

IN THE MATTER  
OF  
FACTFINDING  
BETWEEN  
THE CITY OF GREENVILLE, OHIO  
AND  
GREENVILLE PATROL OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Hearings: November 17, 2010  
SERB Case No.: 2010-MED-03-0401  
Date of Report: December 3, 2010  
Issue: Factfinding

Union Representative:

Jessup Gage  
Hardin, Lazarus, Lewis  
915 Cincinnati Club Building  
30 Garfield Place  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-4322  
FAX: 513.721-7008  
[jessupgage@hllmlaw.com](mailto:jessupgage@hllmlaw.com)

City Representative:

Kelly E. Babcock  
Account Manager  
Clemans Nelson & Associates, Inc.  
420 W. Loveland Avenue, Suite 101  
Loveland, Ohio 45140-2322  
FAX: 513.583.9827  
[kbabcock@clemansnelson.com](mailto:kbabcock@clemansnelson.com)

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Michael Paolucci  
Factfinder

### Administration

By notice dated September 23, 2010, from both Parties, the undersigned was informed of his designation to serve as Factfinder for the Parties. On November 17, 2010, a hearing took place after mediation was inquired into. Following mediation, the Parties submitted the issues to the undersigned and the record was closed. As a result of the mediation and hearing, the issues are now ready for a factfinding report.

### Factual Background

The City is located in Darke County, and is surrounded by a mostly rural environment. Its approximately twenty two (22) patrol officers and sergeants are represented by the Union.

Section 4117-9-05 of SERB's administrative rules addresses the issues that a factfinder must consider when making recommendations. That section, in pertinent part, reads as follows:

(K) The fact-finding panel, in making recommendations, shall take into consideration the following factors pursuant to division (C)(4)(e) of section 4117.14 of the Revised Code:

- (1) Past collectively bargained agreements, if any, between the parties;
- (2) Comparison of the unresolved issues relative to the employees in the bargaining unit with those issues related to other public and private employees doing comparable work, giving consideration to factors peculiar to the area and classification involved;
- (3) The interest and welfare of the public, the ability of the public employer to finance and administer the issues proposed, and the effect of the adjustments on the normal standard of public service;
- (4) The lawful authority of the public employer;
- (5) Any stipulations of the parties;
- (6) Such other factors, not confined to those listed above, which are normally or traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of issues submitted to

mutually agreed-upon dispute settlement procedures in the public service or in private employment. (emphasis added)

The issues will be addressed giving consideration to all of the required factors.

The Parties originally prepared five (5) issues for factfinding. Those issues were:

1. Hours of Work – Article 10.
2. Wages – Article 12.
3. Plus Rating – Article 15.
4. Health Insurance – Article 19.
5. Termination (Duration) – Article 42.

Through mediation, the Parties were able to enter into tentative agreements on Issues 1, 3, and 5. Those tentative agreements are incorporated here, by reference, and are made part of these recommendations. In addition, all other tentative agreements not discussed in factfinding are also made part of these recommendations.

## **ARTICLE 12**

### Wages

#### RECOMMENDATION

After a full review of both Parties positions, and in an attempt to balance the poor economic conditions with the strong comparables, it is recommended that the wage increase be a general wage increase of 1% on January 1, 2011, and 1% on July 1, 2011; with additional 1% increases in January 1, 2012 and July 1, 2012. For the third year of the Agreement, it is recommended that the Parties have a wage re-opener so that the unpredictable economic situation can be more readily addressed at a time closer to when conditions are better known and understood.

As for section 12.5, it is recommended that the current *status quo* language remain.

**ARTICLE 19**  
Health Insurance

RECOMMENDATION

After a full review of both Parties positions, and considering the wage increase that has been recommended, it is recommended that the *status quo* health insurance language remain.

December 3, 2010  
Cincinnati, Ohio



---

Michael Paolucci