

**Meeting Minutes** 

**Date:** 5.18.2023 **Time:** 0606

#### **Board Members in Attendance**

In-person: Davonte Belle, Jen Clayton, Kelsi Wolph, Jamie McMurray, Jordan Wallace,

Jessica Marchione, Ryan Rouillard

Virtual: Cat Hernandez

Absent: N/A

#### Members in Attendance:

In-person: Justin Ashburn (joined at 0636)

Virtual: N/A

Prior meeting minutes: Approved

### Financial update:

- Working through IRS issues to make sure we are in good standing (needing to adjust approved contact person for guild)
- Will reach back out to CPA that never answered regarding audit/tax assistance
- o Reviewing our retainer agreement Current retainer is \$3600/mo, proposed would be \$4500/mo. Since we pay \$325/hr for services now if we switch to a full retainer, inclusive of any hours used, we only need to use 3 hrs/mo to come out ahead (we would be paying \$950 more per mo and 3 hrs = \$975 currently). We are likely to blow that out of the water, especially during a negotiation year, so even with the 3 year agreement to stay at that rate it should be worth it and we can revisit when it expires. Rate was also likely to go up somewhat even if we don't change to a more inclusive retainer due to inflation/adjustments (it has been static for years). All ayes for changing the retainer to \$4500/mo version.

### **Coalition/Small Table Bargaining Updates:**

We're all at a standstill on small table, coalition wide, because they want those wage adjustments to be folded into citywide negotiations so we're all on hold. The City



**Meeting Minutes** 

doesn't want to put in the work to get that done despite many of us already entering our small table negotiations. We will, at the coalition/prep level be having that conversation with each other about what we're all putting in for, but we're not interested in involving the City in that process.

The City claimed yesterday that our 10% COLA alone is more than the money they have total for increases, even though they were supposed to set aside a pot of money for wage increases related to their wage study back when they did the study initially, but now they're saying well we only have one pot of money after all. City labor does have the ability to go to the council and request an increase in their budget, so it might come to us trying to push them to do that.

They City also came up with their own list regarding wage increases based on contacting departments about where they're having trouble with retention and suggesting varying amounts of raises in 'traunches' based in part on the answers they received. It's unclear how they think supervisors aren't struggling with retention/why are supervisors aren't on the list or who/when/how they asked management this questions, especially since PCAs (who are fully staffed) are on the list.

Reviewed current contract actions to date, including presentation of a large (as in, 4 or 5 feet across and rolling it down the stairs), version of our signed petition against the 1% COLA, presentation of a printed stacked version to Brianna Thomas (acting as representative of Mayor Harrell), and then presentation of the same large stacked printout to city council during open council meeting comments along with comments by three of our coalition members including our Secretary/Treasurer Cat Hernandez. City had indicated their upset at recent negotiations about the nature of their current offers and their attempts to continually limit items as 'packaged', to be revoked at any time after TA'ing if not all are accepted. The coalition is not concerned with any of the communications we have had with media to date.

We do generally agree with the city on their vacation proposal, increasing the rate at which we start accruing greater vacation days so that the gains ramp up faster between Year 4 and Year 16, although we are still in disagreement about a start date (they are offering to not start this accrual system until 2025, independent of when we approve a



**Meeting Minutes** 

contract). Our last counter was January 2024 or 60 calendar days after contract ratification, instead, but we have yet to hear back on that.

The coalition is also working on a site we can use to write letters, pre-filled, to the city council and mayor, with an option to add our own comments. Davonte will forward that to us all when it comes available.

### 0636 – Guild member Justin Ashburn joins

Additional plans for contract action may include Folklife and other summer events - collecting signatures, focus on getting community engaged (for example they had a Charles St event collecting employee stories). Our contract is still in effect with our ban for striking, but other unions mostly can if their contract doesn't say otherwise but it takes up to a year from the end of the contract for that to be allowed anyway. Davonte will keep us apprised on further action plans, including if we end up moving toward unfair labor practice arguments over the whole refusal to small table.

#### **New Business**

## Sick leave for mandatory overtime:

Came up in JLMC 1.5 months ago with labor negotiator, right now employees can decide if they want to use sick but that isn't following the law. Per WA state law, the city has to pay us for hours we are/were 'required to work'. They're still working on a draft of that with attorney that they'll bring to us. Per the law it'll be straight pay, we would get our premium pay rates like shift differential but not overtime for use of that sick time. We were the only ones getting away with this. Exemptions don't count, child care exemptions don't count, only skipping OT due to being sick. This includes 'I can't do this last minute OT, I have a doctor's appt', because that's marked out as OT sick. Sick, vacation, etc. are so already legally defined we really can't get out of it, but even though it's not 1.5 times pay at least we'll be getting some pay.



**Meeting Minutes** 

## Proposal to update by-laws:

We aren't going over the whole thing line by line, but we'll add 'designee' in the section on the grievance committee as Justin suggested to ensure it's clear that their work isn't halted due to absences/unavailability of their lead. There is already a line that the President can step in when someone is unable to perform their duties, plus there's the alternate on the committee, plus the ability to communicate by phone and such, but just to make it clear in case the VP is on vacation or what have you. We'll also take on his request for inclusive pronouns.

Other big changes are officially establishing the election committee, we left it open to President to choose because sometimes the whole board is going for reelection. JLMC also solidified in by-laws now.

For dues updates we're just using the same formula that was already in there and taking out some unnecessary language. The dues discussion about whether we would do 1% instead of a flat rate is that we are not wanting it to get much higher throughout the rest of the membership just to save \$5/month for D1, it would be more complex math and might cause push back by the city. Ashburn is focused on the equity of 1% flat, but this would be very complex with PCA's, steps, etc. for little difference to our lowest earners. Further discussions on whether percent based or flat fee is more appropriate for the services the guild provides, and that supervisors use less services on average. Parties present have varying viewpoints, membership will have chance to vote to reflect if they don't approve of current rate updates.

Additional review of items people don't always recall, including that wages, promotions, or shifts hours related LOU/MOU changes require minimum of two town halls prior to board vote and that members can ask their guild for money. For example, for employee recognition related items/prizes. We hope they also use us earlier next year for T-week (we are still attempting to move forward with the \$3K plus installation for the pergola, though there is mention of the FAS delays and concerns of if we move locations in the future).



**Meeting Minutes** 

Motion to approve bylaws by Jamie McMurray, Jessica Marchione seconds, all ayes from the board. (Justin Ashburn departed during the course of this agenda item).

### Open forum:

#### Jamie - Training unit

When the presence of calltakers/dispatchers in the back was converted into PCA positions that didn't really happen with the training unit's input. It takes about 6 months to get someone ready to lead a class, and they want 14 calltaking classes next year. Training keeps getting duties added to them, and is having to go through a process every 6 months for potentially new people to come in the back but there's no process for like someone coming to assist other PCA's but the training setup creates a burdensome set of expectations with rotating PCA's. They have had to do things like flip to a days and swings at the same time, and are forced to rotate while other positions do not.

The question from some other boards members is, instead of then locking down training the way other positions are (particularly with the concerns about workload in the back), we should probably instead focus on opening up the other positions to more rotating assistance/training to allow for opportunities for advancement and development of varying skills by current workforce. For sake of consistency in training, do we see about making one PCA position constant and one rotating? Also overall no matter what we need more opportunities open for people regarding training and advancement, could include rotations for CAD, VIPER, stats, etc. Side note - they're working on a staffing study to give the city by August, not a guarantee, but could help get approval for additional positions.

No additional guild members have joined, officially moved to closed session at 0737

Meeting ended at 0910