as limiting the duties and responsibilities of any position." And it goes on in the next sentence: "They neither limit nor modify the authority of any County official or the Board of Supervisors to assign duties, direct and control the work of employees in the classified service." I think clearly we have some differences in how we are interpreting that particular rule. So, and I...those are the two issues that I thought had clearly surfaced in the current controversy and there's a variety of, I think, other issues of interest. So, I guess my question is: would the Commission be interested in that sort of dialogue? What would be a good setting for it? We could have less than quorum meetings...it's been suggested or...and or...we could have a joint meeting of the Civil Service Commission and the Board of Supervisors and staff to discuss the issues and see if we can at least frame the issues if we don't agree...at least frame the issues and how we see them from our respective positions. So, that's my comment...the ball's in your court."*

Mr. Salter stated, from his point of view, that he welcomed Mr. Edge's suggestion that the parties begin a process of dialogue that will address these issues. He expressed agreement that these two areas will continue to "strike sparks" unless the Commission and the Administrative Office can address issues "in a more collegial fashion." He stated that Mr. Edge's offer to facilitate this dialogue is "very welcome."

President Bergman stated that he thought that such a meeting would be "appropriate" and could be handled via an ad-hoc committee with the committee which would report its findings back to the Commission.

Mr. Chapman agreed and he suggested adding the Window Period for Classifications to the list of topics to discuss.

Mr. Edge responded by stating: *"Let me just...you know...without...hopefully without getting into a violent agreement...let me address that because the window period clearly is one of those issues and I think the President of the Commission and I "sparked" on that at an earlier meeting and that does go to an interpretation and I'll identify my interpretation and it won't come as a surprise to you...in my view, the issue is the Commission's authority to lay the general framework of the rules, the Commission and how the classified service is run and organized and the staff's authority to prioritize workload and make individual determinations....and so, when we "sparked," I think I understand your position of "we're getting a lot of complaints that the window period isn't working; we want it changed." And my position that we can change it, but how we organize a specific work item such as timing, is a staff detail issue in which we say: "Here's what we need to get done. How do we prioritize what needs to get done in terms of the resources that we have available?" And, as we said at the time, and I think Mr. Greek reiterated it, the...rightly or wrongly the window period was initiated to address complaints that that process was not being done in the existing format in a timely fashion, but it disappeared...requests were made and they disappeared into this "abyss" of Personnel. The window period made a date certain period in which people could address those gradual accretion of duty changes and we did have...and I can share it now...one of the issues was a position in the Auditor's office...and how long it took for that position to get through...and learning the details of that, I would actually have disagreed with Mr. Greek's decision on that...in putting it into this annual window period. To me, that would have been identified as a position in which there was a sudden...for lack of a better term...a sudden change in duties...a change in duties that happened because something else, in this case, the SAP system, was put in place. And the*

# Civil Service Commission

*concept of the window period has always been that for something like that, that gets taken on as an immediate as possible need...there's been a change, change the duties...is the classification still appropriate?, Personnel take a look at it versus the window period that was about peoples' perception that the job had gradually been changing and that, at some point, it may have changed sufficiently that it's no longer accurately classified and what that point may be, is always open to debate. So, yeah, the window period...that general versus direct supervision is clearly...that sort of discussion is one that I think can usefully take place.*

President Bergman stated that the Window Period is an issue that can be added to the list for further discussion.

Mr. Chapman asked Mr. Bergman if he planned to include Personnel staff in the committee. President Bergman stated that he would.

Mr. Edge further stated: *"We would look for staff support to an ad-hoc committee because obviously, the staff players are important. And when we're done with this part, I'll make a couple of comments on the Personnel Director recruitment, which I think will be of interest to you, but..."*

President Bergman stated that the Commission will look into the formation of an ad hoc committee sometime after the first of the year. Mr. Tappan stated that he preferred an ad-hoc committee to a joint meeting with the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Edge agreed and stated: *"I think that's a good...I think it's good if we can work out issues...ideally, we work out issues amongst ourselves and then either...and then at that point, when we've reached either an agreement or an agreement on what we disagree upon, a joint meeting in a public setting may be a useful way of...of perhaps settling the overall issue. Mr. Tappan agreed that the overall framing of the issue is important. Mr. Edge continued by stating: "On the Personnel Director...Antonio...Antonia...sorry, I didn't mean to change your sex... Antonia told you we got 21 applications...I'm actually...contrary to the public comment this morning, I'm extremely pleased with the response we got. This is actually...Mr. Bergman, you've been around...this is the third recruitment...open recruitment that we've done for Personnel Director in the time that I've been here and this is by far, the strongest candidate pool that was an open...an open recruitment, as you know....it's by far, and I mean that, by far, the strongest candidate pool that I've seen. It was actually tough trying to winnow out any of the players to...the plan is to...is to make a first paper cut and then have a committee then interview the strongest candidates and recommend a small number...I'm thinking three or four at most but it's going to be up to the committee...to the Board of Supervisors for final...for final choice, as I mentioned. But, this group...without...without revealing Personnel details...is a group that includes...more than half of them are in senior human resources positions in California public sector, both County and City government. And again, without revealing...it includes Human Resources Directors from a couple of cities right now that look like strong candidates. It includes some large County personnel background folks...so as I said, it...particularly in light of our concern about planning for the next generation and who may be out there, this was actually a reassuring group to see. Now, as you know, what looks good on paper may or may not translate to strong candidates but certainly in terms of paper qualifications, this was a...this is...a very strong group and I'm...I think we will get a good candidate and I'd also mentioned to Mr. Cuddy from the Tribune at the break because he asked in terms of any reorganization of Human Resources...that's essentially on hold until we recruit for Richard's replacement and get that person on board...and I think it's important, under the*

# Civil Service Commission

*circumstances, to get that person's input into the organization. I remain convinced that expanding the Personnel Department into a wider Human Resources Department is a...is a more effective operation for the County, but clearly, the new player's preferences will be an important part of that. I just wanted to add that, for your information. Thank you."*

President Bergman asked for a motion to approve Mr. Salter's revised document. He informed Ms. Duggan that Ms. Nix was not present at the meeting due to illness and asked if she could sign the document at a later time. He stated that he wanted to avoid the voting record simply indicating "absent" by her name. Mr. Bergman stated that the document could be approved today with a majority approval. Mr. Tappan asked if the format was changed from memo to letter format. President Bergman responded that it was. Motion to approve the document as amended was made by Mr. Salter, second by Mr. Chapman.

## **Roll Call :**

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

(Commissioner Nix was absent from the meeting but signed the document on Friday, December 15, 2006.)

*Note: A complete record of the hearing packet is on file with the Human Resources Department.*

## **15. Item 13: Adjournment**

Being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:41 a.m.

*<sup>1</sup> 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\December 13, 2006 Regular Meeting.doc