

RECEIVED

DEC 13 1985 JJ

STATE OF WISCONSIN  
BEFORE THE MEDIATOR/ARBITRATOR

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS COMMISSION

-----  
In the Matter of the  
Mediation/Arbitration Between

COMMUNICATION WORKERS OF  
AMERICA, LOCAL 5540

and

CITY OF BLOOMER  
-----

Case 9  
No. 34720, Med/Arb-3221  
Decision No. 22638-A

Sharon K. Imes  
Arbitrator

APPEARANCES:

Patricia A. Collins, Attorney, Communication Workers of America, appearing on behalf of Communication Workers of America, Local 5540.

Mel Bollom, Representative, City of Bloomer, appearing on behalf of the City of Bloomer.

BACKGROUND:

On May 29, 1985, the undersigned was notified by the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission of appointment as mediator/arbitrator, pursuant to Section 111.70(4)(cm)6 of the Municipal Employment Relations Act in the matter of impasse between the Communication Workers of America, Local 5540, hereinafter referred to as the Union, and the City of Bloomer, hereinafter referred to as the City or the Employer. Pursuant to statutory requirement, mediation proceedings were conducted between the parties on August 15, 1985. Mediation failed to resolve the impasse and the parties agreed to proceed to arbitration the same day. At that time the parties were given full opportunity to present relevant evidence and make oral argument. Post hearing briefs were filed with and exchanged through the arbitrator on September 24, 1985. The arbitrator was notified by the parties that they did not intend to file reply briefs on October 1, 1985.

THE FINAL OFFERS:

The remaining issues at impasse between the parties are insurance, pension plan and wages. The final offers of the parties are attached as Appendix "A" and "B".

STATUTORY CRITERIA:

Since no voluntary impasse procedure was agreed upon between the parties regarding the above impasse, the undersigned, under the Municipal Employment Relations Act, is required to choose the entire final offer of one of the parties on all unresolved issues after having given consideration to the criteria identified in Section 111.70(4)(cm)7, Wis. Stats.

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES:

In addition to differing on the unresolved issues, the parties also differ in regard to the areas which they consider comparable. The Union contends that the primary comparable is Chippewa County but also posits the City should be compared to other similarly situated municipalities within a 100 mile radius, to private construction workers and to Black River Falls since it is a city

of similar population located seventy miles from Bloomer with a similar bargaining unit represented by the same Union.

Relying primarily upon wage comparisons, the Union asserts wages is the issue which should determine the reasonableness of the offers since both parties offer the same proposal for life insurance and pension in the second year of the collective bargaining agreement and the difference in cost between their proposals in this area in the first year is insignificant. Concluding that over 85% of the difference between the two proposals lies in the difference between the wage offers, the Union concentrates on the reasonableness of its offer as it affects the salary increase.

Asserting its final offer results in a wage cost increase of 6.1% in 1985 and 5% in 1986, the Union declares that when comparisons are made to other employees performing similar work, its offer is more reasonable than the City's which results in a wage cost increase of 4.2% in 1985 and 3.7% in 1986. Arguing that no matter which set of comparables is used, similar cities with similar employees, Chippewa County, private sector employees performing similar work, or other bargaining units represented by the Union in the area, Bloomer employees are underpaid, the Union declares there is need for a wage proposal which attempts to raise wages for employees in a manner which makes them comparable to others performing similar types of duties. Comparing itself to County employees whom the Union contends have similar positions, it notes a wage rate comparison reveals City workers will be paid "substantially" less than their County counterparts in 1985 and, further, that County employees will be paid more in 1985 than City employees will be paid in 1986 under either final offer.

Also comparing itself to construction workers who perform similar work in the City, the Union asserts that even though private construction workers may receive higher wages to partially compensate for the seasonal nature of their work, the enormous difference in annual income of construction workers compared to City employees is more than a compensation for the nature of their work. Considering similar municipalities within a hundred mile radius of the City, the Union continues that its employees are among the lowest paid employees, if not the lowest paid employees, within the comparables, even though the City is among the largest of the cities surveyed. The Union adds that when Eau Claire is considered, since many Bloomer residents are employed in Eau Claire, the results are the same as those which occur when the City is compared to smaller communities within the area but are even more noticeable. Finally, comparing itself to River Falls, where the Union represents a similar bargaining unit, the Union asserts the comparison shows Bloomer employees are paid far less than their River Falls counterparts.

The Union, challenging the reasonableness of the City's offer, declares the City's offer is arbitrary. Noting the City offers different percentage increases for each position in the bargaining unit, the Union argues the City has provided no support for such a proposal. Further, the Union rejects what it considers to be the City's main argument for its position which is that the wage in-

police unit since the City provides a much larger pension contribution to the police than it does to this bargaining unit.

The Union continues that the reasonableness of its offer is supported by the concessions made by the City regarding the Union position. Noting the City's offer represents an admission that at least four of the bargaining unit positions must be adjusted to correct a severe underevaluation of their services and that at least two other positions were underpaid in 1984, the Union argues that its offer is more reasonable since it not only makes the same type of adjustments but provides a percentage increase for all employees.

Rejecting the City's contention that Bloomer employees are paid comparably, the Union challenges the data submitted by the City and posits the City failed to introduce evidence which indicated the positions identified as management were actually managers and suggests the "adverse-influence" rule should be applied since the City failed to provide evidence within its possession regarding its assertions. Also rejecting the City's comparison with Mid-America Dairymen, Inc., the Union argues a 1.59% increase in wages which results in a fifteen cent per hour increase means the employees were paid basic wage rates from \$9.54 to \$9.58 per hour, a far higher rate than that paid the employees within the City, thus, a percentage comparison is not appropriate.

As to ability to pay, the Union posits the City is able to implement the Union's offer without any adverse impact. It states the 1984 audit contains many "indicia of financial health". It asserts the General Fund balance at the end of 1984 is consistent with the City's "healthy" cash position; the electric and water utilities have earned a combined net income which exceed its projections and the enterprise funds have increased at a rate which "would be envied by many private corporations". In addition, it cites the City's levy of a new sewer tax as a source of income for the City. Rejecting the City's argument that it has \$1.3 million indebtedness and that its 1984 sanitation costs exceeded the budgeted amount by \$30,000, the Union states it is not the degree of indebtedness but whether or not the City can meet its scheduled payments which determines the financial ability of the City. It continues that since the City can afford to meet its scheduled payments, it can afford the Union's offer.

Acknowledging the status of the current farm economy, the Union rejects the City's effort to suggest this is reason to support its offer stating the City has failed to show the condition of the farm economy has had any impact upon the City or its residents. It also rejects the City's data regarding unemployment levels noting the data submitted is from a 1980 source and that the information is no longer relevant. Further, the Union asserts the City failed to provide any connection between unemployment within the County and the City's ability to pay. Finally, the Union states the City's evidence regarding the financial condition of the Price Rite Store is no indication of the financial condition of the area since there is no indication as to the cause for the demise of the business and there is evidence that the store re-opened as Leisureland South on the same day the previous store closed.

Continuing, the Union states that, at first glance, the Consumer Price Index appears to favor the City's offer, but argues the Union's offer is not motivated by the desire to match annual CPI increases. It maintains its goal is to provide wage comparability for the employees represented by the Union and that comparability cannot be achieved by relying basically upon the CPI. In conclusion, the Union asserts the CPI is useful only to emphasize the arbitrariness of the City's final offer since it only points out that all employees would not receive raises consistent with the increase in the CPI.

The City argues only four factors are germane to the issues in dispute: the interest and welfare of the public and the financial ability of the unit of government; comparability; cost-of-living and overall compensation. Analyzing its offer under each criterion, the Employer concludes its offer is more reasonable.

Stating the City is a small city with a high level of indebtedness; that it is located in a geographic area which relies heavily upon agriculture as its primary industry and that the farm economy, particularly the dairy farming economy, is facing economic difficulties which in turn make it difficult for the public to pay taxes, the Employer concludes its offer recognizes the need for restraint in regard to 1985 salary increases. It continues that its offer at 4.3% in 1985 and 4.72% in 1986 exceeds most city and county settlement awards in 1985 and that it is consistent with the settlements it reached with its other City employees as well as with private sector settlements in the area.

Further, the City contends its financial ability to pay is not as great as the Union would suggest. It cites its \$1.3 million indebtedness, a notice to creditors by an employer within the City and argues the Union-suggested surplus is nonexistent and shows the Union's lack of understanding regarding the City's audit. Stating the City budgets on a zero base and that all funds received from the levied sewage tax are obligated, the City maintains there is no surplus.

As to comparability, the City urges that all cities approximately 50% larger or smaller than Bloomer in Chippewa County and the six contiguous counties be considered the appropriate pool of comparables. It states these cities meet the criteria established by arbitrators in determining comparability. Rejecting the Union's proposed statewide comparability, the City states the sole criterion used by the Union was population. It argues the Union failed to show the cities were sufficiently similar economically and that the Union, in testimony, indicated the cities were selected without giving consideration to the criteria established regarding how cities should be selected for comparability. The City also rejects the Union's effort to compare itself to the County stating that under cross-examination the Union admitted there were several County positions which were not comparable and that it was not aware of the degree of training, schooling or experience required by the County for its positions nor whether the County's jobs were similar in job responsibility or working conditions.

Also arguing that internal comparability is important and that arbitrators have long recognized internal patterns of settlement are crucial in determining the reasonableness of the offers, the City submits consistent internal wage settlements achieved in the City should not be broken as the result of an arbitration award. Citing several arbitrators who have ruled consistent with its argument, the City concludes the Union's offer must be rejected since it would not only break the trend of consistent internal wage increases, but it could have a serious effect on bargaining stability within the City.

The City continues its final offer is more reasonable when it is compared to the cost-of-living increases. Citing the CPI-U and the CPI-W as measurements of cost-of-living increases, the City contends its offer compares well with the CPI-W while the Union's offer is nearly 100% above it and concludes such an increase is not reasonable.

Rejecting the Union's argument concerning catch-up, the City states the Union has failed to justify its proposal for a substantial "catch up" wage increase. Asserting that since the Union is proposing "catch-up", it is incumbent upon the Union to justify the

the need, the City continues the Union failed to use valid comparable cities and that the data provided by it makes it impossible to determine whether or not its offer is justified by external wage rate comparisons. It adds that the Union's data is further flawed in that there is no indication whether or not the wage rates were achieved voluntarily or whether the salaries were for one year or multi-year agreements. It concludes that without this information, it would be improper to give serious consideration to the argument of catch-up. Finally, the City argues that if the parties were in agreement on the 1984 year-end rates and voluntarily settled previously, it is difficult to understand why, now, the Union asserts there is a need for catch-up in 1985. In conclusion, the City urges rejection of the Union's offer suggesting the Union's catch-up argument is based upon a comparison of 1984 salaries which provide no correlative data or statistical documentation to support relevant comparables for 1985. It continues that this flaw alone should be sufficient to reject the Union's position.

#### DISCUSSION:

While both parties relied primarily upon comparisons to support their respective positions, neither demonstrated their selected communities were comparable. In order to consider a municipality comparable, it is not necessary to show they are identical, but it is necessary to demonstrate they share enough similar characteristics or qualities to make the comparison appropriate.<sup>1</sup> In other words, it is not sufficient to state a set of comparables should be considered appropriate because they are contiguous or because they are approximately the same size, or because other arbitrators have ruled the criteria was applied in similar situations or because they are represented by the same Union. In order to establish comparability, not only must it be shown the proposed set of comparables are geographically near and of similar size, but it must also be shown the proposed set of comparables share similar socio-economic conditions. Geographic proximity and similar size do not necessarily make the communities similar socio-economically. Some communities are more affected by their proximity to urbanized areas than others. Some communities rely more upon agriculturally related industries than others. Some communities are more service oriented while others are more retail oriented. All of these factors and more affect per capita income. Further, equalized values of property may differ dependent upon the specific land development within the community. Thus, socio-economic factors must also be considered when determining comparability.

In this matter the socio-economic information is lacking. The Employer did submit data comparing Chippewa County to Barron County, but even that data demonstrates there is likely to be different socio-economic conditions prevalent among those cities within each county. However, since the arbitrator is obligated to consider only that evidence submitted by the parties, an effort was made to select communities from those submitted which may contribute some degree of comparability to the City of Bloomer. Consequently, the following communities were selected as those most comparable: Altoona, Chetek, Cumberland, Medford and Stanley. They were selected as those most comparable, not only because they were somewhat geographically near, but because they varied no more than 50% from the population of the City of Bloomer. In addition, each city had a similar unit of employees who were represented by a union and it is assumed that representation assists the employees in reaching a settlement which reflects the socio-economic conditions prevalent within each community. A secondary set of comparables which added Abbottsford, Barron and Ladysmith was also considered. These three cities

---

<sup>1</sup>Dawson v. Myers, 622 F.2d 1304 (1980).

were added as comparables because they also met the first two criteria but they were considered as secondary comparables because they do not have similar employees represented by unions.

Of primary concern in finding whether or not the Employer's final offer should be implemented was the nature of the final offer, itself. In its final offer, the City submits a new salary schedule which moves from the previous contract's one step schedule to a five step schedule which encompasses rate increases over a two year period of time. Further, if the schedule were used to determine the comparability of the rates, the wage rate paid at several positions would not be comparable. However, at the bottom of the schedule, the City has provided for wage adjustments at certain positions which the City has indicated are adjustments in addition to the wage rate set in the salary schedule. For instance, rather than the Foreman-Electric position paying \$9.09 at the end of two years, the position will pay \$9.34. This is substantiated by the exhibits submitted by the City regarding comparison of wage rates and costing. Thus, for the purposes of determining the reasonableness of the final offers by wage rate comparison, the wage rates at the adjusted figure was used. Finally, while arbitrators should be slow to implement change without a demonstration of need for change, neither party raised the issue of the salary schedule change, thus it is concluded that this schedule, while not in the contract, was used in the past or that even though the City did not provide support for its proposed change, the Union did not see it as a problem.

Accepting the parties' argument that wages is the most important issue in this dispute, it is concluded, after reviewing the data, that the Employer's offer should be implemented. While the Union asserts there is the need for "catch-up" since its employees are the lowest paid, if not the lowest paid employees, in comparable cities, a review of the proposals of the parties relative to the mean among the comparables demonstrates that at a majority of the positions the offer by the City would exceed the mean, particularly within the primary comparables. Thus, at least among the employees represented by unions in comparable cities, there are several employees performing similar work who are paid less than the employees in Bloomer. Further, the Union did not demonstrate that there had been any deterioration in the wage rate paid employees in Bloomer as it compares to the position the City has maintained among the comparables. Thus, without a demonstration that the employees are paid significantly less than other employees performing similar jobs or a demonstration that there has been a deterioration in pay, it is not sufficient to assert there is a need for "catch-up" simply because the employees are not paid exactly the same as other employees performing the same type of work.

Since there was no evidence submitted relative to the wage rate increase other employees in comparable communities received, the only measure used to determine the reasonableness of the proposed increase in rates was the comparison of the increase to the average in each identified employee position. The analysis showed that in addition to exceeding the mean at several positions, the City's offer is more comparable to the average rate paid at eight of the twelve positions in the bargaining unit while the Union's is more comparable at five of the twelve positions. In the lineman's position there is only 1¢ difference between the parties offer, therefore it is concluded the parties positions are the same. When the secondary comparables are added into the comparison, the City's offer becomes even more comparable. (See graph on the next page.)

Internal settlement comparisons and comparisons with private sector employees were not considered. Agreeing with the Union that settlement patterns occur generally in situations where there is more than one other bargaining unit, it is concluded that settlement

| <u>Position</u>    | <u>Primary<br/>Comparable<br/>Average</u> | <u>Secondary<br/>Comparable<br/>Average</u> | <u>City<br/>Offer</u> | <u>Union<br/>Offer</u> |
|--------------------|---|---|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Foreman-Electric   | -   | 10.41                                       | 9.34                  | 9.76                   |
| Foreman-Street     | 8.24                                      | 8.91  | 9.34                  | 9.76                   |
| Foreman-Water      | 8.51                                      | 9.25  | 9.34                  | 9.76                   |
| Lineman-Electric   | 8.87                                      | 9.14  | 8.54                  | 8.55                   |
| Laborer-Water      | 8.21                                      | 8.13  | 8.31                  | 8.45                   |
| Heavy Equip. Op.   | 8.19                                      | 8.21  | 8.31                  | 8.45                   |
| Light Equip. Op.   | 8.19                                      | 8.06  | 8.06                  | 8.18                   |
| Treatmt. Plt. Op.  | 8.48                                      | 8.21  | 8.35                  | 8.45                   |
| Garbage Collector  | 7.68                                      | 8.00  | 8.06                  | 7.97                   |
| Computer Operator  | -   | 7.36  | 8.11                  | 8.18                   |
| Clerk-Typist       | 6.17                                      | 6.29  | 7.69                  | 7.82                   |
| Sewage Plt. Admin. | 9.06                                      | 9.95  | 9.34                  | 9.76                   |

with only one other unit and no information on the increases granted non-union employees does not carry the same weight as data regarding several settlements. This is particularly true when the level of fringe benefits differs significantly as is indicated in this situation. Further, while both parties attempted to compare their offers to private sector wage rates and increases, it was determined there was not sufficient information provided to conclude the employees performed similar types of work or shared similar working conditions.

While the Union argued the Employer's offer was arbitrary since it provided differing percentage wage increases and special adjustments, without justification, and should therefore be rejected, it is concluded that while the increases are not the same for all positions, the increases appear to occur on the basis of responsibility and do not vary in percentage increase substantially, the percentage increase varying from 3.3% to 3.9%. Further, a comparison of those positions specifically adjusted indicates the adjustments did more to bring the positions specifically not comparable among employees performing similar position to a rate which is comparable. Thus, it cannot be concluded the offer is arbitrary.

In addition to finding the City's offer more reasonable in regard to wage rate increases, it was also concluded the City's offer more closely approximates the cost-of-living increases which have occurred. In January, when the contract would have been settled, had there not been unresolved issues, the Consumer Price Index was at 4.1%, the exact same package increase proposed by the City for 1985. Further, the cost-of-living has continued to decrease over the year, thus, the City's package increase of 5.3% in 1986 is also reasonable. Further, without justification for "catch-up", there is little support for a package increase which is higher than that proposed by the City.

Finally, it should be noted that while the City offered as reason for additional support of its offer, its ability to pay and the general economic conditions, neither argument was considered in determining the reasonableness of the offers. While the City suggested its level of indebtedness affects its general ability to pay wage increases, it is noted the indebtedness relates generally to capital improvements which are not generally financed through the operating

budget, thus, the more important question was whether or not the City's operating budget is in good financial condition. A review of the City's audit demonstrates the City is in healthy financial condition with a substantial amount available to it both in reserved funds and in surplus. In addition, although the City submitted data regarding unemployment levels within the area and the condition of the farm economy in general, there was no showing that the City's circumstances were any different than those considered comparable, thus, the arguments were not considered relevant to issues in arbitration.

Since it has been determined that the Employer's offer is more reasonable both as it compares to wage increases among the comparables and as it compares to the cost-of-living increases which have occurred based upon the foregoing review of the arguments and evidence and upon the discussion set forth and based upon a review of the data in relationship to the statutory criteria, the undersigned issues the following:

AWARD

The final offer of the City, attached as Appendix B, shall be incorporated into the 1985-87 collective bargaining agreement, together with those provisions of the predecessor collective bargaining agreement which remained unchanged during the course of bargaining and any stipulations of the parties which reflect prior agreements in bargaining as is required by statute.

Dated this 12th day of December, 1985 at La Crosse, Wisconsin.



---

Sharon K. Imes  
Mediator/Arbitrator

SKI:ms



# Communications

(AFFILIATED WITH AFL-CIO)



WISCONSIN  
RELATIONS COMMISSION

## Workers of America

LOCAL 5540 — EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN

April 16, 1985

Robert McCormick, WERC  
1400 W Mifflin  
Box 7870  
Madison, WI 53707

Mr. McCormick:

Enclosed is the final proposal from the Communications Workers of America, Local 5540 for the items we will be taking to Arbitration.

I've asked James Clark to call you on Monday the 22nd. He did meet with Bollom to discuss these articles on March 5, 1985 & April .

Sincerely,

*Barbara R Mousel*

Barbara R Mousel, Sec'y  
CWA Local 5540  
2233 Birch St  
Eau Claire, WI 54703

Today's Date 4-16-85

APR 18 1985

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS COMMISSION

FINAL PROPOSAL BETWEEN  
Communications Workers of America, Local 5540  
and  
The City of Bloomer, Wisconsin

The following three Articles have not been agreed upon by the parties. These are the final proposals from the Communications Workers of America, Local 5540 - Eau Claire, Wisconsin. (11.01, 11.03 & 17)

ARTICLE XI INSURANCE

11.01 The City shall provide Life Insurance in the amount of \$1,000.00 per \$1,000.00 of employee income, paid for by the City.

11.03 Pension Plan

The City shall provide a pension plan for each employee, paid for by the City.

The City of Bloomer agrees to increase the pension plan \$100.00 for each year of the contract per employee maximizing at \$1200.00 per employee in 1986. The contributions will be made on the first payroll after November 30th of each contract year.

Signed Barker Mousel, Secy  
CWA Local 5540

*James L. Clark*

APR 18 1985

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS COMMISSION

ARTICLE XVII  
WAGES AND JOB CLASSIFICATION

| <u>Title</u><br><u>Classification</u>      | <u>Basic Rate Per Hour</u>        |                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|  | <u>Effective</u><br><u>1-1-85</u> | <u>Effective</u><br><u>1-1-86</u> |
| Foreman - Water                            | \$ 9.76                           | \$10.25                           |
| Foreman - Electric                         | \$ 9.76                           | \$10.25                           |
| Foreman - Street                           | \$ 9.76                           | \$10.25                           |
| Lineman                                    | \$ 8.55                           | \$ 8.98                           |
| Meter Mechanic - Electric                  | \$ 8.55                           | \$ 8.98                           |
| Meter Mechanic - Water                     | \$ 8.45                           | \$ 8.88                           |
| Heavy Equipment Operator                   | \$ 8.45                           | \$ 8.88                           |
| Light Equipment Operator                   | \$ 8.18                           | \$ 8.59                           |
| Shop Mechanic                              | \$ 8.45                           | \$ 8.88                           |
| Sewage Treatment Plant Operator - Licensed | \$ 8.45                           | \$ 8.88                           |
| Sewage Treatment Plant Operator - Regular  | \$ 8.18                           | \$ 8.59                           |
| Sanitation Worker                          | \$ 7.97                           | \$ 8.37                           |
| Temporary Part-Time Labor                  | \$ 5.00                           | \$ 5.00                           |
| Computer Operator                          | \$ 8.18                           | \$ 8.59                           |
| General Clerk                              | \$ 7.82                           | \$ 8.20                           |
| Chemist Administrator                      | \$ 9.76                           | \$10.25                           |

All Foreman titles plus Chemist Administrator shall be granted a fifty cent per hour increase plus 5%. All other employees to receive a 5% increase. Effective 1-1-85 and 1-1-86 - a 5% increase applied to each title base wage.

Agreement made this day \_\_\_\_\_

CWA Representative *James L. Clark* City of Bloomer \_\_\_\_\_  
Representative

CITY OF BLOOMER

TELEPHONE (715) 568-3032

1503 MAIN STREET

BLOOMER, WISCONSIN 54724

RELATIONS COMMISSION

April 29, 1985

Mr. Robert McCormick  
WERC Investigator  
14 West Mifflin St., Suite 200  
P.O. Box 7870  
Madison, WI 53707-7870

Dear Mr. McCormick:

Enclosed is the City of Bloomer's final last offer covering the three areas of irresolvable impasse with the CWA contract. Both the City and the CWA acknowledge impasse with no interest in further mediation.

The CWA's 1985 proposal exceeds 7%, the City's 4.6% (State avg.)


Apologies are extended to you for the delay in getting you this document. A Councilman and secretary were absent from the recent meeting, which contributed to the delay.

I am mailing a copy of the three articles to Mr. Clark/CWA.

Mr. Clark is still exploring the State Retirement System (5% total increase in 1986) as a possible settlement of the second year of the contract (1986).

Sincerely,

REPRESENTATIVE - CITY OF BLOOMER



Mel Bollom

llm

Enc.

ARTICLE XVII

WAGES AND JOB CLASSIFICATION

REVISED

MAY 01 1985

| <u>POSITION TITLE</u>                          | <u>HIRE</u> | <u>6-MO.</u> | <u>12-MO.</u> | <u>WAGE SCHEDULE EMPLOYMENT</u> |                    |             |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
|  |             |              |               | <u>18-MO. REL.</u>              | <u>24-MO. COM.</u> | <u>YEAR</u> |
| Foreman-Water                                  | \$ 8.69     | \$ 8.79      | \$ 8.89       | \$ 8.99                         | \$ 9.09            | 1985        |
| Foreman-Electric                               | 9.24        | 9.34         | 9.44          | 9.54                            | 9.64               | 1986        |
| Foreman-Street<br>Administrator-Sewage Plant   |             |              |               |                                 |                    |             |
| Lineman-Electric                               | 8.01        | 8.11         | 8.21          | 8.31                            | 8.41               | 1985        |
|  | 8.41        | 8.51         | 8.61          | 8.71                            | 8.81               | 1986        |
| Sewage Treatment Plant<br>Operators (Licensed) | 7.95        | 8.05         | 8.15          | 8.25                            | 8.35               | 1985        |
|  | 8.28        | 8.38         | 8.48          | 8.58                            | 8.68               | 1986        |
| Meter Mechanic (Water)                         | 7.91        | 8.01         | 8.11          | 8.21                            | 8.31               | 1985        |
| Heavy Equipment Operator                       | 8.20        | 8.30         | 8.40          | 8.50                            | 8.60               | 1986        |
| Shop Mechanic                                  |             |              |               |                                 |                    |             |
| Light Equipment Operator                       | 7.66        | 7.76         | 7.86          | 7.96                            | 8.06               | 1985        |
|  | 7.95        | 8.05         | 8.15          | 8.25                            | 8.35               | 1986        |

CLERICAL

| <u>POSITION TITLE</u> | <u>HIRE</u> | <u>6-MO.</u> | <u>12-MO.</u> | <u>18-MO.</u> | <u>24-MO.</u> | <u>YEAR</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| Computer Operator     | \$ 7.66     | \$ 7.76      | \$ 7.86       | \$ 7.96       | \$ 8.06       | 1985        |
|                       | 7.98        | 8.08         | 8.18          | 8.28          | 8.38          | 1986        |
| General Clerk         | 7.43        | 7.49         | 7.55          | 7.63          | 7.69          | 1985        |
|                       | 7.55        | 7.65         | 7.75          | 7.85          | 7.95          | 1986        |

Any employee designated to be in charge of work operation involving other employees, except Foremen, shall be paid a differential of thirty-five cents (35¢) per hour.

The City of Bloomer recognizes certain positions, based on internal comparisons or similar positions in comparative units of governments, should be granted two (1985 and 1986) pay adjustments. These adjustments shall be as follows for each of the two years of the contract: (1) All Foremen and Sewage Plant Administrators: +25¢ per hour (24-mo. step); (2) Linemen: +13¢ per hour (24-mo. step); (3) Computer Operator: +05¢ per hour (24-mo. step).

The Union will have a one-time option (July 1, 1985) to elect to have the proposed fringe benefit increases (above the 1984 contract levels) equally distributed among the five steps of each salary classification.

RECEIVED

MAY 11 1985

ARTICLE XI

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS COMMISSION

- 11.01 The City shall increase Life Insurance coverage from \$10,000.00 for each employee to \$15,000.00 (+50%) for each employee in 1985, paid for by the City. The City shall increase Life Insurance coverage to an equivalent of each employee's annual salary in 1986, paid by the City.
- 11.03 The City shall provide a Pension Plan for each employee, paid by the City.

Effective January 1, 1985, the City of Bloomer agrees to increase the pension plan to \$1,000.00 per employee.

Effective January 1, 1986, the City of Bloomer agrees to increase the pension plan to \$1,200.00 (+20%) per employee.