

**CUMBERLAND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS'  
SALARY BOARD**

**OCTOBER 26, 2015 – 2:00 PM  
COMMISSIONERS' HEARING ROOM  
COURTHOUSE, CARLISLE, PA**

**Board of Commissioners Present:** Commissioner Barbara Cross, Jim Hertzler and Gary Eichelberger.

**Quorum:** Yes

**Staff Present:** Larry Thomas, Chief Clerk; Sandy Moyle, Deputy Chief Clerk/Meetings Manager; Jennifer Crum, Recording Secretary; Keith Brenneman, Solicitor.

**Departments:** Liz Bouch, Human Resources; Dana Best and Ron Snow, Finance; Mark Adams, IMTO; Al Whitcomb, Controller.

**Media:** Joshua Vaughn, The Sentinel.

**Others Present:**

**Call to Order:** Chairman Cross called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**Roll Call:** Commissioner Cross, Hertzler, Eichelberger and Controller Whitcomb were present.

**Public Comment:** None

**Approval of Minutes:** Commissioner Whitcomb moved to approve the Minutes of September 28, 2015 and October 12, 2015. Commissioner Hertzler seconded the motion and it unanimously carried.

**Approval of Salary Board Actions:** Commissioner Whitcomb moved to approve the Salary Board Actions of October 22, 2015. Commissioner Eichelberger seconded the motion and it unanimously carried.

**Approval of Merit Based Compensation Formula:** Commissioner Whitcomb moved to approve the Merit Based Compensation Formula. Commissioner Eichelberger seconded the motion.

**Commissioner Hertzler Comments:**

Commissioner Hertzler stated points to be address: Since this affects both our taxpayers and our employees going forward, there are certain points that need to be address and made on the record, for the benefit of our public.

I think it is important to point out that this is the first time we've considered and are taking action on a Pay for Performance, or Merit Based, employee compensation plan. While there was one previous vote to authorize a consultant Financial Management Professionals (FMP) to move forward with the development of the outlines of such a Plan, this is the first time we're actually voting on such a Plan. At several recent public forums, I have heard the accusation that there have been "hankles against it" and that I've voted... and I presume the inference was that Commissioners Cross also voted against it on numerous occasions. Let the record reflect that those statements were not true.

Since this is only coming to this Board for a first vote today, I find it disconcerting that the cart was placed before the horse and that the elements of this proposal are posted on the website as if they are already in place. The fact is, it is only being put into place with our action today.

In addition, relative to the posting on our county's website regarding the new compensation system, noticeably absent is the pay chart showing the \$2.3 million pay raise granted in the middle of the year for a minority of our county's workforce. I believe the public has every right to see that spreadsheet, with the facts surrounding the pay raises that were granted for some in our workforce on July 12. People should have the right to see for themselves the pay raises that were granted. They shouldn't have to file a right to know request to see it.

This is a critical point to make and whether we like it or not, this Board of Commissioners is a lame duck Board of Commissioners and depending on the outcome of the election in just one week, I would expect that the entire compensation system that started with the seriously flawed "benchmarking" process on June 22<sup>nd</sup> will very possibly be exposed to a re-evaluation and re-review the kind of thorough examination that should have occurred in the first place with the benchmarking to ensure that the pays established on July 12 were really what the market demanded.

I will also state for the record again here today, that it is my judgement that many of the salaries established on June 22<sup>nd</sup> were way above, way above what the market demanded. I will also note for record today that the "downgrading" of our county's Deputy Chief Clerk position to Administrative Supervisor was never discussed by this Board and never consciously approved by this Board although it was contained in the new classification structure that I had voted against.

Having said all of the above, however, I am today going to support this new Merit Based Compensation System for our county, which I have always said I would support. Many of the elements of this Plan are good and I believe the merit-based Plan has value.

But, I want to make it clear to our employees and our taxpayers alike, that revisions may be in the offing. I think there is a definite need to re-examine the new pay classification structure in particular but that has little to do with this pay for performance plan. On the other hand, I also want to assure all of our hard working, dedicated employees that before any of this takes effect, I for one will want to ensure that the evaluation process and the process known as "norming" will be nothing less that completely fair and equitable. All of our employees deserve nothing less.

**Commissioner Cross's Comments:**

Commissioner Cross disapproved of the "lame duck" statement. She was elected for four years and that's not over until it's over. Decisions may be overturned but most of those decisions have been very fair and will withstand the test of time. She stated that what is being voted on is the formula before the Salary Board and if there is any other comments.

**Commissioner Eichelberger's Comments:**

Commissioner Eichelberger stated that he finds this troubling and after all this time, we have the opportunity to get out of a cycle that feeds our budget problem. A lot of rhetoric of solving a budget problem and there's rarely been much support for trying to do anything about it other than trying to be the headline. It's also troubling when a commissioner who could give Bill Clinton lessons on defining what "the meaning of is-is", and trying to establish the parameters for something that is extremely complicated and that we have employees with very high credentials to do both internally and externally. That's not to say that none of that is beyond question. That's our job, to constantly question and yes revisions will be in the offer, because at last there is a fundamental recognition that we want a different result in how we manage the county, we need to do things differently and things are starting to happen and that's the best opportunity we have to solve long term problems if we focus on long term problems instead of grabbing tomorrow's headline.

I agree with Commissioner Cross that we are here to do the job and our terms are not over. We have in fact delayed this issue, which has been on the table for quite some time. Far too long and yet were told we haven't delayed long enough and to wait until another Board comes along, but we have a responsibility that we are elected to do. What's being suggested is that it is a way to continue to campaign to potentially derail and destroy this fundamental change of how we do business.

There has been this infatuation with censorship for quite some time and to point to the fact sheets on the website that explain fundamentally how this process was undertaken, what the premise is, what the rationale and procedures are and what the results have been. There are fact sheets that are very useful and they should be posted and it was discussed with this Board and only one individual objected to having rationale on the website and trying to suggest it shouldn't be placed there unless there was a unanimous opinion. It's more complete factuals and gives an overall picture of what the county is trying to achieve and stifling people the ability to learn about the process may be a great campaign technique, but lousy for making a long term change. It is there for the public to view and if there are any additional questions, we can address them.

Changes will be made to the program by the Commissioners and while abdicating our responsibilities on key issues might be just another day at the office for some, that's not how some of us operate. We have significant responsibilities and this has been in development for a long time period and the opportunity to ask and receive answers to questions has been in place for a very long time. We do not have all the answers and it's rare you do when a decision needs made on the 2016 budget that will play very heavily into our long term projections. We need to get a system in place for 2016, it's been delayed long enough. I have significant confidence that the outline of what's in place is sound, but doesn't mean there are some questions still

surrounding it. If you are waiting for perfection, you're never going to find it. We have to get something that we reasonably trust in place and can modify as we go and continue to ask questions. This is the responsibility of this Board to act and the fact that is Board has chosen to take action and not be \_\_back to step one. Informing a new Board is going to take a year or more. There will be opportunities to make some changes along the way, so all of revisions in the offering. I think it's received fair vetting and we received significant answers that will help anyone who looks at the facts to formulate informed view point on what the intent is or what the methodology was, to see that we're on the wrong track unless you're objective all along it's simply to mislead and only focus on those picked facts. The management team and committee have done a very good job at something very promising.

Commissioner Cross stated this vote is for the formula only. The motion carried.

**Other Business:** None

**Adjourn:** There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Crum  
Administrative Specialist