

OFFICE OF THE
COUNTY EXECUTIVE
COUNTY OF PLACER

TO: Honorable Board of Supervisors
FROM: Thomas M. Miller, County Executive Officer
DATE: January 12, 2010
SUBJECT: Cost Savings Task Force Recommendations

ACTION REQUESTED:

1. Accept the second set of recommendations of the various subcommittees comprising the Cost Savings Task Force.
2. Authorize the County Executive Office to proceed, as indicated, with the identified cost saving measures and/or productivity improvements reflected in these recommendations.

BACKGROUND:

On November 3rd, 2009 your Board, as a related action to implement budgetary savings this fiscal year, approved nine cost savings solutions totaling over \$300,000, and directed the County Executive Officer to implement these initial cost saving measures and/or productivity improvements. Today, two subcommittees of the Cost Savings Task Force, Benefits and Organization, are presenting an additional seven recommendations for your Board's approval.

The "Cost Savings Task Force" comprises six subcommittees (Automation and Information Technology, Benefits, Organizational, Purchasing, Receiver, and Transportation) whose members include management and confidential personnel. The subcommittees are making progress in their review of over 250 cost saving suggestions initially proposed by those same employees in March of last year, and any additional suggestions proposed thereafter. The subcommittees anticipate bringing forth additional recommendations for your Board's consideration several times this year.

Briefly, the process in place to review the cost saving suggestions begins with the separate subcommittee meetings conducting their review and assessment of each submitted suggestion, and, after consulting with subject matter experts as appropriate, submitting completed recommendations to the Cost Savings Clearinghouse Committee for review, feedback and potential approval to forward to your Board.

As they deliberate the various popular and unpopular cost saving suggestions, subcommittees may recommend not implementing some ideas, or they may find that some suggestions are already underway in the County. They may calculate actual or estimated cost savings totaling anywhere from hundreds of dollars to hundreds of thousands of dollars or more.

Notably, some of the items collectively resulting in significant budget savings may not readily be implemented as they are topics subject to meet and confer with County labor organizations. If the subcommittee recommends the implementation of a cost saving suggestion, then an implementation plan is included.

The Cost Savings Clearinghouse Committee conducts the final review of submitted recommendations. In some instances, similar to the subcommittees' option, the Clearinghouse may recommend not to proceed with the implementation of certain cost saving solutions.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This set of recommended costs savings primarily consists of organizational and/or other changes that necessitate modification of labor agreements.

Staff Presentation:

Members of two Subcommittees reviewed the following submitted cost savings suggestions / productivity enhancements, and are presenting their recommendations:

- Organizational Subcommittee
 - Use the more cost effective method of Standard Permit mail for large mailing projects while meeting business needs.
 - Evaluate each use of contract services.
 - Develop a procedural manual and routine training for the Board of Supervisors' agenda review process.

- Benefits Subcommittee
 - Require employees to use compensatory time off (CTO) rather than cashing it out.
 - Unpaid time with accrual of paid leave credit for employees not able to participate in mandatory time off. *(A recent court ruling may affect implementation of this suggestion).*
 - Extend vacation cash out moratorium for next fiscal year and add another 40 hours to the accrual limits contained in Placer County Code, Section 3.04.47(C)(1a and 1b).
 - Increase Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) percentage for employees.

(Note: the last four suggestions are subject to meet and confer with labor organizations)

TM/HH/AR

ATTACHMENTS

1. BOS Adopted Cost Saving Ideas To Date
2. Recommended Cost Savings / Productivity Enhancements
 - a) Organizational Subcommittee
 - b) Benefits Subcommittee

PLACER COUNTY
COST SAVINGS TASK FORCE
BOS ADOPTED COST SAVING SOLUTIONS
2009 / 2010

NOVEMBER 3, 2009

Cost Saving Solution	Responsible Department
Internal version of Craig's list	Administrative Services
Recycle inkjet cartridges	Administrative Services
Reduce or restrict office supplies purchases	Administrative Services
Utilize the Performance Accounting System/Corporate Express Electronic Invoice business process	Auditor-Controller
Utilize available video and web-based conferencing technology in the County as a regular business practice	Administrative Services
Increase printing efficiency countywide - reduce printing costs	Administrative Services
Audit departments' payroll processing to look for internal control issues and possible abuse of leave hours and overtime	County Executive Office / Auditor-Controller's Office
Change policy on development security deposits	Community Development Resource Agency (CDRA)
Review trust funds for escheatment	Auditor-Controller

Cost Saving Task Force
Organizational Committee

Subcommittee Members:

Sandy Hammock, Linda Brown, Donna Kirkpatrick, Allison Carlos, Allison McCrossen, Bekki Riggan, Kathryn Ripley, Troy Held, Joel Swift, Renee Harvey, Joanne Auerbach

Subject Matter Experts Consulted:

Leslie Blagg, Central Services Manager
Lisa Moan, Central Services Accounting Technician

Cost Savings Suggestion:

County Departments that do large mailings (250 or more envelopes) could see cost savings if they planned ahead to use Standard Permit mail rather than using First Class Permit mail.

Recommendation for Action:

The subcommittee is recommending that departments use the more cost effective method of Standard Permit mail for large mailing projects, provided the additional mailing time necessary for this method meets their business need.

Basis:

There are opportunities for savings by changing from First Class Permit mailing to Standard Permit mailing.

- Central Services conducted a study utilizing data from FY 07-08 based on actual mailings that were sent using First Class Permit mail versus Standard Permit mail.
- The downside of Standard Permit mail is that the delivery time is increased from 1-3 days to 2-10 days.
- Certain types of mailing (for example: tax bills) are required by law to be mailed using First Class postage.

Cost Savings:

One example from July 2007 shows a mailing project of 26,935 envelopes used First Class Permit mail which cost the Department \$8,889. Had the Department utilized the Standard Permit mail (if feasible), the same project would have cost \$6,195, for a saving of \$2,694. The Central Services study determined that the countywide estimate of cost savings for using Standard Permit mail for FY 07-08 would have been \$12,000. This is a productivity enhancement and is difficult to quantify actual cost savings due to mailing time constraints and Federal Government mailing requirements.

Recommendation for Implementation:

1. Central Services to educate Departments on ways to achieve cost saving related to large mailing projects.
 2. The County to develop and adopt a "best practices" Permit mail policy. Central Services to take the lead in finalizing the policy utilized to determine when Standard Permit mail is appropriate.
 3. Central Services to publicize the new Permit mail policy and reinforce best practices by serving as a resource to Departments to assist them with large mailing projects.
 4. Departments contact Central Services for assistance and recommendations for large mailing projects.
 5. Departments begin large mailing projects in sufficient time to allow for the 10 day mailing time associated with Standard Permit mail.
 6. Departments use the less costly Standard Permit mail method whenever possible.
 7. The Organization Subcommittee recommends that the new policy be formalized in County Policy and Procedure manuals and the Central Services Division will be responsible to update the Permit Mail Policy when applicable.
-

Clearinghouse Recommendation:

Idea is ready for Board consideration. Idea appears to have quantifiable savings as identified. The Clearinghouse further noted that Federal Government regulations may influence the use of Standard Permit mail versus First Class Permit mail.

Cost Saving Task Force
Organizational Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members:

Sandy Hammock, Linda Brown, Donna Kirkpatrick, Allison Carlos, Allison McCrossen, Bekki Riggan, Kathryn Ripley, Troy Held, Joel Swift, Renee Harvey, Joanne Auerbach

Subject Matter Experts Consulted:

Jim Boggan, Procurement Services, Purchasing Manager
Chris Artim, Probation, Sr. Administration Services Officer
Georgia Emslie, Health & Human Services, Fiscal Program Manager
Jim Kotey, Risk Management, Management Analyst
Gerald Carden, County Counsel, Chief Deputy County Counsel

Cost Savings Suggestion:

The county should thoroughly evaluate each use of contract services. This topic combined three conflicting, yet related suggestions surrounding the best use of contract services. These suggestions are:

1. Evaluate outside contracts for a variety of services
 - A. routine landscape maintenance
 - B. general routine maintenance activities
 - C. some County services
 - D. custodial, parks, fleet and other appropriate classifications.
2. Eliminate/reduce the use of consultants, contract services, vendor contracts, professional services, etc. that can be reintroduced to County workforce and performed by existing staff.
3. Evaluate and possibly offer contract services to other agencies. Could Placer County staff resources and expertise be shared with other counties, allowing them to reduce costs and alternative funding for staff. Possibilities include County Counsel, Auditor, Sheriff, HHS and other departments.

Recommendation for Action:

- The County should look for economies of scale – there may be opportunities to share with other jurisdictions. (For example – there may be opportunities to work with the North Tahoe Public Utilities District and/or the Tahoe City Public Utilities District on shared contracts).
 - Courier Services could be consolidated.
 - Encourage departments to continue to diligently use scarce resources in order to provide services, and make individual efforts to reduce costs through the use of independent contractors where possible.
 - Departments should work closely with Procurement early on in the process and to use Procurement's resources to leverage contracts wherever possible.
-

Basis:

- Facility Services has contracted with PRIDE Industries for the custodial services at Building B at the Bill Santucci Justice Center and a separate contractor for landscaping services for the site. The PRIDE contract provided cost savings and efficiency, with approximately a 50% savings for the custodial portion. In the case of the Justice Center, no parks and grounds workers were displaced and custodial staff assigned to the departments that moved to Building B was reassigned at other County facilities. The PRIDE contract recently was renegotiated and approved by the Board of Supervisors at a lower rate than the initial contract.
- Due to the current economy, Procurement Services reports that contractors are very anxious to do business with the County and they are seeing bids coming in lower than projected. Current contractors are willing to renegotiate renewals at lower rates. Procurement has the ability to put a project out for bid to see if a contractor can bring in a less expensive option than provided by County staff. With requests for proposals for professional services, the award of the contract is based upon qualifications, not just price. This applies to architects, engineers, environmental, etc.
- Tahoe snow removal has many small contracts that add up to a considerable amount
- Central Services provides many services that other counties contract
- Contracting out reduces retirement and overhead, provides contracts with just-in-time delivery
- Printing at the department level has increased, reducing some need for the print shop
- It is less expensive for Departments to process their own copying jobs than using Central Services when the copying is under \$2,500
- Central Service's turn around-time is slower than outside
- Some jobs can be performed by Department employees at their own workstations (example – small number of brochures)
- Redevelopment can use county building inspectors to perform services for Housing Rehabilitation Loans such as code enforcement and building inspections for first time home owner programs. Some exceptions include:
 - Lead based paint – outside contract
 - Income verification – outside contract
- Health and Human Services (HHS) shares a manager with Nevada County in the Tahoe\Truckee area and they also contract to provide psychiatric beds at Cirby Hills in Roseville to Nevada County.
- HHS does not have ample staffing to open beds in the Children's Shelter to other counties
- HHS is watching their contracts closely in light of state budget cuts and taking several actions:
 - When the budget crisis hit, HHS analyzed over 245 contracts
 - Mental health providers and substance abuse treatment are coming back in-house to save County jobs. This has caused a cutback to community-based organizations.
 - HHS is shifting staff between Divisions, for instance to Human Services from CSOC and ASOC.
 - Consultant contracts have all been cancelled unless it is for a mandated service
 - HHS is in the Request for Proposal process for the crisis residential program currently at Cirby Hills, with options for a new facility or renegotiation of current lease. Smaller counties typically must contract out.

- Other counties are looking for opportunities to share costs
- HHS is currently awaiting State and Federal funding and mandate notifications. The health care debate at a federal level will have an effect and the Governor has proposed possibly privatizing portions of CalWORKS and Medi-Cal.
- Probation has contracts for food service and transit, however there are not many outside contracts with the exception of electronic monitoring. There are several vendors who compete for this contract and it would be a significant endeavor to not contract out for this (some larger counties operate their electronic monitoring in house).
- Child Support Services (CSS) reported that the State is favorable to contracts, but are unfavorable to contracting out child support services work. CSS has many contracts for other type of work, even the depository and disbursement of support payments. They share services with Probation, Sheriff, and District Attorney.
- Risk Management favors outside contracts - using outside contractors when done properly, transfers the risk from the County to the contractor.
- The Placer County Charter provides a broader basis for contracting County services than is available to non-Charter counties under the Government Code. Government Code Section 31000 authorizes the board of supervisors to contract out for *special services*, including financial, economic, accounting, engineering, legal, medical, therapeutic, administrative, architectural, airport or building security matters, laundry services or linen services, and certain custodial services if the board finds that the economic constraints make a contract for custodial services more efficient. This provision is often cited to prohibit a board from contracting for services which can be provided by county employees. However, the Placer County Charter, Article III, Section 302 (h) authorizes the board to "contract with an independent contractor to provide any services required of, or performed by, the county if it is more economical to do so."
- The government of the future may be a smaller workforce, per capita, and will likely rely more on contracts in order to provide County services. Staff may require different skill sets, more centered on contract management rather than direct service. The County needs to make appropriate adjustments in order to take advantage of this shift while maintaining the level of service expected by the public. This may require additional training/retraining of staff in order to successfully manage contract services. Staff training and development costs will prepare the County for better management of contract services.
- Ongoing general services may be more efficiently provided by contracts due to the elimination of labor and benefit costs.
- Contract services may be more cost-efficient for specific or expertise services that staff may not be able to provide
- Contract services may not be more cost-effective when County staff can provide specific expertise or skills, or where management of a contract is more costly than providing the services in a contract.

Cost Analysis: For fiscal year 08/09, countywide contracted services total approximately \$82,000,000. Countywide contracts cover a wide variety of services for the diverse needs of county departments. Further research on a case-by-case basis will need to be conducted by respective departments to determine potential cost savings on contracted services versus

county provided services. Cost of staff time in preparing Best Practices will pay off in streamlined contracting processes and related operational efficiencies.

Recommendation for Implementation:

County to develop and communicate a set of "Best Practices" for contract services through the use of independent contractors (as opposed to contract employees). This discussion will need to include Department Heads, CEO and the Board of Supervisors and will be guided by a team assigned to negotiate with employee unions. The result of the discussion could include:

- A template for decision-making for Departments to use in deciding when and where to use a contract employee/service or to use county staff.
 - Identify right size for staffing, based on long term sustainable staffing levels.
 - Develop tools for identifying what services are provided more efficiently by contract providers.
 - Departments should consider total cost of service, including total cost of staffing, including benefits and risk factors.
 - Contract management costs need to be included with contract price to determine the total cost of a contract.
 - Evaluate and avoid potential areas of conflict of interest with contracted services.
 - Take advantage of competitive bidding process, where possible.
 - Identify funding source.
 - Share costs with other agencies, where applicable.
 - Consider changes in the Administrative Rules that may be necessary to implement the Best Practices.
 - The Organizational Subcommittee recommends that the new policy be formalized in County Policy and Procedure manuals.
 - Organizational Development (OD) to develop training for county staff in project/contract management. Staff training and development costs will prepare the County for better management of contract services.
 - Develop work group of key departments to work with OD.
 - Work group to further evaluate contract data Countywide to develop recommendations of potential areas the county should investigate for cost savings.
-

Clearinghouse Recommendation:

Idea is ready for Board consideration. Idea may not have readily quantifiable savings, but appears to positively impact process improvement and warrants implementation to some degree.

Cost Savings Task Force
Organizational Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members:

Sandy Hammock, Linda Brown, Donna Kirkpatrick, Allison Carlos, Allison McCrossen, Bekki Riggan, Kathryn Ripley, Troy Held, Joel Swift, Renee Harvey, Joanne Auerbach

Subject Matter Experts: Due to the somewhat routine nature of this topic, subject matter experts were not consulted.

Cost Savings Suggestion:

Development of a procedural manual and routine training through Organizational Development (OD) for appropriate county staff on the Board of Supervisors' agenda review process.

Recommendation for Action:

The Committee recommends the following for consideration:

- Development of a procedural manual with examples of well-crafted and differing types of agenda items
 - Development of checklists department staff could refer to before submitting agenda items
 - Placement of procedural manual on Countywide network for convenient access to all County staff
 - Development of routine training (perhaps twice per year) covering the essential components of the agenda development and review process to be offered by County Executive Office and Clerk of the Board staff
-

Basis:

The Committee discussed the challenges associated with the timely development and submission of agenda items to the County Executive Office and to the Clerk of the Board for the bi-weekly Board of Supervisors meetings:

- Currently, no up-to-date countywide reference document exists that delineates the format, timelines, or content requirements for this essential activity within County government
- As a result, significant staff time is consumed as department staffs seek to understand the layers of review entailed in this process and the requirements for proper submission of documents
- The public is best served when consistent, concise agenda items are presented to the Board of Supervisors
- Although the processes are fairly static, they do tend to evolve somewhat over time and sometime changes are made in response to the preferences of the current Board Chairperson
- Countywide staff turnover presents issues as new staff seeks to understand the elements and associated requirements of the agenda review process
- Additional time required to prepare a procedural manual will be captured as savings in document preparation, editing and review.

Cost Savings:

It is anticipated that once the procedure manual is produced and staff is trained, cost savings would be realized countywide through the reduction in time spent by department staff, County Counsel, and CEO/COB administration staff in preparing and review Board agenda items. This is a productivity enhancement and it is difficult to quantify actual cost savings.

Recommendation for Implementation:

- 1) CEO/COB administration staff to develop a procedural manual with examples of well-crafted and differing types of agenda items.
 - 2) CEO/COB administration staff to develop checklists for department staff to use as reference before submitting agenda items.
 - 3) Place procedural manual on countywide network for convenient access by all County staff.
 - 4) COB staff to maintain updates to procedural manual.
 - 5) CEO/COB administration staff to work with OD to develop routine training covering the essential components of the agenda development and review process.
 - 6) Training to be offered twice a year.
 - 7) The subcommittee recommends that the new policy be formalized in County Policy and Procedure manuals.
-

Clearinghouse Recommendation:

Idea is ready for Board consideration. Idea may not have readily quantifiable savings, but appears to positively impact process improvement and warrants implementation.

Cost Saving Task Force
Benefits Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members:

Cheryl Trenwith, Debbie Bartels, Debbie Keeler Drake, Denise Medlin, Gina Langford, Janet Fogarty, Jeff Bell, Mark Rathe, Michelle Beauchamp, Nicole Lopez, Richard Eiri, Ruth Alves, Steven Oliveira, Ted Peterson

Subject Matter Experts:

Mark Rathe, County Counsel

Cost Savings Suggestion:

Require use of compensatory time off (CTO) rather than cashing it out.

Recommendation for Action:

Due to coverage and essential service issues, a county-wide requirement to eliminate cashing out of CTO would likely not be workable. However, a county-wide policy for each department to apply where possible could be implemented and realize the County immediate savings. The committee recommends putting in place a County-wide policy to eliminate CTO cash outs where coverage and essential services are not impacted, as determined by the department head.

This is a meet and confer item that could be included in upcoming negotiations with PPEO.

Basis:

In the 2000 court case of Christenson vs. Harris County, Ct., the Supreme Court held that there is nothing to prevent an employer to require use of compensatory time off in lieu of cashing out.

For the current FY 08/09 up to May 22, the County has paid about \$1,140,000 in compensatory time off cash outs. This is estimated to total about \$1,244,000 for the fiscal year. The total for the prior FY 07/08 was \$1,406,604.

Recommendation for Implementation:

Forward to the Labor Negotiation Team for use in upcoming negotiations. If successfully negotiated, Personnel could include it in the negotiated MOU (Memorandum of Understanding), and update County Code, Chapter 3 – Personnel.

Clearinghouse Recommendation:

Idea is ready for Board consideration. Idea may not have readily quantifiable savings but appears to enhance productivity or otherwise warrant implementation.

Cost Saving Task Force
Benefits Subcommittee

Note: A recent court ruling may affect implementation of this suggestion.

Subcommittee Members:

Cheryl Trenwith, Debbie Bartels, Debbie Keeler Drake, Denise Medlin, Gina Langford, Janet Fogarty, Jeff Bell, Mark Rathe, Michelle Beauchamp, Nicole Lopez, Richard Eiri, Ruth Alves, Steven Oliveira, Ted Peterson

Subject Matter Experts:

Mark Rathe, Therese Leonard

Cost Savings Suggestion:

Unpaid Time with Accrual of Paid Leave for Employees not able to participate in Mandatory Time Off

Recommendation for Action:

That the Board negotiate unpaid days off with leave credit given to those employees who cannot participate in MTO furloughs. The leave credit would generate immediate savings as a "soft" cost in that employees would be required to take the leave as time off and not a cash out. Further, the Compensatory Time Off could have a limitation much as the floating holiday such that it is lost if not used.

This is a meet and confer item that could be included in upcoming negotiations with Placer Public Employees Organization.

Basis:

For fiscal year 2009/2010, PPEO agreed to a total of 12 MTO days off. Unfortunately, positions requiring 24 hour staffing were not able to participate in this cost saving measure due to staffing requirements. As a result, the County wasn't able to maximize cost savings countywide. As an example, if this suggestion were implemented for 12 days in one year, the savings would total at least \$957,349 for the Sheriff's Office only. The total cost savings for these employees would actually be higher because most safety employees have additional pays (POST, wellness, etc.). Inclusion of other departments would increase the savings further.

Recommendation for Implementation:

Forward to the Labor Negotiation Team for use in upcoming negotiations. If successfully negotiated, Personnel could include it in the negotiated MOU (Memorandum of Understanding), and update County Code, Chapter 3 – Personnel.

Clearinghouse Recommendation:

Idea is ready for Board consideration. Idea may not have readily quantifiable savings but appears to enhance productivity or otherwise warrant implementation.

Cost Saving Task Force
Benefits Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members:

Cheryl Trenwith, Debbie Bartels, Debbie Keeler Drake, Denise Medlin, Gina Langford, Janet Fogarty, Jeff Bell, Mark Rathe, Michelle Beauchamp, Nicole Lopez, Richard Eiri, Ruth Alves, Steven Oliveira, Ted Peterson

Subject Matter Experts:

Mark Rathe, Janet Fogarty

Cost Savings Suggestion:

Extend vacation cash out moratorium for next fiscal year and add another 40 hours to accrual limits.

Recommendation for Action:

Extend vacation cash out moratorium for next fiscal year and add another 40 hours (for a total of 80 additional hours) to the accrual limits contained in PC County code section 3.04.470(C)(1)(a) and (b).

This is a meet and confer item that could be included in upcoming negotiations with PPEO.

Basis:

For fiscal year 2009-2010 the county's policy of allowing employees to cash out up to 50% of their annual vacation leave accrual has been suspended with employees allowed to accrue an additional 40 hours of vacation time in excess of the limits provided in County Code section 3.04.470(C)(1)(a) and (b).

This modification allows immediate cash savings, deferring payment to a time in the future where revenues return to normal. Since vacation cash out first was allowed in December 2006, the County has paid out \$625,536 in vacation cash out to date (June 2009), which is equivalent to about \$250,000/year.

Recommendation for Implementation:

Forward to the Labor Negotiation Team for use in upcoming negotiations. If successfully negotiated, Personnel could include it in the negotiated MOU (Memorandum of Understanding), and update County Code, Chapter 3 – Personnel.

Clearinghouse Recommendation:

Idea is ready for Board consideration. Idea may not have readily quantifiable savings but appears to enhance productivity or otherwise warrant implementation.

Cost Saving Task Force
Benefits Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members:

Cheryl Trenwith, Debbie Bartels, Debbie Keeler Drake, Denise Medlin, Gina Langford, Janet Fogarty, Jeff Bell, Mark Rathe, Michelle Beauchamp, Nicole Lopez, Richard Eiri, Ruth Alves, Steven Oliveira, Ted Peterson

Subject Matter Experts:

Jeff Bell, County Budget Administrator

Cost Savings Suggestion:

Increase PERS percentage for employees

Recommendation for Action:

Based on an initial calculation for those employees who currently pay 1% to PERS, it would appear that the county could save between \$700,000-\$725,000 in General Fund costs per percentage point paid by the employee. (Savings could vary depending upon the number of active employees and salary levels.)

Due to the potential savings garnered associated with this item, it is recommended that the county review its PERS employee contribution levels as an option for cost savings during the budget and contract negotiation process.

This is a meet and confer item that could be included in upcoming negotiations with PPEO.

Basis:

Most PPEO represented and management employees currently pay 1% of the 8% employee PERS contribution, with the County paying the remaining 7% on behalf of the employees. There are exceptions. Correctional Officers pay 2.5% as part of their contract, and probation officers will be paying 2% beginning in February 2010. By way of comparison, most non safety state employees currently pay 5% of their salary (after the 1st \$513) for their employee PERS contribution.

Implementation for Action

Forward to the Labor Negotiation Team for use in upcoming negotiations. If successfully negotiated, Personnel could include it in the negotiated MOU (Memorandum of Understanding), and update County Code, Chapter 3 – Personnel.

Clearinghouse Recommendation:

Idea is ready for Board consideration. Idea may not have readily quantifiable savings but appears to enhance productivity or otherwise warrant implementation.

