In the Matter of the Arbitration Between:

VILLAGE OF GROSSE POINTE SHORES

-and-

Case No. Q88-H-0701

COMMAND OFFICERS, MICHIGAN LABOR COUNCIL, FRATERNAL

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COLLECTION Michigan State University

STIPULATED AWARD

MR. HOUGHTON: Mr. Arbitrator, we 21 would like to report to you that we have reached 22 agreement on all issues involved with this 312 Act, as 23 well as all other collateral issues necessary to place a 1 new contract into effect. We would to place the total agreement 3 4

on the record at this time, and then that record that is made will be concurred in by both parties and would then take the form of a stipulated award for issuance based on this understanding and agreement.

First of all, regarding the scope of the settlement it is a total settlement of all issues. And I'll go down each issue, item by item.

First of all two collateral matters. There are two pending grievances, 89-174 and 89-175, that are currently in arbitration.

One of those grievances, 89-174, involves certain issues of retroactivity.

And 89-175 involves certain issues concerning the so-called EMT supervisory pay.

24

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

Brown, Barry C

17 The agreement that the parties have 18 reached encompasses a resolution of those grievances. 19 The understanding of the parties is that those two 20 grievance arbitrations will be, forthwith, withdrawn with 21 prejudice from the arbitration process, based upon this 22 settlement. 23 Secondly regarding all issues which 24 were previously agreed to and tentatively initialed by 1 the parties, the parties confirm and reconfirm all of those earlier understandings and tentatively initialed 2 3 drafts, which will become part of the new three year 4 collective bargaining agreement, which will run from July 5 1st 1988, through June 30th 1991. 6 In particular, regarding earlier 7 agreed to drafts I would make reference to the 8 tentatively agreed to grievance procedure language change 9 dated 4-11-89. 10 Revised lunch time language, dated 4-11-89. 11 12 Revised special conference language, 13 also dated 4-11-89. 14 Holiday language, dated 4-11-89. 15 The so-called package agreement, 16 dated 4-21-89, which consists of 10 numbered items. 17 Revised tuition reimbursement 18 language, dated 4-11-89. 19 And revisions in the discharge 20 language of the contract, also dated 4-11-89. 21 Now in terms of previously initialed 22 and agreed to items I believe that constitutes the 23 package. I would reserve the right, when we've finished

this presentation, just to check my notes for a minute,

24

to see if there are any others, but all of those, I believe, are complete.

The language that's reflected in those tentatively initialed agreements will in fact become the language that's incorporated in the new collective bargaining agreement.

The new collective bargaining agreement will contain two classifications of supervisory command officers designated as follows:

Level "I", Supervisor-Sergeant "I" and Level "II", Supervisor-Sergeant "II".

Sergeant "I" will correspond to and be equivalent to what previously was called the Corporal classification.

And the Sergeant "II" classification will be equivalent to what was previously just called the Sergeant classification under the old agreement.

With respect to that change in nomenclature of the classifications, the Village will then determine appropriate distinction for badge wear on the uniform.

Next item, addressing wages. With respect to these new classification titles, and I might add here that I'm using these new classification titles

as they'll be in the new contract with respect to the wages that will be in the new contract.

The changes in classification titles are changes only and they do not reflect any change in benefits or job responsibilities or duties, but I will use the new title names from this point forward.

First year of the contract, which will be 1988 to 1989, and that's July 1st '88 to June 30th '89; the Sergeant "I"s will be paid \$37,100; the Sergeant "II"s will be paid \$39,850.

Second year of the contract, '89 to '90; the Sergeant "I"s will be paid \$38,800; Sergeant "II"s will be \$41,700.

Third year of the contract, '90 to '91; the Sergeant "I"s will be paid \$40,200; the Sergeant "II"s will be paid \$43,200.

With respect to the wage increases we come to the next issue, which is retroactivity. And the wage increases will be retroactive back to the beginning of the first year of the new contract, and that is July 1st 1988. And those retroactive wage adjustments will apply to all hours worked, which would include both straight time and overtime hours.

In addition, retroactivity will also

include the anniversary holiday, which it was agreed to begin with the second year of the contract. That's a new holiday. And there will be a retroactive incremental payment for any holidays that have already occurred, based on these new wage rates.

There will also be an incremental adjustment of longevity pay. Longevity pay has been paid to the officers under the old schedule. That schedule is revised and there will be an incremental amount due, in some cases, based on the new schedule. So that will also be retroactive.

Other than the items mentioned, any other economic benefits that were negotiated will not be retroactive.

The next item, EMT payments.

Under the new contract there will be no reference to EMT duties or any type of EMT pay, as that will not longer be involved in the collective bargaining agreement.

Regarding any retroactivity on ENT, the officers, command officers, have already received two payments for two quarters for 1988, and they will receive pay for an additional two quarters under the '88-89 contract, which will amount, for Sergeant "I"s, \$559.50,

total; For Sergeant "II"s, \$595.

MR. SUCHER: Could we go off the

record?

MR. BROWN: Off the record.

(Discussion off the record)

MR. HOUGHTON: Those are approximate figures and will have to be adjusted slightly upwards a few dollars, based on the latest wage proposal. So I'll have to recalculate that, but that's the approximate figures.

MR. SUCHER: All right.

MR. HOUGHTON: It would cover those

two quarters.

That is the only retroactive EMT payment that will be made, and that will end the EMT issue, and the employer will have satisfied all duties and obligations under the EMT issue by paying those amounts to the Sergeant "I" and Sergeant "II"s.

Next item: The union had a demand in 312 to change the contract so as to provide for a 3.5 post retirement COLA increase. That demand has been dissolved and dropped. And what will remain in the new contract will be the same language as the old contract has, which provides for an automatic 2.5 percent increase

==LIBURDI VERBATIN REPORTING (313) 527-4040==

for a maximum of 10 years.

Next issue in 312 involved duty related death benefits.

Involve two basic sub-issue, one involving health insurance. This would be continuing health insurance to the spouse of an employee who dies as a direct result of a duty related illness or injury. In that situation the village would continue, for that spouse, the same health coverage as is provided to active employees, for the spouse and dependent children up to age 19. That would continue except if the spouse remarries or receives health insurance coverage from an employer or other source, then under those conditions the village would not longer provide the incurance coverage.

In addition, under the duty related death survivor benefits, in the pension area: [f an employee is killed in the line of duty, or dies directly from a duty related illness, the spouse will receive a pension as if the deceased employee had been qualified, for a full seventy percent pension under the pension plan.

MR. SUCHER: That is for the spouse?

MR. HOUGHTON: Yes.

retirement issues.

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

HR. HOUGHTON: Next items involve

Regarding eligibility for normal retirement, regular retirement, the current contract provides for 2.5 percent for the first 25 years and then one percent for each year after 25 years up to a maximum of 70 percent. That would remain the same, with the same language, except the years after 25 would be increased to 1.5 percent, up to a maximum of 70 percent. This, in effect, would allow an employee to retire with a full 70 percent maximum after 30 years, rather than is currently provided at 32 and a half years.

So the only change, then, would be to change the 1.5 percent for the years after 25, keeping the maximum of 70 percent in place.

The employer, the village, would also withdraw its request that the employees contribute an additional one-half percent. The village was requesting a six and a half percent employee contribution. employee contribution level will remain as it is in the current contract, at six percent.

Hext item, duty disability. command officer becomes disabled as a result of a duty related incident the officer will be entitled to a duty

disability pension, provided he or she qualifies under the terms and conditions of the pension agreement, as if that person had 25 years of service; which means, under the program the person would have a duty disability pension of sixty-two and a half percent. That's based on 5 two and a half percent per year for 25 years. The person 6 would receive that pension. 7 And then when the individual reached 8

1

2

3

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

minimum retirement age, which is 50, at that point the pension would be re-computed up to a maximum of 70 percent, utilizing the years the employee was on disability. That is, if the employee had a sufficient number of years on disability before reaching age 50, the employee would receive additional credit at the rate of one and one-half percent a year up to a maximum of 70.

So the person could go from the sixty-two and a half percent for 25 years of service up to a maximum of 70 percent. And that 70 percent would then be payable from and after age 50, assuming the person had the number of years necessary to reach that level.

The duty disability pension language will incorporate those principles and will utilize the language set forth in Grosse Pointe City duty disability

ij

 requirement, all as set forth in the union exhibit in this case under subheading "G"; and this isn't too long, so I'll read that into the record so we have it:

An employee who is otherwise eligible for disability retirement pursuant to the employer's retirement system shall receive a benefit in the amount of sixty-two and a half percent of the employee's base rate of pay which the employee was receiving at the time of disability.

The disability retirement henefit provided for above shall be reduced by the following:

"A", an amount equal to any workers compensation benefit received; "B", Social Security disability benefits; "C", any other type of disability benefit received; "D", any earnings from employment, to the extent that said earnings, when added to payments received, exceed one hundred percent of base pay as defined.

compensation benefits shall include weekly benefits, redemptions of weekly benefits and settlements in lieu of weekly benefits; but shall not include amounts paid for reimbursement of medical expenses.

Any lump sum payments received for

> h

 $\mathbb{C}0$

2.1

redemption of weekly benefits, or settlement in lieu of weekly benefits, shall be allocated on a weekly basis, an amount of the weekly benefit the employee would be entitled to receive.

IR. SUCHER: Off the record?

(Discussion off the record)

MR. HOUGHTON: The language I just referred to regarding the City of Grosse Pointe duty disability retirement will be included in the new agreement, and in addition there will be language which will reflect the understanding regarding the recomputation at age 50 that I have previously set forth on the record.

entering into this understanding both parties, that is the union, the bargaining unit and the village, all will concur on the record with this total global settlement of all issues; and each party represents that it has full and complete authority to enter into such an agreement, which will result in a stipulated award in this case without any further concurrence or discussion or ratification from any of the principals involved, either the bargaining unit or the village council.

Off the record for a moment.

is the complete set.

(Discussion off the record)

IIR. BROWN: Back on the record.

the agreement. I did review, from the village standpoint, all of our tentatively initialed drafts and I concur that the set that we previously put on the record

Secondly, in terms of the so-called retroactive EMT payout, the exact amounts have been calculated and these figures should be utilized:

For the Corporals, who are now Sergeant "I"s, or will be, under the new contract, their wage rate would be \$37,100 for the time period involved. Three percent of that is \$1113. They have been paid, to date, \$535.62. So, for the two quarters of retroactivity that we have agreed to, the Corporals or Sergeant "I"s would each receive \$577.38.

Looking at the Sergeant "II"s, or Sergeants under the old agreement, their annual salary for the time period in question would be \$39,850, and three percent of that is \$1195.50. They have been paid each \$575.30. So the remaining balance due to each Sergeant or Sergeant II is \$620.20.

I believe that's all I have.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

2

Do you wish to make a comment all of

3

this, sir?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

have.

UR. SUCHER: Just, I would first state that I agree with Mr. Houghton as to all of the issues. I think he's accurately set forth the parties' understanding, and what we expect the new contract to read.

I'd just would like to make one comment on the rank structure with respect to Level "I" and Level "II". Frankly I'm at a loss as to what those actually mean and if they have any implications to the union in future contract negotiations.

I just would like to state that in agreeing to the rank structure I don't think that there should be any implication drawn as to the job and responsibilities with the other named comparables.

We will agree that we are changing the name -- the Corporal and Sergeant rank -- but I do not want any implications drawn as to any agreement as to job responsibilities or duties in the other comparables that we've selected.

And that would be the only comment I

7 8

6

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

HR. HOUGHTON: In response to that comment, to the record is clear, what we have done in these negotiations, in setting up new nomenclature of Sergeant I and Sergeant II is merely a change in nomenclature only. That's all it is, is a mere change in the job title. It does not reflect a change in duties, responsibilities, benefits, authority, anything other than change in the title.

The Level I basic supervisor, was a Corporal. It's now a Sergeant I.

And the Level II, supervisor, within the Village of Grosse Pointe Shores, was a Sergeant, it's now a Sergeant II.

I think that's all the further we've gone with at this point. What we did here was done to change the job title within the village.

MR. SUCHER: I agree with that.

MR. BROWN: I will ask the court reporter to provide me, the chairman of the panel, with a transcript of these proceedings, and then I will prepare a document which I will sign and pass on to the representative of the Michigan Council FOP and to the representative of the village. And when we've all three signed it, then that will represent the stipulated award.

| 1 |
|---|
| 2 |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
| 8 |

It doesn't make any less binding the agreement that has been put down here today, but it just formalizes the matter.

MR. HOUGHTON: And I would suggest, when that document is drawn, we encompass as much of the language as we've got right here on the record. In fact we can have the parties sign the record, if you want, so we have a full and comprehensive view of the language and everything else that's supposed to go in this agreement.

The Panel appointed under Public Act 312 to issue an award in the unresolved issues in bargaining for a new contract for the parties identified above now adopts the agreement reached by the parties on February 27, 1990. The terms of the parties agreement is reflected in the transcript of the Act 312 panel hearing which is shown above.

Michael Kenyon Village Panel Member Brian Smith Union Panel Member

BROWN CHAIRMAN