

Menominee County Personnel Committee
Minutes of Meeting
August 21, 2014

*****Approved 3.6.2015*****

The Personnel Committee met on August 21, 2014 at 9:00 AM at the Menominee County Courthouse, Administrative Office.

Present at the meeting were Coms. Krienke, Plutchak, and Piche, Brian Bousley, & other members of the public.

Call Meeting to order: Chairperson Plutchak called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

Pledge of Allegiance: The Pledge of Allegiance was recited

Roll Call: Roll call was taken; Commissioner Furlong is excused.

Agenda was approved by Com. Krienke and supported by Com. Piche to approve the agenda as written. Motion approved 3/0.

Previous Meeting minutes: Previous minutes from 4/17/2014 were approved. Moved by Com. Piche and seconded by Com. Plutchak 3/0

Public Comment: None

Business:

- a. **Equalization Department DMG Study:** Peggy Schroud requested that her employee Kandace Curran be named deputy director and followed through with the DMG study and it came back recommended with a grade 10. They said that they compared the duties of the grade 10 and the grade 12, but I was unable to get a copy of the grade 12 job description so I don't know where the differences lay. In MCL 211.34 paragraph 3, it says, the personnel of the department shall be under the direct supervision and control of the director of the tax or equalization department who may designate an employee of the department as his/her deputy. So Kandace is performing the same duties as I am as well as completing the duties of the Staff Cartographer position; except she is not able to sign the roll because she doesn't have the state certification. The certification that she does have is the advanced training and certification required for the position. So I'm leaving it up to you to direct what you would like to do with it. I did find appendix B, from abt. 2000 which is where I discovered that the deputy director was listed as a grade 12. The finance committee has put it in the budget as a grade 10. Krienke: Is the DMG study...and the response is a suggestion, it's not mandatory. Schroud: Yes, it's a recommendation. Bousley: What we do is, we contract with MGT to do these studies, so we have a third party recommendation and

no fighting back and forth or no favoritism one way or another. But yes, it is a recommendation to the board. The board can do something else, but my argument is, if we're going to have a third party do this, it leaves the argument out. The last couple of times we have gone with it. Sometimes when we do a DMG study, some might come back lower than what they get now, some might be higher. There's always that risk with the study. Schroud: The other thing is, the grade 12 is a non-union position, whereas the 10 is. Plutchak: that wasn't brought to my attention. Bousley: We put the 10 into the budget. That's about a 4.5% increase from what the position is now. If we go to an 11 step 1, it would be about an 11% increase, so a 12 would be even higher than that. Plutchak: is there any benefits of a 12 being a non-union position? Bousley: That position is already vested, so it'll stay where it's at (MERS). If it's a non-union, then it will be moved to the non-union. But it pretty much stays the same. Schroud: I wanted to add that Kandace is 7 years at the building code department and using the BS&A software was very advantageous in coming into this position because she was familiar with it and she could step right in with using it. With building code she has more knowledge with the different types of buildings and what we do. When she took her courses, she took them on her own. And she didn't have the application of what she learned. She is now; she's in the field today with an assessor up in Meyer Township; and we have been doing field work all summer. Krienke: What is the current pay grade? Schroud: a seven (7) When I got the director position, I went from a 9 to a 15. I should have stated that the advance training and certification is the difference here. I don't think the DMG study realizes the importance. When I got the position, Earl Grandchamp wrote a letter to the personnel committee, and it still holds true. The state tax commission requires more work to be put into the equalization study that is completed by the department staff. Every class of property in every township and city requires studies to be included each year. And we have to do land value and economic condition factor studies in each unit. So the demands have increased, the laws have changed. They require more and more each year. It requires someone who is knowledgeable and professionally educated to provide the taxpayers of this county with the answers that they're requesting. This year the state tax commission suggested that we notify all the taxpayers who we're going to be visiting their properties, and we've had quite a few phone calls, we've both had to "field" the questions. This year people are more aware of what's going on with property taxes, they're paying more attention so it's important that we are able to "field" those calls. Bousley: is there anything in the DMG study that are exclusive to the equalization director's duties? Schroud: Just the signing of the roll requires a level three. Piche: I'm trying to sift through it. The county pays for the people that do the study. As far as I'm concerned, and Com. Lang mentioned it also, we hire these people to do a job, you follow their recommendation. Unless you come to the conclusion that their doing everything wrong, then you abandon that and go on your own instinct. I think it's really important that we go along with their thoughts. I would follow what the study says. Plutchak: Those are my thoughts. We do the study for a reason, we've followed the study throughout, there's no reason we shouldn't follow the study now. Krienke: That is the point, why hire a company to do this if we're not going to. But do the people who do this understand all the underlying circumstances? That this person, through her own initiative, has gone out and gotten the education necessary to make the transition into a very important department almost seamless. There's some merit in that too. Bousley: Well they are looking at the job duties. Peggy filled everything out. That is what we sent in. There

was no title put on it, but everything was sent in. Piche: A year or two down the road, when Kandace has received more education, at the expense of the county, does that study follow through. Bousley: This goes with the position. If we decide to have a new position, then we would have to have a new study done. In other offices because of staff being cut, other people having to pick up other duties, I'm sure other offices would like to redo their DMG studies as well. This has been an ongoing thing with departments. Krienke: Right now it's an untitled. Schroud: the DMG recommended it a Senior Appraiser...Plutchak: or Staff Appraiser. Bousley: If we were to go with the staff appraiser position, it would replace the current 9 to a 10. Krienke: How long is the training supposed to last? Schroud: It depends on when she can get into the level 3 (four courses required first). Krienke: after she completes the courses for level 3. Will she qualify for the Deputy Director position? Schroud: Yes, I believe so. Kreinke: so we're going to be revisiting this in the future? Schroud: Yes, we could. Krienke: And she's going from a seven to a ten? Plutchak: Yes, that is what we're proposing. And that's what the finance committee put into the budget, the grade 10. Schroud: The two classes she signed up for in Sept. and Oct. are coming out of my budget for this year. I've always given money back, and never gone over budget so I don't make a lot of requests for this. Krienke: Am I making a correct assumption that this pay grade will be retroactive to her first day of taking on the position? Schroud: No it's starts Oct. 1, it's budgeted in the 14/15 budget. Bousley: No, there is no retro pay anymore. Consensus of the committee is to move this to the full board as a grade 10 staff appraiser.

B. Personnel Manual updates: The personnel manual has not been updated in quite some time. This is mostly to clean this up to match the contracts.

- 1) Page 4/d (applications) Take out the word "be".
- 2) Page 4/e Employee Selection and processing: Number 5. Remove the word "requested"
- 3) Page 7/c (longevity) this needs to be changed here due to contract language changes. Should read "After completing three (3) years of service, each full-time employee shall receive annually as of December 1st of each year, longevity pay of one hundred dollars (\$100) plus fifty dollars (\$50) for each additional year completed over and above three years; up to a maximum of one thousand dollars (\$1,000)".
- 4) Page 8/b hospitalization and medical insurance: (retirement insurance) "upon retirement from the County's service, the employee may elect to remain in the group hospital insurance program subject to the same being approved by the employer's group hospitalization carrier. In the event that an employee shall remain a member of the group hospitalization program, he must pay the full cost of the insurance premium charged by the group carrier for said benefit. The premium will be paid to the employer, who shall forward the same to the group carrier." This is what is currently in the contracts. Right now, teamsters doesn't allow for retirement insurance. This is up to the insurance carrier.

This is really a lot of stuff that needs to be fixed since it hasn't been updated since 2007. We have Delta County's personnel manual, so we may even be adding a few things. Would like to possibly add training: if taken at the cost to the county, they must pass the course or reimburse the county 100% of the cost. May add, certification training must work for the county for a certain number of years to recoup the cost, or they reimburse the county for the cost of certification. These are a few we may look at

in the future.

Public Comment: Dan Hass, PA: I'm speaking to the committee as a department head who feels his department is understaffed. A few years ago when the county claimed it was suffering in financial straits, I had an employee leave who was full time, and to help the county out, I agreed to fill that position with a ¾ time position to save the county a heck of a lot of money. Now today I sit here at a personnel committee meeting and I see there's a recommendation, in light of a hiring freeze, to increase a person's job classification from a 7 to a 10. My question is, why wasn't this thought of months ago when this person was moved into this position, why is it coming up now after the person is in the position. To me that's short sightedness either on the county board or the department head who put that person into position. What's changed from then until now? Also, where's the MERS study, the impact on MERS this may have, increasing from a 7 to a 10? My concerns: I have an understaffed department; there's a hiring freeze; I look at another dept. where there's basically a change in a job description (if approved); there's no MERS impact that this may have on the county's future budgets; and why wasn't this planned for when this person was put into this position, what's changed over the last few months? Diane Lesperance, County Treasurer: I agree with what Dan said as far as the impact here. I think this is going to effect the moral throughout the courthouse. I have staff that have been in their positions a long time. If you compare their jobs with others in the county, I think their pay grade is way below what it should be. I looked over the DMG questionnaire and I see things in there that I feel are the job of the equalization director. I don't see where a person with a level 2 can do some of the duties on listed on the DMG questionnaire. I have an issue with that. I agree, what is the impact with MERS?

Commissioner Comment: Piche: after listening to Mr. Hass and Diane. We've got some thinking to do about processing things. More studying to do, I guess. Krienke: I seem to recall you sent a email to the board or some of us talking about you wanting this position to have a higher pay grade, some months ago. So it's not out of the blue. Plutchak: this was actually requested a couple months ago, originally to the finance committee then to personnel. In light of the comments we've heard, I guess we have to give a little thought. I'm sure like Dan stated, his office is understaffed, it needs to be dealt with. We'll try to work with each office and try to get things back to where they need to be. Brian whatever you can do to come up with ideas to help department heads would be great.

Adjourn: Moved by Com. Krienke supported by Com. Piche to adjourn the meeting at 9:32 A.M. Motion approved 3/0.