While there is a growing focus on the potential value in the consolidation of emergency services, we cannot discount the impact a collective-bargaining agreement and laws may have on the agencies considering this type of restructuring. More than likely, the human factor will be the most unpredictable. To successfully navigate the added dynamic that a collective-bargaining agreement may have on the consolidation process, you need to keep in mind a few collective-bargaining principles.

- Does the CBA prohibit the consolidation decision?
- If not, does the consolidation decision implicate mandatory subjects of bargaining?
- If so, does the CBA nevertheless arguably contain a mid-term bargaining waiver, which absolves the employer of having to bargain over one or more aspects of the consolidation decision?

The answers to these questions are significant. They may prevent the consolidation altogether or mean bargaining is in your future.
Across the nation, there is a growing trend to consolidate services in the public safety industry. Many jurisdictions have requested studies of the consolidation of Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs). Some municipalities are investigating the consolidation of other emergency services, like police or fire departments. Why is consolidation a growing trend? The answer is simple: money. While the consolidation of emergency dispatch centers has been occurring for decades, no one can deny that all of us have had to scrutinize our budgets more than ever in recent years. Governmental agencies, like the individual citizen, must face the continuing need to reevaluate how their dollars are spent. They must assess how to get the most value for every dime spent. Smart managers go beyond this concept and seek to improve services while cutting costs or reallocating funds.

The most common drivers for consolidation projects are:

- Insufficient capital blocks the necessary upgrade or replacement of obsolete systems.
- State-level agencies or legislatures are mandating the consolidation of local municipal PSAP’s to at least county-level or larger regional models with the goal of reducing the cost of state and locally funded infrastructure.
- Local budgets can no longer support operations (Bono, 2012).

When faced with one of these scenarios, consolidation often becomes a viable option, because feasibility studies tend to show greater efficiency through improvements in technologies and the potential of substantial cost reduction through eliminating duplicative staff and infrastructure. It is hard to dismiss the potential to reduce costs without cutting services in this way.

Currently there are several examples of public-safety consolidation taking place in the Chicago metro area:

- DuPage Public Safety Communications, commonly known as DuComm, absorbed 11 agencies in the last seven years (Ferraro, 2012).
- In July 2012, Effingham County solicited a PSAP Consolidation Feasibility Study Consultant Services Request for Proposal (RFP) (Arndt, 2012).
- Bloomingdale dispatch is combining with the Addison Police department in an effort to save roughly $231,000 per year (Mistretta, 2012).
- In September 2012, Morton Grove and Niles confirmed that they plan to join Glenview Public Safety Dispatch Center. Morton Grove Village Administrator Ryan Horne states, “A conservative estimate has Morton Grove saving about $300,000 annually by joining the Glenview Public Safety Dispatch Center” (Johnson, 2012).
- “Niles' total estimated savings will be $2,343, 075 over five years” (DeFiglio, 2012).
- The Northwest Central Dispatch System added five agencies in the last five years (Barbera-Brelle, 2012)

Not only are 9-1-1 services being consolidated but jurisdictions are considering the consolidation of emergency services. For example, Lake Forest, Highland Park, Lake Bluff and Highwood announced in December 2012 that they plan to study consolidation of fire and EMS. “Going with the national trend of consolidation could save the four communities between $1 million and $1.8 million annually, according to a study by the International City/County Management Association” (Denys Bucksten, 2012). Although Hinsdale and Clarendon Hills also investigated consolidating their police departments,
recently the matter was dropped after the two cities were not able to reach a mutually agreeable solution on a Social Security issue during bargaining. “From the village standpoint,” Cook said, “we are going to continue to try to work together with other communities” to share resources and reduce costs. “It may not (involve) the police, but communities are going to have to find a new operating model, which may involve consolidation” (Fieldman, 2013).

The Consolidation trend is not limited to Illinois:

- In April 2011, Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington: The Army merges with the civilian 9-1-1 center. “The consolidation brings better access to everyone on JBLM and positions the base for future upgrades when digital 9-1-1 technologies improve,” said Jeff Rodeman, Emergency Communications Center Chief, Directorate of Emergency Services. “Before the merger, people dialing 9-1-1 on base either spoke to Lewis civilian emergency operators or McChord active-duty Airmen. Deployments and reassignments pulled them away from the 9-1-1 desk, leaving service gaps to fill” (Smith, 2011).

- In July 2011 Boston, Massachusetts: “A new study recommends that 18 area communities, including Fall River and New Bedford, merge their emergency dispatch centers to improve operations and save money. . . . If the full regional system is created, savings would include $4 million annually for participants by reducing the number of telecommunicators by more than half. . . . The regional system would also reduce the number of 9-1-1 call transfers between telecommunicators, improve management during large-scale emergencies and eliminate the need for redundant equipment and technology” (Welker, 2011).

- In September 2012, Cleveland, Ohio: Cuyahoga County on Monday awarded $180,000 to Bedford, Bedford Heights and Maple Heights to create a consolidated emergency dispatch center. The merger -- aided with a $720,000 federal grant and a $55,000 state Local Innovation grant -- was Executive Ed FitzGerald's first step in a push to eliminate dozens of dispatch centers for police and fire across the county. The county is also paying $270,000 for Cleveland State University to plan for other cities to consolidate. "The status quo was not good enough," FitzGerald said at a news conference with suburban leaders. "It's a waste of money" (Johnston, 2012).

- In November 2012, Dade City, Florida: “Commissioners were told Tuesday that emergency 911 service would improve if the city buys into a consolidation plan being organized by county and local law enforcement agencies. . . . Commissioners expressed interest in further information while acknowledging the benefits, but they were not ready to commit to the plan. . . . There are five primary agencies that have 911 services: Dade City Police Department, Zephyrhills Police Department, New Port Richey Police Department, Port Richey Police Department and Pasco County Fire Rescue. Of these, only Zephyrhills has shown no interest in the consolidation effort” (Hatrick, 2012).

While there is a growing focus on the potential value in the consolidation of emergency services, we cannot discount the impact that a collective-bargaining agreement may have on the agencies considering this type of restructuring. More than likely, the human factor will certainly be the most unpredictable. Collective-bargaining obligations and agreements add an extra factor to the equation. Various governing and operating structures can be adopted when forming a consolidated 9-1-1 operations center, and the structure may influence how the bargaining unit approaches the initiative. For instance, structuring a center as a group of agencies that share a physical space but where the agencies maintain separate employee pay scales and benefits would likely prompt the union to demand that all employees in the consolidated center receive the pay and benefits of the highest-compensated
team in the center. To successfully navigate the added dynamic a collective-bargaining agreement may have on the consolidation process, you need to consider the following issues:

**Does the CBA prohibit the consolidation decision?**

Does a collective bargaining agreement exist between the employer and a union? If so, the employer needs to carefully scrutinize the CBA to make sure that there are no provisions that flatly prohibit the type of consolidation that might be contemplated. Knowing the contract inside and out is paramount (Leka, 2010). For example, if consolidation will result in employee layoffs or subcontracting, it is important to know whether the CBA contains any prohibitions against layoffs and subcontracting. An example of such language could be “The Village shall not lay-off any member of the bargaining unit during the term of this contract” or “The Village agrees that it will not subcontract or outsource bargaining unit work.” If the CBA contains such prohibitions, the employer is contractually prohibited from taking the necessary steps to consolidate its operations with other governmental entities, at least until the CBA expires. At that point, the employer may bargain over the decision, and depending on the dispute resolution mechanism in each state or locality, the final decision on consolidation may rest in the hands of an interest arbitrator.

Assuming that the CBA does not explicitly prohibit taking the necessary steps to implement consolidation, the employer needs to consider what if any bargaining obligation exists.

**If the contract does not prohibit consolidation, is the employer still required to bargain the decision as a mandatory subject of bargaining?**

For public sector entities, legal bargaining obligations typically arise from state or local labor laws. Most labor laws recognize two instances where the duty to bargain can be triggered. First, if the consolidation affects one or more mandatory subjects of bargaining and secondly, the employer may have to bargain the decision. Second, even if the decision itself is not negotiable mandatory subject of bargaining, the agency might still be obligated to bargain over the effects of that decision. State statutes vary, but, in general, mandatory subjects of bargaining pertain to wages, working hours, and terms and conditions of employment. With regard to these topics, an employer cannot make unilateral changes without providing advance notice and an opportunity for the union to bargain over the subject. If unilateral changes are made without notice and an opportunity to bargain, the employer may have committed an unfair labor practice, which could result in rather harsh remedies, including but not limited to restoring the status quo ante by totally reversing any consolidation decision.

What are the various types of mandatory subjects that a public safety consolidation might involve? Here are some examples: wages, layoffs, job eliminations, change in working locations, hours, health insurance, vacation, holidays, and merger of seniority lists. As agencies explore how to save money, jobs typically are the first to go. Moreover, if you are dealing with multiple union agencies, all with different CBA provisions, it is natural that some employees will witness a change in their wages, hours and terms and conditions of employment. Commonly, where parties are engaged in negotiations, the employer must maintain the status quo of all mandatory bargaining subjects absent an overall impasse (Love, 2010).

Assuming that consolidation will involve one or more mandatory subjects of bargaining, it therefore becomes important to again examine any existing CBA(s) in order to determine whether the Union may have somehow waived its right to bargain over the employer’s decision to change certain wages, benefits or terms of employment.
If mandatory by subject matter, does a bargaining waiver exist?

A union can waive its right to bargain over a particular subject by written agreement, by bargaining history or by inaction. Waivers must be clear and unmistakable to be effectual (Leka, 2010). In the case of a “written waiver,” this means that the contract language must be specific. For instance, a union may contractually agree to waive its right to initiate bargaining in general by a “zipper clause;”, that is, a clause intended to waive the obligation to bargain during the term of the agreement on matters not contained in the agreement (Love, 2010). Alternatively, a union may waive the right to bargain over a particular subject through an explicit contractual provision. If an explicit provision exists preserving the employer’s right to “determine appropriate staffing levels,” this would waive the union’s right to bargain over the management’s decision to increase staffing levels for, say, the 4th of July weekend.

A “waiver by bargaining history” would arise when the item or action is not specifically addressed in the CBA but the union and employer have discussed it in contract negotiations and the union has yielded its position. For example, if a union sought to bargain over a no-subcontracting clause but later withdrew its proposal in exchange for another provision that addresses layoffs with language that was more union friendly, the Union arguably has waived its right to bargain over mid-term subcontracting decisions. A waiver of the union’s right to bargain over the subject matter that was withdrawn, in this case, no subcontracting, would exist. The particular words of proposals offered during contract and mid-term negotiations need not be identical for a waiver to exist. The employer should carefully consult with counsel before claiming waiver in such a circumstance, however, as the waiver needs to be quite clear—and the consequences of mistakenly claiming a waiver are high.

A “waiver by inaction” is the third way a union can waive its bargaining rights. Once the union has been notified by the employer of the intent to change a mandatory subject of bargaining that is not already covered by the contract, the union must request to bargain. If the union does not make this request, this would be a “waiver by inaction.” “On the other hand, acquiescence in past changes to a bargainable subject does not betoken a surrender of the right to bargain the next time the employer might wish to make yet further changes, not even when such further changes arguably [sic] are similar to those in which the union may have acquiesced in the past” (Arnault, 2011).

Keep in mind that while these legal principles appear simple in theory, they can be rather difficult to apply in practice. When one also considers the rather “union-friendly” labor agencies that oversee employer actions, and the rather harsh remedies that could be imposed if employers “get it wrong,” the most conservative approach for employers is to bargain a consolidation decision, even if certain contract language arguably could be construed as a mid-term bargaining waiver.

What is the duty to bargain?

Assuming that the CBA contains a clear and unmistakable midterm bargaining waiver, does the employer still need to engage in effects bargaining? Yes, employers may very well still need to engage in some form of good faith bargaining with the Union. In other words, if the consolidation decision is not subject to negotiation, the agency is likely still obligated to engage in “effects bargaining”; that is, to bargain over the procedures to implement the decision and appropriate arrangements for unit employees adversely affected by that decision. Good faith bargaining is defined as meeting at reasonable times and places with the intention of reaching an agreement but it does not require either party to make a specific concession (Love, 2010). The employer has an obligation to provide the union with notice and an opportunity to bargain about the effects of a managerial decision. Topics of bargaining can include termination dates, severance pay, letters of reference, preferential hiring into
another department within the municipality/county, or even health insurance continuation coverage. Alternatively, where employees will be transferred to another locality and take on different duties, effects bargaining topics might include commuting stipends, parking arrangements, and additional training provisions.

As was true above when discussing bargaining over the decision itself, if the collective bargaining agreement contains specific provisions that already cover the effects of a management decision, such as layoff order, notice requirements, bumping procedures, and recall rights, the union may have waived its right to any further effects bargaining, because the parties have in effect already bargained the effects.

**Rolling Meadows, Illinois Example**

We have already addressed when it is necessary to bargain with the union: let's now focus our attention on the specific topics that may have to be addressed. The topics for the absorbing agency will likely differ from those for the transferring agency. For the purposes of this paper, we will consider the following real-life scenario of the City of Rolling Meadows' intent to join Northwest Central Dispatch System (NWCDSD). The consolidation would save the city 1.8 million dollars over three years, but eight full-time telecommunicators would lose their jobs (News & Views, 2009). The Rolling Meadows telecommunicators were represented by the Illinois Council of Police, and NWCDSD at the time had no CBA obligations.

The first step was to determine whether the CBA flatly prohibited the consolidation decision. It did not. The next step, therefore, was to determine whether the consolidation involved mandatory subjects of bargaining for Rolling Meadows and, as such, “decisional bargaining.” No one disputed that consolidation involved a mandatory subject of bargaining. The next step was to evaluate whether bargaining waivers existed. The Rolling Meadows CBA contained two primary contract provisions that arguably constituted midterm bargaining waivers:

**ARTICLE 3**
**MANAGEMENT RIGHTS**

*Except as specifically limited by the express provisions of this Agreement, the City retains all traditional rights to manage and direct the affairs of the City in all of its various aspects and to manage and direct its employees, including, but not limited to, the following: to plan, direct, control and determine the budget and all the operations, services and missions of the City; to supervise and direct the working forces; to establish the qualifications for employment and to employ employees; to schedule and assign work; to maintain a capable and efficient police department; to establish specialty positions and select personnel to fill them; to establish work and productivity standards; to assign overtime; to contract out for goods or services; to subcontract or contract out work or assign bargaining unit work to other employees or non-employees; to determine the methods, means, organization and number of personnel by which such operations and services shall be made or purchased; to make, alter and enforce reasonable rules, regulations, orders, policies and procedures;*

**ARTICLE 20**
**SUBCONTRACTING**

*The City reserves the right to contract out or subcontract out (hereinafter “subcontract” or “contract out”) any work it deems necessary in the exercise of its best judgment. Except where
an emergency situation exists, before subcontracting of bargaining unit work which would result in the layoff of one or more bargaining unit employees, the City will notify the Union of the subcontracting decision a minimum of sixty (60) days prior to implementing its decision to subcontract bargaining unit work. The City shall have the right to implement such subcontracting any time after sixty (60) days have elapsed from the time that such notice was provided to the Union...In the event that any bargaining unit member is laid off as a result of such subcontracting, such laid-off employee shall be given preference for any employment position with the City for which the employee is qualified, such preference expiring one (1) year after such layoff (City of Rolling Meadows and the Illinois Council of Police, 2008).

With these two contract provisions in hand, the Union had arguably waived its right to bargain over the “consolidation” decision, although it still maintained the right to bargain over the “effects” of the decision.

Once the decision to consolidate was made, the union was notified of the decision. The union asked to engage in “effects bargaining.” In a memorandum to the bargaining unit, the Union President announced the terms agreed to in the bargaining sessions.

To all full time dispatch employees, with the news of Rolling Meadows transferring all dispatch responsibilities to Northwest Central Dispatch System, we recently sat down to discuss the severance package for all full time dispatchers. It was determined thru these meetings that the City of Rolling Meadows will follow the following equations when it comes to buyout/severance packages:

- Each full time dispatcher will receive two weeks of pay for every two years they were employed full time.
- Each full time dispatcher will be paid for all unused comp time accrued prior to 7/1/2009.
- Each full time dispatcher will be paid for all unused holiday time accrued prior to 7/1/2009.
- Each full time dispatcher will be paid for all unused vacation time accrued prior to 7/1/2009.
- Each full time dispatcher will continue to work at the front desk after dispatch service has been transferred to Northwest Central Dispatch System up until 7/1/2009, but will be able to use any unused comp/holiday/vacation time if staffing permits.

At this time, we are currently working on a time to have representatives from Northwest Central Dispatch System come in and explain their hiring process... (Bianchi, John, 2009).

In this instance, the effects bargaining was limited to severance pay, the buy out for accrued time, and staffing the front desk. Every bargaining unit has different concerns and, as such, may approach “effects bargaining” differently. As explained above, topics of effects bargaining can include termination dates, letters of reference, preferential hiring into another department within the municipality/county, training, or even health insurance continuation coverage. Once the “effects bargaining” was concluded, the City of Rolling Meadows could then turn its full focus to other aspects of closing its dispatch center and transitioning to NWCDS. Now let us focus our attention to the other half of the equation, the absorbing agency.
Northwest Central Dispatch System was formed in 1972 and was no stranger to welcoming new membership. At the time of the Rolling Meadows consolidation, it dispatched for 19 suburban police and fire departments. NWCDS anticipated the need to hire five full time telecommunicators to accommodate the additional work. As stated earlier, Rolling Meadows Telecommunicators were encouraged to apply to NWCDS. Those that successfully completed the testing process would be given first consideration in the hiring process. The Rolling Meadows Telecommunicators were given an opportunity to attend a meeting where NWCDS outlined the hiring process. Each prospective employee was given a letter outlining his or her specific transition and an initial benefits package. While NWCDS did not have to negotiate these terms, the concept is similar to that of “effects bargaining” in the subjects addressed (Exhibit A):

- Projected Hire Date
- Salary
- Vacation Accrual Rate
- Sick Time
- Insurance Benefits
- Retirement Benefits
- Work and Pay Schedule
- Overtime and Holiday Pay
- Uniform Allowance
- Language Incentive
- Longevity
- Seniority
- Residency

Since the telecommunicators at NWCDS were not unionized at the time, there was no need for administration to negotiate the impact that adding Rolling Meadows Police and Fire Department may have had on the conditions of work. However, NWCDS understood that whenever a significant change is being considered, telecommunicator participation, from both the closing agency and the absorbing center, whether or not unionized, should be part of the process from the beginning. Early involvement helps with a smoother transition later. *(It is important to note that if a bargaining unit does exist, an employer must negotiate through the union and not directly with the employees. The employer is prohibited from directly communicating with the employees in an attempt to persuade them to agree with management’s position. This would be considered unlawful direct dealing.)*

One of the ways NWCDS reached out to their non-unionized telecommunicators was to inform them that a feasibility study was requested, and then employees were kept abreast of the progress. After the study was completed and a decision made, the telecommunicators were included in the preparations to welcome the newcomers. Rolling Meadows applicants came to NWCDS and sat with the dispatch staff. This allowed the NWCDS employees to be included in the assessment process and provided the new employees the opportunity to experience the differences between a consolidated dispatch environment and that of a single agency. Next, all telecommunicators were allowed to ride with officers from member police departments. This was a valuable way to learn the geography and nuances of the geographic area served by NWCDS. Finally, the telecommunicators developed training materials and reference guides for everyone to use both prior to and after the transfer of services.

Although not the case with Rolling Meadows, another technique NWCDS used with both Palatine and Schaumburg was to pay its telecommunicators to work at the transitioning dispatch center. Depending on the staffing needs of that center, NWCDS either detailed telecommunicators full-time or allowed them to sign up to take periodic shifts. If both agencies are open to this approach, it offers three benefits: First, once a center announces its plans to close, most of its employees start to look for employment elsewhere. This cross-staffing approach is ideal to relieve some of the workload from the
remaining telecommunicators. Secondly, this method familiarizes the telecommunicators with the incoming agency’s operations and geography. Thirdly, this type of merging can lay a cooperative foundation and a welcoming environment for the telecommunicators who eventually come on board at the consolidated center. At the same time, such initiatives could trigger certain bargaining obligations, especially if existing CBAs do not contain the appropriate management flexibilities. “There are four possibilities to consider when consolidating: neither party has a CBA, both have a CBA, only the agency seeking membership has a CBA or only the consolidated dispatch center has a CBA. No matter the configuration, when an agency is considering new members, an analysis of all facets of the collective bargaining risk is a must to be included in the feasibility study” (Barbera-Brelle, 2012).

Consolidation Guidelines

There are definite benefits to consolidating services within the public-safety environment, efficiencies achieved through the pooling of monies, splitting the costs and gaining improvements in technologies, and substantial financial savings through the reduction in personnel and facility costs. Nonetheless, one cannot discount the impact a collective-bargaining agreement may have on the agencies considering this type of restructuring. Successful consolidations that involve collective-bargaining units can be achieved when all parties follow some important guidelines.

1. Does the CBA(s) prohibit the consolidation decision?
2. If not, does the consolidation decision implicate mandatory subjects of bargaining?
3. If so, does the CBA nevertheless arguably contain a mid-term bargaining waiver, which absolves the employer of having to bargain over one or more aspects of the consolidation decision? In an answering this question, one should examine the following CBA provisions:
   - Does a bargaining waiver exist?
     - By written agreement
     - Bargaining history
     - Inaction
   - Review the provisions for a potential bargaining waiver:
     - Management Rights
     - Sub-contracting
     - Zipper Clause
4. Even assuming that the CBA contains a clear and unmistakable midterm bargaining waiver, does the employer still need to engage in effects bargaining?
   - What is the duty to bargain?
     - Do you need to engage in 'decisional bargaining'?
       - No unilateral changes for mandatory subjects of bargaining
       - Maintaining status quo during effects bargaining
5. Once the decision is made, communicate, communicate, communicate.
   - Provide notice and opportunity to bargain over effects
   - No Direct Dealing
   - Include the employees/union in the entire process
   - Subjects of bargaining may include:
     - Projected Hire/Termination Dates
     - Training
     - Salary
     - Vacation Accrual Rate
     - Sick Time
- Insurance Benefits
- Retirement Benefits
- Work and Pay Schedule
- Overtime and Holiday Pay
- Uniform Allowance
- Language Incentive
- Longevity

- Seniority
- Residency
- Letters of Reference
- Preferential Hiring
- Transfers into another department within the village

Written By: Rocella M. Rodgers, Operations Manager, Northwest Central Dispatch System, 1975 E. Davis St., Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, 847-590-3427, email: RRodgers@nwcds.org
Name: Rolling Meadows

Rolling Meadows Years of Service: 8 yrs 0 months
Rolling Meadows Hire Date: 5/9/2001
Rolling Meadows Salary: $62,415/yr
Rolling Meadows Vacation Time: 15 days/yr

NWCDS Hire Date: May 1, 2009 (projected)
NWCDS Salary*: $63,031/yr (TC 4 Step 4)
NWCDS Vacation Time: 15 days/yr

*Please note that NWCDS salaries listed are for the 2008/2009 Budget Year.

**Vacation Allowance**

Vacation is calculated based on hire date and your Rolling Meadows hire date will be used to determine your accrued Vacation time. Vacation is earned on a monthly basis, but advanced annually on your NWCDS hire date. Should you terminate for any reason and more vacation time has been used than earned, the difference would be owed to NWCDS. Please see the chart below for earned vacation calculations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Working Days</th>
<th>Hours per Year</th>
<th>Hours per Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>15.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 25 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sick Allowance**

You will be advanced up to 6 sick days (48 hours) on your NWCDS hire date, based on your current accumulated sick time with Rolling Meadows. You will not be eligible to earn additional sick time during the first 3 months of employment. Eight hours of sick leave will be credited to your account at the end of your 4th month of employment and each month thereafter. Sick time may not be used in advance.

**Insurance Benefits**

NWCDS offers a choice of two different medical plans, dental coverage and Life and AD&D coverage for both the employee and their dependents. The medical and dental benefits are provided at a 10% premium cost to the employee, with NWCD paying the remaining 90% of the premium. The Life and AD&D coverage is provided at no cost to the employee, with benefits at 1 times salary up to $50,000 and $2,000 per dependent. Additional Voluntary Life coverage is available with 100% of the premium cost paid by the employee. Please refer to the table below for current year premium rates and employee per pay contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCBS PPO Annual</th>
<th>EE 10% Per Pay</th>
<th>BCBS BlueAdvantage HMO Annual</th>
<th>EE 10% Per Pay</th>
<th>Lincoln Dental Annual</th>
<th>EE 10% Per Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>5,721.72</td>
<td>572.17</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>4,231.08</td>
<td>423.11</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE + CHILD</td>
<td>12,046.56</td>
<td>1,204.66</td>
<td>44.62</td>
<td>8,908.20</td>
<td>890.82</td>
<td>32.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE + SPOUSE</td>
<td>11,800.92</td>
<td>1,180.09</td>
<td>43.71</td>
<td>8,726.52</td>
<td>872.65</td>
<td>32.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>18,125.88</td>
<td>1,812.59</td>
<td>67.13</td>
<td>13,403.64</td>
<td>1,340.36</td>
<td>49.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tax Deferred / Retirement Benefits**
Flexible Spending accounts are available for both medical and dependent care expenses. We also have available a 457 plan offered through ICMA-RC. Please note that the Flexible Spending and 457 plans are all tax-deferred compensation contributions funded entirely by the employee.

ICMA-RC also offers traditional and Roth IRA's as part of retirement planning. NWCDS is also a member of the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund (IMRF) which requires contributions from the employer on behalf of its employees as well as a 4.5% contribution from employees.

Work / Pay Schedule

NWCDS telecommunicators operate on a 5 days on/2 days off, 5 days on/3 days off work schedule, with each work day shift being 8 hours. (Shifts are 0700-1500, 1500-2300, 2300-0700) Paydays are on a bi-weekly schedule with checks issued on the Friday following the end of the bi-weekly time accounting period. The pay time accounting period runs from Sunday to the second Saturday, with the base paid time being 80 hours regardless of the scheduled days assigned. This check smoothing process results in a 48 hour deficit per year between the hours paid and the hours actually worked. Payback hours is the method used to resolve the difference and “payback” the 48 hours which are paid but not worked on the regular 5-2 / 5-3 work schedule. The Payback hours are an annual obligation, renewing January 1, and scheduled as per NWCDS directive I-A-604.

Overtime / Holiday Pay

Overtime hours will be determined by using the number of hours worked per day in excess of 8 hours or the number of hours worked per week in excess of 40 hours. Overtime compensation will be either in the form of compensation time awarded at the rate of 1½ times the amount of overtime worked (to a maximum of 48 hours accumulated time) or in the form of additional wages paid at the rate of 1½ times your hourly wage. Should you work on one of the 7 designated fixed holidays as part of your regular schedule, you will be compensated for that shift as overtime, choosing either of the compensation awards listed above.

Uniform Allowance / Language Incentive

While on duty, telecommunicators are required to wear a standard uniform as defined by NWCDS. In order to comply with this requirement, an annual uniform allowance of $250.00 is available for employee use to either purchase regulation items independently and be reimbursed or order them through NWCDS. You will be provided 2 shirts and one pair of pants as part of your initial compensation.

Any employee who has conversational proficiency in Spanish, Polish or Russian is entitled to an annual incentive award of $450.00. Employees who have an intermediate level of competence in conversational Spanish, Polish or Russian will be entitled to an annual incentive award of $225.00. Incentive payments are awarded on the payday following the employee’s anniversary date.

Longevity / Seniority / Residency

Longevity awards are given to employees who have completed at least 5 years of continuous full time service with NWCDS. These awards are given at the employee’s anniversary date and increase in value with additional years of service, ranging from $400.00 to $1,100.00. Longevity payments are awarded on the payday following the employee’s anniversary date.

Seniority ranking will be based on a combination of years of service with Rolling Meadows and cumulative test scores.

Any residency requirements normally imposed will be waived.
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