

CITY COUNCIL BUDGET HEARING

City Council Chambers, 7:00 P. M.
Wednesday, October 6, 1965

Present on roll call 9: Bott, Cvitanich, Finnigan,
Haley, Herrmann, Johnson, Murtland, Price and Mayor Tollefson.

Mayor Tollefson announced that this is a continued
hearing on the budget for 1966.

58.
pg. 15

Mr. Rowlands explained that so as to save time, prior to hearing from the various employee representatives, it might be appropriate for a brief summary as to the background and procedures leading up to this years' salary recommendations. Mr. Erdahl would comment as to the Department of Public Utilities point of view and he would ask Mr. Bixel, Personnel Director, to summarize the procedures utilized. On October 7th during last year's budget hearing, a letter was received from the Public Utility Board in which it was recommended that a more detailed wage and salary review be conducted in 1965 for use in connection with the preparation of the 1966 Budget. The following day, October 8th, Mayor Tollefson, speaking for the council, announced that such a detailed wage and salary survey would be conducted in 1965. In accordance with these instructions, Mr. Rowlands asked Mr. Bixel to outline the procedures used.

Mr. Bixel stated that the survey procedures involved considerable time; taking staff time in excess of 4 months when computed in terms of one employee. He outlined the procedures beginning in January with the development of the private firms and public jurisdictions to be covered and identification of bench mark positions. These procedures were approved by the Joint Labor Committee February 9th. The private firm data was collected earlier this year in March and April. Prior to publication of the survey, meetings were held with the Joint Labor Committee and individual employee representatives to assist in determining the validity of the data collected. Mr. Bixel pointed out that the survey did not provide all data for all classes and was lacking in data particularly at the administrative and supervisory levels. Data from other 1st class cities was also not included in the summary.

Mr. Bixel continued by explaining that upon completion and distribution of the salary survey, Mr. Rowlands and Mr. Erdahl appointed a Salary Committee consisting of Paul Becker, Gordon Tatum and Ivan Usher from the Department of Public Utilities and Mr. Lund and himself. This Committee was assigned the responsibility for evaluating available salary data, including the City's Wage and Salary Survey as a principal source of reference, and developing recommendations for needed salary adjustments for consideration by Mr. Rowlands and Mr. Erdahl. Prior to scheduled meetings with employee representatives for the week of September 7th, Mr. Rowlands and Mr. Erdahl reviewed these recommendations extensively including a detailed analysis of supporting salary data. This salary informa-

tion included proposed rate changes for public jurisdictions which had been announced or were under consideration since the publication of the survey.

At a meeting with the Joint Labor Committee September 10th, that group requested that further meetings with employee representatives be discontinued and a specific proposal be developed. This was agreed to. After further review of employee representatives written recommendations, departmental recommendations and available salary data, Mr. Rowlands and Mr. Erdahl developed their Preliminary Analysis for 1966 Salary Levels which was distributed to employee representatives and City Council September 20th. This analysis was subject to any additional changes as the result of meetings with employee representatives which were held the week of September 27th. After such changes, final recommendations were then submitted to the City Council October 1st.

For the benefit of those who may not have had an opportunity to read his and Mr. Erdahl's recommendations to the City Council dated October 1, 1965, Mr. Rowlands read the covering memorandum for this report. He stressed the many meetings involved in developing these recommendations. It was felt that the recommendations, if approved, would establish City of Tacoma salary and wage levels on a comparative basis with those in other governmental agencies, industry and business. A number of major problems still existed, however, including evaluations of position worth based on additional duties and class inter-relationships, longevity pay and City-paid family medical coverage. It was therefore recommended by Mr. Rowlands and Mr. Erdahl that funds be provided in the 1966 Budget to underwrite an objective, impartial and thoroughly professional evaluation of these and other problems by an experienced management consulting firm.

Mr. C. A. Erdahl, Director of Utilities, stated that Mr. Rowlands and Mr. Bixel had pretty well covered the procedures used in arriving at the recommendations being made. In addition, he of course had to clear with the Public Utility Board, and after being thoroughly considered by that body, the recommendations as presented received their endorsement. Mr. Erdahl recommended the adoption of the recommendations by the City Council. He further added his recommendation for the need for an over-all class and pay survey to be made in 1966 to resolve remaining problems.

D. H. Ketler, Secretary of the Joint Labor Committee, suggested that all City employees earning \$500 or less per month receive two steps (nearly 10 per cent) and all employees earning more than \$500 receive a flat \$50 increase per month. He added, they were disappointed in the negotiations this year, particularly in the craft unions, as they felt they should have had at least a two step increase in salaries.

John Willis, President of Local #31, of the Firefighters Union felt that the higher the salary the less of a percentage should be given for a wage increase. He suggested that a flat \$50 a month increase be given for a salary over \$500 a month and a two (2) step increase for those receiving less than \$500 a month be granted.

Mayor Tollefson said the Council has to determine whether the salaries as recommended fit the pattern that the City Council has attempted to meet for years; equal pay for equal work. He suggested that a survey of the City's classification plan by an outside firm be conducted during the year 1966.

Lloyd Worrel, 5703 Fawcett, representing the Labor Union, stated his prime objective was to remind the Council that only a 5% increase was being recommended for Laborers and Sewermen. The rest of the employees are getting a 6% increase.

Mr. Rowlands explained that after the meeting with Mr. Worrell it was agreed after careful consideration to add 1% to the class of laborer.

Mr. Murtland asked what a one-range increase constituted.

Mayor Tollefson remarked that it depended upon the range and class.

Mr. Bixel, Personnel Director, stated it averages out in the compensation plan slightly less than 5%.

Mr. Rowlands explained that it was felt the recommendations for 1966 would establish City salaries on a comparative level with private firms and other governmental jurisdictions.

Mr. Worrell asked the Council to check on the Semiskilled Laborer and Sewerman rates. He also asked about the Trackman (I) class.

Mr. Bixel said it was intended that the class of RR Trackman (I) receive the same salary increase as the Laborer class though inadvertently it was not included in the recommendations of October 1, 1965.

Mr. Rowlands stated he was very sympathetic to the sewer-men and asked Mr. Bixel to explain the recommendation for this class.

Mr. Bixel stated that the salary survey did not support greater recognition for this class. Greater recognition had been granted in the past to this class since at one time the duties were part of the Semiskilled Laborer Class. It is now a separate class and paid 10 cents more per hour.

Fred Peck, representing the Joint-Labor Committee, said his committee had studied the Salary Survey in detail and they found justification to bring the Semiskilled Laborer's salary up to more than a one-step increase. He added, in reviewing the recommended salary increases the majority of the appointive positions have more than a one-step increase which he felt was not justified.

John A. Willis, representing Local #31 of the Fire Fighters' Union, stated when the Salary Survey was mentioned, his organization agreed to compare salaries with Seattle and Portland. They have noted that in Portland the firemen work the same hours, but receive \$26.00 more. However, if raises are approved as planned, Tacoma firemen will be within \$1.00 of their salaries for 6 months, but their fiscal year starts in July. In order to be on the level with the Portland Fire Fighters, Tacoma firemen should have a \$50 a month raise as of January 1, 1966.

Mr. Rowlands stated that the rates for other first class cities were not included in the survey.

Fred Stewart, Painters' Union business representative, felt that the salary increases recommended were not the result of collective bargaining, but paternalism. He felt that workers of the City of Tacoma have suffered during the past 12 to 15 years, particularly, in the skilled trades. He added, approximately 10 years ago they were just \$10 a month less than a Fire Capt. and now the difference was \$80 a month.

Mr. Bixel stated that the Fire Fighter and Police Patrolman were at the Laborer's pay rate in 1954 and obviously were grossly underpaid at that time.

Anthony M. Zatkovich, President of Tacoma Police Local #224, stated that the Policemen are being slighted if they go along with only a one-step increase. In the next three years the Department is going to lose several hundred years of experience because of the number of men eligible for retirement. There is no additional pay and no longevity program to hold them. In addition, men working on a graveyard shift should be paid 50¢ more per hour and this would involve 30 men. Under the longevity plan being proposed a man would be entitled to 2% of his base pay after 5 years service and a man with 15 years service would be entitled to 6% of his base pay.

Mayor Tollefson asked if Seattle and Portland have such a longevity plan.

Mr. Zatkovich stated the cities of Spokane, Bellingham, Bremerton, Aberdeen and Yakima have longevity plans. There are no cities in this area having a shift differential.

Mr. Rowlands stated that one of the Union's recommendations, shooting pay, is being recommended. Officers with a certain qualifying score would be eligible for additional pay.

Al Rosso, Professional & Technical Engineers #17, stated he was requesting a 2-step increase for engineers as well as family coverage.

J. Norris Pearson, President of the Tacoma Chapter of Professional Engineers, said in comparison with the Federal Government the salary of City engineers shows a discrepancy of between \$1,000 to \$2,000. He pointed out on a chart that this was based on the 1964 Federal Salary Survey. Their proposal is for a 2-step increase to bring the Senior Engineers and Principal Engineers more in line with Federal and Industrial salaries for like positions. The Professional Engineers urged the Council to consider a 2-step increase starting at the Engineer II level in addition to a 1-step increase for all other grades.

John P. Morris of the Professional Engineers, stated they were also asking for longevity steps on a merit basis at regular intervals.

Mayor Tollefson asked how Tacoma compares with Seattle and Portland in salaries for Engineers.

Mr. Bixel said that Tacoma's salaries for Senior Civil Engineers are reasonably comparable with both Seattle and Portland salaries.

John A. Willis, President of Local #31, Fire Fighters' Union, stated he had requested a \$50 pay increase. Also, a program to reduce the work hours to 48 hours a week and longevity pay of 2% every 5 years up to the 20th year based on the 4th year Roseman's pay. They also requested Pierce County Medical family coverage. The Senior Dispatchers should be upgraded to receive a Captain's pay as Inspectors do the same work as the Public Works inspectors and they should be paid accordingly. He added, before the budget is adopted, they would like an answer on these six items.

Mr. Rowlands pointed out that several adjustments have been made over the years to the Inspector's pay.

Chief Reiser stated he was not against raises, as such, but felt that Public Works Inspectors, Electrical Inspectors, Building Inspectors could not be classified the same as Fire Inspectors. He proposed that in 1966 the Fire Department make a complete survey of the Fire Inspector's Bureau along the lines of pay as well as classification of the jobs, and that a report be submitted to the City Manager before the 1967 budget.

Mr. Bott stated that he felt the Fire Inspectors should be classified at this time.

Mr. Cvitanich asked if their code would also be analyzed. Mr. Rowlands stated this would also be a part of the reorganization.

Mr. Pearson stated that the fire inspectors and marshals are invaluable to the engineers in private practice who plan the buildings in the city.

City Council Budget Hearing - Page 6 - October 6, 1965

Sam Kinville, President of the Pierce County-Tacoma City Employees, Local 120, requested the following:

- 1. A longevity pay plan based on the formula of \$2 per month per year of service. An employee to be eligible, must have ten years' City service.
- 2. A minimum of a two-step pay increase.
- 3. The workday be reduced to seven hours with no reduction in pay.
- 4. Complete medical and hospitalization coverage (family coverage) paid for by the City.

He added, the union wished specific classification adjustments to be made in the following positions.

- 1. Sanitarians who are presently at salary range 23 be raised to salary range 25. Request was based on the premise that Sanitarians are basically inspector-type positions with relatively high qualifications and that their salary range should be commensurate with other inspector positions such as Sign Inspectors.
- 2. Customer Service Assistant (0006) presently at salary range 14.5 be raised to salary range 16. Request was based on the premise that this new classification should be paid more, commensurate with the new job requirements.
- 3. The entire Purchasing and Stores series be revised upward. Request is based on the premise of long standing that the whole series is not paid commensurate with the job requirements.
- 4. Switchboard Operator (0030) be raised from the present salary range 14 to salary range 14.5. Request was based on the premise that this position has historically been paid the same as the County.
- 5. That Photo Lab Assistant, Photographer I, Photographer II and Supervisor of Photo and Reproduction be eliminated from the Trades classification series and placed in the Machine Operation classification series. Request was based on the premise of continuity in the classification series.

Mr. Kinville stated, he also felt he had not had opportunity to collectively bargain on any of these issues. His union met only two hours with the management and he felt this was not sufficient time to call it collective bargaining.

Mr. Rowlands explained, perhaps, Mr. Kinville had not taken full advantage of the opportunities that were available for bargaining.

City Council Budget Hearing - Page 7 - October 6, 1965

Mr. Erdahl, Utilities Director, stated that Mr. Kinville didn't seem to want to accept the personnel report because he said it was not accurate. He felt that the recommendations made to the Council by Mr. Rowlands and himself had been adequately evaluated.

Mr. Rowlands stated that he felt an impartial and a fair hearing was conducted with the Labor Unions, as many hours were spent in reviewing each proposition. The requests presented tonight by Mr. Ketler and Mr. Willis regarding the manner of granting salary increases were not presented at previous sessions.

Mr. Rowlands stated that the City is presently working with the County and he felt the Switchboard rate would be equated as requested.

Mr. Kinville requested that the Clerk Typists in the City be given a 7-hour day, with no reduction in pay, the same as those employees who work for the County on a 7-hour day.

He also asked that the City employees of the Health Dept. be put on a 7-hour day because the County Commissioners have indicated, if the City agrees to put their employees on a 7-hour day they would do likewise.


D. H. Ketler stated that the final recommendation from the City was not made until Monday and there was no time left to discuss anything with Management or the staff. He added, because of this they had to present a counter-proposal directly to the City Council.

Mayor Tollefson asked if there was anything to prevent the Unions from stating that they did not wish to go along with any proposed salary study and only wanted an "across-the-board" increase.

Mr. Ketler felt this could not be done because they hoped the salary study would show two-step increases.

The budget hearing was recessed until Thursday, October 7, 1965 at 7:00 P. M.


Mayor of the City Council

Attest: 
City Clerk