

**Special Joint Human Resource and Finance Committee Meeting**  
**Friday, November 5, 2021, 7:00 a.m.**

**Members Present:** Chairman Nairn, Chairman Carroll, Porter, Berger, Fiscal Officer Romanowski, Fiscal Auditor Lechman

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Nairn. The Fiscal Officer read the roll.

Nairn explained that the committees had been discussing an overtime issue which occurred in the Street Department. The committees realized that there was a discrepancy in the policy and not everyone was on the same page. The committees discussed overtime based on a 40-hour work week and raised the question of whether these hours would include sick, vacation, and/or comp time. The committees needed to make the policy consistent throughout the departments. This would necessitate a change to the Employee Handbook, which would require legislation.

Berger clarified that the committee was discussing overtime being after 40 hours of worked time in a seven-day period and hours over this would be compensated at time and a half. Nairn added worked time would involve being physically present. The Fiscal Officer explained that clarification was required because the handbook specifies that overtime is based on hours worked in a day, not hours paid. The first step would be to change the policy to 40-hours in a week. However, the Police schedules are such that the officers' have 80 hours in a two-week period due to the cycle of shifts. Berger suggested having a different policy for the Police Department than the rest of the Village. Carroll concurred.

Carroll stated that basing the overtime on a 40-hour week was fine with him for the rest of the Village. Porter and Nairn agreed that this would be for the Service, Building, and Administration departments. Porter summarized that the policy would be that the Police would be on an 80-hour, 14-day period.

Nairn questioned this system in terms of 10-hour workdays.

Berger asked about double time, and the Fiscal Officer clarified it was for holidays, but not for the Police. Berger asked how the holiday pay worked with callouts. The Fiscal Officer explained that first, the employee is paid for the holiday. If called in, the employee also gets double time. In essence, they get triple time. Porter added that it is also a four-hour minimum.

Porter questioned the definition of emergency callout, and the Fiscal Officer stated that emergency callout is specifically defined in the Employee Handbook as an unexpected event to include storm damage, snowplow, last minute shift coverage, etc. Due to the inconvenience of the callout, the minimum callout is four hours, but calculation of the overtime is based on the department. Carroll clarified that the event that prompted this discussion was prescheduled. Porter asked if "unexpectedly" should be deleted. Berger asked if the employees must show up for a callout. Porter indicated it was voluntary. Carroll stated that the job description includes the unexpected callout. He would keep the policy as written but would make the emergency callouts as overtime regardless of hours worked in a week. This would include calling an employee off vacation during a normal work week.

Berger questioned how this would be handled with the Police Department. The Fiscal Officer had spoken to the Chief about this and explained that if an employee were called in from vacation for coverage, they would be paid straight time as stated in the handbook. However, if other departments were getting overtime for unexpected callouts, then it should be the same for the Police Department. She further explained that the policy indicates that an emergency callout includes shift coverage. Carroll felt that shift coverage was different.

Berger stated that emergency non-scheduled callouts in the Service Department should be overtime. Porter asked how this would be applied to the Police. Carroll and the Fiscal Officer stated it would apply to emergency situations/crisis events, and not to fill a shift.

The committee agreed to remove the sentence in the Employee Handbook which states, “the calculation when overtime begins may vary depending upon the department.”

Berger asked who would define what a crisis event was, the Mayor, Police Chief, or Street Commissioner. Carroll thought there should be a framework with examples. Back filling a shift would not be a crisis. The Fiscal Officer suggested removing “shift coverage,” and the committee concurred. She added that this should be a Department Head decision. The committee agreed that a questionable emergency could be addressed by Council without penalizing the employee. Porter suggested including, “such as storm damage, snowplowing, or public disturbance, as determined by the effected Department Head.” Nairn and Carroll recommended the inclusion of verbiage pertaining to the public health and safety. Porter summarized that the Employee Handbook definition would read, “such as storm damage, snowplowing, or public disturbance, as determined by the effected Department Head to preserve the public health and safety.” The Fiscal Officer added that the next sentence in the policy would be changed to, “due to the inconvenience of last-minute callouts, the minimum callout time is four hours overtime.”

Berger addressed the topic of the time that would count towards the 40 hours worked in a week. Carroll felt that sick time should not count, but paid time off (PTO) and comp were another discussion. The Fiscal Officer advised that overtime is based on the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) as a benefit. Porter considered the situation where an employee was on vacation for the week and then came in to work for an event. If PTO and comp were included in the 40 hours, the employee would get time and a half. Nairn questioned the impact this would have if all employees chose to take the week off to take advantage of this policy, and Berger said this would be for the Department Head to manage. Carroll pointed out that the Village only really had three situations to which this would apply, Fall Festival, Trash Day, and Shredding Day. Berger said it would cost the Village \$39 for overtime for one employee for three hours.

The committee agreed that comp time and PTO should be considered in the 40-hour work week. The committee discussed the verbiage to be changed and included in the Employee Handbook policy, to include that sick time shall not count towards hours worked. Porter suggested stating that comp time and vacation count towards hours worked, but sick time does not.

Nairn addressed the tiered salary schedule. The Fiscal Officer provided her sample version of the tiered salary schedule for all departments, which included department specific criteria. Carroll thought the example was good. He added that the Police Department also has a good model. Carroll noted the salary disparity between two of the Service Department personnel. The Fiscal

Officer explained that the one individual received a \$1.00 raise after probation and then in 2012 was given another raise of \$1.45 per hour for doing mechanic work. When the other individual came off probation, he received a \$.25 raise and had not received another raise since. When the most recent Service Department employee came off probation, he received a \$.68 raise per hour. There was no consistency. Carroll clarified that the employee doing the mechanical work had already been compensated for these responsibilities. The Fiscal Officer stated that this matter had been the subject of reoccurring conversations. Carroll explained that with the Police Department model, based on experience, an employee might start at a higher rate, but eventually when the employees have the same amount of experience with working in the Village, they should max out at the top rate with the Police Department. The Fiscal Officer indicated it was four to six years to reach the maximum rate, and Porter said the Pay Ordinance comes into play with this. Carroll stated that in the Service Department, there was inconsistency.

Berger articulated that Carroll was saying that the two components of salary would be a raise tied to performance or experience, and the other would be the cost of living. The Fiscal Officer stated this is true for the Police Department. She offered that in the Service Department, this could be based on years of experience or responsibilities, Council could design it however they felt best fit. Carroll offered that other than mechanical work, the Service Department employees were all doing the same job description. After a certain amount of time, they should be at the maximum pay ban for the laborer position.

The Fiscal Officer stated that over the years, she had heard complaints from the Service Department about the disparity in pay. She thought having a model which described how to get to the next pay ban would add clarity. The committee discussed the arbitrary way raises had been handled within the Village. Carroll provided the example of the summer help for whom Council designated a specific salary, but the Mayor and Department Head went against Council's wishes and paid him more. As a result, Council had to balance it by not giving the employee a raise. Porter concurred. Carroll thought this model would help prevent this. He explained that at some point in time the two non-mechanic laborers should be earning the same amount. Furthermore, the Street Commissioner, who started at a lower rate than his predecessor, should be earning what the former Street Commissioner did because this is the value of the position.

Porter asked if the system penalizes the long-term employee by capping what they can make. Carroll replied that this is the purpose of the service or longevity bonus. In the public sector, employees will max out within three to five years. The longevity or service bonus then starts at five years.

Regarding cost-of-living adjustments (COLA), last year, two employees received raises in addition to the COLA for coming off probation. Carroll saw these as two separate topics. The COLA is an annual amount the committee is discussing. The topic of coming off probation and/or maxing out of a ban is where the Village needs consistency. The Police Department is very consistent. The Fiscal Officer concurred and indicated that it is mapped out in such a way that everyone knows what the tiers are; it's in black and white. Carroll reiterated that the Service Department does not have this consistency. One employee has been with the Village for 14 years and the other almost 10 years and there is a \$5,000-\$6,000 difference between them. One employee does mechanical work and is compensated \$5,000 - \$6,000 more than the other employee. Berger indicated that the

employee had been with the Village five years longer, and Carroll asked if he was saying that any employee who has been on five years longer than another should earn \$5,000-\$6,000 more. Everyone would be earning something different. Carroll agreed that someone who had worked for the Village longer should earn more, and that was where the service bonus/longevity bonus applied.

Regarding the employee who does the mechanical work, Carroll reiterated that in 2012, Council compensated him for his additional mechanical ability and the experience he brought to the Village. He felt that the other two should be earning the same, excluding time in service. They would be at the maximum pay band and their time in service would be what differentiated the two employees. Berger addressed the COLA in terms of the model described by Carroll and Carroll explained the pay band gets the raise across the board. Nairn asked if the COLA is a given each year and was informed that for a number of years it was 0. Berger said he did not agree with the raise given the previous year because there was no justification for the percentage. He offered that it would be acceptable to use the statistics from the State Employment Relations Board.

Carroll addressed health care costs. The Village had seen minimal increases compared to the public sector for the last couple of years. This year was higher. He addressed the projected COLA, using the township average of 2.43%. If the Village absorbed the 15% healthcare increase for full-time employees, he asked if a 2.5% COLA be reasonable. He added that the part-time employees should not be punished because of the full-time employees. Carroll considered the different models and provided their potential cost to the Village. He added that his calculations did not include the increased cost of healthcare to the Village. Ultimately, he did not see the impact of his calculated raises to be substantial to the Village. He added that the employees are the number one asset and are more out in the community than Council is. Carroll indicated the committee could apply different percentage amounts to the equation, but it all comes down to the impact of the raise on overall Village budget and how the committee wished to justify it. Carroll concluded that a 2.5% to 3% raise would be reasonable based on statistical information.

The Fiscal Auditor added that the Village was not a private corporation and could not tie increases to performance. Employees have no ability to impact tax revenues. They do not get bonuses when things go well. Over the years, there had been steady increases and there had also been efforts to do merit-based increases. Generally, the raises were under 3%. With government work, typically there were no big jumps in salary. The expectation was generally to have a steady job with small steady increases and no bonuses but also no cuts.

Porter made a motion to go into Executive Session at 8:15 a.m., seconded by Nairn. Roll call – ayes, all. Motion carried.

The committee exited Executive Session at 8:45 a.m.

Nairn addressed the contract recommendation for the Solicitor. The Fiscal Officer referred to the three contract options provided by the Solicitor. The first was the same as it had been at \$225 per hour. The second option was \$1,600 for the first 10 hours a month, and then after this it would be \$225 per hour. The Fiscal Officer recommended this option. The last option would be \$10,000 per month with grants being outside of this amount. The committee agreed the second option was the best choice. The Fiscal Officer asked if the committee had prepared the decision tree it had discussed. Berger replied that this would be done over time. Berger offered that using the Fiscal

Officer as the gate keeper was a good idea and the committee should determine how to implement this.

The Fiscal Officer drafted and distributed an ordinance for blanket purchase orders. She explained that Ohio Revised Code (ORC) requires that on blanket purchase orders, there must be a dollar limit. She queried surrounding communities and found that \$25,000 was a good limit. The committee concurred.

Porter made a motion to adjourn at 8:49 a.m.

---

Chris Berger, Finance Committee Chairman

---

Cindy Nairn, HR Chairwoman

Prepared by Leslie Galicki