

## **Open Work Session**

### **Personnel Manual – Chapters 15 through 19**

**December 5, 2017**

Mr. Matt Creamer, Former Council Administrator, Mrs. Sharon Morris, Former Deputy Director of Administration, and Mr. Ed Baker, Former County Attorney, came before Council. Mrs. Morris said Chapter 15 is the Employee Assistance Program, otherwise known as EAP. She said it is a program designed to assist employees who may be struggling with life choices, alcohol or substance abuse, emotional or sexual abuse, financial difficulties or marital problems, family concerns, or stress management. She said the program is designed to confidentially provide an avenue where employees can seek assistance. She said, if the employee is referred by the supervisor, the supervisor then gets documentation as to the outcome of their treatment. She said, if the employee goes on their own, which they can do as well, then the information is confidential. She said the employee's initial assessment for service for short-term counseling is paid both by the employer and health insurance. She said if it is a longer term, the employee's health insurance plan covers costs. She said the employee is allowed to use administrative leave to attend up to three counseling sessions, and then, after that, the employee has to use vacation time and/or sick leave in order to make the sessions if they are during normal work hours. She said this does not take away from any disciplines that may be impending for the employee who has behavior that is not becoming to the job performance. She said, again, everything is confidential, and it is a volunteer program. Mr. Cannon asked who the local provider is, to which Mrs. Morris responded, it is contracted, and that is subject to change. Mr. Cannon asked if it is a company or an individual, to which Mr. Creamer responded, it is an individual. Mr. Wayne Strausburg, Director of Administration, clarified, it is an individual, a local psychologist. Mr. Creamer said the previous provider was local also, and like any vendor, it can change. He said that is one of the changes in this manual that Council does not see, but the current manual names a specific provider, and that really should not be the case. Mr. Cannon said he agrees.

Mr. Creamer said Chapter 16 begins on page 97 and refers to travel, meals, and lodging. He said the purpose is to ensure that employees who are required to travel in the conduct of business of the County are reimbursed for appropriate approved expenses, such as travel, meals, and lodging, as are detailed in the chapter to come. He said all travel must be approved by the Department Head, or Supervisor, and the County uses a per diem amount, which is subject to change over time, and the expenses that are reimbursable are meals, including taxes, tips, and may be reimbursed up to the maximum per diem total for time away on County business. He said there are two types, no overnight stay, and overnight stay. He said reimbursements for meals are made on a per diem basis, and the U.S. General Services Administration annual rate is the rate that is used. He further said the General Services Administration has documents for the State of Maryland, and they are adopted yearly by the Federal Government, and these are available to Council when they get the additions they have developed, if Council is interested in that. Mrs. Laura Hurley, County Administrator, said an example of that is on the Council table. Mr. Creamer said then he will not spend any more time on that, as it has already been reviewed. Mr. Creamer said, with overnight stays, the reimbursement for meals will be made on a per diem basis, either in whole or in part, at an annually established per diem rate set by the GSA. He said reimbursement would also include the full cost of any conference fees, parking, tolls, taxis, rental cars, and reasonable travel costs which are documented by a receipt. He said he is not always going to mention it, but it is always documentation by a receipt. Mr. Kilmer asked if this is consistent with the current practice, or is this a change, to which Mr. Creamer responded, it is. He said he is not sure if the GSA rate is currently the guide. Mr. Kilmer clarified, he means the per diem rate, in terms of how the per

diem rate is split up. Mr. Creamer said he had not gotten to that yet, but since Mr. Kilmer mentioned it, that is a change the committee is recommending, and it is a lot more complicated than it needs to be. He said the committee is recommending section 16:03 be deleted in its entirety. He said there are a couple of other places where there is reference made, and that language would just come out, and he will not mention those. He said, in reference to mileage in Chapter 16-02(d), travel is not always by public conveyance or County vehicle. He said sometimes people use their own vehicles, and that is out of necessity. He said, if a County vehicle is available, that is the preferred choice, for obvious reasons. He said employees or County officials are reimbursed at the IRS rates that are adopted every year, and sometimes, once in a while, they change during the year, but that is not often. He said the County does use the IRS reimbursement rate. He said, of course, there is no mileage reimbursement if a County vehicle is used. He said per diem means a day, and an employee cannot use excess per diems that he or she did not spend one day, and save it up to move over to the next day. He said the reimbursement for a day is a day. He said they have covered 16-02(l), which is in reference to reporting with receipts. He said an expense report will be required to be completed and submitted to the employee's Department Head within ten days of the return from travel, and original receipts are required. He said, if more than one person is covered by a receipt, the names of the persons involved by the receipt must be written on the back. He said he would like to call Council's attention to section 16-05 at the bottom of Page 98. He read "Elected officials will be reimbursed for reasonable actual expenditures documented by a receipt." He said the committee did not talk about this in their reviews, but he believes this is an appropriate place, based on his experience, to include the Director of Administration, as compared to the County Executive, and the Council Administrator, with regard to the Legislative Body, because a high percentage of the time, travel involving one involves the key staff person, and that is who usually picks up the bill, so he thinks this would be an appropriate place for that to be located. He said those expenses, for example, the Council Administrator's expense report, would be reviewed and approved by the County Council President, and, in the case of the Director of Administration, presumably the County Executive, or whatever arrangements would be appropriate in the Executive Branch. He said that is it for Chapter 16, and it is pretty straightforward the way they have tried to trim it down. Mr. Joe Holloway said Mr. Creamer did not cover section 16-06, to which Mr. Creamer responded, he thought that was pretty straightforward. He read "Travel during normal business hours is considered hours worked, and travel outside of normal business hours may be considered compensatory time, or overtime, in compliance with the compensatory overtime provisions of the manual in other chapters."

Mr. Baker said, in reference to Chapter 17, there are only a couple of places where there were any major changes. He said Chapter 17 is made up in large part by the existing Chapter 26 of the current manual, and they have improved verbiage in a number of places without making any real change. He said the first change they made is in 17-03(a), which is on Page 99, Application for Retirement. He said it provides an employee contemplating retirement to contact HR, as well as the employee's supervisor, no less than 60 days prior to the anticipated date, and providing less than 60 days' notice may result in a delay of pension payments. He said that sentence is out of order, and it should be after notification to HR. He said, essentially, when an employee is going to retire, he notifies HR, and that is existing policy, and it should be done within 60 days. He said the reason for that is, one of the things HR has to do is get the pension information from the actuary, and list all the different options the employee has, which can take a period of time. He said that is why the committee put in there that, if they give less than 60 days' notice, and if that information cannot come back, instead of having a pension check the next month after retiring, it may be delayed some. Mr. Joe Holloway said when they say "may", that sounds like it could be up to whoever is doing the work. He asked if that should be changed to "would" or "shall be"? He said otherwise, it is discretionary on, for example, if maybe it is somebody's friend, or maybe it is not. Mr. Baker said he suspects that HR would be doing this on a routine basis, and the only thing that would

foul it up would be if there is a delay in getting the report back. He said the vast majority of time, that is not going to happen because there are provisions that any employee can get up to a certain number of evaluations of where they stand in retirement, and he thinks most people, when contemplating retirement, start looking out a year in getting those reports once or twice over that period before they hit the 60-day period. He said he does not know of anybody who has ever been delayed in getting a pension the next month. Mr. Cannon asked if this chapter is the retirement plan, or if that is a separate document, to which Mr. Baker responded, no, and in the first paragraph it says this is offering a summary of it, but the actual retirement plan is in the retirement document. Mr. Cannon said that is what confused him, and he was not sure if, since the Personnel Manual constantly refers to a retirement plan, Council should see the retirement plan, or if that is beyond their scope. Mr. Creamer said it is a public document as such. He said a Personnel Manual, in whatever form Council decides, will be adopted by Legislation. He said he believes the retirement plan for Wicomico County was approved by Legislation as well, but that was before his time. Mr. Baker said, Council may recall, the prior Council did a number of changes to it. He said, for example, there was a provision in there that if the employee steals from the County, they forfeit their pension. He said there are a number of different changes that can be made to it, but all the terms relating to retirement are in that plan. Mr. Cannon said he did not know whether this was part of the scope of the committee's review or not, to which Mr. Baker responded, it was not. Mrs. Morris said it is a simple document, and maybe Mr. Cannon should take a look at it. Mr. Baker said that is what brings them to section 17-04. He said, over the years, there have been a number of different changes to how many years an employee has to have in, and this is a recital of all of those changes. He said, otherwise, most of it is the same as the existing manual. He said section 17-03(b) refers to what Mr. Joe Holloway was asking about. He said the employee can get two estimates in that first year, and most people are doing that. He said most of the provisions under section 17-04, which deals with health insurance eligibility and years of service, are out of section 26-06(b) in the existing plan, and have just been restructured a little bit, and put in different order. He said if Council has any questions about it, he can go over each one. He said the biggest change in section 17-05 is on page 100, which talks about the County's provision of medical health coverage, dental and vision, and calls for meaningful reflection. He said this one seems to have caused the biggest concern from retirees. He said he is not in touch with a lot of retirees, and, he can tell Council, the change to United Health Care caused no hiccup for himself personally, but each individual person is affected differently, mainly in the prescription area. He said insurance companies can change their formulary often, and that can have a large impact. He said one of the tasks the committee looked at was what they could do about it, and, starting in Paragraph 17-05(a), the fourth line down, is where he attempted to kick the bucket to Council, and it should be. He said it is a very difficult policy decision. He said by word-of-mouth, and the committee did not have access to any actual numbers, the number of retirees impacted was relatively small. He said some of the retirees he knows personally were able to go back to United Health Care, get the formulary changed, and an alternative was made for them. He said what the committee has suggested as a placeholder for Council is, when they reach the age that Medicare becomes mandatory, retirees would be allowed to remain on active employee health insurance as secondary, which is similar to the way it was before the County went to United Health, or they could go to the supplemental plan, and the County would provide a trust for catastrophic prescription costs for retirees who have prescriptions that are not covered under the Medicare supplement plan. He said there was some confusion about what this meant, or what the committee intended it to mean. He said the committee intended it to mean that the County, meaning the Executive and Council, would come up with the trust terms. He said this would be very similar for what was done for the volunteer firemen's life insurance and death benefit, and he believes a similar thing was done for the deputies to have a trust fund, or some funds available, if they were killed or injured in the line of duty. He said it would be something along those lines, but primarily it would be the County determining what the terms are. Mr. Joe

Holloway asked, being they have this trust for the firemen and sheriff's deputies, would it be advantageous to put those three trust funds together, and manage them in that fashion. Mr. Wayne Strausburg, Director of Administration, came to the podium. He said they are really talking apples and oranges here. He said they have already had an actuary estimate catastrophic pharmaceutical coverage. He said they are talking about a million-dollar trust just to set it up. He said when the pharmaceutical coverages in group policies have been exhausted, they are talking about enormous medical costs, so he thinks they need to be extremely careful with this. He repeated, very, very careful with this. Mr. Baker said, to address what Mr. Strausburg is saying, that is what he was trying to explain. He said the committee is not saying to set up a trust that will pay dollar-for-dollar every out-of-pocket cost for catastrophic prescriptions, but they are saying to set up a trust to address the issue. He further said, if that is the way Council wants to go, they would define the terms, and they could say they are only going to give the retiree 10 percent copay, or they could say they would cover it 100 percent. He said, as Mr. Strausburg pointed out, some of these employees are paying \$7,000-\$8,000 a month, and that could be catastrophic to set up a trust and repay all of that for the lifetime of the employee. He said all that the committee is saying is this is a mechanism that could be put into place for whatever Council decided they wanted to pay. Mr. Joe Holloway said he was misinterpreting this to think that the County Executive's Office had already worked on this. Mr. Strausburg said, if they were going to do that, why would they not do that for active employees? He said he is not quite sure he understands the philosophy. Mr. Creamer said he will comment on how this all came about. He said he thinks Council will remember, early in this Council term, they were reviewing a portion of a new personnel manual, in reference to cost of prescriptions, and they had a number of employees come in, some of which were very much agonized. He clarified, these were all retirees, as current employees are covered under the terms of current coverage with Carefirst, and this is altogether different. He said the committee did not have access to any research or actuarial figures, but this is an idea only to be given consideration, if Council and the Executive were to try to address the catastrophic costs they have just talked about. He clarified, it was not the committee's thinking that it would be 100 percent paid by the County. He said they recommended the change of adding two words to say "The County will provide a trust to defray catastrophic prescription costs." He said that is an amount to be determined, and it could change from year to year, depending upon whether or not there was money appropriated in the budget for that purpose. He said Council may scrap it altogether, because when the numbers come in, which the committee has not seen, it just may not be possible. He said the committee thought Council would want an effort to be made to address issues that were not covered. Mr. Joe Holloway addressed Mr. Strausburg, and said he was at that meeting at the Civic Center, and their main concern was with prescriptions that night, and Mr. Strausburg referred to it as a "donut hole." Mr. Joe Holloway continued, Mr. Strausburg said the County would try to do something to fill that "donut hole." He asked if that has been done, and if there has been any work on that, to which Mr. Strausburg responded, he has not found anything that would reasonably cover the kinds of catastrophic costs they are talking about. He said they have to define "catastrophic costs," and he thinks everybody here knows that about 80 percent of someone's lifetime medical costs are incurred during their last six to nine months of life, and they can be enormous. He said he just urges caution, because they are getting into an area of fiscal impact, particularly as they cast out the direction health coverage and health costs are taking, and they could be taking on something that is just not sustainable. Mr. Joe Holloway said he understands that, but he also understands that a lot of folks who are in the retirement system, or will soon be in the retirement system, are expecting what was promised them. He asked if something should first be changed with new hires coming into the system, so they are not expecting this when it is something that has not been done. He said further attention should be given to what the "donut hole" is, so to say. Mr. Strausburg said, certainly if they could find a reasonable solution to the "donut hole," they would like to find that. He said the point of clarification, however, is that he thinks it was widely interpreted that this

was a change in the personnel manual. He said the personnel manual that exists now has always stipulated when retirees reach Medicare age, they go into the plan the County puts these folks in. He said the trigger for it, and Mr. Joe Holloway may remember this, was the significant increase in premiums two years ago. He said, in making that change, and he is going by memory, he thinks the County saved on the order of \$350,000 by making a change that was already embedded in the personnel manual. He said, certainly, he agrees there should be discussion about what the County can do, because people are living longer, and they are going to need prescription medications for much, much longer periods of time. He said he is just urging caution when they begin to talk about a catastrophic trust, because it can get really expensive. Mr. Cannon said, with the \$350,000 savings the County made, depending on the degree of people who fell through the "donut hole," would it be possible to take any portion of that \$350,000, and compensate the individuals who are having problems, to which Mr. Strausburg responded, such as to do a set-aside. Mr. Strausburg said, one of the things they have to be careful of when they begin to go down that road is they do not want to set themselves up where they begin to have, for lack of any better term, a discriminatory insurance benefit. He said, could the County do something like that? He is pretty sure they could figure something like that out, but it has to be affordable. He said they also have to craft it in a way that they cannot be charged with discriminatory practice, and that is the reason he asked the question about active employees. He said, if they are going to extend that benefit to retired employees, and not extend that same benefit to active employees, that is a slippery slope, so he is just simply urging caution. He clarified, he is not arguing with Council, he is urging caution. Mr. Creamer said active employees are covered fully already, to which Mr. Strausburg responded, no, there is a cap on pharmaceutical coverages. Mr. Cannon asked for clarification, to which Mr. Strausburg responded, there is a stop loss. Mr. Cannon said he does not think there was any complaint on that, and that was understood. He said there was just concern that, when the policy changed, they fell through the loophole between Medicare, to which Mr. Strausburg responded, he understands that. Mr. Cannon said he appreciates the fact the committee put this in there, because Council knew there was a serious problem that needed to be addressed, and this is an effort. He said, the only thing is, to go further with this, in light of what Mr. Strausburg is saying, this cannot be open-ended or vague. He said it has to be very specific, and it might even be so much to say that, in this particular section, they refer to another document that gets established with parameters. Mr. Creamer said that is a possibility. Mr. Cannon said there has to be a discussion, and the other thing he wants to know is how this would be administered, and who would have that authority. He said insurance companies have all their plans in place as to how they do it, so what would the County do? He said he is not being facetious, but he is actually asking where they would send them. Mrs. Morris said it probably should be made of a committee of people, rather than an individual, to which Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Creamer said the committee was thinking, at the very least, there would be a subject to appropriation clause in here, so that it is not an open-ended free pass to the treasury. Mr. Cannon said it is really good to have it here as part of the discussion. Mr. Creamer said this probably has the biggest potential in this whole exercise, but, then again, there have been more concerns expressed by employees as well.

Mr. Baker said, other than letting Council have that problem back, the only other change is really not substantial, and that is on the top of Page 101, Paragraphs A and B. He said the same concept is in the existing manual that basically said the retiree must make arrangements with HR to pay the premium. He said it was a little more general in the existing manual, so the committee provided, for both the retiree and the surviving spouse and dependents, if they fall two months behind in the rears, coverage would be terminated. Mr. Cannon asked if they would need an appeals board for that, to which Mr. Baker responded, it is relatively common that if someone does not pay their health insurance, they will be cut off. Mr. Creamer said he would like to add, and this is not related to the subject, but it is the retiree's

responsibility to make sure that he or she makes the monthly payments. He said HR makes that as convenient as it possibly can, because they send out a notice every month, and it is not something that someone can easily forget. He said somebody may say that, but he cannot imagine the County doing anything that would be more helpful than what they are already doing.

Mrs. Morris said Chapter 18, Personnel Records Management, is very similar to Chapter 5 in the old manual from 2003 that is already adopted. She said the purpose of this is to establish and maintain clear lines of authority for the processing of personnel transactions, and management of all personnel records. She said nothing has changed in the first part of this, and she will just point out a couple of things that she thinks are important. She said, if Council does not have any questions on section 18-01, she would like to go to section 18-02, because it is important they know this has not changed from 2003. She said what has happened here is a matter of processes. She said she will take Council back to a time when none of them were probably here, but the Finance Department gave part of its space to the IT Department. She said they housed Payroll in the back where IT went, so the Payroll Department was moved downstairs where there was space. She said it was not a procedure, and it was not anything more than the Director of Finance saying they were running out of space, and if the IT Department is going to take it, they have to put the Payroll people somewhere. She said those people in Payroll, and the processors of Payroll, went to Human Resources because there was space there. Mr. Cannon clarified, it was just a physical location, to which Mrs. Morris responded, it was a physical location. She said in section 18-02(a) it says the Director of Human Resources shall be designated as the official custodian of all personnel files. She said this document says all payroll files because of the physical relocation of those people, and ultimately that function was best suited in that area. She clarified, the Payroll people physically moved, and she believes at that time it was a person, not several people, but they physically moved from the back of the Finance Office to downstairs for space. Mr. Joe Holloway said they always compare themselves to other Counties, and he asked how other Counties handle that, and if they have Payroll in Finance, or do they have it in HR, to which Mrs. Morris responded, she would not know that. Mr. Strausburg said it is all over the place. Mr. Cannon asked if they are changing this, to which Mrs. Morris responded, they did not change it. Mr. Cannon said, but it is scratched through, and it is the only thing, he thinks, in this entire document that actually has a strikethrough, to which Mrs. Morris responded, that was for the committee's purposes, and to remind them it was only a physical relocation. Mr. Cannon asked if she is suggesting that the payroll files, as a normal fact, are in Finance and not HR, or should be, to which Mrs. Morris responded, she is not going to make a suggestion. Mr. Cannon asked if that is what the strikethrough suggests, to which Mrs. Morris responded, what the strikethrough suggests is that where they were is where they should be housed. She said if Council wants to change that, then they have to do something with this document to make that happen. She said the 2003 document and what is proposed here are the same, and the Director of Finance shall have the overall responsibility for establishing, maintaining, and coordinating all County employee records related to payroll functions, and then it lists them. She said it is exactly the same in the old document, and the committee did not change it. Mr. Cannon asked, if Council were to want to change that, and put payroll files under Director of Finance, then would they have to add it as another bullet point, to which Mr. Baker responded, it is already in there at section 18-02(b). Mrs. Morris said, again, this was done before some of the other processes. She said many times things were done because they were efficient practices, and not policies. She said when the Personnel Action Notification Form was used in paper form, there were three copies. She said one went to Finance, because Finance had to always confirm that the money was there, the other copy went to HR, because it goes in the employee's permanent file, and the third copy went to the Department who made the recommendation for whatever the change was. She said the committee is not suggesting any change, and it is already stated what is in each department. She said, if for some reason Council wants to move it, or the Executive proposes to move it,

in order to continue it as it is practiced, they would have to make that change. Mr. Cannon asked if they would then strikeout the term "All payroll files," and would that be all, because all of the bullet points under Director of Finance are payroll files, to which Mr. Baker responded, that would make it clearer. Mr. Cannon said he did not know if payroll files themselves were a separate entity of information, for lack of a better word. Mrs. Morris said the Personnel Action Notification Form is designed such that it now incorporates everything needed on one document, and previously it was divided. Mrs. Morris said the rest talks about the release of information, and the employee having access to their file. She said Department Heads cannot circumvent or deny an employee's right to review, and if the employee wants to review their personnel file, someone from HR should be with them. Mr. Cannon asked, under Documents, should copies of those files be kept with the personnel records in HR, or are copies kept there? He read "If such files are working files and are not part of the official personnel record, the files are not subject to review," to which Mrs. Morris responded, those are files that Supervisors are allowed to keep themselves, and they do it as part of an employee's evaluation. She said they may have particular notes on an employee if, for instance, they did not want to discipline the employee, but they wanted to make a note that something happened. She said that way, if they had to refer back to it, it would be part of their own record. Mr. Cannon asked if that would be copied to HR, to which Mrs. Morris responded, not necessarily. She said it might now, she does not know. Mr. Cannon said he is not really familiar with how it all goes back and forth, so he is just asking, and it would seem to him that if there were some type of report a Supervisor or Department Head has, it would go to HR. Mr. Creamer clarified, formal evaluations are for the employee record. Mr. Creamer said he will give an example. He said, if an employee came in two minutes late, the Supervisor might make a note of that on such date. He said, over a period of time, the Supervisor might then realize they better go talk to that person. He said that conversation may be informal or formal, and that is all spelled out in the manual. He said, if it is formal, the Supervisor then has documentation that justifies the need to counsel the employee, and, depending on how serious it was, it may or may not be a formal complaint that goes down in the employee's record. He asked if that clarifies it, to which Mr. Cannon responded, yes.

Mrs. Morris said, under section 18-04(d), Department Heads and other Management Officials within the direct line of supervision, or officials as designated by law, may review an employee's personnel record. She said the committee is striking "With the approval of the Director of Human Resources," because a Department Head or Manager, or somebody who is authorized by County law, should be able to look at a personnel file if they have reason to. She said, of course, the County Attorney can do it at any time. Mr. Cannon clarified, they are striking that, to which Mrs. Morris responded, with the approval of the Director of Human Resources.

Mr. Cannon asked if Chapter 19 is just definitions, to which Mr. Baker responded, they went through the existing definitions section, deleted definitions that do not exist in the manual, and corrected the other ones, so hopefully they are all there. Mr. Creamer said he would like to call Council's attention to two definitions. He said the first is under Appointed Positions. He said there are two definitions, and there is some clarifying wording Council may want to look at. He said what is written is "An appointed position is a position that is at will. An employee in this position serves at the pleasure and discretion of the appointing officials subject to the personnel manual." He said, that is to say, "Appointed positions are subject to the personnel manual, except Chapter 13." He said Chapter 13 is the grievance chapter, and appointed officials do not have the protections that might be provided by the personnel manual. He said, in other words, an appointed person cannot appeal his supervisor, the person responsible for hiring him. He said, for example, in Council's case, the Legislature, and in the Executive's case, the Executive Branch. He said appointed positions do have access to health insurance and access to retirement, and that is the way it is. He said this clarifies the only place in the definitions, at least, that

appointed employees are not subject to Chapter 13 of the personnel manual, but they are subject to other parts. Mr. Cannon asked if the committee is suggesting that terminology be added, to which Mr. Creamer responded, yes, for the reason he just spoke of. He said the other change refers to the health insurance provision of the manual where the term "domestic partner" is used, and domestic partner may have many definitions to different people and circumstances. He said the committee suggests Council may want to add language that says a domestic partner, under this manual, is the same as defined in the Code of Public Rules and Regulations of the State of Maryland, Health and General Services, Section 101, under the Health section of Article 101. He said the State has a very specific set of criteria as to what constitutes a domestic partner. Mr. Joe Holloway clarified, Council should refer to the State's definition, to which Mr. Creamer responded, yes. He said it is not in the definitions, but since the term is used in a very important section of the manual, it deserves a definition, and the committee suggests Council uses the definition used by the State of Maryland.

Mr. Cannon said, with the changes suggested here at the table, and things that have a strikethrough, what will the committee bring to Council, such as this recommendation they have on this definition, so Council knows what the final changes are, and what the final documentation might look like. Mr. Creamer said Council deserves that clarification, but the committee needs some additional information from Council. He said he has heard several Councilmembers say they want more discussion, and he does not know just what they mean by that. Mr. Cannon said they will go through the process of a couple of Work Sessions to try to iron out what they have heard from the committee, and what Council wants to change, and then he guesses they will send that information back to the committee, and a final document will come back to Council. Mr. Baker said, eventually, the final document will be an entire personnel manual in the form of a Legislative Bill. Mr. Joe Holloway said this also has to be reviewed with the Executive's office. Mr. Creamer said the things Council has not reviewed yet, or at least that the committee has not reviewed yet either, are comments of employees, and the Executive sent a communication to Council, and those are certainly worthy of being addressed. Mr. Cannon said he was under the impression the committee had reviewed the comments from the employees and the Executive, to which the committee responded, no, they have not seen them. Mr. Kilmer asked if they have reviewed the old comments from the old manual, to which Mr. Creamer responded, at the beginning of this Council term, they reviewed them. Mr. Kilmer asked, so no employee comments on this manual have been taken into consideration, and no comments from the Executive on this manual have been taken into consideration, to which Mr. Creamer responded, that is correct. Mr. Cannon said he had just assumed all of that had been forwarded, and the letter that came from the Executive's office had been forwarded to the committee. Mr. Creamer said, if that is Mr. Cannon's wish, they can give them their thinking on that. Mrs. Hurley clarified, the committee has been provided with the employee comments, as well as the Executive's letter with those comments, but they have not been discussed as a group, if that helps. Mrs. Morris said she does not want to muddy this water, but her understanding was that Council wanted the committee, because they had done it, to present to Council what they had, and they have done that, and that is the groundwork. Mr. Kilmer said, if he could be presumptuous, he thinks probably they need to have the next series of Work Sessions with the Executive's Office to figure out what they think about this, and have Work Sessions with employee comments, or employees if they are allowed to. He said, like Mr. Joe Holloway said, this is just the beginning here, to which Mrs. Morris responded, it is, and Council definitely needs the Executive Office's involvement. Mr. Baker said he thinks between the committee's and Laura's help, they could generate a document with the few changes they recommended, give that to Council, and they can consider all comments, employee's and Executive's, and decide what to do. Mr. Creamer said some comments are going to be pretty easy to address, and there will be a few that take quite a bit of discussion, but the committee has not taken that





step among the three of them. He said the committee will, if that is what Mr. Cannon wants them to do. Mr. Cannon thanked them. There was no further discussion.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John T. Cannon, President

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Larry W. Dodd, Vice President, District 3

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ernest F. Davis, District 1

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marc Kilmer, District 2

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John B. Hall, District 4

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joe Holloway, District 5

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Matt Holloway, At-Large

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Laura Hurley, Council Administrator