



PIMA COUNTY DEPUTY SHERIFF ASSOCIATION
COMBINED LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES OF AZ
312 SOUTH THIRD AVENUE
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701

January 22, 2016

Sheriff Nanos,

I write this letter with the utmost respect. As the PCDSA President, I am bound to represent the members in an ethical and moral manner. I have a duty to do all that I can to promote their wellbeing and to ensure that they are being treated fairly compared to the other employees in Pima County while keeping the best interests of the community as our driving force. How we serve the community and the level of service is the core value of our jobs. If attrition keeps up at this pace, then we will not be able to provide the level of service the community has come to know and expect. Attrition will continue to rise, even with this new proposed pay package.

To recap an order of events, as I have documented them:

- In August of 2015, as the Vice Chairman for the PCDSA, I went in front of the Board of Supervisors asking for the 5.6 million dollars to bring Deputies to the proper level in the step plan. This was to help attrition rates to lower and to maintain retention so that we could continue to provide the level of service for the community that we pride ourselves on.
- This step plan was established and approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2007 for January of 2008 and was started but then stopped in 2009. Deputies, sergeants and corrections agreed to "tighten their belts" to best serve the County and the Community they serve.
- Under your direction to the FOP and the PCDSA, we were informed that it was our responsibility to attempt to get any type of raise (such as cost of living and medical increase). At that time we were only concerned with salary decompression. We understood the hardship it placed on the Community and the County.
- We were told by the Board of Supervisors that there was no money and therefore could not help us.
- The FOP and the PCDSA communicated on several occasions that they wanted to be part of the pay package process, however we were not included. This contradicted previous statements made but we understood because of the new approach by a change in command and we accepted that.

- On October 20th, 2015 the FOP and the PCDSA had a joint meeting that resulted in 140+ votes asking for the FOP and the PCDSA to proceed to looking into a lawsuit. This information was shared with you, Sheriff Nanos, and the immediate acknowledgement was negative as it applied to our actions and the vote.
- On October 23, 2015 I spoke with you in the cafeteria and you made it very apparent that you were not in favor of the potential lawsuit and that it may affect what was being worked on with Mr. Huckelberry. I addressed at that time that we (FOP and PCDSA) would like to be a part of the pay package process. I was ensured that I would be contacted that following Monday, and was asked and provided electronic documents of potential pay packages the FOP and PCDSA had worked on up to that moment to the Chief of Staff, Brad Gagnepain.
- No contact was made to meet, following that encounter.
- On October 30th, 2015 Costaki Manoleas, Eric Johnson, and I spoke with Chief Deputy Radtke about recent events and provided initial versions of what we considered to be a fair pay package and received a response that did not support what we were providing. The FOP and the PCDSA expressed our concern to be a part of the pay package process, once again. We took the advice and revamped the pay packages we had created to meet similar criteria that the Chief Deputy had expressed to us.
- The FOP and the PCDSA were not contacted to participate, however on the date of January 1, 2016 a memorandum was sent out to all deputies, detectives and sergeants in the department advising that a ballot would be collected and that a hundred percent participation would be required. It asked that we absorb the Pima County contribution to the Public Safety Police Retirement System of 3.65%. It offered a 3.65% raise to individuals to offset this transfer. This occurred following an emergency meeting with the Unions the day before the release.
- Within 24 hours, the FOP and PCDSA were able to show numerous issues with this offer to include a loss of money per pay check for all deputies and sergeants. It appeared to only benefit those that do not pay into the retirement system for Public Safety. Following the FOP and PCDSA response, we enquired what was going to happen with the ballots as they were scheduled to go out on January 4, 2015. It was half way through that day when we received the response from you, Sheriff Nanos, that it was "Done".
- On January 8, 2015, the PCDSA was called to the Sheriff's Office for a meeting. The FOP was electronic, present by phone. Upon arrival a new package was offered giving 4.15% raise to the deputies to offset the 3.65% that would be given back to the deputies and sergeants raising the contributions from 8% to 11.65% into the PSPRS. Additionally there was a restructuring of the step plan.
- At first, the plan looked good and both you, Sheriff Nanos, and the Chief of Staff advised that we could respond and counter offer.
- Additional information revealed that years ago the County decided to take on 3.65% of the contribution into the Public Safety Personnel Retirement System in lieu of a 5.0% raise for Sheriff's Department commissioned members.
- After dissecting and including attorneys and accountants, the FOP and the PCDSA identified numerous issues that did not benefit the deputies.

- The major issues identified were translated to the command staff through a joint letter from the FOP and the PCDSA.
- Nothing was discussed or brought up.
- After this, the FOP and PCDSA reached to the command staff and were told in an email that you were moving forward with no explanation.
- On January 15, 2015 the entire department was carbon copied on a memorandum sent to Mr. Chuck Huckelberry as it applied to the same pay package that was provided to the FOP and the PCDSA for review. In the memorandum, it did not change in any way from the original version provided. This was despite several issues identified by the FOP and the PCDSA that were not in favor of the deputies or sergeants.
- Numerous complaints from the deputies and sergeants were received immediately following the release of this memorandum, identifying the same issues discussed.

Because of the amount of concern generated, the facts presented by the FOP and the PCDSA being overlooked as to their response, and the obvious problems with both offers given to the associations over the last four weeks by the Sheriff's Command Staff. With no intent on following the investigative concerns developed by the individual unions, the following is what we have no choice but to do:

1. We are addressing the legality of forcing members of the Pima County Sheriff's Department to conform to accepting the 3.65% currently payed by Pima County after a contract was established years ago where deputies forwent a 5% raise for Pima County to pick up the 3.65% contribution to the Public Safety Personnel Retirement System. A discrepancy of .85% from the original contract. The Arizona Constitution states that no employer can make a change to an employee benefit without it benefiting the employee 100% or with 100% approval from the employee group. This pay proposal clearly does not.
2. The FOP and PCDSA have previously advised you, Sheriff Nanos, that we were holding off with our potential litigation pending the outcome of decompression (movement in a plan that was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff's Department [documents from 2007] and was stalled, not a raise). Due to the recent release of the proposed pay package without the input of the unions after asking for our involvement, leaves us with little choice.
3. The FOP and the PCDSA are asking the Sheriff, Board of Supervisors and Mr. Chuck Huckelberry for a reasonable and compromised position as it applies to the pay package developed by the FOP and the PCDSA on or before the date of February 29, 2016.

The following are concerns and facts that will assist in showing the community the current state of affairs as it applies to the public safety of their community and the unfair treatment of employees that serve Pima County and its people for the betterment of the community.

1. The deputies, sergeants, correction officers, correction sergeants, and civilian staff of the Sheriff's Department and all the Pima County employees have been seriously neglected and are far behind where they should be.
2. Comparisons show that the deputies and sergeants of the Pima County Sheriff's Department are the lowest paid in Pima County despite the fact that they serve the greatest populous and geographic area. Even with the proposed pay package offered by you, Sheriff Nanos, we will remain the lowest paid in the county. Meanwhile, the command staff comprised of Chiefs and excluding the Sheriff, make the most of all agencies in Pima County with the exception of a couple. The discrepancy between command staff and deputies as it applies to pay is the greatest in Pima County.
3. Additionally, all other agencies consider detective as a promotion and includes a pay increase. All other agencies are current on their perspective pay plans with the exception of Tucson Police Department. All other agencies have incentive pay for language and specialized training where the Pima County Sheriff's Department does not. The comparisons from a police comparison report generated by the Oro Valley City Counsel in October of 2014 clarifies these statistics.
4. It was conveyed by the command staff that the Sheriff's Departments biggest concern was the Tucson Police Department. This has discrepancy. The Sahuarita Police Department is the biggest threat to the Pima County Sheriff's Department followed by the Oro Valley Police Department. We have not lost any deputies to the Tucson Police Department in years. We have lost 2 deputies to Oro Valley and 4 deputies to Sahuarita Police Department in the last few weeks. Several remain to be picked up by Oro Valley and up to 12 deputies are looking at other agencies.
5. Since January 1, 2013 to January 1, 2016 the Pima County Sheriff's Department has lost 52 deputies, several sergeants, and 178 correction officers. This equates to over \$4,488,347.69 of tax payer investment that is simply lost to other agencies. Of those numbers, 22 deputies, 1 sergeant, and 43 corrections (half) have left in the last 6 MONTHS. That equates to over \$1,148,210.96. That means 26% of the tax payer's total loss in investment is in the last six months compared to the last three years.
6. I asked for 5.6 million in August for decompression of the deputies, sergeants and corrections. This number combined with the loss of investment by the citizens of Pima County, equates to \$10,088,347.96. Yet we are being asked to sacrifice once again, Sheriff Nanos, to stay under 7.3 million as it applies to decompression.
7. Unfortunately, the 7.3 million fails to cover the 6.8% cost of living that was not given from 2008 to 2015 and the average of 3% -5% increase in medical that has occurred each year since 2010.
8. The pay package that the FOP and PCDSA has come up with is fair, yet still puts us at the bottom of the pay scale, and deputies are fine with this.

The FOP and the PCDSA want to work hand in hand with the command staff and you, Sheriff Nanos, if only given the opportunity. Both Unions strive for what is best for the Sheriff's Department employees and our Community.

Thank you for your time and attention to the concerns of your employees. I look forward to your response and meeting with you.

Kevin E. Kubitskey
Pima County Deputy Sheriff's Association
President

Attachments:

Deputy Sheriff and Correction Officer Pay Proposal (1)
Sergeant and Corrections Sergeant Pay Proposal (1)
Deputy Sheriff and Correction Officer Pay Proposal (2) (PSPRS Shift)
Sergeant and Corrections Sergeant Pay Proposal (2) (PSPRS Shift)

“Professional Representation for Professionals”

