

UNION PROPOSALS	STATUS
Union Proposal #1 – Article 14: Expenses - Increase per diem reimbursement rates for training school attendance in accordance with FGSA	<p>The City would like to maintain the current travel reimbursement rates, however, is reviewing the reimbursement rates city-wide.</p> <p>Union would like to know what, if any, determinations have been made regarding a “review” and if that review is likely to result in any modification to the current rates.</p>
Union Proposal #2 – Article 19: Uniforms- Section 19.1: Increase uniform allowance	<p>Union has provided data re uniform replacement costs. There is significant concern about upcoming budget challenges related to the City’s personnel costs, and uniforms are considered reportable compensation to CalPERS for Classic members.</p> <p>Union is willing to withdraw this proposal in exchange for focusing on some of the other more important matters discussed below.</p>
Union Proposal #3 – Article 8: Wages and Classifications- Section 8.8b: Increase POST and Education Incentives and make them stackable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intermediate certificate/AA degree</li> <li>• Advanced POST/BA degree</li> <li>• Supervisory Certificate/Masters degree (new)</li> </ul>	<p>Due to cost considerations and reportable compensation to CalPERS the City is not interested in increasing POST and education incentives. Five officers are currently eligible for the Master’s degree incentive.</p> <p>Union still wants to discuss this proposal. Also need clarification from City if the City is stating they are not interested in making these stackable as proposed by the Union’s originally (but leaving as is currently) and also, if City is saying they will not create an incentive for the Supervisory/Masters Degree noted to apply to only 5 employees?</p>
Union Proposal #4 – Article 15: Sick Leave - Section 15.5 & 22.7: Provide City match to VantageCare contribution of 1% gross earnings	<p>The City would support additional contribution to the VantageCare plan if it was 100% employee paid.</p> <p>Union will withdraw this proposal.</p>
Union Proposal #5- Article 8: Wages and Classifications- Section 8.8b: Create pay incentive for those holding POST Instructor Certificate, Level 1-4; each certificate incentive would be stackable	<p>Economic, however, the City is open to further discussion regarding this proposal. Presently there are 15 officers identified with POST certificates who would qualify.</p> <p>See alternate proposal below</p>
Union Proposal #6- Article 8: Wages and Classifications- New Section for Master Officer Program: additional pay incentive once officer achieves established metrics	<p>Economic, however, the City is open to further discussion regarding this proposal. Draft language has been provided to the City.</p> <p>See alternate proposal below</p>

<p>Alternate proposal in place of #5 and #6</p>	<p>Union would like to suggest modifying proposals #5 and #6. These proposals were seeking to find a method of additional compensation for the membership other than simply a base salary increase. Union suggests that in place of these proposals that the City instead pay any officer who holds a specialty assignment (motors, K9 etc.) a 2.5% specialty incentive. Officers would be eligible to receive a maximum of 2 such incentives provided they concurrently were working two qualifying specialty assignments. These two incentives would be stackable for a maximum of 5% and any further specialty assignments (3+) would not apply.</p> <p>Union recognizes this is economic but it will not apply to every member and only those members who are adding value to the department by holding speciality assignments would qualify. Union believes that in order for the membership to ever ratify an agreement in which they are taking an immediate 3% pay cut that some attainable compensation increase has to be part of the deal.</p> <p>Union is open to discussing a phase-in where during year one of the contract only the first 2.5% incentive would apply and the second stackable 2.5% incentive (for those who qualify) would not take effect until year 2.</p>
<p>Union Proposal #7- Exhibits A-1, A-2 and A-3: Clarify accurate Step 1 on the pay schedule; consider dropping Step 8 for Court Officer, Investigations, and Corporal</p>	<p>The City confirmed Step 1 is accurate based on the 2011 negotiated MOU with RPOA. The City is agreeable to dropping Step 8 for the Corporal position. Research shared with RPOA on 7-13-17 did not support justification for dropping Step 8 for the two additional classifications.</p> <p>Union agrees to city proposal and will sign a T/A.</p>
<p>Union Proposal #8- Fitness Pay Incentive: provide compensation, or additional vacation or comp time for maintaining fitness levels</p>	<p>Economic, however, the City is open to further discussion regarding this proposal.</p> <p>Union wants to still explore this option by compensate employees alternatively with vacation or comp time or some other one-time financial bonus/gift card etc., that is not PERS-able.</p>
<p>Union Proposal #9- Article 17: Holidays: Reinstate holiday compensation</p>	<p>Option to restore 110 holiday hours with commensurate 5.3% reduction in pay or status quo.</p> <p>Union will withdraw this proposal</p>
<p>Union Proposal #10- Article 18: Vacation – Increase vacation accrual, or institute an annual personal leave bank in addition to regular leave accruals</p>	<p>Maintain current practice for consistency throughout City. The proposal has cost implications to the City.</p> <p>Union will withdraw this proposal</p>

Union Proposal #11- Base pay rate increase with a longer contract with economic triggers

The City is concerned over the ability to provide a balanced 10 year financial plan. In an effort to achieve financial stability moving forward, it is projected that RPOA's portion of savings will need to be approximately \$391,000 annually.

The City desires a longer term contract (4-5 years).

Union is interested in a 3 year contract.

Zero percent wage increases during the term of the contract.

Union is agreeable to this as it pertains to base compensation.

For those eligible, step movement would be frozen for two years.

Union does not agree to this proposal. Fiscal savings to the city is relatively minimal in the grand scheme of things but conversely the impact to the current and future employees, both fiscally and on a morale basis is substantial. We have concerns about both the recruitment and retention implications, particularly in a time when failure by the city to prioritize public safety is a major concern of the citizens.

Additionally, the City desires to change the steps on the salary schedule going forward to a value of 2.5% for each step rather than 5%, and double the amount of steps.

Union does not agree to this proposal for same reasons as prior comment.

The City is interested in developing a revenue sharing formula, based on end of fiscal year audited revenue amounts. In the event that actual Property Tax and Sales Tax revenues exceed the adopted budgeted Property Tax and Sales Tax revenues contained in the Biennial Budget by an amount to be determined, the City will allocate the excess revenues to bargaining unit full time employees on a proportionate basis. The lump sum payment will be made prospectively, no sooner than March 2019 for contracts agreed to by FY 2017-18 and each year thereafter for multi-year contracts. The payment will not be reportable to CalPERS. The Revenue Sharing Agreement is for the term of the contract. The actual revenues to be used in the Revenue Sharing Agreement will be Property Tax and Sales Tax Revenues. No other revenue sources, including any new taxes, will be included in the formula.

Rather than worry about revenue sharing we would prefer to agree to more straightforward terms that can be identified and agreed to in an existing contract (i.e. we pay 3% more in PERS and the City agrees to certain incentives as outlined above).

Further, the City is willing to add re-opener language into the contract if there are unexpected year over year increases (or decreases) in revenues.

<p>Union Proposal #12- Article 8: Wages and Classifications – Establish longevity pay</p>	<p>Due to cost considerations, the City is not interested in longevity pay.</p> <p>Union is willing to withdraw.</p>
<p>Union Proposal #13- Article 9: Hours and Overtime – Establish 5% pay incentive for K-9 Officers rather than overtime rate currently provided</p>	<p>The City is reviewing this proposal.</p> <p>This was initially the city’s suggestion of how to cure the complications that arose with the application of K9 specialty pay. This would however be absorbed by our modified approach to the pay incentives discussed above and would not need to be dealt with on a stand-alone basis.</p>
<p>Union Proposal #14- Article 1: Preamble, Section 1.8 – Create a 10 - 12 schedule (6-22-16 side letter)</p>	<p>The City is currently developing a city-wide alternative work schedule policy.</p> <p>We just received this via email and will review.</p>
<p>Union Proposal #15- Article 8: Wages and Classifications, Section 8.3(b)– define “extended absence” to clearly outline when Police Corporal is eligible for 5% upgrade while covering for Police Sergeant</p>	<p>See City Counter Proposal language to Union Proposal #15. Union suggests defining an extended absence as one week or four (4) 10 hour shifts; or three (3) 12.5 hour shifts.</p> <p>Union agrees with the draft language provided at last meeting and will sign a T/A.</p>
<p>Union Proposal #16 – Article 8: Wages and Classifications, Section 8.5: clarify meaning of section</p>	<p>T/A – 7/13/17</p>
<p>Union Proposal #17 – Article 9: Hours and Overtime, section 9.3(b)– remove mandatory shift rotation language (side letters 2-22-12 and 5-25-14)</p>	<p>Maintain MOU language regarding mandatory shift rotation. The City does find benefit with having shifts rotated periodically.</p> <p>Union will withdraw this proposal.</p>
<p>Union Proposal #18 – Article 9: Hours and Overtime, section 9.9(a) – new language to permit an Investigator to flex work schedule during a holiday week</p>	<p>See City Counter Proposal language to Union Proposal #18. Management will determine work schedule based on work load.</p> <p>Union agrees with the draft language provided at last meeting and will sign a T/A.</p>
<p>Union Proposal #19 Article 17: Holidays – clarify how holidays apply to shift and non-shift employees</p>	<p>See City Proposal #4</p>
<p>Union Proposal #20 Article 18: Vacations, section 18.1 - Eliminate one-time vacation bank language</p>	<p>T/A 6-14-17</p>
<p>Union Proposal #21 Article 18: Vacations, section 18.1(b) – Eliminate duplicative signature page, remove track changes</p>	<p>T/A 6-14-17</p>

Union Proposal #23 Length of contract	<p>The City desires a longer term contract (4-5 years).</p> <p>Union desires 3 year contract. This will provide some stability for the membership and will also cover the time period during which the phase-in for the discount rate reduction from PERS is taking effect. Will permit both sides to evaluate actual economic growth or recession and see if the City is able to explore other revenue sources to help curb the fiscal shortfalls projected.</p>
---------------------------------------	---

**~ CONFIDENTIAL ~**  
**RPOA NEGOTIATIONS PROPOSAL STATUS**  
**Status as of August 22, 2017**

**1% = 120,590**

<b>CITY PROPOSALS</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
City Proposal #1 – Side letters	
City Proposal #2 – Article 1.2 Preamble: language updates for protected classes and status	T/A 6-14-17
City Proposal #4– Article 17 Holidays: non-shift employee definition	
City Proposal #5 – Article 19 Uniforms: new hire uniform reimbursement allowance for new hires to be provided upon initial appointment	
City Proposal #6 – Article 22 Group Health and Welfare Benefit Program: Group health language clean up; discuss additional changes to group health plan; change of health premium contribution to 20% of Base Group Health Plan. Add an account based group health plan (medical and prescription only) as an additional lower cost option. City will contribute an amount to the ABHP for the employee, up to, but not to exceed the dollar amount contributed toward the Base Group Health Plan; eliminating retiree health plan participation for new hires, upon retirement.	<p>The union is not interested in this agreement and would prefer to keep the status quo at this time. Agreeing to percentage increase across the board is too speculative of a potentially increasing negative financial impact to the membership.</p>

City Proposal #7 – Article 21 Retirement Program: Additional cost sharing of CalPERS retirement benefit - 3% for Classic, 2% for PEPRAs; reopener language for significant CalPERS changes, or pending litigation (also known as “The California Rule”).

Union is willing to consider a 3% increase for both Classic *and* PEPRAs provided the City agrees to incentive proposals as outlined below. Union is not interested in adding “reopener language” at this time.