

Compensation Study for Lake County, FL FINAL REPORT



Evergreen Solutions, LLC

May 3, 2016

Table of Contents

	PAGE
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Study Methodology.....	1-1
1.2 Report Organization.....	1-2
2.0 MARKET SUMMARY.....	2-1
2.1 Public Sector Salary Survey Results.....	2-1
2.2 Private Sector Market Data	2-7
2.3 Summary.....	2-9
3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	3-1
3.1 Compensation Analysis.....	3-1
3.2 System Administration	3-9
3.3 Pay Practices.....	3-9
3.4 Summary.....	3-11
APPENDIX A: COMPENSATION STUDY DATA FOR LAKE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (LAKE EMS)	



Chapter 1 - Introduction

In December 2015, Evergreen Solutions was retained by Lake County, FL (County) to conduct a Compensation Study. The methodology and work plan developed to conduct this study was designed to examine the compensation for selected classifications compared to the identified peers. Analyzing the results of the data enabled Evergreen Solutions to assess the external equity, or differences between the County' compensation system and what is similarly available in the market.

Specifically, Evergreen Solutions was tasked to perform the following:

- evaluate the current compensation systems and determine the strengths and weaknesses of the current pay plans;
- conduct a salary survey and provide an external assessment summary regarding the structures' market competitiveness;
- develop strategic positioning recommendations using market data and best practices;
- develop competitive compensation structures; and
- develop and submit draft and final reports summarizing findings and recommendations.

1.1 STUDY METHODOLOGY

Evergreen Solutions combined qualitative as well as quantitative data analysis to produce an equitable solution with the purpose of maximizing the competitiveness of the compensation structures and practices.

Study activities included:

- conducting a project kick-off meeting;
- conducting a market salary survey;
- developing recommendations for competitive pay structures;
- creating implementation plans for the proposed compensation systems; and
- creating draft and final reports.



Kickoff Meeting

The kickoff meeting with the County's project team provided Evergreen Solutions an opportunity to discuss specific study goals, finalize the work plan, and begin the data collection process. The collection of relevant background material (including existing pay plans, current job descriptions, employee salary data, and other pertinent material) was a part of this process.

Salary Survey

For the salary survey, peers were identified that compete with the County for human resources and provide similar services. A specified number of classifications were selected to be included in the salary survey. The salary data collected during this survey were analyzed, and a summary of this market data can be found in **Chapter 2** of this report.

Concurrently, Evergreen Solutions was asked to collect salary data for Lake Emergency Medical Services (Lake EMS). This was accomplished utilizing the same salary survey methodology. The salary data collected can be found in **Appendix A**.

Recommendations

During this phase of the study, Evergreen Solutions proposed utilizing the current pay plan and assigned each classification a pay grade based on the analysis of the salary survey results. The goal was to improve the competitiveness of those classification ranges that were below the market average. Recommendations were made for all classifications; those that were surveyed and those that were not. Next, the cost associated with adjusting salaries of some employees were estimated. A summary of the grade recommendations and the implementation of the new grades can be found in **Chapter 3** of this report. Likewise, recommendations for Lake EMS are presented in **Appendix A**.

1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

The remainder of this report includes the following chapters:

- **Chapter 2** – Market Summary
- **Chapter 3** – Recommendations



Chapter 2 – Market Summary

This chapter provides the County a market analysis in which the existing pay plan's salary ranges were compared to the salary ranges of peer organizations. The data from targeted peers were used to evaluate the competitiveness of the salary structure at the time of this study. It is important to note that the market comparison contained herein does not translate at the individual level and are instead used to provide the County with an overall analyses. The utilized methodology is not intended to evaluate particular salaries offered to individuals because individual compensation is determined through a combination of factors, which could include: the demand for a particular job, a candidate's prior experience, or an individual's negotiation skills during the hiring process.

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

2.1 PUBLIC SECTOR SALARY SURVEY RESULTS

Evergreen Solutions collected pay range information from targeted public sector peers utilizing a survey tool. Development of this tool included identifying 94 County classifications to be surveyed. The title, a description of the assigned duties, and the education and experience requirements were provided in the survey tool for each surveyed classification.

The public sector peers were selected by Evergreen Solutions in collaboration with the County's project team. Several factors were utilized when developing this peer list, including geographic proximity to the County, organization size, and the relative population size being served by the organizations. All data collected were adjusted for cost of living using a national cost of living index factor which allowed any salary information from organizations outside of the immediate area to be adjusted for the cost of living relative to the County. **Exhibit 2A** provides the list of 34 market peers from which data were collected. The list of peers for the Lake EMS survey are provided in **Appendix A**.



EXHIBIT 2A MARKET PEERS

Peer Data Collected	
Clearwater, FL	Seminole County, FL
Clermont, FL	Volusia County, FL
Daytona Beach, FL	Lake County, FL Clerk of Court
Deland, FL	Marion County, FL Clerk of Court
Deltona, FL	Polk County FL, Clerk of Court
Kissimmee, FL	Volusia County, FL Clerk of Court
Lakeland, FL	Marion County, FL Sheriff
Mount Dora, FL	Orange County, FL Sheriff
St. Cloud, FL	Pinellas County, FL Sheriff
St. Petersburg, FL	Seminole County, FL Sheriff
Tampa, FL	School District of Volusia County, FL
Tavares, FL	School District of Lake County, FL
Marion County, FL	School District of Marion County, FL
Orange County, FL	School District of Orange County, FL
Osceola County, FL	School District of Osceola County, FL
Pinellas County, FL	School District of Pinellas County, FL
Polk County, FL	School District of Seminole County, FL

Based on guidance from the County, Evergreen Solutions utilized a comparison of their existing structure's salary ranges, to the average of the resultant peer data. Comparing to, and subsequently positioning pay grades to be more similar to the market average would provide the County with a more competitive pay plan. **Exhibit 2B** provides a summary of the results of the salary market data for the County. The results for Lake EMS are provided in **Appendix A**.

Data is provided for 89 of the 94 benchmark classifications for which sufficient data (three or more responses) were collected. The exhibit contains the following information:

- The market range minimum, midpoint, and maximum. The survey range minimum indicates the average of the minimum peer salary data for each classification provided by the peer organizations. Survey range midpoint provides the average of the midpoint of the peer respondents for each classification surveyed. Survey range maximum provides the average of the maximum of the survey participants for each classification surveyed.
- The differentials for the minimum, midpoint and maximum of each range. These are the results of the County's current salary ranges compared to the collected market data. The differentials specify how the existing salary range for each benchmark

compared to the market average shown in the exhibit. A positive differential indicates the County was above market for that classification at the range minimum, midpoint, or maximum. A negative differential indicates the County was below market for that classification. In the final row of the exhibit, the average percent differentials for the range minimum, midpoint, and maximum are provided. This was calculated by averaging all of the classifications' percent differentials.

- The survey average range width. The second column from the right provides the average range width for each classification surveyed, which is determined by the average maximums minus the average minimums divided by the average minimums. The average range spread for all of the classifications is provided in the final row of the exhibit.
- The total number of survey responses for each benchmark classification. This is provided in the final column, and the average number of responses for all of the classifications is provided in the final row.

EXHIBIT 2B SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
Area Maintenance Supervisor	\$41,507.57	-5.1%	\$53,188.00	0.2%	\$64,868.43	3.2%	57.4%	13
Assistant County Attorney III	\$80,009.65	-22.5%	\$106,960.66	-21.4%	\$133,911.68	-20.8%	69.2%	11
Battalion Fire Chief	\$57,960.93	-4.9%	\$76,162.31	-2.2%	\$94,363.69	-0.6%	63.7%	6
Biological Associate	\$28,876.07	-2.3%	\$37,549.55	1.4%	\$46,223.03	3.5%	60.1%	7
Branch Supervisor	\$47,169.75	-19.4%	\$60,388.08	-13.4%	\$73,606.40	-9.8%	57.6%	7
Budget Manager	\$56,634.20	-2.5%	\$75,225.09	-1.0%	\$93,815.98	-0.1%	65.5%	15
Chief Inspector	\$55,896.82	-30.2%	\$71,568.83	-23.6%	\$87,240.84	-19.7%	56.9%	8
Chief Planner	\$58,180.68	-14.5%	\$71,249.26	-4.0%	\$86,998.93	-0.9%	56.9%	11
Code Enforcement Officer	\$33,675.56	-9.7%	\$43,575.67	-5.2%	\$53,475.79	-2.6%	60.6%	14
Code Enforcement Supervisor	\$41,251.05	-23.6%	\$53,179.78	-18.1%	\$65,108.50	-14.9%	58.4%	6
Commissioners Aide	\$36,083.87	-8.1%	\$46,721.52	-3.8%	\$57,359.18	-1.2%	58.4%	7
Communications Director	\$69,130.84	-15.0%	\$89,164.35	-10.0%	\$109,197.87	-7.1%	58.2%	8
Community Services Director	\$76,832.71	0.5%	\$100,518.95	3.5%	\$124,205.20	5.3%	61.4%	7
Construction Inspection Supervisor	\$62,311.47	-22.7%	\$71,498.52	-4.4%	\$85,757.80	0.5%	51.1%	6
Construction Inspector II	\$42,944.34	-8.7%	\$53,229.53	0.1%	\$63,514.73	5.3%	49.7%	10
Disaster Assistance Specialist	\$40,812.67	-12.3%	\$54,869.03	-12.0%	\$68,925.40	-11.8%	70.1%	6
Economic Development & Tourism Coordinator	\$47,187.27	-1.1%	\$59,595.03	5.4%	\$72,002.78	9.2%	52.4%	5
Economic Growth Director	\$82,475.49	1.9%	\$106,895.96	5.7%	\$131,316.43	7.9%	59.6%	8
Emergency Management Associate	\$39,583.71	-18.6%	\$53,376.30	-18.5%	\$67,168.88	-18.5%	71.1%	6
Engineer II	\$54,206.88	-6.7%	\$70,294.98	-2.6%	\$86,383.09	-0.2%	59.5%	9

**EXHIBIT 2B (CONTINUED)
SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY**

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
Engineer IV	\$66,378.92	-10.5%	\$83,588.65	-3.1%	\$100,798.38	1.2%	55.0%	9
Enterprise Technology Architect	\$65,557.59	-0.4%	\$82,734.75	6.1%	\$99,911.91	9.9%	53.0%	9
Environmental Waste Technician	\$35,175.99	-24.6%	\$43,077.67	-13.1%	\$50,979.34	-6.4%	47.0%	6
Equipment Operator I	\$27,220.01	-24.0%	\$34,421.09	-16.3%	\$41,622.17	-11.7%	53.7%	11
Equipment Operator III	\$32,095.79	-23.6%	\$40,377.97	-15.3%	\$48,660.15	-10.4%	52.8%	12
Facilities & Fleet Management Director	\$84,620.78	-0.7%	\$102,449.36	9.6%	\$124,724.17	12.6%	57.6%	13
Financial Associate	\$29,996.80	2.3%	\$38,594.04	6.8%	\$47,191.27	9.4%	57.1%	12
Fire Lieutenant/EMT	\$51,398.48	-19.5%	\$62,513.77	-7.7%	\$73,629.05	-0.7%	44.0%	9
Firefighter/EMT	\$33,813.91	6.7%	\$45,969.60	6.1%	\$54,744.96	11.2%	47.6%	10
Fiscal & Administrative Services Director	\$78,953.52	-2.2%	\$103,446.17	0.7%	\$127,938.81	2.5%	62.8%	20
GIS Administrator	\$50,826.34	8.0%	\$66,619.66	10.6%	\$82,412.97	12.1%	63.8%	9
Human Resources Director	\$81,108.66	-5.0%	\$106,990.15	-2.7%	\$132,811.56	-1.2%	64.5%	22
Human Resources Manager	\$56,952.58	-3.1%	\$75,074.79	-0.8%	\$93,197.00	0.6%	64.9%	14
Human Resources Specialist	\$37,454.32	5.2%	\$49,031.35	8.0%	\$60,608.38	9.6%	62.9%	16
Information Technology Director	\$77,706.61	-0.6%	\$101,295.79	2.8%	\$124,640.16	5.0%	61.1%	22
Internet Applications Developer	\$53,691.01	2.8%	\$69,514.99	6.7%	\$85,028.79	9.3%	59.5%	12
Laboratory Associate	\$32,541.83	-15.3%	\$40,230.60	-5.7%	\$47,919.37	0.0%	47.8%	5
Laboratory Supervisor	\$59,726.39	-27.9%	\$74,149.98	-17.7%	\$88,573.58	-11.7%	49.6%	5
Laborer	\$22,287.17	-30.5%	\$29,353.91	-27.4%	\$36,420.65	-25.6%	69.5%	9
LAN/WAN Specialist	\$48,545.84	-4.0%	\$63,123.37	-0.2%	\$77,700.91	2.0%	61.3%	9
Landfill Attendant	\$24,349.50	-11.0%	\$30,240.51	-2.2%	\$36,131.53	3.0%	49.5%	6
Librarian I	\$37,802.54	-4.0%	\$48,135.08	1.8%	\$58,467.62	5.2%	56.5%	7
Librarian II	\$42,309.02	-7.1%	\$53,842.95	-1.1%	\$65,376.88	2.5%	56.2%	6
Library Assistant I	\$25,296.99	-25.3%	\$32,122.79	-18.0%	\$38,948.60	-13.7%	55.1%	9
Maintenance Technician II	\$30,607.85	-8.4%	\$38,646.33	-1.5%	\$46,684.82	2.6%	53.4%	7
Maintenance Worker II	\$24,563.03	-11.9%	\$31,215.08	-5.5%	\$37,867.13	-1.6%	54.7%	8
Mechanic I	\$32,554.43	-25.4%	\$42,720.53	-22.0%	\$52,886.64	-20.0%	64.7%	18
Network Administrator	\$53,130.56	-4.6%	\$69,487.11	-1.4%	\$85,843.65	0.4%	62.3%	19
Office Associate III	\$27,056.49	-4.2%	\$34,555.54	1.3%	\$42,054.59	4.6%	56.5%	13
Office Associate IV	\$30,515.29	-8.1%	\$38,519.76	-1.2%	\$46,524.22	2.9%	53.2%	14
Paralegal	\$37,478.79	5.1%	\$48,285.80	9.4%	\$59,092.81	11.9%	58.2%	16
Park Attendant	\$22,661.94	-3.3%	\$28,170.61	4.8%	\$33,679.28	9.6%	49.1%	9
Park Ranger	\$35,048.46	-24.2%	\$45,010.02	-18.2%	\$54,971.57	-14.7%	57.3%	6
Parts & Supply Technician	\$30,599.41	-39.4%	\$40,270.62	-36.1%	\$49,941.84	-34.1%	63.0%	9
Permitting Technician I	\$29,530.33	-13.8%	\$38,295.00	-9.4%	\$47,059.67	-6.8%	59.9%	12
Permitting Technician II	\$31,513.07	-2.6%	\$39,651.68	4.2%	\$47,790.28	8.3%	51.9%	7
Planner	\$41,634.68	-5.4%	\$53,330.32	-0.1%	\$65,025.96	3.0%	56.5%	16
Probation Associate II	\$23,007.88	-4.8%	\$29,052.78	1.8%	\$35,097.69	5.8%	52.9%	5
Probation Officer	\$34,952.59	-4.7%	\$44,674.47	0.8%	\$54,396.35	4.0%	56.4%	3
Procurement Manager	\$54,457.73	1.4%	\$70,126.44	5.9%	\$85,795.14	8.5%	57.5%	10
Program Supervisor	\$47,743.28	-20.9%	\$60,581.52	-13.7%	\$73,419.76	-9.5%	55.0%	6
Programming & Application Support Division Manager	\$60,326.93	-0.4%	\$81,738.41	-0.9%	\$103,149.89	-1.1%	70.5%	10
Public Information Officer	\$47,327.69	6.8%	\$61,517.58	10.2%	\$75,707.47	12.2%	59.5%	8

**EXHIBIT 2B (CONTINUED)
SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY**

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg	# Resp
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Range	
Public Resources Director	\$82,429.37	1.9%	\$107,294.20	5.3%	\$132,159.03	7.3%	61.4%	5
Public Safety Director/Fire Chief	\$78,383.24	6.7%	\$104,740.80	7.6%	\$131,098.36	8.1%	67.4%	9
Public Works Director	\$80,658.37	4.0%	\$106,669.81	5.9%	\$132,681.25	7.0%	65.3%	13
Radio Services Technician	\$42,638.02	-7.9%	\$54,913.83	-3.1%	\$67,189.64	-0.2%	56.6%	8
Right-Of-Way Agent II	\$38,918.06	1.5%	\$51,092.47	4.1%	\$63,266.87	5.6%	62.9%	7
Right-Of-Way GIS Associate	\$33,104.36	-17.3%	\$40,866.22	-7.3%	\$48,628.09	-1.5%	47.3%	4
Risk & Benefits Representative	\$32,994.68	-7.5%	\$42,828.23	-3.4%	\$52,661.79	-1.1%	60.6%	6
Risk & Benefits Specialist	\$40,560.41	-2.7%	\$51,223.96	3.8%	\$61,887.51	7.7%	53.6%	11
Roads Maintenance Operator	\$25,476.95	-26.1%	\$32,085.80	-17.8%	\$38,694.66	-13.0%	52.5%	7
Roads Superintendent	\$57,259.31	-3.6%	\$72,597.40	2.6%	\$87,935.48	6.2%	54.0%	7
Scales Attendant I	\$25,641.37	-7.4%	\$32,696.51	-1.5%	\$39,751.65	1.9%	55.9%	7
Senior Budget Analyst	\$48,795.37	-13.7%	\$63,777.42	-10.1%	\$78,759.46	-8.0%	62.7%	14
Senior Building Inspector	\$40,529.28	-2.6%	\$51,864.66	2.6%	\$63,200.04	5.7%	56.0%	7
Senior CAD Technician	\$38,508.17	2.5%	\$47,617.87	10.6%	\$56,727.56	15.4%	48.9%	5
Senior Contracting Officer	\$43,712.59	-1.8%	\$56,423.19	2.6%	\$69,133.80	5.2%	58.9%	6
Senior GIS Analyst	\$42,010.23	2.1%	\$55,513.21	4.2%	\$69,016.20	5.3%	65.4%	8
Senior Planner	\$49,547.18	-15.4%	\$63,591.13	-9.8%	\$77,635.09	-6.5%	57.1%	17
Senior Plans Examiner	\$47,984.12	-11.8%	\$61,380.48	-6.0%	\$74,776.85	-2.6%	56.3%	10
Sign & Striping Technician I	\$29,535.81	-23.7%	\$37,939.73	-17.8%	\$46,343.65	-14.4%	57.7%	12
Software Developer	\$57,160.84	-3.5%	\$71,354.70	4.2%	\$85,548.56	8.8%	53.4%	9
Spray Truck Operator	\$24,522.03	-11.7%	\$32,255.37	-9.0%	\$39,988.71	-7.3%	64.2%	6
Survey Party Chief (Non-Registered)	\$36,326.26	-8.8%	\$47,449.04	-5.4%	\$58,571.82	-3.3%	61.7%	7
Survey Technician II	\$28,017.50	-17.3%	\$36,526.09	-13.4%	\$45,034.67	-11.1%	62.2%	6
Trades Crew Leader	\$34,774.85	-13.3%	\$43,966.91	-6.2%	\$53,158.98	-2.0%	52.9%	8
Traffic Signal Technician	\$33,382.23	-8.7%	\$43,080.88	-4.1%	\$52,779.52	-1.3%	58.2%	9
Web Designer (Front End Developer)	\$50,984.97	-9.2%	\$65,580.93	-4.1%	\$80,176.89	-1.1%	59.1%	8
Overall Average		-9.0%		-3.7%		-0.4%	57.9%	9.5

Market Minimums

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

As **Exhibit 2B** illustrates, for the surveyed classifications, the County was, on average, approximately 9.0 percent below market at the minimum of the respective salary ranges. Several conclusions can be drawn based on the collected data:

- The surveyed position differentials ranged from 39.4 percent below market minimum in the case of the Parts & Supply Technician to 8.0 percent above market for the GIS Administrator.
- Of the 89 positions for which data were collected, 73 classifications (82.0 percent) had differentials which were below market at the minimum.

- Of the 73 positions with below market minimum differentials, 16 (21.9 percent) had differentials greater than 20.0 percent.

Market Midpoints

This section explores the comparison between the average of the peer midpoints and the midpoints for classifications at the County. Market midpoints are important to consider because they are commonly recognized as the salary point at which employees have achieved full proficiency, and are performing satisfactorily in their classification. As such, midpoint is often considered as the salary point at which a fully proficient employee could expect their salary to be placed.

As **Exhibit 2B** illustrates, for the surveyed classifications, the County was, on average, approximately 3.7 percent below market at the midpoint of the respective salary ranges. Several conclusions can be drawn based on the collected data:

- The surveyed position differentials ranged from 36.1 percent below market midpoint in the case of the County's Parts & Supply Technician to 10.6 percent above market for the Senior CAD Technician.
- Of the 89 positions for which data were collected, 54 classifications (60.7 percent) had differentials which were below market at the midpoint.
- Of the 54 positions with below market midpoint differentials, 5 (9.3 percent) had differentials greater than 20.0 percent.

Market Maximums

In this section, the average of the peer salary range maximums are compared to the County range maximums for each benchmarked classification. The market maximum is significant as it represents the upper limit salary that an organization might provide to retain and/or reward experienced and high performing incumbents. Being competitive at the maximum allows organizations to attract highly qualified employees for in-demand positions.

As **Exhibit 2B** illustrates, for the surveyed classifications, the County was, on average, approximately 0.4 percent below market at the maximum of the respective salary ranges. Several conclusions can be drawn based on the collected data:

- The surveyed position differentials ranged from 34.1 percent below market maximum in the case of the County's Parts & Supply Technician to 15.4 percent above market for the Senior CAD Technician.
- Of the 89 positions for which data were collected, 42 classifications (47.2 percent) had differentials which were below market at the maximum.
- Of the 42 positions with below market maximum differentials, 4 (9.5 percent) had differentials greater than 20.0 percent.

2.2 PRIVATE SECTOR MARKET DATA

Some of the positions surveyed in the public sector could also be found in the private sector. To supplement the public sector data for these positions, private sector salary data for December 2015 from Economic Research Institute (ERI) were analyzed. **Exhibit 2C** summarizes the ERI private sector salary data for government support industries with similar budgets in Orlando, the closest available data region. While salary data from the private sector are useful in determining characteristics of the market as a whole, there are inherent differences between private and public sector classifications which make it difficult to draw conclusions about public sector salary ranges entirely from private sector data. Only those classifications with skills that were more easily transferable to the private sector are included in **Exhibit 2C**. Private sector market data were considered when making pay grade recommendations, which are discussed in **Chapter 3** of this report. Private sector salary data for Lake EMS is provided in **Appendix A**.

**EXHIBIT 2C
PRIVATE SECTOR MARKET DATA**

Classification	ERI Minimum	% Diff at Minimum	ERI Midpoint	% Diff at Midpoint	ERI Maximum	% Diff at Maximum	Survey Avg Range
Budget Manager	\$61,871.00	-12.0%	\$ 82,462.00	-10.7%	\$109,284.00	-16.5%	76.6%
Chief Planner	\$54,500.00	-7.3%	\$ 72,965.00	-6.5%	\$ 98,334.00	-14.1%	80.4%
Communications Director	\$83,953.00	-39.7%	\$103,094.00	-27.2%	\$125,448.00	-23.0%	49.4%
Engineer II	\$44,555.00	12.3%	\$ 60,720.00	11.4%	\$ 82,467.00	4.3%	85.1%
Enterprise Technology Architect	\$74,033.00	-13.4%	\$ 88,582.00	-0.5%	\$108,081.00	2.5%	46.0%
Equipment Operator III	\$32,073.00	-23.6%	\$ 42,514.00	-21.4%	\$ 55,484.00	-25.9%	73.0%
Facilities & Fleet Management Director	\$82,305.00	2.1%	\$ 99,831.00	11.9%	\$120,346.00	15.6%	46.2%
Human Resources Director	\$89,723.00	-16.1%	\$109,927.00	-5.5%	\$133,402.00	-1.7%	48.7%
Human Resources Manager	\$59,415.00	-7.5%	\$ 79,731.00	-7.0%	\$107,076.00	-14.2%	80.2%
Human Resources Specialist	\$42,635.00	-7.9%	\$ 52,242.00	1.9%	\$ 65,585.00	2.2%	53.8%
Information Technology Director	\$91,204.00	-18.1%	\$109,030.00	-4.6%	\$129,592.00	1.2%	42.1%
Internet Applications Developer	\$47,645.00	13.8%	\$ 61,713.00	17.2%	\$ 80,314.00	14.3%	68.6%
Laboratory Associate	\$25,690.00	9.0%	\$ 34,551.00	9.3%	\$ 45,033.00	6.0%	75.3%
Laboratory Supervisor	\$41,314.00	11.5%	\$ 56,308.00	10.6%	\$ 76,685.00	3.3%	85.6%
Laborer	\$23,008.00	-34.7%	\$ 31,313.00	-35.9%	\$ 40,764.00	-40.6%	77.2%
Librarian I	\$37,075.00	-2.0%	\$ 48,239.00	1.6%	\$ 62,717.00	-1.7%	69.2%
Library Assistant I	\$22,944.00	-13.6%	\$ 29,943.00	-10.0%	\$ 38,244.00	-11.6%	66.7%
Maintenance Technician II	\$27,083.00	4.0%	\$ 37,837.00	0.6%	\$ 50,932.00	-6.3%	88.1%
Mechanic I	\$33,584.00	-29.4%	\$ 42,541.00	-21.5%	\$ 53,930.00	-22.4%	60.6%
Network Administrator	\$46,568.00	8.3%	\$ 63,091.00	7.9%	\$ 85,759.00	0.5%	84.2%
Paralegal	\$38,429.00	2.7%	\$ 53,684.00	-0.8%	\$ 72,338.00	-7.9%	88.2%
Parts & Supply Technician	\$22,191.00	-1.1%	\$ 29,162.00	1.5%	\$ 37,674.00	-1.1%	69.8%
Planner	\$40,397.00	-2.3%	\$ 54,332.00	-2.0%	\$ 72,860.00	-8.7%	80.4%
Procurement Manager	\$55,117.00	0.2%	\$ 74,399.00	0.1%	\$ 99,340.00	-5.9%	80.2%
Radio Services Technician	\$37,277.00	5.6%	\$ 47,980.00	9.9%	\$ 61,956.00	7.6%	66.2%
Right-Of-Way Agent II	\$40,949.00	-3.7%	\$ 53,037.00	0.4%	\$ 68,680.00	-2.4%	67.7%
Scales Attendant I	\$23,638.00	1.0%	\$ 32,144.00	0.2%	\$ 42,392.00	-4.6%	79.3%
Software Developer	\$52,869.00	4.3%	\$ 71,902.00	3.5%	\$ 96,408.00	-2.8%	82.4%
Overall Average		-5.6%		-2.3%		-5.5%	70.4%

After examining the private sector data, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- For the selected classifications, the County was approximately 5.6 percent below the private sector minimum.
- For the selected classifications, the County was approximately 2.3 percent below the private sector midpoint.
- For the selected classifications, the County was approximately 5.5 percent below the private sector maximum.

Additional Information Regarding Merit Pay

When surveying market peer organizations, the County wished to obtain additional pay system/practice related information. Primarily, the County was interested in obtaining information from its peers related to merit or pay performance pay. Detailed information from the peers has been provided to the County under separate cover. However, below is the summary of the 13 respondents providing a response to the following question:

- **Does the peer organization offer Merit Pay or Pay for Performance Pay?**
 - Of the responding peers, 11 provided some form of merit pay for which the maximum amount (~3%) was typically described as dependent on and determined by the organization’s annual budget.

2.3 SUMMARY

It should again be noted that the standing of a classification’s pay range compared to the market is not a definitive assessment of an individual employee’s salary being equally above or below market. A salary range does, however, speak to the County’s general ability to recruit and retain talent over time. If a range minimum is significantly lower than the market would offer, the County could lose out to the market peers when seeking to fill a position. It is equally true that range maximums lower than the market maximums may serve as a disincentive for tenured employees to remain with the organizations.

This analysis provided a comparison of the existing compensation structures, to the available market peer data at the time of the study. Some classifications had ranges that were ahead of the market while some were well behind. Overall, when comparing the public sector data at the desired position in the market, the County’s current pay plan was behind their peers. Based on these findings, appropriate recommendations are discussed in **Chapter 3** of this report. Findings and recommendations for Lake EMS are presented in **Appendix A**.



Chapter 3 – Recommendations

The analysis of the County compensation system revealed areas of opportunities for improving its competitiveness. The existing pay plans were designed well and suited the needs of the County. Evergreen Solutions determined that adjusting the pay grades of positions that were below the market average would be the most appropriate method of developing a more competitive pay structure. The focus was placed specifically on recommending pay ranges that should remain competitive for several years with some maintenance by the Human Resources staff. These recommendations, as well as the findings that led to each, are presented in this chapter.

3.1 COMPENSATION ANALYSIS

The compensation analysis consisted of the external market assessment (salary survey). During this assessment, the County's pay ranges for selected benchmark classifications were compared to average pay ranges offered in the identified market. Overall, the salary ranges were below market peers at the minimum, midpoint and maximum of the desired average market position. Details of the external market assessment were provided in **Chapter 2** of this report.

FINDING:

The salary ranges were behind market for a number of the benchmarked classifications indicating a need for revision to the pay grades of some positions to remain competitive.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Utilizing the existing structure, based on salary survey results and a review of internal equity, slot all classifications into the existing pay structure; and propose a method for transitioning employee' salaries into the proposed pay grades.

Exhibit 3A provides the General and Public Safety pay plans for the County.



**EXHIBIT 3A
EXISTING COUNTY PAY PLAN**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
General Employees					
10	\$ 17,076.80	\$ 23,036.00	\$ 28,995.20	69.8%	14
11	\$ 18,574.40	\$ 25,032.80	\$ 31,491.20	69.5%	1
12	\$ 20,196.80	\$ 27,227.20	\$ 34,257.60	69.6%	44
13	\$ 21,944.00	\$ 29,598.40	\$ 37,252.80	69.8%	45
14	\$ 23,878.40	\$ 32,198.40	\$ 40,518.40	69.7%	17
15	\$ 25,958.40	\$ 35,016.80	\$ 44,075.20	69.8%	69
16	\$ 28,225.60	\$ 38,074.40	\$ 47,923.20	69.8%	35
17	\$ 30,700.80	\$ 41,402.40	\$ 52,104.00	69.7%	46
18	\$ 33,384.00	\$ 45,032.00	\$ 56,680.00	69.8%	44
19	\$ 36,337.60	\$ 49,004.80	\$ 61,672.00	69.7%	18
20	\$ 39,499.20	\$ 53,268.80	\$ 67,038.40	69.7%	69
21	\$ 42,931.20	\$ 57,917.60	\$ 72,904.00	69.8%	31
22	\$ 46,696.00	\$ 62,982.40	\$ 79,268.80	69.8%	28
23	\$ 50,793.60	\$ 68,504.80	\$ 86,216.00	69.7%	16
24	\$ 55,244.80	\$ 74,505.60	\$ 93,766.40	69.7%	18
25	\$ 60,091.20	\$ 81,047.20	\$102,003.20	69.7%	13
26	\$ 65,312.00	\$ 88,098.40	\$110,884.80	69.8%	9
27	\$ 71,052.80	\$ 95,825.60	\$120,598.40	69.7%	3
28	\$ 77,251.20	\$104,218.40	\$131,185.60	69.8%	6
29	\$ 84,032.00	\$112,912.80	\$142,625.60	69.7%	5
30	\$ 89,564.80	\$120,806.40	\$152,048.00	69.8%	1
Public Safety Employees					
210	\$ 36,254.40	\$ 48,950.72	\$ 61,647.04	70.0%	85
210P	\$ 43,388.80	\$ 56,085.12	\$ 68,781.44	58.5%	44
213	\$ 43,010.24	\$ 58,065.28	\$ 73,120.32	70.0%	36
213P	\$ 50,144.64	\$ 65,199.68	\$ 80,254.72	60.0%	15
23S	\$ 50,814.40	\$ 68,519.36	\$ 86,224.32	69.7%	6
Average/Total				69.0%	718

Utilizing the existing pay plans, Evergreen Solutions slotted each classification into the appropriate pay grade (range) in each pay plan. Assigning pay grades to classifications required a balance of internal equity, desired market position, and consideration of recruitment and retention issues. Utilizing this method enabled Evergreen Solutions to slot all classifications into proposed pay grades including those for which no salary data were collected. The recommended pay grades for all benchmarked classifications are shown in **Exhibit 3B**. Similarly, the pay grades for those classifications that were not benchmarked are shown in **Exhibit 3C**.



**EXHIBIT 3B
PROPOSED PAY GRADES
FOR BENCHMARKED CLASSIFICATIONS**

County Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
LABORER PARK ATTENDANT	13N	\$21,944.00	\$ 29,598.40	\$ 37,252.80
LANDFILL ATTENDANT MAINTENANCE WORKER II PROBATION ASSOCIATE II SPRAY TRUCK OPERATOR	14N	\$23,878.40	\$ 32,198.40	\$ 40,518.40
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I LIBRARY ASSISTANT I OFFICE ASSOCIATE III ROADS MAINTENANCE OPERATOR SCALES ATTENDANT I	15N	\$25,958.40	\$ 35,016.80	\$ 44,075.20
PARTS & SUPPLY TECHNICIAN PERMITTING TECHNICIAN I SURVEY TECHNICIAN II	16N	\$28,225.60	\$ 38,074.40	\$ 47,923.20
BIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATE EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III FINANCIAL ASSOCIATE MAINTENANCE TECHNICIAN II OFFICE ASSOCIATE IV PERMITTING TECHNICIAN II SIGN & STRIPING TECHNCIAN I	17N	\$30,700.80	\$ 41,402.40	\$ 52,104.00
CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER LABORATORY ASSOCIATE MECHANIC I PARK RANGER PROBATION OFFICER RIGHT-OF-WAY GIS ASSOCIATE RISK & BENEFITS REPRESENTATIVE TRADES CREW LEADER TRAFFIC SIGNAL TECHNICIAN	18N	\$33,384.00	\$ 45,032.00	\$ 56,680.00
COMMISSIONERS AIDE ENVIRONMENTAL WASTE TECHNICIAN SURVEY PARTY CHIEF (NON-REGIS)	19N	\$36,337.60	\$ 49,004.80	\$ 61,672.00
AREA MAINTENANCE SUPERVISOR HUMAN RESOURCES SPECIALIST LIBRARIAN I RISK AND BENEFITS SPECIALIST	20E	\$39,499.20	\$ 53,268.80	\$ 67,038.40
CODE ENFORCEMENT SUPERVISOR DISASTER ASSISTANCE SPECIALIST EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATE PARALEGAL PLANNER RADIO SERVICES TECHNICIAN RIGHT-OF-WAY AGENT II SENIOR BUILDING INSPECTOR SENIOR CAD TECHNICIAN	20N	\$39,499.20	\$ 53,268.80	\$ 67,038.40



EXHIBIT 3B (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADES
FOR BENCHMARKED CLASSIFICATIONS

County Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
LIBRARIAN II SENIOR CONTRACTING OFFICER	21E	\$42,931.20	\$ 57,917.60	\$ 72,904.00
CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR II PROGRAM SUPERVISOR SENIOR GIS ANALYST	21N	\$42,931.20	\$ 57,917.60	\$ 72,904.00
ECONOMIC DEV & TOURISM COORD SENIOR BUDGET ANALYST	22E	\$46,696.00	\$ 62,982.40	\$ 79,268.80
BRANCH SUPERVISOR LAN/WAN SPECIALIST PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER SENIOR PLANNER WEB DESIGNER (FRONT END DEV)	23E	\$50,793.60	\$ 68,504.80	\$ 86,216.00
SENIOR PLANS EXAMINER	23N	\$50,793.60	\$ 68,504.80	\$ 86,216.00
CHIEF PLANNER GIS ADMINISTRATOR HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER INTERNET APPLICATIONS DEVELOPE NETWORK ADMINISTRATOR PROCUREMENT MANAGER ROADS SUPERINTENDENT SOFTWARE DEVELOPER	24E	\$55,244.80	\$ 74,505.60	\$ 93,766.40
CHIEF INSPECTOR ENGINEER II	24N	\$55,244.80	\$ 74,505.60	\$ 93,766.40
BUDGET MANAGER CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION SUPV LABORATORY SUPERVISOR PRGRMNG & APPL SUPPORT DIV MGR	25E	\$60,091.20	\$ 81,047.20	\$102,003.20
ENGINEER IV ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY ARCHITEC	26E	\$65,312.00	\$ 88,098.40	\$110,884.80
COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR	27E	\$71,052.80	\$ 95,825.60	\$120,598.40
ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY III COMMUNITY SERVICES DIRECTOR FISCAL & ADMIN SERVICES DIRECT	28E	\$77,251.20	\$104,218.40	\$131,185.60
HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DIRECTO ECONOMIC GROWTH DIRECTOR FACILITIES & FLEET MGT DIRECTOR PUBLIC RESOURCES DIRECTOR PUBLIC SAFETY DIR/FIRE CHIEF PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR	29E	\$84,032.00	\$113,328.80	\$142,625.60
FIREFIGHTER/EMT	210	\$37,000.00	\$ 49,894.50	\$ 62,789.00
FIRE LIEUTENANT/EMT	213	\$51,000.00	\$ 68,773.50	\$ 86,547.00
BATTALION FIRE CHIEF	23S	\$58,000.00	\$ 78,213.00	\$ 98,426.00



**EXHIBIT 3C
PROPOSED PAY GRADES
FOR NON-BENCHMARKED CLASSIFICATIONS**

County Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
STUDENT INTERN WELCOME CENTER WORKER	10N	\$ 17,076.80	\$ 23,036.00	\$ 28,995.20
DELIVERY SERVICE DRIVER/OPERAT FAIRGROUNDS WORKER	12N	\$ 20,196.80	\$ 27,227.20	\$ 34,257.60
OFFICE ASSOCIATE I SECURITY GUARD TOURISM SUPPORT ASSISTANT	13N	\$ 21,944.00	\$ 29,598.40	\$ 37,252.80
LIBRARY PAGE OFFICE ASSOCIATE II RECORDS MANAGEMENT TECH	14N	\$ 23,878.40	\$ 32,198.40	\$ 40,518.40
MOBILE IRRIGATION TECHNICIAN ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN CONTRACTS TECHNICIAN	15N	\$ 25,958.40	\$ 35,016.80	\$ 44,075.20
DATA ENTRY OPERATOR HAZARDOUS WASTE TECHNICIAN RIGHT OF WAY & MAP SVCS TECH SIGN ASSISTANT	16N	\$ 28,225.60	\$ 38,074.40	\$ 47,923.20
A/V AND ASSET TECHNICIAN EQUIPMENT OPERATOR II HUMAN RESOURCES TECHNICIAN MAINTENANCE TECHNICIAN I	17N	\$ 30,700.80	\$ 41,402.40	\$ 52,104.00
SCALES ATTENDANT II TEEN COURT COUNSELOR DATA TECHNICIAN DOCUMENT SERVICES ASSOCIATE FIELD INSPECTOR	18E	\$ 33,384.00	\$ 45,032.00	\$ 56,680.00
LIBRARY TECHNICIAN PUBLIC HEARING ASSOCIATE TOURISM PROGRAM SUPERVISOR TRANSPORTATION REPRESENTATIVE EXTENSION AGENT I AGENDA COORDINATOR ASSISTANT AREA MAINTENANCE SUP ASSISTANT VETERANS SERVICE OFF ASSOCIATE PLANNER BUILDING AUTOMATION TECHNICIAN COMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATE COMPLIANCE & MONITORING ASSOC HLC GARDENS LANDSCAPE TECH IT INFRASTRUCTURE TECHNICIAN IT SECURITY & COMPLIANCE TECH LIBRARY ASSISTANT II OFFICE ASSOCIATE V OPERATIONS COMPLIANCE SPECIALI RIGHT-OF-WAY AGENT I SIGN & STRIPING TECHNICIAN II SIGN FABRICATOR STORMWATER INSPECTOR I STORMWATER TECHNICIAN	18N	\$ 33,384.00	\$ 45,032.00	\$ 56,680.00



**EXHIBIT 3C (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADES
FOR NON-BENCHMARKED CLASSIFICATIONS**

County Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
CONTRACTING OFFICER I EXTENSION AGENT II	19E	\$ 36,337.60	\$ 49,004.80	\$ 61,672.00
ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST ASSOCIATE PLANS EXAMINER CHIEF MAINTENANCE SUPERVISOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALI CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR I ENERGY MAINTENANCE TECHNICIAN FIXED ASSETS/SURPLUS SPECIALIS MECHANIC/WELDER/FABRICATOR MOBILE IRRIGATION SPECIALIST TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE SPE	19N	\$ 36,337.60	\$ 49,004.80	\$ 61,672.00
AQUATIC SUPERVISOR AUTOMATED SYSTEMS SPECIALIST I ENTOMOLOGIST SUPERVISOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE MANAGER PROBATION SUPERVISOR SPECIAL PROJECTS SUPERVISOR	20E	\$ 39,499.20	\$ 53,268.80	\$ 67,038.40
ASSESSMENT & CUST SVC SUPER ASST TRAFFIC OPERATIONS SUPERV ENERGY MANAGEMENT SUPERVISOR FACILITIES CONTRACT SPECIALIST GIS ANALYST HZRD WASTE & E-CYCLING SUPV LICENSING INVESTIGATOR NETWORK TECHNICIAN OFFICE MANAGER PROGRAM ASSOCIATE STORMWATER INSPECTOR II AUTOMATED SYS SPECIALIST II CHILDRN & ELDER SVC COORDINATO COMM HEALTH WORKER SPECIALIST EXPO CTR/FAIRGROUNDS PROG MGR EXTENSION AGENT III SOLID WASTE COORDINATOR TRIAL COURT LAW CLERK VETERANS SERVICES OFFICER	20N	\$ 39,499.20	\$ 53,268.80	\$ 67,038.40
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM SPECIALST ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST FIRE INSPECTOR LANDFILL SUPERVISOR LEAD NETWORK TECHNICIAN MECHANIC II ROW GIS ANALYST USER SUPPORT ANALYST	21E	\$ 42,931.20	\$ 57,917.60	\$ 72,904.00
	21N	\$ 42,931.20	\$ 57,917.60	\$ 72,904.00



**EXHIBIT 3C (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADES
FOR NON-BENCHMARKED CLASSIFICATIONS**

County Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
CREATIVE SERVICES SUPERVISOR FINANCIAL ANALYST FINANCIAL COORDINATOR FLEET MANAGEMENT SUPERVISOR MPO PROJECT MANAGER PROGRAM SPECIALIST PROPERTY MANAGER/LEGAL OFF MGR REGIONAL BRANCH MANAGER TRANSPOR CONCURRENCY & GIS MGR	22E	\$ 46,696.00	\$ 62,982.40	\$ 79,268.80
PLANS EXAMINER RECREATION COORDINATOR ROADWAY DESIGNER II SENIOR GRAPHIC DESIGNER SENIOR LABORATORY ANALYST TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYS ADMIN	22N	\$ 46,696.00	\$ 62,982.40	\$ 79,268.80
ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER DATABASE AND APP COORDINATOR DATABASE/ADMIN PROGRAM COORD FIXED ROUTE COORDINATOR GIS MANAGER PARKS & TRAILS PROGRAM MANAGER PROGRAM ANALYST RADIO SYSTEMS COORDINATOR SENIOR FINANCIAL COORDINATOR SPORTS DEV & TOURISM COORD SYSTEMS DATABASE COORDINATOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS DIV MGR	23E	\$ 50,793.60	\$ 68,504.80	\$ 86,216.00
CHIEF FIRE INSP/PLANS EXAMINER	23N	\$ 50,793.60	\$ 68,504.80	\$ 86,216.00
CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER COUNTY EXTENSION SERVICE DIREC ECONOMIC DEV & TOURISM MANAGER FIRE MARSHAL/FIRE CAPTAIN HEALTH & HUMAN SVCS DIV MGR RIGHT OF WAY SUPERVISOR RISK AND BENEFITS MANAGER STORMWATER PROJECT MANAGER SUPPORT SERVICES MANAGER TRAFFIC OPERATIONS SUPERVISOR	24E	\$ 55,244.80	\$ 74,505.60	\$ 93,766.40
CHIEF PLANS EXAMINER FIRE CAPTAIN	24N	\$ 55,244.80	\$ 74,505.60	\$ 93,766.40
ENGINEER III FACILITIES MAINTENANCE DIV MGR FLEET MANAGEMENT DIVISION MGR HOUSING & COMM DEV DIV MGR PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COORD SURVEY SUPERVISOR SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR	25E	\$ 60,091.20	\$ 81,047.20	\$ 102,003.20



EXHIBIT 3C (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADES
FOR NON-BENCHMARKED CLASSIFICATIONS

County Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
BUILDING SERVICES DIV MGR CODE ENFORCEMENT DIVISION MGR COMMUNITY LIAISON MANAGER PARKS & TRAILS DIVISION MANGR PLANNING DIVISION MANAGER PUB SAFTY COM TCH DIV MGR/E911	26E	\$ 65,312.00	\$ 88,098.40	\$110,884.80
ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DIV MGR ROAD OPS DIVISION MANAGER	27E	\$ 71,052.80	\$ 95,825.60	\$120,598.40
COMMUNITY SAFETY & COMPLIANCE COUNTY ENGINEER ENVIRONMENTAL SVCS DIV MANAGER LIBRARY SERVICES DIVISION MGR	28E	\$ 77,251.20	\$104,218.40	\$131,185.60
DEPUTY COUNTY MANAGER	30E	\$ 89,564.80	\$120,806.40	\$152,048.00
EXEC DIR MPO	No Assigned Grade	\$ 75,732.80	\$ 98,467.20	\$121,201.60
COUNTY ATTORNEY COUNTY MANAGER	No Assigned Grade	\$104,000.00	\$201,999.20	\$299,998.40
FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC	210P	\$ 44,299.96	\$ 57,257.70	\$ 70,215.44
FIRE LIEUTENANT/PARAMEDIC	213P	\$ 57,500.00	\$ 74,750.00	\$ 92,000.00

After assigning pay grades to classifications, the next phase was to propose a method of transitioning current employee' salaries into the new pay plans. This was done by establishing a method of calculating salaries in the new pay grades and determining whether adjustments were needed to individual employee salaries to bring them to their calculated salary. Evergreen Solutions approached this transition by calculating employee salaries for placement in the new pay grades utilizing a method of bringing employee' salaries to the new minimums as necessary if there was a change in the employee's assigned classification's pay grade. Provided below is the cost estimate for this method. Typically, additional methods are provided, however, at the time of this report, the County was reviewing fiscal constraints and various alternative transition methods.

Bring Employee Salaries to New Minimums

In this approach, each employee's current salary was compared to the minimum of his or her proposed classification's pay grade. If an employee's current salary was below his or her new grade minimum, an adjustment is proposed to raise the individual's salary to the minimum. If the employee's current salary was already above his or her grade minimum, no adjustment is recommended.



With this approach, salary adjustments are recommended for 209 County employees with an approximate annualized cost of **\$588,784**. The approximate cost is for salary adjustments only and does not include the associated cost for employee benefits.

3.2 SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION

The County and compensation system will continue to need periodic maintenance. The recommendations provided to improve the competitiveness of the compensation system 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.

FINDING:

The salary survey results indicated that the existing pay plans for identified classifications were behind the desired market position. As discovered during the salary survey, the pay grades of several classifications should be adjusted to be competitive with the market.

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

While it is unlikely that the pay plan as a whole will need to be adjusted for several years, a small number of classifications' pay grades may need to be reassigned more frequently. If one or more classifications are exhibiting high turnover or are having difficulty with recruitment, the County should collect salary range data from peer organizations to determine whether an adjustment is needed for the pay grade of these classifications.

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

Small-scale salary surveys can improve the market position of specific classifications, however it is recommended that a full classification and compensation study be conducted every three to five years to preserve both internal and external equity of the County's classification and compensation system. 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 both organizations in challenging positions for recruiting and retaining quality employees.

3.3 PAY PRACTICES

While the previous recommendations are intended to maintain the competitiveness over time of particular classifications and the compensation structure, it is also necessary to continue to review, evaluate, and as appropriate, update the County's associated pay practices.



FINDING:

The County's pay practices were within today's standards. However, the County should consider more flexible guidelines to be more aligned with today's best practices. While the method of moving salaries through the pay plan and setting new salaries for new hires, promotions, demotions, and transfers depends largely on an organization's compensation philosophy, it should also consider the practices of its peer market. Ultimately, it is important for the County to have established guidelines for each of these situations, and that they are followed consistently for all employees.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Review and consider revisions to policies for moving employee' salaries through the pay plan, including procedures for determining salaries of newly hired employees and employees who have been promoted, demoted, or transferred to a different classification or department. Best practices for progressing and establishing employee salaries are outlined below.

New Hires

A new employee's starting salary should largely depend on the amount of education and experience the employee possesses beyond the minimum requirements for the job. Typically, an employee holding only the minimum education and experience requirements for a classification is hired at or near the classification's pay grade minimum. An upper limit to the percentage above minimum that can be offered to a new employee with only the minimum requirements is typically established, where approval is needed to offer a starting salary that is a higher percentage above minimum. Another threshold is usually in place as the maximum starting salary possible without approval for new employees with considerable experience and/or education above the requirements for the position. It is common for the midpoint to be used as the maximum starting salary. All starting salaries should take into consideration internal equity, meaning that determining a new hire salary should be done with consideration of existing employee salaries with similar levels of education and experience in the classification.

Salary Progression

There are several best practice, common methods for salary progression including cost of living adjustments (COLA), merit pay, and to a lesser extent today, longevity increases. Organizations sometimes utilize multiple methods together to reward employees. For example, merit pay is often used in tandem with a COLA, so that a minimum increase tied to a measure of inflation is awarded to all employees and an additional percentage increase is earned by employees with positive evaluations. Historically, employers in the private sector and more recently, employers in the public sector have moved away from COLA and longevity as a means of progressing employee salaries and more toward merit. However, in order for a merit pay system to work effectively, a fair, organization-wide performance evaluation system must be in place, and supervisors and management must receive proper training to ensure an equitable application of the process.



Promotions

When an employee is promoted to a new classification, it is important to have guidelines for calculating the employee's new salary that rewards the employee for his or her new responsibilities, moves the salary into the new pay grade, and ensures internal equity in the new classification. It is common for organizations to establish a minimum percentage salary increase that depends on the increase in pay grade as a result of the promotion. For example, if an employee moves into the next pay grade he or she may receive a minimum of a three to five percent increase and if the individual moves up two pay grades he or she may experience an increase closer to six to ten percent. Regardless of the minimum percent increase, the employee's new salary should be within the new pay grade's range, and internal equity of salaries within the classification should be preserved.

Demotions

An employee demotion is a sensitive subject and must be handled as such. While some organizations do reduce the salary of demoted employees, there are other options available for these situations. One option is to adjust the employee's salary to the salary received while in the previous position if the demotion occurs following a promotion to a higher level position within the same job family. Another option is to reduce the employee's salary to a salary commensurate with the level of an employee joining that organization in that classification. Another option is reduce the employee's salary by a percentage, for example three percent, and apply this practice consistently across the organization for all demotions.

Transfers

An employee transfer occurs when an employee is reassigned to a classification at the same pay grade as his or her current classification or when an employee's classification stays the same, but his or her department changes. In either of these cases, it is likely that no adjustment is necessary to the employee's salary. The only situation in which a salary adjustment would be needed for a transferred employee would be if his or her current salary is not aligned with the salaries of employees in the new classification or department. If that occurs, it may be necessary to adjust the salary of the employee or the incumbents of the classification to ensure salary equity within the new classification.

3.4 SUMMARY

The recommendations in this chapter, if implemented, will improve the competitiveness of the County's pay system by providing externally and internally equitable pay plan ranges. In addition, by developing and implementing more flexible pay practices the County will likely alleviate some of its current recruiting and retention concerns. While the upkeep of the compensation system will require work, the County will find that having a more competitive, flexible system that enables strong recruitment and encourages employee retention is well worth this commitment.



Appendix A
Compensation Study Data for Lake EMS



APPENDIX A

Compensation Study Data for Lake Emergency Medical Services (Lake EMS)

Market Summary:

As described in **Chapter 2** Evergreen Solutions collected salary range information for Lake EMS from targeted public sector peers using the same methodology and salary survey tool as for the County. As well, data were researched for the private sector. Exhibits below present the resultant data for Lake EMS.

EXHIBIT A-1 MARKET PEERS

Peer Data Collected
City of Mount Dora
Clearwater
Daytona Beach
Deltona
Gulf County
Hamilton County
Highlands County
Kissimmee
Lee County
Marion County
Okaloosa County
Orange County
Osceola County
Pinellas County
Polk County
Seminole County
St. Cloud
St. Petersburg
Tampa
Tavares
Volusia County

EXHIBIT A-2 SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
EMT (Non-Firefighter)	\$23,107.44	22.1%	\$29,349.11	19.4%	\$35,590.79	17.6%	53.7%	5
Logistics Technician	\$27,529.52	3.3%	\$34,737.67	-1.9%	\$41,945.81	-5.7%	54.2%	7
Paramedic	\$26,967.84	29.7%	\$34,495.62	26.7%	\$42,023.39	24.7%	56.2%	5
Patient Accounts Representative	\$27,555.13	-5.4%	\$34,758.42	-0.4%	\$41,961.70	2.6%	53.0%	9
Safety Compliance Officer	\$38,452.40	-10.4%	\$51,593.12	-11.9%	\$64,733.83	-12.8%	69.1%	6
Telecommunicator 2	\$30,951.07	2.2%	\$39,926.62	4.7%	\$48,902.17	6.2%	58.0%	9
Overall Average		6.9%		6.1%		-0.4%	57.4%	6.8

**EXHIBIT A-3
PRIVATE SECTOR MARKET DATA**

Classification	ERI Minimum	% Diff at Minimum	ERI Midpoint	% Diff at Midpoint	ERI Maximum	% Diff at Maximum	Survey Avg Range
EMT (Non-Firefighter)	\$ 23,102.00	22.1%	\$ 32,729.00	10.1%	\$ 45,097.00	-4.5%	95.2%
Logistics Technician	\$ 22,191.00	22.1%	\$ 29,162.00	14.4%	\$ 37,674.00	5.0%	69.8%
Paramedic	\$ 28,519.00	25.6%	\$ 42,021.00	10.8%	\$ 58,776.00	-5.3%	106.1%
Patient Accounts Representative	\$ 26,082.00	0.2%	\$ 36,010.00	-4.0%	\$ 47,485.00	-10.2%	82.1%
Safety Compliance Officer	\$ 37,645.00	-8.1%	\$ 49,710.00	-7.8%	\$ 65,338.00	-13.9%	73.6%
Overall Average		12.4%		4.7%		-5.8%	85.3%

Recommendations:

Chapter 3 of this report provided for the County, the findings and recommendations from the review of the market data. Provided below are the similar information (exhibits) for Lake EMS.

**EXHIBIT A-4
EXISTING LAKE EMS PAY PLAN**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
N5	\$ 23,762.00	\$ 31,461.30	\$ 39,160.60	64.8%	2
C5F	\$ 25,771.20			-	5
N6	\$ 26,144.00	\$ 34,614.97	\$ 43,085.93	64.8%	5
H6	\$ 28,475.20	\$ 34,076.22	\$ 39,677.25	39.3%	2
N7	\$ 28,765.00	\$ 38,084.86	\$ 47,404.72	64.8%	21
C5	\$ 29,662.88	\$ 36,416.52	\$ 43,170.16	45.5%	61
N7P	\$ 30,855.00	\$ 40,852.02	\$ 50,849.04	64.8%	1
N8	\$ 31,648.00	\$ 41,902.06	\$ 52,156.11	64.8%	8
H4	\$ 33,280.00	\$ 39,735.07	\$ 46,190.14	38.8%	1
N7TF	\$ 33,529.60			-	4
C7F	\$ 34,153.60			-	16
N9	\$ 34,820.00	\$ 46,101.68	\$ 57,383.36	64.8%	3
H3	\$ 37,294.40	\$ 44,634.51	\$ 51,974.62	39.4%	2
N10	\$ 38,310.00	\$ 50,722.44	\$ 63,134.88	64.8%	5
C7	\$ 38,357.02	\$ 47,090.09	\$ 55,823.17	45.5%	53
N10P	\$ 41,968.00	\$ 55,565.22	\$ 69,162.44	64.8%	1
C8	\$ 42,704.22	\$ 52,426.95	\$ 62,149.69	45.5%	11
H1	\$ 47,070.40	\$ 56,324.63	\$ 65,578.86	39.3%	1
E10	\$ 48,931.00	\$ 62,264.96	\$ 75,598.91	54.5%	3
C10	\$ 51,398.36	\$ 63,100.53	\$ 74,802.70	45.5%	9
C12	\$ 60,092.50	\$ 73,774.11	\$ 87,455.71	45.5%	3
E15	\$ 67,111.00	\$ 87,251.98	\$ 107,392.95	60.0%	3
E16	\$ 71,488.00	\$ 93,345.72	\$ 115,203.44	61.2%	1
N11F	\$ 78,686.40			-	1
E20	\$ 92,045.00	\$ 122,301.73	\$ 152,558.45	65.7%	1
E24	\$ 118,514.00	\$ 160,269.10	\$ 202,024.20	70.5%	1
Average/Total				55.2%	224

**EXHIBIT A-5
PROPOSED PAY GRADES
FOR BENCHMARKED CLASSIFICATIONS**

Lake EMS Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Logistics Technician	H6	\$28,475.20	\$34,076.22	\$39,677.25
Patient Accounts Rep	N7	\$28,765.00	\$38,084.86	\$47,404.72
EMT	C5	\$29,662.88	\$36,416.52	\$43,170.16
Telecommunicator II	N8	\$31,648.00	\$41,902.06	\$52,156.11
Regulatory/Safety Compliance	N10	\$38,310.00	\$50,722.44	\$63,134.88
Paramedic	C7	\$38,357.02	\$47,090.09	\$55,823.17



**EXHIBIT A-6
PROPOSED PAY GRADES
FOR NON-BENCHMARKED CLASSIFICATIONS**

Lake EMS Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Administrative Asst	N5	\$ 23,762.00	\$ 31,461.30	\$ 39,160.60
Fiscal Services Representative				
Flex EMT	C5F	\$ 25,771.20	\$ -	\$ -
Procurement Specialist	N6	\$ 26,144.00	\$ 34,614.97	\$ 43,085.93
Executive Assistant				
Payroll Specialist	N7	\$ 28,765.00	\$ 38,084.86	\$ 47,404.72
Provisional Telecommunicator I				
Telecommunicator I				
Installation And Configuration	N7P	\$ 30,855.00	\$ 40,852.02	\$ 50,849.04
Coding & Quality Review Spec	N8	\$ 31,648.00	\$ 41,902.06	\$ 52,156.11
Vehicle Maintenance Tech 1	H4	\$ 33,280.00	\$ 39,735.07	\$ 46,190.14
Flex Prov. Telecommunicator I				
Flex Telecommunicator I	N7TF	\$ 33,529.60		
Flex Paramedic	C7F	\$ 34,153.60		
Quality Assrn/Training Officer	N9	\$ 34,820.00	\$ 46,101.68	\$ 57,383.36
Logistics/Facilities Tech				
Vehicle Maintenance Tech 2	H3	\$ 37,294.40	\$ 44,634.51	\$ 51,974.62
Communications Supervisor				
HR Specialist	N10	\$ 38,310.00	\$ 50,722.44	\$ 63,134.88
Patient Financial Serv. Coord				
Provisional Paramedic	C7	\$ 38,357.02	\$ 47,090.09	\$ 55,823.17
Security & Lead Systems Engr	N10P	\$ 41,968.00	\$ 55,565.22	\$ 69,162.44
Paramedic/FTO	C8	\$ 42,704.22	\$ 52,426.95	\$ 62,149.69
Fleet Maintenance Supervisor	H1	\$ 47,070.40	\$ 56,324.63	\$ 65,578.86
CAD Administrator				
Data Analyst	E10	\$ 48,931.00	\$ 62,264.96	\$ 75,598.91
Financial Analyst/Accountant				
Clinical Quality Officer				
Clinical Training Officer	C10	\$ 51,398.36	\$ 63,100.53	\$ 74,802.70
District Chief				
District Chief - Provisional				
Assistant Chief	C12	\$ 60,092.50	\$ 73,774.11	\$ 87,455.71
Chief Communications Officer				
Chief Information Officer	E15	\$ 67,111.00	\$ 87,251.98	\$107,392.95
Operations Support Manager				
Chief Administration Officer	E16	\$ 71,488.00	\$ 93,345.72	\$115,203.44
Flex Finance Manager	N11F	\$ 78,686.40	\$ -	\$ -
Chief Operations Officer	E20	\$ 92,045.00	\$122,301.73	\$152,558.45
Executive Director	E24	\$118,514.00	\$160,269.10	\$202,024.20



To implement the new pay grades, some adjustments to employee salaries would be required. Evergreen Solutions approached this transition by calculating employee salaries for placement in the new pay grades utilizing a method of bringing employee' salaries to the new minimums as necessary if there was a change in the employee's assigned classification's pay grade. This would result in salary adjustments for 8 Lake EMS employees with an approximate annualized cost of **\$852**. The approximate cost is for salary adjustments only and do not include the associated cost for employee benefits.

