

My view

From: Allen Reichle (allenreichle@yahoo.com)

To: supervisor@eastchinatownship.org

Date: Monday, June 10, 2024 at 04:26 PM EDT

Hey Verne,

Sorry I missed your call this morning, it was a busy day at work.

So I want to touch on some points with regard to the public utility director as well as the health insurance situation.

I agree that some level of health insurance should potentially be provided for the new non union employee. If we cannot come to an agreement with others involved in the health care part of it, I would support Nicole's suggestion of putting him into the supervisor's union in order to get him covered. Probably not the best situation, but that would solve the health care part.

While agree with you on the health care portion of the DPS position, I do think there is room for negotiation as we are offering him 20 paid days off, off the bat. Also, after speaking to some sources at the MTA and someone at another township its no longer normal to "bank" those paid days off. Potentially year on year, but not when they decide to retire. The whole purpose of paid days off is to take a day off, not to bank them. Which if he is so concerned with having vacation days, that shouldn't be an issue.

I do have a random question with the wording of the posting. It stated vacation days and paid time off. So would he be getting paid days off, plus holidays? I would assume yes, but was unsure with the wording.

Now on the park manager portion of this, I have a suggestion that may solve this whole mess. I agree that she's been promised many things for whatever reason over the years from park commissioners. That being said, I finally found that ordinance about the health care benefits. It's very clear in chapter 36 "Employee Benefits", article 2 and under the "full time employee" section, she would have to log at least 40 hours per week. If she were to join the clerical union and work in the office part time (filling in our newly opened position) she could then average less at 37.5 hours. If not, before we provide her with any sort of health, dental, vision etc, we would be forced to change that ordinance.

Not only would bringing her in the office save us the time and money to recruit someone else, but also she could clock in on a time clock as I believe the park staff are still not clocking in on a time sheet. This would also ensure that she would receive employee benefits.

I also look at the amounts that they have increased her wages in the past 10 years and it's crazy. She has been very well paid considering it is a part time gig and that is probably why we have kept her so long. From the time sheets I have looked at, she still did not come close to 30 hours during the winter time. Which, again doing something else to get those hours would be helpful and the office is both air conditioned and heated. There's potential too, if that would not be feasible and she and the other non union employees could kick in a portion of the health insurance coverage. Many places do that in the public sector and almost every private sector job does.

Now onto the township manager portion of this discussion. I do think that the contract should be reopened to eliminate the cash in lieu portion IF we go to actually provide coverage and again should potentially look into cost sharing. I understand it's possible to do it without opening the contract, but if this is the way we are going to go, just get rid of the "cash in lieu" portion and from looking at similar contracts and public positions our \$750 a month is actually SUPER generous from what I have seen initially. The school district only does \$4,000 and that's for top level employees.

I do agree with Nicole on the costs portion of this and this new position will alleviate a lot of the twp managers work load and obviously yours as well as you've been doing a lot of things above and beyond. I realize, myself and Nicole are probably the vast minority on that issue.

On the health care costs though, we should have it very controlled and like she said, the costs are not going down, they're only going to go up.

We have water rates that were already planned to be going up and these added costs are only going to send them higher. Even with more money (taxable value) from DTE, our budget expenditures still might be bigger this year than planned. We voted down people going to a conference (which I agree, as it was not in the budget) for a \$3,000 bill, but for \$56,000 in health insurance, we aren't going to at least question it?

When water rates are out of control, these decisions we are making are going to directly impact that and we need to all keep that in mind.

Regardless of what any employee or employees say or think, we need to remember that we serve the taxpayers. This is not a charity or a piggy bank to raid which is how most public employees view public money. We are here to safeguard those tax dollars to provide services in the most cost effective manner possible, which I hope we all agree on. Sometimes it's not easy to say no, but sometimes that's the way it goes.

Just wanted you to know where I stood and we need to keep this stuff in mind.

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)