

**Jackson County Board of Commissioners Meetings Minutes**  
**February 4, 2003 - Committee of the Whole**  
**Jackson County Commissioners Chambers: 3:30 p.m.**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Jim Rice called the February 4, 2003 Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

(9) Present: Cmr. Herl, Brittain, Day, Baxter, Videto, Shotwell, Mahoney, Elwell, & Rice. (3) Absent: Cmr. Lacinski, Adams & Wilson.

**SPECIAL ORDER:**

A. Orientation – Attorney Peter Cohl. Mr. Cohl reviewed the hand out on the following topics:

- 1) General Powers of the Board of Commissioners
- 2) Role and Relationship between the Board of Commissioners/Elected Officials/Courts
- 3) Relationship between Board of Commissioners and County Employees
- 4) Requirements to go into Closed Session under the Open Meetings Act
- 5) Review of Various Mandatory Statutes Pertaining to the Board of Commissioners

Rice asked Mr. Cohl to speak to the issue of the recent additional compensation given to the Drain Commissioner and the Treasurer. Mr. Cohl clarified that they are being given additional compensation for additional duties as provided by statute. Elwell clarified that they can be given increases at any time but only be reduced after their term expires.

Herl asked if the increase could come out of a special fund, such as the Foreclosure Fund? Mr. Cohl declined to discuss this issue as he had been asked to offer a written opinion on it, and that written opinion went out on January 30, 2003.

Herl also asked if there was a rule to follow as far as Resolution vs Motion. Mr. Cohl replied that he prefers a Resolution as it has more detail and can be reviewed after it's been voted on. Day said that our motions are very detailed and that the Commissioners are allowed to seek clarification before the vote. Elwell asked if either was more binding to which Mr. Cohl replied that they were not.

Mr. Cohl concluded at 5:45 p.m.

B. Employee Wage Issues

- 1) Grades and Steps
- 2) Incentive Pay

Randy Treacher, Deputy Administrator, and Joni Johnson, Interim Director of Personnel reviewed the handouts on these topics. At 6:13 p.m. they opened the floor for questions.

Elwell asked if it would be easier to create progressively consistent steps as opposed to grades and steps. Randy explained that it would cause too large of a separation between the steps. Elwell also asked when the non-union people receive their incentive pay. They receive it on their anniversary/promotion date.

Day asked for clarification on non-union incentive pay and union longevity. Joni explained that the non-union incentive pay is based on the performance evaluation point system and given on the anniversary/promotion date. The union longevity is a flat percent not based on performance.

Day referred to an example given of a secretary 1 making the same amount no matter what department they were in. He asked about regard to workload. Randy answered that they all work 8 hours per day and 40 hours per week. Elwell asked if workload could be one of the factors in the upgrade process. He also said that there are glaring standouts such as the Clerk's office after the new gun law took effect.

Brittain asked why 6 years ago we were only paying the Controller \$66,000 and now we are paying \$107,000 more per year for a created position of Deputy Administrator and the Administrator/Controller position. Chet asked how he came up with that figure and was told that was the total of Randy and Chet's pay, minus the \$66,000. Chet

defended the need for a deputy and said that he had suggested many times to the previous Administrator that he needed a deputy.

Brittain expressed concern that the Board approved such a large pay raise. Rice said that he knew it was happening but did not pick up on the numbers. Brittain thinks that there should be a break down in the budget so that the Commissioners would be more aware. Chet said that it shouldn't be his concern to know what an individual was making.

Elwell agreed with Chet that there was a need for a Deputy Administrator. He also referred to a hand out that

Brittain had given the Commissioners pertaining to pay and incentives. He asked if a certain amount in the IT line included both the 15% Retention Bonus and the 4% Performance Pay. Herl asked for clarification that IT receives the 3% Cost of Living, 15% Retention Bonus and 4% Performance pay.

Videto expresses confusion at this point and would like some clarification so the hand out makes sense. He would like something in writing incentive vs longevity vs retention bonus.

Elwell asked if you have to have your Department Heads approval before going for and upgrade. The answer is no. Elwell wanted to know where they are leaving this. Rice responded that they could bring all questions to him and he would get clarification. Videto said that he would feel better if they could have another informational meeting with everyone. Everyone gets something out of this. Rice said to get the questions to him and he would make a plan.

Shotwell and Rice both expressed to the Commissioners that the Administration, Judges, Elected Officials, and Department Heads are all easy to talk to.

The February 4, 2003 Jackson County Board of Commissioners Committee of the Whole meeting was adjourned at 6:53 p.m. by Rice.

Jim Rice – Chairman, Jackson County Board of Commissioners  
Sandy Crowley – Jackson County Clerk  
Respectfully submitted by Erin Foster – Chief Deputy County Clerk