

PROCEEDINGS OF
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF WEST BLOOMFIELD
4550 WALNUT LAKE ROAD
CONFERENCE ROOM 76

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2009 --- 7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Brown at 7:06 p.m.

Members Present: Trustee Larry Brown
 Trustee Steve Kaplan
 Trustee Howard Rosenberg

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Kent Herbert, Human Resources Director
 Edwin Haapala, Water and Sewer Director
 Police Chief Ron Cronin
 Patricia Page, Exec Asst/PD Chief
 Steve Burns, Code Enforcement Officer
 Gene Farber, Township Trustee
 Cindy Wiechert, Code Enforcement Officer
 Kristi Joss, Code Enforcement-Officer Coordinator
 Patty Hicks, Sr Clerk/Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as submitted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Rosenberg and supported by Mr. Brown to table the January 6, 2009 minutes until next Personnel Committee Meeting.

Ayes: Brown, Kaplan, Rosenberg

Nays: None

Absent: None

Motion carried

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

WATER BILLING OFFICE COORDINATOR

Mr. Herbert stated that at the last meeting, there was discussion as to whether the Township Treasurer would assume supervisory responsibilities of the Water & Sewer Billing Department personnel. Mr. Kaplan stated that the Township Treasurer agreed not to assume the responsibility. Mr. Herbert stated that was correct.

Mr. Brown indicated that he provided information to the Committee regarding the issue of whether the employees could be placed under the Treasurer's Office. However, the Treasurer has already indicated she was not willing to assume the responsibility. Mr. Brown stated that the Township Supervisor has the ability to assign this task to any officer, department head, or supervisory personnel in the Township. Mr. Kaplan questioned the issue of one elected official assigning responsibilities to another elected official.

Mr. Haapala stated he had discussions with the Township Treasurer who indicated that given her current workload, she was not able to supervise the Water & Sewer Billing Department nor was it offered to have one of her staff members to perform that function. Mr. Kaplan asked if the possibility of the Deputy Treasurer undertaking the responsibility was explored. Mr. Haapala stated that it was not relayed to him that it would be a potential possibility.

Mr. Haapala stated he had discussions with the Clerk and Supervisor as well as the TPOAM Unit 1 Vice President. The current Billing Analyst position is at level 4.5 and the Office Coordinator position at level 5 would hold a higher level of responsibilities without being a supervisor to the other staff. There is a difference of \$2,300 for a half step increase.

Mr. Rosenberg expressed concern with the Township Treasurer being unwilling to accept the supervisory responsibility. He stated that given the deficits currently facing the Township, it is important that everyone share in the responsibilities. He stated the Personnel Committee should insist that the Treasurer provide supervision to those personnel. He was not in favor of spending additional monies.

WATER BILLING OFFICE COORDINATOR (Continued)

Mr. Brown agreed and indicated that the employees are currently located in the Treasurer's Office and therefore, it would be appropriate to have supervision responsibilities be performed by the Township Treasurer.

Mr. Kaplan disagreed and asked how many hours of supervision would be required if assigned to the Township Treasurer. Mr. Haapala stated it was approximately ten hours a week. He stated the time has to be split between administrative functions and water and sewer administrative paperwork.

Mr. Kaplan stated the Township has an elected Treasurer, which is a full-time position and therefore, he had concerns with assigning additional responsibilities to the Treasurer that are not part of the statutory duties. Mr. Haapala stated that same issue was raised by the former Township Treasurer.

Mr. Kaplan stated that if the Deputy Treasurer were to perform the supervisory functions, it would amount to approximately \$16,250 a year based on his salary. Therefore, more money would be spent having the Deputy Treasurer undertake the responsibility versus elevating an existing employee.

Mr. Rosenberg questioned whether another supervisor within the Treasurer's Office could perform the functions. Mr. Herbert stated there were two supervisory personnel and one employee at level 6 who currently serves in a technical position, but has not been designated any supervisory functions. Whether that individual could perform the responsibility would require discussion with the Treasurer.

Mr. Rosenberg agreed that the Personnel Committee did not have the authority to assign duties to the elected officials; however, he felt the committee had the authority to question the costs. He was not satisfied that the Treasurer has given full consideration to providing supervisory responsibilities by someone in her staff.

Mr. Brown suggested that the issue be sent back to the Treasurer to determine whether the responsibility could be performed by another individual in her office. Mr. Kaplan questioned who would pick up the slack of the required functions for the individual who has to devote ten hours to supervising the Water & Sewer Billing personnel.

Mr. Brown suggested that two members of the Committee have discussion with the Township Treasurer to determine whether the supervisory functions could be performed by another staff member. Mr. Kaplan did not feel it was the Committee's responsibility to micromanage the departments. Mr. Brown stated it was simply to gather information.

WATER BILLING OFFICE COORDINATOR (Continued)

Mr. Brown asked about the pay grade levels. Mr. Herbert stated the original proposal was for level 5.5 and Mr. Haapala suggested an Office Coordinator at level 5. However, that is not sufficient and supervision was necessary. Mr. Brown expressed concern with upgrading an Office Coordinator position and its cumulative impact to other Office Coordinator positions within the Township. Mr. Herbert stated the job title would be Office Supervisor rather than an Office Coordinator at level 5.5. Mr. Haapala suggested a Senior Office Coordinator.

Mr. Haapala provided a history of the workload in the Water & Sewer Billing Department from 1990 to the current year, which resulted in an increase of accounts from 10,000 to 24,000.

Mr. Herbert referred to the 10/29/07 minutes which indicated that once the Assistant Water & Sewer Director retired, it would be beneficial to advance a current staff member to handle the billing operations rather than continue with an Assistant Water & Sewer Director position. This would be a cost effective solution. The advancement would involve a Water & Sewer Billing Analyst position being upgraded to pay grade level 6.

Mr. Haapala further added that when the current Assistant Water & Sewer Director retired either voluntarily or through a forced retirement due to illness, he wanted to hire a staff analyst at pay grade level 4 to assist with the clerical functions that he is currently performing. This would free up his time to perform more supervision duties.

Mr. Rosenberg asked when the retirement would occur. Mr. Haapala stated it was not known yet; however, he would be receiving a report from the Assistant Water & Sewer Director next week.

Mr. Rosenberg asked if there was a date by policy or law in which a position becomes vacant. Mr. Herbert stated the current policy is two years before the individual is certified to be unable to perform the job. He stated that the Water & Sewer Department had proposals to restructure the department in the fall and therefore, he felt all of the proposals should be done at that time.

Mr. Kaplan stated the Water & Sewer Department has its own funding and therefore, the proposal does not affect the General Fund. He stated the proposal involved a nominal amount of money in comparison to the funding for the department. Mr. Brown stated he was concerned with the philosophy of what is being done and its cumulative effect on other positions. Mr. Herbert stated that would not be an issue if the position was an Office Supervisor at pay grade level 5.5

WATER BILLING OFFICE COORDINATOR (Continued)

Mr. Haapala stated the concern expressed by the TPOAM Unit 1 was whether the duties of one Billing Analyst who is upgraded to a supervisory position would be given to the remaining analysts and whether there should be compensation for those individuals. He stated that is a basic philosophical union tactic that is used everywhere.

Mr. Brown wanted to have discussions with Mr. Haapala to determine the issues involved in the proposal. Mr. Kaplan stated that was not the role of a Personnel Committee member, but rather, the role of the Personnel Director. Mr. Herbert stated he would be willing to assist Mr. Haapala in providing further information to the Committee. He suggested that the Supervisor or the Personnel Committee submit something in writing to the Treasurer rather than it coming from Mr. Haapala and him. Mr. Haapala agreed.

POLICE, DISPATCHER & CADET HIRING PROCEDURE AND ORDINANCE

Mr. Herbert stated that shortly after the last committee meeting, he met with the Police Chief and Police Executive Secretary to discuss the open issues. The issues were summarized by the Police Department and he edited the current ordinance for those changes with the exception of two areas in which he and the Police Chief disagreed.

Mr. Rosenberg summarized the issues that were discussed at the Township Board level:

- Percent of passing for written exam and number of candidates to be considered
- Application requirements for cadets
- Who administers the written exam
- Who chooses the oral board
- Are written and oral boards weighted
- Can cadets be selected without being in the top six

Mr. Rosenberg stated those issues have not been addressed and indicated that there was not an open process for the hiring of cadets as the Board expected and as good policy would dictate there should be. He stated the weighing of the cadets and the additional five points granted to them is too strong in terms of not providing a robust type of hiring process.

Mr. Kaplan referred to Section 18-23(1) and asked that applicants be required to provide criminal history, if any. Ms. Page stated the Police Department conducts a background check. Mr. Herbert stated the application indicates that felonies should be disclosed. Mr. Kaplan stated that the application should also require the disclosure of misdemeanors.

POLICE, DISPATCHER & CADET HIRING PROCEDURE AND ORDINANCE
(Continued)

Mr. Herbert outlined the areas of the ordinance discussed and disputed with the Police Department, which included the following:

- written exam should be administered within 30 days of the application deadline
- selection of the written exam shall be determined by the Personnel Officer
- 80% or median score, whichever is lower, shall be considered the passing score

Mr. Brown felt that the Police Chief should have an opportunity to provide input with respect to the determination of a written exam. He suggested the following language: *“Selection of the written exam shall be determined by the Personnel Officer and shall be consulted with the Chief of Police.”*

Mr. Rosenberg questioned whether the median score will always be lower than the 80%. Mr. Herbert replied, “No” and indicated that has not been the case in the past. Mr. Brown stated that 80% was the threshold. Mr. Rosenberg stated it was his understanding that the Board and the public wanted 80%. In addition, it has already been demonstrated that enough people have scored above 80%. There was a consensus of the Committee that 80% should remain and the language *“or median score”* should be deleted.

There was discussion relative to having an outsider taking part of the police interview process and the costs involved in doing so.

Mr. Kaplan suggested that the interviewers be individuals designated by the Police Chief and the third interviewer would be part of the union. Chief Cronin disagreed with having the third interview from the union and indicated that the unions act as though they run the department now.

Mr. Rosenberg suggested the Oral Board consist of the Human Resources Director and two representatives from the Police Department or the designee of the Police Chief.

Mr. Kaplan disagreed with the Human Resources Director being part of the Oral Board because that individual typically has not served as a police officer and intangibles are involved in the police work.

POLICE, DISPATCHER & CADET HIRING PROCEDURE AND ORDINANCE
(Continued)

Mr. Rosenberg asked about the ordinance and how it addresses the hiring of cadets. Mr. Herbert stated that the cadets must take the same test as the police officers and have to be in the top 30 in order to be hired as a cadet. Mr. Rosenberg asked if interviews would be conducted. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes" and added that the cadets would not receive preferential treatment.

Mr. Rosenberg asked if there would be an open announcement that applications are being taken for hiring cadets. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes." Mr. Herbert stated that in order to be eligible for an interview, cadets have to place in the top 30 and in order to be considered for a police officer position, cadets have to be place in the top 6. Therefore, no preference is given to cadets who are already working in the Police Department.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that he would be more comfortable with cadets being required to pass with a score of 80% and only the top 6 be considered to be hired as a cadet. His understanding was that the standards for hiring cadets would be the same as that for hiring police officers. Mr. Herbert stated that an individual who scores in the top 6 will be ready to become a police officer rather than a cadet. He reiterated the process for hiring cadets.

Mr. Kaplan stated that all other factors being equal, the cadet would be preferred over another individual since that person already has knowledge of the department. Mr. Rosenberg stated there will be an unwillingness to do that if the standards were higher. Chief Cronin stated if that were the case, there would not be any need to hire cadets since all those individuals would prefer to be considered for a police officer position.

Mr. Herbert referred to the following language: *"the results of the physical exam and psychological exams should be filed with the Human Resources Department."* Ms. Page stated that has already been done; it just has not been included in the ordinance.

Mr. Herbert referred to the following language: *"offers of employment shall be made by the Human Resources Department in accordance with the provisions."*

Mr. Herbert referred to the language regarding the eligibility list consisting of six or ten individuals. He stated that the Supervisor wanted the list to contain ten individuals. Mr. Kaplan asked for the advantages of six versus ten. Mr. Herbert stated that either would be fine. He added that an eligibility list of ten individuals was being recommended for the clerical positions. Mr. Kaplan questioned why the same amount could not be applied to the police officer positions. Chief Cronin suggested eight.

POLICE, DISPATCHER & CADET HIRING PROCEDURE AND ORDINANCE
(Continued)

Mr. Herbert referred to the language regarding cadet hiring and indicated that this area may have already been resolved: *"The police chief may select any of the applicants on the eight highest eligibility list."*

Mr. Rosenberg referred to section 18-24(d) and asked about the hiring eligibility list. Mr. Herbert stated that was proposed initially, but the Committee indicated they wanted the same number and group and the amount of eight.

Mr. Rosenberg suggested the following language: *"that the Chief of Police may select any of the applicants on the hiring eligibility list to become a cadet. The hiring eligibility list shall require: the person shall pass the written test by 80%, the person will pass the oral boards, the eligibility shall be 30, and the top eight get listed."*

Mr. Kaplan stated the Police Chief will have the option to select from the top eight and if all eight decline, then he goes to the next eligible person. He suggested that should be clearly defined in the ordinance.

Ms. Page asked if there will be two eligibility lists. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes." Ms. Page stated that some individuals apply for both cadet and police officer positions. Mr. Brown stated there could be one list and all the requirements would be based on percentages.

Mr. Brown stated the ordinance indicates that the eligibility list shall be effective for one year. Chief Cronin stated that he has the authority to extend it for six months.

Mr. Kaplan stated the item of contention is the composition of the oral board. Chief Cronin stated he wanted the oral board to consist of police officers. Mr. Herbert suggested that the Human Resources Director could designate an officer within the Police Department.

Motion by Mr. Brown and supported by Mr. Rosenberg to recommend that the three individuals on the Oral Board consist of the Human Resources Director, Police Chief, and Deputy Police Chief.

Ayes: Brown, Rosenberg

Nays: Kaplan

Absent: None

Motion carried

NEW BUSINESS

STAFFING REORGANIZATION IN ORDINANCE/HOUSING DEPARTMENT

Mr. Brown stated that the Code Enforcement Director retired on 01/23/09 and the Supervisor has proposed a reorganization of the department.

Mr. Herbert referred to the letter submitted by the Supervisor. Mr. Kaplan asked if it indicated the pay grade level. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes." He stated the proposal includes new job descriptions for a Code Enforcement Supervisor and a Housing Code Coordinator at pay grade level 7. Mr. Kaplan asked who prepared the job descriptions and indicated that it was a good amount of effort in a short period of time.

Mr. Rosenberg asked about the pay grade level for the Code Enforcement Director position. Mr. Herbert stated it was at pay grade level 8, which was effective in 2003. Prior to that, it was at level 7.

Mr. Rosenberg asked when the department was removed from the Police Department. Mr. Kaplan stated it was in 1995.

Mr. Brown stated that majority of the violations were related to building, engineering, environmental, and planning issues.

Mr. Rosenberg asked how long Mr. Burns was employed with the Township. Mr. Burns indicated that he was hired in August 1999 and at that time, he and Mr. Killian were both equal Code Officers reporting to Supervisor Jeddy Hood. Mr. Rosenberg asked why the director position was created. Mr. Burns stated there were complaints from residents and requests were made to have them under their own department or placed under the supervision of another department in which statistics, quarterly and annual reports were being maintained and reported to the Township Board.

Mr. Rosenberg did not see any reason to change the current structure. Mr. Kaplan disagreed and indicated that there was an opportunity to save money. Mr. Rosenberg stated there were issues with respect to splitting the job into two positions and the residents having concerns with respect to the reporting structure. In addition, there will be a lot of confusion as to the responsibilities and the amount of overtime required to perform the tasks, which will decrease the amount of savings expected from the restructuring.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that as a board member, he was not willing to give up his authority of having the opportunity to make a selection as to who would be in charge of the Code Enforcement Department.

STAFFING REORGANIZATION IN ORDINANCE/HOUSING DEPARTMENT

(Continued)

Mr. Kaplan stated another option would be to have pay grade level 6.5 and 7 and have a department head status and operate as such. Mr. Rosenberg stated although that was correct, the Board would be giving up its authority to have a direct hire of that particular area. In addition, there is still the matter of paying overtime. Mr. Kaplan stated the Board would still decide who would be in the pay grade level 7 position. Mr. Brown disagreed and indicated that there was a hiring freeze.

Mr. Brown stated that at the last Board meeting, his understanding was that the rental inspection program has been put on the back burner. Mr. Kaplan stated that issue has been buried.

Mr. Brown expressed concern that the proposal would place added stress and strain on the Code Enforcement Department. He did not see the necessity of having two individuals in a supervisory position for the department, since a tremendous amount of work has been eliminated from the department with the scrapping of the rental inspection program. Mr. Rosenberg stated that it adds more work for the Supervisor who has already indicated she was overwhelmed. Mr. Brown agreed.

Mr. Brown asked that if someone internally would be moved into the former Code Enforcement Director's position, would it be necessary to fill another position in that department or can it operate with the current staffing.

Mr. Burns stated he ran the department in the absence of the former Code Enforcement Director's absence and that he could handle the current operations of the department. However, the department recently received a list of over 200 foreclosures, which the department was going to monitor to ensure there are no blight situations in the community. Therefore, it was unknown whether the staffing was adequate to handle that additional work.

Mr. Burns stated that he submitted a proposal to the Supervisor to address the concerns related to property maintenance, but has not yet received a response.

Mr. Burns stated that many municipalities have the Code Enforcement Department as a separate department under the Building Department, which is a common structure. He stated that both the Code Enforcement and Building Department staff have the ability to address housing and property maintenance concerns as well as code enforcement concerns.

Mr. Rosenberg did not feel the Code Enforcement Department structure should be changed. Mr. Kaplan stated there could be a level 7 position that reports directly to the Township Board and indicated that was the case with the former Environmental Manager.

STAFFING REORGANIZATION IN ORDINANCE/HOUSING DEPARTMENT
(Continued)

Mr. Rosenberg suggested that the matter be sent back to the Supervisor. Mr. Herbert stated the issue has been sent to the Committee for recommendation and the item is scheduled for consideration at the 02/02/09 board meeting.

Mr. Kaplan enumerated five possibilities for addressing the issue:

- Status quo – Code Enforcement Director at pay grade level 8
- Supervisor at pay grade level 6 who reports directly to the Township Supervisor
- Place the Code Enforcement Department under the Building Department
- Place the Code Enforcement Department under the Police Department
- One or two Code Enforcement Supervisors at a pay grade level lower than a department head level

Mr. Burns expressed concern with having two supervisors running the same department. Mr. Rosenberg felt there should be one supervisor; however, he felt the Board should be given options.

Mr. Farber held the opinion that if it's not broke, don't fix it; however, he felt that one recommendation should be presented to the Board.

Mr. Brown noted that other Code Enforcement staff members were present and asked if they wished to comment.

Ms. Wiechert did not feel the department structure should be changed and should continue to operate with a department head in place. She indicated that majority of the complaints were related to blight, permit, and property maintenance issues.

Mr. Kaplan stated there is an opportunity to have a pay grade level 7 position, which may address the budgetary concerns raised by some Board members. Mr. Farber stated there would not be a cost savings at level 7 since those positions have the opportunity to receive overtime.

Mr. Herbert stated overtime is out of control and indicated that it was self-assigned in a lot of areas. Mr. Burns stated that is not the case with the Code Enforcement Department. Mr. Herbert stated that was the case with one individual in that department in 2003.

Mr. Rosenberg stated the supervisor would still be required to prepare and attend meetings and those tasks may require overtime. Therefore, he did not see a cost savings with respect to level 7 positions running the department.

STAFFING REORGANIZATION IN ORDINANCE/HOUSING DEPARTMENT

(Continued)

Mr. Brown asked for the monetary difference between level 7 and level 8. Mr. Herbert stated that it was approximately \$19,000. Mr. Brown asked for the pay grade of an entry level Code Enforcement Officer. Mr. Herbert replied, "Level 6."

Mr. Kaplan asked if the Housing Coordinator position could be placed under the Building Department. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes." Mr. Kaplan asked if it was logical. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes."

Mr. Farber asked if the intent was to have the Building Department responsible for code enforcement duties. Mr. Brown replied, "No."

Mr. Rosenberg did not see any advantage to restructuring the department and therefore, he wanted to maintain status quo.

Mr. Kaplan asked if the restructuring could have one Code Enforcement Supervisor and two part-time Code Officers. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes." Mr. Kaplan provided a scenario in which one of the existing Code Officers were elevated to the Code Enforcement Director position and having two part-time Code Officers to replace the one full-time Code Officer. Mr. Herbert stated that structure would work.

Motion by Mr. Rosenberg and supported by Mr. Brown to recommend to the Township Board that the Code Enforcement Director position be maintained at pay grade level 8 and replaced as soon as possible.

Ayes: Brown, Rosenberg

Nays: Kaplan

Absent: None

Motion carried

Mr. Kaplan did not feel he had enough information to vote in support of the motion.

Mr. Kaplan asked about the request for the Housing Coordinator. Mr. Rosenberg stated that no action would be taken with respect to that request. He felt the department head in conjunction with the Supervisor could make any recommendations relative to part-time positions to address the housing issues.

Mr. Kaplan asked if he has found that retired police officers performed well as code enforcement officers. Mr. Burns replied, "Absolutely."

STAFFING REORGANIZATION IN ORDINANCE/HOUSING DEPARTMENT

(Continued)

Mr. Brown stated it has been indicated that two supervisors would be counter-productive. In addition, having a Housing Coordinator report to the Township Supervisor who is already overwhelmed would only add to the situation and all the complaints would have to be addressed by the Supervisor or the Township Board.

Mr. Brown stated that having a supervisor at level 7 reporting to the Building Director would only add stress and strain to what is currently occurring in that department. Therefore, he did not feel Mr. Gentile could take on the additional responsibility at this point. Mr. Kaplan stated he has not had an opportunity to hear from Mr. Gentile. Mr. Brown stated he had discussions with Mr. Gentile who indicated that he preferred not to take on the added responsibility.

NEXT MEETING ITEMS

The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, February 23, 2009 to discuss the following items:

- Survey of Department Heads on Hiring Procedures
- Clerical Hiring Procedures – Review Draft
- Review of Staffing Standards in Police / Fire Departments

AUDIENCE GENERAL COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business before the Committee, the meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marya Duncan

Marya Duncan
HR Specialist