

STATE EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS BOARD

IN THE MATTER

OF

DEC 9 8 30 AM '96

FACTFINDING

BETWEEN

HAMILTON COUNTY SHERIFF

AND

TEAMSTERS LOCAL UNION #100,  
LAUNDRY AND MAINTENANCE WORKERS

Hearing: November 25, 1996  
SERB Case Nos.: 95-MED-12-1099  
Date of Report: December 6, 1996  
Issue: Factfinding

Union Representative:

Ken Barnes  
International Brotherhood of Teamsters  
2100 Oak Road  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45241

County Representative:

Paul Kattleman  
Assistant Hamilton County Administrator  
County Administration Building  
138 E. Court Street, Room 603  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Michael Paolucci  
Factfinder

### Administration

By letter dated February 9, 1996, from the Ohio State Employment Relations Board, the undersigned was informed of his designation to serve as factfinder for the Parties. On November 25, 1996, a hearing went forward in which the Parties presented arguments and documentary evidence in support of positions taken. The record was closed at the end of the hearing on November 25, 1996, and is now ready for a factfinding report.

### Factual Background

The Employer is the Sheriff of Hamilton County, Ohio, which is located in southwest Ohio and surrounds the City of Cincinnati, Ohio. The Employer's organized employees are grouped into thirteen (13) separate bargaining units; pertinent here are the Laundry and Maintenance workers that are represented by the Union. Although the Agreement covers both Laundry and Maintenance employees, the wages for each are not the same and consequently, there are separate provisions of the Agreement addressing wages for each unit. During the factfinding hearing on November 25, 1996, one Article, Article 21- Wages and Compensation, was at issue.

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)

Prior to a recommendation being made, consideration was given to all of the required factors.

## **ARTICLE 21**

### **WAGES AND COMPENSATION**

#### **COUNTY POSITION**

The County proposes a 3.7%, 3.5%, and 3.3% wage increase in each year of a three (3) year collective bargaining agreement for both Laundry and Maintenance employees.

The County argues that the external comparables show that these employees are paid much higher than comparably situated workers in the private sector. It asserts that the internal comparables show that all the other bargaining units got similar, if not exact, wage increases. It contends that these two (2) factors support its position that the increases be made consistent with its proposal.

#### **UNION POSITION**

The Union agreed to the County's proposal regarding the Maintenance employees but

proposes a 5%, 3.5%, and 3.3% in each year of a three (3) year Agreement for the Laundry employees. It argues that these employees, especially the Laundry workers, are dramatically underpaid and as support for its position points out that some of the employees qualify to receive food stamps to supplement their income. It argues that its proposal is fair in light of the gross underpayment of the Laundry workers and asks for a recommendation consistent with its proposal.

### RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Union's proposal be adopted. The overwhelming factor in this recommendation is the modest income the Laundry workers currently receive. The 1<sup>st</sup> year proposal of the Union is the only difference between the Parties and it must be observed that the requested 5% of the Union versus the proposed 3.7% of the Employer is not significantly different. Thus, due to the Laundry Employees current pay, it is recommended that the Union's proposal be adopted.

December 6, 1996  
Cincinnati, Ohio

  
Michael Paolucci