

Minnesota Attorney General: Administrative Rules Proceedings

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

Version 3
August 20, 2018

MINNESOTA STATE REGULATIONS

Notice of filing by the Commissioner of Administration

We have received on this date, stamped and filed 2 copies of Rules and Regulations pertaining to the Civil Defense (Agency or Board)

Regulation No. D.E.S 140 and 141

Subject: Compensation Plan

Department of Administration
Publication, Central Services Division
Documents Section
140 Centennial Office Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
Telephone: (612) 296-2874

FILED
RICHARD L. BRUBACHER
Commissioner of Administration

DEC 18 1975

BY Eda Flaudenmaier RS
AUTH. SIGNATURE

Stamped and filed with the Secretary of State Dec 18, 1975 3:05PM RS

Rev. 9-72

(Delete entire existing DES 140 Compensation Plan and DES 141 Standard Table and insert the following pages.)

Due to the numerous changes in the previous rules they are not shown by ~~strike-out~~; only the new rules are shown.

DES 140 Compensation Plan

(a) Professional
(1) Plan A

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Local Civil Defense Director I	691	723	755	789	826	863	902	944
Local Civil Defense Director II	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079
Local Civil Defense Director III	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Local Civil Defense Director IV	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
Local Civil Defense Director V	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
County Civil Defense Director I	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177
County Civil Defense Director II	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
County Civil Defense Director III	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
County Civil Defense Director IV	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
Asst. Civil Defense Director I	604	631	660	691	723	755	789	826
Asst. Civil Defense Director II	723	755	789	826	863	902	944	987
Asst. Civil Defense Director III	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177
Asst. Civil Defense Director IV	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409
Administrative Officer	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Public Information Officer	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Safety Service Coordinator	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Operations Officer	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Radiological Defense Officer	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079
Communication Officer	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079

(a) Professional

(2) Plan B

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Local Civil Defense Director I	691	723	755	789	826	863	902	944
Local Civil Defense Director II	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079
Local Civil Defense Director III	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Local Civil Defense Director IV	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
Local Civil Defense Director V	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
County Civil Defense Director I	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177
County Civil Defense Director II	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
County Civil Defense Director III	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
County Civil Defense Director IV	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
Asst. Civil Defense Director I	631	660	691	723	755	789	826	863
Asst. Civil Defense Director II	755	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032
Asst. Civil Defense Director III	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Asst. Civil Defense Director IV	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472
Administrative Officer	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290
Public Information Officer	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290
Safety Services Coordinator	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290
Operations Officer	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290
Radiological Defense Officer	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126
Communication Officer	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126

(a) Professional
(3) Plan C

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Local Civil Defense Director I	691	723	755	789	826	863	902	944
Local Civil Defense Director II	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079
Local Civil Defense Director III	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Local Civil Defense Director IV	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
Local Civil Defense Director V	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
County Civil Defense Director I	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177
County Civil Defense Director II	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
County Civil Defense Director III	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
County Civil Defense Director IV	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
Asst. Civil Defense Director I	660	691	723	755	789	826	863	902
Asst. Civil Defense Director II	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079
Asst. Civil Defense Director III	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290
Asst. Civil Defense Director IV	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
Administrative Officer	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
Public Information Officer	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
Safety Services Coordinator	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
Operations Officer	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
Radiological Defense Officer	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177
Communication Officer	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177

(b) Clerical

(1) Plan A

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	383	398	414	430	446	462	483	504
Clerk II	446	462	483	504	525	546	567	588
Clerk III	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk-Typist I	398	414	430	446	462	483	504	525
Clerk-Typist II	446	462	483	504	525	546	567	588
Clerk-Typist III	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk-Steno I	414	430	446	462	483	504	525	546
Clerk-Steno II	483	504	525	546	567	588	614	640
Clerk-Steno III	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694

(2) Plan B

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	398	414	430	446	462	483	504	525
Clerk II	462	483	504	525	546	567	588	614
Clerk III	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725
Clerk-Typist I	414	430	446	462	483	504	525	546
Clerk-Typist II	462	483	504	525	546	567	588	614
Clerk-Typist III	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725
Clerk-Steno I	430	446	462	483	504	525	546	567
Clerk-Steno II	504	525	546	567	588	614	640	667
Clerk-Steno III	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725

(3) Plan C

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	414	430	446	462	483	504	525	546
Clerk II	483	504	525	546	567	588	614	640
Clerk III	567	588	614	640	667	694	725	757
Clerk-Typist I	430	446	462	483	504	525	546	567
Clerk-Typist II	483	504	525	546	567	588	614	640
Clerk-Typist III	567	588	614	640	667	694	725	757
Clerk-Steno I	446	462	483	504	525	546	567	588
Clerk-Steno II	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk-Steno III	567	588	614	640	667	694	725	757

(b) Clerical

(4) Plan D

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	430	446	462	483	504	525	546	567
Clerk II	504	525	546	567	588	614	640	667
Clerk III	588	614	640	667	694	725	757	789
Clerk-Typist I	446	462	483	504	525	546	567	588
Clerk-Typist II	504	525	546	567	588	614	640	667
Clerk-Typist III	588	614	640	667	694	725	757	789
Clerk-Steno I	462	483	504	525	546	567	588	614
Clerk-Steno II	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725
Clerk-Steno III	588	614	640	667	694	725	757	789

(5) Plan E

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	446	462	483	504	525	546	567	588
Clerk II	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk III	614	640	667	694	725	757	789	821
Clerk-Typist I	462	483	504	525	546	567	588	614
Clerk-Typist II	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk-Typist III	614	640	667	694	725	757	789	821
Clerk-Steno I	483	504	525	546	567	588	614	640
Clerk-Steno II	567	588	614	640	667	694	725	757
Clerk-Steno III	614	640	667	694	725	757	789	821

(6) Plan F

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	483	504	525	546	567	588	614	640
Clerk II	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725
Clerk III	640	667	694	725	757	789	821	857
Clerk-Typist I	504	525	546	567	588	614	640	667
Clerk-Typist II	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725
Clerk-Typist III	640	667	694	725	757	789	821	857
Clerk-Steno I	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk-Steno II	588	614	640	667	694	725	757	789
Clerk-Steno III	640	667	694	725	757	789	821	857

DES 141

CIVIL DEFENSE SALARY SCHEDULE

FOR PROFESSIONAL CLASSES

STANDARD TABLE FOR COMPUTING LESS-THAN-FULL-TIME-SALARY AND BI-WEEKLY SALARY RATES

Monthly Salary	Hourly Rate*	Bi-weekly Rate**	Salary Per Working Day for Months with the Following Number of Working Days Plus Holidays. (For Agencies That Pay by the Month or Twice a Month.)***			
			20 Days	21 Days	22 Days	23 Days
$675	$3.88	$310.40	$33.75	$32.14	$30.68	$29.35
691	3.97	317.60	34.55	32.90	31.41	30.04
707	4.06	324.80	35.35	33.67	32.14	30.74
723	4.16	332.80	36.15	34.43	32.86	31.43
739	4.25	340.00	36.95	35.19	33.59	32.13
755	4.34	347.20	37.75	35.95	34.32	32.83
771	4.43	354.40	38.55	36.71	35.05	33.52
789	4.53	362.40	39.45	37.57	35.86	34.30
807	4.64	371.20	40.35	38.43	36.68	35.09
826	4.75	380.00	41.30	39.33	37.55	35.91
844	4.85	388.00	42.20	40.19	38.36	36.70
863	4.96	396.80	43.15	41.10	39.23	37.52
881	5.06	404.80	44.05	41.95	40.05	38.30
902	5.18	414.40	45.10	42.95	41.00	39.22
923	5.30	424.00	46.15	43.95	41.95	40.13
944	5.43	434.40	47.20	44.95	42.91	41.04
965	5.55	444.00	48.25	45.95	43.86	41.96
987	5.67	453.60	49.35	47.00	44.86	42.91
1008	5.79	463.20	50.40	48.00	45.82	43.83
1032	5.93	474.40	51.60	49.14	46.91	44.87
1055	6.06	484.80	52.75	50.24	47.95	45.87
1079	6.20	496.00	53.95	51.38	49.05	46.91
1102	6.33	506.40	55.10	52.48	50.09	47.91
1126	6.47	517.60	56.30	53.62	51.18	48.96
1150	6.61	528.80	57.50	54.76	52.27	50.00
1177	6.76	540.80	58.85	56.05	53.50	51.17
1203	6.91	552.80	60.15	57.29	54.68	52.30
1232	7.08	566.40	61.60	58.67	56.00	53.56
1261	7.25	580.00	63.05	60.05	57.32	54.83
1290	7.41	592.80	64.50	61.43	58.64	56.09
1319	7.58	606.40	65.95	62.81	59.95	57.35
1348	7.75	620.00	67.40	64.19	61.27	58.61
1377	7.91	632.80	68.85	65.57	62.59	59.87
1409	8.10	648.00	70.45	67.10	64.05	61.26
1440	8.28	662.40	72.00	68.57	65.45	62.61
1472	8.46	676.80	73.60	70.10	66.91	64.00
1503	8.64	691.20	75.15	71.57	68.32	65.35
1538	8.84	707.20	76.90	73.24	69.91	66.87
1572	9.03	722.40	78.60	74.86	71.45	68.35
1609	9.25	740.00	80.45	76.62	73.14	69.96

Monthly Salary	Hourly Rate*	Bi-weekly Rate**	Salary Per Working Day for Months with the Following Number of Working Days Plus Holidays. (For Agencies That Pay by the Month or Twice a Month.)***			
			20 Days	21 Days	22 Days	23 Days
$1646	$9.46	$756.80	$82.30	$78.38	$74.82	$71.57
1683	9.67	773.60	84.15	80.14	76.50	73.17
1720	9.89	791.20	86.00	81.90	78.18	74.78
1760	10.11	808.80	88.00	83.81	80.00	76.52
1799	10.34	827.20	89.95	85.67	81.77	78.22
1839	10.57	845.60	91.95	87.57	83.59	79.96
1878	10.79	863.20	93.90	89.43	85.36	81.65
1923	11.05	884.00	96.15	91.57	87.41	83.61
1968	11.31	904.80	98.40	93.71	89.45	85.57
2013	11.57	925.60	100.65	95.86	91.50	87.52
2057	11.82	945.60	102.85	97.95	93.50	89.43
2105	12.10	968.00	105.25	100.24	95.68	91.52
2152	12.37	989.60	107.60	102.48	97.82	93.57
2200	12.64	1011.20	110.00	104.76	100.00	95.65
2247	12.91	1032.80	112.35	107.00	102.14	97.70
2297	13.20	1056.00	114.85	109.38	104.41	99.87
2347	13.49	1079.20	117.35	111.76	106.68	102.04
2398	13.78	1102.40	119.90	114.19	109.00	104.26

*Hourly rates are based on 2088 hours in a year.

**To compute a partial payment on the bi-weekly rate, divide the bi-weekly rate by ten to find the daily rate. Multiply the daily rate by the number of days the employee worked (and/or was on approved vacation, sick leave, or holiday leave). Formula: Rate per working day X number of days worked = salary payment. Hourly rate is as shown in column two headed "Hourly Rate."

***To compute the number of days in the month for which payment is to be made, count the working days plus the holidays. Do not count Saturdays or Sundays. After determining this number, find the appropriate working-day rate for the month salary rate at which the employee is currently being paid.

Multiply the rate per day by the number of days the employee worked (and/or was on approved vacation, sick leave, or holiday leave) in order to compute the payment for the pay period. Formula: Rate per working day X number of days worked = salary payment.

DES 141

CIVIL DEFENSE SALARY SCHEDULE

FOR CLERICAL CLASSES

STANDARD TABLE FOR COMPUTING LESS-THAN-FULL-TIME SALARY AND BI-WEEKLY SALARY RATES

Monthly Salary	Hourly Rate*	Bi-weekly Rate**	Salary Per Working Day for Months with the Following Number of Working Days Plus Holidays. (For Agencies That Pay by the Month or Twice a Month.)***			
			20 Days	21 Days	22 Days	23 Days
$383	$2.20	$176.00	$19.15	$18.24	$17.41	$16.65
398	2.29	183.20	19.90	18.95	18.09	17.30
406	2.33	186.40	20.30	19.33	18.45	17.65
414	2.38	190.40	20.70	19.71	18.82	18.00
422	2.43	194.40	21.10	20.10	19.18	18.35
430	2.47	197.60	21.50	20.48	19.55	18.70
438	2.52	201.60	21.90	20.86	19.91	19.04
446	2.56	204.80	22.30	21.24	20.27	19.39
454	2.61	208.80	22.70	21.62	20.64	19.74
462	2.66	212.80	23.10	22.00	21.00	20.09
473	2.72	217.60	23.65	22.52	21.50	20.57
483	2.78	222.40	24.15	23.00	21.95	21.00
494	2.84	227.20	24.70	23.52	22.45	21.48
504	2.90	232.00	25.20	24.00	22.91	21.91
515	2.96	236.80	25.75	24.52	23.41	22.39
525	3.02	241.60	26.25	25.00	23.86	22.83
536	3.08	246.40	26.80	25.52	24.36	23.30
546	3.14	251.20	27.30	26.00	24.82	23.74
557	3.20	256.00	27.85	26.52	25.32	24.22
567	3.26	260.80	28.35	27.00	25.77	24.65
578	3.32	265.60	28.90	27.52	26.27	25.13
588	3.38	270.40	29.40	28.00	26.73	25.57
601	3.45	276.00	30.05	28.62	27.32	26.13
614	3.53	282.40	30.70	29.24	27.91	26.70
627	3.60	288.00	31.35	29.86	28.50	27.26
640	3.68	294.40	32.00	30.48	29.09	27.83
654	3.76	300.80	32.70	31.14	29.73	28.43
667	3.83	306.40	33.35	31.76	30.32	29.00
681	3.91	312.80	34.05	32.43	30.95	29.61
694	3.99	319.20	34.70	33.05	31.55	30.17
710	4.08	326.40	35.50	33.81	32.27	30.87
725	4.17	333.60	36.25	34.52	32.95	31.52
741	4.26	340.80	37.05	35.29	33.68	32.22
757	4.35	348.00	37.85	36.05	34.41	32.91
773	4.44	355.20	38.65	36.81	35.14	33.61
789	4.53	362.40	39.45	37.57	35.86	34.30
805	4.63	370.40	40.25	38.33	36.59	35.00
821	4.72	377.60	41.05	39.10	37.32	35.70
839	4.82	385.60	41.95	39.95	38.14	36.48
857	4.93	394.40	42.85	40.81	38.95	37.26
876	5.03	402.40	43.80	41.71	39.82	38.09
894	5.14	411.20	44.70	42.57	40.64	38.87
913	5.25	420.00	45.65	43.48	41.50	39.70
931	5.35	428.00	46.55	44.33	42.32	40.48

Monthly Salary	Hourly Rate	Bi-weekly Rate	Salary Per Working Day for Months with the Following Number of Working Days Plus Holidays. (For Agencies That Pay by the Month or Twice a Month.)***			
			20 Days	21 Days	22 Days	23 Days
$952	$5.47	$437.60	$47.60	$45.33	$43.27	$41.39
973	5.59	447.20	48.65	46.33	44.23	42.30
994	5.71	456.80	49.70	47.33	45.18	43.22
1015	5.83	466.40	50.75	48.33	46.14	44.13
1037	5.96	476.80	51.85	49.38	47.14	45.09
1058	6.08	486.40	52.90	50.38	48.09	46.00

*Hourly rates are based on 2088 hours in a year.

**To compute a partial payment on the bi-weekly rate, divide the bi-weekly rate by ten to find the daily rate. Multiply the daily rate by the number of days the employee worked (and/or was on approved vacation, sick leave, or holiday leave). Formula: Rate per working day X number of days worked = salary payment. Hourly rate is as shown in column two headed "Hourly Rate."

***To compute the number of days in the month for which payment is to be made, count the working days plus the holidays. Do not count Saturdays or Sundays. After determining this number, find the appropriate working-day rate for the month salary rate at which the employee is currently being paid.

Multiply the rate per day by the number of days the employee worked (and/or was on approved vacation, sick leave, or holiday leave) in order to compute the payment for the pay period. Formula: Rate per working day X number of days worked = salary payment.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY
DEC 18 1975 19
WARREN SPANNAUS, ATTORNEY GENERAL
BY /s/ Michael B. Miller
SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
FILED
DEC 18 1975
James Anderson Growe
Secretary of State
2:47 P.M.

FILED
RICHARD L. BRUBACHER
Commissioner of Administration
DEC 18 1975
BY Edna Stenemann
AUTH. SIGNATURE
3:05 pm

ADMIN. 1000
3

STATE OF MINNESOTA

DEPARTMENT Attorney General

Office Memorandum

TO : Michael B. Miller
Special Assistant Attorney General

DATE: November 26, 1975

FROM : Joel A. Watne
Special Assistant Attorney General

SUBJECT: Amended Regulations DES 140 and DES 141

Enclosed herewith, please find proposed amended rules and regulations promulgated by the Commissioner of Public Safety relative to the salary schedules of clerical and professional employees under the Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System.

Would you please have them filed with the Secretary of State so that they may go into effect on January 1, 1976 as recommended?

Enc.
JAW: ps

Attorney General

Michael B. Miller
Special Assistant Attorney General

Joel A. Watne
Special Assistant Attorney General

Amended Regulations DES 140 and DES 141

Enclosed herewith, please find proposed amended rules and regulations promulgated by the Commissioner of Public Safety relative to the salary schedules of Clerical and professional employees under the Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System.

Would you please have them filed with the Secretary of State so that they may go into effect on January 1, 1976 as recommended?

Enc.
JAW: ps

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER
211 STATE HIGHWAY BUILDING

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
SAINT PAUL 55155

November 5, 1975

The Honorable Warren Spannaus
Attorney General
State of Minnesota
102 State Capitol
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Dear Mr. Spannaus:

The rules and regulations of the Department of Public Safety pertaining to the Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System are being changed in several respects:

The proposed changes in these rules and regulations were considered at a public hearing on September 12, 1975, following notice to interested parties on July 30, 1975.

After consideration of the testimony given at the joint public hearing and reviewing the written data submitted before and after the hearing, I, as Commissioner of Public Safety promulgated the attached rules and regulations.

The rules for the Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System involve the following changes:

Professional Salary Schedule
Adjust the existing minimum and maximum salaries for all classes on this schedule one and one-half steps (approximately 6.75%). All incumbents will receive this adjustment in their monthly salary.

Clerical Salary Schedule
Adjust the existing minimum and maximum salaries for classes on this schedule in varying amounts from $13 to $35 in monthly salaries. All incumbents in this schedule will receive a $50 per month upward adjustment.

The recommended effective date for these changes is 1-1-76.

Please give these revisions your early approval so that they may be filed with the Secretary of State and the Commissioner of Administration and become effective.

Very truly yours,

Edw Novak

Edward G. Novak
Commissioner of Public Safety

Attachments

Transcript of Public Hearing

Held September 12, 1975

Before Dan Gustafson

Hearings Officer

Dan Gustafson: Ladies and gentlemen, if I can have your attention we will open up the hearing today which is a hearing concerning the adjustment of compensation plans for the county and local departments of public welfare, health, and public safety. Also included is a proposal to base payment of salaries on a forty-hour week and some administrative rule proposals. First I would like to introduce to you the members of the Merit System Council, Mrs. Helen Blomquist, MR. Tom Ryan and my name is Dan Gustafson. I serve as Chairman of the Merit System Council and also your hearings officer today. We have with us today Mr. Jack McKasy representing Dr. Lawson of the Minnesota Department of Health, Mr. Ed Jasinski representing Commissioner Ed Novak from the Department of Public Safety. First of all for the record I would like to show a presentation of Order of Hearing dated July 31, 1975, signed by Vera Likins, Commissioner of Public Welfare, the Order of Hearing dated July 30, 1975 and signed by Dr. Warren R. Lawson, Commissioner of Health and the Order of Hearing dated July 30, 1975 and signed by Mr. Ed Novak, Commissioner of Public Safety. Next is the presentation of Notice of Hearing dated July 31, 1975 signed by Vera Likins, Commissioner of Public Welfare, the Notice of Hearing, dated July 30, 1975 signed by Dr. Warren Lawson, Commissioner of Health and the Notice of Hearing dated July 30, 1975 signed by Ed Novak, Commissioner of Public Safety. The third item for presentation is three Affidavits of Mailing signed by Patricia Flatten and noterized by Patricia Schultz dated August 8, 1975. The fourth item for presentation is the Certificates that the attached mailing labels and sheets for the Departments of Health, Safety and Welfare constitute

the complete list of persons, associations, and other interested groups who as of 8:30 a.m. on the 6th of August, 1975, had requested that their names be placed on file with the Minnesota Secretary of State for the purpose of receiving notices of public hearings on proposed rule changes for the named State agencies. I will now introduce to you Barbara Sundquist, Merit System Supervisor, who will present the results of the Salary Survey and the proposed rule changes.

We will take testimony today on the proposed rule changes. Any final decision on the matters considered today will be withheld 20 days until October 3, 1975, to allow time for anyone who wishes to submit written comments or reactions. Anyone wishing to make any statements or ask any questions after Mrs. Sundquist's presentation may do so by coming forward to the floor mike, stating their name and county or who they represent and if you give additional testimony later, please re-identify yourself. We already have received some written testimony. Please address any additional testimony to the Merit System, fourth floor, Centennial Office Building, St. Paul, Minnesota. Mrs. Sundquist will see to it that all such correspondence is forwarded to the Commissioners of the State agencies specifically affected as well as to the Merit System Council. Barbara will you please take the mike.

Barbara Sundquist: Good morning. All matters which will be considered here today are in regard to the Minnesota Merit System. This System services county welfare departments and local and county public health and civil defense agencies.

Following the public hearing, the Commissioner of Public Welfare has the authority to adopt or not adopt proposals involving the County Welfare Merit System. The State Board of Health has the same authority

for proposals involving the Public Health Merit System and the Commissioner of Public Safety for the proposals involving the Civil Defense Merit System.

The first matter for consideration is salary adjustments to compensation plans. For the most part, proposed adjustments for Welfare, Public Health and Civil Defense will be discussed simultaneously, unless mention is made that a specific proposal pertains just to one system. The rules for all three systems require an annual salary survey. For the record, at this point I wish to introduce the complete 1975 Salary Survey. In making the survey this year, the same sources of data used in past years were utilized to determine the average increase in median salaries. In addition, actual minimum and maximum salaries for classes in the Merit System were compared with salary levels for similar positions in other agencies and businesses and consideration was given to increases in cost-of-living and the current labor market.

Since the proposals to adjust existing salary schedules and incumbents is not the same in all cases, I will first cover the proposals to adjust the existing salary schedules.

The proposal is to adjust the minimum and maximum salaries for all classes on the Professional Salary Schedule one and one-half steps (approximately 6.75%) with some exceptions. These exceptions are listed under the Recommendations section of the Salary Survey, which was distributed prior to the hearing and which also is available here today. The exceptions to raising the classes the general one and one half steps are based on going rates at minimum and maximum salaries for such jobs as determined by the Salary Survey.

I'd like to point out one omission on DPW 140 A, B, and C professional compensation plan. The recommendations read the Personnel Officer II class is to be adjusted 3 steps at minimum and three steps at maximum. Inadvertently, the last step was not printed on the compensation plan. This is $1646 on the A Plan, $1720 on the B Plan and $1799 on the C Plan.

There is one more error on the compensation plan. The Controller class was retitled to Director of Business Management and should have read as such on the salary schedules. The salary listed is correct.

The proposal is to adjust the minimum and maximum salaries for all classes on the support salary schedule two steps (approximately 9%) with the exception of the Counselor on Alcoholism class. We are recommending a two-step adjustment in minimum salary for this class, but only a one-step adjustment at maximum. This adjustment retains the comparability of the maximum salary for this class so similar jobs in other agencies. We also are proposing that the Accounting Officer I, II and III classes be transferred from the clerical salary schedule to the support salary schedule.

The proposal is to adjust the minimum and maximum salary for classes on the clerical salary schedule in varying amounts from $7 to $35 in monthly salaries.

The proposal is to adjust the minimum and maximum salaries for classes on the maintenance salary schedule in varying amounts from $13 to $40 in monthly salaries. The particular increases for the various classes on the clerical and maintenance salary schedules are listed under the Recommendations section of the Salary Survey. The recommended salaries are based on the findings of our salary survey.

Cost-of-living for June 1974 to June 1975 increased 9.18% nationwide and from July 1974 to July 1975, 9.44% nationwide. Cost-of-living from July 1974 to July 1975 in the Twin City area is up 8.7%. This data is from the Consumer Price Index as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Only 58 school districts have settled their contracts for the next two years. The median minimum salary for B.A. teachers for those districts which have settled is $860 per month. With the proposed adjustment this year, the mid-point for the Merit System's beginning rate for Social Worker I, which is our B salary plan, is $863. Historically, we have attempted to have our B salary plan for Social Workers I equivalent to the median beginning teacher's salary. With the lack of data, however, this year it is impossible to predict whether or not this equivalency actually will occur.

Effective July 9, 1975, state employees in the professional classes received a 5.5% increase in monthly salaries. These same employees received a 4.4% increase effective January 8, 1975, which gave them a total increase of 9.9% in 1975. Effective July 9 state employees in clerical and support classes received a $20 per month increase. These same employees, effective January 8, 1975, received a 22¢ per hour increase. State maintenance and trades classes were raised 52¢ per hour effective July 9, 1975. These same employees received a 22¢ salary increase as of January 8, 1975. The State has a built in cost-of-living factor. For each full four-tenths point increase in the Consumer Price Index, all professional monthly salaries are increased by two-tenths of one percent and all support and clerical employees by 1¢ per hour. The next base period for computing the

cost-of-living for state employees is January 1975 to October 1975, and any increase will be effective on the payroll period closest to January 1, 1976. There also is a provision for an additional increase based on the period January 1976 to April 1976.

Hennepin County settled for 10% effective January 1, 1975 and for an additional 5% effective July 6, 1975. These employees will receive an additional 4% effective January 5, 1976. Hennepin County also has a built in cost-of-living adjustment but this factor is not as liberal as the one used by State service. The first adjustment will be based on the April 1975 to April 1976 raise in the Consumer Price Index and it will be payable in July, 1976.

Ramsey County settled for 10% effective January 1, 1975. They have not settled yet for 1976.

The Contract Agreement between the Twin City Hospitals and the Minnesota Nurses Association effective in June 1975, shows a flat $49 across-the-board increase in minimum salaries and a $98 increase in maximums. This is an average increase of 5.83% at minimum salary and 9.48% at maximum. Specifically, General Duty RN's with an AA degree or Diploma received a 6.19% increase at minimum and a 9.84% increase at maximum. General Duty RN's with a B.S. degree received a 5.97% increase at minimum and a 9.84% increase at maximum.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics Report on Wages and Salaries in Minneapolis-St. Paul, 1975, shows an average increase of 8.6% in all classes. The Stanton Survey of Clerical Classes, which involves the 7 counties in the Metropolitan area shows a 14.73% increase in selected clerical classes.

The Manpower Services State-Wide Survey made this spring shows the Merit System B plan minimum as being 18.27% below the first quartile of the state-wide prevailing rates for I level clericals, 15.97% below the II level clericals and 17.50% below for III level clericals. The Merit System F plan minimum is 1.39% higher than the first quartile salaries for the Metropolitan area for I level clericals, 2.06% below for II level clericals and 1.30% below for III level clericals. This survey is broken down into areas of the State and when our A plan for selected clerical classes is compared with the first quartile salaries reported in these different areas for these classes, we find them as being on the average 12.52% below the northeast, 5.81% below the northwest, 9.06% below the southeast and 4.17% below the southwest.

The federal minimum wage will be $2.20 an hour as of January 1, 1976. We have set our beginning level clerical salary on the A salary schedule at the $2.20 rate.

Considerable more data was used at arriving at our recommendations, but for the sake of brevity, I'm not going to cover anymore of it here today. It all is printed in the Salary Survey booklet from pages 1 through 48 and you all should have a copy of it.

I will now move into a discussion of the recommended adjustments of salaries of incumbents as of January 1, 1976. If the recommendations are adopted all employees will receive the adjustment irregardless if the adjustment places them over the stated maximum salary for their class. Under existing Minnesota Rule DPW 116 these adjustments, if adopted, would be mandatory.

The recommendation is 1) all incumbents on the Professional salary schedule receive a one and one-half step adjustment or the new minimum for their class, whichever is greater, 2) all incumbents on the Support salary schedule receive a two-step adjustment in their monthly salary, 3) all incumbents on the Clerical salary schedule receive a $50 increase in their monthly salary and 4) all employees on the Maintenance schedule receive a $50 increase in their monthly salary or in the case of a flat hourly rate, the new rate.

I'd like to point out that under these recommendations all clerical employees will receive a $50 a month increase, a beginning level case aide on the A salary schedule will receive $47 a month and a beginning level social worker on the A schedule $55 a month.

The recommendations I have just cited apply to all systems, but we are proposing some additional rule changes for the County Welfare Merit System. These changes will have some additional affect on the adjustments of incumbents under this system. We are proposing an amendment to Minn. Rule DPW 117 and 141 to the effect that salaries are computed and paid on the basis of a forty hour work week with 2088 hours per year and that payment be made to employees on the basis of a two-week or four-week payroll period and the actual number of hours worked in a day be multiplied by the number of days in the payroll period to compute the two-week or four-week pay.

I'd like to make it clear that we are not proposing that all counties must work 40 hours a week. All we are proposing is that employees will actually be paid only for the number of hours that they work.

Under this provision employees who work 37 1/2 hours, even with the adjustments that I've already outlined, would receive only a slight increase in their annual salary for 1976 as compared to their annual salary in 1975, and a few in some instances may have a lesser salary. Those employees who work 35 hours a week, even with the proposed adjustments will have a decrease in annual salary for 1976 compared to the annual salary for 1975. Since we do not feel it is fair that an employee receive a decrease in annual salary, we are further proposing that all incumbents who are employed full-time but who work less than 40 hours a week, shall further be adjusted to an hourly rate which most closely approximates and at least meets their annual salary as of December 31, 1975. As I stated, in almost all instances, this will apply only to those employees who are working 35 hours a week. To help clarify this situation I'm going to give an example:

A clerk typist works 35 hours a week with a 1975 salary of $396 per month which is equal to $4,752 per year. That's 396 x 12. The recommended $50 increase makes the January 1, 1976 salary $446 per month, which is equal to an hourly rate of $2.56. $2.56 x 1827 hours (which is the number of hours worked in a calendar year in a 35 hour week) equals an annual salary of $4,677, which is $75 less than the 1975 annual salary. Under this proposal, if this employee remains on a 35 hour work week, she will be adjusted to the nearest established hourly rate which exceeds the 1975 annual salary, which in this case is $2.61. Taking $2.61 x 1827 hours equals an annual salary of $4,768. So this employee will actually earn only $16 more a year in 1976 than she earned in 1975.

Up to this time employees who worked full-time, irregardless if they worked 35 or 40 hours a week, were paid on the basis of a monthly salary. This really has not been fair. Counties also have been receiving federal and state administrative reimbursement for these salaries, while the actual amount of hours worked has been different. In addition, ratios for state administrative reimbursement have been computed on the basis of numbers and monthly salaries, which again has not been equitable. The adoption of an hourly rate instead of a monthly rate and the payment of all personnel on the basis of the numbers of hours worked will dissolve some of the inequities.

I'd like to reiterate that under this proposal, payment on a monthly salary or a monthly basis no longer will be allowed. All employees will be paid on the basis of the hourly rate for their monthly salary multiplied times the number of hours they actually work in a two-week or four-week payroll period.

We are proposing a two or four-week payroll period so employees will receive a standard check each month. If payment were allowed on a monthly basis taking the number of working hours in the month, times the hourly rate the check would be different every month, as the number of working days in a month varies. This means that the gross amount would have to be computed each month, as well as the PERA, Social Security, and federal and state withholdings. We are of the opinion that this would not be feasible from the county's standpoint as it would be costly. Also it would not be feasible from the Merit System's standpoint, as we have to check each payroll and we would have to re-figure each check. It also would be confusing to employees, as they would receive a different size check every single month.

The floor is open now for comments, questions and discussion about our proposals concerning the salary adjustments to the salary schedules and to incumbents and the rule changes requiring payment on the basis of an hourly rate computed on a 40 hour work week with 2088 hours in a year, and a two or four-week payroll period (based on an hourly formula) with employees being paid on the hourly rate x the number of hours actually worked, rather than a monthly salary.

Gustafson: Anybody wish to be heard on any of the items? Please give your name and who you represent.

GregCorwin: My name is Greg Corwin and I represent the American Federation of County, State and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO. This is an internation union with over 700,000 members, with members in the State of Minnesota constituting approximately 43% of the non-supervisory employees covered by the County Welfare Merit System. In fact statewide we represent 70-75% of all welfare employees whether under this system or not. I'm here today to specifically object to the proposal to adjust payments of salary on the basis of an hourly rate based on a 40 hour work week. It is our contention that such an item must be a subject of collective bargaining pursuant to the Public Employment Labor Relations Act of 1971 as amended in 1973. As you know public employees in the State of Minnesota now have the right to bargain collectively under this Act. M.S.A. 179.61 requires public employers to meet and negotiate with public employees in an appropriate bargaining unit and provide for written agreements evidencing the result of such bargaining. Now there was substantial legislative policy behind that decision; 1) to promote orderly and constructive relationships between public employers and public employees, 2) that unresolved disputes between the public employer and employees were injurious to the public health as well as to the parties and that there were inequities in the bargaining power between the public employer and the

public employee. You might ask how this applies to this situation? It is our contention that by determining hours of work in a work week and by determing compensation you are in effect acting as a public employer. Hours and compensation are both terms for conditions of employment. These terms and conditions under State statute are to be bargained collectively. The State Department of Public Welfare is an employer. M.S.A.Section 179.63 defines an employer as the State of Minnesota and its political subdivisions and any agency or instrumentality of the State, clearly including the Department of Public Welfare and any subsiderary body. M.S.A. 179.63, Subd. 18 defines terms and conditions of employment as hours of employment and the compensation thereof. And finally M.S.A. 179.66, Subd. 2 states "a public employer has an obligation to meet and negotiate in good faith with the exclusive representative of the public employees in an appropriate unit regarding the terms and conditions of employment." If a public employer fails to perform its obligations under that statute, M.S.A. 179.68, Subd. 2 states that that is an unfair labor practice in that it is refusing to meet and negotiate in good faith. Therefore, our opinion that if a rule such as that proposed here this morning is adopted by the Commissioner of Public Welfare and allowed to go into effect on January 1, 1976, the Commissioner will be commiting an unfair labor practice and will be subject to damages and injunctive relief in the district court pursuant to the statutes. The reason is clear. In counties throughout the state, where the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees is the exclusive representative as duly served by the Bureau of Mediation Services, it has negotiated contracts with these counties concerning the employees and the units it represents. In these contracts are specific provisions dealing with number of hours worked per week. In some of these contracts the number is 35 hours. In some

of the contracts the number is 37 1/2 hours. In some of the contracts the number is 40 hours. But these are numbers of hours that were bargained and put into a contract. In addition, salary levels were bargained. There are different optional salary levels A, B, and C and so on and these levels were determined through collective bargaining with the counties involved because these are terms and conditions of employment. What you seek to to this morning is to unilaterally alter those contracts by in effect indirectly mandating a 40 hour week. In other words the unions bargained for a certain amount of pay or a certain number of hours per week. The salary schedule either A, B, or C was selected for a certain number of hours per week, 35, 37 1/2 or 40. Now what you are doing is saying "we're going to told you to the salary that you bargained for but we're going to change the number of hours per week that you bargained for unilaterally, without collective bargaining." This undermines the sanctity of the contract. In essence it makes a unilateral change in the understanding of the parties without giving the union a chance to bargain over the whole economic issue once again. Such a unilateral action through use of a rule making procedure lies in the path of the purpose behind the employer labor relations act. In effect it denies the union the right to bargain collectively over those issues. If a union cannot bargain over economic issues involving welfare board employees but in essence can be affected by a rule adopted by the Department of Public Welfare, than the rights given to us under this statute mean nothing. The legislature intended that public employers bargain with employees over terms and conditions of employment. You are in effect unilaterially, without collective bargaining, changing those terms and conditions that already exist in existing contracts. In other words, you are in essence tampering with

contracts that are already signed and in existence. Therefore, I respectively request the recommendation be made to the Commissioner of Public Welfare that before any changes be made in this rule, Rules 117 and 141, that bargaining be instituted with all the duly certified exclusive representatives of employees in every county in the state and that this rule be subject to collective bargaining for if it is not, it is our opinion that the Department of Public Welfare is clearly in violation of state statutes and in essence is trying to circumvent the collective bargaining process by a rule making procedure and we feel this would subject the Department of Welfare to an unfair labor practice action in district court under the State statute for both injunctive and monetary relief. This can be avoided by the Department of Welfare taking a voluntary decision to subject these specific terms and conditions of employment to collective bargaining. Thank you.

Gustafson: Thank you. I'm sure you didn't mean when you said "you" that you were refering to the Merit System Council. We haven't taken any action one way or another on these proposals, and we may or we may not. This didn't originate with the Merit System Council as a council. Anybody else?

Elwyn Boe: Elwyn Boe, Welfare Director, Koochiching County. I'm going to stick to a prepared statement here in the interest of time. If I may, with all due respect for the immensity of the job in putting together one of the most complicated Merit System salary adjustment proposals I've seen in the last 20 years, I am here to oppose the greatest outrage ever inflicted upon scores of Merit System employees throughout the state. It is an outrage because fair play and logic are absent in your treatment of employees working less than 40 hours a week. And that is the issue I'm talking about. I represent and am speaking

for the 26 employees of Koochiching Family Services who, at this time of unprecedent escalation in the cost of living, face certain and gravely serious slippage in their buying power in the light of your proposal. I am speaking for employees whose salaries may increase anywhere from $27.03 a month to 25¢ a month. These adjustments range from a high of 2.1% increase in salary to less than 2/100 of 1% increase. That's what I mean in labeling this proposal an outrage. At the August 22nd meeting of my Welfare Board, I saw a totally strange reaction to your proposed adjustments. Strange because, for the first time in my knowledge of the history of the agency, the Board responded sympathetically, probably even protectively on behalf of the employees. This is the very first time that the Welfare Board in Koochiching County has authorized agency staff to attend this hearing at county expense because even our hard-headed county commissioners see the tremendous injustice of the Commissioner's proposal. I am sure that the implication of their actions lends Welfare Board support to my comments this morning. Your proposal is outrageous and unjust because employees in our county have fought pretty long and hard to achieve and maintain their 35 hour work week. More importantly, they accepted these hours in lieu of salary increases years ago. The 35 hour work week has been in effect since 1960. Why didn't the Commissioner propose some changes fifteen years ago if this was not a proper and appropriate way of compensating employees and regulating hours of work. Besides all of this, the courthouse employees in our particular county have a 32 1/2 hour work week and rumors are that they will likely receive salary increases seven and one-half times that of the $10.10 monthly increase for our employees under the Commissioner's proposal.

I'd like to say something else about hours. Teachers who the Merit System uses liberally in making salary comparisons each year further support some of my remarks. A teacher at International Falls, for example, with nine years of experience earns $10.07 per hour and a nine year social worker earns $8.00 per hour. More importantly, the teacher works 36 2/3 hours each week of which five hours are free time for a net work week of 31 2/3 hours assigned duties. It is also interesting to note that a beginning laborer at Boise-Cascade in the Falls earns $4.86 per hour, the beginning social worker starts at $4.85 per hour. I'm wondering what the purpose of your -- of the Commissioner's proposal is if it isn't to demand a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. I don't need to remind her, I'm sure that workloads have grown tremendously and yet our welfare staff has increased but one employee since I came to the agency a number of years ago. Employees have been equal to the task and have put out a tremendously increased volume of work with a negligible increase in man-hours of work. Is your proposal the right way to treat employees who have put forth that kind of effort? Isn't there room in our society to recognize efficiency and high productivity among dedicated employees with fair treatment? I am angry and quite disturbed with the proposal which purports to cement all public servents into one gray mass of conformity. We, and many other counties in Minnesota are doing what I believe is a 40 hour job in 35 or 37 1/2 or 38 or 39 hours. We have an established tradition in our own County over many years of a 35 hour work week. Productivity and efficiency as well as staff morale in our agency is high. Does the Commissioner want to trade this off for that extra five hours of work? I would like to plead for fairness and some logic in the proposal. Let's say that county boards are responsible and can be trusted to make sound

decisions about hours of work. Why not leave some of this to them? Let's allow room for some individual differences in public employment. Koochiching County opposes and resents the apparent lack of fair play and good judgment in the Commissioner's proposal and we don't like another giant step toward complete loss of home rule at the county level. Thank you.

Gustafson: Thank you very much. Would the first gentlemen who spoke, would you spell your name please.

Corwin: C O R W I N

Gustafson: And your first name?

Corwin: G R E G

Gustafson: Greg. Can I ask a question? Is it your intention that the AFSCME will institute proceedings against the Department if they go through with this? This is for my information.

Corwin: I have been authorized to say that we will take every legal step in our power to prevent implementation of that rule.

Gustafson: Thank you.

Sue Kaufman: Sue Kaufman, Local 66 representing the Merit System employees in St. Louis County. I guess I am here again to speak as Elwyn did in opposition to this plan. We also consider it an outrage but we consider it more than that. I guess we feel that its a political mockery of use of employees for political paybacks within the structure that exists, and my suggestion in terms of the political payback, if the Commissioner felt that she didn't have the grounds to authorize the pay of last year and is using this mechanism to consciouses and wills of the rural areas of the community who objected to last year's pay plan, than I suggest she should have come straight forward and said that We object to the forty-hour week first of all because you are in fact setting working conditions without negotiation. You are secondly

removing people from a professional, a salary base pay which you then also invoke or which she will also invoke, the time and one-half for overtime under the minimum wage law. We will be considered hourly employees, not professional employees. We're concerned with these things because we feel that she has now entered into a whole new realm. Whether the move is toward State takeover and this is a move in the long reaching steps to equalize pay plans of Merit System and State Civil Service, we don't know, but we have strong suspicions that this may be the result. The logic does not hold true if there are such inequities and this is a way of making the system more equitable than I would suggest that you need to get rid of the three pay plans before you implement a uniform work week. The second item is not as great a concern to the employees but does concern the county and as an employee of the county and a taxpayer in the county, we do have some concerns. The payroll issue of having checks issued every two weeks or on a four week basis poses great difficulty for us in St. Louis County because the Merit System employees are only a portion of a much greater payroll. Our payrolls are not done separately from the rest of the county and it would impose the re-programming of the computers and it would also require that the rest of the county follow the Merit System and there is some strong objection in terms of our civil service employees to do that and we also represent them in Local 66 so I have to bring that to your attention. We would strongly recommend that the Commissioner in simple terms either "back-off" or negotiate through out the State.

Gustafson: Thank you. I share your concern for cost. I can't feel sorry for a computer of course. Yes sir?

Jerry Tiedeman: I'm one of those hard-headed commissioners from Olmsted County, Jerry Tiedeman. I'm the Chairman of the Olmsted County Board of Commissioners. I would like to read into the record a letter that I have received from the Tony Lund, Chairman of the Olmsted County Board of Health, addressed to me. "Dear Mr. Tiedeman, the Board of Health at its meeting on August 22, 1975, voted to oppose the mandatory features of the new Merit System regulations as they apply to the health department. The Board is not opposed to salary increase per se but does oppose the lack of input the regulations allow. Please make this information known at the Merit System hearing on September 12, 1975." Probably a bit of explanation is needed for the lack of input of the regulations allowed. We feel that on the local area especially in Olmsted County we had little or no input into the percentage of salary increases and the changes in the State Merit System regulations as they are being proposed. But to give you more information on that and the position of the county, I would introduce to you Nancy Vollertsen, Assistant Administrator in charge of personnel.

Gustafson: Thank you.

Nancy Vollertsen: Thank you. My name is Nancy Vollertson, I'm Personnel Director for Olmsted County. I would like to read into the record a prepared statement that we have, it's very brief. This is the statement joined in by the County Board of Commissioners, the Health Department, and the Welfare Department, or the Boards for the various departments. This is a statement of objection. I will provide copies for your record. The Olmsted County Board of Commissioners, along with the Board of Health and Welfare Boards for Olmsted County hereby voice their objections to the proposed adjustments to the compensation plans and changes in the rules. The objections are as follows:

1) The adjustment of a minimum of 6.75% creates a difficult situation for the county in the areas of Public Health and Civil Defense. The county is limited to a 6% increase in the tax levy. At the present time 77% of the Health Department budget is being spent for employee benefits and salaries. With a mandated increase of a minimum of 6.75%, this county will be required to cut back its staff or services, or both, in order to meet the proposed compensation plan. 2) The proposed compensation plan is not measured against other salaries paid in the Olmsted County labor market. At the present time Merit System clerical salaries are at a higher level than most other employees in the community. The present merit system compensation plan is higher than salary schedules for non-merit system employees within county government, in some cases. It is extremely difficult to continually adjust the salaries of the majority of county employees upward, to an ever-increasing salary level of merit system employees, who are a minority. 3) Mandating percentage increases for Merit System employees adversely affects contract negotiations between the County Board and bargaining units. A 6.75% minimum dictated by the Merit System sets an impossible percentage for wage negotiations for other units. 4) The change from a bi-monthly or monthly pay period to a bi-weekly or every four week pay period will be an extremely difficult and expensive task for Olmsted County. At the present time the county pays approximately 600 employees twice a month. If a change is required for the one hundred twenty merit system employees on Olmsted County's payrolls a change must be made for all county employees. This will require extensive reprogramming of the data processing system for payroll, as well as recalculating of deduction schedules for taxes, P.E.R.A., insurance, parking, credit union, deferred compensation, and union

dues. It will require additional time and personnel to prepare payrolls, as well as additional computer time and supplies. There is a serious problem when the effect of a Merit System ruling for a small minority of county employees affects the majority of county employees. 5) Mandatory step and one-half or two-step increases have an effect on program and staff evaluation. A local agency is limited in the "quality control" of its personnel when large salary increases are automatic. The local agency has no flexibility in creating incentives for its personnel.

A basic objection presented herein is that the Minnesota Merit System exercises a great deal of administrative authority over the operation of local agencies. This is of concern to all elected and appointed local officials who must answer to the taxpayers for increasing costs of government operation. Thank you very much.

Gustafson: Thank you and I would appreciate anybody who has a paper they wish entered to bring it up to the clerk please. Yes sir?

Bob Schultz: I'm Bob Schultz, the Welfare Director at Mower County Welfare Department and I would like to read a written statement in behalf of the Mower County Welfare Board concerning the matters before this hearing. This is addresses to Commissioner Vera Likins, dated September 9, 1975. "The purpose of this letter is to present a statement representing the comments and concerns of the Mower County Welfare Board regarding the proposed rule revisions which will be considered today. We respectfully request that this letter be made a part of the record of that hearing and be considered in your deliberations. Our primary comment is affirmative and this Board whole-heartedly supports the proposed amendment to DPW Rule 117 which clarifies the appropriate compensation with respect to the number of hours in

a work week. This has been a difficult area for welfare boards because it was extremely difficult to compare area compensation with different hour arrangements, particularly with employee organizations w did not recognize the differences as a real benefit or value. The potential application of the Fair Labor Standards Act also bears on this question. We want to commend the Merit System Council or rather the Commissioner of Public Welfare for its proposal to clarify this question and we urge your adoption of the revision as proposed. Our reaction to the proposed increase in compensation scales is negative. With the advent of collective bargaining processes we find it increasingly difficult to arrive at equitable settlements at the local level as three-fourths of the issues are mandated through the Merit System Council. It is our opinion that the proposed compensation levels do a much better job of analyzing competitive situations within the range than they do the question of labor market and beginnin scale appropriateness. Several years ago when comparison with teachers salaries was the primary comparison, these salaries reflected demand for personnel and comparative labor market that was a freely operating system. Today there is an abundance of labor pool and this fact is not reflected in the teachers' salary scales or in the Merit System comparisons. There is a basic philosophical problem particularly in an area such as ours where there is substantial unemployment with increasing the basic starting ranges on a continuous basis when we know that qualified people are available and willing to work at lower ranges When this fact is added to the increasing need for flexibility in negotiations at the local level, we are inclined to urge that minimum mandatory increases be provided. On this basis we believe that the changes in the basic step amounts should be smaller. We obviously do not have the resources available to do an analysis which would lead to a specific recommended amount of change. We would simply note

that the process of continually upgrading the compensation program on a mandatory basis places the Merit System in a position of being the employee representative outside of the normal collective bargaining process. This should be avoided as a matter of policy and in recognition of the changes in collective bargaining procedures mandated by the Legislature as well as federal involvement in compensation matters. Mandatory changes in compensation dictated by the Merit System should be minimal. Sincerely, the Mower County Welfare Board, Robert Shaw, Chairman." And I have given Mrs. Sundquist a copy of this.

Gustafson: Thank you, Anybody else who wishes to be heard?

Sally Morehead: I'm Sally Morehead and I represent the Olmsted County Welfare office as a member of the personnel committee and I have been asked to appear today to make the statement that we, as an office, are in favor of the proposed salary schedule adjustments by the Minnesota Merit System and although we are well aware that this does create some problem in negotiation with the other county agencies, we would also like our commissioners to be aware, if not aware, of the fact that welfare employees' salaries are, although it does all end up coming out of the same tax pocket I suppose, when they talk about local county budget money, our salaries are reimburseable by State funds. Social service reimbursement at 75%, all others at 50% and if they would take this into consideration when they're talking about it coming out of the local county budget, as far as ours are concerned there is a lot of State money coming into it. Thank you.

Gustafson: Thank you very much.

Harold Golly: Harold Golly, Faribault County Board, County Commissioner. The Faribault County Board is opposed to the making mandatory the two of four-week payment period. Why do we have to relinquish our

authority to decide on what our payment method should be? Our welfare employees are satisfied with the monthly method of payment. Each time we add a pay period we add to the bookkeeper work of our County Auditors and our Treasurers. We as a board, try to save money and the State continues to add red tape and changes that increase the work in our county offices. I would like to backup what the young lady from Olmsted County said in her objection number 4. We are not opposed to the Merit System but to the mandatory payment method. Thank you.

Gustafson: Thank you.

Arnold Johnson: Arnold Johnson from Aitkin County. I think that there is a question but it's probably quite evident that what is meant by the forty-hour work week is the time that the doors in the offices are kept open, not particularly the time or the amount of work that the social worker does. I'm sure that the department is aware that a social worker does not provide services only between the hours of 8:00 and 5:00 but probably between the hours of 5:00 and 8:00 and that limiting it to this way we would almost be telling the people that we work with that they should schedule their family emergencies and crisis to the period between 8:00 and 5:00. I think this should be given and taken into consideration that the social work profession is willing and has been willing on the basis of the schedule that we have had on a monthly payment basis to provide this extra service to the people who are in need whether their needs come between 8:00 and 5:00 or between 5:00 and 8:00 and I also think as was mentioned before that it does provide for some confusion when you are either in the courthouse or next door to the courthouse when their hours run say from 8:00 to 4:00 like ours does at this time. If we were going to change it to 8:00 to 5:00 then it would be different from the regular courthouse hours, and so if it means keeping the courthouse open

from 8:00 to 5:00 that's one thing. If you mean the time the social worker works then give it a different consideration.

Gustafson: Thank you.

John Elfelt: I'm John Elfelt, Director of the Anoka County Social Service and I have a couple questions that I think will help clarify for me at least a little bit, what we are doing here. First it has to do with the difference between the starting clerical salaries and the proposed pay plan and the $50 adjustment for the incumbent clerical person. Let us assume that we started a Clerk I on the F plan on December 29, the salary would be $454. On January 1, the salary as I understand would advance to $504. On January 2 we start a new Clerk I employee on the F plan and as I understand it the salary would be $483. Now the second employee with the two day tenure over the first employee would six months time have a further adjustment and would continue to be one step ahead all the way through their tenure on the agency with only two days or three days difference in actual employment. Am I right or wrong?

Gustafson: Barbara nods in the affirmative.

Elfelt: O.K. My second question has to do with the concern that my board has about the higher ranges on the compensation plan and the question here is can a welfare board take a look at the performance of somebody on one of the upper steps of the pay plan and evaluating whether a merit increase is due and expect a higher level of performance than someone who is on one of the lower steps for the same Merit System classification. Now, we're to consider merit increases on an annual basis and grant a merit increase unless we find that the employee's performance is unsatisfactory and I for one am unclear as to how we measure the degree of satisfaction. Is it possible to consider that some employees might plateau in a manner of speaking at the third step and so while their work continues to be satisfactory in every

respect in relation to what would be considered satisfactory employment at the end of a six months probationary period, they are not producing what might reasonably expected of an employee with six or seven years of tenure in that classification.

Gustafson: I think in answer our rules merely state that if you do not give a merit increase you must tell the reasons why. I don't believe we've set down any reasons. If you wanted to list that as a reason then it would be a reason.

Elfelt: O.K. Could we go one step further. Would you express a judgment as to whether the Merit System Council upon review, upon appeal would consider that a matter that could be heard?

Gustafson: That rule was just modified and that would not be for an appeal.

Elfelt: It would not be subject for an appeal?

Gustafson: No.

Elfelt: Thank you. Just a further statement in behalf of the Board, as far as the negotiation with the labor organization goes, both sides of course would be expected to negotiate within the framework of law. And if government has the authority to set a minimum hourly wage rate, it would seem not unreasonable to assume that government would have an equal right to set a maximum and I'm sure that my Board is concerned about the increasing salaries in comparison to the local prevailing salary scale and some thought I think should be given by all of us, whether we are for or against the proposal, how would it fair if it was to be put to a public referandum.

Gustafson: I'm afraid a lot of people including myself wouldn't have a job.

Voice from Aud. Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask of Mrs. Sundquist for my clarification. If, does the issue of....

Sundquist: Since we have to make a transcript of this would you just give your name again please?

Elwyne Boe: Elwyn Boe, Koochiching County Family Services. Does the issue of moving from the semi-monthly and monthly pay period to the two and four week monthly pay periods revolve entirely around the forty-week work week standard? Is that the reason for making that change in the rule?

Sundquist: Yes it is, to set up a basic hourly rate and by paying it any other way we would end up with these different checks every single month to be paid on a monthly basis. We are trying to make it so that you wouldn't have to re-compute the checks every month, the gross amount with the deductions and also so that the employee would get the standard check, would know how much they are getting each month, because like in February there is fewer working days than there is in another month and they vary almost every single month, the number of working days from 19 to 23.

Boe: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, then I would like to submit that as a probable solution to this problem as many have indicated, this is going to be a serious problem in their counties, that the Commissioner drop the 40 work week standard as an issue at this time.

Gustafson: I understand your point, if there wasn't a forty hours and..... I understand what you said. Is there anybody else?

Darryl Meyer: Darrel Meyer, Director, Todd County Social Services. In part I believe these comments have already been made but as we look at it from the county agency within the community we are seeing that for the benefit primarily of the State agency matters of pay periods, work hours are being dictated. The convenience of the pay periods is for the State and there is apparently little consideration for the multitude of present pay periods that are effect in the various counties which are established in most instances county-wide and has been mentioned would create havoc in creating or setting-up separate pay periods or else bringing all other systems into

conformance for the sake of one department. The same holds true that many times this is a specifically negotiated item not just for one department but for all county employees and although the statement has been made that it is not mandating a 40 hour week and in fact in practicality it is and it creates a situation within the county structure for much hard feelings. If a county agency, the county welfare department in fact, goes to a 40 hour week to hold the same pay scale as they have had in the past, it's going to create in many instances inequitable work situations compared to other county employees or in fact if it's used to the other extreme, that all county employees would than face a 40 hour week to maintain the same pay schedule. It's going to create all sorts of conflict among county employees which is seriously detrimental toward community relationships. The proposals as it is submitted here seem to be contradictory. There is recognition for the variable pay scales, for variations in pay in communities based upon the multitude of pay scales in effect, A through C for support and professional, up to F for clerical. If there is recognition that there is value for this type of variation than it 's not conceivable in my recognition that there can't be additional recognition that there is variation based upon the work hours.

Gustafson: Thank you very much.

Geraldine Wedel: Geraldine Wedel, Assistant Executive Director of the Minnesota Nurses Association. I have a prepared statement that I am submitting on behalf of the Association. The Merit System proposals for salary classifications for Public Health Nurse reflected in the pay scale is less than the 1975 salary scale in Ramsey, St. Louis and Minneapolis jurisdictions. In the past the C scale has reflected more closely the salaries in existence in these jurisdictions. In

addition a B.S. degree nurse employed at St. Mary's Hospital in Rochester is paid $17 above the Twin City nurses scale for comparable preparation. Registered Nurse salaries as reflected in your Merit System book increased statewide on a median of 10%. The cost of living calculations prepared by the Merit System reflect an April to April calculation, the one you gave today, June to June I believe. The Merit System calculations are, become effective late in the calendar year or mandatorily on January 1 of the ensuing year and, therefore, we are talking about the Public Health Nurse classification salaries that are in existence now in the metropolitan jurisdiction that will become effective in 1976 for the C scale. The cost of living figures used in the nationwide survey, the nationwide yearly annual cost because that's when the salaries become effective, was 12%. These were not considered by Merit System. Interestingly enough the federal government wage panel has reinterated its April proposal for three million white collar federal employees to be an 8.66% increase. This needs to be passed only by one house of the federal Congress. The Minnesota Nurses Association further recommends that the steps in the salary plans for Public Health Nurse I and II and Team Leader category should reflect a nine step salary scale rather the seven step scale. This would be more comparable to other categories of Public Health Nurse classifications and provide for career incentives. It was interesting to note that Sanitarian III has a nine step scale whereas Public Health Nurse (Team Leader) has only a seven step as well as the Senior Public Health Nurse. We feel that we should be allowed the same number of steps as primarily a male occupation.

Gustafson: Thank you Geraldine.

Gustafson: Geraldine, the question was asked where you got that 12% figure from?

Wedel: The cost of living figure?

Gustafson: Yes.

Wedel: From the Consumer Price Index.

Gustafson: What month?

Wedel: December, it was 12.8 I think in December. December, 1974. I was just comparing for the previous year because I was using comparisons for a 10% increase for Public Health Nurses were given in these jurisdictions last January 1, 1975 and this was prepared, and this does not reflect this. It just reflects 1976.

Gustafson: Thank you.

Beth Koski: You've heard from the big-wigs, now you can hear from a little-wig. I'm a Clerk Typist II from Koochiching County. My name is Beth Koski. I have some comments from some of the clerical help there. Fifteen years ago our county welfare board decided to cut the work week to less than forty hours in lieu of a pay raise. All these years the county has saved the dollars that that one step would have cost. Employees should not be further penalized by going to an hourly rate. We live in a strong union town. After working for the county for ten years, welfare clerical employees make about what the clerical help starts at in the mill. Our present 35 hour week has attracted many good workers because the hours have meant that mothers could see their children off to school in the morning before they leave for work and could be home with them shortly after school. Welfare work affects a person not only physically but emotionally and I feel that we should be progressing toward a shorter work week, not retrogressing. There should be concern for the families and the employees as well as for the client. We are loosing our freedom to govern ourselves. If the forty hour week, two week pay period is being promoted for the benefit

of possible future use of computers in making out payrolls, let the counties decide if they want that service. A longer working day impairs efficiency. If counties want to decrease their costs let then grant a 35 hour week instead of a one step mandatory pay increase.

Gustafson: Thank you very much.

Duke Skorich: Mr. Chairman, Duke Skorich from Council 65, Hibbing, Minnesota. Although the legal counsel that we have employed has very well expressed our position on the issue of hours, I would like to go on record here as a representative of Council 65 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, we are supporting the recommendations on the mandatory step increases for 1976. We are opposed to the recommendation changes in Rule 117 on the basis that many of our contracts have been negotiated with local agencies and county welfare boards dealing with the reduction of hours in lieu of pay increase at the time that negotiation table took place. On that basis we ask that the recommendation or the consideration of change of hours be eliminated from the recommendations here today.

Gustafson: Thank you.

Virgil Christensen: Virgil Christensen, Rock County Commissioner. As a commissioner and board member I object to the mandatory provision of any of these proposals but even more so as a citizen, I object to the Merit System changing the hours as the basis of pay for any of my friends. As a taxpayer I also object to the waste and confusion that will result in our county from the two or four week pay period. Thank you.

Gustafson: Thank you.

Richard Hoaglund: I'm Richard Hoaglund, Director, Renville County Welfare Board. In searching the faces at the table I find that there is one absent. I think that the Commissioner is not here. Now I believe I heard the Chairman of the Merit System Council say that the proposal to compute

and pay the salaries on the basis of a forty hour work week was the Commissioner's proposal and not the Merit System Council.

Gustafson: It hadn't been passed by our Council.

Hoaglund: And it would seem to me then that if the Commissioner would propose a change that would affect counties in this drastic way, that she should also be here then to have the benefit of the thinking of the people out in the counties that are being directly affected and I can't imagine why she isn't here today.

Gustafson: Anybody else wish to talk?

Jack DeMorett: Jack DeMorett, Pope County Family Services Director, and the staff has asked me to read a short letter. "We the staff of the Pope County Service Department strongly oppose the monthly salaries being based on 40 hours per week. We feel it is the county's option to determine the length of the work week just as it is their option to determine the pay scale. That is A, B, or C. Many employees were attracted to their employers on the basis of the shorter work week. Now this is being pulled out from under them with no compensation. We don't appreciate the proposal of an indirect salary cut and hope it remains a proposal rather than a rule. It also seems unjustifiable to take one area of county government and not apply the same ruling to all county employees. Respectfully, staff of the Pope County Family Service Department." Thank you.

Gustafson: Thank you. Do you wish to send that up? Anybody else wish to speak? Are there any other matters to come before us? Duke?

Duke Skorich: There is one question I would like to ask for the clarification of the classification for a Collections Supervisor. I believe there was two recommendations in there.

Sundquist: We haven't gotten to that part yet. There will be more.

Gustafson: I'm sorry. I'm really commenting on the areas we were talking about. I think it is fair to say that the, everybody at one time or other

on both sides of labor-management, county board commissioners or us object to something. I've rather got that opinion. Is there any more questions or statements that you wish to make on the issues that we are talking about? If not Barb, do you want to continue on with the rest?

Sundquist: The remaining things to be considered apply only to the County Welfare Merit System. The next proposal involves the establishment of the new class of Collection Services Supervisor I and the retitling of the current class of Supervisor of Collection Services to Collection Services Supervisor II. We also are proposing some revision to this class specification. Under the IV-D provisions support and collection work is required in every agency, which means counties will be putting on additional staff for this work. Some of these will have a number of staff involved in this work, which will require some supervisory positions. The Collection Services Supervisor I position will supervise the activities of a medium or small size collections unit. We are proposing that the salary for this position be established at the same level of the Financial Assistance Supervisor II classification. The Collection Services Supervisor II position will be responsible for the supervision of a large support and collections division. The current qualifications for this position are very rigid and we do not have anyone in our system who would meet them. The class was originally established when Ramsey County was under us and was used exclusively by Ramsey County. Now we expect the positions of this level to appear in St. Louis County. With the proposed change in the qualifications, we will have personnel who can qualify. The floor is now open for comments, discussion or questions about the new class of Collections Supervisor I and the proposed revision and retitling of the Supervisor of Collection Services II.

Gustafson: Does any one wish to speak on this subject?

Doug Boler: Mr. Chairman, my name is Doug Boler, current Vice-Chairman and Chairman Elect of the Minnesota Support and Recovery Council. I'd like to express on behalf of the Council appreciation to the Merit System for providing the Council and its membership an opportunity to join with you and work with you in developing the current job class and the specs that you propose. We feel that by developing such a class, the State of Minnesota, the various 87 counties of the State, will tremendously benefit by these two job classes in that it will greatly strengthen the enforcement of child support in the State. It will also strengthen the public relations between counties, staff members and citizens of the various communities. We are appreciative, we continue to work in this area and we will be available to assist you should we feel there is need for further change. Thank you.

Gustafson: Thank you Mr. Boler.

Dick Hazelmeyer: I'm Dick Hazelmeyer, Carlton County Resources Examiner I and also a board member of the Minnesota Support and Recovery Council. As Doug stated we back up the new positions that you authorized or are trying to authorize with the exception that when you read over the example of work that you have listed out here, you have listed out my job right to a tee with the exception of the very first sentence where it says "assign duties to resource examiners." I'm from a small county, there is no way that I can have any resource examiners other than myself. The only thing I can expect in the future is the possible staffing of a secretary, clerical help and case aides. After 21 years in the service I supervised as high as 20 some people. Now all of a sudden, after reading the job example that I have here, I am not qualified as a supervisor. It doesn't seem fair. The Merit

System is putting me on a plateau where I am at an end. I've got another few years to go and it looks like I'm just stable so anyone that they hire in the future that might have a little more college or something in some other county can override me at any time that they wish. I don't believe that the first sentence there should be written that way. I'd like to see it written that the assigned duties to all IV-D staffing personnel, not limited it to just one type of classification. Thank you.

Gustafson: Thank you. That's something we will take into consideration.

Arlene Skrock: Arlene Skrock, Morrison County Social Services and I am a Resources Examiner and a member of the board of the Support and Recovery Council. I support Dick Hazelmeyer one-hundred percent. I think when they made this with all due respect to Doug and everyone else who made it, they considered the larger counties and the medium countie out in the boon-docks are doing the exact same things and taking all the responsibility that the larger counties are and I think at the discretion of their welfare board they can be titled Supervisor and they can still have other resource examiners under them but have clerical or someone else.

Gustafson: Thank you. I'm sure it wasn't written to eliminate or put a hardship on any individual.

Doug Boler: Doug Boler, being Chairman Elect of the Council I would call your attention to the two previous speakers and on behalf of the board I did write to Bill Daly on August 27 making that recommendation that these people have just a minute ago stated. That the Supervisor of Collections I possibly should have the opportunity to supervise the entire IV-D unit for that county. I think that does make some sense. The job now as outlined really limits their supervisory capacity to supervisees in the job class of Resourses Examiner I and I think to

really orchestrate the unit that person should have a little more opportunity to work with other staff that would be doing the job. Thank you.

Gustafson: Thank you. Anybody else who wishes to heard on this subject? Barbara will go on to the next item. Barbara.

Sundquist: The final matter for consideration is the abolishment of some existing classes all of which are not in use except for one. Most of these classes also were established for Ramsey County who is no longer under our jurisdiction. In checking with our agencies we do not find any of them contemplating the use of these classes. The classes we are proposing to abolish are: Manual Writer and Editor, District Supervisor, Work-and-Training Supervisor, Employment Guidance Supervisor, Medical-Social-Work Consultant, Housing Coordinator, Enployment-Guidance-Counselor Technician, Nutrition Consultant, Pharmacist, Operations Manager, Electronic-Data-Processing Manager, Lead Key-Punch Operator, Tabulating-Machine Operator I and II, Tabulating-Machine Supervisor, Computer Operator, Lead Computer Operator, Offset-Press Helper, Offset-Press Operator, Lead Janitor, Utility Worker and Maintenance-and-Supplies Supervisor. The proposed effective date for abolishing these classes if they are abolished, except for the class of EDP Manager, is the date on which they are filed which will be sometime in November. We are proposing that the effective date of abolishing the EDP Manager be January 1, 1976. We currently have an employee in this class, but the job has changed and the position will be reallocated and the allocation will be completed by January 1, 1976. After this reallocation we do not contemplate the use of the EDP Manager anymore. The floor is now open for comments, discussion or questions about the abolishing of the class specifications listed.

Meyer: To begin with I would have to plead that on this issue I didn't do my homework. I would ask....

Gustafson: Would you state your name?

Meyer: Excuse me. Darryl Meyer, Todd County Social Services. In just a couple of words would you tell me what the position of District Supervisor could encompass for the county agency?

Sundquist District Supervisor is used for the district offices in St. Louis when they had a Hibbing and Virginia Office and they were run pretty much right from those particular offices. We have not used it anywhere else except there and they are no longer using it either because it changed, the organization is such that.

Meyer: Fine. Than just a question, is it conceivable within the rules that presently exist for this position that the other counties than St. Louis could use this position as a liasion position with the State agency in the event that the present State classification of Regional Representative would no longer serve as a liasion or as a representative for the county in working with the State agency? In the present definition could it be used for that purpose?

Sundquist: The kind of work is to administer the public welfare program of a district office of a large county welfare department, is responsible for the implementation of board policies and administrative regulations within the district and perform related work as assigned.

Meyer: We were thinking of multi-county operations in this with such positions but it appears....

Sundquist: It says administers so..

Meyer: Some other may be necessary?

Sundquist: Right.

Gustafson: Any other questions on the proposed abolishment of the various job specs.

Duke Skorich: Talking a[illegible] that supervisor on that resources and that, I'm sorry. Is that [illegible]re we are at?

Sundquist: No but go ahead if you h[illegible] something on it. We did that when you were out.

Duke Skorich: The question was raised about the [illegible]esources examiner and the change in some of the classifications and it was the expressed opinion of some of the people that are involved in smaller counties that until such time that a evaluation of the responsibilities factor can be made there, that perhaps within the same rank, the same classification, an additional step could be added to provide some equity for that responsibility.

Sundquist: On the supervisor.

Skorich: Yes.

Sundquist: The Merit System Council, at their last meeting, did adopt the new position of Collection Services Supervisor on an emergency basis so it can be used right now and any changes that were to be made in it as a result of this hearing could go into it, would go into effect before the position was actually filed. They put it into effect on an emergency basis at their last Council meeting which was August 21.

Skorich: Well, does that permit then the option on the part of the local agency to place the classification to the individual?

Sundquist: They are to send in a classification questionnaire.

Skorich: Right, but I mean that permits the option on the part of a local agency, right?

Sundquist: Yes, the use of it. And an emergency would only last at the most six months but any change would be filed before that time.

Gustafson: Are there any other questions? I will remind you of the fact that these comments today and any additional comments that may be sent in, there will be nothing considered until at least 20 days or until October 3, 1975, to allow everybody time who wants to submit any other documents. Barbara you have something else to say?

Sundquist: I was going to say that we do tape the proceedings here, that a transcript is typed out from the tape and it will be furnished to the Commissioner of Public Welfare, the Commissioner of Health and each board member of the Board of Health, and the Commissioner of Public Safety, with a copy of the complete transcript of the proceedings here today as well as any other correspondence that comes in.

Duke Skorich: Mr. Chairman I would like to ask a question on the recommendation that we have been considering here today. Now the proposal for the hour change coming directly from the Director of Public Welfare or was that coming from the Merit Council.

Gustafson: I think I explained that several times, that the Merit System Council has not made this as a proposal.

Skorich: Would I be asking too much if I would ask a question, what the opinion of the Merit Council would be on the hour changes?

Gustafson: I can't tell you what that opinion is Duke. I know what my own is and will be meeting shortly to discuss these matters and our recommendation which will be made to the Commissioners one way or the other.

Skorich: O.K. Thank you very much.

Gustafson: Thank you. Is there anything else to come before us? If not we will thank you all for your nice attendance and quietness and not the boisterous things we have had occasionally. Thank you very much. We are adjourned.

STATE OF MINNESOTA

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

RULES AND REGULATIONS

DES 140 is amended to read as shown on the attached duplicated pages.

DES 141 is amended to read as shown on the attached duplicated pages.

Dated at St. Paul, Minnesota
this 5th day of November, 1975

Edward G. Novak
Commissioner of Public Safety

Notice of Public Hearing, July 30, 1975

Public Hearing, September 12, 1975

Approved for form and legality
this 18th day of November, 1975

Warren Spannaus, Attorney General

by _____
Asst. Assistant Attorney General

Berry, Ed, Box 144, Emmons 56029

Dawson, James M., Felhaber, Larson et al; W-1080 qst Natl Bk Bldg, St. Paul 55101

Matthias, Dr. Howard, 329 Brown Hall, St. Cloud State College 56301

Ostern, Bill, 513 South Section, Spring Valley 55975

Pure Power Company, 5917 View Lane, Mpls 55436

St. Paul Motorcycle Escort Club, Inc., PO Box 3264, St.Paul 55101

Shields, J.B., Driver Ed.Range, 1000 N. Snelling Ave., St.Paul 55108

Thorson,Mork & Henefield,Attorneys at Law,1st Nat.Bank.Bldg., Blooming Prairie 55917

ALLENDORF MARSHALL
220 GRAIN EX 400 S 4TH
MPLS MN
55415

ALTMAN MILTON H
707 DEGREE OF HONOR BLD
ST PAUL MN
55101

ANCHOR BLOCK COMPANY
PO BOX 3360
ST PAUL MN
55165

ANDERSON GRAHAM
951 E HENN
MPLS MN
55414

ANDERSON JAMES
7703 NORMANDALE RD
MPLS MN
55435

ANDERSON STANFORD P
14600 MINNETONKA BLVD
MINNETONKA MN
55343

ARROWHEAD REGIONAL DEV COMM
900 ALWORTH BLDG
DULUTH MN
55802

ARVER JOHN A
2467 COHANCY
ST PAUL MN
55113

ASSOCIATED INDUST OF MPLS
NATIONAL BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

ASSN OF MINN COUNTIES
55 SHERBURNE AVE #203
ST PAUL MN
55103

BABCOCK LOCHER NELSON ET
118 E MAIN ST
ANOKA MN
55303

BARKER KENT
8100 34TH AVE SO
MPLS MN
55420

BARTHOLOW HAROLD E FIRE C
2600 109 AVE N W
COON RAPIDS MN
55433

BEMIDJI STATE COLLEGE
PLACEMENT BUR.J.C.BRADY
BEMIDJI MN
56601

BENSONI PETER USW OF AM
609 PROVIDENCE BLDG.
DULUTH MN

BEST FLANAGAN ET AL
1ST NATL BANK BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

BEUTEL ROBERT
2200 SILVER LAKE RD
NEW BRIGHTON MN
55112

BREHL JAMES W
332 HAMM BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55102

BRIGGS & MORGAN - B F FRI
2200 W 1ST NATL BK BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

BROOKS WILLIAM F JR
854 MIDLAND BK BLDG
MPLS MN
55401

BROWN D M GOODRIDGE PUB S
IND DIST #561
GOODRIDGE MN
56725

BUCHHOLTZ CHARLES
5044 BRENT AVE E
INV GRV HTS MN
55075

BURGER ALBERT
600 DEGREE OF HONOR BLD
ST PAUL MN
55101

BUSCH NOEL
3131 FERNBROOK LANE N
MPLS MN
55441

CARLSON CARL L
7516 80TH ST S
COTTAGE GROVE MN
55016

CARLSON VERNE E
BOX 755 CITY HALL
WILLMAR MN
56201

ALBERT,AA CALDER CORP
366 JACKSON ST
ST PAUL MN
55101

AM CAMPING ASSN MRS LE COCK
1235 BRIGHTON SQ
NEW BRIGHTON MN
55112

AM INST PROF GEOLOGISTS
2201 PRINCETON AVE
ST PAUL MN
55105

ANDERSON HERBERT
418 8TH ST. SO.
VIRGINIA MN
55792

ANDERSON HAROLD
BOX 3047
MANKATO MN
56001

ANTHONY DICK WDSM RADIO
230 E SUPR ST
DULUTH MN
55102

ARNOLD ROBERT MESPA
41 SHERBURNE
ST PAUL MN
55103

ASMUSSEN,DENNIS,MPIRG
3036 UNIV AVE SE
MPLS MN
55414

ASSOCIATED GEN CONTROF MN
48 E 8TH STREET
ST PAUL MN
55101

ASSN RESIDENCES FOR RETARDED
459 RICE SUITE 301
ST PAUL MN
55103

AUTOMOBILE MFRS ASSN INC
55 SHERBURNE AVE
ST PAUL MN
55103

BADALICH JOHN P
2025 THOMPSON AVE
SO ST PAUL MN
55075

BARRETT FRED
ST LOUIS CO COURT HOUSE
DULUTH MN

BECKLIN ROBERT C
447 N W 4TH
CAMBRIDGE MN
55008

BEECHER EVERETT
10 10 1ST ST SO
HOPKINS MN

BERGERUD ALF
300 ROANOKE BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

BERGSETH THOMAS
1011 NICOLLET MALL
MPLS MN
55403

BLOMQUIST BARRY L

NORTH BRANCH MN
55056

BLOOMINGTON CITY CLERK
2215 W OLD SHAKOPEE RD
BLOOMINGTON MN
55431

BRIGHAM E M III
RR4
RED WING MN
55066

BROEKER JOHN
2850METRO DR. SUITE 504
BLOOMINGTON MN
55420

BRUBACHER RICHARD COMM ADM
208 ADM BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

BRUNING C.R.DEPT.CLINIC.EXP.
BURTON HALL
MPLS. MN
55455

BUR.ENGR.IND.DIV. MR.KIBIGER
219 N. 2ND ST.
MPLS. MN

BUR NATL AFFAIRS INC
1231 25TH ST NW
WASHINGTON DC
20037

CAIN RUTH
730 E 38TH ST
MPLS MN
55407

CAIRNS JOHN A
47TH FLR IDS CENTER
MPLS MN
55402

CARRISON DALE K
MANKATO STATE COLLEGE
MANKATO MN
56001

CENTRAL BUSINESS DATA
BENSON RADIO ARCADE BLD
BENSON MN
56215

CHAMBERLAIN JOHN L
PO BOX 241
MPLS MN
55440

CHERCHES CHRIS CITY MGR
5005 MTKA BLVD
ST LOUIS PARK MN
55416

CITY CLERK
386 CITY HALL
ST PAUL MN
55102

CITIZENS LEAGUE
530 SYNDICATE BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

COLEMAN NICHOLAS D
700 LINWOOD AVE
ST PAUL MN
55105

COLLIN LAURENCE
RT 2
ISANTI MN
55040

CONSUMER SERVICES DEPT COMM
5TH FLR METRO SQ BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

COUNTY ATTYS COUNCIL
95 SHERBURNE AVE S203
ST PAUL MN
55103

CROW WING CO PLANNING & ADV
COURT HOUSE
BRAINERD MN
56401

CUSHMAN J S DAYTON HUDSON
700 NICOLLET MALL
MPLS MN
55402

DANKERS, KENNETH
1200 WEST FOURTH STREET
RED WING MN
55066

DICKINSON MRS JOANNE
BOX 1065
MARSHALL MN
56258

DIEHL JOHN
26 KENWOOD PKWY
ST PAUL MN
55105

DOUGLASS BELL
525 OSBORN BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55102

DOW CHEMICAL
47 BLDG
MIDLAND MI
48640

DUNN OLIVER PLUMBERS LOC 15
708 SO 10TH ST
MPLS MN
55404

DZUGAN KEN ST PAUL PLANNING
421 WABASHA ST
ST PAUL MN
55102

ELDER DR JAMES B
11140 WASHBURN AVE SO
BLOOMINGTON MN
55431

ELDRED R W ARMOUR & CO
UNION STOCK YARDS
SO ST PAUL MN
55075

ENNIS A F BOISE CASCADE
PO BOX 713
INTL FALLS MN
56649

ENV SERV-GEN RESOURCE CORP
6340 INDUSTRIAL DR
HOPKINS MN
55343

CENTRAL MN REGIONAL DEV COMM
1139 FRANKLIN AVE
SAUK RAPIDS MN
56379

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
30 SO 1ST AVE EAST
ELY MN
55731

CHRISTIAN SCI COMM ON PUB
1821 UNIV AVE SUITE 271
ST PAUL MN
55104

CHRISTIANSEN FREDRIK
RM 505 CAPITOL SQ BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55155

CLARKSON J.B.
2350 I.D.S. CENTER
MINNEAPOLIS MN
55402

CLAUSEN PHILLIP
2307 STANDISH ST
ST PAUL MN
55108

COMMUNITY DESIGN CENTER
118 E 26TH ST
MPLS MN
55404

CONCORDIA COLLEGE
DEAN
MOORHEAD MN
56560

COX AND KING
600 BUILDERS EXCH
MPLS MN
55402

CRAVEN NORMAN
10637 THOMAS AVE S
BLOOMINGTON MN
55431

DAILEY THOMAS ECONOMICS L
370 WABASHA ST
ST PAUL MN
55102

DANIELSON RODNEY L
418 AUDITORIUM
ST PAUL MN
55102

DAYTON CHAS SIERRA CLUB
800 MIDLAND BANK BLDG
MPLS MN
55401

DISPATCH PIONEER PRESS
PRESS RM STATE CAPITOL
ST PAUL MN
55101

DORSEY MARQUART
2400 1ST NATL BANK BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

DOYTON MAURICE, MET SEWER BD
350 METRO SQ BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

DUDLEY E H
RT 7 BOX 122
EXCELSIOR MN
55331

EBELING EDWARD H.
161 W. MAIN
PERHAM MN
56573

ELMER EDWIN W
2901 PLEASANT AVE
MPLS MN
55408

EMERICK RICHARD A
1908 IDS CENTER
MPLS MN
55402

ERDMAN ROGER TENNANT CO
701 N LILAC DR
MPLS MN
55441

ERNEST K LEHMANN & ASSOC.
1409 WILLOW ST.
MPLS MN
55403

ESSE KENNETH
4801 W 50TH ST
EDINA MN
55424

EVANS CHAS.L. PRENTICE-HALL
ENGELWOOD CLIFFS
NEW JERSEY

EWING MRS WM
42 ASTAR RD
BABBITT MN
55706

FARRELL FRANK BUR NOR
RM 1180 176 E 5TH ST
ST PAUL MN
55101

FELHABER R S
W 1ST NATL BANK BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

FLADLAND CLINTON MN L&P BUR
796 RAYMOND AVE
ST PAUL MN
55114

FLEMING FREDERICK A
1860 HIGHLAND PARKWAY
ST PAUL MN
55116

FORSBERG AGR SERV
518 SUMMIT AVE
NEW ULM MN
56073

FOX W.E. LINDQUIST & VENNUM
4200 IDSCTR 80 S.8TH ST
MINNEAPOLIS MN
55402

FREDRIKSON BYRON ET AL
47TH FLR IDS CENTER M
PLS MN
55402

FURLONG DR JOHN
RT 1
BOVEY MN
55709

GALVIN M J JR
W2162 1ST NATL BK BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

GARDNER HDW - R A JOHNSON
515 WASHINGTON AVE N
MPLS MN
55401

GEORGE K GRANSE CO
1477 SELBY AVE
ST PAUL MN
55104

GIEL DAVID
RM B-28 STATE CAPITOL
ST PAUL MN
55155

GODIN RALPH J
3824 47TH AVE SO
MPLS MN
55406

GRAHAM THOS H
854 MIDLAND BK BLDG
MPLS MN
55401

GREEN DEL CITY MGR
BLOOMINGTON CITY HALL
BLOOMINGTON MN
55431

GREEN GARY J
41 SHERBURNE AVE
ST PAUL MN
55102

GUSTAFSON WALLACE
BOX 567
WILLMAR MN
56201

HANSON ETHEL
2813 85TH AVE N
MPLS MN
55444

HAROLD J WESTIN CONSTRUCTORS
45 E 8TH ST
ST PAUL MN
55101

EVERETT JERRY NW PETRO ASSN
512 NICOLLET MALL RM917
MPLS MN
55402

EWALD DOUGLAS MINN HOSP A
2333 UNIV AVE SE
MPLS MN
55414

FAEGRE & BENSON ATTN LIBR
1300 NW BANK BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

FARMERS ELEVATOR ASSN
852 GRAIN EXCH BLDG
MPLS MN
55415

FINLEY JAMES F
920 MINN BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

FINNEGAN J.R.
55 E. 4TH
ST.PAUL MN
55101

FITZGERALD DR BOB
3007 LYNDALE AVE SO
MPLS MN
55408

FORBES GORDON MINN RRS AS
203 HANOVER 480 CEDAR
ST PAUL MN
55101

FRANKLIN ROBERT B MPLS TRIB
426 PORTLAND
MPLS MN
55415

FREDIN CONRAD M
811 FIRST NATL BK BLDG
DULUTH MN
55802

F W WOOLWORTH CO
3316 W 66TH ST
EDINA MN
55424

GEBERT K L
220 GRAIN EXCH
MPLS MN
55415

GEO A HORMEL & CO LAW DE
PO BOX 800
AUSTIN MN
55912

GLEESON MICHAEL
909 SOC SC BLDG U OF M
MPLS MN
55455

GLEN. HILLS HOSP.R.VAN HA
3901 GOLDEN VALLEY RD.
MPLS. MN
55422

GRANATH MARVIN -HONEYWELL
2701 4TH AVE SO
MPLS MN
55408

GREATER MET AREA HOSPITAL
5152 CEDAR AVE S
MPLS MN
55417

GREEN JANET
9773 N SHORE DR
DULUTH MN
55804

GUSTAFSON DAN-LABOR TEMPL
312 CENTRAL
MPLS MN
55414

H B FULLER CO
2400 KASOTA AVE
ST PAUL MN
55108

HANFT PHILIP M
1200 ALWORTH BLDG
DULUTH MN
55802

HARVEY MICHAEL
1390 W M HAHA PKWY
MPLS MN
55409

HALLBERG LEE & MCCABE
4927 34TH AVE S
MPLS MN
55417

HEALTH MANPOWER C LARSON
717 DELAWARE ST SE
MPLS MN
55440

HENTHORN GARY WOODSTOCK
7365 LANDAU DR
BLOOMINGTON MN
55438

HARTFELDT WILL
434 HAMM BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55102

HEAD & TRUHN
1007 SOO LINE BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

HEISENFELT WM
BOX 516
BEMIDJI MN
56601

HICHINGER-MARK PLANNING
421 WABASHA ST
ST PAUL MN
55102

HOLDAHL SCOTT
380 N BLDG GRAIN EXCH
MPLS MN
55415

HOLEY GEO AERONAUTICS
DOWNTOWN AIRPORT
ST PAUL MN
55107

HORNER WALDORF - KAZIUKEWICZ
PO BOX 3260
ST PAUL MN
55165

HOULE MELVIN
881 W HWY 96
SHOREVIEW MN
55112

HULSTRAND ANDERSON & LARSON
PO BOX 130
WILLMAR MN
56201

HULTMAN WARREN R
C/O BARBARCSSA R3
OSSEO MN
55369

HUTCHISON R.M. ANOKA CO.COMP
COURT HOUSE
ANOKA MN
55303

HYLAND DEAN
1501 W 50TH ST
MPLS MN
55419

INGVALSON VERN MN.FARM BUR.
3110 WOODDALE DR PO 337
OST PAUL MN
55165

INS FED OF MINN
902 SOO LINE BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

IVERSON DR JOS DEPT ED
ST OLAF COLLEGE
NORTHFIELD MN
55057

IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE MN DI
106 TIMES BLDG 57 S 4TH
MPLS MN
55401

JAIN NIRMAL ENIV PROCESS
1220 GLENWOOD AVE
MPLS MN
55405

JENOS INC
525 LAKE AVE SO
DULUTH MN
55801

JOHNSON CLARENCE IBEW LU 292
3615 37TH AVE S
MPLS MN
55406

JOHNSON LEROY
9939 BLUEBIRD ST NW
COON RAPIDS MN
55433

KABLE RICHARD W

BETHEL MN
55006

HAUN DR J W GEN MILLS
PO BOX 1113
MPLS MN
55440

HAYES, THOMAS W
700 SELLWOOD BLG
DULUTH MN
55812

HESS DONALD MIDWEST PLANNING
2101 HENN BLDG
MPLS MN
55405

HART PATRICK V
112 E LIBERTY BOX 3271
MANKATO MN
56001

HEIM PAUL
1320 SOO LINE BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

HEINTZ MARY ELLEN
PO BOX 599
CINCINNATI OH
45201

HILL JIM ASSOC.MILK PROD.
7850 METRO PARKWAY
MINNEAPOLIS MN
55420

HINRICHSEN PATRICK
MANKATO FREE PRESS
MANKATO MN
56001

HOLMES EUSTIS ET AL
4610 IDS CENTER
MPLS MN
55402

HOPKINS WM.B. DIR.MISCCA
3915 GOLDEN VALLEY ROAD
GOLDEN VALLEY MN
55422

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMM
RM 109 STATE CAPITOL
ST PAUL MN
55101

HOUSE ED STANDING SUB COMM
RM 109 STATE CAPITOL
ST PAUL MN
55101

HUMAN RIGHTS
200 CAPITOL SQ BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

HUNT JAMES P JR
11470 GALTIER DR
BURNSVILLE MN
55378

INGEBRIGTSEN DR K H
23 SE 4TH ST
MPLS MN
55414

INTERSTATE POWER RW STEELE
1000 MAIN ST
DUBUQUE IA
52001

IUCE LCC 49 CHAS SWENSON
2580 UNIV AVE
ST PAUL MN
55101

JACKMAN DONALD G
4023 E LAKE ST
MPLS MN
55406

JENSEN CARL A
127 E MAIN ST
SLEEPY EYE MN
56085

JOHNSON & SANDERSON
ST MARYS HOSPITAL
ROCHESTER MN
55901

JOHNSON M.D. FRUNDT & FRUNDT

BLUE EARTH MN
56013

JOHNSON LANCE J
265 S LAFAYETTE RD
ST PAUL MN
55107

KAVANEY RICHARD
1220 NORTHERN FED BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55102

KEABLE MIKE
909 6TH AVE N
ST CLOUD MN
56301

KING,TIMOTHY
3333 OAKLAND AVE S
MPLS MN
55407

KLOSTER MARION PEAVEY CO
730 2ND AVE S
MPLS MN
55402

KNUTSON DR KEITH,BIOLOGY DPT
ST CLOUD STATE
ST CLOUD MN
56301

KNUTSON R N GRANNIS ETAL
F J SCHULT BLDG
ST ST PAUL MN
55075

KOPP MRS VERNON
2050 65TH ST E
INVER GR HGHT MN
55075

KRAMER ERNEST W
717 DELAWARE ST SE
MPLS MN
55440

LAKE SUPERIOR INDUSTRIAL BUR
828 FIRST AM. BK. BLDG.
DULUTH MN
55802

LANAHAN E F - SIBLEY CO
184 E 6TH ST
ST PAUL MN
55101

LAPP LAZAR LAURIE ET AL
1200 BUILDERS EXCHANGE
MINNEAPOLIS MN
55402

LARSON C L
3800 MINNEHAHA AVE SO
MPLS MN
55406

LEAGUE WOMEN VOTERS OF MINN
555 WABASHA
ST PAUL MN
55102

LIBBEY LEONARD
BOX 17011 NOKOMIS STA
MPLS MN
55417

LOOS CALVIN J
6809 LYNDALE AVE SO
MPLS MN
55423

LOWE DOUG
2701 N LEXINGTON AVE
ROSEVILLE MN
55113

MCDONALD PHILIP M
2077 SELBY AVE
ST PAUL MN
55104

MCFADDEN G H DISPATCH-PRESS
55 E 4TH ST
ST PAUL MN
55101

MALONE E I COMM LABOR & INDU
444 LAFAYETTE RD 5TH FL
ST PAUL MN
55101

MANTHEY T J PICKANDS MATHER
1100 SUPERIOR AVE
CLEVELAND OH
44114

MASTOR & MATTSON LTD
315 PEAVEY BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

MECCA
867 GRAND AVE
ST PAUL MN
55105

MEIEROTTO, JOAN
1794 SO LEXINGTON
ST PAUL MN
55118

KEENAN RICHARD J
4444 IDS BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

KIMBALL ROBERT
647 CAPITOL SQ BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

KLUZ STEVEN J
1910 1ST NATL BK BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

KNOPP TIMOTHY
COLLEGE FORESTRY U OF M
ST PAUL MN
55108

KNVDSON ROBT
4375 BROWNDALE AVE
MPLS MN
55424

KOLLER MR & MRS ERWIN A
1568 DULUTH ST
ST PAUL MN
55108

KRONLOKKEN J E
10048 NORD RD
BLOOMINGTON MN
55437

LANGVIN DAVID
7500 80TH ST S
COTTAGE GROVE MN
55016

LANSING & OAKES
400 SIBLEY ST
ST PAUL MN
55101

LARSON HANS P DIV HOSP SERV
717 DELAWARE ST SE
MPLS MN
55440

LEAGUE MN MUNIC
300 HANOVER 480 CEDAR
ST PAUL MN
55101

LINDALL & JONATHAN DEVELOP.
VILLAGE ONE CENTER
CHASKA MN
55318

LOCKNER GARY
R R 1 BOX 23
BAUDETTE MN
56623

LYNCH DONALD SIBLEY CO
184 E 6TH ST
ST PAUL MN
55102

MCKIBBON MRS SHIRLEY
11 EVERGREEN LN
BABBITT MN
55706

MCLELLAN LARKIN
215 ADM BLDG ST CAPITOL
ST PAUL MN
55101

MANKATO STAT STUDENT SENATE
CENTENNIAL STUDENT UN
MANKATO MN
56001

MANKATO STATE STUDENT AS
BOX 58 MANKATO COLLEGE
MANKATO MN
56001

MAUL WARREN E
320 S 4TH ST
MPLS MN
55415

MAYO FOUNDATION G ORWOLL
200 FIRST AVE NW
ROCHESTER MN
55901

MERRITT GRANT POLLUTION CONT
1935 W CO RD 32
ROSEVILLE MN
55113

MET TFR MEN ASSN A ROSENT
1821 UNIV AVE
ST PAUL MN
55104

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL LIBRARY
300 METRO SQUARE
ST PAUL MN
55155

MIDLAND GLASS- HD SPURLING
PO BOX 69
SHAKOPEE MN
55379

MPLS CHAMBER COMM TRANSP DPT
15 S 5TH ST
MPLS MN
55402

MPLS CITY ATTORNEY
325M CITY HALL
MPLS MN
55415

MIDLAND GLASS-HD SPURLING
PO BOX 69
SHAKOPEE MN
55379

MILLER PAUL J PHARMACY SERV
ST MARYS HOSP
ROCHESTER MN
55901

MINN AFL-CIO, L O LA SHOMB
414 AUDITORIUM ST
ST PAUL MN
55102

MINN ASPHALT PAVEMENT ASSN
555 WABASHA RM 209
ST PAUL MN
55102

MINN. ASSN. PET RETAILERS
1115 2ND AVE. SO.
MINNEAPOLIS MN
55403

MINN ASSN WATERSHED DIST'S

ADA MN
56510

MINN COMMUNITY DEVELOP SERV
512 ROSSMOR BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

MINN COUNCIL STATE EMP NO 6
475 RICE ST
ST PAUL MN
55103

MINN ELECTRICAL ASSN INC
525 SO 7TH
MPLS MN
55415

MINN ENV LAW INST INC
PO BOX 15076 COMM STA
MPLS MN
55415

MINN HEREFORD-LJ SCHAFER

BUFFALO LAKE MN
55314

MINN. HOTEL & MTR. ASSN
2001 UNIVERSITY AVE
ST PAUL MN

MINN LAND USE COMMITTEE
4344 IDS CENTER
MPLS MN
55402

MINN LP GAS ASSN
7515 WAYZATA BLVD 106
MPLS MN
55426

MINN PETROLEUM COUNCIL
1020 NORTHERN FED BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55102

MINN POULTRY & HATCHERY ASSN
BOX 158
MADELIA MN
56062

MINN RETAIL FEDERATION
7600 PARKLAWN STE 457
MPLS MN
55435

MINN RETAIL HARDWARE ASSN
3033 EXCELSIOR BLVD 313
MPLS MN
55416

MINN SOC CERTIFIED PUB ACCTS
1102 WESLEY TEMPLE BLDG
MPLS MN
55403

MINN STATE BAR ASSN
100 MINN FED BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

MILLER RICHARD A
1020 PLYMOUTH BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

MILLER TOM
2311 PILLSBURY AVE S
MPLS MN
55404

MPLS STAR PRESS ROOM
STATE CAPITOL
ST PAUL MN
55101

MPLS TRIBUNE CITY DESK
425 PORTLAND AVE
MPLS MN
55415

MINN APT ASSN
GRIGGS-MIDWAY BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55104

MN. ASN.C&IND H.D.PETERSO
480 CEDAR ST.
ST.PAUL MN
55101

MINN ASSN COOPERATIVES
55 SHERBURNE AVE
ST PAUL MN
55103

MINN ASSN ELEC COOPERATIV
4901 W 77TH ST
MPLS MN
55435

MINN AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSN
GRIGGS MIDWAY BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55104

MINN COMM FOR HANDICAPPED
METRO SQ 492 7TH & ROBT
ST PAUL MN
55101

MINN DEPT HEALTH J C MCKASY
717 DELAWARE S E
MPLS MN
55440

MINN DENTAL HYGIENISTS
5041 YVONNE TERRACE
MPLS MN
55436

MINN FARMERS UNION PRES OFF
1275 UNIV AVE
ST PAUL MN
55104

MINN FOOD RETAILERS ASSN
555 WABASHA
ST PAUL MN
55101

MINN HOUSING INST N T CARTER
7801 METRO PKWY
MPLS MN
55420

MINN HWYS MANAGEMENT SERV
407 HWY BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

MINNE MINE CREDIT UNION
3000 HUDSON PK S 100
ST PAUL MN
55119

MINN.MTR.TRANSP. .J.N.D
1821 UNIV.
ST.PAUL MN
55104

MN REP STATE CENTRAL COMM
555 WABASHA AVE
ST PAUL MN
55102

MINN RESTAURANT ASSN
2001 UNIVERSITY AVE.
ST PAUL MN 55
104

MINN SCH BUS OPERATORS ASSN

FARIBAULT MN
55021

MINN SOCIETY ARCHITECTS A
NW NATL BK BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

MINN STATE BD PHARMACY
717 DELAWARE ST SE #351
MPLS MN
55414

MINN STATE CAPITOL EMP UN
PO BOX 3215
ST PAUL MN
55165

MINN STATE MED ASSN
375 JACKSON ST
ST PAUL MN
55101

MINN STATE RETIREMENT SYSTEM
529 JACKSON ST
ST PAUL MN
55101

MINN.TURKEY GROWERS ASSN
2383 UNIV AVE
ST PAUL MN
55114

MINN VETERANS MED ASSN
2175 W HWY 36
ROSEVILLE MN
55113

MN PUB INT RESEARCH GROUP
3036 UNIV AVE SE
MPLS MN
55414

MOFFITT R.C. [redacted]
MPLS.CITY HALL RM 301M
MPLS MN
55415

MORTON BUILDINGS INC
R #1
FOLEY MN
56329

MPIRG
BOX 45 ST MARYS COLLEGE
WINONA MN
55987

NASS GEO V HENN CO GEN HOSP
5TH AND PORTLAND AVE
MPLS MN
55415

NATL CAR RENTAL ATT D MITZEL
5501 GREEN VALLEY DR
MPLS MN
55437

NAT'L SOLID WASTES-R. GRASSO
1730 RHODE ISLAND AV.NW
WASHINGTON DC
20036

NCEC INC C/O DR DAHLBERG
CONCORDIA COLLEGE
MOORHEAD MN
56560

NESBITT JOHN
7851 METRO PKWY S 118
MPLS MN
55420

NEUMAN RALPH W
RT 2 BOX 125
EMBARRASS MN
55732

NORTH CENTRAL ELEC ASSN
PO BOX 202
BATTLE LAKE MN
56515

NW COUNTRY ELEVATOR ASSN
802 GRAIN EXCH BLDG
MPLS MN
55415

NW BELL TEL CO LEGAL DEPT
224 S 5TH ST RM 2000
MPLS MN
55402

NYQUIST DEAN A
3707 53RD PL N
BROOKLYN CTR MN
55429

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
130 STATE CAPITOL
ST PAUL MN
55101

OLD COLONY GAS & OIL COMPANY
17TH AVE N AT 2ND ST
MPLS MN
55411

OTTER TAIL POWER CO.
215 S. CASCADE ST.
FERGUS FALLS MN
56537

PAYNE WM B
2400 FIRST NATL BK BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

PETERSON JOHN W
510 NW BK BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

MINN TEAMSTERS CREDIT UNION
2021 HENN AVE E
MPLS MN
55413

MINN TBR PRODUCERS ASSN
200 CHRISTIE BLDG
DULUTH MN
55802

MINN WATER RESOURCES BD
RM 206 555 WABASHA ST
ST PAUL MN
55102

MINN-WISC BOUNDARY AREA C
600 2ND ST
HUDSON WI
54016

MOOD R BLOOMINGTON HLTH DEPT
10200 PENN SO
BLOOMINGTON MN
55431

MOONEY, MICHAEL A.
BOX 903, ST.JOHN'S UNIV
COLLEGEVILLE MN
56321

MUELLER SHIRLEY A
787 W COTTAGE AVE
ST PAUL MN
55117

NATL COUNCIL JEWISH WOMEN
4330 CEDAR LK RD
MPLS MN
55416

NATL FAMILY INS CO
2147 UNIV AVE
ST PAUL MN
55114

NELSON DONALD E NSP CO
414 NICOLLET AVE
MPLS MN
55401

NEDELL HAROLD - MEINEKE
6300 W LOOP S SUITE 200
BELLAIRE TX
77401

NIELSEN STOCK & BLACKBURN
415 730 BLDG
MPLS MN

NO SUB MONTESSORI-S SADDL
2487 HELEN COURT
NO ST PAUL MN
55109

NURSING HOME ADMRS BD EXAMRS
RM 340 717 DELAWARE SE
MPLS MN
55414

NUTTER JULIA
743 W MONTANA
ST PAUL MN
55117

O'BRIEN J.DENNIS
1100 1ST NATL.BANK BLDG
MINNEAPOLIS MN
55402

OLOFSON ARTHUR MBO & MAINC
927 SOO LINE BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

OSTRUM DONALD E
PO BOX 33163
COON RAPIDS MN
55433

PATTISON ORVIS
BOX 645
WILLMAR MN
56201

PAYNE COL ALVIN

DEGRAFF MN
56233

PETERSON GARY
854 MIDLAND BK BLDG
MPLS MN
55401

PFEIFER AND SHULTZ, INC
1433 UTICA AVE S
MPLS MN
55416

PHAR MFGRS ASSN WM D PATTON
1155 15TH ST NW
WASHINGTON DC DC
20005

PHILLIPS LEGISLATIVE SERVICE
459 RICE ST
ST PAUL MN
55103

PORTER LYLE O

TRACY MN
56175

PORT AUTH CITY OF ST PAUL
330 MINNESOTA BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

PRAUSE JOS.C.
2220 105TH AVE.N.W.
COON RAPIDS MN
55433

PROCTOR&GAMBLE L THEOHAROUS
IVORYDALE TECH CENTER
CINCINNATI OH
45217

RAUENHORST CORP-C ANDERSON
7900 XERXES S. S-2200
MPLS MN
55431

RED OWL STORES INC
215 E EXCELSIOR AVE
HOPKINS MN
55343

RAMSEY CO MEDICAL SOCIETY
1500 LOWRY MEDICAL BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55102

RICHARDSON THOS
7851 METRO PKWY S 103
MPLS MN
55420

ROBBIE JOSEPH
904 CARGILL BLDG NO CTR
MPLS MN
55402

ROBERTS DAVID E
1260 NW NATL BK BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

SAN SIMEON DEVELOP CORP
OLD 1ST STATE BK BLDG
PAYNESVILLE MN

SAX DOVE & STENSON
310 ENDICOTT BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

ST PAUL ASSN PLBG HTG MECH
614 AM NATL BK
ST PAUL MN

SCARBOROUGH WILLIAM
DIV.ED. U.M.
MORRIS MN
56267

SCHLICHT REV ROBT
611 W MAIN ST
BELLE PLAINE MN
56011

SCHMIDT LARRY WCCO-TV NEWS
50 S 9TH ST
MPLS MN
55402

SCHNEIDER MAHLON
GREEN GIANT
LESUEUR MN
56058

SCHWERMAN EARL JR
1535 8TH AVE SE
ROCHESTER MN
55901

SCHWINN ROBT.P.
1400 SCO LINE BLDG.
MPLS. MN
55402

PINNETTI NICK M HALEY & ASS.
40 CENTRAL PARK S
NEW YORK NY
10019

POPOVICH PETER S
314 MINN BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

POSS DONALD G
6301 SHINGLE CREEK PKWY
BROOKLYN CTR MN
55430

POYZER ROBT
BOX 675
FERGUS FALLS MN
56357

PULSCHER RBT SPRINGSTED INC
813 OSBORN BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55102

RADMAN RICHARD-LABOR TEMPLE
418 AUDITORIUM
ST PAUL MN
55102

RANALLO CLARENCE
800 CENTRAL AVE N E
MPLS MN
55413

REID DAVID H
5633 WASHBURN AVE S
MPLS MN
55410

RENNER R.H. ST PAUL AREA
300 OSBORN BLDG.
ST PAUL MN
55102

RICHARDS MONTGOMERY ET AL
1430 RAND TOWER
MPLS MN
55402

ROE DAVID
175 AURORA
ST PAUL MN
55103

ROSS ALFRED
6356 WARE RD
LINO LAKES MN
55014

RUDY FLOYD
118 AVE C
CLOQUET MN
55720

SANFORD S M
7000 PORTLAND AVE
RICHFIELD MN
55423

SATHRE, HARVEY
375 MARION STREET
ST PAUL MN
55103

ST PAUL BUR HLTH DR P COX
555 CEDAR ST
ST PAUL MN
55101

ST PAUL FOOD RETAILERS AS
1220 ARCADE
ST PAUL MN
55106

SCHMIDT D R MN ASSN REALTORS
6101 WAYZATA BLVD
MPLS MN
55416

SCHMIDT H W TCHRS RETIREM
302 CAPITOL SQ BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

SCHUTZ LINDA
RM 328 CAPITOL BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55155

SCHWARTAU NEAL METH HOSP
201 W CENTER ST
ROCHESTER MN
55901

SCHNEIDER & NEESER
706 1ST ST SO PO BX 876
WILLMAR MN
56201

SCHROEDER ALFRED H
2172 CARROLL AVE
ST PAUL MN
55104

SENATE COUN F ROOM 24
STATE CAPITOL
ST PAUL MN
55101

SENA FINANCE COMMITTEE
113 STATE CAPITOL
ST PAUL MN
55101

SHARP BOB
4125 HIGHWOOD RD
ST LOUIS PK MN
55416

SHAW RCBERT M
616 MCBIL OIL BLDG
MPLS MN
554C2

SKELLY OIL CO R R WELLINGTON
PO BOX 436
KANSAS CITY MO

SLCCUM CHARLES A
1203 IDS TCWER
MPLS MN
55402

SNELL LYN
BOX 314
EDEN VALLEY MN
55329

SNYDER ROBERT W
248 CO B U OF M
ST PAUL MN
55101

STANSFIELD ARLENE LAND OLKS
PO BOX 116
MPLS MN
55440

STATE BD.BARBER EXAMINERS
555 WABASHA
ST PAUL MN
55102

STEELWORKERS CREDIT UNION
BOX 250
BABB ITT MN
55706

STENSLAND M.E. PRES. MVMA
203 NW 22ND ST.
AUSTIN MN
55912

SULLIVAN J KIRK
PO BOX 200
BOISE ID
83701

SUMMIT NATL BANK D L MORRILL
205 AURORA AVE
ST PAUL MN
55103

SWANSON DALE
P O BOX 339
FOREST LAKE MN
55025

SWANSON GERALD H
212 CITY HALL
RCCHESTER MN
55901

TATE VERN 3M CO
3M CENTER 220/6W
ST PAUL MN
55101

THCMPSCN CONRAD
1107 23RD ST NW
ROCHESTER MN
55901

TOUCHE ROSS & CO K H STOCKE
780 NORTHSTAR CNTR
MPLS MN
55402

TWIN CITY RETAIL DRUGGIST AS
2388 UNIV AVE
ST PAUL MN
55104

VAN CLEVE JOHN H
2101 HENN AVE
MPLS MN
55405

VERRILL JOHN E
DEPT SECONDARY ED UOF M
DULUTH MN
55812

VILLAGE OF WOODBURY-F.STRONG
561 TOWER DRIVE
NEWPORT MN
55C55

SENATE GOV OP COMM
RM 303 STATE CAPITOL
ST PAUL MN
55155

SHABATURA EUGENE H
2833 LAKE AVE SO
DULUTH MN
55811

SHELL OIL CO. W.A. ROQUET
ONE SHELL PLAZA BX 2463
HOUSTON TX
77001

SITE ENGINEERS INC
900 REDWELL LANE
APPLE VALLEY MN
55124

SMERIKA WN.
BOISE CASCADE PAPERS
INTL FALLS MN
56649

SMITH MICHAEL
1423 NEWTON AVE N
MPLS MN
55411

SODERBERG HAROLD J
1500 MIDWEST PLAZA BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

SODERMAN ANTHONY
152 S PLAZA BLDG
MPLS MN
55416

STATE BD VETERINARY EXAMINER
C/O DR A C SPANNAUS DVM
WACONIA MN

STD AM LIFE & ANNUITY CO
3801 W 50TH ST
MPLS MN
55410

STOLPESTAD BROWN & SMITH
1550 NW BK BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

STUPKA & MOREM
MIDTOWN BLDG
AUSTIN MN
55912

SUSSEL CO.ATTN:TED SCHWENKER
1850 COMO AVE.
ST PAUL MN
55108

SWANSON BURT E
W-2162 1ST NATL BK BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

SWEITZER R L HONEYWELL INC
2701 4TH AVE S
MPLS MN
55408

THOMPSON HESSIAN ET AL
1500 MIDWEST PLAZA BLDG
MPLS MN
55402

TIMESAVERS INC ATT R S VO
5270 HANSON COURT
MPLS MN
55422

UNION STOCK YARDS
ATTN PRES
SO ST PAUL MN
55075

VAN DRAKE STEPHEN R
BOX 353
PELICAN RAPID MN
56572

VAN EVERA MUNDT ET AL
700 TORREY BLDG
DULUTH MN
55802

VOLDNESS PERRY
IDS 8TH & MARQUETTE
MPLS MN
55402

VOSS REV GORDON O
11120 NE 7TH ST
BLAINE MN
55434

VOS LEROY
2137 BURNS AVE
ST PAUL MN
55119

WALTERS THOS H
4510 W 77TH ST STE 235
MPLS MN
55435

WANQUIST ALLEN
RM 252 FEDERAL BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

WHITING RALPH
555 WABASHA SUITE 204
ST PAUL MN
55102

WHITLOCK A G
ECCN LAB OSBORN BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55102

WILEY ENTERPRISES
101 5TH AVE SE
OSSEO MN
55369

WILSON R GARY PPG INDUSTR
1 GATEWAY CENTER
PITTSBURGH PA
15222

WOZNIAK D D
401 FIRST FED BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55101

WYANT CLINTON W ATTY

ATKIN MN
56431



WALD JEAN
5746 SANDER DR
MPLS MN
55417

WALIGORA ROBERT
3228 SO 17TH AVE
MPLS MN
55407

WELK G V NORTHERN STATES
414 NICOLLET MALL
MPLS MN
55401

WESTIN CHAS W
220 MEDICAL ARTS BLDG
DULUTH MN
55802

WILCOX J PATRICK
1220 NORTHERN FED BLDG
ST PAUL MN
55102

WM.MITCHEL COLLEGE LAW LI
2100 SUMMIT AVE.
ST.PAUL MN
55105

WIS FEEDER PIG MARKET CO-OP

FRANCIS CREEK WI

WOLKERSTORTER THEODORE
676 17TH AVE NW
NEW BRIGHTON MN
55112

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF RAMSEY

BEFORE EDWARD G. NOVAK
COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

In the Matter of the Proposed Amendments of Rules DES 140 and 141 of the State Department of Public Safety Governing the Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System

ORDER ADOPTING RULES

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing before the duly appointed hearings officer, Dan Gustafson on the 12th day of September, 1975, at 9:30 a.m. in the Auditorium of the State Office Building, St. Paul, Minnesota, after proper notice required by M.S. 1971, Section 15.0412 was served upon all persons, associations and other interested groups registered with the Secretary of State for that purpose.

After affording interested persons an opportunity to present written and oral data, statements and arguments, having heard all of the testimony, having considered all of the evidence adduced and upon the records, files and proceedings herein, and applicable statutory standards or criteria, and having confirmed the need for the above captioned rules.

NOW, THEREFORE IT IS ORDERED, that these rules identified as Civil Defense Merit System Rules are adopted this 5th day of November, 1975, pursuant to the authority vested in me by Minnesota Statutes 393.07.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Edward G. Novak
COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF RAMSEY

BEFORE EDWARD G. NOVAK
COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

In the Matter of the Proposed Amendments to Rules DES 140 and 141 of the State Department of Public Safety Governing the Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System

FINDINGS OF FACT

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing before the duly appointed hearings officer, Dan Gustafson on the 12th day of September, 1975, at 9:30 a.m. in the Auditorium of the State Office Building, St. Paul, Minnesota, after proper notice required by M.S. 1971, Section 15.0412 was served upon all persons, associations and other interested groups registered with the Secretary of State for that purpose.

After affording interested persons an opportunity to present written and oral data, statements and arguments, having heard all of the testimony, having considered all of the evidence adduced and upon the records, files and proceedings herein, I find the following:

The salary adjustments proposed are justified in the light of salary increases of similar positions in other agencies and current salary data, including cost-of-living indicators, compiled as a result of a recent salary survey.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Edward G. Novak
COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF RAMSEY

BEFORE EDWARD G. NOVAK

COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

In the Matter of the Proposed Amendment of Rules DES 140 and 141 of the State Department of Public Safety Governing the Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System

ORDER FOR HEARING

To effectively implement changes in Rules and Regulations, the Governor of Minnesota deems it necessary to consider the adoption of the proposed rules captioned above pursuant to the authority vested in me by M.S. 12.22, Subdivision 3.

NOW, THEREFORE IT IS ORDERED that a public hearing on the proposed regulations captioned above be held in the Auditorium of the State Office Building, St. Paul, Minnesota, on Friday, September 12, 1975, commencing at 9:30 a.m., and continuing until all representatives of associations or other groups of persons or individuals have had an opportunity to be heard.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that notice of said hearing be given to all representatives of associations or other interested groups or persons who have registered their names with the Secretary of State for that purpose.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Edward G. Novak
COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Dated: July 30, 1975

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF RAMSEY

BEFORE EDWARD G. NOVAK

COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

In the Matter of the Proposed Amendment of Rules DES 140 and 141 of the State Department of Public Safety Governing the Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System

NOTICE OF HEARING

Notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held pursuant to M.S. 1967, Section 15.0412, Subdivision 4, in the above-entitled matter in the Auditorium of the State Office Building, Wabasha Street (between Aurora and Fuller), St. Paul, Minnesota, on Friday, September 12, 1975, commencing at 9:30 A.M., and continuing until all representatives of associations or other interested groups or persons have had an opportunity to be heard concerning adoption of the proposed rules captioned above by submitting either oral or written data, statements or arguments. Statements or briefs may be submitted without appearing at the hearing.

One matter to be considered is the proposal to adjust the Compensation Plan for positions in local civil defense agencies covered by the Merit System. The recommendation is to adjust the existing professional minimum and maximum salaries one and one half steps, and the salaries of the incumbents 6.75% in accordance with salary regulations outlined in current Merit System regulations, and adjust the clerical salaries by a flat $50 per month amount as of January 1, 1976. The hearing will be held in conjunction with the Department of Public Welfare and the Department of Health and adjustments to the County Welfare and Public Health Merit System's Compensation Plans also will be considered. A copy of the Notice of the Department of Public Welfare and the Department of Health is enclosed for your information.

Copies of the proposed rules are now available and may be obtained by writing to the Supervisor, Civil Defense Merit System, Fourth Floor, Centennial Office Building, 658 Cedar Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155.

Edward G. Novak

COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Dated: July 30, 1975

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF RAMSEY

In the Matter of the Proposed Adoption of Rules of the State Department of Public Safety Governing the Division of Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System Compensation Plan, Minn. Rules DES 140 and 141

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

Pat Flatten, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That on the 8 day of August, 1975, at the City of St. Paul, County of Ramsey, State of Minnesota, (s)he served the attached Notice of Hearing by depositing in the United States mail at said City of St. Paul, a true and correct copy thereof, properly enveloped, with postage prepaid, to all persons and associations at the addresses listed on the attached Certificate of the Secretary of State as well as to all persons listed on the attached sheet as being members of the Minnesota Legislature.

Pat Flatten

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 8th day of August, 1975.

Patricia A. Schultz

PATRICIA A. SCHULTZ
Notary Public, Dakota County, Minn.
My Commission Expires June 19, 1981

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF RAMSEY

In the Matter of the Proposed Adoption of Rules of the State Department of Public Safety Governing the Division of Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System Compensation Plan, Minn. Rules DES 140 and 141

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the attached 432 labels and 1 sheets for Public Safety constitute the complete list of persons, associations, and other interested groups who, as of 8:30 o'clock A.M., this 6th day of August, 1975, have requested pursuant to M.S. 1971, Section 15.0412, that their names be placed on file with the Secretary of State for the purpose of receiving notice of public hearing on proposed rules on the subject captioned above.

Secretary of State

Joan Anderson Growe

By Neil Dunn

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF RAMSEY

BEFORE EDWARD G. NOVAK

COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

In the Matter of the Proposed Revision of Rules DES 140 and 141 of the State Department of Public Safety Relating to the Division of Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System Compensation Plan

STATEMENT OF NEED

The above captioned rules are amendments to existing rules of the Department of Public Safety. The last time these rules were amended was January 1, 1975.

The need to adopt these rules arises from the need to provide salary increases for employees in Merit System agencies due to the general increases in the cost of living and the increases in the salaries of positions in public agencies similar to those of the Merit System.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY.

Edward G Novak
COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Dated: July 30, 1975

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF RAMSEY

BEFORE EDWARD G. NOVAK

COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

In the Matter of the Proposed Amendments to the Department of Public Safety Relating to the Division of Emergency Services (Civil Defense) Merit System, Minn. Rules DES 140 and 141

APPOINTMENT

Dan W. Gustafson is hereby appointed to serve as hearing officer on behalf of the State Board of Health in the above-captioned matter, said hearing to be held on September 12, 1975, and continuing until all representatives of associations or other interested groups or persons have had an opportunity to be heard.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Edward G. Novak
COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Dated: July 30, 1975

NEW RULES AS PROPOSED

DES 140 Compensation Plan

(a) Professional
(1) Plan A

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Local Civil Defense Director I	691	723	755	789	826	863	902	944
Local Civil Defense Director II	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079
Local Civil Defense Director III	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Local Civil Defense Director IV	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
Local Civil Defense Director V	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
County Civil Defense Director I	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177
County Civil Defense Director II	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
County Civil Defense Director III	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
County Civil Defense Director IV	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
Asst. Civil Defense Director I	604	631	660	691	723	755	789	826
Asst. Civil Defense Director II	723	755	789	826	863	902	944	987
Asst. Civil Defense Director III	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177
Asst. Civil Defense Director IV	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409
Administrative Officer	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Public Information Officer	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Safety Service Coordinator	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Operations Officer	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Radiological Defense Officer	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079
Communication Officer	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079

(a) Professional
(2) Plan B

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Local Civil Defense Director I	691	723	755	789	826	863	902	944
Local Civil Defense Director II	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079
Local Civil Defense Director III	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Local Civil Defense Director IV	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
Local Civil Defense Director V	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
County Civil Defense Director I	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177
County Civil Defense Director II	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
County Civil Defense Director III	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
County Civil Defense Director IV	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
Asst. Civil Defense Director I	631	660	691	723	755	789	826	863
Asst. Civil Defense Director II	755	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032
Asst. Civil Defense Director III	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Asst. Civil Defense Director IV	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472
Administrative Officer	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290
Public Information Officer	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290
Safety Services Coordinator	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290
Operations Officer	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290
Radiological Defense Officer	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126
Communication Officer	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126

(a) Professional
(3) Plan C

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Local Civil Defense Director I	691	723	755	789	826	863	902	944
Local Civil Defense Director II	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079
Local Civil Defense Director III	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232
Local Civil Defense Director IV	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
Local Civil Defense Director V	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
County Civil Defense Director I	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177
County Civil Defense Director II	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
County Civil Defense Director III	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
County Civil Defense Director IV	1609	1683	1760	1839	1923	2013	2105	2200
Asst. Civil Defense Director I	660	691	723	755	789	826	863	902
Asst. Civil Defense Director II	789	826	863	902	944	987	1032	1079
Asst. Civil Defense Director III	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290
Asst. Civil Defense Director IV	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348	1409	1472	1538
Administrative Officer	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
Public Information Officer	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
Safety Services Coordinator	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
Operations Officer	987	1032	1079	1126	1177	1232	1290	1348
Radiological Defense Officer	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177
Communication Officer	863	902	944	987	1032	1079	1126	1177

(b) Clerical

(1) Plan A

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	383	398	414	430	446	462	483	504
Clerk II	446	462	483	504	525	546	567	588
Clerk III	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk-Typist I	398	414	430	446	462	483	504	525
Clerk-Typist II	446	462	483	504	525	546	567	588
Clerk-Typist III	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk-Steno I	414	430	446	462	483	504	525	546
Clerk-Steno II	483	504	525	546	567	588	614	640
Clerk-Steno III	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694

(2) Plan B

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	398	414	430	446	462	483	504	525
Clerk II	462	483	504	525	546	567	588	614
Clerk III	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725
Clerk-Typist I	414	430	446	462	483	504	525	546
Clerk-Typist II	462	483	504	525	546	567	588	614
Clerk-Typist III	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725
Clerk-Steno I	430	446	462	483	504	525	546	567
Clerk-Steno II	504	525	546	567	588	614	640	667
Clerk-Steno III	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725

(3) Plan C

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	414	430	446	462	483	504	525	546
Clerk II	483	504	525	546	567	588	614	640
Clerk III	567	588	614	640	667	694	725	757
Clerk-Typist I	430	446	462	483	504	525	546	567
Clerk-Typist II	483	504	525	546	567	588	614	640
Clerk-Typist III	567	588	614	640	667	694	725	757
Clerk-Steno I	446	462	483	504	525	546	567	588
Clerk-Steno II	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk-Steno III	567	588	614	640	667	694	725	757

(b) Clerical

(4) Plan D

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	430	446	462	483	504	525	546	567
Clerk II	504	525	546	567	588	614	640	667
Clerk III	588	614	640	667	694	725	757	789
Clerk-Typist I	446	462	483	504	525	546	567	588
Clerk-Typist II	504	525	546	567	588	614	640	667
Clerk-Typist III	588	614	640	667	694	725	757	789
Clerk-Steno I	462	483	504	525	546	567	588	614
Clerk-Steno II	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725
Clerk-Steno III	588	614	640	667	694	725	757	789

(5) Plan E

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	446	462	483	504	525	546	567	588
Clerk II	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk III	614	640	667	694	725	757	789	821
Clerk-Typist I	462	483	504	525	546	567	588	614
Clerk-Typist II	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk-Typist III	614	640	667	694	725	757	789	821
Clerk-Steno I	483	504	525	546	567	588	614	640
Clerk-Steno II	567	588	614	640	667	694	725	757
Clerk-Steno III	614	640	667	694	725	757	789	821

(6) Plan F

(aa) Class of Positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clerk I	483	504	525	546	567	588	614	640
Clerk II	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725
Clerk III	640	667	694	725	757	789	821	857
Clerk-Typist I	504	525	546	567	588	614	640	667
Clerk-Typist II	546	567	588	614	640	667	694	725
Clerk-Typist III	640	667	694	725	757	789	821	857
Clerk-Steno I	525	546	567	588	614	640	667	694
Clerk-Steno II	588	614	640	667	694	725	757	789
Clerk-Steno III	640	667	694	725	757	789	821	857

CIVIL DEFENSE SALARY SCHEDULE

FOR PROFESSIONAL CLASSES

STANDARD TABLE FOR COMPUTING LESS-THAN-FULL-TIME-SALARY AND BI-WEEKLY SALARY RATES

Monthly Salary	Hourly Rate*	Bi-weekly Rate**	Salary Per Working Day for Months with the Following Number of Working Days Plus Holidays. (For Agencies That Pay by the Month or Twice a Month.)***			
			20 Days	21 Days	22 Days	23 Days
$675	$3.88	$310.40	$33.75	$32.14	$30.68	$29.35
691	3.97	317.60	34.55	32.90	31.41	30.04
707	4.06	324.80	35.35	33.67	32.14	30.74
723	4.16	332.80	36.15	34.43	32.86	31.43
739	4.25	340.00	36.95	35.19	33.59	32.13
755	4.34	347.20	37.75	35.95	34.32	32.83
771	4.43	354.40	38.55	36.71	35.05	33.52
789	4.53	362.40	39.45	37.57	35.86	34.30
807	4.64	371.20	40.35	38.43	36.68	35.09
826	4.75	380.00	41.30	39.33	37.55	35.91
844	4.85	388.00	42.20	40.19	38.36	36.70
863	4.96	396.80	43.15	41.10	39.23	37.52
881	5.06	404.80	44.05	41.95	40.05	38.30
902	5.18	414.40	45.10	42.95	41.00	39.22
923	5.30	424.00	46.15	43.95	41.95	40.13
944	5.43	434.40	47.20	44.95	42.91	41.04
965	5.55	444.00	48.25	45.95	43.86	41.96
987	5.67	453.60	49.35	47.00	44.86	42.91
1008	5.79	463.20	50.40	48.00	45.82	43.83
1032	5.93	474.40	51.60	49.14	46.91	44.87
1055	6.06	484.80	52.75	50.24	47.95	45.87
1079	6.20	496.00	53.95	51.38	49.05	46.91
1102	6.33	506.40	55.10	52.48	50.09	47.91
1126	6.47	517.60	56.30	53.62	51.18	48.96
1150	6.61	528.80	57.50	54.76	52.27	50.00
1177	6.76	540.80	58.85	56.05	53.50	51.17
1203	6.91	552.80	60.15	57.29	54.68	52.30
1232	7.08	566.40	61.60	58.67	56.00	53.56
1261	7.25	580.00	63.05	60.05	57.32	54.83
1290	7.41	592.80	64.50	61.43	58.64	56.09
1319	7.58	606.40	65.95	62.81	59.95	57.35
1348	7.75	620.00	67.40	64.19	61.27	58.61
1377	7.91	632.80	68.85	65.57	62.59	59.87
1409	8.10	648.00	70.45	67.10	64.05	61.26
1440	8.28	662.40	72.00	68.57	65.45	62.61
1472	8.46	676.80	73.60	70.10	66.91	64.00
1503	8.64	691.20	75.15	71.57	68.32	65.35
1538	8.84	707.20	76.90	73.24	69.91	66.87
1572	9.03	722.40	78.60	74.86	71.45	68.35
1609	9.25	740.00	80.45	76.62	73.14	69.96

Monthly Salary	Hourly Rate*	Bi-weekly Rate**	Salary Per Working Day for Months with the Following Number of Working Days Plus Holidays. (For Agencies That Pay by the Month or Twice a Month.)***			
			20 Days	21 Days	22 Days	23 Days
$1646	$9.46	$756.80	$82.30	$78.38	$74.82	$71.57
1683	9.67	773.60	84.15	80.14	76.50	73.17
1720	9.89	791.20	86.00	81.90	78.18	74.78
1760	10.11	808.80	88.00	83.81	80.00	76.52
1799	10.34	827.20	89.95	85.67	81.77	78.22
1839	10.57	845.60	91.95	87.57	83.59	79.96
1878	10.79	863.20	93.90	89.43	85.36	81.65
1923	11.05	884.00	96.15	91.57	87.41	83.61
1968	11.31	904.80	98.40	93.71	89.45	85.57
2013	11.57	925.60	100.65	95.86	91.50	87.52
2057	11.82	945.60	102.85	97.95	93.50	89.43
2105	12.10	968.00	105.25	100.24	95.68	91.52
2152	12.37	989.60	107.60	102.48	97.82	93.57
2200	12.64	1011.20	110.00	104.76	100.00	95.65
2247	12.91	1032.80	112.35	107.00	102.14	97.70
2297	13.20	1056.00	114.85	109.38	104.41	99.87
2347	13.49	1079.20	117.35	111.76	106.68	102.04
2398	13.78	1102.40	119.90	114.19	109.00	104.26

*Hourly rates are based on 2088 hours in a year.

**To compute a partial payment on the bi-weekly rate, divide the bi-weekly rate by ten to find the daily rate. Multiply the daily rate by the number of days the employee worked (and/or was on approved vacation, sick leave, or holiday leave). Formula: Rate per working day X number of days worked = salary payment. Hourly rate is as shown in column two headed "Hourly Rate."

***To compute the number of days in the month for which payment is to be made, count the working days plus the holidays. Do not count Saturdays or Sundays. After determining this number, find the appropriate working-day rate for the month salary rate at which the employee is currently being paid.

Multiply the rate per day by the number of days the employee worked (and/or was on approved vacation, sick leave, or holiday leave) in order to compute the payment for the pay period. Formula: Rate per working day X number of days worked = salary payment.

CIVIL DEFENSE SALARY SCHEDULE

FOR CLERICAL CLASSES

STANDARD TABLE FOR COMPUTING LESS-THAN-FULL-TIME SALARY AND BI-WEEKLY SALARY RATES

Monthly Salary	Hourly Rate*	Bi-weekly Rate**	Salary Per Working Day for Months with the Following Number of Working Days Plus Holidays. (For Agencies That Pay by the Month or Twice a Month.)***			
			20 Days	21 Days	22 Days	23 Days
$383	$2.20	$176.00	$19.15	$18.24	$17.41	$16.65
398	2.29	183.20	19.90	18.95	18.09	17.30
406	2.33	186.40	20.30	19.33	18.45	17.65
414	2.38	190.40	20.70	19.71	18.82	18.00
422	2.43	194.40	21.10	20.10	19.18	18.35
430	2.47	197.60	21.50	20.48	19.55	18.70
438	2.52	201.60	21.90	20.86	19.91	19.04
446	2.56	204.80	22.30	21.24	20.27	19.39
454	2.61	208.80	22.70	21.62	20.64	19.74
462	2.66	212.80	23.10	22.00	21.00	20.09
473	2.72	217.60	23.65	22.52	21.50	20.57
483	2.78	222.40	24.15	23.00	21.95	21.00
494	2.84	227.20	24.70	23.52	22.45	21.48
504	2.90	232.00	25.20	24.00	22.91	21.91
515	2.96	236.80	25.75	24.52	23.41	22.39
525	3.02	241.60	26.25	25.00	23.86	22.83
536	3.08	246.40	26.80	25.52	24.36	23.30
546	3.14	251.20	27.30	26.00	24.82	23.74
557	3.20	256.00	27.85	26.52	25.32	24.22
567	3.26	260.80	28.35	27.00	25.77	24.65
578	3.32	265.60	28.90	27.52	26.27	25.13
588	3.38	270.40	29.40	28.00	26.73	25.57
601	3.45	276.00	30.05	28.62	27.32	26.13
614	3.53	282.40	30.70	29.24	27.91	26.70
627	3.60	288.00	31.35	29.86	28.50	27.26
640	3.68	294.40	32.00	30.48	29.09	27.83
654	3.76	300.80	32.70	31.14	29.73	28.43
667	3.83	306.40	33.35	31.76	30.32	29.00
681	3.91	312.80	34.05	32.43	30.95	29.61
694	3.99	319.20	34.70	33.05	31.55	30.17
710	4.08	326.40	35.50	33.81	32.27	30.87
725	4.17	333.60	36.25	34.52	32.95	31.52
741	4.26	340.80	37.05	35.29	33.68	32.22
757	4.35	348.00	37.85	36.05	34.41	32.91
773	4.44	355.20	38.65	36.81	35.14	33.61
789	4.53	362.40	39.45	37.57	35.86	34.30
805	4.63	370.40	40.25	38.33	36.59	35.00
821	4.72	377.60	41.05	39.10	37.32	35.70
839	4.82	385.60	41.95	39.95	38.14	36.48
857	4.93	394.40	42.85	40.81	38.95	37.26
876	5.03	402.40	43.80	41.71	39.82	38.09
894	5.14	411.20	44.70	42.57	40.64	38.87
913	5.25	420.00	45.65	43.48	41.50	39.70
931	5.35	428.00	46.55	44.33	42.32	40.48

Monthly Salary	Hourly Rate	Bi-weekly Rate	Salary Per Working Day for Months with the Following Number of Working Days Plus Holidays. (For Agencies That Pay by the Month or Twice a Month.)***			
			20 Days	21 Days	22 Days	23 Days
$952	$5.47	$437.60	$47.60	$45.33	$43.27	$41.39
973	5.59	447.20	48.65	46.33	44.23	42.30
994	5.71	456.80	49.70	47.33	45.18	43.22
1015	5.83	466.40	50.75	48.33	46.14	44.13
1037	5.96	476.80	51.85	49.38	47.14	45.09
1058	6.08	486.40	52.90	50.38	48.09	46.00

*Hourly rates are based on 2088 hours in a year.

**To compute a partial payment on the bi-weekly rate, divide the bi-weekly rate by ten to find the daily rate. Multiply the daily rate by the number of days the employee worked (and/or was on approved vacation, sick leave, or holiday leave). Formula: Rate per working day X number of days worked = salary payment. Hourly rate is as shown in column two headed "Hourly Rate."

***To compute the number of days in the month for which payment is to be made, count the working days plus the holidays. Do not count Saturdays or Sundays. After determining this number, find the appropriate working-day rate for the month salary rate at which the employee is currently being paid.

Multiply the rate per day by the number of days the employee worked (and/or was on approved vacation, sick leave, or holiday leave) in order to compute the payment for the pay period. Formula: Rate per working day X number of days worked = salary payment.