

# Compensation Plan Update for Blount County, TN

DRAFT REPORT



Evergreen Solutions, LLC

March 1, 2019

# Table of Contents

	PAGE
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Study Methodology.....	1-1
1.2 Report Organization.....	1-2
<b>2.0 ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT CONDITIONS.....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Pay Plan Analysis.....	2-1
2.2 Employee Salary Placement by Grade.....	2-2
2.3 Salary Quartile Analysis.....	2-5
2.4 Employees by Department.....	2-6
2.5 Summary.....	2-8
<b>3.0 MARKET SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Salary Survey Results.....	3-1
3.2 Market Summary.....	3-7
<b>4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1 Compensation.....	4-1
4.2 System Administration.....	4-10
4.3 Summary.....	4-11



# Chapter 1 - Introduction

Evergreen Solutions, LLC (Evergreen) was contracted in September 2017 by Blount County (County), Tennessee to conduct a Compensation Plan Update. The County's current plan was implemented in July 2015 following a Compensation and Classification Study which was also conducted by Evergreen. A recommendation was made then that the County conduct a review of its compensation system periodically to maintain its competitiveness. Following that guidance, the County's leadership requested an update to ensure its pay structure remains competitive, and in fact, be positioned ahead of the market. This report presents the findings and recommendations of this update.

## **1.1 STUDY METHODOLOGY**

Evergreen used a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to analyze and develop recommendations to position the County's pay structure at a more competitive position within the labor market. Specific study tasks included:

- holding a study kick-off meeting;
- analyzing the County's current salary structure to determine its strengths and weaknesses;
- conducting a salary survey to assess the market competitiveness of the County's current pay plan;
- developing recommendations for revisions to or new pay plans;
- developing a method for implementing the proposed plans; and
- creating a report summarizing the review findings and recommendations.

### **Kick-off Meeting**

The kick-off meeting allowed members of the study team from the County and Evergreen to discuss different aspects of the study. During the meeting, information about the County's compensation structure was reviewed and the work plan for the study was finalized. The meeting also provided an opportunity for Evergreen to explain the types of data needed to begin the study.



## Assessment of Current Conditions

This analysis provided an overall assessment of the County’s current pay structure (plan) and related employee data at the time of the study. The current pay plan and the progression of employees’ salaries through the pay ranges were examined during this process. The findings of this analysis are summarized in **Chapter 2** of this report.

## Market Analysis

For the market analysis, the peer organizations that were utilized in the previous study were again determined as appropriate for this analysis with emphasis placed on collecting peer County data. The peers identified were those that compete with the County for employees and the benchmark classifications utilized in this study represented a cross-section of the departments and levels of work performed by County employees. Following the identification of the peers and benchmarks, a salary survey tool was developed for the collection of salary range data. Salary data were then collected and analyzed; a summary of which can be found in **Chapter 3** of this report.

## Recommendations

The County’s compensation philosophy was reviewed to understand its desired market position, preferred type of pay plan design and methods of salary progression. Using this information and the analysis of the market data, a recommendation for a new structure (pay plans) was developed. Next, a method of implementation was developed to transition employees’ salaries into the new plans, and the associated costs of adjusting employees’ salaries were estimated. A summary of these recommendations is provided in **Chapter 4** of this report.

## 1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report includes the following additional chapters:

- Chapter 2 – Assessment of Current Conditions
- Chapter 3 – Market Summary
- Chapter 4 – Recommendations



## Chapter 2 – Assessment of Current Conditions

The purpose of this evaluation was to provide an overall assessment of the County's compensation structure, employee salary progression, and employee counts in each department. Data included here reflect the conditions when the study began, and should be considered, as such, a snapshot in time. The insights gained from this evaluation provided the basis for further analysis through the course of this study, and were not considered sufficient cause for recommendations independently. Instead, the results of this evaluation were considered during the analysis of internal equity and peer market data. Subsequently, appropriate compensation related recommendations were developed for the County and are described later in this report.

### 2.1 PAY PLAN ANALYSIS

**Exhibit 2A** illustrates that the County administered a step-based pay plan for its employees, with established minimum and maximum salaries. The pay plan consisted of 20 pay grades with 25 steps each for 671 employees. Grades 101 through 112 have a 1.8 percent step progression and a 55 percent range. Grades 113 through 120 have a 2.1 percent step progression and a 65 percent range spread.



**EXHIBIT 2A  
EMPLOYEE PAY PLAN**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
101	\$ 21,100	\$ 26,903	\$ 32,705	55%	18
102	\$ 22,894	\$ 29,190	\$ 35,486	55%	42
103	\$ 24,840	\$ 31,671	\$ 38,502	55%	49
104	\$ 26,951	\$ 34,363	\$ 41,774	55%	57
105	\$ 29,242	\$ 37,284	\$ 45,325	55%	80
106	\$ 31,728	\$ 40,453	\$ 49,178	55%	229
107	\$ 34,425	\$ 43,892	\$ 53,359	55%	44
108	\$ 37,351	\$ 47,623	\$ 57,894	55%	41
109	\$ 40,526	\$ 51,671	\$ 62,815	55%	30
110	\$ 43,971	\$ 56,063	\$ 68,155	55%	23
111	\$ 47,709	\$ 60,829	\$ 73,949	55%	23
112	\$ 51,764	\$ 65,999	\$ 80,234	55%	12
113	\$ 55,129	\$ 73,046	\$ 90,963	65%	8
114	\$ 58,712	\$ 77,794	\$ 96,875	65%	3
115	\$ 62,528	\$ 82,850	\$ 103,171	65%	6
116	\$ 66,592	\$ 88,235	\$ 109,877	65%	3
117	\$ 70,920	\$ 93,969	\$ 117,018	65%	1
118	\$ 75,530	\$ 100,078	\$ 124,625	65%	1
119	\$ 80,439	\$ 106,582	\$ 132,724	65%	0
120	\$ 85,668	\$ 113,510	\$ 141,352	65%	1
<b>Average / Total</b>				<b>59%</b>	<b>671</b>

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by the County as of October 2017.

## 2.2 EMPLOYEE SALARY PLACEMENT BY GRADE

When assessing the effectiveness of the County's pay plan and practices, it is important to analyze where employees' salaries fell within each pay range. Identifying those areas where there may have been clusters of employees' salaries could illuminate potential pay progression concerns within the current pay plan. It should be noted that employees' salaries, and the progression of the same, is associated with an organization's compensation philosophy—specifically, the method of salary progression and the availability of resources. Therefore, the placement of employees' salaries should be viewed with this context in mind.



**Exhibit 2B** illustrates the placement of employees' salaries relative to pay grade minimums and maximums. The exhibit contains the following:

- the pay grades,
- the number of employees in classifications assigned to the pay grade,
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries below the minimum,
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries at the minimum,
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries at the maximum, and
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries above the maximum.

**EXHIBIT 2B  
SALARY PLACEMENT  
BELOW MINIMUM AND ABOVE MAXIMUM BY GRADE**

Grade	Employees	# < Min	% < Min	# = Min	% = Min	# = Max	% = Max	# > Max	% > Max
101	18	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%
102	42	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.4%
103	49	3	6.1%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	2	4.1%
104	57	4	7.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%
105	80	4	5.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	3.8%
106	229	9	3.9%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	8	3.5%
107	44	5	11.4%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
108	43	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.3%
109	28	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
110	23	0	0.0%	2	8.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
111	23	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
112	12	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
113	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
114	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
115	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
116	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
117	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
118	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
119	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
120	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2.5%</b>

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by the County as of October 2017.

Employees with salaries at the grade minimum are typically new hires or are new to their classification following a recent promotion; on the other hand, employees with salaries at the grade maximum are typically highly experienced and proficient in their classification. As **Exhibit 2B** illustrates, at the time of this study, there were six employees with salaries at their grade minimum and no employees with a salary at their grade maximum. The exhibit also shows that 25 employees earned a salary below their designated salary range minimum and 17 earned a salary above their designated salary range maximum.



**Exhibit 2C** illustrates the placement of employees' salaries relative to pay grade midpoints. The exhibit contains the following:

- the pay grades,
- the number of employees in classifications assigned to the pay grade,
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries below the midpoint,
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries near the midpoint (within 5 percent), and
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries above the midpoint of each pay grade.

**EXHIBIT 2C  
SALARY PLACEMENT AROUND MIDPOINT  
BY GRADE**

Grade	Employees	# < Mid	% < Mid	# Near Mid	% Near Mid	# > Mid	% > Mid
101	18	15	83.3%	2	11.1%	1	5.6%
102	42	36	85.7%	3	7.1%	3	7.1%
103	49	38	77.6%	5	10.2%	6	12.2%
104	57	46	80.7%	4	7.0%	7	12.3%
105	80	46	57.5%	18	22.5%	16	20.0%
106	229	180	78.6%	23	10.0%	26	11.4%
107	44	27	61.4%	7	15.9%	10	22.7%
108	43	33	76.7%	6	14.0%	4	9.3%
109	28	18	64.3%	5	17.9%	5	17.9%
110	23	15	65.2%	6	26.1%	2	8.7%
111	23	18	78.3%	4	17.4%	1	4.3%
112	12	5	41.7%	6	50.0%	1	8.3%
113	8	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%
114	3	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%
115	6	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%
116	3	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
117	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
118	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
119	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
120	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>73.0%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>13.0%</b>

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by the County as of October 2017.

Employees with salaries close to the midpoint of a pay range should be fully proficient in their classification and require minimal supervision to satisfactorily complete their job duties. Within this framework, grade midpoint is commonly considered to be the salary an individual could reasonably expect for similar work in the market. Therefore, it is important to examine the percentage and number of employees with salaries above and below the calculated midpoint.





With midpoint being defined as five percent on either side of the calculated midpoint (Near Mid), there were 490 employees (73.0 percent) that had salaries below the midpoint of their respective range (< Near Mid), 94 employees (14.0 percent) had salaries within five percent of the midpoint (Near Mid), and 87 employees (13.0 percent) had salaries above the midpoint (> Near Mid).

### 2.3 SALARY QUARTILE ANALYSIS

This section provides an additional analysis of the distribution of employees' salaries across the pay grades at the time of this study. Examining employee salary placement by grade quartile provided insight into whether clustering of employees' salaries existed within each pay grade. For this analysis, employees' salaries were slotted within one of four equal distributions. The first quartile (0-25) represents the lowest 25 percent of the pay range. The second quartile (26-50) represents the segment of the pay range above the first quartile up to the pay range's midpoint. The third quartile (51-75) represents the part of the pay range above the midpoint up to the 75th percentile of the pay range. The fourth quartile (76-100) is the highest 25 percent of the pay range. This analytical method provided an opportunity to assess how employees' salaries are disbursed throughout each grade (pay range).

**Exhibit 2D** provides a breakdown of placement of employees' salaries relative to salary quartile and provides the following:

- the pay grades,
- the number of employees per pay grade, and
- the location (by quartile) of the employees' salaries within each grade.

The County's employees' salaries were strongly skewed towards the lower end of their respective salary ranges. In order of employee concentration, 407 employees (60.7 percent) had salaries in the first quartile of their respective pay ranges. The next largest cluster of employees' salaries was found in the second quartile with 152 employees (22.7 percent). Additionally, 66 employees (9.8 percent) had salaries in the third quartile of their respective pay ranges, while 46 (6.9 percent) earned in the fourth quartile of their respective pay ranges.



**EXHIBIT 2D**  
**SALARY QUARTILE ANALYSIS**

GRADE	Total Employees	1st Quartile	2nd Quartile	3rd Quartile	4th Quartile
		# Employees	# Employees	# Employees	# Employees
101	18	10	6	1	1
102	42	31	7	3	1
103	49	35	8	4	2
104	57	42	7	4	4
105	80	32	27	9	12
106	229	155	40	22	12
107	44	21	12	5	6
108	43	27	10	4	2
109	28	15	8	1	4
110	23	13	8	1	1
111	23	12	8	2	1
112	12	4	6	2	0
113	8	3	1	4	0
114	3	1	0	2	0
115	6	4	1	1	0
116	3	1	1	1	0
117	1	1	0	0	0
118	1	0	1	0	0
119	0	0	0	0	0
120	1	0	1	0	0
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>22.7%</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>6.9%</b>

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by the County as of October 2017.

## 2.4 EMPLOYEES BY DEPARTMENT

At the time the study commenced, the County employed 671 individuals across 34 departments. **Exhibit 2E** depicts the number of employees and the number of classifications in each department and is intended only to provide basic information regarding how employees are distributed among departments. Also provided is the percentage breakdown of employees by department.



**EXHIBIT 2E  
EMPLOYEES BY DEPARTMENT**

Department	Employees	Classes	% of Total
Administrative Operations	37	23	5.5%
Adminstrative	13	9	1.9%
Animal Center	10	8	1.5%
Central Accounting	9	9	1.3%
Circuit Court	23	3	3.4%
Clerk & Master	7	3	1.0%
County Clerk	24	10	3.6%
Development	8	5	1.2%
Drug Court	9	6	1.3%
Elections	3	2	0.4%
Emergency Management	2	2	0.3%
Fleet Maintenance	4	2	0.6%
General Services	21	14	3.1%
General Sessions	23	11	3.4%
Health Department	23	12	3.4%
Highway Administration	4	4	0.6%
HR & Benefits	3	3	0.4%
Information Technology	7	6	1.0%
Investigative Operations	32	13	4.8%
Juvenile YSO	7	4	1.0%
Library	59	26	8.8%
Mayor Staff	1	1	0.1%
Patrol & Public Safety Operations	112	14	16.7%
Planning	3	3	0.4%
Probation	10	4	1.5%
Property Assessor	16	10	2.4%
Public Defender	2	1	0.3%
Register of Deeds	10	4	1.5%
Road and Bridge Maintenance	40	13	6.0%
Soil Conservation	1	1	0.1%
Support Operations	128	14	19.1%
Training Operations	10	5	1.5%
Trustee	7	7	1.0%
Veteran's Office	3	3	0.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by the County as of October 2017.



As the exhibit illustrates, the largest department in the County was Support Operations, with 128 employees representing 19.1 percent of the County's workforce.

## 2.5 SUMMARY

Overall, the County's compensation structure offered a firm foundation on which to improve. The key points of the current structure were:

- The County administered a step-based plan for its employees with 20 pay grades with 25 steps. The pay grades had constant range spreads of 55 percent for Grades 101 through 112 and 65 percent for Grades 113 through 120.
- Employee salaries were significantly skewed towards the lower end of their respective pay ranges, with approximately 83 percent of salaries falling within the first two quartiles of the salary range.

The County's pay plan provided employees with a clear pay structure in which they could reasonably expect to achieve salary growth. As a pay system is intended to encourage this growth based on an organization's compensation philosophy, this analysis revealed that the County faced challenges in successfully progressing employees' salaries throughout the plan's pay ranges.

The information gained from the review of current conditions was used in conjunction with the market analysis data to develop recommendations for a more competitive compensation plan that would best align with the County's compensation philosophy moving forward. These can be found in **Chapter 4** of this report.



## Chapter 3 – Market Summary

This chapter provides a market analysis in which the County's salary ranges were compared to those at peer organizations. The data from targeted market peers were used to evaluate the overall compensation at the County at the time of this study. It is important to note that the market comparisons contained herein do not translate well at the individual employee level and are instead used to provide an overall analysis. This is not intended to evaluate salaries paid to individuals as this compensation is determined through a combination of factors which could typically include: the demand for a job, a candidate's prior experience, or an individual's negotiation skills during the hiring process.

Furthermore, it should be noted that market comparisons are best thought of as a snapshot of current market conditions. In other words, market conditions change and, in some cases, change quickly; so, while these surveys are useful for making updates to salary structures, they must continue to be done at regular intervals if the County wishes to remain current with its peers and salary trends.

### 3.1 SALARY SURVEY RESULTS

Evergreen collected pay range information from target organizations utilizing a salary survey tool. This included selecting benchmark classifications to be surveyed. The desired outcome of benchmarking was to select a cross-section of the County's classifications so that the surveyed positions made up a subset of all work areas and job levels in the County. The job title, a description of assigned duties, and the education and experience requirements were provided in the survey tool for each benchmark classification.

The target peers were then selected by Evergreen with concurrence from the County's project team. Several factors were utilized when developing this peer list, including geographic proximity to the County, organization size, and the relative population being served by the organization. All collected data were adjusted for cost of living using a national cost of living index factor which allowed salary dollars from organizations outside of the immediate recruiting area to be adjusted for the cost of living relative to the County. **Exhibit 3A** provides the list of market peers from which data were collected from 18 peers for 100 benchmark classifications.

**EXHIBIT 3A  
MARKET PEERS**

Market Peers
City of Alcoa, TN
City of Chattanooga, TN
City of Gatlinburg, TN
City of Johnson City, TN
City of Knoxville, TN
City of Maryville, TN
City of Oak Ridge, TN
City of Pigeon Forge, TN
City of Sevierville, TN
<b>Anderson County, TN</b>
<b>Bradley County, TN</b>
Hawkins County, TN
<b>Knox County, TN</b>
<b>Montgomery County, TN</b>
<b>Rutherford County, TN</b>
Sullivan County, TN
Washington County, TN
<b>Williamson County, TN</b>
<b>Wilson County, TN</b>
Alcoa City Schools
Blount County Schools
Knox County Schools
Maryville City Schools
Maryville College
University of Tennessee
Blount Memorial Hospital
Denso Manufacturing
JTEKT
<b>Oak Ridge National Laboratory</b>
<b>Standard Aero</b>
State Fire Marshal's Office
<b>State of Tennessee</b>
TN Department of Environment & Conservation
TN Department of Transportation
TN Highway Patrol
Young-Williams Animal Center

\*Bold indicates data collected from peer



As an outcome of this study, the County expressed a desire to have a salary structure ahead of its peers. Specifically, the County wanted to have one pay plan for General Employees and Sworn Sheriff Employees at the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile. To determine the position of the existing structure and create new pay plans, Evergreen compared the County’s salary ranges for the benchmark classifications to the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile. The collected market data was also aged, or adjusted by one percent before calculating the pay range differentials. Aging the market data provided more realistic results as the data were collected in December 2017, and market ranges overall steadily increase over time. **Exhibit 3B** provides a summary of the comparison of the benchmark classifications to the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile of the market and contains the following:

- The market salary range information for each classification. This indicates the market minimum, midpoint, and maximum of the peer survey data for each benchmarked classification.
- The percent differentials (to the County’s existing salary ranges). A positive differential indicates the County was above the market average for that classification at the minimum, midpoint, or maximum. A negative differential indicates the County was below the desired market position for that classification. The final row near the bottom provides the average percent differentials for the minimum, midpoint, and maximum for all surveyed classifications collectively.
- The survey average range width. This provides the average range width for each classification surveyed determined by the average minimum and average maximum salaries of the respondents, relative to the minimum. The average range width for all the classifications collectively is provided in the final row. The number of responses collected for each classification is provided in the final column and the average number of responses for all the classifications is provided in the final row.

**EXHIBIT 3B  
SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY  
70<sup>TH</sup> PERCENTILE**

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp.
	70th Percentile	% Diff	70th Percentile	% Diff	70th Percentile	% Diff		
Accounting Analyst	\$42,627.05	-14.1%	\$54,976.46	-15.4%	\$66,752.78	-15.3%	56.6%	11
Accounting Clerk I	\$30,954.11	-14.9%	\$42,558.07	-23.9%	\$54,558.28	-30.6%	76.3%	10
Accounting Manager	\$55,359.11	-6.9%	\$67,580.85	-2.4%	\$81,519.99	-1.6%	47.3%	11
Accounting Technician	\$33,043.85	4.0%	\$43,212.85	1.5%	\$48,825.22	8.5%	47.8%	8
Accounts Payable Clerk, Senior	\$35,181.33	5.8%	\$44,000.49	7.6%	\$56,673.92	2.1%	61.1%	9
Administrative Assistant	\$32,276.57	-19.8%	\$40,543.40	-18.0%	\$49,558.68	-18.6%	53.5%	16
Animal Center Director	\$69,273.90	-25.7%	\$76,689.97	-5.0%	\$85,011.92	6.5%	22.7%	4
Animal Control Officer	\$30,547.45	-4.5%	\$39,429.83	-5.8%	\$46,274.24	-2.1%	51.5%	10
Assistant Superintendent/Engineer	\$73,172.58	-24.6%	\$88,510.85	-13.8%	\$104,053.20	-7.4%	42.2%	8
Budget Manager	\$69,442.55	-45.6%	\$83,955.64	-38.0%	\$99,108.67	-34.0%	42.7%	7
Captain Patrol	\$62,315.59	-20.4%	\$76,477.24	-15.9%	\$94,354.20	-17.6%	51.4%	11
Case Manager	\$36,166.89	-23.7%	\$45,420.09	-21.8%	\$50,163.36	-10.7%	38.7%	5



**EXHIBIT 3B (CONTINUED)  
SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY  
70<sup>TH</sup> PERCENTILE**

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp.
	70th Percentile	% Diff	70th Percentile	% Diff	70th Percentile	% Diff		
Cataloging Specialist	\$34,559.17	-8.9%	\$43,908.13	-8.5%	\$52,453.95	-6.7%	51.8%	5
Chief Deputy Sheriff	\$78,701.42	-18.2%	\$93,616.11	-6.1%	\$114,241.10	-4.0%	45.2%	9
Chief of Staff	\$60,295.99	-9.4%	\$76,332.77	-4.5%	\$88,338.14	2.9%	46.5%	6
Codes Inspector	\$38,557.15	4.9%	\$49,127.72	4.9%	\$57,374.22	8.7%	48.8%	14
Corporal SRO	\$38,843.69	-4.0%	\$46,210.85	3.0%	\$53,977.43	6.8%	39.0%	6
Counter Clerk I	\$28,366.32	-5.3%	\$36,385.64	-5.9%	\$43,654.58	-4.5%	53.9%	8
Courier	\$25,994.27	-23.2%	\$30,591.79	-13.7%	\$35,239.41	-7.7%	35.6%	6
Court Officer	\$35,861.18	-13.0%	\$41,960.88	-3.7%	\$47,548.94	3.3%	32.6%	6
Courtroom Assistant	\$27,006.79	-18.0%	\$35,794.45	-22.6%	\$43,216.64	-21.8%	60.0%	8
Crime Scene Investigator	\$36,314.34	-14.5%	\$48,056.10	-18.8%	\$56,416.58	-14.7%	55.4%	5
Custodial Supervisor	\$32,111.70	14.0%	\$39,055.08	18.0%	\$45,998.47	20.5%	43.2%	7
Custodian	\$23,297.87	-10.4%	\$28,242.13	-5.0%	\$32,949.23	-0.7%	41.4%	11
Dental Assistant	\$32,276.57	-19.8%	\$38,871.87	-13.1%	\$45,467.17	-8.8%	40.9%	6
Deputy Assessor	\$35,111.76	-20.1%	\$47,425.56	-27.2%	\$57,461.67	-26.8%	63.7%	4
Deputy Clerk I	\$26,617.14	-7.2%	\$31,863.88	-0.6%	\$37,152.65	3.5%	39.6%	6
Deputy Sheriff	\$35,900.62	-13.2%	\$45,155.65	-11.6%	\$53,349.82	-8.5%	48.6%	10
Drainage/Grading Supervisor	\$42,608.79	-5.1%	\$52,485.87	-1.6%	\$64,369.08	-2.5%	51.1%	7
Drug Court Programs Director	\$62,703.62	-21.1%	\$74,509.65	-12.9%	\$86,315.67	-7.6%	37.7%	5
Elections Deputy	\$39,024.62	-44.8%	\$46,613.52	-35.7%	\$54,202.42	-29.8%	38.9%	5
Emergency Management Director	\$72,971.81	-32.4%	\$87,316.01	-19.5%	\$99,883.04	-9.8%	36.9%	6
Engineering Supervisor	\$60,075.02	-25.9%	\$80,393.98	-32.2%	\$98,184.95	-32.8%	63.4%	8
Engineering Technician	\$42,916.92	-5.9%	\$52,116.35	-0.9%	\$63,772.98	-1.5%	48.6%	10
Environmental Health Manager	\$57,080.41	-10.3%	\$69,016.89	-4.6%	\$83,800.35	-4.4%	46.8%	4
Environmental Health Specialist	\$56,807.41	-52.1%	\$70,226.51	-47.5%	\$80,218.40	-38.6%	41.2%	4
Equipment Operator I	\$29,706.94	-19.6%	\$36,829.53	-16.3%	\$43,237.94	-12.3%	45.5%	10
Equipment Operator II	\$29,893.17	-10.9%	\$37,604.32	-9.4%	\$44,726.03	-7.1%	49.6%	7
Equipment Operator III	\$31,905.70	-9.1%	\$38,015.02	-2.0%	\$45,855.34	-1.2%	43.7%	8
Equipment Operator IV	\$32,811.57	-3.4%	\$40,957.62	-1.2%	\$49,946.42	-1.6%	52.2%	8
Executive Assistant	\$41,189.52	-10.3%	\$49,331.94	-3.6%	\$63,536.25	-9.7%	54.3%	12
Finance Director	\$101,013.16	-33.7%	\$120,053.55	-20.0%	\$145,450.10	-16.7%	44.0%	14
Fleet & Maintenance Supervisor	\$46,665.07	9.9%	\$56,821.33	13.9%	\$70,057.80	12.7%	50.1%	9
Fleet Maintenance Tech	\$32,596.85	-11.5%	\$45,357.04	-21.7%	\$54,977.45	-21.3%	68.7%	13
General Services Director	\$83,133.61	-17.2%	\$102,503.76	-9.1%	\$120,341.98	-2.8%	44.8%	3
GIS Coordinator	\$48,865.35	-20.6%	\$62,734.72	-21.4%	\$76,185.40	-21.3%	55.9%	10
GIS Technician	\$38,622.29	-12.2%	\$51,992.94	-18.5%	\$63,772.98	-19.5%	65.1%	10
Highway Maintenance Technician	\$31,817.41	-0.3%	\$39,614.75	2.1%	\$47,367.95	3.7%	48.9%	7
HR Director	\$82,312.98	-31.6%	\$99,835.57	-20.5%	\$121,585.42	-17.8%	47.7%	14
Human Resources Coordinator	\$42,916.92	-24.7%	\$53,119.94	-21.0%	\$61,557.35	-15.4%	43.4%	11
Human Resources Specialist	\$35,465.08	12.5%	\$49,805.87	3.6%	\$57,519.90	8.4%	62.2%	11
Instructional Librarian	\$46,486.18	-14.7%	\$57,109.76	-10.5%	\$71,843.48	-14.4%	54.5%	5
Investigator	\$40,487.87	-17.6%	\$49,474.12	-12.7%	\$60,811.18	-14.0%	50.2%	10
Judicial Assistant	\$33,614.58	-15.0%	\$40,768.04	-9.3%	\$48,095.46	-6.1%	43.1%	5
Judicial Commissioner	\$33,157.65	-23.0%	\$38,058.50	-10.8%	\$45,515.27	-9.0%	37.3%	5
Library Director	\$92,121.69	-38.3%	\$117,334.53	-33.0%	\$143,891.23	-31.0%	56.2%	5





**EXHIBIT 3B (CONTINUED)  
SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY  
70TH PERCENTILE**

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp.
	70th Percentile	% Diff	70th Percentile	% Diff	70th Percentile	% Diff		
Lieutenant	\$51,751.39	-8.5%	\$66,983.27	-10.1%	\$80,367.72	-8.7%	55.3%	11
LPN	\$32,201.14	-10.1%	\$40,707.07	-9.2%	\$46,788.15	-3.2%	45.3%	6
Magistrate	\$72,506.69	-16.0%	\$91,089.38	-9.9%	\$106,543.89	-3.3%	46.9%	5
Maintenance Technician	\$30,430.70	-32.9%	\$37,084.17	-27.0%	\$44,283.05	-24.8%	45.5%	5
Mapping Clerk	\$34,213.75	-17.0%	\$41,204.47	-10.5%	\$48,195.18	-6.3%	40.9%	6
Network Administrator	\$60,854.12	-27.6%	\$70,666.16	-16.2%	\$81,878.12	-10.7%	34.5%	9
Nurse Assistant	\$25,730.76	-21.9%	\$30,988.32	-15.2%	\$36,245.87	-10.8%	40.9%	4
Nutrition Educator	\$34,312.43	-17.3%	\$43,270.93	-16.1%	\$49,905.92	-10.1%	45.4%	6
Office Administrator	\$39,209.00	3.2%	\$49,652.26	3.9%	\$60,719.08	3.3%	54.9%	6
Office Manager	\$44,328.03	-9.4%	\$54,612.22	-5.7%	\$63,877.45	-1.7%	44.1%	9
Operations Manager	\$55,030.86	-15.3%	\$71,616.27	-17.7%	\$88,201.68	-19.3%	60.3%	4
Parts Tech	\$31,749.13	-8.6%	\$41,730.26	-11.9%	\$51,711.38	-14.1%	62.9%	6
Paving Supervisor	\$37,928.93	6.4%	\$47,723.13	7.6%	\$57,325.66	8.7%	51.1%	7
Payroll Clerk	\$37,203.35	-8.1%	\$44,801.88	-2.1%	\$52,450.31	1.7%	41.0%	8
Payroll Manager	\$45,385.95	4.9%	\$57,701.81	5.1%	\$70,567.69	4.6%	55.5%	11
PC Specialist	\$36,886.21	-16.3%	\$46,152.23	-14.1%	\$55,793.15	-13.5%	51.3%	11
Planner, Senior	\$52,573.72	-19.6%	\$69,414.00	-23.8%	\$81,674.86	-19.8%	55.4%	8
Planning Director	\$72,666.94	-31.8%	\$89,348.49	-22.3%	\$106,949.69	-17.6%	47.2%	8
Probation Director	\$65,904.94	-12.3%	\$78,453.69	-0.8%	\$89,743.55	7.4%	36.2%	6
Probation Officer	\$36,700.44	-6.6%	\$44,578.88	-1.6%	\$51,929.91	2.7%	41.5%	7
Project Manager	\$70,197.02	-5.4%	\$90,480.35	-2.5%	\$110,972.74	-1.0%	58.1%	6
Property & Evidence Technician	\$32,902.47	4.4%	\$40,920.35	6.8%	\$48,202.96	9.7%	46.5%	8
Public Information Officer	\$42,776.87	2.7%	\$49,788.96	11.2%	\$59,746.75	12.3%	39.7%	11
Purchasing Agent	\$56,430.62	9.8%	\$69,920.84	15.6%	\$82,988.41	19.6%	47.1%	10
Records Clerk	\$27,178.49	-18.7%	\$32,852.57	-12.5%	\$39,289.31	-10.7%	44.6%	9
Reference Librarian	\$48,013.74	-28.5%	\$59,457.19	-24.9%	\$73,123.89	-26.3%	52.3%	4
Risk Manager	\$65,485.47	-26.5%	\$82,107.60	-24.4%	\$97,820.52	-21.9%	49.4%	10
RN	\$53,234.27	-31.4%	\$57,967.37	-12.2%	\$63,468.24	-1.0%	19.2%	7
Sergeant	\$47,326.90	-7.6%	\$57,209.94	-2.0%	\$67,845.74	0.5%	43.4%	11
Shop Supervisor	\$45,484.82	-12.2%	\$56,962.80	-10.2%	\$68,453.56	-9.0%	50.5%	8
Sign Shop Foreman	\$42,649.88	-14.2%	\$51,776.64	-8.7%	\$60,834.93	-5.1%	42.6%	7
Sign Tech	\$29,437.59	-0.7%	\$40,128.36	-7.6%	\$48,010.55	-5.9%	63.1%	8
Stormwater Manager	\$50,961.07	-15.9%	\$67,441.23	-20.3%	\$80,137.44	-17.6%	57.3%	10
Systems Administrator	\$56,882.19	-29.4%	\$68,509.82	-22.2%	\$80,137.44	-17.6%	40.9%	9
Tax & Rebate Specialist	\$35,327.54	-20.8%	\$42,272.27	-13.4%	\$53,992.81	-19.1%	52.8%	5
Treatment Services Assistant	\$30,898.00	-14.6%	\$41,342.61	-20.3%	\$52,377.92	-25.4%	69.5%	5
Treatment Specialist	\$40,487.87	-17.6%	\$48,760.78	-11.1%	\$57,033.69	-6.9%	40.9%	3
Vegetation Control Supervisor	\$35,049.24	13.5%	\$48,946.76	5.3%	\$63,040.15	-0.4%	79.9%	5
Veteran Services, Director	\$54,590.41	-24.2%	\$66,435.27	-18.5%	\$73,982.59	-8.6%	35.5%	3
Veterinarian	\$67,373.14	-7.7%	\$85,561.75	-3.3%	\$103,750.35	-0.6%	54.0%	4
Victim Witness Coordinator	\$33,638.98	-15.0%	\$40,792.69	-9.4%	\$48,054.39	-6.0%	42.9%	3
Welder	\$33,705.17	2.1%	\$46,847.61	-6.7%	\$58,403.47	-9.5%	73.3%	8
Youth Services Officer	\$40,125.74	-26.5%	\$47,752.30	-18.0%	\$55,930.59	-13.7%	39.4%	5
<b>Overall Average</b>		<b>-14.1%</b>		<b>-10.6%</b>		<b>-8.1%</b>	<b>48.7%</b>	<b>7.6</b>



## **Market Minimums**

A starting point of the analysis was to compare the peer's market minimum for each classification to the County's range minimums. Market minimums are generally considered as an entry level salary for employees who meet the minimum qualifications of a classification. Those employees with salaries at or near the range minimums typically are unlikely to have mastered the job and probably have not acquired the skills and experience necessary to be fully proficient in their classification.

As **Exhibit 3B** illustrates, for the benchmarked classifications, the County was, on average, approximately 14.1 percent below its desired market position at the minimum of the salary ranges with regard to the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile. The following observations can be made based on the collected data:

- The surveyed position differentials ranged from 52.1 percent below market minimum in the case of the Environmental Health Specialist classification to 14.0 percent above market for the Custodial Supervisor classification.
- Of the 99 classifications surveyed with differentials, 85 classifications (85.9 percent) had differentials below the market 70<sup>th</sup> percentile at the minimum.

## **Market Midpoint**

Market midpoints are important to consider because they are commonly recognized as the salary point at which employees are fully proficient in satisfactorily performing their work. As such, midpoint is often considered as the salary point at which a fully proficient employee could expect his or her salary to be placed.

As **Exhibit 3B** illustrates, for the benchmarked classifications, the County was, on average, approximately 10.6 percent below the market 70<sup>th</sup> percentile at the midpoint of the respective salary ranges. Based on the collected data, the following observations can be made:

- The surveyed position differentials ranged from 47.5 percent below market minimum in the case of the Environmental Health Specialist classification to 18.0 percent above market for the Custodial Supervisor classification.
- Of the 99 classifications surveyed with differentials, 84 classifications (84.8 percent) had differentials below the market 70<sup>th</sup> percentile at the midpoint.

## **Market Maximums**

In this section, the average of the peer salary range maximums is compared to the County's range maximums for each benchmarked classification. The market maximum is significant as it represents the upper limit salary that an organization might provide to retain and/or reward experienced and high performing employees. Additionally, being competitive at the



maximum allows organizations to attract highly qualified individuals for in-demand classifications.

As **Exhibit 3B** illustrates, the County’s benchmark positions were, on average, 8.1 percent below the market 70<sup>th</sup> percentile at the maximum of the respective salary ranges. Based on the collected data, the following observations can be made:

- The surveyed position differentials ranged from 38.6 percent below market minimum in the case of the Environmental Health Specialist classification to 20.5 percent above market for the Custodial Supervisor classification.
- Of the 99 classifications surveyed with differentials, 77 classifications (77.8 percent) had differentials below the market 70<sup>th</sup> percentile at the maximum.

### **3.2 MARKET SUMMARY**

From the analysis of the data gathered in the external market assessment discussed above, the benchmark classifications’ salary ranges were primarily found to be below the County’s desired 70<sup>th</sup> percentile market positions. The review of the data indicates the County will benefit from the development and implementation of a new pay plan aligned with its desired market position. The proposed new plan and additional recommendations can be found in the next chapter of this report.



## Chapter 4 - Recommendations

The analysis of the County's current pay structure, peer salary data and desired market position revealed a need for the development of new pay plans. Evergreen worked to build on the strength of the existing pay structure while improving its overall competitiveness. Study recommendations, as well as the findings that led to each, are discussed in this chapter.

### 4.1 COMPENSATION

The compensation analysis included conducting an external market salary survey to assess the competitiveness of the current pay plan. During this assessment, the County's pay ranges for selected benchmark classifications were compared to the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile of the identified market. Details regarding the external market assessment were provided in **Chapter 3** of this report.

#### **FINDING:**

Based on the results of the salary survey, the County's pay plan was found to have salary ranges that overall lagged its desired market position. This indicated a need for the development of new pay plans to achieve the County's desire to have a pay plan at the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile.

**RECOMMENDATION 1: Create a new step-based pay plan to align with the desired above market positions. Slot each classification in the respective new plan based on internal and external equity and transition employees' salaries into the plans.**

**Exhibit 4A** shows the proposed new step-based pay plan with 20 pay grades, numbered 101 through 120. The range spreads are consistently 56.0 percent throughout.



**EXHIBIT 4A  
PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN**

Grade/Step	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
101	\$24,222.80	\$ 24,828.37	\$ 25,449.08	\$ 26,085.31	\$ 26,737.44	\$ 27,405.87	\$ 28,091.02
102	\$26,282.31	\$ 26,939.37	\$ 27,612.85	\$ 28,303.18	\$ 29,010.75	\$ 29,736.02	\$ 30,479.42
103	\$28,516.32	\$ 29,229.23	\$ 29,959.96	\$ 30,708.96	\$ 31,476.68	\$ 32,263.60	\$ 33,070.19
104	\$30,939.75	\$ 31,713.24	\$ 32,506.07	\$ 33,318.72	\$ 34,151.69	\$ 35,005.48	\$ 35,880.62
105	\$33,569.82	\$ 34,409.06	\$ 35,269.29	\$ 36,151.02	\$ 37,054.80	\$ 37,981.17	\$ 38,930.69
106	\$36,423.74	\$ 37,334.34	\$ 38,267.70	\$ 39,224.39	\$ 40,205.00	\$ 41,210.12	\$ 42,240.38
107	\$39,519.90	\$ 40,507.90	\$ 41,520.59	\$ 42,558.61	\$ 43,622.58	\$ 44,713.14	\$ 45,830.97
108	\$42,878.95	\$ 43,950.92	\$ 45,049.69	\$ 46,175.94	\$ 47,330.34	\$ 48,513.59	\$ 49,726.43
109	\$46,523.85	\$ 47,686.94	\$ 48,879.12	\$ 50,101.10	\$ 51,353.62	\$ 52,637.46	\$ 53,953.40
110	\$50,478.71	\$ 51,740.68	\$ 53,034.19	\$ 54,360.05	\$ 55,719.05	\$ 57,112.02	\$ 58,539.83
111	\$54,769.93	\$ 56,139.18	\$ 57,542.66	\$ 58,981.23	\$ 60,455.76	\$ 61,967.15	\$ 63,516.33
112	\$59,425.07	\$ 60,910.70	\$ 62,433.47	\$ 63,994.30	\$ 65,594.16	\$ 67,234.01	\$ 68,914.86
113	\$63,288.09	\$ 64,870.29	\$ 66,492.05	\$ 68,154.35	\$ 69,858.21	\$ 71,604.67	\$ 73,394.78
114	\$67,401.38	\$ 69,086.41	\$ 70,813.57	\$ 72,583.91	\$ 74,398.51	\$ 76,258.47	\$ 78,164.93
115	\$71,782.14	\$ 73,576.70	\$ 75,416.12	\$ 77,301.52	\$ 79,234.06	\$ 81,214.91	\$ 83,245.28
116	\$76,447.62	\$ 78,358.81	\$ 80,317.78	\$ 82,325.72	\$ 84,383.86	\$ 86,493.46	\$ 88,655.80
117	\$81,416.16	\$ 83,451.56	\$ 85,537.85	\$ 87,676.30	\$ 89,868.21	\$ 92,114.91	\$ 94,417.78
118	\$86,708.44	\$ 88,876.15	\$ 91,098.05	\$ 93,375.51	\$ 95,709.89	\$ 98,102.64	\$100,555.21
119	\$92,343.97	\$ 94,652.57	\$ 97,018.89	\$ 99,444.36	\$101,930.47	\$104,478.73	\$107,090.70
120	\$98,346.86	\$100,805.54	\$103,325.67	\$105,908.82	\$108,556.54	\$111,270.45	\$114,052.21

**EXHIBIT 4A (CONTINUED)  
PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN**

Grade/Step	8	9	10	11	12	13
101	\$ 28,793.30	\$ 29,513.13	\$ 30,250.96	\$ 31,007.23	\$ 31,782.41	\$ 32,576.97
102	\$ 31,241.41	\$ 32,022.45	\$ 32,823.01	\$ 33,643.58	\$ 34,484.67	\$ 35,346.79
103	\$ 33,896.94	\$ 34,744.37	\$ 35,612.98	\$ 36,503.30	\$ 37,415.88	\$ 38,351.28
104	\$ 36,777.64	\$ 37,697.08	\$ 38,639.51	\$ 39,605.49	\$ 40,595.63	\$ 41,610.52
105	\$ 39,903.96	\$ 40,901.56	\$ 41,924.10	\$ 42,972.20	\$ 44,046.51	\$ 45,147.67
106	\$ 43,296.39	\$ 44,378.80	\$ 45,488.27	\$ 46,625.47	\$ 47,791.11	\$ 48,985.89
107	\$ 46,976.74	\$ 48,151.16	\$ 49,354.94	\$ 50,588.81	\$ 51,853.53	\$ 53,149.87
108	\$ 50,969.59	\$ 52,243.83	\$ 53,549.93	\$ 54,888.68	\$ 56,260.90	\$ 57,667.42
109	\$ 55,302.24	\$ 56,684.79	\$ 58,101.91	\$ 59,554.46	\$ 61,043.32	\$ 62,569.40
110	\$ 60,003.32	\$ 61,503.40	\$ 63,040.99	\$ 64,617.01	\$ 66,232.44	\$ 67,888.25
111	\$ 65,104.24	\$ 66,731.84	\$ 68,400.14	\$ 70,110.14	\$ 71,862.90	\$ 73,659.47
112	\$ 70,637.74	\$ 72,403.68	\$ 74,213.77	\$ 76,069.12	\$ 77,970.84	\$ 79,920.12
113	\$ 75,229.65	\$ 77,110.39	\$ 79,038.15	\$ 81,014.11	\$ 83,039.46	\$ 85,115.45
114	\$ 80,119.06	\$ 82,122.03	\$ 84,175.08	\$ 86,279.46	\$ 88,436.45	\$ 90,647.36
115	\$ 85,326.41	\$ 87,459.57	\$ 89,646.06	\$ 91,887.21	\$ 94,184.39	\$ 96,539.00
116	\$ 90,872.19	\$ 93,144.00	\$ 95,472.60	\$ 97,859.41	\$100,305.90	\$102,813.54
117	\$ 96,778.23	\$ 99,197.69	\$101,677.63	\$104,219.57	\$106,825.06	\$109,495.68
118	\$103,069.09	\$105,645.81	\$108,286.96	\$110,994.13	\$113,768.99	\$116,613.21
119	\$109,767.96	\$112,512.16	\$115,324.97	\$118,208.09	\$121,163.29	\$124,192.38
120	\$116,903.52	\$119,826.10	\$122,821.76	\$125,892.30	\$129,039.61	\$132,265.60



EXHIBIT 4A (CONTINUED)  
PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN

Grade/Step	14	15	16	17	18	19
101	\$ 33,391.40	\$ 34,226.18	\$ 35,081.84	\$ 35,958.88	\$ 36,857.85	\$ 37,779.30
102	\$ 36,230.46	\$ 37,136.22	\$ 38,064.62	\$ 39,016.24	\$ 39,991.65	\$ 40,991.44
103	\$ 39,310.06	\$ 40,292.81	\$ 41,300.13	\$ 42,332.64	\$ 43,390.95	\$ 44,475.73
104	\$ 42,650.78	\$ 43,717.05	\$ 44,809.98	\$ 45,930.23	\$ 47,078.49	\$ 48,255.45
105	\$ 46,276.36	\$ 47,433.27	\$ 48,619.10	\$ 49,834.58	\$ 51,080.45	\$ 52,357.46
106	\$ 50,210.53	\$ 51,465.80	\$ 52,752.44	\$ 54,071.25	\$ 55,423.03	\$ 56,808.61
107	\$ 54,478.62	\$ 55,840.58	\$ 57,236.60	\$ 58,667.51	\$ 60,134.20	\$ 61,637.56
108	\$ 59,109.10	\$ 60,586.83	\$ 62,101.50	\$ 63,654.04	\$ 65,245.39	\$ 66,876.53
109	\$ 64,133.64	\$ 65,736.98	\$ 67,380.40	\$ 69,064.91	\$ 70,791.54	\$ 72,561.33
110	\$ 69,585.46	\$ 71,325.09	\$ 73,108.22	\$ 74,935.93	\$ 76,809.32	\$ 78,729.56
111	\$ 75,500.96	\$ 77,388.48	\$ 79,323.19	\$ 81,306.27	\$ 83,338.93	\$ 85,422.40
112	\$ 81,918.12	\$ 83,966.07	\$ 86,065.22	\$ 88,216.85	\$ 90,422.27	\$ 92,682.83
113	\$ 87,243.33	\$ 89,424.42	\$ 91,660.03	\$ 93,951.53	\$ 96,300.32	\$ 98,707.82
114	\$ 92,913.54	\$ 95,236.38	\$ 97,617.29	\$100,057.72	\$102,559.16	\$105,123.14
115	\$ 98,952.48	\$101,426.29	\$103,961.95	\$106,561.00	\$109,225.02	\$111,955.65
116	\$105,383.88	\$108,018.48	\$110,718.94	\$113,486.92	\$116,324.09	\$119,232.19
117	\$112,233.08	\$115,038.90	\$117,914.88	\$120,862.75	\$123,884.32	\$126,981.42
118	\$119,528.54	\$122,516.76	\$125,579.67	\$128,719.17	\$131,937.15	\$135,235.57
119	\$127,297.19	\$130,479.61	\$133,741.61	\$137,085.15	\$140,512.27	\$144,025.08
120	\$135,572.24	\$138,961.54	\$142,435.58	\$145,996.47	\$149,646.38	\$153,387.54

After developing the new pay plans, Evergreen slotted all classifications into the appropriate pay range within the plans. Both internal and external equity were analyzed when slotting the classifications. Assigning pay grades to classifications requires a balance of internal equity, desired market position, and recruitment and retention concerns. Thus, market range data shown in **Chapter 3** were not the sole criteria for the proposed slotting of each classification. Some classifications' grade assignments varied from their associated market range due to the other factors mentioned above. The resulting recommended pay grades (ranges) for each of the County's classifications are shown in **Exhibit 4B**.



**EXHIBIT 4B  
PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES**

Current Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Courier	101	\$ 24,222.80	\$ 31,001.05	\$ 37,779.30
Custodian				
Custodian PT				
Fleet Services Assistant				
Food Services Associate				
Intern				
Nurse Assistant				
Recycle Center Operator				
Breastfeeding Support Specialist				
Courtroom Assistant				
Deputy Clerk I	102	\$ 26,282.31	\$ 33,636.87	\$ 40,991.44
Deputy Clerk I PT				
Patron Account Associate				
Public Health Office Clerk				
Public Health Office Clerk PT				
Records Clerk				
Supply Specialist				
Collections Clerk				
Counter Clerk I				
Data Clerk				
Data Clerk Investigations	103	\$ 28,516.32	\$ 36,496.02	\$ 44,475.73
Data Clerk Support Ops				
Deputy Clerk II				
Equipment Operator I				
Jail Clerk				
Jail Records Clerk				
Patron Services Specialist				
TIBRS & NCIC Data Clerk				
Vehicle Washing Coordinator				



**EXHIBIT 4B (CONTINUED)  
PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES**

Current Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Accounting Clerk I				
Administrative Assistant				
Assistant Jury Coordinator				
Catering Coordinator				
Counter Clerk II				
Counter Clerk II PT				
Courtroom Supervisor				
Dental Assistant				
Deputy Clerk III				
Education Services Assistant				
Elections Specialist Temp	104	\$ 30,939.75	\$ 39,597.60	\$ 48,255.45
Equipment Operator II				
Financial Services Assistant				
Kitchen Coordinator				
LPN				
Maintenance Technician				
Parts Tech				
Patron Services Assistant				
Personal Property Assistant				
Sign Tech				
Title Deeds Clerk				
Accounting Clerk II				
Administrative Specialist				
Animal Control Officer				
Assessor Clerk				
Cataloging Specialist				
Cattery Operations Manager				
Chaplain				
Clerk & Master Deputy Clerk				
Counter Clerk III				
Deputy Assessor I				
Elections Deputy	105	\$ 33,569.82	\$ 42,963.64	\$ 52,357.46
Equipment Operator III				
Fleet Maintenance Tech				
Health Educator				
Judicial Assistant				
Judicial Commissioner				
Judicial Commissioner PT				
Kennel Operations Manager				
Law Clerk				
Law Enf Training Spec				
Law Enforcement Training Spec				





**EXHIBIT 4B (CONTINUED)  
PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES**

Current Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Mapping Clerk				
Nutrition Educator				
Office Specialist				
Online Services Coordinator				
Personal Property Coordinator				
Records Management Clerk				
School Guard				
Seizure Specialist	105	\$ 33,569.82	\$ 42,963.64	\$ 52,357.46
Social Counselor				
Tax & Customer Service Spec Temp				
Tax & Customer Service Specialist				
Tax Freeze Specialist				
Treatment Services Assistant				
Veterans Treatment Services Assistant				
Veterinary Technician				
Victim Witness Coordinator				
Accounting Clerk III				
Administrative Support Specialist				
Case Manager				
Commission Assistant				
Counter Clerk Supervisor				
Court Officer				
Court Security				
Deputy Assessor II				
Deputy Sheriff				
Deputy Sheriff COPS Grant				
Deputy Sheriff SRO				
Deputy Sheriff Traffic				
Equipment Operator IV				
Escrow & Collections Specialist	106	\$ 36,423.74	\$ 46,616.18	\$ 56,808.61
Maintenance Technician - Hwy				
Office Supervisor				
Payroll Clerk				
PC Specialist				
Probation Officer				
Process Server				
Property & Evidence Technician				
PT PC Specialist				
Public Events Coordinator				
Public Relations Manager				
Tax & Rebate Specialist				
Veterans Treatment Program Coordinator				
Welder				
Youth Services Specialist				



EXHIBIT 4B (CONTINUED)  
PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES

Current Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Accounting & Bankruptcy Specialist				
Accounting Technician				
Accounts Payable Clerk, Senior				
Assistant Facilities Supervisor				
Assistant Office Manager				
Assistant Office Mgr Drug Task Force				
At-Risk Intensive Int & Prev Couns				
Background Investigator				
Crime Scene Investigator				
Custodial Supervisor				
Deputy Assessor, Senior	107	\$ 39,519.90	\$ 50,578.73	\$ 61,637.56
Deputy Sheriff Training				
Elections Chief Deputy				
GIS Technician				
Investigator				
Investigator Drugs				
Investigator Sex Off Reg				
Judicial Commissioner Supervisor				
Office Administrator, Assistant				
TAC & NCIC Data Clerk				
Worker Compensation Coordinator				
Youth Services Officer				
Accounting Analyst				
Assistant EMA Director				
Assistant Veterans Service Officer				
Codes Inspector				
Corporal				
Corporal Adm				
Corporal SRO				
Deputy Assessor, Lead				
Dietician				
Drainage/Grading Supervisor				
Engineering Technician				
Executive Assistant				
Human Resources Coordinator				
Human Resources Specialist	108	\$ 42,878.95	\$ 54,877.74	\$ 66,876.53
Inspection Services Coordinator				
Office Administrator				
Office Manager				
Paving Supervisor				
Purchasing Specialist				
Reference Librarian				
RN				
Shop Supervisor				
Sign Shop Foreman				
Sign Shop Supervisor				
Stormwater Manager & Construction Coordi				
Treatment Specialist				
Vegetation Control Supervisor				



**EXHIBIT 4B (CONTINUED)  
PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES**

Current Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Accountant				
Assistant Director of Veterans				
Business Analyst				
Chief Deputy Clerk & Master				
Chief Deputy of Technology				
Chief Deputy Trustee				
Contract Manager				
Criminal Justice Coordinator				
Network Engineer	109	\$ 46,523.85	\$ 59,542.59	\$ 72,561.33
Planner				
Public Information Officer				
Records Manager & County Archivist				
Sergeant				
Sergeant Investigation				
Sergeant SRO				
Sergeant Traffic				
Sr Asst Veterans Service Officer				
Acquisition Librarian				
Adult Services Coordinator				
Assistant Purchasing Agent				
Chief Deputy Register of Deeds				
Environmental Health Specialist				
Executive Assistant to the Mayor				
GIS Coordinator	110	\$ 50,478.71	\$ 64,604.13	\$ 78,729.56
Learning Commons Coordinator				
Patron Services Manager				
Payroll Manager				
Planner, Senior				
Senior Network Engineer				
Youth Services Coordinator				
Accounting Manager				
Asst Training Dir POST				
Asst Training Dir TCI				
Chief Financial Officer				
Deputy Chief of Staff				
Education Services Manager				
Emergency Management Director	111	\$ 50,428.41	\$ 64,296.25	\$ 78,164.09
Fleet & Maintenance Supervisor				
Lieutenant				
Lieutenant Investigations				
Lieutenant SRO				
Lieutenant Traffic				
Operations Manager				



EXHIBIT 4B (CONTINUED)  
PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES

Current Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Assistant IT Director	112	\$ 59,425.07	\$ 76,053.95	\$ 92,682.83
Building Official				
Chief Deputy Assessor				
Chief Deputy Court Clerk				
Chief of Staff				
Engineering Supervisor				
Environmental Health Manager				
IT Manager				
Network Administrator				
Risk Manager				
Systems Administrator				
Veteran Services, Director				
Animal Center Director				
Captain Adm Ops				
Captain Court Services				
Captain Patrol				
Conservation Director				
Drug Court Programs Director				
General Services Director				
Juvenile Court Services Director				
Probation Director				
Senior Systems Administrator				
Watershed Coordinator				
Budget Manager	114	\$ 67,401.38	\$ 86,262.26	\$ 105,123.14
Deputy Director				
Medical Unit Supervisor				
Purchasing Agent				
Veterinarian				
Appellate Defender				
Assistant Superintendent/Engineer	115	\$ 71,782.14	\$ 91,868.90	\$ 111,955.65
Deputy Chief				
Deputy Chief Investigations				
Deputy Chief Support Ops				
HR Director				
Magistrate				
Planning Director				
Project Manager				
Chief Deputy Sheriff	117	\$ 81,416.16	\$ 104,198.79	\$ 126,981.42
IT Director				
Library Director				
Dentist	120	\$ 98,346.86	\$ 125,867.20	\$ 153,387.54
Finance Director				



After assigning pay grades to classifications, the next step was to develop appropriate alternative methods (options) for transitioning employees' salaries into the new pay plans. This was done utilizing equitable methods of calculating salaries in the new pay plan/grades and determining whether adjustments were necessary to individual salaries to bring them to their calculated salary. Evergreen recommended several options and the County chose the following method of implementing the new plans.

#### **Move to Tenure-Based Step in Revised Pay Plan:**

With this option, each employee was brought up to the closest step based on his/her current salary. A table look-up using tenure as the driving factor was developed by Evergreen in order to provide additional step increases for employees. Total tenure was the main factor for General employees while class tenure was used as the main factor for Sheriff Sworn employees. An additional step adjustment was given to Sheriff Sworn employees by factoring in total tenure as well. Smaller increments were given to employees if they had less than 10 years of class tenure but more than 10 years of total tenure. For every 10 years of total tenure, the employee was adjusted by one additional step.

The County also chose to add a final step to this adjustment option. If any employees received an adjustment of less than 2.5% of his/her salary, a one-time lump sum payment would make up the difference between the actual adjustment given and the amount 2.5% higher than their salary.

Utilizing this approach, adjustments were recommended for 399 General employees, planned to be effective July 1, 2019 with an approximate annualized cost of **\$1,253,342**. Adjustments were also recommended for 275 Sheriff Sworn employees, effective July 1, 2019 with an approximate annualized cost of **\$879,817**. This was the approximate cost for salary adjustments (only) and does not include the associated costs for employee benefits. This adjustment method also included the cost to bring employees' salaries to the proposed minimums of their ranges if previously below. The total additional costs for the lump-sum payments were **\$67,508** for General employees and **\$28,526** for Sworn Sheriff employees.

## **4.2 SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION**

The County's compensation system will continue to require periodic maintenance. The recommendations provided to improve the competitiveness of the plan were developed based on conditions at the time the data were collected. Without proper upkeep, the potential for recruitment and retention issues may increase as the compensation and classification system becomes dated and less competitive.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: Conduct small-scale salary surveys as needed to assess the market competitiveness of hard-to-fill classifications and/or classifications with retention issues, and make changes to pay grade assignments if necessary.**

While it is unlikely that the pay plan will need to be adjusted for several years, a small number of classifications' pay grades may need to be reassigned more frequently. If one or more



classifications are exhibiting high turnover or are having difficulty with recruitment, the County should collect salary range data from peer organizations to determine whether an adjustment is needed for the pay grade of the classification(s). If increasing a classification's pay grade based on market data does not help with the recruitment and/or retention issues, it may be necessary for the County to offer incentives to attract employees to the position and/or to encourage employees to remain in the position.

**RECOMMENDATION 3: Conduct a comprehensive classification and compensation study every three to five years.**

Small-scale salary surveys can improve the market position of specific classifications, but it is recommended that a full classification and compensation study be conducted every three to five years to preserve both internal and external equity for the County. Changes to classification and compensation do occur, and while the increments of change may seem minor, they can compound over time. A failure to react to these changes quickly has the potential to place the County in less than desirable position for recruiting and retaining quality employees.

### **4.3 SUMMARY**

The recommendations in this chapter provide an update to the compensation system for County employees. If implemented, the recommendations will enhance the County's competitiveness in the labor market. By implementing the new (updated) pay plans, the County will have a responsive compensation system for several years to come. While the upkeep of this will require work, the County will find that having a more competitive compensation system that enhances strong recruitment and employee retention is well worth this commitment.

