

Joint Finance and Human Resource Committee Meeting
April 9, 2021 7:30 a.m.

Members Present: Chairman Nairn, Chairman Berger, Carroll, Porter,
Fiscal Officer Romanowski, Chief Rizzo, Mayor

Nairn called the meeting to order and requested the meeting be recorded.

Nairn addressed the staffing at the Police Department and explained that the Chief wanted to add the position of Police Detective. Rizzo explained that this matter was discussed with Safety Committee. The Chief and the committee wanted to add a full-time detective to the staff Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. He explained that the department needed to grow and has had nine full-time officers since 1996 and has not had a secretary or clerk since 2006. The Chief and other officers assumed these duties. Although the activity levels have not increased substantially, the types of calls currently received require more detailed investigation and follow-up. The patrol officers have also had to act as detectives, which often means taking the patrolmen off the road. Additionally, walk-in traffic, phone complaints, radio traffic, etc. can lead to calling patrolmen from their patrol duties to address this business. The detective would handle all incoming traffic, calls, reports, and follow-up. The Chief explained that the plan would be to move the department's current Detective/Patrolman Mike Kleinknecht to the Monday through Friday dayshift position. He could also be used to fill a full-time patrolman position for officers on vacation. With Kleinknecht's position then becoming vacant, the Chief proposed moving one of the new part-time officers into the full-time Patrol Officer position. The Chief explained that since this officer did not have full-time patrolman experience, he would come in as a Class "C" Patrolman, which is set at 20% of the going Patrolman rate. It would take him a number of years to graduate to Class "A" Patrolman. Carroll asked how long the step process would take and how the Chief internally handles the increases. The Chief explained that with less than three years of full-time experience, it would take two years and two good evaluation periods to be moved up into the second class, which would be Class "B". To achieve Class "A" would require another two years and evaluations exceeding expectations. Nairn asked about the frequency of the evaluation, and the Chief explained they are annual evaluations done by the end of the first quarter.

The Chief further explained that generally, there is a \$4,000 difference between ranks: Patrolman to Sergeant, Sergeant to Lieutenant. He explained that during the probation period, the officers' salaries are decremented 10%. At the end of the probation, they are moved to the rate of the full-time patrolman, for example. This is providing the officer has the experience to qualify as a Class "A" patrolman. The Chief clarified that the department is not giving raises after the fact. Carroll verified that if an officer were to come to the Village from Chester Township, that individual would start at 10% below the full-time patrolman salary, and after successful completion of the probationary period, would then receive the full pay. The Chief explained the pay and promotion process for the patrolmen, and then clarified the promotion procedure from Patrolman to Sergeant. With this promotion, the individual receives 50% of the difference between ranks until the six-month probationary period is complete. The remainder of this

difference is awarded after that. The only other raises the officers receive are the annual across the board raises.

Porter asked if the part-time position that will be vacated in this process would be filled. The Chief said it would.

The Fiscal Officer asked the Chief about the job position description and salary for the Detective position. The Chief explained that he provided a proposed job description combining what the department used to have in a Police Clerk and adding detective responsibilities. The Fiscal Officer asked if the salary rate would be the same, and the Chief stated it would. The officer is currently a Class "A" Patrolman/Detective. There would be no change in salary.

Porter asked about the cost to the Village, and the Chief explained it would be the cost of full-time salary for the new officer, which would be for a Class "C" full-time Patrolman. The Chief explained that the new patrolman would start at \$64,000. The Fiscal Officer explained that with benefits it would be \$90,000 - \$100,000. Porter asked if the budget would have to be amended, and the Fiscal Officer concurred.

The Mayor reviewed the pay the new full-time officer would receive. The Chief explained that the officer will be starting at the lowest level and will not receive a raise for two years. The Mayor stated that in 2023 the officer would be earning \$68,000. The Chief explained that this depends on how everything goes and reiterated that there must be two successful evaluations during this period and there is a matter of timing. The Mayor stated that in May of 2025, the officer would be earning \$72,000 assuming there were no other pay raises. The Chief said it would be 10% less than whatever the current Class A Patrolman would be earning. Carroll proposed that the officer should also receive the cost-of-living adjustments (COLA) in addition to any raises, as with all employees.

The Fiscal Officer addressed the matter of raises given to employees after completing the six-month probationary period and explained that raises after the probationary period is new. When it has been done, Council approved a motion listing the new salary amount at the end of the probationary period. With the last two hires, Council gave the dollar amount for that raise at the time of hiring them but did not take into account any across the board increase. The HR committee recommended doing the difference between what the person started at and what the raise was supposed to be. That would not be fair to that person that got the across the board raise but did not get the raise for finishing the probation. Carroll explained that the way the Chief has it, the across-the-board raise should be built in to the 10% raises between classes. The Fiscal Officer acknowledged this but explained that the problem was that when Council passed the motion, it gave an exact dollar amount. She felt the approval of any end-of-probation increase be approved at the end of the probationary period. Carroll stated that it would be nice if there was consistency regardless of department.

The Mayor stated that it would take the new full-time officer four years to pick up two \$4,000 increases. So, if he were at \$64,000 as a Class "C", two years later he goes to Class "B" at \$68,000 and then two years later, he would become a Class "A" at \$72,000. The Chief stated this was a dynamic number because each year the employees receive a cost-of-living increase.

He said it would be whatever the full-time salary is at the time. He explained all patrolmen get paid the same amount of money.

Carroll asked about the salaries of the patrolmen, and the Chief explained that all the patrolmen, unless on probation, make the same amount. The sergeants make the same amount. The Chief explained how he determined the salary of the new Lieutenant.

The Mayor asked about Sergeant Kimball's salary.

Porter asked the Mayor if he agreed with the proposal of the new Police Department position and new full-time officer, and the Mayor agreed. He thought the Village could possibly hire a clerk at \$50,000-\$55,000 and have very little flexibility with additional help. He thought it was more beneficial to bring in another police officer for \$100,000 considering how things had changed. The Chief explained that he looked at the idea of hiring a clerk, but that person would rely on the Chief or a patrolman, which would defeat the purpose.

Nairn noted that the Chief had been fiscally responsible, and she thought the proposal was a good idea.

Porter stated that it would be necessary to amend the Employee Handbook to include the job description. The Fiscal Officer explained that it would be necessary to establish the pay range and amend the budget as well. The Fiscal Officer asked when the committee wanted to do this, and Porter thought the process would begin at the first meeting in May. The Fiscal Officer added that a motion would be necessary to begin the search for a part-time patrolman. Nairn verified that this process could be completed by June 1st. Porter stated yes.

The committee discussed the various positions, duties, and hierarchy of the Police Department.

Nairn addressed the Street Department mechanics position and advised that the Street Commissioner is tracking the time spent doing mechanical work. She spoke to the Street Commissioner about the need to accurately document this information and verified that the Street Committee had done the same. Porter stated he expected to hear more from the Street Commissioner at the next Street Committee meeting, which the committee wanted to change from April 30th to April 23rd at 7:30 a.m. in Village Hall. Nairn asked the committee if they would enlighten her on the method being used to collect the data about how much mechanical work is done in a day, week, month, etc. Carroll stated he would address this with the Street Commissioner. Nairn suggested that the Street Commissioner keep a physical running record instead of just asking the individual how much time he spent on mechanical work last week. Carroll would address this and report on it at the April 12th Council meeting. Nairn thanked Porter for the work he did with writing job descriptions.

The tiered salary system was addressed. The topic was initially discussed at the joint HR/Finance meeting on February 19th. Since that meeting, Berger sent the committees his ideas for pay scales for full-time Village employees. He considered five components of salary: Job classification and salary range, number of years of service with the Village, cost of living adjustments determined by Council, and a yearly performance evaluation level of acceptable. Carroll asked if the raise to which he referred would be the COLA everyone would be getting.

Carroll clarified that Berger was not specifying a tier raise. Carroll thought this was where there was difficulty because if everyone received an acceptable evaluation, they would receive the across-the-board raise. Berger said no because they would have different years of service. Carroll clarified that the evaluation is not going to weigh in as far as the amount the employee would be receiving. Either the employee is acceptable or not. Carroll posed the scenario of something being acceptable in one department but not in another for purposes of receiving the raise. Carroll and Berger agreed it would be based on job classification. Berger explained that the Village must move towards evaluations having some impact on wage increases. Berger suggested that evaluations and raises be done based on anniversary dates, not January 1st. He said it would be a continuing process throughout the year. Nairn felt the concept of staggering the evaluations would be beneficial.

Nairn asked how the COLAs have been determined by Council. Porter advised that someone on Council would identify the consumer price index, and then Council would consider this as the cost-of-living adjustment combined with acknowledgement of the good work employees had done, which was how it had arrived at 3%. Carroll noted that Council gets a 3.5% raise regardless of what the employees get and felt Council's raise should use the same metric used for Village personnel. Porter discussed the potential conflict in doing this and explained this was the rationale with the original decision by Council. Berger added that the evaluation process for Council is at the ballot box.

Berger posed the following questions: How long would it take for an employee to become capable to do all the aspects of his/her job? Is there a point of time in service where after six years, for example, that someone should be fully expected to do everything in their job description 100%? Is there a maximum salary that an employee can make? Berger asked if it were reasonable to say that there is a maximum dollar amount that the Village would pay for a position? Would there be a point to tell someone with 15 years that they are at the maximum salary they could earn with the Village? Carroll provided examples with the Police Department and explained that the only increases available might be the annual COLA. Berger stated that the committees had discussed annual raises in terms of 3%, and Carroll replied that it would be whatever the COLA would be. Berger stated that COLA is 1.3%. Council would not be giving 3% and then all the other adjustments on top of it. That component is going to be 1.3% or 1.5%. Carroll stated that whatever the patrolman's maximum salary, the only increase beyond this would be the COLA/annual raise. Carroll explained that as it was explained by Clemans Nelson, there is a range and when someone reaches the top of the band, it is necessary to increase the band. Carroll asked about longevity bonuses, and Berger stated he kept it in his plan since it seemed to be important to the committees. Carroll saw this as beneficial, and Berger said it provided a recognition for term of service. Carroll thought a flat rate is good. The Fiscal Officer asked whether an employee who is maxed out would still get the COLA but not the raises? Berger agreed. Berger stated that they would still get COLA and service bonuses, but Council would not keep jumping the number up higher in terms of annual compensation because they have breathed another year. Carroll reiterated that they would receive the COLA and longevity pay, but no other arbitrary pay raises, which is what had been done. Carroll thought it would be good to meld Berger's idea with what the Chief had been doing. Nairn asked if it would still be

considered tiered. Carroll described the combined process, and the Fiscal Officer stated that she appreciated that it would be in writing. Berger stated it was all spelled out. Nairn said there would be no arbitrary buckshot. Berger said it is a matrix and it is only necessary to fill in the numbers.

Carroll suggested having another joint HR/Finance meeting. He and Berger could work to meld what the Police Chief described and present something additionally for the committees to consider. Nairn suggested Friday, May 7th, at 8:00 a.m.

Nairn made a motion at 8:50 a.m. that the committees go into Executive Session to discuss employee compensation, seconded by Porter. Roll call – ayes, Nairn, Berger, Carroll, and Porter. Motion carried.

Nairn made a motion at 8:51 a.m. to leave Executive Session, seconded by Porter. Roll call – ayes, Nairn, Berger, Carroll, and Porter. Motion carried.

Nairn made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Porter. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

Cindy Nairn, Chairwoman HR

Chris Berger, Chairman Finance

Prepared by Leslie Galicki