

# CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 191

## **City of Minneapolis Proposed Wage & Benefits Increases for Police & Fire**

**April 1966**

Citizens League  
545 Mobil Oil Building  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

April 27, 1966

REPORT FROM: Citizens League Board of Directors

SUBJECT: Proposed Wage and Fringe Benefits Increases for Minneapolis Firemen and Policemen

We urge the Minneapolis City Council to defer action on proposed 5-2/3% - 7-2/3% wage increases for city firemen and policemen. The increases are unprecedented, amounting to more than double the raises granted these employees in recent years. They grossly violate the President's 3.2% guideline. Although there may be valid reasons for the increases, they have not to date been explained or justified by the Council. If granted, they would materially affect the costs in each and every department of city government at a time when the Council has said the City faces a most serious financial crisis even before any wage increases are considered.

We believe that until the Council can thoroughly justify the proposed action to the public, it runs a severe risk of losing public confidence when confidence is most needed. Minneapolis residents must be in a position to understand the need for the new or higher taxes the Council and other public bodies may be calling on the voters to approve during the coming months.

The City Council has given no reasons for the proposed increases beyond the assertion that Minneapolis firemen's and policemen's pay "must catch up" with that of other cities. The latest figures available to us show that, with the exception of New York City, the beginning salary for firefighters and patrolmen in Minneapolis is highest for all cities over 250,000 population east of the Rocky Mountains. Further, with the exception of New York City, Denver, and Washington, D.C., the maximum salary for firefighters and patrolmen in Minneapolis is highest for all cities over 250,000 population east of the Rocky Mountains. When the West Coast cities and Hawaii are taken into consideration, Minneapolis ranks eighth of 49 cities over 250,000 population for beginning pay and eleventh for maximum pay.

Similarly, Minneapolis ranks at or near the top in fire and police pay among all Minnesota communities. Minneapolis fire and police pensions are generally regarded among the top, both in Minnesota and nationally.

Because wage settlements with the police and firemen traditionally set the pattern for overall pay increases throughout city government and even for some jobs in the schools and in other non-city agencies, the impact of increases of the magnitude proposed would be enormous. For example, the City Coordinator's office computes the 1966 cost of a 5% increase for all employees paid out of the Current Expense Fund alone at \$650,000, if raises are given retroactive to April 1. The cost to Current Expense of carrying forward such an increase through 1967 would be \$800,000, for a total 1-3/4 year cost to that fund of \$1,450,000, not taking into account any further wage increases which might be granted in 1967.

Aside from questions of cost and effect on the overall financial situation of the City, we are concerned that the proposed increases might result in a reduction in the current number of police and firemen and current levels of fire and police protection. In addition, we are aware of no policy guidelines governing questions of pay and working conditions of city firemen and policemen. What should be the criteria governing decisions on fire and police pay?

Are existing salaries paid Minneapolis firemen and policemen adequate? How should the proper relationship for pay scales for public safety employees with those of other city employees be determined? Is the existing pay scale of supervisory personnel in the Minneapolis Fire and Police Departments adequate? How should pay of supervisory personnel relate to that of patrolmen and firemen? What is the value of the fire and police fringe benefits in terms of cost to the taxpayer? How should the cost of these fringe benefits be related to arriving at an equitable salary for firemen and policemen? Are the Minneapolis Fire and Police Departments attracting and retaining a sufficient number of high caliber personnel to assure continuance of an adequate level of fire and police protection for the community? Do existing physical requirements for employment preclude many otherwise qualified applicants from becoming Minneapolis policemen or firefighters?

These and related questions have never been objectively analyzed and answered. The public, the employees involved, and the Council itself need the answers to these questions so that a sound and fair policy governing pay and employment of public service personnel in Minneapolis may be evolved.

On November 6, 1962, 73% of Minneapolis voters who addressed the question voted "no" to a proposal to increase and fix minimum fire and police pay rates in the city charter. The proposal espoused by the fire and police unions was overwhelmingly defeated in every ward in the city.

Following that election, the Citizens League proposed to the City Council that it provide for an impartial and professional study and review of all issues and policy questions related to adequacy of fire and police pay and fringe benefits at all levels of job responsibility, and related questions on recruiting, requirements for hiring and promotion of public service employees, hours, working conditions and efficiency. But no such study has been undertaken. We believe that a study is urgently needed now and we renew our recommendation to the Council that it immediately provide for such a policy review study to cover the important questions raised in our 1962 report, a copy of which is attached to this report.

#### BACKGROUND

As a result of a court-ordered tax equalization, Minneapolis city government faces the loss by 1967 of an estimated \$2-3.5 million dollars in property tax revenue, although the exact amount of the loss cannot be determined until June or July of this year. Even before consideration of city wage increases, the City Council has alleged that it would be impossible to maintain an adequate level of city services through 1967 without recourse to new sources of revenue, which Council members hoped the public would approve at a spring election and now indicate the voters may be asked to approve at a referendum this fall. The Citizens League, while disagreeing with the Council's contention that present revenue sources are inadequate to maintain current levels of city services through next year, agrees that a serious financial situation will face Minneapolis city government commencing in 1968, unless the 1967 session of the State Legislature takes action to provide for new non-property tax sources for the benefit of public education and/or municipal government, not only in Minneapolis but throughout the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

The Citizens League has claimed that city government can operate at present levels of service through 1967 and provide for 3% wage increases for all city

employees both in 1966 and 1967. Three per cent represents slightly more than the average yearly salary increase given by the Council during the last five years. The 5-2/3% - 7-2/3% increase proposed for firemen and policemen this year represents more than double the average recent yearly increases granted these and other city employees.

The major share of the expense of city government goes to provide salary and fringe benefits for city employees. For example, approximately 85% of the city's Current Expense Fund is used to pay city employees, including the approximately 800 policemen and 570 firemen now on the city's payroll. Traditionally, wage increases for all city employees have tended to follow the pattern of those granted to the city's policemen and firemen, who make up the two largest groups of city employees.

In recent years the percentage wage increase for firemen and policemen has been as follows:

1965	-	2.1%
1964	-	3.0
1963	-	3.1
1962	-	2.8
1961	-	2.7

Average for  
5 years - 2.74%

Wage increases for city employees are normally negotiated in the spring and are then made retroactive to the first of the year. However, negotiations last year were so prolonged and the Council was so concerned with the state of the city's finances, that the increase was not determined until late summer and was made retroactive only to July 1, 1965.

Negotiations with the firemen and policemen are generally carried on by the Council's Ways and Means Committee. This year the committee is reported to have originally offered a flat 3% wage increase retroactive to January 1. When this proposal proved unacceptable to the fire and police negotiators, a State Labor Conciliator was called in. The committee is then reported to have offered a straight 4% increase with no fringe benefits, which was also unacceptable to the fire and police unions.

The new proposal, which is reported to be acceptable to three of the five members of the City Council's Ways and Means Committee, and which the firemen and policemen have overwhelmingly voted to accept, involves a wage increase of 7% for all firemen and policemen with 15 years or more of service and a 5% increase for the rest of them. Approximately 40% of the firemen and policemen would be receiving the 7% increase. The wage increases would be made retroactive to April 1. In addition, firemen and policemen would be given an added \$50 annual payment toward their clothing allowance, which is equal to an additional 2/3% wage increase. They currently receive a \$50 allowance which would be upped to \$100 under the proposal.

Total 1966 dollar increases, including the increased clothing allowance, would range from \$372 for rookies to \$551 for firefighters and patrolmen at maximums. The annual salary range would be from \$6,766 to \$7,665, excluding the proposed \$100 clothing allowance.

The proposed increase would have the effect of automatically increasing the pension benefits of not only active firemen and policemen, but also of all retired Minneapolis firemen and policemen. These employees may retire on pension at age 50 and after 20 years of service; however, they do not receive full pension benefits unless they serve 28 years. We have not computed these proposed increased pension costs; however, it should be noted in this connection that the City Coordinator's office in 1962 computed the value of fire and police fringe benefits, including pensions, at 30% of wage, a figure which the police and firemen's unions dispute. If this figure is correct, the total yearly cost to the Minneapolis taxpayer per firefighter or patrolman would range from \$8,795 for the beginning firefighter or patrolman to \$9,964 for the 15-year veteran.

#### ATTACHED TABLES DISCUSSED

The Citizens League in 1962 compiled extensive data, both local and national, on the relative salaries of Minneapolis firemen and policemen, as compared with those of other communities, in addition to other data related to policy questions on fire and police pay, including the relative differentials which exist between the amount paid patrolmen and firefighters and the amount paid persons in a supervisory capacity in Minneapolis public safety employment. In the short amount of time available to us, we have been unable to update all of our 1962 figures, but Tables I, II and III attached to this report bring the most significant figures up to date.

Table I shows that Minneapolis firefighters and patrolmen have maintained their excellent position as among the highest paid in the nation in all cities of 250,000 or more population. In the four years which have ensued, only New York City and Denver have surpassed Minneapolis among cities east of the Rocky Mountains. In five California cities, plus Seattle, Washington, police and firemen continue to be better paid than those in Minneapolis, as was true in 1962. However, on the west coast and in Denver many reforms have been instituted in connection with the utilization of public safety employees. A number of west coast cities now require that applicants for these positions be college graduates; however, in Minneapolis and many other large cities a high school diploma only is required.

The significance of Table I is that, with the exception of New York City, Washington, D.C., and Denver (at maximums only), Minneapolis is paying higher salaries to its firefighters and patrolmen than any other city of comparable or larger size east of the Rocky Mountains.

Our 1962 figures showed Minneapolis to rank at or near the top in both minimum and maximum salaries for firefighters and patrolmen in Minnesota communities. At that time, minimum patrolmen's salaries, for example, in Minneapolis were exceeded only by those in South Saint Paul, and maximum patrolmen's salaries exceeded only by those in Robbinsdale.

Table II, showing comparable 1965 figures, reveals that Minneapolis has surpassed both South Saint Paul and Robbinsdale, but that Richfield is \$2 ahead of Minneapolis in minimum fire and police pay, that Edina where firefighters do extra work is \$5 ahead of Minneapolis at fire maximums, and that three communities are slightly ahead of Minneapolis on maximum schedules for patrolmen.

We have learned that the pattern of wage increases in suburban Hennepin

in 1966 is in the range of 3%, with the Edina minimum increase this year, for example, at 2.2% (\$144), and with other suburban increases ranging up to that granted at maximum by Saint Louis Park, 3.7% (\$264).

Table III shows an acceleration in an undesirable trend noted in our 1962 statistics. Minneapolis now ranks the lowest of all 38 cities in the country with populations of 300,000-1,000,000 in the differential between the pay of police patrolmen and police captains. The figures show that in Minneapolis the police captain, holding a highly responsible supervisory job, is paid only 20.1% more than the patrolman, whereas in the other cities the differential is markedly greater, and up to 84% as in the case of San Francisco.

The information in Table III relates to one of the important questions we raised in our 1962 report calling for an impartial, professional study of all issues bearing on pay, use and deployment of Minneapolis fire and policemen.

With regard to some of the other questions we considered in 1962, the Minneapolis Civil Service Commission has informed us that there is no evidence of inability to attract qualified applicants for positions in both the Fire and Police Departments. In the case of the Fire Department, we are informed there is a waiting list of approximately 150. We are also told that there were nearly 300 applicants for the last examination for patrolman, of whom about 50 were found to be eligible. This is despite the requirement that applicants for patrolmen be at least 5' 10" in height, the requirement that, if hired, they agree to live within the city limits, and the provisions of veterans preference, which are generally considered to be deterrent to applications for city employment, particularly in the Police Department by non-veterans.

Our records on fire and police wage and fringe benefit increases go back to 1955. If the proposed 1966 package is granted, it would represent a greater increase than any previous increase our records show. It would also represent a greater increase than that provided for under the 1962 proposed Amendment No. 18, which was overwhelmingly defeated and which would have provided for minimum pay for Minneapolis firemen and policemen to be increased and fixed by formula in the city charter. Under that proposal, these employees would have been limited to a 5% raise for each of the first three years of the amendment's effect. The proposal was defeated by a city-wide vote of 39,679 for and 108,598 against, and failed by a wide margin to carry in any city ward.

#### 1962 CITIZENS LEAGUE RECOMMENDATIONS RENEWED

On November 7, 1962, the Citizens League issued a report, a copy of which is attached, urging the City Council to take prompt steps to initiate an impartial and professional review of all policies related to the adequacy of fire and police pay and fringe benefits, differentials, recruiting, requirements for employment and promotion, hours, working conditions and efficiencies. In the report, we outlined in detail the questions which we felt were in need of urgent study.

No such study has been undertaken since 1962. We believe that all of the questions raised in our 1962 report are in urgent need of study now. The need is for a firm basis of facts and expert opinion upon which the Council can evolve a sound and fair policy governing the pay, employment, deployment and working conditions of the men who serve two of the most vital functions in city government. The

Council owes it to the public to move swiftly towards the development of such a policy. It owes it to the fire and policemen themselves and to their unions. Policy in this important area should be based on well considered goals and programs for continuing and upgrading the high quality of fire and police protection enjoyed in Minneapolis, not on "power politics" or on a game of hiding or finding available revenues to meet or thwart the wage demands of employee groups.

We renew our call to the Council to immediately initiate an impartial and professional review of the questions we have raised in this and our 1962 report.

#### COUNCIL SHOULD DEFER ACTION ON PROPOSED WAGE INCREASES

We urge the Council to defer action on the proposed wage increases for police and firemen. We believe that the Council should thoroughly explain the background, justification and basis for the proposed increases, particularly inasmuch as these proposed increases are of such magnitude as to represent a change in the Council policy on wage increases which has existed during the last several years. The importance of the Council's explaining and justifying its proposed action in this instance is heightened by the obvious relationship of the proposed change to the serious financial situation of the City of Minneapolis.

The Council should outline in detail the full impact of the proposed wage increase on the city budget. The Council should answer such questions as whether the proposed wage increase for fire and policemen will set the pattern for other wage increases for city employees this year; whether the public should expect wage increases of this proposed magnitude for fire and policemen or for all city employees in 1967; the effect on pensions and the mill rate to maintain pensions for firemen and policemen and for retired firemen and policemen.

We believe that until the Council can thoroughly justify the proposed action to the public, it runs a severe risk of losing public confidence when confidence is most needed. Equalization will quite clearly result in increased taxes next year. The School Board, and perhaps the Library Board and the Council itself will be asking for millage increases. The public may be asked to approve new taxes as early as this fall. Minneapolis residents must be in a position to understand the need for the new or higher taxes. They must be convinced that currently available funds are being wisely utilized by city government and that the policies governing city expenditures are sound and well documented.

We would hope that, in connection with explaining proposed wage increase needs to the public, the Council would be in a position to react to our renewed request for an impartial professional study of all questions related to fire and police wage, employment and utilization policies.

There appears to be no need for hasty action on the Council's part with relation to the proposed wage increases. The Council has already committed itself to making whatever increases it grants retroactive to at least April 1, 1966. The firemen and policemen and other employees would therefore not be adversely affected by any reasonable delay in order to give the Council time to justify and explain its proposed actions to the public.

148

Citizens League of Minneapolis  
and Hennepin County  
545 Mobil Oil Building  
Minneapolis 2, Minnesota

Approved: Board of Directors  
November 7, 1962

REPORT FROM: Citizens League Board of Directors

SUBJECT: Proposed independent review of Minneapolis fire and police pay and work policies.

#### BACKGROUND AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

The rejection by the voters of Minneapolis yesterday of proposed Charter Amendment #18 does not necessarily reflect voter satisfaction with the present pay or working conditions of Minneapolis firemen and policemen. The rejection of the proposed amendment merely indicates that the voters of Minneapolis do not wish these pay policies to be incorporated in the city charter, at least not at the minimum levels provided for under the formula contained in Amendment #18. The basic question of whether present pay levels are fair and adequate remains unanswered.

During the course of the discussion of the merits of Amendment #18, several important policy questions were raised, questions the answers to which either continue in dispute or have not been provided satisfactorily. It is important that answers to these questions be found, both from the standpoint of the general public and Minneapolis firemen and policemen themselves. These questions include the following:

1. What is an adequate pay for Minneapolis firemen and policemen? How should the pay of firemen and policemen be related to that of other city employees and to that paid firemen and policemen in other cities?

The 1953 Minneapolis City Council-appointed Citizens Salary Survey Commission made both a majority and a minority recommendation. The majority 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. The minority report 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 worker, 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 in these crafts, rather than workers in private industry. During the past few years the pay of firemen and policemen, in accordance with this policy, has remained relatively close to 85% of the pay of the city employees in these eight crafts.

The fire and police union leadership, on the other hand, feels this amount is inadequate and is not self-enforcing, and that a fair pay for firemen and policemen is the average pay (not a maximum of 85%) of the city employees in these eight crafts.



2. What is the proper relationship between the pay of Minneapolis firefighters and patrolmen and that of supervisory personnel in the Fire and Police Departments?

Comparative data from other major cities throughout the country show that supervisory personnel in the Minneapolis Police and Fire Departments are given less recognition in terms of salary differential above that paid patrolmen and firefighters than in most other large cities.

3. What is the value of Minneapolis fire and police fringe benefits?

Considerable disagreement exists with respect to the value, in terms of cost to the taxpayer, of the fire and police fringe benefits. The Minneapolis City Council Coordinator's office estimates the cost of fire and police fringe benefits at in excess of 30% of total salary. The fire and police union leadership categorically rejects this estimate as exorbitant, and has contended their fringe benefits amount to only 8.3% of total pay.

4. Is the present caliber of fire and police personnel adequate?

Although there appears to be general agreement that the performance level at existing pay of both Minneapolis Fire and Police Departments ranks among the best among major cities, fire and police union leaders contend that it is important to raise further the caliber of firemen and policemen.

5. Do present Minneapolis fire and police physical and resident requirements need revision?

Considerable support exists for eliminating a number of requirements for qualification as a Minneapolis policeman or fireman. Some, including the Minneapolis Police Chief Pat Walling and the Citizens League, have urged abolition of the requirement that applicants be residents of the City of Minneapolis. Some have suggested a review of the physical requirements, such as minimum height requirements. Others have urged modification of veterans' preference. These are but a few examples of requirements which should be reviewed.

6. Do present fire and police working conditions and procedures need revision?

Recent weeks have seen considerable discussion of the working conditions of Minneapolis firemen and policemen. Some have suggested that the present 60-hour work week for firemen should be changed. There have been suggestions that policemen should not have to purchase firearms, bullets, etc. The City Council itself has considered using non-uniformed personnel for certain functions, such as issuing tags for parking meter violations. These are just a few of the issues which have been discussed to give an idea of the type of work conditions and procedures which might be reviewed.

### CONCLUSION

A number of important policy questions have been raised but not answered during the course of the campaign on Charter Amendment #18. The policemen and firemen naturally are most unhappy over the outcome. The community has turned the proposal down but as of now has provided no procedure under which their complaints and dissatisfactions can be heard and reviewed.

It would be both unfortunate and unnecessary to leave these questions in their present state of doubt. The community has an obligation to insist that the complaints and recommendations made by the fire and police union leadership are heard and given careful consideration at the earliest practical time. It is equally important that other questions raised by the opposition to Amendment #18 be given the same kind of consideration.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We urge the Minneapolis City Council to take prompt steps leading to an impartial and professional review of the issues which have been raised. We believe that such a review can result in findings and recommendations which would receive broad public acceptance as well as the support of members of the Minneapolis Fire and Police Departments. There are a number of ways in which this type of independent and professional review can be made, and we leave to the judgment of the City Council the choice of the most appropriate procedure. However, we respectfully suggest consideration of the appointment by the Council of a broadly representative citizens committee working with professional management consultants as one satisfactory method of accomplishing the desired objective.

2. We urge that the independent and professional review include consideration of, among others, the following policy questions:

- a. Are existing salaries paid Minneapolis firemen and policemen adequate? How should the proper relationship for pay scales for public safety employees with those of other city employees be determined?
- b. Is the existing pay scale of supervisory personnel in the Minneapolis Fire and Police Departments adequate? How should pay of supervisory personnel relate to that of patrolmen and firemen?
- c. What is the value of the fire and police fringe benefits in terms of cost to the taxpayer? How should the cost of these fringe benefits be related to arriving at an equitable salary for firemen and policemen?
- d. Are the Minneapolis Fire and Police Departments attracting and retaining a sufficient number of high caliber personnel to assure continuance of an adequate level of fire and police protection for our community?
- e. Do existing physical requirements preclude many otherwise qualified applicants from becoming Minneapolis policemen or firefighters?
- f. Should the requirement of Minneapolis residency for applicants to the Police and Fire Departments be abolished?

- g. Should veterans' preference laws be modified, and if so in what way?
- h. Should present working conditions, namely a 60-hour work week for firemen and a 40-hour week for policemen, be changed?
- i. Should Minneapolis policemen continue to be required to provide and pay for certain equipment themselves?
- j. Can the efficiency of the Police and Fire Departments be improved through administrative or procedural changes in the method of performing their assignments?

TABLE I

ANNUAL SALARIES OF FIREMEN AND PATROLMAN,  
for 49 cities of 250,000 population and over

Source: Municipal Yearbook, 1965, the latest edition available, published by the International City Managers Association. Data was collected late in 1964 and early in 1965 from city officials. (Two other cities, Memphis and Tulsa, are over 250,000 population, but information was not provided on these two cities.)

City	Minimum Salary Fireman	Rank	Maximum Salary Fireman	Rank	Minimum Salary Patrolman	Rank	Maximum Salary Patrolman	Rank
Oakland, Cal.	\$7752	1	\$8268	5	\$7752	1	\$8268	6
San Francisco	7704	2	8316	4	7716	2	8316	5
Los Angeles	7296	3	8580	1	7296	3	8580	1
Long Beach	7080	4	8508	3	7080	4	8508	3
San Diego	6876	5	8148	6	7044	5	8352	4
Seattle	6420	6	7080	9	6420	6	7080	9
New York City	6355	7	7806	7	6355	7	7806	7
MINNEAPOLIS*	6300	8	7020	11	6300	8	7020	11
Jersey City	6233	9	6678	18	6233	9	6678	18
Detroit	6115	10	7000	13	6115	10	7000	13
Washington, D.C.	6010	11	8570	2	6010	11	8570	2
Chicago	5940	12	6840	16	5688	16	6840	16
St. Paul	5936	13	6987	14	5936	12	6987	14
Milwaukee	5907	14	7015	12	5907	13	7015	12
Boston	5830	15	6300	27	5280	27	5900	34
Newark, N.J.	5778	16	6798	17	5778	14	6798	17
Denver	5700	17	7056	10	5700	15	7056	10
Honolulu	5592	18	7128	8	5592	17	7128	8
Cleveland	5574	19	6600	19	5574	18	6600	19
Portland, Ore.	5574	19	6968	15	5574	18	6968	15
Rochester, N.Y.	5512	20	6578	20	5512	19	6578	20

# Annual Salaries (con't)

City	Minimum Salary Fireman	Rank	Maximum Salary Fireman	Rank	Minimum Salary Patrolman	Rank	Maximum Salary Patrolman	Rank
Akron, Ohio	\$5491	21	\$6240	28	\$5491	20	\$6240	25
Philadelphia	5456	22	5940	34	5456	21	5940	33
Toledo, Ohio	5448	23	6053	31	5448	22	6053	29
Pittsburgh	5351	24	6195	30	5351	23	6195	27
Baltimore	5340	25	6468	22	5340	24	6468	22
St. Louis, Mo.	5305	26	6448	23	5100	31	6060	28
Dayton, Ohio	5291	27	6214	29	5291	26	6214	26
Columbus, Ohio	5278	28	6422	25	5278	28	6422	24
Indianapolis	5250	29	5450	44	5300	25	5300	43
Buffalo, N.Y.	5200	30	6500	21	5200	29	6500	21
Kansas City, Mo.	5130	31	5796	36	5196	30	5820	35
Phoenix	5040	32	6312	26	5280	27	6600	19
Houston	5005	33	5577	41	5044	32	5646	38
Dallas, Texas	4920	34	6000	32	4920	34	6000	31
Omaha, Neb.	4890	35	6000	32	4890	35	6000	31
Fort Worth	4830	36	5460	43	4830	37	5460	42
Wichita	4800	37	5820	35	4800	38	5820	35
Birmingham, Ala.	4716	38	5724	37	4956	33	6012	30
Miami	4680	39	5964	33	4680	41	5964	32
Norfolk, Va.	4680	39	5616	40	4680	41	5616	39
Atlanta	4641	40	5720	38	4641	42	5720	36
Oklahoma City	4590	41	4680	48	4770	39	4860	46
El Paso	4452	42	5508	42	4452	44	5508	40
New Orleans	4356	43	5676	39	4356	45	5676	37
Tampa	4348	44	5059	46	4846	36	5470	41

Annual Salaries (con't)

City	Minimum Salary Fireman	Rank	Maximum Salary Fireman	Rank	Minimum Salary Patrolman	Rank	Maximum Salary Patrolman	Rank
San Antonio	\$4320	45	\$5040	47	\$4560	43	\$5280	44
Louisville	4093	46	5241	45	4692	40	5242	45
Cincinnati			6428	24			6420	23

- \* The salary figures for Minneapolis are salaries which were in effect in 1964. Figures for some other cities are for 1964 and for 1965. It might be said we could justify using 1965 figures, which were \$6,444, minimum, and \$7,164, maximum, but to be absolutely certain that we would not represent unfairly the relative salary positions of Minneapolis firemen and patrolmen, we have used the 1964 figures of \$6,300 to \$7,020. (The salary figures which actually appeared in the 1965 Year Book for Minneapolis were \$6,096 to \$6,818, which were 1963 salaries. Apparently, an error was made, because the 1964 Year Book included the figures of \$6,300 to \$7,020, which were the correct Minneapolis wages for that year. We compared the 1964 and 1965 Year Book figures for the other cities and can find no comparable error.)

TABLE II

Comparison of Monthly Fire and Police Salaries Among  
26 Twin Cities Area Municipalities for 1965

Municipality	Minimum Salary Fireman	Rank	Maximum Salary Fireman	Rank	Minimum Salary Patrolman	Rank	Maximum Salary Patrolman	Rank
Richfield	\$539	1	\$589	4	\$539	1	\$589	7
Minneapolis	537	2	597	2	537	2	597	4
Edina <sup>1</sup>	525	3	602	1	525	3	605	2
West St. Paul	514	4	554	7	515	4	567	16
Brooklyn Center					511	5	592	5
New Brighton					500	6	550	18
Bloomington <sup>2</sup>					498	7	621	1
St. Louis Park	494	5	591	3	494	8	591	6
Anoka					487	9	567	16
St. Paul	487	6	582	5	487	9	582	9
Golden Valley					486	10	591	6
Hopkins					484	11	584	8
Brooklyn Park					480	12	570	14
Roseville					480	12	578	11
Crystal					478	13	580	10
Fridley					477	14	580	10
South St. Paul	476	7	576	6	476	15	576	12
Maplewood					473	16	568	15
North St. Paul					455	17	550	18
Cottage Grove					450	18	572	13
Coon Rapids	445	8	535	8	445	19	535	19
Plymouth					440	20	500	20

Monthly Salaries (con't)

Municipality	Minimum Salary		Maximum Salary		Minimum Salary		Maximum Salary	
	Fireman	Rank	Fireman	Rank	Patrolman	Rank	Patrolman	Rank
Minnetonka					\$435	21	\$555	17
White Bear Lake					430	22	600	3
Robbinsdale							578	11
Burnsville							500	20

Salary range for general deputy, Hennepin County Sheriff's office, 1965: \$522 to \$591.

Salary range for Minnesota Highway Patrolman, 1965: \$455 to \$598.

- 1 The figures for Edina include \$30 for patrolmen for obtaining a first aid certificate and engaging in special emergency work and a comparable amount for firemen for doing maintenance work, including such things as painting fire hydrants.
- 2 Although Bloomington's maximum salary for patrolmen is highest in the area, none of Bloomington's patrolmen has reached the maximum level yet.



TABLE III

COMPARISON OF PAY DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN THE MAXIMUM SALARY FOR  
PATROLMAN AND THE MAXIMUM SALARY OF THE RANK OF CAPTAIN, IN  
ALL 38 CITIES WITH POPULATION BETWEEN 300,000 and 1,000,000

Data is based on a 1965 Survey of Municipal Police Departments conducted by the  
Kansas City, Mo., Police Department.

<u>City</u>	<u>Percentage which Captain's Salary is Above Patrolman's</u>
San Francisco	84%
Washington, D. C.	69%
Baltimore	63%
Columbus	63%
Phoenix	59%
Cincinnati	57%
Birmingham, Ala.	55%
Oakland	52%
Boston	51%
Milwaukee	50%
Fort Worth	49%
San Diego	48%
Toledo	48%
Long Beach	45%
Norfolk	44%
Cleveland	43%
Houston	43%
Newark	43%
Portland	43%
Dallas	42%
Honolulu	41%
New Orleans	41%
Atlanta	39%
Rochester, N. Y.	39%
Kansas City	38%
Oklahoma City	37%
St. Paul	34%
Omaha	32%
San Antonio	32%
Seattle	31%
Buffalo	30%
Denver	30%
Louisville	28%
Memphis	27%
St. Louis	24%
Pittsburgh	22%
Indianapolis	20.5%
MINNEAPOLIS	20.1%