

Classification and Compensation Study for the City of Coral Gables, FL

FINAL REPORT



Evergreen Solutions, LLC
February 24, 2023

Table of Contents

	PAGE
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Study Methodology.....	1-1
1.2 Report Organization.....	1-3
2.0 ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT CONDITIONS.....	2-1
2.1 Analysis of Pay Plans.....	2-1
2.2 Salary Placement Analysis	2-9
2.3 Quartile Analysis	2-14
2.4 Compression Analysis	218
2.5 Department/Location Distribution	2-22
2.6 Summary.....	2-23
3.0 SUMMARY OF EMPLOYEE OUTREACH.....	3-1
3.1 General Feedback	3-1
3.2 Compensation.....	3-2
3.3 Classification.....	3-3
3.4 Summary	3-3
4.0 SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY.....	4-1
4.1 Market Data.....	4-8
4.2 Market Midpoints	4-9
4.3 Market Maximums.....	4-11
4.3 Market Survey Conclusion	4-13
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5-1
5.1 Classification Systems	5-1
5.2 Compensation System	5-3
5.3 System Administration	5-14
5.4 Summary.....	5-15



Chapter 1 - Introduction

In July 2022, Evergreen Solutions was retained by the City of Coral Gables, FL to conduct a Classification and Compensation Study for all employees. The Classification and Compensation Study was designed to focus on the internal and external equity of both the structure by which employees are compensated, as well as the way in which positions relate and compare to one another across the City. The recommendations offered in this study are intended to meet the City's desire to attract and retain qualified employees.

Internal equity relates to the fairness of an organization's compensation practices among its current employees. Specifically, by reviewing the skills, capabilities, and duties of each position, it can be determined whether similar positions are being compensated in a similar manner within the City. The classification component of this study is aimed at resolving any inconsistencies related to job requirements and providing some clarity to the plan in place.

External equity deals with the differences between what the City is paying for each classification of employees and what compensation is available in the market place for the same skills, capabilities, and duties.

As part of the study, Evergreen Solutions was tasked with:

- collecting and reviewing current environmental data;
- reviewing job descriptions and obtaining job analysis questionnaires from employees;
- conducting salary study and providing feedback regarding current market competitiveness;
- conducting a classification analysis to assess internal equity and the efficiency of the current classification plan;
- developing strategic positioning recommendations using market data and best practices;
- developing a compensation structure and implementation cost plan; and
- developing and submitting draft and final reports summarizing findings and recommendations.

1.1 STUDY METHODOLOGY

To provide relevant information to the City, Evergreen combined qualitative with quantitative data analysis to produce recommendations that maximize the fairness and competitiveness of the City's classification structure and practices.

Project activities included:

- conducting a project kick-off meeting;
- facilitating employee focus group sessions;
- conducting salary survey;
- developing recommendations for compensation management;
- developing detailed implementation plans;
- creating the draft and final reports; and
- updating job descriptions

Kickoff Meeting

The kickoff meeting provided an opportunity to discuss the history of the organization, finalize the work plan, and begin the data collection process. Data collection of relevant background material (including existing pay plans, organization charts, policies, procedures, training materials, job descriptions, and other pertinent material) is part of this process.

Assessment of Current Conditions

This analysis provides an overall assessment of the existing pay plans and related data for the City's employees at the time the study began. The pay plans, the progression of employee salaries through pay grades, employee tenure, and the distribution of employees in the City are all examined during this process. The findings of this analysis are summarized in **Chapter 2** of this report.

Employee Outreach

These sessions are designed to brief employees and supervisors on the purpose and major processes of the study. These sessions are intended to address any questions and resolve any misconceptions about the study and relevant tasks. During focus groups, employees are asked about their experience with the City and to identify any concerns they have about compensation or classification. This information, located in **Chapter 3**, provides some basic perceptual background, as well as a starting point for the research process.

Salary Survey

The external market is defined as identified peers with which the City competes for qualified employees, including those that have similar characteristics, demographics, and service offerings as the target organization. Benchmark positions are identified from each area and level of the organization and include a large cross-section of positions in the City. Once the target and benchmark information is finalized, a survey tool is created to solicit salary information from each of the peer organizations. When the results are received, the data are analyzed, cleaned, and entered to provide aggregate findings. The results of the survey are provided in **Chapter 4**.

Job Assessment Tool (JAT) Classification Analysis

Although market data are imperative for determining pay grade value for job titles, they are not the only factor that contributes to recommended placement. In addition to collecting market data, job questionnaire data were used to slot positions. Evergreen's Job Assessment Tool (JAT) was administered to all employees during the study and was available to all employees for a two-week period to allow for sufficient participation. Upon completion of the JAT, supervisors were provided the opportunity to review employee submittals and provide feedback on responses. The JAT provided a score for each City job title which was used to determine the hierarchy and value of all job titles based on each one's complexities. Each classification's score is based on the employee and supervisor responses to the JAT. The scores allowed for a comparison of classifications in the City.

Recommendations

The development of recommendations followed agreement on the structure of the compensation and classification system. During this phase, desired range spreads (distance from minimum to maximum) and midpoint progressions (distance from the midpoint of one pay grade to the next) were established. In addition, the City identified its desired market position and compensation philosophy. Subsequently, the pay plan and job slotting within the system were adjusted to account for this desired position in the market.

As part of the study, job titles for employees were determined to best reflect the roles and responsibilities of each position. With the salary schedules and job titles established, jobs can be slotted into the proposed pay grade structure using market data and feedback from Human Resources staff in the City.

The final step in the development of recommendations was to identify the costs associated with each step of the analysis. The data from the job slotting were applied to the individual incumbents in the organization. This gave the City the opportunity to view the total costs associated with the structural changes. Information was then provided to the City on various ways to implement the proposed structure and possible adjustments that can be made to address any remaining issues. A summary of the findings and the associated recommendations in the study can be found in **Chapter 5**.

1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report includes the following six chapters:

- Chapter 1 – Introduction
- Chapter 2 – Assessment of Current Conditions
- Chapter 3 – Summary of Employee Outreach
- Chapter 4 – Salary Survey Summary
- Chapter 5 – Recommendations



Chapter 2 – Assessment of Current Conditions

Chapter 2 provides an overall assessment of the compensation system in place for employees at the City of Coral Gables, FL. Data included here reflect the demographics in place at the time of the study and should be considered a snapshot in time. The data provide the baseline for analysis throughout the course of this study, but are not sufficient cause for recommendations in isolation. By conducting this review, Evergreen gained a better understanding of the structure and associated salary practices in place, and identified issues for both further review and potential revision.

2.1 ANALYSIS OF PAY PLAN

The City administers six pay plans for employees included in the study. **Exhibits 2A through 2F** provide details related to the value of each pay range at the minimum, midpoint, and maximum; the range spread for each (the distance between the pay range minimum and maximum); and the number of employees in each grade. As shown, the six pay plans feature a total of 71 grades and serve 706 employees. Pay range spreads are mostly inconsistent in the plans, varying from four percent to 51 percent.

Note: There are three employees who are not assigned a pay range and are, therefore, not included in most analyses in this chapter.

**EXHIBIT 2A
PAY PLAN SUMMARY – EXCLUDED**

Pay Plan	Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression	Employees
Excluded	08e	\$35,555.10	\$36,182.54	\$36,809.97	4%	-	1
Excluded	17e	\$39,355.68	\$48,220.74	\$57,085.81	45%	10%	1
Excluded	18e	\$41,328.77	\$50,630.12	\$59,931.47	45%	5%	22
Excluded	19e	\$43,408.14	\$53,170.73	\$62,933.31	45%	5%	4
Excluded	20e	\$45,571.97	\$55,820.96	\$66,069.95	45%	5%	2
Excluded	21e	\$47,842.08	\$58,602.86	\$69,363.63	45%	5%	5
Excluded	22e	\$50,239.49	\$61,537.84	\$72,836.19	45%	5%	4
Excluded	23e	\$52,743.14	\$64,604.45	\$76,465.75	45%	5%	10
Excluded	24e	\$55,373.76	\$67,835.28	\$80,296.81	45%	5%	9
Excluded	25e	\$58,153.19	\$71,230.22	\$84,307.26	45%	5%	8
Excluded	26e	\$61,059.65	\$74,789.46	\$88,519.27	45%	5%	7
Excluded	27e	\$64,114.75	\$78,534.87	\$92,954.99	45%	5%	7

EXHIBIT 2A (Continued)
PAY PLAN SUMMARY – EXCLUDED

Pay Plan	Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression	Employees
Excluded	28e	\$67,297.15	\$82,456.30	\$97,615.44	45%	5%	13
Excluded	29e	\$70,670.70	\$86,573.86	\$102,477.02	45%	5%	6
Excluded	30e	\$74,213.57	\$90,910.66	\$107,607.76	45%	5%	4
Excluded	31e	\$77,926.37	\$95,455.46	\$112,984.56	45%	5%	4
Excluded	32e	\$81,809.10	\$100,219.81	\$118,630.51	45%	5%	5
Excluded	33e	\$85,903.58	\$105,224.39	\$124,545.20	45%	5%	2
Excluded	36e	\$99,444.80	\$121,804.80	\$144,185.60	45%	14%	1
Overall					42.7%	5.0%	115

EXHIBIT 2B
PAY PLAN SUMMARY - EXECUTIVE

Pay Plan	Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression	Employees
Executive	29EX	\$72,437.25	\$88,738.10	\$105,038.96	45%	-	1
Executive	32EX	\$83,854.16	\$102,725.06	\$121,595.97	45%	14%	3
Executive	34EX	\$92,444.14	\$113,243.42	\$134,042.69	45%	9%	9
Executive	35EX	\$97,075.89	\$118,912.25	\$140,748.61	45%	5%	9
Executive	36EX	\$101,929.57	\$124,857.72	\$147,785.87	45%	5%	6
Executive	38EX	\$107,013.92	\$134,155.84	\$161,297.76	51%	5%	3
Executive	39EX	\$117,981.76	\$142,841.19	\$167,700.62	42%	9%	1
Executive	43EX	\$123,881.47	\$151,744.32	\$179,607.17	45%	5%	6
Executive	45EX	\$136,591.31	\$167,304.18	\$198,017.04	45%	9%	1
Overall					45.4%	7.3%	39

EXHIBIT 2C
PAY PLAN SUMMARY – FIRE EXECUTIVE

Pay Plan	Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression	Employees
Fire Exec	36psf	\$129,682.80	\$140,037.56	\$150,392.32	16%	-	3
Fire Exec	38psf	\$145,698.80	\$157,332.66	\$168,966.51	16%	11%	1
Fire Exec	43psf	\$162,159.71	\$175,107.71	\$188,055.71	16%	10%	1
Overall					16.0%	10.6%	5

**EXHIBIT 2D
PAY PLAN SUMMARY – POLICE EXECUTIVE**

Pay Plan	Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression	Employees
Police Exec	36ps	\$129,683.01	\$140,037.66	\$150,392.32	16%	-	5
Police Exec	38ps	\$145,698.80	\$157,332.66	\$168,966.51	16%	11%	1
Police Exec	43ps	\$162,159.71	\$175,107.71	\$188,055.71	16%	10%	1
Overall					16.0%	10.6%	7

**EXHIBIT 2E
PAY PLAN SUMMARY – PART TIME**

Pay Plan	Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression	Employees
Part-Time	06pt	\$29,978.21	\$36,388.98	\$42,799.74	43%	-	4
Part-Time	08pt	\$33,033.31	\$40,112.91	\$47,192.50	43%	9%	2
Part-Time	11pt	\$30,009.07	\$36,426.63	\$42,844.19	43%	-10%	99
Part-Time	12pt	\$31,463.33	\$38,202.11	\$44,940.90	43%	5%	11
Part-Time	13pt	\$32,924.20	\$39,979.91	\$47,035.62	43%	4%	28
Part-Time	14pt	\$34,693.15	\$42,121.14	\$49,549.14	43%	5%	2
Part-Time	15pt	\$36,427.87	\$44,227.04	\$52,026.21	43%	5%	18
Part-Time	16pt	\$38,231.23	\$46,840.77	\$55,450.30	45%	5%	6
Part-Time	18pt	\$41,328.77	\$50,187.18	\$59,045.58	43%	7%	8
Part-Time	19pt	\$44,256.58	\$53,737.01	\$63,217.44	43%	7%	4
Part-Time	20pt	\$46,484.26	\$56,440.07	\$66,395.89	43%	5%	9
Part-Time	21pt	\$48,796.80	\$59,251.82	\$69,706.83	43%	5%	6
Part-Time	22pt	\$51,236.64	\$62,215.61	\$73,194.58	43%	5%	11
Part-Time	23pt	\$53,803.78	\$65,320.11	\$76,836.45	43%	5%	6
Part-Time	24pt	\$56,476.99	\$68,588.10	\$80,699.22	43%	5%	2
Part-Time	25pt	\$59,300.80	\$72,017.61	\$84,734.42	43%	5%	4
Part-Time	26pt	\$62,280.82	\$75,618.09	\$88,955.36	43%	5%	4
Part-Time	27pt	\$65,397.07	\$79,404.94	\$93,412.80	43%	5%	3
Part-Time	29pt	\$70,670.70	\$86,573.86	\$102,477.02	45%	7%	2
Part-Time	32pt	\$83,462.29	\$101,335.42	\$119,208.54	43%	15%	2
Overall					43.0%	4.4%	231

**EXHIBIT 2F
PAY PLAN SUMMARY – TEAMSTERS**

Pay Plan	Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression	Employees
Teamsters	11c	\$29,978.21	\$36,710.02	\$43,441.84	45%	-	2
Teamsters	12c	\$31,463.33	\$38,539.07	\$45,614.82	45%	5%	1
Teamsters	13c	\$33,033.31	\$40,466.92	\$47,900.53	45%	5%	26
Teamsters	14c	\$34,688.16	\$42,492.94	\$50,297.73	45%	5%	43
Teamsters	15c	\$36,427.87	\$44,617.25	\$52,806.62	45%	5%	37
Teamsters	16c	\$38,231.23	\$46,840.77	\$55,450.30	45%	5%	28
Teamsters	17c	\$40,140.86	\$49,173.26	\$58,205.67	45%	5%	18
Teamsters	18c	\$42,156.19	\$51,648.69	\$61,141.18	45%	5%	42
Teamsters	19c	\$44,256.58	\$54,211.25	\$64,165.92	45%	5%	10
Teamsters	20c	\$46,484.26	\$56,938.02	\$67,391.79	45%	5%	38
Teamsters	21c	\$48,796.80	\$59,774.62	\$70,752.45	45%	5%	3
Teamsters	22c	\$51,236.64	\$62,764.52	\$74,292.40	45%	5%	28
Teamsters	23c	\$53,803.78	\$65,896.38	\$77,988.98	45%	5%	11
Teamsters	24c	\$56,476.99	\$69,193.49	\$81,909.98	45%	5%	15
Teamsters	25c	\$59,300.80	\$72,653.10	\$86,005.40	45%	5%	2
Teamsters	27c	\$65,397.07	\$80,105.48	\$94,813.89	45%	9%	1
Teamsters	29c	\$74,100.27	\$89,316.29	\$104,532.31	41%	12%	5
Overall					45.0%	4.8%	310

Exhibit 2G shows the 327 unique job titles that are currently utilized by the City.

**EXHIBIT 2G
CLASSIFICATION TITLES**

Classification Title	Classification Title
ACCOUNTANT I	AQUATICS SUPERVISOR
ACCOUNTANT III	ARCHIVIST
ACCOUNTING CLERK II	ARTS AND CULTURE SPECIALIST
ACCOUNTING SPECIALIST	ASSISTANT AQUATICS SUPERVISOR
ACCOUNTING SPECIALIST/PUBLIC WORKS	ASSISTANT BUILDING DIRECTOR
ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST	ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	ASSISTANT CITY CLERK
ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGER	ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER
ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS SUPERVISOR	ASSISTANT TO CHIEF OF POLICE
ADMN & FISCAL AFFAIRS MANAGER	ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER.
ADULT ACTIVITIES SUPERVISOR	ASST CHIEF OF POLICE FOR OPER.
AGENDA COORDINATOR	ASST. DIRECTOR FOR PLANNING & ZONING

EXHIBIT 2G (Continued)
CLASSIFICATION TITLES

Classification Title	Classification Title
ASST. HISTORIC PRESERV. OFFCR	COMMUNICATIONS MANAGER
ASST. TO THE DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY	COMMUNITY RECREATION DIRECTOR
ASST. TO THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS	COMPENSATION & BENEFITS MANAGER
ASST.CITYATTY/INTERGOV AFF MGR	COMPENSATION COORDINATOR
AUTOMOTIVE BODY WORKER	COMPTROLLER
AUTOMOTIVE COORDINATOR	CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR
AUTOMOTIVE COORDINATOR/TROLLEY	CONSTRUCTION MNGR/SURVEY LEAD
AUTOMOTIVE MECHANIC	COORDINATOR/GENERAL SRVCS.
BANQUET HALL MANAGER	COORDINATOR/GREENSPACE MGMT
BENEFITS COORDINATOR	COORDINATOR/R.O.W.
BUILDING INSPECTOR II	CRIME ANALYST
BUILDING MAINTENANCE MANAGER	D.E.I COORDINATOR
BUILDING SERVICES COORDINATOR	DEPUTY BUILDING OFFICIAL
BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR	DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
CAD/GIS ENGINEER	DEPUTY CITY CLERK
CARPENTER/GENERAL SERVICES	DEPUTY FIRE CHIEF
CHIEF COMM OUTREACH & POLICY ADVISOR	DEV. SRV DIR/BLDG DIRECTOR/BLDG OFFICIAL
CHIEF ELECTRICAL OFFICIAL	DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS
CHIEF PLUMBING OFFICIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSET MANAGER
CIP PROJECTS SPECIALIST	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASST. DIR
CITY ARCHITECT	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
CITY ATTORNEY	ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR II
CITY CLERK	ELECTRICIAN
CITY ENGINEER & PERM. SEC. MGR	ENGINEERING SURVEY LEAD
CITY MANAGER	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I
CITY PLANNER	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR II
CIVIL ENGINEER	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR II/SANITARY
CLERICAL ASSISTANT II	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III
CLERK I	EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
CODE ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANT	FINANCE ASST. DIR FOR MGMT & BUDGET/COMPLIANCE
CODE ENFORCEMENT FIELD SUPV	FINANCE ASST. DIR FOR REPRNTG & OPS
CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER	FINANCE ASST. DIR. FOR PROCUREMENT
COMM. & DIGITAL MEDIA COORD	FINANCE DIRECTOR
COMM.RECREATION ASST. DIRECTOR	FIRE CHIEF
COMMISSION LIAISON	FIRE DIVISION CHIEF
COMMUNICATION OPERATOR I	FIRE EQUIPMENT MECHANIC II
COMMUNICATION OPERATOR II	FIRE INSPECTOR
COMMUNICATION OPERATOR III	FIRE INSPECTOR II
COMMUNICATION SUPERVISOR	FIRE SUPP. SERV. COORD.I

EXHIBIT 2G (Continued)
CLASSIFICATION TITLES

Classification Title	Classification Title
FIRE SUPP. SERV. COORD.II	MAINTENANCE WORKER II PW ROW
FITNESS AND POOL MANAGER	MANAGEMENT & BUDGET ANALYST II
FLEET ANALYST	MECHANICAL INSPECTOR I
FOREMAN	MOBILE PERMITTING COORDINATOR
FOREMAN/GENERAL SERVICES	MONEY ROOM CLERK
FOREMAN/GREENSPACE	MONEY ROOM COORDINATOR
FOREMAN/IRRIGATION	NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY AIDE
GENERAL SERVICES DIV. CHIEF	NIGHT-TIME OFF-STREET OPER SUPER
GOLF COURSE AND PARKS SUPT.	OFF DUTY COORDINATOR
GOLF CRSE&PRKS MAINT. ASST. SUPT	OMBUDSMAN RES/SMALL BUSINESS
GREENSCAPE MGMNT DESIGNER	ON STREET METER MAINT & COLL SUPV.
GREENSPACE MGMT SUPERINTENDENT	OPERATIONAL SERVICES ASSISTANT
HIST. RES. & CULTURAL ARTS DIR	PARALEGAL
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COORDINATOR	PARKING ADMIN. SUPERVISOR
HORTICULTURIST	PARKING ASST. DIR/TROLLEY MNGR.
HUMAN RESOURCES ASST. DIRECTOR	PARKING CLERK II
HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR	PARKING DATA SPECIALIST
I.T. APPLICATIONS ANALYST I	PARKING DIRECTOR
I.T. APPLICATIONS ANALYST II	PARKING ENFORCEMENT SPEC. LEAD
I.T. CUST SUPP & GIS ANALYST I	PARKING ENFORCEMENT SPECIALIST
I.T. NETWORK ANALYST I	PARKING ENFORCEMENT SUPERVISOR
I.T. NETWORK ANALYST II	PARKING METER MECHANIC
I.T. SYSTEMS ANALYST I	PARKING METER MECHANIC LEAD
I.T. SYSTEMS ANALYST II	PASSPORT COUNTER SUPERVISOR
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ASST. DIRECTOR	PASSPORT DIRECTOR
INNOV&TECH.SR. PROJECT MGR.	PAYROLL CLERK
INNOVATION & TECHNOLOGY DIRECTOR	PAYROLL CLERK FIRE
INTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMANDER	P-CARD ADMIN / ADMIN ASSIST.
INVESTIGATIONS ASSISTANT	PERMIT CLERK
IT CUSTOMER SUPPORT & GIS DIV. MANAGER	PERMIT CLERK SUPERVISOR
IT NETWORK DIVISION MANAGER	PERSONNEL ANALYST II
IT SYSTEMS DIVISION MANAGER	PERSONNEL SPECIALIST I
LABOR RELATIONS & RISK MNGMT DIR/CPI OFFICER	PLANS COORDINATOR ASSISTANT
LEAD SOLID WASTE COORDINATOR.	PLUMBER
M.MEDIA&PRODUCTION PRGM COORD	PLUMBING INSPECTOR II
MAINTENANCE REPAIR LEAD	POLICE CHIEF
MAINTENANCE REPAIR WORKER	POLICE DIVISION ASSISTANT
MAINTENANCE WORKER I	POLICE MAJOR
MAINTENANCE WORKER II	POLICE PROPERTY CLERK

EXHIBIT 2G (Continued)
CLASSIFICATION TITLES

Classification Title	Classification Title
POLICE PROPERTY/EVIDENCE SUPERVISOR	PT GUEST SERVICES REP. SPEC.
POLICE RECORDS CLERK I	PT HIGH PERF ATHL COACH SEASONAL
POLICE RECORDS CLERK II	PT HIGH PERF ATHL COACH UNCL.
POLICE RECORDS SUPERVISOR	PT HR CLERICAL ASSISTANT II
POLICE SUPT. SERVICES ASST.	PT INFO SYSTEMS ANALYST
POLICE TRAINING ASSISTANT	PT INSPECTOR
PRINCIPAL PLANNER	PT INT'L. BUSINESS DEV. COORD.
PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST	PT INVESTMENT MANAGER
PROF. TENNIS OPS. SUPERVISOR	PT IT TECHNICIAN
PROJECT ENGINEER	PT LEAD LIFEGUARD
PROJECT MANAGER	PT LIFEGUARD ENTRY LEVEL
PT ACCOUNTING SPECIALIST	PT LIFEGUARD II
PT ACCREDITATION MANAGER	PT LIFEGUARD III
PT ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	PT MAIL/ACCOUNTING CLERK
PT ADMISSION & CONCESSION SPC SEASONAL	PT MAINT. WORKER II-SIGN SHOP
PT ADMISSION/CONCESSION SPEC	PT MAINTENANCE REPAIR WORKER
PT ANALYST	PT MAINTENANCE WORKER I
PT ASSISTANT COMMISSION LIAISON	PT MARKETING ASSISTANT
PT AUTOMOTIVE MECHANIC	PT PARK SERVICE ATTENDANT
PT BACKGROUND INVESTIGATOR	PT PARKING ENFORCEMENT SPEC.
PT CASHIER	PT PASSPORT AGENT
PT CHIEF MECHANICAL OFFICIAL	PT PAYROLL SPECIALIST
PT CLERICAL AIDE	PT PLANS PROCESSOR
PT COMMUNICATION OPERATOR	PT POLICE FLEET MANAGER
PT COMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST	PT POLICE TRAINING OFFICER
PT CONTRACT SPECIALIST	PT PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST
PT CROSSING GUARD/PROT SVC WK	PT PRODUCER/EDITOR/VIDEOGRAPH
PT D.E.I COUNSELOR	PT PROFESSIONAL SURV&MAPPER
PT DIR OF COACHING YTH SOCCER	PT PROGRAM ASSISTANT
PT DOCENT COORDINATOR	PT PROJECT MANAGER
PT ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR II	PT PUBLIC REC/DIG MEDIA SPEC.
PT EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COORD. SPECIALIST	PT RECEPTIONIST
PT EMERGENCY MGMT. PLANNER	PT RECEPTIONIST/ OFFICE ASST.
PT ENGINEERING AIDE 1	PT RECREATION COUNSELOR
PT ERP ANALYST	PT RED LIGHT CAMERA COORDINATOR
PT EXECUTIVE OFFICER	PT SCHOOL CROSS GUARD/PROT SVC WK
PT FOREMAN	PT SERVICE COORDINATOR
PT GRANTS/AUDIT COORDINATOR	PT SPECIAL PROJECT SPEC.
PT GUEST SERVICES REP.	PT SPECIALIZED FITNESS COORDINATOR

EXHIBIT 2G (Continued)
CLASSIFICATION TITLES

Classification Title	Classification Title
PT SR. BACKGROUND INVESTIGATOR	SENIOR AUTOMOTIVE MECHANIC/TROLLEY
PT SUMMER CAMP COORDINATOR	SENIOR BUYER
PT SUMMER CAMP COUNSELOR	SENIOR CONSTRUCTION MANAGER
PT SUMMER GUEST SERVICES REP	SENIOR CRIME SCENE TECHNICIAN
PT SUMMER LIFEGUARD ENTRY LEV	SENIOR PAYROLL SPECIALIST
PT TRAFFIC ENF. POLICE OFFCR	SEWER LINE TECH/SEWER INSPECTOR
PT TRAINER	SEWER MAINTENANCE MECHANIC
PT UTILITY LOCATOR	SOLID WASTE COORDINATOR
PT WATER TRUCK OPERATOR	SOLID WASTE CRANE OPERATOR
PT WTRWY MAINT. COORDINATOR	SOLID WASTE OPERATOR I
PUBLIC RECORDS COORDINATOR	SOLID WASTE OPERATOR II
PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR	SOLID WASTE OPERATOR III
PW ASSISTANT DIR. FOR FLEET MANAGEMENT	SOLID WASTE WORKER
PW ASST DIR FOR SOLID WASTE	SPECIAL PROJECTS COORDINATOR
PW ASST DIR/CAPITAL IMPROVMNTS	SR. ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST
PW ASST. DIR/GREENSPACE MGMT	SR. MANAGEMENT & BUDGET ANALYST
PW DEPUTY DIRECTOR/CITY ENGINEER	SR. PROJECT MANAGER
PW INSP II FOR ROW & SOLID WASTE	SR. REVENUE INSPECTOR
PW PERMIT SECTION ENGINEER	SR. TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER
QUALITY CONTROL MANAGER	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER
RADIO TECHNICIAN	SUSTAINABILITY&RESILIANCE MGR
RADIO TECHNICIAN MANAGER	TECH.SRVCS.COORD/CIC COORD.
RECREATION MARKETING SPECIALIS	TENNIS OPS ASST. SUPERVISOR
RECREATION SPECIALIST	TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER
RECRUITMENT MANAGER	TROLLEY OPERATIONS SUPERVIS
REPAIR WORKER/GENERAL SERVICES	UTILITIES & R.O.W. DIVISION CHIEF
REPAIR WORKER/IRRIGATION	UTILITIES SUPERINTENDENT
REPAIR WORKER/PARKING	VICTIMS ADVOCATE
REPAIR WORKER/PARKS	WORKERS COMPENSATION SPEC.
REPAIR WORKER/SANITARY SEWER	YOUTH CENTER ASSISTANT SUPERV.
REVENUE MANAGER	YOUTH CENTER SUPERVISOR
RISK MANAGER	ZONING INSPECTOR
SENIOR AUTOMOTIVE BODY WORKER	ZONING REVIEWER
SENIOR AUTOMOTIVE MECH/TROLLEY (GRANT)	ZONING REVIEWER LEAD
SENIOR AUTOMOTIVE MECHANIC	

2.2 SALARY PLACEMENT ANALYSIS

When assessing the effectiveness of a pay plan and associated policies, it is helpful to analyze where employee salaries stand in comparison to their classification's pay range. Identifying areas where there are clusters of employee salaries can illuminate potential pay progression concerns within a pay plan. It should be noted that employee 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 employee salaries should be viewed with this context in mind.

Below and At Minimum and At or Above Maximum

In general, the placement of an employee's salary at a classification's pay range minimum would generally indicate a newer employee or an employee that was recently promoted into a classification who has not had the opportunity or experience needed to progress through the range. In contrast, an employee with a salary at or near the maximum of their pay range is generally an employee with longer tenure who has had the opportunity, experience, and/or performance to progress their salary toward the top of the pay range.

Exhibit 2H displays the percentage of employees whose salaries are at or below their respective pay range minimum and at or above the pay range maximum of their respective pay range maximum. Employees not included in these charts are compensated somewhere between the upper and lower thresholds. The percentages presented are based on the total number of employees in that grade. As shown, 165 employees (23.3 percent) have salaries below their respective pay range minimum, 47 (6.6 percent) have salaries at the minimum, 81 (11.5 percent) have salaries at the maximum, and 19 (2.7 percent) have salaries above the maximum.

**EXHIBIT 2H
BELOW AND AT MINIMUM AND AT OR ABOVE MAXIMUM BY GRADE**

Grade	Employees	Below Min		At Min		At Max		Above Max	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08e	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
17e	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
18e	22	0	0.0%	1	4.5%	2	9.1%	2	9.1%
19e	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20e	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
21e	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
22e	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
23e	10	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%
24e	9	0	0.0%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
25e	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%
26e	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%
27e	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%
28e	13	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	2	15.4%	0	0.0%



EXHIBIT 2H (Continued)
BELOW AND AT MINIMUM AND AT OR ABOVE MAXIMUM BY GRADE

Grade	Employees	Below Min		At Min		At Max		Above Max	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
29e	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%
30e	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
31e	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
32e	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%
33e	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%
36e	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
29EX	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
32EX	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%
34EX	9	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%
35EX	9	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
36EX	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%
38EX	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%
39EX	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
43EX	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%
45EX	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
36psf	3	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
38psf	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
43psf	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
36ps	5	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
38ps	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
43ps	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
06pt	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
08pt	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11pt	99	95	96.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%
12pt	11	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
13pt	28	21	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
14pt	2	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%
15pt	18	6	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
16pt	6	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
18pt	8	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%
19pt	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20pt	9	5	55.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
21pt	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	83.3%
22pt	11	4	36.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
23pt	6	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
24pt	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
25pt	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
26pt	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%



EXHIBIT 2H (Continued)
BELOW AND AT MINIMUM AND AT OR ABOVE MAXIMUM BY GRADE

Grade	Employees	Below Min		At Min		At Max		Above Max	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
27pt	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
29pt	2	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
32pt	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11c	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
12c	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
13c	26	0	0.0%	2	7.7%	2	7.7%	0	0.0%
14c	43	0	0.0%	9	20.9%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%
15c	37	1	2.7%	4	10.8%	9	24.3%	0	0.0%
16c	28	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	8	28.6%	0	0.0%
17c	18	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	7	38.9%	1	5.6%
18c	42	1	2.4%	11	26.2%	12	28.6%	0	0.0%
19c	10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%
20c	38	0	0.0%	7	18.4%	4	10.5%	0	0.0%
21c	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
22c	28	0	0.0%	4	14.3%	3	10.7%	0	0.0%
23c	11	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%
24c	15	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%
25c	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
27c	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
29c	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%
Total	707	165	23.3%	47	6.6%	81	11.5%	19	2.7%

Below and Above Midpoint

In addition to assessing the number of employee salaries at minimum and maximum, an analysis was conducted to determine the number of employees with salaries below and above pay range midpoint. Employees with salaries close to the midpoint of a pay range typically would be fully proficient in their classification and require minimal supervision to complete their job duties while performing satisfactorily. Within this framework, pay range 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.

Exhibit 2I displays the percentage of employee whose salaries are below or above their respective pay range midpoint. The percentages presented are based on the total number of employees in that grade. As can be seen, 432 (61.1 percent) employees are compensated below the midpoint and 275 (38.9 percent) are compensated above.



EXHIBIT 21
BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY CLASSIFICATION

Grade	Employees	<Mid		Mid>	
		#	%	#	%
08e	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
17e	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
18e	22	10	45.5%	12	54.5%
19e	4	3	75.0%	1	25.0%
20e	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
21e	5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
22e	4	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
23e	10	4	40.0%	6	60.0%
24e	9	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
25e	8	3	37.5%	5	62.5%
26e	7	1	14.3%	6	85.7%
27e	7	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
28e	13	7	53.8%	6	46.2%
29e	6	2	33.3%	4	66.7%
30e	4	1	25.0%	3	75.0%
31e	4	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
32e	5	2	40.0%	3	60.0%
33e	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
36e	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
29EX	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
32EX	3	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
34EX	9	4	44.4%	5	55.6%
35EX	9	2	22.2%	7	77.8%
36EX	6	2	33.3%	4	66.7%
38EX	3	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
39EX	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
43EX	6	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
45EX	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
36psf	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
38psf	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
43psf	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
36ps	5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
38ps	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
43ps	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
06pt	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
08pt	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
11pt	99	98	99.0%	1	1.0%
12pt	11	11	100.0%	0	0.0%



EXHIBIT 2I (Continued)
BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY CLASSIFICATION

Grade	Employees	<Mid		Mid>	
		#	%	#	%
13pt	28	27	96.4%	1	3.6%
14pt	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
15pt	18	17	94.4%	1	5.6%
16pt	6	6	100.0%	0	0.0%
18pt	8	6	75.0%	2	25.0%
19pt	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
20pt	9	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
21pt	6	1	16.7%	5	83.3%
22pt	11	6	54.5%	5	45.5%
23pt	6	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
24pt	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
25pt	4	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
26pt	4	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
27pt	3	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
29pt	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
32pt	2	1	50.0%	1	100.0%
11c	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
12c	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
13c	26	20	76.9%	6	23.1%
14c	43	30	69.8%	13	30.2%
15c	37	23	62.2%	14	37.8%
16c	28	10	35.7%	18	64.3%
17c	18	10	55.6%	8	44.4%
18c	42	23	54.8%	19	45.2%
19c	10	4	40.0%	6	60.0%
20c	38	21	55.3%	17	44.7%
21c	3	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
22c	28	18	64.3%	10	35.7%
23c	11	3	27.3%	8	72.7%
24c	15	4	26.7%	11	73.3%
25c	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
27c	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
29c	5	1	20.0%	4	80.0%
Total	707	432	61.1	275	38.9



2.3 QUARTILE ANALYSIS

In a quartile analysis, each salary range is divided into four equal segments (quartiles) and employees are assigned a quartile based on where their current salary falls. While there is no best practice for what average tenure should be for each quartile, and other factors outside of the breadth of this analysis can impact placement (e.g. promotional and hiring practices), this analysis is useful in revealing areas of compression within a compensation system when paired with tenure data. Generally, the ideal outcome is for the analysis to show a strong correlation between tenure and quartile, where higher tenure would be experienced in higher quartiles.

Exhibit 2J shows the number of employee salaries that are in each quartile of each pay range. Also, the average overall tenure (i.e. how long an employee has been at the City) by quartile is shown. As displayed, 334 (47.2 percent) employees have salaries in the first quartile of their respective range, 98 (13.9 percent) employees have salaries in the second quartile, 70 (9.9 percent) employees have salaries in the third quartile, and 205 (29.0 percent) employees have salaries in the fourth quartile. Additionally, increases in tenure is consistent through the quartiles: average tenure in the first quartile is 3.3 years, is 7.4 years in the second quartile, is 12.2 years in the third quartile, and is 18.3 years in the fourth quartile.



**EXHIBIT 2J
QUARTILE ANALYSIS**

GRADE	Total Employees	Tenure	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
			#	Avg. Tenure	#	Avg. Tenure	#	Avg. Tenure	#	Avg. Tenure
08e	1	16	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	15.7
17e	1	2	1	2.3	0	-	0	-	0	-
18e	22	10	6	4.4	4	2.6	4	6.1	8	19.2
19e	4	5	2	4.1	1	8.1	0	-	1	4.0
20e	2	13	1	5.3	0	-	0	-	1	20.1
21e	5	8	2	4.1	1	5.3	0	-	2	12.5
22e	4	11	1	3.9	1	3.6	1	18.9	1	17.6
23e	10	14	3	2.2	1	5.2	1	24.0	5	21.8
24e	9	12	4	5.4	2	9.7	2	24.3	1	22.5
25e	8	5	1	1.6	2	3.5	2	7.0	3	6.4
26e	7	16	1	9.1	0	-	2	7.3	4	21.9
27e	7	12	0	-	0	-	2	1.9	5	16.1
28e	13	9	2	1.7	5	5.4	2	4.9	4	19.1
29e	6	5	1	8.1	1	0.3	2	3.8	2	8.4
30e	4	7	0	-	1	0.7	2	9.2	1	7.3
31e	4	10	1	5.6	1	5.1	0	-	2	13.7
32e	5	7	1	0.2	1	0.8	2	15.2	1	3.2
33e	2	19	0	-	1	3.4	0	-	1	33.9
36e	1	3	0	-	0	-	1	3.0	0	-
29EX	1	16	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	16.4
32EX	3	11	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	11.2
34EX	9	7	0	-	4	7.6	3	5.7	2	6.0
35EX	9	9	0	-	2	5.6	1	17.9	6	8.9
36EX	6	8	0	-	2	11.1	2	7.7	2	6.2
38EX	3	13	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	13.4
39EX	1	6	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	6.1

EXHIBIT 2J (Continued)
QUARTILE ANALYSIS

GRADE	Total Employees	Tenure	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
			#	Avg. Tenure	#	Avg. Tenure	#	Avg. Tenure	#	Avg. Tenure
43EX	6	12	0	-	0	-	1	26.0	5	8.7
45EX	1	0	0	-	0	-	1	0.4	0	-
36psf	3	15	1	15.6	2	15.0	0	-	0	-
38psf	1	32	0	-	1	32.5	0	-	0	-
43psf	1	9	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	8.8
36ps	5	20	1	2.9	2	20.8	2	28.9	0	-
38ps	1	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	0.1
43ps	1	34	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	33.7
06pt	4	1	4	1.1	0	-	0	-	0	-
08pt	2	0	2	0.1	0	-	0	-	0	-
11pt	99	2	98	1.3	0	-	0	-	1	34.0
12pt	11	5	10	4.9	1	2.1	0	-	0	-
13pt	28	6	23	6.2	4	2.8	0	-	1	6.3
14pt	2	21	1	7.1	0	-	0	-	1	34.5
15pt	18	5	17	3.3	0	-	0	-	1	28.9
16pt	6	11	6	10.5	0	-	0	-	0	-
18pt	8	11	6	2.7	0	-	0	-	2	37.6
19pt	4	5	4	4.8	0	-	0	-	0	-
20pt	9	7	6	1.0	0	-	0	-	3	18.3
21pt	6	23	0	-	1	3.9	0	-	5	27.2
22pt	11	12	6	5.3	0	-	2	13.4	3	24.6
23pt	6	7	5	2.9	0	-	0	-	1	25.8
24pt	2	16	2	15.8	0	-	0	-	0	-
25pt	4	28	0	-	0	-	1	34.3	3	25.6
26pt	4	20	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	19.8
27pt	3	23	0	-	1	33.1	0	-	2	17.8

EXHIBIT 2J (Continued)
QUARTILE ANALYSIS

GRADE	Total Employees	Tenure	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
			#	Avg. Tenure	#	Avg. Tenure	#	Avg. Tenure	#	Avg. Tenure
29pt	2	5	1	0.1	0	-	1	9.5	0	-
32pt	2	21	0	-	1	2.8	0	-	1	39.0
11c	2	26	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	26.1
12c	1	16	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	15.7
13c	26	7	10	2.5	10	5.5	1	20.1	5	15.0
14c	43	8	19	1.7	11	5.9	3	8.8	10	20.4
15c	37	10	15	4.7	8	6.8	2	8.2	12	19.0
16c	28	13	6	5.2	4	10.6	5	12.7	13	18.0
17c	18	12	7	3.8	3	8.1	0	-	8	21.7
18c	42	10	20	2.0	3	6.1	3	10.3	16	19.0
19c	10	13	1	3.4	3	6.5	2	16.3	4	18.9
20c	38	11	18	4.5	3	7.0	4	10.9	13	20.9
21c	3	5	1	1.2	0	-	1	9.4	1	5.6
22c	28	11	12	4.7	6	10.9	4	14.7	6	21.1
23c	11	19	1	6.0	2	18.1	2	24.2	6	19.1
24c	15	17	3	7.2	1	5.7	3	16.6	8	21.3
25c	2	6	1	10.9	0	-	0	-	1	0.3
27c	1	9	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	9.1
29c	5	10	0	-	1	3.0	3	9.8	1	17.7
Overall	707	9.1	334	3.3	98	7.4	70	12.2	205	18.3

2.4 COMPRESSION ANALYSIS

Comparison with Supervisor Salaries

Compression (when pay differentials are too small to be considered equitable) can be seen as a threat to internal equity and morale. One common form of pay compression can be defined as the lack of variation in salaries between employees with significantly different levels of experience and responsibility. An example of this can be observed when the pay of supervisors and their subordinates are too similar. The following analysis attempts to determine if such compression can be observed in the City.

Employee salary data were utilized to determine if the employee's salary was either less than 80 percent, less than 95 percent, or more than 95 percent of their supervisor's salary; **Exhibit 2K** shows that 666 (94.9 percent) employee salaries fall below 80 percent of their supervisor's salary, 29 (4.1 percent) fall below 95 percent, one (0.1 percent) is above 95 percent, and six (0.9 percent) are above 100 percent. This seems to indicate that there is no serious concern with compression of salaries taking place.

EXHIBIT 2K
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY GRADE

Grade	Less than 80%	80% < X < 95%	95% < X < 100%	Greater than 100%
08e	1	0	0	0
17e	1	0	0	0
18e	22	0	0	0
19e	3	0	0	1
20e	2	0	0	0
21e	5	0	0	0
22e	4	0	0	0
23e	10	0	0	0
24e	8	1	0	0
25e	8	0	0	0
26e	7	0	0	0
27e	5	2	0	0
28e	13	0	0	0
29e	6	0	0	0
30e	4	0	0	0
31e	3	0	0	1
32e	4	1	0	0
33e	2	0	0	0
36e	1	0	0	0
29EX	0	1	0	0
32EX	2	1	0	0
34EX	8	1	0	0
35EX	8	1	0	0
36EX	5	1	0	0

EXHIBIT 2K (Continued)
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY GRADE

Grade	Less than 80%	80% < X < 95%	95% < X < 100%	Greater than 100%
38EX	2	1	0	0
39EX	1	0	0	0
43EX	6	0	0	0
45EX	1	0	0	0
36psf	0	0	0	0
38psf	0	0	0	0
43psf	0	0	0	0
36ps	5	0	0	0
38ps	0	1	0	0
43ps	1	0	0	0
06pt	4	0	0	0
08pt	2	0	0	0
11pt	99	0	0	0
12pt	11	0	0	0
13pt	25	3	0	0
14pt	2	0	0	0
15pt	17	0	1	0
16pt	6	0	0	0
18pt	8	0	0	0
19pt	4	0	0	0
20pt	8	1	0	0
21pt	6	0	0	0
22pt	11	0	0	0
23pt	6	0	0	0
24pt	2	0	0	0
25pt	3	0	0	1
26pt	3	1	0	0
27pt	3	0	0	0
29pt	1	0	0	1
32pt	2	0	0	0
11c	1	0	0	1
12c	1	0	0	0
13c	25	1	0	0
14c	43	0	0	0
15c	37	0	0	0
16c	28	0	0	0
17c	16	2	0	0
18c	41	1	0	0
19c	8	2	0	0
20c	38	0	0	0

EXHIBIT 2K (Continued)
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY GRADE

Grade	Less than 80%	80% < X < 95%	95% < X < 100%	Greater than 100%
21c	3	0	0	0
22c	26	2	0	0
23c	10	0	0	1
24c	10	5	0	0
25c	2	0	0	0
27c	1	0	0	0
29c	5	0	0	0
Totals	666	29	1	6

Actual Versus Expected Salary Placement

Another form of pay compression can occur when employees have not progressed through their pay range as their years of experience increase. The following analysis examines how far each employee has penetrated into his/her current pay range and compares it with their expected placement—assuming a 30-year period between minimum and maximum. Generally, the only source of concern would be employees that are more than ten percent below expected placement. Simply having employees in this group does not necessarily mean there are corresponding compression issues, assuming there is a reason for these placements. It is also acknowledged that the City's compensation practices may differ from progressing employee salaries based upon tenure.

Exhibit 2L displays the number and percentage of employees whose actual salary placement varies from their expected placement. As can be seen, 400 (56.7 percent) employees have salaries that are within ten percent of their expected salary placement, whereas 15 (2.1 percent) have salaries that are more than ten percent below expected placement and 291 (41.2 percent) have salaries that are more than ten percent above.



EXHIBIT 2L
ACTUAL VERSUS EXPECTED PLACEMENT BY CLASSIFICATION

Grade	Less than -10%	-10 < X < -5%	-5% < X < 5%	5% < X < 10%	Greater than 10%
08e	0	0	1	0	0
17e	0	0	1	0	0
18e	0	0	4	3	15
19e	0	0	2	1	1
20e	0	0	0	1	1
21e	0	0	1	2	2
22e	0	0	1	0	3
23e	0	0	3	1	6
24e	0	0	4	0	5
25e	0	0	1	1	6
26e	0	0	1	0	6
27e	0	0	0	1	6
28e	0	0	2	3	8
29e	0	0	0	1	5
30e	0	0	0	0	4
31e	0	0	1	1	2
32e	0	0	1	0	4
33e	0	0	0	0	2
36e	0	0	0	0	1
29EX	0	0	0	0	1
32EX	0	0	0	0	3
34EX	0	0	0	0	9
35EX	0	0	0	0	9
36EX	0	0	0	0	6
38EX	0	0	0	0	3
39EX	0	0	0	0	1
43EX	0	0	1	0	5
45EX	0	0	0	0	1
36psf	1	0	1	1	0
38psf	0	0	1	0	0
43psf	0	0	0	1	0
36ps	0	0	3	2	0
38ps	0	0	0	0	1
43ps	0	0	0	1	0
06pt	0	4	0	0	0
08pt	0	0	2	0	0
11pt	5	89	4	0	1
12pt	1	4	5	0	1
13pt	4	3	15	1	5



EXHIBIT 2L (Continued)
ACTUAL VERSUS EXPECTED PLACEMENT BY CLASSIFICATION

Grade	Less than -10%	-10 < X < -5%	-5% < X < 5%	5% < X < 10%	Greater than 10%
14pt	0	1	0	0	1
15pt	0	3	14	0	1
16pt	0	0	6	0	0
18pt	0	0	6	0	2
19pt	1	0	3	0	0
20pt	3	1	1	1	3
21pt	0	0	0	1	5
22pt	0	0	6	0	5
23pt	0	2	3	0	1
24pt	0	0	2	0	0
25pt	0	0	0	0	4
26pt	0	0	0	0	4
27pt	0	0	0	1	2
29pt	0	0	1	0	1
32pt	0	0	0	0	2
11c	0	0	0	1	1
12c	0	0	0	0	1
13c	0	0	13	8	5
14c	0	0	19	13	11
15c	0	0	14	7	16
16c	0	0	5	4	19
17c	0	0	5	4	9
18c	0	0	20	2	19
19c	0	0	2	0	8
20c	0	0	19	4	15
21c	0	0	1	1	1
22c	0	1	13	5	9
23c	0	0	1	2	8
24c	0	0	3	3	9
25c	0	0	0	1	1
27c	0	0	0	0	1
29c	0	0	0	1	4
Totals	15	108	212	80	291

2.5 DEPARTMENT/LOCATION DISTRIBUTION

As of July 2022, the City employed 710 employees across 17 different departments. The following analysis was intended to provide basic information regarding how employees are distributed among departments and locations.



Exhibit 2M depicts the number of classifications that are present in each department, along with the number and overall percentage of total employees by department. As illustrated, the largest department (in terms of employees) is Public Works, with 195 employees representing 27.5 percent of the City's workforce.

**EXHIBIT 2M
EMPLOYEES AND CLASSIFICATIONS BY DEPARTMENT**

Department	Employees	Classes	% of Total
CITY ATTORNEY	7	6	1.0%
CITY CLERK	16	9	2.3%
CITY COMMISSION	2	5	0.3%
CITY MANAGER	17	14	2.4%
COMMUNITY RECREATION	174	50	24.5%
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES	53	30	7.5%
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	7	7	1.0%
FINANCE	35	27	4.9%
FIRE	14	12	2.0%
HISTORICAL RESOURCES	7	7	1.0%
HUMAN RESOURCES	12	10	1.7%
INNOVATION & TECHNOLOGY	26	17	3.7%
LABOR RELATIONS & RISK MANAGEMENT	4	4	0.6%
PARKING	37	19	5.2%
POLICE	103	42	14.5%
PUBLIC WORKS	195	88	27.5%
RETIREMENT PLAN ADMINISTRATION	1	1	0.1%
Total	710	348	100.0%

*The City utilizes 327 unique job titles; the total displayed here differs due to duplicate classifications across departments.

2.7 SUMMARY

The information contained in this chapter identifies features of the overall structure of the compensation system, as well as the administration of it at the individual employee level. Notably, the following was found:

- **Pay Plans** – The compensation structure utilized by the City offers narrow and inconsistent range spreads for some grades as well as instances of varying midpoint progressions. Best practice suggests range spreads of 50 to 70 percent as well as consistent progression.
- **Salary Distribution** – It was noted that 23.3 percent of employees, most of whom are part-time, are earning below their respective pay range. Additionally, 47.2 percent of employees have salaries within the first quartile of their pay range. This may indicate possible compression between new and tenured employees.



This analysis serves as a starting point for the development of recommendations in this report. These observations were reviewed and considered in more detail throughout the course of the study. Paired with market data, Evergreen was able to make recommendations that will ensure that the compensation system at the City is structurally sound, competitive with the market, and equitable.



Chapter 3 - Summary of Employee Outreach

On July 28 and July 29, 2022, the Evergreen Solutions Team conducted a series of 12 in-person interviews and focus group sessions with the City of Coral Gables employees representing a cross section of departments and classifications as well as management levels.

During these days, 97 employees attended one of the 12 individual meetings and focus group sessions. The objective of these sessions was to collect feedback on strengths and weaknesses of the current compensation and classification plans directly from the employees.

The remainder of this chapter summarizes the comments made by focus group participants. It is important to note that the views shared in this summary are not necessarily supported by Evergreen Solutions nor the City of Coral Gables. Evergreen, however, used this information as a basis for further investigation throughout the course of the study. In all instances, Evergreen has removed any information that may identify the commenter.

3.1 GENERAL FEEDBACK

Although the major purpose of the focus group sessions was to discuss compensation, and classification, the first two questions asked by Evergreen consultants generally received feedback related to issues beyond these two topics. In some cases, even questions related specifically to compensation and classification yielded feedback outside of these domains. This section provides feedback received unrelated to compensation and classification, per se, but important to framing the context in which this study is occurring.

Important factors frequently shared by employees as reasons for coming to work for and/or remaining with the City included:

- **Benefits & Retirement** – Most employees mentioned that the health insurance benefits available for employees was one of the reasons for wanting to work for as well as remain employed by the City. Participants also stated that the City offers a private pension as well as an investment plan for retirement. While some felt the employee contribution for the Pension was high, they appreciate having options.
- **Work Environment** – Many staff members stated the positive work environment as a reason for remaining employed at the City. Employees enjoy working with their coworkers and value these close relationships.



- **Security and Stability** – A number of participants mentioned job security. It was brought up frequently that during the pandemic, the City did not lay off any employees. Staff members saw this as a huge positive and were very thankful. Employees recognized that this stability is oftentimes not found in other municipalities or the private sector.

The most common employment concerns expressed in focus groups were:

- **Job Titles and Job Duties** – Sometimes, job classifications and job descriptions do not encompass the many duties assigned to the employees. Most employees wear many hats and have taken on the responsibilities of vacant positions.
- **Staffing Shortage** – The high rate of turnover amongst employees was mentioned repeatedly as an area of concern. Because of the turnover, workers are having to pick up the slack, which is causing stress and burn-out amongst employees. When asked why people leave, the low pay was the most common answer followed by flexibility.
- **“Training Ground”** – In most focus groups, the City was described as a “training ground” for other municipalities. Oftentimes, new employees will get the training or certification needed for a position, then resign to go work elsewhere so that they can make more money.
- **Flexible Schedules** – All focus groups mentioned the need for some sort of flexible scheduling in each department, whether it was four 10-hour days, telework, or task-based schedules. It was mentioned that the majority of surrounding municipalities offer flexible schedules. Employees felt this would make the City more competitive to new employees as well as help with retention of current staff members, especially those who do not live in Coral Gables.

3.2 COMPENSATION

Specific comments shared by employees related to the City’s compensation practices, policies, and procedures include the following:

- **Competitive Salaries** – Most participants felt the City’s salaries are not competitive with the neighboring municipalities. Consequently, they felt this was the primary reason why the City has a hard time recruiting and retaining employees.
- **Salary Progression** – Many employees commented on the discrepancy between union and non-union employees’ salary progression. Non-union staff members reach the top of their respective pay range very quickly. This was said to be due to hiring these employees well above the pay range midpoint. In addition to this, the range spread was thought to be very narrow, making it easy for these employees to cap out. On the other hand, union employees are brought in at the minimum of their respective pay range. While both groups receive the same percentage increase each year, it takes those in the union much longer to progress through the pay range.



- **Compression** – Due to the aforementioned hiring practices between union and non-union workers, employees were very concerned about compression between new hires and those who had been with the City for many years. This was seen as very discouraging to employees.
- **Cost of Living** – While the City does provide a yearly merit increase, it does not always provide an annual cost of living raise. Due to inflation as well as the high cost of living in the Coral Gables area, employees would like this to be consistently added on top of the merit increase received each year.
- **Merit Pay** – Currently everyone who at least meets expectations on their performance evaluation receives the same percentage of merit pay. There is no incentive for employees to exceed expectations. Staff members voiced concern about this and requested a change in policy in order to motivate employees.

3.3 CLASSIFICATION

Specific comments shared by employees related to the City's classification structure include:

- **Records & Property Clerks** – Employees felt this title did not accurately describe the positions, as these workers have many additional responsibilities. The classification was also said to be “outdated.”
- **Administrative Assistants** – The roles and responsibilities for Administrative Assistants vary by department. Employees stated that some have more of a receptionist position, while others help coordinate programs.
- **Senior Level Classifications** – Some senior level classifications have supervisory duties, but do not receive the same level of pay as other supervisors. This was seen as unfair. A more consistent structure was requested.

3.4 SUMMARY

The concerns expressed and reported above are generally common and exist in many organizations today. The City's commitment to seeking employee input and feedback regarding the compensation and classification system is a positive step toward improvement in these areas. During the outreach sessions, employees consistently stated that the City's compensation system should be improved to be market competitive and equitable to recruit and retain qualified employees.

The input received during employee outreach provided an understanding of the current environment and was considered while conducting the remainder of the study. The analyses discussed in the next chapters ultimately formed the basis for recommendations given in **Chapter 5** of this report.



Chapter 4 – Salary Survey Summary

This chapter contains a market analysis in which the City of Coral Gables salary ranges are compared to select peer organizations. Market comparisons provide key information regarding an organization's competitive position. It is important to note that the comparison of the City's salary ranges does not translate well at the individual employee level. This is because a market range simply provides the thresholds within which an employee's salary should be placed, versus providing any information on where specifically in the range an employee's salary should lay. Employee salary placement in the range is typically determined based on a multitude of variables, such as the incumbent's education level, and prior experience.

The salary survey focused on the average salary ranges offered by the market for 100 classifications. This external equity analysis allowed for a comprehensive examination of the City's compensation structure. Market comparison analysis is best thought of as a snapshot of current conditions and provides the most up-to-date market information available at the time. In other words, market conditions will generally change over time and in some cases will change very quickly. Therefore, a market survey and analysis should be performed at regular intervals to help maintain market competitiveness.

The City considered several factors when selecting peers for comparison, including the location, size, and socio-economic factors that impact the City's ability to recruit and retain highly qualified employees. **Exhibit 4A** shows the 19 unique peers from which Evergreen solicited as well as obtained full or partial general market salary data for their matching classifications.

The Consumer Price Index (CPI), also referred to as the Cost of Living (COL) Index, shown in the chart is a measure reported by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, which examines the weighted average of prices of a basket of consumer goods and services, such as transportation, food, and medical care. It is calculated by taking price changes for each item in the predetermined basket of goods and averaging them. Changes in the CPI are used to assess price changes associated with the cost of living.



EXHIBIT 4A
TARGET MARKET PEERS AND COST OF LIVING FACTORS

Market Peers	Cost of Living Index	COL Factor
Coral Gables	108.4	-
Broward County	108.6	0.998158379
Boca Raton	115.4	0.939341421
Coral Springs	108.6	0.998158379
Doral	108.4	1
Ft. Lauderdale	108.6	0.998158379
Gainesville	101.4	1.069033531
Hialeah	108.4	1
Hollywood	108.6	0.998158379
Homestead	108.4	1
Jacksonville	103.3	1.049370765
Miami	108.4	1
Miami Beach	108.4	1
Naples	117.9	0.91942324
North Miami	108.4	1
Sunrise	108.6	0.998158379
Miami-Dade County	108.4	1
Davie	108.6	0.998158379
Jupiter	115.4	0.939341421
Pinecrest	108.4	1

From the participating peers, 1,206 data points were collected for comparative purposes. Average market salaries were then adjusted for cost of living.

Exhibit 4B provides a summary of the results of the salary survey of all peer organizations at the 60th percentile.

These data represent base salary only and are composed of the following information:

- **Market Range Minimum, Midpoint, and Maximum.** The survey range minimum indicates the average minimum salary for each classification provided by peer organizations. Survey range midpoint provides the average midpoint of the peer respondents for each classification surveyed. Survey range maximum provides the average maximum of the survey participants for each classification surveyed.
- **Percent Differentials.** The percent differentials are shown for survey market range minimum, midpoint, and maximum. The differentials specify the variance between the City's current published salary ranges and the market average shown in the exhibit. A



positive differential indicates the City is above market for that classification at the range minimum, midpoint, or maximum. Information is presented on positions that are above average to provide valuable information regarding the City's competitive edge in the marketplace for those positions. A negative differential indicates the City is below market for that classification, indicating that these salaries are not as competitive.

In the final row of the exhibit, the average percent differentials for the range minimum, midpoint and maximum are provided. This is derived by averaging each classification's percent differential.

- **Survey Average Range Spread.** The range spread which provides the average range width for each classification surveyed is the percentage difference between the average minimum and average maximum salaries of the respondents, relative to the minimum. The average range spread for all the surveyed classifications is provided in the final row of the exhibit.
- **Survey Responses.** The number of survey responses for each classification is provided in the final column, and the average number of responses for the classification category is shown at the bottom along with an overall average for all classification categories.
- **Comparability.** Peers are provided a summary of the job duties and responsibilities for each classification as well as the experience, education and certification requirements required for a match. Based on information provided by the peers, Evergreen uses a general 70 percent match criteria for accepting a peer's proposed classification, based on the similarity of duties and responsibilities as well as the educational, experience and credentialing requirements for the classification. When in doubt, peers are contacted for additional information to ensure comparability.



EXHIBIT 4B
MARKET RESULTS FOR BENCHMARKED POSITIONS – 60TH PERCENTILE

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Avg. Range Spread	Number of Responses
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
Accountant I	\$53,986.60	-0.4%	\$69,454.54	-5.3%	\$84,434.01	-7.9%	56.4%	18
Accounting Clerk II	\$40,803.38	-4.5%	\$52,137.68	-8.7%	\$61,659.87	-8.6%	51.1%	17
Administrative Analyst	\$59,302.63	-9.7%	\$82,711.67	-22.6%	\$102,501.79	-27.2%	72.8%	8
Administrative Assistant	\$45,006.71	-6.5%	\$56,114.85	-8.3%	\$69,097.28	-12.2%	53.5%	18
Arts and Culture Specialist*	\$67,159.91	-34.5%	\$90,786.37	-43.9%	\$112,780.90	-48.5%	67.9%	8
Assistant City Attorney	\$93,187.24	10.9%	\$133,700.32	-4.9%	\$181,997.76	-18.8%	95.3%	14
Assistant Police Chief	\$116,109.04	24.6%	\$143,970.76	10.8%	\$174,510.92	-1.2%	50.3%	14
Automotive Coordinator	\$65,513.11	-19.6%	\$85,035.54	-25.4%	\$106,057.67	-30.5%	61.9%	16
Automotive Mechanic	\$42,920.08	0.2%	\$56,154.32	-6.4%	\$70,406.49	-12.1%	64.0%	15
Background Investigator	\$53,355.98	-2.1%	\$68,234.36	-7.3%	\$83,682.36	-11.4%	56.8%	9
Building Inspector II	\$64,256.89	13.5%	\$83,559.94	7.5%	\$102,862.99	3.6%	60.1%	9
Business Development Coordinator	\$67,449.73	-12.8%	\$87,305.39	-18.3%	\$104,997.35	-19.9%	55.7%	13
Carpenter	\$45,632.75	-1.1%	\$59,231.97	-6.9%	\$72,831.20	-10.7%	59.6%	11
Cashier	\$36,379.20	-7.7%	\$46,495.81	-12.8%	\$60,067.54	-22.1%	65.1%	11
Chief Mechanical Official	\$76,807.50	13.2%	\$99,763.51	7.3%	\$120,416.89	5.3%	56.8%	14
City Engineer	\$108,230.26	-13.8%	\$141,967.48	-20.6%	\$171,674.69	-22.7%	58.6%	14
Civil Engineer	\$71,212.42	-18.2%	\$94,527.81	-26.2%	\$118,061.66	-31.4%	65.8%	13
Clerical Assistant II	\$35,587.91	-5.5%	\$45,416.08	-9.6%	\$55,078.71	-12.0%	54.8%	10
Clerk I	\$33,550.94	-4.4%	\$43,839.23	-10.9%	\$53,893.75	-14.7%	60.6%	12
Code Enforcement Officer	\$47,043.10	0.8%	\$62,482.84	-7.3%	\$76,783.71	-11.1%	63.2%	17
Commission Liaison	\$50,165.11	-17.4%	\$67,410.18	-26.5%	\$81,676.11	-28.8%	62.8%	7
Communication Operator I	\$43,520.33	-1.2%	\$57,101.77	-8.1%	\$71,124.20	-13.1%	63.4%	12
Communication Supervisor	\$55,936.07	2.9%	\$70,058.34	0.7%	\$86,326.57	-3.3%	54.3%	12
Communications Specialist	\$51,606.67	6.1%	\$66,931.59	-0.5%	\$83,241.29	-6.0%	61.3%	12
Community Recreation Director	\$115,608.77	8.9%	\$149,834.56	3.2%	\$184,887.79	-0.9%	59.9%	17
Compensation Coordinator	\$64,263.73	-27.4%	\$86,171.83	-36.2%	\$108,079.92	-41.7%	68.2%	13
Comptroller	\$101,412.24	-14.6%	\$130,825.76	-19.7%	\$163,933.97	-25.4%	61.7%	15

EXHIBIT 4B
MARKET RESULTS FOR BENCHMARKED POSITIONS – 60TH PERCENTILE

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Avg. Range Spread	Number of Responses
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
Contract Specialist	\$56,559.04	-7.9%	\$73,655.84	-14.9%	\$90,304.03	-19.0%	59.7%	15
Coordinator - Greenspace Management Division	\$68,528.53	-22.1%	\$88,579.69	-27.4%	\$108,635.86	-30.9%	58.5%	7
Crime Scene Technician	\$49,056.15	-13.2%	\$63,593.07	-18.8%	\$77,316.55	-21.4%	57.6%	16
Deputy Fire Chief	\$106,854.78	32.7%	\$139,263.00	14.2%	\$167,115.60	3.1%	56.4%	11
Development Services Director	\$117,999.74	6.8%	\$152,636.86	1.4%	\$188,780.26	-3.0%	60.0%	13
Economic Development Asset Manager	\$86,371.60	-3.4%	\$115,446.74	-12.1%	\$145,292.58	-18.2%	68.2%	5
Economic Development Director	\$113,200.00	-13.4%	\$149,843.54	-21.1%	\$184,339.89	-24.9%	62.8%	16
Electrical Inspector II*	\$65,547.28	-64.2%	\$83,692.71	-68.7%	\$98,332.95	-68.5%	50.0%	10
Electrician	\$49,200.45	-3.7%	\$63,314.11	-8.6%	\$76,957.06	-11.3%	56.4%	14
Equipment Operator I	\$36,810.30	-4.0%	\$48,747.93	-11.7%	\$62,169.14	-19.2%	68.9%	16
Finance Director	\$121,221.28	4.2%	\$163,899.03	-5.7%	\$203,597.22	-10.5%	68.0%	18
Fire Equipment Mechanic II	\$46,732.04	11.2%	\$61,905.45	3.4%	\$77,361.33	-2.1%	65.5%	7
Fire Support Coordinator I	\$47,319.17	-19.3%	\$58,178.50	-19.6%	\$69,037.83	-19.9%	45.9%	10
Foreman - General Services	\$51,515.79	1.4%	\$68,076.55	-6.1%	\$84,738.25	-11.2%	64.5%	13
General Services Division Chief	\$73,691.42	14.9%	\$92,049.27	12.9%	\$112,509.53	9.7%	52.7%	9
Golf Course & Parks Superintendent	\$69,616.79	13.2%	\$89,477.00	8.4%	\$110,708.74	4.0%	59.0%	15
Guest Services Rep	\$40,513.69	-28.0%	\$51,409.66	-32.3%	\$62,709.04	-35.8%	54.8%	7
HR Clerical Assistant II	\$44,742.36	-28.2%	\$53,633.85	-26.9%	\$67,717.17	-33.8%	51.3%	11
Human Resources Director	\$117,999.74	-7.8%	\$161,496.10	-16.5%	\$200,947.79	-19.9%	70.3%	18
IT Application Analyst I	\$61,116.75	-25.3%	\$77,962.12	-29.2%	\$97,457.36	-34.6%	59.5%	13
IT Director and Chief Innovation Officer	\$117,739.68	7.1%	\$156,604.55	-1.2%	\$186,346.89	-1.7%	58.3%	17
IT Network Analyst I	\$60,862.09	-24.8%	\$78,724.05	-30.2%	\$97,223.97	-34.3%	59.7%	17
IT Systems Analyst I	\$69,333.10	-37.5%	\$87,024.77	-39.9%	\$104,557.97	-41.3%	50.8%	16
IT-Technician Help Desk	\$49,906.82	-5.1%	\$64,915.03	-12.0%	\$82,429.44	-19.6%	65.2%	15
Labor Relations Analyst	\$61,330.92	-17.9%	\$80,187.00	-24.4%	\$101,423.50	-30.9%	65.4%	13
Lifeguard Entry Level	\$35,126.96	-13.8%	\$44,203.78	-17.4%	\$52,734.70	-18.8%	50.1%	12
Maintenance Worker I	\$31,768.37	-3.8%	\$42,295.72	-12.2%	\$51,064.49	-14.2%	60.7%	17

EXHIBIT 4B
MARKET RESULTS FOR BENCHMARKED POSITIONS – 60TH PERCENTILE

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Avg. Range Spread	Number of Responses
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
Maintenance Worker II - Parking Sign Shop	\$40,086.26	-17.3%	\$52,590.55	-25.0%	\$65,108.84	-30.0%	62.4%	7
Management & Budget Analyst II	\$65,356.12	4.9%	\$85,589.08	-1.7%	\$105,400.41	-5.7%	61.3%	12
Mechanical Inspector II	\$64,368.04	13.3%	\$83,337.61	7.8%	\$102,499.57	3.9%	59.2%	9
Neighborhood Safety Aide	\$41,284.78	-20.2%	\$54,041.64	-27.6%	\$64,021.81	-28.3%	55.1%	10
Off Duty Coordinator*	-	-	-	-	-	-		0
Operational Services Assistant	\$48,150.92	-18.1%	\$62,388.89	-23.7%	\$75,746.99	-26.2%	57.3%	12
Painter	\$41,167.37	-0.5%	\$51,743.35	-3.1%	\$63,402.68	-6.6%	54.0%	8
Park Service Attendant	\$31,479.51	-2.9%	\$40,875.74	-9.6%	\$49,468.51	-12.5%	57.1%	16
Parking Clerk I	\$36,457.54	-7.9%	\$46,495.81	-11.9%	\$56,534.09	-14.6%	55.1%	6
Parking Enforcement Specialist	\$39,760.70	-6.8%	\$50,459.64	-10.3%	\$61,158.57	-12.7%	53.8%	7
Parking Meter Mechanic	\$42,933.60	-14.4%	\$54,824.91	-18.6%	\$66,292.61	-20.7%	54.4%	5
Payroll Clerk	\$47,198.15	-14.2%	\$58,052.29	-14.6%	\$69,956.89	-16.4%	48.2%	13
Permit Clerk	\$37,052.64	10.0%	\$51,055.45	-1.8%	\$60,025.51	-1.1%	62.0%	18
Permits Section Engineer	\$72,459.19	-29.6%	\$96,729.51	-37.9%	\$118,061.66	-40.9%	62.9%	13
Personnel Analyst II	\$61,809.72	-18.7%	\$77,410.19	-20.9%	\$97,163.60	-26.7%	57.2%	12
Personnel Specialist I	\$47,202.06	-11.3%	\$64,688.88	-22.4%	\$79,373.38	-26.0%	68.2%	12
Police Division Assistant	\$47,544.28	-10.0%	\$60,474.25	-13.8%	\$74,279.22	-17.4%	56.2%	13
Police Major	\$110,436.51	18.0%	\$137,023.40	4.2%	\$167,166.14	-8.6%	51.4%	13
Police Property Clerk	\$43,398.69	-15.5%	\$57,114.50	-23.5%	\$68,434.61	-25.3%	57.7%	14
Police Records Clerk I	\$37,552.73	-10.8%	\$47,303.98	-13.6%	\$56,783.82	-15.0%	51.2%	15
Police Training Assistant*	\$41,377.69	-5.9%	\$58,597.49	-20.3%	\$75,817.29	-29.1%	83.2%	2
Principal Planner	\$69,902.89	-1.8%	\$90,567.73	-7.4%	\$108,823.31	-8.9%	55.7%	18
Procurement Specialist	\$52,373.00	12.4%	\$70,818.02	2.6%	\$93,638.61	-8.5%	78.8%	16
Project Manager	\$76,828.08	-16.1%	\$94,507.39	-16.5%	\$114,238.74	-18.6%	48.7%	14
Public Records Coordinator	\$50,477.83	1.5%	\$64,985.59	-3.5%	\$79,185.70	-6.4%	56.9%	10
Public Works Director	\$129,564.87	-2.5%	\$168,779.65	-8.7%	\$207,994.43	-12.7%	60.5%	17
Radio Technician	\$49,056.15	1.5%	\$63,588.81	-4.2%	\$77,762.44	-7.5%	58.5%	6

EXHIBIT 4B
MARKET RESULTS FOR BENCHMARKED POSITIONS – 60TH PERCENTILE

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Avg. Range Spread	Number of Responses
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
Receptionist	\$34,170.63	-11.1%	\$44,353.42	-17.8%	\$54,536.20	-22.2%	59.6%	11
Recreation Counselor	\$31,377.81	-2.6%	\$39,955.18	-7.4%	\$49,237.91	-12.0%	56.9%	14
Recreation Specialist	\$39,232.76	-0.6%	\$50,349.78	-5.2%	\$62,741.84	-10.4%	59.9%	16
Repair Worker - Facilities	\$37,730.05	3.3%	\$48,283.92	-1.1%	\$57,350.06	-1.4%	52.0%	16
Risk Manager	\$87,580.48	-19.4%	\$115,419.59	-26.6%	\$143,258.70	-31.3%	63.6%	16
Senior Welder Mechanic	\$43,846.00	7.8%	\$55,100.08	5.3%	\$71,271.08	-3.6%	62.5%	6
Sewer Maintenance Mechanic	\$41,781.91	7.7%	\$52,531.07	5.1%	\$64,766.99	1.0%	55.0%	14
Solid Waste Coordinator	\$62,957.08	-13.7%	\$78,616.33	-15.6%	\$100,595.33	-23.4%	59.8%	9
Solid Waste Crane Operator	\$44,377.31	-3.2%	\$57,119.08	-8.1%	\$67,978.56	-8.6%	53.2%	5
Solid Waste Operator I	\$38,392.76	-3.3%	\$52,186.80	-13.7%	\$65,710.84	-19.8%	71.2%	6
Solid Waste Worker	\$34,240.00	3.3%	\$42,655.23	1.6%	\$53,398.32	-4.0%	56.0%	7
Structural Engineer	\$78,565.61	25.4%	\$100,944.11	20.7%	\$124,308.25	16.8%	58.2%	12
Sustainability & Resiliency Manager	\$76,469.67	-5.9%	\$101,070.71	-13.5%	\$119,592.33	-13.4%	56.4%	14
Transportation Engineer	\$77,110.06	7.9%	\$102,763.77	-0.5%	\$122,817.82	-1.5%	59.3%	13
Trolley Operations Supervisor*	\$61,903.78	-16.9%	\$78,927.32	-20.9%	\$95,950.86	-23.5%	55.0%	1
Utilities & ROW Division Chief	\$82,397.05	3.7%	\$106,929.42	-2.0%	\$127,385.46	-2.7%	54.6%	15
Youth Center Supervisor	\$51,024.17	10.2%	\$66,604.33	3.8%	\$85,095.17	-3.8%	66.8%	5
Zoning Administrator	\$91,648.44	-14.2%	\$109,214.26	-11.5%	\$133,005.11	-14.3%	45.1%	14
Zoning Inspector	\$52,904.59	-1.2%	\$70,409.04	-9.5%	\$84,389.87	-10.8%	59.5%	14
Overall Average		-5.6%		-11.9%		-16.0%	59.5%	12.1
Outliers Removed		-4.9%		-11.0%		-15.1%		

*Outliers are defined as benchmarks that possess midpoint differentials of 40% or greater from the City of Coral Gables or received less than four (4) responses. Outliers are removed so that extreme differentials do not skew the average results. Classifications identified as outliers are as follows: Off Duty Coordinator, Police Training Assistant, Trolley Operations Supervisor, Arts and Culture Specialist, and Electrical Inspector II.

The following subsections discuss the results of the salary survey, based on data provided in Exhibit 4B.

4.1 MARKET MINIMUM

A starting point of the analysis is to compare the peer average market minimum for each classification to range minimums in the City. Market minimums are generally considered as a starting wage for employees who meet the minimum qualifications for the classification. Those employees with salaries at or near the range minimums are generally new to the role and have not acquired the skills and experience necessary to be fully proficient in their classification.

Utilizing the data gathered in the salary survey for the benchmarked positions with stated salary ranges, the following conclusions can be reached:

- The City is on average 5.1 percent below market minimum across all job titles surveyed.
- The surveyed City position differentials ranged from 32.7 percent ahead of the market minimum in the case of the Deputy Fire Chief position to 37.5 percent below market minimums for the IT Systems Analyst I classification.
- Fourteen (14) positions in the City were found to be greater than 10.0 percent ahead of market minimum.
 - Assistant City Attorney – 10.9 percent above;
 - Assistant Police Chief – 24.6 percent above;
 - Building Inspector II – 13.5 percent above;
 - Chief Mechanical Official – 13.2 percent above;
 - Deputy Fire Chief – 32.7 percent above;
 - Fire Equipment Mechanic II – 11.2 percent above;
 - General Services Division Chief – 14.9 percent above;
 - Golf Course & Parks Superintendent – 13.2 percent above;
 - Mechanical Inspector II – 13.3 percent above;
 - Permit Clerk – 10.0 percent above;
 - Police Major – 18.0 percent above;
 - Procurement Specialist – 12.4 percent above;
 - Structural Engineer – 25.4 percent above; and
 - Youth Center Supervisor – 10.2 percent above.
- Thirty-four (34) City positions were 10.0 percent or greater below market minimums:
 - Automotive Coordinator – 19.6 percent below;
 - Business Development Coordinator – 12.8 percent below;
 - City Engineer – 13.8 percent below;
 - Civil Engineer – 18.2 percent below;
 - Commission Liaison – 17.4 percent below;
 - Compensation Coordinator – 27.4 percent below;
 - Comptroller – 14.6 percent below;



- Coordinator – Greenspace Management Division – 22.1 percent below;
- Crime Scene Technician – 13.2 percent below;
- Economic Development Director – 13.4 percent below;
- Fire Support Coordinator I – 19.3 percent below;
- Guest Services Rep – 28.0 percent below;
- HR Clerical Assistant II – 28.2 percent below;
- IT Application Analyst II – 25.3 percent below;
- IT Network Analyst I – 24.8 percent below;
- IT Systems Analyst I – 37.5 percent below;
- Labor Relations Analyst – 17.9 percent below;
- Lifeguard Entry Level – 13.8 percent below;
- Maintenance Worker II, Parking Sign Shop – 17.3 percent below;
- Neighborhood Safety Aide – 20.2 percent below;
- Parking Meter Mechanic – 14.4 percent below;
- Payroll Clerk – 14.2 percent below;
- Permits Section Engineer – 29.6 percent below;
- Personnel Analyst II – 18.7 percent below;
- Personnel Specialist I – 11.3 percent below;
- Police Division Assistant – 10.0 percent below;
- Police Property Clerk – 15.5 percent below;
- Police Records Clerk I – 10.8 percent below;
- Project Manager – 16.1 percent below;
- Receptionist – 11.1 percent below;
- Risk Manager – 19.4 percent below;
- Solid Waste Coordinator – 13.7 percent below; and
- Zoning Administrator – 14.2 percent below.

4.2 MARKET MIDPOINTS

This section explores the comparison between the average peer midpoints and City classification midpoints. Midpoint is frequently considered the point where employees who have achieved full proficiency in their job duties could expect their salaries to be placed. It is considered the best point of comparison for analyzing variance between an organization and their market peers.

Based on the data gathered at the market midpoint of the positions with stated salary ranges, the following can be determined:

- The City is on average 11.0 percent below market midpoints across all job titles surveyed.
- The surveyed City position differentials ranged from 20.7 percent ahead of the market midpoint in the case of the Structural Engineer position to 39.9 percent below market midpoint for the IT Systems Analyst I classification.
- Four (4) positions in the City were greater than 10.0 percent ahead of market midpoint:
 - Assistant Police Chief – 10.8 percent above;
 - Deputy Fire Chief – 14.2 percent above;



- General Services Division Chief – 12.9 percent above; and
 - Structural Engineer – 20.7 percent above.
- Forty-seven (47) City positions were 10.0 percent or greater below market midpoints:
 - Administrative Analyst – 22.6 percent below;
 - Automotive Coordinator – 25.4 percent below;
 - Business Development Coordinator – 18.3 percent below;
 - Cashier – 12.8 percent below;
 - City Engineer – 20.6 percent below;
 - Civil Engineer – 26.2 percent below;
 - Clerk I – 10.9 percent below;
 - Commission Liaison – 26.5 percent below;
 - Compensation Coordinator – 36.2 percent below;
 - Comptroller – 19.7 percent below;
 - Contract Specialist – 14.9 percent below;
 - Coordinator – Greenspace Management Division – 27.4 percent below;
 - Crime Scene Technician – 18.8 percent below;
 - Economic Development Asset Manager – 12.1 percent below;
 - Economic Development Director – 21.1 percent below;
 - Equipment Operator I – 11.7 percent below;
 - Fire Support Coordinator I – 19.6 percent below;
 - Guest Services Rep – 32.3 percent below;
 - HR Clerical Assistant II – 26.9 percent below;
 - Human Resources Director – 16.5 percent below;
 - IT Application Analyst I – 29.2 percent below;
 - IT Network Analyst I – 30.2 percent below;
 - IT Systems Analyst I – 39.9 percent below;
 - IT Technician Help Desk – 12.0 percent below;
 - Labor Relations Analyst – 24.4 percent below;
 - Lifeguard Entry Level – 17.4 percent below;
 - Maintenance Worker I – 12.2 percent below;
 - Maintenance Worker II, Parking Sign Shop – 25.0 percent below;
 - Neighborhood Safety Aide – 27.6 percent below;
 - Operational Services Assistant – 23.7 percent below;
 - Parking Clerk I – 11.9 percent below;
 - Parking Enforcement Specialist – 10.3 percent below;
 - Parking Meter Mechanic – 18.6 percent below;
 - Payroll Clerk – 14.6 percent below;
 - Permits Section Engineer – 37.9 percent below;
 - Personnel Analyst II – 20.9 percent below;
 - Personnel Specialist I – 22.4 percent below;
 - Police Division Assistant – 13.8 percent below;
 - Police Property Clerk – 23.5 percent below;
 - Police Records Clerk I – 13.6 percent below;
 - Project Manager – 16.5 percent below;
 - Receptionist – 17.8 percent below;
 - Risk Manager – 26.6 percent below;
 - Solid Waste Coordinator – 15.6 percent below;
 - Solid Waste Operator I – 13.7 percent below;



- Sustainability and Resiliency Manager – 13.5 percent below; and
- Zoning Administrator – 11.5 percent below.

4.3 MARKET MAXIMUMS

In this section, City salary range maximum values are compared to the survey respondents' average maximums. Market maximums are often utilized to attract highly qualified employees or retain experienced individuals in a classification.

When comparing peer market pay grade maximums and maximums for the City classifications, the following can be determined:

- The City is on average 15.1 percent below market maximums across all job titles surveyed.
- The surveyed City position differentials ranged from 16.8 percent ahead of the market maximum in the case of the Structural Engineer position to 41.7 percent below market maximums for the Compensation Coordinator classification.
- The Structural Engineer position was the only City position that was greater than 10.0 percent ahead of market maximums.
- Sixty-three (63) City positions were 10.0 percent or greater below market maximums:
 - Administrative Analyst – 27.2 percent below;
 - Administrative Assistant – 12.2 percent below;
 - Assistant City Attorney – 18.8 percent below;
 - Automotive Coordinator – 30.5 percent below;
 - Automotive Mechanic – 12.1 percent below;
 - Background Investigator – 11.4 percent below;
 - Business Development Coordinator – 19.9 percent below;
 - Carpenter – 10.7 percent below;
 - Cashier – 22.1 percent below;
 - City Engineer – 22.7 percent below;
 - Civil Engineer – 31.4 percent below;
 - Clerical Assistant II – 12.0 percent below;
 - Clerk I – 14.7 percent below;
 - Code Enforcement Officer – 11.1 percent below;
 - Commission Liaison – 28.8 percent below;
 - Communication Operator I – 13.1 percent below;
 - Compensation Coordinator – 41.7 percent below;
 - Comptroller – 25.4 percent below;
 - Contract Specialist – 19.0 percent below;
 - Coordinator – Greenspace Management Division – 30.9 percent below;
 - Crime Scene Technician – 21.4 percent below;
 - Economic Development Asset Manager – 18.2 percent below;
 - Economic Development Director – 24.9 percent below;
 - Electrician – 11.3 percent below;



- Equipment Operator I – 19.2 percent below;
- Finance Director – 10.5 percent below;
- Fire Support Coordinator I – 19.9 percent below;
- Foreman, General Services – 11.2 percent below;
- Guest Services Rep – 35.8 percent below;
- HR Clerical Assistant II – 33.8 percent below;
- Human Resources Director – 19.9 percent below;
- IT Application Analyst I – 34.6 percent below;
- IT Network Analyst I – 34.3 percent below;
- IT Systems Analyst I – 41.3 percent below;
- IT Technician Help Desk – 19.6 percent below;
- Labor Relations Analyst – 30.9 percent below;
- Lifeguard Entry Level – 18.8 percent below;
- Maintenance Worker I – 14.2 percent below;
- Maintenance Worker II, Parking Sign Shop – 30.0 percent below;
- Neighborhood Safety Aide – 28.3 percent below;
- Operational Services Assistant – 26.2 percent below;
- Park Service Attendant – 12.5 percent below;
- Parking Clerk I – 14.6 percent below;
- Parking Enforcement Specialist – 12.7 percent below;
- Parking Meter Mechanic – 20.7 percent below;
- Payroll Clerk – 16.4 percent below;
- Permits Section Engineer – 40.9 percent below;
- Personnel Analyst II – 26.7 percent below;
- Personnel Specialist I – 26.0 percent below;
- Police Division Assistant – 17.4 percent below;
- Police Property Clerk – 25.3 percent below;
- Police Records Clerk I – 15.0 percent below;
- Project Manager – 18.6 percent below;
- Public Works Director – 12.7 percent below;
- Receptionist – 22.2 percent below;
- Recreation Counselor – 12.0 percent below;
- Recreation Specialist – 10.4 percent below;
- Risk Manager – 31.3 percent below;
- Solid Waste Coordinator – 23.4 percent below;
- Solid Waste Operator I – 19.8 percent below;
- Sustainability and Resiliency Manager – 13.4 percent below;
- Zoning Administrator – 14.3 percent below; and
- Zoning Inspector – 10.8 percent below.

4.4 MARKET SURVEY CONCLUSION

The standing of individual classifications pay range relative to the market should not be considered a definitive assessment of actual employee salaries being similarly above or below the market; however, such differentials can, in part, explain symptomatic issues with recruitment and retention of employees.

The main summary points of the market study are as follows:

- The City is approximately 4.9 percent below the public-sector market minimum.



- The City is approximately 11.0 percent below the public-sector market midpoint.
- The City is approximately 15.1 percent below the public-sector market maximum.

The results of the market summary chapter are pivotal in the formulation of recommendations by Evergreen Solutions. By establishing the City’s market position relative to its peers, Evergreen is better able to propose recommendations that enable the City to occupy its desired competitive position. Discussion on the recommended changes to the City’s pay plan can be found in **Chapter 5** of this report.



Chapter 5 - Recommendations

The analysis of the City's classification and compensation system revealed some areas of opportunity for improvement. Evergreen focused primarily on developing a more competitive pay plan, as well as reviewing and making recommendations to the classification structure. Study recommendations, as well as the findings that led to each, are discussed in this chapter.

5.1 CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

An organization's classification system establishes how its human resources are employed to perform its core services. The classification system consists of the titles and descriptions of the different classifications, or positions, which define how work is organized and assigned. It is essential that the titles and descriptions of an organization's classifications accurately depict the work being performed by employees in the classifications to ensure equity within the organization and to enable comparisons with positions at peer organizations. The purpose of a classification analysis is to identify such issues as incorrect titles and inconsistent titles across departments.

In the analysis of the City's classification system, Evergreen collected classification data through the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) and Management Issues Tool (MIT) processes. The JATs, which were completed by employees and reviewed by their supervisors, provided information about the type and level of work being performed for each of the City's classifications. In addition, the MIT process provided supervisors an opportunity to provide specific recommendations regarding the pay or classification of positions in their areas. Evergreen reviewed and utilized the data provided in the JATs and MITs as a basis for the classification recommendations below.

FINDING

Overall, the classification system utilized by the City was sound. However, there were a few instances of titles for positions that could be modified.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Revise the titles of some classifications to better reflect job duties.

Exhibit 5A provides a list of the recommended changes to the classification system. The foundation for these recommendations was the work performed by employees as described in their JATs, best practice in the Human Resources field, or unique needs which required a specific titling method.



**EXHIBIT 5A
PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES**

Current Classification Title	Proposed Classification Title
Benefits Coordinator	Benefits & Wellness Coordinator
Fleet Analyst	Fleet Administrative Analyst
Personnel Analyst II	Recruitment Coordinator for Public Safety
Police Property Clerk	Property & Evidence Specialist
Police Records Clerk I	Police Records Technician I
Police Records Clerk II	Police Records Technician II
Police Training Assistant	Police Training Specialist
Solid Waste Operator III	Solid Waste Operator II
P/T Communications Operator	P/T Communications Operator II
P/T Engineering Aide I	P/T Engineering Aide II
P/T HR Clerical Assistant I	P/T HR Clerical Assistant II
P/T Police Property Clerk	P/T Property & Evidence Specialist

FINDING

When comparing the City’s current job descriptions to the work described by employees in the JATs, Evergreen noted some tasks that were missing from the current job descriptions. This can happen over a period of time if the descriptions are not reviewed and updated on a regular basis. Some tasks in one classification are often reassigned to another classification. As such, these changes make it necessary that the City continues to update its job descriptions periodically to ensure each job description accurately reflects the work performed.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Revise all job descriptions to include updated classification information provided in the JAT, and review job descriptions annually for accuracy.

The process of reviewing and updating the City’s job descriptions, as well as comments received from employees and supervisors during outreach, revealed that the descriptions may not, in some cases, accurately reflect current work performed. To minimize this becoming a concern again in the future, Evergreen recommends a regular review of these descriptions, including FLSA status determinations.

A review of the employee’s assigned job classification (description) should occur at least annually. Review of the FLSA determination for exempt or non-exempt status as well as other aspects of the job (such as physical requirements required to perform essential functions) will also ensure consistent, continuous compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) protection. At the time of this report, Evergreen was in the process of revising the job descriptions for all classifications. The descriptions will be provided to the City under separate cover.



5.2 COMPENSATION SYSTEM

The compensation system analysis consisted of two parts: an external market assessment and an internal equity assessment. During the external market assessment, the City’s pay ranges for its classifications were compared to the average of the identified market. Details regarding the external market assessment were provided in **Chapter 4** of this report.

During the internal equity assessment, consideration of the relationships between positions and the type of work being performed by the City employees were reviewed and analyzed. Specifically, a composite score was assigned to each of the classifications that quantified the classification’s level of five separate compensatory factors (leadership, working conditions, complexity, decision-making, and relationships). The level for each factor was determined based on responses to the JAT. The results of both analyses were utilized when developing the recommendations below.

FINDING

The City’s salary ranges were overall found to be behind the market at the minimum, midpoint, and maximum. Implementing a new competitive pay structure (pay plan) would provide the City with an improved ability to attract, hire and retain employees.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Update current pay plans for Excluded, Executive, Teamsters, Part-Time, and Public Safety Executive employees; slot all classifications into the plans based on external and internal equity; and transition employees’ salaries into the new plans.

Exhibit 5B through Exhibit 5F show an overview of the new plans. All plans (excluding Public Safety Executive) offer a consistent range spread of 55 percent for each grade; the Public Safety Executive plan includes a range spread of 16 percent.

EXHIBIT 5B PROPOSED PAY PLAN – EXCLUDED

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression
08e	\$38,079.41	\$48,551.24	\$59,023.08	55.0%	-
17e	\$42,149.89	\$53,741.11	\$65,332.33	55.0%	-
18e	\$44,255.98	\$56,426.38	\$68,596.77	55.0%	5.0%
19e	\$46,476.63	\$59,257.70	\$72,038.77	55.0%	5.0%
20e	\$48,793.30	\$62,211.46	\$75,629.61	55.0%	5.0%
21e	\$51,224.96	\$65,311.83	\$79,398.69	55.0%	5.0%
22e	\$53,790.50	\$68,582.88	\$83,375.27	55.0%	5.0%
23e	\$56,470.91	\$72,000.41	\$87,529.91	55.0%	5.0%
24e	\$59,295.14	\$75,601.31	\$91,907.47	55.0%	5.0%
25e	\$62,262.42	\$79,384.59	\$96,506.76	55.0%	5.0%
26e	\$65,373.75	\$83,351.53	\$101,329.32	55.0%	5.0%

**EXHIBIT 5B (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY PLAN – EXCLUDED**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression
27e	\$68,647.51	\$87,525.57	\$106,403.64	55.0%	5.0%
28e	\$72,075.34	\$91,896.06	\$111,716.77	55.0%	5.0%
29e	\$75,674.40	\$96,484.86	\$117,295.32	55.0%	5.0%
30e	\$79,465.41	\$101,318.40	\$123,171.39	55.0%	5.0%
31e	\$83,437.90	\$106,383.32	\$129,328.75	55.0%	5.0%
32e	\$87,602.34	\$111,692.99	\$135,783.63	55.0%	5.0%
33e	\$91,976.90	\$117,270.54	\$142,564.19	55.0%	5.0%
34	\$96,575.74	\$123,134.07	\$149,692.40	55.0%	5.0%
35	\$101,404.53	\$129,290.77	\$157,177.02	55.0%	5.0%
36e	\$106,474.75	\$135,755.31	\$165,035.87	55.0%	5.0%

**EXHIBIT 5C
PROPOSED PAY PLAN – EXECUTIVE**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression
29EX	\$77,580.32	\$98,914.91	\$120,249.50	55.0%	-
30	\$81,459.34	\$103,860.65	\$126,261.97	55.0%	5.0%
31	\$85,532.30	\$109,053.69	\$132,575.07	55.0%	5.0%
32EX	\$89,808.92	\$114,506.37	\$139,203.82	55.0%	5.0%
33	\$94,299.37	\$120,231.69	\$146,164.02	55.0%	5.0%
34EX	\$99,014.33	\$126,243.27	\$153,472.22	55.0%	5.0%
35EX	\$103,965.05	\$132,555.44	\$161,145.83	55.0%	5.0%
36EX	\$109,163.30	\$139,183.21	\$169,203.12	55.0%	5.0%
37	\$114,621.47	\$146,142.37	\$177,663.27	55.0%	5.0%
38EX	\$120,352.54	\$153,449.49	\$186,546.44	55.0%	5.0%
39EX	\$126,370.17	\$161,121.96	\$195,873.76	55.0%	5.0%
40	\$132,688.68	\$169,178.06	\$205,667.45	55.0%	5.0%
41	\$139,323.11	\$177,636.97	\$215,950.82	55.0%	5.0%
42	\$146,289.27	\$186,518.81	\$226,748.36	55.0%	5.0%
43EX	\$153,603.73	\$195,844.75	\$238,085.78	55.0%	5.0%
44	\$161,283.92	\$205,636.99	\$249,990.07	55.0%	5.0%
45EX	\$169,348.11	\$215,918.84	\$262,489.57	55.0%	5.0%



**EXHIBIT 5D
PROPOSED PAY PLAN – TEAMSTERS**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression
11c	\$32,106.76	\$40,936.12	\$49,765.48	55.0%	-
12c	\$33,706.39	\$42,975.65	\$52,244.90	55.0%	5.0%
13c	\$35,392.52	\$45,125.46	\$54,858.40	55.0%	5.0%
14c	\$37,164.43	\$47,384.65	\$57,604.87	55.0%	5.0%
15c	\$39,022.49	\$49,753.67	\$60,484.86	55.0%	5.0%
16c	\$40,967.13	\$52,233.09	\$63,499.05	55.0%	5.0%
17c	\$43,007.28	\$54,834.28	\$66,661.29	55.0%	5.0%
18c	\$45,172.19	\$57,594.54	\$70,016.90	55.0%	5.0%
19c	\$47,413.35	\$60,452.02	\$73,490.69	55.0%	5.0%
20c	\$49,798.25	\$63,492.77	\$77,187.29	55.0%	5.0%
21c	\$52,279.11	\$66,655.86	\$81,032.62	55.0%	5.0%
22c	\$54,894.17	\$69,990.07	\$85,085.97	55.0%	5.0%
23c	\$57,633.19	\$73,482.32	\$89,331.45	55.0%	5.0%
24c	\$60,516.94	\$77,159.10	\$93,801.26	55.0%	5.0%
25c	\$63,542.75	\$81,017.00	\$98,491.26	55.0%	5.0%
26	\$66,719.89	\$85,067.85	\$103,415.82	55.0%	5.0%
27	\$70,055.88	\$89,321.25	\$108,586.61	55.0%	5.0%
28	\$73,558.67	\$93,787.31	\$114,015.95	55.0%	5.0%
29c	\$77,236.61	\$98,476.68	\$119,716.74	55.0%	5.0%

**EXHIBIT 5E
PROPOSED PAY PLAN – PART TIME**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression
11pt	\$32,106.76	\$40,936.12	\$49,765.48	55.0%	-
12pt	\$33,706.38	\$42,975.63	\$52,244.88	55.0%	5.0%
13pt	\$35,392.35	\$45,125.25	\$54,858.15	55.0%	5.0%
14pt	\$37,164.24	\$47,384.40	\$57,604.57	55.0%	5.0%
15pt	\$39,022.40	\$49,753.56	\$60,484.72	55.0%	5.0%
16pt	\$40,973.52	\$52,241.24	\$63,508.96	55.0%	5.0%
17pt	\$43,022.20	\$54,853.30	\$66,684.41	55.0%	5.0%
18pt	\$45,173.31	\$57,595.97	\$70,018.63	55.0%	5.0%
19pt	\$47,431.97	\$60,475.77	\$73,519.56	55.0%	5.0%
20pt	\$49,817.90	\$63,517.82	\$77,217.74	55.0%	5.0%
21pt	\$52,299.77	\$66,682.20	\$81,064.64	55.0%	5.0%
22pt	\$54,915.81	\$70,017.66	\$85,119.51	55.0%	5.0%



EXHIBIT 5E (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY PLAN – PART TIME

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression
23pt	\$57,655.97	\$73,511.36	\$89,366.75	55.0%	5.0%
24pt	\$60,540.66	\$77,189.35	\$93,838.03	55.0%	5.0%
25pt	\$63,567.73	\$81,048.86	\$98,529.98	55.0%	5.0%
26pt	\$66,745.72	\$85,100.80	\$103,455.87	55.0%	5.0%
27pt	\$70,088.24	\$89,362.51	\$108,636.77	55.0%	5.0%
28	\$73,592.65	\$93,830.63	\$114,068.61	55.0%	5.0%
29pt	\$77,272.28	\$98,522.16	\$119,772.04	55.0%	5.0%
30	\$81,135.90	\$103,448.27	\$125,760.64	55.0%	5.0%
31	\$85,192.69	\$108,620.68	\$132,048.67	55.0%	5.0%
32pt	\$89,452.33	\$114,051.72	\$138,651.11	55.0%	5.0%
33	\$93,924.94	\$119,754.30	\$145,583.66	55.0%	5.0%
34	\$98,621.19	\$125,742.02	\$152,862.85	55.0%	5.0%
35	\$103,552.25	\$132,029.12	\$160,505.99	55.0%	5.0%
36	\$108,729.86	\$138,630.58	\$168,531.29	55.0%	5.0%
37	\$114,166.36	\$145,562.11	\$176,957.85	55.0%	5.0%
38	\$119,874.67	\$152,840.21	\$185,805.75	55.0%	5.0%
39	\$125,868.41	\$160,482.22	\$195,096.03	55.0%	5.0%
40	\$132,161.83	\$168,506.33	\$204,850.83	55.0%	5.0%
41	\$138,769.92	\$176,931.65	\$215,093.38	55.0%	5.0%
42	\$145,708.42	\$185,778.23	\$225,848.05	55.0%	5.0%
43pt	\$152,993.84	\$195,067.14	\$237,140.45	55.0%	5.0%

EXHIBIT 5F
PROPOSED PAY PLAN – PUBLIC SAFETY EXECUTIVE

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression
36PS	\$138,891.04	\$149,980.96	\$161,070.87	16.0%	-
38PS	\$156,043.52	\$168,503.03	\$180,962.53	16.0%	12.3%
43PS	\$173,672.99	\$187,540.30	\$201,407.61	16.0%	11.3%

Evergreen then slotted each proposed classification into the appropriate pay range in the pay plan. 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 4** were not the sole criteria for the proposed pay ranges. Some classifications' grade assignments varied from their associated market range due to the other factors mentioned above. **Exhibit 5G through Exhibit 5K** show the proposed pay grades for all classifications in all plans.



**EXHIBIT 5G
PROPOSED PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS – EXCLUDED EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Classification	
08e	PROF. TENNIS OPS. SUPERVISOR	
17e		
18e	ACCOUNTING SPECIALIST ACCOUNTING SPECIALIST/PUBLIC WORKS ARCHIVIST	P-CARD ADMIN
19e	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ADULT ACTIVITIES ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR ASSISTANT AQUATICS SUPERVISOR COMMISSION LIAISON ADMINISTRATIVE ASST. TO MAYOR	OPERATIONAL SERVICES ASSISTANT TENNIS OPS ASST. SUPERVISOR YOUTH CENTER ASSISTANT SUPERV. INTERNAL AFFAIRS ASSISTANT
20e	DIGITAL EVIDENCE SPECIALIST EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	PERSONNEL SPECIALIST I WORKERS COMPENSATION SPEC.
21e	ASST. TO THE DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY CIP PROJECTS SPECIALIST	SENIOR PAYROLL SPECIALIST SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE ASST.
22e	AGENDA COORDINATOR BOA REVIEWER	PARKING ADMIN. SUPERVISOR PUBLIC RECORDS COORDINATOR
23e	ACCOUNTANT I CODE ENFORCEMENT FIELD SUPV D.E.I COORDINATOR	PW INSP II FOR ROW & SOLID WASTE SPECIAL PROJECTS COORDINATOR
24e	ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS SUPERVISOR ADULT ACTIVITIES SUPERVISOR AQUATICS SUPERVISOR ASSISTANT TO CHIEF OF POLICE ASST. TO THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS	BENEFITS AND WELLNESS COORDINATOR COMM. & DIGITAL MEDIA COORD GOLF CRSE&PRKS MAINT. ASST. SUPT PERMIT CLERK SUPERVISOR RECRUITMENT COORDINATOR FOR PUBLIC SAFETY YOUTH CENTER SUPERVISOR
25e	AUTOMOTIVE COORDINATOR AUTOMOTIVE COORDINATOR/TROLLEY COMPENSATION COORDINATOR GREENSPACE MGMT SUPERINTENDENT	LABOR RELATIONS ANALYST PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST PW PERMIT SECTION ENGINEER UTILITIES SUPERINTENDENT

EXHIBIT 5G (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS – EXCLUDED EMPLOYEES

Grade	Classification	
26e	ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGER ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER. ASST. CITY ARCHITECT CHIEF COMMUNITY OUTREACH & POLICY ADVISOR	HISTORIC PRESERVATION COORDINATOR M.MEDIA&PRODUCTION PRGM COORD OMBUDSMAN RESIDENTS/SMALL BUSINESS PARALEGAL
27e	ACCOUNTANT III BUILDING SERVICES COORDINATOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR CAD/GIS ENGINEER	LEAD SOLID WASTE COORDINATOR. PW PERMIT SECTION ENGINEER II SENIOR CONSTRUCTION MANAGER SR. ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST
28e	ADMN. & FISCAL AFFAIRS MANAGER BUILDING MAINTENANCE MANAGER CIVIL ENGINEER FITNESS AND POOL MANAGER GREENSPACE MGMNT DESIGNER INTERNAL AUDIT & GRANTS COORDINATOR	IT CUSTOMER SUPPORT & GIS DIV. MANAGER IT NETWORK DIVISION MANAGER IT SYSTEMS DIVISION MANAGER MANAGEMENT & BUDGET ANALYST II PRINCIPAL PLANNER LABOR RELATIONS MANAGER
29e	BANQUET HALL MANAGER PROJECT ENGINEER PROJECT MANAGER QUALITY CONTROL MANAGER	REVENUE MANAGER SR. MANAGEMENT & BUDGET ANALYST SUSTAINABILITY&RESILIENCE MGR RECRUITMENT MANAGER
30e	CODE ENFORCEMENT MANAGER COMMUNICATIONS MANAGER	SENIOR PROCUREMENT MANAGER RADIO TECHNICIAN MANAGER
31e	CITY PLANNER COMPENSATION & BENEFITS MANAGER GOLF COURSE AND PARKS SUPT. INNOV&TECH.SR. PROJECT MGR.	RISK MANAGER SR. PROJECT MANAGER ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
32e	CHIEF OF VERTICAL CONSTRUCTION ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSET MANAGER	TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER CHIEF BUILDING INSPECTOR
33e	CHIEF ELECTRICAL OFFICIAL CHIEF MECHANICAL OFFICIAL CHIEF PLUMBING OFFICIAL	DEPUTY BUILDING OFFICIAL
34		
35	COMPTROLLER	
36e	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	



**EXHIBIT 5H
PROPOSED PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS – EXECUTIVE**

Grade	Classifications
29EX	ASST. HISTORIC PRESERV. OFFCR
30	
31	
32EX	COUNTRY CLUB DIVISION DIRECTOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASST. DIR
	GENERAL SERVICES DIV. CHIEF UTILITIES & R.O.W. DIVISION CHIEF
33	
34EX	ASSISTANT CITY CLERK ASST. DIRECTOR FOR PLANNING & ZONING CITY ARCHITECT DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS HIST. RES. & CULTURAL ARTS DIR
	HUMAN RESOURCES ASST. DIRECTOR PARKING ASST. DIR/TROLLEY MNGR. PASSPORT DIRECTOR SR. TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER
35EX	COMM. RECREATION ASST. DIRECTOR FINANCE ASST. DIR FOR REPRNG & OPS FINANCE ASST. DIR. FOR PROCUREMENT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ASST. DIRECTOR
	PW ASSISTANT DIR. FOR FLEET MANAGEMENT PW ASST DIR FOR SOLID WASTE PW ASST DIR/CAPITAL IMPROVMNTS PW ASST. DIR/GREENSPACE MGMT
36EX	ASSISTANT BUILDING DIRECTOR ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY ASST. CITYATTY/INTERGOV AFF MGR
	CITY ENGINEER & PERM. SEC. MGR DEPUTY CITY CLERK FINANCE ASST. DIR FOR MGMT & BUDGET/COMPLIANCE
37	DEPUTY DEVELOPMENT SRVCS DIR. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
	PARKING DIRECTOR PW DEPUTY DIRECTOR/CITY ENGINEER
38EX	HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR
39EX	LABOR RELATIONS & RISK MNGMT DIR/CPI OFFICER
40	COMMUNITY RECREATION DIRECTOR DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY DEV. SRV DIR/BLDG DIRECTOR/BLDG OFFICIAL
	INNOVATION & TECHNOLOGY DIRECTOR FINANCE DIRECTOR PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR
41	
42	ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER
43EX	
44	
45EX	

**EXHIBIT 5I
PROPOSED PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS – TEAMSTERS**

Grade	Classifications
11c	MAINTENANCE WORKER I
12c	
13c	CLERK I MAINTENANCE WORKER II
14c	CLERICAL ASSISTANT II EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I MNTCE REPAIR WORKER/IRRIGATION NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY AIDE
15c	CODE ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANT OFF DUTY COORDINATOR PARKING DATA SPECIALIST PARKING ENFORCEMENT SPECIALIST
16c	ACCOUNTING CLERK II MAINTENANCE REPAIR WORKER POLICE RECORDS TECHNICIAN II
17c	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR II MONEY ROOM COORDINATOR PAINTER PARKING METER MECHANIC
18c	AUTOMOTIVE BODY WORKER COMMUNICATION OPERATOR I EQUIPMENT OPERATOR II/SANITARY EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III MAINTENANCE REPAIR LEAD
19c	AUTOMOTIVE MECHANIC CARPENTER/GENERAL SERVICES FIRE SUPP. SERV. COORD.I FLEET ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST LEAD LIFEGUARD NIGHT-TIME OFF-STREET OPER SUPERVISOR ON STREET METER MAINT & COLLECT SUPV.
20c	CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER COMMUNICATION OPERATOR II CRIME ANALYST CRIME SCENE TECHNICIAN ELECTRICIAN

**EXHIBIT 5I (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS – TEAMSTERS**

Grade	Classifications	
21c	FIRE INSPECTOR FIRE SUPP. SERV. COORD.II RADIO TECHNICIAN	SENIOR AUTOMOTIVE BODY WORKER SENIOR AUTOMOTIVE MECHANIC SENIOR AUTOMOTIVE MECHANIC/TROLLEY
22c	ARTS AND CULTURE SPECIALIST COMMUNICATION OPERATOR III CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR FIRE EQUIPMENT MECHANIC II FOREMAN FOREMAN/GENERAL SERVICES FOREMAN/GREENSPACE FOREMAN/IRRIGATION FOREMAN/MAINTENANCE	HORTICULTURIST MOBILE PERMITTING COORDINATOR PARKING ENFORCEMENT SUPERVISOR PASSPORT COUNTER SUPERVISOR SEWER LINE TECH/SEWER INSPECTOR TROLLEY OPERATIONS SUPERVIS ZONING INSPECTOR FIRE INSPECTOR & PLANS REVIEW SENIOR CRIME SCENE TECHNICIAN
23c	POLICE PROPERTY/EVIDENCE SUPERVISOR POLICE RECORDS SUPERVISOR	ZONING REVIEWER
24c	COMMUNICATION SUPERVISOR CONSTRUCTION MNGR/SURVEY LEAD COORDINATOR/GENERAL SRVCS. COORDINATOR/GREENSPACE MGMT COORDINATOR/R.O.W. FIRE INSPECTOR II	I.T. APPLICATIONS ANALYST I I.T. NETWORK ANALYST I I.T. SYSTEMS ANALYST I SOLID WASTE COORDINATOR ZONING REVIEWER LEAD
25c	ERP ANALYST	TECH SRVCS COORD/CIC COORD
26		
27	I.T. APPLICATIONS ANALYST II I.T. NETWORK ANALYST II	I.T. SYSTEMS ANALYST II
28		
29c	BUILDING INSPECTOR II ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR II	MECHANICAL INSPECTOR I PLUMBING INSPECTOR II

**EXHIBIT 5J
PROPOSED PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS – PART TIME**

Grade	Classifications	
11pt	P/T ENGINEERING AIDE 2 P/T MAINTENANCE WORKER I P/T PARK SERVICE ATTENDANT P/T RECREATION COUNSELOR P/T SERVICE/MAINTENANCE	P/T SPECIAL PROJECTS ASSISTANT P/T SPRING BREAK CAMP COUNSELOR P/T SUMMER ADULT ACTIVITIES INSTRUCTOR P/T SUMMER CAMP COUNSELOR P/T WATER TRUCK OPERATOR

EXHIBIT 5J (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS – PART TIME

Grade	Classifications	
12pt	P/T ADMISSION & CONCESSION SPC SEASONAL P/T ADMISSION/CONCESSION SPEC P/T CLERICAL AIDE	P/T HIGH PERF ATHL COACH SEASONAL P/T HIGH PERF ATHL COACH UNCL. P/T RECEPTIONIST
13pt	P/T BUILDING INSPECTOR P/T CASHIER P/T CROSSING GUARD/PROT SVC WK P/T GUEST SERVICES REP. P/T LIFEGUARD ENTRY LEVEL P/T PARK AMBASSADOR	P/T PROGRAM ASSISTANT P/T RECEPTIONIST/ OFFICE ASST. P/T SPECIALIZED FITNESS COORDINATOR P/T SUMMER CAMP COORDINATOR P/T SUMMER GUEST SERVICES REP P/T SUMMER LIFEGUARD ENTRY LEV
14pt	P/T NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY AIDE P/T SPECIAL PROJECT SPEC.	P/T SPECIAL PROJECTS SPEC.
15pt	P/T GUEST SERVICES REP. SPEC. P/T LIFEGUARD II P/T MAIL/ACCOUNTING CLERK P/T MAINT. WORKER II-SIGN SHOP	P/T MARKETING ASSISTANT P/T MARKETING SPECIALIST P/T PARKING ENFORCEMENT SPEC. P/T PASSPORT AGENT
16pt	P/T MAINTENANCE REPAIR WORKER P/T REPAIR WORKER/FACILITIES	P/T REPAIR WORKER/GENERAL SERVICES P/T UTILITY LOCATOR
17pt	P/T HR CLERICAL ASSISTANT II P/T LIFEGUARD III	P/T PLANS COORDINATOR ASST. P/T PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE SPECIALIST
18pt	P/T ACCOUNTING SPECIALIST P/T ASSISTANT COMMISSION LIAISON	P/T JOURNEYMAN ELECTRICIAN
19pt	P/T ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT P/T AUTOMOTIVE MECHANIC P/T BUILDING MAINTENANCE SPEC	P/T D.E.I COUNSELOR P/T LEAD LIFEGUARD
20pt	P/T CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER P/T COMMUNICATION OPERATOR II P/T DIR OF COACHING YTH SOCCER P/T DOCENT COORDINATOR P/T IT & AV TECHNICIAN	P/T IT TECHNICIAN P/T PAYROLL SPECIALIST II P/T PLANS PROCESSOR P/T SPEC POPL. CNSLR SEASONAL
21pt	P/T FIRE INSPECTOR	P/T RED LIGHT CAMERA COORDINATOR
22pt	P/T BACKGROUND INVESTIGATOR P/T CONTRACT SPECIALIST P/T EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COORD. SPECIALIST P/T FOREMAN	P/T INFO SYSTEMS ANALYST P/T INSPECTOR P/T INT'L. BUSINESS DEV. COORD. P/T PUBLIC REC/DIG MEDIA SPEC.
23pt	P/T ANALYST P/T COMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST P/T PRODUCER/EDITOR/VIDEOGRAPH	P/T RECORDS ANALYST - FIRE P/T TRAINER P/T WEBMASTER/GRAPHIC DESIGNER
24pt	P/T POLICE CIC MONITOR	

**EXHIBIT 5J (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS – PART TIME**

Grade	Classifications
25pt	P/T EXECUTIVE OFFICER P/T LANDSCAPING REVIEWR/INSPECTOR P/T POLICE FLEET MANAGER
26pt	P/T ACCREDITATION MANAGER P/T PROFESSIONAL SURV&MAPPER
27pt	P/T GRANTS/AUDIT COORDINATOR P/T POLICE TRAINING OFFICER
29pt	P/T BUILDING INSPECTOR II P/T CHIEF MECHANICAL OFFICER P/T ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR II
30	
31	
32pt	P/T CHIEF MECHANICAL OFFICIAL
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40pt	P/T CIP PROJECT MANAGER
41	

**EXHIBIT 5K
PROPOSED PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS – PUBLIC SAFETY EXECUTIVE**

Grade	Classifications
36PS	FIRE DIVISION CHIEF INTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMANDER
38PS	ASST CHIEF OF POLICE ADMN SERV ASST CHIEF OF POLICE FOR OPER.
43PS	FIRE CHIEF

After assigning pay grades to classifications, the next step was to develop appropriate methods (options) for transitioning employees’ salaries into the proposed plans. This was done utilizing equitable methods (options) for calculating salaries in the plans and determining whether adjustments were necessary to individual salaries to bring them to their calculated salary. Evergreen calculated and provided a transition method for implementing the new plan, described below.

Hybrid Parity

Realigns employees along their salary range on the basis of their “hybrid years.” A hybrid year would give full credit to an employee for each year they have been serving in their current classification and one-half credit for the amount of time they have spent in any other classification. This is done on a total 30-year basis.

As illustrated in **Exhibit 5L**, adjustments are recommended for 528 employees with a total approximate annualized (salary only) cost of **\$1,901,117.28** and an average adjusted salary of **\$3,600.60** per employee.

**EXHIBIT 5L
RECOMMENDATIONS AND ESTIMATED SALARY COST**

Implementation Option	Total Implementation Cost	# Employees Receiving Adjustments	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Percentage Adjustment
Hybrid Parity	\$1,901,117.28	528	\$3,600.60	4.2%

5.3 SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION

The City’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 system becomes dated and less competitive.

RECOMMENDATION 4: 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 structure (plan) in total will need to be adjusted for several years, a small number of classifications’ pay grades may need to be reassigned more frequently. If the City is experiencing difficulty high turnover or challenges with recruiting one or more classifications, the City should collect salary range data from peer organizations to determine whether an adjustment is needed for the pay grade of the classification(s).

RECOMMENDATION 5: Conduct a comprehensive classification and compensation study every three to five years, subject to budget constraints and as market conditions are warranted.

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. 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 City in less than desirable position for recruiting and retaining quality employees.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Review and revise, as appropriate, existing pay practice guidelines including those for determining salaries of newly hired employees, progressing employee salaries through the pay plans and determining pay increases for employees who have been promoted to a different classification.

The method of moving salaries through the pay plan and setting new salaries for new hires, promotions, and transfers depends largely on an organization's compensation philosophy. It is important for the City to have established guidelines for each of these situations and to ensure that they are followed consistently for all employees. Additionally, the City will need to routinely review non-exempt full-time and part-time hourly rates for internal equity in order to ensure the annual salary reflects the type of work as well as number of hours worked. Common practices for progressing and establishing employee salaries are outlined below.

New Hire Salaries

Typically, an employee holding the minimum education and experience requirements for an existing classification is hired at or near the classification's pay grade minimum. Sometimes, for recruiting purposes an organization might need to consider the ability to offer salaries to new employees that consider prior related experience. It is recommended that the City establish new hire salaries while preserving the internal equity of employees' salaries within each classification to the extent possible. Current employees' salaries should be improved to some degree with implementation of the new plans and the proposed potential adjustments to employees' salaries.

Salary Progression

There are several common methods for salary progression including cost of living adjustments (COLA)/across the board and performance-based. It is recommended that the City evaluate, annually, whether a COLA needs to be applied (to both the pay plan and employees' salaries) to keep up with cost of living. Additionally, the City should continue to provide merit increases, as warranted based on employees' performance evaluation results and as budget permits. It is also recommended that the City continuously evaluate its practices to progress employees' salaries, and if necessary, make improvements to preserve equitable pay practices, particularly in the administration of the employee performance evaluation process.

5.4 SUMMARY

The recommendations in this chapter provide an update to the compensation and classification system for the City's employees. Upon implementation, the City's competitiveness in the labor market will be improved and it will have a responsive compensation system for several years to come. While the upkeep of this will require work, the City will find that having a highly competitive compensation system that enhances strong recruitment and employee retention is well worth this commitment.