

STATE OF OHIO  
STATE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF FACTFINDING BETWEEN: Case No. 2015-MED-10-1110

PUTNAM COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Employer

Date of Hearing: December 21, 2015

Date of Report: January 11, 2016

And

OHIO PATROLMEN'S BENEVOLENT

ASSOCIATION

Employee Organization

Meeta A. Bass, Fact Finder

---

FACT FINDER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

Appearances:

For Putnam County Sheriff:

Matthew B. Baker, Clemans-Nelson & Associates, Inc.

Sheriff Mike Chandler

Brad BruBaker, 911 Coordinator

Laura Huff, Administrative Assistant

For Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association:

Jonathan J. Winters, Allotta|Farley Co., L.P.A

Laurie Schwarzman, Steward

Nancy Hovest, Communications Officer

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Case Background**

This case is a fact-finding proceeding between the Putnam County Sheriff, hereinafter referred to as Employer or County, and the Ohio Patrolmen Benevolent Association, hereinafter referred to as OPBA or Union. On November 25, 2015, the State Employment Relations Board (SERB) appointed Meeta A. Bass as the Fact Finder.

By agreement of the parties, a fact-finding hearing was held on December 21, 2015, 10:00a.m., at the Putnam County Sheriff's Department located at 1035 Heritage Trail, Ottawa Ohio 45875. Both parties submitted the required pre-hearing statements in a timely manner. At the hearing the Employer was represented by Matthew B. Baker, along with Sheriff Mike Chandler, Brad BruBaker and Laura Huff. Union was represented by Jonathan J. Winters, along with Laurie Schwarzman and Nancy Hovest. At the conclusion of the hearing, the parties agreed that the fact Finder would issue her report on January 9, 2016. The parties granted an extension until January 11, 2016 to issue the fact finding report.

On the day of the hearing a good faith effort was made to resolve the remaining issues through mediation as mandated by the Ohio Revised Code, and the parties were successful in reaching tentative mediated agreements on Article 35 (G) regarding Uniforms and Compensation for Supervisor Dispatcher, Article 50 Section D. The parties were not able to agree on the remaining open issue, Article 50 Wages, Section B and the fact-finding hearing was commenced to consider said issue. The parties presented evidence and arguments in support of their positions on the open issue of wages.

## **Description of Employer**

The appointing authority is the Putnam County Sheriff. The Sheriff's Office and its employees are responsible for providing emergency dispatching services for law enforcement and other emergency responders to the citizens of Putnam County, Ohio.

Putnam County is a rural county in northwest Ohio, and the land area is approximately 483.9 square miles. Its neighboring counties include Defiance County, Fulton County, Hardin County, Henry County, Paulding County, Van Wert County, Williams County and Wyandot County.

As of the 2010 Census, the County had a population of 34,499, and the 2014 population estimate is 34,171. Total personal income is \$1,369,003,000. The median value of owner occupied housing units is \$133,500. The per capita income is \$40,161., and the median household income is \$61,192. The civilian labor force is comprised of 18,700 employees. The taxable value of real property is \$710,959,780. Seventy seven and a half percent (77.5%) of the population has income above 200% of poverty level or more. The Private Sector Average weekly wage is \$662. As of 2014 Putnam County has an unemployment rate of 4.5 %.

## **Description of the Bargaining Unit**

The bargaining unit is represented by the Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association (OPBA). The bargaining unit consists of nine (9) full time Communication Officers (Dispatchers). The Communication Officers respond to emergency and non-emergency calls for assistance and information. They provide dispatch and communication support services for law enforcement, emergency responders, and related services to the citizens of Putnam County.

## **History of Bargaining**

The parties entered into negotiations and met on eight (8) occasions October 21, November 2, 11, 18 and 25, and December 1, 3 and 9, 2015 to create a successor agreement. The parties were successful at resolving certain issues of the successor agreement, those agreements are incorporated herein.

A tentative agreement has been reached on the following issues, except the unresolved issues identified above and addressed below:

**Article 5: Non-Discrimination**

**Article 8: Severability**

**Article 9: Waiver in Case of Emergency**

**Article 10: Personnel Files**

**Article 12: Residency**

**Article 13: Probationary Periods Article 20:  
Life and Medical Insurance Article 23:  
Compensatory Leave Article 27: Promotions**

**Article 18: Health and Safety**

**Article 22: Work Schedules**

**Article 34: Grievance Procedure**

**Article 24: Overtime**

**Article 44: Disability Separation**

**Article 32: Discipline**

The parties were unable to come to agreement on the following articles, Article 35: Uniforms and Article 50: Wages, prior to the fact-finding hearing. The parties continued their bargaining through mediation at the fact-finding hearing, and were able to successfully resolve Article 35, and Article 50, Section D; that tentative agreement is incorporated herein. The only remaining unresolved issue was Article 50 Wages, Section B, and the parties proceed to fact-finding hearing.

## **OPEN ISSUES**

Each unresolved issue will be addressed separately. The issue will be listed and a brief summary of the positions of the parties provided, followed

by a discussion and the recommendation of the Fact Finder. In making these recommendations, consideration was given to the factors set forth in Ohio Revised Code Section 4117.14 (G) (7) (a) to (f):

- Past collectively bargained agreements between the parties;
- Comparison of the unresolved issues relative to the employees in the bargaining unit with those issues related to other public and private employers doing comparable work, giving consideration to factors peculiar to the area and the classification involved;
- Interests and welfare of the public, the ability of the public to finance and administer the issues proposed, and the effect on the normal standards of public service;
- Lawful authority of the public employer;
- Stipulations of the parties; and
- Such other factors, not limited to those above, which are normally or traditionally taken into consideration.

### **Position of Employer**

Employer contends that his budget has been reduced in the amount of \$190,146.16 from the years 2007 to 2015. In years 2011 and 2012, the Sheriff's Department lost \$1,158,980.14 in various grants. The combined losses in grants and appropriations total approximately \$1,265,338.57. While the financial situation has improved slightly, the Employer has yet to return to the funding levels of 2007. Despite the decrease in its overall budget and an overall need to contain cost, the Employer has offered bargaining unit employees three (3) years worth of wage increases and not avoid layoffs. Further, Employer's wages are comparable to other SERB region Employers.

Employer contends while it true that the E-911 levy funds can be used for employee salaries, said salaries represent compounded cost. Employer has a responsibility to the tax payers to spend the levy funding efficiently, and cannot afford to violate the public trust and tie up funds in compounding costs.

Employer contends that during the 2013, 2014 and 2015 fiscal years, non-bargaining unit employees received increase of fifty cents (0.50) and one

and one-half percent (1.5%) but during the previous agreement, bargaining unit employees received a total of seven percent (7%) in wage increases.

Employer contends that the Department is dependent upon allocations from the general fund that it receives from the Board of Commissioners and has no ability to increase its revenues or budget. There is no guarantee that allocations will increase in the future or that additional grant monies will be received. While the Employer does have access to levy funding for 911 Operations and Communications, any increase must still be approved by the Board of Commissioners. Employer must live within his budget and the Commissioners are not part of this bargaining relationship. In fact, the Sheriff is the appointing authority and a Fact-finder cannot require the Board of Commissioners to do anything, including the increased expenditure of 911 levy funding.

Employer is proposing shifting the steps during the first year of the Agreement so that the current Step 2 would become the new step 1 and then adding a new Step 5 that is 9% above the current Step 5.

Employer is proposing a 1.0% increase during each year of the Agreement in order to move the County closer to the average rate of pay amongst the comparable counties.

### **Position of Union**

OPBA contends that despite Putnam County's relative size and economic strength when compared to surrounding counties sharing many of Putnam's rural features, the compensation for the Communications Officers is near the bottom of the scale resulting in hiring and retention problems and leaving those Communications Officer who remain in the employ of the Sheriff Department in poor economic conditions. Putnam County is third out of seven counties with the highest median household included in its comparables, but is ranked sixth in the wage comparables amongst said comparables.

OPBA contends that a review of the county's financial statements demonstrate that Employer has the ability to pay the proposed wage increase but simply is unwilling to pay the increase. Employer operates the County 911 Services, and has an unencumbered levy balance of \$801,205.08 that can be used to pay salaries. Putnam County has the lowest sales tax rate amongst the comparables, and an increase by twenty five cents (\$0.25) would bring Putnam County to equal tax rate with its comparables providing additional revenue to pay salaries.

OPBA contends their wage proposal recognizes the need to rectify the weak economic position of the Communications Officers and the need for increases that are above SERB averages to get the Communications' wages to a level that is competitive with the pay in the surrounding area.

OPBA is proposing shifting the steps during the first year of the Agreement so that the current Step 2 would become the new step 1 and then adding a new Step 5 that is 4% above the current Step 5. So that these steps continue to maintain their relative level with other counties, the OPBA proposes that the steps are increased by the same amount as the general increase given to those Dispatchers out of the steps in years two and three of the Agreement.

OPBA is proposing a 3.5% increase during each year of the Agreement in order to move the County to a more competitive level. The OPBA is proposing a move in the steps, and a three and a half (3½) percent increase in each of the year the contract for those Officers who are outside of the steps, and that the same three and a half percent be applied to the steps in year two and year three of the contract in order to move the county to a more competitive level.

## **DISCUSSION**

Employer and Union both share the common desire to establish a fair starting rate of pay for the Communications Officers and to provide a fair increase in the current wages for the existing officers to attract and retain good employees in order to provide for employment stability. The current language of the contract provides in pertinent part:

### **ARTICLE 50: WAGES**

Employees in their first five (5) years of service will receive a step increase in accordance with the following: Beginning on the effective date of this contract, employees who are hired in the months of January through June, will receive their first step increase in the January immediately following their date of hire. Beginning on the effective date of this contract, employees who are hired in July through December, will receive their first step increase in the January immediately following their first anniversary date. After the initial step increase, employees in grades 2 through 5 will receive their step increase each year in accordance with Section C of this Article. Effective August 31, 2013, all Communications Officers will receive a 2% wage increase. Effective January 1, 2014, all Communications Officers will receive a 2.5% wage increase. Effective January 1, 2015, all Communications Officers will

receive a 2.5% wage increase. It is further agreed that the aforementioned wage increases will also be applied to the steps contained in Appendix A of the Communications Officers' CBA.

APPENDIX A

<b>Effective August 31, 2013</b>				
Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$26,759.06	\$27,888.13 (+1,129.07)	\$29,017.19 (+1,129.06)	\$30,147.39 (+1,130.20)	\$31,276.45 (+1,129.06)
<b>Effective August 31, 2014</b>				
Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$27,428.04	\$28,585.33 (+1,157.29)	\$29,742.62 (+1,157.29)	\$30,901.07 (+1,158.45)	\$32,058.36 (+1,157.29)
<b>Effective August 31, 2015</b>				
Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$28,113.74	\$29,299.96 (+1,186.22)	\$30,486.19 (+1,186.23)	\$31,673.60 (+1,187.41)	\$32,859.82 (+1,186.22)

The Employer proposes modifications in the steps as well as a 1% pay increase for each year of the Contract, and OPBA proposes modifications in the steps as well as a 3.5 % pay increase for each year of the Contract. Six of the nine members of the bargaining unit will be affected by the adjustment to the five year step grid, and one of the out of step bargaining unit members plans to retire this year.

Either proposal requires a comparison of wages relative to Communications Officers with those other public and private employers doing comparable work, giving consideration to factors peculiar to the area or the classification involved. OPBA proposes Putnam, Wyandot, Henry, Fulton, Van Wert, Paulding and Williams Counties as comparables. Employer does not dispute these comparables and data submitted by OPBA but adds Defiance and Hardin Counties as suggested comparables. OPBA objects to Defiance County because the County does not have a bargaining unit for their Communications Officer. Notwithstanding, the statute requires a comparison of wages relative to Communications Officers with those other public and private employers doing comparable work. A review of the

county profile information and data indicate that Defiance and Hardin Counties are appropriate comparables to Putnam County.

The average starting wage for Communications Officers in this region is \$29,703.84 with a median of \$30,076.80. The starting wage for Communications Officers in Putnam County is 28,113.74 annually as compared to Wyandot County whose starting rate is \$35,318.40, Henry County whose starting rate is \$32,864.00, Fulton County whose starting rate is \$31,678.40, Van Wert County whose starting rate is \$30,305.60, Paulding County whose starting rate is \$ 30,076.80, Defiance County whose starting rate is \$29,993.60, Hardin County whose starting rate is \$29,702.40, or Williams County whose starting rate is \$19,281.60. Putnam County ranks eighth (8<sup>th</sup>) in this comparison.

The average wage at the top step is \$37,627.74 with a median of \$38,771.20. The Communications Officers at the top step in Putnam County are paid \$32,859.82 annually as compared to Wyandot County whose top step rate is \$40,497.60 annually, Henry County whose top step rate is \$41,912.00, Van Wert County whose top step rate is \$40,352.00, Fulton County whose top step rate is \$39,644.80, Defiance County whose top step rate is \$38,771.20, Paulding County whose top step rate is \$37,128.00, Williams County whose top step rate is \$35,776, and Hardin County whose top step rate is \$31,699.20. Putnam County ranks sixth (8<sup>th</sup>) in this comparison. In Putnam County three (3) Communication Officers are out of step, N.H. who earns \$40,040.00 annually, S. M. who earns \$34,652.80 annually, and L. S. who earns \$33,508.80. The wage of Communication Officer N.H. includes longevity pay which was rolled into her wage in prior contract negotiations.

It is not disputed that the Communications Officers are underpaid when compared to surrounding jurisdictions. The current wage scale

provides an approximate increase of pay in the amount of \$1,129.07 between steps for the first year, \$1,157.29 in the second year, and \$1,186.22 in the third year.

Employer proposes the following schedule in its efforts to work toward parity in salary amongst the comparable counties:

**EMPLOYER’S MODIFICATION TO Appendix A**

**Effective January 1, 2016**

Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$29,592.96	\$30,791.05 (+1,198.09)	\$31,990.34 (+1,199.29)	\$33,188.42 (+1,198.08)	\$34,515.95 (+1,327.53)

**Effective January 1, 2017**

Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$29,888.89	\$31,098.96 (+1,210.07)	\$32,310.24 (+1,211.28)	\$33,520.30 (+1,210.06)	\$34,861.11 (+1,340.81)

**Effective January 1, 2018**

Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$30,187.78	\$31,409.95 (+1,222.17)	\$32,633.34 (+1,223.39)	\$33,855.50 (+1,222.16)	\$35,209.22 (+1,353.72)

Employer’s proposal fall shorts of the 2015 average starting rate of pay of \$29,703.84 for this region for the first year, and slightly exceeds the average in 2017, and exceeds it in 2018. Employer’s proposal falls short of the median starting rate of pay of \$30,076.80 for 2016 and 2017 but exceeds the median for 2018. The proposal falls below the average for the salary at the top step of \$37,627.24 and the median of \$38,771.20 for all three years.

OPBA is desirous of seeing salaries for the Communication Officers at a more competitive rate as established by this region. OPBA opines that comparable wages should constitute the wage determinant, and proposes the following schedule:

OPBA’S MODIFICATION TO Appendix A

**Effective January 1, 2016**

Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$29,299.96	\$30,486.19 (+1,186.23)	\$31,673.60 (+1,187.41)	\$32,859.82 (+1,186.22)	\$34,174.21 (+1,314.39)

**Effective January 1, 2017**

Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$30,325.46	\$31,553.21 (+1,227.75)	\$32,782.18 (+1,228.97)	\$34,009.91 (1,227.73)	\$35,370.31 (+1,360.40)

**Effective January 1, 2018**

Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$31,386.85	\$32,657.57 (+1,270.72)	\$33,929.55 (+1,271.98)	\$35,200.26 (+1,270.71)	\$36,608.27 (+1408.01)

OPBA’s proposal falls short of the 2015 average starting rate of pay of \$29,703.84 and the median of \$30,076.80 for this region for the first year, and exceeds the average in the second and third year of the contract. OPBA’s proposal also exceeds Employer’s proposal for years 2017 and 2018. Although the proposal falls below for the 2015 average for the salary at the top step of \$37,627.74 and median of \$38,771.20 for all three years, it exceeds Employer’s proposal for years 2017 and 2018. Overall, OPBA’s proposal moves the Communications Officer’s compensation closer to the compensation rates in the surrounding area.

The Employer further proposes a one (1%) percent pay increase to all Communications Officers. Employer stated that he would like to be able to grant the increase requested by OPBA; however, Employer argues that prudent fiscal management prohibits the same. The funds for the Sheriff’s Operating Budget are appropriated by the Board of County Commissioners, and Employer must operate the Department within said budget.

It is true that the reasonableness of any proposed wage increase must be measured against the financial conditions of Putnam County. The 2016 Sheriff’s Budget Appropriations for 2016 is \$1,610,424.34 which represents

a \$99,689.66 decrease of his 2015 Budget Appropriations in the sum of \$1,710,113.90. The total net difference in his budget appropriations from 2007 through 2015 is \$190,146.16. Employer also exhausted various grant money in 2011 and 2012 totaling \$1,158,980.14. The Communications Officers positions are full-time positions, and there was no evidence that said positions were dependent on grant funding.

The Sheriff Department also oversees the 911 Operation for the county. Employer receives funding from a publically funded E 911 levy. The money generated by passage of the levy can only be use for the operations of 911 and Communications for Putnam County Safety Services which includes equipment, capital improvements and salaries. Historically, the money generated by the levy has been used for equipment, upgrades and other capital improvements. As of January 1, 2015, the E-911 funds had an unencumbered balance of \$801,205.08. Since that time Employer has encumbered approximately \$475,000 for a special project leaving an approximate balance of \$326,205.08. No major projects are planned in the near future. However, Employer is not desirous of utilizing said revenue for salaries; salaries are an on-going expense and not a one-time expense.

Employer does not dispute that Putnam County has a financially-healthy general fund. Standard & Poor's Rating Services raised its long-term rating and underlying rating to "AA-" from "A+" on the county. The audited statements for the 2012 Fiscal Year indicate that the General Funds revenues were \$9,494,383 with expenditures of \$ 9,590,673 resulting in Excess of Receipts under disbursements totaled \$86,290, and an unencumbered fund balance of \$1,241,077. For the 2013 Fiscal Year, the General Funds revenues were \$9,962,674 with expenditures of \$8,988,062 resulting in Excess of Receipts over disbursements totaled \$974,612, and an unencumbered fund balance of \$2,256,316. For the 2014 Fiscal Year, the General Funds revenues were \$9,243,905 with expenditures of \$8,687,910

resulting in Excess of Receipts over disbursements totaled \$555,995, and an unencumbered fund balance of \$2,446,583. Employer argues that the revenue however is controlled by the Commissioners, and he must operate within his appropriated budget.

OPBA suggests that additional revenue, an estimated \$850,000.00 annually, can be generated by an increase in the sales tax rate. Sales taxes provide a county share of state and local general revenue to meet municipal needs. The current state rate is 5.75%. Putnam County has a sales rate tax rate of 1.25% as compared to the aforementioned comparables who all have the same sales tax rate of 1.50%. OPBA argues that the Putnam county government can increase funding to meet the needs of the municipality, fair wages, by increase taxation. According to the Standard & Poor's Rating Service, the sales tax revenue has been stable for the past several years. Again, Employer argues that he does not control the legislative branch of government.

Nonetheless, Putnam County government has demonstrated such fiscal restraints in prior years so as to permit reasonable increase in wages at least through the contract period of 2016-2018. Employer argues that one percent (1%) increase is reasonable. The total current payroll and related costs for Communications Officers are \$463,228.74. According to Employer, a proposal of three percent (3%) wage increase over three years will cost the Employer approximately \$125,465.03 in total payroll and related costs over the life of the new agreement. Employer's proposal will cost \$83,085.08 in total payroll and related costs for a difference of \$42,379.95. Employer does not argue an inability to pay a wage increase but expressed concern that the amount of the wage increase would affect the operations of the department, and may lead to layoffs. There was insufficient evidence introduce to support this assertions.

OPBA is actually requesting a three and half percent (3 1/2%) wage increase for each of the three years of the contract. OPBA argues that this is the correct number due to the ability to pay by said employer, and the internal and external comparables. The comparisons among non bargaining unit personnel within the Sheriff Department and within Putnam County are also relevant in this instance. The 911 Coordinator received a 3.8% pay increase; the Corrections clerk receive 8.7% pay increase, clerical staff received 7.1% pay increase, clerical staff received 7.6% pay increase, clerical staff received 9.8% increase. The average percent increase for 2014-2015 was 7%. (The Administrative Clerk stated that after the information was released that Employer gave three (3) other non bargaining unit personnel 1.5% wage increases.) The aforementioned staff received a 1.5% pay increase for 2013-2014 resulting in an average increase of 1.5%. The 911 Coordinator received a 2.4% pay increase; the Corrections clerk receive 3.4% pay increase, clerical staff received 2.4% pay increase, clerical staff received 2.5% pay increase, clerical staff received 3.2% increase. The average percent increase for 2012-2013 was 2.8%. In September of 2011, non bargaining unit employees received a \$1.00 per hour increase. Non bargaining unit personnel did not receive in wage increase in 2009, 2010 and 2012. Employer explained the non bargaining personnel also deserved a wage increase to compensate them for their labor. Non bargaining unit members do not receive the same salary benefit package as bargaining unit members such as premium rates or overtime. Within the County, the average percent increase for 2014-2015 was 2.7%. The average percent increase for 2013-2014 was 2.4%. The average percent increase for 2012-2013 was 6.3%. These internal comparables within the Sheriff Department and within the County workforce favor an increase in the wages of the Communications Officers.

A comparison of the wage increase history from 2009-2015 in the region, indicate that Employer has not kept pace with Communications Officers in the surrounding region. For 2016 and 2017, Williams and Van Wert Counties gave a two (2) percent wage increase. Fulton County gave a 2.75% wage increase in 2016 and a three percent (3%) in 2017. Henry County has consistently given a three percent (3%) wage increase from 2009-2017. Defiance County has consistently given a two percent (2%) wage increase from 2009-2017. Hardin County Communications Officers do not have a bargaining unit. Paulding County gave zero percent (0%) in 2016 and two percent (2%) in 2017. The SERB data for 2014 indicates that the statewide average for 2014 wage increases is 1.77%; the county average is 1.98%; police is 2.03%, and Region 7 is 1.83%. Employer is proposing only a one percent (1%) and thus, will continue to lag behind the other counties.

After reviewing the arguments and documentation provided by Employer and OPBA and with due consideration to the stator criteria for fact-finding, the undersigned fact-finder adopts that OPBA's proposal to Appendix A, and further recommends that the following increase be applied to the salary schedule:

In the first year of the agreement	2.5%
In the second year of the agreement	2.6%
In the third year of the agreement	2.7%

The Fact finder proposes the following language:

ARTICLE 50:

WAGES

Employees in their first five (5) years of service will receive a step increase in accordance with the following: Beginning on the effective date of this contract, employees who are hired in the months of January through June, will receive their first step increase in the January immediately following their date of hire. Beginning on the effective date of this contract, employees who are hired in July through December, will receive their first step increase in the

January immediately following their first anniversary date. After the initial step increase, employees in grades 2 through 5 will receive their step increase each year in accordance with Section C of this Article. Effective January 1, 2016, all Communications Officers will receive a 2.5% wage increase. Effective January 1, 2017, all Communications Officers will receive a 2.6% wage increase. Effective January 1, 2018, all Communications Officers will receive a 2.7% wage increase. It is further agreed that the aforementioned wage increases will also be applied to the steps contained in Appendix A of the Communications Officers' CBA.

Appendix A

**Effective January 1, 2016**

Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$29,299.96	\$30,486.19	\$31,673.60	\$32,859.82	\$34,174.21

**Effective January 1, 2017**

Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$30,325.46	\$31,553.21	\$32,782.18	\$34,009.91	\$35,370.31

**Effective January 1, 2018**

Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
\$31,386.85	\$32,657.57	\$33,929.55	\$35,200.26	\$36,608.27

**CONCLUSION**

In this report I have attempted to make reasonable recommendations that both parties will find acceptable. If errors are discovered or if the parties believe they can improve upon the recommendations, the parties by mutual agreement may adopt alternative language.

After giving due consideration to the positions and arguments of the parties and to the criteria enumerated in Ohio Revised Code Section 4117.14, the Fact finder recommends the provisions herein.

In addition, all tentative agreements reached by the parties are hereby incorporated by reference into this Fact Finding Report, and should be included in the resulting Collective Bargaining Agreement.

January 11, 2016

*/s/ Meeta A. Bass*  
 Meeta A. Bass, Fact Finder  
 Dublin, Ohio

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of this Fact Finder Report was sent by e-mail on January 11, 2016.

State Employment Relations Board  
Mary E. Laurant  
65 E. State Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Mary.laurant@serb.state.oh.us

Matthew B. Baker  
Clemans, Nelson & Associates, Inc.  
485 Metro Place South, Suite 200  
Dublin, Ohio 43017  
mbaker@clemansnelson.com

Jonathan J. Winters  
Allotta Farley Co. LPA  
2222 Centennial Rd  
Toledo, Ohio 43617  
jwinters@allottafarley.com

*/s/ Meeta A. Bass* \_\_\_\_\_  
Meeta A. Bass