

The Municipal Employees Civil Service Board met on December 3, 2014 at 5:00 P.M., at the regular meeting place, the Council Meeting Room located at 101 North State Street, with Chairman Russell Frederick presiding.

Members Present: Timmy Farris, Russell Frederick, and Allen Ramke

Members Absent: Victoria Nunez

Also Present: Calvin "Woody" Woodruff, Civil Service Board Attorney
Elaine D. Livers, Municipal Civil Service Director
Mayor Mark Piazza
Councilman Francis Plaisance
Councilman Francis Touchet
Amy Cooper
Marie Buteaux
Roger Fontenot

Calvin Woodruff proceeded with the swearing in of Joseph Vallée who was appointed to the Board by the City Council in their meeting of December 2, 2014.

Roger Fontenot led us in the Pledge of Allegiance.
Mayor Mark Piazza led the assembly in prayer.

-- Introduced by Timmy Farris and seconded by Joseph Vallée to adopt the minutes from the meeting of November 12, 2014. All approved.

-- Joseph Vallée made a motion to approve the Civil Service payroll. It was seconded by Timmy Farris and all approved.

Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

New Business

- a) Election of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson.

Timmy Farris nominated Russell Frederick as Chairperson, and it was seconded by Joseph Vallée. All approved. Allen Ramke nominated Joseph Vallée for Vice-Chairperson, and it was seconded by Timmy Farris. All approved.

- b) Discuss and consider approval of personnel transactions made by the City Council during the last month.

-The probational hiring of Spence Richardson as Apprentice Line Worker 2 in the Electrical Department pending successful completion of all post hire assessments.

-The probational hiring of Tracette Hillman as Administrative Assistant in the Parks & Recreation Department pending successful completion of all post hire assessments.

-The probational hiring of Joshua Salazar as Maintenance Worker 3 in the Wastewater Utility Department pending successful completion of all post hire assessments.

--Joseph Vallée motioned to approve all of the personnel transactions presented. Allen Ramke seconded the motion. It was approved.

- c) Marie Buteaux – Water Plant Operator – Is requesting the Board to review Water Plant Operator Pay. They are now working fewer hours than they were five years ago and therefore earning less per pay period.

Marie had some documentation that she had drawn up and submitted copies to the Board, Mayor, and Council members present. The Board reviewed the information she presented.

Marie's main basis for the request for the raise is that when they were hired they were hired to work 12-hour shifts. They worked four 12-hour shifts the first week for a total of 48 hours and three 12-hour shifts the second week for 36 hours which gave them 76 hours regular time and 8 hours overtime. She had a copy of the policy when she was hired that states that they would work 12-hour shifts. They lost the 12-hour shifts and went down to the 10-hour shifts, which she understands was the whole point of doing the renovations. She indicated that what it did was drop their pay down. She makes \$40 less per check right now than she did 3½ years ago. Instead of working seven 12-hour shifts she works eight 10-hour shifts. It is nearly impossible to get a part-time job working the shifts that they work. She works 80 hours per pay period, so she is getting no overtime. The only overtime they are getting is if it is plant related – like a fire, or a water break. If they do work the overtime they are paid for it.

Calvin Woodruff: What it appears, the second part of your handout is that when you obtained additional licenses you did not get a boost in pay. Is that the point?

Marie Buteau: No, after the change in scheduling, after 3½ years she is making less than she was back then. She is requesting a pay increase based on the fact that she is not making overtime anymore.

The Mayor indicated that other departments besides just the Water Plant were affected. When all this came about five years ago, basically the City could not pay its bills. We were over budget and we were two months behind in paying our bills and he had to make some very tough decisions. What the Council could have done at the time, is they could have walked in and said they were going to let twenty people go and cut everybody's salaries by 10% - that would have been one option, but they did not do that. They asked the Mayor to come up with some solutions and we struggled for several months, but in that several month period through

attrition, as people retired, we juggled positions around, consolidated positions, and over probably a two year period eliminated 17 positions in the City of Abbeville, which today, those 17 positions are still gone. Today's budget is in much better shape than it was five years ago, and actually for the first time in five years we are putting a little bit of money in reserves. One of the consolidations at the time, was when one of the people in personnel there left, about that same time the State changed the law for the size municipality that we are, that we no longer have to operate the plant 24 hours a day. We were able to automate the plant to where if the plant has some kind of mishap or goes down, there is an alarm system now, and whoever is on call is notified. So, we spent \$75,000 and upgraded the Water Plant so that we did not have to replace that person that was no longer there, and that we could save on overtime. We completely restructured the personnel over there as far as the number of hours that they work, we brought them down to an 80 hour pay period, we eliminated overtime and it was all due to some cost-cutting measures. When you talk about the issue of overtime that was not the only department that was affected. During this period when we eliminated 17 positions, the Council also came in and put a cap on overtime. Where overtime was rampant, now there is a limit to 24 hours in certain departments per pay period. After that they have to work on K-time. Keep in mind that overtime is a necessity but it is not mandatory. The Council can walk in tomorrow and cut overtime across the board, period, every department and say we do not have the money and we are not paying any more overtime, every department, fire and police included. It is just not mandatory. On the good side of it, before when we had this 24 hour shift and they were working 24 hour periods, they never had a free weekend. Now at least they get a weekend off occasionally. They were not compensated by an increase in hourly wage because they lost their overtime. They lost their overtime and so did other departments. If their salaries are unfair and you want to do a survey to see what other water plant people are making, I certainly want to make sure that they are paid what other cities are paying these people, but as far as the overtime issue goes, the Council can cut overtime in any department any time they want. That is pretty much the bottom line.

Calvin Woodruff: The request here to just raise the pay scale is something that the Board does not have the authority to do. The Mayor is absolutely correct, if you want to look into it, with a survey, like you did on Wastewater, to try to get some idea about the equity or fairness of the pay scale and work with the Council if you think there is some inequity and make some recommendations in this one department you could, but you cannot direct the Mayor and City Council to raise the pay scale for any department.

The Mayor added that we do not currently give pay increases for certifications. There are a lot of employees in the Water Plant, Sewer Plant, Utility Maintenance, that have taken the initiative upon themselves to go out and get higher certifications in Water and Wastewater Treatment, Collection and Distribution and have never been compensated for those things. I do not know if the Council would look at that. I am not opposed to that but I would like to know what other cities are doing. He indicated that if we do the survey we might want to ask that question too.

Roger Fontenot said that when he first started in 1988 they were compensated for that. He thinks it was 25 cents per hour, in 1988, per license. After a while, several years later, they did cut it out, but they used to do that.

--Timmy made a motion to conduct a survey to determine if cities give an increase for obtaining certifications in Water and Wastewater. Allen Ramke seconded the motion and it was approved.

Marie asked if this was the right place to be to make this request or should she have gone to the Council.

Mayor: Ultimately it is the City Council that is going to approve any type of raise. The City Council is not going to look at one individual. That just does not happen. They might look at an entire department like what we have done in the past with Wastewater and Electrical and say that everybody needs to be brought up to scale because our linemen were way underpaid compared to other municipalities our size. In your case I think that your grievance was that you had a problem with your pay because of something that occurred. If an employee has a problem on an individual basis then I think this is the right place.

Joseph Vallée: If I understand correctly, because this is my first night – we do not have the power to give anyone an increase but we do have the power to investigate and see what the recommendation is to the Council.

Mayor: You do have the power to recommend. Your recommendation to the Council is going to weigh a lot more than an employee saying he/she wants a raise.

Other New Business

Joseph Vallée – He thanked everyone for allowing him to serve on this Board. He looks forward to learning a lot about Civil Service that he did not know before.

Russell Frederick: There have been some rumors going around that a few Councilmen don't particularly care for this Civil Service Board, not personally, but they want to see it abolished. I am not going to name any names and I could care less which one of you guys are. I say, if you want to do away with this Civil Service Board – that is the man that you need to talk to (Calvin Woodruff). He knows all about Civil Service and he knows how you need to go about it. You probably already know how you need to go about it. If the Council does not have enough to come before me or Woody or Ms. Elaine (and I don't think he should be going to Ms. Elaine for that) to come before us and discuss your problems with us I have no respect for you any more – and not just you two, but the whole Council. I find it is below the belt. I have been on this Board probably thirty-something years, since 1984 when I left the City Council. I have never had anybody tell me that we would like to do away with you, except one Councilman and he is not doing that anymore – not because I threatened him, but because I explained some things to him. Maybe some Councilmen do not like the way we do things, but that is the way the law reads. We do what we have to do. Being an old Council Member I had to put up with Civil Service and I put up with it. The Mayor put up with it. We had no problems. We did not always agree with each other but that is the way it goes. But I am very disappointed that the Mayor and the Council, and the Mayor may not be one I do not know, but I am very

disappointed that the Council is trying – and I think this is below the belt. You can agree with me or you don't have to agree with me. Go ahead and do what you have to do because I do not have to be here. I am a retired 74 year old guy who does not need this. I have been doing it long enough and I enjoy it, but guys you can pass this on – I do not need to go through this bull. Do you have a say – either one of you or the Mayor? If somebody wants to come to this meeting and tackle us, please do it, but I am very aggravated that a bunch of Councilmen who run this City should know better. Without Civil Service – I do not know if you are old enough to remember what it was like without Civil Service. I do. Politics were all over the place, with the bullpens and everything else, and whiskey, beer and everything being drank and people were being fired at will. This is baloney guys. This is what Civil Service stops. You agree with me or you disagree with me? You have something to say – say it. You are not going to hurt my feelings more than they are already hurt.

Councilman Francis Touchet: The only thing that I would like to state is that I do not think that this is the right forum to be addressing such a thing. I think one, if there is something that someone informed you of or you heard yourself, I am a person that is going to meet that person straight on and I am going to address that. But to say that the Mayor and all five City Councilmen

Russell Frederick: I did not say that. I said I knew nobody and I mentioned no names.

Councilman Francis Touchet: What I am trying to say is that this is not the right forum, I don't think, to address something that you may have heard or not heard. If you have heard then you address that particular person or those particular people and you address that issue. That, to me, is how I would have handled it.

Russell Frederick: My privilege is to express my concerns to all the Councilmen because I mentioned no names and nobody gave me any names, and without any names, and without knowing who the people are that did it, I will address the whole Council and that is my privilege.

Councilman Francis Touchet: I understand.

Councilman Francis Plaisance: Number one, I agree with Councilman Touchet that this is not the forum.

Russell Frederick: Then what is the right forum?

Councilman Francis Plaisance: Secondly, the comments that may or may not have been made had nothing to do with the Civil Service Board, to clarify that to begin with. Comments that would have been made, had they been made or not made would have been out of frustration over situations that are involved with the Civil Service process. I do not see the Civil Service Board going anywhere and I don't see Civil Service going anywhere either but I think that some things sometimes are said in frustration when we are trying to run a City. It is not directed towards any one individual or the Civil Service Board and not expressing any dissatisfaction whatsoever with the Civil Service Board and its operations. So, I hope that clarifies some of the issues. I would be glad to talk to you in private.

Calvin Woodruff: Every municipal government that I have worked with has had frustrations, not with Civil Service Boards but with issues that Civil Service presents and by the nature of

what it does. This particular Board, in my 30 or 40 years of association with it, has had a lot of different members and a lot of different issues, and a lot of different administrations. In previous administrations way back this board had to be much more active. This board had to actually undertake disciplinary action against some very inappropriate behavior by employees against other employees that for whatever reasons the political power just did not want to put their hands on. It is rare. It has not happened in 20 years. Working with this administration, and I think since Mayor Piazza became a Councilman back in 1990, in my opinion it has been a very good working relationship between the Board and the Appointing and Governing Authority. The rules are what they are. Most of them have been in place since the beginning. They are amended from time to time and generally at the request of the Governing Authority – that they see a problem that has developed and there needs to be an amendment and reconsideration of the way things are working. I do not think that that has ever been denied by this Board, at least not in my memory. And of course the Act is written by the legislature and the rules really reflect more or less what is in the Act. There are some issues that I know have come up lately that perhaps need to be addressed in a dialogue between the Governing Authority and the Board about maybe some amendments to some rules about the way some of these things are working. Times change. A rule that used to work fifteen years ago in this environment now may not work so well. We try to accommodate the Governing Authority by keeping up with those changes as you need them to occur and balance that with what is fair to the employees and what the Act limits that we can do. Councilmen, this is the right forum for you to tell us what your frustrations are, or in private meetings, because we want to know. We want this thing to work. We know what a tough job you have to govern this City. It is tough. Money is always tight. You have great employees, you have sometimes a shortage, some are difficult to manage, and the works need to get done. The citizens need to be served. We want to facilitate that and not be an impediment to the job that you have to do. That door is always open as you know. Problems I think, I agree with the comments of the two Councilmen here tonight, that sometimes it is better to lay out a problem in a one-on-one meeting or a two-on-two meeting, to discuss things. Sometimes there is a lack of understanding on either side about what your needs are and what the limits are of what this Board can do. I think for a matter of efficiency, courtesy, respect, and decorum, the discussions should be initiated on a small level of limited participants and then when ideas develop then presented to this Board on what you need in an organized, coherent fashion. Generally when issues come to Elaine she tries to get them in that format. We need to know what your concerns are so we can try to address them and we want to do that. Frustration is always there in whatever we do, but please try to understand that we will do everything we can as a Board to try to eliminate or lessen that frustration for the job that you have to do that is so important. So, know that, this is not the enemy; this is not the roadblock. In my vision this Board has always worked in partnership with the Governing Authority to try to do what is best for the employees and for the people of this City. With that in mind, my door is always open for anybody that wants to discuss these issues and hers (Elaine's) is too.

Councilman Francis Plaisance: There are two main issues. Should we discuss them tonight or wait and discuss it one-on-one. I have two major issues with Civil Service that I am concerned about that brings frustration.

One, we are supposed to accept the top five is what I understand and I have read the manual very carefully – the top five after testing has been done. The same thing applies to the State. It

is just frustrating. You take those top five – they have tested well, but they have absolutely no experience in the field that you are looking for. But you are obligated to take one of the top five because that is what the Civil Service Rule says.

Calvin Woodruff: I think there is some misunderstanding about what the test means. Elaine and I met about this this afternoon to talk about this. Rule 10.1 deals with weighted value of examinations – because I agree. I spent many, many years working in the school system when positions are advertised and interviewed for, there are all sorts of components, depending on the position. There may be a written component. These are all basically already educated people. There is an interview. There is weight given to experience. There is weight given to advanced training. All of those things come into play. Different percentages or points are assigned. It usually comes out pretty well, but it has to reflect the needs of the position. To give solely a written test to a person who is doing physical or manual labor just does not make much sense to me; or a person who needs some training in a field who maybe does not take written tests well, but has ten years of experience doing exactly what you are looking for, that should be factored in to what is called “the test”. It actually takes into consideration, depending upon how it is designed, a written or oral test, experience and training, and a performance test – can you do the work? – can you climb this ladder? Can you get in this bucket? Can you handle the tools? – in addition to written or oral and experience and training. They can go anywhere from 100% in one category to 50/30/20; 60/40; 50/50/0 – this can be, depending on the position, you can be creative with the tests, and that is the test. It gives a wrong impression, and I agree with you. If you score a 92 and you have never done it before, you just test well, and the other guy scored an 89 and he has been doing it for 10 years – you get the job. That is not the way it is supposed to work. The test takes all of these factors, if that is the way it is set up – and the article allows that to be done, and then you get a final score. If there is a tie then you look at some of these other factors. If you have more experience you get more points. You have a higher chance if it is a tie. That is all laid out. I guess the details of how that test is set up is really the key here. I have never looked at the test – it has never been my role, but I realize now that is important. I think that you are doing the hiring, so you know what you think is important for a particular position. You have the advertisement and the job description and those govern a lot about who meets those qualifications. You can really write that any way you want – to fit to what you need. This test can be tailored – if the most important thing to you is experience and you want to put 60% on experience and score it like that, that can be done. I think what needs to happen is we need to look at all the tests and all of the positions you need to fill and work in collaboration with a committee from this board and a committee from your Council and maybe a City Clerk or whoever else you deem appropriate to review all of the tests, and maybe some of your department heads. As a department head or Councilman or supervisor, I know the kind of person I need in this position and I am more interested in experience and performance testing capabilities than I am in how they score on a written test. So, I think that is the solution to that problem because it is all there. The capability is there – we just have to sit down and roll up our sleeves and look at each one of these positions and each one of the tests and if it needs to be modified to put more emphasis on what you think is important, because they are your jobs that you are filling – you know what you need. The supervisors and department heads know what they need and to realign those to be realistic to the real world, then that is what we need to do, but it can be fixed.

Councilman Francis Touchet: What I am more concerned about is that one, there are certain jobs that require experience. I will give you a prime example. I have ten applicants that are going to be working in a bucket that is going to determine whether your electricity or my electricity is on, and something happens with number six or number seven who had experience, I think I would want to be able to consider someone outside of one through five when it comes to that type of job. If we are talking about somebody who is working on a weed eater or working on a lawn mower – I am concerned that that is a liable situation, and that test, I would like to really see whether or not that test truly takes into consideration, because there are people that have the knowledge here – but I am referring to do you have that experience to work on those high lines, and to do the things that you need to do there.

Calvin Woodruff: There is one scenario in here that puts 60% in one category and 40 in another and ignores the written test. There is another scenario that puts 50/50 on experience and training and performance and ignores the written test. So, that is all doable. It is just in the details. And what we need are two bodies to sit down and work hand in hand to revise. I do not know how this is set up now – she knows. If you say I need – just like the Councilman just did – I am putting somebody in a bucket and he needs to know what he is doing up there or she needs to know what she is doing up there – I do not care how well they do in a written test – if they have never been in a bucket, give me the lady who has ten years even if she made a 70 – the minimum passing score. I agree with that. But that is the input we need from you as the Appointing Authority to help us craft or redesign the weight of these categories.

Elaine Livers: For every position that we post, they all have minimum qualifications, and in the particular one I think that you were referring to, which was the Parks & Recreation Assistant, all five of the top applicants met the minimum requirements.

Councilman Francis Plaisance: But they had no experience whatsoever. I asked them all the same question.

Elaine Livers: They did – they all had experience as an administrative assistant, which is what is in the job description. There is nothing in the job description about having experience in Parks & Recreation. It would have to be in your job description. What they are doing is administrative assistant work, and they had that experience; otherwise they would have never made it in the top five. As far as a line worker all of those job descriptions show they have to have a certain amount of experience. So, they would never be submitted to the Council in any list if they did not have that experience.

Councilman Francis Touchet: You are talking about minimum requirements. I still go back to my question if you have this type of experience and I have number six and number 7 that have that type of experience, I may want to choose number six or number seven that have more experience than the minimum just because I am concerned that they will not get a 2% raise because we will have jacked up liability insurance because of issues that happen out there in the field.

Calvin Woodruff: It is not just you get the points because you have the minimum qualifications. If you put 50% on experience and training, you are going to look at those years of experience and training. The guy who has five years might get 20 points and guy who has 12 years is going to get 40 points. But again, I think the answer to this is all here, the tool is here, we just need to use it. I think we can collaborate on what is best. And she is absolutely right, in the job

description – when you say these are the qualifications and this person has it and it is just administrative assistant experience, and do not say a particular field of administrative experience, and you reject everybody because they do not have something that you did not put in the job qualifications, it is lawsuit city. So, again, there is probably a lot more collaboration that is necessary here and more input, and indicate what is important to us. We have to manage these people, so let's put this particular thing.

Mayor: I agree with everything you all are saying. I would like to go back a bit. When I first got elected to the City Council we were only allowed to pick from three and Russell remembers that, and basically we were going to look at this sheet of paper and if somebody lived in our district then that is the guy we were pulling for. Then the Councilmen would fight about it – we would take turns – you get to pick this week. Then we could not get enough of our people in there so we went to the Civil Service Board and said three is not enough so can we choose from five. So we finally convinced them to give us five people to choose from. I have to give all the credit to this guy right here, Councilman Touchet, when he first got elected he came to us and we were all talking about this same issue, who we were going to hire, looking at this list of people. Francis said I do not know a single person on this list – he said why don't we interview them so we can see what they are like and hear from them what their experience is and what they know how to do and find out who they are. We never did that before. It was not until this guy got elected, until this administration came in that we even interviewed. So, I guess my point is we have come a long way with this process and these rules have been there since Russell was here, years and years ago. Times change and these rules and regulations and procedures and tests need to be modified from time to time. I have been saying for about five years now that our disciplinary policy is 30 years old and very obsolete, and it needs to be looked at, and Ike is going to help with all that. We are going to modify that. The point that I want to make is that one of the things we do, and one of the biggest things we do, is when we interview these five people to pick out of these top five, is we are looking at experience. So, if you want to weigh in experience before and have that be part of who gets into the top five, then you are going to have an issue with who is going to evaluate this person, and how are you going to check on his experience, how you are going to verify his experience, how are you going to weigh his experience – who is going to do all that?

Russell Frederick: Mayor, isn't that the working test period for them?

Calvin Woodruff: No, that is not what we are talking about. We are talking about certifying the top five.

Mayor: Yes, I understand that we are limited with this test and we could lose somebody with experience, but then we are picking from this five who did pass the test, and we are looking at those five people's experience and picking the best qualified most of the time and giving them two working test periods to make sure they can do the job, a 90 day and 180 days.

Calvin Woodruff: I think experience is not that difficult.

Mayor: They have a three month evaluation and 6 month working test period, which we did not do before either. That is something new that this administration implemented.

Calvin Woodruff: We can easily do this. If you make experience a 40, 50 or 60% component and they list they worked here for so many years – that is not hard for her to verify. She can call that employer and verify and they will give her that information.

Mayor: It is still going to be tough because we have such specialized fields over here – Utility Wastewater for example. What is going to happen is, you are going to get some guy that worked in the oilfield for 20 years and comes in here and says oh yes, I worked on sewer systems for 20 years. Really – well that is a whole lot different than working on sewer lines in a municipality. That is where you are going to have this issue.

Calvin Woodruff: The devil is in the details. It is going to take some work to craft that particular job description and to have that test actually give you valuable, reliable data as to how suited that person is to that job description, that you have decided, this is what we need. These are the skills and the education we need for this – how are we going to write this to get that fair evaluation of these applicants and it is doable. It is never going to be perfect. But we can make it a whole lot better.

Mayor: I just want to point out that it is a lot more difficult than it sounds.

Calvin Woodruff: I agree with you.

Councilman Francis Plaisance: The initial hiring and the discipline through Municipal Civil Service for our City is the most difficult we have to deal with as a Council. It is a good thing. The frustration comes with dealing with those two issues and you heard some of it tonight. That is the second one in a row that happened I think with the top five that I can think of. At least there were two that happened recently. It gets to be frustrating. I am glad that you said what you said, and that we can work to try to make it better. There is no issue at all with this Board – we just put another person on. I would just like to see it work better.

Councilman Francis Touchet: I think this is the most important thing – I am very encouraged by the dialogue that we have between our Civil Service, the Mayor and two of these Councilmen that we going to look at trying to do what is best for the employees and making sure that we have the best person in the job. That in itself is just a good thing – that, to me, is in the right direction. Woody has brought out some really good points. Let's get this committee together; let's get people involved in this. Let's not sit on this. Because the Mayor did say that we have made some changes along the way. We cannot just say that it is fixed. We have to continue to look at the times of where we are and make the changes accordingly. I think this is just a good direction.

Calvin Woodruff: This whole process is dynamic. It has to continue to change to keep up with the needs with the workforce that is available to you and the needs of the City Administration to fill those jobs.

Councilman Francis Plaisance: I cannot speak for those that are not here, but Councilman Touchet and I are both very passionate about our City and the Mayor is very much so, and we want to see the City operate the way it should operate and street and municipal employees are very, very important to make it run right. It is getting the right people in the right places that is critical.

Calvin Woodruff: I suggest to you gentlemen, because our lady is not with us tonight, that you consider tonight, that we not wait that long, that this will be a working group and the two people from this group be the director and myself and perhaps one board member who would be willing and able to do this, to start without delay, to meet with the administration.

Allen Ramke volunteered to be on the committee.

--Timmy Farris made a motion to establish the subcommittee to restructure the "test" and Allen Ramke seconded the motion.

Mayor: I just wanted to inform you that we are right in the middle of formalizing the budget, and the budget is going to be coming out Friday. This year again, for the second year in a row, I have put in and asked the Council, and the Council is going to go along with I am sure, a 50 cent per hour raise for all City employees, municipal, not Fire and Police. Fire and police are mandated by law to get a 2% increase. This is part of a four year plan that we started last year, to try and bring everybody's salaries to a higher level. The whole idea behind it for example – someone that makes \$12 per hour is no longer going to get a 24 cents raise, they are going to get a 50 cent raise, so they are getting twice as much of a raise as they were getting in the past. I would like to thank you for cooperating with the Mayor and Council because you are the entity that allowed us to get away from the percentage raise and implement a dollar amount raise so that we could get these raises up to a higher level. Again, the whole reason for it, was that somebody who was making \$10.00 per hour was getting a 20 cent raise and somebody that was making \$20 per hour was getting a 40 cent raise – twice as much. We just did not feel like that was fair. On top of that, we wanted the ability to give higher raises, and we did not want to give 5% raises because we did not want this gap to spread. A five percent raise for a guy that makes \$10 per hour was 50 cents and the guy that makes \$20 per hour would get a \$1 raise. So they are still getting twice as much. We wanted everybody to get an equal share and doubled it from where we were in the past. Hopefully we can continue with that plan.

Calvin Woodruff: That is great news – thank you Mayor.

Russell Frederick: We look forward to working with you. May I say that I did not mean to point anybody out. I said I knew no names, nobody talked to me, nobody mentioned names. I like to deal aboveground though. I like to work with the Council because I have been on the Council and you know that. There is no better working relation than these two Boards. If you have a problem you can come see me, come see her, or you can go see Woody – I do not care who it is. But if somebody has a personal vendetta against this Board as a total, then I would like to have somebody come to us – come settle your accounts with us and maybe we can straighten it out.

Calvin Woodruff: So, whenever you have a working group – just please let the director know. She will get with us and we will start meeting.

Russell Frederick: Remember some of our rules have not been updated for a while, some have. If you need something – then come to us and say hey this is not working, and it is not to the advantage of the City – come to us. All you have to do is come to us.

Roger Fontenot: He thanked the Mayor and Council and the Board for the raise that we will be getting this year. It makes us feel like we are doing a good job. We thank you.

Marie expressed appreciation for the Board's consideration of possibly giving them a raise and doing the research.

Councilman Plaisance announced that there was going to be an inspirational speaker at Harvest Time Church this evening at 7:00 – someone that escaped from Derick Todd Lee would be speaking.

Director's Report

We then discussed Ethics training. Members of this Board are required to take one hour of Ethics training each year. Woody is a certified Ethics Trainer which he does for the school employees. He is doing it for 40 of the City of Kaplan employees on December 29th, at the Kaplan City Hall. You can sit live through a one-hour session. If not, you will need to do it online. It takes an hour. It is interactive. You have to answer questions every few minutes. You can get them all wrong and you will still pass it. We scheduled our next meeting for Tuesday, February 10, 2015.

--Allen Ramke motioned to adjourn the meeting. Timmy Farris seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

APPROVE:

Elaine D. Livers
Secretary, Civil Service Board
City of Abbeville, Louisiana

Russell Frederick
Chairman
Abbeville Municipal Employees Civil Service Board