

12/31/75. ARB

Big Rapids City of

In the Matter of the Arbitration

Between

TEAMSTERS LOCAL 214 BIG RAPIDS
POLICE OFFICERS DIVISION OF
POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF
MICHIGAN

And

CITY OF BIG RAPIDS

FINDINGS OF FACTS AND DECISION

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS LIBRARY
Michigan State University

JUL 26 1976

BACKGROUND:

Teamsters Local 214, hereafter referred to as the Union, requested arbitration under Section 3 of Act 312 Public Acts of 1969 as amended, MSA 17,455(31)-17,455(47), of the expired collective bargaining agreement between it and the City of Big Rapids, hereafter referred to as the City, pertaining to wages, hours and other working conditions. The bargaining unit at present consists of ten (10) Police Officers (patrolmen) and two (2) detectives.

In a letter dated September 9, 1975 Robert G. Howlett, Chairman of Michigan Employment Relations Commission, informed Leo W. Walsh of his appointment as chairman of a panel of arbitrators including Billy D. Mendenall as delegate for the Union, and Gerald Wensloff as delegate for the City in accordance with the provisions of the aforementioned act.

Walsh, Leo W.

The police officers of the City have had collective bargaining representation for a period of several years prior to July 1, 1975. The last two agreements have been for two years. Teamsters Local 214 have recently become their collective bargaining representative and have represented them in the negotiations pertaining to a new agreement and in the arbitration hearing. There has been both extensive collective bargaining and mediation but no agreement was reached.

The presentation for the Union was made by Joseph Valenti, President of Local 214; the presentation for the City was made by James L. Stokes and Jon G. March of the law firm of Miller, Johnson, Snell & Cummiskey. The arbitration hearing was held at the Grand Rapids office of Michigan Employment Relations Commission on Monday, December 1, 1975, Tuesday, December 2, 1975 and Wednesday, December 3, 1975. The Arbitration Panel met in executive session the evening of Wednesday, December 3, 1975 and Tuesday, December 16, 1975.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES

DURATION OF AGREEMENT:

Although not specifically presented to the Arbitration Panel, the City presented its proposals on the basis of a two-year agreement and the Union on the basis of a one-year agreement. During the course of the arbitration hearing the last

offers of both parties were changed to provide the Arbitration Panel with the last offers of both parties on an agreement of either one or two years. Consequently the Arbitration Panel has before it for determination the issue of the duration of the agreement. It is the conclusion of a majority of the Arbitration Panel that the agreement should be for two years retroactive to July 1, 1975 and terminating July 1, 1977 subject to such provisions already or later agreed upon regarding automatic or other renewal provisions. Our reasons for such determination are based upon the following:

- (1) It appears the parties have had reasonably compatible and viable bargaining relations for two successive contracts of two years duration.
- (2) A cost of living escalation provision is hereafter established providing a tool (albeit an imperfect one) for automatic periodic salary increases to minimize the adverse effect on workers under long term contracts from the cruel and disastrous galloping inflation this country has experienced in recent years.^{1/}

1. We have recently experienced the anomaly of a severe recession and double digit inflation going hand in hand. The non-professional workers saddled with long term collective bargaining agreements without cost of living escalator provisions have been helpless to alleviate their plight. On the contrary the manufacturer, the middleman and the retailer as well as the white collar workers have been for the most part able to, in part at least, offset this condition by raising prices, commissions, salaries or whatever form compensation for their services takes.

- (3) Longer term agreements reduce the cost and loss of productive time in collective bargaining, legal fees, arbitration expenses, but perhaps, most important of all, they minimize the stress, strain, animosity and reduction in efficiency that inevitably accompanies the collective bargaining process.

SALARIES:

Salaries are determined on an annual basis for an agreed number of hours. They are paid by-weekly. The by-weekly amount is determined by determining the hourly rate based on the annual salary for each employee and multiplied by the number of hours worked during the period.

The City has proposed salary increases based on a reduced period of pay progression to a maximum period of three instead of four years as prevailed in the past.

The job classifications presently consist of police officers and detectives. Although there is no job classification of sergeant, the Union has proposed a salary schedule for sergeants. The City salary proposal is based on a two-year agreement starting July 1, 1975 and ending July 1, 1977. The

City's proposed increases are 10% for the first year and 6% for the second year. It has also been necessary to make adjustments to implement the reduced period of salary escalation. The City's offer is contained in City Exhibit 3 and is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

The Union's proposed salary schedule also provides for a reduction of one year in the progression schedule. Its two-year proposal is contained in Union Exhibit 2 and is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

The Arbitration Panel has prepared a comparison of salary offers which is attached hereto as Exhibit C. This comparison has been helpful to it in reaching a decision on this issue.

Perhaps the most compelling of the criteria for resolving issues provided in the act to be considered by the Arbitration Panel is Section 9(d) providing for a comparison of wages, etc.:

(d) Comparison of the wages, hours and conditions of employment of the employees involved in the arbitration proceeding with the wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employees performing similar services and with other employees generally:

(i) In public employment in comparable communities.

(ii) In private employment in comparable communities.

City Exhibit 44 makes a comparison of current salary rates in the communities of Alma, Cadillac, Ionia, Manistee, Ludington, Greenville, Mecosta County Sheriffs Department and Ferris State Campus Police.^{2/} These communities are in the general area of Big Rapids and the Panel believes are truly comparable to Big Rapids. Their average cash maximum compensation including shift differential and longevity is \$10,790.00 while Big Rapids is \$11,026.00.

The dollar value of the fringe benefits of city officers with a family based upon the City best offer is \$5,641.00. These are very substantial fringe benefits and their extent and costs have had considerable impact on this panel in arriving at its decision on this issue. (City Exhibit 27)

The City has submitted another salary comparison consisting of 21 cities in Michigan Municipal League area 3 of the state which covers the northern part of the lower peninsula and the upper peninsula. These cities are in the 10,000-25,000 population spread with three exceptions, and include Big Rapids. The salaries for each city were furnished by the Michigan Municipal League for the 1975-76 period when available. When they were for the prior year they were increased by 7.6% representing the rise in the consumer price index of the Labor

2. Big Rapids is located in Mecosta County and Ferris State College is contiguous to Big Rapids and has its own police department.

Department for the year ending October, 1975. The average top salary for patrolmen in these cities was \$10,029 compared with \$10,705 for Big Rapids. (City Exhibit 42)

Personnel remaining the same, the total salary increases under the City last offer are \$11,091 for the first year and \$11,337 for the second year. Under the Union last offer they are \$22,074 for the first year and \$12,149 for the second year.

It is the conclusion and decision of a majority of the Arbitration Panel that for the foregoing reasons the last two year salary offer of the City set forth in Exhibit A should be and are the salary rates that shall be incorporated into the collective bargaining agreement of the parties for the period commencing July 1, 1975 and terminating on June 30, 1977.

All retroactive pay resulting from the above decision shall be paid forthwith.

COST OF LIVING:

After a written submission of the Chairman's decision on each issue was presented to the Arbitration Panel on December 16, 1975, it developed for the first time that there was substantial disagreement on the Union last offer on Cost of Living. This offer was never submitted in writing. It was transmitted to the Arbitration Panel and the representatives of the City by several oral statements on the record by Mr. Valenti. One of these statements was made shortly after the hearing opened. It later

developed that the last offers made by the Union were all based on a one year contract whereas those made by the City were based on a two year contract. For the first time all concerned realized that the duration of the agreement was an unresolved issue to be decided by the Arbitration Panel.

It then became necessary for both parties to change some of their last offers where they pertained either to a one year or a two year agreement only so there would be a last offer before the Arbitration Panel which applied to the eventuality of a decision on either a one year or a two year agreement.

For this reason Mr. Valenti made another statement on the record pertaining to the Union last offer on Cost of Living which contained some references to separate treatment of each year in this area if the Arbitration Panel concluded that the agreement should be of two year duration. He also at other times made statements on the record regarding cost of living.

The result as indicated above was confusion and disagreement as to the exact meaning of the various statements referred to above. The Chairman of the Arbitration Panel understood the Union last offer on cost of living to be that if cost of living was granted to the Union it had to be for the duration of the agreement. On the contrary it was the understanding of Mr. Stokes, attorney for the City, and other City representatives that the Union offer permitted the granting of a cost of living provision

for either one year or two years of a two-year agreement.

At the December 16th meeting of the Arbitration Panel Chairman Walsh stated had he not considered it a major variation of the Union last offer, he would have granted cost of living in the last year only.

For the foregoing reasons Chairman Walsh concluded it was imperative in order to make a correct and enforceable decision on the issue of cost of living, to reopen the hearing and require the Union to submit a complete written offer on this subject so the Arbitration Panel could confidently and properly decide this issue on the basis of a last offer understood by all.

Accordingly he sent all concerned a telegram on Saturday, December 20th, 1975, reconvening the hearing only for the above purpose on Saturday, December 27, 1975, at 10:30 A.M. at the offices of Michigan Employment Relations Commission. In the telegram he directed the Union to submit a complete written last offer on cost of living explaining the reasons he deemed this essential. The City was given the same opportunity.

The proposed decision referred to above and submitted to the Arbitration Panel was discussed on December 16, 1975, the City member agreeing to the conclusions of the Chairman on all issues except cost of living, and the Union member agreed with the Chairman on the cost of living issue. The award was not signed

by the members, however, because it needed to be retyped to correct several typographical and other errors. The meeting closed with the understanding that the Chairman would have the award retyped and submitted to the other Arbitration Panel members for their signatures. It was after this meeting and before the award was submitted for signature of the panel members that the heretofore discussed disagreement and uncertainty arose over the Union cost of living last offer.

In a letter dated December 23, 1975 from Mr. Valenti to the Chairman, he stated that due to the agreement reached verbally by the Arbitration Panel on December 16, 1975, the Chairman had no authority to reopen the hearing for resubmission of a written final offer on cost of living and requested that a signed decision be submitted to the parties as soon as possible. He further stated that the Union would not attend the reconvened hearing on Saturday, December 27, 1975.

The reopened hearing was convened at the appointed time and place. No one appeared for the Union. Nor was Billy D. Mendenall, the Union appointed Panel member, present although he had received notice of the hearing and had raised no objection to it.

The reasons for reopening the hearing and all facts pertaining to notice and the response of the Union, was placed on the record by the Chairman. Mr. Stokes also placed on the record a complete statement of the events which brought it about as well as

his reasons, including the statements made during the original hearing by Mr. Valenti which caused him to arrive at a contrary conclusion than that of the Chairman as to the Union last offer on Cost of Living.

The City also at this point made its first last offer on cost of living. It reads as follows:

"This will be effective in the second year of the contract. The June 1976 index published approximately July 20 (1967=100, All Cities Index) will be the base. Adjustments will be made quarterly with the first adjustment effective October 1. There will be a 1¢ increase for every 0.4 rise in the Index.

The yearly maximum will be 25¢."

This cost of living formula of the City is identical to the Union cost of living formula except for its duration.

Had this formula been in effect in the year commencing July 1, 1973 and the year commencing July 1, 1974, in the first of those years the hourly rate increases would have been: in 1973-74 an increase in cost of living of 11.5% resulting in an increase in the hourly rate of 28¢, however the annual maximum would have reduced that to 25¢; in the second of those years the increase in the cost of living was 9.7% resulting in an increase in the hourly rate of 24¢.

The past several months has shown a steady decline. As of October 1975, the last month reported by the Bureau of Labor

Statistics the annual rate of increase is 7.6%. Under the cost of living formula set forth above the hourly rate would have increased 19¢.

The Union contends that the continuous substantial increases in cost of living results in substantial increases in the cost of living for its members with no means of relief for the duration of the agreement unless a cost of living escalator provision is included in the agreement. As a consequence the standard of living of its members is being continuously lowered to an extent illustrated by the examples set forth above. (Union Exhibit 1)

For these reasons and the ones set forth in footnote 1 a majority of the Arbitration Panel concludes that the new agreement of the parties should include a cost of living provision as proposed by the City. Accordingly, a cost of living article containing the provisions set forth above shall be included in the new collective bargaining agreement effective for the last year of the agreement.

WEEKLY HOURS OF WORK:

Under the last collective bargaining agreement the hours of work in a normal work week were established at 42.

The last offer of the Union was for a 40 hour work week.

The last offer of the City was for a 42 hour work week for the first year and 40 hours for the second year.

The City last offer is reasonable and represents improvement in this area for the employees.

It is the decision of a majority of the Arbitration Panel that the last offer of the City shall be incorporated into the new agreement.

CALL BACK AND COURT TIME:

The last offer of the Union provides that time required in court outside the employee's regular work day should be paid at time and one-half with a minimum of two and one-half hours. In the area of call back for regular duties he should be paid at time and one-half for a minimum of four hours.

The City last offer provides for two hours guaranteed at time and one-half for both call back for court work and for regular work.

A majority of the Arbitration Panel adopts the last offer of the City and it shall become a part of the new agreement.

LONGEVITY PAY:

The last offer on this issue by the City provides after five years of seniority a 2% increase in the base pay, after ten years a 3% increase and after 20 years a 4% increase in the base pay.

The Union last offer provides for longevity increases of 2% after five years, 4% after ten years, 6% after 15 years and 10% after twenty-five years.

Only four of the bargaining unit members would be affected by the improvements in longevity requested by the Union and their increase in base pay would only amount to \$113.00 as to three police officers and \$117.00 as to one detective.

It is the conclusion of a majority of the Arbitration Panel that this provision of the new contract should remain the same as in the last contract as proposed by the City.

LIFE INSURANCE:

The expired agreement provided for \$2,000.00 of straight life insurance and \$7,000.00 for accidental death with the entire premium paid by the City.

The City last offer in this area is for \$5,000.00 life insurance and \$15,000.00 accidental death.

The Union last offer is \$15,000.00 life insurance and \$30,000.00 accidental death.

A majority of the Arbitration Panel concludes that the City offer presents a substantial improvement in this area and it is therefore adopted. The new contract shall provide for life insurance benefits accordingly.

FALSE ARREST AND LIABILITY INSURANCE:

The City last offer provides for liability insurance in the amounts of \$100,000.00 for each occurrence and an aggregate amount of \$300,000.00 against liability for acts of the employee while he is in the performance of his official police duties. A copy of the policy will be furnished to the Union bargaining committee upon request.

The Union last offer as set forth in Article XV of its proposed agreement is: The City shall carry false arrest and liability insurance of \$100,000.00 each and \$300,000.00 aggregate.

Although these proposals seem to be identical, the Union raised questions regarding the wording of the policy at the hearing. In an attempt to satisfy these questions, the City added to its proposal the last sentence as set forth above regarding the furnishing of a copy of the policy to the Union.

The City proposal is a fair and reasonable proposal and a majority of the Arbitration Panel concludes that it shall become a part of the new agreement between the parties.

The Union will have an opportunity to examine the policy and if it does not conform to the agreement it may take appropriate action to bring about compliance.

COMPENSATION FOR COLLEGE CREDIT:

The Union last offer in this area was a \$400.00 annual increase in base pay for a B.A. degree and \$800.00 annual increase

in base pay for a B.A. or B.S. degree.

The City last offer provides a 2% increase in base pay for a degree in police science.

The Union last offer would credit college graduate unit employees where their college training was not directed toward improved skills in police work. The amount of the base pay increase it proposes, although not excessive in the judgment of the Arbitration Panel, could create additional costs which, along with the other increased costs contained in this award, impose too heavy a financial burden on the City.

A majority of the Arbitration Panel concludes that the 2% increase in base pay for employee attaining a degree in police science shall be adopted and be included in the new agreement.

VACATIONS:

The City last offer provides for vacations of two weeks after one year, three weeks after seven years and four weeks after fourteen years.

The Union last offer provides for vacations of ten days after one year, fifteen days after five years, twenty days after twelve years and twenty-five days after twenty years.

The vacation after one year is the same in both last offers; the City last offer would require two more years of service to attain a three-week vacation, and two more years to earn a four-week vacation. Unlike the Union, the City offer does not provide for a five-week vacation.

During the term of the agreement under the Union offer only two employees would qualify for a four-week vacation, none would qualify for four weeks under the City last offer. None would qualify for the five-week vacation under the Union last offer.

Under the Union last offer, six employees would qualify for a three-week vacation. Under the City offer seven employees would qualify for a three-week vacation and five for a two-week vacation.

It appears to a majority of the Arbitration Panel that the City last offer is reasonable and fair to all employees and should be adopted. Accordingly, the new contract shall provide a vacation article containing the provisions of the City last offer.

DETECTIVE CLOTHING ALLOWANCE:

The City last offer contained an allowance of \$100.00 per year for detectives clothing allowance. The Union last offer would provide detectives with \$250.00 for clothing. Uniforms, laundry and shoes are furnished to police officers. Detectives wear civilian clothes. Under these circumstances an allowance annually of \$100.00 to detectives for outer clothes, although not adequate to provide outer clothes and shoes for a year, is at least substantial financial assistance toward such needs. Having in mind that few if any non-uniform employees are furnished any

clothing by their employers, the City last offer is reasonable if not generous and is adopted by a majority of the Arbitration Panel.

RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT:

The City last offer on this subject requires unit members must live within ten miles of the City. The Union opposes any residency requirement.

Compared with most residency requirements for police officers, this is liberal. Of the comparable cities mentioned above, three have no residency requirement, three require residence in the community, one requires residency in the city or certain nearby townships, and no information on the subject was available from two.

A majority of the Arbitration Panel adopts the last offer of the City. It shall become a part of the new agreement.

PERSONAL LEAVE DAYS:

The Union last offer would provide three personal leave days annually. The City opposes any personal leave days.

So called personal leave days are actually additional days of vacation and should be treated as such. The vacation issue is disposed of above. This last offer is denied by a majority of the Arbitration Panel.

SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL:

The Union last offer provides for an hourly rate increase over base rate for workers on the 4:00 P.M. to 12:00 M. shift of 15¢ and a similar rate increase of 25¢ for the 12:00 M. to 8:00 A.M. shift.

The City opposes any premium time because the unit members rotate on the three shifts with each sharing equally the benefits and burdens of the different shifts.

Of the eight comparable communities named above, five have no shift rate differentials, two provide 15¢ and 20¢ hourly increases on the second and third shifts and one provides 15¢ and 25¢ hourly increases on the second and third shifts. (City Exhibit 43)

Premium pay for the second and third shifts are generally justified and perhaps are in this situation; however, the decisions on the previous issues place a substantial increased burden on the City which should not be further increased. Perhaps another contract renewal time will provide a more favorable climate for granting premium time. For the foregoing reasons, a majority of the Arbitration Panel denies the Union's request.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION SUPPLEMENT:

The City last offer provides for the use of sick leave to make up the difference between Workmen's Compensation and base pay. (City Exhibit 35)

The Union last offer would require the City to pay the difference for one year and after that accumulated sick leave would be used to make up the difference until it was exhausted.

Of the eight comparable communities, five have no such provision, one pays the difference for 39 weeks, one for 26 weeks and one pays the difference for the full period workmen's compensation is paid.

The City proposal was in prior agreements. Because of the substantial increase in costs of maintaining its police department caused by the issues resolved herein, it is the determination of a majority of the Arbitration Panel that the present practice be continued. Therefore, the new agreement shall contain a provision that when an employee is unable to work and is receiving workmen's compensation, those payments shall be supplemented by sick leave to the extent required to provide him with his base pay as long as he has sick leave credits.

FURNISHING TURKEY OR HAM TO EACH EMPLOYEE ON CHRISTMAS:

It has been the custom of the City to make a gift of a turkey or a ham to each employee at Christmas. Because of an article in the agreement which provides in essence that employees shall have no rights, privileges or benefits except those expressly provided in the agreement, the Union insisted orally at the conclusion of the arbitration hearing that this custom should be reduced

to writing and included in the new agreement. The City refused contending that this was a gift as an annual generous gesture of good will to its employees for their past year of service and should not be denigrated to a contractual requirement. This proposal is denied by a majority of the Arbitration Panel and shall not become a part of the new agreement.

GUN ALLOWANCE AND SECOND CHANCE VEST:

The City furnished each officer a gun to be carried but only while on duty. The Union has requested a \$200.00 annual cash allowance. The purpose of this request is to provide police officers with a gun which they may carry when not on duty. It is against the policy of the City for reasons that need not be enumerated here for officers to carry guns while not on duty.

Presumably the second chance vest is a protective device worn by police officers. Although the Union requested one be furnished to each police officer, no explanation was made nor evidence submitted to the Arbitration Panel as to its cost although the request was for a \$65.00 annual allowance for this purpose. If such equipment is provided, it should be done under Article XXIII of the proposed agreement providing for the furnishing of clothing, shoes and equipment by the City. If this device would provide additional protection to officers in the performance of their potentially hazardous duties, it should be furnished. However, not having received any evidence to this effect, a majority

of the Arbitration Panel has no basis to form a judgment. The requests for gun allowance and second chance vest are denied.

PAST PRACTICE ARTICLE:

The Union raised objections to the past practice provisions contained in Article XIX of the expired agreement in connection with the furnishing of ammunition and a turkey or ham at Christmas. It was not made clear to the Arbitration Panel if part of its last offer contained the elimination of this provision from the agreement.

This type of provision is found in most Collective Bargaining Agreements. It resulted from countless disputes, many of which terminated in arbitration that arose during the term of the contract over claims of Unions of oral agreements on various matters which should be abided by. Many times such alleged oral agreements were contested by the employees for various reasons. To eliminate this problem such provisions became a part of the agreement at the insistence of the employers. It has eliminated many disputes, strikes and arbitrations. This Union has agreed to it in previous agreements. A majority of the Arbitration Panel sees no reason for its elimination. If the Union was proposing this, the proposal is denied.

The foregoing resolves all issues presented to the Arbitration Panel by agreement of two members (a majority) on each

issue in accordance with the aforementioned act. That, along with the resolution of all other issues raised by either party during negotiations prior to and during recesses in the arbitration hearing, the terms and conditions of a complete collective bargaining agreement have been reached and should now be reduced to writing and signed by the parties.

/s/ GERALD WENSLOFF

Member

Member

/s/ LEO W. WALSH

Chairman

Dated: December 31, 1975.

I dissent to the foregoing decision.

Member

Dated: December _____, 1975.

EXHIBIT A

CITY OF BIG RAPIDS
LAST BEST OFFER
ANNUAL SALARY RATES

	<u>1974-1975 Rate</u>	<u>10% Increase Effective July 1, 1975</u>	<u>Rates July 1, 1975- June 30, 1976</u>	<u>6% Increase Effective July 1, 1976</u>	<u>Rates July 1, 1976- June 30, 1977</u>
Detective	10,065	1,007	11,072	664	11,736
Patrol Officers:					
After 4 years	9,730	*	*	*	*
After 3 years	9,340	975	10,705	642	11,347
After 2 years	8,945	*	10,130	608	10,738
After 1 year	8,555	*	9,555	573	10,128
After 6 months	8,360	*	9,270	556	9,826
Starting	8,165	817	8,982	539	9,521
Sergeant			11,105	666	11,771

*Effective July 1, 1975, the maximum patrol officer's rate shall be achieved after three years. The intervening rate steps have been adjusted accordingly.

EXHIBIT B

UNION LAST BEST WAGE OFFER

	Old Rates (Prorated)	New Rates Effective On		
		<u>7-1-75</u>	<u>1-1-76</u>	<u>7-1-76</u>
Starting Employee	8,165	8,866	9,567	9,987
After 6 months	8,426	9,149	9,872	10,305
After 12 months	8,687	9,432	10,177	10,623
After 2 years	9,209	9,999	10,789	11,262
After 3 years (Journeyman Patrolman)	9,730	10,565	11,400	11,900
Detective	10,065	10,932.50	11,800	12,300
Sergeant		11,265	12,100	12,600
Percentage Wage Increase		8.58%	7.90%	4.39%
				3.36%

EXHIBIT C

COMPARISON OF SALARY OFFERS

<u>Patrolmen</u> Starting Employees		<u>7-1-75</u>		<u>1-1-76</u>		<u>7-1-76</u>		<u>1-1-77</u>	
City Union		+817. -	8,982	+ 0 -	8,982	+559. -	9,521	+ 0 -	9,521
		+701. -	8,866	+701. -	9,567	+420. -	9,987	+336. -	10,323
After 6 months									
City Union		+910. -	9,270	+ 0 -	9,270	+556. -	9,826	+ 0 -	9,826
		+723. -	9,149	+723. -	9,872	+433. -	10,305	+346. -	10,651
After 12 months-City Union									
		+1000. -	9,555.	+ 0 -	9,555	+573. -	10,128	+ 0 -	10,128
		+775. -	9,432	+745. -	10,177	+446. -	10,623	+357. -	10,980
After 2 years-City Union									
		+1185. -	10,130	+ 0 -	10,130	+608. -	10,738	+ 0 -	10,738
		+790. -	9,999	+790. -	10,789	+473. -	11,262	+378. -	11,640
After 3 years-City Union									
		+1365. -	10,705	+ 0 -	10,705	+642. -	11,347	+ 0 -	11,347
		+835. -	10,565	+835. -	11,400	+500. -	11,900	+400. -	12,300
Detective-City Union									
		+1007. -	11,072	+ 0 -	11,072	+664. -	11,736	+ 0 -	11,736
		+867.50 -	10,932.50	+867.50 -	11,800	+500. -	12,300	+300. -	12,600
Sergeant -City Union									
		11,105		11,105		11,771		11,771	
		11,265		12,100		12,600		12,900	