

As noted, both parties propose wholesale changes to Section Q, with the FOP wanting to add a classification (Range Officer) and the City desiring to remove bonus payments for three (3) classifications, one effective January 1, 2011 (Accreditation Officer). The correct call here is the *status quo* which, of course, is not an option presented by the parties.

I agree that there is no justification for the Union's proposal to add yet another specialty bonus pay assignment to Article VI where only of the 17 agreed-upon comparables provide specialty pay for Range Officers (CX 36). Moreover, apparently the parties have already agreed that the Accreditation Officer's bonus pay should lapse once the incumbent officer leaves that position (*Brief* at 35; R. 150). Also, no bench-mark jurisdiction offers such a bonus for officers who pay accreditation work (CX 53).

**On balance, the Administration makes the better case and its position is awarded.**

## **VI. AWARD**

Applying the statutory criteria outlined for interest arbitrators, and for the reasons articulated above, as well as the authority vested in me by Section 14 of the Act, the following is awarded:

- |                         |                                  |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| A. Term of Agreement:   | City's final offer               |
| B. Wages:               | City's final offer               |
| C. Longevity:           | City's final offer               |
| D. Insurance:           | Union's final offer (as amended) |
| E. Holiday Pay:         | City's final offer               |
| F. Specialty Bonus Pay: | City's final offer               |

Dated this 20<sup>th</sup> day of December,  
2011, at DeKalb, IL 60115



Marvin Hill,  
Arbitrator