| From: | Liz Bettencourt |
|--------------|--|
| To: | <u>Gary Kremen; "Tony Estremera"; Barbara Keegan; Richard Santos; Dennis Kennedy; Nai Hsueh; Linda LeZotte</u> |
| Cc: | <u>Metra Ulloa; Jason Christie; Liz Bettencourt</u> |
| Bcc: | Ingrid Bella; Lilian Dennis; Merna Leal |
| Subject: | Time Sensitive: Board Item Tonight - Staffing Report |
| Date: | Tuesday, February 24, 2015 4:13:00 PM |
| Attachments: | image001.png |
| Importance: | High |
| | |

Dear Chair and Board Members:

Item 7.1 on the Board's agenda tonight is a report from HR regarding staffing resources. As you are no doubt aware, the three unions have shared our concerns and have been asking for information and to meet on these very issues for months now. We were disappointed that we were not afforded an opportunity to review this report before it was made public so that we could provide our questions and concerns in a constructive and timely way.

In the spirit of collaboration, and absent the opportunity to fully vet the data in the report at such a late date, we are opting to provide each of the Board members with this written statement rather than challenge the report in the public meeting tonight.

With a cursory look, we have found several things that beg clarification and/or further comments and questions. Such as:

- 1. We do not agree that the large discrepancy between temporary staffing budgets for the comparator agencies and SCVWD is inconclusive. The difference in the temporary staffing budget between all the agencies and SCVWD is alarming and needs to be highlighted. Metropolitan Water District, which has 3 times the staff of SCVWD, has only 25% of our temporary staffing budget. Look at the "actual" number for Capital; temporary staff has increased 400% since FY10. This isn't a "budgeted" value but the actual value.
- 2. Item 7.1 compares Temp cost to Regular employee costs. The comparison should be based on number of personnel, not costs. We do not use temps in unclassified or unit manager positions. Therefore, it's not 731 positions minus 60 vacancies-in-recruitment. It's 731 minus 60 plus vacancies, 50 unit managers, and 32 unclassified which is then a workforce of 589. That raises the value of the 54 temps to 9.13% of the workforce. (54/589)
- 3. We do not use temps as described by the International Public Management Association for Human Resources study (pg 8). Specifically, temps are rarely hired to close the gap while HR recruits for the permanent position because it can take several weeks to get a temp hired. Additionally, there are many instances where

temps are hired to perform long-term core business needs (i.e. recycled water).

4. The CEO has been candid with us from the beginning, explaining that the 731 number was not reached scientifically. He was not convinced of the actual staff needs for core business and thus limited the addition of FTE's. This report states that the limit is due to financial concerns.

These are just a few of the things that stood out with a quick review.

It is our intention and hope to meet with management on this information soon. CAO Nava has already reached out offering to meet with us. Once we have had the chance to do this, we will provide updated comments to you.

Labor and Management have recently made good strides in coming to collaborative solutions—we do not want to take two steps forward and one step back. We hope you will continue to encourage your staff to work with us pro-actively and focused on the One District philosophy.

Thank you.

Liz Bettencourt, EA; Metra Ulloa, ES; Jason Christie, PMA

