



September 8, 2010

Unit 5, California Highway Patrol Officer Salary Survey

Department of Personnel Administration
Labor Relations Division
Office of Financial Management and Economic Research
1515 S Street, North Building, Suite 400
Sacramento, California 95811



Table of Contents

Overview	1
Labor Agreement Survey Requirement.....	1
Government Code Section 19827 Survey Requirement	2
Survey Methodology	2
Government Code Section 22944.3.....	3
Survey Results.....	4
Government Code Section 19827 Survey Requirement	Attachment 1
Survey Lag Computation	Attachment 2

Overview

This salary survey is prepared by the Department of Personnel Administration (DPA) in accordance with the bargaining agreement between the State of California and the California Association of Highway Patrolmen (CAHP), covering collective bargaining Unit 5, Highway Patrol and Government Code (GC) Section 19827. The labor agreement also referred to as the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the period of July 3, 2006 to July 2, 2010, required that the State use the results of the survey to determine the General Salary Increase (GSI) for California Highway Patrol Officers (CHP) effective July 1, 2010.

An amendment to the 2006 – 2010 MOU was approved by the Legislature that gave the State the authority to redirect the GSI for 2009 and 2010 toward prefunding retiree health benefits. The 2010 survey resulted in a 1 percent GSI to be effective July 1, 2010. The 0.5 percent GSI that CHP Officers would have received effective July 1, 2009, based on the result of the 2009 survey was therefore redirected toward retiree health benefits per the amendment. Additionally, the amendment required CHP Officers to begin contributing 0.5 percent of their salary toward retiree health benefits, which made the total contribution in 2009 equal to 1 percent. As of August 23, 2010 a new MOU was enacted for the term of July 3, 2010 to July 3, 2013. The MOU temporarily suspends the terms of the amendment to the 2006 - 2010 MOU that required the State to redirect the result of the 2010 salary survey toward prefunding retiree health benefits and requires that it be redirected along with the additional 1 percent established in 2009 to go toward funding employee pensions.

Labor Agreement Survey Requirement

The 2006 – 2010 MOU, Article VI, Section 15(a) directed the State to continue providing for a GSI as required by GC 19827. The GSI was based on the agreed upon difference of weighted average of the total compensation salary survey as referenced in GC 19827 and the total compensation for the CHP Officer using the survey methodology and definitions of total compensation.

In August of 2009, however, the State and CAHP agreed to amend the 2006 – 2010 MOU and the Legislature added GC Section 22944.3 to the Government Code, which states that any amount that would otherwise be used to permanently increase compensation pursuant to GC 19827 effective July 1, 2009, and on July 1, 2010, instead be used to permanently prefund retiree health care benefits for CAHP members.

On August 23, 2010, a new MOU was enacted effective July 3, 2010 to July 3, 2013. Per the 2010 – 2013 MOU the amount used to prefund health benefits from the 2010 survey results of 1 percent is to be redirected to instead go toward funding employee pensions along with the 1 percent from the 2009 contributions.

Government Code Section 19827 Survey Requirement

This code section requires the State and CAHP to jointly and annually

- survey five specific public law enforcement organizations,
- calculate the estimated average total compensation conduct the survey using the methodology described in the “Description of Survey Process Pursuant to GC 19827 Regarding the Recruitment and Retention of California Highway Patrol Officers” dated July 1, 2001,
- project the average total compensation ahead to July 1 of the year in which the survey is conducted.

The GC also identifies the components of total compensation to be measured, and indicates that total compensation should include retirement contributions made by the employer on behalf of the employee.

Survey Methodology—Description of Survey Process Pursuant to Government Code Section 19827

Attachment 1 details the survey methodology, including the law enforcement organizations and position classifications to be surveyed. The methodology requires:

- That the survey measure and report on salary range maximum, patrol bonuses, seniority pay (also known as longevity or retention pay), physical performance pay, Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and other education incentives, and the employee contribution to retirement¹.
- The use of an average entry age of 24 years, when the employee’s retirement contribution rate varies based on age in the surveyed organizations.
- The CAHP to verify the survey compensation and staffing data collected by the DPA.
- The DPA and CAHP will finalize survey findings by March 31 of each year as data is projected to July 1. A labor agreement Side Letter agreement provides that if an agency for which a projection has been made resolves its contract after March 31 but before the State Controller’s cutoff date for the July pay period, then the survey must be adjusted to reflect the actual figures of the new agreement.
- The DPA to provide survey information on an Excel spreadsheet.

The methodology identifies the following surveyed organizations and classifications, and indicates the survey’s intent is to survey the classification that most closely matches the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Officer, Range A.

Organization	Surveyed Classification
--------------	-------------------------

¹ Government Code Section 19827(a)(1) requires that total compensation include retirement contributions made by the employer on behalf of the employee. The Description of the Survey Process pursuant to GC 19827 does not require that total compensation include retirement contributions made by the employer on behalf of the employee. Per past agreement between CAHP and DPA, the survey follows the Description of the Survey Process requirement.

San Francisco Police Department	Police Officer Q2 ²
San Diego Police Department	Police Officer II
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department	Deputy Sheriff
Los Angeles Police Department	Police Officer II ³
Oakland Police Department	Police Officer
California Highway Patrol	CHP Officer, Range A

The methodology determines the percent of which the California Highway Patrol Officer weighted total compensation leads or lags the combined, weighted average total compensation of the five surveyed organizations.

For the July 1, 2009 and July 1, 2010 results, the amendment to the 2006 - 2010 MOU and GC 22944.3 ordered any amount that would otherwise be used to permanently increase compensation pursuant to GC 19827 be used to permanently prefund post employment health care benefits for patrol members. In calculating future increases as required by statutory salary setting methodology, the State shall take credit for amounts that would have been otherwise paid as salary increases in 2009 and 2010.

Government Code Section 22944.3

The provisions of GC 19827 that have been amended as a result of the enactment of GC 22944.3 and are identified in that code section as to:

- Redirect any amount that would otherwise be used to permanently increase compensation pursuant to GC 19827 effective July 1, 2009, and July 1, 2010, to permanently prefund retiree health care benefits for patrol members.
- Limit the amount used to prefund benefits relative to any increases under the survey methodology effective July 1, 2010, in that it shall not exceed 2 percent.
- Direct the State to take credit for these contributions in the survey methodology established in GC 19827 in the same manner as it would for a GSI.
- Require that patrol members shall contribute an additional 0.5 percent of their base pay toward prefunding retiree health benefits. This contribution shall not reduce the base salary of patrol members under the survey methodology established by GC 19827.

² In the Description of the Survey Process Pursuant to GG 19827 document, the surveyed classification is Police Officer III Q4. This is the Police Officer having a POST Advanced Certificate. However, per past agreement between CAHP and DPA, the surveyed class was changed to Police Officer Q2, which is the officer having the POST Basic Certificate. To meet the intent of the Survey Methodology, the Police Officer Q2 more closely matches the California Highway Patrol Officer, Range A.

³ In the Survey Methodology, the surveyed classification is Police Officer II. However, per past agreement between CAHP and DPA, the weighted average salary is computed based on the combined count of Police Officer I, II and III incumbents. The reason is that the Field Training Officer function of the Police Officer III duties is the same as the Field Training Officer function of the CHP Officer, Range A, duties. The Police Officer III class is an assignment to a higher pay grade for a position carrying greater responsibility or requiring greater expertise. The Police Officer I is the cadet class.

Attachment 2 displays the computation for the CHP Officers' lag in total compensation behind the survey organizations. The survey methodology is summarized as follows:

- The survey individually weights the patrol bonus, seniority, physical performance, and education incentive pays for each surveyed organization and the CHP Officer by the number of officers receiving those pays in each organization.
- For the five surveyed organizations as a group, the survey collectively weights the patrol bonus, seniority, physical performance, and education incentive pays and maximum base salary and employee contribution to retirement by the total officers in the five organizations. The result is the weighted compensation subtotal before subtracting the employee contribution to retirement.
- For the CHP Officer, the survey combines the weighted maximum salary and weighted special pays to determine the weighted compensation subtotal before subtracting the employee contribution to retirement.
- For the five surveyed organizations and the CHP Officer, the survey subtracts the weighted employee contribution to retirement from the compensation subtotal resulting in total compensation.
- The CHP Officer total compensation and surveyed organizations' total compensation are compared to determine the percent by which the CHP Officer leads or lags the surveyed organizations' total compensation.
- A CHP Officer lag, rounded to 1/10th percent, becomes the percent of the CHP Officer salary that as of July 1, 2010 would originally have been used to increase the salary of CHP Officers but instead will be redirected toward funding employee pensions.

Survey Results

The 2010 survey produced a 1% lag for CHP Officers. This was the result of the CHP Officer total compensation lagging the weighted average total compensation of the surveyed organizations.

Based on the 2010 - 2013 MOU, the contributions implemented in 2009 that are to be made by patrol members toward prefunding retiree health benefits are to be temporarily redirected along with the 1 percent from the 2010 survey results for a total contribution of 2 percent contribution toward retirement.



July 1, 2001

Description of Survey Process Pursuant to Government Code Section 19827 Regarding the Recruitment and Retention of California Highway Patrol (CHP) Officers



Department of Personnel Administration Policy Development Office

1515 S Street, North Building, Suite 400
Sacramento, California 95814

Contents:

Executive Summary of Process
Introduction/background
Methodology
Identifying compensation items to be surveyed
Survey estimates to July 1st
Use of weighted average and additional information
Survey Contact List–Management
Survey Contact List–Labor
Survey Data Sheet

Attachment A
Attachment B
Enclosed

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF PROCESS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document presents the survey methodology and process for the Department of Personnel Administration's survey of five jurisdictions pursuant to Government Code Section 19827. In addition, this methodology and process is to be used for any future surveys performed under this section.

GOVERNMENT JURISDICTIONS SURVEYED FOR JOB MATCHES

- San Francisco City
- City of San Diego
- Los Angeles County
- City of Los Angeles
- City of Oakland

COMPENSATION ITEMS TO BE SURVEYED

- Salary Range Maximum
- Patrol Bonuses
- Seniority Pay
- Physical Performance Pay
- Post/Education Incentives
- Employee Contribution to Retirement

SURVEY TIMING AND EFFECTIVE DATE

The parties will finalize survey findings prior to March 31st of each year. Per Government Code Section 19827, survey data is projected to July 1st.

USE OF WEIGHTED AVERAGE

Calculations use numbers of employees receiving compensation multiplied by the amount paid and divided by the survey population to produce the "weighted average."

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

This survey is produced by the Department of Personnel Administration, in cooperation with the California Association of Highway Patrolmen (CAHP) pursuant to:

Government Code Section 19827: (a) In order for the State to recruit and retain the highest qualified employees for the California Highway Patrol, it is the policy of the State to compensate State traffic officers the estimated average total compensation as of July 1 of the year in which comparisons are made for the rank corresponding to State traffic officer within the Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, San Diego Police Department, Oakland Police Department, and the San Francisco Police Department. Total compensation includes, but is not limited to, salary, retirement, health and dental insurance, educational incentives, longevity pay, night shift differential, and other skill or incentive pay. Any increase in total compensation resulting from this subdivision shall be implemented through a memorandum of understanding negotiated pursuant to the Ralph C. Dills Act (Chapter 10.3 [commencing with Section 3512] of Division 4 of Title 1). If the provisions of this subdivision are in conflict with the provisions of a memorandum of understanding reached pursuant to Section 3517.5, the memorandum of understanding shall be controlling without further legislative action, except that if the provisions of a memorandum of understanding require the expenditure of funds, the provisions shall not become effective unless approved by the Legislature in the annual Budget Act. (b) When determining compensation for State excluded sworn classifications of the California Highway Patrol, it is the policy of the State to consider total compensation for corresponding ranks within jurisdictions specified in subdivision (a), as well as other factors, including internal comparisons.

METHODOLOGY

The survey considers salary rates paid to rank and file officers in five California local governments, law enforcement agencies: San Francisco City Police, City of San Diego Police, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, City of Los Angeles Police, and City of Oakland Police. Both the Department of Personnel Administration and the CAHP have access to information and agree to cooperate in the collection and analysis of data necessary to complete this survey. The parties may review these job matches from time to time, but it is the intent of the parties to utilize the classification in the jurisdiction that most closely matches the "CHP Officer, Range A." The surveyed classes in the local government jurisdictions are currently San Francisco City - "Q-4" classification; San Diego City - "PO II" classification; Los Angeles County - "Deputy Sheriff" classification; Los Angeles City - "PO II" classification; and City of Oakland - "Police Officer" classification.

IDENTIFYING COMPENSATION ITEMS TO BE SURVEYED

In determining 2001 survey findings, the DPA studied compensation items paid to CHP officers and officers in the survey jurisdictions. The DPA and CAHP determined that the significant items to be measured and reported were base salary, patrol and incentive bonuses, seniority pay, physical performance pay, POST and other education incentives, and employee contribution to retirement. The parties agree that any pay or incentive items added to the survey must be significant items in order to be reported in the survey. In the original study, some items were studied but not reported due to the direct comparability of the items between jurisdictions or that there was de minimus effect of those items.

SURVEY ESTIMATES TO JULY 1ST

The parties will finalize survey findings prior to March 31st of each year as data is projected to July 1st. The parties may also provide periodic survey updates thereafter and meet to review findings. Projected figures will take into account salary schedule adjustments occurring on July 1st or during that fiscal year. As an example, if a 4 percent adjustment is to be granted on July 1st, and another 4 percent adjustment on January 1st, then the total impact of the increases for the fiscal year would be 6 percent. This annualized change is based on the 4 percent on January 1st being an annualized 2 percent base salary increase. This annualized 2 percent, when added to the 4 percent increase on July 1st increase, brings the total annualized increase to 6 percent. In the event that a jurisdiction is in the process of negotiating economic terms, the parties may use reasonable projection methods including past history of the jurisdictions and reasonable estimates of anticipated settlements.

USE OF WEIGHTED AVERAGE AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

In reporting data, survey information will be provided by the DPA on an "Excel" spreadsheet using a format provided by the Policy Development Office, DPA. The spreadsheet enclosed with this report shall be the format for presenting survey findings under this section. Further, various worksheets for the determination of various special pay items actually included in the survey findings will be documented on a "Word" format. Agreements reached by jurisdictions engaged in negotiations prior to July 1st would be taken into account.

The DPA will collect compensation and staffing data from the jurisdictions and from the State Controllers' Office (SCO) and the CHP, Office of Labor Relations for CHP Officers. Data will be provided to CAHP and verified. In turn, CAHP will provide salary rates and incentive pays for each jurisdiction based on information provided by the unions and their respective MOUs. The DPA will confirm these figures. Calculations will use the numbers of employees receiving compensation items surveyed multiplied by the amount paid and divided by the survey population to produce the "weighted average."

Salary will be determined by utilizing the top step of the surveyed class in each jurisdiction. Incentive pays will then be added to arrive at a subtotal for compensation before subtracting the employee's contribution to retirement. In jurisdictions where the employee's retirement contribution varies based on age, an average entry age of 24 years will be utilized.

LIST OF CONTACTS, GOVERNMENT EMPLOYERS

Carmella A. Villasica
City & County of San Francisco
Dept of Human Resources
Employer Relations
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, Ca 94103
415.557.4928; Fax: 415.557.4919
Carmela.A.Villasica@sfgov.org

Mary A. Moser
City of San Diego
Associate Personnel Analyst, Classification and Compensation
Personnel Department
Civic Center Plaza
1200 3rd Avenue, Suite 300
San Diego, Ca 92101-4107
619.236.6071; Fax: 619.236.5515
Main Number 619.236.6400
DavisC@sandiego.gov

Gilbert Robles
Los Angeles County
Senior Departmental Personnel Technician
Los Angeles County's Sheriff's Department
Personnel Administration – Classifications Unit
11515 S. Colima, C-104
Whittier, CA 90604
562.903.7548; Fax: 323.415.6585
GRobles@lasd.org

Maritta Aspen
City of Los Angeles
Senior Labor Relations Specialist II
CAO, Employee Relations Division
220 N. Main Street Los Angeles, Ca 90012
213.978.7641; Fax: 213.978.7613
Maritta.Aspen@lacity.org

Penny Ha
City of Oakland
Senior Human Resources Analyst
Recruitment & Classification
150 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 3rd Floor
Oakland, Ca 94612-2019
510.238.4478; Fax 510.238.2976
pha@oaklandnet.com

LIST OF CONTACTS, LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Association of Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs
800.452.5237

Los Angeles Police Protective League
213.251.4554

Oakland Police Officers Association
510.834.9670

San Diego Police Officers Association
858.573.1199

San Francisco Police Officers Association
415.861.5060

California Highway Patrol Five-Jurisdiction Survey Projected to July 1, 2010, Survey Lag Computation

Attachment 2

A	B	C	D=B*C	E=From Worksheets	F=From Worksheets	G=B*F	H=D+G	I=From Worksheets	J=B*I	K=From Worksheets	L=B*K	M=From Worksheets	N=F+I+K+M	O=B*N	P=C+N	Q		S=P+R	T	U=S*T	V= B*U	W=S-U	X
Surveyed Agency	# Officers in Surveyed Class	Max. Rate	Total Cost of Max Salary	Patrol Incentive Unweighted	Patrol Incentive Weighted by Officers Receiving Differential	Total Cost of Patrol Incentive	Total Cost of Max Salary and Patrol Incentive	Seniority Pay Weighted by Officers Receiving Differential	Total Cost of Seniority Pay	POST/Educ. Diff. Average	Total Cost of POST Education Diff. Pay	Physical Performance Pay (PPP)	Total of Patrol+Seniority+POST/Educ+PPP Pays	Verify Special Pays Calc	Salary+ Patrol Seniority+ POST/Educ+ Physical	Employee Contribution to Retiree Health	Employee Retiree Health Cost	Total After Retirement Contribution to Retiree Health	Employee Ret. Contri Rate	Employee Retire. Cost	Total Retirement Cost	Total After Retirement Contribution	Net Pay
San Francisco P.D.	1,675	\$8,695	\$14,564,625	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$14,564,625	\$43	\$71,725	\$278	\$465,868	\$0	\$321	\$537,593	\$9,016	NA	NA	NA	7.50%	\$676	\$1,132,666		\$8,340
San Diego P.D.	1,160	\$6,350	\$7,366,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,366,000	\$0	\$0	\$319	\$370,396	\$0	\$319	\$370,396	\$6,669	NA	NA	NA	7.44%	\$496	\$575,588		\$6,173
L.A. County Sheriff	7,888	\$6,511	\$51,361,608	\$130	\$21	\$167,993	\$51,529,601	\$89	\$702,446	\$615	\$4,848,652	\$0	\$725	\$5,719,090	\$7,236	NA	NA	NA	7.53%	\$545	\$4,298,177		\$6,691
L.A. City P.D.	6,540	\$6,673	\$43,640,766	\$200	\$131	\$855,799	\$44,496,565	\$147	\$958,343	\$244	\$1,593,489	\$0	\$521	\$3,407,631	\$7,194	NA	NA	NA	9.00%	\$647	\$4,234,356		\$6,546
City of Oakland P.D.	653	\$8,175	\$5,337,980	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,337,980	\$98	\$63,844	\$363	\$237,062	\$0	\$461	\$300,906	\$8,635	NA	NA	NA	0.00%	\$0	\$0		\$8,635
			\$122,270,979			\$1,023,793	\$123,294,772		\$1,796,358		\$7,515,466			\$10,335,616				NA			\$10,240,787		
						\$6,882								\$577									
Survey Total	17,916	\$6,825			\$57		\$6,882	\$100		\$419		\$0	\$577		\$7,402		NA			\$572			\$6,830
CHP Off., Rng. A	6,264	\$6,866			\$0		\$6,866	\$70		\$197		\$109	\$376		\$7,242	0.50%	\$36	\$7,278	8.00%	\$513	\$3,214,654	\$6,765	\$6,765
Projected Lag at 7/1/10																						0.964%	

Per MOU, Up to 2% of lag at 7-1-10 shall be diverted to other post employment benefits.

1.0%