8/20/93
FF)n S U

1033

MICHIGAN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

FACT-FINDING DISPUTE	)	FACT FINDING REPORT
between the	)	and
JUDGES OF THE PROBATE COURT	)	RECOMMENDATION
of	)	MERC Case #G91K-0696
BERRIEN COUNTY	)	August 20, 1993
and	)	Alvin N. Zachrich
THE BERRIEN COUNTY PROBATE & JUVENILE	))	Fact-Finder
COURT EMPLOYEES AFSCME LOCAL NO. 2757	))	
AFSCME/MICHIGAN COUNCIL NO.25	)	

RECEIVED
93 AUG 30 AM 9:52
STATE OF MICHIGAN
EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS
DETROIT OFFICE

Berrien County (Probate Court)

APPEARANCES

For The Union
Edward Morgan, Staff Representative
Freddie Moore, President AFSCME Local 2757
D.O. Spence, Register, Probate Court
Dick Paulsen, B C J C Steward

For The Employer
Thomas Byerly, County Attorney
Shelly Smith, Labor Relations Representative
Michael J. Moran III, Director Court Services
Beverly J. Ruis, Accounting Mgr. Probate Court
J. Mike Henry, County Coordinator
Stuart F. Meeks Jr., Chief Probate Court

BACKGROUND

The Berrien County Probate and Juvenile Court (hereinafter "Employer/County") and AFSCME, Michigan Council 25 (hereinafter "Union") have been negotiating since November 20, 1991 for a successor agreement that expired December 31, 1991. These negotiations led to (3) three mediation sessions in August and November 1992. The negotiations and mediations failed to resolve all of the impasse items between the parties. On 11/24/92 the Employer filed a request with MERC for fact-finding.

On June 1, 1993 the undersigned was appointed by MERC as the fact-finder in the matter captioned above. Subsequently a fact-finding hearing was held on August 3 & 4, 1993 in a conference room in the Berrien County Courthouse in St. Joseph, Michigan. At the hearing each party had the full opportunity to make its case before the fact-finder via exhibits, witnesses, argument and rebuttal. The fact-finder maintained and then utilized an electronic tape. It has been erased.

At the outset of the hearing the parties stipulated to the items at impasse before the fact-finder. Some issues were then resolved. There remained (4) four items before the fact-finder as set-out below:

Item #1 - Duration (Article 20, s.1)
Item #2 - Pension (Article 17, 6)
Item #3 - Health Insurance (Article 17, s.2)
Item #4 - Wages and Classifications

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. A comparison of the positions of the Union and the Employer on each of the (4) four Impasse Items is set-out on the following pages:

Item	Employer	Union
1. Duration	3 Years, effective first of the month contract is ratified.	3 Years, 1/1/92 - 12/31/94.
2. Pension	Union can have any benefit multiplier they desire provided they pay the actual cost of such multiplier; Add the following benefits at no additional cost to employee: a. Pop-up provision b. Up to 6 months of sick leave roll-over c. 5 year vesting d. Enhanced survivor benefits	Increase benefit multiplier to 2.2-1.8 fully funded by the employer; and decrease employee contribution to 3.5%

Item	Employer	Union
3. Health Insurance	Add $10.00 per pay period contribution (pre-tax basis); Delete "me-too" provision; cap chiropractic coverage; eliminate cap on post 65 retiree insurance premiums.	Allow opt-out plus $450.00 cash payment; Maintain cap on retiree insurance premiums
4. Wages and Classifications	New salary schedule and grades-effective the first month contract is ratified; Move onto new schedule at the step that affords the employee a raise; take next available step on normally scheduled date; If above the new schedule's maximum rate of pay, receive a 2.0% increase.	Signing bonus of $600.00 per employee; increase maximum salary by 6%, retroactive to 1/1/92; 5% increase for employees on their anniversary date. Upgrade of numerous positions; addition of more "floaters" at Juvenile Center.

2. The employer used the following counties as comparable counties:

a.Calhoun
b.Jackson
c.Monroe
d.Muskegon

3. Property tax revenue decreased from $1,100,000 in 1990 to $248,000 in 1993 (Ex-1).

4. Investment Interest Earnings dropped from approximately $1,300,000 in 1989 to approximately $400,000 in 1993. Investment Interest dropped $380,000 from 1992 to 1993 (Ex-2). Revenue from DDA/TIFA dropped approximately $11,000 from 1992 to 1993.

5. In 1993 the Expenses for Employee Health/Life Insurance was $3,106,000. The 1994 estimate for such Insurance will increase to $3,572,000. A 15% increase in Health Care Costs ($466,000) (Ex. 4).

6. From 1984 through 1991 Expenditures generally exceeded Revenue.

7. In the Courthouse Unit the Employer Pension Contribution was $560,000 in 1987 and 1989. It reached a high in 1991 at $682,000 (Ex. 6).

8. In 1993 the Budget Breakdown shows that 13.3% of the budget was expended for fringes. The preliminary 1994 percentage for fringes is estimated to be 14.3%, and increase of 1% (Ex-8).

9. The 1994 Employer Pension costs are set at $59,538.73 if the Pension Plan remains in its current form. The Employer estimated costs for the Union Pension proposal is $74,423.41. A difference of $14,884.68 (Ex.10).

10. Health Insurance data regarding the Comparable Counties is set out below (Ex. 12).

COUNTY	PLAN DESIGN	EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION	OPT-OUT
Berrien	90/10	Yes ($10.00 Per PPD; Tax Deferred)	No
Muskegon	90/10	Yes ($10.00 Per PPD)	No
Calhoun	80/20	No	Yes
Monroe	90/10	No	Yes
Jackson	90/10	No	No

12. The employees in all of the other 8 county labor unions pay $10.00 per month for their Health Insurance.

13. 1992 starting hourly salary in seven classifications in Comparable Counties and the corresponding 1991 starting hourly salary and salary rank ( ) for Berrien County is set out below (Ex. 16).

County	Youth Specialist	Deputy Probate Register	Food Service Manager	Secretary	Deputy Juvenile Register	Home Detention/ Tether	Pro-bation Office
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank
Berrien	8.66 (2)	8.16 (2)	9.47 (1)	8.16 (2)	8.16 (4)	11.82 (3)	12.42(2)
Muskegon	7.18	7.47	5.87	6.36	6.63	13.61	9.69
Calhoun	8.02	7.51	8.30	8.02	8.79	10.90	10.90
Monroe	8.85	8.68	7.77	8.11	8.68	13.64	13.79
Jackson	8.10	7.99	11.78*	8.40*	8.41*	N/A	11.85

*No range reported; flat salary.

14. 1992 High hourly salary in seven classifications in Comparable Counties and the 1991 corresponding high hourly salary and salary ranking ( ) for Berrien County is set out below (Ex. 16).

County	Youth Specialist	Deputy Probate Register	Food Service Manager	Secretary	Deputy Juvenile Register	Home Detention/ Tether	Pro-bation Office
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank
Berrien	11.25 (2)	10.61 (2)	12.30 (1)	10.61 (1)	10.61 (3)	15.37 (3)	16.14(2)
Muskegon	10.20	10.66	8.29	9.00	9.39	17.26	15.88
Calhoun	11.52	10.56	10.92	10.56	11.52	14.35	14.35
Monroe	10.37	9.66	9.04	9.53	10.17	16.99	17.33
Jackson	9.17	9.87	11.78*	10.58	10.59	N/A	16.04

*No Range reported; Flat salary.

15. The Plante Moran Salary Schedule proposed by the employer 20 months ago is set out in the appendix at page 14 .

16. A computation of salary increases of each member of this unit from the current schedule to the Plante Moran Salary Schedule is set out in the appendix at pages 15 & 16.

ITEM #2 - PENSION (Article 17,6)

ARGUMENT OF THE EMPLOYER (Pension)

The Employer argues that since negotiations started it has offered the four enhancement provisions. Further improvements have not been offered as additional expenditures are not justified as it is cost prohibitive. The employer contribution is scheduled to go up next year. The Employer has always paid more (4.65%) than the employee (4.0%) towards the pension plan and believes it to be a very reasonable mix between the Employer and the employee. There is no other Unit in County government that has a greater multiplier.

The Employer offers additional pension improvements if the employee desires to pay for them as is done in the sheriff's department.

ARGUMENT OF THE UNION (Pension)

Because of the fact that the county has been reducing its amount of contribution into the Pension Fund. Because of the fact that the county Pension plan is over funded the Union wants the same kind of pension benefits that are given to elected and appointed officials. The Union seeks the same multiplier 1.7 to 2.2 at no additional cost to each employee. This can and should be done because other persons are not paying any additional cost for this benefit.

DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATION (Pension)

The Union argues that because the County has been reducing the amount of its contribution into the County's Pension Fund and the fund is over funded, it should be provided the same Pension benefits provided to elected and appointed County officials.

Joint Ex-I does show that the actual dollar contribution in the Pension Fund was reduced from 1991 to 1990. However, Union witness Spence on cross examination agreed that the reduction was the result of the actuarial assumptions being changed. This reduction in actual dollar contribution does not free up revenues to improve employee Pension benefits. Nor does over-funding of the County Pension Fund provide funds to be used for that purpose. Shelly Smith testified that the County's Actuaries recommended that the fund be established at a higher amount than 100% funding.

There are no other units in County government that have a greater multiplier. To increase the multiplier as sought by the Union would increase Pension benefits with this Unit alone by $14,485. This is unreasonable and beyond the financial ability of the County to fund employee fringe benefits. Employer Exhibits 7 & 8 show that in 1994 fringe benefit will require a higher expenditure of County revenues. Conversely the Employer proposal is fair and reasonable as it enhances the employees Pension benefits very well.

It is the recommendation of the fact-finder that the Employer Pension Proposal is the most reasonable of the two in evidence and should be incorporated into the new Agreement.

ITEM #3 HEALTH INSURANCE (Article 17,5)

ARGUMENT OF THE EMPLOYER (Health Insurance)

The Employer offer on Health Insurance is consistent with the other eight County labor units. Unit members here will also pay $10.00 per pay check towards the cost of Health Insurance. According to the Employer, this seems fair and reasonable in view of the rapidly rising health care costs at 15%-20% per year.

The Employer seeks to cap chiropractic coverage (Cap the number of visits to 36 per year), a normal Blue Cross-Blue Shield procedure. Chiropractic coverage has caused problems in the past. Additionally the Employer proposes that the retiree $50.00 per month maximum cap for health insurance be eliminated with a change to a 50%/50% split. As to the "me-too" provision. The Employer seeks to have this eliminated in the new agreement as it reasons that this Unit should stand on its own and bargain all aspects of Health Insurance as all other Units do.

The Employer argues its final offer, in light of the increasing health care costs, and not increasing the employee insurance costs for the next two years is a very reasonable offer under the circumstances.

ARGUMENTS OF THE UNION (Health Insurance)

The Union argues the $10.00 deduction for Health Insurance was never negotiated into the contract. Both an arbitrator and the Department of Labor uphold the Union argument that the county can not arbitrarily deduct $10.00 from employees wages.

Additionally the Union argues that its employees should be allowed to opt-out of the Employees Health Insurance plan because one person, the County Coordinator, has opted-out and the union seeks the same privilege. It is only fair and equitable that all unit employees have this right under the Agreement.

DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS (Health Insurance)

There are five separate issues sought by the parties with health Insurance.

Employer:

1) Each employee to make a $10.00 contribution every pay period ($260.00 per year) towards his or her health care costs.

2) Delete "me-too" provision from the new Agreement

3) Cap chiropractic coverage

4) Cap on post 65 retire insurance

Union:

5) Allow opt-out

According to the Union, Arbitrator Frost, (Union exhibit 1,) upholds the Union argument that the county can not arbitrarily deduct $10.00 from employees wages. As viewed by the fact -finder, arbitrator Frost's Award is not at point here as that issue was determined from an earlier

Contract. In the dispute here the Employer is not seeking to arbitrarily deduct $10.00 per pay day. Rather the Employer is attempting to negotiate such language into the contract. This fact negates this Union argument.

As viewed by the fact-finder the Employer proposal is fair and reasonable as the $10.00 cost is consistent with the other eight County labor Units. Additionally with the Employer 3 year duration proposal this $10.00 cost would be frozen the last two years of the Agreement even if costs continue to increase.

The Employer Health/Insurance costs will increase $466,000 or 15% in 1994 (See Fact No.5). With this rapid increase in Health/Life Insurance costs it seems fair and reasonable to the fact-finder that all County employees assume a part of this large increase. The $10.00 per employee cost per year amounts to $260. According to Ex-15 there are 64 employees in this unit. (64 employees x $260 = $16,640). This Unit's share of the increased insurance costs would be $16,640.

Based on the foregoing discussions the fact-finder recommends that the position of the Employer be established in the next Agreement. Each employee shall pay $10.00 per pay period towards health insurance.

As to the Employer's proposal to cap chiropractic coverage the fact-finder considers there is insufficient evidence in the record to support this proposal. Fact-finders generally will not recommend a change in contract language unless the evidence shows a need for such changes. Therefore the fact-finder recommends that the chiropractic coverage language remain per current Agreement in the new Agreement.

As to the "me-too" language, the fact-finder agrees with the Employer that it should be removed from the new contract. The language in an earlier contract (See Arbitrator Frost's Award, Union Ex.-1) failed to work as the Employer intended. As viewed by the fact-finder, under the circumstances, the process can better be served by deciding Health Care issues by negotiations than by "me-too" language. Therefore the fact-finder recommends that the "me-too" language be deleted from the new Agreement.

As to the Employer's proposal to eliminate the cap on retiree insurance. There is little evidence and no comparability to support elimination of the cap. The fact-finder recommends that the cap on retiree insurance remain per current Contract language in the new Agreement.

As to the Union proposal to opt-out the facts show that of the comparable Counties Calhoun and Monroe allow an opt-out. Muskegon and Jackson do not. Beyond this comparison there is a dispute between the parties as to whether or not an employee can opt-out under the Blue Cross-Blue Shield Contract. The Employer through its witness Smith argues that this can not be done because there is no Rider to the Blue-Cross-Blue Shield Policy. Further she takes the position that the Blue-Cross-Clue Shield Contract has no language to cover such a condition. Ed Morgan stated on the record that he had called Blue Cross-Blue Shield and it informed him that a Berrien County employee could opt-out of the County's insurance policy. According to Morgan all an employee need do is to file a waiver form with Blue Cross-Blue Shield with their social security number and the county's insurance policy number. Witness Smith's response to Morgan's testimony was, "That's not a part of our plan, we don't have that."

The fact-finder considers the opt-out dispute can be resolved be a joint Employer-Union letter to Blue Cross-Blue Shield addressing the issue. Therefore the fact-finder recommends that as soon as practicable the parties communicate by letter with Blue-Cross-Blue Shield to ascertain whether or not an employee can opt-out of the County's Health Insurance Policy.

ITEMS #1&4 WAGES & CLASSIFICATIONS - DURATION

ARGUMENT OF THE EMPLOYER (Wages, Classifications & Duration)

A few years ago the county paid for an outside independent review (Plante Moran) of all the wage classifications in this until as well as all other Units in the County.

During negotiations the county moved to implement this study. The implementations meant that some red circled employees were being paid more than the study recommended. Those wages were lowered. Conversely green circled employees were paid below the study recommendations. These employees received an immediate up-grade to a higher minimum salary. According to the Employer there was no way mathematically that all employees can be paid the same percentage increase. The transition from the old wage schedule to the Plante Moran recommendations has been very reasonable. The reason the wage increases are different is because of internal equity and that is what the Plante Moran study is all about. According to the Employer the recommendations from Plante Moran is very reasonable in light of decreasing revenues.

On a comparable basis, Ex. 16 shows that Berrien County does very well in the market place. This is especially true as the Berrien County salaries in the exhibit are 1991 salaries from the old contract and for the other counties, 1993 salaries.

According to the Employer it is noteworthy that the Union has not established any evidence from outside sources to show its members are under-paid or that the wages are inadequate. The Union produces no evidence to show that the increase it seeks is justified on any basis whatsoever.

As to retroactivity the Employer indicated to the Union from the start of negotiations 20 months ago that the retroactivity of wage increases goes to the first of the month in which an agreement is reached. This is consistent with all of the County's bargaining Units.

Because of uncertain revenues this wage proposal is only for the year the new contract is ratified. The Employer proposes wage re-openers for the second and third year of the new Agreement.

ARGUMENT OF THE UNION (Wages, Classifications & Duration)

There are other income sources in addition to the tax revenues as set out by the Employer. The Union argues that these other sources could make it possible to provide its employers with substantial wage increases. As an example some of the employees need not be funded by the general fund as is the case with some unit employees such as revenue from the Child Care Fund.

The Union takes a strong position that the Plante Moran salary structure is completely unacceptable. It shows no equity or fairness among all employees. It is out dated and makes no provision for cost of living allowances and other factors which establish the Union's position on wage increases.

Even though the Employer has indicated since negotiations began there would be no retroactivity the Union contends the employees would lose one year or 20 months out of the contract without any increase in salary and benefits. This is unfair. The burden of responsibility lies with the County as it requested fact-finding. The Union has bargained in good faith for these 20 months but the County has been unfair. The County is not in the poor financial conditions that it contends. The County is financially stable and can meet the Unions request for retroactivity from 1/1/91.

DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATION (Wages, Classifications, & Duration)

The Employer does not argue an "Ability to pay". It does however indicate it is an issue. This is reflected by the facts which show that expenditures generally have exceeded revenues. Additionally Property Taxes, DDA/TIFA and Earned Interest Income are dropping.

While the Union argued there are sufficient revenues to cover its wage proposal it offered no specific evidence to show the increase it seeks is justified.

The facts in this disputes clearly show that the wages paid to the employees in the unit are generally higher than wages paid to similar employees in Comparable Counties. Facts No. 13 & 14 show that Berrien County is ranked 1st or 2nd in five of the seven classifications both as to the starting rate as well as the top rate. It should be noted also that these comparisons are 1992 wage rates in Comparable Counties and 1991 rates in Berrien County.

Because of the high comparable salaries it appears to the fact-finder that Plante Moran study was timely and reasonable. It is reasonable as the consultants applied internal equity as the new grade classifications were developed with the new salary schedule. The Union proposal with across the board increases does not do this.

As viewed by the fact-finder the Plante Moran Salary Schedule is more reasonable and more within the financial means of the County than the wage proposal of the Union. According to the Employer, employees who were still on step this year have already received a 3% wage increase based their step. Everyone in transition will receive some wage increase for 1 day. Those employees still on the salary schedule will get a 5% wage increase on their anniversary date. From Fact No. 16 the average wage increase in this Unit is $470.75. The average percentage increase is 2.07%.

As far as retroactivity is concerned, the Employer offered the Plante Moran proposal during negotiations 20 months ago. The stipulation was that the new schedule would be implemented when the contract is ratified. This is consistent with all County Units.This stipulation applied to all language in it. The contract is not yet ratified and therefore the fact-finder considers to recommend any retroactiviy to the wage issue would not be reasonable.

It is the recommendation of the fact-finder that the Wages, Classifications, and Duration as proposed by the Employer is the most reasonable of the two in evidence and should be established in the new 3 year Agreement.

This Report dated this 20th day August 1993, Good Hart, Michigan.

Alvin N. Zachrich

Alvin N. Zachrich
Fact-Finder

E-14.

BERRIEN COUNTY
SALARY TABLE--NON-UNION EMPLOYEES

GRADE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	12853	13496	14170	14879	15623	16404	17224
3	14137	14844	15586	16365	17184	18043	18945
4	15551	16328	17145	18002	18902	19847	20840
5	17106	17961	18859	19802	20792	21832	22924
6	18817	19758	20746	21783	22872	24016	25217
7	20699	21734	22821	23962	25160	26418	27739
8	22769	23907	25103	26358	27676	29060	30513
9	25047	26299	27614	28995	30445	31967	33565
10	27551	28929	30375	31894	33488	35163	36921
11	30306	31821	33412	35083	36837	38679	40613
12	33336	35003	36753	38591	40520	42546	44673
13	36670	38504	40429	42450	44573	46801	49141
14	40337	42354	44472	46695	49030	51481	54055
15	44371	46590	48919	51365	53933	56630	59461

Appendix

COMPUTATION OF SALARY INCREASE FROM MOVE TO PLANTE MORAN

NAME	GRADE	STE	SALARY @ 5-1-93	PLANTE MORAN GRADE	PLANTE MORAN STEP		PLANTE MORAN SALARY	SALARY INCREASE	PERCENT INCREASE
ZAHUI, PATRICIA	33	4	16916.00	4	3		17145.00	229.00	1.35%
THORNTON, S	33	9	19699.00	5	4		19802.00	103.00	0.52%
PAYNE, GLORIA	33	1	15920.00	4	2		16328.00	408.00	2.56%
BURKETTE, RAMON	33	3	16408.00	4	3		17145.00	737.00	4.49%
NELUMS, MARILYN	33	5	17439.00	4	4		18002.00	563.00	3.23%
NEEDLES, H	33	9B	20696.00	4	7	*	21109.92	413.92	2.00%
KIMMONS, LINDA	33	9	19699.00	4	6		19847.00	148.00	0.75%
LULL, LEE	33	9	19699.00	4	6		19847.00	148.00	0.75%
LEE, WILLIA	33	7	18534.00	4	5		18902.00	368.00	1.99%
MALONE, SHARON	33	1	15920.00	4	2		16328.00	408.00	2.56%
HEYN A	33	9B	20696.00	4	7	*	21109.92	413.92	2.00%
EICHMAN, J	33	9	19699.00	4	6		19847.00	148.00	0.75%
HORNE, M	34	9B	21199.00	3	7	*	21622.98	423.98	2.00%
FERGUSON, K	34	1	16307.00	3	4		16365.00	58.00	0.36%
JOHNSON, DIANNE	36	1	17145.00	4	4		18002.00	857.00	5.00%
BECKER, MARIE	36	9	21215.00	4	7	*	21639.30	424.30	2.00%
FERGUSON, L	38	7	20963.00	6	4		21783.00	820.00	3.91%
JARDINE, DAVID	38	3	18558.00	6	1		18817.00	259.00	1.40%
BETTISON. E	38	9A	22837.00	6	5		22872.00	35.00	0.15%
TYSON, ROBERT	38	6	20334.00	6	3		20746.00	412.00	2.03%
WHITE, MICHAEL	38	9	22280.00	6	5		22872.00	592.00	2.66%
HOLMES, ANNETTE	38	6	20334.00	6	3		20746.00	412.00	2.03%
SIMS, BARBARA	38	5	19724.00	6	2		19758.00	34.00	0.17%
GOLLIDAY, GEORG	38	5	19724.00	6	2		19758.00	34.00	0.17%
LEDYARD, SAMIE	38	1	18006.00	6	1		18817.00	811.00	4.50%
BISHOP, DONALD	38	5	19724.00	6	2		19758.00	34.00	0.17%
LEONOR, LUIS	38	1	18006.00	6	1		18817.00	811.00	4.50%
MORGAN, REBECC	38	5	19724.00	6	2		19758.00	34.00	0.17%
MUHAMMAD. A	38	9A	22837.00	6	5		22872.00	35.00	0.15%
VACANT	38	1	18457.00	6	1		18817.00	360.00	1.95%
VACANT	38	1	18006.00	6	1		18817.00	811.00	4.50%
TIGNER, J. ERIC	38	4	19132.00	6	2		19758.00	626.00	3.27%
ADAMS, NAOMI	38	7	20963.00	6	4		21783.00	820.00	3.91%
RAMOS, SHARON	38	4	19132.00	6	2		19758.00	626.00	3.27%

MUHAMMAD, ASKA	38	5	19724.00	6	2		19758.00	34.00	0.17%
STARK, J	39	9A	23409.00	5	7	*	23877.18	468.18	2.00%
JONES, SCOTT	39	1	18457.00	6	1		18817.00	360.00	1.95%
EDWARDS, LARRY	39	2	18738.00	6	1		18817.00	79.00	0.42%
BLEDSOE, W	39	6	20844.00	6	4		21783.00	939.00	4.50%
REYNOLDS, PAUL	39	4	19612.00	6	2		19758.00	146.00	0.74%
ROBINSON, CORA	39	9	23438.00	5	7	*	23906.76	468.76	2.00%
CLARK, BONITA	42	9	24607.00	7	5		25160.00	553.00	2.25%
PAULSEN, R	42	9A	25222.00	7	6		26418.00	1196.00	4.74%
LINDSAY, RONALD	42	4	20497.00	7	1		20699.00	202.00	0.99%
ROLLINS, DORAS	42	9	24607.00	6	7	*	25099.14	492.14	2.00%
GORDON, C.B.	42	8	23869.00	7	4		23962.00	93.00	0.39%
NEMITZ, J	45	9	26445.00	6	7	*	26973.90	528.90	2.00%
TEACHOUT, M	48	9B	29972.00	8	7	*	30571.44	599.44	2.00%
JARDINE, DON	48	3	24497.00	7	5		25160.00	663.00	2.71%
EDDY, GEORGE	48	4	24497.00	7	2		25160.00	663.00	2.71%
SMITH, MARILYN	48	9B	29972.00	7	7	*	30571.44	599.44	2.00%
JOYNER, KATHLEE	48	5	25255.00	7	6		26418.00	1163.00	4.61%
STEELE, JAN	48	8	27672.00	7	7	*	28225.44	553.44	2.00%
PETERS, T.	50	9B	31479.00	8	7	*	32108.58	629.58	2.00%
CORK, M	50	9B	31479.00	8	7	*	32108.58	629.58	2.00%
SHULER, C	50	9B	31479.00	8	7	*	32108.58	629.58	2.00%
MOORE, F	50	9B	31479.00	8	7	*	32108.58	629.58	2.00%
LINDEMUTH, P	50	9B	31479.00	8	7	*	32108.58	629.58	2.00%
CHAMBERS, D	50	9B	31479.00	8	7	*	32108.58	629.58	2.00%
WALKER, WILLIAM	50	9B	31479.00	8	7	*	32108.58	629.58	2.00%
WALKER, GEORGE	50	9B	31479.00	8	7	*	32108.58	629.58	2.00%
YARBROUGH, C	50	9B	31479.00	8	7	*	32108.58	629.58	2.00%
FITZGERALD, D	50	9B	31479.00	8	7	*	32108.58	629.58	2.00%
DAVIS, JOHN	50	9A	30711.00	8	7	*	31325.22	614.22	2.00%
			1452767.00				1482895.44	30128.44	2.07%

* CURRENT SALARY PAST STEP 7

NOTE: Jump to Plante Moran would be on the first day of the month contract is ratified. Red-circled employees would receive a 2% raise on the first day of the month the contract is ratified.

on anniversary date + 5%