

STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD

-----x

In the Matter of the Interest :
Arbitration :

- Between -

RE: IA-2202-023
M2002-183

VILLAGE OF FLORAL PARK

"Village"

- and -

FLORAL PARK POLICE BENEVOLENT
ASSOCIATION

NYS PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD
RECEIVED

"PBA"

MAY 06 2004

-----x

APPEARANCES

For the Village

John E. Ryan, Esq., Attorney
Ann V. Corbett, Mayor

For the PBA

Michael C. Axelrod, Esq., Attorney
Michael J. Hearne, Vice-President

**BEFORE: HOWARD C. EDELMAN, ESQ., CHAIRPERSON OF THE PANEL
VIRGINIA APPEL, PUBLIC EMPLOYER PANEL MEMBER
ROBERT PEDLEY, EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION PANEL MEMBER**

BACKGROUND

The parties are signatories to a Collective Bargaining Agreement which expired on May 31, 2002. Efforts to negotiate a successor Agreement were unsuccessful. So, too, were mediation attempts. Consequently, and pursuant to Section 209.4 of the Civil Service Law of the State of New York, the undersigned Panel was constituted to hear and decide the dispute. Hearings were held before us on July 31, 2003; September 9, 2003; and November 19, 2003. Thereafter, the parties submitted written closing arguments. When the Panel received them the record was declared closed. This Opinion and Award follows.

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES¹

PBA

The PBA contends that substantial economic improvements are necessary to keep pace with settlements elsewhere in the County and to restore the Officers' wages to their once high standing when compared with other jurisdictions. In this context, the PBA notes that in 1982 its members earned \$2,000 more than a County

¹To expedite these findings, I have summarized the parties' positions.

Police Officer. By 1996, Officers were \$3,000 behind the County wage scale, it points out. That disparity has increased, it insists, so that substantial wage increases are necessary, even though the County's Officers took a wage freeze for 2001.

In addition, the PBA suggests that increases in the County have averaged 4.0 per cent or better for 2002 and 2003. For example, it notes that the Village of Freeport and Sands Point saw their wage scale rise by 4.5 per cent or more for these two years. PBA Exhibit 16. Consequently, the PBA asks the Panel to fashion wage increases which reflect the "going rate" elsewhere, plus needed "catch-up" monies.

As to longevity stipends, the PBA submits that the figure of \$2,550 (after 20 years of service) is very low when compared to other similarly situated communities, as well as Nassau County. For example, it notes, of eighteen reporting jurisdictions, only Garden City, Lynbrook and Rockville Centre pay less in longevity for comparable periods of time. Consequently, the PBA asks the Panel to adopt the following longevity schedule:

<u>Years of Employment</u>	<u>Amount</u>
6-9	\$1,400
10-14	\$2,500
15	\$3,700
16	\$4,050

17	\$4,400
18	\$4,750
19	\$5,100
20	\$5,450
21	\$5,800
22	\$6,150
23	\$6,500
24	\$6,850
25	\$7,200

For each year over 25, an additional \$350 with no maximum.

As to night differential, the PBA submits that the current flat dollar amount of \$4,000 is not in keeping with the percentage paid in most other jurisdictions. Therefore, it asks that Officers who work between 1500 (3:00 p.m.) and 0800 (8:00 a.m.) receive ten per cent of their base pay for such work. It also asks that this differential apply to sick and vacation leave.

The PBA contends that the equipment and uniform maintenance allowance currently provided is low. Therefore, it asks that this stipend be increased to \$1,000.

As to work schedules, the PBA strongly asserts that its members and the Village will benefit by adopting the twelve hour steady tour schedule which was discussed during negotiations. It maintains that this schedule provides Officers a regular set of working hours, thereby improving morale. Moreover, it insists, experience with this schedule in other jurisdictions has resulted in

reduced utilization of sick and personal leave. Thus, it argues, the twelve hour tour it has proposed makes sense for all concerned and should be awarded.

With respect to unused sick leave the PBA asks that Officers be entitled to accumulate and be paid for their total accruals upon retirement. If adopted, this provision might well reduce sick leave usage and save the Village overtime costs, the PBA suggests.

The PBA alleges that better insurance coverage is needed for its members. Therefore, it makes the following proposals:

DENTAL PLAN

The Village shall contribute \$50,000.00 per year toward a suitable PBA dental plan.

LIFE INSURANCE

- A. The Village's contribution for the life insurance policy shall be increased to pay the entire amount of the policy.
- B. The Village shall purchase AFLAC cancer insurance for each member.

OPTICAL PLAN

The Village shall contribute \$12,000.00 per year to the PBA's optical plan.

The PBA submits that the Village can well afford to fund its proposals. It suggests that Police Department expenditures have decreased as a percentage of the total budget. PBA Exhibit 31. Moreover, the PBA contends,

the Village has consistently reported its excellent financial condition to the public. See PBA Exhibit 32. Also, the PBA argues, the median family income of \$92,221 compares favorably with other jurisdictions. Finally, with respect to the Village's ability to pay, the PBA asserts that, as reported to the public, the Village had a 1.2 million dollar surplus for 2002. Consequently, it insists, the Village's ability to pay does not justify rejection of its demands.

In sum, the PBA maintains that its proposals are reasonable in light of settlements in comparable communities and the Village's sound fiscal condition. Accordingly, it asks the Panel to award them as presented.

The Village contends, initially, that a three year Award is warranted. This is so, it stresses, because the prior Agreement expired on May 31, 2002 and an Award of lesser duration will return the parties to the bargaining table as soon as it is issued.

Concerning wages, the Village maintains that the prior Panel in this jurisdiction concluded that Floral Park's economic bases does not justify paying its Police Officers at the highest level of other communities in the County. PBA Exhibit 6, p. 18. Also, the Village

submits, 32 per cent of its budget is allocated to the Police Department, and the average cost of a Police Officer, including wages and benefits, exceeds \$130,000 per year, a figure which surpasses the median family income here. Village Exhibit A. Given these and related factors, the Village maintains that the median increase of comparable communities, now four per cent or less, is warranted here and ought to be awarded.

Concerning longevity payments, the Village contends that only minimal increases should be granted. It notes that the current stipend is greater than that paid in Garden City, Lynbrook and Rockville Centre. Thus, in the Village's words, "[T]here is no basis for the drastic increases in longevity payments sought by the PBA." Village's brief, p. 12.

As to night differential, the Village proposes an increase of \$150 per year. It notes that the PBA's demand for a ten per cent differential for all hours worked between 3:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. would cost more than \$50,000, an increase of over 35 per cent above current expenditures. It sees no reason for such a large rise in this stipend.

With respect to the uniform and cleaning allowance, the Village contends that the PBA has offered no

meaningful evidence to justify increasing this allotment. Therefore, it asks the Panel to reject the PBA's proposal in its entirety.

The Village also rejects the PBA's proposal to adopt a "Twelve Hour Steady Tour Schedule." It alleges that such a proposal, if adopted, would infringe upon its management right to properly deploy Police Officers. Nor has the PBA offered any evidence that implementing this schedule would benefit its operations, the Village maintains. Consequently, it asks the Panel to reject this demand.

The Village notes the PBA's requests for improvements in payout of accumulated sick leave, dental plan, additional life insurance and a better optical plan. It argues that there is no basis in the record to award any of these items. Thus, it asks the Panel to reject these proposals of the PBA.

In addition, the Village makes a number of affirmative proposals of its own. First, it points out that while the Department has the discretion to approve personal days and compensatory days, it does not have the discretion to approve mutual swaps between Sergeants.

The Village acknowledges that in the prior Interest Arbitration the Panel modified the then existing language

by capping the swaps to twelve per year per Sergeant. However, it asserts, since then all Sergeants have utilized this maximum, resulting in additional overtime costs exceeding \$50,000 per year. Consequently, the Village asks that the current Agreement be modified to give the Department the same discretion to approve ~~Sergeant switches as it has with respect to personal and~~ compensatory days for Police Officers.

Second, the Village argues that the current sick leave provisions in the Agreement are inadequate to prevent abuse by Officers. It alleges that, in practice, the Officer's sole obligation is to report his/her illness to the Department, and nothing more. In the Village's opinion, "There is absolutely no definition as to what constitutes sick leave or absence abuse. Nor is there any consequence whatsoever specified for a sick leave abuser." Village's brief, p. 26.

Also, the Village argues, sick leave abuse is a continual and growing problem within the Department. While acknowledging that a number of Officers use little or no sick leave, the Village points out that others take up to 17 days per year for such claimed ailments as cold/flu/sorethroat/chills/fever and stomach ache/virus/food poisoning. Such utilization costs the

Village approximately \$350,00 per year, it suggests.

Given these factors, the Village argues that a comprehensive sick leave abuse/utilization policy should be implemented. It proposes a policy which, it claims, is taken from other policies or Collective Bargaining Agreements in the County. See Village Exhibits K and L.

Furthermore, the Village contends that given soaring health insurance costs for Police Officers (from \$5,454 in 1998 to \$33,242 in 2003), its contribution should be capped at current levels.

Finally the Village makes the following proposals:

A. Attendance at Training and Supervisory Meetings

The Village is requesting that a provision be included in the new Agreement that PBA members may be scheduled for five (5) training days per year without receiving overtime. In addition, the Village requests that supervisory personnel be required to attend six (6) staff meetings per year without receiving overtime.

B. Recall

The expired Agreement provides that a member who is recalled to work after finishing a tour of duty "shall receive a minimum of six (6) hours salary for time worked." See Joint Exhibit 5, p. 6. The Village is seeking to have this provision amended so that the member who is recalled to work receives time and one-half rather than a mandatory minimum of six (6) hours.

C. Holidays

The expired Agreement lists thirteen (13)

holidays, including separate holidays for Lincoln's Birthday and Washington's Birthday. Petitioner's Exhibit 4, p.9. The Village is requesting that these two days be combined into what is now the single, nationally recognized holiday of President's Day.

In sum, the Village asserts that its proposals fairly reflect the needs of Police Officers and its fiscal and operational constraints. Accordingly, it asks that they be awarded as presented.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Several introductory comments are appropriate. As Interest Arbitrator I derive my authority from Section 209.4 of the Civil Service Law of the State of New York ("Taylor Law"). That statute sets forth the criteria I must apply in reaching my determination. These criteria are:

- a. comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment of the employees involved in the arbitration proceeding with wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employees performing similar services or requiring similar skills under similar working conditions and with other employees generally in public and private employment in comparable communities;
- b. the interests and welfare of the public and the financial ability of the public employer to pay;
- c. comparison of the peculiarities in regard to other trades or professions, including specifically, (1) hazards of employment; (2)

physical qualifications; (3) educational qualifications; (4) mental qualifications; (5) job training and skills;

- d. the terms of collective agreements negotiated between the parties in the past providing for compensation and fringe benefits, including, but not limited to, the provisions for salary, insurance and retirement benefits, medical and hospitalization benefits, paid time off and job security.

Section 209.4(V) of the CSL

With these criteria in mind and based solely on the record adduced at the hearings, as well as the arguments of the parties, the Panel issues the following findings:

1. Duration of Award

The prior Collective Bargaining Agreement expired May 31, 2002. Labor relations stability justifies an Award exceeding two years. Indeed, when these findings are issued approximately one month will remain before the new Award expires.

However, the Taylor Law prohibits an Award exceeding two years' duration, absent agreement of the parties for a longer one. Therefore, despite the desirability of a longer finding, the Panel is barred from issuing one. Thus, we shall direct that the Award's effective date begin on June 1, 2002 and expire on May 31, 2004.

One additional comment on this issue is warranted. During the course of the proceedings, the parties discussed the possibility of an Award which exceeded two

years. The Panel remains ready, if the parties desire, to assist in those efforts so as to promote labor relations stability and avoid the necessity of protracted negotiations including, possibly, additional costly Interest Arbitration proceedings soon after the Award is issued. Nonetheless, and for the reasons set forth above, the Panel finds that the term of this Award shall be from June 1, 2002 through May 31, 2004.

2. **Wages**

Wages comprise the most significant element of most Interest Arbitration Awards. Officers need to be able to provide for themselves and their families. Even in times of low inflation, wages, generally, though not always, rise. Wages also have the greatest impact upon the employer's finances. Personnel costs are the largest element in any budget and Floral Park is no different from any other community in this regard.

The Panel has reviewed the record in detail regarding the appropriate increases to be granted. In 1999, I issued an Award involving these same parties. I noted that:

Floral Park's economic base does not justify paying its Police Officers at the highest level of other communities in the County.

PBA Exhibit 6

Though that Award was rendered five years' ago, its

holding is still relevant today. Floral Park is, essentially, a well run Village with sound finances. However, the median income of its residents is certainly below that of a number of upper income Villages such as Brookville, Kings Point, etc. As such, the Panel simply cannot justify imposing raises which would bring wages here to the level in these and other similarly situated jurisdictions.

On the other hand, we find no basis to grant percentage increases less than what are being achieved in the rest of Nassau County. A median percentage increase keeps Floral Park in its relative position. It is, thus, fair to Police Officers and the Village. Moreover, it is consistent with criterion (a) above, which requires us to consider wages and other terms and conditions of employment with employees performing similar services. As such, we turn to the relevant data in this regard.

A review of that data reveals the following percentage increases:

<u>Community</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
Malverne	2.5	-
	2.5	-
Glen Cove	2.25	3.75
	2.25	2.375
Old Westbury	4.0	4.0

Nassau	3.9	3.9
Kings Point	4.50	4.50
Long Beach	5.0	-
Hempstead	2.5	3.5
Rockville Centre	3.0	3.5
Port Washington	4.0	4.0
Sands Point	4.5	4.5
Brookville	2.0	3.5
Lynbrook	2.5	-
	2.5	4.0
Freeport	4.5	5.0
Garden City	4.0	4.0
Average	3.77	4.1

The Panel notes that a number of the increases listed above are implemented not in June of each year, as exists here, but in January (e.g., Glen Cove, Nassau County, Long Beach). Also, the split year raises (i.e., Glen Cove, Freeport) have been assigned their percentage value in the year in which the raises are given. Thus, for example, Lynbrook for 2002 is assigned a value of 3.75 per cent though the "rate" increase is 5.0 per cent.

Given this analysis, it is clear that the median increase for 2002 and 2003 is just about 8.0 per cent overall or 4.0 per cent per year. These raises will maintain Floral Park's relative ranking. Thus, they are

reasonable and consistent with the statutory criteria set forth above. Accordingly, we shall direct that wages be improved as follows:

Effective June 1, 2002 - 4.0 per cent

Effective June 1, 2003 - 4.0 per cent

3. **Longevity**

The Panel has reviewed the comparative data on this issue. PBA Exhibit 18 reveals that while reasonable increases were awarded in 1999 for the period 1999-2002, longevity stipends remain low here. Of seventeen Nassau County reported communities, Floral Park ranks 13th after 6 years of service; 16th after 10 years of service; 14th after 15 years of service and 14th after 20 years of service. Also, the average longevity stipend after twenty years of service is \$4,330 which is approximately \$1,800 above the current stipend here.

This substantial disparity requires that longevity payments be improved significantly, the Panel is convinced. However, we are also mindful of the cost impact of large longevity increases. In consideration of this factor we shall award the longevity schedule listed below, with the first schedule effective June 1, 2003 and the second effective May 31, 2004. In this way longevity payments will be far closer to the median of comparable

communities but will not unduly burden the Village during the period covered by this Award. Accordingly, we direct that longevity payments be provided as follows:

Years of Completed Service	Effective June 1, 2003	Effective May 31, 2004
6	\$1,300	\$1,500
7	\$1,300	\$1,500
8	\$1,300	\$1,500
9	\$1,300	\$1,500
10	\$1,500	\$1,700
11	\$1,700	\$1,900
12	\$1,900	\$2,100
13	\$2,100	\$2,300
14	\$2,300	\$2,500
15	\$2,500	\$2,700
16	\$2,700	\$2,900
17	\$2,900	\$3,100
18	\$3,100	\$3,300
19	\$3,300	\$3,500
20	\$3,500	\$3,700
21	\$3,700	\$3,900
22	\$3,900	\$4,100
23	\$4,100	\$4,300
24	\$4,300	\$4,500
25 and over	\$4,500	\$4,700

4. Uniform Allowance

The current allowance falls at or close to the mid-range of other communities with whom Floral Park is often compared. Thus, the Panel finds, a modest increase, to reflect potential increases elsewhere, is justified. Consequently, we shall direct that the Uniform Allowance be improved as follows:

Section 3d of the Agreement shall be modified to provide for the following payments:

Effective June 1, 2002 - \$1,000

Effective June 1, 2003 - \$1,025

5. Night Differential

It is true, as the Village pointed out, that Officers' Night Differential was raised substantially as a result of the prior Award; i.e., from \$2,750 to \$4,000.

In light of this finding only a very modest increase is justified. Thus, the Panel concludes that, Night Differential is to be increased to the following levels:

Effective June 1, 2003 - \$4,200

6. Twelve Hour Steady Tours

The PBA proposed the institution of such a system. The Village resisted, contending it improperly circumscribed its right to deploy Officers. It also maintained that the PBA had not demonstrated that the schedule would be beneficial to the Village.

The Panel has reviewed these competing claims. The record reveals that the twelve hour tour has been implemented in most other jurisdictions in the County. We know of no successful legal challenge to the implementation of these tours.

Moreover, the expired Collective Bargaining Agreement (PBA Exhibit 4) delineates the current schedule of Officers' work hours. See Article III. It is known

as the 4/72 tour, four days of eight hours' duration on and 72 hours off. The Panel sees no reason why a 4/72 tour may be included in the Agreement, while a twelve hour steady tour may not. As such, we reject the Village's contention that the proposed PBA tour schedule unduly burdens the operations of the Department, while the current schedule does not.

As to the value of the twelve hour tour, PBA Exhibit 9 delineates the apparent benefit of this schedule to both the Village and Police Officers. Among these are improved morale resulting from working steady tours, as well as unity of command wherein the same Sergeants supervise Police Officers. However, the Panel is reluctant to direct the implementation of the tour absent mutual agreement of the parties. They are in the best position to know whether a major change in how and when Officers work will result in mutual benefits. Thus, we shall remand this issue to the parties for their consideration and we shall retain jurisdiction in the event they cannot agree upon a resolution of the PBA's proposal.

7. Sick Leave Policy

The Village proposed a comprehensive policy to be incorporated into the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

It asserted that in light of sick leave usage by certain Officers and the proposals' inclusion in other Agreements, either in whole or in part, its demand should be granted.

The Panel has reviewed this proposal carefully. Controlling sick leave abuse is an inherent management right. Officers may utilize sick leave if they or their families take ill or suffer injury. They may not abuse sick leave by taking days off for non-illness/injury related reasons.

The Panel is convinced that the Village has not fully exercised both its inherent and contractual rights to control perceived sick leave abuse. As such, we find, we cannot grant the Village's proposal on this issue at this time. However, should the Village find that Police Officers continue to engage in abuse of sick leave, the Panel shall retain jurisdiction to resolve this issue.

8. Sergeant Schedules

The Village noted that Sergeants currently utilize all the days they are permitted to adjust schedules without approval of the Police Department. As such, it asked the Panel to require departmental approval before such swaps are effectuated.

The "twelve switch maximum" was newly included in

the Award issued in 1999. The Panel is not convinced that an additional change is justified so soon after the provision was first awarded. However, we are constrained to remind all concerned that the purpose of permitting these switches is not to build up overtime but to adjust schedules as personal commitments require. Frankly, were the maximum utilization to continue until such time as an Interest Arbitration Panel is convened to address terms and conditions of employment after May 31, 2004, it might well look favorably on such a proposal. Nonetheless, it cannot be awarded at this time.

9. **Other Proposals**

The Panel has reviewed the parties' other proposals, not addressed above. They are rejected. In all cases, the comparative data does not warrant their adoption. For example, while the Village correctly noted the substantial rise in health insurance premiums, no other jurisdiction caps its payments for Police Officers, insofar as this record reveals. Also, increases in benefits such as sick leave payments are not justified in light of the economic improvements awarded in this finding and in the past with respect to wages, longevity, uniform allowance and night differential. As criterion (d) above makes clear, these past and present emoluments

must also be considered and we conclude that any other increases would result in an economic package which is not justified by the Village's ability to pay [See Criterion (b) above]. Accordingly, all other proposals of the parties are rejected.

In sum, the Panel is convinced that our findings reflect an appropriate balance between the needs of the PBA and the obligations of the Village. Accordingly, they are awarded as indicated herein. It is so ordered.

AWARD

1. **Term of the Award**

The term of this Award shall be from June 1, 2002 through May 31, 2004.

2. **Wages**

Wages shall be increased as follows:

Effective June 1, 2002 - 4.0 per cent

Effective June 1, 2003 - 4.0 per cent

3. **Longevity**

Longevity stipends shall be paid in accordance with the following schedule:

Years of Completed Service	Effective June 1, 2003	Effective May 31, 2004
6	\$1,300	\$1,500
7	\$1,300	\$1,500
8	\$1,300	\$1,500
9	\$1,300	\$1,500
10	\$1,500	\$1,700
11	\$1,700	\$1,900
12	\$1,900	\$2,100
13	\$2,100	\$2,300
14	\$2,300	\$2,500
15	\$2,500	\$2,700
16	\$2,700	\$2,900
17	\$2,900	\$3,100
18	\$3,100	\$3,300
19	\$3,300	\$3,500
20	\$3,500	\$3,700
21	\$3,700	\$3,900
22	\$3,900	\$4,100
23	\$4,100	\$4,300
24	\$4,300	\$4,500
25 and over	\$4,500	\$4,700

4. **Uniform Allowance**

Section 3d of the Agreement shall be modified to provide for the following payments:

Effective June 1, 2002 - \$1,000

Effective June 1, 2003 - \$1,025

5. **Night Differential**

Effective June 1, 2003 the Night Differential shall be increased to \$4,200.

6. **Twelve Hour Steady Tours**

The issue of Twelve Hour Steady Tours is remanded to the parties for negotiations. The Panel shall retain jurisdiction in the event they cannot agree upon this issue.

7. **Sick Leave Policy**

The Village's sick leave policy is not awarded at this time. Should the Village find that sick leave abuse continues, the Panel shall retain jurisdiction to resolve this dispute.

8. **Other Proposals**

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

DATED: *May 4, 2004* *Howard C. Edelman*
HOWARD C. EDELMAN, ESQ., ARBITRATOR

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

I, Howard C. Edelman, Esq., do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is my Award.

DATED: *May 4, 2004* *Howard C. Edelman*
HOWARD C. EDELMAN, ESQ., ARBITRATOR

Concur _____

Dissent XXX (See attached)

DATED: 4/29/04



 Virginia Appel
 Public Employer Panel Member

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

I, Virginia Appel, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Public Employer Panel Member that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is my Award.

DATED: 4/29/04



 Virginia Appel
 Public Employer Panel Member

MAYOR
ANN V. CORBETT

TRUSTEE
PHIL GUARNIERI

TRUSTEE
KEVIN J. GREENE

TRUSTEE
GERARD M. BAMBRICK

TRUSTEE
THOMAS J. TWEEEDY



VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR
VIRGINIA APPEL

VILLAGE CLERK
YVONNE R. BLABER

SUPERINTENDENT PUBLIC WORKS
KENNETH J. TYMECKI

SUPERINTENDENT BUILDINGS
STEPHEN L. SIWINSKI

ASSESSOR
GAY TAFFEL

Incorporated Village of Floral Park

ONE FLORAL BOULEVARD, P.O. BOX 27, FLORAL PARK, N.Y. 11002
TELEPHONE 516-326-6300
VILLAGE HALL FAX 516-326-2734 PUBLIC WORKS FAX 516-326-6435
WEB FPVILLAGE.ORG

April 29, 2004

Howard C. Edelman, Esq.
Labor Arbitrator and Mediator
119 Andover Road
Rockville Centre, NY 11570

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I respectfully dissent from the Floral Park PBA Arbitration Award. The Panel's retention of jurisdiction over the issue of twelve-hour steady tours is improper as it relates solely to a matter of management's right to schedule and deploy police officers.

I also dissent from the Panel's determination not to adopt an enhanced sick leave policy. The record contains overwhelming evidence of the need for enhanced procedures to deal with the problem of absence abuse, which year after year generates unnecessary overtime expense for the Village. For these same reasons, I also object to the Panel's retention of jurisdiction over this issue.

Very truly yours,

INC. VILLAGE OF FLORAL PARK

Virginia Appel
Village Administrator

VA/sk
cc: Mayor Ann V. Corbett
John Ryan, Esq.

