

Public comments

June 20, 2022

Carol Rose

Item 8A:

I have commented at a previous meeting when this item was rejected by a majority of the Board that I think this is a very weak move on the part of DPMWD. Even in good economic times it is highly dubious that such a small District requires a second administrative officer with a high paying salary. Here is the job description as offered:

To direct, manage, supervise, and coordinate assigned programs and activities within the Administrative Services Department including but not limited to finance, human resources, payroll, risk management, customer service and information systems; coordinate assigned activities with other departments and outside agencies; provide highly responsible and complex administrative support to the General Manager; and when General Manager is unavailable, act as Assistant General Manager.

This is a description of a GM's position. This small District does NOT need duplicate administrative positions. We cannot afford it. I do not see any changes (major or otherwise) in the complexity of the administration of this District that would warrant such a position. I may not be aware of those changes, but the Board Members should certainly clarify. Is there a part of some forward-thinking reorganization of the District?

I will be very disappointed in any Board member who does not see a responsibility to ask *why* we need this upgraded position to better serve the District. This is a critical time for DPMWD to be mindful of spending, especially raising salaries without thoroughly investigating the need, duties, and all expenses for this new position. There will be employment package costs in addition to actual salary costs. Why has the District NOT done an independent survey and staffing analysis as requested by Director Matteoli?

The focus of DPMWD at this point (and especially the Board of Directors) should be moving into the process of upgrading our infrastructure. I do not see any value in this agenda item moving toward that goal.

I trust this Board will do the right thing.

Victoria Hoppe

From: Evelyn [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 3:50 PM
To: Victoria Hoppe
Subject: Comments for June 20th 2022 meeting

Could someone on the Board explain the COLA increases for those employees that will get them. Could you also explain the present hourly pay for those affected. What was their hourly pay before the COLA and then after the COLA. What step are they in the salary band. I understand that overtime can increase their yearly compensation. I don't have a problem with a COLA for our employees. I would like to hear any reasons for any other employee salary increases.

I am aware of the mess that the current Board was left with. I am more than satisfied with steps they have taken so far. I know that we will see a significant increase in what we pay for water. I hope the ratepayers will see the need for it. Keep up your good work.

I don't have a problem with a COLA for our employees. I would like to hear any reasons for any other employee salary increases.

David [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

This email provides comments related to two items on the DPMWD June 20, 2022, 6:00PM Meeting.

Agenda Item 8.A, Establish an Administrative Services Manager at the salary bands provided.

Background

The background states that "the actual work that the current occupant of the position exceeds by 70% the productivity and complexity normally required by a comparable Office Manager...". This may be a correct statement, however, no comparable job descriptions or workload statistics were provided against which rate payers or Board Members could make a reasonable determination. The explanation provided by the General Manager for the lack of substantiation is that the DPMWD Office Manager (and other positions) require far more time and a mixture of duties than other Districts. Assuming that to be correct, it becomes more important to fully document the administrative needs of the DPMWD as a whole, then evaluate current staffing levels and numbers.

The General Manager specified in the Background that the current occupant has been working approximately the equivalency of a "1.75 person year" or approximately 70 hours a week. This is an alarming workload statistic. Assuming this to be correct, the Office Manager was expected to be in the office working 70 hours per week without the General Manager or the DPMWD Board doing something to relieve the workload. This would appear to be a dereliction of proper supervision. Until workload and staffing issues are resolved, the General Manager should consider reprioritizing workload and/or the use of temp agencies to ease the strain on existing staff.

Draft Job Description

1. As generally stated in the Background, the duties require far more time and a mixture of abilities than other Districts. Again, it is important for the workload to be supported by a workload study. A work study would provide the information needed for ratepayers to understand and the Board to make an informed decision regarding organizational structure, staffing needs, fiscal impacts, etc.. Providing a promotion will not change the workload, additional staffing would.
2. In reviewing the Draft Organizational Chart, it is very unclear exactly what is being approved. If the new classification/promotion is approved, the implication is that the Administrative staff will increase to include not only an Administrative Services Manager, but an Office Manager and an Office Assistant. It is important to note, that a similar staffing growth occurs on the "Field" side as well. As presented on the Organizational Chart and parts of the Administrative Manager Job Description, if approved, the DPMWD Board conceivably doubles its staff from the stated "Board Authorized Staff of 5" to 10 staff. This appearance of growth may be a lack of clarity on the Organizational Chart or it could truly be a view of a new Organizational structure. If indeed, this is a proposed new structure, then workload studies and duty statements should be attached.
3. The Job Description contains several responsibilities that should not be required or amended to better reflect responsibilities.

"...and when General Manager is unavailable, act as Assistant General Manager," and again "Act as interim or acting General Manager as required for overseeing matters when General Manager is unavailable." The DPMWD General Manager is required to have specific training and licensing in matters of water management; the Administrative Services Manager is not so required. The Field Manager with his/her required water management training would be the appropriate Acting/Interim Manager and provide direction to Administrative staff as they conduct normal office business. Without proper training and licensing, proper decision-making regarding field work assignments and problem solving could create unnecessary liability for the DPMWD.

“In coordination with ACWA/JPIA, monitor worker’s compensation claims; investigate and resolve third party tort claims; conduct inspections of facilities and work sites.”

- DPMWD has a consultant attorney; the investigation and resolution of third-party tort claims is a legal responsibility not Administrative. The DPMWD legal consultant may request administrative support in those cases, but administrative staff should not be expected nor required to investigate and resolve legal issues.
- The ability to make decisions based on inspections of facilities and work sites belong with those that have the proper experience and licensing, the General Manager and/or the Field Manager. Administrative staff are not required, nor should they be, the water engineering specific background to make such inspections. Again, this responsibility could create unnecessary liability for the DPMWD.

There are multiple mentions of accounting and budget responsibilities. Currently, DPMWD has an accounting firm that provides this service. It is unclear from the draft Job Description how the duties differ between the accounting firm and the proposed Administrative Manager.

There are references to the Administrative Manager selecting, hiring, and directing staff. This relates to the attached Organizational Chart that has not been approved. If the Administrative Services Manager position is approved, it can be assumed that the “Draft Organizational Chart” is also approved. No substantiating information has been provided for which rate payers to comment and Board Members to make an informed vote.

Fiscal Impact. As stated, "the first-year fiscal impact is about \$15,00 plus CalPERS". This information is short-sighted and does not provide sufficient information. The Position will remain beyond one year; all estimated costs should be provided (salary, CalPERS, benefits, Workers Comp). Again, if the Draft Organizational Chart with its implications is approved, the fiscal impact is much larger than indicated. The revenue source has not been identified making this a commitment that the DPMWD should not be accepting at this time.

Final Comment related to Agenda Item 8.A. I wish to be clear; I am not opposed to appropriate changes to the staffing organization of the DPMWD. However, until the Grand Jury Findings have been resolved and a Master Plan updated, creating a new organizational structure is premature. Once the Master Plan has been updated, an organizational structure that supports the short-term and long-term district needs can be developed and a revenue source defined that will support the DPMWD’s needs. Anything less does not provide the transparency of fiscal impacts the ratepayers have requested.

In addition, I am supportive of creating a compensation package that recognizes the long hours, hard work, and dedication shown by the current Office Manager. I believe that either identifying a period of time as “Arduous;” meaning sustained overtime without overtime compensation or a “out-of-class” assignment in recognition of the additional duties taken on prior to the General Manager being hired. Both of these, I believe are good options to compensate her for the exceptional service provided. Another option would be to recognize her with a Sustained Superior Accomplish Award with a compensation to be recommended then agreed upon by the Board.

Until organizational structure clarity is provided, I request that Agenda Item 8.A NOT be approved.

Item 11.A.1 Scheduling a special meeting for consideration and approval of FY 2022/2023 annual budget. Until a decision is reached regarding staffing, the 2022/23 budget should not be approved