

Letter: EDC assessor challenges counselor's facts

Publisher's note: This letter was sent June 4 to El Dorado County Counsel Robyn Drivon from county Assessor Karl Weiland explaining how she gave misinformation to the Board of Supervisors.

Robyn,

At today's budget hearing, you made the statement that the longevity for prior service clause was not added, it was in the resolution all along. I disagree with your assertion for the following reason:

Here is §901 from the May 19th redline version which is item 5) in file 15-0634 Version 2



And here is §901 from the redline version 6/2/15 which is item 2:



First note that the language in question is not present in the May 19 version. Second, the language recognizing prior service is highlighted in red and underlined as are all other additions. Obviously, if the language were present in previous versions, the text would be in black with no emphasis.

I see that only the original contract routing sheet is part of the agenda item. Clearly, a significant change was allowed to be made to the document with no additional review by county counsel being posted as part of the agenda item.

As I expressed in a prior email, my concern is with process. If more evidence is needed to convince everyone that the process has serious flaws, consider this: This longevity reinstatement language is also contained in Resolution 235-14. This is the resolution that was intended only to restore longevity and CPA differential for the elected department heads. There was no publicly stated intent to adjust longevity

of appointed department heads.

I am not at all familiar with the agenda process or CAO/county counsel or HR's internal review procedures. There might be some validity in the argument that a new administration, new counsel and relatively new board all combined to allow such a glaring change to slip through ... once. But twice?

There is no argument that the salaries of public officials and executives is a sensitive issue that must be administered in a manner above reproach. If there is a time for complete, honest and full disclosure, this would be where those attributes need to be present though out the entire process. There is no place here for any taint of deceptive practice, intentional or accidental.

That this was almost allowed to occur points to the need for strengthening the process to be more inclusive and deliberative.