

**A G E N D A**  
**Civil Service Board**  
**Room 431, Yates Building**  
**February 4, 2016**  
**4:00 p.m.**

**1. Interview and Selection Procedure for job posting:**

**CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER/CIVIL SERVICE BOARD**

**GRIEVANCE HEARINGS**

**2. DAVID ADAMS vs. OFFICE OF PROPERTY APPRAISER and  
EMPLOYEE SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

The Employee Services Department has initiated a Reduction in Force/Layoff within the Property Appraiser's Office. The City alleges the Reduction in Force (RIF) is appropriate. The City initiated, applied and issued a Reduction in Force using Civil Service and Personnel Rules and Regulations under Rule 7.03, Layoffs. Allegedly, a vacancy notice was currently advertised seeking a Property Appraiser position within the same office at this time.

Mr. Adams alleges that he was not timely notified when he was laid off. He received the RIF notice on October 30, 2015, yet continued to work until November 4, 2015. He was placed on Administrative leave and given an "Employee Separation Agreement." He also alleges that Civil Service and Personnel Rules and Regulations have been incorrectly applied, the method used for classification is distorted, the calculations assessment is inaccurate, the manner which the layoff/RIF determination, severance and waiver/release proposed is flawed and the procedures utilized are discriminatory.

He requests that his leave account be exhausted and not paid as a lump sum. He asked to run his accumulated leave balance out. He believes that the procedure for layoffs, Rule 7.03 has been incorrectly applied for determining tenure and seniority for this position.

Employee's Attorney: Pro se

Employer's Attorney: Craig Feiser

**3. KURT KRAFT vs. OFFICE OF PROPERTY APPRAISER and EMPLOYEE SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

On October 31, 2015, Mr. Kraft was reverted from an appointed position to a Civil Service position in the Property Appraiser's Office. His annual salary was \$44,571. as a Field Appraiser in the appointed position. With the Civil Service position he was reverted back to a Property Field Representative, which has an annual high pay range of \$51,849. The Property Appraiser's Office wants to pay Mr. Kraft \$38,389 annually as a Property Field Representative, allegedly based on an out of date, non-existent job description of Appraiser II from 18 years ago, that he previously held. Since the job description for Field Appraiser (appointed position) and Property Field Representative (Civil Service position) have comparable job description, he is requesting that his annual salary not be reduced and he keep his current salary.

He is citing the following Civil Service and Personnel Rules:

2.01(4)...It is the policy of the City to pay a fair and equitable salary based on the responsibility of the position within The City and upon the performance of the individual occupying that position; and

9.07(1)...The Civil Service Board shall have jurisdiction to determine on employee's entitlement to receive back pay when authorized.

Employee's Attorney: pro se

Employer's Attorney: Wendy Mumma

**4. Old / New Business**