New York State Civil Service Law, Article 14
“Taylor Law”

Section 209.5
(v) the public arbitration panel shall make just and reasonable determination of the matters in dispute. In arriving at such determination, the panel shall specify the basis for its findings, taking into consideration, in addition to any other relevant factors, the following:

a. comparison of the wages, hours and conditions of employment of the employees involved in the arbitration proceeding with the wages, hours, and conditions of employment of other employees performing similar services or requiring similar skills under similar working conditions and with other employees generally in public and private employment in comparable communities;
b. the interests and welfare of the public and the financial ability of the public employer to pay;
c. comparison of peculiarities in regard to other trades or professions, including specifically, (1) hazards of employment; (2) physical qualifications; (3) educational qualifications; (4) mental qualifications; (5) job training and skills;

There are many criteria that should factor into a “just and reasonable” arbitration award for New York City police officers. PERB arbitrator Howard Edelman seems to think there is only one: the City’s “bargaining pattern” with its other employees, a term never mentioned in the Taylor Law. He agrees that New York City police officers are the “finest.” He agrees that they “walk a dangerous tightrope” in order to protect the city. He concludes that they are paid 16% less than their local counterparts. He agrees that “the City can afford to pay reasonable [wage] increases” to police officers. But never mind all of that: to Edelman, the so-called “pattern” raises agreed to by other groups dictate that they must remain the lowest paid police officers in the area.

Arbitrator Howard Edelman: Hopelessly Compromised
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