In the Matter of the Interest Arbitration

: Additional

- Between -

Supplemental Award

COUNTY OF NASSAU

"County"

- and -

POLICE BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION, POLICE DEPARTMENT, COUNTY OF NASSAU, NEW YORK, INC.

"PBA"

#### **APPEARANCES**

### For the County

LAMB & BARNOSKY, L.L.P.
Richard Zuckerman, Esq., Attorney
Michael Krauthamer, Esq., Attorney
Robert McGuigan, 1st Deputy Commissioner of Police
Karen O'Callahan, Deputy Chief
Daniel McCray, Director of Labor Relations

### For the PBA

GREENBERG, BURZICHELLI, GREENBERG, P.C. Harry Greenberg, Esq., Attorney Seth Greenberg, Esq., Attorney Robert Rettinger, 4th Precinct Trustee Michael Bonsignore, 8th Precinct Trustee Dean Losquadro, 5th Precinct Trustee Joseph Smith, Delegate Thomas O'Reilly, 7th Precinct Trustee Kenneth Cortes, 2nd Precinct Trustee John LaSala, HQ Trustee Brian Engelhardt, 3rd Precinct Trustee Wayne Hartmann, Tresurer James McDermott, Sergeant at Arms Paul Schaefer, Delegate Kevin Tobin, 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-President James Carver, 1st Vice-President Anthony Famulari, HQ Trustee

BEFORE: JOHN M. DONOGHUE, ESQ., CHAIRMAN OF THE PANEL
MARTIN F. SCHEINMAN, ESQ., NEUTRAL MEMBER OF THE PANEL
HOWARD C. EDELMAN, ESQ., NEUTRAL MEMBER OF THE PANEL
TIMOTHY DRISCOLL, ESQ., COUNTY MEMBER OF THE PANEL
GARY DELARABA, PBA MEMBER OF THE PANEL

These findings follow hearings held on April 24, 2006 and November 2, 2006, at which certain items were addressed which remained unsolved from our prior determinations rendered in 2003, 2004 and 2005. At the hearing the following issues were addressed:

- 1. Chart 13 Shift Differential
- 2. Lag Payroll
- 3. Reopener
- 4. Civilianization
- 5. Mentally Aided/Prisoner Staffing
- 6. Personal Time Off
- 7. Deployment Order
- 8. Holiday Pay for New Hires
- 9. Union Excusal
- 10. Vacation Scheduling
- 11. Executive Board Pay
- 12. Special Assignment Stipends

The Panel has reviewed the record with respect to these issues. Based upon that review and consistent with the criteria set forth in Section 209 of the Taylor Law, we issue the following

### **FINDINGS**

# 1. Chart 13 - Shift Differential

Our initial Award modified the hours during which

shift differential (formerly "night differential") was to be paid. It also changed the percentage to be paid during those hours. However, that Award was intended to apply only to Chart Orange and to no other chart. Also, it was not intended to require the payment of the differential where none had been paid before, other than as pertaining to Chart Orange. Nor was it intended to increase the shift differential provided to any other officers not in Chart Orange in terms of hours paid or percentage received unless otherwise specifically provided for. On the other hand, our Award was also not intended to deprive Police Officers of differential where one had been paid before.

It is into the latter category that Chart 13 falls. In essence, the Chart consists of a two week schedule. For one week Officers work days, generally 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., though the starting and ending times may vary somewhat. The other week officers work evenings, generally 11:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m., again with some flexibility. Thus, the chart consists of a day tour and an evening tour and for a number of years Officers were, in essence, paid night differential for the evening tour and not for the day tour.

As noted above, it was never the Panel's intent to

eliminate the shift differential for working Chart 13 by virtue of the changes incorporated in our initial Interest Arbitration Award rendered in September 2003. The reductions in shift differential as implemented by the County following the issuance of our Award effectively eliminate the major portion of the differential. Thus, we shall direct that, retroactive to January 1, 2004, Police Officers working Chart 13 shall be paid shift differential as it existed on December 31, 2003.

### 2. Lag Payroll

We disagree with the PBA that the determination by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Michael Adams v. Thomas Suozzi (03-CIV-4363 dec'd September 18, 2006) constitutes a final determination which requires us to make Police Officers whole for the effects of the lag payroll previously instituted. Thus, we conclude, the matter has still not been fully resolved through the judicial process. Accordingly, the issue of the lag payroll continues to be remanded to the parties for resolution. Should additional decisions be forthcoming we shall retain jurisdiction to finally resolve the dispute.

However, we are mindful of the inordinately long time the appeals process has taken in the litigation

related to this issue. In order to prevent any party from taking actions which may be viewed as dilatory, we shall direct that either may revisit this issue before us if no final determination is rendered by October 1, 2007.

### 3. Reopener

The PBA has asked that it receive additional benefits based on its claim that other sworn personnel were granted better terms and conditions of employment in their Interest Arbitration Awards than the PBA was. The Panel has reviewed these items in light of the relevant record, the criterion set forth in the Taylor Law and the parties arguments advanced at the hearings held on April 24, 2006 and November 2, 2006. Based upon this review we make the following findings:

# Date Changes Re: Hourly Calculations, Quarter Days, Flag Day, Travel Time and Termination Pay

The fact that a benefit reduction begins at a later date in the SOA Award as opposed to the PBA's does not mean that the reopener clause has been triggered so as to delay the reduction in the benefit for the PBA. Instead, the difference in date implementation reflects differences in the periods covered by the PBA and SOA Awards. It also reflects the timing as to when the Awards were issued. For example, retirement stipend

recalculation was implemented one year earlier for the PBA than for the DAI because the PBA finding was issued almost one year before the DAI's. Detectives who contemplated retiring had to receive reasonable notice as to what their payouts would be so they could make informed decisions as to the date they chose to retire. The same was true for Police Officers. Affording such notice required that in some instances implementation dates had to be later in the DAI Award than in the PBA In addition, the Panel's findings in all three Award. cases and the cost savings achieved were based in part on the dates they were implemented. Thus, with respect to the claims raised concerning implementation dates, we do not find that the reopener clause has been triggered. Therefore, the PBA's request in this regard is rejected.

### 4. Civilianization

At the hearing of April 24, 2006, this matter was addressed, though not fully analyzed. At issue are nine positions yet to be civilianized. It is understood that these positions would not come from the precincts or the blotter recorder. While representatives of the Police Department and the PBA met to discuss the matter, apparently no agreement was reached.

The record is devoid of sufficient evidence for the

Panel to determine which jobs should be civilianized. Accordingly, we direct the parties to submit a list, within sixty days of their receipt of this Award, of proposed jobs to be civilianized and the rationale therefor. Obviously, the parties are free to engage in further discussions during this period to agree upon a resolution of this issue. However, in the event the parties are unable to agree, we shall decide this matter on an expedited basis.

# 5. Mentally Aided/Prisoner Staffing

We have reviewed the record carefully on this issue. We find no basis to modify our original determination that two Officers must be assigned to guard a prisoner or mentally aided individual. In the case of a mentally aided individual, one officer must be of the same gender as the individual. However, we reiterate our comments made at the hearing that we expect the parties to apply this provision with common sense where unusual circumstances may arise. Where unusual circumstances do arise, prior to the assignment the parties may mutually agree to have fewer than two Officers assigned to guard a prisoner or mentally aided individual.

### 6. Personal Time Off

The PBA's concerns are in the nature of the way in

which the contractual provisions are being implemented. As such, they are not properly before us but must be processed through the parties' grievance procedure.

# 7. Deployment Order

As with the PBA's demand regarding personal leave, this issue is not properly before us. Rather it constitutes a grievance which must be brought in that forum.

# 8. Holiday Pay for New Hires

The PBA's concerns are in the nature of the way in which the contractual provision on this issue is being implemented. Consequently, this item also constitutes a grievance which must be brought in that forum.

### 9. Union Excusal

We have concluded that this item is not properly before us. It must be remanded to the grievance procedure, we conclude.

### 10. Vacation Scheduling

This item does not involve either a "reopener" matter or a clarification of our prior Award. Instead, it involves an issue relating to the scheduling of vacations not previously addressed. Hence, it belongs within the grievance procedure and not before this Panel.

# 11. Executive Board Pay

We agree, like the DAI, effective January 1, 2005, Executive Board Members shall have their time served as Delegate calculated in for eligibility for Executive Board stipends.

After reviewing the record, the Panel finds that, like the SOA, the Trustee stipend shall be paid upon the individual taking elected office as Trustee, effective January 1, 2006.

## 12. Special Assignment Stipends

We agree the assignments which the PBA seeks to incorporate into base pay are analogous to our Award concerning Detective Supervisors' Differential. In that instance, the differential was placed into base pay as it was part of the basic emolument of the position.

The same justification applies here. In central testing, dive team, B.S.O., E.S.U. and applicant investigation units, the stipends are granted in recognition of the basic functions Police Officers perform when assigned to those units. Thus, as with the Detective Supervisors' differential, these emoluments should be part of a Police Officer's base pay. Accordingly, the PBA's request is awarded effective December 31, 2006.

# 13. Other Proposals

All other proposals of the parties, whether or not specifically addressed herein, are rejected.

### **AWARD**

### 1. Chart 13 - Shift Differential

Police Officers working Chart 13 are to be made whole for lost shift differential retroactive to January 1, 2004, as it existed on December 31, 2003.

# 2. Lag Payroll

The PBA's demand that Officers be reimbursed for the County's implementation of a lag payroll is rejected. This issue remains in abeyance until the merits of the dispute are finally resolved in other, parallel proceedings or October 1, 2007, whichever comes first.

### 3. Reopener

The PBA's proposals are rejected.

### 4. Civilianization

Within sixty days of their receipt of this Award, the parties shall submit a list of proposed positions to be civilianized, outside of the precincts or the blotter recorder. Unless the parties agree, the Panel shall decide this matter on an expedited basis.

# 5. Mentally Aided/Prisoner Staffing

The Panel reaffirms its prior holding subject to the comments set forth in this Opinion.

### 6. Personal Time Off

This issue is not properly before this Panel.

# 7. Deployment Orders

This issue is not properly before this Panel.

### 8. Holiday Pay for New Hires

This issue is not properly before this Panel.

### 9. Union Excusal

This issue is not properly before this Panel.

# 10. Vacation Scheduling

This issue is not properly before this Panel.

# 11. Executive Board Pay

Effective January 1, 2005, Executive Board Members shall have their time served as Delegate calculated in for eligibility for Executive Board stipends.

Effective January 1, 2006, the Trustee stipend shall be paid upon the individual taking elected office as Trustee.

### 12. Special Assignment Stipends

Effective December 31, 2006, the stipends for central testing, dive team, B.S.O., E.S.U. and applicant investigation shall be incorporated into base pay.

### 13. Other Proposals

All other proposals of the parties, whether or not specifically addressed herein, are rejected.

DATED: 4/13/07

John M. Donoghue, Esq.,

Chairman

Interest Arbitration Panel

STATE OF NEW YORK )

SS.:

COUNTY OF NASSAU

On this day of here 2007, before me personally came and appeared JOHN M. DONOGHUE, ESQ., Chairman, to me known and known to me to be the individual described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and he acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

EMILIE A. LONG
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 01L06135760
Qualified in Grange County
Commission Expires 10/24/

Scheinman, Esq.,

Neutral Member Interest Arbitration Panel

STATE OF NEW YORK }

) 53.:

COUNTY OF MASSAU

On this 15% day of 2007, before me personally came and appeared MARTIN F. SCHEINMAN, ESQ., Neutral Member, to me known and known to me to be the 2007, before me individual described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and he acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

DATED: April 13.2007

Neutral Member

Interest Arbitration Panel

STATE OF NEW YORK )

) ss.:

COUNTY OF NASSAU

On this <u>13<sup>TH</sup></u> day of <u>APRIL</u> 2007, before me personally came and appeared HOWARD C. EDELMAN, ESQ., Neutral Member, to me known and known to me to be the individual described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and he acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF NEW YORK NO. 01HA6101766

QUALIFIED IN NASSAU COUNTY

Concur	As to sections 1-10 and 13.
Dissent	As to sections II and 12 (pp 7 and 8) for reasons expressed by (pp 10 and 11) the County's advocate at the hearings on this matter.
DATED:	Timothy Driscoll, County Member Interest Arbitration Panel

STATE OF NEW YORK ) ) 55.: COUNTY OF NASSAU

On this 16 day of 1001 2007, before me personally came and appeared TIMOTHY DRISCOLL, County Member, to me known and known to me to be the individual described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and he acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

NOTARY PUBLIC

DEBORAH AUSTIN
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 30-4729801
Qualified in Nassau County
Commission Expires Feb. 28, 2011

Concur
Dissent
DATED: 4/13/07 Gary DeLaRaba, PBA Member
Interest Arbitration Panel
TATE OF NEW YORK ) ) ss.:
OUNTY OF NASSAU )
On this 3 day of ARS 2007, before me ersonally came and appeared GARY DELARABA, PBA Member, o me known and known to me to be the individual
escribed in and who executed the foregoing instrument and he acknowledged to me that he executed the same.
NOTE PURITY

JOSEPH C. FAILLA, JR. NOTARY PUBLIC, State of New York No. Q1FA5040080 Quelfied in Nessau County Commission Expires March 8, 29......