

Menominee County Executive Committee
Minutes of Meeting
October 9, 2013

*****Approved 2.28.2014*****

The Executive Committee met on October 9, 2013 at 7:30 AM at the Menominee County Annex Building, Stephenson, MI.

Present at the meeting were Com. Plutchak, Meintz (enters late) and Nelson. Brian Bousley, Marc Kleiman

Call Meeting to order: Commissioner Nelson called the meeting to order at 7:30 AM.

Roll Call: Roll call was taken; Commissioner Meintz currently absent, but will be here.

Agenda was approved by Com. Plutchak and supported by Com. Nelson to approve the agenda as written. Motion approved 2/0

Commissioner Meintz enters the meeting.

Previous Meeting minutes: Aug. 15, 2013 – moved by Com. Plutchak and supported by Com. Nelson to approve the minutes of the Aug. 15, 2013 Executive Committee meeting. Motion approved 3/0

Public Comment: Larry Schei, Menominee Township - reads from Bylaws of the Co. Commissioners, Standing committees ~ Exec. Committee, and Personnel Committee. I believe your agenda is improper for this meeting; it should be done by the personnel and finance committee.

Discussion of Buildings and grounds department personnel: Nelson: We brought this up because we're looking at losing a person in the Buildings and grounds department. Personnel committee would be excluded from looking at consolidation of positions because that's to establish a job description, based on the position we currently have. The discussion we're having today, instead of Personnel is to discuss consolidation of a position. And is it a union or non union position? That's why it is appropriate for this committee. It is not covered under Personnel.

Brian: That position is always going to be a union position. I'm the head of that department and the Parks department. It's not a department head position. Nelson: Does he supervise anyone? Brian: Yes Meintz: Should that position be changed to be a department head position so we don't have a situation with the union? Nelson: If you supervise directly, you should not have a union position supervise another union position. Brian: Some do exist...Building Code, he is part of the union and I tried to fight that. He does have Kandace as a secretary. Nelson: Does Kandace work directly for him or does she work for...Brian: both. Nelson: It should not be a supervisor position within the union because that person would be directly responsible for discipline of the other. Brian: The other one was Veterans Affairs. He's in the union, but he doesn't supervise anyone with the exception of he does have an intern sometimes. If we move buildings and grounds from a union position to a department head position, there's a whole different pay grade and a different retirement division too. Nelson: Would we hire a person to work directly under you? Brian: Al's actual title is the Asst. Superintendent, I'm considered the Superintendent. Nelson: Who's responsible for disciplinary action? Brian: I would be for both. Nelson: How would you get the information about the employee if they weren't performing? Brian: From the assistant. Nelson: I would have this go to the personnel committee for review. Their job is to establish a job description. In this case, should we put

people directly under you. I know it's going to be inconvenient, but we shouldn't get caught up into direct supervision from one union employee to another. Meintz: that's a conflict of interest. Unless you're going to be the direct supervisor over them. Brian: which to a point I am. Nelson: it's part of Brian's job description. We just need it to be clear that they are under Brian as far as supervision. Personnel should look at that too and Brian's contract.

Discussion of the Emergency Management Coordinator Position: Meintz: Chris had mentioned, do we continue the EMC position or part time or should we look at trying to collaborate with another entity. Nelson: It was approx. \$57,000 budgeted for that position and we get back \$18,000 which is 31%, that's not 37%, maybe you get "up to" 37%. The previous year was 26%. We weren't getting back anywhere near that percentage. Brian: What happens, in the fourth quarter, whatever is left over is what we get. So you usually get shorted that fourth quarter. Meintz: The big concern is to make sure, if we do something with this position, we'll have to make sure it falls in the "defined contribution" division. Have you had contact with any other counties about a shared position? Brian: We're always talking about ways to consolidate with other counties. Meintz: My understanding with Trina, it was a no brainer for her with the new position she'll have. Nelson: Everything I've gathered about Trina, she was exceptional with everything she did. Meintz: I think she went above what the job description says. We'll be hard pressed to find that qualified of a person. Nelson: some counties are at 35 hrs./wk. Meintz: the tough thing with this position is it's not a 9-5 job. As emergencies arise you have to respond. Nelson: If we refer this to personnel they can go over the job description. Brian: Trina left me an updated job description; I just have to make the changes. Nelson: We should have personnel committee look at this, but it should also go to the finance committee. Would it be possible to have Sgt. Brown come in for clarification? Plutchak: Brian just said Trina updated the job description. That'll help. Nelson: Can it be combined based on review of other positions? It costs a substantial amount of money for the county.

Discussion of Defined Contribution Division (MERS): Brian: this is what I received back from MERS. If we set up a new division, for all new employees (non union division first). Then we can negotiate this "base" with the unions. We can do this if we tie it into the existing non union division (10) and convert that from defined benefit to defined contribution. There's a mandatory projection study which will cost \$1,000 and if we allow the people within that division to go to DC, it'll cost an additional \$600. Nelson: We'd still be funding old hires. Brian: We're essentially closing that division because there will no longer be anyone going into it. If we do that, they will give us the schedule for the accelerated funding to close out that division. Nelson: How many employees do we have non-union? Brian: 12 or 13. Nelson: We're going to end up doing that with the others anyway. We already planned that. You mentioned elected officials. Every four years they technically become a "new person" They have to be sworn in again. What happens with them, as far as MERS is concerned at the fourth year. Meintz: You asked Stoker about that, didn't you? Brian: I did and Stoker gave us a very convoluted answer. Nelson: so it wouldn't be a conflict to keep the current employees in there, but anyone new is out of it. Meintz: did you get the actuaries on 911 and Road Patrol? Brian: Yes we approved that. Meintz: Do they have enough money in their budgets? Nelson: in the sheriff dept. 2011/12 to 2013/14 budgets, the MERS they run 50% in two years. From 135 to 202 (thousand) why did these go up so much. Brian: there was a restructure change in the sheriff dept. with salary changes and the MERS rate has increased huge. Nelson: That's inconsistency to the report we received back from the sheriff. because he said we had all those people go so it should be cheaper. In discussing the defined contributions, how'd we come up with that one? What is our status with the Union as far as the defined benefit, defined contribution? Brian: I told them what we discussed as far as the rate and everything. They're discussing it, but they're apprehensive to come to the table at all. Meintz: I think when the restructuring was done in the sheriff dept., that was a total of about an \$8,000 increase in salaries, altogether. I may be wrong. Nelson: there was a \$43,000 increase in salaries. Brian: because we move from corporals to sergeants, and one Lieutenant to two Lieutenants. Meintz: and then you had a 2% increase across the board. Brian: It's a large department at 2% Nelson: Yah, \$16,000 is 2%. Plutchak: Start with \$16 then add a few here and a few there, don't take long to get to 43. Meintz: we added another full time position there too.

Nelson: Longevity doubled. Overtime didn't make much difference, hiring freeze had no effect there, contrary to what was said. When do we meet with the union again? We have a hiring freeze on and I would be opposed to removing, ever, until this is taken care of. Brian: right now they're discussing everything, they just have to get back to me. I call and email them every other week. 911 will come to the table. Meintz: I would like to move forward that we recommend the board to open the defined contribution plan, for all department heads and elected officials. With that said, the question to the board... what do we do with some of the elected officials that are on defined benefit now, and then they get re-elected again. Brian: The ones we have now are vested in that. So if they're vested in that, that's what they have. Nelson: We could Hybrid those, that could be an option. Meintz: I understand they're to some extent an employee, granted they're elected for their term, then they could lose their job. But the statement was made that all the employees would honor the benefit that was given. Granted, they are a new person each time they're re-elected again. That would be the discussion with the board; What do we do with elected officials that are in place now and if they're elected again? Nelson: that's a tough area, because you're in the system already. I know at the state, when they made the changed to defined contribution from defined benefit, all management structure stayed under the defined benefit program. I think we should discuss it. Plutchak: What about any new elected officials? Repeat ones have to go to the DC and return ones stay where they're at? Meintz: You'd have to have that published before the election, of what the expectations of the pay are. Is that pay scales or does that include benefits? Nelson: Benefits are not considered salaries. Brian: salaries, you cannot decrease, but you can increase. Benefits can be changed. Marc Kleiman: There's been a lot of debate about this at the state. I have not seen a firm answer on if it's considered part of the compensation package or not. Meintz: I find it irritating that they want to charge us \$1,000 to do a study on that. Brian: one more thing about the division 10, there is no COLA (Cost of living) rider in there. Nelson: I recommend we move forward for NEW non-union and NEW elected officials, come under defined contribution. Is this considered a new division? Brian: Yes Nelson: it keeps the old employees in one bracket and the new employees in another bracket. Meintz: Matching copay with the DC? Brian: First of all we have the county set a contribution and an employee max contribution then there is a county match to match their percentage. Nelson: The state has used a 4% flat, and a match of up to 3% depending on what the employee pays, up to 3% match max. That will fix the county cost forever. Meintz: did you get any information on what their average returns are on their contribution plans? I would like have a reasonable solution for them. Brian: The employee gets to choose what investments are used for their contributions (within parameters set by MERS). Plutchak: there could also be an option for a current employee to switch to the DC plan, even if they're vested in the DB. Nelson: I'd like to move forward with reg. hiring, but I'm opposed to it until we get this into play. I think that making a change with the elected officials and with the appointed officials, it shows our intent to treat every employee the same. Meintz: We'll move this DC for elected officials to the board.

Public Comment: None

Commissioner Comment: Nelson, I'm glad we're moving some of this stuff forward and looking at positions. We have a static revenue source (we're not going up), with the costs increasing, this about protecting the people we currently have and making sure the money is there when it happens. I think it's the right thing to do, not the easy thing to do.

Adjournment: Moved by Com. Plutchak supported by Com. Nelson to adjourn the meeting at 8:32 AM.