

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & INDUSTRY SERVICES  
EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

COUNTY OF MUSKEGON,  
GENERAL EMPLOYEES UNIT,

Public Employer/Respondent.

MERC File No. L00 J-9006

James Corbin, Mediator

and

Richard N. Block, Ph.D., Fact-Finder

TEAMSTERS, LOCAL 214,

Labor Organization/Petitioner.

---

For the Employer:

Attorney Theodore N. Williams, Jr.,  
James B. Delaney, Human Resources Director  
and Deborah Groeneveld, Human Resources  
Deputy Director

For the Union:

Attorney Michael L. Fayette,  
Fred W. Bennett, Business Agent and  
Robert Vasquez, Chief Steward, General  
Employees Bargaining Unit

---

**FACT-FINDING REPORT**

## **I.**

### **INTRODUCTION**

This is a report of the fact-finding hearing for the County of Muskegon and Teamsters, Local 214, General Employees Unit, held on Wednesday, November 7, 2001, at 10:00 a.m. in the Conference Room for the Michigan Employment Relations Commission.

## **II.**

### **REPORT OF FACT FINDING PETITION**

In his petition for fact-finding, Fred Bennett, Business Agent for Teamsters, Local 214 cited the following as remaining unresolved issues following one mediation session conducted in March of 2001:

- (1)    Reclassification Upgrades
- (2)    Martin Luther King Day
- (3)    Prescription Rider Cost
- (4)    F55/25 Pension Rider
- (5)    Wages
- (6)    Retroactive Pay
- (7)    Duration of Agreement
- (8)    Mileage
- (9)    Rates of New Positions and Classifications
- (10)   Subcontracting
- (11)   Independent Grievance Panel Option Last Step of Grievance Procedure

### **III.**

#### **PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE**

The parties met by agreement at a pre-hearing conference which was conducted on September 17, 2001. As a result of that conference, the nature and number of open issues were adjusted. Specifically, the Employer added Dental Plan to the list of unresolved issues. The parties agreed to withdraw as issues the following:

- (1) Retroactive Pay - Both parties agreed to retroactivity.
- (2) Duration of Agreement - Both parties agreed to a four (4) year agreement, expiring December 31, 2004.
- (3) Rates of New Positions and Classifications - Both parties agreed to maintain the existing contract language.

Further, the parties, being unable to agree to either the list of, or the number of external counties that would be submitted to this procedure as comparables, submitted briefs on that issue. Following my review of their respective positions, I issued a ruling finding that eight (8) counties would be used as comparables for this proceeding. Those eight (8) comparable counties are:

- (1) Berrien
- (2) Calhoun
- (3) Jackson
- (4) Monroe
- (5) Ottawa
- (6) Saginaw

(7) Kent

(8) Kalamazoo

As a result of the review at the pre-hearing conference, the parties submitted nine (9) open issues at the time of the hearing which remained in dispute. Those issues will be reviewed in the order in which they appear in the parties most recently expired Collective Bargaining Agreement.

#### IV.

#### **EVIDENCE PRESENTED OF UNRESOLVED ISSUES**

##### 1. **Recognized Holidays - Section 14.1**

A. It was the Employer's position with respect to this issue that Martin Luther King Day should be added to the list of recognized holidays and that Washington's Birthday be deleted from the list of recognized holidays. The Union position was to add Martin Luther King Day to the list of recognized holidays.

In support of its position, the Employer referred to three (3) different exhibits. The first, Exhibit Eight (8), entitled "Internal Bargaining Unit's Holidays" showed that by the exchange it maintained parity with its other internal bargaining units. The Employer also referred to Exhibit Nine (9), which is entitled "External Comparables - Holidays" and a review of that exhibit shows that if the holiday was exchanged, the Employer would maintain parity with the external comparable counties as well. Finally, the Fact-Finder's attention was directed to the Employer's Exhibit Ten (10) entitled "Cost to Pay for Holidays for GEU Bargaining Unit". That exhibit demonstrates that the cost of an additional holiday would result in an annual lost work time cost of nearly \$25,000.

B. The Union, in its Exhibit Three (3), showed that of the eight (8) comparable counties, six (6) counties already had Martin Luther King Day. However, this also demonstrated that the comparables averaged eleven (11) holidays, while the County of Muskegon already had twelve (12) holidays.

2. Grievance and Arbitration Procedure - Section 20.1, Step 3

Under this Section, the Union had proposed the adoption of a new grievance procedure modeled after a procedure employed by it within the City of Detroit. The Union claimed that the existing procedure was ineffective at resolving disputes which arose between the parties concerning the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Union pointed out that the resolution of grievances, except at the very lowest levels of the process, was virtually nonexistent. It contended that the "panel" process can effectuate discussions and lead to effective resolution disputes. The Employer had countered in its position by proposing a return to the existing contract with the deletion of language which allowed for the optional selection from a list of arbitrators agreed to by the parties. In opposition to the Union's significant change in what had been a long history of resolving grievances, the Employer referred the Fact-Finder to Exhibit Eleven (11) which demonstrated among internal comparables all relied upon lists from either the Federal Mediation Conciliation Service or the American Arbitration Association. The Employer also referred to Exhibit Twelve (12) for the external comparables counties. All either use the American Arbitration Association or the Federal Mediation Conciliation Service. Finally, the Employer in Exhibit Thirteen (13), showed that for this Bargaining Unit, sixty-seven (67) grievances were filed during the four (4) year term of the prior agreement. Of that number only ten (10) went to arbitration, or less than three (3) per year.

3. Mileage Compensation - Article 25.1

The Union had proposed that the employee's mileage reimbursement be increased from \$.22 per mile to the rate published annually by the Internal Revenue Service. The Union contended that the existing mileage rate was woefully inadequate given the increasing costs of operating an automobile. The Union pointed out that several of the external comparable employers provide for the Internal Revenue Service mileage rate. In response, the Employer had proposed to increase the mileage rate to \$.27 per mile. In support of its position, the Employer referred to several exhibits, specifically Exhibits Fourteen (14), Fifteen (15), and Sixteen (16). In Exhibit Fourteen (14), the Employer examined its internal comparables. As the exhibit demonstrates, for other bargaining units there is either no language or those bargaining units are being reimbursed at the rate of \$.22 per mile. In looking at Exhibit Fifteen (15), which reviewed the surveyed counties, the reimbursement rate ranges from \$.28 per mile to the IRS rate. The Employer also demonstrated by Exhibit Sixteen (16) that it has a fleet of seven (7) vehicles available for employees to use for travel in lieu of mileage reimbursement.

4. Medical Coverage, Prescription Drug Co-Pay - Section 26.2

It was the Employer's proposal to modify this provision to provide for a co-pay of \$7 for generic drugs, \$12 for preferred brand name drugs, and 50% for non-preferred brand name drugs. In support of that position, the Employer referred the Fact-Finder to several exhibits, specifically, Employer's Exhibits Seventeen (17) and Eighteen (18). In Employer's Exhibit Seventeen (17), it depicts that this same option had been accepted by two (2) of its collective bargaining units, both represented by this same Union, specifically, the Deputy Unit and the Corrections Unit. In reviewing the external comparables, no discernable pattern existed with regard to the payment of

this benefit. The Union proposed to maintain the current \$5 prescription drug co-pay for the remainder of the contract. It contended that the employees are less able to handle the higher co-pay, and that this new requirement should not be placed on the employees' backs. The Union conceded that the trend is toward higher co-pays. The Union was also forced to acknowledge that there had been no adjustment in the co-pay for a number of years.

5. Dental Coverage - Article 26.3

The Employer, as noted above, added this issue at the time of the pre-hearing conference and proposed that dental coverage be changed by changing the "caps" that it paid and going to Delta Dental Plan D, which in essence provided for co-pays of 100%/50%/50%. In support of its position, the Employer referred the Fact-Finder to Exhibits Nineteen (19) and Twenty (20). The Union offered in opposition, Exhibit Number Two (2). In the Employer's Exhibit Nineteen (19), it showed the current coverage for its internal bargaining units. A review of that Exhibit Nineteen (19) shows that three (3) employee groups received the Delta Dental Plan D option. However, eight (8) had the Delta Dental Plan A option. It is noted that along with the plan option, the amount of the "caps" tended to vary among the internal bargaining units.

In reviewing Exhibit 20, the external comparables, it is much more difficult to determine any pattern of coverage, although generally the coverages available were less favorable than those presently enjoyed by Muskegon County employees. The Union objected to the insertion of this issue into the fact-finding. However, I overruled the objection. The Union argued that the Employer could handle rate increases above the caps the Employer had been willing to agree to. In essence, the Employer was willing to increase its obligation of the dental insurance from \$35

per month to \$42 per month over the term of the agreement. This amounted to a 20% increase over four (4) years, or 5% for each of the four (4) years of the contract.

6. Retirement - Section 28.7

The Union had proposed to upgrade the retirement benefits of its members by the addition of MERS Benefit Program F55(15) at no cost to the employee. In support of that position, the Union submitted Exhibit Four (4). A review of that exhibit, which focused on survey counties, shows that most of those plans carried significant cost to the employees. For example, the cost in Calhoun, according to Union's Exhibit, appears to be as high as 14%, where the cost in Jackson would appear to be 2.5%, and in Kent County the cost would be 6.5%. The only county offering a plan without a contribution is Monroe. Only one (1) county appears to offer a F-55(15) option type.

The Employer relies upon Exhibits Twenty-One (21) and Twenty-Two (22). The Employer's exhibits, like the Union's exhibits, show that there are a variety of retirement plan options available among its comparable counties. The only discernable pattern is that in most cases, employee contributions are required. This is shown by the review of the external comparables in Exhibit Twenty-Two (22). Similarly, in reviewing Employer's Exhibit Twenty-One (21), the Employer's exhibit shows that of the non-Act 312 internal comparables, that one has a 55/25 benefit program without contribution. In consideration of the impact of that fact, and reviewing Employer's Exhibit Four (4), I note that the nurses unit has fifteen (15) members.



7. Contracting Out Work - Section 28.11

This is a proposed change in the contract language by the Union. The Union has proposed that Employer allow it access to the bidding process in order to maintain a fair and equitable bid and to allow the Union to bid for any work. The Employer had proposed to retain the existing language. In support of its position, the Union offered Exhibit Five (5). Of eight (8) comparable counties, two (2) of the contracts had no language on this issue. The counties were Calhoun and Saginaw. Two (2) counties allowed subcontracting, specifically in the counties of Kalamazoo and Kent.

Of the four (4) remaining contracts, there is subcontracting language but with "a no layoff" provision. The language in the contract for the County of Muskegon allows the Employer to subcontract work, but only if it could be done cheaper. There is no prohibition against Union participation. The Employer referred the Fact-Finder to its exhibits in this case, specifically Exhibit Twenty-Three (23) and Twenty-Four (24). In Exhibit Twenty-Three (23), a review of its internal comparables showed that none of the internal comparables contained the language proposed by the Union in this contract. This includes several bargaining units represented by this same Union.

8. Wages/Pay Range Adjustment - Appendix A

On this issue, the Union sought both an across-the-board wage increase and an adjustment in the pay grade for the various classifications represented by this Collective Bargaining Unit. Specifically the Union had proposed the following across-the-board wage adjustment: effective the first full pay period following January 1, 2001, 3½%; effective the first full pay period following January 1 of each year of the remaining years of the contract, an increase based upon

changes in the Consumer Price Index in the range between 3 to 4%. The Employer had countered with a proposal effective the first full pay period following January 1, 2001, of 2.75% and then using the same CPI formulation, an increase of between 2 to 3.5% for each subsequent year of the contract.

On the issue of pay range adjustments, the Union had, at the pre-hearing conference, indicated that it would pursue adjustments for all classifications. In support of its position on wages and pay range adjustments, the Union offered Exhibit One (1) and specific sub-exhibits for a total of twelve (12) classifications. Of those twelve (12), it was determined that the exhibits for Laborer and Senior Secretary, respectively, were not relevant. The Employer countered by offering its Exhibit Two (2), entitled "Muskegon County versus Surveyed Counties per capita Personal Income". Exhibit Three (3), entitled "Muskegon County versus Surveyed Counties median household income" and Exhibit Four (4) which showed "Muskegon County versus Surveyed Counties Average Sale Price of Existing Homes". All three (3) exhibits depicted the County of Muskegon as being on the lower end of the economic ladder when compared to the survey of comparable counties. The Employer also offered Exhibits 29 through 41, which will be discussed later.

### Wages

On the wage issue, the Employer specifically offered Exhibits Twenty-Five (25) through Twenty-Eight (28). On Exhibit Twenty-Five (25), it showed in comparison to its internal comparables that several had received a 3% increase and several were in negotiations on its 2001 salary. Similarly, several of the comparable counties, as shown by Exhibit Twenty-Six (26), were also in negotiations. Several other counties had received pay rate increases ranging from 2½% to

7½% in the case of Kent County. It is noted by the Fact-Finder, however, that in the preceding year, employees in Kent County received a lump sum payment as opposed to a percentage increase. Finally, the Employer showed in Exhibit Twenty-Seven (27) that the 2.75% wage increase that it had proposed would cost an additional \$163,894.69; and further that this figure did not include the associated increase in benefit costs. And finally, in Exhibit Twenty-Eight (28), as offered by the Employer, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it showed that for 2002, (September 2001 to September 2002) the cost of living had increased by 2.6%.

### **Pay Range Adjustments**

On the pay range adjustment issue, the Employer offered Exhibits Twenty-Nine (29) through Forty-One (41), which will be reviewed below. With the exception of Exhibit Twenty-Nine (29), each of the exhibits represented a specific job classification. Exhibit Twenty-Nine (29) is a two-page document entitled "GEU hire/retention data for the year 2000" and the second page is the same analysis for year to date 2001. A review of the document shows that the majority of the hires for this bargaining unit are from Muskegon County and the retention rate approached 80% for 2000 and approaches 90% for 2001.

The Employer also presented data on several specific job classifications. The first had to do with Exhibit 30A for the Account Clerk I position. Once again, the exhibit shows a very high retention rate, that this is a three (3) position class and there was only one (1) hired in 2000, and no new hires in 2001. Of the one (1) hire, that person lived in Muskegon County on the date of hire. A review of the survey data shows that the average maximum wage for this position is \$25,844, while the maximum wage in Muskegon was \$21,882.

Exhibit Thirty-One (31)A through C reflects the Account Clerk II position. The Exhibit shows that this is a fourteen (14) position class and during 2000 there was only one (1) new hire and that person lived in the County of Muskegon at date of hire, giving this position a nearly 93% retention rate for 2000, and a 100% retention rate for 2001. In the Account Clerk II class, the average maximum was \$27,504 for external comparables, while the maximum paid by the County of Muskegon was \$24,856.

The next class examined by the Fact Finder was Animal Control Officer, as depicted in Exhibit Thirty-Two (32)A through C. This is a four (4) person class which had in both 2000 and 2001 a 100% retention rate. It is noteworthy that several of the surveyed counties include animal control officers who were in Act 312 eligible bargaining units. The average maximum wage based on that survey was \$30,022. The maximum wage for the County of Muskegon was \$30,825.

The Appraiser class was depicted by the Employer in Exhibit Thirty-Three (33)A through C. There were three (3) total positions and in 2000 and 2001, there was 100% retention. The average maximum paid by the surveyed counties was \$33,606, while the maximum wage paid by Muskegon County was \$35,193.

The next class examined was that of Building Maintenance Mechanic I, as shown by Employer's Exhibit Thirty-Four (34)A through C. This is a two (2) person class which had a 100% retention rate for both 2000 and 2001. The average maximum for the surveyed or comparable counties was \$26,158, where as the maximum wage paid by the County of Muskegon was \$27,019.

The Employer also presented data on the Building Maintenance Mechanic II classification as shown by Exhibit Thirty-Five (35)A through C. This is a four (4) person class with a 100%

retention for 2000 and 2001. The average maximum wage paid by the surveyed counties was \$27,893, while the County paid a maximum wage of \$32,240.

The Employer also presented an exhibit on the class of Clerk II. This is a forty-seven (47) person class. During 2000 there was nine new hires; all but one (1) lived in the County of Muskegon at the time of hire. The class had nearly an 81% retention rate. In 2001, the number of positions increased to forty-eight (48) and there were thirteen (13) new hires. All new hires, with one (1) exception in 2001, lived in Muskegon County at the time of hire. The one (1) exception was from the County of Ottawa, Spring Lake. In 2001 the retention rate was 73%. The average maximum wage paid for this class among surveyed counties was \$22,227. The County of Muskegon maximum wage was \$21,882.

The Employer also examined the class of Housekeeper. This was a five (5) person class which during the year 2000 and 2001 had no new hires. The average maximum paid by the comparable counties was \$20,281 as shown by the Employer's Exhibit Thirty-Seven (37)A through C. The maximum paid by the County was \$18,491.

The Employer also offered Exhibit Thirty-Eight (38)A through C as to the class of Legal Secretary. This is an eight (8) person class which during 2000 had one (1) new hire who lived in Muskegon County at the time of hire, meaning an 87.5% retention rate for 2000, and no new hires to date for 2001. The average maximum wage paid in comparable counties is \$26,748. The maximum paid by the County of Muskegon is \$25,875.

The Employer also offered Exhibit Thirty-Nine (39)A through C for the class of Microfilm Operator. This is a one (1) person class with 100% retention for 2000 and 2001. The average

maximum wage in surveyed counties is \$23,128. The County of Muskegon pays \$21,028 at the maximum.

The Employer also offered Exhibit Forty (40) for the class of Secretary. This is a four (4) person class that enjoyed a 100% retention for the year 2000 and 2001. The average wage paid by comparable counties is \$25,537. In Muskegon County the maximum wage is \$24,856.

The final position examined by the Employer was the position of Youth Specialist as shown in Exhibit Forty-One (41)A through C. This is a ten (10) person class which had one (1) new hire who lived in Ottawa County at the time of hire and 2001 had no new hires. In that class, the average maximum wage among surveyed counties is \$29,576. The maximum paid by the County of Muskegon is \$25,875.

## V.

### DISCUSSION

The Fact-Finder wishes to thank the parties for the presentation of exhibits and other evidence in this case. The issues were diverse and required extensive preparation. The parties jointly presented for review in this matter a total of over sixty (60) exhibits, many of them with subsections. On the basis of these exhibits, the Fact-Finder was able to develop an opinion not only as to the position that the County of Muskegon held in relation to the communities that had been chosen as comparables, but also to develop a picture of the standing of this particular Bargaining Unit to the internal bargaining units of the County of Muskegon. As to each of the issues raised by the parties, the Fact-Finder was able to develop an opinion based upon the relative standing of this Bargaining Unit to the employees of the County of Muskegon and employees of the other comparable communities. In so doing, it is the opinion of the Fact-Finder

that the recommendations which are to follow are best suited to resolve the dispute between the parties and to obtain a fair and equitable settlement of the contract which is currently in negotiations. I have also reviewed this proceeding with a concern for the best interests of the citizens of the County of Muskegon, as well as the Union and Employer in this matter. It is in fulfillment of these objectives that I offer the recommendations listed below, which I believe to be in keeping with all of the evidence presented at the hearing in this matter.

## **VI.**

### **FACT-FINDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based upon the above exhibits, evidence and the record as a whole, my fact finding recommendations are as follows:

1. **Section 14.1- Recognized Holidays**

Add Martin Luther King Day to those holidays recognized and delete Washington's Birthday from that list, effective January 2002.

2. **Section 20.1, Step 3- Grievance Procedure**

It is my recommendation that the language of the Employer utilizing FMCS for arbitrator selection be adopted.

3. **Section 25.1- Mileage Compensation**

It is my recommendation that effective the first of the calendar month which is not less than sixty (60) days after the execution and signing of this agreement, that the mileage rate be changed from \$.22 to \$.27 per mile.

4. **Section 26.2 - Medical Coverage**

It is my recommendation that effective the first of the calendar month which is not less than sixty (60) days after the execution and signing of this agreement that prescription drug co-pay be changed as follows: \$7 for generic drugs; \$12 for preferred brand name drugs; and 50% of the cost of non-preferred brand name drugs.

5. **Section 26.3- Dental Coverage**

It is my recommendation that effective at the first of the month which is not less than sixty (60) days after the execution and the signing of this agreement that the Employer agrees to



provide all permanent employees with Delta Dental Plan A insurance and coverage "caps" as follows: 2001 - \$36.35 per subscriber per month; 2002 - \$38 per subscriber per month; 2003 - \$40 per subscriber per month; 2004 - \$42 per subscriber per month.

6. Section 28.7 - Retirement

It is my recommendation that effective at the first of the month which is not less than sixty (60) days after the execution and signing of the agreement, the Employer provide to all permanent employees the MERS benefit program identified at F55(25) with an employee contribution of .25%

7. Section 28 - Contracting Out Work

It is my recommendation that the language contained in the most recently expired Collective Bargaining Agreement continue in this section unchanged.

8. Appendix A Wages/Pay Range Adjustment

On the basis of my review of the various wage exhibits, data and the record as a whole, I recommend the following wage and pay raise adjustments:

A. Wages

- i. Effective the first full pay period following January 1, 2001, 3.5%.
- ii. Effective the first full pay period following January 1, 2002, the hourly rate for each step will be increased based upon the change in the September, 2001 Index as compared to the September 2000 Index from the official Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers - United States City Average. "All items" published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor (1982=100), such increase shall not be less than 2% nor more than 3.75%.

iii. Effective the first full pay period following January 1, 2003, the hourly rate for each step will be increased based upon the change in the September, 2002 Index as compared to the September 2001 Index from the official Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers - United States City Average. "All items" published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor (1982=100), such increase shall not be less than 2% nor more than 3.75%.

iv. Effective the first full pay period following January 1, 2004, the hourly rate for each step will be increased based upon the change in the September, 2003 Index as compared to the September, 2002 Index from the Official Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers - United States City Average; "All items" published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor (1982=100), such increase shall not be less than 2% nor more than 3.75%.

B. Pay Range Adjustments

After reviewing the volumes of evidence presented by the parties on the various pay ranges for the classifications represented by this Bargaining Unit, it is my recommendation that the following classifications be adjusted to the pay grades indicated below, effective January 1, 2002:

Classification	Current Pay Grade	Recommended Pay Grade
Account Clerk I	00040	00070
Account Clerk II	00120	00138
Account Records Clerk	00100	00120
Account Records Clerk, Senior	00110	00138
Bus Operator	00140	00160
Clerk II	00040	00070
Clinic Clerk	00050	00070
Departmental Clerk	00120	00138
Legal Secretary	00140	00160
Secretary	00120	00138
Statistical Clerk	00120	00138
Surveillance Worker	00140	00170
Typist	00040	00070
Youth Specialist	00140	00170

There is a special problem which may be created by these classification pay grade increases. It is my understanding that some pay grades have six (6) pay steps, while others have nine (9) pay steps. In the event of an increase from a six (6) step pay grade to a nine (9) step pay grade, the employee will be placed at the same step he or she was at in the former pay grade or at the step which will provide a pay increase, whichever step is higher.

### CONCLUSION

The above recommendation is the result of extensive review and consideration. It will not resolve all of the problems, both perceived and real, which exist between the parties, especially

given the fact that the Union sought both across the board increases, as well as classification increases to nearly every position. The recommendation does, however, address as many of the inequities as the Fact-Finder could identify, taking into account the fact that this Employer, like all public employers, does not have unlimited resources. It is my sincere hope that the recommendation will form the basis for an agreement between the parties.

Dated: November 28, 2001

---

Richard N. Block, Ph.D.  
Fact-Finder

## **APPENDIX**

### **Union's Submissions:**

- Exhibit 1      Classification Increases –
- 1.1      Average of Directly Comparable Classifications
  - 1.2      Account Clerk Comparison
  - 1.3      Animal Control Officer Comparison
  - 1.4      Appraiser Comparison
  - 1.5      Building Maintenance Worker Comparison
  - 1.6      Clerk/Typist Comparison
  - 1.7      Custodian Comparison
  - 1.8      Laborer Comparison
  - 1.9      Legal Secretary Comparison
  - 1.10      Microfilm Operator Comparison
  - 1.11      Secretary Comparison
  - 1.12      Senior Secretary comparison
  - 1.13      Youth Specialist Comparison
- Exhibit 2      Dental Plan Comparison
- Exhibit 3      Holidays Comparison
- Exhibit 4      Retirement Benefit Comparison
- Exhibit 5      Subcontracting Language Comparisons
- Exhibit 6      Collective Bargaining Agreements –

6.1	Berrien County	2001 – 2003
6.2	Calhoun County	1198 – 2000
6.3	Jackson County	1998 – 2000
6.4	Kalamazoo County	2000 – 2003
6.5	Kent County	2001 – 2003
6.6	Monroe County	1999 – 2002
6.7	Muskegon County	1998 – 2000
6.8	Ottawa County	2000 – 2002
6.9	Saginaw County	2001 – 2004
6.10	Saginaw County	1999 – 2001
6.11	Saginaw County	1999 – 2001

Exhibit 7      MAC Study

Exhibit 8      Elected Officials Wage Increase

**Employer's Submissions:**

Exhibit 1      Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the County of Muskegon and the  
General Employees Unit, Expiration December 31, 2000

Exhibit 2      GEU Fact Finding Internal Comparable Bargaining Units

Exhibit 3      GEU External Comparable Bargaining Units

Exhibit 4      Comparable Income Muskegon versus Surveyed Counties/Per Capita Personal  
Income

Exhibit 5	Comparable Income Muskegon Versus Surveyed Counties/Median Household Income
Exhibit 6	Comparable Income/Average Sale Price – Existing Home Sales
Exhibit 7	Survey Report From the Employers Association of West Michigan
Exhibit 8	GEU Internal Comparables for Holidays
Exhibit 9	External Bargaining Unit – Holidays
Exhibit 10	Cost to Pay for Holidays for GEU Bargaining Unit
Exhibit 11	Internal Comparables Arbitration Procedure
Exhibit 12	External Comparables Arbitration Procedure
Exhibit 13	1997 - 2000 Grievance Activity Report
Exhibit 14	Internal Bargaining Unit Mileage Exhibit
Exhibit 15	External Comparables Mileage Exhibit
Exhibit 16	Report on Fleet Vehicles
Exhibit 17	Internal Comparables on Prescription Co-Pay
Exhibit 18	External Comparables on Prescription Co-Pay
Exhibit 19	Internal Comparables on Dental Coverage
Exhibit 20	External Comparables on Dental Coverage
Exhibit 21	Internal Comparables on Retirement
Exhibit 22	External Comparables on Retirement
Exhibit 23	Internal Bargaining Unit Contracting Out Work Language
Exhibit 24	External Comparables Contracting Out Work Language
Exhibit 25	Internal Bargaining Unit Exhibit Concerning Wages

- Exhibit 26      External Comparables Concerning Wages
- Exhibit 27      Cost of a 2000 Wage Increase for GEU Bargaining Units
- Exhibit 28      Bureau of Labor Statistics Report Concerning the Changes in the Consumer Price  
Index
- Exhibit 29      GEU Hiring Retention Data Survey for the Year 2000 and Year to Date 2001
- Exhibit 30A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Account Clerk I Position
- Exhibit 31A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Account Clerk II Position
- Exhibit 32A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Animal Control Position
- Exhibit 33A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Appraiser Position
- Exhibit 34A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Building Maintenance Mechanic I  
Position
- Exhibit 35A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Building Maintenance II Position
- Exhibit 36A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Clerk II Position
- Exhibit 37A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Housekeeper Position
- Exhibit 38A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Legal Secretary Position
- Exhibit 39A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Microfilm Operator Position
- Exhibit 40A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Secretary Position
- Exhibit 41A-C      Retention Data and Wage Data for the Youth Specialist Position