

State Employment Relations Board

Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012

The State Employment Relations Board met on January 26, 2012, at 10:00 a.m., at 65 East State Street, 12th Floor, Columbus, Ohio. Present at the meeting were Chair W. Craig Zimpher, Vice Chair Robert F. Spada, and Board Member N. Eugene Brundige.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE JANUARY 12, 2012 BOARD MEETING:

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board approve the minutes for the January 12, 2012 Board meeting. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

II. MEDIATION AND FACT-FINDING MATTERS AT ISSUE:

1. Case 2011-MED-06-0952 Fraternal Order of Police, Ohio Labor Council, Inc. and City of Westerville

On June 27, 2011, the Fraternal Order of Police, Ohio Labor Council, Inc. (Full-time Records Technicians, Community Service Aide, Crime Prevention Specialist, and Police Division Secretary) ("Incumbent Employee Organization") filed a Notice to Negotiate concerning negotiations for a successor collective bargaining agreement with the City of Westerville ("Employer"). Case No. 2011-MED-06-0952

On December 19, 2011, the Fraternal Order of Police, Ohio Labor Council, Inc. filed a Motion to Revoke Certification seeking to no longer be the exclusive representative for the bargaining unit. SERB's Board Meeting of January 12, 2012, granted the Revocation of Certification of the bargaining unit on Case No. 2010-REP-01-0008.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board Dismiss the Notice To Negotiate on Case No. 2011-MED-06-0952. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

2. Case 2011-MED-08-1048 International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local #20 and Perrysburg Township Board of Trustees

On August 17, 2011, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local #20 (Full-time and Part-time Road Maintenance Employees and Mechanics in the Road Maintenance Department) ("Incumbent Employee Organization") filed a Notice to Negotiate concerning negotiations for a successor collective bargaining agreement with the Perrysburg Township Board of Trustees ("Employer"). Case No. 2011-MED-08-1048

On December 6, 2011, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local #20 filed a Motion to Revoke Certification and Disclaimer of Interest seeking to no longer be the exclusive representative for the bargaining unit. SERB's Board Meeting of January 12, 2012, granted the Revocation of Certification of the bargaining unit on Case No. 2005-REP-04-0069.

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 2 of 22

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board Dismiss the Notice To Negotiate on Case No. 2011-MED-08-1048. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

3. Case 2011-MED-10-1579 City of Toledo and International Association of Firefighters, Local No. 92

On October 20, 2011, the City of Toledo (“City”) filed a Notice to Negotiate with the State Employment Relations Board (“SERB” or “the Board”) and served a copy of this notice on the International Association of Firefighters, Local No. 92 (“Local 92” or “Union”).

On January 3, 2012, the City requested SERB appoint a fact-finding panel.

On January 5, 2012, SERB issued a letter to the parties for the selection of a fact-finding panel from a list of five potential panel members. SERB’s January 5, 2012 letter clearly states that if SERB does not receive an email response from the parties’ with their mutual selection of a fact-finder by January 12, 2012, SERB will appoint a fact-finder at its discretion in accordance with Ohio Administrative Code Rule 4117-9-05(E).

On or about January 9, 2012, the City of Toledo sent an email to counsel for Local 92 indicating that the City was amenable to the selection of Fact Finder Gregory P. Szuter or Fact Finder Daniel G. Zeiser from the list of potential panel members provided by SERB.

The parties did not notify SERB that they had made a mutual selection of a fact finder by January 12, 2012.

On January 12, 2012, International Association of Firefighters, Local No. 92 filed a Local 92’s Motion to Compel the City of Toledo to Comply with R.C. § 4117.14(C)(3) and OAC 4117-9-05(B) and to Extend the Statutory Timeline (*Motion to Compel and to Extend Statutory Timeline*).

Because the parties failed to notify SERB that they had made a mutual selection of a fact finder by January, 12, 2012, SERB appointed Fact Finder Michael Paolucci on January 13, 2012, pursuant to Ohio Administrative Code Rule 4117-9-05(B).

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board deny the Union’s Motion to Compel and to Extend the Statutory Timeline as moot, since the Board has properly appointed a fact finder in this matter pursuant to Ohio Administrative Code Rule 4117-9-05(B). Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 3 of 22

4. Case 2011-MED-12-1733 Champaign County Engineer and Champaign County Engineer Employees Association

On December 15, 2011, the Champaign County Engineer Employees Association (“the Association”) filed a Notice to Negotiate with the State Employment Relations Board (“the Board”) and served a copy of this notice on the Champaign County Engineer (“Employer”). “Ohio Council 8, Local 2632, AFSCME, AFL-CIO” (“Ohio Council 8”) is listed as the name of the Employee Organization on the Notice to Negotiate.

On January 6, 2012, the Employer filed a Motion to Dismiss the Notice to Negotiate on the basis that the notice lists the incorrect name of the Employee Organization subject to collective bargaining with the Employer. The Employer states that the Champaign County Engineer Employees Association is the deemed-certified representative of certain employees within the Champaign County Engineer’s Office. The Employer states that the Champaign County Engineer’s Office has negotiated multiple contracts with the Champaign County Engineer Employees Association; however, Ohio Council 8 has never been the exclusive representative of the Association’s bargaining unit employees.

On January 12, 2012, Ohio Council 8 filed a Memorandum in Opposition to the Employer’s Motion to Dismiss. Ohio Council 8 notes that the Association filed an “Amended Notice to Negotiate” with SERB on or about January 11, 2012, and that this amended notice clearly states that the name of the Employee Organization is “Champaign County Engineer Employees Association.” Ohio Council 8 states that the Association has designated Ohio Council 8 as its authorized representative, similar to the designation that the Union and Ohio Council 8 assume exists between Downes Fishel Hass Kim LLP and the Employer.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board deny the Employer’s Motion to Dismiss as moot, since the Union has filed an Amended Notice to Negotiate that shows the correct name of the Employee Organization as “Champaign County Engineer Employees Association.” Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

III. REPRESENTATION MATTERS AT ISSUE:

1. Case 2011-REP-11-0122 Parma Service Workers Local 1 and USW Local I-7001 and City of Parma
(February 8 – February 21, 2012)

All parties have executed and filed the appropriate Consent Election Agreement seeking a mail-ballot election.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board approve the Consent Election Agreement and direct a mail-ballot election to be conducted during the polling period of February 8, 2012 through February 21, 2012. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 4 of 22

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

2. Case 2012-REP-01-0005 Ohio Council 8, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO and Delaware County Department of Job and Family Services
3. Case 2012-REP-01-0008 Ohio Civil Service Employees Association, AFSCME Local 11, AFL-CIO and The State of Ohio

The parties jointly filed Petitions for Amendment of Certification. The proposed amendments appear appropriate.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board approve the jointly filed petitions and amend the units accordingly. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

4. Case 2011-REP-10-0115 Fraternal Order of Police, Ohio Labor Council, Inc. and Cuyahoga County

The Employer filed a Petition for Amendment of Certification seeking to change its name from Cuyahoga County Sheriff's Office to Cuyahoga County. The Employee Organization responded by filing a letter stating that it has no objections to the petition. The proposed amendment appears appropriate.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board approve the petition and amend the certification accordingly. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

5. Case 2011-REP-12-0138 North Central State Faculty Association - American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and North Central State College

The parties jointly filed a Petition for Clarification of Bargaining Unit seeking to clarify the existing unit description currently certified as "all full-time faculty at the Mansfield Campus" to include the newly created classifications of Practicum Site Coordinator and Program Coordinator. The proposed clarification appears appropriate.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board approve the jointly filed Petition for Clarification of Bargaining Unit and clarify the unit accordingly. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 5 of 22

6. Cases 2011-REP-10-0108 Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association and
2011-REP-10-0111 Cuyahoga County
2011-REP-10-0114
2011-REP-10-0116
2011-REP-10-0117
2011-REP-10-0118

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board table these matters. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

7. Case 2010-REP-03-0047 Graphic Communications
Conference/International Brotherhood of
Teamsters, Local 546M and City of Warrensville
Heights

- There were 13 valid ballots cast
- There were 4 void ballots
- There were 2 challenged ballots
- No Representative received 0 votes
- Graphic Communications Conference/International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 546M received 13 votes and prevailed in this election.

8. Case 2011-REP-09-0085 Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association and
(Unit 2) Board of Trustees of Central Ohio Youth Center
(Juvenile Detention Officers)

- There were 9 valid ballots cast
- There were 0 void ballots
- There were 2 challenged ballots
- No Representative received 1 vote
- Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association received 8 votes and prevailed in this election.

9. Case 2011-REP-09-0093 Teamsters Local #348, affiliated with the
International Brotherhood of Teamsters and
International Association of Machinist
& Aerospace Workers, Local Lodge 1363 and
Metro Regional Transit Authority

- There were 33 valid ballots cast
- There were 0 void ballots
- There were 0 challenged ballots
- No Representative received 0 votes
- International Association of Machinist & Aerospace Workers, Local Lodge 1363 received 0 votes
- Teamsters Local #348, affiliated with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters received 33 votes and

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 6 of 22

prevailed in this election.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board certify the election results and certify each prevailing employee organization as the exclusive representative of all employees in the relevant bargaining unit. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

10. Case 2011-REP-09-0085 Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association and Board of Trustees of Central Ohio Youth Center (Teachers)

- There was 1 valid ballot cast
- There were 0 void ballots
- There were 0 challenged ballots
- Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association received 0 votes
- No Representative received 1 vote and prevailed in this election.

11. Case 2011-REP-09-0086 Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association and Board of Trustees of Central Ohio Youth Center (Assistant Supervisors)

- There were 3 valid ballots cast
- There were 0 void ballots
- There were 0 challenged ballots
- Ohio Patrolmen's Benevolent Association received 1 vote
- No Representative received 2 votes and prevailed in this election.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board certify the election results and certify that the employees in each unit have chosen to have no exclusive representative for the purposes of collective bargaining. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RECOMMENDATIONS AT ISSUE:

1. Case 2010-ULP-04-0116 Tameka W. Ross v. Cuyahoga County /Cuyahoga Support Enforcement Agency

Tameka W. Ross ("Charging Party" or "Ms. Ross") filed an unfair labor practice charge against Cuyahoga County Board of Commissioners/Cuyahoga Support Enforcement Agency ("Charged Party" or "CSEA"), alleging Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code (O.R.C.) §§ 4117.11(A)(1) and (A)(3).

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 7 of 22

Without rendering any judgment on the merits of Charged Party's unfair labor practice charge, the State Employment Relations Board ("SERB" or "the Board") ordered the parties to pre-determination mediation.

On August 4, 2010, the parties participated in pre-determination mediation and, as a result, filed a settlement agreement. On September 9, 2010, the Board voted to grant Charging Party's request to withdraw the unfair labor practice charge, in accordance with paragraph 9 of the parties' settlement agreement. On October 19, 2010, the Board issued a Directive granting Charging Party's request to withdraw her unfair labor practice charge.

On October 18, 2011, Charging Party filed a motion requesting enforcement of settlement agreement and a brief in support. On or about November 22, 2011, Charged Party filed a response to Charging Party's motion. On December 19, 2011, Charging Party filed a response to Charged Party's response. On January 11, 2012, Charged Party filed a response to Charging Party's December 19, 2011 response.

In her motion, Ms. Ross seeks enforcement of paragraphs 1 and 5 of the parties' settlement agreement. Paragraphs 1 and 5 state as follows:

1. The employees of Unit 16, as constituted on August 1, 2010, of the Establishment Division shall be offered the opportunity to participate in a mediation and a unit professional development training. The mediation shall be conducted by a Human Resources staff mediator. Subsequently, the training shall be developed by the Division of Employment Relations and/or the Office of Human Resources. Participation in the mediation shall remain voluntary. Participation in training shall be mandatory.

5. Effective September 1, 2010, Mary Dillinger shall be assigned to the Supervisor position with Unit 16 until at least December 31, 2010, subject to the rights provided to management in the current and any successor collective bargaining agreements. The Employee shall remain in Unit 16 subject to the rights accorded to bargaining unit members and management in the current and any successor collective bargaining agreements. *The Employer reserves the right to make future changes based on a good faith assessment of operational needs.* [Emphasis added.]

Paragraph 1 of Settlement Agreement

Ms. Ross asserts that Cuyahoga County/CSEA has failed to comply with the terms of paragraph 1 of the parties' settlement agreement because CSEA has not yet arranged for a voluntary mediation session and a mandatory unit professional development training session for the employees of Unit 16 of the Establishment Division, as constituted on August 1, 2010.

Charged Party has provided information to show that CSEA has complied with paragraph 1 of the parties' settlement agreement. The information provided indicates that CSEA actively pursued arrangements for the mediation and the professional

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 8 of 22

development training required by paragraph 1 of the parties' settlement agreement in August of 2010. Specifically, CSEA Deputy Director Anthony Sharaba promptly submitted the parties' settlement agreement to representatives of Cuyahoga County's Office of Human Resources (CCHR) on August 6, 2010, which was just two days after the parties executed their agreement. Mr. Sharaba submitted the settlement agreement with a specific request for assistance in complying with paragraph 1 of the agreement.

Two events delayed the implementation of the professional training and mediation described in paragraph 1. First, CCHR was involved in the Cuyahoga County's transition to a charter form of county government. That transition began in 2009, when the citizens of Cuyahoga County adopted the charter form of government. The transition continued through 2011, when the entire elected leadership of the county changed. Second, Ms. Ross began an extended leave of absence on January 7, 2011. Ms. Ross was absent from her employment with CSEA for several months and was eventually separated through a disability separation, effective June 29, 2011. Ms. Ross remained on disability separation through August 2011, and was reinstated on September 1, 2011, pursuant to O.R.C. § 124.32. Because paragraph 1 of the parties' settlement agreement requires that the mediation and the professional training be provided to the employees of Unit 16, as constituted on August 1, 2010, CSEA determined that it would not be appropriate to conduct the mediation and the professional development training until Ms. Ross returned to work. It is noted that paragraph 1 of the settlement agreement does not require that the professional training and mediation occur within a specific time period.

On December 21, 2011, the professional development training required by paragraph 1 of the parties' settlement agreement was completed. At the end of the training, the employees who attended, including Ms. Ross, were given the opportunity to participate in voluntary mediation. None of the employees pursued this opportunity or expressed an interest in doing so. Therefore, Charged Party has complied with the provisions of paragraph 1 of the parties' settlement agreement by providing mandatory professional training and by offering mediation to employees in Unit 16 of the Establishment Division.

Paragraph 5 of Settlement Agreement

Ms. Ross asserts that Cuyahoga County/CSEA violated paragraph 5 of the parties' settlement agreement when CSEA reassigned her from Unit 16 to Unit 14 within the Establishment Division in September 2011. Ms. Ross requests that the Board order CSEA to reassign her to Unit 16 within the Establishment Division.

The information provided indicates that Cuyahoga County/CSEA is in compliance with paragraph 5 of the parties' settlement agreement. Mary Dillinger was reassigned as the Supervisor of Unit 16, effective September 1, 2010. She is still assigned to this unit. Tameka Ross remained under the supervision of Ms. Dillinger in Unit 16, until Ms. Ross left on an extended disability leave of absence in January 2011. Ms. Ross was reinstated on September 1, 2011, in accordance with O.R.C. § 124.32. O.R.C. § 124.32 provides that when a person is reinstated from disability separation, that person shall be reinstated in the same office held or in a similar position to that held at the time of separation. Ms. Ross was reinstated to the same office and to a similar position within CSEA. Specifically, she was placed in a Support Officer position assigned to Unit 14 of the Establishment Division.

The information provided by CSEA indicates that the decision to place Ms. Ross in a

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 9 of 22

Support Officer position assigned to Unit 14 rather than Unit 16 within the Establishment Division was based upon CSEA's good faith assessment of operational needs. Prior to receiving notice of Ms. Ross' return to work, CSEA was in the process of planning a series of personnel adjustments in order to balance out work units so that each unit had a comparable number of productive workers and no single unit had a disproportionate share of workers with production backlogs or workers on leave of absence. As a result, nine employees were reassigned, including Ms. Ross.

Ms. Ross argues that her reassignment was in bad faith because the planning and implementation of the personnel changes discussed above occurred after Human Resources informed CSEA management on August 5, 2011 that Ms. Ross was returning to work from her disability separation. In support of her argument, Ms. Ross cites several August 2011 email exchanges between CSEA Deputy Director Anthony R. Sharaba and Cuyahoga County Senior Personnel Officer Jainice Belcher. Ms. Ross also cites August 25 and 26, 2011 memorandums from Establishment/Outreach Division Manager Michael R. Falatach.

Although the August 2011 emails and memorandums cited by Ms. Ross are dated after CSEA management was notified of her return to work, these documents do not support a conclusion that CSEA reassigned Ms. Ross in bad faith. The August 2011 emails are focused on arranging for Ms. Ross to return to work. The only open question was her supervisory unit. Mr. Sharaba communicated that the supervisory unit where Ms. Ross would be assigned depended upon staffing needs and that Mr. Falatach would make the assignment decision. Therefore, while the August 2011 emails reference organizational and staffing needs in terms of Ms. Ross' return to work, these emails do not provide information regarding the timeline and the overall process for planning and implementing organizational changes within the Establishment/Outreach Division. Moreover, the August 25 and 26, 2011 memorandums reflect a reorganization process that involved a significant level of analysis of operations and a number of departments or sections, such as Human Resources and Payroll. Overall, the memorandums indicate that the planning for organizational changes in the Establishment/Outreach Division had been in progress for a significant period of time, rather than as a response to the August 5, 2011 email notifying CSEA management of Ms. Ross' return to work. Therefore, the August 2011 emails and memorandums do not indicate that Mr. Sharaba and Mr. Falatach acted in bad faith in reassigning Ms. Ross to Unit 14. Instead, the information provided indicates that CSEA reassigned all nine employees, including Ms. Ross, based on a good faith assessment of operational needs.

In conclusion, the Board should deny Ms. Ross' motion to enforce settlement agreement because: (1) Cuyahoga County/CSEA has complied with paragraph 1 of the parties' settlement agreement by providing mandatory professional training and by offering mediation to employees in Unit 16 of the Establishment Division and (2) Cuyahoga County/CSEA did not violate paragraph 5 of the parties' settlement agreement when CSEA reassigned Tameka Ross from Unit 16 to Unit 14 within the Establishment/Outreach Division in September 2011, because this reassignment was based on a good faith assessment of operational needs.

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 10 of 22

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board deny Charging Party's motion requesting enforcement of settlement agreement. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE:	<u>Yes</u>	SPADA:	<u>Yes</u>	ZIMPHER:	<u>Yes</u>
Affirmed	<u>X</u>	Denied	<u> </u>		

2. Cases 2011-ULP-02-0064 SERB v. Perry Township Board of Trustees, Stark
2011-ULP-04-0124 County
2011-ULP-05-0137
2011-ULP-05-0153
2011-ULP-07-0193

On February 14, 2011, April 21, 2011, May 13, 2011, May 31, 2011, and July 11, 2011, Perry Organized Workers (Charging Party) filed unfair labor practice charges against Perry Township Board of Trustees, Stark County (Charged Party or Respondent), alleging that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code §§ 4117.11(A)(1), (A)(2), and (A)(5).

On October 13, 2011, the State Employment Relations Board determined that probable cause existed to believe Charged Party had committed or was committing an unfair labor practice, consolidated the cases, authorized the issuance of a complaint, and referred the matter to hearing.

On November 22, 2011, a complaint was issued and this matter was set for a prehearing conference and evidentiary hearing in January 2012.

On January 11, 2012, Counsel for Complainant filed a motion to dismiss with a copy of the parties' settlement agreement.

3. Cases 2011-ULP-02-0074 SERB v. Perry Organized Workers
2011-ULP-04-0126

On February 18, 2011 and April 21, 2011, Perry Township Board of Trustees, Stark County (Charging Party) filed unfair labor practice charges against Perry Organized Workers (Charged Party or Respondent), alleging that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code §§ 4117.11(B)(2) and (B)(3).

On October 13, 2011, the State Employment Relations Board determined that probable cause existed to believe Charged Party had committed or was committing an unfair labor practice, consolidated the cases with all current Perry Township cases, authorized the issuance of a complaint, and referred the matter to hearing.

On November 22, 2011, a complaint was issued and this matter was set for a prehearing conference and evidentiary hearing in January 2012.

On January 11, 2012, Counsel for Complainant filed a motion to dismiss with a copy of the parties' settlement agreement attached.

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 11 of 22

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board grant the motions to dismiss and dismiss with prejudice the unfair labor practice charges and complaints in these consolidated cases. The Board shall retain jurisdiction over these matters for purposes of enforcement, in accordance with Ohio Administrative Code Rule 4117-7-06. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

4. Case 2011-ULP-10-0275 SERB v. Pike-Delta-York Local School District Board of Education

On October 27, 2011, Pike-Delta-York Education Association, OEA/NEA ("Charging Party") filed an unfair labor practice charge against the Pike-Delta-York Local School District Board of Education ("Charged Party"), alleging that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code ("O.R.C.") § 4117.11(A)(1) and (A)(5).

On December 15, 2011, the State Employment Relations Board ("the Board" or "Complainant") determined that probable cause existed for believing Charged Party had committed or was committing an unfair labor practice, authorized the issuance of a complaint, and referred the matter to hearing.

On December 30, 2011, a complaint was issued and this matter was scheduled for a prehearing conference and evidentiary hearing in January 2012.

On January 6, 2012, the parties filed a settlement agreement that resolved the unfair labor practice charges in Case No. 2011-ULP-10-0275.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board construe the parties' settlement agreement as a motion to withdraw, grant the motion, and dismiss with prejudice the unfair labor practice charge and complaint therein. The Board shall retain jurisdiction over this matter for purposes of enforcement, in accordance with Ohio Administrative Code Rule 4117-7-06. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

5. Case 2011-ULP-09-0237 SERB v. Nordon Hills City School District Board of Education

On December 21, 2011, Respondent, Nordon Hills City School District Board of Education (Respondent), filed Respondent's Motion to Stay SERB Proceedings Pending Outcome of Arbitration. On January 3, 2012, Intervenor, Ohio Association of Public School Employees, OAPSE/AFSCME Local 4/AFL-CIO and Local 246 (Intervenor), filed its Memorandum Contra of Intervenor Ohio Association of Public School Employees (OAPSE)/AFSCME Local 4/AFL-CIO and its Local 246 to Motion to Stay. On January 17, 2012, Respondent filed its Supplement to Respondent's Motion to Stay SERB Proceedings Pending Outcome of Arbitration.

In its Motion To Stay, Respondent essentially asks this Board to stay the instant ULP case that is currently set for record hearing on February 9, 2012 and February 10, 2012.

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 12 of 22

Respondent has requested this Stay so that the Arbitration in this matter, set for March 20, 2012 before Arbitrator Felicia Bernadini, may proceed.

Respondent posits that the Arbitrator will address in the March 2012 Arbitration precisely the same issues (subcontracting and privatization) that this Board would address in its February 2012 scheduled ULP hearing. Further, Respondent argues that presenting essentially the same facts on the same issues two times within a six-week period fails to maximize adjudicatory economy and could even lead to contradictory, contemporaneous determinations on the same facts.

Conversely, Intervenor argues that this Board should deny Respondent's Motion To Stay for two reasons. First, Intervenor notes, SERB has already found Probable Cause in the ULP case. Secondly, Intervenor does agree that the underlying facts of this ULP case are the same ones that will be presented to the Arbitrator. Yet, Intervenor asserts, the pertinent subject matter and applicable law in the ULP case are not the subject matter and applicable law that would be relevant in the Arbitration. Thus, Intervenor avers, neither adjudicatory efficiency nor the need to avoid contradictory determinations would be served by granting Respondent's Motion To Stay.

Because the Arbitration in this matter will take place very shortly and because adjudicatory efficiency is likely to be maximized by staying the instant ULP case until resolution of this Arbitration, Respondent's Motion To Stay should be granted.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board grant Respondent's Motion To Defer Case No. 2011-ULP-09-0237 pending resolution of the afore-mentioned Arbitration, in accordance with *In re Upper Arlington Edn. Assn.* SERB 92-010 (6-30-92). Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE:	<u>Yes</u>	SPADA:	<u>Yes</u>	ZIMPHER:	<u>Yes</u>
Affirmed	<u>X</u>	Denied	<u> </u>		

V. UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE MATTERS AT ISSUE:

1. Case 2011-ULP-10-0263 Gallia County Support Staff Association, OEA/NEA v. Gallia County Local School District Board of Education

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(1) and (5) by failing to maintain the status quo during bargaining.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed Charged Party appears to have failed to maintain the status quo after the expiration of the contract by unilaterally implementing a salary/step freeze for the members.

Chair Zimpher moved that the Board find probable cause to believe an unfair labor practice has been committed, authorize the issuance of a complaint, refer the matter to an expedited hearing to determine if Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11(A) (5), but not (1), by failing to maintain the status quo during negotiations when it implemented a salary freeze, and direct the parties to expedited mediation not to exceed thirty days to run concurrently with the expedited processing of the charge and complaint. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 13 of 22

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

2. Case 2011-ULP-10-0269 Gallia County Local Education Association, OEA/NEA v. Gallia County Local School District Board of Education

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(1) and (5) by unilaterally freezing the salaries of bargaining-unit employees.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed Charged Party appears to have failed to maintain the status quo after the expiration of the contract by unilaterally implementing a salary/step freeze for the members.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board find probable cause to believe an unfair labor practice has been committed, authorize the issuance of a complaint, refer the matter to an expedited hearing to determine if Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11(A)(1) and (5), by failing to maintain the status quo during negotiations when it implemented a salary freeze, and direct the parties to expedited mediation not to exceed thirty days to run concurrently with the expedited processing of the charge and complaint. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

3. Case 2011-ULP-10-0272 Vantage Teachers Organization, OFT/AFT v. Vantage Career Center Board of Education and Superintendent Staci Kaufman

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(1) and (5) by unilaterally adjusting the lab-lab teachers' schedules for the 2011-2012 school year..

Information gathered during the investigation revealed despite Charged Parties' argument the matter should be deferred to arbitration, it appears the matter may be resolved through SERB-facilitated mediation.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board, without rendering any judgment on the merits, order the parties to pre-determination mediation for a period not to exceed 30 days with instructions to the mediator to report back to the Board at the conclusion of the mediation or the mediation period, whichever occurs first, authorize the assigned mediator, after consultation with the parties to issue and e-mail a mediator's procedural order, including date, time, and location of mediation within the time period designated. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 14 of 22

4. Case 2011-ULP-11-0282 Ohio Council 8, AFSCME, AFL-CIO v. Stark County Park District

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(5) by unilaterally implementing its last, best, final offer for a successor agreement.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed despite Charged Party's argument the charge is untimely, it appears the parties are showing movement in their negotiations for a successor agreement.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board, without rendering any judgment on the merits, order the parties to pre-determination mediation for a period not to exceed 30 days with instructions to the mediator to report back to the Board at the conclusion of the mediation or the mediation period, whichever occurs first, authorize the assigned mediator, after consultation with the parties to issue and e-mail a mediator's procedural order, including date, time, and location of mediation within the time period designated. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

5. Case 2011-ULP-11-0299 Wapakoneta City School District Board of Education v. Wapakoneta Education Association, OEA/NEA

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board table the matter. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

6. Case 2011-ULP-11-0308 Rosemary Valentine v. State of Ohio Department of Youth Services, Scioto Juvenile Correction Facility

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(1) by violating the pick-a-post agreement provided for in the collective bargaining agreement.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed the allegations are purely contractual with no evidence of a statutory violation.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board dismiss the charge with prejudice for lack of probable cause to believe that an unfair labor practice has been committed by Charged Party. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 15 of 22

7. Case 2011-ULP-11-0309 Rosemary Valentine v. Ohio Civil Service Employees Association, AFSCME Local 11, and Its Chapter 2130-745

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (B)(1) by allowing the violation of the pick-a-post agreement provided for in the collective bargaining agreement to continue.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed the allegations are purely contractual with no evidence of a statutory violation.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board dismiss the charge with prejudice for lack of probable cause to believe that an unfair labor practice has been committed by Charged Party. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

8. Case 2010-ULP-08-0311 Service Employees International Union, District 1199 WKO v. Mentor Public Library

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(1), (3), and (5) by transferring Lisa Layton in retaliation for the exercise of guaranteed rights.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed neither party filed a Motion for Review of the arbitration award. The thirty-day time limit has expired for filing such motions. Thus, it appears the matter has been resolved and the charge should be dismissed.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board dismiss the charge with prejudice as having been resolved between the parties pursuant to the grievance-arbitration process. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

9. Case 2011-ULP-11-0283 Mogadore Educational Support Association, OEA/NEA v. Mogadore Local School District Board of Education

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(1) and (5) by unilaterally eliminating the paid lunch period for its part-time Teaching Assistants, which results in an extended workday.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed the matter appears to be purely contractual with no arguable statutory violation. Charging Party did not provide sufficient information or documentation to show the part-time paid lunches were a past practice. Charging Party has filed a grievance which is proceeding through the grievance/arbitration process. Charging Party did not provide sufficient information or

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 16 of 22

documentation to support the (A)(1) allegation.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board dismiss the charge with prejudice for lack of probable cause to believe that an unfair labor practice has been committed by Charged Party. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

10. Case 2011-ULP-11-0302 International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local Union 637 v. Licking County Sheriff's Office

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(1) and (3) by retaliating against Deputy Jeremy Wolverton for his exercise of guaranteed rights.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed under all the facts and circumstances, it does not appear Charged Party interfered with, restrained, or coerced Deputy Wolverton in his exercise of guaranteed rights. Charging Party did not provide any information or documentation to show in what protected activity Deputy Wolverton was engaged in at the time of the Internal Affairs investigation. Charging Party did not provide sufficient information or documentation to support the (A)(3) allegation.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board dismiss the charge with prejudice for lack of probable cause to believe that an unfair labor practice has been committed and as untimely filed. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

11. Case 2011-ULP-11-0303 Chazzs Seals, Sr. v. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 244

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (B)(6) by failing to take his grievance to arbitration and failing to provide him with proper representation.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed Charged Party's actions do not appear to rise to the level of a statutory violation. Charged Party filed a grievance, advanced it to Step 3, and made the decision not to advance the grievance to arbitration because it lacked merit.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board dismiss the charge with prejudice for lack of probable cause to believe that an unfair labor practice has been committed by Charged Party. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 17 of 22

12. Case 2011-ULP-11-0307 Chazzs Seals, Sr. v. International Brotherhood of Teamsters Joint Council 41

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (B)(6) by denying his request to provide him with a different representative other than the local president.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed Charged Party is not Charging Party's exclusive representative. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local 244 is Charging Party's exclusive representative. SERB does not have jurisdiction over a party who is not the exclusive bargaining representative. It appears a proper venue for Charging Party to have followed may have been through the procedure outlined in the Local's Constitution and By-laws when a member disagrees with a decision made by the Local or its' Executive Board.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board dismiss the charge with prejudice for lack of jurisdiction. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

13. Case 2011-ULP-12-0320 Natalie Qualls v. State of Ohio, Department of Development

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(1) by denying her grievance extension request in retaliation for engaging in protected activity, and by allowing an intern to do bargaining-unit work.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed based on the totality of the circumstances, it does not appear Charged Party interfered with, restrained or coerced Ms. Qualls in the exercise of her guaranteed rights. Both parties provided documentation to show Ms. Jordan was the presenter at the session Ms. Qualls alleges was conducted by the Intern. The parties' agreement states grievance extensions have to be by mutual consent and Charged Party did not agree to Ms. Qualls extension request. Charging Party did not provide sufficient information or documentation to support any of the allegations made in the charge.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board dismiss the charge with prejudice for lack of probable cause to believe that an unfair labor practice has been committed by Charged Party. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

14. Cases 2011-ULP-12-0330 David Murray v. City of Columbus
2011-ULP-12-0331 David Murray v. Fraternal Order of Police, Capital City Lodge #9

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 18 of 22

Charging Party alleges Charged Parties violated 4117.11(A)(1), (A)(8) and violated 4117.11(B)(1), (B)(2) and (B)(6) respectively by colluding to delay the timely arbitration of his grievance. Information gathered during the investigation reveals that the charge was not filed timely.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board dismiss the charges with prejudice as untimely filed. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

15. Case 2011-UPL-11-0297 Ohio Council 8, AFSCME, AFL-CIO and Its Local 7, AFSCME, AFL-CIO v. City of Toledo and Ellen Grachek

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(1), (5), and (8) by refusing to correct or amend the language in a proposed draft successor agreement and demanding it sign the draft that did not reflect the specific language negotiated between the parties and incorporated in the Tentative Agreement.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed it appears Charged Party changed the language the parties had agreed to in the September 30, 2011 Tentative Agreement when it presented Ordinance 465-11 to the City Council on October 11, 2011. Charging Party did not provide sufficient information or documentation to support the (A)(1) allegation.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board find probable cause to believe an unfair labor practice has been committed, authorize the issuance of a complaint, refer the matter to an expedited hearing to determine if Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11(A)(5) and (8), by refusing to correct or amend the language in a proposed draft successor agreement and demanding Charging Parties sign the draft that did not reflect the specific language negotiated between the parties and incorporated in the Tentative Agreement, and direct the parties to expedited mediation not to exceed thirty days to run concurrently with the expedited processing of the charge and complaint. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

16. Case 2011-UPL-11-0310 The City of Toledo v. Ohio Council 8, AFSCME, AFL-CIO and Its Local 7, AFSCME, AFL-CIO

The Employer alleges that the Employee Organization violated 4117.11(B)(1), (2) and (3) by refusing to execute the successor agreement. Information gathered during the investigation reveals that the actions of the Employee Organization do not appear to rise to the level of a statutory violation. Further, the Employer did not provide sufficient information or documentation to support the (A)(1) allegation.

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 19 of 22

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board dismiss the charge with prejudice for lack of probable cause to believe that an unfair labor practice has been committed by Charged Party. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

17. Case 2011-ULP-12-0329 Robert E. Lonneman III v. Fraternal Order of Police, Ohio Labor Council Inc.

Charging Party alleges that the Union violated 4117.11(B)((6) by failing to allow all members the opportunity to vote on the Tentative Agreement. Information gathered during the investigation does not support Charging Party's allegations.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board dismiss the charge with prejudice for lack of probable cause to believe that an unfair labor practice has been committed by Charged Party. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

18. Case 2011-ERC-12-0003 Robert E. Lonneman III v. Fraternal Order of Police, Ohio Labor Council Inc.

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code 4117.19(C)(4) by not following its own By-laws regarding voting procedures on a Tentative Agreement.

Information gathered during the investigation revealed even though not required by Chapter 4117, the Employee Organization did provide notification of the vote on the Tentative Agreement to all members. Contrary to the Complainant's allegation the notice be posted on the bulletin board, that procedure is not mandated by the Employee Organization's Constitution or By-laws. It appears the Complainant has pursued his complaint through the proper venue when he filed a grievance/complaint with the Employee Organizations' Grievance Committee.

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board dismiss the complaint with prejudice. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

19. Case 2011-ULP-11-0292 Amalgamated Transit Union Local 697 v. Toledo Area Regional Transit Authority

The unfair labor practice charge alleged that Charged Party violated Ohio Revised Code § 4117.11 (A)(1) and (5) by unilaterally implementing work rule changes which affect terms and conditions of employment.

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 20 of 22

Information gathered during the investigation revealed it appears the matter may be resolved through a SERB-facilitated mediation.

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board, without rendering any judgment on the merits, order the parties to pre-determination mediation for a period not to exceed 30 days with instructions to the mediator to report back to the Board at the conclusion of the mediation or the mediation period, whichever occurs first, authorize the assigned mediator, after consultation with the parties to issue and e-mail a mediator's procedural order, including date, time, and location of mediation within the time period designated. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

- 20. Case 2011-ULP-07-0199 Springfield Education Association, OEA/NEA v. Springfield Local School District Board of Education
- 21. Case 2011-ULP-08-0221 Service Employees International Union, District 1199 v. Cincinnati State Technical and Community College
- 22. Case 2011-ULP-09-0240 North Central State Faculty Association - American Association of University Professors v. North Central State College

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board construe the requests for reconsideration as motions for reconsideration, and deny the motions with prejudice. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

- 23. Case 2011-ULP-07-0206 Jainagesh A. Sekhar v. University of Cincinnati
- 24. Case 2010-ULP-08-0321 Ohio Association of Public School Employees, AFSCME Local 4 and Its Local 008 v. Ridgemont Local School District Board of Education
- 25. Case 2011-ULP-12-0325 International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local 957 v. Harrison Township, Montgomery County
- 26. Case 2011-ULP-09-0249 Lexington Support Association, OEA/NEA v. Lexington Local School District Board of Education

Board Member Brundige moved that the Board construe the requests to withdraw as motions to withdraw, and grant the motions with prejudice. Vice Chair Spada seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for discussion and the vote.

State Employment Relations Board
Board Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2012
Page 22 of 22

- **Chairman Zimpher, General Counsel Don Collins and Executive Director Christine Dietsch will present** at the 2012 Ohio Public Employers Labor Relations Association's (OLPHERA) Annual Conference on February 06, 2012 to update them on updates to SERB.
- **Chairman Zimpher will speak** at the Ohio City/County Management Association (OCMA) winter conference February 22, 2012 regarding the annual publication of the Cost of Health Insurance in Ohio's Public Sector produced by SERB.
- **Summer Legal Intern Program:** SERB is in conversation with 3 potential candidates for summer legal internships. The students are associated with the Moritz College of Law at OSU and are in their final stages of law school.

FORWARD LOOK FOR FUTURE TRAINING:

- **SERB Academy** – 3/15/12 & 3/16/12. Registrations are rolling in. ODOT has been confirmed as the site to host the academy in their auditorium.

Fact Finders Conference – scheduled for August 10, 2012.

IX. ADJOURNMENT:

Vice Chair Spada moved that the Board adjourn the meeting. Board Member Brundige seconded the motion. Chair Zimpher called for the vote.

Vote: BRUNDIGE: Yes SPADA: Yes ZIMPHER: Yes
Affirmed X Denied _____

The Board meeting adjourned at 10:46 a.m.


/s/

W. Craig Zimpher, Chair