amNewYork

"Two ways to look at 1.5% and Roger is right"

Chuck Bennett

March 26, 2006

The controversial part of the rejected contract now up for a revote is the 1.5% of gross wage deduction for a new health insurance premium to pay for the health care of retirees.

Union leadership says all the 1.5% does it reduce the 10.5% in raises over three years to a 9% raise over three years.

Roger is right and Ainsley is wrong.

Union dissidents, on the other hand, like Ainsley Stewart have repeatedly said, that the contribution equals 4.5% over the life of the contract so the raise is just 6%.

Roger is right and Ainsley is wrong.

Let's figure it out. The contract up for a vote calls for 3%, 4% and 3.5% in raises.

Let's say a worker makes $1,000 a pay check. The first year a worker will get $30 extra for his 3% raise and then lose $15 for the 1.5% health insurance deduction. Total of $1,015.

The next year, the worker's pay check, now at $1,030 will rise 4% to $1,071.20. Subtract the 1.5% for health insurance ($16.07) and he ends up with $1055.13.

The final year, the worker's pay check at $1,071.20 rises 3.5% ($38.5) to $1,109.70. Subtract 1.5% for health insurance ($16.65). So the worker ends up with $1,093.05.

After three years, the worker's pay check including raises and minus health insurance, rose 9.305% from $1,000 to $1,093.05.

Roger's math is right.

Roger's math is right. Anyone figure differently?

http://newsday.typepad.com/news_local_tracker/