

# Frequently Asked Questions about Alameda's Budget

## A. PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PENSIONS

*1. How much is currently paid out on a monthly basis by PERS to City retirees.*

**CalPERS does not provide the City with information about how much it pays out a on monthly basis for Alameda retirees as the agency does not consider this public information. The City Manager's Office feels strongly that the public should be entitled to this information since the pensions are being paid with the public's money.**

*2. Do City employees pay for their pensions? If so, how much*

**Yes. Under the CalPERS system, pension contributions consist of an employee share (as a percentage of qualifying pay) and an employer share. In many cities, the taxpayers fund the employee share; not so in Alameda. Alameda's city employees pay the entire employee share, as well as a portion of the employer share.**

**Miscellaneous employees contribute the full 7% employee share and, beginning January 13, 2013, these employees will contribute an additional 1.868% of the employer share. As a result, miscellaneous employees will contribute a total of 8.868% towards their pensions. This 8.868% was the maximum allowable employee contribution at the time the Memorandum of Understanding was negotiated with the Miscellaneous Employees' bargaining units in Spring 2012.**

**Safety Employees contribute the full 9% employee share, plus 2% of the employer share, for a total of 11%.**

**The recent Pension Reform Legislation allows cities to negotiate additional cost sharing of the employer's contribution to pension costs. However, the Pension Reform legislation limits the amount of costs sharing that can be imposed upon employees to 12% for Safety Employees and 8% for Miscellaneous Employees.**

*3. Why isn't the City taking any action to reduce employee pensions?*

**The City has taken significant action to reduce the cost of employee pensions. As described above, effective February 15, 2012 Safety employees now pay 2% of the employer's contribution to PERS, increasing their contributions from 9% of their qualifying earnings to 11%. Beginning January 13, 2013, Miscellaneous employees will pay 1.868% of the employer's contribution to PERS (the maximum allowed under California law at the time MOU was signed), increasing their contributions from 7% to 8.868%—and higher than current law would allow the City to impose.**

*4. What is the source of the funding to pay the monthly retirement benefits for retired City employees? And where does that money come from?*

**For retired City employees covered under the 1079 / 1082 discontinued pension plans for Police and Fire, the entire amount is paid for by the City's General Fund.**

**For employees covered under PERS, the majority of the funding for payments for pension benefits and post retiree medical is from the City's General Fund, with other funds contributing as well, based upon the number of City employees charged to each of the City's Special Revenue, Capital Project and Sewer Funds.**

**The City's General Fund is funded through a variety of sources, including property taxes, sales tax, and charges for services. The funding for other funds comes from restricted dedicated sources such as community development, parks and recreation fees, and sewer service charges.**

*5. What portion of the City's budget is allocated toward paying employee pensions?*

**For Fiscal Year 11-12, approximately 15% of the General Fund goes towards pension payments (including the 1079/1082 discontinued pension plans), and for all funds, approximately 5% of total expenditures are for pension payments. The larger percentage reflected in the General Fund is due to significantly higher pension payments for current and retired sworn public safety officers, due to the enhanced pension program (3% at 50) compared to the pension program for other City employees (2% at 55).**

*6. Why doesn't the City put a measure on the ballot to reduce employee pensions like the City of San Jose?*

**The City is a member of the statewide CalPERS system for retirement benefits. The City of San Jose has its own City of San Jose Retirement System. Therefore, unlike the City of San Jose, the City of Alameda must conform to the pension offerings and rules of the CalPERS system, which cannot be modified by a vote of the citizens of Alameda.**

*7. Why doesn't the City create its own pension system like the City of San Jose?*

**Withdrawing from CalPERS and creating its own retirement system would be a major and complex undertaking for the City from a financial, legal, and operational perspective. Also, it should be pointed out that the City of San Jose has a population of almost one million people, with a City staff of approximately 5,400 employees. The City of Alameda has a population of approximately 75,500 people, with a City staff of approximately 487 employees. Retirement systems typically achieve cost benefits from large numbers of participants. Participation in CalPERS is like being part of an insurance risk pool. Cities such as San Diego**

**demonstrate that having a stand-alone retirement system does not necessarily promote financial prudence.**

*8. While the state retains many powers regarding PERS, the City does have the right to negotiate a change with its unions to step down pension benefit formulas – e.g., change public safety from 3 at 50 to 2 at 55, yes? And would the City be able to do that for everyone in a department past and present, or would it have to be a tiered system where the new levels would apply to future employees only?*

**As a PERS agency, the City cannot reduce through negotiations the retirement benefits of current City retirees receiving benefits. Benefit decreases are also restricted for current City employees already working under current agreements, must be achieved through collective bargaining. On January, 2013 future employees will be subject to the new Pension Reform formulas, which are far less generous than has been the case for existing employees. So, for example, while we cannot unilaterally step current employees down to 2% at 55, we will – as a result of state Pension Reform – use 2.7% at 57 as the formula for new hires.**

*9. Could the City eliminate PERS entirely, and if so, could the City do it unilaterally or would it need to be negotiated with the unions? (I saw a pension survey conducted by the League of California Cities and saw that there was one East Bay city without a pension plan, so I figured I should ask.)*

**The City is required by law to provide retirement benefits and cannot unilaterally eliminate PERS. Negotiations with ALL City employee bargaining units and PERS members would have to occur, and ALL would have to agree on an alternative retirement system. With a large existing pool of current City retirees receiving benefits from CalPERS, the City is committed to PERS for a very long time.**

*10. Does the City participate in Social Security? Is that an option for the City and if so, what, if any, impact would that have on benefit levels and costs?*

**The City does not participate in Social Security.**

**When City employees reach retirement age and begin to receive benefits, they are subject to the Windfall Elimination Program-Government Pension Offset (WEP-GPO). Under the WEP-GPO, if a person receives a government pension (i.e., from CalPERS), then his or her Social Security benefit, or that of his/her surviving spouse, will be reduced by about 70%. In other words, if a retired City employee is receiving a pension under CalPERS was entitled to a \$1000 per month Social Security benefit, that benefit would be reduced to approximately \$300 because he/she also receives a pension from CalPERS. There is no provision or measurable data to suggest that any savings would occur by the City participating in Social Security.**

## **B. PUBLIC EMPLOYEE SALARIES**

### *1. Why doesn't the City reduce employee salaries five to ten percent across the board?*

The salaries of all City of Alameda employees, except for executive management employees, are negotiated through collective bargaining agreements, called Memoranda of Understanding (“MOUs”). According to California law, specifically, the Meyers-Milias Brown Act, the City must attempt to meet and confer in good faith regarding any change in working conditions, salary or benefits in the MOU and cannot simply “impose” a change in salary.

Before January 1, 2012, “imposition” of changed conditions was theoretically possible, depending on a City’s own Ordinances regarding impasse. However, beginning January 1, 2012, AB 646 was passed, adding Sections 3505.5 and 3505.7 to the Government Code and repealing Section 3505.4. This provision set firm procedures for what a City can do when “impasse” is reached during negotiations and when and how a City can actually impose a change in negotiated salaries or benefits.

AB 646 continues to provide that the City must meet and confer in good faith regarding wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with representatives of recognized employee organizations. However, if agreement is not reached, they may mutually agree on the appointment of a mediator and equally share the cost.

If the mediator is unable to effect settlement of the controversy within 30 days of his or her appointment, the employee organization can request that the matter be submitted to a fact-finding panel, consisting of one member selected by each party as well as a chairperson selected by the California Public Employee Relations Board (PERB) or by agreement of the parties. The fact-finding panel is authorized to make investigations and hold hearings, and to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

All political subdivisions of the State are required to comply with the panel’s requests for information. If the dispute is not settled within 30 days, the fact-finding panel makes findings of fact and recommends terms of settlement. The City would need to make these findings of fact publicly available within 10 days after their receipt. This bill would prohibit a public agency from implementing its last, best, and final offer until at least 10 days after the fact finders’ written findings of fact and recommended terms of settlement have been submitted to the parties and the City has held a public hearing. This process is new, but it is estimated that a fact-finding procedure could take several months to complete.

2. Has the City reduced its employee compensation package as a result of budget constraints?

Two of the City’s Miscellaneous bargaining units (ACEA and MCEA), last experienced a cost of living adjustment (COLA) in 2008. The current labor agreements provide for a 1.5% COLA in January 2014; this amounts to five years of no COLAs for these bargaining unit employees. The City’s Executive Managers took a 5% reduction in compensation in FY 2011-2012. Safety bargaining units (APOA, APMA, IAFF, and AFMA), last experienced increases in 2007; 5% implemented at six month intervals. The current MOUs expire 6/29/2013 and do not include any salary increases. The City recently negotiated with all Miscellaneous employees to begin paying 1.868% of the City’s employer share of the pension contribution to CalPERS in January 2013. This is in addition to the 7% of qualifying pay that the employees already contribute towards pensions.

In addition to the retirement plan cost share, the City negotiated for Miscellaneous employees to pay increasing portions of healthcare premiums:

	Employee Portion of Premium Increase	City Portion of Premium Increase
2013	15%-25%	85%-75%
2014	25%	75%
2015	50%	50%

In January 2012, all Safety employees (AFMA, APMA, APOA, and IAFF) began paying 2% of the City’s employer share of the pension cost. This is in addition to the 9% of qualifying pay that the employees already contribute towards pensions.

Safety employees hired on or before June 7, 2011 and employed with the City of Alameda for at least five years shall receive medical coverage up to the two-party rate. Safety employees hired after June 7, 2011 will become eligible for retiree health benefits in ten years and will receive single-party coverage only

3. When was the last time City employees received a raise and when are they next scheduled to receive one?

**Alameda City Employees Association (ACEA)**

Last increase effective 8/3/2008 (1-4%)

Next increase 1/12/2014 (1.5%-4%)

ACEA is comprised of hourly workers who provide administrative support (i.e., Intermediate Clerk, Senior Clerk, etc.), maintenance services (i.e., maintenance worker, fleet mechanic, etc.), through journey-level professional careers (i.e., planners, engineers, etc.).

**Management and Confidential Employees Association (MCEA)**

**Last increase effective 1/6/2008 (3.4%)**

**Next increase 1/12/2014 (1.5%-4%)**

**MCEA is comprised of hourly confidential workers (i.e., administrative technician, executive assistant, etc.) and mid- through senior management workers (management analyst, accountant, assistant general manager, etc.)**

**Executive Management (EXME)**

**Last increase effective 6/22/2008 (3.2%)**

**Next increase 1/12/2014 (1.5%-4%)**

**EXME is comprised of department heads and other upper level management employees who report to the City Manager.**

**International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW)**

**Last increase effective 1/1/2012 (5%)**

**Next increase 12/30/2012 (3%)**

**IBEW is comprised of hourly workers that work in the office (e.g., system dispatchers and computer aided drafters) as well as those in the field to operate and maintain the city's electric transmission and distribution systems (e.g., line workers, warehouse, and streetlight) workers. Compensation increases for this bargaining unit are covered by the AMP enterprise fund and have no impact on the City's general fund.**

**The negotiated raises of the bargaining units and Council-appointed officers as described above are approved by Council and implemented on the mutually agreed date.**

**Alameda Police Officers Association – Non-sworn (PANS): Last increase effective 12/21/2008 (3.8%). Next increase is survey based.**

**PANS is comprised of Non-sworn safety hourly workers that provide administrative and clerical support to the police department (i.e., public safety dispatcher and police identification technician, etc.)**

**Alameda Fire Management Association (AFMA), Alameda Police Managers Association (APMA), Alameda Police Officers Association (APOA), and International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF): Last experienced increases in 2007; 5% implemented at six month intervals; The current MOUs expire 6/29/2013 and do not include any salary increases.**

**AFMA is comprised of salaried sworn management emergency medical and fire suppression workers (i.e., division chief).**

**APMA is comprised of salaried sworn management law enforcement workers (i.e., police lieutenant and police captain).**

**IAFF is comprised of hourly sworn emergency and fire suppression workers (i.e., firefighter, fire apparatus operator, and fire captain).**

**APOA is comprised of hourly sworn law enforcement workers (i.e., police officer and police sergeant).**

*4. How does City employee compensation compare to the private sector (if there are equivalents)?*

**There are not equivalents to the private sector.**

The following chart shows the difference between Alameda compensation compared to the other public agencies.

<b>GROUP or CLASSIFICATION</b>	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>+/- MEDIAN</b>	<b>Survey Group</b>
IBEW Benchmark classes	2012	low: -8.70% high: -3.24% average: -5.37% median: -4.18%	limited to Alameda, Santa Clara & Palo Alto
City Manager	2011	-1.79%	Regular
City Attorney	2011	-8.27%	Regular
City Clerk	2011	-1.61%	Regular
City Clerk, 4-Day	2011	2.20%	Regular
Chief of Police	2011	5.09%	Regular
Fire Chief	2011	0.46%	Regular
Exec Director Housing Authority	2010	9.83%	Special HA
Public Works Director	2009	-5.87%	Regular
Public Works Director, 4 Day	2009	-1.80%	Regular
EXME	2005	low: -9.76% high: +16.07% average: -0.8% median: -1.76%	Regular
EXME, 4 Day	2005	low: -5.53% high: +19.29% average: +3.07% median: +2.16%	Regular
MCEA	2005	low: -26.99% high: +12.26% average: -3.62% median: +0.9%	Regular

MCEA, 4 Day	2005	low: -22.11% high: +15.64% average: +0.37% median: +0.9%	Regular
ACEA (Hourly, 4 Day not applicable)	2006	low: -21.82% high: -1.47% average: -10.92% median: -9.49%	Expanded
Regular Survey Group: Concord, Daly City, Hayward, Mt. View, Palo Alto, Redwood City, Richmond, San Leandro, San Mateo, Walnut Creek.			
Expanded Survey Group: Regular plus Berkeley, Livermore, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale.			
Special HA Survey Group: Marin County, Pittsburg,			
Richmond, Santa Cruz County, Santa Rosa, Vallejo.			

5. *What are the employee and employer contributions, based on slides in the City's budget presentation? Those show a 41 percent number for 2016-17 for employer share and this means employer share of employee salary?*

**CalPERS sets the contribution rates, based on current market performance, for a fiscal year two years prior to its collection. In other words, for FY 2012-13, the City's PERS contribution rate was set in the fall of 2010 and was based on the performance of the market at that time. The FY 2016-17 rates will not be set until the fall of 2014, so that 41% number is an estimate. (The data in the budget presentation represents the employer share only, not the employee share.)**

6. *The MOUs - ACEA's says City employees will contribute 7 percent of their salaries toward PERS, while IAFF's says the City will contribute 9 percent as an employee share of PERS. Is that an extra payment the City makes for Safety in lieu of additional pay, or does that come straight out of safety employees' paychecks?*

**Under the 3% at 50 retirement formula, which is the retirement formula for all City Safety employees, the employee share is 9% of qualifying earnings. That 9% is paid by the Safety employees out of their paychecks. The City's Miscellaneous employees are under the less lucrative 2% at 55 retirement formula, which requires a lower employee contribution of 7% of qualifying earnings. The Miscellaneous employees pay the full 7%. In 2011, the City's Safety employees agreed to contribute an additional 2% towards their pensions; funds that come directly out of their paychecks. This 2% is part of the total pension contribution that the City must make for Safety employees. In 2012, the Miscellaneous employees agreed to contribute an additional 1.868% toward their pensions— funds that come directly out of their paychecks.**



7. Controlling for inflation, how do City employee salaries compare over the last ten years?

Fiscal Year Ending 6/30/	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Salaries	46,466,756	50,535,026	54,599,685	61,387,102	58,475,829	59,418,747	63,837,737	60,884,613	55,885,921	46,795,988	44,219,142	
Benefits	13,448,869	15,282,640	18,962,560	24,076,526	28,882,125	28,610,647	28,197,359	29,622,926	23,938,579	20,607,657	21,756,405	
Total	59,915,625	65,817,666	73,562,245	85,463,628	87,357,954	88,029,394	92,035,097	90,507,539	79,824,500	67,403,645	65,975,547	
% Change from Prior Year										0.88		
Salaries	4.85%	8.76%	8.04%	12.43%	-4.74%	1.61%	7.44%	-4.63%	-8.21%	-16.27%	-5.51%	
Benefits	5.91%	13.64%	24.08%	26.97%	19.96%	-0.94%	-1.44%	5.06%	-19.19%	-13.91%	5.57%	
Total	5.08%	9.85%	11.77%	16.18%	2.22%	0.77%	4.55%	-1.66%	-11.80%	-15.56%	-2.12%	19.27%
June Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W) San Francisco - Oakland-San Jose												
CPI - W %	1.2%	1.6%	1.7%	1.1%	3.9%	3.0%	4.7%	-0.2%	1.4%	2.9%	2.9%	24.2%
Difference	3.88%	8.25%	10.07%	15.08%	-1.68%	-2.23%	-0.15%	-1.46%	-13.20%	-18.46%	-5.02%	-4.93%

Fiscal Year Ending 6/30	2002	2012	
Salaries	46,466,756	44,219,142	
Benefits	13,448,869	21,756,405	
Total	\$59,915,625	\$65,975,547	
% Change from Prior Year			
Salaries	4.85%	-5.51%	
Benefits	5.91%	5.57%	
Total Salaries and Benefits Total Dollars	5.08%	-2.12%	
June Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W) San Francisco - Oakland-San Jose			
CPI - W	1.2%	2.9%	
Difference between current year percentage change and CPI-W	3.88%	-5.02%	

No. of Employees	731.2	549.2	
Average Cost per Employee			% Increase between 2002 and 2012
Salaries	\$63,549	\$80,516	27%
Benefits	18,393	39,615	115%
Total	\$81,942	\$120,130	47%

8. *How does the City compare to the County in terms of fire salaries?*

**The HR department is currently conducting a compensation survey. The City is confident it will show that the City's firefighters rank in the bottom third of compensation and significantly behind the County.**

### **C. PUBLIC EMPLOYEE BENEFITS**

1. *What is the monthly cost for medical benefits paid on behalf of City retirees?*

**For Miscellaneous retirees, the City contributes the Minimum Employer Contribution amount of \$112/month (employee only).**

**For Safety retirees hired before 6/7/11, the City contributes for Fiscal Year 2012-13 up to \$711.10/month (employee only) or \$1,422.20/month (employee & spouse).**

**For Safety retirees hired after 6/7/11, the City will contribute up to \$711.10/month for Fiscal Year 2012-13 (employee only).**

2. *What of the following benefits can be implemented or negotiated at the City level if any?*

- Increase Retirement Ages – as a result of pension reform all new safety employees will be subject to the 2.7%@57 formula. All new non safety employees will have the 2%@62 formula. There may be other options that **can be negotiated and subsequently implemented however it is unclear currently exactly what those options will be.; requires negotiation amendment to PERS contract**
- Require Three-Year Final Compensation to stop spiking. Also as a result of pension reform, all new employees will be subject to final three year compensation. It is possible that we might be able to negotiate from single highest year to the final three year compensation for existing employees.

- Limit Post-Retirement Employment – **Cannot negotiate or implement this as it is the purview of the California state legislature. Pension reform requires a 180 day gap in employment before new retirees can be employed.**
- Felons Forfeit Pension Benefits– **Cannot negotiate or implement this as it is the purview of the California state legislature.**
- Prohibit Retroactive Pension Increases –new pension reform law prohibits public employers from granting retroactive pension benefit enhancements that would apply to service performed prior to the date of the enhancement. This would apply to current and future employees. Prohibit Pension Holidays – **Pension holidays occur when the agency suspends employer and/or employee contributions necessary to fund annual pension normal costs. It's prohibited under the new law.**
- The pension reform legislation eliminates the ability of any public employee to purchase nonqualified service or “airtime” unless an official application was received by the PERS system prior to January 1, 2013. Increase Pension Board Independence and Expertise – **The jurisdiction of the City’s Pension Board is limited to oversight of the City’s legacy 1079 and 1082 plans. The Pension Board has no authority over the City’s contract with CalPERS.**
- Reduce Retiree Health Care Costs – **As stated above in response to question, Safety employees hired on or before June 7, 2011 and employed with the City of Alameda for at least five years shall receive medical coverage up to the two-party rate. Safety employees hired after June 7, 2011 will become eligible for retiree health benefits in ten years and will receive single-party coverage only.**
- Equal Sharing of Pension Costs –All new employees must pay 50% of the employer normal cost.
- Five-year vesting period – **This is the current requirement set by the California state legislature.**
- 3% @ 50 for Public Safety Employees and 2% @ 55 for all other City employees – **These are the Safety and Miscellaneous retirement formulas currently in place; The formula in place for current safety and non safety employees does not change and would be the formula for anyone new hired who is a “legacy employee” (not new or currently active in PERS with no six month break in service.) All new safety employees would be subject to the 2.7% @ 57 formula and all new non safety employees would be subject to 2% @ 62.**
- Work agreements (side letters) not included in the contract – **All MOUs now include previously attached side letters. Side letters have been negotiated for inclusion in the current MOUs or are specifically identified and referenced in the MOU as an appendix.**

## **D. PUBLIC CONTRACTS**

### *1. How do public contracts work?*

Public contracting is heavily regulated by State, Federal and local law, depending on the type of contract and the funding sources and the entity involved. The goal for non-professional services is to ensure a high degree of competition and to allow a wide response from a diverse pool.

For construction-related services, contracts must be publically bid in an open and fair process using with a set scope of services in which sealed bids are received. The lowest responsive and responsible bidder is chosen. By law, in most cases, a low bid construction contract may not be negotiated.

For most professional service contracts, a Request for Qualification solicitation is widely issued to assure that the best qualified person or firm is chosen. After a qualifications appraisal, a contract price and scope will be negotiated with the most qualified individual.

For goods, similar procurement processes are in place to ensure a high degree of competition in the marketplace.

### *2. What is negotiable? What is not?*

Negotiations require that two parties are willing to talk and come to an agreement. In the case of the City, all negotiations and resulting agreements must also comply with state and federal law. For labor agreements, generally anything having to do with wages or conditions of employment is a mandatory bargaining issue. Professional services contracts are fully negotiable.

Construction sealed bid contracts are generally not negotiable.

## **E. DECLARING A FISCAL EMERGENCY**

### *1. What would be the criteria for the City to declare financial emergency? After depleting all of the General Fund reserves, asset to liability imbalance, verge of Bankruptcy, etc.?*

California Constitution Article XVI, Section 18 prohibits the City from incurring debts or liabilities in any year that exceed the revenue and reserves available in a fiscal year. This concept of not using one-time funds to pay for on going expenses drives the City's annual budget process. Depending on whether the City's inability to balance the budget is temporary or structural, different considerations would apply.

*2. After declaring financial emergency, is the City able to open labor agreement for renegotiation, or can the City impose direct cost reduction action immediately?*

**Labor agreements can be re-opened any time if there is mutual agreement between the parties to do so. The City's labor agreements have provisions addressing procedures to be used in the event of the occurrence of different events. The City's Memoranda of Understanding with the unions and bargaining units can be found on the City's website. If the City anticipates it will not have the funds available to pay City employees, and represented City employees are not willing to accept pay cuts, the City could opt to reduce City staff.**

*3. If the City were to declare bankruptcy, would the City be relieved of its pension obligations?*

**No. The City of Vallejo declared bankruptcy and tried to do this two years ago and was prevented by a lawsuit. It now appears to be settled law that a City may not relieve itself of its pension obligations by declaring bankruptcy.**

**Furthermore, as of January 1, 2012, a bill signed by Gov. Brown last fall, AB 506, requires local governments, before declaring bankruptcy, to go through a lengthy neutral evaluation process to declare a fiscal emergency. This makes it much more difficult for local governments to declare bankruptcy.**

## **F. OTHER CITY MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS**

*1. Why can't the City privatize and outsource its non-core services like parks, libraries, maintenance, etc.?*

**The City can, however, such a comprehensive plan of action would require extensive analysis of financial, legal, and operational impacts before a decision could be made as to whether the benefit would outweigh the cost/risk of such an approach. The City should and does examine the effectiveness of its service provision on a case by case basis. In the past year, and as a result of this continuing self examination, the City has outsourced the animal shelter and the jail.**

*2. Who governs the oversight of operations and support: scheduling of work hours, filling vacancies and promotions, staffing levels, operations of facilities, etc.?*

**The City Charter designates the City Manager as the Chief Administrative Officer for the City. The City Manager is appointed by the City Council and serves at the pleasure of the Council, which is the policy-setting body. The City Manager has responsibility for oversight of operations, and support for all departments, hiring and firing of personnel, etc. The City Manager delegates certain responsibilities**

**to department heads, but the City Manager retains responsibility and authority for the operation of the City.**

*3. How do City staffing levels compare to where they have been historically?*

<b>Department</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1993</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Housing Authority		39.6	46.2	44.7	
Fire - TOTAL	101	99	116	98	98
Sworn <sup>1</sup>	99	96	111	91	91
Non-sworn	2	3	5	7	7
Police - TOTAL	111	149	152	128	120
Sworn	92	100	104	88	88
Non-sworn	19	49	48	40	32
Alameda Municipal Power	73	98	130	91	91
All Other Departments	153	208.4	287	187.5	176.58
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>594</b>	<b>731.2</b>	<b>549.2</b>	<b>485.58</b>
1 October 2010 - October 2014 plus 6 SAFER Grant funded Firefighter positions.					