

**Joint HR and Streets Committee Meeting**  
**October 7, 2025, 7:30 a.m. Village Hall**

**Present: HR Chairman Bell, Council Member Berger, Streets Chairman Cavanagh, Council Member Galicki, Mayor (arrived approximately 8:15 am), Fiscal Officer Romanowski, Police Chief Rizzo, Street Commissioner Young, Solicitor Matheney**

Bell called the meeting to order. The first item addressed was the 1.25 hour of overtime and callout policy. As background, the Street Commissioner explained that when he started, there was a policy that when the Service Department employees came in to do the park, they would get 1.25 hours overtime. The employees told him that this was an agreed upon thing. The Fiscal Officer explained that she was never aware of this policy. The former Street Commissioner used to empty the trash at the park so there was not typically overtime on Saturdays. When there was, the employee timesheets reflected the hours worked as 1.25 hours. However, the new Service Department employee initially documented that he was being paid for 1.25 hours without entering any time for the date worked. The Fiscal Officer stated that it is necessary to know when the employees are physically here in the event they get injured on the job. In response, the employee entered that he was working for a half hour but being paid for 1.25 hours of overtime. She spoke to the Street Commissioner who told her the department came up with a 1.25-hour rule prior to his employment, and the Fiscal Officer advised she needed a policy for the auditors. Cavanagh reiterated that previously, the former Street Commissioner took care of the trash and asked when the Service Department started to do the trash at 1.25 hours. The Fiscal Officer said it was late 2023 to 2024. Bell recalled the former Street Commissioner discussing this rule for garbage duty and understood why the employees would think it was the policy.

The Solicitor asked what a call in was, and whether it was expected that the employees would come in on Saturday or whether it was handled with a phone call. The Street Commissioner said that the Building Department Administrative Assistant posts a schedule for the reservations for the park pavilion. The Service Department employees come in to change out that trash for 1.25 hours. The Solicitor asked if this is something that is discussed the Friday before the event. The Street Commissioner said the schedule is provided a month ahead. The Solicitor verified it is not handled with a phone call to the employee on a Saturday morning, but something the employees already know. The Street Commissioner concurred. Bell verified that in the two instances in question, the Street Commissioner did not call the employee in and the Street Commissioner said that was correct. Bell stated that there are two issues; who is calling in the employees and what is the policy for time. The Street Commissioner said that this is correct. Galicki clarified that there is the 1.25-hour issue and the Mayor's emergency callout.

Bell asked for the timing of the background for the two days in question. The Street Commissioner said the department members have the pavilion rental information, and the routine is for the guys to come in and empty the trash for each event. If there is a morning event, they come in and empty the trash and then come back and take care of the trash if there is an afternoon event. When they figured out that the 1.25 hour compensation was not an official policy, the Street Commissioner explained that the Mayor called the employee and told him there was trash and asked him to come and get it. He said

the Mayor called the employee directly, he did not. Galicki asked if the reservation was on the list, and the Street Commissioner acknowledged it was. Galicki verified that someone would have been assigned to be there to empty garbage. The Street Commissioner agreed but explained that when he conveyed to his employees that the 1.25-hour policy was not official and that they would only be paid for the time they were there, the employee said he did not want to come in for a half hour. The Street Commissioner decided they would deal with the repercussions on Monday. Bell noted it was a conscious decision not to respond to the scheduled pavilion event. Cavanagh stated that the employee came in, and the Street Commissioner said that the Mayor called him. Galicki clarified that he was not going to come in because the employees did not think it was worth his time to come in for 15-20 minutes, and the Street Commissioner agreed. Galicki asked who told him to stop the informal policy. The Street Commissioner discussed the matter with the Fiscal Officer and because there was no official policy, it was not permissible to pay them as such. The Fiscal Officer explained that they could only document time they actually worked until a policy was put in place. Then it would be Council's decision whether to adopt a policy perhaps ratify it backwards. Galicki asked which days the Mayor called the employee in, and the Fiscal Officer said it was both Saturday and Sunday, September 20<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup>. She further explained that per the Employee Handbook, when it is a planned event, compensation is for the actual time worked. When an employee is called in for an emergency callout, it is from the time the call is received. The Solicitor surmised that the employee has not been with the Village long enough to have been on a callout. The Street Commissioner said he had not and was just going with what he was told or what was requested of him. The Fiscal Officer advised that for a half hour, the employee would get \$16.56. With an hour and a quarter minimum, he would get \$62.25. For the four-hour callout, he would receive \$198.67 for each day so it would be a total of about \$400 for the two days. The Street Commissioner added that from what the guys had told him, the 1.25 was agreed upon before for this reason. They did not feel it was fair for four hours to empty trash cans, so it was a compromise.

Galicki thought it would be beneficial to have a policy but wondered if it should apply to all Village employees. The Building Department Administrative Assistant comes in for board meetings, and sometimes the meetings may only last 15 minutes. She gets paid for 15 minutes even though it is in the evening and she may have had to come in from where she lives. If there is a policy for the Service Department employees, it should be an inclusive policy. Berger thought policy statements could be written to address different issues. He did not think one blanket policy could describe how every callout would be handled. The Fiscal Officer explained there was already one policy for callouts, which is the four-hour minimum. She further explained that the Building Department Administrative Assistant accepted this dynamic as part of her job and the Fiscal Officer questioned whether the Service Department employees were not aware that they would have to empty trash. She did not understand why it could not be a single policy. Is it a matter of it being outside the normal working hours or of not knowing something is part of your job? Berger responded that it had to do with the type of callout. The Solicitor advised that it was not a callout because it was an expected job. The Street Commissioner proposed differentiating between callout and emergency callout in the policy. The Police Chief explained that the emergency is the 4-hour callout and what is needed is to develop a policy for a scheduled event. The Fiscal Officer provided the example of a scheduled burial on a

weekend. Galicki reiterated that the policy should be for all employees, and Berger thought that all the issues should be addressed.

Cavanagh offered that she thought the Building Department Administrative Assistant worked less than 40 hours a week to accommodate the board meetings. The Fiscal Officer said she works 40 hours a week since the office is open. Berger countered that on Fridays, she can leave at noon when the office closes if she has had board meetings during the week which would go towards her 40 hours. The Fiscal Officer clarified that Berger was saying that the Building Department Administrative Assistant's time is restricted to the week because that is not how it has been handled. The extra four hours on Friday have been used for administrative work. Berger thought that the original arrangement was that if she had her 40 hours in as of noon on Friday, then she would go home at noon. The Fiscal Officer clarified that this meant that the Building Department Administrative Assistant's 40 hours should stay within the week and that although she was inconvenienced in having to come in for an evening meeting that lasted 15 minutes, she has to go home at noon on Friday. In contrast, the message is that the Service Department employees' time is more valuable when they come in outside of normal working hours and will be paid at least 1.25 hours even though they only work a half hour. Berger acknowledged that this is inconsistent, and Council wants to create consistency. Cavanagh pointed out that when the Service Department has to come in on the weekend to clean up trash, it means they are working six or seven days in row. Galicki asked if the trash is emptied on Fridays before the staff leaves for the day, and the Street Commissioner said they do. Cavanagh concluded that if there are no scheduled events, then no one comes in. The Solicitor verified this would include not coming in to clean the bathroom, and the Street Commissioner concurred and said that everything is washed clean and serviced Friday late afternoon and then everything is checked on Monday. The Solicitor asked about late weekday events at the park like the cross country meets, and the Street Commissioner said there is usually no garbage to empty.

Berger inquired about how many times in a year there is a need to empty trash in the park after working hours. The Street Commissioner said that last year it did not seem like there were many but this year it has been every weekend and at times the pavilion is double booked on Saturday and Sunday. Berger concluded that it was more than 20 times in a year, and the Street Commissioner agreed and added that there are times when they have to empty trash from events that were not scheduled for the pavilion. Berger proposed that Streets or Parks Committee investigate the potential of having patrons clean up after themselves and dispose of their own garbage. Galicki added that this is a policy of many of the Geauga Parks.

Berger provided the committees with a draft policy. He acknowledged that it would not be a callout but a park maintenance issue that involved after-hours work that is scheduled at 1.25 hours. If the work exceeds 1.25 hours, it would just be the actual time worked with a minimum of 1.25 hours. Cavanagh questioned whether this was straight time and the Street Commissioner and Fiscal Officer explained that it would be overtime if they had put in their 40 hours for the week.

There was further discussion about making the policy applicable for all employees and also about the Building Department Administrative Assistant's work and meeting schedule. Terminology relating to call ins, callouts, and scheduled outside working hours were also considered.

The Solicitor discussed modifications to verbiage in the policy. She recommended it simply state a "minimum of 1.25 hours" with an explanation of time over that amount. The Solicitor also re-worded the sentences pertaining to supporting documentation, and Berger suggested moving forward with the policy as amended by the Solicitor. The Fiscal Officer asked that it be made retroactive to January 1, 2025.

Berger addressed the 4-hour minimum for callouts. The Mayor called out one of the employees to deal with the trash issue. Bell asked if this was directly, and Berger said yes. Galicki asked if it was on one or two occasions, and the Street Commissioner said it was twice on the same weekend, Saturday and Sunday. Berger questioned what constituted an emergency. The Solicitor stated that it is not really defined in the policy, but it describes it as when an employee is called to come to work unexpectedly, such as storm damage, snow plowing, or a public disturbance that is determined by the department head to be an emergency for public health and safety. Galicki noted that it said, "determined by the department head," and asked if the Street Commissioner was aware of the employee being called by the Mayor. The Street Commissioner said he became aware when the employee did his time sheets. Berger clarified that it was not concurrent with the event and the Mayor did not call him about a problem that needed to be taken care of. The Street Commissioner said that was correct. Bell asked if it involved trash again and questioned whether this was a public emergency. Galicki asked if the action by the Mayor was in response to the 1.25 policy being in question. Bell asked what the dates were, and the Fiscal Officer said September 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>. Berger explained that he researched "emergency," and found that an emergency can be declared for a natural disaster, civil disturbance, human cause disasters such as explosions, fires, sabotage, or other events that threaten life and property and threats to essential services. One of the key requirements is that it must be a formal written declaration of an emergency that is publicized. The Chief thought this would be along the lines of a natural disaster where the Emergency Management Association would be called for a tornado, hurricane, etc. Berger said that at the very least, it should be disseminated to Council and Department Heads that there is an emergency with a description of how it is being handled. He was uncertain that trash would rise to the level of emergency although it might be a public nuisance. The Fiscal Officer explained that typically a callout would be when the SWAT team is brought in or when there is snowplowing or flooding. Should Council be notified of these events? The Solicitor thought Council was informed. The Chief explained that he typically keeps Council informed unless it has to do with the department being dispatched to another community outside the Village. The Fiscal Officer said that the most prevalent emergency callouts are for snowplowing and the Solicitor added that this is a separate codified ordinance. The Mayor, Police Chief, and Street Commissioner are the only ones who can declare the snow events.

Regarding the callouts, the Chief asked if the Mayor could call one of the patrol officers in for an emergency without notifying the Chief. The Street Commissioner was not notified in this case. It should be the department head. Galicki would have expected the Mayor to contact the department

head and then at the department head's discretion, dispatch one of his employees. It is unusual that the Mayor would go directly to an employee. The Solicitor said this would be the best practice and the policy could specify that the Mayor notify the department head. However, she felt the Mayor had some authority to call out an employee for an emergency, but it is a question of what an emergency is. Berger acknowledged that it would have been best for the Mayor to contact the department head to ask how the department head wanted to handle the situation. However, he also thought that the Mayor should have latitude to do what needs to be done in a time of crisis. The Street Commissioner concurred and added that a phone call even after the fact to the department head would suffice. The Chief did not want to beat a dead horse but thought the chain of command should be included in the policy. It should not be a direct call to a low-ranking patrol officer. Berger agreed with the chain of command but thought there could be circumstances where it would not be followed and allowances must be made. Berger thought the department heads should be informed as soon as practicable.

Cavanagh asked if the Solicitor was rewriting the four-hour callout policy, and the Solicitor said she was not but advised that the identification of who can make a call out is not clear in the policy. The definition of emergency is another issue. Currently, it states "for a public disturbance that is determined by the department head to be an emergency for public health and safety." She did not feel this was specific enough. Berger concluded that there should be a catch-all phrase stating that other such circumstances as may be determined. People are paid to use their best judgement and if the worst thing that happens is that an employee comes in and gets paid 4 hours of overtime for a situation that was not an emergency, then you have a conversation afterwards. The Solicitor advised that Council should approve what is paid because the Village just had a lawsuit over time. Approval is needed because it does not fit a callout, and the employee put down four hours on his timesheet. It is necessary to make note of this by Council. Bell clarified that Council needed to approve the four-hour emergency callouts not the 1.25 hour working off hours. The Solicitor explained that Council would need to approve the four-hour callout as far as paying it because it was not a callout by definition. Berger noted that HR would make the motion to approve the payments. The Solicitor also stated that this should not be a precedent setting event. It was two days at 4 hours each, not one day or one instance. Additionally, it was not unexpected work. It does not fit the definition of a callout.

Berger advised that the Village has the right to schedule employees to deal with issues like emptying the trash as part of their jobs. Once the policy is in place, it should no longer be an issue. The Solicitor stated that Council could also just approve 1.25 hours for each of the days instead of the four hours since it was not a callout. Berger asked what the employee's expectation was. The Solicitor did not know. The Fiscal Officer said it was the four-hour callout as shown on his timesheet. Berger did not want to penalize an employee for doing what he was told to do. It is not a failure of the employee but of management in that the situation was not managed correctly. Berger concluded that the employee would get paid and then move on. The Fiscal Officer reiterated that she needed it documented by Council for the auditors.

There was further discussion of the definition of an emergency. Berger thought the four categories of natural disaster, civil disturbance, human caused disasters, and threats to essential functions were all encompassing. The Solicitor pointed out that currently, this is as determined by the department head.

The Mayor asked if the proposed policy had flexibility if a guy is coming into do trash and finds a water leak. Would it be changed from a call in to an emergency? The Solicitor said in terms of the policy, she did not think so. The Street Commissioner said that this would fall into the category of getting the 1.25 hour minimum and the other hours worked. The policy is guaranteeing the employees 1.25 hour pay to empty trash, which should not take any longer than that. The Mayor asked if this was regular time, and Berger said that if they have their 40 hours in, it would be overtime. The Mayor asked if Sunday was different or holidays. The Fiscal Officer said holidays are only the listed holidays. In the Mayor's example, the person who came in to empty trash and found the water leak would be paid the 1.25 hour minimum, but if someone else were called in for the water leak it would be a 4-hour emergency callout.

Berger revisited the topic of who declares an emergency and wondered if anyone objected to the department heads having this power. Cavanagh asked if the Mayor should as well. Berger said that ultimately, he does. Cavanagh also clarified that in the event of snow, a patrol officer could call the Street Commissioner to report the need for plowing and the Chief concurred. Berger concluded that it is appropriate for the department heads to make this decision and should keep Mayor and Council in the loop.

Bell stated that they still needed a definition of emergency. The Solicitor suggested that it could read, "for a public service that is determined by the department head or the Mayor to be an emergency for public health and safety." Berger agreed that this would be the catch all. He thought that in the event of an emergency callout, there would be a discussion afterwards as to why and what happened, the circumstances, and if it is necessary to modify the policy going forward.

The Solicitor asked what the emergency was for the callout for the Service Department employee on September 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>. The Mayor said there was no emergency. They met Friday afternoon, and he said he was going to come in on Saturday. He told the employee he would check the garbage cans since he was there and let him know what time the employee would be needed. He came in and did the garbage cans and cleaned the bathrooms, etc. He thought cleaning the bathroom was the employee's idea of an emergency. He did not know. The Solicitor asked if the Mayor told him to put down four hours as a callout. The Mayor said he did not think so. Galicki said that there was then a new issue. Berger agreed it was different, and Galicki said it was fraud. The Solicitor said they did not know if the employee expected the four hours. She did not think it met the callout definition. They need to be careful having just come from a lawsuit regarding time. Council should really reconsider moving with two four-hour timesheet entries. The Mayor explained that the employee was coming in to do trashcans and asked if they normally clean the bathroom. The Street Commissioner said they will if needed. The Mayor asked if a dirty bathroom constituted an emergency and said that's his decision. The Solicitor stated it would not be the employee's decision. The policy states that it is the department head who determines the emergency. Bell asked who directed the employee to come in over the weekend since the Street Commissioner said there was a schedule. The Street Commissioner said there are scheduled events, but with the 1.25 overtime question and only getting paid for the actual time spent, the individual would not come in. The Mayor then reached out to him and brought him in. The Mayor explained that what happened was on Friday afternoon, September 19<sup>th</sup> around 3:00 p.m.,

they were all talking about what was going to happen. What was decided was that the Mayor would check the trashcans on Saturday. However, he forgot. At 7:42 a.m. Sunday morning, he texted the employee, "Mayor Koons apologizes for not communicating better. The trashcans are full with two events on Sunday, 10-12 and 1-6. I can get them this morning if you can do this afternoon and evening. Off to church til 10." The Mayor said this was on Sunday. The employee responded, "Good morning. I came in last night at 6:00, got all of the garbage cans at the pavilion, playground, and bathrooms. Also did a sweep through the Village for roadkill. Thank you." This was Sunday morning at about 8:00 a.m. Galicki verified that at 7:42 a.m., the Mayor saw trash that the employee just said he picked up on Saturday. The Mayor said no that he talked to the employee on Friday. He said he saw the trash cans on Saturday that were full at 4:00 p.m. when he went to church. Then he did not respond to the employee. So, he responded Sunday morning that he apologized for not communicating better. "Trashcans are full with two events on Sunday, 10-12, 1-6. I can get them this morning (Sunday morning) if you can do this afternoon and evening. Off to church." The employee responded, "good morning. I came in last night at 6:00 p.m. (Saturday night). Got all the garbage cans for the pavilion, playground, and playground. Also did a sweep for the Village for roadkill." The Mayor knew he was supposed to come in on Saturday. Galicki verified that Mayor knew the employee was supposed to come in, so it was not an emergency, but the Mayor declared it was an emergency. Earlier, the Street Commissioner said there was a decision made because they were not getting 1.25 hour minimum that no one would come in. But the Mayor was saying that the employee was going to come in, and Galicki was confused. If he was scheduled to come in, he should not be getting the four hours, but then that opens the door to why he claimed four hours?

The Mayor said in his opinion, the employee came in on Saturday and saw that the bathrooms were a mess and decided to stay and clean them, that was above and beyond what he was expected to do, which was to empty trashcans. Galicki said that according to the Street Commissioner, he was not expected to come in. The Mayor thought he was just coming in on Saturday. The Street Commissioner stated that there were Saturday and Sunday scheduled times, but then with the thought of not getting the 1.25 hour, he said he would not come in and the Street Commissioner said they would deal with it on Monday. Cavanagh added that the employee did come in, and the Mayor agreed. The Solicitor verified it was without a phone call, and the Mayor said yes. The Mayor said the employee came in because he thought someone needed to do it and he was scheduled. So he did it. The Solicitor said in her view, that is not a 4-hour callout. Berger concurred and said it would 1.25 hour minimum or actual time depending on how much time he spent. He thought the Street Commissioner needed to have that conversation with his employee. He did not think the situation rose to the level of malfeasance at this point. There needs to be clarification. The Mayor stated that an employee came in on a Saturday at 6:00 p.m. and on his own cleaned the bathrooms. The Solicitor said she thought the Mayor said the employee was scheduled. The Mayor said he was going to come in. He was not scheduled to clean the bathroom. He decided on his own to clean the bathrooms, and the committees was going to reward him with 1.25 hour? Berger said it would be that or whatever his actual time was over 1.25, like 2 hours. The Mayor thought he probably spent more than that. Berger offered that the employee needed to tell them that. Galicki said the other side of this is that in corporate America, the employee does not decide whether he/she will come in on a weekend and get overtime.

Galicki was confused with the conflicting details. Perhaps it is time to find out what really occurred. The Mayor said Galicki was getting what really occurred.

Galicki asked the Mayor to explain what happened on Friday with the discussion of employees refusing to respond due to an overtime policy issue. What was the agreement the Mayor reached with the Street Department employees at that time. The Mayor said that the agreement he understood was that the employee was coming in on Saturday and he would let the employee know what time because he was going to check and see how much trash was there. Galicki said there was a difference in what the Street Commissioner was saying which was that no one was scheduled to come in and the Mayor said that the employee was coming in. The Mayor asked the Street Commissioner whether the employee was scheduled. The Street Commissioner said that the employee was not going to come in for the half hour and he said they would deal with it on Monday. The Mayor continued to say that the employee came in on Saturday. Galicki asked if there was an agreement between the Mayor and the employee when he left on Friday that he was coming in. The Mayor said it was his understanding that the employee was coming in on Saturday. Galicki clarified that the Mayor's understanding was that the employee was scheduled to come in and not that the Mayor directed him to come in. The Mayor said no, he does not do that. The employee was scheduled to come in on Saturday and the Mayor was supposed to call him but forgot to call him. The employee came in on his own and did the work, and the Mayor reiterated the information about contacting the employee Sunday. Sunday morning, the employee answered that he came in and did the work and then was coming in on Sunday because there were two events.

The Solicitor verified that the employee wrote "Mayor call in" on his timesheet and the Fiscal Officer confirmed he did so for both days. The Solicitor asked the Mayor if this was accurate, and the Mayor said as a call in, he did not call and say hey we want you at this particular time. He just knew he was coming in that night, which he did. Cavanagh concluded that all the committees were trying to do at this point was to make clear the way things should be done. The Mayor responded that going forward, it needs to be made clear, but it should also look at the point of view of the employee who is coming in to do trash. Since he is not there to do bathrooms, he is not going to clean the bathrooms. He is going to come in and do the minimum. Eventually, they will all be unavailable if they are tied down to 15-20 minutes of trash picking. The committees have the chance to say thank you to this guy who decided on Saturday night to clean the bathrooms on his own. And this is how they are treating him? Bell did not think they were trying to treat him poorly at all, but rather to figure out what he is owed and how he was called in. Bell asked if it was possible that he was scheduled to come in, and decided not to come in, but the Mayor did not get that part of the story that he decided not to come in and went forward assuming he was coming. Cavanagh thought that was exactly what happened. The Mayor thought it was very possible, but he did not stick around on Friday. The Street Commissioner was under the impression that they were not going to go in until the overtime issue was sorted out. The Mayor said he was under the impression the employee was coming in. With the emotions Friday afternoon, when he left, he thought the employee was coming in. This is why he apologized for not calling him. He went by the park Saturday afternoon to check the trash cans, and they were full. The Street Commissioner did not think this was a question of whether the employee was right or wrong for doing what he did,



but how much to pay him for what he did. Cavanagh agreed. The Street Commissioner explained that the employees are not the type of group to say they are only paid to empty the trashcans and that is all they are going to do. They will stay 15 minutes after work and then never put it on their timesheet. The Fiscal Officer clarified that if they are being paid for 1.25 hours, and if there is work to be done, is that not their responsibility to do it? It is the same for the callout. The Street Commissioner said the responsibility is to empty the trash. The Fiscal Officer asked then if other departments can empty the trash for 1.25 hour minimum if they can come in for 15 minutes and get paid for 1.25 hours overtime to build up their comp bank. The only requirement would be to empty the trash. The Street Commissioner responded that it would depend on their job description. Galicki offered that the job descriptions say, 'and other duties as assigned.'

The Street Commissioner thought if the employee came in on Saturday and there was a question, he will be told he gets 1.25 hours and then on Sunday, he will get paid for a 4-hour callout, but moving forward it will be 1.25 hours. Bell acknowledged there was confusion but did not want to punish the employee for doing his job. Moving forward there will be the policy for a 1.25 hour minimum or hours worked. The Street Commissioner asked if they wanted him to have this conversation with the employee about getting 1.25 on the 20<sup>th</sup> and 4-hour callout on the 21<sup>st</sup>?

Cavanagh clarified that the former Street Commissioner had this 1.25-hour minimum policy and the Street Commissioner said the employees told him they did. The Fiscal Officer explained that in reviewing the timesheets, the practice started in 2024 or the end of 2023. Cavanagh observed that if the employees are not scheduled or they do not want the emergency callout, it sounds like it comes back to the Street Commissioner to come do it. Galicki said that the employees are scheduled for the event and wondered if it was the same person for the entire weekend or if it was assigned by the day. The Street Commissioner said he leaves it up to the guys to decide how to cover the event and it varies. In this case, it was the same employee since he was the new guy. Cavanagh verified that this is primarily a summer issue of three to four months and the Street Commissioner agreed.

Bell asked if there was any further discussion, and the Fiscal Officer stated she would need a motion at the Council meeting. The Street Commissioner asked if the motion would be for two four-hour callouts, 1.25 hours on both days or 1.25 hours one day and 4 hour call out the next. The Chief stated that before all this happened, the employee was fully aware that there was a scheduled clean up of trash on both days. The Street Commissioner said this was correct. The Mayor asked the Chief how many times his guys did trash on their own at the park. The Chief did not think there was a situation where they picked up trash. If they were on duty, though, they would not be coming from home to pick it up. The Mayor said the guys in uniform have picked up trash on the weekend.

The Solicitor indicated that direction was still needed. As stated earlier, Bell explained that the employee would not be punished. Berger said to pay him the 8 hours of overtime as a onetime event and not a precedent setting event. A motion will be required at the October 13<sup>th</sup> Council meeting. The Street Commissioner said he would make it clear to the employee that this is a one-time event.

Bell addressed the Vehicle Policy, and Berger said he made the one change requested by the Mayor at the last Council meeting. Bell thought the policy looked good. The Solicitor said she had a few

changes in verbiage that would be ready for the October 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Mayor made a change to Items 3 and 4 because he wanted it written down that we don't want cars going home daily but from time-to-time it is very convenient for people to take the Village car home at night to go to their event and come back the next day versus driving to the Village campus to get the car. In the case of the Street Commissioner, he lives east and should take the car home when he goes to Warren and comes back here and drops the car off and gets his car. The same thing was done for a police officer going south to Columbus with taking the car home at night. The Mayor wanted this in the policy. The Solicitor suggested just leaving it with the Police Chief giving pre-approval. The Mayor did not think the Police Chief should have anything to do with it. In the case of the Fiscal Officer using the car for an out-of-town conference, she is a department head and is equal. The Solicitor explained that the Police Chief is enforcing the policy. The Solicitor asked Berger if he understood what the Mayor was asking, and Berger confirmed he did but totally disagreed. The Solicitor advised that this is Council's policy. The Police Chief is the one enforcing the policy and getting the notice of who is using the car. The Fiscal Officer felt it was beneficial to have the Chief in charge in part to coordinate the reservation of the car. The Mayor thought the department heads should be treated equally, and no one should have to go to the Chief to get permission. The Solicitor reiterated that the whole thing is about the Chief being in charge of the policy since the approval goes through the Chief and the Chief is the one who is aware of who has the cars. Galicki saw the issue as being a struggle over someone having control or no one having control, which is the way it currently is. His point, however, was that he did not think there was any reason to have a domicile-to-duty policy at all. The Village is close enough that if a government car is needed, the individual can drive in, leave their car, and pick up the government car without significant inconvenience. He agreed with Berger in that the proposed revisions only serve to allow people to willy nilly use a government vehicle. Cavanagh and the Fiscal Officer noted that having the car the night before a trip saves time and often saves the Village another night's hotel charge. There was further discussion of coordination of the Village vehicles and someone being in charge to know where the cars are. The Solicitor asked if Item 3 could be changed to not include the words "to be on 24-hour call". Berger agreed. The Solicitor further advised to end it after the words "Police Chief."

The Streets Committee, Street Commissioner, Mayor, and Solicitor left the meeting.

The Fiscal Officer shared that regarding health insurance, Medical Mutual was offering a .01 decrease. Anthem is a little cheaper, but the deductibles are higher and on a calendar year which would mean paying the deductible twice. Bell suggested that the Village should stay with Medical Mutual, addressing the difficulty in changing health plans for the employees. The Fiscal Officer requested a motion for health insurance at the next Council meeting.

Regarding the budget, the Fiscal Officer is preparing a comparison for Council of the different possible percentage increases for employee pay. She also provided the committee with a salary comparison for all Village positions in comparison with surrounding communities. She suggested the committee could discuss this further in preparation for a recommendation for the budget.

The committee discussed the Cintas first aid box expenses. The Village had been getting away from using the service, but the Street Commissioner wanted to keep it. Cintas would not agree to come quarterly and advised at the very least, it would come every other month and there would be a service charge regardless of whether anything was provided. Many times, they come and no one is available at the Service or Police Departments to let them in or say what is needed. The Fiscal Officer asked for a schedule from Cintas, but they did not get back to her. The Chief added that Cintas mandates that certain items be maintained in the cabinet, but the items seem to have abbreviated expiration dates. There are other companies that provide the service, and he suggested having it requested. The Fiscal Officer explained that this is in the Street Commissioner's job description, and it should be communicated to him that they want him to get quotes for this service. The committee agreed.

The meeting was adjourned.