

Lara Weisiger

From: Alamedahouse Freeman <dfreeman@pacbell.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 3:41 PM
To: Tony Daysog; Jim Oddie; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Malia Vella
Cc: Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Alameda City Council Agenda December 1, 2020 Item 5L

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Council Members,

Alameda City Council Agenda December 1, 2020 Item 5L

The negotiations for the extension of the Alameda International Association of Firefighters (IAFF) Local 689 is a process better left to a time when the public can have proper participation. The existing contract is not due to expire until December 18, 2021. Why was it necessary to negotiate an extension during a time when it is difficult for the public to participate in the decision?

The staff report and the Letter of Agreement refer to a 2% increase like it is being calculated on the present wage and is a straight increase in salary.

The contract in existence at this time calculates any 2% increase on several city tax numbers and not on base salaries. Will these new 2% increases be calculated on the tax income or the base salary. This should be made clear to the public in the staff report. But it is not!

Statement quote from existing contract:

2020: Wage increases to begin the first full pay period after January 1, 2020 will be based upon the BRI for fiscal year (FY 2018-2019) over fiscal year (FY 2017-2018). The wage increase for 2020 based upon this formula will be a minimum of 3.0% and a maximum of 5.0%.

Future wage increases in these Memoranda, unless specifically stated otherwise, shall be based on the previous year's Balanced Revenue Index ("BRI").

BRI is defined as 50% of the one year rate of growth, between the two previous successive fiscal years, of the combined dollar amount of the following five local Alameda taxes:

General Fund Property Tax,
1% Bradley Burns Sales Tax,
Utility Users Tax,
Transient Occupancy Tax, and
Property Transfer Tax.

End of statement quote.

Where is the benefit to the citizens of Alameda to extend the contract at this time? This should be made clear in the staff report. Stating the 6 month savings at \$174,000 implies that will be the same cost to the City in the two subsequent years of wage increase. That is not true if the wage increase is not calculated on present wage but on tax increases that hopefully will be higher in 2021 after the vaccine is distributed and we are again, hopefully able to recover from the downturn in the economy.

Another area of concern is the following statement quote from the new contract agreement.

The cost of the 2% increase in Fiscal Years 2021-22 and 2022-23 will be subject to future City Council approval for appropriations.

End of statement quote.

The salary increase for 2021 is set in the existing contract to a minimum of 2% but it appears that the increase for 2021-22 and 2022-23 is up to City Council negotiation. So the increase for these two years may be higher than 2%. This is also not made clear to the public.

The following statement quote is also from the existing contract:

2021: The City shall conduct a total compensation survey in June 2020. The survey will be structured using five similarly sized east bay cities as determined by the City and APOA through meet and confer prior to June 2020. The five cities to be included in the survey shall not include either Oakland or Alameda. The survey will be performed in June 2020. The parties will meet and confer with sufficient time before December 31, 2020 to discuss the results of the survey and what, if any, equity adjustments are necessary or appropriate. It is agreed that if the total compensation of an officer falls below the average of the five surveyed cities, salaries will be adjusted to the average of these five agencies, beginning the first full pay period after January 1, 2021. The equity adjustment will not be less than a minimum of 2.0% nor a greater than a maximum of 5.0%. If the total compensation of an officer falls above the average of the five surveyed cities, the wage increase for 2021 shall be 2.0%.

End of statement quote.

There is no indication in the staff report that this survey was completed and if it was, what are the five cities used in the survey and what are the results of the survey? The last statement from the previous paragraph would imply that Alameda's salary for total compensation falls above the average of the five surveyed cities so the increase was set at just 2%.

Having contract negotiations for the major cost item in Alameda's budget at a time when it is not imperative to do is not good governance. Having contract negotiations when there is not full disclosure of the negotiated items and when the citizens cannot be active participants due to a national health emergency is also not good governance.

Respectfully yours

Dorothy Freeman

cc: City Clerk Weisiger
City Manager Levitt