Date /Time:	Tuesday, October 20, 2015 / 3:00 p.m.
Location:	JW Olver Transit Center, 12 Olive Street Greenfield, MA – Library
Facilitator:	Bill Perlman, Chair

Carol Grandfield, Municipal Resources

COUNCIL REP ATTENDEES:

- Bill Perlman, Regionally Elected Representative
- Gordon Fretwell, Sunderland Representative
- Dawn Magi, Warwick Representative
- Marilyn Wilson, Rowe Representative,

STAFF: GUEST:

- Linda Dunlavy, Executive Director
- Pat Auchard, Finance Director
- Bob Dean, Director of Regional Services
- Phoebe Walker, Director of Community Services

REGRETS & ABSENCES:

• Brian Noble, Northfield Representative, Regrets

1. Reorganize

Bill Perlman opened the meeting at 3:04 p.m.

- Gordon Fretwell nominated Bill Perlman for Committee Chair
- Bill Perlman nominated Gordon Fretwell for Committee Chair

Dawn moved the slate of nominations. Marilyn seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Adopt 6/3/15 minutes

Minutes were not available for approval at this time.

3. Discussion with Carol Granfield of Municipal Resources about Wage and Classification Study

Bill described the request for Carol Granfield, consultant from Municipal Resources, to assess our wage structure and grading system. Carol passed out the comparative market review. Job descriptions will be mailed next month for review. Carol reviewed the comparative market data with members.

Bill asked about the economic research institute column. This is a New England composite. Carol showed how they use it. She recommends FRCOG pay within 10% of the average, plus or minus. Five positions were higher, 4 were lower, and the rest were within the 10% range. Bill asked what number of comparisons would be important to have in order to have confidence in the data. Carol said 5 are ideal. Members discussed whether they should get more comparisons.

Dawn asked if the median has been compared to the average. Carol Granfield said no, they are close enough, in their experience. Phoebe offered to make more calls if the committee wants, especially for FCCIP and PFY, which have very few comparables. Gordon asked if any positions were hired at rates higher than grade average that need to be taken out of analysis. Linda responded no.

Carol reviewed the proposed pay plan with 16 grades vs the 20 current grades. Each is 7% apart, but longer — from 28% to 35% of the low end of each. She has taken out all the unused ones (grades 1-4). She thinks this is what is needed for expansion and growth of staff, and to prevent people from being moved into a higher grade to get a raise, when the grade they were in was appropriate.

Bill asked how people move up in other organizations in their grade. Carol said merit increase systems help with this. We need to increase by CPI or other COLA measure annually to stay current, she said.

The group discussed longevity as a basis for increases. Gordon asked if FRCOG should reduce the minimum and increase to 50% the width of each range, to make it more attractive. The group discussed this and Carol pointed out that the market study will show an actual minimum.

Carol reviewed the proposed classification plan. Gordon asked Linda whether FRCOG would hire anyone in grade 1. Linda said only interns or intern-like employees.

Members discussed whether to take all the empty rows out and take upper level admin out of the system. Carol said a time might come when director (department head) jobs expand up. Bill P. suggested fewer higher grades (14, 15) and widening out to 6 and 9. Marilyn said it was important not to appear top heavy, while protecting our valuable staff. Fewer empty grades at the top would be better, she added. Gordon agreed. Bill would like to find some kind of automatic increase. Carol said longevity might be possible along with the merit system. Gordon felt there were too many different actions in the upper levels.

Bill suggested FRCOG could stop grading at a certain point for upper administrative staff. Carol said they could be contracted instead.

The group discussed the importance of providing the staff with a mechanism to move, not just give them a wider range. Bill said FRCOG needs to be competitive and stay competitive, and have a process that is not a burden to manage.

Carol said they will finalize the grading instrument in the next month and draft a final report. This will give the committee time to review before the public distribution.

Bill reiterated his idea: COLA, longevity, merit. Gordon feels longevity shouldn't be a bonus, but added to salary.

Bill said the wage study should be implemented going forward to find the right place for new people, and for existing staff to do an analysis of years with COG and in current position, etc. Dawn asked if grades of positions had changed. Linda said no.

Gordon asked if we can assess years of experience coming into a job. A discussion ensued on the topic.

Linda asked if the project will be far enough along to have the joint meeting with the finance committee in mid November. Gordon asked if there were financial impacts. Carol said there is no financial impact based on her study, but how it is implemented is a decision of the committee.

4. Updates on Personnel Policy overhaul

Linda reviewed the potential new policies and asked members to consider whether or not they would support them. The committee will review it and address it later.

5. Discussion of new state sick time law

Linda explained the sick time law and the Finance Committee vote not to implement it this year. Gordon asked what the actual cost to towns might be. Linda explained that it wouldn't be an expense for the towns as it would come out of indirect.

Gordon made a motion to offer sick time to employees who work 20 hours or less. Dawn seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

Pending personnel policy completion or completion of the draft of the wage classification document, the next meeting will take place on November 17, 2015 at 3:00.

Dawn moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:57 p.m. Gordon seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED:

- Agenda
- Comparative Market Review