

In the City Council,
City of Lodi,
Lodi, California.

RESOLUTION NO. 1531

APPROVING SALARY AND WAGE SCHEDULE
EFFECTIVE AS OF JULY 1, 1950.

RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Lodi, in regular meeting this 21st day of June, 1950, that the " WAGE AND SALARY RECOMMENDATION " to be effective July 1, 1950 as submitted to each member of this City Council June 19, 1950, be, and the same is hereby approved and adopted as the salary and wage schedule to apply to the several classifications named therein for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950. A copy of said " WAGE AND SALARY RECOMMENDATION " is annexed hereto and made part hereof with the same force and effect as if set forth in full herein.

- - - - -X- - - - -

Certified to be a true copy of Resolution No. 1531 as passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Lodi in regular meeting held June 21, 1950 by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmen, Rinn, Preszler, Bull and Tolliver (Mayor)
NOES: Councilmen, None. ABSENT: Councilman, Haskell.



City Clerk.

Annexed is a true copy of the " Wage and Salary Recommendation " mentioned in the above resolution.

WAGE AND SALARY RECOMMENDATION

To Be Effective July 1, 1950

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Present Range</u>	<u>Proposed Range</u>
Clerk-Typist	\$150-170	\$150-160-170-180-190
PBX Operator	\$180-200	\$180-185-190-195-200
Clerk-Stenographer	\$170-190	\$170-180-190-200-210
Account-Clerk	\$190-210	\$180-190-200-210-220
Labor (Unskilled)	\$190-205	\$190-200-210-220-230
Janitor	\$190-210	\$190-200-210-220-230
Groundman	\$210-240	\$210-220-230-240-250
Maintenance Labor	\$210-232.50	\$230-240-250
Secretary to C.M.	\$200-230	\$220-230-240-250
Truck Driver	\$220-242.50	\$210-220-230-240-250
Engineering Aide	\$220-250	\$220-230-240-250-270
Meter Reader	\$220-242.50	\$240-250-260-270-280
Deputy City Clerk	\$240-270	\$240-250-260-270-280
Sewage Plant Operator	\$235-265	\$240-250-260-270-280
Equipment Operator	\$220-242.50	\$240-250-260-270-280
Park Caretaker	\$210-232.50	\$240-250-260-270-280
Poundmaster	\$220-250	\$240-250-260-270-280
Street Painter	new	\$250-260-270-280-300
Patrolman	\$250-280	\$260-270-280-290-300
Fireman	\$250-280	\$260-270-280-290-300
Motor Patrolman	\$260-290	\$270-280-290-300-310
Labor Foreman	\$240-270	\$250-265-280-295-310
Apprentive Lineman	\$240-270	\$250-265-280-295-310
Purchasing Clerk	\$260-290	\$250-265-280-295-310
Electric Serviceman	\$270-292.50	\$270-280-290-300-310
Collector	\$260-290	\$270-280-290-300-310
Utility Plant Operator	\$250-280	\$270-280-290-300-310
Water Service Foreman	\$275-305	\$270-280-290-300-310
Sewage Plant Foreman	\$270-292.50	\$270-280-290-300-310
Street Foreman	new	\$275-290-305-320
Senior Engineering Aide	\$260-290	\$275-290-305-320
Water & Sewer Const. Foreman	new	\$275-290-305-320
Police Sergeant	\$290-312.50	\$275-290-305-320
Fire Marshal	\$290-312.50	\$275-290-305-320
Lineman	\$280-310	\$310-320-330
Surveyor	\$270-300	\$300-310-320-330-340
Plumbing Inspector	\$290-320	\$300-310-320-335-350
Electric Inspector	\$290-320	\$300-310-320-335-350
Building Inspector	\$300-330	\$310-320-330-345-360
Construction Engineer	\$310-340	\$310-320-330-345-360
Office Manager	\$330-360	\$330-340-350-360-370
Electric Const. Foreman	\$315-350	\$350-370-390
Ass't. Supt of Utilities	\$330-360	\$390-400-410+
Office Engineer	\$380-410	\$380-390-400-410-420

Police Clerk

210-230-240-250-260

June 19, 1950

To the Honorable Mayor and
Members of the City Council

Gentlemen:

Attached hereto is my salary recommendation for fiscal 1950-51. I can assure you that I share your wish that personnel costs could be stabilized, but that unfortunately does not seem to be the direction in which the economy is moving.

I have tried to be fair in arriving at this recommendation, bearing in mind my responsibility both to the employees and the public. I have met on many occasions during the past two months with the employees' salary committee, have investigated wages in the District where comparable jobs exist, and have studied a half-dozen authoritative and recent salary surveys covering private industry and public employment.

The present salary and wage structure, you will recall, was established effective September 1, 1948, and since that time there have been only a few spot adjustments. Because of the terrific pressures exerted throughout the labor market, there have been substantial revisions generally throughout industry and almost without exception in public employment. To cite one example of this, the City of Stockton at the time of our 1948 survey was paying a maximum salary of \$288 to police patrolmen, \$8 over the maximum then established in Lodi. Stockton now pays \$322 for this position and there is some movement toward further increases. The same situation is true right down the line and points up the fact that we have not kept pace with adjustments being made elsewhere. From a rather cold-blooded point of view, perhaps we may consider ourselves lucky that the issue has not come up before now, but the fact remains that an increase is in order.

It is unfortunate that a request for salary revision arose on the heels of the City's obligations arising out of the new pension program, and if I felt that the request were based only on a desire to replace salary lost through pension contributions, I should most certainly recommend that it be denied. However, even with our pension plan, retirement

benefits in Lodi do not compare particularly well with those in other employments and our employees would therefore be at a general disadvantage at average pay.

One of the principal advantages of the pension plan is that it will permit us gradually to eliminate superannuated and inefficient personnel. In order to replace those employees with workers of higher grade, however, we must be prepared to offer salaries which will be attractive to effective men and women. If salaries are unduly low, we will simply be replacing inefficient personnel with others of indifferent ability and we will have lost a major justification for spending public funds on employee retirement.

In round figures, the initial request by the employees would have added about \$42,000 to the annual payroll, exclusive of additional pension costs. The attached recommendation would cost an estimated \$28,000, including pension costs, the latter making up about \$1,300 of the total.

If granted, the recommendation will do little more than bring our schedules in line with the average for comparable work. It is emphatically not designed to put Lodi at or near the top in public jurisdictions of similar size. A few examples might serve to indicate our proposed relative position:

Recommended top for patrolman and fireman is \$300. Stockton, as I have indicated, pays \$322. Palo Alto pays \$325, Albany pays \$300 and San Leandro pays \$310.

Recommended top for unskilled labor is \$230. Stockton pays \$238, Palo Alto pays \$235, Albany pays \$250, San Leandro pays \$260. Locally, Claude Wood pays \$268, Super Mold \$231, General Mills \$240 and Guild \$208.

Recommended top for truck driver is \$250. Stockton pays \$266, Palo Alto \$265, Albany \$265 and San Leandro \$270.

Recommended top for engineering aide is \$270. Stockton pays \$282, Palo Alto \$325, Albany \$290 and San Leandro \$310.

Parenthetically, these cities do not represent the only ones checked. Some are generally higher and some lower. The figures for Stockton are included because even though that city is much larger, we must consider their scales because of proximity.

The recommendations for employees in the Utilities Department, i.e., apprentice lineman, groundman, lineman, electric construction foreman and assistant superintendent of utilities are in line with almost identical jobs in other cities and in the local P.O. & E. office. These recommendations are from \$2 to \$10 below similar local jobs.

Salary scales are extremely difficult to fix accurately. Except in a very few cases, it is next to impossible to determine the comparability of jobs in different jurisdictions, regardless of job title or description. In a relatively small organization such as our own, it is also very hard to avoid thinking of a job in terms of the person holding it, and this, of course, would make any survey inequitable and virtually worthless. I believe that the attached recommendation is about as sound as could be obtained and I hope that it will receive your careful consideration on Wednesday night.

Respectfully submitted,


H. D. WELLER
City Manager

HDW/bg