

CITY OF BURTON

FINANCE SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 23, 1996, 9:00 A.M., COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The Meeting was called to order by Keith Cox, Chairman, at 9:25 A.M.

Members Present: Cox and Martinbianco.

Members Absent: Abbey.

Others Present: B. Becker, Treasurer/Controller; D. Lowthian, Assessor; R. LaDuke, Building Department Supervisor and R. Riess, Water & Sewer Supervisor.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING: Discussion and Possible Recommendation
Concerning Ordinance 68 (C).

PRESENTATION: None.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: None.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

Ordinance 68 (C):

Mr. Martinbianco was concerned with the elimination of Sub Section 6 of Ordinance 68 (C), which states: During the pay period following the effective date of this ordinance, administrative officers may be entitled to a one time, lump sum compensation in an amount determined by the Mayor, not in excess of three per cent of their base annual salary. What has been proposed is the elimination of that provision and inserted instead was a predetermined amount of a 2 1/2% raise giving full compensation of 5% total. The language that reflects this is important, so the City doesn't have to deal with the multi-level raises as a result in future negotiations.

Mr. Cox supports the removal of Section 6. We can leave it to the bargaining teams to give fair and equitable increases. It will be easier dealing with this at budget time. He would like a one time increase in lieu of Section 6 and then have it eliminated.

Mr. Martinbianco wanted clarification on the \$15,000 fund transfer in relation to this topic.

Mr. Becker said the original 2 1/2% increase has been accounted for during budget negotiations. The \$15,000 will cover the current increase of 2 1/2% in lieu of the elimination of Section 6.

Mr. Cox said the second transfer will be reflected, even if we remove Section 6 under Ordinance 68 (C). For those five positions and the non-union non-charter five positions, it will also be reflected in their wages. We might not even need Section 6 to reflect the base wages.

Mr. Becker said Sections 1-5 talks about specific salaries. Those specific salaries were increased by 5%. The decision is to decide whether to make the language in Section 6 reflect the additional 2 1/2% raise. He suggested deleting Section 6 and including the 5% in Sections 1-5.

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 23, 1996/9:00 A.M.

PAGE -2-

Mr. Martinbianco asked what percentage the SEIU would get next year.

Mr. LaDuke said the SEIU will get a 3% raise next year and the other unions will be negotiating their contract in the next year.

Discussion continued on the deletion of Section 6 and language to reflect the current 2 1/2% additional amount.

Mr. Becker said the first five Sections require annual action and will be revisited every year. If you want to add a clause to this ordinance, that can be done.

Mr. Martinbianco said for the record, Section 1 would change to \$40,523.04, Section 2 to \$50,760.30., Section 3 to \$47,818.04, Section 4 to \$48,847.72, Section 5 to \$41,869.50 and Section 6 will be deleted.

Mr. Becker said the first reading will be on the next agenda. The second reading

will be on the subsequent agenda along with the transfer of fund resolution and probably a non-union non-charter confirmation as well.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Martinbianco moved and Cox supported the following motion:

Approve and authorize the elimination of Section 6, as currently in 68 (C), incorporate the additional 2 1/2% and put the additional transfer on the agenda with the understanding that these minutes will reflect the fact we will look at those numbers again next year, as they are proposed to us with the next Ordinance revision of this issue next year. He would like Council to put together a Salary Commission to get involved at that level with the negotiations.

Motion carried 2-0.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:45 A.M.

Gayle Webster
City Clerk

GW/cml