

CALHOUN COUNTY
PROCEEDINGS OF THE
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

August 17, 2006

The Special Session of the Calhoun County Board of Commissioners convened at 4:00 p.m., Thursday, August 17, 2006 in Administrative Conference Room No. 3-700, County Building, 315 West Green Street, Marshall, Michigan.

Roll Call: Present: Comrs. Bolger, Segal, Solis and Todd. Temporarily Excused: Comrs. Miller and Moore. Excused: Comr. Strowbridge.

2007 BUDGET SESSION

Vice Chairperson Segal stated that the session shall commence with an overview of the 2007 budget requests to discuss what the Board would like as budget priorities and areas to be reviewed for "trimming." Vice Chairperson Segal advised that the Budget Committee requested different information from the department heads this year to understand how their resources have been used, caseload increases, what their priorities are, etc. Vice Chairperson Segal advised that if the Board has any questions, she will be taking notes and the Budget Committee shall inquire during the budget meetings with the departments heads and report back.

County Administrator/Controller Greg Purcell advised that the Finance Department did not receive the Sheriff Department's budget information yet. Mr. Purcell stated that he asked Mr. Redman to submit it, however, he was unable to do that until the Sheriff returns from vacation. Mr. Purcell advised that the Finance Department will get that information sometime tomorrow at the earliest, and that 2006 budget numbers have been provided for the Sheriff Department.

Comr. Todd inquired why the Sheriff Department failed to submit their budget information by the budget deadline. Mr. Purcell responded that Mr. Redman indicated that he had some other projects going on and felt uncomfortable with submitting the Department's information prior to discussion with the Sheriff.

Interim Finance Director Pam Kline reviewed revenues, pointing out that the major piece of the revenue is not there because there is no delinquent tax transfer into the General Fund represented within the budget at this time. Ms. Kline stated that \$1.5 Million of the revenue shortfall could be alleviated if there is that transfer. Ms. Kline stated that there shall be an increase to the jail bed rental revenue for 2007, however, that without the Sheriff Department's budget information she does not know exactly how much that increase shall be. Mr. Purcell advised that the change would be over the \$200,000 additional revenue estimated for this year; therefore, he would estimate that the 2007 Sheriff Department revenue would be over \$1/2 Million in additional revenue over the projected 2006 jail bed rental revenue.

Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006

Comr. Segal addressed the proposed Sheriff Department tether program, advising that revenue projected for 2006 has not “come to light.” Comr. Bolger inquired whether any revenue deficit is anticipated at the end of the year. Ms. Kline responded “No, that no deficit is anticipated.” Mr. Purcell advised that the change in payment of winter property taxes in July could result in a shortage at the end of the year. Ms. Kline stated regarding property tax revenue, that hopefully there will be other revenue increases that could offset that so that the General Fund budget itself is not in a deficit. Mr. Purcell stated that property taxes is an issue in looking at the 2007 budget because there are issues with that relating to revenue sharing. Mr. Purcell advised that for the 2007 budget, Administration is projecting the 2006 number in terms of property tax revenue, even though some increase is believed. Ultimately, the taxes will be “caught up” in 2008. Mr. Purcell stated that there are sufficient reserves to cover the shortage.

Ms. Kline addressed the expenditure side of the budget, advising that for personnel salaries she put in a 2.5 percent increase “across the board,” and increased hospitalization costs 33 percent based on 2006 rates to cover claim costs. Mr. Purcell advised that the illustrated rates did not bring in sufficient revenue to cover expenditures, plus the county had some significant medical costs. Mr. Purcell stated that it appears that the reserve should be sufficient to cover the expenses for the balance of the year, and advised that Administration has McGraw Wentworth looking at that and coming back with a recommendation. Discussion continued regarding the advantages of being self-insured or being under an insurance plan. Comr. Bolger stated that at some point in time he would be interested in knowing what the 33 percent increase represents.

Chairman Miller arrived and noted that the departments have requested \$3.2 Million more than this year. Chairman Miller stated that insurance is the least of the county’s problems, pointing out that departmental requests have significantly exceeded revenues projected for the year. Chairman Miller stated that the departmental requests are in, and that the purpose of the special session is for the Board to provide guidance to the Budget Committee. Chairman Miller stated that the Board cannot simply say “we don’t want to cut this and we don’t want to cut that. If someone is going to give to one department, then that person better point to where that funding shall come from another department.” Chairman Miller stated that his comments stem solely from the display of last year; advising that the end of his final term will not be punctuated by crying, that the Board is going to sit here, figure the budget out and determine priorities, or the Board shall come back after the regular Board meeting and keep going until the priorities are figured out so that there is no December “tears in your beer” or “crying over spilt milk.” Chairman Miller stated that the departments will have the opportunity to defend their requests and make their individual appeals to the Budget Committee that shall be empowered to use the Board’s directions to determine all the budgets for next year. Chairman Miller advised that ultimately every member of this body will have the opportunity to exercise their right given to them by the people of their respective districts to either approve or reject the final budget, however, this Board will not repeat last year’s budget. Chairman Miller pointed out that there are a lot of people who have been with county government for the last 30 years and have never seen a display like that in their life, so that will not happen again.

Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006

Brief discussion regarding labor agreements that are still unsettled. Assistant County Administrator Wendee Woods advised that there are no contracts in place for 2007 that provide a 2.5 percent salary increase, that 1.75 percent is the highest.

Comr. Moore arrived.

Comr. Segal addressed the Management Team's suggestions for trimming the budget, advising that a couple of the suggestions have been discussed at the Budget Committee's last meeting.

Comr. Bolger inquired whether the Planning Office can be included for G.I.S. Comr. Segal responded that the county contracts that service and would have to re-do the contract to include Planning. Comr. Segal advised that some outside grant funding is being looked into and that the topic of a county-wide G.I.S. system has been discussed with the Road Commission to determine what the Road Commission may or may not be willing to do.

Comr. Bolger inquired whether the Equalization Department's G.I.S. system could go to the Treasurer's Office. Mr. Purcell responded that Administration would have to review the Equalization Department's statutory requirements regarding that; further, pointed out that two positions were cut from the Equalization Department last year. Mr. Purcell stated that he does not believe that the Treasurer has the interest or the expertise to take on Equalization; further, pointed out that the Treasurer is pretty busy with the Land Bank activities. Comr. Bolger stated that he is really talking about a shift in the reporting structure to offer Mr. Lee some additional support; e.g., more staff to answer the phones and provide services. Mr. Purcell responded that the Board is ultimately responsible for providing the equalization reports, but could delegate the responsibility for supervising equalization to the Treasurer. Mr. Purcell stated that he does not know if any other counties do that, and does not believe it is a particularly good idea or how it would save any money.

Comr. Moore stated that for years the Board has discussed using the Clerk's staff more efficiently, whether it is within the Extension Office, the Drain Office, the Planning Office, the Equalization Department or where ever the staff has similar functions. Comr. Moore stated that he believes there should be more consolidation of departments with like operations. Mr. Purcell pointed out that the Planning Office and the Equalization Department do not have any clerical staff. Comr. Moore stated that perhaps some departments should be moved. Comr. Segal questioned the intent of consolidations; i.e., to increase customer service or decrease staffing. Comr. Bolger responded that he would like to see both. Comr. Segal stated that the Budget Committee needs more specific direction of how to consolidate within the County Building, pointing out that there are only three clerical positions within the Building. Comr. Bolger inquired whether consolidation of the Equalization Department to the Treasurer's Office without adding any clerical staff would help with increased customer service. Mr. Purcell pointed out that building reconfiguration would be involved. Comr. Moore suggested creating a new department of all departments with like issues, pointing out that the Extension Office and the Drain Office have a clerical person.

Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006

Comr. Bolger inquired whether the Finance Director position could be eliminated from county administration by moving the finance function to the Treasurer's Office. Mr. Purcell responded that Administration will talk with the Treasurer to acquire her views regarding such. Mr. Purcell stated that he does not see any dollar savings by such a move, however, that perhaps there would be the staff to handle the telephones. Comr. Bolger stated that there may not be any direct savings, other than not filling the Finance Director position, however, that such a move might help with the finance function.

Comr. Bolger suggested consolidation of the Veterans Affairs Department and Senior Services. Mr. Purcell stated that there are pros and cons involved. The pros are that consolidation could provide for shared clerical staff for both departments. The concern is the location of those operations. Mr. Purcell stated that the Veterans Affairs Department operates at a more efficient level in the Toeller Building, and Senior Services has operated quite effectively within the County Building, however, that perhaps the Senior Services Department could be moved into the Toeller Building. Mr. Purcell inquired whether there is space available within the Toeller Building. Administrative Services Director Bradley Wilcox advised "Not on the third floor," that the Senior Services Department would have to be located on the garden level. Comr. Solis questioned whether the Senior Services staff could perform Veterans Affairs work under the legalities of the millage. Comr. Segal responded that the services would have to be carefully supported.

Comr. Moore inquired whether Senior Services could be placed within the Health Department for improved customer coverage and impact upon the General Fund. Mr. Purcell stated that it could make some sense. Mr. Wilcox advised that Senior Services would be easier to facilitate and that it is an opportune time in terms of planning as Administrative Services is bringing in an interior design person. Chairman Miller pointed out that there is no comparable support position within the Health Department.

Comr. Bolger again addressed G.I.S., questioning whether the Drain Office, Extension Office, Planning Office, and Community Development could be made into a new department. Comr. Moore stated that Administration needs to sit down with all the parties to discuss what kind of G.I.S. is needed and whether all G.I.S. requirements can be provided with one system. Comr. Moore stated that he does not believe the Board is even close to making any decision of whether there should be a county GIS department, however, that he believes a county-wide G.I.S. system should be a priority for this year or next year. Comr. Segal advised that the need for a survey was discussed by the Budget Committee. Chairman Miller questioned whether the survey would be specific to G.I.S. Comr. Segal responded Yes. Chairman Miller stated that he believes that those organizations that seek the most use from G.I.S. could be part of the primary funding resource for that survey. Chairman Miller stated that he believes the Chamber of Commerce would have a vested interest in helping with the survey.

Comr. Bolger noted some technology suggestions, and questioned what technology enhancements are available. Discussion of the recently Board approved CrimeCog System for the Sheriff Department followed. Mr. Wilcox advised that Administrative Services conducted an evaluation at the Justice Center to determine whether going

Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006

wireless would give the departments the ability to go paperless. Mr. Wilcox addressed plans for the fourth, third and second floors, and possibly the first floor. Mr. Wilcox stated that another project is imaging. Mr. Wilcox advised that St. Clair County is three months ahead in their imaging project and that he is going to review their project and implement it here. Discussion continued regarding customers accessing services through the website rather than services being provided at the counters.

Comr. Solis inquired whether the Clerk's Office still has their own imaging system. Mr. Wilcox responded Yes. Comr. Bolger noted that the Clerk's budget states "funding as needed" within the Office's technology fund, and inquired whether the Clerk needs more technology resources. Mr. Wilcox responded No. Comr. Bolger further noted that the Clerk had a lot of suggestions for the courts, and inquired whether the Committee could request those suggestions from the Clerk. Comr. Segal responded Yes. Chairman Miller requested that the Committee also address fees with the Clerk.

Comr. Segal inquired regarding progress in getting employees to use their printers more efficiently. Mr. Wilcox responded that all the computers are network ready and the plan is to do away with the laser printers and everyone go to the Xerox copiers; further, the copiers are being defaulted to have the copies be duplexed. Mr. Wilcox advised that he has recommended that all the budgets be cut by 10 percent in the printing area. Comr. Segal inquired whether training shall be provided. Mr. Wilcox responded Yes. Ms. Woods inquired whether the 10 percent reduction in printing appropriations was reflected in the numbers provided to the departments. Mr. Wilcox responded Yes.

Comr. Bolger stated that he would like employee incentives explored for programs that generate revenue or reduce expenses. Comr. Segal advised that incentives can be explored, however, that the Employee Recognition and Relations Committee offered such incentives for a year and really did not receive any suggestions. Mr. Wilcox suggested in addition to employee incentives, that the incentive also be on a departmental basis. Comr. Segal stated that perhaps a portion of the savings returned to departments could be tied to the Board's priorities.

Comr. Bolger inquired what privatization of services; e.g. payroll, can be considered. Mr. Purcell responded that privatization of payroll functions could occur, however, pointed out that there is the complication of having ten bargaining units and consideration of the JD Edwards switch. Chairman Miller inquired what other counties privatize their payroll function and what type of software those counties utilize. Mr. Purcell responded that he does not know, however, advised that he shall be attending the Michigan Association of Counties conference next week and shall pose that question to the other counties. Comr. Bolger stated that just because other counties do not privatize their payroll function, does not mean that Calhoun County should not.

Chairman Miller inquired what jail operations are available for privatization. Mr. Wilcox responded that a lot of those operations are already privatized; e.g., medical services, commissary, food services. Mr. Wilcox advised that the Purchasing Division has evaluated almost every major contract. Mr. Wilcox stated that he would have to think about what other operations there might be.

**Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006**

Comr. Bolger addressed elimination of longevity and replacement with performance bonuses. Ms. Woods advised that new employees do not receive longevity, and that longevity has been a long time county precedent that the long term employees feel very strongly about; further, pointed out that longevity is a provision of some labor agreements. Ms. Woods further advised that employees that receive longevity have been “grand-fathered” in if they were hired before a certain date. Ms. Woods advised that Administration would have the opportunity to eliminate longevity with the contracts that are expiring. Chairman Miller inquired whether Commissioner Bolger is suggesting the elimination of longevity completely or grand-fathering all current recipients and not providing longevity to new employees. Comr. Bolger responded that he would like to at least move towards elimination of longevity.

Corporation Counsel Nancy Mullett stated that the elimination of longevity does not have to go through negotiations if the county switches to performance bonuses; however, pointed out that she has been employed with the county for 15 years and has never had a performance evaluation, further, that the majority of the employees have not had one. Ms. Mullett stated that she believes the biggest battle would be shifting the department heads’ and the elected officials’ mind set to conduct performance evaluations.

Comr. Moore questioned the point of employee evaluations, what the employees would receive with a good evaluation. Comr. Solis responded that within the Prosecutor’s Office the employee would receive a step increase. Mr. Purcell advised that the bargaining units typically worry that there will be favoritism with the evaluations, which could be a real issue in some departments. Chairman Miller stated that another consideration would be having Civil Service rules with one union contract.

Comr. Segal stated that there has been discussion regarding all aspects of this issue, and questioned what the priority is that the Budget Committee should focus upon; i.e., grand-fathering, pointing out that obviously current labor agreements cannot be impacted. Chairman Miller recommended grand-fathering longevity for those employees who receive it currently and eliminating longevity for new employees. Comr. Moore recommended eliminating longevity paid to the elected and appointed department heads and grand-fathering the others who receive it. Ms. Woods pointed out that if longevity is eliminated for the elected/appointed department heads, that would also include their deputies. Discussion continued regarding which department heads and their deputies would be losing longevity. Comr. Segal stated that she would prefer to discuss this issue on a policy level rather than picking and choosing the various people.

Comr. Moore inquired whether there is any recommendation regarding changing employees’ health care. Comr. Segal responded that Administration has to get a lot more information from McGraw Wentworth first to make any determination. Comr. Segal advised that the information shall be provided to Board members as soon as it is received.

Comr. Moore questioned how general oversight of departments can be accomplished, pointing out that oversight of county operations is the Board’s responsibility. Comr. Segal responded that there will be a couple of presentations in September regarding that issue, and advised that there would have to be a new system put into

**Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006**

place for checks and balances.

Comr. Segal recapped the priorities provided to the Budget Committee:

- Review of employee health care costs
- Various office re-configurations/location changes to improve customer service:
 - Veterans Affairs Department/Senior Services Department/Treasurer's Office/Equalization Department/Planning Office/Finance Department/Health Department/Human Resources Department
- County-wide G.I.S. collaboration
- Imaging and going wireless within the buildings
- Cutting all department printing expenditures by ten percent
- Elimination of longevity to elected/appointed department heads and officials and their deputies, and grand-fathering the remaining employees who currently receive it.
- Departmental and employee incentives for cost savings

Comr. Segal stated that she would like the Board to determine the percentage amount of reward and whether the reward should be tied to a specific use. Comr. Segal stated that she would like any reward to be invested into technology improvements; however, is aware that some departments would like funding for capital improvements or training. Comr. Bolger stated that the department receiving the award should have the option to use the funds as desired, that he would not want to limit use of the reward to a specific area of the budget. Discussion continued regarding the issue of allowing the departments to determine how to utilize cost savings rewards versus the issue of legislative oversight of departments.

Ms. Mullett inquired whether employee training is going to be eliminated. Comr. Segal responded that employee training has already been eliminated for most departments. Ms. Mullett voiced concern that elimination of employee training leads to mistakes and lawsuits. Mr. Wilcox advised that there are no training funds within his budgets; and pointed out that when the smaller departments are advised to reduce their budget by ten percent, there is nothing else to cut but training and travel. Ms. Mullett stated that elimination of employee training is a bad plan in terms of risk management.

Chairman Miller requested that the Board review the departmental requests commencing with those requests that are above this year's budgets; e.g., Judicial, Prosecutor's Office, Clerk's Office, Child Care to determine what questions the Board would like the Budget Committee to ask the departments. Chairman Miller stated that he would like the Committee to ask the departments what percentage of their additional appropriation request is for salaries, how the departments plan to spend their appropriations, where additional revenue shall be coming from, to discuss the issue of sharing clerical staff, to inquire whether the Circuit Court would require the Sheriff to provide bailiff functions if court services positions are cut, and to inquire of all departments whether staff other than clerical can be shared.

Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006

Comr. Todd questioned whether all positions have job descriptions, and if a deputy has to assume clerical work/court services, how that deputy's performance would be evaluated. Comr. Bolger stated that he believes the Clerk and the Court should sit down to discuss the Clerk's ideas for the courts; further, that there should be agreement between the Prosecutor, Sheriff and the Court, and the Court and the Clerk; and that they should be allowed to determine how to reduce that budget by \$500,000.

Discussion continued regarding the increased appropriation requests for the Child Care Fund and the Prosecutor's Office.

Chairman Miller stated that he would like the Budget Committee to ask what the two Assistant Prosecuting Attorneys that assist the four Circuit Court judges do during the time when the judges are assigned civil work, and raise the theme of shared staff.

Discussion continued regarding how to determine the number of cases that went to trial versus those plead out; further, the number of filings and number of Circuit Court trials. Comr. Moore stated that he would like the Budget Committee to question courtroom utilization time and how the other time is spent when there is no court. Ms. Woods stated that another question would be what the office staff is doing when not in the courtroom.

RECESS:

The meeting recessed at 6:52 p.m. at the call of the Chair to go into Regular Session.

The Special Session reconvened at 8:15 p.m. in Administrative Conference Room 3-700.

Members Present: Comrs. Bolger, Miller, Moore, Segal, Solis, Strowbridge and Todd.

Discussion continued regarding the percentage amount to offer for employee cost of living salary increases in 2007, when during the year increases should be implemented, whether the increases should be paid in a lump sum rather than be added to the base salary, or a combination thereof, and the net affect upon salaries due to increased health insurance co-payments. Mr. Purcell cautioned the Board regarding offering no salary increase to non-union employees while union employees receive increases under their employment agreements. Various percentages were discussed; e.g., 2.5 percent, 2 percent, 1.5 percent, 1 percent. Ms. Woods stated that it would be very helpful prior to U.A.W. negotiations next week if the 2.5 percent would go away, and if a message could go from the Board or the Budget Committee that "The first move we have made is to reduce the salary increase in the budget from what was presented. We have changed the personnel numbers and they no longer reflect 2.5 percent increase. They are now 1 or 1.5 percent." Consensus of the Board is 1.5 percent.

Discussion continued regarding the increased appropriation requests for the Clerks Office with Board members noting a combined \$282,000 discrepancy between requested amounts and fees generated. Chairman Miller questioned whether there is anything specific causing the discrepancy; i.e., a new program, more staff. Ms.

**Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006**

Kline responded that historically the Clerk-Register of Deeds revenue projections have been very conservative within the requested budgets and that usually the projections have been “bumped up” based upon history, which is a possibility for some of the discrepancy. Ms. Kline stated that she would imagine that the revenues should be running even with 2006.

Chairman Miller questioned the reason for the \$67,500 discrepancy within the Circuit Court Clerk unit. Ms. Kline stated that she believes that perhaps it is salary and fringes. Comr. Segal inquired whether the Clerk put the reclassification amounts back into the budget. Ms. Kline responded yes, advising that the employees received the increase in their contract for 2007. Comr. Solis inquired who authorized the reclassifications. Ms. Mullett responded “Greg did.” Ms. Woods inquired whether the technology funds were moved only for this year or for forever. Ms. Kline responded that she believes the funds were moved for 2006 only.

Chairman Miller inquired whether the requested amount within the Circuit Court Clerk’s line item for record maintenance shall go down as the county makes its transition to electronic copies. Ms. Kline advised that the funding is for records storage at Fort Custer. Comr. Moore asked Mr. Wilcox whether he is aware of space at the Justice Center where those records can be stored. Mr. Wilcox responded no, that there is no space available at the Justice Center. Chairman Miller inquired whether there is the possibility of gradually pulling those records from Fort Custer and housing them in the jail. Mr. Wilcox responded that three or four years ago he put a plan forward for storing the archives at the old jail, however, the Clerk went ahead on her own. Comr. Moore pointed out that the Board could cut that line item out. Comr. Segal recommended the issue of imaging the archives versus storage be placed on the Budget Committee’s agenda for further review.

Chairman Miller questioned the fees loss of revenue of \$2,600 within Circuit Court Clerk line item 1216. Ms. Kline stated that court costs must be down. Chairman Miller inquired whether the Board recently approved an increase of fees. Mr. Purcell responded that the increase was approved for the courts. Ms. Kline stated that perhaps that amount is a little “light” too.

Comr. Bolger questioned what can be done to increase self-service of the Clerk’s documents and thus reduce staffing, advising that other counties have a lot more documents on-line. Mr. Wilcox advised that the web server will be on-line within the next 30 days. Chairman Miller stated that just about all the counties have campaign financing reporting on-line now and there is no earthly reason why the same could not be occurring here. Chairman Miller requested that the Budget Committee ask the Clerk how much it costs to keep a separate website. Comr. Segal responded that she cannot remember, however, advised that the Budget Committee did review that cost.

Comr. Moore addressed the issue regarding physical layout in the District Court. Mr. Wilcox advised that there has been no movement on that, pointing out that it is too difficult to move people around at the Justice Center. Chairman Miller stated that he believes the Clerk has her eyes on the Battle Creek City space. Mr. Wilcox stated “That’s true, but the space is tied up now.”

**Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006**

Comr. Bolger inquired regarding health insurance for the labor agreements that are coming up for renewal. Ms. Woods responded that the co-pays for the contracts in place are 10 percent for 2007 and 15 percent for 2008, however, advised that because of the increase in the premium the employees will be seeing a significant increase to the amount they will be paying. Comr. Bolger inquired whether there is anything that can be done to lower the 33 percent increase. Ms. Woods responded that Administration has discussed a number of different options, however, have not made final plans. Ms. Woods advised that there are some different benefits that can be reviewed, the coverage can be "tightened up" or a lower priced plan could be offered. Ms. Mullett advised that the savings for the lower plans were very nominal; i.e., \$2 per pay period. Ms. Woods advised that Administration has asked for the illustrated rates based on a 12 month period rather than on a 24 month period as in the past, which will be more experience rated and will provide a more realistic picture. Ms. Woods stated that the stop loss or the aggregate could be reviewed also. Chairman Miller stated that he believes it is wise to consider plan changes, however, pointed out that there is nothing significant that can be done without unduly burdening the employees. Ms. Mullett stated that the increase this year is an anomaly. Mr. Purcell advised that it will not happen in the future because Administration will be taking a closer look at it. Mr. Purcell advised that Administration has a meeting in late September with McGraw Wentworth and shall have to make some decisions that hopefully will not put an undue burden upon the employees.

Chairman Miller requested Commissioner Segal recap the questions the Board has identified for the Budget Committee to review with respect to the departments.

Comr. Segal advised that questions for the courts are:

- Where are the collection losses the Budget Committee has heard about?
- What the courts will be doing to get those collections?
- What does the staff do when the various courtrooms are not being fully utilized?

For the Sheriff Department:

- Deputies versus Court Service Officers -- What their roles could or could not be?

The Child Care issue with the judicial branch:

- Why have expenditures increased?

For the Prosecutor's Office:

- We need a breakdown of the requested appropriation increase. How much of it is for health care and how much of it is for a contract increase in pay?
- More explanation of what happens during judges' rotations in civil court when they are not doing criminal court.

**Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006**

- What does the staff and the Assistant Prosecuting Attorneys work on during those rotations?
- How many Circuit Court trials are the Assistant Prosecuting Attorneys trying?
 - How many are plead out?
- Where are the savings coming from the various technology improvements, including the new imaging and Crimecog systems?
 - What does this mean to the Prosecutor's Office and how will the Office achieve those savings?
 - What are those savings going to be?

For the Clerk's Office:

- Look into the storage at Fort Custer and storage here.
 - How long would it take and the cost to get those records stored at Fort Custer imaged in a timely manner?
 - How long to realize savings if those records were to be imaged?
- The Clerk says that filing fees are down, however, the Prosecutor says that filings are up.
 - Try to get to the "bottom" of those two departments to determine what is going on.
- What is the cost for the Clerk's separate county website?

All Employees' 2007 Salary Increase: 1.5 percent

Comr. Moore stated that he would like to see the cost differential for lump sum payments of 2 percent versus the 1.5 percent increase added to base salaries.

Longevity:

- Eliminate longevity for elected/appointed officials and their deputies and grand-father the remainder of employees currently receiving longevity.

Chairman Miller inquired whether the Board can agree that the Budget Committee should be directed to move forward with the Sheriff Department regarding an incentive for acquiring additional funds, and determine the Department's percentage to do with as the Sheriff desires, and the county's percentage to establish a capital improvements reserve fund for the Jail. Chairman Miller suggested the incentive be 5 to 10 percent. Comr. Bolger questioned whether discussion had been for a three-way split, with some of the funding coming back to the General Fund. Comr. Segal inquired from where the new jail security system shall be paid. Mr. Wilcox responded that the agreement states from the General Fund. Comr. Bolger stated that he believes the Sheriff should be allowed to determine what he wants to do with the Department's percentage. Mr. Purcell stated that he believes there must be more thought regarding this, pointing out that the Sheriff Department is not the only department that acquires additional funding. Chairman Miller stated that he believes there should be a meeting

**Board of Commissioners
SPECIAL SESSION
August 17, 2006**

with the Sheriff to discuss additional funds and the Board's united commitment to reserve a percentage for establishment of a jail capital improvements fund.

Comr. Moore stated that there should be elimination of phantom positions within all department budgets. Mr. Purcell pointed out that this issue has been a point of contention with the Sheriff for a number of years, and advised that the Sheriff will want to "go to the mat" on that issue. Chairman Miller stated that this issue goes back to the issue of deputies acting in a dual capacity as court service officers. Chairman Miller stated that the Budget Committee could state that if the Sheriff wants 173.1 FTEs, he will have to make those 173.1 FTEs do more work. Comr. Solis stated that he believes if the Board is going to eliminate phantom positions, then phantom positions should be eliminated for all departments. Ms. Woods stated that perhaps this is an issue that can be reviewed in negotiations to determine whether the positions are casual, part-time, retirees, or employees returning to work because the Sheriff Department is having huge issues with employees out on sick and accident and workers' compensation. Ms. Mullett recommended caution is assigning court services work onto the corrections staff, and advised that she will research the labor agreement.

Comr. Moore stated that as the Board moves towards accountability, he believes it is important that the Board have more oversight over the departments and that next year during the budget process that the Board take advantage of the expertise on the Board and prepare specific questions to each department for the Budget Committee to send out to the departments.

Comr. Bolger requested the Board's direction regarding whether townships should be requested to participate in the costs of Sheriff Department road patrols, advising that he does not. Comr. Solis advised that he agrees with Commissioner Bolger. Comr. Bolger stated that he believes no more road patrol services agreements should be established. Comr. Strowbridge advised that a community group asked him whether townships would be requested to participate in the costs of Sheriff Department road patrols, and that he responded No. Comr. Bolger advised that he is saying no also. Comr. Solis pointed out that the townships would say that they are already paying for law enforcement services. Comr. Segal stated "And some more than others."

ADJOURNMENT:

The Special Session adjourned at 9:22 p.m. at the call of the Chair.

mlb