

REPORT OF THE FACT-FINDER 2003 AUG 11 A 9 09

IN THE MATTER OF
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIREFIGHTERS,
LOCAL 300, AFL-CIO

AND

CITY OF CHILLICOTHE

SERB 03-MED-02-0145

FACT-FINDER

JOSEPH P. SANTA-EMMA

DATE OF HEARING

JUNE 25, 2003

DATE OF REPORT

August 5, 2003

I. APPEARANCES

A. On behalf of the Union

**Stephen J. Steele, President,
Union Committee**

B. On behalf of the Employer

**Kenneth L. Edsall
Clemens, Nelson & Associates, Inc.**

**Wayne McLaughlin
Human Resources Director**

**William Morrison
City Auditor**

II. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The parties, Local 300 IAFF, hereinafter known as the Union, and the City of Chillicothe, hereinafter known as the Employer, are signatories to a Collective Bargaining Agreement running from October 1, 1999, to March 31, 2003.

The unit is described in the expired contract as all bargaining unit employees (referred to as “all employees”) and includes fire inspectors and all fire fighters, lieutenants and captains, but excludes chief and assistant chiefs. There are approximately forty-five (45) members in the unit.

The unit provides general fire duties for the City of Chillicothe, a city of approximately 22,000 people located south of Columbus, Ohio. It is a city of minor industrial workers and a variety of other workers including farmers.

This negotiation, the second in the history of the relationship, began after the first of the year 2003. It was preceded by two other union agreements, FOP and AFSCME, plus a catch-all wage increase provided by the Employer unilaterally.

AFSCME negotiated a 3.5% - 3% - 3% agreement while the FOP received a 2% - 3% - 3% agreement for its members. Both agreed to an employee insurance contribution beginning in the second year.

These terms are significantly important in a "small" community where everybody knows everybody's business and jealousy is quick to arise. Thus, entering into the IAFF negotiations it had been preceded by two other negotiations and a definite pattern had been established.

This would be an important factor to be considered under the provisions of the Ohio Revised Code.

A. The Union's Position

The IAFF has submitted in its post conciliations brief numerous documents, one of which purports to be the costs of its economic proposal. (Appendix I)

This document reveals the following:

- 1. A 3% raise each year would cost approximately \$340,000 without any "crawl" considerations. This is a moderate increase especially in light of the other unit increases.**
- 2. A pension pick-up from 6.5% to 7% in the 3rd year of the contract.**
- 3. The seniority improvement is added to the current yearly figures from the first payment of \$250.00 to \$500.00 to the final 15 or more years to \$750.00. In addition, steps are added at the beginning and conscripted at the end. The raise is significant to the Union's position and greatly desired by the membership, especially the older employees, and would cost \$66,000.**
- 4. The dispatcher pay increase at \$30.80 would cost \$104,000.00 after three years.**
- 5. The proposal for hazardous duty pay would cost almost \$250,000.00 after three years.**

6. The EMT pay based on years of service would cost \$62,700.00 after three years.

A recent financial analysis completed through IAFF Headquarters in Washington D.C. provides relevant information about the fiscal health and viability of the City.

The significance of these figures is that while the across-the-board increase requests are a moderate 3% - 3% - 3% at a cost of \$340,000.00; the add-ons inflate that figure to \$852,000.00.

(Appendix I)

It is not to deny that the Union arguments are not legitimate and persuasive but it is a directive that according to both Union and City officials, money should be spent wisely. During the conciliation meeting a City representative remarked, "We are not out of money, but we only have a limited amount to spend."

The Union in its post conciliation brief presents the following: The City maintains a significant and Unreserved Fund Balance that is more than sufficient to fund the pay package the Union has presented.

The report shows that Chillicothe's Asset to Liability ratio was 2.84, which means the city had General fund assets of \$2.84 for each \$1.00 in Fund Liabilities, which is a positive ratio.

The report also shows that the Level of Fund Balance was 29.51%. This is an interesting figure when according to Moody Investor Service, “The level of fund balance is related to the likelihood of drawing on these accumulations. Generally, a fund balance of 5% of the budget is deemed prudent. A smaller balance may be justified by a long-term trend of annual budget surplus, while a larger balance may be warranted, particularly if budget revenue and expenses are economically sensitive or otherwise not easily forecasted.”

Chillicothe’s fund balance is almost six (6) times the level deemed prudent by this accepted standard.

This coupled with the prevailing up-turn in the economy is more than enough justification for the pay package and an indication as to the City’s true fiscal health.

B. The City’s Position

The City’s position is presented in a report to the Fact-finder dated June 23, 2003, entitled “Financial Conditions of the City of Chillicothe.” In its analysis of the report, the City Auditor states the following:

“Analysis: The City has multiple financial problems. The loss of revenue in interest earned is serious. Interest in 2000 was \$922,492;

2001 was \$719,317; 2002 was \$322,220 and projections for 2003 are \$144,000. This is a decrease of \$778,492 in three years. Estate taxes are being eroded by the change in state law and Municipal Court fees are down due to fewer summons being issued. The addition of E.M.S. fees is expected to eventually add approximately \$500,000 to \$600,000 to the general fund. Mandatory income tax filing was put in place as of 1/01/03 and will result in some additional revenue. There appears to be some benefits already at the peak level of tax while collections are about even in spite of the losses at MeadWestvaco.”

After viewing these positions, each side has validity in its position. From a layman’s analysis, it appears that the City has limited resources in that it has money and the major question is where and how it wants to spend it.

An important aspect of this case is the wage demand of the Union. The Union is seeking an across-the-board increase of 3% - 3% - 3%. In addition there are other demands which shall be discussed later.

The Union places great emphasis on their demand as shown in their brief which states: “It is the intent of the Union to provide a proposal within the fiscal means of the City, as well as a proposal

whereas the Union members maintain a compensation package that is competitive with comparable municipalities throughout the State of Ohio.”

In presenting its comparables, the Union cites cities from Ohio which have a population of twenty-five to thirty thousand people, incidentally none of these cities are in the SERB region to which Chillicothe belongs. It shows an average top pay of \$45,942.79 and Chillicothe at \$40,942.72.

In another comparison, the Union uses the same regions in SERB Region 4 in which the average top pay is \$41,200.23. In another ranking the Union presents the following cities with population ranging from about ten to thirty thousand (10,000 – 30,000), listing them from the highest down.

1.	Westerville	\$51,688.00
2.	Whitehall	\$50,021.00
3.	Worthington	\$48,652.00
4.	Upper Arlington	\$46,001.00
5.	Columbus	\$47,840.00
6.	Delaware	\$45,565.00
7.	Galion	\$45,655.00
8.	Marion	\$42,631.00
9.	Newark	\$41,932.00

10.	Mansfield	\$41,361.00
11.	Chillicothe	\$40,942.00
12.	Lancaster	\$38,932.00
13.	Portsmouth	\$35,855.00
14.	Washington C.H.	\$35,690.00
15.	Shelby	\$34,714.00
16.	London	\$34,532.00
17.	Bucyrus	\$32,292.00

The average for the above is \$41,200.00. Thus Chillicothe at \$40,942.72 ranks 11th out of the 17 cities.

A 3% raise in the first year would produce \$1,228.28 added to \$40,942.72 equals \$42,171.00. This figure would move Chillicothe to 9th place on the list. This would place Chillicothe roughly in the middle. A 1.5% raise as proposed by the Employer would produce $1.5\% \times \$40,942.72 = \611.14 . $\$40,942.72 + \$611.14 = \$41,556.86$ and would move them to 10th in the rankings.

The trouble with this list is that it is highly influenced by Columbus and the large cities which pay substantially more. None are comparable to Chillicothe except by population.

There are many problems with these comparisons. First and foremost they ignore the complete economic position enjoyed by the

employee which does not show up in the comparison. Second, they completely ignore the effects of employee choice in programs offered by the Employer. Third, they ignore the effects of what is commonly known as ‘cherry picking’ which is the method of allowing the group, either employer or employee, to pick cities which support their position. Last is the effect geography played in the selection.

Another comparison is offered by the Fact-finder. The figures in this comparison of cities or political divisions of cities within the region ranging from 10,000 to 30,000 in population are supported by SERB Benchmark Report dated July 16, 2003.

	Population	Top Wages
1. Bucyrus	13,224	\$32,292
2. Delaware	25,243	\$45,565
3. Franklin Township	11,197	\$46,535
4. Galion	11,341	\$31,749
5. Madison Township	14,680	\$28,230
6. Portsmouth	20,909	\$35,855
7. Prairie Township	17,058	\$43,086
8. Violet Township	16,893	\$46,503
9. Washington C.H.	13,524	\$37,123
10. Whitehall	19,201	\$50,021
11. Worthington	14,123	\$48,652
12. Upper Arlington	33,686	\$46,001

Again, as discussed earlier, these comparisons are highly influenced by Columbus.

The argument can be raised about including Upper Arlington, Worthington, Whitehall, and Westerville, which are all rich subdivisions of Columbus. In any regard, the average of the above is \$39,920.00. Chillicothe is already above the average with the figure of \$40,942.00. A raise of 1.5% as suggested by the Employer would raise Chillicothe to \$441,556.00 ($\$40,942 \times 1.5\% = \614) ($\$40,942 + \$614.13 = \$41,556$); or a raise of the suggested 3% would raise Chillicothe to \$42,170.00 ($\$40,942 \times 3\% = \1228) ($\$40,942 + \$1228 = \$42,170$). Both figures place the Union far above the average and place them about in the middle of all the entities cited in Appendix II.

Appendix II, a SERB Benchmark Report dated July 16, 2003, shows all of the percentage raises basically for the last three years with most being in the range of four to five percent and some lower. The cities reporting first year contracts in 2002 or 2003 are typically 4% raises.

SERB quarterly for the first quarter of 2003 shows the following increases for firefighters statewide.

1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
3.75	3.61	3.70	3.41	3.55	3.42	3.54	3.81	3.88	3.87

Appendix III shows the inflation rate for the last ten (10) years with year 10 being 1.67% or the last three years being 1.60%. When you mix all the prior information together and consider all the quasi wage items such as extra remuneration, clothing allowance, emergency squad, shift differential, and dispatchers pay, pension pick-up, longevity pay and hazardous duty pay and a generous fringe benefit package, the Employer's offer of 1.5% - 2% - 2% could be argued to be a fair package especially in light of the City's financial picture.

On the other hand, the dangerous aspect of the firefighter's daily job performance coupled with increasing additional responsibilities such as chemical problems and terrorist complications, the City could hardly afford to pay for the everyday professional way in which the firefighter carries out his responsibilities.

Not to be ignored in the Union's arguments are items concerning the wages for all other employees, showing the recent pay raises given to the AFSCME Unit and the FOP Unit. These items are stated in terms which any person can understand. It far out-shadows the volumes of statistics, records, and data presented by both sides.

Nevertheless, the differences between the parties must be resolved.

III. RECOMMENDATION

A. Salary

- 1. Effective April 1, 2003, a 1.5% per annum increase to the current salary range, i.e., firefighter, lieutenant, assistant captain and captain.**

Effective October 1, 2003, a 1.5% per annum increase to the current salary range, i.e., firefighter, lieutenant, assistant captain and captain.

- 2. Effective April 1, 2004, a 1.5% per annum increase to the current salary range, i.e., firefighter, lieutenant, assistant captain and captain.**

Effective October 1, 2004, a 1.5% per annum increase to the current salary range, i.e., firefighter, lieutenant, assistant captain and captain.

- 3. Effective April 1, 2005, a 1.5% per annum increase to the current salary range, i.e., firefighter, lieutenant, assistant captain and captain.**

Effective October 1, 2005, a 1.5% per annum increase to the current salary range, i.e., firefighter, lieutenant, assistant captain and captain.

B. Other Economic Issues, Article 8, Section 4

1. Longevity. The current longevity plan is presented as follows:

5 – but less than 10 years	\$250.00
10 – but less than 15 years	\$500.00
15 – but less than 20 years	\$750.00
20 – but less than 25 years	\$1,000.00
25 or more years of service	\$1,250.00

In the area of longevity, an overview of comparables from SERB Benchmark Report of July 2, 2003, shows that of 14 cities or townships reported, all pay some form of longevity ranging from \$12.50 for the first years to a high of \$1,400 per year at the top. This makes it difficult to make a comparison, but in reviewing those cities or townships with a money payoff, Chillicothe appears to be behind. Therefore, a small increase is in order.

RECOMMENDATION

All eligible fire department employees shall be entitled to longevity benefits according to the following schedule for total service in the City of Chillicothe.

5 but less than 10 years of service	\$350.00
10 but less than 15 years of service	\$650.00
15 but less than 20 years of service	\$850.00

20 but less than 25 years of service	\$1,150.00
25 or more years of service	\$1,350.00

C. Article 8, Section 3 (B), EMT Pay

The SERB Benchmark cited previously gives the following cities with EMT pay.

1. Bucyrus	Yes	\$30.00
2. Delaware	No	
3. Franklin Township	No	
4. Galion	No	
5. Madison Township	Yes	\$0.17 per hour
6. Marion Township	No	
7. Orange Township	No	
8. Portsmouth	No	
9. Mt. Vernon	No	
10. Marysville	No	
11. Violet Township	No	
12. Washington C.H.	No	
13. Whitehall	No	
14. Worthington	No	
15. Prairie Township	No	
16. Upper Arlington	Yes	\$1.00

Thus it is obvious that special pay for EMT's is very rare. In the current contract, a firefighter with an EMT certification earns more than \$200 per year. The proposal doubles the first year to \$500 and

increases based on years of service to \$750.00. The current figure is much more generous and the proposed raise with no documentation is without merit.

RECOMMENDATION

No change in current language.

D. Article 8, Section 5, Emergency Squad Shift Differential and Dispatcher Pay

The current language pays the emergency squad \$10.00 per 24 hour duty. A dispatcher is paid \$5.00 per shift.

The proposal raises the emergency squad to \$20.00 and the dispatcher to \$20.00. Such an increase, doubling the pay for emergency squad duty and quadrupling the dispatcher pay without supporting evidence lacks merit.

RECOMMENDATION

No change in current language.

E. Hazardous Duty Pay

The Union proposes a new hazardous duty pay of \$1,800 per year for all uniformed fire department employees.

In the last contract, in order to affect a pay increase, the existing \$4,800 hazardous duty pay was rolled into the hourly rate.

There are no comparables presented in terms. The rationale for the new payment is limited to the agreement to roll the existing money into the wage scale. The argument that the chief and two assistants received an increase is without merit. The Union does not represent those individuals and the City is free to unilaterally determine their pay schedule.

The Union is bound by what it agreed to in the last contract. The Employer's position is that the IAFF's hazard pay is included in their base wages rather than being shown as a supplemental pay.

The Union agreed to roll the then current pay rate into the existing rate and cannot now come back and say we want another Hazardous Duty pay. The Union, in making the agreement must now live with it.

The Employer's argument has merit and therefore the Union's position is denied.

RECOMMENDATION

No Change.

F. Article 8, Section 8

The pension pick-up was 4.5% in October 1, 1999, and has risen each April to its current level of 6.5%. The Union now seeks to raise the figure to 7% which is that figure noted in Section 8 of Article 8.

A review of the SERB Benchmark Report cited above shows a majority of the cities or townships pay some amount of the pension pick-up ranging from 1% to 10%. It appears from the history of the benefit has steadily risen over the years. With that history in mind and the placing of the increase in the third year, the demand has small economic consideration and will impact the financial situation of the City in a minor sense.

The City has limited resources and this proposal has limited impact, therefore I find merit in the Union's position.

RECOMMENDATION

Change Article 8, Section 8, Police and Fire Pension Pick-up to 7% on April 1, 2005.

G. Article 3, Succession Clause

The Union's rationale for this proposal is that it would require the City to negotiate with the Union if it, the City, sought to change the current contract. The Union is afraid that the City may decide to

incorporate the Fire Department in to a larger city or county Fire District.

The City has argued that the Union is protected in such an eventually by the current contract and state law; however, the Union has opinions to the contrary.

Under ORC 4117 08 (A), the Employer must bargain with the Union over a variety of subjects including “the change of an existing condition of a Collective Bargaining Agreement.” Under that protection, the Union proposal and its arguments are speculative at best and do not warrant a change in the agreement.

RECOMMENDATION

No change.

H. Article 14, Injury Leave/Infectious Disease

The Union proposal HAZMAT Exposure/Personal leave falls into two (2) areas.

- 1. Replacing the BWC with an entity known as the Adena Regional Occupational Health Services.**

In the Union’s rationale contained in its post hearing brief, there is no information about the Adena Group. It is unfair to the firefighter to ask him to replace the BWC with its record with an unknown group.

Just because the Union is displeased with some decisions is no reason to suggest such drastic action as it proposes.

- 2. The second proposal entails a new section in the contract, Section 6. The replacement of the current state agency with its long record of employee protection by an unknown entity is without merit.**

Section 6

In the event an employee has been injured or exposed to a toxic substance or to an infectious disease in the course or scope of his/her employment with the City of Chillicothe, and is sent to the hospital for testing, treatment and/or preventative measures, and Worker's Compensation subsequently determines that there was no injury sustained, shall have all bills pertaining to the employee's testing, treatment and/or preventative measures be the responsibility of the City of Chillicothe.

The Union argues that if a member is injured in the scope of his/her employment with the City that the City assumes responsibility for that member's care. The economic impact to the City we would hope would be zero, we do not want any member injured or exposed,

but we also believe that the City has a responsibility and obligation to its employees.

Of course, the problem lies in the term “injured.” The whole Section 4, Injury, deals with injury leave and how to resolve problems arising and on injuries sustained by employees.

While I am sympathetic to the concepts of the proposed section 6, a Fact-finder’s hearing with such limited information is not the forum in which to resolve such issues.

It seems more proper for the City and the Union to establish a joint committee to investigate the problems illustrated by the Union and to move on such problems if proper cause is found.

RECOMMENDATION

No change.

I. Article 14, Sick Leave

The Employer proposes a change in Article 14, Sick Leave and Personal Leave, and rejects the Union’s Section 6. The changes contained above apply to the Employer’s proposal and the Fact-finder’s suggestion of a new committee.

As everyone knows, HealthCare costs are spiraling out of sight. It is unrealistic for there to be no employee contribution and for the Employer to pay 100% of the insurance premium for health care.

A review of the comparable cities shows a majority of the political entities employees pay some contribution. A review of Chillicothe financial situation shows that it is mandatory the employees contribute to the insurance premium. The Employer's demand is not big or costly to the employee and does not take effect until the second year.

Payment of Employee Contribution

	Yes	No
1. Bucyrus	X	
2. Delaware	X	
3. Franklin Township		X
4. Galion		X
5. Madison Township		
6. Marion Township	X	
7. Orange Township		X
8. Portsmouth		X
9. Mt. Vernon	X	
10. Marysville	X	
11. Violet Township	Not Reported	
12. Washington C.H.	X	

- 13. Whitehall X
- 14. Worthington X
- 15. Prairie Township X
- 16. Upper Arlington Not Reported

The Employer Position

The Employer proposes the following changes in insurance.

- 1. Institute an employee contribution beginning in the second year.

Per Month	Single	Dual	Family
January 1, 2004	\$20.00	\$25.00	\$30.00
January 1, 2005	\$25.00	\$30.00	\$35.00

Prescription Drugs

	Generic	Brand
January 1, 2004	\$5.00	\$30.00
January 1, 2005	\$5.00	\$30.00

The IAFF Insurance Proposal

Article 15, Insurance

Section 1. The City shall provide hospitalization and major medical coverage comparable to current plans.

The rate for such coverage will be deducted in two (2) equal deductions per month and will be as follows:

BEGINNING	SINGLE	DUAL	FAMILY
January 1, 2004	\$20.00 per month	\$25.00 per month	\$30.00 per month
January 1, 2005	\$25.00 per month	\$30.00 per month	\$35.00 per month

Section 2. The City shall provide available coverage to meet or exceed the present level of EMT Liability insurance of \$1,000,000.00.

Section 3. Due to the unavailability of the supplemental insurance package originally agreed upon, which is secondary to the city of Chillicothe coverage, effective July 1, 2000 and through the duration of the current contract, the city of Chillicothe shall contribute up to \$47.50 per month to the Ohio AFSCME Care Plan for each employee who is covered by the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the City of Chillicothe and The International Association of Firefighters, Local 300 for the AFSCME Care Plan Vision, Life Insurance, Dental Level 1, Prescription Reimbursement, and Hearing Benefits. The following participation requirements have been met:

- 1. There is currently a collective bargaining agreement between the City of Chillicothe and AFSCME (Local #1562). There is a current collective bargaining agreement between the City of Chillicothe and IAFF #300. The City of Chillicothe is obligated to make contributions on behalf of an AFSCME bargaining unit.**
- 2. IAFF is the sole and exclusive representative of all the employees in the non-AFSCME bargaining unit.**
- 3. All employees in the bargaining unit are covered.**
- 4. The City of Chillicothe shall contribute up to \$47.50 per month for each employee who is covered by the agreement.**
- 5. There is specific language in the agreement requiring the City of Chillicothe to pay the premium contribution rate.**

Section 5. Effective January 1, 2003, the parties agree to implement the Employer's prescription drug cost savings measures.

The other two employee units who have recently settled have agreed to employee contributions. The other two units as well as their

non-union employees will now be making contributions to the insurance premium.

Therefore, I will make the following recommendation:

RECOMMENDATION:

Institute the Employer's Health Care proposal.

I. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, Article 20

The Union seeks to add a new section.

Section 9

No member shall be ordered to perform capital improvements to public or privately owned property. However, members may volunteer to perform such activities during normal Fire Department 40-hour workweek scheduled hours.

In the past few years there have been instances where bargaining units have been ordered to perform work outside their normal duties. The firefighters have always been willing to maintain and even construct some capital improvements. The City has crossed over the unit in the recent past even to the point of infringing on other bargaining unit's normal duties. This proposal is an effort to stop those excesses.

The City is seeking to retain Article 20 in its entirety and rejects the proposed Section 9.

Article 20 is the language found in many management rights clauses and maintains the Employer's right. As such the City with its rights under Article 6, augmented by Article 20 is within its right without Section 9. In addition, Section 9, if agreed to, would be an arbitrator's delight.

RECOMMENDATION

No change.

J. Article 26, Minimum Firefighter Safety/Staffing

The Union in its proposal seems to go beyond the language in the current Article 26 which provides for a committee approach with the Safety Director making the final decision. The Union in its proposals of new Sections A, B, Section 1 & 2, seeks by contractual agreement to establish staffing requirements which must be adhered to by the City.

The City maintains this is a management right guaranteed under ORC 4117.08 and is a permissive subject of bargaining.

The Fact-finder agrees with the City that the subject of staffing is a right reserved to management and therefore Article 26 in its

committee approach is allowable but the new language as proposed by the Union is not.

RECOMMENDATION

No change.

This completes the Fact-finder's Report.

NOTE: The Fact-finder wishes to complement both parties on the submissions found in their briefs and the completeness of their arguments in support of their positions. They are professionals and it shows in their work.


Joseph P. Santa-Emma

Date of Report August 5, 2003

CETIFICATE OF SERVICE

**The undersigned certifies that a true copy of the Fact-finder's Report
was sent by first class U. S. Postal Services on August 5, 2003 to:**

**SERB
Bureau of Mediation
65 E. State St.
Columbus, OH 43215**

**Stephen Steele
IAFF Local 300
54 E. Water St.
Chillicothe, OH 45601**

**Kenneth L. Edsall
5100 Park Center Ave., Suite 120
Dublin, OH 43010**

Appendix I

Proposed Economic Issues

Item #1	3% Raise Each Year			
Current Rate/Salary Average	\$13.80	\$40,185.60	Cost Increase	
1st year	\$14.21	\$41,391.17	\$ 55,456.13	
2nd year	\$14.65	\$42,632.90	\$112,575.94	
3rd year	\$15.08	\$43,911.89	<u>\$171,409.35</u>	\$339,441.41
Item #2	Pension Pick-Up, ½% Increase Third Year			
Current Rate/Pension Pick-Up	\$13.80	\$ 2,612.06	Cost Increase	
1st year @ 6.5%	\$14.21	\$ 3,570.00	\$ 3,604.65	
2nd year @ 6.5%	\$14.65	\$ 2,771.14	\$ 7,317.44	
3rd year @ 7.0%	\$15.08	\$ 3,073.83	<u>\$21,241.34</u>	\$ 32,153.43
Item #3	Double Seniority Pay	Longevity		
Current		\$22,000.00	Cost Increase	
1st year		\$44,000.00	\$22,000.00	
2nd year		\$44,000.00	\$22,000.00	
3rd year		\$44,000.00	<u>\$22,000.00</u>	\$ 66,000.00
Item #4	Squad/Dispatcher Pay @ \$20.00			
Current Cost Per Day	\$ 85.00	\$31,025.00	Cost Increase	
1st year	\$180.00	\$65,750.00	\$34,675.00	
2nd year	\$180.00	\$65,750.00	\$34,675.00	
3rd year	\$180.00	\$65,750.00	<u>\$34,675.00</u>	\$104,025.00
Item #5	Hazardous Duty Pay @ \$1,800.00			
Current		\$ 0.00	Cost Increase	
1st year	\$1,800 x 46	\$ 82,800.00	\$82,800.00	
2nd year	\$1,800 x 46	\$ 82,800.00	\$82,800.00	
3rd year	\$1,800 x 46	\$ 82,800.00	<u>\$82,800.00</u>	\$248,400.00
Item #6	EMT Pay Based on Years of Service			
Current	\$200.00 x 46	\$ 9,200.60	Cost Increase	
1st year		\$30,100.00	\$20,900.00	
2nd year		\$30,100.00	\$20,900.00	
3rd year		\$30,100.00	<u>\$20,900.00</u>	\$ 62,700.00
			Total Proposal	\$852,729.84

State Employment Relations Board Clearinghouse Benchmark Report

July 16, 2003

Employer	Population	County	Union	Local	BU	Size	Start Date	End Date	Effective Date	Entry Level	Top Level	Hours/Week	Hours/Day	# of Steps	Step Years
MADISON TOWNSHIP	12,355	FRAN	IAFF	2507	FF	35	05/01/01	04/30/04	01/01/03	\$58,183.00	\$58,183.00	56.00		1	
Count of Employers: 3										Average:					
										\$46,748.88	\$47,076.84				
FIREFIGHTER															
BLOOM TOWNSHIP	5,765	FAIR	IAFF	3465	FF	15	05/01/02	12/31/04	05/01/02	\$27,176.00	\$38,999.00	56.00		4	3
BUCYRUS CITY	13,224	CRAW	IAFF	1120	FF	15	01/01/03	12/31/05	01/01/03	\$26,307.58	\$32,292.52	53.00	24.00	4	2
CHILLICOTHE CITY	21,976	ROSS	IAFF	300	FF	45	10/01/99	03/31/03	04/01/02	\$31,915.52	\$40,942.72	53.00	24.00	6	
COLUMBUS CITY	711,470	FRAN	IAFF	67	FF	1,534	06/01/01	05/31/04	06/01/03	\$33,155.20	\$50,752.00	48.00	24.00	5	
DELAWARE CITY	25,243	DELA	IAFF	606	FF	35	04/01/00	03/31/03	01/01/02	\$36,382.60	\$45,565.99	50.00	24.00	5	3
FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP	11,197	FRAN	IAFF	1441	FF	36	03/01/03	02/28/06	03/01/03	\$30,985.00	\$46,535.00	56.00		5	
GALLON CITY	11,341	CRAW	IAFF	435	FF	21	01/01/02	12/31/04	01/01/03	\$27,367.08	\$31,749.12	53.00	24.00	3	2
HAMILTON TOWNSHIP	4,467	FRAN	IAFF	3344	FF	18	07/01/02	06/30/04	07/01/02	\$29,331.00	\$42,625.00	56.00		4	3
LANCASTER CITY	35,335	FAIR	IAFF	291	FF	80	01/01/02	12/31/04	01/01/03	\$30,189.90	\$38,992.40	50.00	24.00	5	
LIBERTY TOWNSHIP	9,182	DELA	IAFF	3754	FF	24	06/17/02	12/31/03	01/01/03	\$30,942.00	\$45,413.00	56.00		4	4
LONDON CITY	8,771	MADI	IAFF	3509	FF	8	08/01/00	07/31/03	08/01/02	\$27,973.40	\$34,532.68	53.00	24.00	5	
MADISON TOWNSHIP	14,680	RICH	IAFF	3417	FF	5	01/01/03	12/31/05	04/01/03	\$22,339.00	\$28,230.00	48.00		4	3
MANSFIELD CITY	51,000	RICH	IAFF	266	FF	102	12/01/99	12/01/02	12/01/01	\$30,991.00	\$41,361.00	48.00	24.00	5	
MARION CITY	53,318	MARI	IAFF	379	FF	64	04/01/00	03/31/03	04/01/02	\$31,724.16	\$42,631.68	48.00	24.00	9	20
NEWARK CITY	46,279	LICK	IAFF	109	FF	72	01/01/01	12/31/03	01/01/03	\$26,884.06	\$41,932.00	56.00		3	
PLEASANT TOWNSHIP	6,704	FRAN	IAFF	2937	FF	10	07/01/99	07/01/02	07/01/01	\$27,629.00	\$41,822.00	53.00		4	3
PORTSMOUTH CITY	20,909	SCIO	IAFF	512	FF	37	01/01/03	12/31/05	01/01/03	\$28,662.40	\$35,855.56	53.00	24.00	3	
PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP	17,058	FRAN	IAFF	2985	FF	24	07/01/00	06/30/03	07/01/02	\$27,330.00	\$43,086.00	56.00		4	3
SCIOTO TOWNSHIP	9,165	PICK	IAFF	4000	FF		01/01/01	12/31/03	01/01/03	\$29,780.00	\$29,780.00	56.00		1	
SHELBY CITY	9,821	RICH	IAFF	2492	FF	12	01/01/01	12/31/03	01/01/03	\$28,899.78	\$34,714.42	53.00	24.00	5	5
UPPER ARLINGTON CITY	33,686	FRAN	IAFF	1521	FF	61	01/01/02	12/31/04	01/01/03	\$29,170.44	\$46,001.28	53.00	24.00	4	
VIOLET TOWNSHIP	16,893	FAIR	IAFF	3558	FF	29	01/01/01	12/31/03	01/01/03	\$31,311.00	\$46,503.00	53.00		6	
WASHINGTON C H CITY	13,524	FAVE	IAFF	2474	FF	13	01/01/01	06/30/04	07/01/03	\$31,776.68	\$37,123.32	53.00	24.00	6	3.5