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## EVERGREEN SOLUTIONS, LLC

## 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 <br> 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 |
| Average / Total |  |  |  | 59\% | 671 |

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 <br> SALARY PLACEMENT BELOW MINIMUM AND ABOVE MAXIMUM BY GRADE

| Grade | Employees | \# < Min | \% < Min | \# = Min | $\%=\operatorname{Min}$ | \# = 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\% |
| Total | 671 | 25 | 3.7\% | 6 | 0.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 17 | 2.5\% |

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\% |
| Total | 671 | 490 | 73.0\% | 94 | 14.0\% | 87 | 13.0\% |

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 75 th 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 <br> 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 |
| Overall Total | 671 | 407 | 152 | 66 | 46 |
| Overall Average | 100.0\% | 60.7\% | 22.7\% | 9.8\% | 6.9\% |

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\% |
| Total | 671 | 255 | 100.0\% |

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 reasonable 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
Anderson County, TN
Bradley County, TN
Hawkins County, TN
Knox County, TN
Montgomery County, TN
Rutherford County, TN
Sullivan County, TN
Washington County, TN
Williamson County, TN
Wilson County, TN
Alcoa City Schools
Blount County Schools
Knox County Schools
Maryville City Schools
Maryville College
University of Tennessee
Blount Memorial Hospital
Denso Manufacturing
JTEKT
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Standard Aero
State Fire Marshal's Office
State of Tennessee
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 a pay plan for General Employees at the $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile, and a plan for Sworn Sheriff Employees at the $75^{\text {th }}$ 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 $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile and to the $75^{\text {th }}$ 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. Exhibits 3B and 3C provide a summary of the comparison of the benchmark classifications to the $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile and $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile of the market, respectively, and contain 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 65TH PERCENTILE

| Classification | Survey Minimum |  | Survey Midpoint |  | Survey Maximum |  | Survey <br> Avg <br> Range Width | \# Resp. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 65th <br> Percentile | \% Diff | 65th <br> Percentile | \% Diff | 65th <br> Percentile | \% Diff |  |  |
| Accounting Analyst | \$42,399.08 | -13.5\% | \$54,181.66 | -13.8\% | \$65,677.69 | -13.4\% | 54.9\% | 11 |
| Accounting Clerk I | \$30,546.11 | -13.3\% | \$41,195.44 | -19.9\% | \$51,915.24 | -24.3\% | 70.0\% | 10 |
| Accounting Manager | \$55,359.11 | -6.9\% | \$66,670.61 | -1.0\% | \$77,982.10 | 2.8\% | 40.9\% | 11 |
| Accounting Technician | \$32,596.60 | 5.3\% | \$41,335.77 | 5.8\% | \$47,290.32 | 11.4\% | 45.1\% | 8 |
| Accounts Payable Clerk, Senior | \$35,181.33 | 5.8\% | \$43,308.67 | 9.1\% | \$55,787.13 | 3.6\% | 58.6\% | 9 |
| Administrative Assistant | \$32,239.84 | -19.6\% | \$38,984.74 | -13.5\% | \$47,866.73 | -14.6\% | 48.5\% | 16 |
| Animal Center Director | \$68,499.07 | -24.3\% | \$75,037.50 | -2.7\% | \$82,532.15 | 9.3\% | 20.5\% | 4 |
| Animal Control Officer | \$30,530.33 | -4.4\% | \$39,038.12 | -4.7\% | \$45,135.69 | 0.4\% | 47.8\% | 10 |
| Assistant Superintendent/Engineer | \$72,048.80 | -22.7\% | \$88,510.85 | -13.8\% | \$103,848.97 | -7.2\% | 44.1\% | 8 |
| Budget Manager | \$69,122.58 | -44.9\% | \$83,631.54 | -37.5\% | \$97,820.52 | -32.3\% | 41.5\% | 7 |
| Captain Patrol | \$61,429.01 | -18.7\% | \$75,207.19 | -14.0\% | \$90,096.44 | -12.3\% | 46.7\% | 11 |
| Case Manager | \$35,331.42 | -20.8\% | \$43,783.03 | -17.4\% | \$48,989.31 | -8.1\% | 38.7\% | 5 |
| Cataloging Specialist | \$33,988.52 | -7.1\% | \$42,649.07 | -5.4\% | \$50,707.25 | -3.1\% | 49.2\% | 5 |
| Chief Deputy Sheriff | \$77,357.31 | -16.2\% | \$93,487.09 | -6.0\% | \$111,328.26 | -1.3\% | 43.9\% | 9 |
| Chief of Staff | \$60,295.99 | -9.4\% | \$75,403.57 | -3.2\% | \$84,935.95 | 6.6\% | 40.9\% | 6 |
| Codes Inspector | \$38,318.39 | 5.4\% | \$48,823.32 | 5.5\% | \$56,687.02 | 9.8\% | 47.9\% | 14 |
| Corporal SRO | \$38,581.04 | -3.3\% | \$46,179.38 | 3.0\% | \$53,977.43 | 6.8\% | 39.9\% | 6 |
| Counter Clerk I | \$27,824.97 | -3.2\% | \$36,282.71 | -5.6\% | \$43,422.31 | -3.9\% | 56.1\% | 8 |
| Courier | \$25,903.42 | -22.8\% | \$30,300.86 | -12.6\% | \$34,591.74 | -5.8\% | 33.5\% | 6 |
| Court Officer | \$35,623.27 | -12.3\% | \$41,769.52 | -3.3\% | \$47,437.92 | 3.5\% | 33.2\% | 6 |
| Courtroom Assistant | \$26,912.76 | -17.6\% | \$34,651.64 | -18.7\% | \$41,451.59 | -16.8\% | 54.0\% | 8 |
| Crime Scene Investigator | \$36,102.02 | -13.8\% | \$47,351.43 | -17.1\% | \$55,799.47 | -13.5\% | 54.6\% | 5 |
| Custodial Supervisor | \$29,682.89 | 20.5\% | \$35,747.94 | 24.9\% | \$41,812.99 | 27.8\% | 40.9\% | 7 |
| Custodian | \$22,909.22 | -8.6\% | \$27,584.62 | -2.5\% | \$32,222.54 | 1.5\% | 40.7\% | 11 |
| Dental Assistant | \$32,276.57 | -19.8\% | \$38,871.87 | -13.1\% | \$45,467.17 | -8.8\% | 40.9\% | 6 |
| Deputy Assessor | \$34,640.31 | -18.5\% | \$47,425.56 | -27.2\% | \$57,422.32 | -26.7\% | 65.8\% | 4 |
| Deputy Clerk I | \$26,438.57 | -6.4\% | \$30,936.91 | 2.3\% | \$35,498.27 | 7.8\% | 34.3\% | 6 |
| Deputy Sheriff | \$35,676.32 | -12.4\% | \$44,487.04 | -10.0\% | \$52,899.12 | -7.6\% | 48.3\% | 10 |
| Drainage/Grading Supervisor | \$42,414.40 | -4.7\% | \$52,100.83 | -0.8\% | \$63,003.54 | -0.3\% | 48.5\% | 7 |
| Drug Court Programs Director | \$61,698.45 | -19.2\% | \$72,293.13 | -9.5\% | \$82,887.80 | -3.3\% | 34.3\% | 5 |
| Elections Deputy | \$37,561.37 | -39.4\% | \$44,466.26 | -29.4\% | \$51,371.15 | -23.0\% | 36.8\% | 5 |
| Emergency Management Director | \$72,262.53 | -31.1\% | \$86,253.23 | -18.1\% | \$96,159.63 | -5.7\% | 33.1\% | 6 |
| Engineering Supervisor | \$59,312.24 | -24.3\% | \$76,682.23 | -26.1\% | \$94,914.44 | -28.4\% | 60.0\% | 8 |
| Engineering Technician | \$42,873.44 | -5.8\% | \$51,686.25 | 0.0\% | \$63,142.11 | -0.5\% | 47.3\% | 10 |
| Environmental Health Manager | \$56,882.19 | -9.9\% | \$68,509.82 | -3.8\% | \$83,142.59 | -3.6\% | 46.2\% | 4 |
| Environmental Health Specialist | \$54,697.03 | -46.4\% | \$68,443.26 | -43.7\% | \$78,119.66 | -34.9\% | 42.8\% | 4 |
| Equipment Operator I | \$29,403.56 | -18.4\% | \$36,060.76 | -13.9\% | \$41,421.48 | -7.6\% | 40.9\% | 10 |
| Equipment Operator II | \$29,768.13 | -10.5\% | \$37,102.63 | -8.0\% | \$44,445.72 | -6.4\% | 49.3\% | 7 |
| Equipment Operator III | \$31,714.10 | -8.5\% | \$37,981.92 | -1.9\% | \$45,712.64 | -0.9\% | 44.1\% | 8 |
| Equipment Operator IV | \$32,442.87 | -2.3\% | \$40,784.76 | -0.8\% | \$49,232.00 | -0.1\% | 51.7\% | 8 |
| Executive Assistant | \$38,933.63 | -4.2\% | \$48,892.93 | -2.7\% | \$62,296.01 | -7.6\% | 60.0\% | 12 |
| Finance Director | \$99,279.62 | -31.4\% | \$118,524.91 | -18.4\% | \$139,456.05 | -11.9\% | 40.5\% | 14 |
| Fleet \& Maintenance Supervisor | \$45,473.92 | 12.2\% | \$56,432.72 | 14.5\% | \$66,433.00 | 17.2\% | 46.1\% | 9 |
| Fleet Maintenance Tech | \$31,762.59 | -8.6\% | \$43,723.58 | -17.3\% | \$52,240.23 | -15.3\% | 64.5\% | 13 |
| General Services Director | \$82,367.64 | -16.1\% | \$102,100.55 | -8.7\% | \$118,769.59 | -1.5\% | 44.2\% | 3 |
| GIS Coordinator | \$48,355.04 | -19.3\% | \$62,296.20 | -20.6\% | \$74,879.87 | -19.2\% | 54.9\% | 10 |
| GIS Technician | \$36,689.83 | -6.6\% | \$51,525.85 | -17.4\% | \$62,641.69 | -17.4\% | 70.7\% | 10 |
| Highway Maintenance Technician | \$31,413.02 | 1.0\% | \$37,920.02 | 6.3\% | \$45,731.42 | 7.0\% | 45.6\% | 7 |

## EXHIBIT 3B (CONTINUED) SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY 65 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE

| Classification | Survey Minimum |  | Survey Midpoint |  | Survey Maximum |  | Survey <br> Avg Range Width | \# Resp. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 65th <br> Percentile | \% Diff | 65th <br> Percentile | \% Diff | $\begin{gathered} \text { 65th } \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | \% Diff |  |  |
| HR Director | \$81,509.82 | -30.4\% | \$99,132.01 | -19.7\% | \$117,852.25 | -14.2\% | 44.6\% | 14 |
| Human Resources Coordinator | \$42,771.99 | -24.2\% | \$52,403.09 | -19.4\% | \$61,306.56 | -14.9\% | 43.3\% | 11 |
| Human Resources Specialist | \$35,100.38 | 13.4\% | \$46,882.59 | 9.3\% | \$55,351.42 | 11.9\% | 57.7\% | 11 |
| Instructional Librarian | \$45,116.13 | -11.3\% | \$56,891.93 | -10.1\% | \$70,037.76 | -11.5\% | 55.2\% | 5 |
| Investigator | \$40,332.64 | -17.2\% | \$49,246.27 | -12.2\% | \$59,251.85 | -11.0\% | 46.9\% | 10 |
| Judicial Assistant | \$33,015.41 | -12.9\% | \$40,331.62 | -8.2\% | \$47,995.73 | -5.9\% | 45.4\% | 5 |
| Judicial Commissioner | \$33,143.68 | -23.0\% | \$38,049.99 | -10.7\% | \$44,249.11 | -5.9\% | 33.5\% | 5 |
| Library Director | \$87,808.58 | -31.9\% | \$109,297.76 | -23.9\% | \$133,474.65 | -21.5\% | 52.0\% | 5 |
| Lieutenant | \$50,759.67 | -6.4\% | \$65,066.16 | -7.0\% | \$78,156.75 | -5.7\% | 54.0\% | 11 |
| LPN | \$31,374.29 | -7.3\% | \$38,748.16 | -3.9\% | \$44,909.60 | 0.9\% | 43.1\% | 6 |
| Magistrate | \$69,378.52 | -11.0\% | \$90,217.11 | -8.9\% | \$105,719.93 | -2.5\% | 52.4\% | 5 |
| Maintenance Technician | \$30,313.94 | -32.4\% | \$37,010.44 | -26.8\% | \$43,976.61 | -23.9\% | 45.1\% | 5 |
| Mapping Clerk | \$34,213.75 | -17.0\% | \$41,204.47 | -10.5\% | \$48,195.18 | -6.3\% | 40.9\% | 6 |
| Network Administrator | \$54,177.61 | -13.6\% | \$66,059.19 | -8.6\% | \$81,643.11 | -10.4\% | 50.7\% | 9 |
| Nurse Assistant | \$25,728.69 | -21.9\% | \$30,916.04 | -14.9\% | \$36,245.87 | -10.8\% | 40.9\% | 4 |
| Nutrition Educator | \$34,263.09 | -17.2\% | \$43,142.40 | -15.7\% | \$49,050.55 | -8.2\% | 43.2\% | 6 |
| Office Administrator | \$36,140.01 | 10.8\% | \$47,172.28 | 8.7\% | \$59,139.89 | 5.9\% | 63.6\% | 6 |
| Office Manager | \$43,309.08 | -6.9\% | \$54,612.22 | -5.7\% | \$63,877.45 | -1.7\% | 47.5\% | 9 |
| Operations Manager | \$51,587.72 | -8.1\% | \$67,041.88 | -10.2\% | \$82,496.04 | -11.6\% | 59.9\% | 4 |
| Parts Tech | \$31,165.24 | -6.6\% | \$41,121.69 | -10.3\% | \$49,910.36 | -10.1\% | 60.1\% | 6 |
| Paving Supervisor | \$37,234.66 | 8.1\% | \$47,186.48 | 8.7\% | \$57,078.53 | 9.1\% | 53.3\% | 7 |
| Payroll Clerk | \$37,093.77 | -7.8\% | \$44,659.78 | -1.7\% | \$52,450.31 | 1.7\% | 41.4\% | 8 |
| Payroll Manager | \$45,110.93 | 5.4\% | \$56,394.26 | 7.3\% | \$66,654.04 | 9.9\% | 47.8\% | 11 |
| PC Specialist | \$36,709.56 | -15.7\% | \$46,150.07 | -14.1\% | \$55,290.13 | -12.4\% | 50.6\% | 11 |
| Planner, Senior | \$52,313.24 | -19.0\% | \$68,396.42 | -22.0\% | \$81,619.01 | -19.8\% | 56.0\% | 8 |
| Planning Director | \$72,233.84 | -31.0\% | \$89,022.74 | -21.9\% | \$105,619.04 | -16.1\% | 46.2\% | 8 |
| Probation Director | \$64,806.86 | -10.4\% | \$77,589.93 | 0.3\% | \$89,743.55 | 7.4\% | 38.5\% | 6 |
| Probation Officer | \$35,181.33 | -2.2\% | \$43,864.77 | 0.1\% | \$51,588.73 | 3.3\% | 46.6\% | 7 |
| Project Manager | \$66,952.90 | -0.5\% | \$86,375.45 | 2.1\% | \$106,111.61 | 3.4\% | 58.5\% | 6 |
| Property \& Evidence Technician | \$32,851.92 | 4.6\% | \$40,761.98 | 7.1\% | \$48,166.55 | 9.7\% | 46.6\% | 8 |
| Public Information Officer | \$41,304.02 | 6.1\% | \$49,121.44 | 12.4\% | \$59,183.81 | 13.2\% | 43.3\% | 11 |
| Purchasing Agent | \$54,632.58 | 12.6\% | \$69,314.12 | 16.3\% | \$82,390.12 | 20.1\% | 50.8\% | 10 |
| Records Clerk | \$27,081.94 | -18.3\% | \$32,849.34 | -12.5\% | \$38,881.74 | -9.6\% | 43.6\% | 9 |
| Reference Librarian | \$47,732.71 | -27.8\% | \$58,857.23 | -23.6\% | \$72,204.99 | -24.7\% | 51.3\% | 4 |
| Risk Manager | \$62,875.82 | -21.5\% | \$79,456.01 | -20.4\% | \$96,087.94 | -19.8\% | 52.8\% | 10 |
| RN | \$52,210.60 | -28.8\% | \$56,827.59 | -10.0\% | \$62,166.51 | 1.0\% | 19.1\% | 7 |
| Sergeant | \$46,755.18 | -6.3\% | \$56,337.54 | -0.5\% | \$66,380.23 | 2.6\% | 42.0\% | 11 |
| Shop Supervisor | \$45,451.17 | -12.2\% | \$56,681.09 | -9.7\% | \$67,968.56 | -8.2\% | 49.5\% | 8 |
| Sign Shop Foreman | \$42,624.77 | -14.1\% | \$51,302.94 | -7.7\% | \$59,937.76 | -3.5\% | 40.6\% | 7 |
| Sign Tech | \$29,309.35 | -0.2\% | \$39,509.90 | -6.0\% | \$47,664.83 | -5.2\% | 62.6\% | 8 |
| Stormwater Manager | \$48,338.36 | -9.9\% | \$66,015.18 | -17.8\% | \$79,012.10 | -15.9\% | 63.5\% | 10 |
| Systems Administrator | \$56,882.19 | -29.4\% | \$68,509.82 | -22.2\% | \$80,137.44 | -17.6\% | 40.9\% | 9 |
| Tax \& Rebate Specialist | \$34,300.13 | -17.3\% | \$41,597.16 | -11.6\% | \$52,672.17 | -16.2\% | 53.6\% | 5 |
| Treatment Services Assistant | \$30,767.19 | -14.2\% | \$40,146.45 | -16.8\% | \$49,968.74 | -19.6\% | 62.4\% | 5 |
| Treatment Specialist | \$40,487.87 | -17.6\% | \$48,760.78 | -11.1\% | \$57,033.69 | -6.9\% | 40.9\% | 3 |
| Vegetation Control Supervisor | \$34,970.85 | 13.7\% | \$48,561.57 | 6.0\% | \$62,544.06 | 0.4\% | 78.8\% | 5 |
| Veteran Services, Director | \$52,185.37 | -18.7\% | \$64,962.29 | -15.9\% | \$72,725.43 | -6.7\% | 39.4\% | 3 |
| Veterinarian | \$64,663.83 | -3.4\% | \$80,692.08 | 2.6\% | \$96,720.34 | 6.3\% | 49.6\% | 4 |
| Victim Witness Coordinator | \$33,522.14 | -14.6\% | \$40,100.64 | -7.6\% | \$46,805.12 | -3.3\% | 39.6\% | 3 |
| Welder | \$33,526.28 | 2.6\% | \$44,893.16 | -2.3\% | \$55,358.18 | -3.7\% | 65.1\% | 8 |
| Youth Services Officer | \$39,809.82 | -25.5\% | \$47,678.06 | -17.9\% | \$55,506.57 | -12.9\% | 39.4\% | 5 |
| Overall Average |  | -12.9\% |  | -9.2\% |  | -6.2\% | 47.8\% | 7.6 |

## EXHIBIT 3C SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY 75 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE

| Classification | Survey Minimum |  | Survey Midpoint |  | Survey Maximum |  | Survey <br> Avg <br> Range <br> Width | \# Resp. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 75th <br> Percentile | \% Diff | 75th <br> Percentile | \% Diff | $\begin{gathered} 75 \text { th } \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | \% Diff |  |  |
| Accounting Analyst | \$47,163.87 | -26.3\% | \$56,161.52 | -17.9\% | \$68,270.68 | -17.9\% | 44.8\% | 11 |
| Accounting Clerk I | \$31,513.26 | -16.9\% | \$43,383.62 | -26.3\% | \$55,875.26 | -33.8\% | 77.3\% | 10 |
| Accounting Manager | \$55,433.99 | -7.1\% | \$68,946.21 | -4.5\% | \$86,826.82 | -8.2\% | 56.6\% | 11 |
| Accounting Technician | \$33,562.65 | 2.5\% | \$43,801.70 | 0.2\% | \$50,243.56 | 5.8\% | 49.7\% | 8 |
| Accounts Payable Clerk, Senior | \$35,181.33 | 5.8\% | \$44,692.30 | 6.2\% | \$57,560.71 | 0.6\% | 63.6\% | 9 |
| Administrative Assistant | \$32,299.32 | -19.8\% | \$42,153.34 | -22.7\% | \$51,118.34 | -22.4\% | 58.3\% | 16 |
| Animal Center Director | \$69,653.79 | -26.3\% | \$78,815.23 | -7.9\% | \$88,731.58 | 2.5\% | 27.4\% | 4 |
| Animal Control Officer | \$30,547.45 | -4.5\% | \$39,521.10 | -6.0\% | \$47,840.27 | -5.5\% | 56.6\% | 10 |
| Assistant Superintendent/Engineer | \$73,493.66 | -25.2\% | \$88,761.83 | -14.1\% | \$105,452.14 | -8.9\% | 43.5\% | 8 |
| Budget Manager | \$69,442.55 | -45.6\% | \$84,441.81 | -38.8\% | \$101,040.91 | -36.6\% | 45.5\% | 7 |
| Captain Patrol | \$64,035.82 | -23.7\% | \$76,709.12 | -16.2\% | \$94,790.16 | -18.1\% | 48.0\% | 11 |
| Case Manager | \$37,002.36 | -26.5\% | \$47,057.14 | -26.2\% | \$51,337.41 | -13.3\% | 38.7\% | 5 |
| Cataloging Specialist | \$35,129.82 | -10.7\% | \$45,167.20 | -11.7\% | \$54,200.64 | -10.2\% | 54.3\% | 5 |
| Chief Deputy Sheriff | \$80,045.53 | -20.2\% | \$93,745.13 | -6.2\% | \$117,153.94 | -6.6\% | 46.4\% | 9 |
| Chief of Staff | \$60,295.99 | -9.4\% | \$77,261.97 | -5.8\% | \$93,441.41 | -2.7\% | 55.0\% | 6 |
| Codes Inspector | \$40,109.12 | 1.0\% | \$49,331.94 | 4.5\% | \$57,519.90 | 8.4\% | 43.4\% | 14 |
| Corporal SRO | \$39,106.34 | -4.7\% | \$46,242.32 | 2.9\% | \$53,977.43 | 6.8\% | 38.0\% | 6 |
| Counter Clerk I | \$28,833.94 | -7.0\% | \$36,481.55 | -6.2\% | \$44,601.40 | -6.8\% | 54.7\% | 8 |
| Courier | \$26,085.12 | -23.6\% | \$30,882.72 | -14.8\% | \$35,887.07 | -9.7\% | 37.6\% | 6 |
| Court Officer | \$36,099.10 | -13.8\% | \$42,152.24 | -4.2\% | \$47,659.96 | 3.1\% | 32.0\% | 6 |
| Courtroom Assistant | \$27,405.49 | -19.7\% | \$36,260.99 | -24.2\% | \$44,601.40 | -25.7\% | 62.7\% | 8 |
| Crime Scene Investigator | \$36,526.65 | -15.1\% | \$48,760.78 | -20.5\% | \$57,033.69 | -16.0\% | 56.1\% | 5 |
| Custodial Supervisor | \$35,754.91 | 4.3\% | \$44,015.80 | 7.6\% | \$52,276.69 | 9.7\% | 46.2\% | 7 |
| Custodian | \$23,308.38 | -10.5\% | \$28,448.66 | -5.7\% | \$33,948.02 | -3.8\% | 45.6\% | 11 |
| Dental Assistant | \$32,276.57 | -19.8\% | \$38,871.87 | -13.1\% | \$45,467.17 | -8.8\% | 40.9\% | 6 |
| Deputy Assessor | \$35,583.21 | -21.7\% | \$47,425.56 | -27.2\% | \$57,501.03 | -26.9\% | 61.6\% | 4 |
| Deputy Clerk I | \$26,795.70 | -7.9\% | \$32,790.86 | -3.5\% | \$38,807.03 | -0.8\% | 44.8\% | 6 |
| Deputy Sheriff | \$36,181.16 | -14.0\% | \$45,926.11 | -13.5\% | \$53,491.62 | -8.8\% | 47.8\% | 10 |
| Drainage/Grading Supervisor | \$42,615.64 | -5.2\% | \$52,723.65 | -2.0\% | \$65,503.46 | -4.3\% | 53.7\% | 7 |
| Drug Court Programs Director | \$63,708.78 | -23.1\% | \$76,726.17 | -16.3\% | \$89,743.55 | -11.9\% | 40.9\% | 5 |
| Elections Deputy | \$40,487.87 | -50.2\% | \$48,760.78 | -41.9\% | \$57,033.69 | -36.5\% | 40.9\% | 5 |
| Emergency Management Director | \$73,681.10 | -33.7\% | \$88,378.78 | -21.0\% | \$103,606.46 | -13.9\% | 40.6\% | 6 |
| Engineering Supervisor | \$61,167.12 | -28.2\% | \$81,494.04 | -34.0\% | \$100,404.86 | -35.8\% | 64.1\% | 8 |
| Engineering Technician | \$42,916.92 | -5.9\% | \$52,761.52 | -2.1\% | \$64,013.21 | -1.9\% | 49.2\% | 10 |
| Environmental Health Manager | \$57,377.75 | -10.8\% | \$69,777.49 | -5.7\% | \$84,549.73 | -5.4\% | 47.4\% | 4 |
| Environmental Health Specialist | \$57,944.51 | -55.1\% | \$70,473.76 | -48.0\% | \$80,861.00 | -39.7\% | 39.5\% | 4 |
| Equipment Operator I | \$30,056.01 | -21.0\% | \$37,384.75 | -18.0\% | \$45,259.92 | -17.6\% | 50.6\% | 10 |
| Equipment Operator II | \$30,073.76 | -11.6\% | \$38,266.07 | -11.4\% | \$44,915.10 | -7.5\% | 49.3\% | 7 |
| Equipment Operator III | \$32,199.56 | -10.1\% | \$38,646.64 | -3.7\% | \$46,449.42 | -2.5\% | 44.3\% | 8 |
| Equipment Operator IV | \$33,949.91 | -7.0\% | \$41,928.33 | -3.6\% | \$52,003.08 | -5.7\% | 53.2\% | 8 |
| Executive Assistant | \$42,420.23 | -13.6\% | \$52,235.16 | -9.7\% | \$64,078.43 | -10.7\% | 51.1\% | 12 |
| Finance Director | \$101,098.66 | -33.9\% | \$123,158.14 | -23.1\% | \$145,450.10 | -16.7\% | 43.9\% | 14 |
| Fleet \& Maintenance Supervisor | \$47,856.22 | 7.5\% | \$57,209.94 | 13.3\% | \$73,682.59 | 8.2\% | 54.0\% | 9 |
| Fleet Maintenance Tech | \$33,756.28 | -15.4\% | \$46,354.15 | -24.3\% | \$57,560.71 | -27.0\% | 70.5\% | 13 |
| General Services Director | \$83,899.57 | -18.3\% | \$102,906.97 | -9.5\% | \$121,914.37 | -4.2\% | 45.3\% | 3 |
| GIS Coordinator | \$49,336.38 | -21.7\% | \$62,981.80 | -21.9\% | \$77,150.58 | -22.8\% | 56.4\% | 10 |
| GIS Technician | \$41,196.78 | -19.7\% | \$52,238.30 | -19.0\% | \$64,013.21 | -20.0\% | 55.4\% | 10 |
| Highway Maintenance Technician | \$32,424.00 | -2.2\% | \$42,142.03 | -4.2\% | \$49,575.70 | -0.8\% | 52.9\% | 7 |

## EXHIBIT 3C (CONTINUED) SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY 75 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE

| Classification | Survey Minimum |  | Survey Midpoint |  | Survey Maximum |  | Survey <br> Avg <br> Range Width | \# Resp. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 75th <br> Percentile | \% Diff | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 75th } \\ & \text { Percentile } \end{aligned}$ | \% Diff | 75th <br> Percentile | \% Diff |  |  |
| HR Director | \$82,312.98 | -31.6\% | \$100,890.92 | -21.8\% | \$126,472.20 | -22.6\% | 53.6\% | 14 |
| Human Resources Coordinator | \$42,916.92 | -24.7\% | \$54,129.16 | -23.3\% | \$62,585.09 | -17.3\% | 45.8\% | 11 |
| Human Resources Specialist | \$37,119.70 | 8.4\% | \$49,933.97 | 3.4\% | \$60,763.32 | 3.3\% | 63.7\% | 11 |
| Instructional Librarian | \$47,856.22 | -18.1\% | \$57,327.60 | -10.9\% | \$73,649.20 | -17.2\% | 53.9\% | 5 |
| Investigator | \$40,487.87 | -17.6\% | \$49,687.39 | -13.2\% | \$62,563.01 | -17.2\% | 54.5\% | 10 |
| Judicial Assistant | \$34,213.75 | -17.0\% | \$41,204.47 | -10.5\% | \$48,195.18 | -6.3\% | 40.9\% | 5 |
| Judicial Commissioner | \$33,171.63 | -23.1\% | \$38,067.00 | -10.8\% | \$47,414.50 | -13.5\% | 42.9\% | 5 |
| Library Director | \$96,434.80 | -44.8\% | \$125,371.30 | -42.1\% | \$154,307.80 | -40.4\% | 60.0\% | 5 |
| Lieutenant | \$54,440.52 | -14.1\% | \$67,466.15 | -10.9\% | \$80,849.75 | -9.3\% | 48.5\% | 11 |
| LPN | \$33,027.98 | -12.9\% | \$42,665.98 | -14.4\% | \$48,666.70 | -7.4\% | 47.3\% | 6 |
| Magistrate | \$75,634.86 | -21.0\% | \$91,089.38 | -9.9\% | \$106,543.89 | -3.3\% | 40.9\% | 5 |
| Maintenance Technician | \$30,547.45 | -33.4\% | \$37,157.90 | -27.3\% | \$44,589.48 | -25.7\% | 46.0\% | 5 |
| Mapping Clerk | \$34,213.75 | -17.0\% | \$41,204.47 | -10.5\% | \$48,195.18 | -6.3\% | 40.9\% | 6 |
| Network Administrator | \$67,530.62 | -41.5\% | \$75,273.12 | -23.7\% | \$82,113.13 | -11.0\% | 21.6\% | 9 |
| Nurse Assistant | \$25,730.76 | -21.9\% | \$30,988.32 | -15.2\% | \$36,245.87 | -10.8\% | 40.9\% | 4 |
| Nutrition Educator | \$34,361.77 | -17.5\% | \$43,399.45 | -16.4\% | \$50,761.29 | -12.0\% | 47.7\% | 6 |
| Office Administrator | \$42,277.99 | -4.3\% | \$52,132.24 | -0.9\% | \$62,298.26 | 0.8\% | 47.4\% | 6 |
| Office Manager | \$45,346.98 | -11.9\% | \$54,612.22 | -5.7\% | \$63,877.45 | -1.7\% | 40.9\% | 9 |
| Operations Manager | \$59,494.05 | -24.7\% | \$77,523.56 | -27.4\% | \$95,553.07 | -29.2\% | 60.6\% | 4 |
| Parts Tech | \$32,333.02 | -10.6\% | \$42,338.82 | -13.6\% | \$53,512.41 | -18.1\% | 65.5\% | 6 |
| Paving Supervisor | \$38,970.35 | 3.8\% | \$48,198.79 | 6.7\% | \$57,398.50 | 8.6\% | 47.3\% | 7 |
| Payroll Clerk | \$37,234.66 | -8.2\% | \$44,842.49 | -2.2\% | \$53,166.09 | 0.4\% | 42.8\% | 8 |
| Payroll Manager | \$46,498.30 | 2.5\% | \$58,348.43 | 4.1\% | \$71,585.93 | 3.2\% | 54.0\% | 11 |
| PC Specialist | \$37,602.30 | -18.5\% | \$46,779.13 | -15.6\% | \$56,465.85 | -14.8\% | 50.2\% | 11 |
| Planner, Senior | \$53,123.38 | -20.8\% | \$69,990.93 | -24.8\% | \$83,711.88 | -22.8\% | 57.6\% | 8 |
| Planning Director | \$72,966.42 | -32.4\% | \$89,602.45 | -22.7\% | \$109,503.31 | -20.4\% | 50.1\% | 8 |
| Probation Director | \$67,003.03 | -14.1\% | \$79,317.46 | -2.0\% | \$89,743.55 | 7.4\% | 33.9\% | 6 |
| Probation Officer | \$38,979.10 | -13.2\% | \$45,508.23 | -3.7\% | \$52,399.80 | 1.8\% | 34.4\% | 7 |
| Project Manager | \$73,441.14 | -10.3\% | \$94,585.24 | -7.2\% | \$115,833.87 | -5.4\% | 57.7\% | 6 |
| Property \& Evidence Technician | \$34,004.73 | 1.2\% | \$41,409.39 | 5.7\% | \$48,449.70 | 9.2\% | 42.5\% | 8 |
| Public Information Officer | \$43,827.61 | 0.3\% | \$51,901.12 | 7.4\% | \$61,447.49 | 9.8\% | 40.2\% | 11 |
| Purchasing Agent | \$58,913.55 | 5.8\% | \$70,517.82 | 14.9\% | \$83,812.52 | 18.8\% | 42.3\% | 10 |
| Records Clerk | \$27,275.05 | -19.1\% | \$32,855.81 | -12.6\% | \$39,696.88 | -11.9\% | 45.5\% | 9 |
| Reference Librarian | \$48,250.02 | -29.2\% | \$60,150.39 | -26.3\% | \$73,903.46 | -27.7\% | 53.2\% | 4 |
| Risk Manager | \$68,029.31 | -31.4\% | \$83,087.27 | -25.9\% | \$97,820.52 | -21.9\% | 43.8\% | 10 |
| RN | \$53,423.34 | -31.8\% | \$59,063.99 | -14.3\% | \$65,420.83 | -4.1\% | 22.5\% | 7 |
| Sergeant | \$48,259.98 | -9.8\% | \$57,484.72 | -2.5\% | \$68,817.16 | -1.0\% | 42.6\% | 11 |
| Shop Supervisor | \$46,084.89 | -13.7\% | \$58,650.23 | -13.5\% | \$68,755.18 | -9.5\% | 49.2\% | 8 |
| Sign Shop Foreman | \$42,684.12 | -14.3\% | \$52,280.38 | -9.8\% | \$61,876.64 | -6.9\% | 45.0\% | 7 |
| Sign Tech | \$30,334.90 | -3.7\% | \$40,357.08 | -8.2\% | \$48,490.61 | -7.0\% | 59.9\% | 8 |
| Stormwater Manager | \$54,767.50 | -24.6\% | \$68,128.18 | -21.5\% | \$80,137.44 | -17.6\% | 46.3\% | 10 |
| Systems Administrator | \$56,882.19 | -29.4\% | \$68,509.82 | -22.2\% | \$80,137.44 | -17.6\% | 40.9\% | 9 |
| Tax \& Rebate Specialist | \$36,354.95 | -24.3\% | \$42,947.39 | -15.2\% | \$55,313.44 | -22.0\% | 52.1\% | 5 |
| Treatment Services Assistant | \$31,028.82 | -15.1\% | \$42,538.78 | -23.8\% | \$54,787.11 | -31.2\% | 76.6\% | 5 |
| Treatment Specialist | \$40,487.87 | -17.6\% | \$48,760.78 | -11.1\% | \$57,033.69 | -6.9\% | 40.9\% | 3 |
| Vegetation Control Supervisor | \$35,127.63 | 13.3\% | \$49,331.94 | 4.5\% | \$63,536.25 | -1.1\% | 80.9\% | 5 |
| Veteran Services, Director | \$56,995.45 | -29.6\% | \$67,908.24 | -21.1\% | \$75,239.76 | -10.4\% | 32.0\% | 3 |
| Veterinarian | \$71,092.28 | -13.7\% | \$92,228.66 | -11.3\% | \$113,365.03 | -9.9\% | 59.5\% | 4 |
| Victim Witness Coordinator | \$33,755.82 | -15.4\% | \$41,484.74 | -11.3\% | \$49,303.66 | -8.8\% | 46.1\% | 3 |
| Welder | \$34,579.44 | -0.4\% | \$47,594.82 | -8.4\% | \$59,719.10 | -11.9\% | 72.7\% | 8 |
| Youth Services Officer | \$40,567.59 | -27.9\% | \$47,826.53 | -18.2\% | \$56,566.62 | -15.0\% | 39.4\% | 5 |
| Overall Average |  | -17.1\% |  | -13.1\% |  | -11.0\% | 48.9\% | 7.6 |

## 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 Exhibits 3B and 3C illustrate, for the benchmarked classifications, the County was, on average, approximately 12.9 percent below its desired market position at the minimum of the respective salary ranges with regard to the $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile, and 17.1 percent below its desired market position with regard to the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile. The following observations can be made based on the collected data:

- Of the 99 classifications surveyed with differentials, 84 classifications (84.8 percent) had differentials below the market $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile at the minimum.
- Of the 99 classifications surveyed with differentials, 87 classifications ( 87.9 percent) had differentials below the market $75^{\text {th }}$ 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 Exhibits 3B and 3C illustrate, for the benchmarked classifications, the County was, on average, approximately 9.2 percent below the market $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile at the midpoint of the respective salary ranges and 13.1 percent below the market $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile. Based on the collected data, the following observations can be made:

- Of the 99 classifications surveyed with differentials, 79 classifications ( 80.0 percent) had differentials below the market $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile at the midpoint.
- Of the 99 classifications surveyed with differentials, 86 classifications (86.9 percent) had differentials below the market $75^{\text {th }}$ 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 Exhibits 3B and 3C illustrate, the County's benchmark positions were, on average, 6.2 percent below the market $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile at the maximum of the respective salary ranges and 11.0 percent below the market $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile. Based on the collected data, the following observations can be made:

- Of the 99 classifications surveyed with differentials, 69 classifications (70.0 percent) had differentials below the market $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile at the maximum.
- Of the 99 classifications surveyed with differentials, 81 classifications (81.8 percent) had differentials below the market $75^{\text {th }}$ 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 $65^{\text {th }}$ and $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile market positions. The review of the data indicates the County will benefit from the development and implementation of new pay plans aligned with its desired market positions for General and Sworn Sheriff Employees. The proposed new plans 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 $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile and $75^{\text {th }}$ 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(s). This indicated a need for the development of new pay plans to achieve the County's desire to have a General Employee pay plan at the $65^{\text {th }}$ percentile and a Sworn Sheriff Employee Pay Plan at the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Create new step-based pay plans 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 for General Employees with 20 pay grades, numbered 301 through 320. The range spreads are consistently 56.0 percent throughout, differing from the plan adopted in 2015 to be more similar to peer structures.

## EXHIBIT 4A <br> PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Grade/Step | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 301 | \$ 23,821.90 | \$ 24,417.45 | \$ 25,027.88 | \$ 25,653.58 | \$ 26,294.92 | \$ 26,952.29 | \$ 27,626.10 |
| 302 | \$ 25,847.33 | \$ 26,493.51 | \$ 27,155.85 | \$ $27,834.74$ | \$ 28,530.61 | \$ 29,243.88 | \$ 29,974.97 |
| 303 | \$ 28,044.36 | \$ $28,745.47$ | \$ 29,464.11 | \$ 30,200.71 | \$ 30,955.73 | \$ 31,729.62 | \$ 32,522.86 |
| 304 | \$ 30,427.68 | \$ 31,188.37 | \$ 31,968.08 | \$ 32,767.28 | \$ $33,586.46$ | \$ $34,426.13$ | \$ 35,286.78 |
| 305 | \$ 33,014.22 | \$ 33,839.57 | \$ $34,685.56$ | \$ $35,552.70$ | \$ $36,441.52$ | \$ $37,352.56$ | \$ 38,286.37 |
| 306 | \$ 35,820.91 | \$ $36,716.43$ | \$ 37,634.35 | \$ 38,575.20 | \$ 39,539.58 | \$ 40,528.07 | \$ 41,541.28 |
| 307 | \$ 38,865.83 | \$ 39,837.47 | \$ 40,833.41 | \$ 41,854.24 | \$ 42,900.60 | \$ 43,973.11 | \$ 45,072.44 |
| 308 | \$ 42,169.28 | \$ 43,223.51 | \$ 44,304.10 | \$ 45,411.70 | \$ $46,546.99$ | \$ 47,710.67 | \$ 48,903.44 |
| 309 | \$ 45,753.85 | \$ 46,897.70 | \$ 48,070.14 | \$ 49,271.90 | \$ 50,503.69 | \$ 51,766.29 | \$ 53,060.44 |
| 310 | \$ 49,643.26 | \$ 50,884.34 | \$ 52,156.45 | \$ 53,460.36 | \$ 54,796.87 | \$ 56,166.79 | \$ 57,570.96 |
| 311 | \$ 53,863.46 | \$ 55,210.05 | \$ 56,590.30 | \$ 58,005.06 | \$ 59,455.18 | \$ 60,941.56 | \$ 62,465.10 |
| 312 | \$ 58,441.56 | \$ 59,902.59 | \$ 61,400.16 | \$ 62,935.16 | \$ 64,508.54 | \$ 66,121.26 | \$ 67,774.29 |
| 313 | \$ 62,240.64 | \$ 63,796.66 | \$ 65,391.57 | \$ $67,026.36$ | \$ 68,702.02 | \$ 70,419.57 | \$ 72,180.06 |
| 314 | \$ 66,285.85 | \$ 67,942.99 | \$ 69,641.57 | \$ 71,382.61 | \$ 73,167.17 | \$ 74,996.35 | \$ 76,871.26 |
| 315 | \$ 70,594.11 | \$ 72,358.96 | \$ 74,167.94 | \$ 76,022.14 | \$ 77,922.69 | \$ 79,870.76 | \$ 81,867.53 |
| 316 | \$ 75,182.37 | \$ 77,061.93 | \$ 78,988.48 | \$ 80,963.19 | \$ 82,987.27 | \$ 85,061.95 | \$ 87,188.50 |
| 317 | \$ 80,068.68 | \$ 82,070.40 | \$ 84,122.16 | \$ 86,225.21 | \$ 88,380.84 | \$ 90,590.36 | \$ 92,855.12 |
| 318 | \$ 85,273.37 | \$ 87,405.20 | \$ 89,590.33 | \$ 91,830.09 | \$ 94,125.85 | \$ 96,478.99 | \$ 98,890.97 |
| 319 | \$ 90,815.63 | \$ 93,086.02 | \$ 95,413.17 | \$ 97,798.50 | \$ 100,243.46 | \$ 102,749.55 | \$ 105,318.29 |
| 320 | \$ 96,719.17 | \$ 99,137.15 | \$ 101,615.58 | \$ 104,155.97 | \$ 106,759.87 | \$ 109,428.87 | \$ 112,164.59 |

## EXHIBIT 4A (CONTINUED) PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Grade/Step | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 301 | \$ $28,316.75$ | \$ 29,024.67 | \$ 29,750.29 | \$ 30,494.05 | \$ 31,256.40 | \$ 32,037.81 |
| 302 | \$ $\quad 30,724.35$ | \$ 31,492.46 | \$ 32,279.77 | \$ 33,086.76 | \$ $33,913.93$ | \$ $34,761.78$ |
| 303 | \$ $33,335.93$ | \$ $34,169.33$ | \$ 35,023.56 | \$ 35,899.15 | \$ 36,796.63 | \$ 37,716.55 |
| 304 | \$ $36,168.95$ | \$ 37,073.17 | \$ 38,000.00 | \$ 38,950.00 | \$ 39,923.75 | \$ $40,921.85$ |
| 305 | \$ 39,243.53 | \$ 40,224.62 | \$ 41,230.23 | \$ 42,260.99 | \$ 43,317.51 | \$ 44,400.45 |
| 306 | \$ 42,579.81 | \$ 43,644.30 | \$ 44,735.41 | \$ 45,853.80 | \$ 47,000.14 | \$ $48,175.14$ |
| 307 | \$ 46,199.25 | \$ 47,354.23 | \$ 48,538.09 | \$ 49,751.54 | \$ 50,995.33 | \$ 52,270.21 |
| 308 | \$ 50,126.02 | \$ 51,379.17 | \$ 52,663.65 | \$ 53,980.24 | \$ 55,329.75 | \$ 56,712.99 |
| 309 | \$ 54,386.95 | \$ 55,746.63 | \$ 57,140.29 | \$ 58,568.80 | \$ 60,033.02 | \$ 61,533.85 |
| 310 | \$ 59,010.23 | \$ 60,485.49 | \$ 61,997.63 | \$ 63,547.57 | \$ 65,136.26 | \$ 66,764.66 |
| 311 | \$ 64,026.73 | \$ 65,627.40 | \$ 67,268.08 | \$ 68,949.78 | \$ 70,673.53 | \$ 72,440.37 |
| 312 | \$ 69,468.65 | \$ 71,205.36 | \$ 72,985.50 | \$ 74,810.13 | \$ 76,680.39 | \$ 78,597.40 |
| 313 | \$ 73,984.56 | \$ 75,834.18 | \$ 77,730.03 | \$ 79,673.28 | \$ 81,665.11 | \$ 83,706.74 |
| 314 | \$ 78,793.04 | \$ 80,762.87 | \$ 82,781.94 | \$ 84,851.49 | \$ 86,972.78 | \$ 89,147.10 |
| 315 | \$ 83,914.22 | \$ 86,012.07 | \$ 88,162.37 | \$ 90,366.43 | \$ 92,625.59 | \$ 94,941.23 |
| 316 | \$ 89,368.21 | \$ 91,602.42 | \$ 93,892.48 | \$ 96,239.79 | \$ 98,645.78 | \$ 101,111.93 |
| 317 | \$ 95,176.50 | \$ 97,555.91 | \$ 99,994.81 | \$ 102,494.68 | \$ 105,057.05 | \$ 107,683.47 |
| 318 | \$ 101,363.24 | \$ 103,897.32 | \$ 106,494.75 | \$ 109,157.12 | \$ 111,886.05 | \$ 114,683.20 |
| 319 | \$ 107,951.25 | \$ 110,650.03 | \$ 113,416.28 | \$ 116,251.69 | \$ 119,157.98 | \$ 122,136.93 |
| 320 | \$ 114,968.70 | \$ 117,842.92 | \$ 120,788.99 | \$ 123,808.72 | \$ 126,903.94 | \$ 130,076.53 |

## EXHIBIT 4A (CONTINUED) PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Grade/Step | 14 | 15 |  |  | 16 |  | 17 |  | 18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 301 | $\$$ | $32,838.75$ | $\$$ | $33,659.72$ | $\$$ | $34,501.21$ | $\$$ | $35,363.74$ | $\$$ |
| $36,247.84$ | $\$$ | $37,154.03$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 302 | $\$$ | $35,630.82$ | $\$$ | $36,521.59$ | $\$$ | $37,434.63$ | $\$$ | $38,370.50$ | $\$$ |
| $39,329.76$ | $\$$ | $40,313.01$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 303 | $\$$ | $38,659.46$ | $\$$ | $39,625.95$ | $\$$ | $40,616.60$ | $\$$ | $41,632.01$ | $\$$ |
| $42,672.81$ | $\$$ | $43,739.63$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 304 | $\$$ | $41,944.89$ | $\$$ | $42,993.51$ | $\$$ | $44,068.35$ | $\$$ | $45,170.06$ | $\$$ |
| $46,299.31$ | $\$$ | $47,456.79$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 305 | $\$$ | $45,510.46$ | $\$$ | $46,648.23$ | $\$$ | $47,814.43$ | $\$$ | $49,009.79$ | $\$$ |

Exhibit 4B shows the proposed step-based pay plan for sworn Sheriff employees with 20 pay grades, numbered 101 through 120. The range spreads are consistently 56.0 percent throughout, differing from the plan adopted in 2015.

## EXHIBIT 4B <br> PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN SWORN SHERIFF EMPLOYEES

| Grade/Step | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 101 | \$ 24,708.10 | \$ 25,325.80 | \$ 25,958.95 | \$ 26,607.92 | \$ 27,273.12 | \$ 27,954.95 | \$ 28,653.82 |
| 102 | \$ 26,808.87 | \$ 27,479.10 | \$ 28,166.07 | \$ 28,870.23 | \$ 29,591.98 | \$ 30,331.78 | \$ 31,090.07 |
| 103 | \$ 29,087.64 | \$ 29,814.83 | \$ 30,560.20 | \$ 31,324.21 | \$ 32,107.31 | \$ 32,909.99 | \$ 33,732.74 |
| 104 | \$ 31,559.62 | \$ 32,348.61 | \$ 33,157.33 | \$ 33,986.26 | \$ 34,835.92 | \$ 35,706.81 | \$ 36,599.48 |
| 105 | \$ 34,242.38 | \$ 35,098.44 | \$ 35,975.90 | \$ 36,875.30 | \$ 37,797.18 | \$ 38,742.11 | \$ 39,710.67 |
| 106 | \$ 37,153.49 | \$ 38,082.33 | \$ 39,034.38 | \$ 40,010.24 | \$ 41,010.50 | \$ 42,035.76 | \$ 43,086.66 |
| 107 | \$ 40,311.68 | \$ 41,319.47 | \$ 42,352.45 | \$ 43,411.26 | \$ 44,496.55 | \$ 45,608.96 | \$ 46,749.18 |
| 108 | \$ 43,738.02 | \$ 44,831.47 | \$ 45,952.26 | \$ 47,101.06 | \$ 48,278.59 | \$ 49,485.56 | \$ 50,722.70 |
| 109 | \$ 47,455.95 | \$ 48,642.34 | \$ 49,858.40 | \$ 51,104.86 | \$ 52,382.48 | \$ 53,692.05 | \$ 55,034.35 |
| 110 | \$ 51,490.04 | \$ 52,777.29 | \$ 54,096.72 | \$ 55,449.14 | \$ 56,835.37 | \$ 58,256.26 | \$ 59,712.66 |
| 111 | \$ 55,867.24 | \$ 57,263.92 | \$ 58,695.52 | \$ 60,162.91 | \$ 61,666.98 | \$ 63,208.65 | \$ 64,788.87 |
| 112 | \$ 60,615.64 | \$ 62,131.04 | \$ 63,684.31 | \$ 65,276.42 | \$ 66,908.33 | \$ 68,581.04 | \$ 70,295.56 |
| 113 | \$ 64,556.06 | \$ 66,169.96 | \$ 67,824.21 | \$ 69,519.81 | \$ 71,257.81 | \$ 73,039.26 | \$ 74,865.24 |
| 114 | \$ 68,751.75 | \$ 70,470.55 | \$ 72,232.31 | \$ 74,038.12 | \$ 75,889.07 | \$ 77,786.30 | \$ 79,730.95 |
| 115 | \$ 73,220.29 | \$ 75,050.80 | \$ 76,927.07 | \$ 78,850.24 | \$ 80,821.50 | \$ 82,842.04 | \$ 84,913.09 |
| 116 | \$ 77,979.23 | \$ 79,928.71 | \$ 81,926.93 | \$ 83,975.10 | \$ 86,074.48 | \$ 88,226.34 | \$ 90,432.00 |
| 117 | \$ 83,047.32 | \$ 85,123.50 | \$ 87,251.59 | \$ 89,432.88 | \$ 91,668.70 | \$ 93,960.42 | \$ 96,309.43 |
| 118 | \$ 88,445.63 | \$ 90,656.77 | \$ 92,923.19 | \$ 95,246.27 | \$ 97,627.43 | \$ 100,068.11 | \$ 102,569.81 |
| 119 | \$ 94,194.07 | \$ 96,548.92 | \$ 98,962.64 | \$ 101,436.71 | \$ 103,972.63 | \$ 106,571.94 | \$ 109,236.24 |
| 120 | \$ 100,317.23 | \$ 102,825.16 | \$ 105,395.79 | \$ 108,030.68 | \$ 110,731.45 | \$ 113,499.74 | \$ 116,337.23 |

## EXHIBIT 4B (CONTINUED) <br> PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN SWORN SHERIFF EMPLOYEES

| Grade/Step | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 101 | \$ 29,370.17 | \$ 30,104.42 | \$ 30,857.03 | \$ 31,628.46 | \$ 32,419.17 | \$ 33,229.65 |
| 102 | \$ 31,867.33 | \$ 32,664.01 | \$ 33,480.61 | \$ 34,317.63 | \$ 35,175.57 | \$ 36,054.96 |
| 103 | \$ 34,576.06 | \$ 35,440.46 | \$ 36,326.48 | \$ 37,234.64 | \$ 38,165.50 | \$ 39,119.64 |
| 104 | \$ 37,514.47 | \$ 38,452.33 | \$ 39,413.64 | \$ 40,398.98 | \$ 41,408.96 | \$ 42,444.18 |
| 105 | \$ 40,703.43 | \$ 41,721.02 | \$ 42,764.04 | \$ 43,833.14 | \$ 44,928.97 | \$ 46,052.20 |
| 106 | \$ 44,163.82 | \$ 45,267.92 | \$ 46,399.62 | \$ 47,559.61 | \$ 48,748.60 | \$ 49,967.31 |
| 107 | \$ 47,917.91 | \$ 49,115.86 | \$ 50,343.76 | \$ 51,602.35 | \$ 52,892.41 | \$ $54,214.72$ |
| 108 | \$ 51,990.76 | \$ 53,290.53 | \$ 54,622.79 | \$ 55,988.36 | \$ 57,388.07 | \$ 58,822.78 |
| 109 | \$ 56,410.21 | \$ 57,820.46 | \$ 59,265.97 | \$ 60,747.62 | \$ 62,266.31 | \$ 63,822.97 |
| 110 | \$ 61,205.48 | \$ 62,735.62 | \$ 64,304.01 | \$ 65,911.61 | \$ 67,559.40 | \$ 69,248.38 |
| 111 | \$ 66,408.59 | \$ 68,068.81 | \$ 69,770.53 | \$ 71,514.79 | \$ 73,302.66 | \$ 75,135.23 |
| 112 | \$ 72,052.95 | \$ 73,854.28 | \$ 75,700.63 | \$ 77,593.15 | \$ 79,532.98 | \$ 81,521.30 |
| 113 | \$ 76,736.87 | \$ 78,655.29 | \$ 80,621.67 | \$ 82,637.21 | \$ 84,703.14 | \$ 86,820.72 |
| 114 | \$ 81,724.23 | \$ 83,767.33 | \$ 85,861.52 | \$ 88,008.06 | \$ 90,208.26 | \$ 92,463.46 |
| 115 | \$ 87,035.91 | \$ 89,211.81 | \$ 91,442.11 | \$ 93,728.16 | \$ 96,071.36 | \$ 98,473.15 |
| 116 | \$ 92,692.80 | \$ 95,010.12 | \$ 97,385.38 | \$ 99,820.01 | \$ 102,315.51 | \$ 104,873.40 |
| 117 | \$ 98,717.17 | \$ 101,185.10 | \$ 103,714.72 | \$ 106,307.59 | \$ 108,965.28 | \$ 111,689.41 |
| 118 | \$ 105,134.06 | \$ 107,762.41 | \$ 110,456.47 | \$ 113,217.88 | \$ 116,048.33 | \$ 118,949.54 |
| 119 | \$ 111,967.15 | \$ 114,766.33 | \$ 117,635.48 | \$ 120,576.37 | \$ 123,590.78 | \$ 126,680.55 |
| 120 | \$ 119,245.66 | \$ 122,226.80 | \$ 125,282.47 | \$ 128,414.53 | \$ 131,624.90 | \$ 134,915.52 |

## EXHIBIT 4B (CONTINUED) PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN SWORN SHERIFF EMPLOYEES

| Grade/Step | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 101 | \$ $34,060.39$ | \$ $34,911.90$ | \$ 35,784.70 | \$ $36,679.31$ | \$ 37,596.30 | \$ 38,536.20 |
| 102 | \$ 36,956.33 | \$ 37,880.24 | \$ 38,827.24 | \$ 39,797.92 | \$ 40,792.87 | \$ 41,812.69 |
| 103 | \$ 40,097.63 | \$ 41,100.07 | \$ 42,127.58 | \$ 43,180.77 | \$ 44,260.28 | \$ 45,366.79 |
| 104 | \$ 43,505.29 | \$ 44,592.92 | \$ 45,707.74 | \$ $46,850.43$ | \$ 48,021.70 | \$ 49,222.24 |
| 105 | \$ 47,203.50 | \$ 48,383.59 | \$ 49,593.18 | \$ 50,833.01 | \$ 52,103.83 | \$ 53,406.43 |
| 106 | \$ 51,216.49 | \$ 52,496.91 | \$ 53,809.33 | \$ 55,154.56 | \$ 56,533.43 | \$ 57,946.76 |
| 107 | \$ 55,570.09 | \$ 56,959.34 | \$ 58,383.32 | \$ 59,842.91 | \$ 61,338.98 | \$ 62,872.46 |
| 108 | \$ 60,293.35 | \$ 61,800.68 | \$ 63,345.70 | \$ 64,929.34 | \$ 66,552.57 | \$ 68,216.39 |
| 109 | \$ 65,418.55 | \$ 67,054.01 | \$ 68,730.36 | \$ 70,448.62 | \$ 72,209.83 | \$ 74,015.08 |
| 110 | \$ 70,979.59 | \$ 72,754.08 | \$ 74,572.93 | \$ 76,437.26 | \$ 78,348.19 | \$ 80,306.89 |
| 111 | \$ 77,013.61 | \$ 78,938.95 | \$ 80,912.42 | \$ 82,935.23 | \$ 85,008.61 | \$ 87,133.83 |
| 112 | \$ 83,559.33 | \$ 85,648.32 | \$ 87,789.53 | \$ 89,984.26 | \$ 92,233.87 | \$ 94,539.72 |
| 113 | \$ 88,991.24 | \$ 91,216.02 | \$ 93,496.42 | \$ 95,833.83 | \$ 98,229.68 | \$ 100,685.42 |
| 114 | \$ 94,775.05 | \$ 97,144.43 | \$ 99,573.04 | \$ 102,062.36 | \$ 104,613.92 | \$ 107,229.27 |
| 115 | \$ 100,934.98 | \$ 103,458.35 | \$ 106,044.81 | \$ 108,695.93 | \$ 111,413.33 | \$ 114,198.66 |
| 116 | \$ 107,495.23 | \$ 110,182.61 | \$ 112,937.18 | \$ 115,760.61 | \$ 118,654.62 | \$ 121,620.99 |
| 117 | \$ 114,481.65 | \$ 117,343.69 | \$ 120,277.28 | \$ 123,284.21 | \$ 126,366.32 | \$ 129,525.48 |
| 118 | \$ 121,923.28 | \$ 124,971.36 | \$ 128,095.64 | \$ 131,298.03 | \$ 134,580.49 | \$ 137,945.00 |
| 119 | \$ 129,847.56 | \$ 133,093.75 | \$ 136,421.10 | \$ 139,831.62 | \$ 143,327.42 | \$ 146,910.60 |
| 120 | \$ 138,288.41 | \$ 141,745.62 | \$ 145,289.26 | \$ 148,921.49 | \$ 152,644.53 | \$ 156,460.64 |

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 Exhibits 4C and 4D.

EXHIBIT 4C
PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Class Title | Proposed Grade | Proposed Minimum | Proposed Midpoint | Proposed Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Courier <br> Custodian <br> Custodian PT <br> Fleet Services Assistant <br> Food Services Associate <br> Intern <br> Jail Clerk <br> Recycle Center Operator | 301 | $\$ 23,821.90$ | \$ 30,487.97 | \$ 37,154.03 |
| Breastfeeding Support Specialist Courtroom Assistant <br> Deputy Clerk I <br> Education Services Assistant <br> Nurse Assistant <br> Patron Account Associate <br> Supply Specialist <br> TIBRS \& NCIC Data Clerk | 302 | \$25,847.33 | \$ 33,080.17 | \$ 40,313.01 |
| Collections Clerk <br> Counter Clerk I <br> Data Clerk <br> Data Clerk Investigations <br> Data Clerk Support Ops <br> Deputy Clerk II <br> Equipment Operator I <br> Jail Records Clerk <br> Law Enf Training Spec <br> Patron Services Specialist <br> Public Health Office Clerk <br> Public Health Office Clerk PT <br> Records Clerk <br> School Guard <br> Vehicle Washing Coordinator | 303 | \$28,044.36 | \$ 35,892.00 | \$ 43,739.63 |

## EXHIBIT 4C (CONTINUED) PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Class Title | Proposed Grade | Proposed Minimum | Proposed Midpoint | Proposed Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accounting Clerk I Animal Control Officer Assistant Jury Coordinator Catering Coordinator Counter Clerk II Courtroom Supervisor Deputy Clerk III Elections Specialist Temp Equipment Operator II Financial Services Assistant Kitchen Coordinator LPN <br> Maintenance Technician Parts Tech Patron Services Assistant Personal Property Assistant Sign Tech Title Deeds Clerk | 304 | \$30,427.68 | \$ 38,942.24 | \$ 47,456.79 |
| Accounting Clerk II Administrative Assistant Administrative Specialist Assessor Clerk Cataloging Specialist Cattery Operations Manager Clerk \& Master Deputy Clerk Counter Clerk III Dental Assistant Equipment Operator III Escrow \& Collections Specialist Fleet Maintenance Tech Health Educator Judicial Assistant Judicial Commissioner Judicial Commissioner PT Kennel Operations Manager Law Clerk Office Specialist Online Services Coordinator Records Management Clerk Seizure Specialist Tax \& Customer Service Spec Temp Tax \& Customer Service Specialist Tax Freeze Specialist Treatment Services Assistant Veterinary Technician Victim Witness Coordinator Youth Services Specialist | 305 | \$33,014.22 | \$ 42,252.57 | \$ 51,490.91 |

## EXHIBIT 4C (CONTINUED) PROPOSED (UPDATED) PAY GRADES GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Class Title | Proposed Grade | Proposed Minimum | Proposed Midpoint | Proposed Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accounting Clerk III <br> Accounting Technician <br> Administrative Support Specialist <br> Background Investigator <br> Case Manager <br> Commission Assistant <br> Counter Clerk Supervisor <br> Court Officer <br> Deputy Assessor <br> Deputy Sheriff <br> Deputy Sheriff COPS Grant <br> Elections Deputy <br> Equipment Operator IV <br> Financial Services Assistant <br> GIS Technician <br> Judicial Commissioner Supervisor <br> Maintenance Technician - Hwy <br> Mapping Clerk <br> Nutrition Educator <br> Office Supervisor <br> PC Specialist <br> Probation Officer <br> Process Server <br> PT PC Specialist <br> Public Events Coordinator <br> Public Relations Manager <br> Social Counselor <br> Tax \& Rebate Specialist <br> Veterans Treatment Program Coordinator <br> Welder | 306 | \$35,820.91 | \$ 45,844.65 | \$ 55,868.40 |
| Accounting \& Bankruptcy Specialist Accounts Payable Clerk, Senior <br> Assistant Office Manager <br> Assistant Office Manager Drug Task Force <br> At-Risk Intensive Int \& Prev Couns <br> Corporal <br> Custodial Supervisor <br> Deputy Assessor, Senior <br> Elections Chief Deputy <br> Executive Assistant <br> Law Enforcement Training Spec <br> Office Administrator, Assistant <br> Payroll Clerk <br> TAC \& NCIC Data Clerk <br> Worker Compensation Coordinator Youth Services Officer | 307 | \$38,865.83 | \$ 49,741.62 | \$ 60,617.42 |

## EXHIBIT 4C (CONTINUED) PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Class Title | Proposed Grade | Proposed Minimum | Proposed Midpoint | Proposed Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accounting Analyst <br> Assistant EMA Director <br> Assistant Veterans Service Officer <br> Codes Inspector <br> Contract Manager <br> Dietician <br> Drainage/Grading Supervisor <br> Engineering Technician <br> Human Resources Coordinator <br> Human Resources Specialist <br> Investigator Sex Off Reg <br> Office Administrator <br> Office Manager <br> Patron Services Manager <br> Paving Supervisor <br> Purchasing Specialist <br> Sign Shop Foreman <br> Treatment Specialist <br> Vegetation Control Supervisor | 308 | $\$ 42,169.28$ | $\$ \quad 53,969.48$ | \$ 65,769.68 |
| Adult Services Coordinator Chief Deputy Clerk \& Master Chief Deputy of Technology Collections Librarian Criminal Justice Coordinator Inspection Services Coordinator Learning Commons Coordinator Network Engineer Records Manager \& County Archivist Shop Supervisor Sign Shop Supervisor Sr Asst Veterans Service Officer | 309 | \$45,753.85 | \$ 58,557.13 | \$ 71,360.40 |
| Assistant Purchasing Agent <br> Chief Deputy Register of Deeds <br> Environmental Health Specialist <br> GIS Coordinator <br> Payroll Manager <br> Reference Librarian <br> Senior Network Engineer <br> Sergeant <br> Stormwater Manager \& Construction Coordinator <br> Youth Services Coordinator | 310 | \$49,643.26 | \$ 63,534.90 | \$ 77,426.54 |

## EXHIBIT 4C (CONTINUED) PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Class Title | Proposed Grade | Proposed Minimum | Proposed Midpoint | Proposed Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chief Financial Officer <br> Deputy Chief of Staff <br> Education Services Manager <br> Fleet \& Maintenance Supervisor Juvenile Court Services Director <br> Lieutenant <br> Network Administrator <br> Operations Manager <br> Planner, Senior <br> RN <br> Veteran Services, Director | 311 | \$53,863.46 | \$ 68,936.04 | \$ 84,008.62 |
| Accounting Manager <br> Assistant IT Director <br> Building Official <br> Chief Deputy Assessor <br> Chief Deputy Court Clerk <br> Engineering Supervisor <br> Environmental Health Manager <br> IT Manager <br> Systems Administrator | 312 | \$58,441.56 | \$ 74,795.22 | \$ 91,148.88 |
| Chief of Staff Conservation Director Drug Court Programs Director Risk Manager Senior Systems Administrator Watershed Coordinator | 313 | \$62,240.64 | \$ 79,657.40 | \$ 97,074.16 |
| Budget Manager <br> Deputy Chief Investigations <br> Deputy Director <br> Medical Unit Supervisor <br> Probation Director <br> Purchasing Agent <br> Veterinarian | 314 | \$66,285.85 | \$ 84,834.57 | \$103,383.30 |

EXHIBIT 4C (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Class Title | Proposed <br> Grade |  | Proposed <br> Minimum | Proposed <br> Midpoint |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Animal Center Director <br> Appellate Defender <br> Assistant Superintendent/Engineer <br> Emergency Management Director <br> General Services Director <br> HR Director <br> Magistrate <br> Planning Director <br> Project Manager <br> IT Director <br> Library Director <br> Dentist <br> Finance Director | 315 | $\$ 70,594.11$ | $\$ 80,348.42$ | $\$ 110,102.72$ |

EXHIBIT 4D
PROPOSED NEW PAY GRADES SWORN SHERIFF EMPLOYEES

| Class Title | Proposed Grade | Proposed Minimum | Proposed Midpoint | Proposed Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Court Security <br> Property \& Evidence Technician | 105 | \$34,242.38 | \$ 43,824.41 | \$ 53,406.43 |
| Asst Training Dir POST Court Officer Crime Scene Investigator Deputy Sheriff Deputy Sheriff COPS Grant Deputy Sheriff SRO Deputy Sheriff Traffic Process Server | 106 | \$37,153.49 | \$ 47,550.12 | \$ 57,946.76 |
| Corporal <br> Corporal Adm <br> Corporal SRO <br> Deputy Sheriff Training <br> Investigator <br> Investigator Drugs <br> Investigator Sex Off Reg | 107 | \$40,311.68 | \$ 51,592.07 | \$ 62,872.46 |
| Public Information Officer | 108 | \$ 43,738.02 | \$ 55,977.20 | \$ 68,216.39 |

## EXHIBIT 4D (CONTINUED) PROPOSED (UPDATED) PAY GRADES SWORN SHERIFF EMPLOYEES

| Class Title | Proposed <br> Grade | Proposed <br> Minimum | Proposed <br> Midpoint | Proposed <br> Maximum |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sergeant <br> Sergeant Investigation <br> Sergeant SRO <br> Sergeant Traffic | 109 | $\$ 47,455.95$ | $\$$ | $60,735.51$ | $\$ 4,015.08$ |
| Asst Training Dir TCI <br> Lieutenant <br> Lieutenant Investigations <br> Lieutenant Traffic | 111 | $\$ 55,867.24$ | $\$ 81,500.53$ | $\$ 87,133.83$ |  |
| IT Manager <br> Captain Adm Ops <br> Captain Court Services <br> Captain Patrol | 112 | $\$ 60,615.64$ | $\$ 77,577.68$ | $\$ 94,539.72$ |  |
| Deputy Chief <br> Deputy Chief Investigations <br> Deputy Chief Support Ops <br> Chief Deputy Sheriff | 113 | $\$ 64,556.06$ | $\$ 82,620.74$ | $\$ 100,685.42$ |  |

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 Toward Market (3-Tier) \& Closest Step in Revised Pay Plan:

With this option, employees are first brought to the minimum of their respective proposed pay grade if not already at or above this value. Then, employees' salaries are moved closer toward the market point of their proposed pay grade range based on total tenure. The 'tiers' used in this method are 1-3 years, 3-7 years, and over 7 years. Increments are designed to give larger adjustments (in percentage terms) to those with salaries furthest from the market (midpoint) and to provide greater adjustments to those employees with more tenure. Employees at or above the market point are unaffected. Next, all employees whether above or below the market point of their respective ranges are brought up to the nearest step value in their respective pay grades. If any employees already had salaries above the highest step in their pay grade, their salary was unaffected.

Utilizing this approach, adjustments were recommended for 509 general employees, planned to be effective July 1, 2019 with an approximate annualized cost of \$1,681,900. Adjustments were also recommended for 158 sworn Sheriff employees, effective July 1, 2019 with an approximate annualized cost of $\$ 592,584$. This is the approximate cost for salary adjustments (only) and does not include the associated costs for employee benefits.

### 4.2 SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION

The County's compensation system will continue to require periodic maintenance. The recommendations provided to improve the competiveness 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 plans 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.

### 4.4 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.

