STATE OF MICHIGAN

DEFARTMENT OF LABOR

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR STATE OF MICHICAN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION OF THE LATIONS COMMISSION OF THE LATION OF THE LATIONS COMMISSION OF THE LATIONS COMMISSION OF THE LATION OF T

University

LABOR ALD ENDUSTRIAL

RE: COUNTY OF MACOMB

RELATIONS LIBRARY

-And

AFSCME, COUNCIL 23, LOCAL 1905, Case No. D73 C-546

AFL-CIO

FACT FINDING RECOMMENDATIONS

A fact finding hearing was held on August 6, 1973, at 1565 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan. The parties agreed that there were three areas in dispute.

Representing the County were:

Joseph Zacharzewski, Director of Personnel, Alfred A. Blomberg, Civil Counsel.

Representing the Union were:

Henry J. Mueller, President Local 1905, Gary A. Garwood, President Macomb Chapter, Ralph A. Liberate, President Council #23, AFSCME.

The parties outlined their respective positions on the following issues in dispute:

- Annual salaries of County Probation officers at entry 1. level, at the end of six months, and at the end of each year, up to and including the fifth year of em ployment;
- 2. Automobile mileage;
- 3. Parking fees.

The Fact Finder and the parties all agreed that Briefs, with attached Exhibits, should be submitted to the Fact Finder and no further testimony need be taken unless the Briefs were inadequate to supply all of the information necessary for the Fact Finder to make his

recommendations. Thereafter, voluminous Briefs with comprehensive Exhibits were submitted by both parties and the Fact Finder carefully reviewed the same in arriving at the following recommendations:

1. ANNUAL SALARY

The County supplied Exhibits 1 through 5 which indicated that, with the possible exception of St. Clair County, the Probation Officers in neighboring Counties, such as, Wayne and Oakland Counties, and those Probation Officers working directly for the State of Michigan, are paid basic salaries in excess of those in Macomb County. It would also appear, however, as the County contends, that the fringe benefits already received by the Macomb County Probation Officers, such as Holidays, Sick Leave, and Insurance Benefits, are generally more favorable than the fringes received by the Probation Officers thus compared. Taken on balance, the Fact Finder makes the following recommended salary schedule in order to bring Macomb into parity with the others, taking into consideration the relative fringes:

Annual Compensation

| Entry Level - | \$ 10,191.00 |
|---------------|--------------|
| 6 Months - | 10,497.00 |
| l Year - | 11,175.00 |
| 2 Years - | 12,425.00 |
| 3 Years | 13,500.00 |
| 4 Years - | 14,200.00 |
| 5 Years - | 14,900.00 |

2. AUTOMOBILE MILEAGE

The County offers a mileage allowance of 12 cents for the first 500 miles; 10 cents for the next 500 miles; and 8 cents thereafter with

no limit. It is difficult to compare this offer, and the Union's demand for a straight 15 cents per mile, with the State allowances, but it is clear that all three neighboring Counties which were compared offer better mileage allowances than those tendered to the Union here. The Fact Finder determines that the Oakland County schedule most closely approximates the driving conditions faced by the Union in Macomb County and therefore recomends its adoption here. The Schedule is as follows:

- 13 cents first 600 miles;
- 11 cents next 400 miles;
- 9 cents thereafter.

3. PARKING FEES

The Union has offered to pay for parking on a once-a-day basis but seeks reimbursement or free parking when re-entry is made to the parking lot since the automobiles are being used on County business.

The County, on the other hand, points to its uniform Contracts with other County employees, who must pay the re-entry fees out of their own pockets. The County claims that the Probation Officers have shown no reason for preferential treatment.

The Fact Finder agrees with the County's contention that the policy should be kept uniform among the County employees and, thus, recomends that the Union be denied free re-entry to the County parking lot.

CONCLUSION

The Fact Finder considers these recommendations on salaries and benefits as reasonable either under the theory that skilled public employees should be allowed to catch up with those employed in the private sector, or under the theory that salaries of Probation Officers

in one County should not be unfavorably compared with nearby, similar Counties. It is the opinion of the Fact Finder that long standing inequities have existed for years in the public sector and that these inequities should gradually be corrected. Both sides have very ably presented their respective positions and the Fact Finder feels that his recommendations are based on a digest of all of the available pertinent information.

John B. Kiefer

John B. Kiefer

1565 Penobscot Building Detroit, Michigan 48226

Wo. 1-8080

Dated: November 5, 1973