

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 147

**Minneapolis Charter Amendment #18
Pay Levels for Fire and Police**

October 1962

(147)

Citizens League
545 Mobil Oil Building
Minneapolis 2, Minnesota

APPROVED
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
DATE OCT 3 1962

REPORT TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Minneapolis Government Reorganization Committee with the concurrence of the
Committee on Taxation & Finance

SUBJECT: Proposed Minneapolis Charter Amendment #18 establishing minimum pay levels
for firemen and policemen and granting the City Council broad additional
tax-levying power to finance the higher pay scales

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The proposed amendment, which will appear on the November 6 general election ballot in Minneapolis as Amendment #18, proposes to establish by charter minimum salaries of firemen and policemen in Minneapolis. Currently, salaries of firemen and policemen, as is now and will continue to be the case for all other city employees, are determined by the City Council. The amendment fixes the minimum salary for patrolmen and firefighters after four years of service at not less than the average monthly salary paid by the City of Minneapolis for its employees in the following construction building trades: bricklayers, carpenters, electricians, painters, pipefitters, plumbers, sheet metal workers and structural iron workers. Currently, the City has just under 100 employees in these eight construction building trade categories. At current pay rates for employees in the eight listed crafts, the amendment would produce an 18% pay raise for patrolmen and firefighters. The initial pay increase would take place on January 1, 1963. Raises would be limited to a maximum of 5% each year until such time as the minimum is reached.

The amendment proposes to meet the additional cost of the salaries of patrolmen and firefighters by granting the City Council broad new taxing power. The amendment provides "in the event that at any time there are not sufficient funds available to pay and maintain the salary increases provided for herein, then the City Council is authorized and directed to levy a tax or taxes, except that it may not levy under this section any local ad valorem tax on property in addition to property taxes otherwise permitted by law, any general sales tax, any general income tax or any tax which is prohibited by constitution or statutes of the State of Minnesota. . . The proceeds from any new or additional tax or taxes levied under this chapter shall be first applied to the payment and maintenance of the salary increases authorized herein and the balance, if any, shall be used to defray the current expenses of the City of Minneapolis."

WHY THE SPONSORS OF AMENDMENT #18 SAY IT IS NECESSARY AND WHAT IT WILL ACCOMPLISH

Amendment #18 is being sponsored by the Minneapolis Fire & Police Joint Council, which is the coordinating council for the Firefighters Association of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Police Officers Federation. In its presentation on behalf of the proposed amendment, the Fire & Police Joint Council has presented the following arguments in favor of the amendment.

1. The establishment in the city charter of a formula governing salaries of firefighters and patrolmen will remove them from politics, since they no longer will have to engage in the traditional political "push and pull" in attempting to obtain Council approval for adequate salaries.

2. The amendment will provide increased salaries for patrolmen and fire-fighters without further burdening the home owner. The amendment grants the Council power to levy new and additional taxes, but specifically prohibits raising real and personal property taxes to pay for the salary increases.

3. By insuring that salary standards will retain their same relative value through changing economic conditions, the problems of recruitment of high caliber personnel will be largely solved.

4. Under a salary formula for police and fire, the method of adjustment of salaries will depend strictly upon factual information instead of annual sessions of "push and pull" with the City Council.

5. The best insurance to maintain the present high peaks of performance in both the Fire and Police Departments is to provide for a stable career service for qualified people.

6. The amendment, through the power granted the Council to levy new taxes, will provide added revenue for other city services.

7. Precedent exists elsewhere for this type of amendment. The City of Oakland, California, enacted a similar charter amendment in 1958.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

In 1953 the Minneapolis City Council appointed a Citizens Salary Survey Commission to determine and appraise the community pattern of wages and working conditions for jobs comparable with those in the city service under the jurisdiction of the City Council. The Citizens Commission report included the finding that the salaries of Minneapolis employees in the public safety group had not kept relative pace with the salaries of labor, skilled and unskilled, in the city service. The majority of the Citizens Commission recommended that the maximum pay rate for patrolmen and firefighters should be based on the midpoint between the rate of pay for permanently employed laborers in outside employment and the average rate of pay for building trades craftsmen under the jurisdiction of the City Council. A minority of the membership on the Commission recommended that the maximum rate of pay should be 85% of the average construction trade rate in the AGC contracts for bricklayer, carpenter, electrician, pipefitter, plumber, sheet metal workers, structural iron worker, roofer and painter. The City Council subsequently adopted the minority recommendation as its guiding policy, with the modification that the Council would base its comparison on wage rates of municipal employees rather than workers in private industry.

In 1954, when the Council began using this guiding policy in establishing fire and police pay rates, the pay of patrolmen and firefighters was approximately 75% of the average of these eight crafts. During succeeding years the differential was steadily reduced until, at present, patrolmen and firefighters are paid approximately 86% of the comparable figure for employees in these crafts. Thus, patrolmen and firefighters today are paid in excess of the maximum recommended by the Citizens Commission in 1954.

Until this year, there appeared to be general satisfaction on the part of both the fire and police unions with this formula. Their principal concern has been to keep the pay as close to the recommended maximum of 85% as possible. Late this spring, the Fire & Police Joint Council presented to the Minneapolis Charter Commission a proposed amendment designed to incorporate the formula into the city charter, with two important differences. First, the formula became the average pay of

employees in these eight crafts, rather than the previous 85%. Second, the formula became a minimum instead of a maximum. The amendment stated: "To provide the funds for the increase in the monthly salaries provided for herein the City Council is authorized and directed to levy a tax or taxes on transactions, occupations, privileges and subjects within its jurisdictional limits, except that it may not levy under this section any local ad valorem tax on property in addition to property taxes otherwise permitted by law, any general sales tax, or any general income tax. Any new or additional tax or taxes levied hereunder shall be in the amount or amounts estimated to produce the approximate amount necessary to pay the cost of the salary increases provided for herein, and the proceeds of said tax or taxes shall be used for no other purpose except for those enumerated herein." The Charter Commission referred the proposed amendment to a subcommittee, whose report to the Commission, following a hearing and study, was essentially negative. It soon became obvious to all that the Commission would decline to submit the amendment to the voters of Minneapolis.

The Fire & Police Joint Council, once it saw that favorable action by the Charter Commission would not be forthcoming, began to circulate petitions to place the proposed amendment on the ballot. However, the amendment was changed in three respects: (1) The Council's power to levy new taxes was further broadened. (2) The restriction limiting revenue from the new tax to approximately the amount needed to meet the pay increases and prohibiting use for any other purpose was replaced by a provision allowing all surplus revenues to go into the City's General Revenue (Current Expense) Fund for use as needed for other city services. (3) The maximum per cent by which fire and police pay could be increased in any single year was reduced from the previously allowed 8% to 5%.

A sufficient number of valid signatures has been obtained and the amendment will be before the voters of Minneapolis at the November 6 general election. A vigorous "Vote Yes" Campaign, under the direction of the Fire & Police Joint Council, is presently under way. Most community, civic, business, labor and political organizations are just beginning their analysis of the provisions of Amendment #18 and, therefore, the amendment has not as yet received much in the way of formal support or opposition.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We oppose Amendment #18 and urge the voters of Minneapolis to vote "No" on November 6, for the following principal reasons.
 - a. The exceedingly broad power granted to the City Council to levy new and additional taxes by a simple majority of its membership is so excessive that Amendment #18 must be opposed on this basis alone, irrespective of the merits of any other part of the amendment.
 - b. The amendment will in no way accomplish what its sponsors claim is its primary objective -- removing Minneapolis patrolmen and firefighters from the political arena. On the contrary, the amendment is likely to result in intensification of the level of their political activity because:
 - (1) The amendment establishes the formula, not as a schedule, but as a minimum below which fire and police salaries may not fall. The understandable temptation on the part of fire and police personnel to press for salary levels above this minimum, in future years, doubtless will prove irresistible.

- (2) The amendment not only provides taxing power to pay for increased salaries to reach the prescribed minimum, but it also provides unlimited taxing power to pay for fire and police salaries at any level above the minimum. With revenues so freely available, the incentive to press for higher fire and police pay will be greater than it is today. For the same reason, there will be greater likelihood that the Council will submit to these pressures.
- (3) The formula relates fire and police salary levels to that of other city employees not to that of workers in private industry. Fire and police political activity will not diminish. Instead, it will be transferred to helping push for higher pay for the city employees to which fire and police salaries are tied.

Amendment #18 should be presented to the voters in a forthright manner for what it really is -- a campaign by Minneapolis patrolmen and firefighters to raise substantially the level of their salaries. Had its sponsors really intended to remove fire and police personnel from the political arena they would have established the formula as a schedule, not a minimum, and would have related the formula to some statistical index or to the pay of employees in private industry, which could not be affected materially by fire and police or other city employees.

- c. Placing salary-fixing provisions for one group of municipal employees in a basic document, such as a constitution or charter, is repugnant to all sound principles of government. It should never be done, unless it can be clearly shown that the salary-setting body (Council) has been so remiss as to leave no reasonable alternative. No such evidence has been presented, nor, to our knowledge, is any such allegation being made by the sponsors of the amendment.
 - d. The sponsors present no evidence to show that the minimum salary levels for patrolmen and firefighters established by the amendment are justified, either in terms of equity or as being necessary to maintain high grade police and fire service in Minneapolis. In the absence of this kind of evidence, there can be no justification whatsoever for freezing into the charter these higher minimum salary levels.
2. Because #18 raises such important and basic questions of public policy, and because of the serious ramifications which could result from its adoption, we strongly urge all community, civic, business, labor and political organizations to assess promptly and carefully its provisions and to take a public position either for or against the amendment prior to the election.
 3. We urge the Minneapolis City Council to take prompt steps leading to an impartial and professional review of existing salary levels for fire and police personnel. The purpose of this review would be (1) to assess the adequacy of existing salary levels and (2) to recommend procedures and guidelines to help determine the proper relationship of pay scales for the public safety group with those of other city employees. The selection of a broadly-representative Citizens Committee

working with a professional management consultant, which was the method used by the City Council in 1952, would seem to provide a satisfactory procedure.

4. It is generally agreed, even by the sponsors of Amendment #18, that the Minneapolis Police and Fire Departments rank among the best of any city in the country. No evidence has been presented alleging that this high level of performance is deteriorating because of inadequate salary levels. Despite this commendable record, we must constantly search for ways to strengthen further this high level of fire and police service. We therefore respectfully urge consideration of the following three specific proposals which, in our opinion, would materially strengthen the Minneapolis Police and Fire Departments and would do so without any cost whatsoever to the taxpayers.

- a. Adoption of our previously-stated recommendation to remove the city residence requirement barring non-residents from applying for the positions of patrolman and firefighter. Minneapolis Police Chief Pat Walling stated a similar viewpoint on August 13 of this year when he said, "I recommend the city residency requirement be removed. We need a broader base from which to recruit."
- b. Review the physical requirements and change those which unduly preclude many otherwise qualified applicants from becoming Minneapolis policemen or firefighters.
- c. Implementation of the long-standing Citizens League recommendation that existing veterans' preference laws be modified. Few changes would do more to improve the efficiency or morale of the Police and Fire Departments.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

1. Amendment #18 contains so many variables and uncertainties that it is not possible to calculate the additional annual cost to the taxpayer which would result from its passage. However, it seems certain that the rock bottom minimum added annual cost would be somewhat in excess of \$1,500,000. If the minimum fire and police salary levels provided for under the formula contained in Amendment #18 were in effect today, it would cost this much more merely to finance the approximately 18% higher salary level. The amount by which the additional annual cost will exceed \$1,500,000 is completely dependent upon the actions of the City Council. The additional cost will depend, for example, on: (1) How much, if anything, the Council determines the patrolmen and firefighters should be paid above the minimum established by the formula. (2) The degree to which the salaries of other city employees must be revised upward in order to maintain a proper relationship with salary levels paid to fire and police personnel. These other employees will exert strenuous pressure on the Council to restore previous differentials, particularly since proposed higher police and fire salary levels will push into, and in some cases exceed, present salary levels for supervisory personnel in many areas of city government. (3) The increased cost of fringe benefits, such as the fire and police retirement programs. Retirement benefits rise automatically whenever salaries are increased. (4) The extent of the authority granted under Amendment #18 to levy new or additional taxes for other city services and the degree to which the City Council exercises this authority.

2. #18 gives the Council, by simple majority vote of its membership, the authority to select from a greater assortment of taxes than is, to our knowledge,

available to any other city in the United States. The amendment authorizes imposition of any tax, except an increase in the real and personal property tax, a general sales tax, an income tax, and taxes specifically prohibited by the state constitution or by the laws of Minnesota. It should also be noted that the amendment places no ceiling on the rate at which any new tax may be imposed. Among the types of new taxes which would appear to be authorized would be gross receipts or occupation taxes on business; a sales or excise tax on any number or grouping of products, so long as the list did not become sufficiently long to constitute a general sales tax; a wheelage tax on automobiles and trucks; a hotel and motel room tax; a tax on billboards; a tax on parking lots and ramps; a tax on telephone users; and a tax on admissions. In addition, there are others too numerous to mention here.

3. The amendment seems made to order to encourage "coattail riding" under the banner of the politically appealing plea to strengthen the level of fire and police service. The amendment, by failing to restrict the expenditure of funds from new tax sources to paying for fire and police pay increases, will encourage the levying of new taxes at rates which will produce revenues considerably in excess of the amounts required. The excess then will be used for other city services. Amendment #18 itself is a good example of this type of camouflage. The amendment is presented simply as a means of strengthening fire and police service by removing patrolmen and firefighters from the political arena. The other far-reaching aspects of this amendment tend to become lost beneath the politically appealing slogans.

4. As an organization which has worked continually over the years to ease the excessive burden on real and personal property taxes, and as an organization which has itself proposed specific new sources of revenue to help ease this overdependence on the property tax, we naturally welcome the support for our position as evidenced by the amendment's exclusion of the tax on property as a means of financing the pay raises. However, we reject categorically the exceedingly broad approach proposed by Amendment #18. It was neither necessary nor desirable to open the floodgates to such a vast array of possible new taxes, nor was it sound to leave completely unrestricted the rate at which any new tax can be imposed. We have in the past and will in the future, at least under the City's existing totally inadequate structure of government, restrict our support to carefully spelled out and strictly limited grants of additional taxing power.

In at least one respect, Amendment #18 could well increase the pressure for higher taxes on real and personal property. It must be remembered that the substantial increases in the level of pay for fire and police personnel will inevitably increase the pressure for upward adjustment for other municipal employees in order to restore long-standing pay differentials. The amounts which will be necessary to finance salary increases for other city employees will have to be provided in one or both of two ways: By excess levies on non-property tax sources authorized under this amendment or through the traditional method of increasing the tax level on real and personal property.

5. We disagree with the argument made by the sponsors of the amendment that through the formula proposed the level of fire and police salaries will depend strictly upon factual information rather than on political pressures. This will not happen when the formula is nothing more than a minimum level below which salaries cannot fall. Nor can it happen when the pay of the employees to which the salaries of patrolmen and firefighters are tied is itself left completely to the discretion of the Council and subject to all political pressures.

6. We reject as dangerously deceptive the sponsors' statement that this type of amendment has precedent elsewhere and with their citation of Oakland, Cali-

fornia, as having a similar charter provision. Our review of the Oakland charter provision discloses several critically important differences. The amendments are similar in that they both establish a formula relating the pay of patrolmen and firefighters to specific categories of employees in other types of work. Major differences include: (1) The Oakland charter provision provides a formula which automatically must be followed. Amendment #18 establishes the formula merely as a minimum. (2) The Oakland formula is based on the pay levels of specified production workers in private industry in the Oakland-Bay area. Amendment #18 relates the formula to specified employees of the City of Minneapolis. (3) At the time the Oakland formula was adopted, the existing relationship between the pay of fire and police personnel and production workers in private industry was used as a starting point. Amendment #18 sets a minimum salary level approximately 18% above existing salary levels for members of the Fire and Police Departments. (4) The Oakland charter provision grants no new or additional taxing power for the purpose of financing the required pay increases. Amendment #18 contains a wide-open provision granting extensive new taxing authority to the City Council. In our opinion, there is very little resemblance in most important respects between the Oakland charter provision and Amendment #18.

7. Amendment #18 will compel further charter earmarking of funds for specific functions of city government. Minneapolis city government is already plagued by excessive charter earmarking of funds, and every effort should be made to curtail rather than extend further this unsound practice.

8. Those who are not compelled to reject Amendment #18, as we do, on the basis that it gives excessive taxing power to the City Council, and that placing salary-fixing provisions in a basic document, such as a constitution or charter, is repugnant to all sound principles of government, must determine whether the minimum salary level prescribed by the formula contained in the amendment is reasonable. The issue to this person is not whether members of the Fire and Police Departments should receive salaries above those now being paid. The issue is whether the level provided for by the formula is equitable or excessive.

Currently, Minneapolis patrolmen and firefighters with four years' service receive an annual salary of \$6,612, exclusive of the value of fringe benefits. City Council administrative officials estimate the cost to the City of these fringe benefits, the most expensive of which is the retirement program, at a minimum of 30% of basic salary. On this basis, the value of the total compensation at current salary levels amounts to \$8,872 a year. If the minimum salary level provided for under the formula in Amendment #18 were in effect today, patrolmen and firefighters with four years' service would be receiving a basic salary of \$7,800 a year. Adding the value of fringe benefits, again computed at 30% of salary, would bring the total compensation to \$10,140 a year.

We do not feel qualified to determine whether current salary levels are adequate and equitable, whether the proposed higher level is proper, or whether the level should be somewhere in between these two figures. However, certain criteria are commonly used to determine the general adequacy of a given salary level. Our findings with respect to certain of these criteria are as follows:

- a. The City Council, which is charged with the responsibility of setting the salaries for members of the Fire and Police Departments, apparently is convinced the existing level is adequate and equitable. We base this conclusion on the fact that the Council established the present salary level, that no member of

the Council is publicly urging increased salary levels for members of the Fire and Police Departments, and that the City Council is not seeking additional revenue for this or any other function of government under the Council's jurisdiction.

- b. There appears to be general agreement, even by the sponsors of Amendment #18, that at current salary levels the performance of the Minneapolis Fire and Police Departments ranks among the top for cities of equal or larger size anywhere in the country, and that no signs of deterioration appear visible.
- c. Recruiting of qualified patrolmen and firefighters to fill vacancies is not a serious problem. On the contrary, the Police Department within the past year increased its manpower by nearly 25% without difficulty even after tightening up its requirements for eligibility. The Fire Department has a backlog of eligible requirements which far exceeds the number of firefighters who can be hired for many years to come. Police Chief Pat Walling, on August 13 of this year, said, "Salary is no problem in attracting personnel." The Minneapolis Civil Service Commission concurs with this viewpoint.
- d. The number of patrolmen and firefighters leaving city service for reasons other than retirement and physical disability is exceedingly low and shows no signs of trending upward. We find no evidence whatsoever that existing salary levels are leading to premature terminations of service.
- e. Minneapolis patrolmen and firefighters today are paid salaries that rank near the top among the largest cities of our country. (See Table 1). Only six of the 42 largest cities currently pay a higher minimum salary and only eight cities pay a higher maximum salary for patrolmen and firefighters. If the minimum salary level provided for in Amendment #18 were in effect today, fire and police salaries would exceed or equal that of every one of the 42 largest cities in the United States. Working conditions and fringe benefits provided Minneapolis fire and police personnel appear to compare favorably with those in other large cities.
- f. The current Minneapolis fire and police salary level compares favorably with that of fire and police personnel elsewhere in this area. (See Table 2). It is considerably in excess of that for members of the Minneapolis State Highway Patrol. It exceeds the salary level of deputies in the Hennepin County Sheriff's office. It is slightly above the St. Paul level. If the substantially more generous fringe benefit program afforded Minneapolis fire and police personnel is taken into consideration, their salary level substantially exceeds that of suburban fire and police personnel in the Twin Cities metropolitan area.
- g. Comparative statistical data indicate that although Minneapolis patrolmen and firefighters' salaries compare favorably with those in other large cities throughout the country, supervisory personnel in the Police and Fire Departments are given less recognition in terms of salary differential above that paid patrolmen and firefighters than in any of the largest cities throughout the country. (See Table 3).

- h. During the past ten years Minneapolis patrolmen and firefighters have improved their relative salary position when compared with most employees in other types of work. (See Table 4). For example, since 1953 the salary of Minneapolis patrolmen and firefighters has increased 59%. This compares with a 44% increase over the same period of time for production workers in private industry in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The same favorable comparison holds true for city employees in the eight crafts to which fire and police salaries are tied under the formula prescribed in Amendment #18. In 1953, the salary of patrolmen and firefighters was 75% of the average wage level paid to city employees in the eight crafts. Today, it stands at 86%.
- i. It is a dangerous oversimplification to think only in terms of equating the salary levels of patrolmen and firefighters with wages paid to other employees, such as those of the eight listed crafts working for the City. The value of fringe benefits is substantially higher for fire and police personnel than it is for other city employees. Working conditions vary. The ability to work at two jobs, available to many fire and police personnel, is an intangible but important factor which must be considered. These are but a few of the relevant factors which should dictate caution in reaching hasty and generalized conclusions in comparing salary levels of different employees.
- j. Based on cost-of-living figures over the past ten years, Minneapolis patrolmen and firefighters have substantially improved their standard of living. The prime index since 1953 has risen less than 15%, while fire and police salaries have increased 59% during this same period of time.
- k. While it is true that firemen and policemen are engaged in a more dangerous and hazardous occupation than is the average employee, statistical information available to us indicates that it is less hazardous than for several groups of employees working for government and is less hazardous than that for construction workers in private industry. (See Table 5).

In our opinion, none of the above generally accepted criteria for determining the adequacy of salary levels for Minneapolis patrolmen and firefighters justifies establishing by charter a minimum salary level 18% above existing levels and amounting to \$7,800 a year (\$10,140 total annuan compensation).

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Amendment #18 is a thoroughly unsound amendment in every major respect. The amendment violates all sound principles of government in attempting to incorporate in the constitution or charter subject matter which has no place there, subject matter which properly is and must be the responsibility of the elected officials of the City. The amendment grants to the City Council by simple majority vote of its membership power to select from a greater number of types of taxes than to our knowledge is granted by charter to any other city in the country. Its sponsors have introduced no evidence justifying why a salary level 18% above existing levels for patrolmen and firefighters is a reasonable minimum level which should be frozen

into the city charter. And, finally, the amendment will not even accomplish what its sponsors have chosen to present to the public as its principal objective -- removing firemen and policemen from politics.

Surprising as it may seem, Amendment #18 has an excellent chance of receiving voter approval on November 6. No organized campaign to oppose the amendment has yet been organized, and perhaps will not be. Most community leaders are already committed to spending their time and attention on other issues or candidates. They are, for the most part, unaware of the exceedingly unsound and dangerous provisions contained in Amendment #18. Other individuals and organizations who do understand the implications of this amendment are reluctant to speak out against it because it means being against members of the Fire and Police Departments. Under all these circumstances, it is unlikely that most voters will have a clear understanding of what Amendment #18 really does when they vote on November 6.

Arrayed in favor of the amendment is a well-organized campaign organization which has been functioning smoothly for more than six months. Although listing itself as the "Remove Fire and Police from Politics Committee," this campaign organization is in reality the leadership of the fire and police unions. The campaign is readily aided both financially and physically by most patrolmen and firefighters who fully realize that a successful effort means a substantial increase in pay. The case being made for the amendment is a simple and an appealing one: "Keep the men in blue out of politics! Vote Yes on Fire and Police Amendment #18." Visible signs of the "Vote Yes" campaign appear everywhere, even at this early date, and the main barrage is yet to come.

We are deeply disappointed, not that the members of the Fire and Police Departments are promoting an amendment which would increase their salaries -- this is understandable -- but by the methods the fire and police union leadership has adopted in presenting the amendment to the voters. To so misrepresent the true objective and the effect of Amendment #18 brings discredit to the high esteem in which we should and do hold the members of our Fire and Police Departments. The amendment should be presented to the voters for what it really is, an effort to obtain substantial pay increases for patrolmen and firefighters and to assure the availability of the financial resources necessary to pay for these increases. Out of this type of campaign we feel certain will come lasting harm through loss of public confidence and respect, irrespective of whether the amendment wins or loses. This will, indeed, be unfortunate for all concerned.

This report uses strong language, stronger than usual for a Citizens League report. But the circumstances appear to justify these comments, indeed compel them. We are no more anxious to seem to be opposed to adequate fire and police salaries and service, nor to incur the disfavor of so important a segment of city employees, than are other community organizations. But to take less than a forthright position against so unsound a proposition would be incompatible with the purpose for which the Citizens League was founded. We urge, in the strongest terms possible, that all other community organizations express their views prior to the election. If and perhaps only if this is done will the amendment be defeated.

TABLE 1A

1961 MINIMUM & MAXIMUM SALARIES OF PATROLMEN
(Cities over 300,000 population)

<u>City</u>	<u>1960 Pop. (000's)</u>	<u>Minimum Salary</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Maximum Salary</u>	<u>Rank</u>
San Francisco	743	\$7,092	1	\$7,692	1
Oakland	368	6,972	2	7,440	3
Los Angeles	2,479	6,540	3	7,692	1
Long Beach	344	6,132	4	7,320	4
San Diego	573	5,940	5	7,044	5
Seattle	557	5,778	6	6,420	9
<u>Minneapolis</u>	483	5,712	7	6,432	8
St. Paul	313	5,442	8	6,408	10
New York	7,782	5,400	9	6,895	6
St. Louis	750	5,340	10	6,060	17
Milwaukee	741	5,340	10	6,324	13
Detroit	1,670	5,294	12	6,141	16
Chicago	3,550	5,280*	13	6,360*	11
Cincinnati	503	5,278	14	6,151	15
Toledo	318	5,188	15	5,765	21
Phoenix	439	5,180	16	5,760	22
Washington, D. C.	264	5,160	17	6,450	7
Newark	405	5,100	18	6,000	18
Pittsburgh	604	5,097	19	5,900	20
Cleveland	876	5,064	20	6,360	11
Philadelphia	2,003	5,056	21	5,540	26
Denver	494	5,016	22	5,616	23
Portland	373	4,992	23	6,240	14
Columbus	471	4,944	24	5,977	19
Boston	697	4,880	25	5,500	27
Buffalo	533	4,700	26	5,300	30
Baltimore	939	4,620	27	5,500	27
Houston	938	4,620	27	5,160	32
Rochester, N.Y.	319	4,602*	29	5,598	24
Indianapolis	476	4,600	30	4,600	39
Omaha	302	4,530	31	5,580	25
Kansas City, Mo.	476	4,400*	32	5,220	31
Dallas	680	4,380	33	5,460	29
Fort Worth	356	4,275	34	4,920	35
San Antonio	588	4,230	30	4,560	40
Birmingham	341	4,224*	36	5,088*	33
Oklahoma City	324	3,960	37	4,284	42
Atlanta	487	3,913	38	4,936	34
Louisville	391	3,912*	39	4,416*	41
Norfolk	305	3,900*	40	4,680	38
New Orleans	628	3,780	41	4,848	36
Memphis	498	3,700	42	4,700	37

* 1960 figures

Source: The Municipal Year Book, 1962

TABLE 1B

1961 MINIMUM & MAXIMUM SALARIES OF FIREFIGHTERS
(Cities over 300,000 population)

<u>City</u>	<u>1960 Pop. (000's)</u>	<u>Minimum Salary</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Maximum Salary</u>	<u>Rank</u>
San Francisco	743	\$7,092	1	\$7,692	1
Oakland	368	6,972	2	7,440	3
Los Angeles	2,479	6,540	3	7,692	1
Long Beach	344	6,132	4	7,320	4
San Diego	573	5,940	5	7,044	5
Seattle	557	5,778	6	6,420	10
<u>Minneapolis</u>	483	5,712	7	6,432	9
St. Paul	313	5,442	8	6,408	11
Chicago	3,550	5,412	9	6,516	7
Milwaukee	741	5,340	10	6,324	13
Detroit	1,670	5,294	11	6,141	17
Denver	494	5,280	12	6,180	15
Cincinnati	503	5,278	13	6,151	16
New York	7,782	5,200	14	6,581	6
Toledo	318	5,188	15	5,765	22
Washington, D. C.	764	5,160	16	6,450	8
Newark	405	5,100	17	6,000	19
Pittsburgh	604	5,097	18	5,900	21
Cleveland	876	5,064	19	6,360	12
Philadelphia	2,003	5,056	20	5,540	26
St. Louis	750	5,053	21	6,141	17
Portland	373	4,992	22	6,240	14
Columbus	471	4,944	23	5,977	20
Boston	697	4,880	24	5,500	27
Buffalo	533	4,770	25	5,300	30
Phoenix	439	4,680	26	5,760	23
Baltimore	939	4,620	27	5,500	27
Houston	938	4,620	27	5,136	31
Rochester	319	4,602*	29	5,598*	24
Indianapolis	476	4,600	30	4,600	38
Omaha	302	4,530	31	5,580	25
Dallas	680	4,380	32	5,460	29
Fort Worth	356	4,275	33	4,900	33
Birmingham	341	4,164*	34	4,884*	34
San Antonio	588	4,080	35	4,320	41
Kansas City, Mo.	476	4,080*	35	4,980*	32
Oklahoma City	324	3,960	37	4,284	42
New Orleans	628	3,960	37	4,560	39
Atlanta	487	3,913	39	4,836	35
Louisville	391	3,912*	40	4,416*	40
Norfolk	305	3,900*	41	4,680*	37
Memphis	498	3,700	42	4,700	36

* 1960 figures

Source: The Municipal Year Book, 1962

TABLE 2

1962 MINIMUM & MAXIMUM SALARIES OF PATROLMEN

(Minnesota Cities over 10,000 Population)

<u>City</u>	<u>Minimum Salary</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Maximum Salary</u>	<u>Rank</u>
South St. Paul	\$6,168	1	\$6,408	5
<u>Minneapolis</u>	5,892	2	6,612	2
Richfield	5,700	3	6,300	9
Edina	5,604	4	6,492	4
Anoka	5,530*	5	5,760*	19
Roseville	5,520	6	5,928	17
St. Paul	5,364	7	6,408	5
Bloomington	5,352	8	6,048	15
St. Louis Park	5,347	9	6,565	3
Brooklyn Center	5,340	10	6,264	11
Coon Rapids	5,100	11	5,340	23
Golden Valley	5,070	12	6,312	8
Hopkins	5,040	13	6,240	16
Austin	4,989	14	5,661	21
Minnetonka	4,980	15	6,000	16
Rochester	4,968	16	5,676	20
Columbia Heights	4,950	17	6,266	10
West St. Paul	4,944	18	6,390	7
Brooklyn Park	4,920	19	6,264	11
Robbinsdale	4,908	20	6,636	1
Fridley	4,836	21	5,880	18
White Bear Lake	4,756	22	5,400	22
Faribault	4,680	23	4,920	29
Virginia	4,653	24	5,253	25
Brainerd	4,595*	25	4,949*	28
Albert Lea	4,512	26	4,872	30
Duluth	4,380	27	5,316	24
Moorhead	4,290	28	4,698	35
Winona	4,260	29	4,650	36
Hibbing	4,200	30	4,440	37
Owatonna	4,200	31	4,800	31
Mankato	4,170	32	4,800	31
Red Wing	4,110	33	4,800	31
Crystal	4,000	34	6,240	13
St. Cloud	3,960	35	4,980	27
Willmar	3,948	36	4,723	34
New Ulm	3,880	37	4,240	38
Fergus Falls	3,840	38	5,100	26
Hennepin County Sheriff's Deputies	5,112		6,228	
State of Minnesota Highway Patrol	4,620		5,844	

* indicates 1961 figure

Source: 1962 Salary Survey - League of Minnesota Municipalities

TABLE 3

NATION-WIDE INJURY RATES, BY SELECTED INDUSTRIES, 1956

<u>Industry</u>	No. of Report- ing Units	Injury-Frequency Rates ^a		Injury Severity Rates ^b	Average Days of Disability Charged Per Case	Percent of Disabling Injuries Resulting in -		
		1956	1955			Death	Permanent Impairment	Temporary Total Disability
<u>Fire Protection</u>	210	27.1	28.3	3,286	121	.8	1.7	97.5
<u>Police</u>	199	27.2	27.8	2,132	78	.6	1.3	98.1
<u>Gov't State and Local</u>								
1. Electric & gas utility	177	16.8	16.4	2,212	132	1.6	1.7	96.7
2. Water supply utility	454	22.7	24.1	1,273	57	.4	1.7	97.9
3. Sanitation departments	196	39.7	43.9	1,238	31	.2	.8	99.0
4. Sewer departments	197	32.9	35.6	---	--	--	--	---
5. Hospitals	313	11.9	---	584	49	.3	1.5	98.2
<u>Contract Construction</u>	5,734	31.2	34.5	2,330	85	.8	2.5	96.7
1. Gen'l bldg.construction	1,836	34.5	39.8	1,825	53	.3	2.5	97.2
2. Highway construction	603	34.2	37.5	3,856	113	1.3	2.9	95.8
3. Other heavy construction	367	30.9	30.1	3,843	121	1.4	2.5	96.1
<u>Trucking and Warehousing</u>	1,648	30.2	28.7	2,064	63	.6	1.7	97.7
<u>Manufacturing</u>	50,088	12.0	12.1	712	59	.3	6.3	93.4

a. The injury frequency rate is the average number of disabling work injuries for each million employee-hours worked. The term "injury" includes occupational disease.

b. The severity rate is the average numbers of days of disability resulting from work injuries for each million employee hours worked. The computation of days of disability includes standard time-charges for deaths and permanent impairments.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Injury Rates by Industry 1956, December 5, 1957.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF HOURLY EARNINGS OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN
WITH THOSE OF TWIN CITIES MANUFACTURING-PRODUCTION WORKERS

<u>Year</u>	<u>Average Hourly Earnings - Mpls. Policemen & Firemen in Top Step - 4th Year</u>	<u>Average Hourly Earnings, Mpls.-- St. Paul Mfg. Production Workers</u>	<u>Uniformed Forces</u>	<u>Production Workers</u>
1953	\$2.00	\$1.82	100	100
1954	2.26	1.89	113	104
1955	2.38	1.97	119	108
1956	2.50	2.05	125	113
1957	2.63	2.15	132	118
1958	2.75	2.25	138	124
1959	2.88	2.35	144	129
1960	3.00	2.45	150	135
1961	3.08	2.56	154	141
1962	3.17	2.62*	159	144

* June 1962

Source: Monthly Labor Reviews, 1953-1962

TABLE 5A

COMPARISON OF RATIO OF PAY OF HIGHER RANKS TO PAY OF
POLICEMAN IN PHILADELPHIA AND 17 OTHER CITIES
BASED ON MAXIMUM PAY RATES EXCLUDING LONGEVITY
JANUARY 16, 1959

City	<u>Policeman</u>		<u>Sergeant</u>		<u>Lieutenant</u>		<u>Captain</u>	
	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Index</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Index</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Index</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Index</u>
Philadelphia	\$4,930	100	\$5,652	115	\$6,192	126	\$7,100	144
Chicago	5,640	100	6,888	122	7,608	135	8,400	149
Detroit	5,669	100	6,507	115	7,307	129	8,838	156
Los Angeles	6,540	100	7,692	118	8,580	131	10,668	163
New York	5,881	100	6,756	115	7,541	128	9,297	158
Baltimore	5,000	100	5,600	112	6,100	122	7,500	150
Boston	5,500	100	6,280	114	6,960	127	8,000	145
Buffalo	4,800	100	5,450	114	6,000	125	7,300	152
Cincinnati	5,502	100	6,434	117	7,232	131	8,297	151
Cleveland	5,700	100	6,690	117	7,368	129	8,694	153
Houston	4,980	100	5,700	114	6,360	128	6,900	139
Milwaukee	5,726	100	6,450	113	7,032	123	8,447	148
Minneapolis	5,748	100	6,036	105	6,216	108	6,732	117
New Orleans	4,608	100	4,848	103	8,328	113	6,048	129
Pittsburgh	5,450	100	5,975	110	6,345	116	6,450	118
St. Louis	5,200	100	5,800	112	6,300	121	7,000	135
San Francisco	6,192	100	7,032	114	7,752	125	9,672	156
Washington, D. C.	6,000	100	7,240	121	8,050	134	9,050	151
Average (excluding Philadelphia)	\$5,537	100	\$6,316	114	\$6,947	125	\$8,075	146

TABLE 5B

COMPARISON OF RATIO OF PAY OF HIGHER RANKS TO PAY OF FIREMAN IN PHILADELPHIA AND 17 OTHER CITIES
 BASED ON MAXIMUM PAY RATES EXCLUDING LONGEVITY
 JANUARY 16, 1959

<u>City</u>	<u>Fireman</u>		<u>Fire Lieutenant</u>		<u>Fire Captain</u>		<u>Fire Battalion Chief</u>	
	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Index</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Index</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Index</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Index</u>
Philadelphia	\$4,930	100	\$5,652	115	\$6,192	126	\$7,100	144
Chicago	5,640	100	6,888	122	7,608	135	8,400	149
Detroit	5,669	100	6,507	115	7,307	129	8,838	156
Los Angeles	6,540	100	7,692	118	8,580	131	10,668	163
New York	5,881	100	7,426	126	8,715	148	9,345	163
Baltimore	5,000	100	5,600	112	6,100	122	7,000	140
Boston	5,500	100	6,280	114	6,960	127	8,000	145
Buffalo	4,800	100	5,450	114	5,800	121	6,300	131
Cincinnati	5,502	100	6,434	117	6,700	122	8,297	151
Cleveland	5,790	100	6,690	117	7,986	140	8,694	153
Houston	4,980	100	5,700	114	6,360	128	6,900	139
Milwaukee	5,726	100	6,450	113	7,032	123	8,447	148
<u>Minneapolis</u>	5,748	100	-	-	6,324	<u>110</u>	7,080	<u>123</u>
New Orleans	4,608	100	5,148	112	5,508	120	6,408	139
Pittsburgh	5,450	100	-	-	6,345	116	7,290	134
St. Louis	5,305	100	-	-	6,448	121	7,836	148
San Francisco	6,192	100	7,200	116	7,752	125	9,852	159
Washington, D. C.	6,000	100	7,240	121	8,050	134	9,050	151
Average (excluding Philadelphia)	\$5,544	100	\$6,479	117	\$7,033	127	\$8,141	147