

DRAFT

**MINUTES OF THE ALAMEDA COUNTY WASTE
MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY MEETING
OF THE
PROGRAMS AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**

Thursday, July 13, 2017

9:00 A.M.

**NOTE MEETING LOCATION
Oro Loma Sanitary District
2655 Grant Avenue
San Lorenzo, CA 94580
510-276-4700**

Members Present:

Castro Valley Sanitary District	Dave Sadoff
City of Dublin	Don Biddle
City of Hayward	Sara Lamnin
City of Livermore	Bob Carling
City of Oakland	Dan Kalb
City of Newark	Mike Hannon
Oro Loma Sanitary District	Shelia Young
City of San Leandro	Deborah Cox
City of Union City	Lorrin Ellis

Absent:

County of Alameda	Keith Carson
City of Berkeley	Jesse Arreguin
City of Fremont	Vinnie Bacon

Staff Present:

Wendy Sommer, Executive Director
Pat Cabrera, Administrative Services Director
Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director
Arliss Dunn, Clerk of the Board

Others Present:

Jason Warner, Oro Loma Sanitary District

1. Convene Meeting

Chair Dave Sadoff called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. Public Comments

There were none.

3. Approval of the Draft Minutes of June 8, 2017 (Pat Cabrera)

Action

DRAFT

Board member Carling made the motion to approve the draft minutes of June 8, 2017. Board member Biddle seconded and the motion carried 8-0 (Ayes: Biddle, Carling, Cox, Ellis, Hannon, Lamnin, Sadoff, Young. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Bacon, Arreguin, Carson, Kalb).

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 4. Changes to the Agency's Human Resources Manual (Pat Cabrera) | Action |
| That the P&A Committee recommend that the Waste Management Authority Board approve the changes to the Agency's HR manual, specifically the elimination of Attachment A and changes to pages 2-4, 2-5. | |

Pat Cabrera provided an overview of the staff report. The report is available here:

[Changes-HR-Manual-07-13-17.pdf](#)

Ms. Cabrera distributed an additional attachment to the human resources manual. The attachment is section 1.7. - New Employees. The attachment is included in the minutes as a matter of record.

Chair Sadoff inquired if the requirement for an employee to maintain satisfactory performance was included in the previous performance evaluation plan. Ms. Cabrera stated yes, but it will now be tied to a metric that states the employee must not be in a performance improvement plan in order to receive any wage adjustment including cost of living. Chair Sadoff inquired if any employee had ever not received a raise under the previous plan. Ms. Cabrera stated no. Board member Carling inquired about how the raise package is determined. Ms. Cabrera stated that the COLA (cost of living adjustment) and the 5% step increase determine the raise package until the employee reaches the top of the salary range. Mr. Padia added if an employee is already at the top of the range they are only allowed the COLA increase. Board member Hannon stated that it is important to reward excellent performance and inquired if there is a mechanism to award a merit increase. Ms. Cabrera stated yes, Ms. Sommer as Executive Director can award an additional merit increase if it does not exceed the top of the salary range. Ms. Sommer stated that many employees felt that the pay for performance plan was not motivating and most placed a higher value on the mission of the organization as opposed to receiving a minimal increase in pay. Board member Hannon stated the importance in providing written feedback to employees.

Board member Carling inquired about the process for setting priorities for employees. Ms. Cabrera stated that some employees may have duties across several projects depending on the deliverables and the difficulty was providing weight to the particular assignment, i.e. the project was necessary but maybe not as complex as another project. Board member Ellis referenced the Priority Setting Process that staff presented to the Board in 2016 and inquired if staff priorities will be aligned with the established agency priorities. Ms. Sommer stated yes, the programs and deliverables identified in the recently adopted budget was a culmination of the priority setting process and staff was assigned clear roles and responsibilities and will be evaluated under these guidelines. Board member Carling stressed the importance of holding the project lead accountable for providing written feedback both affirmative and negative. Ms. Sommer stated that this has not been a practice but we are now becoming more proactive with respect to progressive discipline when needed.

Board member Lamnin stated that she is concerned about automatic step increases increasing costs for public agencies and recommended a regional effort in looking at how to address this issue. Ms. Sommer stated that this pay structure aligns with most public agency pay structures and in her opinion is the most equitable for employees. Board member Young concurred with Board member Lamnin's comments and added most public agencies conduct a compensation study when employees reach the top of the range which results in an increase in the top of the range. Board member Lamnin inquired if staff can receive a

DRAFT

COLA and step increase in the same year and if so as a smaller agency maybe we can look at creative ideas that could be piloted for other agencies such as not simultaneously awarding a step increase and a COLA. Ms. Cabrera reminded that this issue can be discussed during the compensation study scheduled for the spring of 2018. Board member Young commended Ms. Sommer for working on creating a smaller agency and reducing the financial obligation.

Board member Hannon stated that the 5% increase is technically not a raise but is a step increase dependent upon satisfactory performance. Most often employees start at the bottom of the range with the expectation that the employee will progress in skill and experience to an expected level and reach the top of the range. Board member Cox inquired if there will be flexibility to award less than the 5% step increase. Ms. Cabrera stated that the wording states “up to 5%” however the expectation is to award the 5% step increase. Ms. Cabrera reiterated that any employee in a PIP (performance improvement plan) is ineligible for any increase.

Board member Ellis made the motion to approve the staff recommendation. Board member Biddle seconded and the motion carried 9-0:

(Ayes: Biddle, Carling, Cox, Ellis, Hannon, Kalb, Lamnin, Sadoff, Young. Abstain: None. Absent: Arreguin, Bacon, Carson).

5. Oro Loma and Castro Valley Sanitary Districts Horizontal Levee Project (Tom Padia) Information/Tour

This item is for information only.

Jason Warner, General Manager of the Oro Loma Sanitary District provided an overview of the horizontal levee demonstration project and provided a video presentation. A link to the video is available here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o2Hh3jWufA>

Board member Lamnin inquired if the water is being used by the waste water treatment facility and are there discussions about recycled water dispersal for use in other areas. Mr. Warner stated that although the water is clean it still needs to be retreated and for the foreseeable future will be used to treat the habitat and used to treat urban drool. Ms. Sommer inquired about the joint financial investment for the project and what are the ongoing costs that the community could help support. Mr. Warner stated that Oro Loma contributed two-thirds to the project and Castro Valley contributed one-third of the cost and ongoing expenses include the monthly cost of \$600 for offering tours of the project but first year maintenance cost have been very minimal.

Chair Sadoff thanked Mr. Warner for the presentation and for hosting the Committee meeting.

6. Member Comments

There were none.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m. and the tour immediately followed.

1.7.1 New Employees

The first 12 months of continuous employment at the Authority is considered a probation period. During this time it is hoped that each new employee will learn his/her responsibilities and demonstrate satisfactory competence in the new position. It is also an opportunity for the employee to get acquainted with coworkers and determine whether or not the position meets his/her needs and expectations. Probationary program staff will receive a review at approximately six months from a selected team of staff, in order to provide on-going feedback and maximize the success of the probationary period. ~~Depending on when the six month juncture occurs, this review can be conducted in conjunction with the mid-year review outlined in Attachment A.~~ This team, under oversight from the ASD, will provide written feedback to the appropriate program group leads who will meet with the new employee and deliver this feedback including advising the employee of any problem areas with proposed corrective measures. Just prior to the probationary employee reaching the end of the probation period, the team will again provide feedback to the program group leads regarding the employee's progress which will take into consideration any comments and/or corrective action resulting from the first evaluation. Based on this feedback the program group lead will make a recommendation to the ED as to whether or not the probationary employee should be granted regular employee status or released from service.

The ED has the authority to end probationary periods prior to the completion of one year, as allowed by law.

Upon completion of the probation period, if the employee's performance is satisfactory and a recommendation is made to end probationary status, he/she will be granted regular employee status and subject to the normal evaluation process ~~outlined in the Salary Adjustment Plan (Attachment A).~~