

Addendum and corrections for approved meeting minutes of July 22nd Special Board meeting regarding the incorrect conversion of wages to salary for Fire Chief Craig Williams and Fire Marshal Ben Covington resulting in proposed salary freeze of 1 year for Fire Marshal Covington (not 2 years as incorrectly recorded in approved minutes) and 2 years for Fire Chief Craig Williams.

Fallon gave an explanation of how the error occurred and presented a corrected formula that was not reflected in the approved minutes. The following is Fallon's explanation and presentation verbatim;

"The dilemma that exists; Ben and I and Craig have talked it through and I am not interested in playing the blame game but what it amounts to right now is on June 30th, 2019, Craig's gross wage was \$75,492.00 or \$36.29 per hour and Ben's was \$60,000.00 or \$28.89 per hour. The motion we made at the August 5th meeting (brings up image of meeting minutes on projector) that we discussed the budgeted overtime from the prior year which was 18% of Craig and Ben's wages which is about \$20,000.00 split between them and that represents about 7 ½ hours of overtime. Craig was saying that they use 3 to 5 and then there was a motion made down here if you look at the second motion, it was limiting it to 4 hours. So, if we're going to be talking about 4 hours of overtime added to their base pay then what I went and did here is in the middle of the screen you're going to see this little calculation that attempts to arrive at how much of that overtime is for them and you can see where Craig got \$9800.00 and Ben got \$7800.00. So those amounts then were added to Craig's base of \$65,000.00 and the overtime and that comes out to June 30th of \$75,492.00. The agreement that we got should have moved him up to \$78,511.00 which would have been a 4% increase from one year to the next." ... "We can't take anything away so my observation is ...July 1st, 2019, Craig was getting \$75,492.00 and he was bumped up to \$87,000.00 during that year on August 5th which meant that he got a 16% pay raise and if I'm looking at that out over time and I'm looking at a 4% increase per year which is what we're giving everybody else, then he shouldn't have any raises until part way into fiscal year 2023. You can see that if you go (*pause*) what I have off to the right side there under column AS are the numbers that would grow at 4% per year. So, \$78,511.00 is 4% higher than \$75,492.00, \$81,652.00 is 4% higher than \$78,000.00. The \$84,900.00 is 4% higher and the \$88,000.00 is 4% higher. So, he can get maybe a little bit of a bump in 2023. I'll say just 1%, I don't know; even though everybody else may get a 4%. But, really the year in which he comes off of the no increase, we would have to look and see, 'ok, what's everybody else been getting along the way so that everybody keeps pace with inflation?' But, to me that's the concern with Craig. The concern with Ben is he comes off the schedule one year earlier than Craig would but not by much. So, he would have to have it be flat for almost through the end of fiscal year 2022 even though everybody else will be getting pay raises because of the miscalculation. That's my perspective on it. Now, all the other Trustees can take whatever position they want but that's the way I view it and the numbers that we got to, Ben and I and Craig had discussions on (*pause*) in column AE, I attempted to make sure that I read the minutes of August 5th and I knew how to make sure we accounted for everything for June 30th, 2019 for both Craig and Ben to come up with what the legitimate comparable numbers would be and it's all created some awkwardness but this is just what it looks like it needs to be in order to make it all be fair for a long period of time."