

PROCEEDINGS OF

**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF WEST BLOOMFIELD
EMPLOYEE LUNCH ROOM
4550 WALNUT LAKE ROAD**

OCTOBER 16, 2006 --- 4:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Trustee Spector.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Trustee Deborah Macon
Trustee Robert Sher
Trustee Robert Spector

Members Absent: None

In Attendance: Kent Herbert, Personnel Director
Ed Haapala, Water & Sewer Director
Lisa Hobart, Township Assessor
Dan Sears, Assessing Department
Douglas Plachinski, Planning Director
Dan Sears, Assessing Department
Garry Simpson, Water & Sewer Department
Ron Lee, Water & Sewer Department
Steve Padgett, Water & Sewer Department

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Herbert stated that since the agenda was published, a couple of employees have expressed concern regarding the layoff policy. He stated the policy addresses department heads and includes the following language: "*Department heads can be laid off, but only by action of the Township Board.*" He stated that all the union contracts address layoff procedures; however, there was no language to address layoff procedures for department heads.

Ms. Macon asked that Discussion regarding Boards and Commissions be added to the agenda as Item 7g.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Ms. Macon and supported by Mr. Sher to approve the agenda as amended.

Ayes: Macon, Sher, Spector

Nays: None

Absent: None

Motion carried

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Sher asked to abstain from voting on the approval of the minutes since he was not on the Committee at that time.

Motion by Ms. Macon and supported by Mr. Spector to approve the minutes of 07/31/06 as submitted.

Ayes: Macon, Spector

Nays: None

Absent: None

Abstain: Sher

Motion carried

SET NEXT MEETING DATE

Ms. Macon stated that the Township Board was expecting a report regarding boards and commissions within two meetings. She suggested that meetings be held for the next two Mondays at 4:00 p.m. to discuss that issue.

The next two meetings were scheduled for Monday, October 23, 2006 and Monday, November 13, 2006 at 4:00 p.m.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

RECOMMENDATION FOR WATER & SEWER SPECIALIST – UPGRADE PAY LEVEL

Mr. Haapala submitted the following information to the Committee:

(insert)

Mr. Spector asked if an upgrade had already been done for this position. Mr. Haapala replied, "No." Mr. Spector recalled that a classification was changed. Mr. Haapala stated that a Mechanic position was upgraded from level 4, which is still considered field staff, but on a more technical nature.

Mr. Spector asked what this particular position was for. Mr. Haapala stated this was for specialist duties which perform analysis, research, and liaison work with engineering consultants. He stated that because of the amount and magnitude of construction projects currently ongoing, this position will provide administrative support for the Water & Sewer Director. He stated although the position is a non-supervisory capacity, it is heavily laden with responsibility.

Mr. Haapala stated that since the Assistant Water & Sewer Director is now involved with supervision of the Billing Department, it is necessary to have an individual handle other matters in the Water & Sewer Department. He stated there was also the matter of a back-up operator in charge, with respect to the MDEQ. He stated that furthers itself to the advanced level of water certification through the State of Michigan.

Mr. Haapala stated that typically, the department holds water certification levels of 4, 3, 2 and 1. The Director and Assistant Director are required to hold S-1 water licenses. He stated that with the current workload, it has been very difficult for those two individuals to attend meetings together. Therefore, it is necessary to have an individual available in the absence of those two individuals. In addition, he was attempting to resolve a matter that was becoming more burdensome.

Mr. Haapala stated he was asking to upgrade the position from pay grade level 5 to 5.5. He stated the position is still involved with the hourly field staff and in the same classification as well as having the rights and privileges of being on-call. He stated that because of the amount of overtime, this position has the potential to match and/or exceed a foreman's salary, which is at pay grade level 6.

Mr. Spector asked if he was simply requesting to upgrade an existing position rather than hire an additional staff person. Mr. Haapala stated that was correct. Mr. Spector asked if the upgrade would create a vacancy in the department. Mr. Haapala replied, "No" and indicated that additional responsibilities would simply be given to the employee's current duties.

Mr. Herbert stated that in order to justify the pay grade level upgrade, there has to be additional responsibilities to the existing classification.

Mr. Haapala stated the SCADA is going to be a more advanced system and given the amount of field application that the field foremen are involved with, it will be necessary to have an individual responsible at the office to review, troubleshoot, and operate the SCADA all day long.

Mr. Sher asked if the upgrade would result in an increase of \$4,000 in the salary. Mr. Haapala replied, "Yes." Mr. Sher asked about the overtime amount. Mr. Haapala estimated the overtime amount at approximately \$1,000 for an additional 80 hours a year.

Mr. Sher asked if the employees received compensatory time or were they simply paid overtime. Mr. Haapala stated that the employees had the option to use compensatory time or be paid overtime.

Mr. Sher asked about the organizational chart for the department. Mr. Haapala stated he provided a copy at the budget sessions; however, he did not have one available at this meeting.

Mr. Sher asked how the upgrade would affect the other employees. Mr. Haapala replied that the other employees would want to be paid more. Mr. Spector stated that occurred in any organization.

Mr. Sher asked about the Township policy with respect to upgrades. Mr. Herbert stated that prior to him being hired by the Township, there were some promotions that caused a stir throughout the organization because they involved 25% pay increases. He stated that one of his responsibilities during his first year was to conduct a study on internal and external comparables. In many cases, some unfair pay practices were found within the organization. At that point, he recommended that those cases be rectified, but that those positions should also be compared to external positions.

Mr. Sher asked if Mr. Herbert provided recommendations to the Committee as part of the process. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes." He stated that duties which required skill were proposed to be added to this particular position and therefore, he felt the Committee should consider approving the upgrade.

Mr. Haapala stated he chose to propose a pay grade level upgrade rather than request a full-time administrator, which would result in a cost of \$100,000 per year.

Mr. Spector stated that in the two years serving as Trustee, Mr. Haapala's management of the department has been excellent and has resulted in a positive cash flow for a multi-million dollar operation. He added that Mr. Haapala's tutelage of the department appears to be impeccable and therefore, he did not have a problem with the request for a pay grade level upgrade.

Motion by Ms. Macon and supported by Mr. Sher to recommend approval of the upgrade for the Water & Sewer Specialist from pay grade level 5 to 5.5.

Ayes: Macon, Sher, Spector

Nays: None

Absent: None

Motion carried

Mr. Haapala suggested that the item be discussed at a Budget Work Session since the upgrade will have to be included in the 2007 budget.

Mr. Herbert asked that he be given a copy of the job description agreed to by the union prior to the issue going before the Township Board.

Ms. Macon suggested that Mr. Haapala coordinate the introduction of the item with the Budget Director, in terms of when the various budgets are brought back before the Township Board.

Mr. Herbert stated that the battery in the microphone needed to be replaced and asked that the Committee take a short recess.

The Committee took a short recess at 4:28 p.m. and reconvened at 4:29 p.m.

RECOMMENDATION FOR CHIEF APPRAISER – UPGRADE PAY LEVEL

Ms. Hobart submitted the following information to the Committee:

(insert)

Ms. Hobart stated that Dan Sears has been in the Assessing Department since 1990. Since her arrival in 1999, the department has experienced a number of changes. In 2003, the Assistant Assessor was removed from the department complement, which resulted in a reduction of one staff position.

Ms. Hobart stated since that time, the workload has been re-shifted among the existing employees and Mr. Sears has willingly accepted a number of those responsibilities. She stated that his area of responsibility has expanded greatly beyond residential properties and he has begun writing the in-house commercial and industrial appraisals for use in defense of assessments at the Michigan Tax Tribunal. In order to do that, Mr. Sears has enhanced his educational requirements. He currently holds a level 3 assessor's certification with the Michigan State Assessor's Board.

Ms. Hobart stated that based upon his work performance, his outstanding ability to defend assessments, and communication skills, she respectfully asked that his current position be upgraded from pay level 6.5 to 7.

Ms. Macon asked what other positions within the Township were at pay grade level 7. Mr. Herbert stated those positions include Deputy Directors, Assistant Directors, and Computer Programmer. He stated the positions in this pay grade level involved a high level of technical aspects.

Ms. Macon stated that because of the reduction in staff back in 2003, this request would basically be aligning the department in the same fashion as the other departments with the similar pay grade level.

Ms. Hobart stated that was correct and indicated that she did not have any other level 7 positions in the Assessing Department. She stated the request would not conflict with other positions in similar classifications because Mr. Sears acts in a supervisory capacity to the other level 3 appraisers in the department and he facilitates some of the most difficult appraisal work.

Mr. Sher asked for the organizational chart. Ms. Hobart provided the Committee with a handwritten chart. Mr. Herbert stated that a graphic organization chart could be provided to the Committee at a later date.

Mr. Spector asked if upgrading the level would result in a vacancy in the department. Ms. Hobart replied, "No" and indicated that the increase would simply compensate Mr. Sears for the workload which he has already been performing. In addition, a salary study was conducted which reflected that pay grade level 7 was more comparable with what other communities were paying an individual performing the same tasks.

Mr. Spector asked for the costs involved in the upgrade. Ms. Hobart replied that it would cost less than \$5,000 a year. Mr. Spector stated the reason he asked the question was because the Board was currently conducting budget sessions and there were concerns.

Ms. Hobart stated that from a revenue aspect, the Township has had tremendous success in defending the Michigan Tax Tribunal appeals. Mr. Spector stated although he understood that, the Township has gone from a \$5 million General Fund balance to \$1.7 million and the Township is expected to lose an additional \$700,000. Therefore, the pay grade level increase might not be a favorable item with the Board.

Ms. Hobart stated although she fully understood the concerns, if the Township was not able to receive the training and education that Mr. Sears currently possesses or be successful in defending the Tax Tribunal appeals, the revenue received from property taxes would be much lower. She stated that the Assessing Department, particularly the contributions which Mr. Sears has made in that area, is helping to preserve and increase the Township revenues.

Mr. Herbert stated this is a union position and typically when raises are negotiated, they are done across the board. The study he conducted on behalf of the employee indicated that he is being compensated below the amount of where he should be for the responsibilities which he performs. Therefore, the amount which Ms. Hobart has requested as part of the pay level upgrade is in line with the amounts being paid by other communities.

Ms. Macon asked if this position and the other level 7 positions were in the same supervisory union. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes."

Motion by Mr. Sher and supported by Ms. Macon to recommend approval of the upgrade for the Chief Appraiser from pay grade level 6.5 to 7.

Ayes: Macon, Sher, Spector

Nays: None

Absent: None

Motion carried

Mr. Spector referred to the comment made regarding Township employees who were being overcompensated. Mr. Herbert stated that was true when compared to external comparables. He stated that although they match up pretty well within the organization, there were a lot of clerical positions that would not be paid at the same rate at other communities that were similar in size to the West Bloomfield.

Mr. Spector asked if authorization needed to be given to conduct a study to address that issue. Mr. Herbert stated the Township still had two years before they needed to address that issue because the union contract expires in December 2008.

Mr. Herbert stated there has always been a philosophy in the Township that the wage increases given to the Police and Fire employees should be paid to the General Office employees. However, the Police and Fire increases were typically two different pay grade levels and they received the same increases as a group. However, the General Office employees have received increases based on the fact that their department heads felt they were excellent employees and when one individual received an increase, it resulted in other employees coming forward asking for increases as well as using the justification that they did the same amount of work as the employee who already received an increase.

Mr. Herbert stated the Township has increased the pay rates of the General Office employees 10 to 15 percent more than the Police and Fire employees. He stated the General Office employees who make under \$55,000 a year are compensated more than any other employees in the comparable group. He stated that has added significantly to the Township's costs.

Mr. Spector asked if he was indicating that even if they were to find an inequity now, the Township has to wait until the contract expired. Mr. Herbert stated that was correct.

POLICY CONCERNING TRADE TIME FOR DIRECTLY RELATED CLASS ATTENDANCE

Mr. Herbert stated this issue came up when an employee was not able to attend a class because it was not offered in the evening. However, the class was required as part of the degree. The Supervisor was not sure how to address the issue since there was no policy to do so.

Mr. Herbert suggested that the Township simply do a straight swap for time, hour for hour. So if the employee chose to take the class, he could do so during the day and simply give back the number of hours taken in the same pay period.

Mr. Herbert felt the proposed policy would address that type of issue and that it was a good policy for the following reasons: (1) it is equitable, (2) the Township recognizes there are professional employees who want to enhance their skills, and (3) the Township has experienced difficulty in recruiting individuals at this level and therefore, the Township needs to allow for some flexibility in those positions.

Mr. Haapala asked if this would apply to all employees. Mr. Herbert replied, "No" and indicated that it would only apply to department heads.

Mr. Spector asked for a summary of the recommendation. Mr. Herbert stated that department heads unable to schedule educational classes in the evening, should be allowed to schedule trade time with advance notice. Such trade time, however, shall not interfere with the duties required of the department head nor cause staff reschedulings that would disrupt the operation of the department.

Mr. Spector asked if the Township was differentiating what the trade time could be used for since there were a multitude of classes. Mr. Herbert stated it would address those classes that are not offered in the evenings. He stated the classes would have to be authorized by the Township.

Ms. Macon stated the policy would apply only to those classes that meet all the qualifications, not extraneous. In addition, no professional would request time off to do something that is frivolous.

Mr. Sher stated it was a good idea; however, he expressed concern as to how the employees in the department would be supervised in the absence of the department head. Mr. Herbert stated considering the department heads which the Township has, they should not be allowed to be out of the department for up to 8 hours in one week to attend class.

Ms. Macon stated the Township already has a policy that allows any department head to attend a five day seminar. The proposed policy would address something totally different from that and therefore, the language needed to be clarified. She added that she did not have a problem with the proposed policy.

Motion by Ms. Macon and supported by Mr. Sher to recommend approval of Article 12.B.4 as amended to allow department heads to trade time to maintain their academic class.

Ayes: Macon, Sher, Spector
Nays: None
Absent: None
Motion carried

Ms. Macon asked when they would be presented to the Township Board. Mr. Herbert planned on submitting the item in two meetings.

Mr. Plachinski stated that up to now, he has been taking vacation time in order to attend the required class and asked if there was anyway to allow retroactive compensation for the vacation time used.

Mr. Herbert stated that he could discuss the issue with the Township Supervisor and obtain clarification as to what could be done with respect to that situation.

POLICY CONCERNING TRAVEL AND EDUCATION

Mr. Spector stated that this issue was basically discussed in the previous item and asked if Mr. Herbert had anything further to add. M. Herbert suggested \$25 for dinners rather than \$20. Mr. Spector asked what was wrong with McDonalds.

Mr. Herbert stated that a sentence needed to be added to Article 12.A.4 indicating, "*out of state travel*" or "*travel in excess of 300 miles needs to be approved by the Township Board.*" He suggested that the Committee recommend approval of the second sentence.

Mr. Spector asked if this was something that needed to go before the Township Board or could it be handled by the Township Supervisor. Mr. Herbert stated that it was a big issue with the Township Board; therefore, it should be presented to them for consideration.

Motion by Mr. Sher and supported by Ms. Macon to recommend approval of Article 12.A.4 as amended to include the following language: "*pre-approval of travel in excess of 300 miles one way from West Bloomfield Township requires approval by the Township Board for members of the Township Board and staff.*"

Ayes: Macon, Sher, Spector

Nays: None

Absent: None

Motion carried

POLICY CONCERNING TIME KEEPING AND LAYOFFS

Mr. Herbert referred to Article 6.A.2 and indicated that the word "*Supervisor*" should replace the word "*Department head*" so that it reads as follows: "*Employees who are absent must notify their Supervisor or designee.*"

Mr. Herbert referred to Article 6.C.1 and indicated that the following sentence should be added: "*The Police and Fire Chiefs shall maintain proper time records by recording time worked and time off through the daily Police or Fire Department log.*"

Mr. Spector stated that accurate time could be kept by the use of a time clock and questioned why the Township did not have one. Ms. Macon stated that it was unprofessional. Mr. Herbert stated that he brought the issue before the Committee at a previous meeting and the item was tabled.

Mr. Herbert stated the Township has a serious timekeeping problem. Mr. Spector agreed and indicated that his understanding was that not everyone is at work on time. Mr. Herbert stated the building is dark a lot of times at eight o'clock, with the exception of a couple of lights.

Mr. Spector expressed concern that individuals were paid for being at work at a certain time; however, some of them are not present at that time. He stated that most organizations use time clocks. He stated that it did not necessarily require punching in a card; rather, it could simply involve a nametag with a chip in it and when the employee walks past a door, it clocks in the time. He stated that in speaking with some of the employees, a lot of individuals do not come into work on time, but they are getting paid for it.

Mr. Sher stated that was not part of this particular issue. Mr. Spector stated although that was true, he felt it was an important part of management.

Mr. Sher asked how other communities handled this type of situation. Mr. Herbert stated that most communities have time clocks. He stated there were a few people who show up on time and some even come in early; however, the Township does not pay those individuals for coming into work early.

Ms. Macon stated that it appeared this particular item is an attempt to supervise through policy as opposed to leadership. She felt that both the Police Chief and Fire Chief were professional individuals who both report to the Township Supervisor. She questioned whether the Township Supervisor has ever asked those individuals to follow a certain policy in order to be consistent with existing practices. She felt that it was a leadership issue and therefore, she was reticent to attempt to supervise an individual through policy where a person to person interaction would be absolutely appropriate.

Mr. Spector stated the question is whether they want the Supervisor to contact the Police Chief and directly ask him what time he arrived to work. Ms. Macon stated that was not what she had suggested.

Mr. Herbert stated the two individuals and their predecessors never submitted time sheets. Therefore, the Township did not have any documentation on how they were to maintain their time. He stated they certainly were not following the procedure of submitting time sheets. Therefore, he felt the matter needed to be addressed as to how they were going to report their time.

Mr. Herbert did not believe anyone has ever approached those two individuals to indicate that they submit time sheets.

Ms. Macon stated that if there is an expectation that every department head follow certain steps with respect to their time, then the Police Chief and Fire Chief should be asked to do the same. However, if those individuals were never asked to submit time sheets, it indicated to her that there was not a problem.

Mr. Spector disagreed and indicated that it was an ongoing problem. Ms. Macon stated there was no problem unless there has been a request. She stated that Mr. Herbert indicated that he was not aware that the two individuals have ever been asked to follow the same practice as every other department head.

Mr. Spector stated he did not want to point any fingers or accuse anyone; however, he felt that as elected officials, they have a responsibility to the residents and there are department heads that come and go as they please as well as not show up at all and they are not accountable to anyone.

Ms. Macon asked if he was referring to department heads who report to the Township Supervisor. Mr. Spector replied, "No" and indicated that he was referring to department heads who do not report to the Township Supervisor.

Ms. Macon stated, "I can't imagine who that could be." Mr. Spector stated, "I don't want to mention any names, but I think we both know who it is." Mr. Spector stated he was referring to an elected official. Ms. Macon stated that elected officials are not department heads; rather, they were officers of the Township and therefore, they are not the same.

Ms. Macon stated that if the language were to indicate that all department heads shall maintain proper time records by recording time worked and time off through the daily log, then that would be a policy language. However, she felt the proposed language was doing something else. She stated there should be a statement that applied to all department heads.

Mr. Herbert stated the policy indicates that all department heads should accurately record the time they begin and end their work. However, the Police Department does not do that.

Ms. Macon stated that if she worked for an organization and there was a step that the policy indicates she should follow and if she was not following that policy, how would she know to do so. Mr. Herbert stated that past practice indicates that the individual's time should be placed recorded in a departmental log.

Ms. Macon stated there appeared to be a proposal to change that practice. Mr. Herbert stated that was not correct; rather, the reason for policies, was to avoid any problems.

Mr. Sher asked if the Police Chief and Fire Chief were of the belief that they were not considered to be department heads, but something different. Mr. Herbert stated he did not know.

Mr. Herbert stated the Board needed to decide whether to make them a part of the existing process for department heads or add language to the policy. He stated there should also be discussion with the Township Supervisor about this issue.

Ms. Macon stated that if the Committee were to accept the proposed language, then the Police Chief and Fire Chief would not have to follow the same practice as all other department heads, but would be able to continue what they have done in the past. Mr. Herbert stated that was correct. Ms. Macon asked that being the case, why was it necessary to add the language to the policy? Mr. Herbert stated that it needed to be in writing, otherwise they had no policy to adhere to.

Ms. Macon suggested that the language could be revised as follows: *“The Supervisor will review and initial the time record before submitting it for payroll processing. In the case of the Police Chief and Fire Chief, recording time in the daily log is acceptable.”*

Mr. Sher stated it has been indicated that process is unacceptable. Mr. Herbert stated that was correct. Ms. Macon stated the proposed language was affirming that the current practice they follow was correct. Mr. Herbert stated that was correct and indicated that they have been following that practice for years.

Ms. Macon stated that the language, *“shall maintain”* made it appear as if there was a sense that it was improper. She stated that entering the time into the daily Police and Fire Department logs as is current practice, is acceptable for these two individuals. Mr. Herbert stated that was exactly what the language was indicating.

Motion by Ms. Macon and supported by Mr. Sher to recommend approval of the following articles: Article 6.A.2 as amended: *“Employees who are absent must notify their Supervisor or designee.”* Article 6.C.1 as amended: *“The Police and Fire Chiefs shall maintain proper time records by recording time worked and time off through the daily Police or Fire Department log.”*

Ayes: Macon, Sher, Spector
Nays: None
Absent: None
Motion carried

Mr. Herbert referred to Article 6.A.7 and indicated that it should be amended to include the following language: *“Employees may be laid off by action of the Township Board by amending the Township’s Operating Budget.”*

Ms. Macon stated that Article 6.A.7 was redundant and indicated that the language included in that article is already a practice of the Township. She stated the adoption of the Township Budget is a policy statement and therefore, the Township already has the authority to lay off employees.

Mr. Herbert stated the union contracts allow layoffs and this language addresses layoffs for department heads. He stated the old Employee Manual addressed layoffs; however, when the Board adopted the Department Head Employee Manual, language addressing layoffs was not included in the manual. Therefore, he was proposing specific language to be included in the manual and this particular section applied only to the department heads.

Ms. Macon asked about language in the manual indicating that department heads were “at will” employees. Mr. Sher asked if there was a different policy for layoffs versus terminations. Ms. Macon replied, “No.”

Mr. Spector felt the language regarding “at will” employees was necessary because there was a problem on one of the boards and commissions involving an individual who moved to another state and an individual who was removed from the board.

Ms. Macon stated the manual already has language indicating that every department head is an “at will” employee. She stated this language has nothing to do with the boards and commissions. She stated there was no policy for boards and commissions.

Ms. Macon stated the Township already had the right to terminate an individual’s employment with the “at will” language and provided an example by indicating that the Township Board could approve a budget that only listed the legally required departments in it. However, she was not recommending that the Township do so. She stated that according to Michigan State law, the only legally required departments are Assessing, Finance, Fire and Police.

Mr. Spector stated the Board has already eliminated departments that they were not legally required to have because the Parking Enforcement Department was removed from the budget in 2005.

Mr. Spector asked that if the policy already existed, why was it necessary to include it in the manual. Mr. Herbert stated he wanted to include language in the manual simply to make a clear statement. Mr. Spector stated there should be clear language that the Township reserves the right to layoff department heads other than the ones that are necessary by law.

Mr. Sher asked if he was indicating that the language "at will" was ambiguous and he simply wanted to expand on it. Mr. Herbert suggested that he would speak with the Township Labor Attorney and come back with a recommendation at the next meeting.

EVALUATION SYSTEMS SOFTWARE

Mr. Herbert stated there have been discussions at previous meetings relative to performance evaluations. Recently, he was provided with materials from HRN Management Group about a requirements review system. He stated the information came in after he submitted his proposed budget so it was not included at that time.

Mr. Herbert stated that he would not recommend the Performance Pro Proposal from HRN Management Group unless it had the support of the officers. He stated the Township currently had a basic system and some of the issues were not addressed.

Mr. Sher asked what the Township currently had in place. Ms. Macon stated it was currently done using paper and pen. Mr. Herbert stated he would provide the forms to the Committee for review.

Ms. Macon stated that since 2007 will be the first year in which the Township Board will have a conversation about Township Board goals, this recommendation is appropriate. She stated that Mr. Herbert is providing a system that will support actually operationalizing a system in which they look at performance measures.

Ms. Macon believed that the entire constituency is customer service driven. She stated she would be interested in tying this into the customer service system.

Mr. Herbert stated that knowing how long the discussion of Township goals might take, this would more than likely be a 2008 project. He felt it deserved consideration and it required the support of the Township officers, who have not been that interested in evaluation systems in the past.

Ms. Macon believed that residents would see benefits and there could even be cost savings as the Township became more efficient across the board.

Mr. Sher stated he would be interested in the proposed evaluation system as well as which surrounding communities were utilizing this system or some other system.

Ms. Macon saw the evaluation system as a way to support high performance within the Township staff that would show marked results out in the community.

Mr. Herbert stated it would also justify any of the decisions involving disciplinary actions, layoffs, etc. Ms. Macon added that it would also justify decisions involving praising an employee for their performance.

Mr. Spector asked how the evaluation system would work and whether representatives from HRN Management Group would administer the program. Mr. Herbert stated the Township would purchase the license for their software and he would work with the department heads as well as the Personnel Committee to set up the program and tie it into the Township goals and objectives.

Mr. Sher asked if the Township currently had a policy for evaluating employees every year. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes." Mr. Sher asked if there was a policy addressing the format of that evaluation process. Mr. Herbert replied, "No" and indicated that at one time, there was a checklist that was too simple and then they went to something that was a little more than what the Board wanted to do.

Mr. Sher stated that if the Board mandated the evaluation system, the department heads would be required to complete the performance evaluations. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes" and added that the three individuals who are the key administrators for the system are the three Township officers.

Ms. Macon stated it would be important to her to have feedback on this issue from some of the department heads. She stated the percentage of the employees that relate to each of the officers is skewed. Therefore, this would have to be supported by the Township Supervisor. She felt that there were some department heads who would welcome the utilization of this type of system.

Mr. Spector stated there should be a system specially designed for department heads because there are three or four department heads that excel their functions.

Ms. Macon stated the Township Board gets what they ask for and they have yet to be specific in terms of what they want the department heads to provide.

Mr. Herbert stated that it would be helpful if the Board members met with each department to discuss all the aspects of that particular department, once for every term of office. He stated that not too long ago Mr. Sher met with the Police Department, Fire Department, and the Water & Sewer Department. He stated that he received a lot of positive feedback from employees at the lower levels.

Ms. Macon recommended that the Committee follow-up on Mr. Herbert's suggestion; however, she wanted to have an in-depth conversation with department heads on a quarterly basis rather than every year.

Mr. Herbert stated that rather than meet with the department heads during the budget process and simply dealing with numbers, the Board should meet with four department heads once a quarter and televise that meeting because it would be great public relations for the community.

Mr. Herbert stated that meeting with each department would require more Township Board meetings. Ms. Macon stated although that was true, the Board would be in a better position to make quality decisions.

Ms. Macon asked if the Committee wanted to move forward with a recommendation to the full Board to institute a way to follow-up on the suggestions made relative to interacting with the department heads in depth on a once a year basis.

Mr. Spector stated an easy way of doing that would be to have a seminar and have Mr. Haapala and Mr. Labadie teach the other department heads how to set up goal statements.

Mr. Spector stated he would like to have a statement from the department heads as to what was done in the past and what would be done in the next year.

Ms. Macon stated that as a result of the Township Board decision made at a previous meeting, they were already on track for the year 2007. She stated the Supervisor is already on target with respect to following up on the motion approved by majority of the Board to do exactly what the Committee has been discussing. Therefore, a recommendation from this Committee would be in support of the motion made a few weeks ago.

Ms. Macon suggested that the Committee make a recommendation to the Township Board that they move forward in 2007 with an in-depth conversation with department heads before getting to the goal setting for the next year.

DISCUSSION REGARDING BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Ms. Macon stated that Mr. Spector and Mr. Sher have expressed interest in getting a copy of the original report and presentation on Boards and Commission as well as the official language adopted by the Board. She stated it was a lot of reading, but once they have seen all those items together, it would put the Committee in position to have a policy document that would be supportive of all appointed boards and commissions.

Ms. Macon stated that ten of the decisions were already made and therefore, it would simply be a matter of actually implementing them. She added that background material has already been provided in that packet.

Mr. Spector stated he wanted to see a synopsis. Ms. Macon suggested that he read the minutes. Mr. Spector stated the actual report was two inches thick. Mr. Herbert stated that was incorrect and indicated that the report only contained 20 pages. Ms. Macon stated the reason for the thickness of the reports was because she provided all the research and background data.

Mr. Herbert stated he wanted to put together amendments to the ordinance that would incorporate what the Board originally intended before they got into the idea of fast track permits that really did not happen.

Mr. Spector stated that the fast track process will work; however, there are individuals currently serving on the boards and commissions that are used to making all the decisions at the board level. He stated the fast track permit process is actually a great idea and it involves an administrative process. He stated the Township hired a top-notch Environmental Director that knows the ordinance inside and out. However, he has not been allowed to use the fast track permit process.

Ms. Macon stated the current Wetland Ordinance was written and adopted before there was a paid professional and highly qualified individual to administer the wetland permit process. She stated that in the beginning, there were only good citizens who knew how to do the work. As organizations changed and evolved, a decision was made to hire professional staff because the burden was greater. However, the Township never changed the Wetland Ordinance to give the highly qualified professional responsibilities that they could do because it meant taking some authority away from the original individuals who were all volunteers at that time.

Ms. Macon stated she was not indicating that the volunteers do not do an excellent job; she was simply indicating that the Township has never aligned the ordinance with giving the Environmental Director the authority that person is now ready to do.

Ms. Macon stated the Township has actually given the Wetland Board members more authority than the Township Board members retain themselves. She stated there was something fundamentally askew with that situation.

Ms. Macon stated the decision made in October 2004 was to give responsibility to the highly qualified Environmental Director to make certain decisions and there was a lot of pushback. She stated the fast track permit process is very narrow and the conditions which the Boards and Commissions Committee was working toward have remained there. There is still an onerous procedure that is costly, time consuming and very intimidating for the average resident.

Mr. Sher stated that process could be changed by the Township Board. Ms. Macon stated there has never been the will of the Township Board to actually challenge it. Mr. Sher suggested that the issue be placed on the next Township Board agenda.

Mr. Herbert stated the ordinance needs to be redrafted and once that is done, it could be placed on the Township Board agenda. He suggested that the Committee have the process completed by the end of the year.

Ms. Macon stated there are a lot of opinions in the community that say the members of the Wetland Board are the experts and they are. She stated the issue is that currently, the Township does not allow the highly qualified Environmental Director to do the things that an individual of that capacity would have responsibility for in any other community.

Mr. Sher stated that in the future, he wanted to see a program or an ordinance that addressed the issues which Ms. Macon has raised. Ms. Macon suggested that since the Committee had the foresight to schedule a meeting of the Boards and Commissions Committee for next Monday, they be provided with a copy of the wetland portion.

Mr. Spector asked if the Committee had the authority to meet with the Township Attorney. Mr. Herbert suggested that the Committee look back at what the Board authorized the Committee to do and felt that they already had the authority to do certain things without having to go back to the Township Board.

Ms. Macon stated her understanding was that they were to present an implementation plan to the Township Board before the Committee did anything. She stated that the Township Board expects the Committee to be accountable to them for this movement.

Mr. Herbert asked whether the implementation plan was to implement a recommendation. Ms. Macon stated that it was simply to let them know whether all the recommendations adopted in 2004 should be recommended for implementation.

Ms. Macon felt that all the recommendations should be adopted for implementation. Mr. Spector stated the problem was that the Board adopted ten recommendations that were not enacted. Ms. Macon stated that was correct.

Mr. Spector stated the fact that the recommendations were not enacted on, that indicated to him that it was not the will of the majority of the Township Board. Ms. Macon stated that was not correct. Mr. Herbert agreed.

AUDIENCE GENERAL COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Mr. Haapala thanked the Committee for their support of the Water & Sewer Department. He asked that in the future, if he had an employee at pay grade level 5 or 5.5, who wanted to finish up an engineering degree and was only a few credits shy and needed to take a day course, would it be granted.

Ms. Macon stated that issue would have to be brought back to the Committee for discussion and indicated that the Committee set a tone that it would only apply to department heads.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:13 p.m.

Robert Spector
Personnel Committee Chair

Transcribed by: Millie Gray, Recording Secretary