

DEPT. OF ADMINISTRATION, DIVISION OF FINANCE AND PERSONNEL SERVICES
MINUTES OF THE FINANCE/ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE MEETING

August 16, 2011

6:00 p.m.

KCAB 2nd Floor Conf. Room

MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Clark, J. O'Day, J. Gentz, F. Ekornaas, T. Rose, D. Singer, W. Grady, YIG Member Kadri, YIG Member Schultz

OTHERS PRESENT: M. Molinaro, R. Frederick, B. Frederick, R. Zerban, E. Kubicki, M. Underhill, M. Goebel, D. Hallmon, E. Decker, Lorette Mitchell, Robert Riedl, Diane Leiting, Jim Olson, Donna Esposito, David Beth, Charles Smith, Paul Falduto, Ray Arbet, Nick Kasmer, Local 70 Members, Local 990 Jail Members

1. Call to Order - Chairman Clark called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. Chairman Clark stated the intent of the meeting is to allow for input from employees, administration and the legislative body with regard to the interim policies. The public hearing forum is an appropriate means to achieve this. Chairman Clark advised that the Committee must be very careful to remain in compliance with Act 10 and not permit it to be a bargaining session. Chairman Clark further noted that the manner in which the meeting has been structured is similar to a public hearing on a zoning issue as the Committee will be receiving input and there is no intent to come to an agreement. Rather, the intent is to gather information so the Committee can make an informed decision about policies we need to set. Chairman Clark stated it was his hope that the Finance/Administration Committee can come to a consensus in regards to amendments to be presented to the County Board. Chairman Clark will report on the action taken at Committee and present proposed amendments and adopted amendments in the hope that whatever issues are out there can be resolved at Committee level rather than on the Board floor.

L. Mitchell from Corporation Counsel stated it was her understanding that the budget repair bill Act 10 views collective bargaining means to meet and confer with the intention of reaching an agreement. As Chairman Clark indicated, there is no intent to reach an agreement with respect to anything that occurs at this particular meeting. Additionally, collective bargaining includes reducing to writing and a signed document. L. Mitchell continued noting because there is no intent to reach an agreement, or reduce anything to a signed document; we are abating the violation of that prohibition with respect to collective bargaining. L. Mitchell stated if the meeting appears to be crossing over to collective bargaining, she will throw a penalty flag as she does not want the County to run afoul of the law. L. Mitchell stated she believes the Supervisors have the right to obtain as much information as they need to make an informed decision about what is presented to them. As such, that is how it was presented and under those circumstances it is a good idea to have this forum. Not only will the Board hear from the unions but also from administration on these various policies and the pros and cons of each. L. Mitchell further noted that the meeting was noticed as a public hearing so any interested person could attend and be party to the process and it also avoids looking like a collective bargaining session.

2. Public Hearing on Interim Policies for Employees in Local 70 and 990 Jail

M. Montague, 7835 36 Avenue, spoke relative to the importance of the issues being discussed and noted mandatory overtime is of much concern to their membership. M. Montague stated they are preparing figures to forward to the County Board relative to the call-in sheets since 1999. M. Montague thanked the Committee for allowing this forum.

D. Buehn, 24607 67 Street, spoke relative to mandatory overtime as well as the seniority issue. D. Buehn also thanked the Committee for this opportunity to participate in the process.

3. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Interim Policies for Employees in Local 70 and 990 Jail

Chairman Clark invited N. Kasmer and a representative from 70 and 990 Jail to join the Committee at the table. M. Montague and F. Storz participated. Chairman Clark stated the County Board had a public hearing on these policies with the second reading as well without taking action. He did not want to have a procedural debate on the Board floor and while the process may be cumbersome, when the policies are brought to the Board, he will present for the Committee the amendments made and the action taken and the Board will vote on them one by one. J. Gentz asked for reassurance that the process will not be considered collective bargaining if the Committee listens to the employees and administration and that any ruling made by the Committee will not be considered bargaining. L. Mitchell stated it would not. N. Kasmer thanked the Committee for the opportunity and stated this action goes a long way with employees knowing that the Board is willing to listen.

N. Kasmer distributed the employees proposed amendments. Chairman Clark stated the Committee will hear the issues and act on each individually.

SENIORITY – (as provided by employee groups) “provide that for shift preferences, vacation picks, overtime assignments (see below), layoffs and bumping, temporary assignments, and job postings that seniority will be the determining factor. Provide further that in the case of Holiday picks for the Jail and Truck Assignments for the Highway, that seniority will be the determining factor”.

N. Kasmer spoke relative to the seniority issue as being easy and the smart way to do things. R. Riedl stated the County’s position on seniority for items related to vacation and shift preference are best determined by the department. The County does not want to be limited in the area of promotion and lay off. The new law does allow an evaluation system which could drive promotion and lay off and the ability to give a job based on skills and abilities. C. Smith stated the Sheriff is an advocate of seniority for vacation selection and shift preference but does not advocate seniority as exclusive means for overtime picks. R. Arbet stated the Public Works is fine with seniority for basis of vacation selection as well. R. Arbet stated that he would not want seniority for the sole consideration for a job opening; it may be a consideration, but clearly not the sole or primary means of making the job selection.

Motion by T. Rose that these rules provide seniority be the basis for vacation selection, shift preference and holiday picks for both units. Second by W. Grady. Discussion followed. For the record, both departments indicate the vacation requests for 2011 have been put in and will be honored. F. Ekornaas requested that the 2011 holiday picks still need to be made and should be included in holiday for 2012. All aye, motion carried; including YIG members.

Discussion regarding seniority for lay off and bumping. R. Riedl stated the County will have a comprehensive evaluation system and the policies you approve will require all managers to evaluate employees. The evaluation, work record, attendance record and other issues will go into who gets promoted or laid off. D. Singer stated he would like overtime assignments to be on a seniority basis and then equalized. R. Riedl stated the Highway Division does equalize overtime and he could not speak for the jail. P. Falduto stated there are written guidelines in place for overtime equalization and it does not use seniority and the old system did not equalize overtime. P. Falduto stated seniority would trump and then overtime would not be equalized. D. Singer stated he is recommending overtime assignments start with seniority and then equalize thereafter. P. Falduto said that would

work as long as they can use existing language to fill the slots. N. Kasmer stated employees were not looking for a strict seniority system just a baseline to start the overtime. During discussions L. Mitchell cautioned the parties that the forum was close to bargaining. M. Molinaro stated he was not sure why debate was continuing when administration has agreed to utilizing seniority to start the overtime list and then equalizing thereafter. How does the Committee get assurance that approval of the vague language is not changed or different overtime policy created. R. Riedl stated the Committee could direct administration to include that language in policy.

Motion by T. Rose to move inclusion of equalization of overtime and the start point of overtime be based upon seniority for both units. Second by D. Singer. On the question: J. Gentz questioned whether this would be used in the broad-based plan. R. Riedl stated no, these two units, as well as Brookside have unique overtime needs and probably should be segregated with respect to the policy. Vote: All aye, motion carried; including YIG members.

WAGES – (as provided by employee groups) “provide that scheduled wage increases will occur.” R. Riedl stated it was the County’s position that all Highway Division employees, except one, are at the top of the step progression and step progression is not part of Act 10. R. Riedl stated the Sheriff had brought up that there would be a small group of 990 Jail employees who would not receive their step progression as the wage policies stop at the time you pass the policies.

Motion by D. Singer that the 990 Jail employees who have not received step increase for anniversary date between 8/31/11 and 12/31/11 be granted the step increase on their anniversary date. Second by T. Rose. W. Grady asked how many employees fall into this category. R. Riedl stated no more than 20. All aye, motion carried, including YIG members.

OVERTIME – (as provided by employee groups) “provide that benefit time used will be considered hours worked”. R. Riedl stated from the County’s perspective recommend FLSA rules which pays time and one-half after 40 hours for Highway Division employees and time and one-half after 171 hours in a 28 day period for Jail employees. R. Riedl further stated if County Board proceeds with FLSA overtime, administration could consider benefit time for hours worked. Discussion followed about the cost and how FLSA overtime would be calculated. It was noted if the Board should include benefit time in the calculation for overtime; the savings would be reduced by about \$14,000 annually. L. Mitchell said the County administration’s standpoint is from this day forward to adopt FLSA overtime for all units in the County. The County is attempting to achieve about \$67,000 in savings by adopting FLSA overtime as opposed to overtime after an 8 hour day.

Motion by D. Singer that the policy count benefit time when determining hours worked for overtime. Second by J. O’Day. On the question: T. Rose said we are using FLSA for both units. Chairman Clark said FLSA is in the policy. T. Rose said he thought the two had to be tied together. Chairman Clark said he could support the motion if linked together and he said he thought they had to be the same. T. Rose said the motion would be adopt FLSA for both units and to give them credit for benefit time toward the overtime. M. Molinaro stated the policy currently references FLSA for both groups and you cannot make an amendment to include FLSA because it is already in there so the motion is in order. F. Ekornaas asked whether benefit time includes casual or sick time. R. Riedl said yes. Chairman Clark asked if sick time or casual time is that benefit paid? R. Riedl said yes. Chairman Clark said the Committee is voting on the amendment as we have FLSA in the policy. Chairman Clark asked D. Singer to restate the motion. D. Singer said basically it was to strike the word “not” on second page. Benefit time will be included as time worked in the computation of overtime. Chairman Clark stated for the record FLSA is in the policy and this is on 70. Vote: All aye, motion carried; including YIG members.

T. Rose moved the same motion for the 990 Jail members. Chairman Clark said the jail currently does not have FLSA in there. T. Rose moved with respect to the jail that it be FLSA with the credit for the benefit time. Second by W. Grady. D. Beth said the FLSA rules will be paid differently for corrections staff compared to cooks. The 171 hours only applies to the corrections staff; cooks work a regular 40 hour work week. L. Mitchell stated under FLSA jailers are considered protective service and exempts them from 40 hour rule and puts them under 171 hours. D. Singer asked what the original amendment from 7/14/11 did. R. Riedl said it returned overtime to the current process. R. Riedl said the 171 hours over 28 day period recognizes the unusual schedule of 48 hours one week and 32 hours another week and normalizes it over 28 days. D. Beth read a proposal for overtime for the correctional staff, "Employees shall be paid at one and a half times (1 ½) their normal rate of pay for all hours of work and mandatory school appears that exceed their normally scheduled hours on any given workday or any time worked on any day off". N. Kasmer stated FLSA is a very different animal for the jail and is a large difference between what that facility does and what the highway workers do. R. Zerban questioned the 171 hours under FLSA and stated he could not find that on the US Department of Labor website. L. Mitchell distributed the FLSA regulations outlining the 171 hours. Discussion followed regarding the use of 171 hours or 160 for computing overtime. Chairman Clark inquired about the impact to FLSA using 160 hours. R. Riedl stated he would have to have that analyzed by payroll. Chairman Clark asked the Sheriff if he was continuing the schedule as is through current year. The Sheriff stated he was. D. Singer stated 171 hours computes to 2223 hours per year. An amendment was suggested to use 160 hours and benefit time to compute the overtime for jail staff. R. Riedl said he did not want to enter into another 6/2 situation and needed to make sure the 160 hours is legal and consistent. Chairman Clark advised R. Riedl to be prepared to answer that question at the Board meeting. Vote on amendment to use FLSA for overtime and allow benefit time to be considered hours worked. All aye, motion carried; included YIG members.

VACATIONS – (as provided by employee groups) "place each vacation schedule into the respective policy". R. Riedl stated no ones time off will be altered for 2011. The change is to a paid time off policy for 2012. Chairman Clark said nothing is changed and new proposal will be brought forward prior to 1/1/12 and concerns could be expressed at that time.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE – (as provided by employee groups) "Expand the grievance procedure further to at a minimum cover all disciplines. Also set forth that the impartial hearing officer will actually be an impartial party". R. Riedl said administration will follow the law in terms of what an impartial hearing officer is and we are hiring same. It may be WERC person, it may not be. It may be someone who works in the same capacity as Ms. Mitchell from another county. Administration is not inclined to commit to using WERC under any circumstance. N. Kasmer said he thought the process applies to all disciplines. T. Rose said the policy only triggers for suspension and he believed all disciplines whether verbal or written ought to have right to a hearing.

T. Rose moved to change policy to allow all disciplines through the grievance process in both policies. Second by D. Singer. On the question: R. Riedl stated WI Act 10 defines it as serious disciplines and then reviewed the levels of appeal in the policies. Chairman Clark asked any discipline goes through Personnel, correct? R. Riedl said yes. T. Rose asked if the paper review is what the statute requires. He suggested a De novo review with presentation by Personnel and employee representative. L. Mitchell stated administration is writing this as we go along and there will be a full hearing and record at the impartial hearing. Does the Committee want another full hearing on any matter involving a written reprimand? Motion by T. Rose to define grievance as any discipline subject to the grievance procedure. Second by D. Singer. R. Riedl said he cannot advocate that to have an impartial hearing for a verbal warning; it cannot be tolerated and it is defined as a discipline of serious situations. F. Ekornaas said a verbal or written reprimand is a matter of recordkeeping of employees behavior over time. To take these things to full hearing every time will be expensive and cumbersome. A due cause meeting is held in the department for those reprimands

as well. F. Ekornaas said he could not go along with grievance procedure including all disciplines. D. Celebre stated Act 10 states the appeal process shall be to the highest level of the governing body of the local government and it does not allow for the arbitrator to have the final say. D. Celebre said if we are to have the Board be the final say, there ought to be something the Board can rely on and with the wealth of knowledge through the WERC it would behoove the County to refer to arbitrator decision and make that part of the entire process. Chairman Clark asked the cost for current arbitration process. R. Riedl said \$800 which is split between County and the union under the old law. Discussion followed regarding allowing verbal or written reprimands to be included. Chairman Clark suggested a two tier classification of disciplines. Class 1 would be as defined in Act 10 and Class 2 would be all other discipline levels. Class 2 would appeal to the Committee and the Committee would determine whether it moves on to impartial hearing officer or not. M. Molinaro urged the Committee to vote down the amendment on the table and make motion to what Chairman Clark has suggested. F. Ekornaas moved the previous question. Second by D. Singer. All aye, motion carried; including YIG members. Vote on the amendment: T. Rose, aye; D. Singer, aye; W. Grady, nay; J. O'Day, nay; J. Gentz, nay; F. Ekornaas, nay; J. Clark, nay; YIG members, nay. Motion failed.

Motion by D. Singer to determine discipline by class. Class 1 is defined in Act 10; Class 2 is all other levels of discipline. Class 2 discipline employees can appeal to the Finance/Administration with presentation of the facts De novo review and the Committee has all options available at Class 2 appeal including assigning an impartial hearing officer. Vote on amendment: T. Rose, aye; D. Singer, aye; J. O'Day, aye; J. Gentz, nay; W. Grady, aye; F. Ekornaas, aye; J. Clark, aye; YIG members, aye. Motion carried.

Motion by T. Rose to define more serious discipline in Class 1 to include a day or more suspension. Second by D. Singer. T. Rose, aye; D. Singer, aye; F. Ekornaas, nay; J. Gentz, aye; J. O'Day, aye; W. Grady, aye; J. Clark, aye; YIG Members, aye. Motion carried.

T. Rose stated he would like to see criteria be established for selected the impartial hearing officer. Selection by the Risk Manager can easily be manipulated. Motion by T. Rose that the criteria for selection of the impartial hearing officer be a retired judge, WERC member or members of the American Arbitration Association. Second by D. Singer. On the question: R. Riedl said the law defines management right and the parameters in the law to select the impartial hearing officer. Specific criteria for who administration may use also will increase the cost of the impartial hearing officer. W. Grady asked if the 3 were exclusive. T. Rose stated those 3 exclusively. This is meant to be an assistance to management, not a detriment. This is less costly than the system we currently have in place. R. Riedl asked if Committee would consider broadening the criteria to more than 3. L. Mitchell stated it was left open-ended and much more general. Administration has had many discussions about what constitutes an impartial hearing officer. In order for whatever decision we get to stand, if is appealed beyond our system, we have to have an impartial hearing officer and with someone with the highest level of criteria. We have discussed WERC would have those people or retired members of the WERC who we know make fair decisions. The problem is WERC itself is changing, people are retiring; the pool is changing in terms of who is available. We would like to have the more experienced people available to us because they will be difficult decisions and we want them to stand. L. Mitchell said there may be others. Chairman Clark suggested T. Rose add that the Finance/Administration Committee could expand that criteria definition. D. Singer stated he thought the Finance/Administration Committee should approve who the impartial hearing officer is that we are sending to. The Committee would define them and we could change it now so we can have an amendment and not wait until later. Chairman Clark asked T. Rose if he would allow the Committee to have ability to expand that definition. T. Rose said he thought they should be listed. D. Singer offered a friendly amendment to allow the Committee and administration to be able to expand the categories he is looking for if they fit in for what they decide. T. Rose said that is fine.

M. Molinaro stated we have heard from Corporation Counsel that the definition exists currently of what an independent hearing officer is which determines who your pool of people are. Why continue to try to define who they are when no one in this room other than a few in administration has an inkling of what they are. Definition is there, now you want to give the authority to the Committee to make that decision. So Committee made up of individuals who are knowledgeable in that venue to make well educated decisions of who is qualified or not. M. Molinaro thought the debate was unnecessary as the definition exists. J. Gentz said he would not support it and he thinks staff is tasked by law to come up with a fair and impartial and in serious Class 1 we have final say anyway. F. Ekornaas said he would not support e amendment as it is unnecessary. VOTE: J. Gentz, nay; F. Ekornaas, nay; W. Grady, nay; D. Singer, aye; T. Rose, aye; J. O'Day, nay; J. Clark, nay. YIG members, nay; Motion failed.

The Committee took a 10 minute recess. The meeting commenced at 9:20 p.m.

HIGHWAY UNIT ONLY – N. Kasmer stated the first issue is the meal period and hours of work. Currently employees receive a 30 minute unpaid lunch break. Hours of work are 7 to 3:30 p.m. with a shift to be between 4 and 7 a.m. with proper notice. Employees do not have a problem with 4 ten hour days. R. Riedl said the 30 minute unpaid lunch break is fine. WI Act 10 allows the County flexibility in the standard work week so we can control costs and appropriately manage the work. County may determine the hours to be 7 to 3:30 and winter different set of hours. R. Arbet said administration wants to keep the options open and do not want hard and defined hours. Is there an anticipated change, no. Is it possible that it may make sense to have different start times or subgroups within the team. It may make sense to do that. We want to take full advantage of the flexibility under the law. To do anything short of that is irresponsible. T. Rose stated he wanted a legal opinion on whether this is negotiations or subject to this type of discussion. This is quite different than policies we discussed moments ago. L. Mitchell stated she would agree. When she first saw the letter from AFSCME to the County Board Supervisors she considered a lot of what she would consider back-door bargaining. These are issues that were matters of the collective bargaining agreement. We no longer have the collective bargaining agreement then they fall back to management rights. Management sets the hours and how the work will be divided up. Those types of things were also limited by the collective bargaining agreement and now management is looking for opportunity now to step forward and create a work environment that benefits both parties. It may require employees adjust to certain changes whether it be in hours or scheduling. T. Rose said he did not see anything further to discuss. What is left to be discussed here as these types of things are not subject to public policy. Chairman Clark asked Corporation Counsel to review the list. We had the letter and we had meetings and asked over and over whether we were bargaining or not bargaining and now hearing this for the first time; he was disappointed. L. Mitchell said these issues; you are here to take suggestions and you will take suggestions and make your decisions based on the agreement with your Committee as to what you put in the policy or do not put in the policy. If Mr. Rose makes a note of the fact that some of these things go beyond what the Committee is willing to put in policy then that is something that should be discussed. Chairman Clark said he question was whether we are bargaining. The question of whether we are bargaining in your opinion based on this discussion, we need to be very clear on it. L. Mitchell said the proposed amendments that have been provided by the unions addressed the major issues first for both units. Now getting into each separate unit, she saw these issues as things that were clearly subjects of the collective bargaining sessions that we went through. At this point with respect to setting hours and equipment, this should be deferred to management for their decision. J. O'Day said he was inclined to leave all these items to management because we will only be locked in to the end of the year and we can review it. T. Rose said that is not his point. It is whether we should be discussing these at all. Chairman Clark said he does not disagree with him. He has clearly asked the question and for lack of a better word, to be blindsided, to hear this right now, he is disappointed. If the opinion is that these are inappropriate a motion to adjourn would be appropriate. T. Rose moved to adjourn. Second by F. Ekornaas. N. Kasmer asked to speak. N. Kasmer said if this is bargaining then everything else all evening was bargaining. We have only presented what we would like to see. There is a difference between bargaining and lobbying. Chairman Clark said whether you think these are management decisions, that is what the

Committee should say. L. Mitchell stated she needed to clarify things as she did not want Chairman Clark to think he was blindsided. She believed the Committee has taken the high road and taken great efforts to resolve a serious problem and serious issues that must be resolved and working very hard to do so. If discussing those issues is going to put those issues to rest so there is no more dissension among the ranks between the employees and management and the County Board, she is all for it. If these are proposed and the Committee discussing them among themselves and makes a decision one way or the other, then that is not bargaining. Chairman Clark said if these are not dealt with tonight, then they are coming to the County Board and it will be another long one. Either we are on legal ground to be discussing these items or not. That was the question that was raised. F. Ekornaas said there was a motion to adjourn. Chairman Clark said it was not recognized. D. Singer said under overtime on policy #1. Chairman Clark said didn't we talk about overtime? We have had a discussion about hours and 30 minute unpaid lunch break. Let's finish those issues before moving on. Administration said 30 minute lunch break, no problem. Currently there is nothing in there relative to hours.

D. Singer said he did not think anything should be done with the work hours and administration needs flexibility to do that. Chairman Clark called for any amendment on those two issues. No amendment to lunch break or work hours. R. Riedl stated he would like one amendment to the work week commencing Sunday morning at 12:00 a.m. not 12:01 a.m. **Motion by D. Singer to change the work week commencing Sunday morning at 12:00 a.m. Second by J. O'Day. All aye, motion carried.**

EQUIPMENT – (as provided by employee groups) “Provide that equipment will be assigned/awarded on the basis of seniority”. R. Arbet said there will be times when it does make sense to assign a given task based on type of equipment needed and the operator needed. Other times it will not make any sense at all based on seniority and not particular vehicle. To limit it to that is not the way to do things. Chairman Clark said he had a memo for Supervisor Gail Gentz and there was some discussion about this that snowplowing and operation has particular routes and zoning and he could not see management jerking people around with equipment because they are having fun when that would not be an efficient use of manpower or trucks. F. Ekornaas said he did not see how it was our call and that is micromanaging. T. Rose agreed with F. Ekornaas. Important perhaps in collective bargaining process. W. Grady said Sipsma assured Committee that the status quo would be maintained for snowplowing.

Chairman Clark called for any amendments on hours. There were none. Chairman Clark called for amendments on equipment. There were none.

OVERTIME – N. Kasmer said this was discussed. However, would like to see mandatory overtime utilized as outlined in proposal. D. Singer said initial inkling is to make overtime voluntary. However, the department has indicated they really need it for the snow removal. **D. Singer moved to amend it to be: “Such a request request for overtime is considered to be mandatory for snow removal operations.” It meets what they are looking for and does not require mandatory overtime for other seasons. Second by W. Grady. On the question: F. Ekornaas said he did not think the administration would call people in just to call people in. He would vote against amendment as there are other emergencies than just the snow season. F. Ekornaas did not believe it should be limited. R. Arbet suggested to add “snow and ice removal” in the language. The Committee agreed. VOTE: T. Rose, nay; F. Ekornaas, nay; J. Gentz, aye; W. Grady, aye; D. Singer, aye; J. O'Day, aye; J. Clark, aye; Motion carried.**

JAIL ONLY ISSUES

SCHEDULES AND WORKING HOURS – (as provided by employee groups) “Eliminate the section stating schedules and working hours are subject to change at any time at the Sheriff's discretion”. Chairman Clark said the Sheriff has indicated there are not planned schedule changed for 2011. The Sheriff said shifts may change January 1st. Chairman Clark called for any amendments. There were none.

FLEXING OF SHIFTS AND HOURS – (as provided by the employee groups) “Either eliminate said section or modify it to provide that said flex or modification is only for a temporary basis of up to ninety days (Section 6.3 of contract)”. The Sheriff said this is not what the union believes it is Flexing of a shift is never for a 90 day period. Chairman Clark called for any amendments. There were none.

SWAPS – (as provided by the employees groups) “Eliminate the limit of 10 swaps and eliminate the requirement that five casual days be used before swaps are available”. R. Riedl said the casual days is the problem and has become the ace of spades to use when time off is difficult to get. The Sheriff has had to call emergencies during the Christmas season to get enough staff during the holiday season. Discussion followed from F. Storz and D. Beth. Chairman Clark called for any amendments. There were none.

R. Riedl requested the Committee amend the casual day language to state the casual days may be used in ½ day increments not in hour increments as currently stated in the policy. **Motion by W. Grady to approve. Second by J. O’Day. All aye, motion carried.**

Motion by D. Singer to adjourn. Second by T. Rose. All aye, motion carried.

The Committee adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A tape recording of the meeting is available.

Prepared by:

Donna Esposito, Division of Personnel Services

Submitted by:

Robert J. Riedl, Director, Division of Personnel Services