

From: [Ericks, Mark](#)
To: [Woodard, Jim](#)
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget
Date: Friday, October 17, 2014 8:41:03 AM

Thanks Jim. I've never seen anything so crazy. She's a staff analyst acting like she's the one that is going to reorg the office. Nuts.

From: Woodard, Jim
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 7:59 AM
To: Ericks, Mark
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget

Well said, Mark.

My inbox has 34 emails from yesterday's exchange on this subject.

Jim Woodard
Sr. Financial Consultant
Snohomish County Finance 
425.388.3325
Jim.woodard@snoco.org

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)

From: Ericks, Mark
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 7:56 AM
To: Neely, Susan; Clawson, Bridget; Woodard, Jim
Cc: Christman, Daniel; Crawford, Lenda; Haseleu, Brian; Somers, Dave; Isenberg, Marcia
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget

I've been trying to have a few days off, but honestly this last email string is unbelievable. Here's what I wrote and sent to you on Wednesday, "Sounds good. Please emphasize that the ME office is a work in progress. Our goal is to restructure based on best practices and professional recommendations. Some of the employee classifications will probably change." Is that not clear enough? I've told the Council during INDIVIDUAL BRIEFINGS that we are going to bring a recommendation forward on a new structure. If I'm not mistaken, you were even in the room on at least one occasion.

From: Neely, Susan
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 2:41 PM
To: Clawson, Bridget; Woodard, Jim
Cc: Christman, Daniel; Ericks, Mark; Crawford, Lenda; Haseleu, Brian; Somers, Dave; Isenberg, Marcia
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget

Honestly, I don't want to belabor this 😊 But doesn't changing the administrative structure with a new Deputy Director position affect the Operations Manager position and its duties? I understand the level of responsibility being evaluated at a higher pay range in November 2013 prior to the

Deputy being added. But I think that addition warrants another review of the administrative structure and justification of two such high level positions. This is a small office. The top four positions constitute a total annual salary of \$630,463, which is 44% of the entire salary amount for the 16 FTEs (\$1,439,200)! [And I realize that the top two positions are unique to our organization and that necessary skill set requires that they be the top County earners --and those two alone account for \$398,187 (28%) of the MEO salaries.]

Susan Neely, Senior Legislative Analyst
Snohomish County Council
425.388.6250
susan.neely@snoco.org

Please be advised: all e-mail correspondence sent to and from this e-mail address is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (Chapter 42.46 RCW). E-mail and data attached to e-mail (including metadata) sent to and from this e-mail address may be monitored and archived, and may be disclosed to third parties pursuant to state law.

From: Clawson, Bridget
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 2:20 PM
To: Neely, Susan; Woodard, Jim
Cc: Christman, Daniel; Ericks, Mark; Crawford, Lenda; Haseleu, Brian; Somers, Dave; Isenberg, Marcia
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget

I hear you. What is unique about this particular job I think is that it calls for a multi-discipline administrator who can also oversee a 24/7 medical facility in a law enforcement environment. So when I looked at it, I felt I had to give weight to that environment. In class/comp work, working across disciplines at a high level gets you lots of salary lift. In this case the incumbent will be working independently in HR including a difficult union environment with lots of history, employee accommodation, purchasing, payroll, contracting, plus working with multi-cultural family death issues, law enforcement, funeral homes, L&I etc. I did think that pushed it from a potential 112 to 113 at the time I was looking at it. Over time, as things change, if I'm asked to look at it anew, the way it operates could change and a different result may occur. I hope that helps.

From: Neely, Susan
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 2:04 PM
To: Clawson, Bridget; Woodard, Jim
Cc: Christman, Daniel; Ericks, Mark; Crawford, Lenda; Haseleu, Brian; Somers, Dave; Isenberg, Marcia
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget

Yes it makes sense – except this is not PW or IT. This is a 16 FTE department with one program and one budget with limited scope and complexity. That's where it stops making sense.

But, I'm not the policy maker.

Susan Neely, Senior Legislative Analyst
Snohomish County Council
425.388.6250
susan.neely@snoco.org

Please be advised: all e-mail correspondence sent to and from this e-mail address is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (Chapter 42.46 RCW). E-mail and data attached to e-mail (including metadata) sent to and from this e-mail address may be monitored and archived, and may be disclosed to third parties pursuant to state law.

From: Clawson, Bridget
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 2:00 PM
To: Neely, Susan; Woodard, Jim
Cc: Christman, Daniel; Ericks, Mark; Crawford, Lenda; Haseleu, Brian; Somers, Dave; Isenberg, Marcia
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget

Susan, below is response to some of your earlier questions about how classification decisions were made regarding the Operations Manager.

Previously, Operations Manager work activities oversight was provided by both Chief Investigator (incumbent was Noriega) and Chief Medical Examiner (Incumbent Dr. Thiersch). A decision was made to give the position of Operations Manager in the ME's Office independent authority on all non-medical day to day operations decisions, with oversight by the Executive's Office. When the Deputy Director ME was established, Operations Manager continues this level of autonomy and authority, and reports directly to the Deputy Director ME on all non-medical day to day operations. When looking at other similar positions with similar levels of authority and responsibility across the County, my analysis is that the Operations Manager position in its current form is comparable to division and program level supervisor in more technically complex operations such as IT and PW, which are 113. Prior to this reclassification, the position was Administrative Assistant and functioned as a high-level clerical employee overseeing lower level clerical employees. In its current form, the position of Operations Manager ME's Office is responsible for all non-medical related administration and oversight of operations, including complex scheduling, employee medical issues management, payroll, all purchasing, subcontracting, and relationships with families, funeral homes, and compliance legal requires of a medical office. The responsibilities moved from transactional in nature to a more consultative, oversight and problem solving/decision making position.

The salary represents the level of responsibility associated with the position and does not take into consideration the incumbent's pay.

Please let me know if this makes sense, if you need more, or have follow up questions. Thanks.

From: Neely, Susan
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 11:20 AM
To: Clawson, Bridget; Woodard, Jim
Cc: Christman, Daniel; Ericks, Mark; Crawford, Lenda; Haseleu, Brian; Somers, Dave; Isenberg, Marcia
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget

And why were the Ops Manager's responsibility and authority substantially increased? And does it warrant a 48% increase (when comparing either bottom step to bottom step, or top step to top step)? Especially in light of creating a new Deputy Director? This is a really small department – I am

having trouble understanding what appears to be top heavy administration and the only justification provided is the job duties changed, the responsibility increased, etc. – but no reason for those changes. Thanks!

Susan Neely, Senior Legislative Analyst
Snohomish County Council
425.388.6250
susan.neely@snoco.org

Please be advised: all e-mail correspondence sent to and from this e-mail address is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (Chapter 42.46 RCW). E-mail and data attached to e-mail (including metadata) sent to and from this e-mail address may be monitored and archived, and may be disclosed to third parties pursuant to state law.

From: Clawson, Bridget
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 11:16 AM
To: Neely, Susan; Woodard, Jim
Cc: Christman, Daniel; Ericks, Mark; Crawford, Lenda; Haseleu, Brian
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget

Susan and Jim et al,

I want to clarify classification titles etc.

Al Noriega was Medical Investigator Chief at level 110. This position became vacant and was reclassified at that time to Deputy Director.

Heather Oie was hired as Operations Manager at 109, which had previously been titled Administration Assistant. The reason Heather Oie was given step one when the Operations Manager position was substantially increased in responsibility and authority is that under the reclassification rules, the appropriate step of a 113 range when the incumbent is at 109 range prior to reclassification is step one.

I hope this clarifies the “from” “to” questions related to these two positions. If not, please let me know.

From: Neely, Susan
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 9:58 AM
To: Woodard, Jim
Cc: Christman, Daniel; Ericks, Mark; Crawford, Lenda; Clawson, Bridget; Haseleu, Brian
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget

I do have one additional question – was the Operations Manager Position reclassified (to a different salary range)? If so, when and why? If not, why is the incumbent still at step one? Thanks!

Susan Neely, Senior Legislative Analyst
Snohomish County Council
425.388.6250

susan.neely@snoco.org

Please be advised: all e-mail correspondence sent to and from this e-mail address is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (Chapter 42.46 RCW). E-mail and data attached to e-mail (including metadata) sent to and from this e-mail address may be monitored and archived, and may be disclosed to third parties pursuant to state law.

From: Woodard, Jim
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 9:46 AM
To: Neely, Susan
Cc: Christman, Daniel; Ericks, Mark; Crawford, Lenda; Clawson, Bridget; Haseleu, Brian
Subject: RE: 2015 Budget

Susan,

Lenda asked me to send you the responses to your questions regarding the Medical Examiner's budget. Please see the attachment.

Thank you,

Jim Woodard
Sr. Financial Consultant
Snohomish County Finance 🌲🌲
425.388.3325
Jim.woodard@snoco.org

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)

From: Neely, Susan
Sent: Monday, October 06, 2014 3:00 PM
To: Christman, Daniel
Cc: Woodard, Jim
Subject: 2015 Budget

I have had a chance to do a quick review of the Executive's Recommended Budget and have a few questions (below) – mostly around the FTE changes from the adopted 2014 budget (revenues are status quo and expenditures, other than salaries and benefits, are almost that). I'm not sure it's necessary to meet face-to-face, given the logistics, but if you want to perhaps we could carve out some time next week.

Here are the questions – just let me know if you want to answer in writing or meet. Thanks!

FTES:

- From what existing position was the Deputy Director Medical Examiner position created? How was the salary range, etc. determined? How are the duties for this position differentiated from the Operations Manager? Is this envisioned as the structure for the long term (two relatively highly paid positions overseeing 12 FTEs)?
- Priority Package 395 states that a \$19,482 service level reduction will be achieved by delaying hiring until November 10, 2015, but neglects to say what position(s) will be delayed. Will it be

- one or both of the two new Medical Investigator II positions?
- Are there currently any vacant positions?
- Were there any reclasses in 2014 (beyond what was one to create the Deputy Director position)?

REVENUES:

- The 2015 proposed revenues are the same as the 2014 adopted. What is the status of the 2014 revenue – will the target be met?

EXPENDITURES;

- The Professional Services line is increasing by \$35,000 (90%) – I assume this is for the METS software upgrade. You asked for \$50,000 – what will \$15,000 less mean?
- You also asked for \$26,500 in equipment (Priority Packages 371 and 374 - \$15,000 for the Image Pilot upgrade and \$11,500 for the rack system). The Equipment line is being reduced by \$15,000 from 2014 (a 52% decrease) – what was that for and what are the ramifications of it not being funded in 2015?

Susan Neely, Senior Legislative Analyst

Snohomish County Council

425.388.6250

susan.neely@snoco.org

Please be advised: all e-mail correspondence sent to and from this e-mail address is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (Chapter 42.46 RCW). E-mail and data attached to e-mail (including metadata) sent to and from this e-mail address may be monitored and archived, and may be disclosed to third parties pursuant to state law.