

STATE OF WISCONSIN  
BEFORE THE WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

-----  
In the Matter of the Petitions of

WISCONSIN COUNCIL 40, LOCAL 1362,  
AFSCME, AFL-CIO and CALUMET  
COUNTY

Involving Certain Employees of  
CALUMET COUNTY  
-----

Case 3  
No. 37593 ME(u/c)-119  
Decision No. 11158-A

Appearances:

Mr. Jack Bernfeld, Staff Representative, Wisconsin Council 40, AFSCME,  
AFL-CIO, 5 Odana Court, Madison, Wisconsin 53719, for the Union.  
Mr. M. E. Mellor, Corporation Counsel, Calumet County, 2028 Jackson,  
New Holstein, Wisconsin 53061, for the County.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,  
AND ORDER CLARIFYING BARGAINING UNIT

Wisconsin Council 40, Local 1362, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, hereinafter the Union, having, on September 15, 1986, filed a petition requesting the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission to clarify an existing certified bargaining unit of all regular full-time and regular part-time clerical and maintenance employees of Calumet County, hereinafter the County, employed in the Calumet County Courthouse to determine whether certain employees should be included in said unit, and the Union having, on November 21, 1986 amended the petition to include additional employees; and the County having, on March 2, 1987, petitioned the Commission to determine whether the combined position of the Register in Probate/ Probate Registrar/Juvenile Clerk and the combined position of Computer Operator/ Programmer/Analyst should be excluded from said unit; and the Union, having, on April 16, 1987 amended its petition to specify the titles of positions earlier referred to by employee name; and hearing having been set for April 29, 1987; and said hearing having been rescheduled at the parties' request to May 27, 1987; and said hearing having been held in abeyance to facilitate the parties' voluntary resolution of the matter; and the County having on November 18, 1987 amended its petition to request the Commission to determine whether the position of Deputy Planning and Code Administrator should be excluded from said unit; and the parties having, on March 3, 1988 informed the Examiner that only one position still remained in dispute, and hearing having been conducted May 19, 1988, before Examiner Jane B. Buffett, a member of the Commission's staff; and a transcript of the proceeding having been completed and received in two parts on May 26, 1988 and June 7, 1988; and the parties having, on July 1 and 7, 1988, exchanged briefs, and the Union having, on July 17, 1988 waived a reply brief, and the County having, on July 20, 1988 submitted a reply brief and the Commission, being fully advised in the premises, makes and issues the following

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. That Wisconsin Council 40, Local 1362, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, hereinafter referred to as the Union, is a labor organization and has its offices at 2323 North Twenty-ninth Street, Sheboygan, Wisconsin 53083.
2. That Calumet County, hereinafter referred to as the County, is a municipal employer and has its offices at 206 Court Street, Chilton, Wisconsin 53014.
3. That in Calumet County, Dec. No. 11158 (WERC, 9/72) the Commission certified the Union as the exclusive certified bargaining representative of County employees in the following unit:

all regular full-time and regular part-time clerical and maintenance employees of Calumet County employed in the Calumet County Courthouse, but excluding supervisory, managerial and confidential employees.

4. That on September 15, 1986, and by amended petitions on November 21, 1986 and April 16, 1987 the Union petitioned the Commission to clarify the unit described in Finding of Fact 3, above, to include the positions of Technician, Assistant Bookkeeper, Accounting Co-ordinator, Assistant Planning and Code Administrator, Deputy Planning and Code Administrator and Data Processing Manager; that on February 27, 1987 and by amended petition on November 18, 1987 the County petitioned the Commission to clarify said unit to exclude the combined position of Register in Probate/Probate Registrar/Juvenile Clerk, hereinafter the Register in Probate, and the combined position of Computer Operator/Programmer/Analyst, and the position of Deputy Planning and Code Administrator; and that the parties voluntarily resolved their disputes as to all positions except the Register in Probate 1/ which the Union contends should be included in said unit, and the County contends should be excluded as a supervisory and managerial position.

5. That on February 9, 1987, Circuit Judge of Calumet County Hugh F. Nelson ordered that whereas the decision in Eau Claire County vs. WERC, 122 Wis.2d 363 (1984) found the Register in Probate was not a municipal employee, when the Register in Probate position became vacant, the appointment would be made by the Judge from qualified persons who apply and there will be no requirement that the position be first offered to County employees pursuant to any collective bargaining agreement; and that Judge Nelson further ordered that:

the Register in Probate when appointed in addition to the duties specified in Section 851.72 of the Wisconsin Statutes shall:

- I. Act as a department head in all dealings with the Calumet County Board and its committees;
- II. Prepare and administer the annual budget for the Office of Register in Probate and Probate Registrar; and
- III. Supervise all Deputy Registers in Probate, including any temporary employees of the office, in the performance of their duties.

6. That on December 3, 1987, Joann Vaughan was appointed Register in Probate, hereinafter Register; that under the general direction of the Circuit Judge, she is responsible for the probate department; that as Register in Probate she maintains records and prepares reports regarding probate, adoption, guardianship and juvenile matters; that as Probate Registrar she administers informal probate procedures; and that as Juvenile Clerk she maintains pertinent documents and is responsible for juvenile restitution monies.

7. That the 1988 Register in Probate budget had been prepared by Vaughan's predecessor; that in the future, the Register will prepare the budget which is presented to the Salary and Personnel Committee and subsequently to the Finance and Audit Committee and finally to the entire County Board; that prior to the 1988 budget, the Register in Probate budget was included in the Circuit Court budget, but was prepared by the Registers; that of the 1988 budget which totaled \$37,122, salary and fringe benefits, which are set by the County Board, or through the collective bargaining process, accounted for \$30,997; that payment for professional services such as guardian ad litem that are required by statute accounted for \$4,000; that amounts for items such as office supplies and photocopies are based on the previous year's experience; that the Register must approve reimbursement for meals and expenses relating to her professional meetings, and those claimed by the Juvenile Court Intake Worker but those reimbursements rates are governed by County policy; that the Register has

---

1/ At the hearing, the parties withdrew those portions of their petitions relating to the positions no longer in dispute.

discretion over the budget item of "Outlay" which can include such items as file cabinets, desks and typewriters and which in the 1987 budget amounted to \$775, but in 1988 did not include any budgeted monies; that the Register can recommend the discontinuation of the maintenance contract for office equipment, but cannot choose a different maintenance service provider; that the budget provides for a part-time secretary for approximately two days a week; that in the future the Register could ask the County to increase the budgeted amount for the part-time secretary to provide additional hours to meet general workload needs or provide more services for citizens proceeding in informal probate; that the Register participates in department head meetings occurring once or twice a month at which meetings department heads exchange information with County Administrative Coordinator John Keuler; and that at said meetings, the Register has offered suggestions regarding CPR training and regarding an Arthur Young pay plan survey.

8. That the Register has no deputy, but has a part-time secretary, referred to in Finding of Fact 7, above; that the Register alone directs the secretary's work in the Register's office; that the secretary is scheduled for the hours deemed necessary by the Register whose scheduling authority is limited only by the total hours budgeted which is approximately 40 percent of full-time on an annual basis; that the Register schedules the secretary for more hours during the times of the year when the work load is heavy or the Register is absent, and fewer hours during periods of lesser work load; that, during 1987, the secretary's hours varied from a low of 7.5 hours during a two-week pay period to a high of 67.5 hours; that the secretary also works for the Register in Deeds, working 210 hours in that office during 1987; that if another employee were to be hired in the department, the Register would advertise for applicants, screen them, and make recommendations for hiring to the County Salary and Personnel Committee; that the Register will evaluate the secretary once a year, and that evaluation will be part of the secretary's personnel file; that the Register can independently take lower level disciplinary action against the secretary; that pursuant to that authority she cautioned the secretary regarding the use of the County telephone, but did not consider it necessary to document the incident in the personnel file; that the Register could effectively recommend to the Administrative Coordinator the dismissal of the secretary; that the secretary notifies the Register if she cannot come to work, but the secretary receives no paid leave; that the Register signs the secretary's time cards; that no one else exercises the above-noted authority over the secretary; that the Register spends approximately 20 percent of her time performing clerical duties similar to those performed by the secretary; and that the Register has no authority to adjust any grievances the secretary might have.

9. That the Calumet County Personnel and General Administrative Policies manual provides in pertinent part, the following:

#### SECTION 6 - EMPLOYMENT

. . .

6.05 Prospective employees shall receive job information and application from the Administrative Coordinator's Office. The Administrative Coordinator shall review all applications and resumes with the Department Head and submit a list of those applicants who meet the established qualifications to the Department Head. The Department Head and Committee shall then hire from among the qualified applicants. The Administrative Coordinator shall assist in hiring all Department Heads and shall also assist the Committee and Department Head in the employment process for managerial and supervisory positions. Origin of additional positions and all position salaries in a department shall be subject to the approval of the Salary and Personnel Committee and the County Board. The Department Head shall send a letter of offer to the successful applicant. A copy of that letter shall be provided to the Administrative Coordinator who will then send a letter to each unsuccessful applicant.

. . .

all regular full-time and regular part-time clerical and maintenance employes of Calumet County employed in the Calumet County Courthouse, but excluding supervisory, managerial and confidential employes.

4. That on September 15, 1986, and by amended petitions on November 21, 1986 and April 16, 1987 the Union petitioned the Commission to clarify the unit described in Finding of Fact 3, above, to include the positions of Technician, Assistant Bookkeeper, Accounting Co-ordinator, Assistant Planning and Code Administrator, Deputy Planning and Code Administrator and Data Processing Manager; that on February 27, 1987 and by amended petition on November 18, 1987 the County petitioned the Commission to clarify said unit to exclude the combined position of Register in Probate/Probate Registrar/Juvenile Clerk, hereinafter the Register in Probate, and the combined position of Computer Operator/Programmer/Analyst, and the position of Deputy Planning and Code Administrator; and that the parties voluntarily resolved their disputes as to all positions except the Register in Probate 1/ which the Union contends should be included in said unit, and the County contends should be excluded as a supervisory and managerial position.

5. That on February 9, 1987, Circuit Judge of Calumet County Hugh F. Nelson ordered that whereas the decision in Eau Claire County vs. WERC, 122 Wis.2d 363 (1984) found the Register in Probate was not a municipal employe, when the Register in Probate position became vacant, the appointment would be made by the Judge from qualified persons who apply and there will be no requirement that the position be first offered to County employes pursuant to any collective bargaining agreement; and that Judge Nelson further ordered that:

the Register in Probate when appointed in addition to the duties specified in Section 851.72 of the Wisconsin Statutes shall:

- I. Act as a department head in all dealings with the Calumet County Board and its committees;
- II. Prepare and administer the annual budget for the Office of Register in Probate and Probate Registrar; and
- III. Supervise all Deputy Registers in Probate, including any temporary employees of the office, in the performance of their duties.

6. That on December 3, 1987, Joann Vaughan was appointed Register in Probate, hereinafter Register; that under the general direction of the Circuit Judge, she is responsible for the probate department; that as Register in Probate she maintains records and prepares reports regarding probate, adoption, guardianship and juvenile matters; that as Probate Registrar she administers informal probate procedures; and that as Juvenile Clerk she maintains pertinent documents and is responsible for juvenile restitution monies.

7. That the 1988 Register in Probate budget had been prepared by Vaughan's predecessor; that in the future, the Register will prepare the budget which is presented to the Salary and Personnel Committee and subsequently to the Finance and Audit Committee and finally to the entire County Board; that prior to the 1988 budget, the Register in Probate budget was included in the Circuit Court budget, but was prepared by the Registers; that of the 1988 budget which totaled \$37,122, salary and fringe benefits, which are set by the County Board, or through the collective bargaining process, accounted for \$30,997; that payment for professional services such as guardian ad litem that are required by statute accounted for \$4,000; that amounts for items such as office supplies and photocopies are based on the previous year's experience; that the Register must approve reimbursement for meals and expenses relating to her professional meetings, and those claimed by the Juvenile Court Intake Worker but those reimbursements rates are governed by County policy; that the Register has

---

1/ At the hearing, the parties withdrew those portions of their petitions relating to the positions no longer in dispute.

Upon the basis of the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Commission makes and issues the following

ORDER CLARIFYING BARGAINING UNIT 2/

That the position of Register in Probate/Probate Registrar/Juvenile Clerk set forth in Finding of Fact 6, above, be and hereby is, excluded from the bargaining unit represented by Wisconsin Council 40, Local 1362, AFSCME, AFL-CIO.

Given under our hands and seal at the City of  
Madison, Wisconsin this 15th day of September, 1988.

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

By Stephen Schoenfeld  
Stephen Schoenfeld, Chairman  
Herman Torosian  
Herman Torosian, Commissioner  
A. Henry Hempe  
A. Henry Hempe, Commissioner

- 
- 2/ Pursuant to Sec. 227.48(2), Stats., the Commission hereby notifies the parties that a petition for rehearing may be filed with the Commission by following the procedures set forth in Sec. 227.49 and that a petition for judicial review naming the Commission as Respondent, may be filed by following the procedures set forth in Sec. 227.53, Stats.

227.49 Petitions for rehearing in contested cases. (1) A petition for rehearing shall not be prerequisite for appeal or review. Any person aggrieved by a final order may, within 20 days after service of the order, file a written petition for rehearing which shall specify in detail the grounds for the relief sought and supporting authorities. An agency may order a rehearing on its own motion within 20 days after service of a final order. This subsection does not apply to s. 17.025(3)(e). No agency is required to conduct more than one rehearing based on a petition for rehearing filed under this subsection in any contested case.

227.53 Parties and proceedings for review. (1) Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, any person aggrieved by a decision specified in s. 227.52 shall be entitled to judicial review thereof as provided in this chapter.

(a) Proceedings for review shall be instituted by serving a petition therefore personally or by certified mail upon the agency or one of its officials, and filing the petition in the office of the clerk of the circuit court for the county where the judicial review proceedings are to be held. Unless a rehearing is requested under s. 227.49, petitions for review under this paragraph shall be served and filed within 30 days after the service of the decision of the agency upon all parties under s. 227.48. If a rehearing is requested under s. 227.49, any party desiring judicial review shall serve and file a petition for review within 30 days after service of the order finally disposing of the application for rehearing, or within 30 days after the final disposition by operation of law of any such application for rehearing. The 30-day period for serving and filing a petition under this paragraph commences on the day after personal service or mailing of the decision by the agency. If the petitioner is a resident, the proceedings shall be held in the circuit court for the county where the petitioner

(Footnote two continued on page six)

---

(Footnote two continued from page five)

resides, except that if the petitioner is an agency, the proceedings shall be in the circuit court for the county where the respondent resides and except as provided in ss. 77.59(6)(b), 182.70(6) and 182.71(5)(g). The proceedings shall be in the circuit court for Dane county if the petitioner is a nonresident. If all parties stipulate and the court to which the parties desire to transfer the proceedings agrees, the proceedings may be held in the county designated by the parties. If 2 or more petitions for review of the same decision are filed in different counties, the circuit judge for the county in which a petition for review of the decision was first filed shall determine the venue for judicial review of the decision, and shall order transfer or consolidation where appropriate.

(b) The petition shall state the nature of the petitioner's interest, the facts showing that petitioner is a person aggrieved by the decision, and the grounds specified in s. 227.57 upon which petitioner contends that the decision should be reversed or modified.

. . .

(c) Copies of the petition shall be served, personally or by certified mail, or, when service is timely admitted in writing, by first class mail, not later than 30 days after the institution of the proceeding, upon all parties who appeared before the agency in the proceeding in which the order sought to be reviewed was made.

Note: For purposes of the above-noted statutory time-limits, the date of Commission service of this decision is the date it is placed in the mail (in this case the date appearing immediately above the signatures); the date of filing of a rehearing petition is the date of actual receipt by the Commission; and the service date of a judicial review petition is the date of actual receipt by the Court and placement in the mail to the Commission.

## CALUMET COUNTY

### MEMORANDUM ACCOMPANYING FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSION OF LAW AND ORDER CLARIFYING BARGAINING UNIT

#### POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

##### The Union

The Union asserts the Register in Probate is a municipal employee and the County has failed to show any basis for excluding her. The Union argues the Commission's decision must be founded on the evidence of the Register in Probate's activities, and not the Judge's order which in any case exceeds judicial authority.

According to the Union, there is no evidence of confidential status. Regarding the positions alleged managerial status, the Union asserts there is no evidence of policy making, and argues the Register in Probate has control over only 5% of the budget. As to the alleged supervisory component, the Union asserts the intake workers are directed by the Judge, and the part-time secretary receives work assignments from the Register in Probate but is not truly supervised by her. The total work hours for the secretary are limited by the budget. The Union points out the Register in Probate was never told she could discipline the secretary and the one incident in evidence was not disciplinary.

##### The County

The County contends the disputed position is both managerial and supervisory. Regarding the financial responsibility of the Register in Probate's alleged managerial status, it points to her budget preparation, done independently of the Judge, and to her authority to cancel a maintenance contract and to determine a level of service as reflected in the use of informal probate. Other alleged managerial indicia are her attendance at department head meetings, the suggestions she makes at those meetings, and the level of independence she has in her work.

Arguing that the Register in Probate is also a supervisor, the County relies on her authority to assign work, reprimand, and recommend hiring and discharge. It also cites the authority she exercises over the juvenile intake workers.

#### DISCUSSION

##### Standards for Decision

The County relies upon a Commission case which concluded the Door County Register in Probate should be excluded from the bargaining unit 3/ and a Court of Appeals, District III decision reversing a Commission ruling on the Register in Probate of Eau Claire County. 4/ These cases notwithstanding, the Commission is required to analyze each disputed position not by its title, but by the pertinent facts in each case to determine whether it falls within the statutory exclusions from the municipal employee definition. 5/

##### Confidential Status

At the hearing the County expressly reserved its right to argue the Register in Probate is confidential; however, no significant evidence was presented to support such a conclusion and the County did not make that argument in its brief. Therefore, the record contains no basis to exclude the Register in Probate as a confidential employee.

---

3/ Door County, Dec. No. 24016-A (WERC, 3/88).

4/ Eau Claire County v. WERC, 122 Wis.2d 363 (CtApp III, 1984).

5/ Village of Shorewood, Dec. No. 6552 (WERC, 11/63).

### Alleged Managerial Status

In determining whether a position has managerial status and thereby is not an employee pursuant to the Municipal Employment Relations Act, the Commission has said:

Managerial employees are those persons whose relationship to management imbues them with interests significantly at variance with those of other employees. Such a divergence of interests has been found where the employee involved participates in the formulation, determination and implementation of management policy but to yield managerial status, such involvement with the municipal employer's policies must be at a relatively high level of responsibility and to a significant degree. 6/

Application of these criteria does not demonstrate that the Register in Probate is a managerial employee. Although she participates in the one or two department head meetings a month, the record establishes the meetings are primarily for the Administrative Coordinator to share information with the department heads. At one meeting, Vaughan was asked to share her knowledge of how Arthur Young pay plans surveys are conducted. At another meeting she shared an idea regarding CPR training. There is no evidence that her comments had any impact beyond the meeting, or that in any other way she creates management policy.

The second analysis used by the Commission to determine managerial status relates to the employee's power to commit the employer's resources, that is, to establish an original budget or to allocate funds from differing program purposes from such an original budget. In this regard the Commission has offered the following caution:

However, preparation of a budget, per se, does not establish effective authority to commit the employer's resources. The Commission will not confer managerial status on an employee whose budget preparation duties primarily involve projecting the cost of implementing the policy decisions of another. Rather, to be considered managerial, an individual's budget preparation duties must involve authority to allocate resources in a manner which significantly affects the nature and direction of the employer's operations. Authority to significantly affect the nature and direction of the municipal employer's operations includes, inter alia, authority to determine the following: the kind and level of services to be provided; the kind and number of employees to be utilized in providing services; the kind and number of capital improvements to be made; and the systems by which the services will be provided, including use of outside contractors. 7/

Although Vaughan's predecessor prepared the 1988 Register in Probate budget, there is no evidence she had discretion to establish a budget which significantly affected the nature and direction of the County's operations. The overwhelming preponderance of the budget is salaries and related fringe benefits, both of which are set by the County Board alone or in bilateral negotiations with the Union. Other budget accounts concern such things as office supplies, and reproduction costs which are based on the previous year's cost. The three minor items over which the Register in Probate exercises some discretion are de minimis: one, the decision whether or not to continue the service maintenance contract (the Register in Probate did not have authority to change providers, only to choose between continuing or discontinuing the service); two, the authorization of expenses for her professional meetings (the rate of reimbursement is set by the County); and, three, the "outlay" category, comprising office furniture, which had no entry in 1988, but in the previous year had a \$775 entry.

---

6/ Jackson County, Dec. No. 17828-B (WERC, 10/86). (Footnotes deleted.)

7/ Jackson County, Ibid.



One significant area of potential managerial authority regards the part-time secretary. Vaughan testified that she could, in future budgets, recommend an increase in the wages allocated for the part-time secretary, thereby increasing her hours of work and, consequently, the level of assistance the secretary could offer citizens using informal probate. However, the Register in Probate cannot be excluded as managerial on the basis of such future speculation.

#### Alleged Supervisory Status

In determining if a position is supervisory, the Commission considers the following criteria:

1. The authority to effectively recommend the hiring, promotion, transfer, discipline or discharge of employees;
2. The authority to direct and assign work force;
3. The number of employees supervised, and the number of other persons exercising greater, similar or lesser authority over the same employees;
4. The level of pay, including an evaluation of whether the supervisor is paid for his or her skills or for his or her supervision of employees;
5. Whether the supervisor is primarily supervising an activity or is primarily supervising employees;
6. Whether the supervisor is a working supervisor or whether he or she spends a substantial majority of his or her time supervising employees; and
7. The amount of independent judgment exercised in the supervision of employees. 8/

It is evident the Register possesses authority in hiring, evaluation, discipline and discharge. Although the only formal investiture of that authority was the Judge's so informing her, without further elaboration, of her supervisory duties, the Register had a firm understanding of those duties, based on her participation in Department Head meetings and her reading of the County's Personnel and General Administrative Policies manual. The Register understood she had authority to screen applicants and make recommendations in the event of a vacancy in her department. She will make annual evaluations of the secretary and she would recommend discharge of any department employee if she found it necessary.

Since, at the time of the hearing, the Register had held her position for only six months, the exercise of these powers prior to the hearing had been minimal. The Register had not hired anyone, for the sole employee in her department, the secretary, had been hired four-and-a-half years before the Register, in 1983. The only discipline the Register exercised was a verbal admonition which she felt did not merit documentation in a personnel file. Additionally, the Register had not yet prepared an annual evaluation for the secretary. At the same time that the Register has exercised few supervisory powers, we are satisfied that she indeed possesses supervisory authority, for there is no evidence of anyone else supervising the secretary in her work in the Register's department, nor is there evidence that contradicts the showing of the Personnel and General Administrative Policies manual that the County invests such supervisory powers in its Department Heads.

A major supervisory function in the Register's department is the scheduling and assigning of work to the secretary. Despite the restriction imposed by the County budget which limits the secretary's total annual hours to 40 percent of a

---

8/ City of Milwaukee, Dec. No. 6960 (WERC, 12/64), Sauk County (Sheriff's Department), Dec. No. 17201-A (WERC, 6/87).

full-time equivalency, the Register has wide-ranging discretion in scheduling within this limitation. In 1987, the secretary's hours varied from one to nine days during two-week pay periods. Clearly, in this respect the Register controls a significant aspect of the secretary's working conditions. In a similar vein, the Register signs the secretary's time cards and excuses her when she is unable to come to work.

The Union argues that the Register's supervisory authority is de minimis. While we recognize that the Register currently supervises only a 40 percent full-time equivalent employee, we find that she, and no one else, is the supervisor of that employee. While the third criterion for determining supervisory status addresses the number of employees supervised, that criterion is only one of seven, and where, as here, the authority possessed is clearly supervisory, and there is no one else responsible for the supervision of that employee, we find the disputed position to be supervisory. 9/

In conclusion, we find the Register to exercise supervisory authority in sufficient combination and degree to be a supervisor within the meaning of the Municipal Employment Relations Act, and be appropriately excluded from the bargaining unit.

Dated at Madison, Wisconsin this 15th day of September, 1988.

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

By Stephen Schoenfeld  
Stephen Schoenfeld, Chairman

Herman Torosian  
Herman Torosian, Commissioner

A. Henry Hempe  
A. Henry Hempe, Commissioner

---

9/ See, for example, Portage County, Dec. No. 6478-C (WERC, 10/87) for a position which supervised a single, part-time employee.