IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED REGULATIONS #61-06

PUBLIC HEARING

BEFORE:

Bryan Lentz, Chairman

HEARING:

Friday, May 12, 2017

10:12 a.m.

LOCATION: 110 North 8th Street

Suite 503

Philadelphia, PA 19107

WITNESS:

Marwan Kreidie

Reporter: Amy Gribauskas

Any reproduction of this transcript is prohibited without authorization by the certifying agency.

φ

	2
1	INDEX
2	
3	OPENING REMARKS
4	By Chairman 4 - 11
5	TESTIMONY
6	By Mr. Kreidie 11 - 17
7	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES 17 - 18
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

-				3
1		EXHIBITS		
2				
3	37 3		Page	
4	Number	Description	ffered	
5	1	Proposed Rulemaking Packet		
6	2	Public Hearing on Proposed		
7		Regulations		
8	3	Testimony of Marwan Kreidie		
9	4	Article of Marwan Kreidie		
10		11/9/16		
11	5	Article of Marwan Kreidie		
12		and John Stevens		
13	6	Article of Brad Brumsted		
14		8/2/15		
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

# PROCEEDINGS

# CHAIR:

Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the State Civil Service Commission's public hearing scheduled pursuant to Commission Rule 93.4 to receive comments on proposed regulations which were recently published in Volume 47, Issue Number 16 of The Pennsylvania Bulletin.

As noticed ---. As noted in our published preamble, these regulations are being proposed to bring the Civil Service Commission's regulation into conformity with recent amendments to the Civil Service Act.

Specifically, current rules of the State Civil Service Commission Numbers 91.3; 95.47; 97.3; 97.11, and 97.12 are being amended. And a new chapter, 98, containing --- containing new rules 98.1 and 98.2 is being added to the current rules to comply with changes made to the Civil Service Act by Act 69 of 2016.

I'm going to read a brief summarized statement that I'm going to make. My complete statement will be part of the record --- the official record.

Before we begin receiving public comments, I want to take an opportunity to address issues that had been raised in connection with the Fiscal Note, which the Budget Office provided for our proposed regulations. The Fiscal Note prepared by the Budget Office acknowledges that these proposed regulations are cost neutral and, quote, will not result in a loss of revenue or an increase in program costs to the Commonwealth or its political subdivisions, end quote.

The Fiscal Note then goes on to state that there will be both added costs and lost savings to the Commonwealth because the Commission's proposed regulations do not implement, and that's in quotes.

Quote, do not implement, end quote, Section 212(d) and 502 of Act 167 of 2016. With all due respect to the Budget Office, this assertion is simply not true.

Beginning with Section 212(d). The amendment to Section 212(d) in Act 167 Of 2016 added the following language to Section 212(d) in the Civil Service Act. Quote, the commission shall enter into an agreement to utilize the form and method of an employment application that is standard across departments and agencies that are under the Governor's jurisdiction for the purpose of entrance to, or

promotion in, the classified services, end quote.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Commission's current rule regulating Civil Service applications is 95.1. Our proposed rule change --- or proposed change to Rule 95.1 added the above language from the statute nearly verbatim to our existing rule, which now reads, quote, section a, Submission of applications. Applications required of a candidate for entrance to, or promotion in, the classified service, shall be made in a format prescribed by the Director, shall utilize a form and method of application that is standard across departments and agencies that are under the Governor's jurisdiction, and shall contain a statement made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. § 4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities, verifying the truthfulness of all responses contained thereon, end quote.

Clearly, by using language directly from the Act, the Commission's proposed regulation implements Section --- Section 212(d) of Act 167.

The second claim made by the Budget
Office is the rule change does not implement Section
502 of Act 167. The amendment to Section 502 in Act
167 changed Section 502 of the Civil Service Act, in
relevant part. And it now reads as follows:

Quote: Examinations shall be conducted to establish employment and promotion lists. Such examinations may be written or oral, or a demonstration of skill, or an evaluation of experience and training (sic), or a combination of these, which shall fairly appraise the fitness and ability of competitors.

The appointing authority shall select the method of examination that shall be used for the individual position or the class of positions for which the employment or promotion list is being established. Such examinations shall be practical in character and shall relate to the duties and responsibilities of the position for which the applicant is being examined and shall fairly test the relative capacity and fitness of persons examined to perform the duties of the class of positions to which they seek to be appointed or promoted, end quote.

Our rule change to Rule 95.20 adds the following language to the existing rule: If the Director determines that more than one method of examination will fairly test the relative capacity and fitness of persons examined to perform the duties of the class of positions to which they seek to be appointed or promoted, the appointing authority shall

select the method of examination that will be used for the individual position or the class of positions for which the employment or promotion list is being established.

When the same classification is used by more than one appointing authority, the affected appointing authorities must reach a consensus on the method of examination that will be used for that classification as only one examination method will be used by the Commission to examine all candidates for positions in the same classification, end quote. I should note that the Director, as used in that section, refers to the Commission itself.

This rule change once again repeats elements from the statute verbatim in order to implement Section 502 of Act 167 of 2016. The Commission is recognizing with this rule change that the appointing authorities will have the final say on which examination method will be used for the individual positions (sic) or the class of positions for which the employment or promotion list is being established.

However, the rule change also recognizes that it is still the Commission's obligation under Section 502 to determine which method or methods of

examination will fairly test the relative capacity and fitness of persons examined to perform the duties of the class of positions to which they seek to be appointed or promoted.

Accordingly, the rule now obligates the Commission to identify as many alternative valid examination options as possible, and then offer them all to the appointing authority, which will then select the method it wants to use to fill vacancies in its complement. If an individual position or a class of positions is used exclusively by a single appointing authority, that appointing authority's examination choice will be final.

While there are many such classifications, including Corrections Officers or Corrections Counselors, used exclusively by the Department of Corrections, there are many other classifications which are used by appointing authorities throughout the Commonwealth. Examples are Clerk Typist, Accountant, Human Resource Analyst, etc.

This rule change, therefore, also recognizes the reality that there are many such classifications in which persons are similarly employed by multiple appointing authorities throughout the Commonwealth. When filling these positions, in

addition to satisfying the requirements of Section 502 as amended, the Commission is equally obliged to comply with other provisions of the law applicable to filling classified service positions. Section 2 of the Civil Service Act states that greater efficiency and economy in the administration of the government of this Commonwealth is the primary purpose of the (sic) Act.

Section 501 of the Act provides that, quote, appointments of persons entering the classified service or promoted thereon --- therein shall be from eligible lists established as a result of examinations given by the Director.

The Pennsylvania Military Code provides that ten points will be added to the score of a veteran who passes a Civil Service examination, and that a veteran who is among the three highest scoring candidates on an eligible list will have a mandatory appointment preference.

All these regulations ---. The purpose of all these regulations is to allow the Commission to continue to fulfill its mission of making sure that hiring in the Civil Service system is merit-based.

At this time, I will make the balance of the --- of my remarks as part of the record by

incorporation. And I will open the floor to public comment.

If you want to make a public comment, please stand and be recognized. And when you begin to speak, identify yourself for the record. Thank you.

# MR. KREIDIE:

Good morning, Chairman Lentz.

#### CHAIR:

The Chair recognizes former Commissioner Marwan Kreidie.

# MR. KREIDIE:

Good morning. And first, I'd like to start by congratulating the Civil Service Commission on their 75th anniversary. Let's hope that we have another 75 years of independence and service to the Commonwealth.

You need my address? Let me give you my address. So my name is Marwan Kreidie, M-A-R-W-A-N, K-R-E-I-D-I-E. My address is 922 North Orianna Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19123.

I currently teach at West Chester
University and I'm --- I'm speaking here as a private
citizen, but also as someone who was the previous
Chair of the State Civil Service Commission
from ---. Well, seven years, I served around seven

years as Chair.

Prior to that, though, I have to also say that I served around eight years in the Civil Service Commission of the City of Philadelphia. So let me read my statements. I also have a couple of articles. I don't know if you want to take these in or not.

#### CHAIR:

They can be made part of the record.

# MR. KREIDIE:

They can be made part of the record.

Okay. So it's my ---. I'm going to read this verbatim. It was my pleasure to have served as Chairman of the State Civil Service Commission and I'm here to talk about the new regulations ---.

# CHAIR:

Do you want to take your old seat?
MR. KREIDIE:

No, no. I should, right? I sat there for a long time. So --- but I like to look at ---. I don't like my back to people. So I'm here to talk about the new regulations and threats to merit-based employment in the Commonwealth of PA.

To understand this threat one must first understand that the State Civil Service Commission is

the first line of defense against the ravages of political corruption and nepotism that seems to be the norm rather than the exception in Pennsylvania.

One only needs to google political corruption and the number of articles on Pennsylvania fills the screen. I have an article here from Brad Bumsted of the Pittsburgh Tribune, printed on August 2nd, 2015 entitled Pa., Breeding Ground for Corruption, experts say. Obviously this is not a stand-alone article and I could have printed out dozens more.

Let us examine some highlights from the last decade or so.

All Philadelphia Traffic Court Judges were removed from their positions for corruption and the Traffic Court abolished. In Wilkes-Barre, President Judge Mark Ciavarella and Senior Judge Michael Conahan sold kids to Juvenile facilities. Two of our former Attorney Generals, Ernie Preate and Kathleen Kane had to resign from their positions. And our State --- our former State Treasurer, Rob McCord, had to resign as well.

I cannot keep an accurate count at the number of state legislators who had to resign or go to jail, but it is a least a dozen. I could go on and

one with Mayors, Congress people and local DAs, all under indictment, who resigned or served time in jail.

This systematic corruption is not only rampant with elected officials. Whole agencies are also affected. We have serious issues within the Turnpike Commission and locally in Philadelphia, just a few --- a block from here, one of the most recent examples is the Philadelphia Parking Authority, whose former Executive Director's main occupation seems to have been granting large raises for himself and his executives and sexually harassing women on his staff.

In fact, I have another article which I wrote an op/ed for <a href="The Philadelphia Inquirer">The Philadelphia Inquirer</a>, published on November 9th, 2016, in which I recommended that to really affect change and reform, the Philadelphia Parking Authority should become a Civil Service agency. The latest news out of the PPA, the Philadelphia Parking Authority, which changed its Executive Director is that the new Executive Director who was supposed to reform the agency just hired her daughter's roommate for a managerial position.

One thing that all of these agencies and individuals have in common is that they occur in non-Civil Service agencies. Having a true merit system would be significant --- would be a significant

barrier to these corruption shenanigans endemic to patronage agencies. Merit systems do not hire on the basis of whom you know or what party you are in. That is, our Civil Service Commission does not hire based on who you know or what party you are in. Employees are not dependent on their political patrons and do not cower or fear their leadership so as to cover up for them.

Can you imagine the various corruption scandals that would have occurred in our Commonwealth if 70 percent of all jobs in our state were not covered by the Civil Service Commission?

And the Chairman recently in his statement talked about the various preferences that we give to them. In studies that I have conducted in the past and am currently doing, agencies that are non-Civil Service in this state have significantly lower rates of veteran hiring. Hiring of veterans should happen regardless of whether an agency is merit-based or not.

I am currently doing a study on those counties with pass-through funded jobs which were mostly Child Welfare, Drug and Alcohol, et cetera, which historically were part of the State Civil Service Commission. These counties --- some of these

counties have opted out of the State Civil Service Commission to have a local merit system, rather than be part of the State Civil Service system.

While I have not finished this study, the required yearly compliance audits have, for the most part, not been done or done in such a fashion as to make them useless. One way to examine them --- the non --- the new local merit system for adherence to merit system principles and rules is to look at their rate of veteran hiring. The percentages of veterans being hired is virtually zero. Where previously, when they operated under the State Civil Service Commission, it was at least over ten percent.

Again, without proper audits of these county systems, we cannot be sure that the people being hired are qualified or hired and promoted based on merit. From my early analysis, and I have not finished the study yet, most of them appear to be, in essence, at-will agencies at best and patronage havens at worst.

In regards to reform and change. I think it is important that not only is a merit system important to protect against nepotism and corruption, it also has to be efficient and forward-looking. I was proud that when I was Chairman, and I assume today

as well, the State Civil Service Commission outperformed the non-Civil Service system. This was --- and this was a study was conducted by the Office of Administration, the non-Civil Service arm of the state.

In closing, I have read some of the comments that are posted on the Independent Regulatory Review Commission website. They seem to be eerily similar, as though someone gave these agencies the same sample letter to use. These similar, almost word for word recommendations make me think that there is a concerted effort to squash these proposed regulations.

Recommendations that these agencies request go against the spirit of a real merit system. If they really wanted to improve the system and make it easier for employees to apply and get jobs, they should recommend increasing the Civil Service complement and reopening the Allentown testing center.

In conclusion, what we need to do is strengthen not weaken the State Civil Service system and regulations. Thus, I support the regulations as proposed and find them to be fair and workable. Thank you.

### CHAIR:

Thank you.

	18
1	MR. KREIDIE:
2	And, if you wish, I can give you
3	CHAIR:
4	We will make your typed statement and
5	the articles part
6	MR. KREIDIE:
7	And these articles There's an
8	additional article about an article I co-wrote
9	with the former Chair, John Stevens, about the Corbett
10	plans for the Civil Service.
11	CHAIR:
12	Thank you. Does anyone else wish to
13	make a public comment?
14	Seeing no no takers, we can close
15	the hearing at this time. Thank you all.
16	* * * * * *
17	HEARING CONCLUDED AT 10:30 A.M.
18	* * * * * *
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
- 1	

#### CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, hearing held before Chair Lentz was reported by me on 5/12/2017 and that I, Amy Gribauskus, read this transcript, and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.

Ony Nubrustias
Court Reporter

Amy Gribauskas