

SEPTEMBER 22, 2011

On the above date the Luzerne County Board of Commissioners convened a Salary Board Meeting with the following present: Maryanne Petrilla, Chairman; Thomas P. Cooney, Commissioner; Stephen A. Urban, Commissioner; Walter Griffith, Controller; Douglas Pape, County Manager for Legislation/Chief Clerk; Vito DeLuca, Solicitor; Andy Check, Director of Human Resources; Angelo Terrana, Esq., Board of Assessment Appeals

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No Public Comment

**COMMUNICATIONS:.....Douglas A. Pape
County Manager/Chief Clerk**

REQUEST A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE SALARY BOARD MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2011.

It was moved by Commissioner Urban, seconded by Commissioner Cooney
“**AYES” PETRILLA, COONEY, URBAN, GRIFFITH**

REQUEST A MOTION TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING SALARY BOARD ACTION

FOR:

ASSESSORS OFFICE:

- Eliminate:** One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$25,250 effective September 22, 2011.
- Two (2) Real Property Field Investigators at an Annual Salary of \$30,797 effective September 22, 2011.
- One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$24,250 effective September 22, 2011.
- One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$23,250 effective September 22, 2011.
- One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$24,750 effective September 22, 2011.
- One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$31,209 effective September 22, 2011.
- One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$27,192 effective September 22, 2011.
- Create:** One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$ 25,750 effective September 22, 2011.
- Two (2) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$ 31,297 effective September 22, 2011.
- One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$ 24,750 effective September 22, 2011.
- One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$ 23,750 effective September 22, 2011.

One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$ 25,250 effective September 22, 2011.

One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$ 31,709 effective September 22, 2011.

One (1) Real Property Field Investigator at an Annual Salary of \$ 27,692 effective September 22, 2011.

Walter Griffith

Is there a signed agreement from the Union? So you don't know if the Union is going to settle the grievance? I asked for one.

Max Blaskiewicz

Not yet---there's not one.

Griffith

We don't know if you are going to get grieved or not?

Blaskiewicz

They were to agree with the settlement of that particular grievance.

Griffith

But you don't have anything in writing that states that....

Blaskiewicz

No. Not as yet. Are you asking that there won't be further grievances from other people? I don't have that guarantee.

Griffith

This is for re-classification of the entire office, correct?

Blaskiewicz

Yes...that's part of it. What we agreed to do was that eight field assessors would be given a \$500.00 increase. But I don't know if there would be other grievances. I don't have that yet.

Griffith

Where does the eight come from when the agreement the Commissioners signed in 2009 had 5 field assessors?

Blaskiewicz

Where do 8 come from?

Griffith

Yes.

Blaskiewicz

There are eight field assessors currently in the office.

Griffith

But the grievance they filed said that there are 5, right?

Blaskiewicz

That's not a grievance.

Griffith

But this is what the Commissioners signed in 2009.

Blaskiewicz

That was an agreement signed in 2007 and there was a grievance filed on that particular document under the condition that would be met... (Unintelligible) They then re-filed this new agreement in 2010.

Andy Check

That was the staffing at that time in that job class. Presently there are 8 field assessors.

Griffith

But this grievance, unless they filed a new grievance I did get, deals with this particular issue.

Blaskiewicz

What I am saying is that particular grievance on that document was withdrawn because they were under the understanding that the document was going to happen. The agreement was to go ahead and re-classify the office. But the conditions of putting increases on it were not met and they refilled a new grievance in 2010.

Griffith

Did I receive it?

Blaskiewicz

Yes. I sent it to you by email.

Angelo Terrana

I was looking at the 2009. The five individuals come from...there were 3 field investigators and 2 clerks who went to 21st Century to learn their system and I believe that's where the 5 came from. It was a new idea 21st Century came up with to learn their software. The October 2007 agreement made reference to these 5 people.

Blaskiewicz

The 2010 grievance will resolve re-classification of the department and I can't guarantee there won't be more grievances at a later time.

Terrana

And that's the issue! We need something in writing that will guarantee that 20 more people won't come back and file a grievance for an increase.

Commissioner Urban

You don't file a grievance for an increase. What needs to be done is...if people are doing additional work, you must update their job descriptions. There is a formal process where you run those descriptions by the union and get approval and bring them back to us. That has to happen at your level. This today is to get rid of the grievance once and for all. You need to look at each person in your office. Look at their work and if they need an increase do the formal documentation and run it through the Union and bring it back to the Salary Board. That would prevent anything from being filed in the future. But this is to settle something right now...You have to determine what is going to be. We aren't going to give everyone a \$5,000 to \$10,000

raise. And yet as of right now, the Salary for the Board of Assessment Appeals cannot be any higher.

Commissioner Petrilla

That has nothing to do with this motion, Steve. You can talk about that at another time. This is the motion on the table. I have one question about this motion. If this grievance was to re-classify the office, where did the \$500.00 per person come from?

Blaskiewicz

I believe it was negotiated down from the union and they came and agreed to settle for \$500.00. This was earmarked for arbitration, too.

It was moved by Commissioner Urban, seconded by Commissioner Cooney
“AYES” URBAN, COONEY “NAY” PETRILLA, GRIFFITH, TERRANA

Motion fails.

Commissioner Urban

You have a job to do now. Your job now is to go through every job classification and do it the right way. The way it was to have been done in 2007. And I'd like to be done expeditiously.

Terrana

We have done it.

Commissioner Urban

Well, where is it? It's not up-to-date. We have a grievance here. It has not been resolved...

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

It was moved by Commissioner Cooney, seconded by Commissioner Urban
“AYES” PETRILLA, COONEY, URBAN, GRIFFITH

Respectfully submitted,



Jennifer Thomas, Recording Secretary