

\*Received before business hours on 4/28/16, processed same business day\*

FACT-FINDING REPORT

STATE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD

STATE OF OHIO

April 28, 2016

In the Matter of:

Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority	)	
	)	Case No. 2015-MED-10-1046
and	)	Dispatchers
	)	
Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association	)	

APPEARANCES

For the CMHA:

Craig M. Brown, Attorney  
F. Allen Boseman, Jr, Attorney  
Angel Morales, Deputy Chief  
Ronaye Steele, Deputy Director of Human Resources  
Thomas Burdyshaw, Lieutenant

For the Union:

Jeff Perry, Business Agent  
Tonya Pope, Union Director

Factfinder:

Nels E. Nelson

## BACKGROUND

The instant case involves the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Agency and the Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association. The CMHA provides housing to low income residents in Cuyahoga County. The union represents the eight dispatchers employed by the CMHA.

The parties are negotiating a successor agreement to the one that expired on December 31, 2015. They had three negotiating sessions beginning in December 2015. When the parties were unable to reach agreement, an impasse was declared and the fact-finding process was invoked.

The Factfinder was notified of this appointment on January 25, 2016. A fact-finding hearing was held on April 19, 2016. When the Factfinder concluded that a mediated settlement was not possible, he conducted a hearing and prepared this report with his recommendations for settlement.

The recommendations of the Factfinder are based upon the criteria set forth in Section 4117-9-05(k) of the Ohio Administrative Rules. They are:

- (a) Past collectively bargained agreements, if any, between the parties;
- (b) 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;
- (c) The interest and welfare of the public, and 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;
- (d) The lawful authority of the public employer;
- (e) The stipulations of the parties;
- (f) Such other factors, not confined to those listed in this section, which are normally or traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of issues submitted to

mutually agreed upon dispute procedures in the public service or in private employment.

## ISSUES

The parties submitted eight issues to the Factfinder. For each issue the Factfinder will state the positions of the parties, summarize the arguments and evidence they offered in support of their positions, present a discussion of the issue, and provide his recommendation for the resolution of the issue, including recommended contract language.

1) Article 9 - Discipline, Section 2 - Notice of Charges - The current contract requires the CMHA to notify an employee of charges and the reason for the charges within 45 business days for a violation of Department Policy or for charges relating to a criminal matter and within 90 business days for charges relating to sexual harassment, drug/alcohol abuse, or workplace violence. The CMHA proposes to increase the deadline to 90 business days for charges relating to criminal matters. The union opposes the CMHA's demand.

Employer Position - The CMHA argues that its demand should be recommended. It points out that there is no reason to treat charges relating to a criminal matter differently from charges related to sexual harassment, drug/alcohol abuse, or workplace violence. The CMHA notes that the investigation of a criminal matter is not unlikely to take significant time and that a charge related to criminal conduct should be thoroughly investigated before charges are issued.

Union Position - The union opposes the CMHA's demand. It states that the 45-day limit for criminal matters has been in the contract for many years and has never been a problem. The union indicates that the time needed to investigate charges against dispatchers should be less

than for other employees because all of the dispatchers' actions are recorded and can be easily and quickly reviewed.

Analysis - The Factfinder recommends the CMHA's proposal. First, while he acknowledges that allegations of criminal conduct by dispatchers might ordinarily take less time to investigate than for other employees, in certain cases, a 45-day limit might be problematic. The Factfinder feels that proper investigations are more important than a shorter deadline.

Second, the Factfinder understands the CMHA's desire to have the same time lines in its agreements with all of the law enforcement units. A variety of different deadlines invites confusion.

Third, the CMHA's proposal is not unreasonable. It requires the charges relating to violations of department policy to be made within 45 days. The additional time is appropriate to investigate and to bring charges in cases involving criminal conduct because such cases are likely to be more complex and more time-consuming.

Recommendation - The Factfinder recommends the following contract language:

An employee who is charged with a violation of Departmental Policy shall be notified of such charges and the reason for such charges by written notice.

Charges shall be preferred and presented to the employee within forty-five (45) business days from the date of the incident or the date CMHA becomes aware of the incident.

For charges concerning sexual harassment, drug/alcohol abuse or workplace violence, charges shall be preferred and presented to the employee within ninety (90) business days from the date of the incident or the date CMHA becomes aware of the incident.

For charges concerning criminal matters, when criminal charges are filed against an employee, charges shall be preferred and presented to the employee within ninety (90) business days following disposition of the criminal case.

2) Article 17 - Seniority, Section 5 - Recall Rights - The current contract establishes the length of employees' recall rights based on their length of service. It provides that employees with less than five years of service are subject to recall for 24 months and employees with more than five years of service have recall rights for 36 months.

The parties have adopted different positions. The CMHA proposes that employees with less than 12 months of continuous service have recall rights equal to their length of service and employees with more than 12 months of continuous service have recall rights for 18 months. It also proposes that employees on a leave of absence for 12 consecutive months shall have no recall rights. The union opposes any change in the provision.

Employer Position - The CMHA argues that its demand should be recommended. It points out that in July 2014, AFSCME accepted its proposal and it was subsequently agreed to by the other bargaining units. The CMHA notes that employees should be treated the same with respect to recall rights.

Union Position - The union opposes the CMHA's proposal. It claims that recall has never been a problem with the dispatchers because the "constant challenge" is to find enough of them. The union adds that "internal parity is diminished" by the CMHA's proposal because the police officers never had as good language as the dispatchers so that the proposed change would harm the dispatchers more than the police officers, i.e., the dispatchers are being asked to give up more recall time than the police officers.

Analysis - The Factfinder recommends the CMHA's position. He believes that there is no rationale for the dispatchers to have different recall rights than employees in the other law enforcement units. The 31 protection offices represented by the Teamsters, the 35 sworn officers

represented by the FOP/OLC, and the 18 promoted officers and supervisors represented by the OPBA have already accepted the CMHA's proposal.

Recommendation - The Factfinder recommends the following contract language:

Seniority shall be broken (or terminated) when an employee:

- a) quits or resigns;
- b) is discharged for just cause;
- c) with less than twelve (12) months of continuous service is laid off for a period of time equal to or exceeding his/her service time;
- d) with twelve (12) months or more of continuous service is laid off for a period of eighteen (18) consecutive months
- e) is absent without leave for three (3) or more work days, unless proper excuse for the absence is shown;
- f) is absent without leave for three (3) or more work days, and fails to give notice of the reasons for such absence unless the failure to give notice was beyond the reasonable control of the employee;
- g) fails to report for work when recalled from layoff within ten (10) working days from the date on which CMHA sends the employee notice by certified mail (to the employee's last known address as shown on CMHA's records); or
- h) is on a leave of absence for twelve (12) consecutive months.

### 3) Article 19 - Overtime Pay and Court Time, Section 1 - Calculation of

Overtime - The current contract provides that employees are entitled to overtime for work in excess of eight hours in a day or 40 hours in a week provided the employee is in "full pay status for subject week." The union proposes that to include "all hours for which an employee is compensated except for sick leave" in the calculation of overtime pay. The CMHA opposes the union's demand

Union Position - The union argues that its demand should be recommended. It points out that the others safety forces are entitled to overtime based on all hours paid except for sick leave.

Employer Position - The CMHA opposes the union's demand. It states that the current contract is fair because it pays employees for hours actually worked. The CMHA claims that the union did not "put forth any justification for [its] baseless proposal." (Employer Pre-Hearing Statement, page 24)

Analysis - The Factfinder recommends the union's demand. He can see no reason to treat the dispatchers differently from the other law enforcement employees.

Recommendation - The Factfinder recommends the following contract language:

All employees, for work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week, when approved by or scheduled by the Immediate Supervisor and the employee is in a full pay status for the subject week, shall be compensated at the employee's election, either at: a) the rate of one and one half (1 ½) times the employee's regular hourly rate for all overtime; or b) compensatory time computed at the same rate to be taken in the future as approved. For purposes of the above, work performed shall include all hours for which an employee is compensated, whether or not such hours are actually worked with the sole exception of sick leave (Article 23). Compensatory time must be used in the year it is earned. Once, yearly, an employee shall elect to receive compensatory time or pay under this section.

4) Article 19 - Overtime and Court Time, Section 4 - Court Time - The current contract provides that dispatchers who appear in court are entitled to a minimum of four hours of pay. The CMHA seeks to reduce the minimum to 2½ hours. It also proposes that court time that begins prior to the start of an employee's shift stop when the employee's shift begins and that multiple or consecutive/continuous court time be considered a single event with respect to the court time minimum. The union rejects the CMHA's proposal.

Employer Position - The CMHA argues that its proposal should be recommended. It observes that employees have historically not had to spend four hours in court when appearing

on its behalf. The CMHA complains that the four-hour minimum has resulted in employees being significantly overpaid, i.e., paid for more hours than they worked.

The CMHA contends that its demand is supported by agreements reached with other bargaining units. It reports that the other police units have accepted its proposal.

The CMHA maintains that court time is not an important factor for dispatchers. It states that they are rarely required to appear in court. The CMHA indicates, however, that the sworn officers regularly appear in court so that the union's demand will create a "ripple effect."

Union Position - The union argues that the CMHA's attempt to reduce court time should be rejected. It states that in the City of Cleveland, dispatchers who are required to appear in court receive a minimum of four hours of pay. The union indicates that retaining the four-hour minimum for dispatchers would cost the CMHA very little.

Analysis - The Factfinder recommends the CMHA's demand be adopted. First, the fact that the other police units have accepted the CMHA's demand supports the extension of the CMHA's proposal to the dispatchers. Second, the changes sought by the CMHA will have virtually no impact on the dispatchers. The union acknowledges that dispatchers appear in court only once or twice per year. Third, while the dispatchers in the City of Cleveland may have a four-hour minimum for court time, the comparison to the CMHA's other law enforcement personnel is more relevant.

Recommendation - The Factfinder recommends the following contract language:

Whenever approved by the Immediate Supervisor, employees called in to work or appearing in court on behalf of the CMHA, for a time period of less than two and one-half (2½) hours when the employee is not on duty, shall be compensated not less than two and one-half (2½) hours subject to the election of the method in which compensation is to be received as set forth within Section 1

of this Article. Court time prior to the start of the employee's shift shall be compensated only until the start of the employee's shift. Multiple or consecutive contiguous court time shall be considered a single event for purposes of this Section.

5) Article 31 - Compensation, Section 1 - Wage Schedule - The current contract has a six-step wage schedule (a hiring rate plus five steps) with varying increments between the steps. The minimum rate is \$12.40 per hour and the maximum rate is \$19.24 per hour. The union demands step one and step six be increased by 4% in 2016 and 2017 and 3% in 2018; step two be increased by 2% in 2016, 3% in 2017, and 2% in 2018; and that steps three, four, and five be increased by 3% in 2016 and 2017 and 2% in 2018. The CMHA proposes that all wages be increased by 3% in 2016 and 2017 and by 2% in 2018.

Union Position - The union argues that its demand should be recommended. It acknowledges that its proposal exceeds the pattern settlement offered by the CMHA. The union states, however, that its demand is "fairly close to the pattern," i.e., it follows the pattern for steps three, four, and five; steps one and six are only 1% more than the pattern; and step two is 1% less than the pattern in 2016 and then the increases follow the pattern.

The union contends that its proposal makes sense. It points out that the extra 1% in step one should increase the number and quality of applicants and that step two is decreased to level out the amount of money between the steps and to save the CMHA some money. The union notes that the additional 1% at the top step will "chip away at their inequity in pay." (Union Pre-Hearing Statement, page 11)

The union maintains that the dispatchers have fallen behind other employees. It states that the police officers allowed their entry wage and pay scale to grow too slowly in order to favor

senior officers. The union indicates that this would have resulted in the starting rate for dispatchers exceeding the starting rate for police officers. It observes that for that reason, the Factfinder, who served as the Conciliator in the last round of bargaining, ordered step six of the dispatcher's wage schedule to be frozen for the duration of the contract.

The union reports that the turnover rate for dispatchers is "incredibly high." It complains that there are never enough dispatchers or sufficient dispatchers to train new employees. The union asserts that "most new hires leave as soon as they learn just how difficult job is." (Union Pre-Hearing Statement, page 12)

The union argues that high turnover has resulted in dispatchers working too much overtime. It claims that dispatchers cannot take time off without other dispatchers being required to work overtime. The union observes that police officers have been allowed to do dispatching so dispatchers can take some time off.

The union contends that the dispatchers are paid less than other dispatchers in Cuyahoga County. It states that in 2012 the average wage for a 10-year dispatcher in 16 Cuyahoga County cities was \$48,756 compared to \$40,019 for the CMHA -- only 82% of the average. (Union Exhibit 2, page 2) The union indicates that in 2015 the average wage increased to \$51,063 leaving the CMHA's dispatchers earning only 78% of the average. (Union Exhibit 2, page 3) It reports that the data for total compensation shows dispatchers even further by Cuyahoga County dispatchers.

The union rejects the CMHA's argument that internal parity dictates the adoption of its wage proposal. It points out that many other units have no wage scales and others have fallen into the same trap as the police. The union adds that "it can certainly be said that every

bargaining unit doesn't have the frozen top of a wage scale the dispatchers had during the life of the [previous] contract." (Union Pre-Hearing Statement, page 13)

The union maintains that the economy is improving. It suggests that this is shown in a number of reports about the local and national economy. (Union Exhibit 1)

Employer Position - The CMHA argues that its proposal should be recommended. It states that its "financial condition is troubling and in the next few years it will have to make drastic changes in its operations to maintain and sustain viability." (Employer Pre-Hearing Statement, page 9) The CMHA indicates that reduced funding for public housing will require it to engage in "a drastic cost-cutting campaign." It adds that as of December 31, 2014, it operated at a loss of \$20.6 million. (Employer Exhibit 2)

The CMHA contends that it has limited options. It points out that it cannot raise prices or produce more to increase output to produce more revenue. The CMHA notes that in the face of funding reductions or increases in expenses, it must curtail or eliminate services or reduce its cost.

The CMHA maintains that the finances of its Police Department are complicated. It observes that under the Low Income Housing Program, all employees are assigned to a cost center for allocating revenues and expenses so that administrative and overhead costs are shared by all of the Asset Management Properties. The CMHA reports that the expenses for sworn officers and protection officers are charged to the affected AMPs.

The CMHA argues that parity supports its wage offer. It states that approximately 475 employees and 7 bargaining units have agreed to its wage offer. The CMHA complains that despite the long history of pattern bargaining, the union seeks a "pattern busting settlement."

The CMHA contends that the wage increases of other public employees strongly support its offer. It points out that wage increases for area public employees are as follows:

City of Cleveland (FOP, IUOE, IBPAT, IAM, IUPA, OPBA, IBT, AFSCME, SEIU, ONA, MFLU, IBEW, IAFF)

2013 - 1%  
2014 - 2%  
2015 - 2%

Cleveland State University (CWA)

2014-15 - 2%  
2015-16 - 2.5%  
2016-17 - 2.5%

Cuyahoga Community College (AFSCME)

2014-15 - 1%  
2015-16 - 2%  
2016-17 - 1%

Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority (FOP)

2014 - 3%  
2015 - 2.4%  
2016 - 0-3% (based on revenues)

Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (IUOE, AFSCME)

2015 - 1% (+1% lump sum)  
2016 - 2%  
2017 - 2%

Cuyahoga County (LIUNA, OPBA)

2015 - 2%  
2016 - 2%

(Employer Pre-Hearing Statement, pages 20-21)

The CMHA maintains that the State Employment Relations Board's Annual Wage Settlement Report supports its wage offer. It observes that it shows that in 2015 the wages of Ohio police officers increased by 2.22%; the wages of public employees in the Cleveland Region increased by 1.99%. (Employer Exhibit 6) It adds SERB data for dispatchers in 17 Cuyahoga

County cities show that the average wage increase for dispatchers is 2.41% in 2015; 2.26% in 2016; and 2.30% in 2017. (Employer Exhibit 8)

Analysis - The Factfinder must recommend the CMHA's wage demand. First, its position is strongly supported by internal comparisons. The record shows that the other seven bargaining units have agreed to the CMHA's proposal. Factfinders generally attach significant weight to an employer's wage settlements with other bargaining units.

Second, the wage increases offered by the CMHA are greater than those being granted to other public employees. The State Employment Relation Board's Annual Wage Settlement Report shows that the average wage settlement in 2015 in Ohio was 2.02% and the settlements for each year of a three year agreement were 2.12%, 2.07%, and 2.05%. (Union Exhibit 2, page 1) The union's data for dispatchers in Cuyahoga County cities show an average wage increase in 2015 for the seven cities for which data is available is 2.25%.

Third, while the Factfinder recognizes that the wages of the CMHA's dispatchers are lower than the wages of dispatchers in Cuyahoga County cities, the difference appears to reflect differences in funding sources. Until HUD increases the CMHA's funding, progress in closing the gap between the CMHA's dispatchers and those in Cuyahoga County cities will be slow. In the instant case, however, the CMHA's above average wage offer will reduce the wage gap over the term of the agreement.

Recommendation - The Factfinder recommends the following contract language:

	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>
Hiring Rate	\$12.77	\$13.15	\$13.41
After 1 year	\$15.13	\$15.58	\$15.89
After 2 years	\$15.84	\$16.32	\$16.65
After 3 years	\$16.90	\$17.41	\$17.76
After 4 years	\$17.61	\$18.14	\$18.50
After 5 Years	\$19.82	\$20.41	\$20.82

Hourly rates shall become effective on the employee's anniversary date of hire as a Dispatcher for those employees with 60 months (hiring rate through after 4 years) or less of service.

Dispatchers who are on the step schedule (hiring rate through after 4 years) will hold their hourly rate of pay until their anniversary date of hire as a Dispatcher in the next contract year.

#### Dispatchers Completing the Wage Step Schedule During the Term of this Agreement

During year 2016, upon completion of one (1) year at the last step in the above step schedule, the employee will receive a three percent (3.0%) wage increase on his/her current hourly rate on the employee's anniversary date of hire as a Dispatcher.

During year 2017, upon completion of one (1) year at the last step in the above step schedule, the employee will receive a three percent (3.0%) wage increase on his/her current hourly rate on the employee's anniversary date of hire as a Dispatcher.

During year 2018, upon completion of one (1) year at the last step in the above step schedule, the employee will receive a two percent (2.0%) wage increase on his/her current hourly rate on the employee's anniversary date of hire as a Dispatcher.

#### Dispatchers Who Have Completed the Wage Step Schedule

An employee at the top of the above step schedule for at least one (1) year as of December 31, 2012, will receive a three percent (3.0%) wage increase on his/her their current hourly rate in 2013.

An employee at the top of the above step schedule for at least one (1) year as of December 31, 2013, will receive a three percent (2.0%) wage

increase on his/her current hourly rate in 2014.

An employee at the top of the above step schedule for at least one (1) year as of December 31, 2014, will receive a three percent (2.0%) wage increase on his/her their current hourly rate in 2015.

All wage adjustments for those employees with 61 months (after 5 years) or more of service as a Dispatcher will become effective on the Saturday of the first complete pay period immediately following January 1 of each contract year.

6) Article 31 - Compensation, New Section - On Call - The current contract has no provision relating to dispatchers who are on call. The CMHA, however, has a policy where dispatchers annually select two-week periods during which time they are on call. The procedure results in dispatchers being on call for two weeks followed by two months before they are on call for another two weeks. Under the policy, dispatchers receive two hours per week of compensatory time for being on call.

The union proposes three changes. First, it wishes to limit on-call to one week at a time rather than two consecutive weeks. Second, the union seeks to increase the compensation for being on call from two hours per week to three hours per week, with the stipulation that dispatchers who are required to be on-call for a second week, shall receive an additional three hours of compensatory time for a total of six hours of compensatory time in the second week and a grand total of nine hours of compensatory time for the two-week period. Third, it proposes that the on-call procedure be included in the collective bargaining agreement.

The CMHA opposes the union's demand.

Union Position - The union argues that its demand is justified. It states that the limited number of dispatchers results in a substantial amount of overtime, including mandatory

overtime. The union indicates that this suggests that the payment for being on call should be increased.

The union contends that the on-call policy should be included in the contract. It points out that this would mean that the policy could not be changed at the sole discretion of the CMHA. The union adds that including the procedure in the contract would also facilitate the enforcement of the procedure.

Employer Position - The CMHA argues that the union's demand should be rejected. It states that the union's proposal is nothing more than a "money grab." The CMHA indicates that the attempt to increase the payment for the on-call duty is an attempt to avoid the pattern settlement.

The CMHA contends that being on call for two consecutive weeks is convenient for employees. It points out that this means that after being on call for two weeks, dispatchers are not on call for the next two months. The CMHA notes that if dispatchers were on call for only one week, they would be on call at some point during every month.

Analysis - The Factfinder believes that some increase in the payment for being on-call is appropriate. The union's demand for a 50% increase from two hours per week to three hours per week is excessive. It would be more reasonable to increase it to 2½ hours per week.

The Factfinder recommends that the two weeks of on call be changed to one week. This should prove more convenient to the dispatchers without adversely impacting CMHA

The Factfinder understands the union's argument that the on-call procedure belongs in the collective bargaining agreement. He notes, however, that the OPBA supervisors' unit and the FOP sworn officers' unit have on-call procedures but they are not included in their contracts. A

reasonable resolution to the issue is to recommend that a provision be added to the contract that requires the CMHA to maintain the current policy with respect to on-call duty.

Recommendation - The Factfinder recommends the following contract language:

The CMHA shall continue its on-call policy for the term of the agreement unless the parties mutually agree to change the policy. Employees who are required to be on-call shall receive 2½ hours of compensatory time per week for being on-call and shall be on call for periods of one week.

7) Article 31 - Compensation, New Section - Trainers - The current contract has no provision relating to trainers. The CMHA, however, has a policy where dispatchers assigned to train new employees receive two hours per week of additional compensation. The union seeks to increase the compensation for trainers to five hours per week and to include a section in the contract setting forth the additional compensation.

Union Position - The union argues that the Factfinder should recommend its demand. It states that “many dispatchers get paid extra due to the extra work and responsibility involved in training the dispatchers.” (Union Pre-Hearing Statement, page 14) The union indicates that in the instant case, training is more cumbersome because of the “huge turnover.” It claims that “coupled with the need for filling overtime, there is very little down time to recover from the pressures of dispatching, let alone the additional stress of training.” (Union Pre-Hearing Statement, pages 14-15)

Employer Position - The CMHA rejects the union’s demand. It characterizes the union’s demand as “another attempt to grab money” and to “beat the pattern.” The CMHA adds that the current arrangement works.

Analysis - The Factfinder finds merit in the union's position. First, there is a need to increase the extra compensation for training new employees to be dispatchers. Such training is an important and not undemanding task. While the current stipend of one hour of pay per week appears to be too low, the fivefold increase, sought by the union, is too much. An increase in the stipend to three hours per week would be more reasonable.

Second, the collective bargaining agreement must include some reference to the extra compensation for trainers. As with the extra compensation for being on call, the Factfinder recommends a provision be added to the contract that requires the CMHA to continue its policy for the term of the agreement.

Recommendation - The Factfinder recommends the following contract language:

The CMHA shall continue its policy regarding trainers for the term of the agreement unless the parties mutually agree to change the policy. Employees who serve as trainers shall receive three hours of compensatory time for each week they are required to serve as trainers.

8) Article 38 - Layoffs, Section 3 - Recall - The current contract states that bargaining unit members who are laid off and have less than five years of service have recall rights for 24 months and bargaining unit member with more than five years of service have recall rights for 36 months. The CMHA proposes adding a phrase indicating that recall from layoff shall be in accordance with Article 17, Section 5. The union opposes the CMHA's demand.

Analysis - Since the Factfinder has recommended a change in recall rights in Article 17, Section 5, recommending the CMHA's demand is simply a housekeeping matter.

Recommendation - The Factfinder recommends the following contract language:

A member of the bargaining unit who is laid off shall be subject to recall from lay off in accordance with Article 17, Section 5, of this Agreement. However, the employee will be held responsible for the updating of the Basic Training Certificate at their expense.

9) Tentative Agreements - During the course of negotiations, the parties reached tentative agreements on a number of issues.

Recommendation - The Factfinder recommends the tentative agreements reached by the parties.



---

Nels E. Nelson  
Factfinder

April 28, 2016  
Russell Township  
Geauga County, Ohio