

STATE OF OHIO

STATE EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS BOARD

STATE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD

JAN 10 10 27 AM '97

FACT FINDING PANEL

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE
OHIO LABOR COUNCIL, INC.

AND

CITY OF SPRINGDALE

SERB CASE NO. 96-MED-03-0246

FACT FINDER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

MICHAEL MARMO

FACT FINDER

JANUARY 9, 1997

HEARING

The Hearing took place at the Springdale Municipal Building on December 17, 1996 and lasted from 9:45 a.m. until 1:45 p.m.. Representing the City were James Freland, the Chief of Police; Joy L. Adams, Administrative Supervisor in the Police Department; Derrick Parham, Assistant City Administrator; and Paul R. Berninger, Attorney for the City and its principal representative. Representing the FOP were two Associates, Kimberly E. Reuschen, a Dispatcher/Court Clerk; Marilyn J. Dysart, a Dispatcher; and its principal representative, Deborah A. McCormick, a staff representative for the FOP.

ISSUES REMAINING AT IMPASSE

At the outset of the Hearing, the following issues remained at impasse:

1. Preamble/Recognition
2. Dues Checkoff
3. FOP Business
4. Grievance Procedure
5. Discipline
6. Wages
7. Court Time
8. Holidays
9. Uniforms
10. Insurance
11. Publicizing Job Opportunities
12. Tuition Reimbursement
13. Shift Premium
14. Duration

MEDIATION

Mediation was attempted and was successful in reaching agreement on the issue of Publicizing Job Opportunities. The parties also reached agreement on the issue of Duration, but since they did not sign off on this provision it will be included in this report.

CRITERIA FOR DECISION

As provided under Rule 4117-9-05(J) of the State Employment Relations Board, the fact finder based his recommendations on the following:

- Past collectively bargained agreements, if any between the parties;
- Comparison of 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;
- 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;
- The lawful authority of the public employer;
- Any stipulations of the parties; and
- 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.

ISSUES REMAINING AFTER MEDIATION

PREAMBLE/RECOGNITION

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The only issue at dispute in these two provisions is the employee's title. The City proposed that the employees titles be changed to either "Violations Bureau Clerk" or "police clerk". They contend that the employees are essentially clerical/administrative personnel with very few dispatching responsibilities. A title change, the City argued, would more accurately reflect the jobs actually performed by the employees.

The FOP argued that the employees be defined as "Dispatchers", the term used in the SERB certification of this unit. In view of the fact that the City raised no objections to the employee title when certification was accomplished and has not subsequently attempted to amend the SERB certification, the Union said, the SERB designation should stand.

FINDING OF FACT

The collective bargaining process is clearly not the appropriate forum to address this issue. If the City did not believe the current job title accurately reflected the duties of these employees a number of options were available to them. Since this is an initial contract, the City could simply have changed the job title before the State Employment Relations Board

got involved in the certification process. Next, the City could have challenged the job title during the SERB certification process. Finally, the City could have attempted to amend the SERB designation after certification was achieved. Because the City chose not to pursue any of these more appropriate forums to address this issue the fact finder does not believe it should be recommended for the collective bargaining agreement.

In addition, the fact finder believes he would be exceeding his authority by recommending a change in job title, without a change in SERB certification.

RECOMMENDATION

The PREAMBLE should read as follows:

"This AGREEMENT, made and entered into by and between THE CITY OF SPRINGDALE, OHIO, hereinafter referred to as the "City" or "Management", and the FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE OHIO LABOR COUNCIL, INC., hereinafter referred to as the "F.O.P.", a labor organization as defined in Chapter 4117 of the Ohio Revised Code, on behalf of the full time Dispatchers in the Springdale Police Department."

The RECOGNITION article should read as follows:

"The Employer recognizes THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE OHIO LABOR COUNCIL, as the sole and exclusive bargaining agent for the purpose of representation and collective bargaining in any and all matters related to wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment of all employees in the bargaining unit consisting of full-time Dispatchers in the Springdale Police Department. It is understood that membership in the F.O.P. is at the discretion of each individual employee. Employees in the bargaining unit covered by this Agreement have the right to participate or not participate in the F.O.P. as they see fit. Neither party to this Agreement shall exert any pressure on any employee to join or refrain from joining the F.O.P."

DUES CHECKOFF

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The F.O.P. proposed the addition of a fair share fee. Such a provision is appropriate, the Union argued, because they are scrupulous in guaranteeing that all legal requirements regarding fair share are followed. The F.O.P.'s fair share provisions, they pointed out, have very rarely been challenged, and if they are, the Union agrees to hold the Employer harmless. Finally, the Union argued that fair share is the norm in Ohio police contracts, with 75% of agreements containing such provisions.

The City, in turn, argued that it is inappropriate to compel any public employee to suffer an "involuntary reduction of income in order to support a political organization."

FINDING OF FACT

A union's interest in achieving a fair share provision is very straight forward; they believe that if they spend time, effort, and money to represent employees, those employees should pay for that representation. Although there is considerable merit to this argument, the fact finder does not believe it is particularly relevant to a unit of five employees. In such a small unit, all employees should be intimately aware of what their bargaining agent does for them.

In addition, the fact finder believes that when ability to pay is not an issue, a neutral should be more willing to grant a union concessions on "money" issues than on "language" issues. Language issues are most appropriately addressed by the parties directly.

RECOMMENDATION

For the reasons given, the fact finder recommends that the Union's proposal for Section 3.2 NOT be included in the Agreement.

F.O.P. BUSINESS

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

With a minor modification to reflect size differences between the two units, the FOP has proposed the same language in this provision as appears in the current Patrol Officers contract. If such language is appropriate for the Patrol Officers, the FOP argued, it should also apply to the Dispatchers. In addition the Union raised what they regarded as a significant procedural issue; they received neither a written proposal on this issue during negotiations nor did the Employer outline its position in its prehearing submission to the fact finder and the Union. As a result of this procedural deficiency, the Union argued, the fact finder should not consider the Employer proposal on this issue.

The Employer's concern on this provision involved only one question; whether union negotiators should be paid or given compensatory time for time spent during negotiations when they are not on duty. According to the City, such involvement in negotiations is "personal business" and should not be compensated by the Employer.

FINDING OF FACT

Two of the Union's arguments on this issue are extremely compelling. First, fact finders are required by SERB's rules to take the "comparables" into account when making recommendations. Because the Employer has agreed to this provision for its Patrol Officers, the fact finder believes it is also appropriate for the Dispatchers. Second, the fact finder believes that the FOP was disadvantaged by the Employer's failure to submit a written proposal on this issue either during negotiations or in its pre-hearing submission.

RECOMMENDATION

Article 7, F.O.P. Business should read as follows:

Section 7.1-F.O.P. Employee Representatives. The F.O.P. may select from the bargaining unit a maximum of two (2) F.O.P. employee representatives who may investigate and process grievances and represent employees as provided in the Discipline section of this Agreement. The F.O.P. shall provide the City Administrator with a list of the designated representatives and shall advise the City Administrator in writing immediately of any changes in the list. A representative whose name does not appear on the list shall not be given time away from his regular duties for grievance handling.

Section 7.2 A representative shall be permitted a reasonable amount of time during his regular duty hours without loss of pay or benefits to investigate and process grievances. A representative shall notify his immediate supervisor that he requires time to handle a grievance and shall obtain the approval of the supervisor before spending duty time on the grievance matter. It is the intention of the parties that grievances be promptly and properly handled without interfering with the work assignment of either the grievant or the representative.

Section 7.3 Only one representative at a time will be assigned to a grievance and only the assigned representative will be given time during his regular duty hours to handle the grievance. If shift rotation schedules or vacation schedules make investigation and processing of a grievance impossible, the officer coordinator or another representative may be substituted for the representative originally assigned. The City Administrator shall be advised of the substitution.

Section 7.4 Neither a grievant nor his representative will receive compensation for time spent on grievance matters other than the reasonable time during duty hours described in this section and/or as specifically provided in the grievance procedure.

Section 7.5-Officer Coordinator. In addition to the F.O.P. employee representatives described in the preceding section, the F.O.P. may designate one member of the bargaining unit as the officer coordinator and may designate an alternate officer coordinator to serve in place of the officer coordinator when the officer coordinator is absent due to authorized leave. The F.O.P. shall advise the City Administrator in writing of the identity of the officer coordinator and shall advise the City Administrator immediately of any substitution. The City shall be obligated to recognize as officer coordinator and alternate officer coordinator those individuals so designated. The officer coordinator shall have the following responsibilities:

- (a) Posting of F.O.P. notices on the designated bulletin board areas.
- (b) Representing employees in the grievance procedure in place of a representative in accordance with the preceding section.
- (c) Representing the F.O.P. and not on behalf of the individual members of the bargaining unit.
- (d) General supervisory review of grievances.

(e) Acting as liaison between the City, the F.O.P. and the employees.

Section 7.6 The officer coordinator shall be permitted a reasonable amount of time during his regular duty hours without loss of pay or benefits to perform the duties set forth above, except items (d) and (e) above. The officer coordinator shall notify his immediate supervisor before spending duty time to perform his officer coordinator responsibilities and shall obtain the approval of the supervisor before spending duty time on officer coordinator responsibilities. The approval shall not be unreasonably withheld by the immediate supervisor. The supervisor may, however, schedule such time at the time which is least disruptive to the efficient operation of the Police Department. The officer coordinator shall not receive compensation for any time spent in pursuing F.O.P. business other than the reasonable time discussed in this section and/or in the provisions of the grievance procedure.

Section 7.7 -Negotiators. The F.O.P. may designate up to two (2) members of the bargaining unit to serve on its negotiating committee. The F.O.P. shall inform the City Administrator of the identity of the persons so designated at least sixty (60) days prior to the expiration of this Agreement or any extensions hereof. Any committeeman who is scheduled for duty during the time of negotiations sessions may attend the negotiation session during his scheduled duty hours. Any committeeman on duty may be relieved from duty one hour before a negotiation session to meet and confer with the other committeemen. The committeemen will be compensated at their regular rate for their scheduled duty hours during which they attend negotiation sessions and during the hour preceding each session. Any committeeman not on duty during such hours will be given equal time off within the same pay period or, at the City's option, be paid for such time. At the end of the negotiation session, a committeeman shall return to his regular assignment if the session ends before the end of his regularly scheduled shift. In the event of an emergency or if, in the judgment of the Chief of Police, a committeeman is needed for duty the committeeman may be required to leave the negotiation session and return to duty. The City will make a good faith effort to schedule the hours of committeemen so that they will have sufficient time to sleep between the end of their shift immediately preceding the negotiation session and the beginning of the negotiation session."

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE/DISCIPLINE

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The issues of the grievance procedure and discipline will be considered jointly because they involve the identical concern. The City has proposed that both of these provisions be identical to their counterparts in the contract with the Springdale Police Officers. The Police Officers contract does not permit employees to grieve disciplinary action above a reprimand. Discipline involving suspensions, demotions or discharge can only be appealed to the Civil Service Commission and may not proceed through the grievance procedure to arbitration. The FOP proposed that any disciplinary action the employee believes is without just cause, proceed through the grievance procedure culminating in arbitration.

The City argued that the current system of discipline for Dispatchers has worked well . Why change a system, the City asked, that has worked well for both sides. In addition, the Employer argued that consistency should dictate that the same procedure that is used for Police Officers also be used for the Dispatchers. Finally, the City said that both sides in the Dispatchers negotiations agreed that the decision of conciliator Sheridan in the Police Officers case should also be followed by the Dispatchers. This understanding was reached, the City said, before Sheridan rendered his decision.

The FOP, in turn, argued that based on the "comparables" all disciplinary actions should be subject to arbitration. About 90% of all police contracts in Ohio, the Union said, arbitrate all disciplinary matters. The FOP cited the recommendation of fact finder Goulet, who said in March of 1996 that Springdale Police officers should be able to pursue all disciplinary matters through the grievance procedure. And they pointed out that while conciliator Sheridan did not award Springdale Police Officers arbitration of all grievances, he recognized the superiority of such an approach over an appeal to the Civil Service Commission.

FINDING OF FACT

The FOP is correct when it asserts that arbitration is superior to appeals to a Civil Service Commission. The whole concept of the grievance procedure is predicated on the ability to appeal a decision to a true neutral; someone jointly selected by both parties. Clearly, this is not the case with the Civil Service Commission. The Union is also correct when it states that arbitration of all grievances is the norm: for police contracts in Ohio, for other public employees in Ohio, and for private sector workers throughout the United States.

Nevertheless, a more compelling argument dictates that the Union proposal not be accepted. There should be consistency in the treatment of Police Officers and Dispatchers. And in fact, both sides recognized this reality when they agreed that the decision of Philip Sheridan in the Police Officer conciliation should also be applicable to the Dispatchers.

RECOMMENDATION

Article 8, Grievance Procedure, and Article 9, Discipline should be identical to those in the current Agreement between the parties for Police Officers.

WAGES

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The FOP proposed wage increases of 3.5% on January 1, 1997, 3.5% on January 1, 1998, and 3.5% on January 1, 1999. They argued that since the contract covering Police Officers which took effect on January 1, 1996 provided for annual increases of 3.5%, the

same increase should be granted to Dispatchers. The Union said that both Springdale Police Officers and Dispatchers currently rank fifth in wages among comparable employees in Hamilton County. Their proposed increase in wages, the FOP maintained, would enable Dispatchers to maintain their relative ranking.

The City proposed 2% wage increases in each of the next three years. They contend that unit employees now rank second in pay in Hamilton County. The Employer argued that the wage increase granted Dispatchers need not mirror the increases given to Police Officers. The labor market for Police Officers, the City said, is extremely competitive, and unless their pay remains relatively high they will lose Officers to other jurisdictions. In contrast, the City does not believe granting the pay increases it proposes would impair its ability to attract and retain high quality Dispatchers. Lacking such competition for employees, the City said, a cost of living increase is appropriate for Dispatchers.

FINDING OF FACT

For certain issues it makes sense to have consistent treatment for groups of closely related employees. This is one of the major reasons it was recommended that the grievance procedure for Dispatchers mirror that of Police Officers. Similarly, uniformity in insurance coverage is also appropriate.

There is, however, no inherent reason why the wage increases received by Dispatchers need be identical to those received by Police Officers. This is particularly true because the contract for Police Officers takes effect a year before the agreement for Dispatchers. At this point, of course, we have no idea what wage increase Police Officers will receive on January 1, 1999.

It is also true, however, that the Union has argued very persuasively for several "language" proposals (fair share, grievance procedure) which were not recommended by the fact finder. As has been indicated previously, if fact finders are forced to choose between recommending "language" proposals and "money" proposals, it does less disservice to the collective bargaining process to recommend money increases. Since these "language" proposals were not recommended, a somewhat larger wage increase is appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

The contract should read:

"Effective at 12:01 a.m. on January 1, 1997, the hourly rates of the employees will be increased by 3.5%. Effective at 12:01 a.m. on January 1, 1998, the hourly rate of the employees will increase by 3.5%. Effective at 12:01 a.m. on January 1, 1999, the hourly rate of employees will increase by 3.25%,"

COURT TIME

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The FOP proposed to include the identical Court Time article that appears in the Police Officer contract. The Union argued that Dispatchers do occasionally appear in court and they should receive extra compensation for this work. Because Dispatchers work rotating shifts, the Union said, it is quite possible that they will be asked to appear in court when they are not scheduled to work. Finally, the FOP cited a number of Dispatcher agreements that provide additional compensation for court appearances.

The City argued against this proposal that unit employees do not appear in court in a work related capacity any more often than do other non-sworn City employees. Because of this, the Employer said, there is no justification for providing extra compensation for court appearances.

FINDING OF FACT

Although Dispatchers do work for the Police Department, regular appearances in court are not an inherent part of their job as it is for sworn officers. The FOP did not dispute the City's contention that Dispatchers do not appear in court any more frequently than non-sworn City employees. It is therefore not appropriate to provide them with extra compensation for court appearances.

RECOMMENDATION

The contract should NOT contain a provision dealing with court time.

HOLIDAYS

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

Bargaining unit employees currently receive ten paid holidays, or 80 hours of holiday time off. However, the FOP argues that because Dispatchers currently work 10-hour days, granting them ten paid holidays should result in their receiving 100 hours of holiday time off. The Union claims that it would be unreasonable to give an employee only 8 holiday hours when their regular shift is 10 hours long.

The City argued that bargaining unit employees do not currently receive 10 holidays, they receive 80 hours of holiday time off. Thus, the City says, if an employee normally works a 10-hour day and takes a holiday off, it should count as receiving 10 hours of holiday time off. To grant the FOP request, the Employer contends, would be to grant employees 20 additional hours of holiday time. Finally, the City said that 10-hour shifts were instituted at the behest of the employees, and the City should not be penalized for trying to accommodate the wishes of their employees.

FINDING OF FACT

The intent of the City historically was clearly to provide 80 hours of holiday time off to their employees. Most other employees of the City of Springdale, including most Police Officers receive 80 hours of holiday time off. Clearly, a quirk in scheduling should not serve as justification to grant Dispatchers 20 more hours of holiday time off than other City employees.

RECOMMENDATION

The Holiday provision should read:

"Each permanent full-time employee who has completed one month of continuous service prior to the following holidays shall be given the holidays with pay, namely: New Year's Day, Martin Luther King Day, President's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Columbus Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, and the employee's birthday. If any employee is required to work on a holiday or his birthday, he shall be entitled to 8 hours off on another regular work day, or at his option, receive 8 hours pay in lieu of the off day. Under no circumstances will any employee receive more than their accumulated holiday hours of holiday pay in lieu of time off."

UNIFORMS

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

Both sides stipulated that there is no disagreement regarding Sections 18.1 and 18.2. For Section 18.3, the FOP proposed an annual uniform allowance of \$150.00 to clean and repair their uniforms. The Union also proposed that employees receive up to \$50.00 reimbursement for the purchase of uniform shoes. The FOP argued that Police Officers receive \$ 200 as a uniform allowance, and it is appropriate that Dispatchers also receive money to maintain their uniforms.

The City maintains that by providing Dispatchers with uniforms they are receiving a benefit that other City employees doing similar work do not receive. Other workers, the City contends, must buy and clean the clothes they wear to work. The City also offered Dispatchers the option of wearing relaxed office attire to work rather than uniforms. The City agreed to reimburse Dispatchers up to \$50.00 for the purchase of uniform shoes.

The FOP said they were troubled by the fact that the City did not care whether or not they wore uniforms, contending that uniforms presented a "professional" look.

FINDING OF FACT

The Union's main justification for the uniform cleaning allowance is that a similar benefit is received by Police Officers. Such a comparison, however, is not appropriate. Police

Officers work outside, in an environment that is often dirty. Their work periodically involves considerable physical effort, which also is hard on their uniforms. Such conditions are simply not present for Dispatchers.

RECOMMENDATION

Section 18.3 should read:

"Each Dispatcher shall receive reimbursement of up to \$50.00 per year for the purchase of uniform shoes."

INSURANCE

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The FOP proposed that this article contain the identical language that appears in the current Police Officers contract. During negotiations over the Police Officers contract, the Union said, the City argued strongly that they desired all City employees to have the same plan and benefits package.

The City proposed that employees share in insurance costs by paying deductibles and minimum co-pays for certain services.

FINDING OF FACT

Based on the fact that the City never provided any specifics to flesh out its insurance proposal; the fact that it previously argued that uniformity was necessary for the insurance packages of all City employees, and the fact that most impartial observers agree that uniformity is important, it is hard to conclude that the City is serious about achieving this proposal. It is surely a proposal that was included to provide some bargaining leverage, but one that they never really expected to achieve.

RECOMMENDATION

The article dealing with Insurance should be identical to the Insurance article in the current Agreement with the Springdale Police Officers.

TUITION REIMBURSEMENT

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

Only one aspect of this Article remains in dispute; the FOP proposed the inclusion of a statement saying: "Employees who have not finished a course due to an Employer required schedule change shall be reimbursed the full tuition amount paid by the

employee." The Union contends that an employee should not suffer a personal financial loss as a result of a schedule change that is unforeseen and beyond their control.

The City argued that unit employees know what their schedule is in advance and should be able to plan accordingly. They are worried about potential abuses in the Union's proposal and the difficulty in determining whether failure to complete a course was the result of a change in schedule or some other reason.

FINDING OF FACT

It appears to be possible to address the expressed concerns of both the Union and the Employer, if contract language is formulated that eliminates the potential financial loss to employees due to a schedule change and also reduces the risk of potential abuses.

RECOMMENDATION

The Tuition Reimbursement Article should read:

Section 31.1 Tuition Reimbursement

A. Each employee who is subject to the provisions of this Agreement shall be eligible for reimbursement of tuition. Tuition must be for courses of instruction taken towards a job-related degree or job-related courses not necessarily within the degree program at an accredited School, College or University. Tuition will be reimbursed up to fifteen hundred dollars (\$1,500) per calendar year per covered employee. Employees who are required to miss more than two scheduled classes due to an Employer required schedule change shall be reimbursed the full tuition amount paid by the employee.

B. All courses must be taken during non-working hours. All scheduled hours of courses must be filed and approved by the Police Chief and Mayor. Any situation which, in the discretion of the Police Chief and Mayor would require an employee's presence on the job shall take complete and final precedence over any times scheduled for courses.

C. Financial assistance from Governmental or Private Agencies available to a covered employee, whether applied for and regardless of when assistance may have been received, shall be deducted in the entire amount from the total tuition. When the employee's tuition is fully covered by another Governmental or Private Agency, the employee is not entitled to reimbursement.

D. All course work subject to reimbursement shall be approved in advance by the Police Chief and Mayor. An employee shall make application for approval of reimbursement at least fifteen (15) days before the start of the course of study.

E. Reimbursement shall be made upon successful completion of the course with a grade of C (2.00) or better. The employee shall submit an official transcript or certificate demonstrating successful completion of the course and a receipt from the institution confirming the employee paid for tuition and fees. The employee will only be reimbursed for tuition, fees and books. No incidental expenses such as paper, supplies, mileage, parking, meals and/or other expenses will be paid.

SHIFT PREMIUM

POSITIONS OF PARTIES

The FOP proposed a shift premium of \$.30 per hour for each hour worked between 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. The Union provided a list of a number of regional jurisdictions that pay shift differentials to Dispatchers.

The City argued that since shifts are rotated all workers would eventually receive the shift differential. It is therefore, the City said, essentially a wage increase, which would be equivalent to 1.3%.

FINDING OF FACT

Since shifts are rotated, the City is correct in saying that this proposal is really the same as an increase in wages. Since the fact finder believes an equitable wage increase was recommended, he does not feel it is appropriate to recommend a shift differential.

RECOMMENDATION

The Agreement should NOT contain a provision for a shift premium.

DURATION

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

Both parties stipulated that they desired a three year agreement retroactive to January 1, 1997. However, since they did not sign off on this issue, it will be addressed as a formal recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

The Duration Article should read:

This Agreement shall become effective at 12:01 a.m. on January 1, 1997. This Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for three years until midnight on December 31, 1999. This Agreement will be automatically renewed for successive one year periods unless either party to the Agreement on or before 90 days prior to the expiration date or, if applicable, the extended expiration date, notifies the other party, in writing, of its intention to modify or terminate this Agreement. This Agreement reflects the full and final agreement of the parties and may only be modified during its term by the written agreement of the parties.

This concludes the findings of fact and recommendations of the fact finder.

Michael Marmo

Michael Marmo
Fact Finder
Cincinnati, Ohio
January 9, 1997

PROOF OF SERVICE

This is to certify proof of service this ninth day of January, 1997 by United States Mail, Overnight Delivery to Deborah A. McCormick, 9643 Waterford Place, Suite 205, Loveland, Ohio 45140; and Derrick Parham, City of Springdale, 11700 Springfield Pike, Springdale, Ohio 45246; and by regular United States Mail to Paul R. Berninger, Wood and Lamping, 2500 Cincinnati Commerce Center, 600 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202; and G. Thomas Worley, SERB, 65 East State Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213.

Michael Marmo

Michael Marmo
Fact Finder