

**Class Review Bargaining**  
**June 1, 2006 Mediation Summary**  
 Eugene Public, 9:00 a.m.

On June 1<sup>st</sup> we held a second mediation session with the City in an attempt to settle the remaining areas of disagreement (wages and retro pay plus some other issues around allocation of employees into the new classifications). Below is a summary of the session.

We opened the session with two areas of disagreement: Administrative Aides and Engineering Permit Technicians.

**Union's Initial Proposal**

**1. Administrative Aide, Administrative Specialist, and Senior Administrative Specialist**

Class	City's Proposed Range	Union's Proposed Range
Administrative Assistant 1	12	12
Administrative Assistant 2 (Administrative Specialist)	15	15
Administrative Assistant 3 (Senior Administrative Specialist)	17	<b>17</b> through July 8, 2006 <b>18</b> effective July 9, 2006

- At the last session the City had indicated that they would not consider any Union package if it did not contain a Range 17 proposal for the Senior Administrative Specialist (Sr. AS). So we began by proposing Range 17 through the end of the fiscal year and then a Range 18 effective July 9, 2006. We also had given up our request for a separate classification for the Eugene Police Department Administrative Aids. At this point we were willing to try anything in an attempt to settle the AA bargaining. The one area we felt strongest about was the market based demand for Range 18 for the Sr. AS. The bargaining team felt Range 18 needed to stay in the Union proposal.
- We also asked for a lump sum of \$1400 per employees working in each of these classifications. This would be about \$1000 after taxes, we thought the City would see this was the same as their offer of \$1000. Our demand was basing a rough estimate the actual back pay owed to AAs over the past 2 years. During the previous mediation we had reduced our lump sum demand by \$600, a substantial reduction on our part.
- Finally, based on the City's earlier refusal to discuss allocation issues, we added allocation language for the following members: Jan Griffin, Lynn Dixon, Mandy Fox, Sarita Black, and Cathi Lacki.

**2. Engineering Permit Tech 1/2**

With Range 21/23 effective July 9, 2005 and a stormwater quality review agreed to, the remaining issue for this classification review was back pay. We reluctantly reduced our request to \$1400 to be paid to each employee in the classification. We had initially asked for \$2000 per employee. Other agreements included:

- An agreed upon labor management process for developing a training and evaluation program for new employees.
- An agreement on how current employee would be trained and a “safety net” should it be needed.
- An agreement to review the impact of stormwater quality standards on the work unit with in 6 months of the adoption of the stormwater quality ordinance.

**3. Residential Plan Reviewers**

- Implementation effective July 10, 2005 at Range 24.

**4. Stores Clerks, Parts and Supply Specialist and Fleet Parts Specialist**

- Implementation effective July 10, 2005 at Ranges, 15, 17 and 19.

**5. Box Office Specialist**

- Implementation effective July 10, 2005 at Range 13.

**6. Recreation Facility Office Coordinator**

- Implementation effective July 10, 2005 at Range 16

**Blow by Blow – here’s how it went down. . .**

We meet at 9:30 and presented the City with our initial offer. At 11:45 am, the City responded by:

- Rejecting the Range 18 for the Sr. AS effective July 9, 2006.
- Rejecting the lump sum \$1400 and sticking with \$1000 for AA prorated for period of time worked as an AA and for part-time employees.
- Rejecting the lump sum payment for EPT but proposing \$1200 paid to employees who worked at the EPT2 level from Jan. 1 2005 to July 1, 2005; prorated for the portion worked during that period and for part time work.
- Rejecting proposed placement and retro pay requests for all of the employees listed

At 1:30 we made our second proposal splitting the package into two parts: AAs and everything else. Union Proposal #2 included all the classifications except the AAs (that proposal was floated at 2:50 pm). Our goal was to settle what we could.

The City responded that they would not look at Proposal #2 without a proposal on the AAs. We had to reassure the mediator that an AA proposal was being prepared.

At 2:30 the City replied with to Proposal #2 with the following changes reducing the lump sum to \$1200 for only 4 of the current EPTs, and prorated the lump sum amount based on FTE status and percent of time worked Jan. 1, 2005 to June 30, 2005.

We did not think this was fair, two of our members were not going to get a lump sum. They would receive the retro back pay effective July 10, 2005. In discussing this the City pointed out these members had not performed the higher level duties for the classification during this time period. While we also did not agree to a \$200 reduction in the lump sum, in the end the group consensus was that it was not what we thought was fair but was very close to our last offer (\$1400) that we should accept it in order to settle. So we reluctantly accepted.

At 2:50 we gave the City our Proposal #3 – the AA proposal. We tried to explain our various positions on allocation issues and requests for retro pay etc. But the mediator pointed out that if we did not move on Range 18, the rest of the proposal was meaningless. In the end the bargaining team did not feel we could agree to drop our request for Range 18. This ended the session. We declared impasse.