

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING  
MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2016

#1

The regular monthly meeting of the City Civil Service Commission was held on Monday, March 21, 2016 at 1340 Poydras Street, Suite 964. Ms. Doddie Smith, Personnel Administrator of the Management Services Division, called the roll. Present were Vice-Chairperson Ronald P. McClain, Commissioner Cordelia D. Tullous and Commissioner Tania Tetlow, representing a quorum. Commission Chairperson Michelle D. Craig and Commissioner Joseph S. Clark were absent. Vice-Chairperson McClain convened the meeting at 10:12 a.m. The Commission then proceeded by sounding the Commission's docket. At 10:21 a.m., on the motion of Commissioner Tetlow, seconded by Commissioner Tullous, the Commission voted unanimously to go into executive session to discuss matters taken under advisement and pending litigation. At 11:00 a.m. the Commission completed its executive session and proceeded with the business portion of the meeting.

The first item on the agenda was the minutes from the February 15, 2016 meeting. Commissioner Tetlow moved approval of the minutes. Commissioner Tullous seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Item #2 was a series of requests from NOPD. Item #2 (a) was a request to amend the special rate of pay for officers who are assigned to motorcycle duty. Mr. Robert Hagmann, Personnel Administrator, presented staff's position. He noted that NOPD was reassigning officers from the Motorcycle Unit of the Traffic Division to motorcycle assignments in each of the eight districts. Mr. Hagmann then outlined the proposed new special rate of pay for these officers, which would ensure that they retain the pay that they currently earn. Representing NOPD was Deputy Chief of Staff Jonathan Wisbey, who relayed NOPD's support of the proposal outlined by Mr. Hagmann.

Commenting on this matter was Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) attorney, Mr. Donovan Livaccari. Mr. Livaccari noted FOP's support for this request, but added that the special rates of pay for the Police Department need a more comprehensive review. He noted that officers with similar duties may not each receive the same special rate of pay. Mr. Livaccari continued, adding that some special rates of pay are paid on a percentage basis, while others are based on an annual flat rate. Mr. Wisbey concurred that a review of these premium pays is warranted. With no other comments and agreement on this proposal,

Commissioner Tetlow moved for its approval. This motion was seconded by Commissioner Tullous and was approved unanimously.

Item #2 (b) was a request to allocate civilian information technology (IT) positions to NOPD. Mr. Hagmann again presented staff's position on this matter. He noted that this request was premature. Staff has requested that the questionnaires needed to investigate this matter be completed and returned. Mr. Wisbey agreed that this request was not yet ready to be presented to the Commission.

Item #2 (c) was a request to allow for NOPD Reserve Officers that wish to serve on a part-time basis to be processed as reinstatements instead of taking an exam as an entry-level Police Recruit. Mr. Wisbey outlined the request. He noted the department's goal is to get qualified officers on the street and available to answer calls for service quickly. Mr. Wisbey added that a number of the particulars to allow volunteer reserve officers to become part-time paid officers have been worked out with staff. He stated that a remaining area of contention is in regard to those reserve officers who had never been paid officers. Mr. Wisbey clarified, adding that, while many reserve officers volunteer after having retired or otherwise leaving service as paid officers, some do not and become reserves without having passed a Civil Service test. He opined that having served as a volunteer reserve officer was sufficient evidence to show that the duties of a part-time paid officer could be performed and that additional testing was superfluous.

Providing staff's position were Assistant Personnel Director Amy Trepagnier and Personnel Administrator Shelly Stolp. Ms. Trepagnier explained that, when NOPD first presented this plan in December 2015, staff was presented with a list of about 30 reserve officers for consideration. Most of these met the conditions outlined in the Rules to be reinstated. A smaller subset of about 10 reserve officers had not previously been vetted through the police hiring process. Ms. Trepagnier noted that, if the concern with requiring a test was expediency, having been on notice of this requirement since December and the availability of walk-in Police Recruit testing offered Monday through Friday, should have addressed this concern. She added that the test is for the aptitude to perform police work and should not seem overly daunting for these officers. Rather, Ms. Trepagnier hypothesized that this request seems aimed at providing a "back-door" to be allowed to join the NOPD without having to pass a test.

Ms. Stolp noted that NOPD was not requesting a waiver of the background, medical or psychological screenings, which are much more time consuming than the Civil Service test offered on a walk-in basis. Mr. Wisbey repeated his position

that the testing was a superfluous part of the process for these individuals who, he contended, could perform policing duties. Vice-Chairperson McClain noted the importance of the move from volunteer status to becoming a paid employee. Personnel Director Lisa Hudson added that staff had no control should NOPD desire to change an employee's status from part-time to full-time. Vice-Chairperson McClain stated that he was reluctant to overturn staff's decision on this matter. Mr. Wisbey then offered his opinion that some of these individuals would not submit to the proposed testing and would rather prefer to remain as volunteers. He next asked if a different classification could be created to address this situation. Ms. Trepagnier replied that having employees doing the same duties in two different classifications would be an issue. Commissioner Tetlow noted the importance of the ability to write clear and accurate police reports, which is measured by the testing. She suggested that an alternate way forward on this issue may need to be explored. At the end of the public discussion, there was no motion on this request.

Item #3 was the introduction of a number of proposed amendments to Civil Service Rules. Director Hudson emphasized that the purpose of this agenda item was only to introduce proposed Rule amendments publicly and to solicit suggestions and comments. Item #3 (a) was proposed amendments to the Merit Pay Rule, Rule IV Section 2.5, and to the Performance Evaluation System Rule, Rule XI. Director Hudson summarized the proposals noting that they would alter: 1) the date for merit pay, 2) the dates for performance evaluations, 3) the titles of the official categories of performance, and 4) create a requirement for discipline for those not meeting performance expectations. She noted that copies of the Rule change proposals would be made available.

Item #3 (b) was proposed amendments to Rule II, related to Appeals, including Section 4.12, new Section 6.8 and Section 8.1, and new Section 8.3. Director Hudson noted that these proposals would add a series of timelines for steps that may be taken in the disciplinary appeal process.

Item #3 (c) was proposed amendments to Rule III, Section 6 related to Contracts. Director Hudson explained that the proposed changes would eliminate language found to be unconstitutional by an earlier Louisiana Supreme Court Case.

Item #3 (d) was the introduction of an amendment to Rule VIII, Section 4 related to Civil Leave and consideration of an exception to the current Civil Leave Rule. Director Hudson noted that in February non-essential employees were instructed to leave work because of impending storms. These storms later caused tornados in

nearby parishes. She added that Civil Leave was granted in this instance and that part of the request would be to retroactively approve this use of leave.

Item #4 on the agenda was Classification and Compensation Matters. Item #4 (a) was a request from the Office of Network for Economic Opportunity to create a new classification of Summer Youth Worker. Mr. Hagmann presented this request. He noted that staff worked with the Mayor's Office to create the proposed new class and that it would carry special hourly and per diem rates of pay. Mr. Hagmann added that this would allow the summer worker program to remain in-house, rather than outsourced to entities such as Goodwill Industries. He explained that different tasks would carry different special daily or hourly rates. The goal for this summer, it was explained, is to hire and pay approximately 1,700 young people for this program. Commissioner Tetlow moved approval of the request. This motion was seconded by Commissioner Tullous and was approved unanimously.

Item # 4 (b) was a request from the Fire Department to amend the current job specifications of the Fire Recruit and Firefighter I classes to include fire prevention and major emergency response activities. Mr. Hagmann began by informing the Commission that they were the final arbitrator of which duties were part of a job classification. He noted that, through much give and take, parties have agreed on most areas of dispute. However, three areas remain in dispute: 1. manning emergency shelters; 2. performing fire prevention inspections; and 3. canvassing neighborhoods to request to be allowed to install smoke detectors.

Regarding the first of these, manning emergency shelters, Mr. Hagmann noted that the Superintendent of Fire had added these tasks and that staff's recommendation was that those areas be omitted from the job descriptions. He noted that it was staff's opinion that those statements do not help distinguish the work of a Firefighter.

At this point, Fire Superintendent Timothy McConnell was offered an opportunity to address this point. However, he chose to first discuss the fire prevention tasks that were under contention. These tasks only appear on the Firefighter job specification, not on that for Fire Recruit. Superintendent McConnell opined that to remove or qualify the suggested language would undermine the department's efforts to emphasize the importance of fire prevention.

Commenting on this matter next was the President of the New Orleans Firefighters Association (Local #632), Nicholas Felton. Mr. Felton noted that individuals in



the Fire Prevention Inspector job class series are required to perform many of the duties that the Superintendent outlined. Mr. Felton added that, by including too many duties not specific to firefighting, the exemption to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), allowing the City not to pay Firefighters overtime until they have worked 212 hours over a 28-day period, could be in jeopardy. Mr. Felton asked Mr. Clifton Moore, also representing Local #632, who was experienced as a fire inspector, to comment. Mr. Moore read from the job description for Fire Prevention Inspectors, noting the areas of overlap with the Superintendent's proposed language.

Superintendent McConnell explained that the administration was requesting new language in the "Distinguishing Features of Work" section of the job specification, while the Union was requesting both qualifying language for this section and the removal of a related statement in the "Examples of Work" section. Mr. Hagmann noted that the "Distinguishing Features of Work" section is used to distinguish the work of one classification from that of another. He pointed out that this could be important should claims of working out-of-class be raised and suggested that it would, therefore, be advantageous to qualify this language. Mr. Felton and Mr. Moore suggested that describing the work as "basic inspection" would be more accurate and would distinguish it from code violations inspection work.

Fire Captain Deany Robert commented next. He noted that he had to do 110 inspections a year. Vice Chairperson McClain asked about the role of Firefighters and Fire Recruits during these inspections. Captain Robert replied that these employees cannot assist in inspections because they have not been trained to do so. He also noted that Fire Suppression companies, like his, now fine violators after inspections, which had not been part of these inspections earlier. Superintendent McConnell clarified that Fire Captains do not fine violators but send repeat violators to the Fire Prevention Inspectors who are charged with taking enforcement actions.

Then, Fire Captain Marlon Hyde spoke. In response to questions from Vice Chairperson McClain, Captain Hyde reiterated Captain Robert's contention that Firefighters and Fire Recruit cannot help with inspections because they are not trained to do so. He added that Fire Captains receive one week of training on inspections, a task that he held should require two semesters for thorough training. Captain Hyde added that he felt that he was being held responsible for inspections that he was not properly trained to conduct and that his training was conducted by unqualified instructors. Superintendent McConnell retorted that the Inspector

General investigated a complaint regarding the qualifications of the trainers and found no merit to the charge.

Commissioner Tetlow proposed a systematic approach, treating the three areas in dispute and the language about which all parties agreed each separately. Thus, four votes were held. Specific language had been documented in an e-mail and provided to all by Superintendent McConnell, which served as reference.

Next, Commissioner Tetlow noted that there had been a full discussion on the language regarding inspections. She then moved to approve the Fire Department's suggested changes to the Firefighter job specification regarding inspections. This motion was seconded by Commissioner Tullous and approved unanimously.

The second issue with the job descriptions discussed concerned the installation of smoke detectors. Again, this statement appears only on the Firefighter job specification and not that for Fire Recruit. Superintendent McConnell noted that much of the proposed new language was not in contention. However, the Union suggested an additional phase that would eliminate a requirement to solicit smoke detector installation. Superintendent McConnell objected to this suggestion, stating that canvassing neighborhood was an important part of the smoke detector installation program. Mr. Felton noted that coming to someone's house when there is a fire to extinguish is different than approaching homes without warning residents, which he characterized as dangerous. He noted that citizens treat Firefighters differently than they treat Police. Mr. Felton suggested that more public education regarding smoke detectors could be done. Superintendent McConnell retorted that advertisements and public education programs were not effective enough.

Firefighter George Rickoll commented on this issue. He noted that he supported installing smoke detectors because they can save lives. He added, however, that when his company was canvassing a neighborhood, separately knocking on doors to offer to install smoke detectors, they were late responding to a medical call because they had to meet back up before they could respond. Also commenting was Mr. Terry Hampton, retired Fire Captain and Union representative. He noted that a Firefighter knocking at a door could face someone with a gun or a vicious dog. Fire Captain John Klumpp also commented, expressing his position in opposition to the requirement to solicit the installation of smoke detectors.

After this discussion, Commissioner Tetlow then moved to approve the Fire Department's suggested changes to the Firefighter job specification regarding

installing smoke detectors. These changes include the use of the word “may” in describing the testing, checking, and installation of smoke detectors, and did *not* include a prohibition on solicitation of such installations, as was requested by the Union. This motion was seconded by Commissioner Tullous and approved unanimously.

The third issue with the job descriptions discussed was a proposed requirement for manning emergency shelters. Statements regarding this duty appear on both the Firefighter and the Fire Recruit job specifications. Superintendent McConnell stated that this work is currently done by Firefighters and that he felt that it is appropriate to ensure that Firefighters are aware of their responsibilities. He added that there is an upcoming drill on emergency evacuations that will include NOFD participation.

Mr. Felton stated that this duty takes Firefighters away from their mission of fighting fires. He reminded the Commissioners of testimony at last month’s meeting from a Fire Captain who stated that he was ordered not to respond to a fire because he was already manning an emergency shelter during a freeze event. Mr. Felton suggested that Firefighters could be hired to do this on an overtime basis and not taken away from their fire and medical response duties to man emergency shelters.

Superintendent McConnell described the duties of Firefighters when working at emergency shelters. Vice-Chairperson McClain then asked Ms. Alexandra Norton, Director of Service and Innovation, about NOFD’s role in manning emergency shelters. She stated that NOFD is the secondary operator for all emergency shelters.

Mr. Hagmann and Director Hudson next gave staff’s position. Mr. Hagmann noted that work in emergency shelters does not define the work of a Firefighter. He stated that this work is neither typical nor representative of Firefighter work and argued that this statement should not be included in the job specifications. Mr. Hagmann noted that the management of emergency shelters could be assigned to a number of agencies, such as Police or EMS. Director Hudson began presenting staff’s position. Vice-Chairperson McClain interjected and asked if she was aware of the contents of the City’s emergency shelter plan document. Director Hudson replied that she was not. She then noted that the contents of that document could be changed making Police or another agency, and not Fire, responsible for running emergency shelters. Logically, therefore, employees of those agencies could argue

that they are working out of their class, given this statement in the Firefighter job specification.

Commissioner Tetlow asked if the fact that all of NOFD is trained to perform emergency shelter work would not support placing this statement in the Firefighter job specification. Mr. Hagmann responded that each department has a representative who is trained in tasks to perform at a shelter during an emergency. He noted that training an Accountant to do these tasks should not result in changing the job specification for all Accountants. Commissioner Tetlow noted that since all Firefighters are trained in this duty, it seemed to her to be appropriate to inform them of that in the job specification. Director Hudson responded noting that any City employee in any class could be asked to do this work and it would seem inappropriate to change all job specifications of all classes to include this task. Commissioner Tetlow asked if that was because it would be too much trouble to change all job specifications. Director Hudson responded that the concern was not the work needed to change job specifications, but the fact that this task statement is not useful to distinguish one job from the other. Mr. Hampton commented to express his opinion that this language should not be included in the job specification.

Commissioner Tetlow first moved to include the language regarding emergency shelters proposed by NOFD. Commissioner Tullous seconded that motion and it passed unanimously. Next, Commissioner Tetlow moved to include in the job specifications all of the language to which all sides agreed. Prior to the vote, Mr. Felton registered his objection that these actions would diminish fire protection for the city. Again, Commissioner Tullous seconded the motion made and it passed unanimously.

Item #4 (c) was a request from Mr. Carlos Metoyer for retroactive pay for the position of Airport Services Manager for the Aviation Board. Mr. Hagmann presented staff's response to this request. He stated that staff has been working with the Aviation Board to find a way to award extra pay to Mr. Metoyer for the additional duties that he has been performing. Mr. Hagmann noted that this required the Aviation Board to enumerate the special projects done by Mr. Metoyer. Aviation has since provided this justification, supporting additional pay for the period January 15, 2009 to July 14, 2013. Mr. Hagmann added that staff supports a 10% increase for Mr. Metoyer for this time period, as allowed by Rule IV, Section 2.2. Mr. Metoyer asked about both the time period used and the percentage increase that he would receive. He was told that the time period was based on the request received from Aviation and the percentage increase was based



on a like class that could be expected to perform similar duties at the Sewerage and Water Board. The motion to approve this retroactive pay request was made by Commissioner Tullous, seconded by Commissioner Tetlow and approved unanimously.

Item #4 (d) was a request from Office of Inspector General to appeal staff's recommendation for a new classification of Information Technology Security Specialist. Mr. Hagmann spoke in behalf of staff. Representing the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) were Mr. Edouard Quatrevaux, Inspector General, and Ms. Nadiene Van Dyke, Deputy Inspector General for Inspections and Evaluations. Mr. Hagmann noted that on March 2, 2016 staff received a request from OIG regarding an Information Technology (IT) position. He added that, after staff's review of the proposed duties and responsibilities for the position, a proposal was quickly made. Staff's proposal was for a new class at the same level as Information Technology Manager. Mr. Hagmann noted that this was a considerable upgrade from the existing allocation. He explained that the Information Technology Manager position is at pay grade 93, with a minimum salary of about \$68,000. The former allocation was at pay grade 86, minimum salary of \$57,909. Mr. Hagmann continued, noting that the OIG would have the ability to hire at \$88,344, if the Hiring Above the Minimum Section of the Rules is invoked, as is allowed after the Great Place to Work Initiative Rule Changes. He elaborated, stating that this pay grade places the position second only to the Information Technology Director position, which is responsible for all centralized information systems for whole of City Government. The OIG proposal was for a classification at the same level as the Information Technology Director and greater than that for the class used to oversee the IT function for the Sewerage and Water Board. Mr. Hagmann stated that, to grant this request would cause a serious inequity in the uniform pay plan.

Mr. Quatrevaux spoke next. He illustrated the importance of information systems security by relating stories of agencies who were threatened with data breaches and from whom ransom was demanded. Mr. Quatrevaux stated that his office has spent over \$400,000 in the last six month on system security specialists. He said that, when trying to fill this position, six people responded to his request to interview them and he felt that two of these were qualified for the job. However, both of those two potential employees had taken other jobs. Mr. Quatrevaux noted that the OIG had asked for a position starting at \$79,900. He expressed confusion at the staff's response allocating a position which would start at about \$68,000. Mr. Quatrevaux stated that staff's proposal and explanation regarding the ability to

hire above the minimum was “a subterfuge,” “not transparent,” “designed to deceive,” and “unethical.”

Commissioner Tetlow responded. She noted the importance of maintaining a uniform pay plan and recognized that it comes at a cost regarding recruiting. Commissioner Tetlow suggested that Mr. Quatrevaux should, given his position, understand the role of the Commission in protecting against patronage and ensuring equality in pay. Director Hudson added that she had spoken to Ms. Suzanne Lacey of OIG regarding this position. Ms. Lacey stated that OIG had a current City employee in mind for the position who was making about \$74,000. Director Hudson stated that staff was trying to work with the OIG to meet their needs with this request and had responded quickly with an alternative that would maintain a uniform pay plan and is allowable under the Rules.

Mr. Quatrevaux repeated his conviction that his office would have difficulty recruiting given the published minimum range. Ms. Stolp responded, noting that the ability to hire within the range of salaries for the class is explained on official Civil Service announcements. Commissioner Tetlow explained that the Commission is in the process of hiring a contractor to examine the pay plan and make recommendations that would take into consideration all other related classes, as is required by the State Constitution. Vice-Chairperson McClain noted that a hiring range has been offered and suggested that Mr. Quatrevaux return before the Commission, if necessary. He then called for a motion to bring this matter to a conclusion. Commissioner Tetlow moved to accept the staff's recommendation for a new classification of Information Technology Security Specialist. Commissioner Tullous seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Item #4 (e) was a request from the Fraternal Order of Police for an exception to Rule VIII, Section 2.9 (a) to reclassify an injury from worker's compensation to injured on duty. Mr. Donovan Livaccari explained the request. He noted that Officer Damon Harris was injured on duty; however, the paperwork on this request was not submitted within 30 days, as is required by the Rules, through no fault of the Officer. Mr. Livaccari also explained the importance of the difference in injury designations. One whose injury is ruled to be “injured on duty” receives their entire pay check without having to use their sick leave balance. If one's injury is determined to be “worker's compensation,” the employee must use sick leave to make up the balance not paid by the City's worker compensation insurance. Mr. Hagmann noted that this was an error of process, not an error of content. Commissioner Tetlow asked if staff had an issue with granting the exception in this case. Mr. Hagman replied that they did not. Commissioner Tetlow moved to grant

the requested exception to the Rules. Vice-Chairperson McClain seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Item #5 on the agenda was Recruitment and Selection Matters. Item #5 (a) was examination announcements. Director Hudson explained that there were no announcements for the Commission to approve this month.

Item #6 on the agenda was the ratification of Public Integrity Bureau (PIB) 60-day extension requests. FOP Attorney, Mr. Claude A. Schlesinger, asked to speak on this agenda matter on behalf of Officer Sam Davis. Mr. Schlesinger stated that there were 78 extension requests presented to the hearing officer. All but two of these requests were recommended for approval. He noted that New Orleans is the only jurisdiction operating under the Louisiana Police Officer Bill of Rights that grants these extensions so routinely.

Ms. Elizabeth Robbins spoke in behalf of NOPD. She explained that officers are given notice when there is a hearing before the Hearing Officer regarding a request to extend the amount of time for an internal investigation. Ms. Robbins then claimed that the department would be denied due process if the case is argued again before the Commission. Commissioner Tetlow pointed out that the Hearing Officer's recommendation does not bind the Commission and that they still have the responsibility of deciding which of those recommendations to uphold. She added that this matter had been properly noticed. Ms. Robbins next cited the fact that the report describing the Hearing Officers' reasoning when considering 60-day extension requests was not available. Commissioner Tetlow responded that using these reports to make the case is the responsibility of the department.

Vice-Chairperson McClain asked Ms. Robbins how much more time was needed to complete the investigation into Officer Davis. Ms. Robbins responded that she did not know. Ms. Robbins repeated her contention that it was unfair to the department to reconsider the 60-day extension request decisions made by the Hearing Officer. Commissioner Tetlow retorted that they were not reconsidering decisions, but considering the department's motion to grant an extension in the time needed to conduct internal investigations. She then requested that, on the next month's agenda, there be an explanation as to why internal investigations take so long. Commissioner Tetlow added that, while she appreciates efforts to speed these investigations along by adding civilian investigators, she realizes that these investigations can have a real impact on officers' careers. Commissioner Tetlow then moved that all of the recommendations for 60-day extension requests be approved, except that for Sam Davis. Vice-Chairperson McClain seconded that

motion and it passed without objection. Ms. Robbins noted her intention to file a request for reconsideration and added that they would request from staff the Hearing Officers' reports on these matters.

Item #7 on the agenda was Communications. Item #7 (a) was a report on ADP ongoing issues. Mr. Hagmann informed the Commission that the error reported at the last Commission meeting as an ADP data entry error, was not that, but a process error caused by the timing of a number of sets of changes (hiring rate changes, mass pay grade changes, etc.). He noted the importance of correct data entry and mentioned the fact that departments too frequently do not update employee's Civil Service status (e.g., from probationary to permanent) in a timely manner. Mr. Hagmann stated that the next big ADP projects include:

- hiring of summer workers;
- processing merit pay; and
- getting Fire employees to the correct pay grade.

Mr. Roy Guercio, City Comptroller, added that he met with a number of ADP customers. Those representatives indicated that, from their perspective, the City is doing well with our ADP experiences. He noted that in the over 5,000 W-2's recently issued, there were only two known errors.

Item #7 (b) was a report on Civil Service staffing issues. Director Hudson stated that staff is still recruiting for a Personnel Administrator for the Test Development & Validation Division and that she would like to further discuss the proposed audit positions. Vice-Chairperson McClain asked if staff would start preparing information for the Commission regarding the department's budget needs. At Director Hudson's suggestion, he proposed that this item appear on next month's agenda. Mr. Hagmann added that two promotional request forms for Civil Service Analysts had been submitted to the Chief Administrative Office and staff was awaiting word on those requests.

Item #7 (c) was a report on the comprehensive classification and compensation study. Director Hudson noted that the RFP/ RFQ for this contract was posted on 3/7/2016, the proposals are due on 4/8/2016, the selection committee is to make its decision on 4/19/2016, and the winning bidder is to be noticed on 4/21/2016. Vice-Chairperson McClain asked how long it would take once work began. Director Hudson indicated that it could take up to a year, but may be done more quickly. Ms. Norton responded that the pay plan proposals may be presented in batches to speed the process. Mr. Felton suggested that NOFD employee's pay be considered first.



With no other communications to consider, on motion of Commissioner Tetlow and seconded by Vice-Chairperson McClain, the Commission voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 2:08 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald P. McClain, Vice-Chairperson

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Cordelia D. Tullous, Commissioner

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tania Tetlow, Commissioner