

Local 1553-S

February 15, 2022, Meeting Minutes

Those in attendance:

County's Negotiation Team:

- Joshua Groat – Chief Negotiator/Employee & Labor Relations Manager
- Heather Kvokov – HR Generalist
- Sara Erb – HR Generalist
- Randy Bischoff – Chief Deputy Auditor
- Tony Hall – Purchasing Manager
- Patricia Cruz – Administrative Assistant 3/County's Note taker

Union's Negotiation Team:

- Lyle Johnston- 1553-S
- Natalie Hilderbrand – C2
- Michelle Perrinn – 1553-S

The meeting started at 9:34

Natalie passed out union's response to County proposals

NH: as we get started here, I have met Tony once but not sure Lyle and Michelle.

Tony – introduced himself

Response from Local 1553-S through County proposal.

Prop 1 –

NH: TA- realize 911 no longer part of the County

Prop 2: - Union Security

- NH: Candidly our group talked about it and do not believe this is a non-economic, employer needs to stay silent, it is union business, not county responsibility to enlighten employees on union

Article 5.1 – Union Security

- NH: reject- employer needs to stay neutral on union business, s/b directed back to union leadership. Not County's responsibility to enlighten employees on union business
- NH: have heartburn with proposed edits; County doesn't want to share with us but want us to share with County. We don't believe it is one way. Its share information. The union has been good with sharing forms with County- should be a two-way street
- JG: original language is only employer provides copy of authorization; That we had to provide the copy
- NH: intent is two-fold; whoever gets the form, needs to share with the other; both sides share equally.
- NH: authorization cards- cards need to be done by either party

- JG: that's what proposed language says
- NH: wants the union to share with employer, but not the other way around (?)
- JG: We are not saying we won't share; employee should be giving it to the union, then the union provides to the County. We are not saying that if it is presented to us that we will not share, we will direct them to the to the Union if they share it with us, we will provide a copy to the Union. Ex – Sara and Patricia, should work with the union to provide union due cards, not the Employer.
- NH: Concern since you are limiting our access to employees in other areas yet asking us to have more control over some of these. The form says to return to their payroll clerk, Vickie D wanted to make sure payroll had a copy. Seems intent was not to share if we received it.
- TH: one standard process, is what we are wanting.
- NH: Make the process clear for everybody. Can be word-smithed; they read a different intent into proposed language
- JG: Employees need to work with the union, not provide to the employer first
- NH: Employer trying to make it difficult for union to reach employees; employees get the form one way or another, sometimes employees give to union, sometimes interoffice to payroll- need to shore up employer's intent. Thought employer was intending not to share info.
- JG: if it came to County, would forward to union or direct employee to send to union
- NH: want clear process for everybody

Article 5.3 (New Hire Orientation, NHO)-

- NH: We are rejecting that because its will be hard to connect the employee. By time to find the employee after the new orientation. Realistic the new hire-orientation it's the opportunity to introduce ourselves to the new employee. If the Union it is not part of NHO, by the time they find out how to contact employee, employee will be at County 4-9 weeks. Realistically NHO gives them info that new employee has been hired. Gives them opportunity to introduce themselves.

Article 5.4 Union indemnity-

- NH: moving through to definition we reject that language. Unpaid we understand. But paid leave its hours worked. We want to clarify. Heartburn with regular employee definition - extend probation period for leave; paid leave has always been considered hours worked. Is it the County's intent that new employees will always a 1-year probation, and promo will be 6 months? If employee is 8 months into probation and promotes, what is probation period?
- JG: 4 months. If someone who continually changes position could be on continuous probation, if not ending (for regular). Any new hire, 12 months' probation from start date, regardless if they promote, etc.
- NH: If promote past 12 months, then promotion probation is 6 months? Need to clarify intent. Every time a person promotes, they have another 6-month probation? Need to make sure they understand.
- JG: more familiar with people not having a probation period upon promotion- employer will take another look.
- NH: concern about not including paid time toward probation period.
- JG: what is issue with indemnity?

- NH: need to word-smith and have agreement on union security language in totality. Since they don't agree with proposed union security language, can't agree with indemnity language.
- JG: if there is a mistake in union dues, who is held liable?
- NH: depends on what mistake is. Is it on union side, or County side...? We want to make sure we are talking the same language.

Article 5.6.2 – We agree with that.

Articles 5.6.3 & 5.6.4- fine with proposed edits (TA)

Article 5.7:

- NH: not OK with not providing monthly info to union. Still vital & needed.
- JG: will take a look.
- NH: similar to what's listed in 5.1- trying to get logic behind striking.
- JG: already covered under 5.1 (p 4)- providing reports to union. Some duplicate.
- NH: doesn't cover date of hire, date ee transferred into local
- JG: if we included date of hire & other, can we just move it under 5.1?
- NH: union needs all info. Understands taking out DOB but needs home address and other info.
- TH: what's intended use of home address?
- NH: union sends welcome packet to home address. Helps in grievance prep. If problem contacting anyone, can get ahold of them with home address or phone. Shouldn't be using County's system to conduct union business.

Prop 3: Union Activities

Article 7.1: Notice and Authorization of Union Representatives

- NH: Honestly, we do not agree with that. Historically haven't had to submit leave slip; if de minimums, why need to track (if <30 minutes).

Article 7.2.2: Types of activities

- NH: reject; union want full and free access. They already provided notification. Requiring "approval by" flies in face of full and free access.
- JG: not trying to deny access. no just want to make sure the approval is for it is ok to come in, not the intent to keep you out, just give management and leadership the ability to stay great but help adjust the time. We just want, the case Union show up in a not good hour. We just looking for, you guys can come whenever you want. Our intent it makes clear the time and if people are available.
- MP: language isn't necessary- extra steps required. I don't think this is needed; I can set up meetings in a conference room
- JG – no to employees, you are good, you work in Juvenile, you have access, cannot go to Courts to meet without Tim knowing and giving approval. It is important to give the dept head notice.
- JG: only applies to business reps – not union presidents or show stewards
- NH: applies to everyone

- JG: If MP wanted to go into another dept, is employee of County but not of other dept- should need to coordinate with other EO/DH. May be secured areas- would need pre-approval. Should still be letting EO/DH know.
- RB: should coordinate with departments, vs. demanding access
- NH: using elections conference room as example, she's coordinated. Union was reading it as not just coordinating but allowing departments to deny access. If EO/DH says not, can't conduct union
- business? Coordinate with department for approval. We took it as I notify and then Tony says no! We understand your intent, and if they deny, our hands are tied.
- JG: If you have any problem with that you can come to talk with me.
- NH: I understand but we have to talk again about.

Article 7.3: Union Functions

- NH: Union rejecting 50% rollover; have offered 10 working days, historically have loaned time to other locals. have loaned those days to other locals in the past. Heartburn is that employer added "without pay."

Article 7.3.1:

- NH: Rejecting this – intent is to have it just covered by a policy – does not guaranteed it will be negotiated with us, if you have something better you are more than welcome to bring it to us. Counter proposal- 1 Local 1553S in "designated work unit". Really talked about this last time, one per unit. Updated the language to clarify who can go. These edits and clarify.

Prop 4: Paid Time OFF (PTO)

- NH: Reject. Understands intent- covered by policy but it was without discuss with us. Doesn't mean policy will be negotiated... thinks language needs to stand. Want predictability.

Article 9.9c: TA on clarification

Prop 5: Bereavement Leave

TA on clarification

Prop 6: Hours of Work

- NH: We reject but want give the feedback. That eliminate the guarantee.

Article 12.1.3:

- NH: reject. Big thing is having a guarantee of 2 consecutive days off; don't want to eliminate that guarantee. If mutual agreement bet/specific employee and employer, that's different. Concern with removing as it eliminates guarantee for everyone else.

Article 12.1.3.2:

- NH: rejects. Prefer “will” to “may.” Talked a lot about this came down with will, may, shay. Will, means they will consider.

Article 12.2:

- NH: reject. Employer doesn’t want to negotiate impacts of alternative work shifts. Union thinks negotiating impacts is fundamental. Alternative work schedules – rejecting these need to be negotiate the effects of the changes, all agree, and all support the shifts.

Article 12.3:

- NH: reject. Has been a cornerstone. Historically all paid leave counts toward OT. Paid leave – paid hours will not count to OT, all paid time in the past counts to OT.

Prop 7: Leaves of absence

Article 13.3.2:

- NH: The Union agree with the edit.
- JG: question came up during master; county has to look at if 2 weeks is legal
- NH: has to be within the same work week, per FLSA. Don’t think there’s that big of an impact.
- JG: we thought it was fine depending on the different OT schedules. Need to take a look at it. Need to make sure we’re consistent but doing it correctly.
- NH: We understands your intent; didn’t see there was much of an impact. Most supervisor realize they either need to make up time or use leave time. Employees know they have make up time or use accruals. Try to handle in days.

Article 13.3.3:

- NH: reject. Understands Sheriff declares emergency. Not everyone has the ability to work from home. Want consistency. There have been times when County closes and pays people. No fault of employees- why shouldn’t they get paid? Not how it’s been done in the past.
- JG: prior to COVID, people didn’t have capability to work from home. Vastly different today. If employee is unaffected and working from home, County shuts down, but other people get paid (?) Need to look at the balance.
- MP: Employees may have other responsibilities if schools close- doesn’t necessarily mean teleworkers won’t have other obligations.
- NH: Employees may want to work from home, but not have technology. Not fair that if employee doesn’t have capability to telework they have to use leave time.
- MP: lives on Mt Spokane, always loses power. Now employee has to go unpaid or use leave? Doesn’t seem like a force of nature should dictate if they get paid or not.
- Sara: It’s the same with the County. County is not responsible for nature event also. Why has to pay for?
- JG: expecting County to pay no matter what; we also provide employees with accrued time to use. Not the County’s fault, not the employees fault. Alternative is not to shut it down, ever. Then employees will complain County is putting lives in jeopardy. Got to have some balance to reflect today’s environment.
- NH: How often does this come up? Want consistent treatment among employees- employees who can’t work shouldn’t be penalized. Will everyone have ability to telework? Will hear from employees that they want to work from home but can’t- now have to burn leave. Either

everyone gets paid, or everyone has ability to telework. Otherwise, will be inconsistent from one employee to the next.

- JG: consistency doesn't work with today's workforce.
- MP: also have people who live 2 hours away. Are they paid for commute time? If weather is bad, can take that much longer.
- NH: intent is equitable treatment. Doesn't mean can't get there, just need to wordsmith.
- TH: what is percentage of 1553S that can telework?
- NH: don't have any data.

Prop 8: Classification/Reclassification

Article 14.1.3:

NH: Rejecting, 14 calendar days is really tight. Reject- too tight of turnaround. What to do with weekends, or holidays?

Articles 14.2, 14.3, 14.4, 14.5

- NH: get rid of reclassification, pay increase. Think it is import so that know what is going to happen, it is needed. Need language. Spells out what happens with rates of pay.

Article 14.6: Starting Rates:

- NH: Union proposed going back to 7 steps. Starting pay upon initial employment what would be the language if we go back to a 7-step scale. I started at step 1, now at step 3. Some of this language will affect. Heartburn-a big thing is not leapfrogging. Now that recruitment has changed, County wants to bring someone in from the outside and pay them more. Isn't right. If surpass current employee, leads to problems. Current language spells out that it requires mutual agreement. Union can do damage control in selling to leapfrogged employees. Can't explain to employee. Want everything above board. We understand the intent, advance step surpasses a current employee, this helps alleviate and you can show the reason, we can do some behind the scenes, to help minimize EE issues.HK: how would you deal with the situation now with the needs to make an offer quickly?
- MP: if leapfrogging was going to occur, bring all employees up to same step?
- SE: would experience be a consideration?
- MP: Employee may have worked in other lower-level position- has done their time, come through County ranks.
- (discussion about what experience is looked at- apples to apples, not a willy filly process)
- JG: need to be able to justify actions; otherwise, opens up to a pay equity lawsuit
- MP: there's a lot of gray area
- NH: proposed language gives County carte blanche in step placement. Don't want current employees surpassed. People from outside may have other experience but don't know County the way a current employee would.
- NH: Also, not fair for people who promote from within. Language dictates step placement upon promotion. Existing language provides predictability.

Article 14.6.5:

- NH: reject. Need to clarify, what is a step? Want to keep percentages in there, steps at 5.12%. Current language based on 13 step salary plans; union wants to revert to 7 step ranges.

Article 14.7:

- NH: problem with “an increase” and no guarantee. What if it’s 5 cents/hour? Want all reference to steps to be 5.12%. Want everyone to be on the same page.
- NH: what is a non-competitive recruitment:
- JG: references reclass. County wants to get away from- all vacancies will be posted.
- NH: language needs to be spelled out that competitive recruitments will all be posted. Still need to make sure everyone is on the same page about what a “step” is. Rejecting proposals that refer to 1-step as 2.56%, because they want to go back to 7-step range.

Article 14.8:

- NH: Disagree with “an increase’- no guarantee on amount. Need predictability for minimum increase. – Removing 5.12 is a concern no guarantee of what the amount is. What some predictability.

Article 14.10:

- NH: (demotion) need language in 14.10.2. Employee s/b able to revert, as well as employer. should be employee or supervisor deciding if this is a good fit.

Article 14.12:

- NH: counter propose with edits to reference correct articles

Prop 9: Seniority

- NH: The Union rejects. How is this any different than employee requesting LOA to travel abroad? It’s an “authorized LOA”- for whatever reason. Understands historic – Gordon & Dean went to union from County; why wouldn’t County want them back?
- JG: understand why they do it, especial in law enforcement, but not sitting very well.

Prop 10: Discipline and Discharge

- NH: cleanup is TA’d. Asked about prior org chart request. Want 7 steps of JC included

Prop 11: Grievance Procedure

- NH: clean up is TA’d

Article 18.6:

- NH: reject 45 days limitation. No counter. Didn’t like proposal.

Prop 12: Promotion/Vacancies/Reassignments

- NH: Need to word smith. Is intent that person has completed probation?
- JG: we’ll discuss in caucus.

- NH: would language about leaves taken during probation also apply here? Understand intent.
- NH: value in keeping option for either employees or supervisor to apply a bump back.
- NH: for employees hired outside County, first 12 months is review (?) Discussed earlier (how leave time impacts). Current language denotes its paid time.
- NH: voluntary demotions. Union thinks it's been a valuable tool- has helped in some circumstances. Life situations change.
- JG: what if position isn't available? Anything moving forward will be a competitive recruitment.
- NH: why waste everyone's time to post?
- JG: why should only 1 person have priority to fill a position? Entire intent is to have open, competitive recruitments.
- NH: has resolved issues in other locals

(discussion about situations where voluntary demotions have come about)

Prop 13: General Conditions

Article 21.2 Personnel files & Civil Service.

- NH: One personnel file, either in HR or CS (?)
- JG: there is 1 personnel file. Departments can keep their own files- working files. Official file is the one in HR or CS (for Sheriff employees).
- NH: (clarification that Sheriff Office employees only have a Civil Svc file?) One file, either HR or Civil Svc is the keeper of the file. What happens when employees move from one side to another? Specifically, when non-Civil Service employee moves to Civil Service. Does HR send over the file?

Article 21.3: Information Request

- NH: isn't always just the business agent making request. County's intent to limit?
- JG: yes- all info requests needs to be filtered through business reps. Union could also designate one other person- not just "or designee".
- NH: would County be OK to say "union officer"?
- JG: want to have as narrow a scope as possible.
- MP: business rep could be out on sick leave or vacation...
- JG: just don't want it opened up to several other people.
- NH: heard County's interest, but very narrow.
- JG: hardly ever happens, but certain requests shouldn't be made under union requests
- NH: Information requests – want to verify, that you are saying the business rep as in "Me" Natalie.
- JG: Yes this is our intent – Gordon brought this up, if you want to designate one person when you are unavailable that is ok.
- NH: what if it stated Union Officer? What if I am out, and Michelle on FMLA at same time. Then other officer?
- JG: No, the idea it is keep as closest is possible.

Article 21.4: Dress code.

- NH: Was actually an interest of the County to include. Want to make sure with deleting?
- JG: County has a dress code policy; new leadership doesn't think it's necessary
- NH: We believe this item needs more discussion, so no response given by the Union.
- JG: I don't know why County add that if we have.

Article 21.7: Mileage

- NH: need to word smith, question has come up. "all miles driven" commute is not included. Should clear up language. Clarify the all miles driven. How does it factor in, if driving from home?
- RB: wanting clarification on which miles count.

Article 21.9 reasonable suspicion:

- NH: we do not believe it is a benefit to remove this. There is a county policy, was this negotiated with 1553-S no, but this one has. Was a big interest of the County to get into contract. Not beneficial to remove from contract. County policy hasn't been negotiated with 1553S, but this language has. Assures if changes are made to process, will be negotiated.
- NH: Supplement vs. supplant- need to shore up what we're really talking about. Emergency situation? Non rep working in ripped position all day? 30 minutes? What is a "short period of time", what is an emergency? May be different from one department to another?
- JG: Are we supposed to do? If all the employees are out, then what? Just let work sit?
- NH: Are there employees in the base unit who could do OOC work? Would prefer that to allowing a non-rep to do the work. Understand intent is not to supplant, but need stricter parameters.
- JG: if doing work 1-3 months... that's a long time. But 1 week? That's a short period of time (example of COVID). If a person can step in immediately, that's a much better way to go – no training required.
- JG: if more than 1 month, questions will be asked. Are they needing to fill the position? What's going on? Would need very very good reason for why it would exceed 1 month.
- NH: "short period of time" is subjective.
- MP: juvenile tries to open up for voluntary OT first.
- JG: what happens in emergency situation?
- TH: what about using "temporary"?
- JG: semantics.
- NH: would like first opportunity to be OT to other supervisors. Don't automatically go to non-rep employee.

Prop 14: Lockout and Strikes

- NH: need more discussion. What would County call information picket?
- JG: union had a right to do. CBA had expired.
- NH: so it only applies during the term of the agreement?
- JG: believes it's state law that union cannot strike?
- NH: they can, and they have. Need to clarify timeframe.

Prop 15: Authorized Agents

- NH: TA on clean up language.

Prop 16: Effective date, contract period and changes

- NH: TA on mutually agreed upon term.

Prop 17: Signatures update

- NH: Clean up on signature line edits

Prop 18: Appendix #1 – Local 1553-S Classifications

- NH:HR would need to update Appendix 1 with correct job codes & titles

Prop 19: Appendix #2 Seven Steps of Just Cause Discipline

- NH: Want 7 steps to remain in CBA

Prop 20: Normal (Lag) Pay System

- HB: Michelle and Lyle weren't part of the initial discussions. Requested Randy walk through exactly what process is.
- JG: will discuss in caucus and come back with more info.

Prop 21: Minor clean up items:

- NH: TA on clean up language (typos)
- NH: when formatting was done last go around, creating a lot of different issues.
- JG: will get union a clean copy with correct formatting.
- JG: have had to scan in a lot of pdf's and convert to word. Trying to clean up the CBA's.
- JG: provided org chart of County- with caveat a couple of positions notated as vacant have been filled (Cat Nichols & Mike Sparber).

Caucus at 11:42am- take lunch

Reconvene 2:09pm

Housekeeping- any TA's will be routed electronically -via AdobeSign- no longer have DocuSign license.
NH: Tuesday work the best for Michelle P.

Josh provided County responses- all comments below were made by Josh Groat, unless otherwise noted

Prop 2: we heard you, you want us to remain neutral, do not agree and leave it crossed out. Not in agreement with remaining neutral. Union should be providing us with docs; employees should give

authorization to union, then union send it to County. Union should be providing to us the authorization cards, we will keep a copy in a secure location for union to review and vice versa.

Article 5.3 and 5.4: (NEO) maintain County's initial proposal

Article 5.7: (Definitions)- leave in, except the home mailing and phone, consistent with prior. Clean up probationary period, added in 5.6.4 section.

- New hire
- Promotional

Added Probationary Period definitions (5.6.4 currently)

- JG: other language in CBA regarding probationary period has been stricken
- NH: under 5.6.4.4: anytime for 6 months, can revert if DH/EO is OK with it?
- JG: may be clarified later. This would be appropriate for the 12 months not any extension periods.

Prop 3:

Article 7.3- no changes, absences of 15+ minutes using leave slip.

- MP: what is workplace? If in current office, hasn't left "workplace", how does that apply?
- JG: not proposing any change to "workplace"... status quo on how it's being applied now

Article 7.3.1: clarified 1553S employee

- JG: what is purpose of including "designated"?
- NH: delineates a specific work unit. Would you consider the jail a work unit? Or is it Detention vs Probation?
- JG: we discussed as well... work unit is defined in CBA as a group of employees who answer to a common supervisor.
- NH: "supervisor" is immediate supervisor? How many levels up?
- (discussion regarding "work unit" and "supervisor")
- JG: our proposal isn't changing definition of work unit

Prop 4:

The answer is kept it. We are, once again, if going to change it is going to change to everyone.

If we want to make a change, we want to make change to all employees covered under plan. Do not want various unions in various STD and LTD plans.

Prop 6:

Article 12.1.3: heard you, updated language Added "no more than" and "no less than"- still has standard 5 follow by 2, unless Employee and Manager agree to something different.

Article 12.1.3.2: withdrew "may".

Article 12.2: maintain original proposals

Prop 7:

Article 13.3 Leave of Absence –

- JG: we need to determine the length of time employee has to make up time. You wanted consistency, so we made it, regardless of if employee can work from home. Can you imagine a time when Operations is shut down, and paid them? Can this language fill this situations if county decides to pay employees?
- NH: we understand your intent of the language.

Article 13.3.2- conceptually we're good, need to make sure we're handling it correctly per FLSA

Article 13.3.3: Union wanted consistency- for ALL employees, may elect to go unpaid or use accruals

- NH: if ever declared as paid leave, would this verbiage lock employees in?
- JG: would need to be handled on a case-by-case basically.

Prop 8:

Article 14.1.3 : we think 14 days is more than enough time for class spec changes. Mostly with complete information from County to what and why, still provides the opportunity to extend by mutual agreement

Article 14.2: moving away from reclassifications- want to move toward open process across the board. County may initiate a reclassification, want to get to competitive posting.

Article 14.3: Added language regarding wage adjustments. Union must request to bargain impacts

Articles 14.4 and 14.5- still proposing to eliminate

Article 14.6: heard concern about leapfrogging, but it limits our ability to offer advanced steps.

Article 14.7: agree to maintain at least a 5% increase upon promotion

Article 14.8: if, for some reason, ever a need- agree it will be at least a 5% increase.

- NH: regarding reclasses... will employer be the only one to initiate?
- JG: yes- County driven process.
- NH: if assigned additional work that is outside current classification. If employer is the only one who can bring issue forward, what does that look like?
- JG: HR would look at it... go through process to determine which is appropriate classification and make determination.
- NH: same example- employee brings it up to dept, dept says just keep doing it. What is recourse for employee? What if this goes on for 2 year?
- JG: it would be on department to pursue reclassification. Should be between department & HR, not an employee-driven process.

Article 14.10.2: withdrawing change

Article 14.12: still striking language.

Prop 9:

Maintain if employee wants to take position outside county, lose seniority.

Prop 10:

Article 17.4 withdrew proposed deletion of 7 Steps... now a TA in full

Prop 11:

Article 18.6- maintaining our proposal. County wants language- if there is a specific timeframe other than 45 days, we'd be open to talking about it, but need to have something.

Prop 12:

transferred some of this language to definitions. In some cases, was deleted- dictates terms of other contracts- cannot do that. Would just apply whatever verbiage is in prior contract. One CBA can't dictate the terms of another.

- JG: both employee and supervisor can invoke bumping, but needs to be within 30 days
- JG: (3) also dictates terms of another CBA
- JG: (4) moved to probationary period definitions
- NH: with reference to "days"... are they calendar or working?
- JG: calendar

Article 19.4 Demotions- not aware of any examples in 1553S where an employee has requested to demote outside of applying for a lower-level position. (discussion followed)

- HB: We are not aware of voluntary demotions, one of discipline, and then two detective. More fluid in DSA

Prop 13:

need further clarification on what happens if employee files transfer from HR to Civil Svc (or vice versa)- don't believe they currently transfer

- NH: has found that files need to be requested from both

Article 21.4: Dress Code language has been around a very long time- still propose to remove

Article 21.9: Risk Management has a policy that should be followed- still want to strike

Supplement vs. supplant: length of time cannot be determined, could vary from department to department- might be 1 week, might be 3 weeks, could be 2 months. Doesn't make sense to train someone to do the work. No way to put specific parameters around – maintaining original proposal.

Article 21.7: IRS provision is too long to include... just added "business miles". IRS rules may change.

Prop 14:

looking into further

Prop 19:

County withdrawing

Prop 20:

- RB: 2 phases. Currently 15% of employees are on lag pay. Current pay days are 15th and end of month. All time worked 1st-15th, paid on 22nd. All time worked 16th- end of month, paid on 7th. Actual pay days will shift. A variety of options are being offered to bridge the current pay day to the new proposed pay day. Not currently looking at bi-weekly... will keep semi-monthly.
- JG: County will be moving to a new time system.
- NH: # of pay periods changing to 26?
- JG: not slamming door on bi-weekly; depends on what time keeping system we move to.
- RB: will implement lag, then look at moving various groups to new time keeping systems. Will take additional time. Trying to eliminate manual processes being used today.

(add'l discussion regarding implementation of lag vs. implementation of time keeping system)

- JG: 0% loan option is least likely to be offered as an option- not shutting anything out, but is less likely than the other options to be offered.
- NH: intent to cash out up to 1 week, or up to 40?
- JG: 1 week, either 37.5 or 40
- NH: any other options at this point?
- JG: not right now, but open to other ideas
- NH: any talk about cashing out additional time if lag is longer than 5 days?
- JG: limited to 1 week

Prop 21:

- JG: must have a full TA for proposals to be TA'd- not individual elements.
- NH: any responses to Union proposals
- JG: only to non-economic
- NH: any response to economics?
- JG: can't say for sure. Wants to see what kind of progress we make between now and next meeting.

Article 21.2 personnel file comments-

- NH: how will it work with benefits? Does Civil Service receive benefit info from HR? Maybe need some type of definition of personnel file(?) Need some clarification around what's in the HR file and what's in the Civil Svc file...

Will look at additional future dates.

Meeting ended 3:26pm