

Civil Service Commission

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



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

The San Luis Obispo County Civil Service Commission Regular Session Meeting Action¹ Minutes Wednesday, January 24, 2007, 9:00 a.m.

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

MINUTES

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

Staff present: Commission Secretary Richard Greek and Acting Clerk Heather Gunderlock

Counsel: Deputy County Counsel Ann Duggan attended the morning session of the meeting; Commission Attorney Larry Frierson attended the afternoon (hearing) session of the meeting

1. Call To Order:

A. Call To Order: President Bergman called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

B. Flag Salute: President Bergman led the flag salute.

C. Roll Call: Staff took roll; all Commissioners were present.

D. Election of Officers: Ms. Nix made a motion to nominate Mr. Bergman as Commission President, second by Mr. Tappan. Motion passes 5-0-0. Mr. Chapman made a motion to nominate Ms. Nix as Vice President, second by Mr. Salter. Motion carries 5-0-0.

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, December 13, 2006 (Regular Meeting)

Motion to approve the meeting minutes was made by Commissioner Tappan. Second by Commissioner Salter. Ms. Nix was not present at the meeting so abstained. President Bergman asked for a roll call vote. Motion passed 4-0-1.

Civil Service Commission

Roll Call – Wednesday, December 13, 2006 (Regular Meeting):

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

4. Future Agendas:

Mr. Greek stated that he provided the current calendar to Commissioners at the last Commission meeting and stated that there are no changes. He reported on the status of the current grievances and appeals: there are 14 in progress: six are in Step III; three are scheduled for hearing; one is awaiting a response from a physician's office; two pre-hearings have been held; one pre-hearing is scheduled and one wherein the Commission took jurisdiction at the last meeting. Mr. Greek stated that all are actively being worked on. Ms. Nix asked about the status of the older grievances. Mr. Greek responded that "extraordinary efforts are being taken" to resolve these three or four older grievances. He stated that he is not requesting additional tentative hearing dates at this time.

5. **Report by Commission Representatives – Open Session:** Planning for the Next Generation Committee (Action/Information)
- a. Commissioner Chapman
 - b. Commissioner Nix

Mr. Chapman stated that there was no report.

6. **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)**

President Bergman asked if Ms. Duggan wanted to comment on this item. Ms. Duggan stated she has a draft of the contract. She explained that the contract will be approved by the Board of Supervisors so there is not a need for the contract to come before the Commission unless the Commissioners express an interest. Ms. Nix responded that she does not need to see it, but wanted to confirm that the contract reflects the basic issues that were contained in the Request for Proposal. Ms. Duggan confirmed that it does. She further stated that the contract would renew automatically on an annual basis, and that the Commission can discontinue the attorney's services without the Board of Supervisor's approval. Mr. Tappan asked Ms. Duggan if the Board has the authority to cancel the contract. Ms. Duggan responded that the Board can cancel the contract "for legitimate reasons."

Civil Service Commission

7. **Revised Specification:** *(Action)*

Water Systems Worker Trainee, I, II, III, IV– Public Works Department by Mark McKibben, Personnel Analyst

Mr. McKibben presented the revised specification to the Commission. He indicated that the specification was last updated in 1998 and that changes within the department have necessitated an update to the specification. He advised the Commission that the State has added certifications to the requirements of those who work within a water systems plant. Mr. McKibben stated that the revised specification reflects the fact that the water systems plant is open 24 hours, seven days a week with facilities located throughout the County. He stated that the revised specification requires flexibility with regard to how duties are defined to allow the department to meet their need of deploying individuals across the County for emergency situations or for day-to-day operations. He explained that the State rates County facilities on a scale of 1 to 5 depending on the characteristics of the population, the complexity of the facility and other factors. These facilities consist of water treatment, water distribution and wastewater treatment facilities. He stated that the County has to have employees obtain the appropriate level of certification to operate these. Mr. McKibben then reviewed the specification with the Commissioners. With regard to Page 7(3), he advised the Commission of a correction: CSA 18 should be listed as a Wastewater II rather than a Wastewater I facility. Mr. McKibben reviewed Page 7(4) and 7(5), the department's organizational charts. He stated that Page 7(6) is a comparison of the revised and the current specification. He stated that the "level of work" contained in the current specification refers to terminology that is inconsistent with the current classification manual and current specifications thus Mr. McKibben has made changes to reflect the current class manual and current specifications. He stated that the Experience requirements remain essentially the same with the exception of the Water Systems Worker I wherein the experience requirement has been increased from six months to one year of experience as a Water Systems Worker Trainee. He stated that this requirement is driven by the fact that it will take additional time for the Water Systems Worker I level to obtain the necessary required water treatment and water distribution certifications. He explained that the "Operator in Training" certification requires an application only, that no experience is required for Water Systems Worker I and that the wastewater operator certification requires 2080 hours of actual experience before an Operator-in-Training can obtain a wastewater operator certification. With regard to "additional certifications," Mr. Tappan asked Mr. McKibben why the Operator-in-Training certificate is not required by the Water Systems Worker I position. Mr. McKibben responded that the hours requirement is difficult for individuals employed at some County wastewater facilities to obtain and that the specification is written with the understanding that it may take additional time for such an individual to obtain this certification and that this could become a barrier to a recruitment for that position. He explained that this would make it possible for individuals not currently employed by the County to enter County employment with treatment and or distribution certification and would provide a reasonable timeline for that individual to obtain wastewater certification as an Operator-in-Training since he stated that the wastewater certificate is more difficult to obtain. Mr. Tappan asked when WSW II and III are expected to obtain their T2 and D2 certifications. Mr. McKibben responded that they must have these certifications at the time of appointment. Mr. Tappan asked why the specification's "certification levels are usually one level below the facility's rating." Mr. McKibben explained that to be designated a "Shift Operator" per the State's guidelines, the individual needs to possess a certification one level below the facility in which he or she is working. Mr. McKibben pointed out a correction on Page 7(7), the Operator Certification Table, he listed an additional employee, "Employee P," in error. Mr. McKibben explained that the specification is the entry level career series, but that the Personnel Department will review the management classification series once the entry-level specifications are approved by the Commission. Mr. McKibben stated that Trish Stamper, Personnel Analyst, Public Works will be working on the management series specifications. Mr. McKibben introduced Mr. Dean

Civil Service Commission

Benedix, Utilities Division Public Works, who was present to address questions from the Commission.

Ms. Kimberly Daniels, SLOCEA, addressed the Commission regarding Item 7. She stated that SLOCEA worked very closely with Personnel and the Public Works Departments to refine the Water Systems Worker specifications. She stated that the overall proposed language does not constitute a problem for SLOCEA, but she expressed concern about various differences in facilities and in regard to the management series specifications, i.e., Chief Plant Operator III and IV. She is concerned that the current language may not "go far enough" in addressing the differences in requirements between facilities for the upper level positions. She stated that she expressed this concern because this factor could affect the salaries set for the positions by the Administrative Office. Ms. Daniels requested that the Commission act promptly if they had any changes or adjustments to the specification so that when the specification is reviewed by the Administrative Office for salary survey purposes, the Administrative Office knows "what they're dealing with" especially in light of the fact that there are no comparable counties to survey in this case, according to Ms. Daniels. She further explained there are no entities she is aware of that have a comparable system, one in which operators are triple certified and work in any one of the three areas: treatment, distribution and wastewater. She stated that all of the water workers must be able to work in any one of the three disciplines. Ms. Daniels stated that, currently, it is sufficiently difficult to recruit for these positions and so is concerned about the possibility of more complex requirements being added to the specification and wants to ensure that the requirements of the different County water facilities are balanced. She stated that SLOCEA is in agreement that the Water Systems Worker IV should not be included in the career series brought before the Commission today she disagrees with Mr. McKibben's proposal that the Water Systems IV position be deleted upon the incumbent leaving County employment. Ms. Nix asked Ms. Daniels if she could provide Commissioners with specific examples to illustrate the fact that the specification "does not go far enough." Ms. Daniels deferred to the Water Systems Workers who were present at the meeting to provide technical examples of why the specification "does not go far enough."

Mr. Ron Coleman, Water Systems Superintendent, offered testimony regarding Item 7. He stated that he does not feel the specification "goes far enough." He stated that the specification does not currently address the upper level Water Systems Workers' concerns regarding licensures and certification requirements or compensation issues. He stated that his concern is the requirement that some employees in the same class operate higher-rated and more complex facilities without additional compensation. Mr. Coleman was granted permission by the Commission to distribute a handout, Exhibit 7(36). Mr. Coleman stated that the exhibit illustrated the County's water systems locations and explained there are requirements and regulations for the facilities in addition to requirements for the employees. Mr. Coleman stated his objection to the specification is that employees covered under the same class will be required to perform more complex duties without higher compensation. Ms. Nix again asked Mr. Coleman where in the specification he would suggest adding language to address his concerns. Mr. Coleman stated that the current specification does not address it but he did not have language to propose. Ms. Nix reminded Mr. Coleman that the Commission does not have the authority over compensation issues.

Mr. Dean Benedix, Utilities Division Manager Public Works, stated that the most recent specification does not require three certifications. He explained that the specification to which Mr. Coleman referred was one that was previously proposed to Personnel by the Public Works Department. He explained that the previously proposed specification did not require three certifications, that it proposed one Water Systems I specification with two certifications and one with three; a Water Systems Worker II specification with two certifications; one with three and a Water Systems Worker II specification with two certifications and one with three certifications. He said that the Public Works Department's goal was to cover employees who only had two certifications while maximizing

Civil Service Commission

flexibility and succession planning to incorporate employees with three certifications. Mr. Benedix explained that after discussions with Personnel staff, they determined that since it is Public Works' goal to have Water Systems employees with three certifications, they should not propose the initial specification that had been discussed and they continued to work with Personnel to formulate the revised specification. Mr. Benedix stated that the Chief Plant Operator, Plant Superintendent and Assistant Plant Superintendent are the designated Operator and Chief Plant Operator of all the County water facilities and need to possess the certifications necessary to be the responsible individual to operate that plant for liability and reporting purposes.

Mr. Chapman asked Mr. Benedix if it is management's goal to have all Water Systems Workers triple-certified so that management has the flexibility to transfer among facilities. Mr. Benedix responded that it is and cited a recent example. He stated that Public Works had a very difficult time recruiting for a Level IV, Chief Plant Operator at the Lopez facility and so management's goal became one of "growing" qualified and or certified individuals in-house to fill these positions. It is their intention to maintain a career succession plan for these positions. Mr. Chapman stated that the Commission is charged with approving specific language; they require specific language changes, not concept changes. Ms. Nix stated her agreement with Mr. Chapman. Mr. Bergman asked Mr. Coleman if it is his opinion that those Water Systems Workers who are triple-certified who are currently working in a plant that only requires one or two certifications constitutes a disparity. Mr. Coleman responded that he is concerned about the responsibility level of the individual who has three certifications but works at plant that only requires one or two and the individual who possesses three and is liable and responsible for that facility constitutes a discrepancy and "needs to be rectified." Mr. Chapman asked Mr. Coleman if he believes that the individual who is being paid for having three certifications, but working in a facility that only required one or two is "unfair." Mr. Coleman stated that it is. Mr. Coleman stated that he disagreed with Mr. Benedix's statement that it has been difficult to recruit for staff with Wastewater certification; the problem has been in recruiting for individuals with water treatment certification. He also stated it is not sufficient for individuals to have the certification only, that the individuals need to have the necessary experience as well. Ms. Nix asked Public Works management to respond to these issues.

Mr. Paavo Ogren, Deputy Director-Administration-Public Works offered testimony in support of the revised Water Systems Worker specification. He stated that the specifications need to allow management the flexibility to transfer individuals. He stated that each facility is unique and each require different experience and they don't have a rotation schedule but they need to be able to rotate individuals if needed on a case-by-case basis. In addition, he stated that these issues management addressed during organizational analysis studies, prior to the specification planning stage. Management didn't want to have one spec for North County facilities, one for South County, one for Coast and vice versa. Ms. Nix agreed this would be "muddy." Initially, he stated that Management proposed such a specification but upon further analysis, it was agreed to not make the specification location-specific. He stated that although the specification is not "perfect," it will work very well and will meet the State requirements for the various County water facilities. In regard to the salary issue, Mr. Ogren stated that management is interested in establishing salary incentives, i.e., providing an pay incentive for an individual who has one or two certifications to obtain his/her third certification.

Ms. Nix asked Mr. Ogren whether the Chief Plant Operator, Assistant Plant Operator and Superintendent staff are located on-site. Mr. Ogren responded that they are. Mr. Tappan asked Mr. Benedix whether staff is currently rotated among facilities. Mr. Benedix responded that currently they do not rotate staff between north and south county facilities but they want the flexibility to do so.

Civil Service Commission

Mr. Coleman responded that he agrees that having triple certified staff makes sense, however he believes the number of certifications should be dependent on the location and complexity of the plants where individuals are assigned and would like to see such language included in the revised specification. Mr. Chapman addressed Mr. Coleman's comment by stating that the class specification is designed to deal with all positions within a class, not specific geographical areas unless there are special geographical distinctions within a class which would require an additional specification and asks whether or not the jobs similar enough that they can be included in one job classification.

Mr. Michael Jianuzzi, Water Systems Worker IV, offered testimony in regard to the revised Water Systems Workers specifications. He stated that he has T3 and D2 certification but not a wastewater certification because in the 33 years he's worked for the County, he has never worked at a wastewater facility and that Cayucos does not have a wastewater facility. He stated that this is significant because in order to obtain a wastewater certification, one needs to obtain wastewater experience before one can take the test to obtain the certification. He stated that he perceives a problem is that the Water Systems Workers are employed under the County's job specifications but are "ruled by" State mandates. Mr. Chapman asked Mr. Jianuzzi if he was reasonably compensated for all the certifications that are required by the State if he would be "a happy camper." He stated that he understands that the salary inequity stands at approximately 15 to 25 percent. Mr. Tappan asked he has to update his T3 and D2 according to State requirements. Mr. Jianuzzi responded that they have to obtain continuing education credits or take required State tests in order to maintain their certifications. Mr. Ogren added Mr. Jianuzzi's history and career is a good example of the reason why the job specification should not be "tied to" a specific facility. Mr. Jianuzzi was working for the County in Los Osos when the Los Osos Community Services District was created and he opted to continue his employment with the County and to not work for the CSD and further stated that governmental organizational changes impact the various water facility operations thus the specification should not be connected to the facility location. Ms. Nix asked what would be required of Mr. Jianuzzi to work at a wastewater treatment facility, Lopez for instance. He responded that he would have to obtain his Operator-in-Training certificate or work at a wastewater facility for a required number of hours before he would be eligible to take the test to work at such a facility. Mr. Tappan asked Mr. Ogren why Public Works management is talking about transferring when according to Mr. Jianuzzi's testimony, he and other Water Systems Workers would not be able to work at other facilities because although they possess the required certifications, they lack the required experience to work at such facilities. Mr. Ogren stated that the Mr. Jianuzzi's position should be grandfathered and stated that Mr. Jianuzzi could potentially work at the County's treatment facilities but not at wastewater facilities.

Mr. Charles Berna, Assistant Water Systems Superintendent, offered testimony regarding Item 7. He stated that he wanted to express to the Commission that not all of the County Water Systems Workers are opposed to the revised specification. He stated that the North, Coastal and South regions "see things differently" and that "there is no way the job specs are going to make everybody happy." He encouraged the Commission to approve the revised specification as written.

Mr. Joe Phillips, Assistant Water Systems Superintendent, offered testimony regarding the Water Systems Worker revised specification. He stated cross-training has been mandatory at the South County facility. Mr. Benedix stated that the South County facility has different requirements than the North County facility and that he doesn't tell those facilities how to staff their plants.

Ms. Salter asked if Mr. Coleman wanted to respond to testimony before the issue is concluded. Mr. Coleman stated that there are many differences between facilities and facility requirements. Mr. Salter asked Mr. Coleman if he can produce some suggested language. Mr. Coleman stated he wanted to have all interested parties get together and discuss the specification further.

Civil Service Commission

Mr. Tappan asked Mr. McKibben if he can address Mr. Coleman's concerns. Mr. McKibben stated that he thinks the issues are beyond the classification or class specification. He stated that his intent was to broadly define the duties, to identify the minimum requirements for individuals to work at any of the County water facilities. He stated that his interpretation of the testimony provided at the meeting related to particular assignments within the job classification. He added that a specification cannot be created to address each individual location.

President Bergman agreed with Mr. McKibben and stated that historically, it has been the Commission's opinion that broader rather than narrow specifications are preferable.

Mr. Greek stated that Personnel spent a substantial amount of time looking at the organizational implications of operational changes so that the Utilities Division can work as efficiently as possible and that there has been ongoing dialogue with all of the parties. He assured the Commission that "everyone has had a voice in this process." He concluded that he doesn't see how going back and "trying to wrestle through the same issues again" would be helpful or that a different conclusion would be reached.

President Bergman asked Ms. Duggan if she wanted to comment. She asked if Mr. Coleman had reviewed the proposed job specification. Mr. Duggan and President Bergman asked if there are duties that are performed at the South County facility that are not described on the proposed specification. He responded that there are not.

The Commission took a brief recess from 9:35 to 9:45 a.m. for Mr. Coleman to review the proposed specification.

Brian McLean, Water Systems Worker III, offered testimony regarding Item 7. He stated that he is a Shift Operator at the Lopez Lake facility. He stated that he has worked at the facility for nine years, that the facility is a 24 hour-7 day a week operation and that all employees who are employed at the plant are required to be triple-certified. He stated that the lesser certified employees are paid the same amount as those who possess three certifications so he doesn't understand what incentive exists for those to obtain additional certifications.

Ms. Duggan asked Mr. Ogren if South County facility employees can work at that facility with only two certifications. He responded that they can but that this would complicate work assignments.

Ms. Nix asked Mr. Ogren if South County staff have to perform more complex duties than staff in other facilities. He answered that they do not, that duties are different but not necessarily more complex and that job assignments are different. She asked Mr. Ogren if having additional Level IV positions at the South County would help to equalize the levels of complexity between facilities. He responded that the Water Systems Worker IV issue relates more to the Coastal facility than the South County facility. He stated that it's his belief that having the Chief Plant Operator IV at the Lopez facility which required additional requirements causes an issue. He stated that management plans to review the Chief Plant Operator IV specification soon. She noted staff members seated in the audience, shaking their heads in response to Mr. Ogren's comment and concluded that management's perspective is "at variance" with that of the employees. He responded that the Chief Plant Operator is required at the Lopez facility because it is more complex. He asks if it would be reasonable for Public Works management to approach the Administrative Office to request an additional Level IV "for equity purposes." He stated that it is his opinion that this issue is more of a position allocation than a job specification issue. Ms. Nix stated that if the IV position is deleted, it would be a specification issue and it is the Commission's understanding that management's intent is to delete the IV position from the career series when the incumbent retires. Mr. McKibben addressed Ms. Nix's concern. He stated that the IV level is not appropriate for the Water Systems

Civil Service Commission

Worker entry level series since it falls under the Supervisory Bargaining Unit 05 whereas the Trainee, I, II and III fall under Bargaining Unit 02. He stated that the IV position will be considered when the management level specifications are reviewed. Ms. Nix asserted that the IV position is a valuable position and if those duties and that it would be more appropriate to shift those job duties into another position than to delete the specification completely. Mr. McKibben added that by removing the IV position from the career series that the liability has been removed from the entry level positions and placed with the higher-level supervisory classification. Ms. Nix asked if hypothetically, a Water Systems Worker III made an error on his or her shift, if his or her job would be in jeopardy. Mr. Ogren answered that the level of liability would be determined by the State, that the liability level coincides with the certification level.

Mr. Tappan asked if there is a I and II included in the Chief Plant Operator levels. Mr. Ogren answered that there is a III and IV.

Mr. Greek stated that the entry level Water Systems Worker specification will set the foundational base upon which the supervisory/management level specifications will be reviewed.

When Mr. Coleman finished reviewing the revised specification, President Bergman asked if there are any duties he performs that are not listed. Mr. Coleman maintained that South County employees perform more complex duties than employees at other locations. Mr. Coleman stated that the revised specification "covers the vague duties." Again, Mr. Bergman asked if he had any proposed language to add; Mr. Coleman responded that he did not.

Mr. Jianuzzi asked to address the Commission regarding the specification. He stated "that these job specs cover all the needs of the water systems workers and facilities they operate and he suggested Mr. Coleman meet individually with Mr. Ogren and Mr. Benedix to resolve his differences with the specification.

President Bergman asked the Commission what action they would like to take regarding the specification. Mr. Tappan stated that the Commission wants specifications to be "broad," and that he is in favor of approving the specification. Mr. Salter stated that the specification "appears to be sufficiently broad to cover the entire class" and he had provided Mr. Coleman with the opportunity to add proposed language but that Mr. Coleman did not thus it he asserted the specification "ought to be approved as written." Ms. Nix agreed with her fellow Commissioners. She asked Mr. Greek if when the upper level Water Systems Worker specifications are revised that this specification would return to the Commission and that the Commission would have input with regard to the Water Systems Worker IV position. Mr. Greek stated that he would recommend that the Commission approve the specification today, including the Water Systems Worker IV position until the Commission reviews the supervisory and management level Water Systems Worker specifications. Ms. Nix wanted to be clear that she didn't want to approve the specification before discussing the IV position in more detail. Ms. Nix encouraged staff and management to get together, to discuss their issues and implement a solution. Mr. Chapman stated that he agreed with the specification as written. Mr. Chapman stated that "it's one of the better written specs that we've received," and found only one correction 7(31), line 16: the comma should be removed:

"reading, comprehension..."

Mr. McKibben stated that he would delete the comma.

Civil Service Commission

President Bergman thanked the Water Systems Workers for attending and offering their testimony.

Motion to approve the specification as amended by Mr. Tappan, second Mr. Salter. Motion passed 5-0-0.

8. Approved Specifications – Final CSC Review: (Information)

Division Manager – Road Maintenance – Public Works Department, by Christina Wong, Personnel Analyst (December 13, 2006 revisions)

The Commission gave final approval of the Division Manager – Road Maintenance specification.

9. Time Reserved for Commission President

No report.

10. Tie Reserved for Commission Counsel

No report.

11. Time Reserved for Commission Secretary

a. Workload and Staffing Update – Mr. Greek stated that he is addressing “the majority of the questions asked” by the Commission and that he will provide the final document to Ms. Nix. He stated that Personnel is fully staffed with Personnel Analysts and Human Resources Analyst Aides but that Administrative Support is currently 45% understaffed. Ms. Nix stated that she perceives less of an urgency for Commissioners to ask the Board to for a special mid-term allocation” on behalf of the Personnel Department. Mr. Greek concurred that he would not recommend that action at this time.

b. Reimbursement for Commissioners for Special Meetings – Mr. Greek stated that the Personnel Department is conducting an audit of Commissioner paychecks and will make any adjustments that are needed. Mr. Bergman stated this is the first time there has been an error so he doesn't think additional research is necessary at this point. Mr. Greek reminded the Commissioners to please e-mail staff when they attend special meetings so that they are adequately paid.

c. Senior Medical Records Technician – Update: Mr. Greek stated that two positions had been reclassified to senior level during the 2005 open window period. Personnel was waiting for the department to fill the supervisory vacancy so the supervisor could participate in the selection and training of the promotional allocations. He stated that the concerns have been handled, staff members who were previously possibly working out of class have participated in the recruitment process and selections have been made. The senior medical records technician positions have been filled as well as the supervisory medical records technician.

d. Additional – Mr. Greek informed the Commission that due to recent equipment problems, staff will research digital recording equipment. Mr. Tappan asked if Mr. Greek had an update on the Human Resources Director position. Mr. Greek responded that he understood that the Board conducted interviews last week but that no decision had been reached. Mr. Salter asked Mr. Greek if there is a protocol that he and Mr. Chapman should follow as members of the Commission subcommittee designated to meet with he Administrative Office. Mr. Greek stated he would follow up and report back to the Commission.

Civil Service Commission

12. Closed Session – (Closed Session per Gov. Code, Section 54957.6—Conference with County Labor Negotiator): 2005 Civil Service Rule Changes (*Action*)

No reportable action.

The Commission recessed for lunch break and reconvened at 1:15 p.m. Mr. Tappan exited the meeting at the lunch recess.

13. Hearing – Closed Session: Appeal A06-81, dated September 20, 2006 (*Action*)

The meeting adjourned into Closed Session for the hearing of A06-81. Upon reconvening into Open Session, the Commission reported that no action was taken in Closed Session.

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

14. Adjournment

Being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

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\2007\January 24, 2007 Regular Meeting.doc