

PROCEEDINGS OF PERSONNEL COMMITTEE  
EMPLOYEE LOUNGE  
WEST BLOOMFIELD TOWN HALL  
4550 WALNUT LAKE ROAD  
THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2009 – 6:30 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Trustee Larry Brown called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Members present: Trustee Larry Brown  
Trustee Steve Kaplan (6:45 p.m.)  
Trustee Howard Rosenberg

Members absent: None

Staff Present: Denise Maier, Human Resources Director

General Public: Michele Economou-Ureste, Township Supervisor  
Cathy Shaughnessy, Township Clerk  
Teri Weingarden, Township Treasurer  
JoAnn Kochanowski, 4940 Lockhart  
Kristi Joss, Code Enforcement Dept  
Mary Kay Hare, 6961 Evershed  
Ron Lee, Water & Sewer Dept  
Marvin Daitch, 3245 Interlaken  
Teresa Hebert, IT Dept  
Linda Furman, Development Services Dept  
Cindy Summerfield, IT Dept  
Richard Nicholson, Building Dept  
David Robertson, ZBA Chair  
Molly Preston, Police Dept  
Kim Shaw, Police Dept  
Judy Sheridan, Purchasing  
Linda Smith, Development Services Dept  
Phil Gentile, Building Director  
Doug Plachcinski, Planning Director  
Millie Gray, Development Services Dept

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Motion by Mr. Rosenberg and supported by Mr. Brown to approve the agenda as submitted.**

**Ayes: Rosenberg, Brown  
Nays: None  
Absent: Kaplan  
Motion carried**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion by Mr. Rosenberg and supported by Mr. Brown to approve the minutes of 03/10/09, 04/14/09, and 05/28/09 as presented.**

**Ayes: Rosenberg, Brown  
Nays: None  
Absent: Kaplan  
Motion carried**

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

### **NEW BUSINESS**

### **REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

Mr. Brown stated the Committee would not be reviewing the entire reorganization of the department. He indicated that correspondence received from the Township Supervisor reflected a review of only the Building Director and Planning Director positions.

Mr. Brown stated the township is experiencing a reduction in state shared revenues and as a result, the township needs to consider some cost savings and as such, the Township Supervisor has proposed a reorganization of the Development Services Department.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated a special board meeting was held on 06/22/09 to address reductions in state shared revenue and a proposal to eliminate positions. However, after further investigation, a decision was made to withdraw the recommendation of eliminating the Purchasing Agent and Engineering Assistant positions and replacing them with a Purchasing Analyst and Engineering Coordinator positions.

**REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
(Continued)

Ms. Economou-Ureste provided the following recommendations:

- elimination of the Building/Code Director position
- elimination of the Planning Director position
- creation of Senior Planner position
- changing Assistant Building Director position to Community Development Director position

Ms. Economou-Ureste indicated that at the last Township Board meeting, it was difficult for her to address the performance concerns of the Building/Code Director and Planning Director in the public setting. Since that meeting, she had discussions with Mr. Plachcinski and Mr. Gentile on several occasions.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that the Building/Code Director is approving variances unilaterally of the ZBA as well as against the decision of the ZBA to deny a variance. The decision should have been appealed to the Circuit Court. In addition, there were violations within the township under his responsibility.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that Mr. Gentile would be appealing to the Committee to recommend an early retirement incentive for a full pension and/or working in the capacity of assisting with economic development. Mr. Gentile indicated to her that it was very imperative for the township to devote resources to economic development in an effort to generate substantial bottom line benefits. She felt there were possible options which the Committee could evaluate relative to moving Mr. Gentile from the Building/Code Director position to an Economic Development Director position reporting to the Township Supervisor or consider an early retirement buy-out.

Mr. Economou-Ureste stated a report would be provided by the Township Actuary, GRS, on 06/29/09 reflecting actual dollar amounts. GRS has indicated that it may not be very costly with respect to one individual.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated she has consulted with three labor attorneys as to the appropriate approach with respect to the elimination of positions and has received consistent responses relative to addressing the issues for both economic and performance reasons. She added that the Township Labor Attorney was present at the meeting.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated she was willing to work with Mr. Gentile in a different capacity and was inclined to give Mr. Plachcinski an opportunity to work as a Senior Planner under the guidance of the Community Development Director, if that position were to be approved.

**REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
(Continued)

Ms. Economou-Ureste provided the Committee with an updated financial projection based on operating status quo, which indicated a negative general fund balance of \$2,123,000 in 2012. This amount was based on the adjustments to state shared revenue reflecting a reduction of \$211,000 in 2009 and \$440,000 in 2010.

Mr. Rosenberg asked about the Township Organizational Chart as a result of these recommendations. Ms. Economou-Ureste stated an organization chart was provided to the Committee, which was the same document provided to the Township Board at the 06/22/09 meeting.

Mr. Rosenberg asked that if the Committee recommended approval to eliminate two director positions and create two other positions, would those positions be required to follow the normal hiring process. Ms. Economou-Ureste replied, "Yes" and indicated that the positions would be posted.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that the Economic Development Director and Senior Planner positions were brand new positions. In addition, the two individuals whose positions are being eliminated are department heads. He asked if those two department heads have the same rights for consideration of the positions prior to posting the positions outside of the township.

Mr. Rosenberg asked if the Community Development Director was considered a department head position. Ms. Economou-Ureste replied, "Yes." Mr. Rosenberg stated that in order to hire an individual for that particular position, the hiring policy would have to be followed, which would also require posting the position outside of the township in addition to posting internally.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated her proposal was to modify the Assistant Building Director title, which would result in a new title of Community Development Director for the individual currently holding the position.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated that in the past, employees have been reviewed for an increase in pay grade levels without re-posting the position. Therefore, she did not feel the Community Development Director position would have to be posted, if it were approved.

**REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
(Continued)

Mr. Rosenberg asked if the Community Development Director would report to the Township Board. Ms. Economou-Ureste replied, "Yes." Mr. Rosenberg stated that the Building Director and the Assistant Building Director positions were proposed to be eliminated. Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that was correct and indicated that the Community Development Director position would be at pay grade level 7.5, which is consistent with the Personnel Director pay grade level. The Community Development Director would oversee the building, code enforcement, and planning areas.

Mr. Rosenberg wanted an understanding that the recommendation as proposed could be accomplished within the existing policy constraints.

The Township Labor Attorney stated the Personnel Policy Manual did not dictate the hiring of department heads and it was simply a matter of how the Township wished to proceed. He added there was no State law requiring a posting or hiring for a department head position.

Mr. Brown stated that being said, it appeared the Township could simply upgrade a position and not be required to go through the job notification process.

Mr. Rosenberg questioned whether the hiring policy would have to be followed. The Township Labor Attorney indicated that he did not have an opportunity to review the policy and therefore, could not provide an answer. Mr. Rosenberg stated he wanted an answer to that question prior to proceeding with the recommendation.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated there is a mechanism in place to review and change job descriptions. The changes are submitted to the Township Board for consideration. She did not feel that changing the title of the Assistant Building Director to Community Development Director was a new job, but simply a review of an existing position.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated the Planning Director position being changed to a Senior Planner position was different, in that a department head position at pay grade level 8 was being changed to a union position at pay grade level 6.5. She questioned whether the position would be placed in the Supervisory Unit and was informed by union representatives that would be the case only if the position included supervisory functions. Ms. Weingarden added that there were positions ranging from pay grade level 6 to pay grade level 7 that were not included in the supervisory unit.

Mr. Rosenberg agreed with Ms. Shaughnessy's comments relative to the Community Development Director position and asked whether the same process applied to the Senior Planner position. Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that position would have to be posted and interviews conducted because it would be a new position.

## **REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

(Continued)

Mr. Rosenberg asked that since Mr. Plachcinski was not in the union, would he be given any preference. Ms. Shaughnessy stated the position would be posted internally first. Mr. Rosenberg stated the union employees would have an opportunity to apply for the position and if no one is qualified, the position would be posted outside. He stated that Mr. Plachcinski would fall under the outside posting. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that was correct.

Mr. Rosenberg wanted Mr. Plachcinski to understand that the township would be required to post the position outside and that his application would be considered with all the applications received as a result of the posting.

Mr. Plachcinski stated it was his understanding that a position could be upgraded within a collective bargaining unit without posting and questioned whether that would apply to the downgrading of a position as long as it satisfied the agreements of the labor contracts.

Ms. Hebert stated that there were no department head positions in either Unit 1 or Unit 2. Therefore, the upgrade of the Assistant Building Director position to a Community Development Director at a department head pay grade level of 7.5 would result in that particular position being removed from the union.

Ms. Hebert stated that with respect to the Senior Planner position, it could be considered a general office position and be part of Unit 1 unless the position has supervisory functions. In that case, it would be part of Unit 2, the Supervisory union. In addition, it would be considered a new position which would require the job to be posted internally first and then outside.

Ms. Shaughnessy asked if the Assistant Building Director position was currently in the TPOAM union in the Supervisory unit. Ms. Hebert replied, "Yes" and added that there are positions at pay grade level 6, 6.5, and 7 in both units and differentiation is made with respect to whether the position includes supervisory functions.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated the Personnel Committee could make a recommendation to upgrade the Assistant Building Director and inform the union that the position has been eliminated. Ms. Hebert stated it would also result in the creation of a new position and therefore, it appeared it would require a job posting. Ms. Shaughnessy disagreed and indicated that based on conversations with employees, job descriptions have been reviewed and pay level changes made in the past for an existing position.

## **REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

(Continued)

Ms. Hebert stated that reviews of job descriptions and changes to pay grade levels have been done in the past, but those positions remained in the union in Unit 1 or Unit 2. She provided an example by indicating that previously, the Purchasing Agent position was in Unit 1 and when supervisory functions were added to the position, it was moved to Unit 2. Ms. Shaughnessy asked if the position was posted. Ms. Hebert replied, "No, because it was an upgrade of an existing employee's position to a supervisory position and not to a department head position." Ms. Hebert stated that upgrading a union position to a department head position would actually remove the position from the union.

Mr. Kaplan asked that assuming the current Planning Director position were to become the Senior Planner position, did she feel the position should be open to competitive bid or should the existing Planning Director be automatically placed in the Senior Planner position.

Ms. Hebert stated the union would want to review the job description at both Unit 1 or Unit 2 level and since the position would be held by a general office employee, the union would want that job description added to one of the two units.

Mr. Kaplan stated the Committee could be asked to make a policy decision if this situation is not controlled by the Personnel Manual or union contracts.

Mr. Brown summarized the recommendation as follows:

- the Assistant Building Director position at pay grade level 7 upgraded to a Community Development Director at pay grade level 7.5
- the Community Development Director position would not be posted and would be removed from the union
- the hiring and firing of the Community Development Director position would be decided by the Township Board.
- the Senior Planner position is a new position that would be posted
- the Planning Director would be considered as part of the group of applicants for the Senior Planner position and would not be given preference

Mr. Kaplan stated that if the Assistant Building Director is upgraded to the Community Developer Director, does the existing employee have automatic bumping rights back to a union position. Ms. Hebert stated that if an employee leaves a unit, that individual does not have any bumping rights back into a unit.

**REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
(Continued)

Mr. Kaplan asked if there was an instance in which the union would agree to allow an employee to bump back into a unit. Ms. Hebert stated that it has not been done in the past and would have to be negotiated with the union.

Mr. Rosenberg asked about the proposal relative to a retirement buy-out of 3 years and 9 months for Mr. Gentile. Ms. Economou-Ureste stated she made a recommendation consistent with one made on 06/22/09 to eliminate positions and create positions.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated she presented options and after speaking with Mr. Gentile, he was amenable to stepping out of the Building Director role and expressed interest in an early retirement package. There was also an option of devoting an individual to economic development which would help generate revenue for the Township. She felt that Mr. Gentile's contacts with developers and other business individuals would be helpful in the role of an Economic Development Director.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that another option would be to allow Mr. Gentile the opportunity to work in the position of Economic Development Director until December 2010 and offer him a two-year retirement buy-out.

Mr. Brown asked about the pay grade level for the Economic Development Director position. Ms. Economou-Ureste replied that it would be at pay grade level 8.

Mr. Rosenberg stated there was no job description or position approved for an Economic Development Director. Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that was correct and indicated that she was simply presenting options to the Committee for consideration.

Mr. Kaplan stated the first issue was to determine whether the Building Director position was necessary and that had nothing to do with the individual currently holding the position. He stated if it was determined that the position was no longer necessary, then the Township would be wise to eliminate the position in order to save money.

Mr. Kaplan stated the creation of an Economic Development Director was a separate issue that should not be considered at the same time as the elimination of a position.

Mr. Brown stated that the individuals in the Code Enforcement and Building Departments were currently in their busy season. He expressed concern with the elimination of a position in this area and placing added responsibilities on one individual who would be serving in the role of a Community Development Director. He did not want to overburden one individual with all the work.

## **REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

(Continued)

Mr. Brown wanted to give Mr. Gentile an opportunity to address the issues related to his performance as well as the recommendation for the elimination of the Building Director position and the creation of an Economic Development Director position.

Mr. Kaplan stated if the mission of the Committee was to decide whether to make a recommendation to eliminate the Building Director position, the performance of the existing employee in that position was not relevant. Rather, the focus would be on the necessity of the position. Therefore, to have the individual respond to allegations that have been made would not have any relevance to whether the position was necessary.

Mr. Rosenberg stated the Supervisor raised economic and performance issues as the reasons for the elimination of the Building Director position. He stated that the Supervisor has publicly addressed specific performance issues and therefore, he felt that Mr. Gentile should absolutely be given an opportunity to respond.

Mr. Kaplan questioned whether it was the position of the Committee to address the parameters of the decisions and consider the performance as well as necessity of the position or both. Mr. Rosenberg stated the Committee should consider both issues.

Mr. Kaplan asked if the Committee agreed that regardless of whether Mr. Gentile was the best or worst Building Director, it had nothing to do with a decision to maintain the position. Mr. Brown agreed; however, he wanted Mr. Gentile to have an opportunity to speak on the matter.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated the motion of the Township Board was to specifically review the reorganization and the job descriptions involved.

Mr. Rosenberg wanted to make it clear that the Supervisor indicated the recommendation was economic and performance related for both the Planning Director and the Building Director. He did not believe the Committee would be meeting to consider a reorganization if it were not for performance-based issues. Therefore, this being a Personnel Committee meeting, he felt that Mr. Gentile and Mr. Plachcinski have the right to respond if they chose to do so.

Ms. Shaughnessy did not have a problem with that and indicated that for the purposes of the Committee's deliberation, she simply wanted to clarify the directive of the Township Board, which was to address the reorganization and the job descriptions. Mr. Kaplan stated the Committee was exceeding the scope of the Township Board's directive.

**REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
(Continued)

Mr. Rosenberg stated, "Based on that and only that, I would be opposed to the reorganization." He indicated that he would argue against the reorganization because it was too early in the process for the reorganization. He felt the Township Board should wait until the Supervisor submits a full budget recommendation after the entire Board has gone through the budget workshops. With a full budget recommendation and reorganization, everything should be done at one time because he did not want to piecemeal a reorganization one at a time. If there were performance issues combined with economic reasons, he was willing to move forward. However, he did not want to rush on a simple reorganization and was not prepared to move on that issue yet.

Mr. Kaplan disagreed and indicated that if the Township Board determined that a position was not needed, then it should be eliminated.

Mr. Brown stated the reason the matter was brought before the Board was because of performance issues combined with economic issues. Therefore, the individuals should be allowed to speak on the matter.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated she received very sound advice from legal counsel and approached the matter in the way she did. As Supervisor, she could not ignore the issues and therefore, she brought the recommendations forward based on those issues. She added that it was entirely up to the Committee to address the matter in whatever manner they so chose.

Phil Gentile, Building Director, stated he has served in the role of Building Director since 1991 and has worked for numerous administrations. In the past 20 years, he has worked well with all of the Township Supervisors and had excellent performance reviews. He thanked the Committee for allowing him the opportunity to speak on the events that have transpired since the new administration has taken office.

Mr. Gentile stated he was willing to work with the Supervisor whether it was in the capacity of a Building Director or another position. He stated that the Township needed to retain the existing employees if it wished to maintain the current level of services.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that the recommendations she proposed were not meant to be personal. The primary reason for these discussions was to address the negative fund balance in 2012 and adherence to the Township ordinances.

Mr. Brown stated the Supervisor has proposed an Economic Development Director position and asked if Mr. Gentile felt that the responsibilities of his current position would expand into those of the Economic Development Director and work towards bringing more businesses into the Township.

## **REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

(Continued)

Mr. Gentile replied, "Per the request of Michele that is correct." He stated that in event the Supervisor decided that the position was simply not working out, he wanted assurance that he was not being set up to fail and ultimately pushed out the door after over 20 years of service.

Mr. Rosenberg stated he did not see any proposal for an Economic Development Director and that the recommendation was for the consideration of eliminating the Planning Director, Building Director and changing the Assistant Building Director position to a Community Development Director position at pay grade level 7.5. He stated that there were no deals or guarantees of another position, especially with a hiring freeze. Although economic development and redevelopment would fit into the Township plans, there was no guarantee that a position would be created to address that issue.

Mr. Rosenberg asked what the Township would lose if the Assistant Building Director position were eliminated and a Community Development Director position created with added responsibilities. Mr. Gentile stated it was his understanding that the elimination of the Assistant Building Director and creation of a Community Development Director included responsibilities taken from both the Building Director and Assistant Building Director job descriptions.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that a lot of progressive communities were structured with a Community Development Director and a Senior Planner reporting to the director. Therefore, the Township was moving in that direction to have the ability for cost savings by restructuring in this manner. Unfortunately, the Township is in an economic crisis and the recommendations were based on that information. If the Township could afford to have an Economic Development Director position, the Building Director position could simply be reclassified and have Mr. Gentile work in that capacity.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that she could work with Mr. Gentile in that regard and felt he would be very effective. If the Board felt money was available to invest in Mr. Gentile serving in the capacity of the Economic Development Director, she would agree to do that and asked for the Committee's support in that endeavor.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated that with respect to Mr. Rosenberg's concerns regarding the recommendations as presented, she believed that as the Personnel Committee, it was incumbent upon the members to make decisions and it would be totally appropriate to make recommendations that include items that have not been placed before the Committee. If the Committee had other options for the Township Board to consider, it was appropriate for the Committee to make those recommendations.

**REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
(Continued)

Mr. Kaplan stated that although Mr. Gentile was given high performance ratings by the former Supervisor, he was not sure that addressed the issue. Rather, the current Supervisor who is aware of what occurred on a daily basis has made two serious allegations against Mr. Gentile regarding two residential properties.

Mr. Gentile stated those two cases have been brought forward by the Supervisor and he was prepared to defend himself; however, he did not feel it was necessary at this time. He stated that whatever happens, he did not want to leave on a sour note. Given the opportunity to defend his actions, it would reflect that he acted in good faith and attempted to resolve the issues.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated the ZBA denied one case in October 2008 for the placement of an appliance and it was since approved by the Building Director.

Mr. Brown stated that he went out to both properties being discussed and on one property, he was not aware that the air conditioners were on because the lawn sprinklers on the adjacent property made more noise. He felt that the case should go back to the ZBA for a determination. Mr. Gentile stated he was working towards that and the property owner was doing everything possible to make the best of the situation.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated she went to the property located on Barnsbury and felt the placement of the appliance was a flagrant violation because it was located ten feet away from a bedroom window and included a six foot fence. Therefore, there were two ordinance violations on that particular property.

Mr. Brown stated the Committee is charged with making a recommendation as to whether the reorganization of the Development Services Department would include a Community Development Director, which will be Tom Walsh; eliminating the Planning Director position; creating a Senior Planner position that would report to the Community Development Director; creating an Economic Development Director with a job description to be drafted and brought before the Personnel Committee.

Mr. Rosenberg stated there was discussion that there would not be any problems with respect to the existing policy to move the current Assistant Building Director to the Community Development Director position. However, the Senior Planner position would have to be posted and follow the general office employee hiring policies that are currently in place.

**REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
(Continued)

Mr. Rosenberg asked if the Economic Development Director position would have to be posted. Ms. Economou-Ureste asked whether it would be possible to simply reclassify the Building Director position. Ms. Shaughnessy stated if that were done, it would no longer involve the elimination of the Building Director position, but rather, a reclassification.

Mr. Rosenberg asked if she was asking to change the Building Director's job description. Ms. Economou-Ureste stated she was asking to reclassify the job description and title.

Mr. Keene stated he attended the meeting to defend Mr. Gentile's actions with respect to addressing the situation and indicated that Mr. Gentile's efforts resulted in a win-win situation.

Ms. Economou-Ureste indicated that the current administration wanted to realign the Township to be more progressive and the recommendations as presented were solution-oriented.

Mr. Daitch stated there appeared to be some misunderstanding with respect to the placement of his generators. He indicated that approval was given in July 2008 to move the generators to the east side of the rear yard and subsequent to that approval he applied to the ZBA to obtain a variance, but was denied in October 2008. However, he did obtain approval to re-locate the generators in the rear yard prior to denial by the ZBA. He stated that Mr. Gentile recommended that the generators be moved to the west side of the rear yard, which would be an additional 30 feet from the adjacent home. Therefore, he moved the generators to that location.

Mr. Brown asked that when the generators were moved from one location to the other, was the property owner required to go back to the ZBA. Mr. Gentile stated he referred that question to Mr. Walsh and informed him that there was an agreement to place the generators in the far corner. Mr. Walsh never indicated that it would be a problem. Therefore, he moved forward with the decision for the placement of the generators. Mr. Brown stated that in the future, issues should be brought back to the ZBA to ensure there are no problems.

Mr. Daitch stated he had approval to place the generators on the east side of the rear yard. He simply went before the ZBA to avoid the expense of moving the generators. He stated the only discussion at the ZBA meeting was that he had feasible alternatives.

**REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
(Continued)

Ms. Shaughnessy stated the Township has been sued on a regular basis from individuals in the community who did not receive the decision they wanted from the ZBA and many of those cases involve the placement of appliance units.

Ms. Shaughnessy asked if Mr. Gentile was willing to adhere to the Township ordinances and carry out the responsibilities of a job based upon the ordinance requirements. Mr. Gentile stated that it has been his intent to adhere to the ordinances and he believed that all of his actions reflected that. Ms. Shaughnessy did not believe that was the case and indicated that she was absolutely certain that in at least one of the cases, a variance was not received from the ZBA.

The Committee took a recess at 8:12 p.m. and reconvened at 8:35 p.m.

Mr. Plachcinski stated that he was hired four years ago and although he has fallen short in the performance of his duties, he still has the creativity, ingenuity, and capability to continue to do what is expected. He stated there was a benefit to having a Planning Director position and indicated that he has attended numerous Township Board meetings. He asked for another opportunity to prove his value to the organization.

Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that she appreciated Mr. Plachcinski's attitude and would be willing to give him a second chance to be committed to Orchard Lake Road redevelopment and planning issues.

Mr. Brown asked if she was making any modifications to any of the issues that need to be addressed. Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that Mr. Plachcinski has asked that the Committee consider maintaining the Planning Director position at pay grade level 8A with an annual salary of \$65,000, which would be a reduction from his current annual salary of \$80,650. Ms. Economou-Ureste stated that it would eliminate the necessity of posting the Senior Planner position.

Mr. Brown asked if that was a recommendation. Ms. Economou-Ureste stated she was not making any further recommendations and that she was simply presenting a proposal suggested by Mr. Plachcinski.

Mr. Kaplan asked how many individuals Mr. Plachcinski supervised. Ms. Economou-Ureste replied, "None." Mr. Kaplan asked that if the Committee accepted the proposal, would it change his responsibilities. Ms. Economou-Ureste replied, "No" and indicated that it would be a good solution to give Mr. Plachcinski the opportunity to serve in the capacity of a Senior Planner working under the guidance of a Community Development Director.

## **REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

(Continued)

Mr. Brown asked who Mr. Plachcinski would report to if the Committee were to recommend approval of his proposal. Mr. Kaplan stated he would be in the same position, but at a lower pay.

Mr. Plachcinski stated the conditions of the proposal would include that he work in absolute lockstep with Mr. Walsh and Mr. Gentile on the major issues.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that he was not prepared to consider anything other than the organizational chart that has been presented and what has been presented is the elimination of the Building Director and Planning Director positions; the creation of a Senior Planner position; and upgrade of the Assistant Building Director position to a Community Development Director position at pay grade level 7.5.

**Motion by Mr. Kaplan and supported by Mr. Brown to recommend approval to the Township Board of the following:**

- (1) reclassify the position of Assistant Building Director/Zoning Administrator to Community Development Director at pay grade level 7.5;**
- (2) eliminate the position of Planning Director and create position of Senior Planner at pay grade level 6.5;**
- (3) the posting for the Senior Planner position shall occur in accordance with Township rules and guidelines;**
- (4) reclassify the position of Building Director to Economic Development Director and review the position before December 31, 2010 to determine the necessity of the position beyond that date;**
- (5) prior to the next Township Board meeting, the Supervisor or designee shall provide the Township Board with a job description for the position of Economic Development Director.**

Mr. Rosenberg stated there was no positive net gain in costs with the motion as presented. Mr. Kaplan stated there was a \$15,000 savings with respect to the elimination of the Planning Director position and creation of a Senior Planner position. He stated there was an increase of approximately \$7,000 for the elevation of the Assistant Building Director to Community Development Director. He stated there was a total savings of \$5,000.

## **REVIEW OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

(Continued)

Mr. Gentile stated that the Economic Development Director position would be a new position and typically there is a probationary period with a performance review. He asked what guidelines the individual would be required to adhere to in order to meet the expectations of the Supervisor and the Township Board. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that would be addressed with the job description.

Mr. Brown stated the motion indicated that there would be a review on 12/31/10 to determine whether the position should remain in place beyond that date. Mr. Rosenberg stated that the intent of the motion was that unless there was an affirmative action, the position would end on 12/31/10. Mr. Kaplan stated that was reasonable and indicated that it might not make a difference because if the Township Board wanted to keep the position, it would be maintained.

Mr. Rosenberg asked that if the Township Board did not act on December 31, 2010, the position ends. Mr. Kaplan stated that was correct.

Mr. Rosenberg asked that if the position of Community Development Director and Economic Development Director were approved by the Township Board, would both continue to be department head positions. Mr. Kaplan replied, "Yes."

The following vote was taken after completion of discussion:

**Ayes: Brown, Kaplan, Rosenberg**

**Nays: None**

**Absent: None**

**Motion carried**

Mr. Kaplan asked what meeting would this item be scheduled for review by the Township Board. Mr. Brown asked that it be placed on the 07/15/09 agenda.

## **REQUEST OF TREASURER CONCERNING PAY RATES IN TREASURER'S OFFICE**

Ms. Weingarden stated that within her department, she currently has a Cash Administrator position and an interim Deputy Treasurer position. However, there will be a full-time Deputy Treasurer within two weeks.

Ms. Weingarden felt these two positions were at an equal level in terms of responsibilities and activities. She wanted her management team to be structured in a way that includes the Treasurer and two other staff persons. In addition, there is an Office Manager who oversees the activities of the cashiers.

**REQUEST OF TREASURER CONCERNING PAY RATES IN TREASURER'S OFFICE**

(Continued)

Ms. Weingarden stated that within the Treasurer's Office, there are individuals who handle the taxes and individuals who handle the cash management. There are similar responsibilities and primary duties which are very equal.

Ms. Weingarden stated that currently the reporting structure includes the Treasurer, Deputy Treasurer, Cash Administrator, Office Manager, and Cashiers. She felt that both the Deputy Treasurer and Cash Administrator consult with her and back her up on a lot of different issues. Therefore, she felt that both positions could be at the same pay grade level of 6.5. She indicated that the proposal would not result in a net increase.

Ms. Weingarden stated that she reviewed the responsibilities of the current Cash Administrator and some of those duties as well as other duties not included in the job description have been performed for quite some time without additional compensation. This resulted from an individual leaving a position in the department and that position was not replaced.

Mr. Kaplan stated the Deputy Treasurer is a statutory position and one which has unfettered discretion as to whom to appoint. The Township Board has no input into that decision. Secondly, the Deputy Treasurer has been second in command within the Treasurer's Office. He expressed concern that if the Deputy Treasurer and Cash Administrator positions were made equal in stature, the Treasurer might not be able to attract the best candidate. It was perceptual that the Deputy Treasurer has to be the number two level in the department.

Ms. Weingarden stated that in the interview process, the candidates were told that the position was at pay grade level 6.5 and she also indicated that the department was going through reorganization. She stated that the candidates did not appear to have an issue with that level of hiring.

Mr. Kaplan stated that might have something to do with economics and the fact that individuals are unemployed. Ms. Weingarden felt that pay grade level 6.5 was a pretty significant level.

Mr. Kaplan provided an analogy of the Clerk's Office in which the Deputy Clerk was at the same level of the Office Manager and asked if she felt that made sense. Ms. Weingarden stated that within the Clerk's Office, there was a position which was to be reduced half a pay grade when the position was vacated. However, Ms. Shaughnessy asked that the position remain at the same pay grade level because of the responsibilities within the job description. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that position was at pay grade level 6.

**REQUEST OF TREASURER CONCERNING PAY RATES IN TREASURER'S OFFICE**

(Continued)

Mr. Kaplan stated that if for some reason, the Treasurer was not able to perform in that capacity due to an illness or disability, the Deputy Treasurer would step in and perform the duties of the Treasurer. He stated that in that situation, having the Deputy Treasurer and Cash Administrator at the same pay grade level would cause problems within the department.

Ms. Weingarden stated the Cash Administrator position is not a supervisory role. Mr. Kaplan stated although that may be true, the positions are equal in pay. Ms. Weingarden stated the positions were equal in responsibilities, but not every task was identical. The Deputy Treasurer would have the supervisory portion which the Cash Administrator would not have.

Mr. Kaplan asked if the Deputy Treasurer would supervise the Cash Administrator. Ms. Weingarden stated that has not been the reporting structure in the past. Mr. Kaplan asked that if the change were made, would that be the case. He questioned how the two positions could be equal when the Deputy Treasurer is a statutory position. Ms. Weingarden stated the fact that it is a statutory position has nothing to do with the supervision of the Cash Administrator; it simply means that the position performs some of the statutory duties of the Treasurer.

Mr. Kaplan asked if that in the absence of the Treasurer, the Deputy Treasurer would become the supervisor of the Cash Administrator and indicated that if those two positions are equal, it would be difficult to have one supervising the other. Mr. Brown stated that was a good point.

Mr. Rosenberg disagreed that the proposal would not result in a net increase because the Deputy Treasurer was not part of the Retiree Health Care or the Pension Plan; however, the Cash Administrator is part of those plans. Therefore, increasing the Cash Administrator's pay increases all of the legacy costs along the way. He stated this proposal was not an equal pay issue.

Mr. Rosenberg asked that Ms. Weingarden reconsider the request in light of the legacy costs and the comments made by Mr. Kaplan with respect to the reporting structure. He indicated that he could not support the request as submitted.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated the review before the Committee involved both the job description and pay grade level. She stated that a lot of the functions proposed to be performed by the Cash Administrator would impact the internal controls. She stated that after the internal control audits have been completed, Ms. Weingarden might reconsider the added responsibilities.

**REQUEST OF TREASURER CONCERNING PAY RATES IN TREASURER'S OFFICE**

(Continued)

Ms. Shaughnessy stated the basic theory is that an individual should not have responsibility for more than one of three transaction components. Some of the responsibilities would result in an individual handling two of the transaction components.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated the Deputy Treasurer was not only a statutory position, but that individual also has bank access authority. According to the Investment Policy, the Treasurer could actually delegate some of her responsibilities such as the investment and movement of money to the Deputy Treasurer.

Ms. Hebert stated the Cash Administrator has taken on a higher level of responsibility for at least eight months without additional compensation. She stated the union contract addresses the performance of duties for a temporary period of 20 weeks without additional compensation. She asked that the Committee consider the additional compensation for the individual since she has been performing the duties in excess of 20 weeks.

Mr. Brown asked if these additional duties occurred recently or in the prior administration. Ms. Weingarden stated some of the duties occurred in the prior administration and some of the duties were not included in the job description. Ms. Hebert stated that the individual was performing a more detailed level of work.

Mr. Rosenberg stated the Deputy Treasurer should take on the roles of that particular position and additional work should not be given to the Cash Administrator. In fact, the Cash Administrator should perform the work that was clearly defined in the job description. Although he wanted to be fair to the Cash Administrator and the fact that she has been taking on additional duties, the Township was looking to save money. Therefore, the Treasurer would have to assume those additional responsibilities.

Ms. Weingarden stated she has been taking on some of the higher level responsibilities as well as the Deputy Treasurer responsibilities.

Ms. Shaughnessy referred to the proposed job description and pointed out that one of the duties assigned to the Cash Administrator involved credit card statement back up as well as balancing monthly bank statements, investments, and credit card statements. She stated the Credit Card Resolution approved by a former Township Board indicates that the Treasurer is responsible for issuing, accounting for, monitoring, retrieving, and generally overseeing compliance with the Township's Credit Card Policy.

**REQUEST OF TREASURER CONCERNING PAY RATES IN TREASURER'S OFFICE**

(Continued)

Ms. Weingarden stated that she signed off on all the statements and the Cash Administrator simply inputted and filed the information. Ms. Shaughnessy stated the Credit Card Policy clearly states that is the responsibility of the Treasurer. She could not vote in favor of the job description as presented because it did not adhere to a resolution approved by the Township Board.

Mr. Brown suggested that Ms. Weingarden meet with the Human Resources Director to finalize the job descriptions and determine which responsibilities should be performed by which individual.

Mr. Brown asked if the Deputy Treasurer would be hired at pay grade level 6.5. Ms. Weingarden stated that she had discussion with Ms. Maier and agreed that the individual simply be provided a salary amount rather than a specific a pay grade level. Mr. Brown asked for the salary amount. Ms. Weingarden replied that it was \$60,927.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated that a Deputy position is at pay grade level 7. Ms. Weingarden stated that being the case, the individual would have to be offered \$58,703 or \$60,223. Mr. Brown asked how much the individual was currently earning. Ms. Weingarden replied, "Approximately \$60,000."

Ms. Weingarden asked how long it took an individual to progress through the pay grade steps. Ms. Maier stated that it occurred on an annual basis on the employee's anniversary date.

**REVIEW OF PROPOSED EMCO TEST FOR CADETS**

Mr. Rosenberg stated that Lt. Lawson should review the test and indicated that he would be willing to approve the EMCO Test contingent on approval by Lt. Lawson.

Ms. Maier stated that the Deputy Police Chief and Ms. Page reviewed the test and removed questions 14 and 15.

**Motion by Mr. Rosenberg and supported by Mr. Brown to approve the EMCO Test for Cadets contingent on approval by Lt. Lawson.**

**Ayes: Brown, Kaplan, Rosenberg**

**Nays: None**

**Absent: None**

**Motion carried**

**REVIEW AND REVISION OF HIRING POLICIES**

**Motion by Mr. Rosenberg and supported by Mr. Kaplan to approve the Cadet, Dispatcher, General Employees, and Police Hiring Policies as presented.**

**Ayes: Brown, Kaplan, Rosenberg**

**Nays: None**

**Absent: None**

**Motion carried**

**AUDIENCE GENERAL COMMENTS/QUESTIONS**

None

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at

Respectfully submitted,

*Marya Duncan*

Marya Duncan  
HR Specialist

*NOTE: Approved minutes of this meeting are maintained as part of the public record and are available upon request. A fee will be required for copies of all meeting tapes and and/or approved minutes. Please contact the Human Resources Department for information.*