

## Personnel Committee Minutes

Honorable Council  
City of Newark, Ohio  
February 7, 2022

There was a meeting of the Personnel Committee in Council Chambers on February 7, 2022 following the Capital Improvements Committee with these members in attendance:

Jonathan Lang -Chair  
Cheri Hottinger- Vice Chair  
**Mark Labutis**  
Spencer Barker  
Colton Rine

We wish to Report:

1. **Discussion on Ordinance No. 20-16-C** That was Tabled in Council on 1/18/22 until 2/22/22 Council Meeting

**20-16-C** AN ORDINANCE SETTING COMPENSATION AND STATING POLICY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN POSITIONS WITHIN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE LICKING COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE CITY OF NEWARK, OHIO AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS IN CONFLICT

**Mr. Lang** – This Ordinance was Tabled until our February 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting and I believe there was a desire to discuss some new proposed amendments from Ms. Phelps, so since we Table it until the 22<sup>nd</sup> we have tonight to discuss in detail any changes to that legislation and then following this meeting we can turn the notes over to our Law Director and if there is any proposed amendment that can be drafted and be ready for the 22<sup>nd</sup>. So, Ms. Phelps if you would just like to walk us through any changes you are wanting to make to the legislation, we can put that on the record, we can talk about it a bit and we'll have something to work on from there.

**Marcia Phelps, Clerk of Municipal Court** – Once again listen to my plea, and not a guilty plea, joking. Basically, the only changes necessary here is on the Information Technology Coordinator, at the onset it was called Specialist and somehow in all of the drafts and re-drafts it got changed back to Coordinator and it really should just be Specialist. Then I have proposed, with some reluctance, but none the less, in a motion of cooperation, to remove the Deputy Clerk Information Technician Coordinator. I've stated in the past, that position is needed. I'm not disputing the fact that it isn't needed, I'm just trying to bring some compromise, if you will, to the members of council and the administration, as they presented the cost of this legislation and now that we've moved on, it's going to be even less costly, but to remove that position would allow for even less cost. There will be a time when we will have to come back for that position because we will be in a position in the

Clerks Office to change our case management system, a conversion, if you will, not that we're looking forward to it, but we will have to have somebody assigned to do that job, along with the IT Specialist. In absence of having a second person, then a consultant would probably have to be hired and that's probably much more expensive and they really don't have knowledge of our case management system, it takes somebody with experience because it's a bit different, it's not just word documents, but a case management system. So, those are the two proposals to present for consideration of amendments.

**Mr. Lang** – Thank you, so we're really just talking about the correction of the Title on section 3 on the first page and exhibit A, updating that and then removing altogether the newly created position.

**Ms. Hottinger** – Is that position that you are removing, that we might need when the conversion happens, is that a temporary position, because once the conversion is completed will that position still be needed and what would it be needed for.

**Ms. Phelps** – Yes, it would still be needed because right now we only have one IT person for the entire judicial system. One IT person as anybody would know probably is not a real good business practice because when that one person is missing, we are left with no one to support the case management system internally. Of course we do pay an annual fee through the Computer Fund, not the General Fund, for maintenance and any upgrades. Right now, we can experience gaps of service because he has to have time off. He gets sick, he gets vacation and when that occurs, we need to bother him when he is out of the office or we wait to get it fixed. You can't have an entire software system go down and continue to manage the cases, particularly if they are presented in court. So, to answer your question, they would focus first and foremost on conversion and then secondly continue to be a backup. If that were to be the case, if this second person were 100% IT, then we could use the Computer Fund 100%, but they probably wouldn't be 100% IT backup. So, when I come back, and I'll be back, sorry, our Computer Fund may be able to take part of that, but we first have to find out what this new upgrade or conversion is going to cost. We've applied for the Supreme Court Grants twice and both times we've gotten looked over, but we keep trying.

**Mr. Barker** – The position that we're removing, I'm just curious, when and if it comes back, is that a position that you foresee an in-house position or would that be a remote position.

**Ms. Phelps** – Do you mean work from home? No, it would have to be in-house.

**Mr. Barker** – There would be no remote option if they were just managing software?

**Ms. Phelps** – No, because often times you have hardware issues too. To manage cases, you can't do it remotely. And to maintain the system that manages those cases you would have to do it in-house. Our IT person can do remote work, I don't want to deceive you saying he can't because he does. Often times such things as a server going down, I'm not an IT person so I'm doing the best I can with the knowledge I have, but if the server goes down, he can remotely check that. Wednesday it went down, so people couldn't make online payments and so he could remotely fix that for us because we shut down early Thursday and I got ahold of him and he was able to remotely fix the website and everything was happy happy. There are some remote things that can be done, but my recommendation would be that they work on-site, the same business hours that we work.

**Mr. Marmie** – So, your IT person, does that person handle both your office and the judges?

**Ms. Phelps** – He handles, Probation, the Courts, the Clerks Office and some for Law Director's Office, well the Case management system on the charges that are filed. So he does all of those departments.

**Mr. Lang** – So with the updates you are looking to make, I know you had it with the notes you passed along to us, your projected cost is just shy of \$71,000 annually, at least for the first year, right? Mr. Bubb, I don't know if you are prepared to answer this question or not, but I had reached out to have you guys verify the total cost and I think what you had sent back was just over \$61,000, so I'm not sure what the difference was between the two projections. I don't know if you can speak to that, or if you want to just let us know that's fine too.

**Ryan Bubb, City Auditor** – I can pull up the message, but I believe it was less the positions, it was also less one Clerk, so it was less two positions, the new number that I sent over compared to the original \$150,000 number, if that makes sense.

**Mr. Lang** – I'll certainly say, it's your request and if you are looking to amend it before we give a final vote I'm supportive of actually voting on what you want to request, so I will work with the Law Director to get that amendment presented to Council at our February 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

**Ms. Phelps** – That's wonderful, thank you I appreciate it.

The Personnel Committee is adjourned

Jonathan Lang- Chair