

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING  
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 2019 – 6:00 P.M.  
MAYOR WILLIAM G. KOONS PRESIDING**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Canton, Carroll, Galicki, Nairn, Porter, Schloss

**OFFICIALS PRESENT:** Fiscal Officer Romanowski, Solicitor Matheney

The Mayor called the Special Council meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Fiscal Officer read the roll.

The Mayor stated he wanted to appoint Nancy Grattino to the position of part-time Building and Zoning Administrative Assistant/Board Secretary with 25 flexible hours a week on average, \$20.00 per hour, and pending successful passage of a drug and alcohol screening and six months probationary period. Schloss made a motion to hire Nancy Grattino, seconded by Porter.

Canton said it was very difficult for him to make these types of decisions because both applicants were qualified for the job. He believed that Grattino had more experience with Village work. Porter stated that the Mayor is appointing Grattino and Council was confirming through the motion brought forth by Councilman Schloss. The Mayor stated that the Village was offering \$20.00 per hour, and the candidate was currently making almost \$26.00. He asked if Council wanted to give flexibility to the Mayor. The Mayor said if it were split halfway, it would be \$22.00 between \$17.50 and \$26.00. Porter asked the Fiscal Officer what the top end of the position was, and he thought it was \$22.00 and change. Nairn asked for clarification regarding by whom the “top” was set. Porter stated it was by the Village’s pay ordinance. The Fiscal Officer replied that the range was \$15.75 to \$22.84. Carroll stated he would start with \$20.00 per hour and at the end of the probation period raise her pay at that time. Nairn stated she agreed with this if Council were to make the probation 90 days instead of 6 months. She stated that Grattino was very qualified and experienced and if she were to be kept at a lower paygrade for a half year, Nairn was concerned that the Village would not be able to keep her.

Carroll asked what Grattino was currently earning. The Mayor stated she had been working for Broadview Heights but currently was working for a lawyer for \$14.00 per hour. Porter added it was part-time. Carroll stated he was aware she made more when she worked for Broadview Heights, but he thought comparing Broadview Heights and South Russell was not an equal comparison. Carroll stated that because the Village utilized a 6-month probation period, he would prefer to remain consistent with this. He understood Nairn’s concern and acknowledged that the candidate was well qualified. Porter stated he was fine with a 90-day probationary period and a starting wage of \$20.00. He added that an adjustment could be made on completion of the probationary period. Regarding what she made in Broadview Heights, and what she was currently earning, he thought \$20.00 per hour was fair compensation. He stated that the Building Department Secretary position was 25 hours a week and wanted to know what additional hours would be added for the Board Secretary position. The Fiscal Officer explained that the 25 hours

was the combined total. Porter stated this was fine with him. Canton asked if it made sense to stay with the 6-month probation, and Galicki asked Canton how he felt about it. Canton said in his work experience, the period was usually 30 or 60 days. He suggested that if the probationary period were kept at 6 months with a starting pay of \$20.00, after 3 months it could be bumped up to \$21.00 and after 6 months, \$22.00 to motivate her to stay.

Porter felt she was motivated to stay now. Nairn asked Porter how he knew this, and Porter stated it was the way she interviewed. Canton added that during his first couple of years of teaching, he was given a limited 9-month contract for the year. Galicki said he was leaning towards a 6-month probationary period because it was the Village policy. However, he wanted to hear the argument as to why Council would shorten the probationary period for this employee and not others. Canton added that it would be with the suggestion that after 3 months, the pay be bumped up to \$21.00 and after the 6 months was complete and with good job performance, \$22.00.

Nairn asked if the applicant would be informed of this arrangement. Council agreed this would be fair. The Fiscal Officer said there had been problems with such arrangements in the past where someone was told up front that this would happen, but then was found to not be up to standards. The employee was then demanding the money. Galicki advised against making implicit promises. He would let Grattino know she was hired with a 6-month probationary period, and if in 6 months Council wanted to increase her pay, it could be done at a Council meeting. Carroll asked if it would be appropriate to say that with a 6-month probationary period, at the end of the 90-day period there would be an evaluation to gauge what Council wanted to do in terms of potential incremental pay increases. He favored consistency in the policy. Canton said it was necessary to be consistent with this.

The Mayor asked the Fiscal Officer what the starting salary was. She replied that it was \$15.75, and that the Building Department Secretary currently earned \$17.51. The high range for the position was \$22.84. Porter stated he was ok with the 6 months.

The Mayor asked what would happen if he were to offer Grattino \$20.00 per hour and she declined. Galicki stated Council could address it if and when it occurred. Schloss asked if Grattino would be notified the following day, and the Mayor said yes.

Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

The Mayor stated that Council was also meeting to accept the resignation of the Street Commissioner and asked Galicki to make the motion. Galicki made a motion for Council to accept the resignation of the Street Commissioner. The Mayor asked Canton if there was a second, to which Canton seconded the motion. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

Carroll stated as a point of order, he would appreciate it if the Mayor would not direct motions and seconds. He asked that Council be allowed to do their bidding. The Mayor agreed.

For the record, Galicki stated that Council was accepting the retirement request of the Street Commissioner instead of the resignation. He was clarifying this in the event he had spoken in

error by calling it a resignation request. Carroll stated he thought it was a resignation of retirement, or something to that effect.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Being that there was no further business before Council, Porter made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Carroll. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William G. Koons, Mayor

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Danielle Romanowski, Fiscal Officer

Prepared by Leslie Galicki