

**STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & INDUSTRY SERVICE  
EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION**

*In the Matter of the Fact Finding  
between:*

**CITY OF DETROIT**

**-and-**

**MERC Case No. D01 E-0639**

**TEAMSTERS LOCAL 214**

---

**APPEARANCES:**

**FOR THE CITY OF DETROIT:**

Roger N. Cheek, Director, Labor Relations  
Allen Lewis, Chief Labor Relations Specialist  
Roger Short, Budget Director

**FOR TEAMSTERS LOCAL 214:**

Joseph Valenti, President  
Joseph M. Valenti, Business Agent  
Robert Bittner, Chief Steward  
Floyd P. Ware, Chief Steward  
Alex Germany, Chief Steward

**FACT FINDER'S REPORT, FINDINGS OF FACT  
AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Introduction**

Teamsters Local 214 represents some approximately 925 City of Detroit employees in various departments throughout the City, namely, approximately nine departments. These departments include the Department of Public Works, Public Lighting, Airport Department, Health Department (Animal Control Unit), Consumer Affairs Department, Municipal Parking, Recreation and Zoo. The classifications include:

Truck Driver  
Vehicle Operator I  
Vehicle Operator II  
Vehicle Operator III

Construction Equipment Operator  
Construction Equipment Operator - 50 Ton Crane  
Line Helper - Driver I  
Line Helper - Driver II  
Assistant Equipment Dispatcher - Field Construction  
Assistant Equipment Dispatcher - Asphalt Plant  
Equipment Dispatcher  
Assistant Sanitation Yard Dispatcher  
Sanitation Yard Dispatcher  
Refuse Collection Packer Operator  
Senior Airport Service Worker  
Airport Service Worker  
Building Attendant A  
Service Guard - Airport  
Service Guard - General  
Senior Service Guard - General  
Airport Security Officer  
Airport Operations Assistant  
Animal Control Officer  
Weights & Measures Inspector  
Zoo RR Train Operator  
Project Traffic Adjuster  
Traffic Investigator  
Traffic Sign Mechanic  
Traffic Sign Worker  
Parking Enforcement Officer  
Parking Meter Repair Worker  
Senior Parking Meter Collection Assistant  
Service Guard Public Utility  
Airport Police Officer  
Senior Garage Attendant  
Equipment Dispatcher

Though the employees are spread out over approximately nine departments, the majority of Local 214 members work in the Department of Public Works.

For a number of years, Teamsters 214 and the City of Detroit have had numerous successive Collective Bargaining Agreements. The most recent signed Collective Bargaining Agreement between the parties covered the period from July 1, 1998 through June 30, 2001. At

about the time the 1998-2001 Agreement expired, the parties began negotiations for a successor Agreement.

The parties held numerous bargaining sessions, including mediation sessions but reached impasse. As a result, Teamsters 214 filed a petition for fact finding. The petition as amended set forth 11 issues in dispute between the parties, including wages.

After pre-trial discussions with the parties and conducting fact finding sessions, the outstanding issues between the parties to be reported on in this Fact Finding Report were reduced to three, recognizing that within the wage issue there were sub-issues, namely:

1. Wages
  - A. Across-the-board increases
  - B. Adjustments
  - C. Effective Date
2. Elimination of the two-tier wage system
3. Duration of the Agreement

It is noted that these remaining issues are economic issues.

#### **General Considerations**

Fact finding is a form of interest arbitration. Over the years, fact finders have developed certain criteria forming the basis for making recommendations. In a different context, the State Legislature formulated the criteria to be used by interest arbitrators in police and fire interest arbitrations, enacted by Act 312 of Public Acts of 1969 wherein, in Section 9, certain criteria to be used were codified. These criteria are the criteria used by fact finders.

As to economics, the criteria as set forth in Act 312 utilized by fact finders includes the economic ability of the community to fund any economic improvements as well as both external and internal comparables. In addition, the parties' bargaining history in current bargaining and

over the years becomes a factor when addressing economic issues, as this history gives some indicia of the potential for settlement. There is also the criteria of a review of cost of living.

The City of Detroit is the largest municipality in the State. Because of this and the fact that the City is experiencing economic difficulties, it seems that the appropriate criteria is three-fold, namely, the ability of the City to fund any economic improvements, along with the internal comparables. This follows because it is the internal comparables in an economic distressed municipality that become paramount when combined with the bargaining history, not only with Teamsters Local 214, but with the City's other bargaining units represented by other unions, to gauge what the settlements might be or should be in the economic climate of Detroit.

Overlapping these criteria, of course, is a consideration of the cost of living.

### Economics

The issue in this fact finding involves economics, namely, wages and the issue of the two-tier wage system. This requires a review of the City's ability to pay in conjunction with the internal comparables and the bargaining history.

### The Detroit Economic Picture

#### Prior to July 1, 2001

In describing the financial picture in Detroit prior to July 1, 2001, this Fact Finder in his Fact Finding report issued between these parties in their dispute as to the 1998-2001 Agreement on October 11, 2000 wrote at pages 4-6:

From the 1949-50 fiscal year through the 1998-99 fiscal year, a period of 49 fiscal years, the City has had a surplus for only 18 of those years, meaning that in 31 fiscal years, it has had a financial deficit. By the fiscal year 1989-90, the City began a path of fiscal year deficits that ran through the fiscal year 1993-94. In two of the years during that period, 1990-91 and 1991-92, the deficit reached over \$105M, or

approximately 9% of the total expenditures. By 1993-94, the deficit still remained at \$53M annually.

It was during this period that the City took drastic action including wage freezes and concessions from many of its unions, including Teamsters 214. By the fiscal year 1994-95, the City operated with a surplus, namely, \$19M. However, despite careful budgeting, the 1998-99 budget only produced a \$1,600,000 surplus as compared to the \$19M surplus in 1994-95.

The significance of this limited surplus is this: the 1998-99 daily expenditures for the City is \$3.4M. If, for some reason, there is an extraordinary event or a miscalculation, the projected surplus for 1998-99 of \$1.6M would only cover one-half day of operations.

The City of Detroit receives its revenues from six major categories of major sources, namely:

| <u>Revenue Source</u>  | <u>Amount</u>        | <u>% of totals</u> | <u>10 yr.<br/>ave.growth</u> |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| Municipal Income Tax   | \$387,400,000        | 27.4%              | 2.8%                         |
| Property Tax           | \$159,322,689        | 11.3%              | 2.0%                         |
| Utility User's Tax     | \$ 54,600,000        | 3.9%               | 0.0%                         |
| State Revenue Sharing  | \$332,000,000        | 23.5%              | 2.9%                         |
| Wagering Tax (Casinos) | \$ 80,700,000        | 5.7%               | N/A                          |
| Other Revenue          | <u>\$399,348,883</u> | <u>28.3%</u>       | <u>2.6%</u>                  |
| TOTAL                  | \$1,413,371,572      | 100.0%             | 2.6%                         |

"Other revenue" includes revenue from federal sources.

A review of the above chart which is based upon the fiscal year 2000-01 budget, indicates that the growth in revenue in Detroit has averaged 2.6%. This chart also demonstrates that the expected growth of revenue is approximately 2.6%. However, in making this observation, there are two fallacies. It is not clear how much revenue will be generated in the future from the casinos. Likewise, as result of Public Act 532 of 1998, the state revenue sharing for the City of Detroit has been frozen at \$332M for the next ten years, even though the experience in the past has been that state revenue sharing has increased on an average of 3% per annum. This means that the City cannot expect additional increases in state revenue sharing. Furthermore, as a result of Public Act 500 in 1998, the income tax on both residents and non-residents will gradually be reduced which will further reduce the projected growth of tax revenues from income tax sources, which in fiscal year 2000-01, produced 27.4% of the City's revenues.

What also should be noted is that the property tax valuation has not grown per year at the same rate as other sources of revenue. Furthermore, contrary to the experience in surrounding suburbs, the property tax base has been reduced or is stabilizing in Detroit, and thus is not a major source of revenue. With the freezing of state revenue sharing and the reduction of the municipal income tax, the primary area of potential growth is from the wagering tax. In the fiscal year 1999-00, the wagering tax brought the City approximately \$51M, with two casinos operating. The third casino, the Greektown Casino, was not open during that fiscal year. However, with the anticipation of its opening, the City may receive \$80.7M from the wagering tax which could increase the percentage of revenue in relation to the total revenue from that source.

Analyzed as above, the City of Detroit's financial health may be stabilizing but it must be carefully monitored to prevent a reoccurrence of the deficits of the early '90's. It was against this background that the City settled most, if not all, of its non-police and fire contracts, with a general wage increase of 2% for fiscal year 1998-99, 3% for fiscal year 1999-00, and 3% for fiscal year 2000-01, along with a possible 1% performance bonus and a bonus of up to 2%, based upon the City's financial condition. There were also special rate adjustments for a substantial number of employees represented by Council 25 AFSCME. Most if not all of the contracts run from July 1, 1998 through June 30, 2001. These settlements were carefully crafted, recognizing the need for a delicate balance in the City's finances, as described above.

### **Current Economic Situation**

In the discussion quoted above, this Fact Finder noted "A review of the above chart which is based upon the fiscal year 2000-01 budget, indicates that the growth and revenue in Detroit has averaged 2.6%...." Later, this Fact Finder wrote, "Analyzed as above, the City's financial health may be stabilizing, but it must be carefully monitored to prevent reoccurrence of the deficits of the early '90's." These observations were made in the Fact Finding Report dated October 11, 2000.

Since that time, the nation, and in particular, the rust belt area, which includes Detroit, depending on manufacturing, has been experiencing an economic downturn. In Michigan, for example, this downturn has resulted in state budget shortfalls. These state shortfalls, plus the

economic downturn, have had an impact on the City of Detroit's financial health. As explained by the City's Budget Director, Roger Short, in the 2003-2004 budget, the City experienced a 6.5% state revenue sharing cut plus a reduction of the City income tax rate of 1/10th of 1%. There were also increased pension costs and fringe benefit costs that put economic pressure on the City. The City responded to these budget pressures by elimination of vacancies, by relying on a casino enhancement fund, bonding risk management payments, refinancing of the debt, and entering into a contract to collect delinquent accounts.

For the fiscal year 2004-05, the property tax delinquent collections were decreased and could result in a potential \$15 million reduction. Additional state revenue sharing cuts are expected to the tune of at least \$2.5 million. There is also the loss of the casino enhancement funding, as it is expiring. It is anticipated, because of previous bonding, there will be the loss of funding for risk management payment which could amount to up to \$60 million. The City in the 2004-05 budget is faced with increased pension costs due to the performance of the stock market, tipping fee increases, and general fund subsidy increases. At the present time, the City expects, combined with a revenue shortfall of \$117 million and appropriation challenges of \$146 million, a potential need to adjust the budget to account for a potential \$264 million adjustment caused by the factors just discussed in the 2004-2005 budget.

The above facts would suggest that, because of matters beyond the control of the City, the City's financial health is precarious at best. And without most careful monitoring, the deficit experienced in the early '90's could be looming. For this reason, the current administration is most concerned in taking every possible step to avoid deficits. Nevertheless, the financial health of the City, caused in large part because of the economic climate, is precarious and will take

extraordinary efforts to keep its health stabilized.

### **The Internal Comparables and Bargaining History**

In the fact finding, it was noted that at least four bargaining units, representing a majority of the City's unionized employees, have reached settlements. These settlements are in two categories. The two police uniformed units were settled by virtue of an arbitrator's award pursuant to Act 312. The settlement with the Department of Transportation Equipment Operators (Bus Drivers) and with the local unions represented by AFSCME Council 25 were as a result of negotiations.

The settlement with the Detroit Police Officers Association, representing 2,878 employees, as a result of the arbitrator's award, was for the year 2001 a 0% increase, 2002 a 0% increase, and 2003 a 5% increase. The Act 312 award involving the Lieutenants and Sergeants, representing 907 employees, again was a 0% increase for years 2001 and 2002, a 3% increase for the year 2003, and then went into 2004 with a 5% increase and 2005 with a 3% increase. In addition, as a result of management concerns, 174 Investigators were promoted to the rank of Sergeant.

The interesting point of the two Act 312 awards is that for the first two years (2001 and 2002), because of the City's financial concerns, the awards were 0% increases. The arbitrator for the Lieutenants and Sergeants apparently believed that the contract should be a five year contract to obviously assist the City in monitoring its financial health.

Yet, it is also noted that both arbitrators recognized that by 2003, apparently due to inflation and comparable data from external sources, wages increases would be necessary.

The settlement for the Department of Transportation Equipment Operators (Bus Drivers)



was a four year agreement representing 1,065 employees, with no increases for the years 2001 and 2002, and an increase of 2% for each of the years 2003 and 2004. There was an adjustment on July 1, 2003 for all members of the bargaining unit of up to 50¢ per hour.

It was explained by the City that there is only one classification in the DOT bargaining unit – Equipment Operators (Bus Drivers); that though there was an adjustment for all members of the bargaining unit, the 50¢ did not apply to each member, but instead was pro-rated based upon the longevity of the member, with the newest employees receiving a 35¢ adjustment which would be increased as the employees gain longevity so as the employee could reach the 50¢ adjustment.

The AFSCME locals represent 4,600 City employees in various departments in various classifications. AFSCME reached a four year agreement through June 30, 2005. For 2001 and 2002, there were no increases, namely, zero increases. On July 1, 2003, there was a 2% across-the-board increase and employees who were actively on the payroll as of the date of contract ratification received a \$400 bonus. There was also a pay increase of 2% for July 1, 2004. In addition, employees in 138 classifications received a 50¢ per hour special adjustment.

Employees in five classifications received a \$1.50 per hour special adjustment. The number of employees affected by the adjustments were 3,613, or approximately 78% of the membership of the AFSCME locals. As to the \$1.50 per hour adjustments, the City noted that these adjustments were primarily in the nurse category and were necessary to retain and recruit in this category, recognizing that nurses are in demand in the workplace.

But, again, the AFSCME settlement followed a pattern of zero increases in each of 2001 and 2002 and, with the exception of the DPOA agreement, went beyond a three year agreement,

apparently as an assistance to the City in monitoring its financial health.

Local 214, by the time the matter was argued before the Fact Finder, had on the table a request for a three year contract effective July 1, 2001, with a 3% across-the-board increase in all classifications effective July 1, 2001, effective July 1, 2002, and effective July 1, 2003, plus a signing bonus in 2003 plus special adjustments.

As to special adjustments, the adjustments sought by Local 214 at fact finding involved adjustments for 459, or approximately 48% of the members of the bargaining unit. For most of the classifications, the adjustment sought was 50¢ an hour. There were two classifications, Airport Service Workers and Operation Control Airport, where \$1.00 an hour was sought. In addition, adjustments were sought for the Equipment Dispatcher and the Assistant Equipment Dispatcher.

The City's offer was on July 1, 2001 a zero increase, July 1, 2002 a zero increase, July 1, 2003 2% and a bonus of \$400, and on July 1, 2004 a 2% increase. The City's position as to the special adjustments was set forth in a letter to the Fact Finder dated June 13, 2003 from its Labor Relations Director in which he wrote:

*Special Adjustments (for virtually all craft and non-craft classifications in the bargaining unit) effective July 1, 20, 2001.*

The City's position is that special adjustments are called for only if there are recruitment or retention problems for the classification, the duties or skill levels of the classification have increased, or to resolve existing equity issues. Some special adjustments may be justified.

In fact finding, the City did recognize that there could be a basis for some special adjustments, but none were formally offered, as noted previously the City had questioned the number in the classifications sought to be adjusted as well as the amounts, particularly the amounts over 50¢.

### Discussion on Wages

The bargaining history with the other settled bargaining units reveals that in the City's economic difficulties two unions (DOT and AFSCME) voluntarily agreed that for 2001 and 2002 there would be no increases. Both unions agreed to a four year contract, obviously to balance the interests of the City in monitoring its financial health and the concerns of the employees for pay increases addressing inflationary concerns, even though in this period of economic times, inflation is at a low level, as represented by the cost of living indexes.

In the two arbitration decisions involving the DPOA and the Lieutenants and Sergeants, the arbitrators recognized that for the first two years (2001 and 2002), there should be zero increases. Though the DPOA arbitrator did not go beyond three years, the Lieutenants and Sergeants went five years – again recognizing the City's financial health and the need to monitor same over a period of time. The conclusion, therefore, is that, contrary to the demand of Local 214, there should be a four year contract. In addition, there is no basis, considering the bargaining history described above and the City's economic concerns, that there be any pay increases for the first two years of the contract, namely, 2001 and 2002, or that there be 3% raises for neither the DOT nor AFSCME received such raises. In addition, it would seem that, recognizing that the City has offered a \$400 bonus to Local 214 based on a four year contract with 2% increases in 2003 and 2004, that this should also be offered to 214, which the City has done.

Therefore, as to across-the-board increases, the Fact Finder, based upon the bargaining history criteria, will recommend a four year contract commencing July 1, 2001 and ending June 30, 2005, with no increase in 2001 and 2002, a 2% across-the-board increase beginning July 1,

2003, and a 2% increase beginning July 1, 2004; that, in addition, as was in the case with the AFSCME locals, a \$400 bonus will be paid to 214 employees of the City who are on the active payroll on the date that the contract is ratified by Local 214 following this Fact Finding Report.

### **Special Adjustments**

The Fact Finder has already referred to the concern over special adjustments, setting forth the City's position and noting that at the bargaining table the City questioned the classifications and numbers of special adjustments. In fact finding, Local 214's position was that it believed that 45% of its members in various classifications needed special classifications because of competitive factors. In addition, the Local noted that, whereas 78% of the members of the AFSCME locals received 50¢ adjustments or more, namely, 3,613 employees out of 4,600, or 78.54%. Local 214 noted that it is asking for special adjustments for 459 employees, or approximately 48% of its bargaining unit, suggesting that the special adjustments that the Local is seeking are not inconsistent with the approach taken by the City with the AFSCME locals.

The Fact Finder has reviewed the request in Appendix A and has several comments. As to the Equipment Dispatcher, the Fact Finder does not consider this a special adjustment. Rather, because of the work of the Equipment Dispatchers in connection with the CEO, it would seem that the Equipment Dispatcher should have a one-time adjustment to the rate of pay to be equal to a CEO. Likewise, there is a relationship between the Assistant Equipment Dispatcher and the VO III. For this reason, the Fact Finder agrees that the Assistant Equipment Dispatcher should have a one-time adjustment to the rate of pay to be equal to a VO III. The Recommendation will so provide.

The second point is there was a request for three classifications – Airport Service

Workers of \$1.50, the Assistant Equipment Dispatchers for \$1.00 and the Operator Control Airport for \$1.00. As the testimony indicated, there were some classifications in AFSCME that received the \$1.50 adjustment. But these adjustments were for recruiting and retention purposes in a very mobile classification where there is scarcity of employees, namely, in nursing. For this reason, there was justification for the \$1.50 adjustment. In the view of this Fact Finder, there is no justification for the Airport Service Workers or the Operator Control Airport to receive a \$1.00 adjustment, though there is justification along with the other classifications to receive a 50¢ adjustment.

The Fact Finder refers to justification. The fact is that the City did reach an agreement with the AFSCME locals which was ratified that included an adjustment for 78.54% of the AFSCME members. Another union, Local 214, representing a number of employees who are similarly situated to AFSCME employees is seeking the same adjustment in the same year, in the same amount, for less than half of its members. Furthermore, there was evidence that a number of the employees for which adjustments are sought operate equipment; that in Detroit, as compared to other communities, those employees operating equipment are expected to operate a variety of equipment rather than a single or two pieces of equipment; that such employees are therefore more flexible and able to perform a variety of services for the City as compared to employees in other municipalities. When these factors are considered, and considering the bargaining history, particularly in relationship to AFSCME locals and 214, it would seem that in order to have a contract ratified the special adjustments, except as modified by this Fact Finder, should be implemented.

The adjustments that are sought by Local 214 represent about \$775,000 during the life of

the contract. The adjustments given AFSCME Council 25 locals represents \$3.7 million. True, more employees were involved in AFSCME. But the fact is the economic impact of the package with the adjustments for Local 214 over four years of the contract is approximately \$1.6 million. This money has to be provided in some way. The Fact Finder recognizes this. But the AFSCME contract settlement as negotiated has a similar ratio of cost. It is difficult to suggest to one local that there can be certain economic gains, but then deprive another local of similar economic gains. For this reason, the Fact Finder will recommend the special adjustments effective November 1, 2003 as set forth in Appendix A, attached hereto. The Fact Finder will also recommend that the Equipment Dispatcher receive a one-time adjustment so that that classification will be paid the same as a CEO. Likewise, the Fact Finder will recommend that the Assistant Equipment Dispatcher wages be adjusted so that said classification be paid at the rate of a VO III.

### **The Two-Tier Wage System**

The Union has proposed the elimination of the two-tier wage system, explaining its position as follows:

Teamsters Local 214 is the only labor union currently in the City of Detroit that suffers under a two-tier wage system. It was granted to the City by the Union in 1992 as a concession. That concession was to have expired in 1995 at the conclusion of the three-year agreement. It was never lifted, and today our members continue to suffer under this inequity.

Because of the complexity of this issue, we are requesting that you recommend the elimination of the two-tier wage system by establishing a committee who will mete after the first of the year and work out a formula to eliminate such inequity.

The City's position is that it cannot afford to eliminate the two-tier system; that the two-

tier system, namely, for employees hired after 1992 being hired at a lower wage than the classification and then moving up over a period of six years to reach the top of the classification, has been the basis of being able to provide economic benefits to Local 214 over the years; that particularly in the current economic climate faced by the City, it cannot afford to give improvements of any type while eliminating the two-tier system.

The Fact Finder agrees with this general proposition. As the Fact Finder has outlined, the City has a most difficult economic situation. Though the City, as indicated in the bargaining history and through arbitration awards, is providing for some increases which will impact on the City's financial ability, the City just cannot afford to make additional changes, particularly a change such as eliminating the two-tier wage system. The economic impact of such changes would undermine the ability of the City to meet the obligations set forth in this Recommendation as well as the other settled contracts.

For this reason, the Fact Finder will not recommend a change in the two-tier system. However, there appears to have been some administrative problems in administering the two-tier system that has generated a number of grievances. To address this problem, the Fact Finder will recommend that a committee of representatives of the City and Local 214 in equal numbers be formed within sixty (60) days of ratification of the Agreement; that this committee should meet at least monthly for six (6) months following its creation; that if at the end of six (6) months the administrative problems have not been resolved in administering the two-tier system, the parties shall return the matter to this Fact Finder for further recommendations, except that in utilizing the services of this Fact Finder in this connection, the parties will be responsible for the Fact Finder's fees.

This provision shall be attached to the contract as a Letter of Understanding. However, it should be clear that this Fact Finder does not recommend eliminating the two-tier system. It stays.

### **The Art of the Possible**

There is another criteria that Fact Finders use, namely, the art of the possible. In the situation here, the art of the possible, namely, if the parties were left to their own devices, what would the parties agree to at the table if there was a right to strike and other possibilities? And the answer is that the parties would ultimately reach an agreement based upon the pattern. Though the Union suggests there is no pattern, the Fact Finder believes that the AFSCME contract and, to some extent, the DOT contract, do set a pattern. And the Recommendation here is based upon this pattern. It represents the art of the possible in very troubled economic times. This cannot be ignored. There is no more money and the membership of Local 214 must recognize this fact.

The Recommendation that follows is based upon the above comments.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. **Duration of Contract.** July 1, 2001 wages 0%; July 1, 2002 0%; July 1, 2003 2%; July 1, 2004 2%. Bonus of \$400 to be paid to employees on active payroll as of the date of ratification of contract by Local 214.
2. Adjustments as set forth in Appendix A effective November 1, 2003 following ratification of contract by Local 214.
3. The Equipment Dispatcher shall receive, effective November 1, 2003, an adjustment so that the said classification shall be paid at the rate of a CEO. Likewise, the



Assistant Equipment Dispatcher shall receive an adjustment on November 1, 2003 so that that classification shall be paid at the rate of the VO III.

4. Two-tier wage system will continue as is. The parties, within sixty (60) days of this Report shall form a committee consisting of equal representation from the City and Local 214 and shall meet, beginning sixty (60) days from this Report on a monthly basis for six (6) months to resolve administrative issues involving the administration of the two-tier system. If after six (6) months the parties have not reached agreement on resolution, the matter may be returned to the Fact Finder for further recommendations on specific problems and the Fact Finder will be acting at the expense of the parties. This provision shall be set forth in a Letter of Understanding between the parties.

  
GEORGE T. ROUMELL, JR.  
Fact Finder

November 21, 2003

## Teamsters Special Adjustments

| Classification                             | Number of Employees in Class   | Amount of Adjustment |
|--|--|----------------------|
| CEO – 50 Ton                               | 6  | \$.50                |
| CEO  | 55   | \$.50                |
| Line Helper Driver I and II                | 5  | \$.50                |
| Equipment Dispatcher                       | 1  | \$1.20**             |
| VO III and VOI                             | 250  | \$.50                |
| Zoo Train Operator                         | 4  | \$.50                |
| Airport Service Workers                    | 10   | \$1.00*              |
| Animal Control Officer                     | 13   | \$.50                |
| Weights and Measures                       | 3  | \$.50                |
| Parking Meter Repair                       | 10   | \$.50                |
| Parking Enforcement Officer                | 46   | \$.50                |
| Service Guards (Public Utility)            | 12   | \$.50                |
| Project Traffic Adjusters                  | 1  | \$.50                |
| Traffic Investigator                       | 6  | \$.50                |
| Traffic Sign Mechanic                      | 8  | \$.50                |
| Traffic Sign Worker                        | 16   | \$.50                |
| Sanitation Yard Dispatcher                 | 3  | \$.50                |
| Assistant Equipment Dispatcher             | 1  | \$1.00*              |
| Airport Police Officer                     | 2  | \$.50                |
| Operations Control (Airport)               | 5  | \$1.00               |
| Laborer A (DPW)                            | Shall be paid the maximum rate of pay when working in these classifications.<br><br>This classification is part of a multi-title and does not exist alone. |                      |
| Sanitation Laborer                         |  |                      |
| Laner Truck Operator Mechanic              | 1  | \$.50                |
| Senior Garage Attendant                    | 1  | \$.50                |
| Senior Parking Meter Collections Assistant | 4  | \$.50                |

\* This would bring this classification up to parity with VO III.

\*\* This would bring this classification up to parity with CEO

**Total number of employees affected – 459**

## Teamsters Special Adjustments

| Classification                                | Number of<br>Employees in Class | Amount of Adjustment |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| CEO - 50 Ton                                  | 6                               | \$.50                |
| CEO   | 55                              | \$.50                |
| Line Helper Driver I and II                   | 5                               | \$.50                |
| VO III and VOI                                | 250                             | \$.50                |
| Zoo Train Operator                            | 4                               | \$.50                |
| Airport Service Workers                       | 10                              | \$.50                |
| Animal Control Officer                        | 13                              | \$.50                |
| Weights and Measures                          | 3                               | \$.50                |
| Parking Meter Repair                          | 10                              | \$.50                |
| Parking Enforcement Officer                   | 46                              | \$.50                |
| Service Guards (Public Utility)               | 12                              | \$.50                |
| Project Traffic Adjusters                     | 1                               | \$.50                |
| Traffic Investigator                          | 6                               | \$.50                |
| Traffic Sign Mechanic                         | 8                               | \$.50                |
| Traffic Sign Worker                           | 16                              | \$.50                |
| Sanitation Yard Dispatcher                    | 3                               | \$.50                |
| Airport Police Officer                        | 2                               | \$.50                |
| Operations Control (Airport)                  | 5                               | \$.50                |
| Laner Truck Operator Mechanic                 | 1                               | \$.50                |
| Senior Garage Attendant                       | 1                               | \$.50                |
| Senior Parking Meter Collections<br>Assistant | 4                               | \$.50                |