

## **RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

### **MINUTES OF JACKSON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING**

**OCTOBER 23, 2006**

Pizzino called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. at the Jackson Township Hall with all Trustees, Fiscal Officer, Lyon, Fitzgerald and Chief Neftzer present.

Pizzino moved and Meeks seconded a motion to go into Executive Session for Police Department Personnel (Appointment/Employment/Compensation) – Interview applicants for Major. **3-0 yes**

Upon return from Executive Session, Pizzino opened the Work Session at 5:17 p.m.

#### **Fred Pisani, Recycling Station Interior Remodeling.**

##### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 A**

Fred Pisani, 430 West Lisbon St., Waynesburg, the Recycling Station Manager, informed the Board that they would like to add a 6 ft. 8 in. x 11 ft. 3 in. room in the recycling center to be used as an office to contain a computer and the cash register so it will be out of sight of the windows. Another room would be converted into his office and the lunchroom would be where his office currently is. These changes would put his office between the lunchroom and the new office and he would be able to monitor both.

The total cost would be approximately \$1,000.00. The Carpenter's Union has agreed to do the labor for free and the Electrician's Union is also considering that.

Pizzino summarized that Pisani was requesting authorization from the Township for the remodeling, it will not involve any cost to the Township, and it will improve the service and operation of the Recycling Center.

Meeks thanked Pisani for letting them know about the plans and congratulated him on a job well done.

Pizzino said plans are also in the works to improve the landscaping at the Recycling Center and that work continues with the Highway Department on traffic flow.

Pisani reminded the Board there was a Recycling Board Meeting on Friday at 1:00.

#### **Police Department – Early Retirement Incentive.**

##### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 B**

Pizzino: This Board has been looking for a number of years for ways to improve services and any way that we can possibly save money, combining jobs, and so on and so forth. I guess I'll

turn it over to Mr. Meeks talking a little bit about the early retirement incentive. We talked about that last year when you were President.

Meeks: One thing that this Board has always been committed to, in every department we try and look at ways that we can be more efficient. Whether it is when we have an employee that leaves and seeing if we can combine duties when we do rehire that position or look at ways that we can give back to our residents the best bang for their buck. That is our job. That's what we are charged with by the people that vote us in – elect us. This is just another step in that direction. What we've asked our Police Chief and Fiscal Officer to do is put a plan together and see how we can look at our Police Department and see how we can be more efficient as far as the supervisors that we may have, ones that may be coming up for retirement, whether that be through natural attrition or through possible buyout and looking along those lines. So we've asked both Harley and Randy to put a plan together showing us the monies that we can save. Because one thing that we do not do or would not want to do is spend money to reward someone and then have it cost the taxpayers even more. That is not what we do. That is not what our goal is and again, our goal is at the end of the day making our Police Department the best that it can be and that is through the men and women that patrol our streets, right on through to the levy and the funding that our residents have graciously approved. So with that, Randy or Harley, you want.

Neftzer: I'll start. Thank you Mr. Meeks, Mr. Pizzino. As you know, with the assistance of Mr. Fitzgerald, Ms. Lyon and Randy, we've been evaluating the ideas of an early retirement incentive. I guess, for the media's purpose, I'll give you some background about who we're talking about. I don't think it's a surprise to anybody that oftentimes employers' most costly employees are those that have the most time on the job. Those are the people that are at or near retirement in age and there could be a benefit or cost savings to the community if we could provide some kind of incentive to encourage them to go ahead and retire. So the people we are talking about are those people that are working at the Police Department in whatever capacity, civilian or sworn. But under the Public Employee Retirement System, you must meet certain criteria. You have to have 25 years of service at 48 years of age if you're an officer, if you're not able to qualify under those parameters you have to qualify under regular PERS. So to retire under PERS you have to have 30 years of service at any age or 25 years at age 55 to 59 or 5 years of service at age 60.

So if you will look at the second page that you have in your packet, there is a spreadsheet that identifies who those people are and the other thing you have to do under an early retirement incentive is to offer that for, at a minimum, of one year. So if we looked at, and this is not a firm date, but if we just looked at the period of 12/1/06 to 11/30/07, identifying those people that would qualify, there were five people that would be eligible for the different years of service that are listed there and we looked at anywhere up to three to five years. After evaluating this, and it's my opinion that we need to focus in on the two year number, because I think it would be cost prohibitive to look beyond that and you'll see what I'm talking about when we get to those kind of numbers. The numbers jump pretty significantly to buy a third year. But if we look at the sheet that's listed 12/1/2006, the individuals that would qualify there, our expense for that early retirement incentive, if everybody took it on day one that it was offered would be \$180,348.00. And these are just, I don't want to say they're generic numbers, Randy can talk about that better,

but these are numbers that are based on some projections by us, they're not absolute numbers because they're dependent upon some exact figures that only PERS has and until we develop our actual plan and identify those specific people and they make application to PERS we won't have real numbers but these numbers are based on a CD that PERS provided to us, so they're as close as we can possibly project.

Pizzino: Chief Neftzer. Before you go any further, you said you were looking at the cost of a two year buyout?

Neftzer: Yes.

Pizzino: Okay and you said all five of these people would qualify. By the sheet I'm looking at it doesn't show that.

Neftzer: No, they would qualify within that year's time frame so only those people that are listed there for two years would qualify on day one. Some of them qualify within the year. If only those people listed on that sheet took it, it would be a minimum of \$180,000. So then you have to go to the next spreadsheet. That's on the next page so that if on the last day that it was offered what employees would qualify and what would those expenses be. So if you go to the second spreadsheet you'll have five employees listed there and for a two year buyout our cost is \$265,676.00. Is everybody with me on that? Okay. So our cost, depending upon who were to take it, and again, we're making some assumptions here that every employee would take it, but if every employee took it, our cost is going to fall between \$180,000 and \$265,000, depending upon what time they took it during that year that it was offered. And I wouldn't recommend extending it beyond a year because that just allows employees to continue to work a longer period of time and so I would encourage that we only offer it for a year's time.

Pizzino: You're offering it for one year's time with a two year buyout.

Neftzer: That's my recommendation because when you look at the three year on page 2 there where it's effective 11/30/07, you'll see that your number jumps to \$503,000. That's going to be a hard number to justify to anybody. Quite honestly, I can't show a cost savings in that neighborhood. Mr. Gonzalez and I have been working at this pretty diligently for the last couple months. If you go back to your first spreadsheet, we identified the areas where we think we would save money. I won't go through every one of these line items but the salary of two new officers versus two senior officers, the salary of two new secretary threes versus two senior secretary threes, the salary of a new secretary one versus a senior secretary one, the vacation benefit that's added. When we looked at the amount of overtime that's being generated by, Randy you might have to help me here, these senior employees accumulate a total of 27 weeks of vacation per year. A new employee in year one would get zero years of vacation, so the first year we would implement this we would save 27 weeks of either overtime or employee cost for that amount of time. We would actually be getting work done instead of vacation during that 27 weeks. Now that decreases over a five year period, but the numbers are reflected there. Randy's office put together in year one what it would save, year two, year three, year four and through five years. So you know when you figure in vacation fill ins for sergeants, vacation fill ins for secretary threes, or at the front desk which is manned 24/7, 4% longevity, 2% longevity, you can

see down at the bottom of the chart on page one, the different cost savings through the years. By year 5, we would save \$274,294.00. So you have to compare that number to whatever your costs are, and again, our costs are going to be anywhere from \$180,000 to \$265,000, depending upon when during that term the employees actually take the buyout. So anyhow I think the issue for me as I was evaluating this is I didn't want to spend more money than we were saving and I think we can clearly demonstrate here that this is going to save the department our taxpayer's dollars. Randy, I don't know if you want to comment further about that.

Gonzalez: Well, some other factors that came into play is, we could pay this to PERS over a three year period and we can use monies that are not levy dollars, we can use State reimbursements of personal property tax dollars for the next three years to pay those payments. Lastly, one of the biggest factors is we can offer this just to the Police Department without offering it township wide. If we had to offer it township wide it may not be a cost savings. We'd have to look at each department and this, at least, gives us the ability to do that.

Neftzer: Mr. Pizzino, to answer your question the reason I wouldn't look at that three year buyout is even if we played this out to year six through ten, we're looking at around \$300,000 as our maximum savings as we've generated this document. So to me it would be cost prohibitive to look at a \$500,000 number when all we're going to save is \$300,000. So at two years, we're definitely going to save dollars, at three years, it looks like it would be cost prohibitive, I think, to go that direction.

Pizzino: Okay.

Neftzer: I guess I would like the Board to take this into consideration. The next step for us would be to draft an actual plan that we would submit to PERS for them to ensure that it met their legal requirements. Mr. Fitzgerald is aware of what's necessary there. And then they would return that back to us, I guess, as a formal plan that we could adopt. We could set our dates and our time lines if the Board's willing to go forward with this. I'll be happy to answer whatever questions you might have.

Pizzino: This number if we wouldn't fill a position, it would be on top of that, correct?

Neftzer: Correct. If there were any type of reorganization or consolidation, those savings would be in addition to these savings and jointly I would say a lot of these dollars have already been saved because the major's position has been vacant for a year and a half. So there's been quite a bit of cost savings there.

Gonzalez: One of the intangible differences is also 26 weeks of vacation, that's half a year. We're paying overtime to someone to fill those spots. I'm sure there are occasions and I'm sure Harley can address that better, but we don't have all the slots filled up and we're running one car less that shift.

Neftzer: Well, it has happened and one of the things is we totaled this up over five years, I think it was a total of 95 additional weeks. I'd have to go back and look at the numbers but I think it was a total of 95 weeks of additional patrols for our Jackson residents over the next five years. I

mean that's two years' worth of one officer patrolling their neighborhoods. That's a big number. You really can't factor in a value for that. That was something that really stood out to Randy and me.

Gonzalez: I think we were looking for the most effective plan we could come up with that would put the most officers on the streets for the least amount of money to the taxpayers, so we could stretch our levies as far as we possibly can. We certainly know we have to go back to the taxpayers in a few years and we are trying to be able to do that without asking for additional taxes then.

Meeks: Well, the main reason I know that the Board has asked to look at this was because we are committed to putting the maximum patrol officers in cars in the streets, not being weighed down on the upper burden of paid positions. However, if we do choose to fill it, it would be a trickle down effect to where, when you move people you are hiring in at a lower rate, much lower rate, where we again save the dollars and the residents have told us numerous times and that is the most important thing, they want to see patrol cars in their neighborhoods, on the street and so do we. And this is a way that we can start getting the most out of the dollars that we are given.

Pizzino: I agree. I think if we could come up with this cost savings plus that additional patrol, I think that would be the way to go. Again, I would like to have some time to look at these numbers and we'll discuss this again possibly next meeting.

Neftzer: Okay.

Pizzino: If you want to come up with some type of a draft for next meeting, that's fine. Mr. Burger, your feelings? Mr. Meeks, I know Mr. Meeks' feelings.

Burger: I agree with both of you.

Pizzino: Mr. Gonzalez, anything else? Anything else, Chief?

Neftzer: No, I think that's it.

Pizzino: Thank you so much.

### **Highway Department – Mike Rekstis, ME Companies**

#### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 C**

Boger introduced Mike Rekstis from ME Companies who reported on the Fulton / Wales Intersection Improvement and new information regarding the Portage / Lutz Intersection.

Mr. Rekstis reported the Stage 3 plans for Fulton / Wales are currently on schedule for a completion date of Nov. 22, 2006. The right of way acquisition is proceeding. Of the eighteen parcels, they have nine signatures to date. Negotiations are continuing with the nine outstanding

property owners. Nothing has been heard from the gas company in regards to relocation, but ME will be watching cautiously for their plans.

Meeks brought up a concern that Mercy has not completed their work. Caritas has not been turned over to the Township and the question is who will be responsible for snow removal and safety. Meeks asked that Mr. Rekstis or Mr. LaRocco contact Mercy and remind them that they will be responsible for snow removal on Caritas until it is no longer private property. Mr. Rekstis will make the call and let Boger know what the outcome is.

Mr. Rekstis reported they have been working on a design for a storm water detention basin, a dry detention basin for a future fire station, and the road water drainage at the Portage / Lutz intersection. In order to make room for the basin, they have to move the drainage channel over toward the west.

Boger addressed concerns made about moving the stream to the west and losing the trees. He said the trees would be lost but a new barrier of trees could be put in but is not designed into the job at this point. Another concern was whether the detention basin was going to be over in the stream area. The detention basin will be over next to Lutz, not in the stream area at all. Future drainage downstream still needs to be addressed but is not part of this design.

Meeks said he has looked at the property and discussed the design change with the engineers. He said the engineers, Mike Rekstis and Rich LaRocco have all assured him that the flow going into the ditch will not be any greater than it is now. He wanted the Board to know that they are being proactive especially in the design stage and that they are talking with the residents and are doing everything possible to move forward yet still ease the pressure on the residents.

At 6:00 p.m., Pizzino called the General Session to order with all department heads present. He requested that all cell phones and pagers be turned off at this time.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**Public Speaks – None**

### **Administration Department**

#### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 D**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the attached Health Benefit Plan Amendment No. 19, changing the name of Professional Claims Management (PCM) to Aultra Administrative Group (AAG), effective October 1, 2006. **3-0 yes**

#### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 E**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the attached Novation Agreement with Professional Claims Management, Inc., and Aultra Administrative Group, effective October 1, 2006. **3-0 yes**

## **Fire Department**

### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 F**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to adopt and authorize the placement of the Board members signature upon the attached Agreement with the Board of Trustees of Osnaburg Township for weight equipment. **3-0 yes**

### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 G**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the appropriation transfer request from account code 228.210.5450, Dispatch Services, to account code 228.210.5120, Overtime, in the amount of \$40,692.50, from account code 210.210.5220, Hospitalization, to account code 210.210.5120, Overtime, in the amount of \$39,212.72 and from account code 210.210.5220, Hospitalization, to account code 210.210.5136, Longevity, in the amount of \$11,348.35, for a total of \$91, 253.57. **3-0 yes**

### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 H**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the appropriation transfer request from account code 210.210.5220, Hospitalization, to account code 210.210.5214, Emp. Medicare, in the amount of \$13,000.00. **3-0 yes**

## **Highway Department**

### **RESOLUTION 06-098, ATTACHED**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion pursuant to ORC Section 515.01, we determine that the public health and safety requires the placement of street illumination light on an existing pole at the intersection of West Boulevard and Peninsula Drive and adopt and authorize the placement of the Board President's signature upon the attached letter to American Electric Power. **3-0 yes**

## **Legal Department**

### **RESOLUTION 06-099, ATTACHED**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to adopt and authorize the placement of the Board President's signature upon the attached ODOT Easement and Donation Letter. **3-0 yes**

## **Police Department**

### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 I**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to accept the resignation of George Reuscher in accordance with the attached letter of resignation. **3-0 yes**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to accept the resignation of Megan Bovenzi in accordance with the attached letter of resignation. **3-0 yes**

Chief Neftzer announced that in partnership with the high school on Wednesday, November 1, an internet safety class will be held from 7:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. This is geared toward parents to inform them of possible threats and concerns regarding the internet.

## **Fiscal Office**

### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 J**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to pay the bills in the amount of \$429,598.49.

**3-0 yes**

### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 K**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the minutes of October 10 and October 19, 2006 Board of Trustees' meetings.

**3-0 yes**

### **ATTACHMENT 10/23/06 L**

Meeks moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the fund transfer from fund 101, General Fund, to fund 214, Park Fund, in the amount of \$193,145.36.

**3-0 yes**

Gonzalez explained that all the money for the Parks comes from the General Fund. There are no levies to cover the expenses of the Parks.

Pizzino moved and Meeks seconded a motion to set a public hearing on November 13, 2006 at 6:30 p.m. for Shady Knolls #2 Street Lighting District.

**3-0 yes**

## **Routine Business**

### **Announcements**

- Next regular Board of Trustees meeting, November 13, 2006, 4:00 p.m. Executive Session and/or Work Session, 6:00 p.m., General Session, Township Hall.
- LOGIC, November 2, 2006, 9:00 a.m., Safety Center, Chiefs' Conference Room.
- CIC, November 6, 2006, 5:30 p.m., Jackson Library.
- Board of Zoning Appeals, November 9, 2006, 7:00 p.m., Township Hall.
- Citizens Advisory Committees:
  - Park, November 14, 2006, 6:30 p.m., Township Hall.
  - Highway/Traffic, November 15, 2006, 6:30 p.m., Township Hall.
  - Community Celebration, November 20, 2006, 6:00 p.m., Township Hall.
- Halloween Trick or Treat in Jackson Township set for Sunday, October 29, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

**Old Business**

Meeks asked Fitzgerald if he has given any thought to bringing on an assistant to help him in police matters and the court system. Fitzgerald replied that he will look further into the position of a police assistance advisor.

**New Business** – None

**Public Speaks – Open Forum**

No one came forward.

Pizzino moved and Meeks seconded a motion to go back into Executive Session for Police Department Personnel (Appointment/Employment/Compensation) – Interview applicants for Major. **3-0 yes**

At 7:47 p.m., Pizzino called the meeting back to order.

Pizzino moved and Meeks seconded a motion to set a special meeting for October 26, 2006 at 5:00 p.m. **3-0 yes**

Pizzino moved and Meeks seconded a motion to adjourn. **3-0 yes**

---

**John Pizzino**

---

**Randy Gonzalez**