R-XX-2022 - Resolution Authorizing a Contract with Municipal Solutions, LLC, to engage in conducting a compensation survey for staff

## City Council of the City of Glenarden, Maryland 2022 Legislation

Resolution Number:<br>R-XX-2022<br>Introduced By:<br>Derek D. Curtis, II, Council President<br>Co-Sponsor:<br>At the request of the Administration TBD<br>Public Hearing:<br>Regular Session<br>Session:<br>Monday, April 11, 2022

## Resolution Authorizing a Contract with Municipal Solutions, LLC, to engage in conducting a compensation survey for staff

WHEREAS, the mission of the City of Glenarden is to provide excellent services and provide employment opportunities to the community; and

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the City of Glenarden to offer the best quality services and an appropriate salary to its employees for providing those services; and

WHEREAS, health insurance, transportation, and gas costs have risen significantly (especially within the past few years) and are expected to rise significantly more in the near future, as are other costs of living; and

WHEREAS, these compensation issues adversely impact staff at the City of Glenarden; and

WHEREAS, the City of Glenarden wishes to remain competitive in the market for all positions in its employee base; and

WHEREAS, the City of Glenarden has issued a request for proposals (RFP) for services by a qualified firm to determine and update the City's salaries and benefits; and

WHEREAS, two offerors responded to the RFP with scope of work herein attached; and
WHEREAS, staff has reviewed the proposals and Municipal Solutions, LLC is the best offeror in terms of scope of work, price, and qualifications.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Glenarden, Maryland sitting in Regular Session this XX day of April 2022 as follows;

1. That the City Council does approve the conducting of a Compensation Study by Municipal Solutions, LLC to include all City Employees with the intent of updating employee classification and compensation; and

R-XX-2022 - Resolution Authorizing a Contract with Municipal Solutions, LLC, to engage in conducting a compensation survey for staff
2. That the City Manager is authorized to enter into a contract with Municipal Solutions, LLC in the amount of Thirteen Thousand, Six Hundred and Twenty-two dollars (\$13, 622).
3. The foregoing source of funds shall be line item 7131.10.10.10 Professional Services

Date Approved: $\qquad$

ATTEST:
City Council of Glenarden

Victoria Lewis, Council Clerk
Derek D. Curtis, II, Council President

Angela D. Ferguson, Council Vice President

Erika L. Fareed, Councilwoman

Kathleen J. Guillaume, Councilwoman

Maurice A. Hairston, Councilman

James A. Herring, Councilman

Robin Jones, Councilwoman

R-XX-2022 - Resolution Authorizing a Contract with Municipal Solutions, LLC, to engage in conducting a compensation survey for staff

Votes:

Yes
No
Abstain

## City of Glenarden

James R. Cousins, Jr., Municipal Center
8600 Glenarden Parkway
Glenarden, MD 20706-1522
Attntion: Jordan McClung

## RE: Engagement Letter for Salary \& Benefits Study Services

## Dear Mr. McClung:

I would first like to thank you for the opportunity to assist you in updating the City's Salaries and Benefits. This engagement letter and draft scope of work included below represents the phases we recommend - in line with what we believe will bring you success. Note: our compensation and classification studies are generally completed between 90 and 120 days.

## Project Objective \& Goals

This project will be the mechanism for finding and creating an appropriate baseline for adjusting salaries and compensation and appropriately forecasting and establishing employee salary and compensation expenditures for future years. Municipal Solutions LLC will Review the existing compensation system, analyze research, discuss findings with City administration and propose a salary and compensation plan that is fair and equitable to employees, fiscally sound, and rewards performance, merit, and further education / training in addition to length of service. Goals of this project are:
a. Review the current pay and classification plan and policies and procedures;
b. Determine how well the plan meets organizational objectives and reflects current job content and organizational structure;
c. Evaluate the current pay plan structure (i.e. number of pay grades, including recommenced additions, deletions, and/or consolidations, appropriateness of pay range spread from salary minimum to maximum and percentages between salary grades);
d. Recommend a strategy for potential improvements including methodologies and estimated costs for implementation;
e. Design professional certification incentive program to encourage career development.

## WORK PLAN

Our approach on this project follows a standard process we have used in more than 50 compensation and classification studies. Each item is explained in detail below:

```
Step 1: Management \& Department Head Orientation
Step 2: Internal Job Analysis including FLSA determination (not included)
Step 3: Classification \& Compensable Factors Analysis (internal) (not included)
Step 4: Compensation: Regional Salary \& Benefits Study (external)
Step 5: Policy Review \& Preliminary review with Management \& Staff
Step 6: Report Finalization \& Implementation Training
```

See attached Statement of Qualifications and Scope of Work for schedule outlining work and completion dates.

## Step 1: Orientation, Mobilization and Staff Kick-Off

Project Management will then conduct on-site or virtual orientation and briefing sessions for employees at appropriate levels to educate them on the goals of the study and potential outcomes, and to review existing organization structure and job descriptions and to familiarize the consultant team with the organization, its positions and reporting relationships.

## Step 2: Job Analysis (not included)

Perform a limited Job Analysis / Job Survey of key 'anchor positions' (generally department heads). Provide job description surveys for all employees to provide specific insight into duties, knowledge, skills, and level of education required for the position. In positions where there are several employees, evaluations of select 'anchor' job classifications may be used in place of multiplo job-survoys. The process may involvo-our consultants conducting personal interviews with select Department Heads to review the selected job descriptions and job classifications. Once these two processes are completed, the job descriptions are rewritten to include "compensable factors" language allowing us to tie job descriptions to the classification system

Consultants will use this information to:
$\rightarrow$ Determine if current job descriptions contain necessary language regarding the position's required education, skilllovel, knowledgo, ability and more,
$\rightarrow$ Determine if the hierarchical relationships between pay classifications are appropriate,
$\rightarrow$ Update job descriptions with most recent requirements for training, education, knowledge, experience and skill levels, and
$\rightarrow$ Determine which positions are properly and improperly classified.
The Job Analysis / Job Survey is designed to be rapid with minimal imposition on daily routines.

## Step 3: CLASSIFIGATION\& COMPENSABLE FACTORS ANALYSIS (INTERNAL) (NOT INGLUDED)

$\rightarrow$ Review the job classification system, and propose amendments or a now classification system as necessary, including a review of management vs. non-management classification and policy to ensure that all employees are included within the appropriate job classification.
$\rightarrow$ Review all existing classifications using an empirical classification tool to correlate like positions internally and externally.

Results allow consultants to:
$\rightarrow$ Determine whether a position's associated salany rango was appropriately assigned,
$\rightarrow$ Determine whether certain changes to oxisting classifications should be considered,
$\rightarrow$ Determine (with the results of the satary study) whether all positions are correctly compensated, and
$\rightarrow$ Recommend adjustments to the current Classification System.

## Step 4: Regional Salary \& Benefits Study (external)

With the necessary evaluation tools in place, our consultants will contact the appropriate comparable communities previously proposed by Municipal Solutions and approved by senior management. Our consultants will personally contact other local government representatives for the Glenarden Compensation Study and send them a copy of our simple Survey. We will follow up with them personally to receive all the necessary data. Generally, we receive a $95 \%$ return / -response rate.

In the event that our efforts produce fewer than 10 comparables in a certain job classification, data from the alternate communities will be examined and relevant information will be included from comparable positions as appropriate. If the examination of the primary and alternate communities fails to produce a comparable salary position comparison, the Compensable Factors analysis is helpful in determining a close comparison for internal classification. Positions with less than 10 comparables will be notated in the report and tables with an asterisk (*) for reconciliation. Our approach is simple:
$>$ Work with City staff to determine the most comparable communities to collect data from, called Primary and Alternate Communities;
> Contact each community to obtain personnel salary information (including minimums, midpoints and maximums as well as current salaries) for each position;
$>$ Gather data from these communities concerning benefits. Obtain least six (6) comparable positions from Primary Communities for comparison purposes. Where we do not have six comparisons from Primary Communities, Alternate Communities are used if available;
> Use online-survey or paper survey instrument to obtain information from comparables;
> Input the data as necessary; and
$>$ Communicate with the agencies until the data is obtained or unavailable.

## Step 5: Policy Review \& Preliminary Review w/ Management Staff

We will have ongoing meetings with the City Manager / Administrator \& Department Heads and select employees to review the preliminary findings of this report and 'dial-in' the accuracy and relevancy of the findings of our analysis. Where verification identifies errors in the salary research corrections, these issues will be discussed and considered. Where an organizational structure or pay / grade system from another City illustrates an alternative, we will incorporate this into our recommendations.
> Provide a comparative assessment with data relating to salaries and benefits policies and standards of comparable communities (includes retirement, insurances, vacation, sick leave, etc);
> Review and make simple and appropriate recommendations of necessary amendments to the City's employee policies and procedures. Identify the appropriateness of other key compensation practices within the City including pay for performance, skill pay, executive compensation, shift differentials, special assignment pay, out of class pay, specialty pay, on-call pay, bilingual pay, education pay, etc. Note: this is not a full rewrite, rather a cursory review and recommendations. Additional consultations are considered 'additional work' and billed at a reduced hourly rate. Present alternatives and recommendations for implementing new or revised benefits policies (if necessary);
> Recommend an adjusted or new salary range table, encompassing all City classified positions;
> Review the current performance evaluation methods, practices and tools; and
> Recommend a performance evaluation tool that improves supervisor-employee communication, employee performance and correlates with recommended adjustments to the employee compensation plan.

## Step 6: Report Finalization \& Implementation Training

Once the new system has been determined suitable for the City key employees will need to be trained on its implementation and sustainability. We will conduct ongoing training throughout the performance of each element to minimize the cost, while increasing the benefits to staff and ensuring the long-term success of the new system.
> Recommend an implementation \& maintenance strategy for the new system;
> Recommend a maintenance system or procedures that will be used to keep the salary system current and equitable. Software / data (spreadsheets and documents) will be provided by the consultant to expedite and simplify future updates;
> Provide a procedure manual and training for Human Resources Director and key Employees to enable them to maintain the recommended classification system and pay plans (if desired); and
> Provide hands-on training for key staff.
Final training on the implementation of the new system occurs after the Final Report has been presented and approved.

## Principal Staff to Be Assigned

> David Evertsen is the Principal and CEO of Municipal Solutions and has been a local government consultant to more than 800 public institutions in the United States and Internationally. He will serve as Project Manager for the study.
> Cristian \& Roberto Morelli, Cristian recently graduated with his Master's Degree in International Relations. As Analysts, he and Roberto assist Municipal Solutions on executive searches and compensation studies. They are practitioners of government and incredibly-gifted researchers and writers.
> Becky Smith has assisted in successfully conducting 100s of resume evaluations and background investigations of candidates. She will assist in candidate evaluation, employment and education verification, reference checks and the assembling of candidate information and background reports and will serve as Senior Analyst on this project.
> Alan \& Gale Larsen have assisted Municipal Solutions on multiple compensation studies and executive searches. They are fluent in human resource management and salary and benefits analysis.

Note: These or other Consultants and Analysts may be used to complete the project.
Deliverables \& Timing

| Item | Task / Milestones | Timing |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| I. | Mobilize / Staff Orientation | w/in 5 days of Notice to Proceed (NtoP) |
| II. | Internal Job Analysis | begins immediately |
| III. | Classification Analysis (internal) | begins immediately |
| IV. | Compensation Analysis (external) | begins immediately |
| V. | Policy Review / Preliminary review | begins after Comp. and Class. analysis |
| VI. | Report Finalized \& Training Begins | ongoing* |



## FEE

Municipal Solutions' rates are structured one of three ways: Project-based, Hourly Rate-based, or Reduced Hourly Rate-based. Project-based rates are determined by overall project scope, time required for completion and the likelihood of variable costs or shifting timelines.

Normally, Hourly Rate-based rates average between $\$ 125-\$ 250$ per hour but can vary depending upon the complexity / risk of the project, municipal organization and / or service level complexity, size and budget of the municipality, regional factors, the priority requested by a client, the levels of cooperative and independent effort, and the time constraints necessary to complete the work.

For purposes of this assignment, a Project-based price of $\$ 13,622$ is offered for the performance of work as detailed. Below is our estimates, however it has been our experience that we spend significantly more time with the client than we ever include in our billing.


Costs associated with candidate travel for interviews and on-site work are included. Internal project status worksheets are kept by the Consultant to ensure all projects do not exceed the amount contracted. Unless otherwise stated in this agreement, clients are billed in 'progress payments' payable within 15 days of invoice date. Invoices will not be itemized. This project will be billed as follows:

- $30 \%$ due immediately upon the execution of this agreement.
- $30 \%$ due within 15 days of submittal of Preliminary Report.
- $40 \%$ due within 15 business days of submittal of the Final Report.

Because Municipal Solutions, LLC consultants are specialists and practitioners in various fields and professions, retaining the best, but affordable team members is essential to the success of this project. Consultant delays may occur if consultants become incapable of meeting within the specified timeline, due to illness or scheduling conflict. Consultant will put forth every effort to mitigate such occurrences, however the client will be accommodating if such delays occur.

Additional meetings or unexpected client delays (i.e. delayed information, return visits, presentations, edits or revisions and approvals) will be billed as additional expense if incurred. Under such circumstances, the client will be billed actual costs associated with local per diem for \# days x \# persons; airfare and related travel expenses for \# persons.

## OTHER

The City has the ultimate responsibility for identifying a project manager or contact for the course of this project, and outlining necessary outcomes of this agreement. The Consultant has the responsibility of providing timely and accurate information, communications, and the results in fulfilling the established objectives and tasks of this agreement. This responsibility includes the maintenance of adequate records and internal controls and the safeguarding of accomplished tasks. Our agreement cannot be relied upon to disclose every problem in the relationship; however, both parties agree to notify each other immediately if any such matters come to one or the other's attention. We have confidence that the relationship will greatly benefit both parties.

Unexpected or changing circumstances may be encountered during the engagement, therefore, changes may be necessary, by the request of either party, without revision to the terms of this Agreement, though it is also understood that changes should be reduced to writing. Client also understands that many of our consultants are practitioners in other public agencies, which will require some flexibility in scheduling arrangements, adjustments of deadlines and substitution of consultants (if necessary).

Municipal Solutions cannot provide an assurance that a 'perfect' product will be rendered. However, all efforts will be made to ensure the best product possible for the client. Circumstances may arise in which it is necessary for us to modify our efforts or withdraw from the engagement. The City also reserves the right to terminate the engagement. To mitigate the effects of such circumstances, the findings or reasons for concern, modification or withdrawal will be communicated clearly by each party to this agreement, and reduced to writing as often as possible. Both parties agree to work in good faith to avoid any delay or premature termination in the relationship. If Municipal Solutions withdraws from this engagement, it shall provide the City with all work papers and data developed up to the date of withdrawal. If either party withdraws from or terminates this Letter of Engagement the parties agree to negotiate fair and equitable compensation for services rendered.

The City agrees that all records, documentation, and information in its possession in connection with our engagement will be made available to us, and Consultant agrees that all records, documentation, and information in our possession in connection with our engagement will be disclosed one to another, and that consultant will have the full cooperation of the City's personnel, under the direction of its Principal, for the efficient and effective completion of the requested services.

Both parties agree that the City shall own any document, record, product or information created by the parties under this Letter of Engagement. The City shall not have to pay any party for the use or continued use of any document created under this Letter of Engagement, and the City shall not prohibit Consultant from using any product from this engagement for marketing, promotional and sales purposes.

Municipal Solutions LLC is an independent contractor to the City in the performance of this Letter of Engagement. This Letter of Engagement does not create a partnership, joint venture, employment relationship or any other legal relationship other than independent contractor between the City and Municipal Solutions, LLC and Municipal Solutions, LLC's consultants.

This Letter of Engagement is to be governed and interpreted under the laws of New Mexico, exclusive if its principals governing conflicts or choice of laws. Any litigation related to this Letter of Engagement shall be brought in Arizona State courts located in Maricopa County, Arizona.

## Potential Equipment / Space Needed:

City agrees to provide the necessary documents listed in Appendix A and also agrees to make space available for consultants while onsite including access to Internet, photocopiers, telephones as necessary. As is appropriate to minimize expenses, the following is requested to be provided by the City:

- Dedicated work space for both days (i.e. conference room with space for 3-4).
- Individual 'meeting' spaces in each department or division for sit-down or face-to-face meetings (i.e. space for 3-4).
- Internet access for web research and email correspondence (send and receive capability).
- Use of Printer, Photocopier and telephone equipment while on-site.

Municipal Solutions consultants use electronic communication via email, Skype or other mediums to maintain efficiency and reduce project costs while offsite.

## Insurance

Municipal Solutions, LLC carries a $\$ 1$ Million / $\$ 2$ Million commercial comprehensive, E \& O and automotive liability insurance policy through the Hartford, and Philadelphia Insurance and carries workers compensation insurance as required by law. The City shall be listed as an insured party and certificate holder on such policy or policies of insurance. Certificates of Insurance can be provided upon notice request.

## Indemnification

Mutual Indemnity. To the fullest extent permitted by law, each Party shall indemnify, defend and hold the other Party, its governing board or body, officers, departments, employees and agents, harmless from and against any and all suits, actions, legal or administrative proceedings, claims, demands, liens, losses, fines or penalties, damages, liability, interest, and attorneys', consultants' and accountants' fees or costs, and expenses of whatsoever kind and nature, resulting from or arising out of any act or omission of the indemnifying Party, its agents, employees or anyone acting under its direction or control, whether intentional, negligent, grossly negligent, or amounting to a breach of contract, in connection with or incident to the performance of this Agreement. The City's obligations under the paragraph are subject to the provisions and limitations of the New Mexico's Local Government Tort Claims limitations, funds appropriated for that purpose, and the limits of any applicable policy or policies of insurance.

## Signatures

This letter outlines the basic understanding of the work to be performed in this engagement. Please indicate the City's acceptance by signing below so that we can begin our efforts.

For City of Glenarden

| Title |
| :---: |
| Signature |

Date: $\qquad$
Municipal Solutions ${ }^{*}$
Efficiency. Technology. Safety.
For Municipal Solutions, LLC
$\square$
Signature
Date: $\qquad$

## APPENDIX A

A project of this scope mandates full cooperation of all participating agencies and internal departments, including Finance, City Clerk, IT, etc., and especially the cooperation of the agencies that will potentially be affected by our work: Human Resources, Information Technology and others.

During the Pre-assessment phase, department staff will be provided a list of documents, details and data which will be needed by the consultants. Documents which may be requested include (but are not limited to) the following:

## General Information:

- Prepared public information regarding local economics, demographics, and statistics.


## Staff Contact Information

- Internal Telephone and Email list.


## Rules, Policies \& Procedures

- Personnel Manual/Policies and Procedures, including purchasing, vehicle use, customer service, operational policies, etc.


## Organizational Structure/Personnel

- Current Organizational Chart including all classified positions in all departments, divisions, boards \& commissions (include Enterprise Funds).
- Total Personnel by department current and last five (5) years.
- Current Employee Classification System, including pay grades and ranges for positions, employees by classification and their current pay grades and ranges.
- Copies of Job Descriptions for all classified positions.


## Accounting, Budget, Finance, Revenue \& Expenditure Analysis:

- Operating Budgets for Fiscal Year and previous two years. Include any special revenue or enterprise funds.


## City of Glenarden Salary and Benefits Price Quote

REVitalize Consultants, LLC is submitting this price quote in response to the City of Glenarden's invitation for firms to submit a price quote for services that involve analyzing the City of Glenarden's Salary \& Benefits practices, and providing the City with a condensed Compensation Study.

## Who We Are

We are a small agile team of multi-disciplinarian professionals, who are committed to improving processes and profit for organizations of all sizes to deliver EPOCH results.

Our Core Principles are EXCELLENCE, PERFORMANCE, OUTCOMES, CONSISTENCY, HARMONY.

We provide executive consulting services to private and public management, program, and project teams. We critically analyze organizational strategies, goals, and business plans to customize and implement innovative solutions to better serve our clients and the customers they serve

## What We Do

As your Business Consultant and Business Advisor, the REVitalize Consulting Group (RCG) will help you maintain and improve operations by providing professional subject matter expertise to sustain and improve your processes and procedures. Our highly skilled professionals offer strategic planning, executive coaching/mentoring, proposal development, grants management, HR support, and financial management services.

## The REVitalize Model



We assess what you do and how you get it done. We engage employees, clients customers and stakeholders. We improve processes, performance, profits and services. We optimize resources, capital, and efforts. We uplift communities, neighborhoods, churches, homes, schools, and businesses.

## Our core competencies

If you are a startup company or organization with decades of experience, we can help you develop, recapture and sustain business growth in your market segment. Our core competencies are Organizational Development, Employee Development and Technical Assistance.

We will work with the City of Glenarden to produce EPOCH results.

## Our Approach

REVitalize Consultants, LLC will help the City of Glenarden accurately adjust salaries and compare the City's Compensation System with other similar-sized Municipalities. We will lead the effort for the City of Glenarden to find and create an appropriate baseline for adjusting salaries and compensation; appropriately forecasting and establishing employee salaries as well as compensation for future years to come by reviewing the existing compensation system, analyzing, and discussing findings with the City Manager. Subsequently, REVitalize Consultants will propose a salary and compensation plan that is fair and equitable to the employees, fiscally sound, rewards performance, merit, and length of service.

Cost Proposal

| Task | Project Schedule | Cost |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kickoff Meeting | Within 5 days of award | $\$ 2,000.00$ |  |  |
| Project Management Plan | Within 10 days of award | $\$ 8,000.00$ |  |  |
| Current State Evaluation | Days 10-20 | $\$ 8,000.00$ |  |  |
| Benchmarking Analysis | Days 10-20 | $\$ 8,000.00$ |  |  |
| Strategic Process Improvement Plan | Days 10-30 | $\$ 10,000.00$ |  |  |
| Career Development Plan | Days 20-60 | $\$ 20,000.00$ |  |  |
| Exit Meetings and Way Forward Plan | Days 45-60 | $\$ 4,000.00$ |  |  |
| TOTALS |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 6 0 , 0 0 0 . 0 0}$ |

REVitalize Consultants, LLC is pleased to submit the above price quote and look forward to working with the City of Glenarden.

Sincerely,
Reginald E. Vance, Ph.D.
REVitalize Consultants, LLC CEO
202-641-0832

PROFESSIONAL RESUME<br>VANCE, REGINALD ERIC,PH.D.<br>9816 Ruby Lockhart Boulevard Mitchellville, MD 20721<br>Email: reggievance@yahoo.com<br>Phone: (202) 641-0832

## EDUCATION

John F. Kennedy School of Government 2016
Executive Education Certificate
Senior Executive Fellows (SEF) Program
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Federal Executive Institute (FEI) 2011
Leadership for a Democratic Society (LDS) Certificate
Charlottesville, VA
Ph.D. Public Policy and Urban Affairs (Finance) 2006
Nelson Mandela School of Public Policy
Southern University and A\&M College
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
M.A. Mass Communications 1989

Southern University and A\&M College
B.A. Broadcast Journalism 1987

Southern University and A\&M College

## CERTIFICATIONS

Lean Six Sigma Black Belt Certification| Teleos Executive Coaching Certificate of Completion| Contracting Officers' Representative (COR) Certification| Federal Acquisition Certification for Program and Project Managers (FAC-P/PM) Senior Level

## PROFESSIONAL PROFILE

My professional background includes, but is not limited to talent and performance management, employee development, budgeting and finance, leadership development, training, executive coaching, as well as program and project and program management.

- Strong leadership, managerial, analytical and organizational skills obtained over a 30 year professional career, with success in numerous support and leadership positions.
- Significant budget formulation and execution experience gained from years of hands on practical application of best business practices.
- Creator, developer and mentor of an international collegiate internship program that included students from the United States of America, Africa, France and South Korea.
- Leader and manager of change with experience in leading people to achieve continuous business process improvement and productivity enhancement.
- Strategic planner and operations leader adept at setting the vision, developing the mission and providing leadership and direction that fosters goal achievement and organizational success.
- Highly self-motivated, industrious and enthusiastic leader who consistently generates spirited teamwork; commitment to excellence based on a proven autonomy, authority and accountability model. skilled motivator, developer, advisor, mentor and trainer.


## WORK EXPERIENCE

Senior Executive Advisor

From: 11/1/2021 - Present
City of Annapolis, Maryland
160 Duke of Gloucester Street
Annapolis, MD 21401
As the Senior Executive Advisor to the City of Annapolis, Maryland, I provide consulting services to various management, program, and project teams, including the Mayor, City Council, City Manager, and senior level Department heads. Study and examine budgets, staffing models, organizational goals, strategies, and business plans to determine what changes and process improvements are implemented to better serve the city's executive team and the citizens they serve. This includes facilitating an effective means for the City of Annapolis to develop, implement, and manage processes that improve administration of federal, state, public and private grants, funds, policies, and programs.

Key Accomplishments

- Negotiated the first ever Interagency Personnel Agreement (IPA) between the City of Annapolis and the Federal Government (Department of Veterans Affairs)
- Developed Executive-level and Department-level engagement plans that help guide budget formulation, strategic planning and resource management
- Conducted facility review that resulted in immediate process improvements for maintenance protocols that ensures cleanliness, reduces chances of COVID-19 infections, and improves staff accountability
- Developed, designed, conducted and finalized the first ever City of Annapolis Department of Recreation and Parks S.W.O.T. Analysis as a benchmark for strategic planning and business development

Director, Enterprise Operations - Human Capital Service Center (HCSC)<br>From: 6/2018 - Present<br>U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs<br>810 Vermont Avenue, NW<br>Washington, D.C. 20420

Key Accomplishments

- Led the Office of Enterprise Support Services (OESS) Contracts Review Lean Six Sigma Black Belt project that resulted in $36 \%$ cost reductions totaling nearly $\$ 32$ Million
- Served on the VA Modernization Team that delivered the VA high-level Plan for Reorganizing Federal Government and Reducing the Federal Civilian Workforce in response to OMB's M-17-22
- Coached several OESS employees during their Lean Six Sigma Green Belt projects that produced streamlined process as well as cost and time savings
- Served on the VA HR Future State Working group that delivered two potential HR operating models, including an enterprise-wide shared services approach
- Deployed TMS 2.0, contributing to the VA future state enterprise Learning Management solution.


## Interim Executive Director, Human Resource Enterprise Center - Office of Enterprise Support Services (OESS)

From: 1/2017-6/2018
U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs

810 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20420
As an additional duty, I was responsible for executing the Senior Executive Service (SES) duties of the Director of the Human Resources Enterprise Center (HREC) to lead and manage HREC's efforts to deliver Department-wide support services, improve support services capability and performance and optimize existing support service delivery processes.

I am responsible for developing and leading the newly formed Human Resource Enterprise Center (HREC) to deliver best-in-class human resource (HR) services and capabilities to VA's Administrations and Staff Offices, allowing them to focus on delivering world-class benefits and services to Veterans and eligible beneficiaries.

Key Accomplishments

- Led the Office of Enterprise Support Services (OESS) Contracts Review Lean Six Sigma Black Belt project that resulted in $36 \%$ cost reductions totaling nearly $\$ 32$ Million
- Served on the VA Modernization Team that delivered the VA high-level Plan for Reorganizing Federal Government and Reducing the Federal Civilian Workforce in response to OMB's M-17-22
- Coached several OESS employees during their Lean Six Sigma Green Belt projects that produced streamlined process as well as cost and time savings
- Served on the VA HR Future State Working group that delivered two potential HR operating models, including an enterprise-wide shared services approach
- Deployed TMS 2.0, contributing to the VA future state enterprise Learning Management solution.


## Director, Policy and Resource Management (Acting) - VA Learning University (VALU)

From: 5/2012 - To: 8/2012
U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs - Office of Human Resources and Administration (HR\&A)

810 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20420
As an additional responsibility, I served as the principal manager responsible for the integration of human resources management, administrative functions, budget formulation, execution, and reporting. I represented VA in inter-agency planning and development of Government-wide and joint operations and policies.

Key Accomplishments

- Directed, planned, implemented and managed VA-wide educational training policies, financial resources and contracting actions totaling more than $\$ 200$ million dollars
- Improved prioritization and funding processes that led to decreased time from budget submission to actual funding
- Established efficient communication and feedback protocols that reduced errors and rework by $20 \%$
- Assured audit readiness for all VALU programs and projects that contributed to reduced number of audit findings
- Reduced current year unobligated and prior year unliquidated balances that saved the government more than three million dollars


## Director, Learning Infrastructure - VA Office of Enterprise Support Services (OESS)

From: 1/2017-10/2019
Formerly Director, Learning Infrastructure - VA Learning University (VALU)
From: 8/2010-12/2016
U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs

810 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20420
I am responsible for building coalitions, partnerships and teams to design and manage the learning technology operations and infrastructure for department-wide education, leadership development, learning and training delivery systems. I leveraged previous federal, enterprise-level and customer-centric experiences to establish an integrated learning delivery system across the VA.

On many occasions, I performed the duties of Acting Dean, VA Learning University (SES). That experience, as well as my present position, requires me to plan, initiate, implement, monitor and control organizationalwide strategies. This includes establishing the vision for delivering a shared services strategy, which will improve service delivery and reduce cost.

Key Accomplishments

- Designed, developed, and deployed the largest non-Department of Defense computerbased, training system in the federal government, serving more than 500,000 end users, more than 16,000 system administrators and nearly 900 Domain Managers
- Developed and managed multiple Human Capital Investment Plan (HCIP) and VA Office of Information Technology (OIT) contracts totaling nearly $\$ 20$ million dollars to support and sustain multiple learning delivery and auxiliary systems
- Led the Training Leaders Council (TLC) Learning Technology and Innovation Subcommittee
- Led Department-wide Employee Experience and Engagement Leadership Development Program Forum and developed a process improvement plan to decrease costs by $5 \%$, while increasing throughput by $10 \%$
- Developed the strategy for sustaining a leadership development continuum
- Led a Lean Six Sigma Kaizen event to design an integrated VA Strategy regarding Outreach, Application and Candidate Selection for VA Leadership Development programs with more than 1,000 applicants per year


## Business Manager and Executive Assistant to the ADCIO

From: 2/2009 - To: 8/2010
U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs - OI\&T Office of Enterprise Development (OED) 470 L'Enfant Plaza East, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024-2135
I served as the senior expert analyst and advisor for Medical Health Care Information Technology (IT) programs and operations. I managed a multi-year, multi-billion dollar budget.

Key Accomplishments
$\square$ Developed and managed multiple Human Capital Investment Plan (HCIP) and VA Office of Information Technology (OIT) contracts totaling nearly $\$ 50$ million dollars annually
$\square$ Contributed to the design and deployment of the VA Project Management Accountability System (PMAS) that resulted in $20 \%$ decrease in project slippage and costs overruns

I developed the process to coordinate and conduct PMAS audits and gate reviews

## Senior Manager

From: 11/2008 - To: 2/2009
Brooks and Associates, CPA
9701 Apollo Drive Largo, MD 20774
I directed business and employee development efforts for a Certified Public Accounting firm in the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan area. I secured a major contract to conduct the FY 2007 Budget Execution Independent Review for the United States Department of Veterans Affairs. I developed, and conducted an extensive audit of financial transactions totaling over $\$ 200$ million dollars.

Key Accomplishment
$\square$ Secured a major contract to conduct the FY 2007 Budget Execution Independent Review for the United States Department of Veterans Affairs.
$\square$ Developed and conducted an extensive VA Office of Information and Technology audit of financial transactions totaling over $\$ 200$ million dollars
$\square$ Developed employee development strategy to close skills gaps and increase productivity
$\square$ Developed financial management and program management courses for delivery to more than 200 federal government employees

## Chief - Office of Business and Finance

From: 12/2003 To: 11/2008
U.S. Department of the Interior/National Park Service - Office of the Chief Information Officer 1201 Eye Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
I led and managed the administrative and financial management activities including procurement, acquisition of goods, services and supplies, contracting, budget, finance, personnel, payroll, office space and property management. I provided professional advice to senior executives on all administrative functions, particularly budget and finance, as well as maintained a liaison role with other offices, government agencies, and civic organizations.

Key Accomplishments

- Developed, coordinated and maintained an integrated system of budget and financial services for the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO)
- Developed and executed the staffing plan for the first ever NPS CIO office
- Managed OCIO, National Information Systems Center (NISC), National Information Technology Center (NITC) and Cyber Security budgets of approximately $\$ 60$ million
- Developed and executed space plans for more than 100 current and future employees
- Developed the oversight plan for internal and external audits
- Served as the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) on contracts supporting OCIO, NISC and NITC


## Management/Budget Analyst

From: 5/2003 To: 11/2003
U.S. Department of the Interior/National Park Service - Washington Budget Office (90 Day Detail)

1849 C Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20240
I served as a Management/Budget Analyst responsible for performing a variety of analytical functions supporting management of the NPS Washington D.C. Budget Formulation Office. I analyzed and evaluated services provided by the Budget Office as they related to administrative functions of the Washington Service Office (WASO) office and support of regional offices and National Parks.

Key Accomplishments

- Coordinated and managed key aspects of Department of the Interior's NPS Budget submission to Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
- Responded to budget directives pursuant to the President's agenda, Congressional mandates, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requests, Secretary of the Interior's Orders and National Park Service (NPS) Director's initiatives


## Adjunct Professor

From: 01/2003 To: 12/2003
University of Alaska-Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive Anchorage, Alaska 99508
I set goals and objectives for graduate students to achieve high levels of academic understanding of the theoretical and practical applications of Public Administration.

Key Accomplishments

- Increased students' aptitude in the process of learning and the relationship between theory and practice. Taught models and theories for making administrative decisions
- Developed and improved students' analytical and written communication skills


## Program/Management Analyst

From: 08/2001 To: 03/2002
U.S. Department of the Interior/National Park Service - Denali National Park and Preserve 2525 Gambell Street Anchorage, Alaska 99505

I coordinated and developed management policies, budget processes and administrative changes in Denali National Park and Preserve. I supervised and assisted in the gathering of critical data needed to evaluate the effectiveness of various park-wide programs.

Key Accomplishments

- Led the effort to restructure budget formulation at the division and park levels. This effort led to a streamlined process that reduced work load and increase efficiencies
- Performed analysis to identify program, organizational, and park priorities
- Served as the park-wide coordinator for the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)
- Authored and published the Denali National Park and Preserve Comprehensive Budget Analysis 1998-2001
- Authored and published the Tuskegee Partnership General Survey for Supervisors 2001
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## Section l: Study Overview \& Executive Summary

## Study Overview

Municipal Solutions, Ilc of Goodyear, AZ was hired to review the City of North Pole's employee pay classification and compensation system (salaries and benefits) to recommend improvements in the system. Our work was designed to be the instrument for finding and creating an appropriate baseline for adjusting salaries and compensation and appropriately forecasting and establishing employee salary and compensation expenditures for future years. Our team was tasked with reviewing the existing compensation system, analyzing research provided by other local governments, and discussing findings and recommendations with City administration which may include: proposing a salary and compensation plan that is fair and equitable to employees, fiscally sound, and rewards performance, merit, and further education / training in addition to length of service.

Goals of this project were:
$\checkmark$ Review the current pay and classification plan and policies and procedures to analyze strengths and limitations;
$\checkmark$ Determine how well the plan meets organizational objectives and reflects current job content and organizational structure;
$\checkmark$ Evaluate the current pay plan structure (i.e., number of pay grades, including recommenced additions, deletions, and/or consolidations, appropriateness of pay range spread from salary minimum to maximum and percentages between salary grades) against a 'market' of regional comparable public agencies;
$\checkmark$ Recommend a strategy for potential improvements including methodologies and estimated costs for implementation and;
$\checkmark$ Propose a professional certification incentive program to encourage career development and merit-based pay.

The following benchmarks / milestones have been completed:
Item
Status Complete
Item 1: Management \& Department Head Orientation; ongoing contact 100\%
Item 2: Formal Job Audit of all Classified Positions 100\%
Item 3: Classification System \& Compensable Factors Analysis (internal) 100\%
Item 4: Regional Salary \& Benefits Study and Comparative Analysis (external) 100\%
Item 5: Review Policy \& Final Report with Management \& Staff 75\%*
Item 6: Finalization of the Report \& Implementation Training 50\%**
*To be adjusted after presentation / discussion of the draft Final Report with City Council.
**To be completed after presentation of Final Report.
This analysis is nearly complete and is provided as a draft Final Report with the recommendations that the City should discuss before adopting.

## Executive Summary

Consultants and Analysts were pleasantly surprised at the results of the study. Similar studies with other local governments often yield serious findings with significant fiscal impact. Such is not the case here.

Overall, the City of North Pole is not going to see a negative fiscal impact from this study.
$\checkmark$ Job Descriptions. Antiquated and need to be standardized. Multiple job descriptions need to be eliminated. Standard terminology needs to be adopted and a universal Compensable Factors system needs to tie Job Descriptions directly to the Classification and Compensation system. Some positions are so unique that they appear to combine multiple classifications (i.e. HR Manager / Clerk / CIO or Director of City Services). In such cases, separate job descriptions should be created to allow for unique duties, knowledge, education, experience, and responsibilities to be clearly delineated - and then, if necessary - assigned to a uniquely-skilled individual.

Job Description findings and recommendations are found beginning on page 17.
$\checkmark$ Job \& Pay Classifications. Compression exists among and between current classifications. The good news is, this can easily be corrected - with room for future changes to avoid future compression. Consultants are recommending a new Classification System.

Findings and recommendations relating to Job and Pay Classifications begin on page 23.
$\checkmark$ Actual Pay vs. Market Research. No employees appear to be paid under the currently established pay range minimum. With past client cities, when we observe individuals being paid under the minimum of the established range, this inequity often creates an unanticipated spending which needs to be reconciled. In such instances, the fiscal impact can be well into the $\$ 100,000$ s. Broadly, pay inequities do not exist, however there are a handful of positions which are not properly compensated (HR Manager / City Clerk / CIO, Director of City Services, and some utility positions). Consultants are recommending some equalization of pay among a few positions.

While the City of North Pole's current salaries are good, the pay ranges could to be more competitive. Consultants are recommending new Pay Ranges for all classifications.

Analysis and research results, findings and recommendations relating to salaries begin on page 23.
$\checkmark$ Employee Benefits. With the exception of Accrual of Vacation and Sick Leave, there are no significant differences in benefits among the comparable cities, boroughs and towns. There are, however, several areas where the City of North Pole might improve quality of benefits while also decreasing costs to the City and to the Employee. Overall, the City of North Pole's benefits are highly competitive.

Consultants are recommending the formation of a 5-7 member Benefits Committee to further explore and recommend changes to the city's Employee Benefits options.

A fascinating comparison of municipal budgets \& personnel-related expenditures starts on page 33. A summary of our benefits findings and recommendations begins on page 34.

Policies. Three key policies appear to be missing - and easily corrected:
(a) policies regarding pay increases, how to make them and guidelines to be followed by management,
(b) standardization of Personnel Evaluations, when and how to do them, what format to follow, and how they are tied to merit increases, and
(c) policies regarding Professional Development, Succession Planning and Professional Development.

Consultants are recommending the creation and adoption of these policies to increase the value the City and its residents receive from personnel-related expenses and work quality from municipal employees.

Specific policy findings and recommendations begin on page 42, and samples / examples have been provided in Appendix F and G.

Special thanks to the following individuals for developing the necessary personal contacts and for ongoing assistance of:

- Mike Welch, Mayor for facilitating open access to all employees, and for his patience with the length of the study \& report completion process.
- Aaron Rhoades, City Clerk / Human Resources Director for his diligence and success in obtaining necessary salary \& benefits data from some local governments.
- Tricia Fogarty, Finance Director for her patience with the data analysis and frequent financial questions for clarification on policy.
- Chief Steve Dutra \& Lt. Jeromey Lindhag, Chiefs Heineken and former Chief Jeff Coon, and Mr. Bill Butler for hours of video calls to clarify compensation and classification-related questions.
- City Attorney, Zane Wilson for additional clarification and discussion.
- Municipal Solutions Team including Sean Pogue, Senior Associate, Suzanne Tungate and Alan Larson, Senior Analysts and Cristian Morelli, Analyst for their diligence in in contacting, obtaining and analyzing salary and benefits data from public agencies.



## Section II: Approach \& Methodology

## Essential links in Employee Classification \& Compensation Systems

Every organization has functions which need to be performed. How those functions are organized and assigned are essential questions to any HR / Salary / Organizational Analysis. Once the key functions of an organization have been determined and an organizational structure created and implemented, it is necessary to create job descriptions detailing the work which must be performed to achieve the intended outcomes of an organization. Determining appropriate rates of pay for all job classifications is critical prior to hiring new employees.

## Illustration \#1: <br> The Modern Classification \& Compensation System

Job Descriptions
(quantifyable)

Equitable Pay Classifications (Internal)

Market-based Salaries
\& Benefits (External)

Modern Classification \& Compensation Systems in local government are critically linked by three 'systems': job descriptions, classification system and market-based salary ranges. Under these modern systems, job descriptions contain specific (and quantifiable) language to help distinguish one position among all other positions and create an internal hierarchy. This hierarchy becomes the classification system. With a classification system in place, market-based salary range data is obtained and used to provide a basis for assigning salary ranges to the classifications. Once a compensation system is complete, these systems must be managed effectively, or pay inequities will stem from one or more of these three areas.

## The 4-Phase Analysis

All cities and counties have positions which have equity issues that are not simple to resolve. These issues cannot be addressed with a simply market study. Many issues relating to classification and compensation are complex and interrelated which is why our audit includes 4 elements. To avoid potential for error, assure accuracy, and restore any imbalance in existing classification and compensation systems, our four-phase analysis involves: Pre-assessment, Job Survey and Job Description Audit, Compensable Factors Analysis and Market Wage \& Classification Analysis.

## Illustration \#2: <br> Our 4-Phase Analysis

Job Description Survey \& Audit

Classification System Audit

Compensation System Audit

Our approach on this project follows a standard process we have used in more than 50 compensation and classification studies. The steps are:

# Analysis Phase 1: Pre-Assessment \& Management Orientation <br> Analysis Phase 2: Job Description Survey \& Audit <br> Analysis Phase 3: Classification Audit: Compensable Factors Analysis (internal) <br> Analysis Phase 4: Compensation Audit: Regional Salary \& Benefits Study (external) 

Upon completion of the analysis phases, the following activities work towards completion of the Final Report and Implementation of consultant recommendations

## Policy Review \& Preliminary review with Management \& Staff <br> Report Finalization \& Implementation Training on Phase-in Plan

Each step is explained in detail on the following pages.

## Phase 1: Pre-Assessment \& Management Orientation

The consultant team gathered information from City staff and reviewed a wide-range of information to better understand the operations of the City of North Pole, necessary to meet the goals and objectives of the study.

Our project team met virtually with the Mayor and Department Managers in early October to review the objectives of the project and to establish an effective timeline for deliverables. Together, they reviewed the purpose of the study, the process to be followed, and the importance of employee their participation in the study.

The initial meeting was followed by job surveys to each employee to clarify appropriate compensable factors and duties, a salary and benefits survey was sent to primary communities, and numerous face-to-face and telephone interviews with staff from these communities were conducted to answer questions and clarify all data. Active participation of Senior Management was essential to the success of the results and recommendations of this report.

Issues and concerns that were very important to Staff brought up during this initial meeting and in follow-up conversations have been discussed, investigated and considered throughout our work and our analysis to date. Concerns of the City's Management Team regarding this study - including regional factors and characteristics of unique positions - have been incorporated into this Final Report.

## Phase 2: Job Description Survey \& Audit

Consultants administered the Job Description surveys and conducted face-to-face (Zoom) interviews with all Department Heads as part of the job description analysis and revision, as well as administering the classification analysis. The Job Surveys / Job Audits are designed to be rapid and complete with minimal imposition from employees' daily routine.

As part of the Compensable Factors analysis, consultants reviewed more than 114 job descriptions (various versions and dates) to obtain a clearer understanding of levels of education, knowledge, experience, reporting relationships, working environment and level of physical and mental effort to be expected. This information was valuable in assuring accuracy of Market Study comparisons but it also extremely valuable for the following reasons:

1. Clarifying duties, responsibilities and reporting relationships of each position;
2. Providing Management the ability to hold employees accountable;
3. Providing Management the ability to take necessary
 disciplinary actions and reduce risk of legal action; and
4. Providing a reliable basis for evaluating the position for salary increases.

Job Survey Results were used to determine which positions performed certain municipal functions to ensure that the most appropriate comparison was used.

We asked employees in those positions to respond to a series of questions regarding the current required levels of knowledge, skills, abilities, education and other factors their position requires. This was completed by nearly all employees within 3-4 days.

Job Surveys completed by each employee helped to determine the appropriate levels of education, knowledge, experience for each position. Management employees were asked to identify the position's levels of skill (education, experience, and knowledge), responsibility (budget, operations, and interpersonal work) and community (networking), and non-management employees identified the level of effort (physical and mental demand) and working conditions to be expected in their position. Each job survey was weighted and scored, and the data was used to evaluate whether certain classifications were internally equitable or needing adjustment.

Job audits were necessary to:
$\checkmark$ Create a simulated Classification System of all North Pole positions;
$\checkmark$ Analyze the existing Classification System for inequities;
$\checkmark$ Recommend adjustments and corrections to assure clarity and accountability within an updated Classification System;
$\checkmark$ Establish fair and equitable pay ranges to assure employees are assigned to the most appropriate pay classification; and
$\checkmark$ Reduce the risk the City might otherwise experience in human resource litigation.
We used this information to:

- Determine if the hierarchical relationships between classified positions are appropriate; and
- Determine which positions are properly and improperly classified.

Revisions to job descriptions - while not part of this assignment - should be completed per the recommendations in this study, and in conjunction with the approval and adoption of the new classification system and pay ranges.

Results of the Job Audit are displayed in the Compensable Factors Analysis in the supplemental documents and Appendices.

## Phase 3: Classification System Audit: Compensable Factors Analysis

In addition to its future use in creating new job descriptions, data collected from the Job Surveys was used in determining appropriate levels of compensation. A Compensable Factors tool was used to allow a comparison of different positions within the City's organization. Each position was evaluated, ratings were assigned and a total score developed for each position. Discussions with Department Heads further clarified the scores. (See Tables $1 \& 2$ below for illustrations and Appendix A for complete details). Results allowed us to:
> - Determine whether a position's associated salary range was appropriately assigned,
> - Determine whether certain changes to existing classifications should be considered,
> - Determine (with the market salary results) whether all positions are correctly compensated, and
> - Recommend adjustments to the current Classification System.

Table 1: Compensable Factors: Weighted Factors

| Management: Weighted Factors |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Factors |  | Degrees | 1st | 2nd | 3 rd |
| Skill |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Education |  | 12.5 | 25.0 | 50.0 |
| 2 | Experience |  | 15.0 | 30.0 | 60.0 |
| 3 | Knowledge |  | 17.5 | 35.0 | 70.0 |
| Responsibility |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Budget |  | 10.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 |
| 5 | Oversee Op | Operations | 6.3 | 12.5 | 25.0 |
| 6 | Work with | others | 6.3 | 12.5 | 25.0 |
| Community |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Networkin |  | 12.5 | 25.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  |  | 80.0 | 160.0 | 320.0 |


| non-Management Weighted Factors |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Factors |  | Degrees | 1st | 2nd | 3rd |
| Skill |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 Education |  | 7.5 | 15.0 | 30.0 |
| 2 | Experience |  | 12.5 | 25.0 | 50.0 |
| 3 | Knowledge |  | 15.0 | 30.0 | 60.0 |
| Effort |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 4 Physical Demand |  | 10.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 |
|  | 5 Mental Dem and |  | 7.5 | 15.0 | 30.0 |
| Job Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 Working Conditions |  | 12.5 | 25.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  |  | 65.0 | 130.0 | 260.0 |

Using the common language / terminology of the Job Surveys, all job descriptions can be standardized and the Compensable Factors System can be easily understood and maintained by the City staff in the future. The Job Surveys should be used (a) whenever a new or restructured position is considered, and (b) when a position is considered for re-classification.

Table 2: Compensable Factors for Comparison \& Classification: Management positions (sample)

| Management Range: |  | Skill |  |  |  |  |  | Responsibility |  |  |  |  |  | Community <br> Networking |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Education |  | Experience |  | Knowledge |  | Budget \& Finance |  | Oversee operations |  | Work w/ others |  |  |  |  |
| Position | Total Points | Degres | Pants | Degree | Paims | Degree | Points | Degree | Pants | Degres | Poins | Degree | Poins | Degree | Points | Total Points |
| Reserved | 320 |  | 12.50 |  | 15.00 |  | 17.50 |  | 10.00 |  | 6.25 |  | 6.25 |  | 12.50 | 320 |
| Reserved | 310 |  | 12.50 |  | 15.00 |  | 17.50 |  | 10.00 |  | 6.25 |  | 6.25 |  | 12.50 | 310 |
| Reserved | 300 |  | 12.50 |  | 15.00 |  | 17.50 |  | 10.00 |  | 6.25 |  | 6.25 |  | 12.50 | 300 |
| City Accountant / CFO | 295 | 3 | 50.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 295 |
| Police Chief | 295 | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 295 |
| Fire Chief | 295 | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 295 |
| Director of City Services | 282.50 | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 50.00 | 282.50 |
| Deputy City Manager (proposed new) | 282.50 | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 50.00 | 282.50 |
| Reserved | 270 |  | 12.50 |  | 15.00 |  | 17.50 |  | 10.00 |  | 6.25 |  | 6.25 |  | 12.50 | 270 |
| City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO | 262.50 | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 262.50 |
| HR Director / PIO (proposed new) | 262.50 | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 262.50 |
| Deputy Fire Chief | 250 | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 250 |
| Police Lieutenant | 250 | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 250 |
| Senior Accountont (proposed new) | 245 | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 2 | 12.50 | 2 | 25.00 | 245 |
| City Clerk (proposed new) | 232.50 | 2 | 25.00 | 2 | 30.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 232.50 |
| Police Sergeant | 221.25 | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 1 | 10.00 | 1 | 6.25 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 221.25 |
| Reserved | 210 |  | 12.50 |  | 15.00 |  | 17.50 |  | 10.00 |  | 6.25 |  | 6.25 |  | 12.50 | 210 |
| Reserved | 200 |  | 12.50 |  | 15.00 |  | 17.50 |  | 10.00 |  | 6.25 |  | 6.25 |  | 12.50 | 200 |

A more complete explanation of the Job Survey, Classification System, and the Compensable Factors and their application is included in the supplemental information in the Appendix.

## 4. Compensation Audit: Regional Salary \& Benefits Study

With the necessary evaluation tools in place, our consultants contacted the appropriate comparable communities previously proposed by Municipal Solutions and approved by senior management. Benefit, job classification and salary range information were gathered from the following communities based on:
a. Regional proximity to the City of North Pole,
b. Similarity to the City in budget, population size and tax base, and
c. Similarity in services provided.

Obtaining data from other cities and agencies is always a challenge. Obtaining salary and benefits information requires direct and often constant contact with each of the agencies. Our consultants personally contacted representatives in each of the primary communities and asked them to send a copy of their Pay Classifications / Grades and full details on employee Benefits. Obtaining comparison data for most of the positions was not easy but most communities were able to provide the information while being limited on staff resources.

Some agencies took between 2-3 months to provide us any usable salary or benefits data - despite committing to do so. Due to the timing of budget preparation in Alaska, COVID-19, and the variable nature of data gathering in general, our efforts exhaustive and to ensure that proper comparisons were appropriately identified, and enough comparisons were received for statistical significance. Only in two instances did we encounter an unwillingness to accommodate the request for information. This report reflects the most current salary and benefits data we could acquire.

Initially, consultants and analysts contacted the following communities to be used as primary comparisons which included:

Table 3: Cities, Towns, Counties, and Organizations Surveyed

| Primary Cities | Alternate Agencies |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | City of Cordova | City of Fairbanks | City \& Borough of Juneau |
| City of Bethel | Borough of Haines | Central Matsu Fire Dept. | Borough of Fairbanks North Star <br> Borough of Bristol Bay |
| City of Homer | City of Kenai | UAF Police Department | Fairbanks International Airport PD |
| City of Ketchikan | City of Kodiak | Fort Wainright | Fort Greeley |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | City of Palmer | Clear Air Station |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | City of Soldotna |  |  |
| City of Valdez | City of Wasilla |  |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell |  |  |  |

Most of the cities and towns we gathered information from had a formalized pay or compensation plans. Their step systems - grades ranges - varied widely among these local governments. Some have multiple pay and compensation plans for collective bargaining units. Some local governments only reported actual pay - which is noted in the 'notes' column of the report. Most communities we observed appeared to distribute key municipal functions in a manner which compare to most positions in North Pole. Most of the local governments had a very close comparisons / matches for each of North Pole's. In several instances, some cities job classifications lacked sufficient data, sufficient comparables, or positions didn't appear appropriate to use as a comparison. While all positions don't always clearly align with a counterpart position in North Pole, careful analysis of the materials provided and follow-up with local government representatives - and North Pole Department Heads - helped to assure close apples-to-apples comparisons were used.

In the event that a classified North Pole position lacked fewer than 6 comparables in other communities, data from the alternate communities were examined and relevant information was included from comparable positions as appropriate. If after examining the primary and alternate communities failed to produce a comparable salary position comparison, the Compensable Factors analysis absorbs the rare positions and helps determine a close comparison for internal classification.

Ms. Tungate, Mr. Larson and Mr. Morelli also assisted in direct communication with each comparator municipalities and special agencies. Overall, the consulting team was responsible for:

1. obtaining data from each of the participating cities and agencies,
2. performing data entry,
3. contact with communities to ensure enough accurate data was collected, and
4. assisting in the entry of salary and benefits data and analysis.

Some agencies have opted not to provide any information while others provided full policies and collective bargaining agreements and studies - some consisting of more than 500 pages. Data was not received from all agencies.

This report addresses only the analysis of current versus market average salaries for most classified positions. Where consultants were unable to identify enough comparable positions, benchmarking will occur through the use of the Compensable Factors Analysis Tool in recommending an appropriate salary range.

## Policy Discussion \& Preliminary Review with Management \& Staff (complete)

Throughout the project, we continued to have ongoing meetings with the City Clerk, Finance Director, Police Chief, Fire Chief, Deputy Fire Chief, City Accountant and Mayor to review the findings of this report and 'dialin' the accuracy and relevancy of the findings of our analysis. Where verification identified errors in the job descriptions, job classifications, or salary research corrections, these issues were discussed and considered. Where an organizational structure, job description, classification or pay / grade system from another city illustrates an alternative, we have incorporated these changes into our recommendations.

## Policy Discussion \& Final Review with Council \& Staff (pending)

As with many of our studies, we anticipate a Work Session with the Council upon delivery of the Final Report - whether during a regular meeting or in a special session - to provide Council Members the opportunity to understand what the data is telling us, to allow the public an opportunity to learn about the 'true value' of a public servant, and why we recommended what we recommend.

This draft Final Report represents the 'reportable' efforts of the consultant's efforts and is intended for final discussion with City Administration before final adoption. After any remaining feedback has been the consultant's presentation to the City Council - either from Councilmembers or Employees, final adjustments will be made to the recommendations and incorporated into the submitted version of the Final Report.

## Report Finalization \& Implementation Training (pending)

Final training on the implementation of the new system occurs after the Final Report has been presented and approved. As implementation can be a challenge - particularly if salary adjustments, freezes, increases or changes to benefits plans are recommended - we expect to discuss our recommendations with the Council to put them into context with the current financial and economic conditions of the City.

Once the new system has been determined suitable for the City, key employees will need to be trained on its implementation and sustainability. Training on the new system - including use of all tools, surveys, spreadsheets will be made available to designated key staff who will be designated as custodians of these materials. The HR Director and Finance Director are generally recommended. Consultants will go through all materials and make sure implementation of recommendations is efficient. Effective and sustainable.

Specific employees - most likely the HR Manager and City Accountant will become the custodians and guardians of the new system. We will conduct training of each element to assure the most effective implementation and utilization of the new Classification System and Pay Ranges to assure the highest the benefits to staff and assuring the long-term success.


## SECTION II: FINDINGS \& RECOMMENDATIONS

## 1. Job Descriptions: Inconsistent, Missing, Multiple or Obsolete Job Descriptions

a. All positions need current descriptions. Many of the job descriptions for the 26 classifications do not follow a common form or format. Some appear to have been updated in several years. Key functions, duties and relationships in some job descriptions were confusing and unclear to existing employees and managers. Many are not consistent with the duties the employee currently performs, and the necessary skill levels, education, level of knowledge and experience required for the position. This was evidenced by the additional duties and responsibilities provided to us by staff during the Job Survey process. Some descriptions required re-working and/or were out of date with respect to standard terminology.

Recommendation: With multiple or redundant versions of some Job Description, consolidation of some descriptions is recommended.

## 2. Job Descriptions: Most Job Descriptions are not FLSA / ADA compliant

a. Some of the Job Descriptions appear to have been updated recently and nicely correlate with one another in form and format, many do not appear to have been updated in several years.
b. Sections of some job descriptions misinterpret key language of the ADA to include the entire job duties as Essential Job Functions and as a result, many descriptions are not consistent with the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) exposing the City to potential liabilities.
(a) Several policies need clarification: Management / non-Management, Exempt / non-Exempt, Salary /Hourly, Overtime, Workweek, and Pay Period. No clear policies could lead to waste, fraud or abuse. See Finding \#20 below.

Recommendations: Job descriptions need to be streamlined to avoid unnecessarily complicating the document, providing clarity to employees, accountability in reporting relationships, and minimize risk/ exposure to the City.

## 3. Job Descriptions: More emphasis on 'Essential Functions' is needed, not just 'Duties and Responsibilities'

a. Some Job Descriptions contain duties and responsibilities which are not essential, while other job descriptions omit critical data. Cross department assignments or distinguishing characteristics of positions with similar titles are unclear, and in some instances reporting relationships are also unclear.

Recommendation: Same as \#2 above.
4. Job Descriptions: Not linked to empirical classification system

Current Job Descriptions are not uniformly tied to compensation with any empirical method. Without a method of tying job descriptions to the classification empirically, human-error and time can cause misclassifications and establishment of inappropriate rates of pay.

Recommendation: Adopt the recommended Classification System. See \#6 below.

## 5. Job Classifications: Not Enough unique Pay Classifications

After careful review, interviews and examination of job descriptions it was determined that some current Job Classifications warrant separate classifications. Creating separate classifications minimizes the potential for narrow-banding some jobs that are uniquely different which creates pay inequity.

Recommendation: Adopt the recommended Classification System. See \#6 below.

## 6. Job Classifications: Classification inequities exist

a. The City's current Classification System inequitably bands some of the 24 positions narrowly into 15 separate classifications. There is no clear distinction for Management and non-Management positions, and the existing classification system does not appear allow for easy evaluation of a position according to a common set of 'compensable factors.'

Table 4: Existing North Pole Classifications \& Grades
See Appendix A for more details.

| Poasition | Clamaticaton | Ranke 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ranak } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\cos _{3}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rank } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Burge } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{6}{\text { Rank }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Raga } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Farge } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Range } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ratge } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | trange 11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rank } \\ 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rawe } \\ & \text { Is } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rank } \\ 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lange } \\ & \text { is } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Irank } \\ 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { flane } \\ 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bumbe } \\ 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rank } \\ 19 \end{gathered}$ | Ratgo 20 (Maximum) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meyor | 15 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 | 5750 |
| Police Culet | 14 | 4558 | 4695 | 4836 | 4981 | 5130 | 5284 | 5442 | 5606 | 5774 | 5947 | 6126 | 6309 | 6499 | 6694 | 6894 | 7101 | 7314 | 7534 | 7760 | 7992 |
| Fire Chiet | 14 | 4558 | 4695 | 4836 | 4961 | 5130 | 5284 | 5442 | 5606 | 5774 | 5947 | 6126 | 6309 | 6499 | 6694 | 6894 | 7101 | 7314 | 7534 | 7760 | 7992 |
| CtyCork/HR | 14 | 4558 | 4695 | 4836 | 4981 | 5130 | 5284 | 5442 | 5606 | 5774 | 5947 | 6126 | 6309 | 6499 | 6694 | 6894 | 7101 | 7314 | 7534 | 7760 | 7992 |
| Oty Act | 14 | 4558 | 4695 | 4336 | 4981 | 5130 | 5284 | 5442 | 5606 | 5774 | 5947 | 6126 | 6309 | 6499 | 6694 | 6894 | 7101 | 7314 | 7534 | 7760 | 7992 |
| Dincetor of dtysis | 14 | 4558 | 4695 | 4836 | 4981 | 5130 | 5284 | 5442 | 5606 | 5774 | 5947 | 6126 | 6309 | 6499 | 6694 | 6894 | 7101 | 7314 | 7534 | 7760 | 7992 |
|  |  | 26.30 | 27.09 | 27.90 | 28.74 | 29.60 | 30.49 | 31.40 | 32.35 | 33.32 | 34.32 | 35.35 | 36.41 | 37.50 | 38.62 | 39.78 | 40.97 | 42.20 | 43.47 | 44.77 | 45.12 |
| Policetr. | 13 | 4199 | 4325 | 4455 | 4588 | 4726 | 4868 | 5014 | 5164 | 5319 | 5479 | 5643 | 5612 | 5587 | 6166 | 6351 | 6542 | 6738 | 6940 | 7149 | 7363 |
| Dep Fire Chiet | 13 | 4199 | 4325 | 4455 | 4588 | 4726 | 4868 | 5014 | 5164 | 5319 | 5479 | 5643 | 5612 | 5967 | 6166 | 6351 | 6542 | 6738 | 6940 | 7149 | 7363 |
| Public Wodss Superasar | 13 | 4199 | 4325 | 4455 | 4588 | 4726 | 4868 | 5014 | 5164 | 5319 | 5479 | 5643 | 5812 | 5987 | 6166 | 6351 | 6542 | 6738 | 6940 | 7149 | 7363 |
| Utility Superasor | 13 | 4199 | 4325 | 4455 | 4588 | 4726 | 4568 | 5014 | 5164 | 5319 | 5479 | 5643 | 5812 | 5987 | 6166 | 6351 | 6542 | 6738 | 6940 | 7149 | 7363 |
|  |  | 24.23 | 24.96 | 25.71 | 26.48 | 27.27 | 28.09 | 28.98 | 29.80 | 30.69 | 3161 | 32.56 | 33.54 | 34.55 | 35.58 | 36.65 | 37.75 | 38.88 | 40.05 | 41.25 | 42.49 |
| Police Sergeant | 12 | 4077 | 4199 | 4325 | 4455 | 4589 | 4726 | 4858 | 5014 | 5165 | 5320 | 5479 | 5644 | 5613 | 5987 | 6167 | 6352 | 6542 | 6739 | 6941 | 7149 |
|  |  | 23.52 | 24.23 | 24.95 | 25.70 | 25.47 | 27.27 | 28.08 | 28.93 | 29.79 | 30.69 | 31.61 | 32.56 | 33.53 | 34.54 | 35.58 | 36.64 | 37.74 | 38.87 | 40.04 | 41.24 |
| Poilice Detactive | 11 | 3945 | 4063 | 4185 | 4311 | 4440 | 4573 | 4711 | 4852 | 4997 | 5147 | 5302 | 5451 | 5625 | 5798 | 5967 | 6145 | 6331 | 6520 | 6716 | 6918 |
|  |  | 22.75 | 23.43 | 24.14 | 24.86 | 25.61 | 26.37 | 27.16 | 27.98 | 28.82 | 29.68 | 30.57 | 31.49 | 32.44 | 33.41 | 34.41 | 35.44 | 36.51 | 37.60 | 38.73 | 39.89 |
| Police Otticer | 10 | 3838 | 3953 | 4072 | 4194 | 4320 | 4449 | 4583 | 4720 | 4862 | 5008 | 5158 | 5313 | 5472 | 5636 | 5805 | 5979 | 6159 | 63.4 | 6534 | 6730 |
|  |  | 22.14 | 22.80 | 23.49 | 24.19 | 24.92 | 25.67 | 26.44 | 27.23 | 28.05 | 28.89 | 29.75 | 30.65 | 31.57 | 32.51 | 33.49 | 34.49 | 35.53 | 36.59 | 37.69 | 38.82 |
| Utility Operator | 9 | 3708 | 3819 | 3984 | 4052 | 4173 | 4299 | 4428 | 4560 | 4697 | 4838 | 4983 | 5133 | 5287 | 5445 | 5609 | 5777 | 5950 | 6129 | 6313 | 6502 |
|  |  | 21.39 | 22.03 | 22.69 | 23.37 | 24.07 | 24.80 | 25.54 | 25.31 | 27.10 | 27.91 | 28.75 | 29.61 | 30.50 | 31.41 | 32.35 | 33.32 | 34.32 | 35.35 | 36.42 | 37.51 |
| Public Worss Assistant | 8 | 3515 | 3620 | 3729 | 3841 | 3956 | 4075 | 4197 | 4323 | 4453 | 4586 | 4724 | 4856 | 5012 | 5162 | 5317 | 5476 | 5641 | 5810 | 5954 | 6164 |
| Utility Assistont | 8 | 3515 | 3620 | 3729 | 3841 | 3956 | 4075 | 4197 | 4323 | 4453 | 4586 | 4724 | 4856 | 5012 | 5162 | 5317 | 5476 | 5641 | 5810 | 5984 | 5164 |
|  |  | 20.27 | 20.88 | 21.50 | 22.15 | 22.81 | 23.50 | 24.20 | 24.93 | 25.68 | 26.45 | 27.24 | 28.06 | 28.90 | 29.77 | 30.66 | 31.58 | 32.53 | 33.50 | 34.51 | 35.54 |
| Reconds Mav/Acchiust | 7 | 3124 | 3218 | 3314 | 3414 | 3516 | 3622 | 3730 | 3542 | 3957 | 4076 | 4198 | 4324 | 4454 | 4588 | 4725 | 4857 | 5013 | 5163 | 5318 | 5478 |
| AR, AP, Utillity ailling Clerk | 7 | 3124 | 3218 | 3314 | 3414 | 3516 | 3622 | 3730 | 3842 | 3957 | 4076 | 4198 | 4324 | 4454 | 4588 | 4725 | 4857 | 5013 | 5163 | 5318 | 5478 |
| Admin Asst Evidence Cust/Despr | 7 | 3124 | 3218 | 3314 | 3414 | 3516 | 3622 | 3730 | 3842 | 3957 | 4076 | 4198 | 4324 | 4454 | 4588 | 4725 | 4867 | 5013 | 5163 | 5318 | 5478 |
|  |  | 18.02 | 18.56 | 19.12 | 19.69 | 20.28 | 20.89 | 21.52 | 22.16 | 22.83 | 23.51 | 24.22 | 24.94 | 25.69 | 26.45 | 27.26 | 28.07 | 28.92 | 29.78 | 30.68 | 31.60 |
| Fire Captain | 6 | 4077 | 4199 | 4325 | 4455 | 4569 | 4726 | 4868 | 5014 | 5165 | 5320 | 5479 | 5644 | 5813 | 5987 | 6167 | 6352 | 6542 | 6739 | 6941 | 7149 |
| 19 diy cyde |  | 17.70 | 15.23 | 18.78 | 19.34 | 19.92 | 20.52 | 2113 | 21.77 | 22.42 | 23.09 | 23.79 | 24.50 | 25.24 | 25.99 | 26.77 | 27.58 | 28.40 | 29.26 | 30.13 | 31.04 |
| Fire Lieutenant | 5 | 3932 | 4050 | 4171 | 4297 | 4426 | 4558 | 4695 | 4836 | 4981 | 5130 | 5284 | 5443 | 5606 | 5774 | 5948 | 6126 | 6310 | 6499 | 6694 | 6895 |
|  |  | 17.07 | 17.58 | 18.11 | 18.65 | 19.21 | 19.79 | 20.38 | 20.99 | 21.62 | 22.27 | 22.94 | 23.63 | 24.34 | 25.07 | 25.82 | 26.59 | 27.39 | 28.21 | 29.06 | 29.93 |
| Fire Engineer | 4 | 3838 | 3953 | 4072 | 4194 | 4320 | 4449 | 4583 | 4720 | 4852 | 5008 | 5158 | 5313 | 5472 | 5636 | 5805 | 5979 | 6159 | 63.44 | 6534 | 6730 |
|  |  | 16.66 | 17.16 | 17.67 | 18.20 | 18.75 | 19.31 | 19.89 | 20.49 | 21.10 | 2174 | 22.39 | 23.05 | 23.75 | 24.47 | 25.20 | 25.96 | 26.73 | 27.54 | 28.36 | 29.21 |
| Police Off cer Recruit | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wage at Academy |  | 15.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Firctighter | 2 | 3347 | 3447 | 3551 | 3657 | 3767 | 3880 | 3996 | 4116 | 4240 | 4367 | 4498 | 4633 | 4772 | 4915 | 5063 | 5215 | 5371 | 5532 | 5698 | 5869 |
|  |  | 14.53 | 14.97 | 15.41 | 15.88 | 16.35 | 16.84 | 17.35 | 17.87 | 18.41 | 18.96 | 19.53 | 20.11 | 20.72 | 21.34 | 21.98 | 22.64 | 23.32 | 24.02 | 24.74 | 25.48 |
| Ovetire Firefighter | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 127 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

b. Job classifications do not appear to tie directly to a standardized set of 'compensable factors' for management and non-management including: education, experience or knowledge required to perform the position requirements, physical, mental and networking responsibilities, and fiduciary and personnel (management) responsibilities (if any). See Table 5 a \& 5 b (below).
c. Some employees within the same classification appear to be performing uniquely different work or have significantly different compensable factors (certifications and / or skills, education, etc.) warranting a separate classification.
Examples: More than one individual performing the duties of Utility Operator clearly have different functions due to a higher certification and experience with electronics. Utility Assistant is similarly observed.
d. Based on the Compensable Factors Analysis, some of the pre-existing positions appeared to be mis-classified and are either under-classified with the duties actually being performed or overclassified by the duties assigned or being performed. This is illustrated in the Current Class / Grade column of Tables $6 \mathrm{a} \& 6 \mathrm{~b}$ (below).
Example: One management position - the City Clerk has a current class / grade of 14 - similar to Police Chief, Fire Chief, and City Accountant / CFO, however the Compensable Factors Analysis illustrates significant differences which would require it to be classified at a lower classification.
HOWEVER - the duties of Human Resource Director / Manager roles are significantly higher than Clerk and proportionate to Police Chief and Fire Chief.
Also, several non-Management positions appear grossly misclassified including: Fire Captain, Public Works Assistant, Police Officer Recruit, Firefighter / EMT, Firefighter Recruit, Fire Engineer, Utility Assistant and Evidence Custodian.

Table 5a: Classification Analysis for Management Positions See Appendix A for more details.

| Management Range: | Skill |  |  |  |  |  | Responsibility |  |  |  |  |  | Community <br> Net working |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Education |  | Experience |  | Knowledge |  | Budget a Finance |  | Oversee operations |  | Work w/ others |  |  |  |  |
| Position | Degree | Paints | Degree | Paints | Degree | Paints | Degree | Pairts | Degree | Paints | Degree | Poins | Degree | Points | Total Points |
| City Accountant / CFO | 3 | 50.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 295 |
| Police Chief | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 295 |
| Fire Chief | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 295 |
| Director of City Services | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 50.00 | 282.50 |
| Deputy City Manager (proposed new) | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 50.00 | 282.50 |
| Reserved |  | 12.50 |  | 15.00 |  | 17.50 |  | 10.00 |  | 6.25 |  | 6.25 |  | 12.50 | 270 |
| City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 262.50 |
| HR Director / PIO (proposed new) | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 262.50 |
| Deputy Fire Chief | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 250 |
| Police Lieutenant | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 250 |
| Senior Accountant (proposed new) | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 2 | 12.50 | 2 | 25.00 | 245 |
| City Clerk (proposed new) | 2 | 25.00 | 2 | 30.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 232.50 |

Table 5b: Classification Analysis for non-Management Positions
See Appendix A for more details.

| Non-Management Range: | Skill |  |  |  |  |  | Effort (Demand) |  |  |  | Job Conditions <br> Working <br> Conditions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Education |  | Experience |  | Knowledge |  | Physical |  | Mental |  |  |  |  |
| Position | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Point | Total Points |
| Reserved | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 260,00 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 250,00 |
| Utility Supervisor | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 245.00 |
| Police Sergeant | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 260.00 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 220.00 |
| Public Works Supervisor | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 215.00 |
| Fire Captain | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 245.00 |
| Public Works Assistant | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 190.00 |
| Fire Lieutenant | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 190.00 |
| Building Technician | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 185.00 |
| Fire Engineer | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 170.00 |
| Utility Operator (Operator / \& II propos | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 170.00 |
| City Planner (proposed) | 3 | 30.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 167.50 |
| Firefighter / EMT | 1 | 7.5 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 162.50 |
| Police Officer | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 190.00 |
| AP Tax \& License Clerk (revised) | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 145.00 |
| AR / Utility Billing Clerk (revised) | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 145.00 |
| Police Officer Recruit | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 177.50 |
| Utility Assistant II (proposed) | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 140.00 |
| Fiscal Accounting / Fund Accounting | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 132.50 |
| Deputy Clerk (proposed) | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 132.50 |
| Firefighter Recruit (proposed) | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 127.50 |
| Records Manager / Archivist | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 122.50 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 110.00 |
| Executive Assistant (proposed) | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.50 |
| Utility Assistant I | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 1 | 7.5 | 3 | 50.0 | 132.50 |
| Administrative Assistant PWD (propo | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.50 |
| Admin is trative Assistant Police | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.50 |
| Administrative Assistant Fire | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.50 |
| Records Preparation Clerk | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.50 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 90.00 |
| General Laborer (Summer Heip) | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 1 | 7.5 | 2 | 25.0 | 87.50 |
| Receptionist Admin | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 72.50 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 60.00 |

Without standardized language to be included in Job Descriptions, it is very difficult to maintain pay equity (fairness) among positions and puts the City at risk / exposure. Adopting a 'measurable', transparent and standardized classification system will ultimately allow the City to (a) assign an appropriate pay range for adjusted classifications, (b) assure appropriate compensation for all employees, (c) accurately forecast financial impact of salaries over multiple budget years, and (d) minimize risk / exposure to the City.

Below is the recommended new classification system - which has been tested against the Market (illustrated later).

Table 6b: Broad-banding of Current \& Proposed Pay Grades: Management (w/ proposed grade changes)

| Management Positions | Total Points | $\begin{gathered} \text { PROPOSED } \\ \text { Range } \end{gathered}$ | Current Class / Grade | PROPOSED Grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reserved | 320 | 320 |  | 25 |
| Reserved | 310 | 310-319 |  | 24 |
| Reserved | 300 | 300-309 |  | 23 |
| Police Chief | 295 | 290-299 | 14 | 22 |
| Fire Chief | 295 |  | 14 |  |
| City Accountant / CFO | 295 |  | 14 |  |
| Deputy City Manager (proposed new) | 282.50 | 280-289 | 15 | 21 |
| Director of City Services | 282.50 |  | 14 |  |
| Reserved | 270 | 270-279 |  | 20 |
| City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO | 262.50 | 260-269 | NEW | 19 |
| HR Director / PIO (proposed new) | 262.50 |  | NEW |  |
| Deputy Fire Chief | 250 | 250-259 | 13 | 18 |
| Police Lieutenant | 250 |  | 13 |  |
| Senior Accountant (proposed new) | 245 | 240-249 | NEW | 17 |
| City Clerk (proposed new) | 232.50 | 230-239 | 14 | 16 |
| Police Sergeant | 221.25 | 220-229 | 12 | 15 |

Table 6b: Broad-banding of Current \& Proposed Pay Grades: non-Management (w/ proposed grade changes)

| Non-Management Positions | Total <br> Points | $\begin{gathered} \text { PROPOSED } \\ \text { Range } \end{gathered}$ | Current Class / Grade | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROPOSED } \\ & \text { Grade } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Sergeant | 260 | 260 | 12 | 21 |
| Reserved | 250 | 250-259 | - | 20 |
| Utility Supervisor | 245 | 240-249 | 13 | 19 |
| Fire Captain | 245 |  | 6 | 19 |
| Reserved | 230 | 230-239 | - | 18 |
| Police Detective | 225 | 220-229 | 11 | 17 |
| Public Works Supervisor | 215 | 210-219 | 13 | 16 |
| Reserved | 200 | 200-209 |  | 15 |
| Utility Operator II (proposed) | 195 | 190-199 | - | 14 |
| Public Works Assistant | 190 |  | 8 | 14 |
| Police Officer | 190 |  | 10 | 14 |
| Fire Lieutenant | 190 |  | 5 | 14 |
| Building Technician | 185 | 180-189 | - | 13 |
| Police Officer Recruit | 177.50 | 170-179 | 3 | 12 |
| Utility Operator (Operator I \& II proposed) | 170 |  | - | 12 |
| Fire Engineer | 170 |  | 4 | 12 |
| City Planner (proposed) | 167.50 | 160-169 | - | 11 |
| Firefighter / EMT | 162.50 |  | 2 | 11 |
|  | 150 | 150-159 |  | 10 |
| AP Tax \& License Clerk (revised) | 145 | 140-149 | 7 | 9 |
| AR / Utility Billing Clerk (revised) | 145 |  | 7 | 9 |
| Utility Assistant II (proposed) | 140 |  | $\cdot$ | 9 |
| Fiscal Accounting / Fund Accounting Clerk | 132.50 | 130-139 | 7 | 8 |
| Deputy Clerk (proposed) | 132.50 |  | - | 8 |
| Utility Assistant I | 132.50 |  | 8 | 8 |
| Firefighter Recruit (proposed) | 127.50 | 120-129 | 1 | 7 |
| Evidence Cust / Rec. Mgr / Archivist | 122.50 |  | 7 | 7 |
| Reserved | 110 | 110-119 | - | 6 |
| Executive Assistant (proposed) | 107.50 | 100-109 | - | 5 |
| Administrative Assistant PWD (proposed) | 107.50 |  | - | 5 |
| Administrative Assistant Police | 107.50 |  | - | 5 |
| Adminis trative Assistant Fire | 107.50 |  | $\cdot$ | 5 |
| Records Preparation Clerk | 107.50 |  | 7 | 5 |
| Reserved | 90 | 90-99 |  | 4 |
| General Laborer (Summer Help) | 87.50 | 80-89 | $\cdot$ | 3 |
| Receptionist Admin | 72.50 | 70-79 | $\cdot$ | 2 |
| Reserved | 60 | 60-69 |  | 1 |

Note: Broad-banding is a practice of creating parity among similar positions to reduce inequity in compensation and number of classifications for easy administration.

Recommendations:
(a) Adopt the recommended Classification System based on Compensable Factors Analysis including the new Grades. Classifications should be expanded, retitled (and compensated) differently. When uniquely classified positions are classified within the same range, this creates (unfair) inequity in compensation inequity. An equitable classification system minimizes risk / exposure to the City, while also assuring transparency and equity among all positions.
(b) Create separate classifications to reduce the potential and risk of misclassification and salary inequity, AND are valuable in assuring unique positions have been identified and salary ranges affixed - regardless of whether they are budgeted. Specifically, create the following new classifications:

| - Deputy City Manager | - HR Director / PIO | - Senior Accountant |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - Utility Operator II | - Utility Operator I | - City Planner |
| - Deputy City Clerk | - Utility Assistant II | - Utility Assistant I |
| - Firefighter Recruit | - Executive Assistant | - Administrative Asst (PWD) |

- General Laborer
- Deputy City Manager Classification: used simply as a baseline for the CAO roles. Many communities have an actual salary for their Mayor, and consultants created a baseline for future reference - regardless of the actual final title.
- Utility Operator: appears to be two separate classifications compressed into one, and employee pay demonstrates inequity as a result. Recommending two separate classifications I \& II
- City Planner: recommended for classification purposes and future reference.
- Deputy City Clerk: recommended for classification purposes and future use.
- Firefighter Recruit: recommended for classification purposes and future use.
- Executive Assistant: recommended for classification purposes and future use in all departments.
- General Laborer: recommended for classification purposes and future reference
(c) Revise the following classifications to differentiate these positions, reduce risk of misclassification and salary inequity:
- AP Tax \& License Clerk • AR / Utility Billing Clerk
- AR, AP, Utility Billing Clerk: Currently two employees serving under an aggregated title. Job Surveys and interviews determined that these are there are TWO unique positions and recommend classifications appropriate for what they do.


## 7. Job Classifications: Positions with difficult-to-observe comparisons

Several classified positions in the City of North Pole appear to be unique in that comparable positions in communities, and were difficult to identify or did not exist at all. All cities have unique classifications which emphasizes the need for an internally and externally-based equitable classification system. Without an empirically-based classification system which rank-orders compensable factors such as levels of education, years of experience, and the physical working environment, all positions (not just irregular and new positions) cannot be properly classified and salary disparity is likely to occur.

Positions with difficult to observe comparisons (less than 6 or not exact comparables) include:

- City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO - Director of City Services
- City Accountant / CFO

Most comparable communities have classifications for City Clerk, HR Manager or Director, and / or Public Information Officer, however most do not have a combined classification with all three key functions. This occurrence in North Pole creates pay compression and inequity.

- City Accountant / CFO: Title listed in the Code, generally has high levels of Compensable Factors (education, experience, knowledge, etc.) which is directly tied to both classification within the pay system AND a high rate of pay. According to the Compensable Factors Analysis and Market Salary Study results - a junior CFO position is warranted.
- City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO: Our Job Surveys and Compensable Factors Analysis identified that the City Clerk is performing HR Functions as well as some Public Information duties. The Compensable Factors (levels of education, experience, knowledge, etc.), the need for two separate classifications for HR Manager and City Clerk. Most municipalities have separate classifications, and unique pay ranges for each.
- Director of City Services is also a unique position in the that City of North Pole combines the functions of Public Works Director with Building Official, Planner, Code Enforcement and more.

Recommendations: See 6b above.
8. Salaries: Current minimum Pay Ranges are consistently too low and too wide when compared to the Market - more significantly for Management than for non-Management positions

Results from the market research clearly illustrates that the width of North Pole's salary ranges (between minimum and maximum salary) is much broader than comparable cities, towns and boroughs. On average, North Pole's Management classifications are $\$ 40,000$ wide while the comparable communities are much narrower. See Table 7a and 7b below.

Recommendations: All recommendations for \#8-13 are included at the end of Finding \#13.

Table 7a: Salary Range Width for Management Positions
See Appendix C for more details.

| Management Positions | Existing Salary Range |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NP Current Minimum |  | NP Current Maximum |  | Range Width in $\$$ | Market Minimum | Market Maximum | Rainge Width in S |
| Police Chief | \$ | 54,704 | S | 95,930/ | \$41,226 | \$96,659 | \$131,366 | \$34,707 |
| Fire Chief | 5 | 54,704 | S | 95,930 | \$41,226 | 586,217 | \$120,189 | S33,973 |
| City Accountant / CFO | 5 | 54,704 | \$ | 95,930 | \$41,226 | -91,651 | \$124,959 | \$33,308 |
| Deputy City Manager (proposed new) | \$ | 69,000 |  | - |  | 94,828 | \$133,007 | \$38,179 |
| Director of City Services | 5 | 54,704 | 5 | 95,930 | \$41,226 | \$91,383 | \$121,703 | \$30,319 |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HR Director / PIO (proposed new) | \$ | 54,704 | \$ | 95,930 | \$41,226 | \$79,084 | \$107,596 | \$28,513 |
| Deputy Fire Chief | \$ | 49,192 | S | 86,253 | \$37,066 | \$83,030 | \$108,382 | \$25,352 |
| Police Lieutenant | 5 | 49,192 | S | 86,258 | \$37,066 | 579,735 | \$105,820 | \$26,085 |
| Senior Accountant (proposed new) | 5 | 54,704 | S | 95,930 | \$41,226 | \$68,898 | \$93,233 | \$24,335 |
| City Clerk (proposed new) | 5 | 54,704 | S | 95,930 | \$41,226 | \$75,374 | \$108,618 | \$33,243 |
| Police Sergeant | 5 | 48,924 | 5 | 85,788 | \$36,864 | \$68,083 | \$94,935 | \$26,852 |

Table 7b: Salary Range Width for non-Management Positions

| Non-Management Positions | Existing Salary Ranges |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current Minimum | Current Maximum | Range Width (in S) | Market <br> Minimum | Market <br> Maximum | Ronge Width (in S) |
| Police Sergeant | 548,924 | 585,788 | \$36,864 | 568,083 | 594,935 | \$26,852 |
| Reserved | - |  | - | - | - | - |
| Utility Supervisor | 549,192 | 586,258 | \$37,066 | \$68,396 | 592,629 | \$24,233 |
| Fire Captain | 548,924 | 585,788 | \$36,864 | 570,547 | 595,267 | \$24,720 |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Police Detective | 547,340 | \$83,016 | \$35,676 | 63,779 | 586,510 | \$22,731 |
| Public W orks Supervisor | 549,200 | 586,268 | \$37,068 | \$67,453 | 593,797 | \$26,344 |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | . |
| Utility Operator II (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public W orks Assis tant | S42,180 | 573,963 | \$31,788 | 5 1 1,423 | 582,792 | \$21,369 |
| Police Officer | 546,056 | 580,760 | \$34,704 | 5 9,9,464 | 583,340 | \$23,875 |
| Fire Lieutenant | S47,184 | \$82,740 | \$35,556 | S 514,825 | 576,205 | \$21,380 |
| Building Technidian | - | - | - | 5:5,278 | 577,384 | \$22,105 |
| Police Officer Recruit | \$46,056 | 580,760 | \$34,704 | 556,024 | 578,757 | \$22,733 |
| Utility Operator (Operator I \& II proposed) | 544,491 | 578,021 | \$33,530 | 556,382 | 577,224 | \$20,842 |
| Fire Engineer | 546,056 | 580,7¢0 | \$34,704 | 556,257 | 574,373 | \$18,117 |
| City Planner (proposed) | - | - | - | - - | - | - |
| Firefighter / EMT | 540,164 | 570,428 | \$30,264 | 548,302 | 567,882 | \$19,580 |
|  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| AP Tax \& License Clerk (revised) | \$37,482 | 565,72 8 | \$28,246 | 547,016 | 563,407 | \$16,392 |
| AR / Utility Billing Clerk (revised) | 537,482 | 565,72 8 | \$28,246 | 546,170 | 562,486 | \$16,316 |
| Utility Assistant II (proposed) | - | - | - | - - | - | - |
| Fis cal Accounting / Fund Accounting Clerk | - | - |  | S55,004 | 574,52 | \$19,521 |
| Deputy Clerk (proposed) | - | - |  | \$52,273 | 571,72 | \$19,448 |
| Utility Assis tant I | 542,180 | 573,968 | \$31,788 | \$47,792 | 565,65 | \$17,862 |
| Firefighter Recruit (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Evidence Cust / Rec. Mgr / Archivist | 537,482 | 565,728 | \$28,246 | 547,383 | S64,966 | S17,583 |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Assistant (proposed) | $\checkmark$ | - | - | \$51,878 | 570,208 | \$18,330 |
| Administrative Assistant PWD (proposed) | 537,488 | 565,736 |  | S45,334 | 562,218 | \$16,884 |
| Administrative Assistant Police | 537,488 | 565,736 |  | 544,432 | \$61,930 | \$17,499 |
| Adminis trative Assistant Fire | \$37,488 | \$65,736 | \$28,248 | S44,432 | 561,930 | \$17,499 |
| Records Preparation Clerk | 537,488 | 565,736 | \$28,248 | 546,189 | 562,329 | \$16,140 |

9. Salaries: The City's current minimum and maximum pay ranges for Management and nonManagement positions are lower than the market minimum, with some exceptions*
Non-Management classification pay ranges slightly are more consistent with the market, but is more pronounced for Management positions. See Tables 8a \& 8b below.
*The current maximum pay ranges for the following positions are higher than the market:

| - Senior Accountant | - Fire Lieutenant | - Police Officer Recruit |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - Utility Operator | - Fire Engineer | - Firefighter / EMT |
| - AP / Tax \& License Clerk | - AR Utility Billing Clerk | Utility Assistant |
| - Evidence Custodian | - Administrative Assistants |  |

*The current maximum pay ranges for the following positions are significantly under the market:

- Public Works Assistant (significantly under) - Police Sergeant (significantly under)
- Fire Captain (significantly under) - Fire Engineer (slightly over)
- Utility Assistant I (significantly over),

Table 8a: Minimum \& Maximum Salary Ranges for Management Positions
See Appendix C for more details.

| Management Positions | Existing Salary Range |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NP Current Minimum | NP Carrent Maximam | Range Width in S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Market } \\ & \text { Minimum } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Market } \\ & \text { Maximury } \end{aligned}$ | Range width in $S$ |
| Police Chief | 5 54,704 | S 95,93) | 541,226 | \$96,659 | \$131,366 | \$34,707 |
| Fire Chief | /5 54 | S 95,930 | 541,226 | \$86,217 | \$120,189 | 533,973 |
| City Accountant / CFO | \$ 54,704 | \$ 95,930 | 541,226 | \$91,651 | \$124,959 | \$33,308 |
| Deputy City Manager (proposed new) | S 5 | - |  | 594,828 | \$133,007 | \$38,179 |
| Director of City Services | \$ 54,704 | \$ 95,930 | 541,226 | \$91,383 | \$121,703 | \$30,319 |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HR Director / PIO (proposed new) | \$ 54,704 | \$ 95,930 | 541,226 | \$79,084 | \$107,596 | \$28,513 |
| Deputy Fire Chief | \$ 4949,192 | \$ 86,258 | 537,066 | \$83,030 | \$108,382 | \$25,352 |
| Police Lieutenant | \$ 49,192 | \$ 86,258 | \$37,066 | \$79,735 | \$105,820 | \$26,085 |
| Senior Accountant (proposed new) | S 54,704 | 5 95,930 | 541,226 | 568,898 | 593,233 | \$24,335 |
| City Clerk (proposed new) | 5 5 54,704 | \$ 95,930 | 541,226 | 775,374 | \$108,61\% | \$33,243 |
| Police Sergeant | \$ 48,924 | \$ 80,788 | \$36,864 | \$68,083 | 594,935 | S26,852 |

Table 8b: Minimum \& Maximum Salary Ranges for non-Management Positions See Appendix C for more details.

| Non-Management Positions | Existing Salary Ranges |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current Minimum | Current <br> Maximum | Range Width (in S) | Market Minimum | Market Maximum | Range Width (in S) |
| Police Sergeant | \$48,924 | 585,788 | \$36,864 | S68,083 | \$94,935 | \$26,852 |
| Reserved | - |  | - | - | - | - |
| Utility Supervis or | \$49,192 | \$86,258 | \$37,066 | \$68,396 | \$92,629 | \$24,233 |
| Fire Captain | S48,924 | 585,788 | \$36,864 | 570,547 | 595,267 | \$24,720 |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Police Detective | 547,340 | 583,016 | \$35,676 | 563,779 | \$86,510 | \$22,731 |
| Public W orks Supervisor | \$49,200 | 586,268/ | \$37,068 | \$67,453 | 593,797/ | \$26,344 |
| Reserved | - |  | - | - | - | - |

Table 8c: Minimum \& Maximum Salary Ranges for non-Management Positions (continued) See Appendix C for more details.

| Non-Management Positions | Existing Salary Ranges |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current Mihimum | Curkent Maximum | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Range Width } \\ & \text { (in S) } \end{aligned}$ |  | Market Maximum | Range Width (in S) |
| Utility Operator II (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public W orks Assis tant | S42,180 | 573,968 | \$31,788 | S61,423 | \$82,792 | \$21,369 |
| Police Officer | \$46,056 | 580,760 | \$34,704 | \$59,464 | \$83,340 | \$23,875 |
| Fire Lieutenant | \$47,184 | S82,740 | \$35,556 | \$54,825 | \$76,205 | \$21,380 |
| Building Technidan | - | - | - | \$55,278 | \$77,384 | \$22,105 |
| Police Officer Recruit | \$46,056 | \$80,760 | \$34,704 | \$56,024 | \$78,757 | \$22,733 |
| Utility Operator (Operator I \& II proposed) | \$44,491 | 578,021 | \$33,530 | \$56,382 | 577,224 | S20,842 |
| Fire Engineer | \$46,056 | \$80,760 | \$34,704 | \$56,257 | 574,373 | \$18,117 |
| City Planner (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Firefighter / EMT | 540,164 | 570,428 | \$30,264 | 548,302 | \$67,882 | \$19,580 |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| AP Tax \& License Clerk (revised) | \$37,482 | S65,728 | \$28,246 | 547,016 | 563,407 | \$16,392 |
| AR / Utility Billing Clerk (revised) | \$37,482 | S65,728 | \$28,246 | 546,170 | \$62,486 | \$16,316 |
| Utility Assistant II (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fis cal Accounting / Fund Accounting Clerk | - | - |  | \$55,004 | \$74,525 | \$19,521 |
| Deputy Clerk (proposed) | - | - |  | \$52,273 | \$71,721 | \$19,448 |
| Utility Assis tant I | S42,180 | 573,968 | \$31,788 | \$47,792 | S65,653 | \$17,862 |
| Firefighter Recruit (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Evidence Cust / Rec. Mgr / Archivist | \$37,482 | S65,728 | \$28,246 | 547,383 | S64,966 | S17,583 |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Assistant (proposed) | - | - | - | \$51,878 | \$70,208 | \$18,330 |
| Administrative Assistant PWD (proposed) | S37,488 | S65,736 |  | 545,334 | 562,218 | \$16,884 |
| Adminis trative Assistant Police | 537,488 | 565,736 |  | \$44,432 | 561,930/ | \$17,499 |
| Adminis trative Assistant Fire | \$37,488 | 565,73/6 | \$28,248 | 5 44,432 | 561,930 | \$17,499 |
| Records Preparation Clerk | 537,488 | 565,736 | \$28,248 | 54\%,189 | 562,329 | \$16,140 |

10. Salaries: Actual Salaries for all employees are above the current pay range minimum*

All employees at the highest rate of pay within each classification appear to be receiving pay at or above the minimum level of pay required in the current pay ranges. Some employees may be currently being paid at a rate lower than the minimum. If any employees are paid at a rate lower than the current minimum, their minimum salary should be increased (in the least) to the minimum of the pay grade (and higher if warranted).

See Table 9a \& 9b for details - noted classifications are highlighted in RED.

## 11. Salaries: Actual Salaries for some employees are above the current pay range maximum

Several Management and non-Management employees within the current pay ranges system are paid in excess of the current pay range maximum or at the maximum of the range.

See Table 9a \& 9b for details - noted classifications are highlighted in RED.
Management Positions over the current maximum salary range include:

- Director of City Services (significantly over $\$ 68,000$ )
- Police Chief (significantly over, \$17,000) - Fire Chief (significantly over \$6,000)
- Deputy Fire Chief (maxed, top of range) - Police Lieutenant (maxed, top of range)

Non-Management Positions over the current maximum salary range include:

- Utility Supervisor (significantly over $\$ 29,000$ ) $\begin{aligned} & \text { - Police Detective (maxed, top of range) } \\ & \text { - Utility Operator (over } \$ 9,500 \text { ) }\end{aligned}$. Police Officer (maxed, top of range)
- AP Tax \& License Clerk (over \$4,000)

Table 9a: Actual Pay vs. Pay Ranges - Management Positions
See Appendix C for more details.

| Management Positions | Current Base Salary | Existing Salary Range |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NP Current Minimum | $\begin{gathered} \text { Under Min } \\ (X=y e s) \end{gathered}$ | NP Current Maximum | $\begin{gathered} \text { Over Max } \\ (X=\text { yes }) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Market } \\ \text { Minimum } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Under Min } \\ (X=y e s) \end{gathered}$ | Market Maximum | Over Max ( $X=$ yes) |
| Police Chief | S112, 882 | S 54,704 |  | S 959,930 | X | 596,659 |  | \$131,366 |  |
| Fire Chief | S101,700 | S 54,704 |  | S 95,930 | X | \$86,217 |  | \$120,189 |  |
| City Accountant / CFO | 578,000 | S 54,704 |  | S 95,930 |  | S91,651 | X | \$124,959 |  |
| Deputy City Manager (proposed new) | \$70,366 | S 69,000 |  | - |  | 594,828 | X | \$133,007 |  |
| Director of City Services | S164, 154 | S 54,704 |  | S 95,930 | X | 591,383 |  | \$121,703 | X |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City Qerk / HR Manager / PIO | \$61,568 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HR Director / PIO (proposed new) | 561,568 | S 54,704 |  | S 95,930 |  | 579,084 | $\times$ | S107,596 |  |
| Deputy Fire Chief | \$86,258 | S 49,192 |  | S 86,258 | X | 583,030 |  | S108,382 |  |
| Police Lieutenant | \$86,258 | S 49,192 |  | S 86,258 | X | 579,735 |  | S105,820 |  |
| Senior Accourtant (proposed new) | 578,000 | S 5 54,704 |  | S 950,930 |  | 568,898 |  | 593,233 |  |
| City Clerk (proposed new) | S61,568 | S 54,704 |  | S 950,930 |  | 575,374 | X | \$108,618 |  |
| Police Sergeant | 578,499 | S 48,924 |  | S 85,788 |  | \$68,083 |  | 594,935 |  |

Table 9b: Actual Pay vs. Pay Ranges - non-Management Positions
See Appendix C for more details.

| Non-Management Positions | Current Base Salary | Existing Salary Ranges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Current <br> Minimum | Under Min $\text { ( } X=y \text { yes) }$ | Current Maximum | Over Max (X=yes) | Market <br> Minimum | Under Min $\text { ( } X=\text { yes })$ | Market Maximum | Over Max (X=yes) |
| Police Sergeant | 578,499 | 548,924 |  | 585,788 |  | 568,083 |  | \$94,935 |  |
| Reserved | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | . | - |
| Utility Supervisor | \$115,523 | 549,192 |  | 586,258 | X | \$68,396 |  | \$92,629 | X |
| Fire Captain | 578,498 | 548,924 |  | 585,788 |  | 570,547 |  | \$95,267 |  |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Police Detective | 588,026 | 547,340 |  | 583,016 | X | \$63,779 |  | \$86,510 | X |
| Public Works Supervisor | \$81,307 | 549,200 |  | 586,268 |  | 567,453 |  | 593,797 |  |
| Reserved | - | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ut ility Opera tor II (proposed) | - | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public Works Assistant | \$58,365 | 542,180 |  | 573,968 |  | \$61,423 | X | 582,792 |  |
| Police Officer | 580,746 | 546,056 |  | 580,760 | X | 559,464 |  | \$83,340 |  |
| Fire Lieutenant | 567,276 | 547,184 |  | 582,740 |  | 554,825 |  | \$76,205 |  |
| Building Tedinician | - | - | - | - | - | 555,278 |  | 577,384 |  |
| Police Officer Recruit | - | 546,056 |  | 580,760 |  | 556,024 |  | 578,757 |  |
| Utility Operator (Operator I \& II proposed) | 587,526 | 544,491 |  | 578,021 | X | 556,382 |  | 577,224 | X |
| Fire Engineer | \$65,313 | 546,056 |  | 580,760 |  | \$56,257 |  | \$74,373 |  |
| C ity Planner (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Firefighter / EMT | \$55,584 | 540,164 |  | 570,428 |  | 548,302 |  | \$67,882 |  |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| AP Tax \& Licerse Clerk (revised) | \$69,742 | 537,482 |  | \$65,728 | X | 547,016 |  | \$63,407 | X |
| AR / Utility Billing Clerk (revised) | 547,487 | 537,482 |  | 565,728 |  | 546,170 |  | \$62,486 |  |
| Ut ility Assistant II (proposed) | - | - | - | - | . | - | - | - | - |
| Fiscal Accounting / Fund Accounting Clerk | 560,154 | - |  | - |  | 555,004 |  | \$74,525 |  |
| Deputy Clerk (pr oposed) | - | - |  | . |  | 552,273 |  | \$71,721 |  |
| Utility Assistant I | \$65,686 | 542,180 |  | 573,968 |  | 547,792 |  | \$65,653 | x |
| Firefighter Recruit (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Evidence Cust / Rec. Mgr/ Archivist | 546,093 | 537,482 |  | \$65,728 |  | 547,383 | X | \$64,966 |  |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Assistart (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | 551,878 | - | 570,208 | - |
| Administrative Assistant PWD (proposed) | - | 537,488 |  | 565,736 |  | 545,334 |  | \$62,218 |  |
| Administrative Assistant Police | 546,093 | 537,488 |  | 565,736 |  | 544,432 |  | \$61,930 |  |
| Administrative Assistant Fire | 546,093 | 537,488 |  | 565,736 |  | 544,432 |  | \$61,930 |  |
| Records Preparation Clerk | - | 537,488 |  | 565,736 |  | 546,189 |  | \$62,329 |  |

## 12. Salaries: Actual Salaries for some employees are below the 'market' minimum

Several Management and non-Management employees appear to be paid below the current market pay range minimum. See Table 9a \& 9b for details - noted classifications are highlighted in RED.

Management Positions under the current minimum 'market' salary range include:

- City Accountant / CFO (under \$13,000 as Finance Director, in range as Senior Accountant) *
- City Clerk (under \$8,500 as Clerk only, under \$17,500 as City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO.
* appear to be mis-classified. Current classification does not compare to market comparables.

Non-Management Positions under the current minimum 'market' salary range include:

> - Public Works Assistant (under, \$1,500) •Evidence Custodian / Records Archivist (\$1,300)

## 13. Salaries: Actual salaries for some employees are above the 'market' maximum

Several Management and non-Management employees within the market analysis are paid in excess of the current pay range maximum or at the maximum of the range.

See Table 9a \& 9b for details - noted classifications are highlighted in RED.
Management Positions above the current maximum 'market' salary range include:

- Director of City Services (significantly over, \$43,000)

Non-Management Positions over the current maximum 'market' salary range include:

- Utility Supervisor (significantly over, $\$ 23,000$ )
- Utility Operator (significantly \$11,500)
- AP Tax \& License Clerk (over \$6,300)
- Police Detective (slightly over, \$1,500)
- Police Officer (not all, maxed, top of range)
- Utility Assistant (at maximum)


## Salary Recommendations for \#8-13:

(b) Employee salaries who exceed the current range should be frozen (until new pay ranges are adopted) to maintain equity within the existing system, assure fair employee compensation and minimize risk / liability to the City. See Tables 10a \& 10b below for proposed new pay ranges.

Management positions with recommended pay freezes:

- Police Chief
- Fire Chief
- Director of City Services
- Deputy Fire Chief
- Police Lieutenant


## Non-Management

- Police Detective
- Utility Supervisor*
- Utility Operator*
- Police Officer
- Utility Assistant
- AP Tax \& License Clerk*
(c) All positions impacted by Moose Creek development should have a Pay Differential (see Recommendation \#14).
(d) Adopt the proposed new Pay Scale for Management and Non-Management classifications.

Positions below the new range minimum should be brought to (at the least) the range minimum. Positions exceeding the new range maximum should be frozen.

Samples provided below include 1.5\% step and 3.0\% step options.

Benefits of the new Management Pay Scale:
$\checkmark$ Internally equitable \& externally competitive ('roughly proportional' with the market),
$\checkmark$ Narrows the pay ranges to more closely align with market best-practices,
$\checkmark$ Increases pay range minimums and maximums for most classifications,
$\checkmark 1.05 \%$ increase between pay classifications (vertical),
$\checkmark$ No management positions under the range,
$\checkmark 1$ position under the minimum: City Clerk / HR Manager,
$\checkmark 2$ positions remain over the maximum: Director of City Service (freeze) \& Police Lieutenant (reclassify), and
$\checkmark$ Proposed reserved ranges for future use.
Fiscal Impact: $\$ 4,500$ to get Clerk / HR Manager to minimum
Benefits of the new non-Management Pay Scale:
Internally equitable \& externally competitive ('roughly proportional' with the market), Increases pay range minimums for most classifications,
Increases maximum for some upper-level classifications,

- Narrows the pay ranges to more closely align with market best-practices,
- $1.0375 \%$ increase between pay classifications (vertical),
- No positions under the minimum,
- 6 positions over the maximum: Utility Supervisor (freeze), Police Detective (freeze or reclassify), Utility Operator (freeze), AP Tax \& License Clerk (freeze), Utility Assistant (freeze), and Proposed reserved ranges for future use.

Fiscal Impact: \$0. *Frozen salaries or re-classification of position if warranted.
Table 10a: Proposed New Pay Ranges - Management Positions w/ 1.5\% and 3\% steps
See Appendix D for more details.

| Management Positions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROPOSED } \\ & \text { Grade } \end{aligned}$ | current BaseSalary | Existing Salary Range |  |  |  | Proposed Salary Range |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { NP Current } \\ \text { Minimum } \end{array}$ | NP Current Maximum | Narket <br> Atinimum | Market Maximum | New Salary Minimum | New Salary Naximum | New Haurly Minimum | New Hourly Naximum |
| Reserved | 25 |  |  | - |  |  | 588,386 | 5134,013 | 542.49 | 564.43 |
| Reserved | 24 |  |  |  |  |  | 584, 177 | 5127,027 | 540.47 | 561.07 |
| Reserved | 23 |  |  |  |  |  | 580,169 | 5120,405 | 538.54 | \$57.89 |
| Police Chief | 22 | \$112,882 | \$ 54,704 | § 95,930 | \$96,659 | \$131,366 | 576,351 | 5114, 128 | 536.71 | \$54.87 |
| Fire Chief |  | \$101,700 | S 54,704 | \$ 95,930 | 586,217 | \$120,189 | 576,351 | 5114,128 | 536.71 | \$54.87 |
| City Accountant / CFO |  | 578,000 | \$ 54,704 | \$ 95,930 | \$91,651 | \$124,959 | 576,351 | 5114,128 | 536.71 | 554.87 |
| Deputy City Manager (praposed rew) | 21 | 570,366 | \$ 69,000 | - | 594,828 | \$133,007 | 572,715 | 5108,178 | 534.96 | 552.01 |
| Director of City Services |  | \$164, 154 | \$ 54,704 | \$ 95,930 | \$91,383 | \$121, 703 | 572,715 | 5108,178 | 534.96 | \$52.01 |
| Reserved | 20 |  |  |  |  |  | 569,252 | \$102,538 | 533.29 | 549.30 |
| City Clerk / HR Manager / P1O | 19 | \$61,568 |  |  |  |  | 565,954 | 597,192 | 531.71 | 546.73 |
| HR Director /PIO (proposed new) |  | \$51,568 | \$ 54,704 | \$ 95,930 | \$79,084 | \$107,596 | 565,954 | 597,192 | 531.71 | 546.73 |
| Deputy fire Chief | 18 | \$96, 258 | S 49, 192 | ¢ 86,258 | \$83,030 | \$108,382 | 562,813 | 592,125 | 530.20 | \$44.29 |
| Police Lieutenant |  | 586,258 | \$ 49, 192 | ¢ 86,258 | \$79,735 | \$105,820 | 562,813 | 592, 125 | 530.20 | 544.29 |
| Senior Accourtant (proposed new) | 17 | 578,000 | S 54,704 | \$ 95,930 | 568,898 | \$93,233 | 559,822 | 587,322 | 528.76 | 541.98 |
| city clerk (proposed new) | 16 | \$51,568 | \$ 54,704 | \$ 95,930 | 575,374 | \$108,618 | 556,973 | 582,770 | 527.39 | 539.79 |
| Police Sergeant | 15 | 578,499 | S 48,924 | \$ 85,788 | \$68,083 | 594,935 | 554,260 | 578,455 | 526.09 | 537.72 |
| Reserved | 14 |  |  |  |  |  | 551,676 | 574,365 | 524.84 | \$35.73 |
| Reserved | 13 |  |  |  |  |  | 549,215 | 570,488 | 523.66 | 533.89 |
| Reserved | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 546,871 | 566,813 | 522.53 | 532.12 |
| Reserved | 11 |  |  |  |  |  | 544,639 | 563,330 | 521.46 | \$30.45 |
| Reserved | 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 542,513 | 560,028 | 520.44 | 528.86 |
| Reserved | 9 |  |  |  |  |  | 540,489 | 556,899 | 519.47 | 527.36 |
| Reserved | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 538,561 | 553,933 | \$18.54 | \$25.93 |
| Reserved | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 536,725 | 551,121 | 517.66 | 524.58 |
| Reserved | 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 534,976 | 548,456 | 516.82 | 523.30 |
| Reserved | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 533,310 | 545,930 | 516.01 | \$22.08 |
| Reserved | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 531,724 | 543,536 | \$15.25 | 520.93 |
| Reserved | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 530,213 | 541,266 | 514.53 | 519.84 |
| Reserved | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 528,774 | 539,115 | 513.83 | 518.81 |
| Reserved | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | \$27,404 | 537,076 | 513.18 | 517.83 |

1.5\% Option: 22 to 29 steps at $1.5 \%$ intervals, maximum step varies $\%$.


3\% Option: 12 to 16 steps at 3\% intervals, last step varies in \%


Table 10b: Proposed New Pay Ranges - non-Management Positions
See Appendix D for more details.

| Non-Management Positiors | $\begin{gathered} \text { PROPOSED } \\ \text { Rarge } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROPOSED } \\ & \text { Grade } \end{aligned}$ | Current Base Salary | Existing Salary Ranges |  |  |  | Proposed Salary Range |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Current Minimum | Current <br> Maximum | Market Minimum | Market Maximum | New Salary <br> Minimum | New Salary <br> Maximum | New Hourly Minimum | New Hourly Maximum |
| Police Sergeent | 260 | 21 | 578,499 | 548,924 | 585,783 | 568,083 | \$94,935 | 567,424 | \$112,375 | \$32.42 | \$54.03 |
| Reserved | 250-259 | 20 | - | - |  | . | - | \$64,956 | \$108,261 | 531.23 | \$52.05 |
| Utility Super visor | 240-249 | 19 | 5115,523 | 549,192 | 586,258 | 568,396 | 592,629 | 562,578 | \$104,298 | \$30.09 | \$50.14 |
| Fire Captain |  | 19 | 578,498 | 548,924 | 585,788 | 570,547 | 595,267 | 562,578 | \$104,298 | \$30.09 | \$50.14 |
| Reserved | 230-239 | 18 | . | . | . | - | - | 560,287 | \$100,480 | 528.98 | 548.31 |
| Police Detective | 220-229 | 17 | 588,026 | 547,340 | S83,016 | 563,779 | 586,510 | \$58,050 | 596,802 | \$27.92 | \$46.54 |
| Phbic Works Supervisor | 210-219 | 16 | \$81,307 | \$49,200 | \$86, 268 | \$67,453 | 593,797 | \$55,954 | S99,258 | \$26.90 | \$44.84 |
| Reserved | 200-209 | 15 | - | d | . | - | - | 553,906 | 589,844 | \$25.92 | \$43.19 |
| Utility Operator II (proposed) | 190-199 | 14 | . | . | - | - | - | \$51,933 | 586,555 | \$24.97 | \$41.61 |
| Phbic Warks Assistant |  | 14 | 558,365 | 542,180 | 573,968 | 561,423 | \$82,792 | \$51,933 | S86,555 | \$24.97 | \$41.61 |
| Police Officer |  | 14 | \$80,746 | 546,056 | S80,760 | \$59,464 | \$83,340 | \$51,933 | 586,555 | \$24.97 | 541.61 |
| Fire Lieutenamt |  | 14 | \$67,276 | 547,184 | S82,740 | \$54,825 | 576,205 | \$51,933 | S86,555 | \$24.97 | \$41.61 |
| Building Tectrician | 180-189 | 13 | - | . | - | 555,278 | \$77,384 | \$50,032 | 583,386 | \$24.05 | \$40.09 |
| Police Officer Recruit | 170-179 | 12 | - | 546,056 | 590,760 | \$56,024 | 578,757 | S48,200 | 580,333 | \$23.17 | \$38.62 |
| Utility Operator (Operator 1 \& 11 proposed) |  | 12 | 587,526 | 544,491 | 578,021 | \$56,392 | 577,224 | \$48,200 | 590,333 | \$23.17 | 538.62 |
| Fire Engineer |  | 12 | \$65,313 | 546,056 | 590,760 | \$56,257 | 574,373 | 548,200 | 590,333 | \$23.17 | \$38.62 |
| City Plarner (proposed) | 160-169 | 11 | . | . | . | - | . | S46,435 | 577,392 | 522.32 | \$37.21 |
| Firefighter / EMT |  | 11 | \$55,584 | 540,164 | 570,428 | 548,302 | \$67,882 | S*6,435 | S77,392 | \$22.32 | 537.21 |
| Reserved | 150-159 | 10 | - | - | . | - | - | S44,735 | 574,559 | \$21.51 | \$35.85 |
| AP Tox fi Liamse Clerk (revised) | 140-149 | 9 | S69,742 | \$37,482 | S65,728 | \$47,016 | \$63,407 | S43,097 | 571,829 | \$20.72 | S34.53 |
| AR/Utility Billing Oerk (revised) |  | 9 | S47,487 | 537,482 | 565,728 | 546,170 | 562,436 | 503,097 | 571,829 | \$20.72 | 534.53 |
| Utility Assistant ill (proposed) |  | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | S43,097 | 571,829 | 520.72 | 534.53 |
| Fiscal Accounting / Fund Accounting Clerk | 130-139 | 8 | \$60,154 | - | $\cdots$ | 555,004 | 574,525 | 541,519 | 569,199 | \$19.96 | 533.27 |
| Deputy Clerk (propased) |  | 8 | - | . | . | \$52,273 | \$71,721 | S41,519 | 569,199 | \$19.96 | \$33.27 |
| Utility Assistant 1 |  | 8 | 565,686 | \$42,180 | 573,968 | 547,792 | 565,653 | \$41,519 | \$69,199 | \$19.96 | \$33.27 |
| Firefighter Recruit (proposed) | 120-129 | 7 | - | . | . | - | , | \$39,999 | \$66,666 | \$19.23 | \$32.05 |
| Eviderce Cust / Rec. Msy / Archivist |  | 7 | S46,093 | 537,482 | 565,728 | 547,303 | 564,966 | \$39,999 | 566,666 | 519.23 | \$32.05 |
| Reserved | 110-119 | 6 | . | . | . | - | - | S33,535 | \$64,225 | \$18.53 | \$30.88 |
| Executive Assistant (proposed) | 100-109 | 5 | - | - | . | \$51,878 | 570,208 | 537,124 | 561,874 | \$17.85 | 529.75 |
| Administrative Assistant PWD (proposed) |  | 5 | . | 537,488 | \$65,736 | 545,334 | 562,218 | 537,124 | 561,874 | \$17.85 | \$29.75 |
| Administrative Assistant Police |  | 5 | 546,093 | 537,488 | 565,736 | S44,432 | 561,930 | 537,124 | 561,874 | \$17.85 | 529.75 |
| Administrative Assistant Fire |  | 5 | S46,093 | \$37,488 | \$65,736 | 544,432 | \$61,930 | 537,124 | \$61,874 | \$17.85 | 529.75 |
| Recorck Preparation Clerk |  | 5 | - | 537,488 | 565,736 | \$46,189 | \$62,329 | 537,124 | \$61,874 | \$17.85 | \$29.75 |
| Reserved | 90-99 | 4 | $\cdots$ | . | . | . | - | 535,765 | \$59,609 | \$17.19 | \$28.66 |
| General Laborer (Summer Hep) | 80-89 | 3 | $\checkmark$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\checkmark$ | + | 534,456 | 557,427 | \$16.57 | 527.61 |
| Receptionist Admin | 70-79 | 2 | - | - | . | - | - | 533,195 | \$55,325 | \$15.9\% | \$26.60 |
| Reserved | 60-69 | 1 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\cdots$ | $\checkmark$ | \$31,900 | \$53,300 | \$15.38 | \$25.63 |

1.5\% Option: 36 steps at 1.5\% intervals, last step .46\%

| Non-Management 1.5\% Steps |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Points | Grade | Minimum |  | Midpoint |  | Maximum |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 |  | 18 |  | 36 | \% |
| 260 | 21 | \$ | 67,424 | \$ | 86,843 | \$ | 112,375 | 0.46\% |
| 250 | 20 | \$ | 64,956 | \$ | 83,665 | \$ | 108,261 | 0.46\% |
| 240 | 19 | \$ | 62,578 | \$ | 80,602 | \$ | 104,298 | 0.46\% |
| 230 | 18 | \$ | 60,287 | \$ | 77,651 | \$ | 100,480 | 0.46\% |
| 220 | 17 | \$ | 58,080 | \$ | 74,808 | \$ | 96,802 | 0.46\% |
| 210 | 16 | \$ | 55,954 | \$ | 72,070 | \$ | 93,258 | 0.46\% |
| 200 | 15 | \$ | 53,906 | \$ | 69,432 | \$ | 89,844 | 0.46\% |
| 190 | 14 | \$ | 51,933 | \$ | 66,891 | \$ | 86,555 | 0.46\% |
| 180 | 13 | \$ | 50,032 | \$ | 64,442 | \$ | 83,386 | 0.46\% |
| 170 | 12 | \$ | 48,200 | \$ | 62,083 | \$ | 80,333 | 0.46\% |
| 160 | 11 | \$ | 46,435 | \$ | 59,809 | \$ | 77,392 | 0.46\% |
| 150 | 10 | \$ | 44,735 | \$ | 57,620 | \$ | 74,559 | 0.46\% |
| 140 | 9 | \$ | 43,097 | \$ | 55,510 | \$ | 71,829 | 0.46\% |
| 130 | 8 | \$ | 41,519 | \$ | 53,477 | \$ | 69,199 | 0.46\% |
| 120 | 7 | \$ | 39,999 | \$ | 51,520 | \$ | 66,666 | 0.46\% |
| 110 | 6 | \$ | 38,535 | \$ | 49,634 | \$ | 64,225 | 0.46\% |
| 100 | 5 | \$ | 37,124 | \$ | 47,816 | \$ | 61,874 | 0.46\% |
| 90 | 4 | \$ | 35,765 |  | 46,066 | \$ | 59,609 | 0.46\% |
| 80 | 3 | \$ | 34,456 |  | 44,380 | \$ | 57,427 | 0.46\% |
| 70 | 2 |  | 33,195 | \$ | 42,756 | \$ | 55,325 | 0.46\% |
| 60 | 1 | S | 31,980 | \$ | 41,191 | \$ | 53,300 | 0.46\% |

3\% Option: 19 steps at $3 \%$ intervals, last step $.85 \%$

14. Salaries: Abuse / Inequity of Pay Differentials. Application of 'special conditions' creates pay inequity and opens the City up for litigation if (a) practice is not policy, and (b) if policy is not uniformly applied

In researching the observed pay inequities of some utility positions, consultants became acquainted with the current practice of paying some employees for additional impact to their position beyond their normal duties - outside the maximum pay range. Consultants are familiar with the significant impact that commercial / residential developments and utility projects can have on a local government, however best-practices in Financial Management AND Risk Management.

## Positions likely impacted by Moose Creek:

- Administrative / Legal positions: City Attorney \& Mayor
- Finance positions: City Accountant / CFO
- Clerical positions: City Clerk / Human Resources, AP License Clerk, AR Utility Billing Clerk, Fiscal / Fund Accounting Clerk, Records Clerk
- Utility positions: Utility Supervisor, Utility Operator, Utility Assistant


## Salary Recommendation for \#14:

(a) Determine of actual / anticipated general impact on overall municipal resources and services,
(b) Determine of actual / anticipated specific impact on every position affected,
(c) Create of a uniform policy regarding compensation such as pay differentials, how they apply, when they are to go into effect and when they are to be discontinued*, and
(d) Determine and memorialization of \$ amounts and salary adjustments*, if any.

* Note: IRS guidelines must be followed with regards to Exempt and non-Exempt employees, accumulation of pay-based benefits calculations, overtime, leave, retirement, etc.


## 15. Personnel Budgets: Comparison of Local Government Budgets and distribution of Personnel Expenses illustrates that:

(a) Staffing Levels: NP has more 30\% employees per capita than comparable cities (see note below),
(b) NP spends $2.74 \%$ more of its Gen. Fund Budget on Personnel Expenses,
(c) NP spends $2.43 \%$ more of its Gen. Fund Personnel Expenses on Salaries, and $2.43 \%$ less of its Gen. Fund Personnel Expenses on Benefits

Table 11a: Local Government - General Fund Personnel Expense Comparison See Appendix B for more details.

| City / Town | Resident <br> Population | Total FT <br> Employee <br> Equivelant* | Employee per Capita | FY General Operating Budget | Total Personnel Costs | \% of Budget as Personnel Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Borough of Fairbanks North Star | 97,581 | 405 | 4.15 | \$257,323, 148 | \$37,563,100 | 15\% |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | 192 | 6.09 | S35,898,820 | \$24,324,069 | 68\% |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 | 1805 | 56.40 | \$369,928,500 | \$219,037,600 | 59\% |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | 135 | 12.80 | S20,582,140 | S14,881,223 | 72\% |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | 95 | 11.03 | S31,408, 943 | \$12,889,847 | 41\% |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | 177 | 21.35 | S64,362,428 | S23,056,073 | 36\% |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | 91 | 11.74 | S16,873,839 | \$12,487,564 | 74\% |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | 71 | 9.65 | \$11,612,724 | \$8,152,793 | 70\% |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | 60 | 9.09 | S13,165, 225 | 58,049,869 | 61\% |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | 134 | 22.45 | \$40,654,886 | 517,981,692 | 44\% |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | 108 | 18.59 | \$12,874,350 | \$8,647,865 | 67\% |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | 73 | 15.63 | \$13,529,340 | \$8,297,740 | 61\% |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | 134 | 35.02 | \$58,960,000 | \$20,100,000 | 34\% |
| City a Borough of Wrangell | 2,503 | 48 | 18.98 | \$4,906,932 | \$3,727,110 | 76\% |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | 54 | 21.62 | S19,728,710 | \$3,310,159 | 17\% |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | 58 | 26.85 | S16,508,435 | \$6,521,403 | 40\% |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | 891 | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | 46 | 3.45 | \$47,978,722 | $\cdots$ | - |
| Median | 6,953 | 95.37 | 15.63 | \$60,958,655 | \$12,688,706 | 60.18\% |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | 49 | 22.27 | \$ 6,305,356 | \$ 3,967,396 | 62.92\% |

Table 11b: Local Government General Fund Budgets - Salary \& Benefits Comparison

| City / Tow n | Total Salaries Budget | Salaries as a \% of Personnel Costs | Median <br> Employee <br> Salary** | Total Budget Benefits | Benefits as a \% of Personnel Costs | Average Benefits Expense per Employee** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Borough of Fairbanks North Star | \$23,990,550 | 64\% | \$59,236 | S13,572,550 | 36\% | \$33,512 |
| City of Fairbanks | \$16,841,522 | 69\% | \$87,716 | \$7,482,547 | 31\% | \$38,972 |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | \$135,250, 100 | 62\% | \$74,941 | S83,787,500 | 38\% | S46,426 |
| City of Wasilla | 59,970,419 | 67\% | 573,992 | S4,910,804 | 33\% | \$36,444 |
| City a Borough of Sitka | \$7,644,283 | 59\% | S80,154 | \$5,245,564 | 41\% | \$55,002 |
| City of Ketchikan | \$15,997,613 | 69\% | \$90,382 | \$7,058,460 | 31\% | \$39,878 |
| City of Kenai | \$7,250,506 | 58\% | \$79,371 | \$5,237,058 | 42\% | \$57,330 |
| City of Palmer | \$4,827,388 | 59\% | S68,474 | S3,325,405 | 41\% | S47,169 |
| City of Bethel | \$4,870,940 | 61\% | S81,182 | S3,178,929 | 39\% | S52,982 |
| City of Kodiak | 59,967,002 | 55\% | \$74,381 | \$8,014,690 | 45\% | \$59,811 |
| City of Homer | \$5,721,270 | 66\% | S52,975 | S2,926,595 | 34\% | S27,098 |
| City of Soldotna | \$5,823,199 | 70\% | 579,433 | S2, 474,541 | 30\% | S33,754 |
| City of Valdez | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | \$2,315,412 | 62\% | \$48,746 | S1,411,698 | 38\% | S29,720 |
| Borough of Haines | \$2,065,303 | 62\% | S38,604 | \$1,244,856 | 38\% | S23,268 |
| City of Cordova | S4,084,917 | 63\% | 570,430 | S2,436,486 | 37\% | 542,008 |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | - | - | - | - | - | . |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | - | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |
| Median | \$7,250,506 | 62.39\% | \$74,381 | \$4,910,804 | 37.61\% | \$39,878 |
| City of North Pole | \$ $2,571,863$ | 64.82\% | \$52,487 | \$ 1,395,534 | 35.18\% | \$28,480 |

Note: While the study reflects a 30\% staffing level per capita higher in North Pole than comparable Cities, this is NOT UNUSUAL for smaller communities to need a greater number of employees to fulfill the range of service needs of a self-serving community.

If North Pole were closer to a multi-city metropolitan area, the City would benefit from:

- mutual-aid / automatic aid in public safety,
- public-public partnerships between North Pole and other local governments, and
- the potential of public-private partnerships which some services potentially being offered by a private company.

Unfortunately, North Pole is 12-miles from the nearest large city, but nothing akin to large, multi-city / town metropolitan areas like Kansas City, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, Seattle, or even Anchorage. As a result, consultants aren't too concerned with the appearance of overstaffing.

A work-flow analysis would clearly determine whether employees in various positions are appropriately skilled and properly placed. If a significant number of employees lack the expected KSAs (knowledge, skills, abilities, education, etc.), then it could be possible that North Pole is paying for more employees who can do less. Conversely, if the analysis determines that staff have KSAs at a higher-than-expected level, the City would be getting a bargain.

Note: Before any reduction in workforce is considered, the City must conduct a staffing-level / workflow analysis to (a) determine which departments might be overstaffed, and (b) to consider realignment of staff to meet program demands the community's desired service levels expected of the community.

## Benefits Recommendations for\#15:

(a) Conduct a Workflow \& Staffing Level Analysis to determine if employees meet the minimum expected levels of education, experience, skills, etc. This analysis would determine the appropriate level of staffing, deficient KSAs, proper alignment/ realignment of staffing resources, and efficiency, effectiveness and fiscal impact of staffing realignment or reduction.
(b) Consider a re-distribution of fiscal resources to either Salaries or Benefits if savings can be realized. Example: if the Benefits / Health Care Committee is successful in exploring and identifying improved service options with cost savings, those cost savings can be reapportioned to salaries or savings.
16. Benefits: There are opportunities for North Pole to promote its competitiveness and to further improve the health care costs. Several Findings are reported below.
(a) Salary \& Pay Increase Policies:

- Steps \& Grades. The City of North Pole's current classification system is rather simple, and comparable with the majority of the other comparison cities. Cities like Sitka, Bethell, Kenai, Ketchikan and Wasilla maintain three (3) separate classification systems - Police, Fire, and General Employees. Wasilla maintains 4. Unfortunately, North Pole's system is slightly too simplified, in that it compresses positions which have enough differing characteristics into common classifications, which results in wage compression. This causes pay inequity as well as creates risk to the City for litigation for unfair labor practices.

Table 12a: Benefits Comparisons: Salary Scales: \# of Steps \& Grades
See Appendix E for more details.

| Agency | General Employees | Police | Fire |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Borough of Haines | 16 Grades, 15 Steps | w/ regular plan | w/ regular plan |
| C\&B Juneau | 8 Grades, 13 Steps | - | - |
| City of Sitka | 30 Grades, 15 Steps | 8 Grades, 15 Steps | 6 Grades, 14 Steps |
| City of Wrangell | non-Ext 7 Gr, 13 St <br> Fac-Main 16 Gr, 13 St Exempt 11 Gr, 13 St | w/ regular plan | w/ regular plan |
| City of Bethel | 9 Grades, 31 Steps | 6 Grades, 20 steps | 6 Grades, 20 steps |
| City of Cordova | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| City of Kenai | 24 Gen. Class: 9 St 5 Dept Heads: Min-Max only | N/A | 5 Classifications: 5 Steps |
| City of Ketchikan | >890 Grades, 21 Steps Pub Emp: 190 Clas, 21 Steps Util: 281 Class, 21 Steps | Part of General Grid | 190 Classifications, <br> 17 Grades, 90 Steps |
| City of Valdez | 33 Grades (use 28), 10 St | w/ regular plan | w/ regular plan |
| City of Wasilla | 4 Unions Gen: 11 Grades, 13 Steps Salaries EEs: 7 Gr, 13 St | 12 Grades, 17 Steps | General Table |
| North Pole | 15 Classes. 20 Grades, (no salary / hourly separation) | No separation for Public Safety | No separation for Public Safety |

- \% between Steps: Unlike the City of North Pole's 3\%, only two of our surveyed comparable cities' had a \% step increase greater than $2.5 \%$ (Valdez \& Palmer, 3.5\%) for classifications in their pay systems.

Table 12b: Benefits Comparisons: \% or \$ Between Steps
See Appendix E for more details.

| Agency | General Employees | Police | Fire |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Borough of Haines | \$0.50 | \$0.50 | \$0.50 |
| City of Palmer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| City of Bethel | 2.4\% | 2.4\% | 2.4\% |
| City of Fairbanks | Not defined | Not defined | Not defined |
| City of Sitka | 2.5\% | 2.48\% | 2\% |
| City of Wrangell | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| City of Bethel | 2.4\% | 2.4\% | 2.4\% |
| City of Kodiak | Min-Mid-Max only | same | same |
| City of Kenai | 2.44\% (steps 1-2) 2.27\% (steps 4-7) 2.08\% (steps 8-9) 24.24\% (between Mgr. Min-Max) | same | same |
| City of Ketchikan | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| City of Valdez | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| City of Soldotna | EEs 3\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |
| North Pole | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% |

- Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA): Most comparable cities adjust their COLA annually, unless it is contained within a $3-4$-year collective bargaining agreement. City of North Pole does not appear to have a standard policy - though historically COLA appears to have been $3 \%$ does not mean this is permanent and should be adjusted annually by the Consumer Price Index (CPU) for the region.

Table 12c: Benefits Comparisons: Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA): \% and Frequency See Appendix E for more details.

| Agency | General Employees | Police | Fire |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Borough of Haines | - | - | - |
| C\&B Juneau | - | - | - |
| City of Homer | - | - | - |
| City of Wasilla | 1.64\% 2020; <br> Adjusted annually | 2-3.5\%; <br> Every 4 years | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2-3.5\%; } \\ \text { Every } 4 \text { years } \end{gathered}$ |
| City of Bethel | - | - | - |
| City of Fairbanks | Not defined | Not defined | Not defined |
| City of Sitka | $1.5 \%$ (Salary Survey every 5 years) | 1 step (2.48\%) | 1 step (2\%) |
| City of Wrangell | $1.9 \%$ avg; <br> 1 step per year | same | Same |
| City of Bethel | - | - | - |
| City of Kodiak | GE: 2.5\% Merit; 2.38\% COLA | 2.38\% | 2.38\% |
| City of Kenai | - | - | - |
| City of Ketchikan | 2\% Annually approved; inconsistent (3\% 2009, 2\% 2012, 1\% 2014, 0\%2015; 2.5 2016-17; 1.6\% 2018; 2\% 2019-20) | $2 \%$; Annually approved | 2\%; Annually approved |
| City of Valdez | - | - | - |
| City of Soldotna | - | - | - |
| North Pole | Historically 3\%; No policy; COLA \& Merit not separated | same | same |

(b) Vacation Leave:

- Months of Service Required: At least eight (8) cities - Bristol Bay, Fairbanks, Ketchikan, Kenai, Haines, Juneau, Sitka, and North Pole have a combined Vacation \& Sick Leave. Generally, all employees accrue from date of hire, but cannot use until the end of 30 days or the defined probationary period. Ketchikan, Sitka and Wrangell require 6 months before use. Several cities allow for immediate use: Haines, Juneau, Bethell, Kenai, Palmer, Soldotna.

By comparison, North Pole's 90 -day waiting period is fairly reasonable, but could be more liberal / flexible.

- Number of Days carried-over annually: The City of North Pole allows a maximum carry-over of 80 hours ( 10 days) per year. This creates a current unfunded liability of $\$ 278,240$ per year, however this liability is not significantly larger the comparative cities generally (Cordova, 77.5; Homer, 80; Kodiak, 60/97;).

The City of Cordova only allows 37 -use-it-or-lose-it days, Sitka allows a maximum of 720 hours ( 90 days) per year, and Haines \& Ketchikan have no limit on the amount of carry-over of leave annually in an employee's leave bank.

- Number of Days Earned per year: Varies significantly by city and within General Employees, Police and Fire within each city. Below is a sample

Table 12d: Benefits Comparisons: Paid Vacation by Comparison
See Appendix E for full details.

| PAID VACATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Annual Rate of Accrual: Years of Service / Days per Year |  |  |
| arouna | Cen. Entioyees | Police | Fire |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | 1 yr 13.5 days <br> 2 yrs 16 कys <br> 5 ys 21.75 dys <br> 10 yrs 24.76 dys | Iyr 11.5 days <br> 2 yrs 16 dys <br> 3 ys 21.73 dys <br> 10 ys 24.76 digs | Iye 13.5 days <br> 2 yrs 16 days <br> 5 yrs 21.75 days <br> 10 yrs 24.76 days |
| Borough of Haines | PTo conbined <br> 0.3 yeas 160 hous i yonr 1208 ir dyys) <br> 4.6 yoas 200 nous (yonr ( 2258 ir dya) <br> 7.9 yeas 240 hous t your ( 1308 tr dya) <br> 10 - yoars 256 hours / year (122 hr diys) |  |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | $1 y e-3 y+19$ dyys <br> $4-7+19$ days <br> $8-y s-25$ days <br> Max 40 hous of sidx kave atomatically converited to vacation cach calondar yex. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year 1-18 dys } \\ & 2 \cdot 4 \cdot 24 \mathrm{dyys} \\ & 5.8 \cdot 27 \mathrm{dyy} \\ & 9 \cdot 12 \cdot 10 \mathrm{dys} \\ & 13 \cdot \mathrm{ys} \cdot 36 \mathrm{dyy} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell |  | Iff 10 dyys <br> 2 ys 15 dys <br> 5 ys 20 dys <br> 10 ys 25 daj <br> 15 y 30 das <br> 20 ys 30 dys | Iy 10 days <br> 2 ys 15 dyys <br> 5 yss 20 dyy <br> 10 ys 25 dys <br> 15 y 30 dys <br> 20 ys 30 days |
| City of Bethel |  |  |  |
| City of Cordova | Iy 12 dips <br> 2 ys 12 dys <br> $3 y \mathrm{~s}$ 18 dys <br> $10 y \mathrm{ys}$ 24 dys <br> $15 y$ 28 dys <br> $20 y \mathrm{ys}$ 28 dis |  | Iy 12 dyys <br> $2 y s$ 12 days <br> $3 y s$ 18 days <br> $10 y s$ 24 dys <br> $15 y$ 28 days <br> $20 y s$ 28 day |
| City of Homer | 158 ye - 5.34 hirs paypor 194.04 hirs w $2 \mathrm{ddyr}-6.46 \mathrm{hrs}$ paypd - $167 . \% \mathrm{hrs}$ ye <br>  6 th 9th y $: 8.31 \mathrm{irs}$ pay po -216.06 hours y toth 144 yr-9.27 hrs pay pd - 239.98 hous yr 13 yepos 10.77 has pyyd 280.02 hours yr | 154 ye- 5.34 hers paypd- 144.04 hrs w $2 n d y-6.46$ hrs pay pd $\cdot 167.96$ hrsyr <br>  6th 9th yr -8.31 trs pay pd - 216.06 houn yr 10th $\cdot 148 \mathrm{yr}-9.23 \mathrm{hrs}$ pay pd +219.98 houss yr 13 he yeples 12.77 trs paypd - 230.02 hours yr | Sty-5.54 ws poypd-144.04 wisy yy 2ndye 6.46 trs my me - 167.96 trs yr 3nd-5in yr- 7.38 hrs paypd 19 L .38 mos yr G6 - 9h ye -8.31 hs pay pl 216.06 hours yr tan - 3 tuhye -9.23 hes mypd -239.98 hours yr 15 en y pias 10.77 hes pay pd - 280.02 hors yr |
| City of Valdez | $\begin{array}{cc} 1 \cdot 2 \mathrm{ys} & 24 \text { dayg } \\ 1 \text { - } 5 \mathrm{yes} & 27 \text { dya } \\ 6-10 y & 30 \text { days } \\ -10-y s & 39 \mathrm{dyg} \end{array}$ |  |  |
| City of Wasilla | $12 \mathrm{His} / \mathrm{MO}-3 \mathrm{yc}$ $16 \mathrm{hr} / \mathrm{mog}^{-3 \cdot 3 \mathrm{~F}}$ 200r 8 . | 12 Hrs/m O-3y $16 \mathrm{molmo}-1 \cdot 3 \mathrm{yr}$ zore a | $12 \mathrm{Hg} / \mathrm{MO} \cdot 1 \mathrm{yc}$ <br> 36 trimo - 3 - 8 F 20108 . |
| City of North Pole | ```FT tired after Jan 1990 0.2 y \(10.75 \mathrm{rr} / \mathrm{wh}\) \(2 \mathrm{yr}-4 \mathrm{y} 17.3 \mathrm{hrs} / \mathrm{wk}\) 5 - 4.21 .8 ns mk FT Hired prióa do 1989 0.1 y \(12 \mathrm{~m} /\) indiys 3. \(18 \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{wk}\) 4. \(\mathrm{ys} 24 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{wk}\)``` <br> Separate Lave paicies for Anink trative, Court, Mibtary, Funent, Training, incertive: <br> Volintay LoaveBank option for Medicat a Matonnity, Componsatogy time accinat $11 / 2 \mathrm{ke}$ excess hous worlied. max: 8 pours | Separace Lonve paicies for Amingtrative, Cour, Mistay, Funcal, Training, liscotive: <br> VoLntary Leave Eank cotion for Medicat a Matemity; Componeatoy tine accruat $11 / 2 \mathrm{x}$ excess hous nooked. Max: 8 hours | FT wiredatter Jon 1990 .- 19pdy ode $0-2 \times 14.25 \mathrm{ng} /$ wa per 19 day ocie $2 y$. $4 \mathrm{yy} 23 \mathrm{ha} /$ whe per 19 diy code $5 \cdot$ - 28.73 hs ? wher 19 day ock <br> Separave Leave poscies fa Aminstative, Court, msilary, Fusera, Trainhe, Incentwe: Volurtay Loave Emok option to Modial a Matemity; Componcatory binc accruat i 1/2e occess hoirs wosted, max: 120 nours |

- Pay for Unused: Bristol Bay is the only city with a 'use-ti-or-lose-it' policy. Most other cities are Comparable to North Pole - with nearly all of the comparable cities requiring a minimum bank of 80 hours carried over annually, and a full-pay out of 80 hours ( 10 days) upon separation or termination.
- Ketchikan permits a maximum of 50 days to be carried over and paid-out upon separation.
(c) Sick Leave: Sick Leave policies among comparable cities appear comparable to North Pole.
- Months of Service Required: Generally, all employees accrue from date of hire, but cannot use until the end of 30 days or the defined probationary period. At least eight (8) cities - Bristol Bay, Fairbanks, Ketchikan, Kenai, Haines, Juneau, Sitka, and North Pole have a combined Sick \& Vacation Leave.
- Number of Days Earned per year: North Pole allows 13 days earned per year, not significantly different with other communities (Wrangell, 12; Cordova, 12, Ketchikan, 12; Kodiak, 13). The City of Sitka offers 18 days per year.

Table 12e: Benefits Comparisons: Sick Leave by Comparison
See Appendix E for more details.

| SICK LEAVE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City / Town / County / Boroush | Months of Service Required |  |  | \# Days Earned Per Year |  |  | \# of Days Annual Carryover Allowed |  |  | Pay for Unused? |  |  |
|  | Gen. Employees | Police | Fire | Gen. Employees | Police | Fire | Gen. Employees | Police | Fire | Gen. Employees | Police | Fire |
| Borough of Bristol Bay |  | - | - | Combined | Combined | Combined | . | - | - | - | - |  |
| Borough of Haines | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { see paid vacation, } \\ \text { City has PTO } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | . | - | . | . | . | . | - | - | - | . |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | see paid vacation, City has PTO | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | - | - | . |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Eligible From Date of } \\ \text { Hire } \end{array}$ | Vacation and Sick Leave Combined Into Personal Leave | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Eligible From Date of } \\ & \text { Hire } \end{aligned}\right.$ | 18 Days | Vacation and Sick Leave Combined Into Personal Leave | 18 Days | 720 Hours | Vacation and Sick Leave Combined Into Personal Leave | 720 Hours | $\$ 1.00$ Per Hour Upon Seperation or Termination | Vacation and Sick Leave Combined Into Personal Leave | No |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Eligible From Date of } \\ \text { Hire } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Eligible From Date of } \\ \text { Hire } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Eligible From Date of } \\ \text { Hire } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 12 | 12 | 12 | yes 480 HRS ? | yes 480 HRS ? | yes 480 HRS ? | No | no | no |
| City of Bethel | $\begin{gathered} \text { First biweekly pay } \\ \text { period } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { First biweekly pay } \\ \text { period } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { First biweekly pay } \\ \text { period } \end{gathered}$ | 6 hours per month | 7 hours per month | 8 hours per month | 720 | 720 | 720 | Only if have worked 11 years + 1 day | Only if have worked <br> 11 years + 1 day | Only if have worked 11 years + 1 day |
| City of Cordova | - | - | - | 12 | 12 | 12 | Yes 77.5 | Yes 77.5 | Yes 77.5 | yes | yes | yes |
| City of Fairbanks | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined |
| City of Homer | - | - | - | 40 hrs | 40 hrs | 40 hrs | a max of 80 hrs | a max of 80 hrs | a max of 80 hrs | No | No | No |
| City of Kenai | see paid vacation, City has PTO | - | - | - | - | . | - | . | - | - | - | - |
| City of Ketchikan | See Vacation | See Vacation | See Vacation | 12 Days | 12 | 12 | All | All | All | No | no | no |
| City of Kodiak | Available from Date of Hire, but must be taken before annual leave is taken to cover an illness | Available from Date of Hire, but must be taken before annual leave is taken to cover an illness | Available from Date of Hire, but must be taken before annual leave is taken to cover an illness | 4 hours per pay period | 4 hours per pay period | $\begin{gathered} 4 \mathrm{hrs} / \mathrm{day} / \mathrm{ppd} \mathrm{FD} \\ \text { Ees on platoon system } \\ \text { accrue at } 1.33 \mathrm{the} \\ \text { normal rate } \end{gathered}$ | 480 non-combined 587 combined | 638 non-combined 779 combined | 638 non-combined 779 combined | EE may cash-in $2 x$ per year, must leave 80 hours balance. (emergency cash-in allowed) | EE may cash-in $2 x$ per year, must leave 80 hours balance. (emergency cash-in allowed) | EE may cash-in $2 x$ per year, must leave 80 hours balance. (emergency cash-in allowed) |
| City of Palmer | . |  | - | Combined | Combined | Combined | Combined | . | - | $\cdot$ | - | - |
| City of Soldotna |  | Ssee Previous Tab | Ssee Previous Tab | Combined | Combined | Combined | . |  | - | no | no | no |
| City of Valdez | 30 days | 30 days | 30 days | Combined | Combined | Combined | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| City of Wasilla | - | - | - | Combined | Combined | Combined | Yes all | Yes All | Yes All | Yes 25\% | Yes 25\% | Yes 25\% |
| City of North Pole | 90 days, however hours accrue from firs day of employment. | 90 days, however hours accrue from first day of employment. | 90 days, however hours accrue from first day of employment. | 320hrs combined w Sick Leave. <br> When an employee's leave accrual reaches the maximum limit they must elect either to receive monetary compensation or take leave | 320hrs combined w Sick Leave. When an employee's leave accrual reaches the maximum limit they must elect either to receive monetary compensation or take leave | 420 hours combined <br> w Sick Leave. <br> When an employee's leave accrual reaches the maximum limit they must elect either to receive monetary compensation or take leave | Option to cash-out max 80 hours / year, or donate to Emergency Leave Bank for other employee use. | Option to cash-out max 80 hours / year, or donate to Emergency Leave Bank for other employee use. | Option to cash-out max 120 hours $/$ year, or donate to Emergency Leave Bank for other employee use. | Combined w/ Sick Leave Option to cashout max 80 hours / year, or donate to Emergency Leave Bank for other employee use. | Combined w/ Sick Leave Option to cashout max 80 hours / year, or donate to Emergency Leave Bank for other employee use. | Combined w/ Sick Leave Option to cash- out max 80 hours / year, or donate to Emergency Leave Bank for other employee use. |

- Number of Days carried-over annually: The City of North Pole allows a maximum carry-over of 80 hours ( 10 days) per year. This creates a current unfunded liability of $\$ 278,240$ per year, however this liability is not significantly larger the comparative cities generally (Cordova, 77.5; Homer, 80; Kodiak, 60/97).

The City of Cordova only allows 37 -use-it-or-lose-it days, Sitka allows a maximum of 720 hours ( 90 days) per year, and Ketchikan has no limit on the amount of carry-over of leave annually in an employee's leave bank.

- Pay for Unused: This benefit varies significantly among cities. For example, some cities to not allow for cash-out of Sick Leave (Wrangell, Homer, Ketchikan, Sotdotna), but other cities allow cash-out - often all of what is earned and not used in a year, and cash-out upon termination varies (Fairbanks, 240 hours/ 30 days; Wasilla, 25\% /80 hrs / 10 days; Kodiak, 80 hrs / 10 days; North Pole, 80 hrs / 10 days). Cordova pays up to 37 days at full value.
Most of the communities maintain an emergency Bank for employees to make donations of unused Sick Leave for other employees to use in case of an emergency. Policies on use vary.
- Unfunded Vacation and Sick Leave: As stated above, North Pole has a substantial unfunded liabilities --vacation and sick leave combined is $\$ 278,240$. Annual accrual and carry-over limitations and payout amounts of sick and vacation pay is an ongoing burden that is not formally recognized in the budget process.
(d) Group Insurance: Comparable boroughs and cities use a variety of health-care providers including: Premera / Blue Cross / Blue Shield (6), Meritain (2), Aetna (2), self-funding (2) and 4 didn't specify provider names.
The City of North Pole appears to pay on the high-end of the cost spectrum ( $\$ 1,600$ / month for employee Medical / Dental / Vision insurance. Distribution of City / Employee / Dependent costs appear to be in line with how other comparable Cities are distributing costs for these benefits.

Table 13: Benefits Comparisons: Medical, Dental, Vision and Life / Disability See Appendix E for more details.

| Agency | Medical Agency \%/EE \% | Dental Agency \%/EE \% | Vision Agency\%/EE \% | Life Ins. \& Disability Agency\%/EE \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Borough of Haines | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% / 0 \% \\ 90 \%(\$ 1,500) / 10 \% \\ \text { Depend: } \$ 136-220 \end{gathered}$ | Incl. w/ Medical | Incl. w/ Medical | Available at EE cost. |
| C\&B Juneau | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% / 0 \% \\ \text { Depend: } \$ 0-311+\text { Flex } \$ 113- \\ 220 \text { if in Wellness } \end{gathered}$ | Incl. w/ Medical 0\%/100\% | Incl. w/ Medical | City pays 100\% for $\$ 300,000$ policy |
| City of Sitka | 90\% / 10\% (\$176-311) <br> Depend: City 90 / EE 10 | Incl. w/ Medical | Incl. w/ Medical | \$2,000 Life $\$ 5,000$ AD\&D City pays 100\% |
| City of Wrangell | $85 \%$ or $90 \%$ * $15 \%$ or $10 \%$ * (if in Wellness Plan) | Incl. w/ Medical ( $\$ 1,500$ value) | Incl. w/ Medical | \$30,000 Life / AD\&D City pays 100\% |
| City of Bethel | 98\% / 2\% (EE pays \$25/mo) Depend: EE+1 \$50; Fam \$75 | Incl. w/ Medical | Incl. w/ Medical | 100\% / 0\% |
| City of Cordova | Self-funded | 80\% / 20\% | Incl. w/ Dental | N/A |
| City of Kenai | FT: 88\% (\$949) / 12\% (\$123) PT: 50\% (\$519) / 50\% (\$519) Depend: EE \$1,800 to \$2,700 | Incl. w/ Medical | Incl. w/ Medical | 100\% / 0\% |
| City of Ketchikan | 90\% / 10\% <br> Depend: 90\% / 10\% | Incl. w/ Medical | Incl. w/ Medical | Incl. w/ Medical |
| City of Valdez | 96\% / 4\% | 96\% / 4\% | 96\% / 4\% | 96\% / 4\% |
| City of Wasilla | $\begin{gathered} 100 \%(\$ 1,600-\$ 1,755 / \mathrm{mo} .) / \\ 0 \%(\$ 0 \text { to } \$ 15 / \mathrm{mo} .) \end{gathered}$ | 100\% / 0\% | 100\% / 0\% | City pays for $\$ 50,000$ policy |
| North Pole | City: $\$ 850$ per / pay pd / EE EE: $\$ 23$ / pay pd Dep: \$90/pay pd | Incl. w/ Medical | Incl. w/ Medical | City pays for $\$ 50,000$ policy. EEs may elect for more. |

Unlike other cities with multiple collective bargaining agreements, the City of North Pole does not significantly deviate between general employees and public safety employees.

## Recommendations: below

(e) Paid Holidays: The number of paid holidays does not vary significantly from other comparable public agencies - most of which provide 10-11 paid holidays.

Table 14: Benefits Comparisons: Paid Holidays
See Appendix E for more details.

| PAID HOLIDAYS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City / Town / County $/$ Borough |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | - | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Borough of Haines | x | - | x | - | X | X | X | X | x | x | x | x | X | - | - | - |
| City of Fairbanks | X | X | x | - | x | x | X | x | x | x | - | - | X | - | - | - |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | x | X | X | X | x | X | X | x | X | x | X | - | x | - | - | - |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | x | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Police } \\ \text { Coliv } \end{array}$ | x | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { Police } \\ \text { Only } \end{array}$ | x | x | x | x | x | x | - | - | x | - | - | - |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | X | X | X | X | x | X | X | X | x | X | - | - | X | - | - | $\cdot$ |
| City of Bethel | x | - | $\times$ | - | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | - | x | - | - | 1 floasing hoilday'y |
| City of Cordova | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Homer | X | - | X | X | x | X | X | x | x | x | X | - | X | - | - | - |
| City of Kenai | x | - | x | - | x | x | X | x | x | x | x | - | x | - | - | 1 floaing hoilday'y |
| City of Ketchikan | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | - | x | - | - | - |
| City of Kodiak | x | X | x | X | x | X | X | X | x | X | - | - | X | - | - | bday |
| City of Palmer | x | . | x | - | x | x | X | - | x | X | X | - | X | - | - | 2 floaing |
| City of Soldotna | X | - | x | - | x | x | X | X | x | X | X | - | X | - | - | 1 floating hoiday's |
| City of Valdez | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $7 . \mathrm{hrs}$ |
| City of Wasilla | X | X | x | $\checkmark$ | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 floasing hoiday'y |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of North Pole | x | x | x | - | x | x | x | - | x | x | - | - | x | - | x | 1 Personal Holiday |

Recommendations: below
e. Retirement: The City of North Pole appears to be very consistent with is retirement plans and pension liabilities. Distribution of City / Employee contributions appear to be in line with other comparable cities.
Unlike other cities with multiple collective bargaining agreements, the City of North Pole does not significantly deviate between general employees and public safety employees.

Table 15: Benefits Comparisons: Retirement \& Pensions
See Appendix E for more details.

| Agency | Retirement System | Defined Benefit Plan City / EE \% | Vesting Years GE / Police / Fire | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Borough of Haines | Alaska PERS | 22\% / 8\% <br> PERS Tier 4 EEs after7/1/2006 | 5 years | N/A |
| C\&B Juneau | Alaska PERS | \$5 up to 5\% | 5 years | Employee Assistance Plan |
| City of Sitka | Alaska PERS | 22\% / 8\% PERS Tier 4 EEs after7/1/2006 | 5 years | ICMA, Waddell \& Reid, 457 @ 100\% EE expense |
| City of Wrangell | Alaska PERS | 22\% / 8\% <br> PERS Tier 4 EEs after7/1/2006 | 5 years | 457, no details No EAP |
| City of Bethel | Alaska PERS | 22\% / 8\% <br> PERS Tier 4 EEs after7/1/2006 | 5 years | EAP + reduced water \& sewer |
| City of Cordova | Alaska PERS | $22 \% / 8 \%$ PERS Tier 4 EEs after7/1/2006 | 5 years | N/A |
| City of Kenai | Alaska PERS | $4 \%$ of first $\$ 37,500$ wages $(\$ 1,500)$ | 5 years | N/A |
| City of Ketchikan | Alaska PERS | N/A | 5 years | 457, no details |
| City of Valdez | Alaska PERS | 22\% / 8\% <br> PERS Tier 4 EEs after7/1/2006 | 5 years | 457 up to \$19,500 |
| City of Wasilla | Alaska PERS | 22\% / 8\% <br> PERS Tier 4 EEs after7/1/2006 | 5 years | N/A |
| North Pole | Alaska PERS | 22\%/8\% PERS Tier 4 EEs after7/1/2006 | Tier 1: 5yrs Tier 2: 8yrs | N/A |

(f) Pension \& Deferred Compensation: Did not receive enough detailed information.

## Benefits System Recommendations for\#16a-d:

(a) Consider adding additional alternatives for Employee-funded retirement plans such as ICMA, Health Savings Accounts. And Health Insurance Benefit (HIB) in lieu of City / Employee enrollment.
(b) Form a Council / Employee Benefits Committee to meet regularly and review current benefits, alternatives and recommend potential changes to the Mayor and City Council. Such a committee should consist of:

- one to three (1-3) Councilmember,
- the Human Resources Director,
- the Finance Director,
- and two (2) staff from the two largest departments by (a) budget and (b) \# of employees.

In North Pole this would likely be the Director of City Services and Chief of Police.
Councilmembers are not generally HR or Finance experts however it is important that elected officials understand the mechanics and details of the City's benefits system, and how it impacts (a) employee attraction, morale and retention, and (b) short and long-term fiscal health of the City. Rather than surprise elected officials with changes to salaries and benefits, elected officials participating in the Benefits Committee will provide long-term continuity and success of the City's budget

Objectives of the Committee would be:

- Set specific goals, milestones and deadlines for research and committee member updates,
- Administer a Benefits Survey to the Employees,
- Review Benefits Survey; discuss what the value / need from the City' program,
- Review the benefits details provided by the comparable local governments,
- Contact other Boroughs / Cities to investigate details of their benefits policies,
- Create a draft report with recommendations for the City Council - with cost alternatives and benefits analysis.


## 17. Policy: Missing policy for pay increase recommendations

Pay increases appear to be arbitrary, position-specific, and not based on a rational nexus. Consultants were unable to identify the presence of a standardized employee salary increase policy including an easy-tofollow step and grade system for each classification.
18. Policy: Personnel Evaluations are not standardized and systematically tied to pay increases

Consultants were unable to identify a standardized evaluation format / process which is used by all departments. In fact, it appears that various departments use different tools for evaluation, and these tools do not appear to be comprehensive enough to support either a performance / merit-based salary increases or career planning.
19. Policy: Career, Succession Planning and Professional Development appears to be lacking; negatively impacting Employee Retention
(a) Staff retention is not simply a function of salaries and benefits, but also a by-product of a positive work culture which enhances personal and professional growth opportunities. An opportunity exists within North Pole to improve Succession Planning and Career Planning within the organization for each position to provide employees with knowledge about future job opportunities and value of continued city employment. No succession plans or succession planning or career planning activities were observed during consultations with staff.

Additionally, while employee longevity and start-date information was not collected as part of this study, the City needs to know how many employees will retire within 5 to 10 years, and require department heads to work with staff to develop succession plans for key positions. Often cities are not prepared for the resulting impact as employees leave with vast experience and knowledge.

Attainment of job-related certifications and education have costs. Many of the agencies in the Education Pay Incentives Chart (below) offer, upon degree completion, a monetary amount per year ( $\$ 100$ to $\$ 250$ per year), or an hourly differential.
20. Policy: Several policies need clarification. Management / non-Management, Exempt / nonExempt, Salary / Hourly, Overtime, Workweek, and Pay Period.
(a) There is no clear definition of Management vs. non-Management positions, which are designated as Exempt or Salaried, and which are designated non-Exempt or hourly. IRS Tax Code and the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) regulations outline the conditions for such designations and how overtime calculations should be made. Without this clarity in North Pole, the potential for poor time management to occur, which could lead to waste, fraud or abuse of time management and overtime by employees, causing the City greater personnel expenses than are necessary or efficient.

## Table 16: Sample Education Pay Incentives

See Appendix F for more details.

| ADMINISTRATIVE | Hourly Rate Increase | \% or Step Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clerk or Deputy Clerk |  |  |
| 25 points - Municipal Clerk's Certificaion | \$0.25 | 25\% |
| 50 points - Municipal Clerk's Certification | \$0.50 | 25\% |
| 75 points - Municipal Clerk's Certification | \$0.75 | 25\% |
| IIMC Certification | \$1.25 | 1.5\% |
| Other incentive goals as appropriate. |  |  |
| Finance Director or Accounting Staff |  |  |
| Certified Public Finance (CPFO) Officer Exams | \$0.50 | 1.5\% |
| Certified Public Finance Officer (CPFO) Designation | \$1.50 | 1.5\% |
| Unqualifed Audit Opinion | \$0.25 | .5\% |
| GFOA Recognized Outstanding Budget | \$0.50 | .5\% |
| GFOA Recognized Outstanding Financial Statements | \$0.50 | .5\% |
| Training towards Risk Manager Certification | \$0.25 | .5\% |
| Risk Manager Certification | \$0.25 | 1.5\% |
| Other incentive goals as appropriate. |  |  |
|  | Option 1 | Option 2 |
| GENERAL / WATER / SEWER/ STREETS / PARK | Hourly Rate Increase | \% or Step Increase |
| General |  |  |
| Commercial Drivers License (CDL) | \$0.50 | .5\% |
| Commercial Pesticide Applicator | \$0.50 | 25\% |
| Water |  |  |
| D Water Treatment License | \$0.25 | .5\% |
| C Water Treatment License | \$0.75 | .5\% |
| B Water Treatment License | \$1.25 | .5\% |
| A Water Treatment License | \$2.00 | .5\% |
| Class I Water Distribution Certificate | \$0.25 | .5\% |
| Class II Water Distribution Certificate | \$0.50 | .5\% |
| Class III Water Distribution Certificate | \$0.75 | .5\% |

## Recommendations for Findings \#17, 18, 19 \& 20:

(a) Adopt a standard maximum 1.5\% Merit-based Pay Increase Policy.
(b) Adopt a standard Performance Evaluation which involves an annual Work Plan with activities (certifications, education, skills development, training, etc.) directly tied to Pay Increases - up to 3 x $.5 \%$ attached is recommended. See Appendix G for details.
(c) Base up to $1.5 \%$ of pay increases on performance / merit and added value to the City, not simply COLA or longevity. See Appendix F for details.
(d) Adopt the Classification System which delineates management and non-management.
(e) Review and update the City's Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual to clearly define Management, non-Management, Exempt, non-Exempt, Salary, Hourly, work-week, overtime and other important policies relating to compensation.


## SECTION IV: EXHIBITS \& APPENDIX
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107
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## Appendix A: COMPENSABle Factors Classification Guidelines, Job <br> SURVEYS \& AsSESSMENT RESULTS

The following outlines how and why the consultants used this tool in comparing positions.

Pre-developed Compensable Factors are used as a method of comparing positions that are normally difficult to compare - Police Chief to Library Assistant to Recreation Worker to any other position. Specifically, this tool is used to:
(a) determine the unique characteristics of a position in the City,
(b) the unique characteristics of any position in comparison to another,
(c) to determine common 'bands' or uniquely similar positions and
(d) to compare these 'common positions' with the existing pay grades to determine whether they are equitable - internally and externally.

This tool can be very useful in determining internal and external equity of pay classifications and associated pay grades.

These factors involve quantifying the knowledge, skills, abilities and experience necessary to perform each job. They vary from position to position and depend on supervisory requirements as well as the manual requirements. For example, a mechanic must perform physical labor in a potentially hazardous working environment. It does not require, however, that the position oversee a budget or network with the community. The City Clerk, on the hand, must do the latter but not the former (unless, of course, he has a hostile council creating an environment which is hazardous to his health). An example for how our compensable factor for education works is below. A complete list and a definition for each is listed below.

## Skills Example

## Education:

First Degree: High school diploma or equivalent.

Second Degree: Two year degree from an accredited college or junior college.

Third Degree: Bachelor's degree in Public Administration, Business, Accounting or other related advanced degree pertaining to a relevant field.

If the position required a high school degree, the position would be considered first degree in terms of education. If it required a Bachelors degree, it would be considered a third degree position in terms of education. Note that a full explanation of the compensable factors is provided in this Appendix. Additionally the weighting of the factors varies according to the level of the position. It is, for example, very important for the City Clerk to have a Bachelors Degree while is it not for a mechanic. Differences between Management and nonManagement are explained below.

## Management Compensable Factors

## Skill

Education:
First Degree: Holder of High School Diploma or equivalent education.
Second Degree: Holder of a Bachelors degree in Engineering, Science, Public Administration, Business, Accounting or other related degree pertaining to a relevant field.

Third Degree: Holder of an advanced degree above the Bachelors degree. Preferable in Masters Public Administration, Masters in Business Administration, Masters of Accountancy or other related advanced degree pertaining to a relevant field.

## Experience:

First Degree: Less than 3 years experience in a comparable position at another City or city or in the private sector.

Second Degree: Three to five years experience in a comparable position at another City or city or in the private sector.

Third Degree: More than 5 years experience in a comparable position at another City or city or in the private sector.

Knowledge:
First Degree: Use of mathematics with the use of complicated drawing, specifications, charts, tables; various types of precision measuring interments. Equivalent to one to three years' applied trades training in a particular or specialized occupation.

Second Degree: Use of intermediate knowledge of law, mathematics, finance, budgeting, personnel management and public administration and or the use of complicated drawings, specifications, charts, tables, handbooks formulas; all varieties of precision measuring instruments. Equivalent to complete accredited apprenticeship in a recognized trade, craft or occupation; or equivalent to a four-year college.

Third Degree: Use of a high mathematics involved in the application of business principles and the performance of related practical operation, together with a comprehensive knowledge of the theories and practices of law, public administration, finance, budgeting, personnel management, mechanical, electrical, chemical, civil, or like engineering field. Equivalent to completing an advanced degree form an accredited university.

## Responsibility

Budget:
First Degree: Responsible for general oversight of funds and some distribution to various entities.

Second Degree: Responsible for oversight of funds, assisting in the writing of grants and proposals to support the Department's operations budget, and / or facilitating intergovernmental financial support for municipal operations.

Third Degree: Responsible for the oversight of Department funds, evaluating and recommending rate restructuring, writing grants and proposals as a principal source to the Department's operations budget or the City's General Fund, and / or facilitating intergovernmental financial support for operations.

## Oversee Operations:

First Degree: General oversight of operation with in a functional area.
Second Degree: Responsibility of an area with moderate control of various staff and resource support within a functional area.

Third Degree: Major oversight of multiple department operations and / or multiple functional areas, various staff and resource support within this department and among other departments within the City.

## Work with Others:

First Degree: Works with others within a functional area.
Second Degree: Works with others within functional area and occasionally into other areas, and coordinates activities that require cross-functional support.

Third Degree: Works in an extensive capacity within other functional areas, including making recommendations to the City Council (or other Boards and Commissions) on various issues.

## Community

Networking:
First Degree Works with community on various issues and internal matters dealing with managers in functional area.

Second Degree Work with community on various issues for internal matters and external matters. Handles all cross-functional interactions as needed. Occasionally informs the public or responds to public comment, or informs residents and groups on City issues.

Third Degree Works with community on various issues in community development and business issues. Regularly informs the public, responds to public comment, or informs residents and groups on City issues.

## Non-Management Compensable Factors

## Skill

Education:
First Degree: Holder of High School Diploma or equivalent education.
Second Degree: Holder of an applied science degree or at least two year of secondary education at an accredited college.

Third Degree: Holder of a Bachelors degree in Public Administration, Business, Accounting or other related advanced degree pertaining to a relevant field.

## Experience:

First Degree: Less than five years of experience in a similar position.
Second Degree: Five years experience at a related position or at least three years of experience in the next lower position.

Third Degree: Eight years or more experience at a related position or at least five years of experience in the next lower position.

## Knowledge:

First Degree: Use of reading and writing, adding and subtraction of whole numbers; following of instructions; use of fixed gauges, direct reading of instruments, and similar devices; where interpretation is not required. Beginner's knowledge of basic computer and technical skills.

Second Degree: Use of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division of numbers including decimals and fractions. Simple use of formulas, charts, tables, drawing, specifications, schedules, wiring diagrams, use of adjustable measuring instruments, checking of reports, forms, records and comparable data where interpretation is required. Intermediate knowledge of basic computer and technical skills.

Third Degree: Use of mathematics with the use of complicated drawings, specifications, charts, tables, and various types of precision measuring instruments. Equivalent to one to three years applied trades training in a particular or specialized occupation. Advanced knowledge of basic computer and technical skills.

## Effort

Physical Demand:
First Degree: Light lifting of objects that are generally less than 20 pounds with assistance. General office work with limited (organizational) filling of documents. Minimal standing, walking, crawling or climbing.

Second Degree Medium to heavy lifting of objects that are generally less than 50 pounds with assistance, occasional climbing and carrying of objects. General office or file and documents maintenance work with recurring movement, lifting or frequency. Recurring standing, walking, crawling or climbing.

Third Degree Medium to heavy lifting of objects that may exceed more than 50 pounds with assistance. General office work and medium to heavy file and document maintenance work with movement, lifting or high frequency including operation of office and / or heavy equipment. High frequency of standing, walking, crawling or climbing.

Mental Demand:
First Degree: $\quad$ Requires little or no decision making for day to day operations of a functional area. Often takes direction from superiors when performing tasks.

Second Degree: Requires moderate independent decision making / interpretation within duties or daily operations within a functional area. Superiors have delegated certain authority over general tasks.

Third Degree: Requires moderate to heavy independent decision making within duties or daily operations and within in the allocation of resources, time or equipment.

## Job Conditions

## Working Conditions:

First Degree Works in non-hazardous conditions and have general contact with internal and external customers.

Second Degree Occasionally works in semi-hazardous or occasionally hazardous conditions. Interfaces with internal and external customers on special projects that require employee to consult external help from other functional areas.

Third Degree
Regularly works in hazardous or potentially hazardous conditions with heavy equipment that is sensitive to over-handling. Frequently works with external customers on a regular basis.

## Job Surveys: Management \& Non-Management

## Employee Job Description Survey management Positions - Key Elements

## Introduction \& Overview:

Municipal Solutions, llc is currently gathering salary and compensation data from other comparable communities throughout the region to ensure employee salaries and benefits in North Pole are competitive and appropriate. As part of this work, revisions to the City's Job Descriptions are being made to ensure that all descriptions meet current legal standards, better correlate with compensation and provide clarity to the individual currently in that position.

This survey is used to determine whether certain key elements are properly identified and contained in current job description to adequately reflect the essential levels of experience, education, skill and effort that distinguish one position from another. Such distinction and similarities help to ensure appropriate levels of compensation between all City staff and among similar positions other communities.

Please take a few minutes to consider your position and suggest appropriate responses for each question.

In order to ensure the results from regional research, they need to clearly understand the KSAs (levels of knowledge, skills and abilities), levels of education, experience, and levels of effort and responsibility that is appropriate for someone in your position. The survey is not an evaluation of the person currently employed in this position, nor should it reflect the current employee's KSAs. Rather this survey is designed to be completed by the person currently employed in this position, and reflect what the position itself requires for anyone filling the position.

NOTE: Whether or not you meet these requirements is not important, They are not changing the functional duties of the job descriptions at this time.

## Instructions:

1. All employees, including part-time and seasonal employees, should complete the following survey.
2. If the position you are currently in is considered 'Management', please fill out the Management survey only.
3. If your position is considered 'non-Management', please fill out the non-Management survey only. Seasonal employees and volunteers are to fill out the non-Management survey
4. If you don't know the appropriate answer to a question, leave the box blank and offer a recommendation and comment in the 'Details' box.
5. Give the results to Aaron by Friday, October $2^{\text {nd }}$ by 5:00 PM.
6. Aaron will collect and deliver to Dave Evertsen, Principal.

If you have any questions, please call David Evertsen directly at 623.207.1309 or email at devertsen@municipalsolutions.org.

## Management Position Questions

| Department: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Position Title: |  |
| Your Name: |  |
| Reports To: |  |
| Total \# I Supervise |  |

My position is currently: (check most appropriate boxes)
$\square$ Appointed $\square$ Contract $\quad \square$ Salary $\quad \square$ Hourly $\quad \square$ Full-time $\quad \square$ Part-time $\square$ Other
(if other, please explain)
Details:

## ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS \& ABILITIES:

When determining what level of knowledge, skills, experience and abilities are essential for your position, think about the following statements and check the one which most appropriately applies. You should reflect upon what the position would require if the City needed to fill your position. Do not include what your current education level or ability.

Example: You may have been in this position for 12 years, though you worked up into the position. You may feel that someone following you in that position should have a minimum of 5 years experience in certain trades or skills. List the standard, and any details.
Skill

## Education:

Are there any certificates, licenses or registrations required to perform the essential duties and responsibilities? X Mark the appropriate box below and please list any additional detail.
$\square \quad$ Hold a High School diploma, general education degree, professional certificate from college or technical school or equivalent education.
$\square \quad$ Hold a Four-year degree (Bachelor's (B.A.)) from an accredited college or university in Engineering, Science, Public Administration, Business, Accounting or other related degree relevant to current position.
$\square \quad$ Hold an advanced degree above the Bachelors degree. Preferable in Masters Public Administration, Masters in Business Administration, Masters of Accountancy or other related advanced degree pertaining to a relevant field.

Details:

## Experience:

Select the level of education needed to successfully accomplish the essential duties of this position. This will not necessarily reflect your level, but the level needed for the job. If your level of needed education is not listed below, simply write it in below. X Mark the appropriate box below and please list any additional detail.
$\square$ Less than 3 years experience in a comparable position at another municipality or in the private sector.
$\square \quad 3$ to 5 years experience in a comparable position at another municipality or in the private sector.
$\square \quad$ More than 5 years experience in a comparable position at another municipality or in the private sector.

## Details:

## Knowledge:

Please select the level of knowledge or technical skills needed to successfully accomplish the essential duties of this position. This will not necessarily reflect your level, but the level needed for the job. Please provide details (such as specific technical, computer, language, or other skills or knowledge) below if necessary. X Mark the appropriate box below and please list any additional detail.Use of basic knowledge in mathematics or equivalent technical skills necessary to review and prepare of complicated drawing, specifications, charts, tables; various types of precision measuring interments and techniques. Equivalent to one to three years' applied trades training in a particular or specialized occupation.
$\square$ Use of intermediate knowledge of law, mathematics, finance, budgeting, personnel management and public administration and or the use of complicated drawings, specifications, charts, tables, handbooks formulas; all varieties of precision measuring instruments. Equivalent to complete accredited apprenticeship in a recognized trade, craft or occupation; or equivalent to a four-year college degree.Use of an advanced knowledge of mathematics or equivalent technical skills used in the application of business principles and the performance of related practical operation, together with a comprehensive knowledge of the theories and practices of law, public administration, finance, budgeting, personnel management, mechanical, electrical, chemical, civil, or like engineering field. Equivalent to completing an advanced degree (Masters, Juris Doctorate or Doctorate) from an accredited university.

Details:

## Responsibility

## Budget:

What level of finance / budget oversight does this position require? To what degree is this position responsible for the department's budget, expenses, purchasing, revenue, and rates for services it provides. X Mark the appropriate box below.
$\square \quad$ Responsible for limited oversight of funds and some distribution to various entities, including purchasing, payroll, and documentation. In this position, such authority is generally delegated, infrequent or limited in authority.

Responsible for moderate oversight of funds, assisting in the writing of grants and proposals to support the Department's operational budget, and / or facilitating intergovernmental financial support for municipal operations. Moderate oversight of funds $\&$ distribution, processing $\&$ overseeing purchasing, payroll, $\&$ documentation for example.
$\square \quad$ Responsible for extensive oversight of department funds, evaluating and recommending rate restructuring, writing grants and proposals as a principal source to the department's operations budget or the General Fund, and / or facilitating intergovernmental financial support for operations. Principal accountability for the Department's budget and fiscal management falls under this position's responsibility.

## Details:

## Oversee Operations:

Please select the level of oversight needed to successfully accomplish the essential duties of this position. This will not necessarily reflect your level, but the level needed for the job.
$X$ Mark the appropriate box below and please list any additional detail.Requires responsibility for and general oversight over one or two departmental operations or functional areas with limited control of staff and financial resources within the department.
$\square \quad$ Requires an intermediate level of responsibility for and oversight of multiple departmental operations or functional areas with moderate control of various staff and resource support within those functional areas, sometimes requiring interdepartmental coordination of staff and resources.

Requires major oversight of multiple department operations and / or multiple functional areas, various staff and resource support within this department and among other departments within the City.

## Details:

## Working with Others:

Please select the level of interaction needed to successfully accomplish the essential duties of this position. This will not necessarily reflect your level, but the level needed for the job.
$X$ Mark the appropriate box below and please list any additional detail.
$\square \quad$ Works with others within a functional area.Works with others within functional area and occasionally into other areas, and coordinates activities that require cross-functional support.

Works in an extensive capacity within other functional areas, including making recommendations to the Commission (or other Boards / Commissions) on various issues.

## Details:

## Community:

## Networking:

Does this position require that a person interact with people within and outside of the organization? Select one of the following characteristics that most appropriately describe the networking responsibilities and duties of the position. Please mark the appropriate box. Provide additional detail below if necessary.
$\square \quad$ Work to resolve various issues and internal matters through managers or supervisors dealing with community residents or businesses only within my department or functional area.

Work with community residents or businesses, elected officials or other community groups on various issues for internal and external matters and / or handle some crossdepartmental or cross-functional interactions as necessary. This position is required to inform the public or responds to public comment, informs residents and groups on City issues.
$\square \quad$ Frequently work with community residents or businesses, elected officials or other community groups on various issues for internal and external matters media or press on various issues in community development and business issues. Regularly informs the public, responds to public comment, meets or corresponds with press or media, and informs residents and groups on City issues often in person.

X Mark all that apply.

| $\square$ | Residents (Youth) | $\square$ | Residents (Adults) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ | Local Elected Officials | $\square$ | Regional \& State Elected Officials |
| $\square$ | Local News Media | $\square$ | Regional \& State Media |
| $\square$ | County Department Heads | $\square$ | State Agency / Department Heads |
| $\square$ | Local Businesses | $\square$ | Regional Professional Associations |
| $\square$ | Council of Governments | $\square$ | Community Groups (Rotary, Lions, other...) |
| $\square$ | Others: | $\square$ | Others: |

Duties: Please comment on or list your duties as currently assigned.
$\square$

Additional Comments: Are there any other circumstances or details about this position which may require special qualifications, skills or abilities. Please provide additional information below.

## Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Please attach a copy of your current job description and return both documents to Klo Abeita immediately. The results from this survey will be used to update all job descriptions and will be available for viewing in the coming weeks.

## Non-Management Position Questions

| Department: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Position Title: |  |
| Your Name: |  |
| Reports To: |  |
| Total \# I Supervise |  |

My position is currently: (check most appropriate)
$\square$ Appointed $\square$ Contract $\square$ Salary $\square$ Hourly $\square$ Full-time $\square$ Part-time $\square$ Seasonal $\square$ Other
(if other, please explain)
Details:

## ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS \& ABILITIES:

When determining what level of knowledge, skills, experience and abilities are essential for your position, think about the following statements and check the one which most appropriately applies. You should reflect upon what the position would require if the City needed to fill your position. Do not include what your current education level or ability is.

Example: You may have been in this position for 12 years, though you worked up into the position. You may feel that someone following you in that position should have a minimum of 5 years experience in certain trades or skills. List the standard, and any details.
Skill
Education:
Are there any certificates, licenses or registrations required to perform the essential duties and responsibilities? $\underline{X}$ Mark the appropriate box below and please list any additional detail.
$\square \quad$ No prior training; less than high school education.
$\square \quad$ High school diploma or general education degree (GED); post-high school education or professional certificate from college or technical school.
$\square \quad$ Two or Four-year degree (Associate's (A.A.) or Bachelor's (B.A.)) from an accredited college or university.

## Details:

## Experience:

Select the level of education needed to successfully accomplish the essential duties of this position. This will not necessarily reflect your level, but the level needed for the job. If your level of needed education is not listed below, simply write it in below.
X Mark the appropriate box below and please list any additional detail.
$\square \quad$ No prior experience to one year experience.One to three years experience at a related or next lower position.More than three years experience (please detail below) at a related or next lower position.

## Details:

## Knowledge:

Please select the level of knowledge or technical skills needed to successfully accomplish the essential duties of this position. This will not necessarily reflect your level, but the level needed for the job. Please provide details (such as specific technical, computer, language, or other skills or knowledge) below if necessary.
X Mark the appropriate box below and please list any additional detail.
$\square$ Use of reading and writing, adding and subtraction of whole numbers; following of instructions; use of fixed gauges, direct reading of instruments, and similar devices; where interpretation is not required. Beginner's knowledge of basic computer and technical skills.
$\square$ Use of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division of numbers including decimals and fractions. Use of simple formulas, charts, tables, drawing, specifications, schedules, wiring diagrams, use of adjustable measuring instruments, checking of reports, forms, records and comparable data where some interpretation is required. Intermediate knowledge of basic computer and technical skills.
$\square$ Use of mathematics with the use of complex drawings, specifications, charts, tables, and various types of precision measuring instruments - where regular interpretation is required. Advanced knowledge of basic computer and technical skills.

Details:

## Effort

Physical Demand:
Does this position require that weight be lifted or force be exerted? If so, how much and how often? (e.g. once a day, once a week, twice a year, etc.).
$X$ Mark the appropriate box below.
quent lifting of heavy objects that generally does not require assistance. General office work with minimal recurring movement including filling of documents, lifting standing, bending, stooping, walking, crawling or climbing.

Potential for recurring lifting of heavy objects that generally requires assistance. General office or file and documents maintenance work or work with recurring movement, lifting, standing, bending, walking, crawling or climbing.

Potential for frequent lifting of objects that often requires assistance. General office work and medium to heavy file and document maintenance work with movement, lifting or high frequency including operation of office and / or heavy equipment, and standing, walking, crawling or climbing.

Details:

## Mental Demand:

Please select the level mental effort needed to successfully accomplish the essential duties of this position. This will not necessarily reflect your level, but the level needed for the job. $X$ Mark the appropriate box below and please list any additional detail.
$\square \quad$ Requires little or no decision making for day to day operations of a functional area. Often receives guidance from superiors when performing tasks.Requires moderate independent decision making / interpretation within duties or daily operations within a functional area. Requires reading and comprehending simple instructions, preparation of simple correspondence and memos, and the ability to effectively present information to the supervisor. Occasionally receives guidance from superiors when performing tasks.
$\square \quad$ Requires moderate to heavy independent decision making within duties or daily operations and within in the allocation of resources, time or equipment. Superiors have delegated certain authority over general tasks. Requires ability to read and interpret documents such as safety rules, operating and maintenance instructions, and procedure manuals. Requires ability to write routine reports and correspondence, and the ability to speak effectively before groups of employees or residents. Rarely needs to receive guidance from superiors when performing tasks.

## Details:

## Job Conditions

Working Conditions:
Select one of the following characteristics that most appropriately describe the working conditions of the position. Provide additional detail below if necessary.
$X$ Mark the appropriate box below and please list any additional detail.
$\square$ Works in non-hazardous conditions; limited general contact with other employees and / or external customers.Works in semi-hazardous or occasionally hazardous conditions; regular contact with employees and external customers. Position can require attention to special projects that require employee to consult external help from other functional areas.
$\square \quad$ Regularly works in hazardous or potentially hazardous conditions with heavy equipment that is sensitive to over-handling. Frequently works with external customers on a regular basis.

X Mark all that apply.
Noise:

| Environmental Conditions: |  |  | Other Conditions: (describe) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $\square$ | None | $\square$ | Wet or Humid | $\square$ |  |
| $\square$ | Low | $\square$ | Work near moving parts | $\square$ |  |
| $\square$ | Moderate | $\square$ | Work in high, precarious places | $\square$ |  |
| $\square$ | High | $\square$ | Fumes or Airborne Particles | $\square$ |  |
|  |  | $\square$ | Toxic or Caustic chemicals | $\square$ |  |
|  |  | $\square$ | Outdoor weather conditions | $\square$ |  |
|  |  | $\square$ | Extreme Cold (non-weather) | $\square$ |  |
|  |  | $\square$ | Extreme Heat (non-weather) | $\square$ |  |
|  | $\square$ | Risk of Electrical Shock | $\square$ |  |  |
|  |  | $\square$ | Work with Explosives | $\square$ |  |
|  |  | $\square$ | Risk of Radiation | $\square$ |  |
|  |  | $\square$ | Vibration | $\square$ |  |

Contact with Others:
Does this position require that a person interact with people within and outside of the organization? Please mark the appropriate box.

X Mark all that apply.

| $\square$ | Residents (Adults, Youth) |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ | Developers |
| $\square$ | Vendors |
| $\square$ | Council Members |
| $\square$ | Other elected officials |
| $\square$ | County or State Agencies |
| $\square$ | Others: |

Duties: Please comment on or list your duties as currently assigned.
$\square$

Additional Comments: Are there any other circumstances or details about this position which may require special qualifications, skills or abilities. Please provide additional information below.
$\square$

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.
Please attach a copy of your current job description and return both documents to Klo Abeita immediately. The results from this survey will be used to update all job descriptions and will be available for viewing in the coming weeks.

## Results of Compensable Factors Analysis

Compensable Factors for Comparison \& Classification: Management

## Initial Survey Results - Management

| Management Range: | Skill |  |  |  |  |  | Responsibility |  |  |  |  |  | Community |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Education |  | Experience |  | Knowledge |  |  <br> Finance |  | Oversee operations |  | Work w/ others |  | Networking |  |  |  |
| Position | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Total <br> Points |  |
| Police Chief | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 282.50 | Steve Dutra |
| Fire Chief | 2 | 25.00 | 2 | 30.00 | 2 | 35.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 230.00 | Geoff Coon (listed 1 or 2 on Education) |
| City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 295.00 | Aaron Rhodes |
| City Accountant / CFO | 1 | 12.50 | 3 | 60.00 | 2 | 35.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 2 | 25.00 | 210.00 | Tricia Fogarty (should be Bachelors 2) |
| Director of City Services | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 2 | 25.00 | 257.50 | Bill Butler puts emphasis on experience |
| Police Lieutenant | 1 | 12.50 | 3 | 60.00 | 2 | 35.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 202.50 | Jeromey K. Lindnag (put 1 tor |
| Deputy Fire Chief | 1 | 12.50 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 237.50 | Chad Heineken (put 1 for education) |

Finalized Results - Management

| Management Range: | Skill |  |  |  |  |  | Responsibility |  |  |  |  |  | Community <br> Networking |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Education |  | Experience |  | Knowledge |  |  <br> Finance |  | Oversee operations |  | Work w/ others |  |  |  |  |
| Position | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Total Points |
| City Accountant / CFO | 3 | 50.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 295 |
| Police Chief | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 295 |
| Fire Chief | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 295 |
| Director of City Services | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 50.00 | 282.50 |
| Deputy City Manager (proposed new) | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 50.00 | 282.50 |
| Reserved |  | 12.50 |  | 15.00 |  | 17.50 |  | 10.00 |  | 6.25 |  | 6.25 |  | 12.50 | 270 |
| City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 262.50 |
| HR Director / PIO (proposed new) | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 262.50 |
| Deputy Fire Chief | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 250 |
| Police Lieutenant | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 25.00 | 2 | 25.00 | 250 |
| Senior Accountant (proposed new) | 2 | 25.00 | 3 | 60.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 3 | 40.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 2 | 12.50 | 2 | 25.00 | 245 |
| City Clerk (proposed new) | 2 | 25.00 | 2 | 30.00 | 3 | 70.00 | 2 | 20.00 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 25.00 | 3 | 50.00 | 232.50 |

Compensable Factors for Comparison \& Classification: non-Management
Initial Survey Results - non-Management

| Non-Management Range: | Skill |  |  |  |  |  | Effort (Demand) |  |  |  | Job Conditions <br> Working <br> Conditions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Education |  | Experience |  | Knowledge |  | Physical |  | Mental |  |  |  |  |  |
| Position | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Total } \\ \text { Points } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AP Tax \& License Clerk | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 155.0 | Terri Nelson |
| AR, Utility Billing Clerk | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 155.0 | Terri Nelson |
| Deputy Accountant | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 132.5 | Michelle Peede |
| Records Manager/ Archivist | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 122.5 |  |
| Special Assistant to the Mayor | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.5 |  |
| Receptionist | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 72.5 |  |
| Public Works / Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Works Supervisor | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 245.0 | Cody Lougee (put 2 for Knowledge) |
| Utility Supervisor | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 245.0 | Paul Trissel (left last one blank; make equal to PW Super) |
| Public Works Assistant | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 215.0 | Thomas Blaire (put 3 for knowledge) |
| Utility Operator II (proposed re-title) | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 195.0 | James Donovan (put 2 and 3 in education, changed WC to 3) |
| Utility Operator I (proposed new) | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 170.0 | new classificaiton |
| Utility Assistant | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 140.0 | Randy Binkley (put 2 for knowledge, changed to 1 Education |
| Utility Assistant | $z$ | 45.0 | z | 25.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 220.0 | Robert Sommenturg P (put 2 Ed, 2 Exp, $3 \mathrm{Know}, 3$ Mental) |
| Utility Ass istant / General Laborer | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 162.5 | Chris Lindsoe (put 2 for Ed and 3 for Mental) |
| General Laborer (Summer Help) | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 137.5 | John Linell (left Knowledge blank) |
| General Laborer (Summer Help) | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 135.0 | Tessa Longee |
| Administrative Assistant PWD | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.5 |  |
| Police Department |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Police Sergeant | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 215.0 | Bruce M ilne, Jed Smith, Phil McBroom |
| Police Detective | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 195.0 | Kurt Lockwood |
| Police Detective | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 190.0 | Nathan Werner |
| Police Officer |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 65.0 | James McBroom |
| Police Officer | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 1 | 15.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 175.0 | Sydney Rosenbalm |
| Police Officer | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 145.0 | Jake Tibbits |
| Police Officer | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 177.5 | Benjamin Wages |
| Police Officer Recruit | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 162.5 |  |
| Evidence Custodian / Dispatcher | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 120.0 | Rachael Wing |
| Administrative Assistant Police | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.5 | Alison Trubacz |
| Fire Department |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fire Captain | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 215.0 | Andrew Hamilton |
| Fire Captain | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 230.0 | Richard Hagen II |
| Fire Lieutenant | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 245.0 | Sam Sanders |
| Fire Lieutenant | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 190.0 | Erik Winkler, Kyle Fagerstrom (put 3 on education) |
| Fire Engineer/ EMT | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 245.0 | Tany a Stugart (add into the salary mix), Michael Crane (Engi |
| Firefighter / EMT | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 162.5 | Calla Westcott |
| Firefighter/EMT | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 220.0 | Linsey Longridge |
| Firefighter/ EMT | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 190.0 | Justin Reardon put $1 \& 2$ for knowledge |
| Administrative Assistant Fire | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 1 | 15.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 140.0 | Michelle M y hill (put 1 \& 2 on knowledge) |
| Building Technician | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 185.0 |  |
| City Planner | 3 | 30.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 167.5 |  |
| Records Preparation Clerk | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.5 |  |

Finalized Results - non-Management

| Non-Management Range: | Skill |  |  |  |  |  | Effort (Demand) |  |  |  | Job Conditions <br> Working <br> Conditions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Education |  | Experience |  | Knowledge |  | Physical |  | Mental |  |  |  |  |
| Position | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Degree | Points | Total Points |
| Reserved | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 260.00 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 250.00 |
| Utility Supervisor | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 245.00 |
| Police Sergeant | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 260.00 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 220.00 |
| Public Works Supervisor | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 215.00 |
| Fire Captain | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 245.00 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 200.00 |
| Utility Operator II (proposed) | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 195.00 |
| Police Detective | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 225.00 |
| Public Works Assistant | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 190.00 |
| Fire Lieutenant | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 190.00 |
| Building Technician | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 185.00 |
| Fire Engineer | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 170.00 |
| Utility Operator (Operator I \& I/ propos | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 170.00 |
| City Planner (proposed) | 3 | 30.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 167.50 |
| Firefighter / EMT | 1 | 7.5 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 162.50 |
| Police Officer | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 190.00 |
| AP Tax \& License Clerk (revised) | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 145.00 |
| AR / Utility Billing Clerk (revised) | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 145.00 |
| Police Officer Recruit | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 177.50 |
| Utility Assistant II (proposed) | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 140.00 |
| Fiscal Accounting / Fund Accounting | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 132.50 |
| Deputy Clerk (proposed) | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 132.50 |
| Firefighter Recruit (proposed) | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 127.50 |
| Records Manager / Archivist | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 122.50 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 110.00 |
| Executive Assistant (proposed) | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.50 |
| Utility Assistant I | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 3 | 40.0 | 1 | 7.5 | 3 | 50.0 | 132.50 |
| Administrative Assistant PWD (propo | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.50 |
| Administrative Assistant Police | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.50 |
| Administrative Assistant Fire | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.50 |
| Records Preparation Clerk | 2 | 15.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 107.50 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 90.00 |
| General Laborer (Summer Help) | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 1 | 7.5 | 2 | 25.0 | 87.50 |
| Receptionist Admin | 1 | 7.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 15.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 72.50 |
| Reserved |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 7.5 |  | 12.5 | 60.00 |

Appendix B: General Fund Personnel Costs vs. Comparable Cities

Table 11a: Local Government - General Fund Personnel Expense Comparison

| City / Town | Resident <br> Population | Total FT <br> Employee <br> Equivelant* | Employee per Capita | FY General Operating Budget | Total Personnel Costs | \% of Budget as Personnel Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Borough of Fairbanks North Star | 97,581 | 405 | 4.15 | \$257,323,148 | \$37,563,100 | 15\% |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | 192 | 6.09 | \$35,898,820 | \$24,324,069 | 68\% |
| City a Borough of Juneau | 32,000 | 1805 | 56.40 | S369,928,500 | \$219,037,600 | 59\% |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | 135 | 12.80 | S20,582, 140 | S14,881,223 | 72\% |
| City a Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | 95 | 11.03 | S31,408,943 | S12,889,847 | 41\% |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | 177 | 21.35 | S64,362,428 | \$23,056,073 | 36\% |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | 91 | 11.74 | S16,873, 839 | S12,487,564 | 74\% |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | 71 | 9.65 | \$11,612,724 | \$8,152,793 | 70\% |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | 60 | 9.09 | S13,165, 225 | 58,049,869 | 61\% |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | 134 | 22.45 | S40,654,886 | S17,981,692 | 44\% |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | 108 | 18.59 | S12,874,350 | \$8,647,865 | 67\% |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | 73 | 15.63 | \$13,529,340 | \$8,297,740 | 61\% |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | 134 | 35.02 | \$58,960,000 | \$20,100,000 | 34\% |
| City a Borough of Wrangell | 2,503 | 48 | 18.98 | S4,906,932 | \$3,727,110 | 76\% |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | 54 | 21.62 | S19,728,710 | \$3,310,159 | 17\% |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | 58 | 26.85 | S16,508,435 | S6,521,403 | 40\% |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | 891 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | 46 | 3.45 | S47,978,722 | - | - |
| Median | 6,953 | 95.37 | 15.63 | \$60,958,655 | \$12,688,706 | 60.18\% |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | 49 | 22.27 | \$ 6,305,356 | \$ 3,967,396 | 62.92\% |

Table 11b: Local Government General Fund Budgets - Salary \& Benefits Comparison

| City / Town | Total Salaries Budget | Salaries as a \% of Personnel Costs | Median <br> Employee <br> Salary** | Total Budget Benefits | Benefits as a \% of Personnel Costs | Average Benefits Expense per Employee** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Borough of Fairbanks North Star | S23,990,550 | 64\% | \$59,236 | S13,572,550 | 36\% | \$33,512 |
| City of Fairbanks | S16,841,522 | 69\% | \$87,716 | 57,482,547 | 31\% | \$38,972 |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | \$135,250, 100 | 62\% | \$74,941 | S83,787,500 | 38\% | S46,426 |
| City of Wasilla | 59,970,419 | 67\% | 573,992 | S4,910,804 | 33\% | S36,444 |
| City a Borough of Sitka | 57,644,283 | 59\% | 580,154 | \$5,245,564 | 41\% | \$55,002 |
| City of Ketchikan | S15,997,613 | 69\% | 590,382 | \$7,058,460 | 31\% | \$39,878 |
| City of Kenai | S7,250,506 | 58\% | \$79,371 | \$5,237,058 | 42\% | \$57,330 |
| City of Palmer | S4,827,388 | 59\% | S68,474 | \$3,325,405 | 41\% | \$47,169 |
| City of Bethel | S4,870,940 | 61\% | S81,182 | S3,178,929 | 39\% | S52,982 |
| City of Kodiak | 59,967,002 | 55\% | \$74,381 | \$8,014,690 | 45\% | S59,811 |
| City of Homer | \$5,721,270 | 66\% | \$52,975 | \$2,926,595 | 34\% | \$27,098 |
| City of Soldotna | \$5,823,199 | 70\% | \$79,433 | \$2,474,541 | 30\% | S33,754 |
| City of Valdez | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City a Borough of Wrangell | \$2,315,412 | 62\% | S48,746 | \$1,411,698 | 38\% | S29,720 |
| Borough of Haines | \$2,065,303 | 62\% | \$38,604 | S1,244,856 | 38\% | S23,268 |
| City of Cordova | \$4,084,917 | 63\% | \$70,430 | S2,436,486 | 37\% | \$42,008 |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | - | - | - | - | - | . |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Median | \$7,250,506 | 62.39\% | \$74,381 | \$4,910,804 | 37.61\% | \$39,878 |
| City of North Pole | \$ 2,571,863 | 64.82\% | \$52,487 | \$ 1,395,534 | 35.18\% | \$28,480 |

APPENDIX C: SALARY SURVEY RESULTS
Salary Survey Results: Position-by-Position comparisons

| Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deputy / Assistant City Manager |  |  |  |  |  | Notes (proposed classification) |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max | Actual: \$110,628. Mayor: \$86,507 |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Chief of Staff | . | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| City \& B Brough of Juneau | 32,000 | no response | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | . | . |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Mayor | \$101,933 | \$118,657 | \$135,603 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Administrator | - | - | - | Administrator has contract \$129,168 |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Assistant City Manager | \$128,119 | \$148,688 | \$172,558 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Directors | \$ 70,554 | \$ 92,186 | \$117,270 | Highest paid personnel listed |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined |  | . | . | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Deputy City Manager | \$ 89,376 | \$111,714 | \$134,052 | City Manager has contract |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | no comparable | . | . | - |  |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Assistant to the City Manager | \$ 75,504 | \$ 86,559 | \$ 97,614 | City Manager has contract \$137,000 |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Assistant City Manager | \$103,482 | \$122,213 | \$140,944 | City Manager has contract |
| City \& B Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | no comparable | - | - | - | Poolice Chief highest paid personnel listed \$96.4k to \$121.8k. |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 94,828 | \$113,336 | \$133,007 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 70,366 |  |  | Mayor Welch |
|  |  | Current fY Range | \$ 69,000 | . | . |  |
| City Clerk |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | City Clerk | - | - | - | Current \$91,790 |
| City \& B Brough of Juneau | 32,000 | no response | - | . | - |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | . | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | City Clerk | \$101,933 | \$118,657 | \$135,603 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Municipal Clerk | \$ 86,133 | \$ 102,440 | \$ 121,680 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | No Comparable Position | - | - | - | Deputy Clerk \$45.4k to \$61.1k. Highest Clerk Classification |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | City Clerk |  |  |  | Clerk does not have a grade level |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Deputy Clerk | \$ 46,738 | \$ 60,819 | \$ 77,147 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined |  | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Deputy Clerk / Records | \$ 66,693 | \$ 83,366 | \$100,040 | City clerk has contract |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | City Clerk | - | . | - | Current: \$102,981 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | City Clerk | - | - | - | Deputy Clerk $\$ 63.1 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 81.7 \mathrm{k}$. City clerk has contract $\$ 102,600$ |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | City Clerk | - | $\cdot$ | - | Deputy Clerk $\$ 68.8 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 93.9 \mathrm{k}$. City clerk has contract |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | No Comparable Position | - | . | $\cdot$ | Accounting Generalist \$48.2k to $\$ 60.8 \mathrm{k}$ |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Not listed |  |  |  |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | . | . | . |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 75,374 | \$ 91,321 | \$ 108,618 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 61,568 |  |  | Aaron Rhodes |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 54,704 | \$ 73,512 | \$ 95,930 |  |
| HR Manager / PIO |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | HR Director | . | . | . | Current \$94,328 |
| City \& B Brough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | HR Generalist | \$ 59,904 | \$ 69,722 | \$ 79,685 | HR Director not listed |
| City \& B Brough of Sitka | 8,647 | HR Director | \$ 90,438 | \$ 107,515 | \$ 127,795 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | HR Manager | \$ 95,264 | \$110,558 | \$128,307 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | HR Director | \$ 91,603 | \$ 100,755 | \$109,928 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | HR Specialist | \$ 56,306 | \$ 73,424 | \$ 93,267 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | HR Manager | \$ 66,693 | \$ 83,366 | \$100,040 | exempt |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Human Resources Manager |  | - |  | Current: $\$ 100,786$ |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Accountant / HR Manager | \$ 75,504 | \$ 86,559 | \$ 97,614 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | HR Director | \$ 96,757 | \$114,169 | \$131,580 |  |
| City \& B orough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Finance Director | \$ 79,284 | \$ 89,112 | \$ 100,152 | HR Director not listed |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Not listed |  |  |  |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | . | - | $\cdot$ |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 79,084 | \$ 92,798 | \$ 107,596 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 61,568 |  |  | Aaron Rhodes |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 54,704 | \$ 73,512 | \$ 95,930 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance Director / CFO |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Chief Finance Officer | \$101,234 | \$112,486 | \$ 123,739 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Director of Finance | \$101,900 | \$118,750 | \$135,600 |  |
| City \& B Brough of Sitka | 8,647 | Chief Finance \& Administrative Officer | \$109,900 | \$132,600 | \$ 155,300 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Treasury / Sr. Accountant | \$ 62,607 | \$ 73,464 | \$ 84,322 | Finance Director $\$ 113.3 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 152.5 \mathrm{k}$ |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Finance Director | \$106,122 | \$123,099 | \$140,076 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Finance Director | \$ 70,554 | \$ 92,186 | \$117,270 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Finance Director | \$ 85,106 | \$106,383 | \$127,660 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Finance Director |  | - | . | Current: $\$ 136,591$ |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Finance Director | \$ 96,325 | \$110,428 | \$124,530 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Finance Director | \$103,482 | \$122,213 | \$140,944 |  |
| City \& B Brough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Finance Director | \$ 79,284 | \$ 89,112 | \$ 100,152 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Not listed |  |  |  |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | . |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 91,651 | \$108,072 | \$124,959 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 78,000 |  |  | Patricia Fogarty |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 54,704 | \$ 73,512 | \$ 95,930 |  |


| Senior Accountant |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | General Ledger Accountant / Grants Mgr | \$ 83,262 | \$ 92,508 | \$101,754 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Controller | \$ 92,668 | \$107,972 | \$123,276 | Director of Finance \$101.9k to \$135/6k |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Supervisory Senior Accountant | \$ 69,264 | \$ 83,595 | \$ 97,926 | Chief Finance \& Administrative Officer $\$ 109.9 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 155.3 \mathrm{k}$ |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Treasury / Sr. Accountant | \$ 62,607 | \$ 73,464 | \$ 84,322 | Finance Director \$113.3k to \$ 152.5 k |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Finance Manager | \$ 79,061 | \$173,930 | \$ 94,869 | Finance Director \$106.1k to \$140.1k |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Finance Manager | \$ 56,306 |  | \$ 93,267 | Finance Director $\$ 70.6 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 117.3 \mathrm{k}$ |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Senior Fiscal Analyst | \$ 59,779 | \$149,448 | \$ 89,669 | Finance Director \$85.1k to \$127.7k |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | General Ledger Accountant | - | - | - | Current: \$74,459 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | undetermined | - | $\cdot$ | - | Finance Director $\$ 96.3 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 124.5 \mathrm{k}$ |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Comptroller | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | Finance Director \$103.5k to \$140.9k |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Accounting Specialist / Deputy Clerk | \$ 48,235 | \$ 109,013 | \$ 60,778 | Finance Director $\$ 79.3 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 100.2 \mathrm{k}$ |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | undetermined | . | - | - |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 68,898 | \$112,847 | \$ 93,233 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 78,000 |  |  | Patricia Fogarty |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 54,704 | \$ 73,512 | \$ 95,930 |  |
| AR AP Clerk (Sales Tax \& Bus. Lisc.) |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Accounting Specialist | \$ 59,259 | \$ 65,842 | \$ 72,426 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 | no response | . | . | - |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Finance Clerk 1 | \$ 40,914 | \$ 47,611 | \$ 54,413 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Utility / Harbor Billing Clerk | \$ 43,701 | \$ 51,917 | \$ 61,714 | grade not listed, used grade 25 |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Accounts Payable Coordinator | \$ 45,594 | \$ 52,936 | \$ 61,464 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Accounting Technician I | \$ 53,518 | \$ 58,864 | \$ 64,230 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Accounting Technician I | \$ 40,373 | \$ 52,437 | \$ 66,456 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Fiscal Specialist | \$ 41,366 | \$ 51,707 | \$ 62,048 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Accounting Specialist I / Accounts Payable | - | - | - | Current: \$63,669 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Account Clerk III | \$ 55,328 | \$ 63,440 | \$ 71,552 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Customer Service Rep / Accountant | \$ 55,896 | \$ 66,268 | \$ 76,640 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Accounting / Utility Accounts Clerk | \$ 38,584 | \$ 43,243 | \$ 48,506 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Accounting Clerk II | \$ 42,640 | \$ 50,336 | \$ 58,032 | Accounting Clerk $\$$ \$33.3k to \$47.9k. |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 47,016 | \$ 54,964 | § 63,407 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 69,742 |  |  | Terri Nelson |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 37,482 | \$ 50,376 | \$ 65,728 |  |
| Utility Billing Clerk |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Accounting Specialist | \$ 59,259 | \$ 65,842 | \$ 72,426 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 | no response | . | - | - |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Finance Clerk 1 | \$ 40,914 | \$ 47,611 | \$ 54,413 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Utility / Harbor Billing Clerk | \$ 43,701 | \$ 51,917 | \$ 61,714 | grade not listed, used grade 25 |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Accounts Payable Coordinator | \$ 45,594 | \$ 52,936 | \$ 61,464 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Accounting Technician I | \$ 53,518 | \$ 58,864 | \$ 64,230 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Accounting Technician I | \$ 40,373 | \$ 52,437 | \$ 66,456 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Fiscal Specialist | \$ 41,366 | \$ 51,707 | \$ 62,048 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Account Clerk III | \$ 55,328 | \$ 63,440 | \$ 71,552 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Customer Service Rep / Accountant | \$ 55,896 | \$ 66,268 | \$ 76,640 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Accounting / Utility Accounts Clerk | \$ 38,584 | \$ 43,243 | \$ 48,506 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Accounting Clerk I | \$ 33,342 | \$ 40,622 | \$ 47,902 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 46,170 | \$ 54,081 | \$ 62,486 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 47,487 |  |  | M. Swanson |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 37,482 | \$ 50,376 | \$ 65,728 |  |
|  | Accountant / Fiscal Agt / Fund Acct |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Accounting Specialist | \$ 59,259 | \$ 65,842 | \$ 72,426 | GL Accountant / Grants Manager \$83.2k to \$101.8k |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Finance Clerk III | \$ 49,504 | \$ 57,689 | \$ 65,874 | Tax Auditor / Accountant \$69.6k to \$92.6k |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Accountant | \$ 54,059 | \$ 64,272 | \$ 76,378 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Senior Accountant | \$ 62,607 | \$ 72,657 | \$ 84,322 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Accountant | \$ 71,739 | \$ 78,915 | \$ 86,091 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Accounting Technician II | \$ 46,378 | \$ 61,763 | \$ 77,147 | Finance Manager \$56.3k to \$93.3k |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Senior Fiscal Analyst | \$ 59,786 | \$ 74,732 | \$ 89,679 | exempt |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Accounting Specialist I/ Accounts Payable | - | . | - | Current: \$63,669 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | undetermined | . | - | - | Accoutant / HR Manager $\$ 77.5 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 97.6 \mathrm{k}$ |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ | Comptroller / Analyst $\$ 73.9 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 100.3$ |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Accounting Generalist / Deputy Clerk | \$ 48,235 | \$ 54,122 | \$ 60,778 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Accountant II | \$ 43,472 | \$ 50,752 | \$ 58,032 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 55,004 | \$ 64,527 | \$ 74,525 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 60,154 |  |  | Michelle Peede |
|  |  | Current FY Range | . | $\cdot$ | - |  |


| Deputy Clerk |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Deputy City Clerk | \$ 53,934 | \$ 61,922 | \$ 69,909 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Deputy City Clerk | \$ 59,904 | \$ 69,722 | \$ 79,685 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Deputy Clerk / Records Clerk | \$ 54,059 | \$ 64,272 | \$ 76,378 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Deputy Clerk / Records Mgr | \$ 45,386 | \$ 52,666 | \$ 61,110 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | None |  |  |  |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Deputy Clerk | \$ 46,738 | \$ 60,819 | \$ 77,147 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | . | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Assistant Clerk | \$ 39,065 | \$ 48,832 | \$ 58,598 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Deputy City Clerk | - | - | - | Current: \$74,440 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Deputy Clerk | \$ 63,128 | \$ 72,395 | \$ 81,661 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Deputy Clerk | \$ 68,809 | \$ 81,363 | \$ 93,917 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Accounting Generalist / Deputy Clerk | \$ 48,235 | \$ 54,122 | \$ 60,778 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Deputy Clerk | \$ 43,472 | \$ 50,752 | \$ 58,032 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 52,273 | \$ 61,686 | \$ 71,721 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | . |  |  |  |
|  |  | Current FY Range | - |  | - |  |
| Records Preparation Clerk |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 53,934 | \$ 59,935 | \$ 65,936 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 | no response | . | . | - |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Planning Clerk | \$ 49,504 | \$ 57,637 | \$ 65,874 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Office Assistant | \$ 37,253 | \$ 44,346 | \$ 52,666 | Did not have grade assigned used grade 23 |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | None | - | - | - |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 51,002 | \$ 56,098 | \$ 61,194 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Administrative Assistant - Comm Dev | \$ 37,149 | \$ 48,235 | \$ 61,090 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Administrative Specialist | \$ 41,366 | \$ 51,707 | \$ 62,048 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 50,523 | \$ 57,897 | \$ 65,270 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 59,812 | \$ 70,902 | \$ 81,991 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Public Works Administrative Assistant | \$ 42,182 | \$ 47,507 | \$ 53,498 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Administrative Assistant II | \$ 39,166 | \$ 46,446 | \$ 53,726 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 46,189 | \$ 54,071 | \$ 62,329 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | . |  |  |  |
|  |  | Current FY Range | § 37,488 | \$ 50,376 | § 65,736 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Records Manager / Archivist |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Deputy City Clerk |  | \$ 53,934 | \$ 69,909 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Records \& Communications Manager | \$ 76,585 | \$ 89,149 | \$101,881 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Deputy Clerk / Records Clerk | \$ 54,059 | \$ 64,272 | \$ 76,378 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Deputy Clerk / Records Mgr | \$ 45,386 | \$ 52,666 | \$ 61,110 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | City Clerk Dept Admin Assistant | \$ 51,002 | \$ 56,098 | \$ 61,194 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Deputy Clerk | \$ 46,738 | \$ 60,819 | \$ 77,147 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Assistant Clerk | \$ 39,065 | \$ 48,832 | \$ 58,598 | Deputy Clerk / Records? |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | undetermined | . | - | - |  |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | None |  |  |  |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Records Manager | \$ 59,812 | \$ 70,902 | \$ 81,991 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Accounting Generalist / Deputy Clerk | \$ 48,235 | \$ 54,122 | \$ 60,778 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Curator / Archivist II | \$ 41,330 | \$ 48,610 | \$ 55,890 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 51,357 | \$ 59,940 | \$ 70,487 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 37,488 | \$ 50,376 | \$ 65,736 |  |
| Special Asst to the Mayor |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Executive Assistant |  | . |  | Current \$71,490 |
| City \& B Brough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Executive Assistant to the Mayor | \$ 63,294 | \$ 73,676 | \$ 84,199 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Administrative Coordinator | \$50,086 | \$ 59,509 | \$ 70,637 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Executive Assistant | \$ 50,086 | \$ 58,198 | \$ 67,475 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Assistant to the City Manager | \$ 79,061 | \$ 86,965 | \$ 94,869 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Administrative Asst - Mayor | \$ 37,149 | \$ 48,235 | \$ 61,090 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Administrative Specialist | \$ 41,366 | \$ 51,707 | \$ 62,048 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Executive Administrative Assistant | - | - | - | Current \$ 102,002 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 50,523 | \$ 57,897 | \$ 65,270 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Administration Administrative Assistant | \$59,812 | \$ 70,902 | \$ 81,991 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Administrative Assistant - Police | \$ 48,235 | \$ 54,122 | \$ 60,778 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Administrative Assistant II | \$ 39,166 | \$ 46,446 | \$ 53,726 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 51,878 | \$ 60,766 | \$ 70,208 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Current FY Range | . |  |  |  |


| Receptionist |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 46,821 | \$ 56,347 | \$ 65,874 |  |
| City \& B orough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 34,070 | \$ 39,666 | \$ 45,386 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Office Assistant | \$ 37,253 | \$ 44,346 | \$ 52,666 | Did not have grade assigned used grade 23 |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Office Services Technician | \$ 39,354 | \$ 45,656 | \$ 52,998 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 51,002 | \$56,098 | \$ 61,194 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Receptionist \& Cashier | \$ 33,904 | \$ 43,950 | \$ 55,598 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Administrative Specialist | \$ 41,366 | \$ 51,707 | \$ 62,048 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | No comparable | - | - | - |  |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 50,523 | \$ 57,897 | \$ 65,270 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Customer Service Rep / Admin Assistant | \$ 55,896 | \$ 6,268 | \$ 76,640 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Accounting / Utility Accounts Clerk | \$ 38,584 | \$ 43,243 | \$ 48,506 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Office Assistant I | \$ 25,813 | \$ 33,093 | \$ 40,373 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 41,326 | \$ 48,934 | \$ 56,959 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | Current FY Range | . | . | . |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Police Department |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Police Chief |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Police Chief | \$108,971 | \$121,077 | \$133,182 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Chief of Police | \$101,933 | \$118,657 | \$135,603 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Police Chief | \$ 95,035 | \$112,902 | \$134,202 | Police Chief is listed as grade 38, but current wage is $\$ 174,990$ per year 2080 hrs |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Police Chief | \$107,782 | \$125,086 | \$145,167 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Police Chief | \$100,944 | \$117,100 | \$133,256 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Police Chief | \$ 70,554 | \$ 92,186 | \$117,270 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Chief of Police | \$ 85,106 | \$106,383 | \$127,660 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Police Chief | - | - | - | Current \$126,000 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Police Chief | \$ 96,325 | \$110,428 | \$124,530 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Public Safety / LEO Chief | \$103,482 | \$ 122,213 | \$140,944 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Police Chief | \$ 96,456 | \$108,420 | \$121,848 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Not listed |  |  |  |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | . | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 96,659 | \$113,445 | \$131,366 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$112,882 |  |  | Steve Dutra |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 54,704 | \$ 73,512 | \$ 95,930 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Police Lieutenant |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Police Lieutenant | \$ 84,448 | \$ 96,086 | \$107,723 |  |
| City \& B Brough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Police Lieutenant | \$ 84,242 | \$ 98,064 | \$112,069 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Lieutenant | \$ 78,042 | \$ 92,768 | \$110,261 | Lieutenant - Services is listed as grade 34 but current wages are \$125,008, 2080 |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,889 | Police Lieutenant | \$ 82,160 | \$ 95,347 | \$110,656 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Police Lieutenant | \$ 87,194 | \$ 95,909 | \$104,624 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | None |  |  |  |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Police Lieutenant | \$ 66,693 | \$ 83,366 | \$100,040 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Police Lieutenant | - | - | - | Current \$109,200 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Police Lieutenant | \$ 83,138 | \$ 95,358 | \$107,578 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Law Enforcement Lieutenant | \$ 84,681 | \$ 99,791 | \$14,901 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Police Lieutenant | \$ 67,018 | \$ 75,254 | \$ 84,531 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Not listed |  |  |  |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | $\cdot$ |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 79,735 | \$ 92,438 | \$105,820 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 86,258 |  |  | Jeremy Lindhag |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 49,192 | \$ 66,120 | \$86,258 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deputy Police Chief |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | None | - | . | $\cdots$ |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Deputy Chief of Police | \$ 92,668 | \$107,870 | \$123,276 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | None | - | - | - |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Deputy Police Chief | \$ 92,940 | \$107,861 | \$125,177 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | None |  |  |  |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Commander | \$ 56,306 | \$ 73,424 | \$ 93,267 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | None | - | - | - |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | None | - | $\cdot$ | - | Police Lieutenant - Current \$109,200 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | None | $\cdot$ | - | - |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Public Safety Tech Supervisor | \$ 84,681 | \$ 99,791 | \$114,901 |  |
| City \& B orough of Wrangell | 2,509 | None | - | - | - |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Not listed |  |  |  |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 81,649 | \$ 97,237 | \$114,155 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Current FY Range | - |  |  |  |


| Police Sergeant |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Police Sergeant | \$ 73,986 | \$ 86,060 | \$ 98,134 |  |
| City $\&$ Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Police Sergeant | \$ 79,622 | \$ 97,178 | \$116,106 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Police Sergeant | \$ 64,480 | \$ 76,648 | \$ 85,072 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Police Sergeant | \$ 71,552 | \$ 83,034 | \$ 96,408 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Police Sergeant | \$ 79,061 | \$ 86,965 | \$ 94,869 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Police Sergeant | \$ 53,102 | \$ 69,243 | \$ 87,984 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Police Sergeant | \$ 59,786 | \$ 74,732 | \$ 89,679 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Police Officer IV (Sergeant) | - |  | - | Current \$ 102,733 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Police Sergeant | \$ 76,627 | \$ 93,787 | \$110,947 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Law Enforcement Sergeant | \$ 79,211 | \$ 93,215 | \$107,218 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Police Sergeant | \$ 64,355 | \$ 72,280 | \$ 81,224 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Police Sergeant | \$ 56,514 | \$ 63,794 | \$ 71,074 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | . | - | - |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Fairbanks North Star |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UAF Police Department |  | Senior Police Officer (PO III) | \$ 58,698 | \$ 67,475 | \$100,506 |  |
| Fairbanks International Airport PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Wainright |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Greeley |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear Air Station |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska Department of Public Safety |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 68,083 | \$ 80,367 | \$ 94,935 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 78,499 |  |  | * Highest: P. McBroom and Milne; J. Smith (\$67,735) |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 48,924 | \$ 65,748 | \$ 85,788 |  |
| Police Detective |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Police Detective | \$ 72,530 | \$ 83,450 | \$ 94,370 |  |
| City \& B Brough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Investigator | \$ 71,573 | \$ 87,464 | \$104,499 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Police Officer - Detective | \$ 60,320 | \$ 71,698 | \$ 79,581 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Police Detective | \$ 63,253 | \$ 73,362 | \$ 85,176 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Police Sergeant | \$ 79,061 | \$ 78,915 | \$ 94,869 | Police Officer \$71.7k to \$86.1k |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Police Sergeant - Detective | \$ 53,102 | \$ 69,243 | \$ 87,984 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Police Specialist / Detective | \$ 48,272 | \$ 60,341 | \$ 72,408 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Police Officer III / Investigator | . | - | - | Current \$76,185 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | None | - | - | - |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | LEO | \$68,809 | \$ 81,363 | \$ 93,917 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Police Sergeant | \$ 64,355 | \$ 66,685 | \$ 81,224 | Police Officer \$59.4k to \$74.9k |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Police Sergeant | \$ 56,514 | \$ 63,794 | \$ 71,074 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | . | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 63,779 | \$ 73,631 | \$86,510 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$88,026 |  |  | *Highest: K. Lockwood; N. Werner (\$75,941) |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 47,340 | \$ 63,624 | \$ 83,016 |  |
| Police Officer |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Police Officer | \$ 63,253 | \$ 76,138 | \$ 89,024 |  |
| City \& B Brough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | $\cdot$ | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Police Officer I | \$ 58,074 | \$ 70,866 | \$ 84,677 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Police Officer | \$ 60,320 | \$ 71,698 | \$ 79,581 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,889 | Police Officer | \$ 60,216 | \$ 69,867 | \$ 81,120 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Police Officer | \$ 71,739 | \$ 78,915 | \$ 86,091 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Police Officer II | \$ 49,941 | \$ 65,104 | \$ 82,638 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Police Officer | \$ 45,973 | \$ 57,466 | \$ 68,958 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Police Officer II | - | - | - | Current \$79,813 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Police Officer | \$ 67,267 | \$ 82,389 | \$ 97,510 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | LEO | \$ 68,809 | \$ 81,363 | \$ 93,917 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Police Officer | \$ 59,384 | \$ 66,685 | \$ 74,880 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Police Officer II | \$ 54,350 | \$ 61,630 | \$ 68,910 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | . | - |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Fairbanks North Star |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UAFPolice Department |  | Police Officer II | \$ 54,246 | \$ 59,301 | \$92,768 |  |
| Fairbanks International Airport PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Wainright |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Greeley |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear Air Station |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska Department of Public Safety |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 59,464 | \$ 70,118 | \$ 83,340 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 80,746 |  |  | *Highest: B. Wages; J. Tibbits, J. McBroom ( 563,752 ), S. Rosenbalm ( $\$ 61,880$ ) |


| Police Officer Recruit |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Police Officer | \$ 63,253 | \$ 76, 138 | \$ 89,024 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak sland | 13,345 | no response | . | . | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Probationary Officer | \$ 52,208 | \$ 63,794 | \$ 76,232 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Police Officer | \$ 57,200 | \$ 71,698 | \$ 79,581 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Police Officer | \$ 60,216 | \$ 69,867 | \$ 81,120 | No specificic listing for recruit |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Police Officer | \$ 71,739 | \$ 78,915 | \$ 86,091 | No specific listing for recruit |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Police Officer I | \$ 43,555 | \$ 56,638 | \$ 71,843 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Police Officer | \$ 45,973 | \$ 57,466 | \$ 68,958 | No specifici listing for recruit |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Police Officer II | . | - | - | Current \$70,543 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Police Officer | \$ 67,267 | \$ 82,389 | \$ 97,510 | No specific listing for recruit |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | LEO | \$ 68,809 | \$ 81,363 | \$ 93,917 | No specific listing for recruit |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Police Officer Recruit | \$ 46,114 | \$ 51,709 | \$ 58,053 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Police Officer in Training | \$ 50,586 | \$ 57,866 | \$ 65,146 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | . | - |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Fairbanks North Star |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UAF Police Department |  | Police Officer I | \$ 45,365 | \$ 56,971 | \$ 77,605 |  |
| Fairbanks International Airport PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Wainright |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Greeley |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear Air Station |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska Department of Public Safety |  |  |  |  |  | \$26.93 |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 56,024 | \$ 67,068 | \$ 78,757 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Current fy Range | \$ 46,056 | \$ 61,896 | \$ 80,760 |  |
|  | Evidence Cust / Rec. Mgr / Archivist |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Evidence Custodian | \$ 46,821 | \$ 56,347 | \$ 65,874 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak sland | 13,345 | no response | - | . | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Admini Assistant | \$ 47,070 | \$ 57,408 | \$ 68,619 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Dispatch \& Records Clerk | \$ 43,638 | \$ 51,875 | \$ 57,574 |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Evidence Custodian | \$ 45,885 | \$ 53,269 | \$ 61,776 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 53,518 | \$ 58,864 | \$ 64,230 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Evidence $\&$ Records Custodian | \$ 40,373 | \$ 52,437 | \$ 66,456 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Police Service Specialist | \$ 41,366 | \$ 51,707 | \$ 62,048 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Admin Asst. Evidence / Records | - | - | - | Current \$53,559 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Admin. Assistant / Evidence Custodian | \$ 55,328 | \$ 63,440 | \$ 71,552 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Public Safety Technician | \$ 59,812 | \$ 70,902 | \$ 81,991 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Admin. Assistant - Police | \$ 48,235 | \$ 54,122 | \$ 60,778 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Administrative Assistant II | \$ 39,166 | \$ 46,446 | \$ 53,726 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | . | - |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Fairbanks North Star |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UAF Police Department |  | Evidence Custodian / Dispatch |  |  |  | no wage information given |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Wainright |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Greeley |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear Air Station |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska Department of Public Safety |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 47,383 | \$ 56,074 | \$ 64,966 | Rachael Wing |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 46,093 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 37,482 | \$ 50,376 | \$ 65,728 |  |
| Administrative Assistant Police |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 46,821 | \$ 56,347 | \$ 65,874 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Admini Assistant | \$ 47,070 | \$ 57,408 | \$ 68,619 |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Office Assistant | \$ 37,253 | \$ 44,346 | \$52,666 | Did not have grade assigned used grade 23 |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 45,386 | \$ 52,666 | \$ 61,110 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 53,518 | \$ 58,864 | \$ 64,230 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Administrative Assistant - Public Safety | \$ 37,149 | \$ 48,235 | \$ 61,090 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Administrative Specialist | \$ 41,366 | \$ 51,707 | \$ 62,048 |  |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Admin. Asst. Police | - | - | - | Current \$54,898 |
| City of Soldotna | 4,689 | Admin. Assist / Evidence Custodian | \$ 55,328 | \$ 63,440 | \$ 71,552 |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Public Safety / LE Admin. Assistant | \$59,812 | \$ 70,902 | \$ 81,991 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Admin. Assistant - Police | \$ 48,235 | \$ 54,122 | \$ 60,778 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Administrative Assistant II | \$ 39,166 | \$ 46,446 | \$ 53,726 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Fairbanks North Star |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UAF Police Department |  | Admin Assistant - Pubic Safety |  |  |  | no wage information given |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Wainright |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Greeley |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear Air Station |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska Department of Public Safety |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 46,464 | \$ 54,953 | \$ 63,971 |  |
|  | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 46,093 |  |  | "Highest: R. Wing; A. Trubacz ( 544,762 ) |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 37,488 | \$ 50,376 | \$ 65,736 |  |


| Fire Department |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fire Chief |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Fire Chief | \$108,971 | \$121,077 | \$133,182 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | . | . | . |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | None | . | . | . |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Fire Chief | \$ 86,133 | \$ 102,440 | \$ 121,680 |  |
| City of Ketch hikan | 8,889 | Fire Chief | \$100,087 | \$116,154 | \$134,802 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Fire Chief | \$ 96,108 | \$111,483 | \$126,857 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Fire Chief | \$ 70,554 | \$ 92,186 | \$117,270 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | Fire Chief | \$ 66,007 | \$ 85,395 | \$104,782 |  |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Fire Chief | \$ 82,807 | \$103,508 | \$124,210 | 2080 hours |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Fire Chief | . | . | - | Current \$113,285 |
| City of Soldotna / Central Emerg. Svcs | 4,689 | undetermined | - | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| city of Valdez | 3,834 | Fire / EMs Chief | \$103,482 | \$122,213 | \$140,944 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Fire Chief | \$ 61,800 | \$ 69,384 | \$ 77,976 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Not listed |  |  |  |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Matsu Fire Department |  | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 86,217 | \$ 102,649 | \$ 120,189 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$101,700 |  |  | Chad Heineken |
|  |  | Current fY Range | \$ 54,704 | \$73,512 | \$ 95,930 |  |
| Deputy Fire Chief |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max | generally we prefer results for 6 positions for statistical accuracy. |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Assistant Fire Chief | \$89,773 | \$ 99,746 | \$109,720 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | . | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | Provided by Fire District (below) | . | . | - |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | None | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ | Chief and Captain |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Assistant Fire Chief | \$ 88,462 | \$102,664 | \$119,145 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Deputy Chief | \$ 87,194 | \$ 95,909 | \$104,624 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | No comparable | . | - | - |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Deputy fire Chief | \$ 66,693 | \$ 83,366 | \$100,040 | 2080 hours |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | None | . | - | - |  |
| City of Soldotna / Central Emerg. Svcs | 4,689 | undetermined | . | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| City of valdez | 3,834 | None | - | . | . |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | None | . | . | - |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Not listed | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Matsu Fire Department |  | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 83,030 | \$ 95,421 | \$ 108,382 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 86,258 |  |  | Chad Heineken (former salary) |
|  |  | Current fY Range | \$ 49,192 | \$ 66,120 | \$ 86,258 |  |
| Fire Captain |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Battlion Chief | \$ 72,238 | \$ 6,,994 | \$ 83,762 | Fire Captain 566.4 k to 577.9 k |
| City $\ddagger$ Brough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| city of Wasilla | 10,529 | None | . | - | - |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | EMS Fire Captain | \$ 85,438 | \$ 98,143 | \$ 108,376 | 2496 hours |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Fire Captain | \$ 70,834 | \$ 82,206 | \$ 95,403 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Batallion Chief | \$ 71,532 | \$ 56,368 | \$ 85,850 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Fire Training Coordinator | \$ 49,941 | \$ 65,104 | \$82,638 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | Fire Captain | \$ 75,399 | \$ 92,300 | \$109,200 |  |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Fire Captain | \$59,785 | \$ 74,739 | \$ 89,692 | 2764 hours |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Fire Captain | . | - | . | Current 579,556 |
| City of Soldotna / Central Emerg. Svcs | 4,689 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Fire / Ems Captain | \$ 79,211 | \$ 66,394 | \$107,218 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | undetermined | . | - | . | FF Medic Trainer (\$45k to 60.7k) |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | No Comparable | $\cdot$ | - | - | FF EMT Training Officer ( 548.4 to 563 k ) |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | No Comparable | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Matsu Fire Department |  | undetermined | - | - | . |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 70,547 | \$ 75,206 | \$ 95,267 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | S 78,498 |  |  | *Highest: S. McGilvary; R. Hagen (\$76,231); A. Hamlin (\$77,992) |
|  |  | Current FY Range | S 48,924 | \$ 65,748 | \$ 85,788 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fire Lieutenant |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Battaion Chief |  | \$ 72,238 | ¢ 83,762 |  |
| City \& B orough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | . | - | . |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | None | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| City \& Brough of Sitka | 8,647 | None |  |  |  |  |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Fire Marshal | \$ 70,845 | \$ 82,264 | \$ 95,430 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Fire Marshal | \$ 53,830 | \$ 59,218 | \$ 64,605 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Fire Training Coordinator | \$ 49,941 | \$ 65,104 | \$82,638 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | . | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Firefighter / EMT III | \$ 43,671 | \$ 54,589 | \$ 65,507 | 2764 hours |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Firefighter / EMT | . | . | . | Current \$59,256 |
| City of Soldotna / Central Emerg. Svcs | 4,689 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | . |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Fire / Ems Lieutenant | \$ 68,809 | \$ 81,363 | \$ 93,917 |  |
| City $\&$ Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Fire / Medic / Trainer | \$ 48,235 | \$ 54,122 | \$ 60,778 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Firefighter / EMT Training Officer | \$ 48,443 | \$ 55,723 | \$ 63,003 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | . | . | - |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Matsu Fire Department |  | undetermined | $\cdot$ | . | $\cdot$ |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 54,825 | \$ 65,578 | \$ 76,205 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 67,276 |  |  | *Highest: S. Sanders; Winkler (565.313), G. Galvin (no salary) |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 47,184 | \$ 63,408 | \$82,740 |  |


| Fire Engineer |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Driver |  | \$ 61,256 | \$ 72,779 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | No comparable | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Senior Fire Engineer | \$ 77,725 | \$ 89,282 | \$ 98,592 | 2496 hours |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Senior Fire Medic | \$ 64,172 | \$ 74,474 | \$ 86,430 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Fire Engineer | \$ 48,818 | \$ 53,706 | \$ 58,573 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | no comparable | . | . | - | Fire Training Coordinator \$49.9k to \$82.6k |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Firefighter / EMT II | \$ 41,377 | \$ 51,714 | \$ 62,052 | 2764 hours |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Firefighter / EMT | - | - | . | Current \$57,776 |
| City of Soldotna / Central Emerg. Svcs | 4,689 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Fire / EMS Engineer | \$ 59,812 | \$ 70,902 | \$ 81,991 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | no comparable | - | - | - | Fire / Mefdic / Trainer $\$ 48,2 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 60.8 \mathrm{k}$ |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Firefighter / EMT | \$ 45,635 | \$ 52,915 | \$ 60,195 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | . | - | - |  |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | 891 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Matsu Fire Department |  | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 56,257 | \$ 64,893 | \$ 74,373 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 65,313 |  |  | *Highest: K. Fagerstrom; M. Crane \& Tanya Stugart (\$61,886) |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 46,056 | \$ 61,896 | \$ 80,760 |  |


| Firefighter |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Firefighter | \$ 37,648 | \$ 53,508 | \$ 69,368 |  |
| City it Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | None | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Fire Engineer / EMT i | \$ 51,992 | \$ 59,729 | \$ 65,944 | 2496 hours |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Firefighter / EMT | \$ 58,137 | \$ 67,469 | \$ 78,302 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Firefighter | \$ 44,262 | \$ 48,693 | \$ 53,123 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Fire Training Coordinator | \$ 49,941 | \$ 65,104 | \$ 82,638 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Firefighter / EMT i | \$ 39,055 | \$ 48,840 | \$ 58,597 | 2764 hours |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Firefighter / EMT | - | - | - | Current \$ 56,367 |
| City of Soldotna / Central Emerg. Svcs | 4,689 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | - | - |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Fire / EMS Engineer | \$ 59,812 | \$ 70,902 | \$ 81,991 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Fire / Medic / Trainer | \$ 48,235 | \$ 54,122 | \$ 60,778 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Firefighter / EMT | \$ 45,635 | \$ 52,915 | \$ 60,195 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | . | - | - |  |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | 891 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | - | - |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Matsu Fire Department |  | undetermined | - | $\cdot$ | - |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 48,302 | \$ 57,920 | \$ 67,882 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 55,584 |  |  | *Highest: J. Reardon; C. Wescott \& L. Longridge ( 546,456 ) |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 40,164 | \$ 53,976 | \$ 70,428 |  |


| Administrative Assistant Fire |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary Agencies | Population | Position Title | Min | Mid | Max |  |
| City of Fairbanks | 31,516 | Administrative Assistant |  | \$ 58,053 | \$ 68,120 |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 32,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Kodiak Island | 13,345 | no response | - | - | - |  |
| City of Wasilla | 10,529 | None | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 8,647 | Office Assistant | \$ 37,253 | \$ 44,346 | \$ 52,666 | Did not have grade assigned used grade 23 |
| City of Ketchikan | 8,289 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 45,386 | \$ 52,666 | \$ 61,110 |  |
| City of Kenai | 7,778 | Administrative Assistant | \$ 51,002 | \$ 56,098 | \$ 61,194 |  |
| City of Palmer | 7,306 | Administrative Assistant - Public Safety | \$ 37,149 | \$ 48,235 | \$ 61,090 |  |
| City of Bethel | 6,600 | undetermined | - | - | - | provided scale, with no legend. |
| City of Kodiak | 5,968 | Administrative Specialist | \$ 41,366 | \$ 51,707 | \$ 62,048 | 2080 hours |
| City of Homer | 5,810 | Administrative Assistant | - | - | - | New - no range provided |
| City of Soldotna / Central Emerg. Svcs | 4,689 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| City of Valdez | 3,834 | Fire / EMS Admin. Assistant | \$ 55,896 | \$ 66,268 | \$ 76,640 |  |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 2,509 | Admin. Assistant - Police | \$ 48,235 | \$ 54,122 | \$ 60,778 |  |
| Borough of Haines | 2,474 | Administrative Assistant II | \$ 39,166 | \$ 46,446 | \$ 53,726 |  |
| City of Cordova | 2,160 | undetermined | - | - | - |  |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | 891 | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| Secondary Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Matsu Fire Department |  | undetermined | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |  |
| Market Average |  |  | \$ 44,432 | \$ 53,104 | \$ 61,930 |  |
| City of North Pole | 2,200 | FY Current | \$ 46,093 |  |  | M. Myhill |
|  |  | Current FY Range | \$ 37,488 | \$ 50,376 | \$ 65,736 |  |

Salary Survey Results: Actual Salary, Current vs. Market Range (Management)

| Management Positions | Current Base Salary | Existing Salary Range |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { NP Current } \\ \text { Minimum } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Under Min } \\ (X=y e s) \end{gathered}$ | NP Current Maximum | Over Max $\text { ( } X=y \text { yes })$ | Range Width in 5 | Market Minimum | Under Min (X=yes) | Market Maximum | Over Max (X=yes) | Range Width in $\$$ |
| Reserved |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Police Chief | \$112,882 | \$ 54,704 |  | \$ 95,930 | x | \$41,226 | \$96,659 |  | \$131,366 |  | \$34,707 |
| Fire Chief | \$101,700 | \$ 54,704 |  | \$ 95,930 | X | \$41,226 | \$86,217 |  | \$120,189 |  | \$33,973 |
| City Accountant / CFO | \$78,000 | \$ 54,704 |  | \$ 95,930 |  | \$41,226 | \$91,651 | X | \$124,959 |  | \$33,308 |
| Deputy City Manager (proposed new) | \$70,366 | \$ 69,000 |  | - |  |  | \$94,828 | X | \$133,007 |  | \$38,179 |
| Director of City Services | \$164,154 | \$ 54,704 |  | \$ 95,930 | X | \$41,226 | \$91,383 |  | \$121,703 | X | \$30,319 |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO | \$61,568 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HR Director / PIO (proposed new) | \$61,568 | \$ 54,704 |  | \$ 95,930 |  | \$41,226 | \$79,084 | X | \$107,596 |  | \$28,513 |
| Deputy Fire Chief | \$86,258 | \$ 49,192 |  | \$ 86,258 | x | \$37,066 | \$83,030 |  | \$108,382 |  | \$25,352 |
| Police Lieutenant | \$86,258 | \$ 49,192 |  | \$ 86,258 | X | \$37,066 | \$79,735 |  | \$105,820 |  | \$26,085 |
| Senior Accountant (proposed new) | \$78,000 | \$ 54,704 |  | \$ 95,930 |  | \$41,226 | \$68,898 |  | \$93,233 |  | \$24,335 |
| City Clerk (proposed new) | \$61,568 | \$ 54,704 |  | \$ 95,930 |  | \$41,226 | \$75,374 | X | \$108,618 |  | \$33,243 |
| Police Sergeant | \$78,499 | \$ 48,924 |  | \$ 85,788 |  | \$36,864 | \$68,083 |  | \$94,935 |  | \$26,852 |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | So |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | so |  |  |  |  | So |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | So |  |  |  |  | So |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | So |  |  |  |  | So |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | So |  |  |  |  | so |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | So |  |  |  |  | So |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | So |  |  |  |  | so |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | So |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | So |  |  |  |  | So |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | So |  |  |  |  | So |
| Reserved |  |  |  |  |  | So |  |  |  |  | so |

Salary Survey Results: Actual Salary, Current vs. Market Range (non-Management)

| Non-Management Positions | Current <br> Base <br> Salary | Existing Salary Ranges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Range <br> Width (in \$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Current <br> Minimum | Under Min (X=yes) | Current <br> Maximum | Over Max $\text { ( } X=y e s \text { ) }$ | Range Width (in \$) | Market Minimum | Under Min ( $X=y e s$ ) | Market <br> Maximum | Over Max (X=yes) |  |
| Police Sergeant | \$78,499 | \$48,924 |  | \$85,788 |  | \$36,864 | \$68,083 |  | \$94,935 |  | \$26,852 |
| Reserved | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |
| Utility Supervisor | \$115,523 | \$49,192 |  | \$86,258 | X | \$37,066 | \$68,396 |  | \$92,629 | X | \$24,233 |
| Fire Captain | \$78,498 | \$48,924 |  | \$85,788 |  | \$36,864 | \$70,547 |  | \$95,267 |  | \$24,720 |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Police Detective | \$88,026 | \$47,340 |  | \$83,016 | X | \$35,676 | \$63,779 |  | \$86,510 | X | \$22,731 |
| Public Works Supervisor | \$81,307 | \$49,200 |  | \$86,268 |  | \$37,068 | \$67,453 |  | \$93,797 |  | \$26,344 |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Utility Operator II (proposed) | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public Works Assistant | \$58,365 | \$42,180 |  | \$73,968 |  | \$31,788 | \$61,423 | X | \$82,792 |  | \$21,369 |
| Police Officer | \$80,746 | \$46,056 |  | \$80,760 | X | \$34,704 | \$59,464 |  | \$83,340 |  | \$23,875 |
| Fire Lieutenant | \$67,276 | \$47,184 |  | \$82,740 |  | \$35,556 | \$54,825 |  | \$76,205 |  | \$21,380 |
| Building Technician | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$55,278 |  | \$77,384 |  | \$22,105 |
| Police Officer Recruit | - | \$46,056 |  | \$80,760 |  | \$34,704 | \$56,024 |  | \$78,757 |  | \$22,733 |
| Utility Operator (Operator I \& II proposed) | \$87,526 | \$44,491 |  | \$78,021 | X | \$33,530 | \$56,382 |  | \$77,224 | X | \$20,842 |
| Fire Engineer | \$65,313 | \$46,056 |  | \$80,760 |  | \$34,704 | \$56,257 |  | \$74,373 |  | \$18,117 |
| City Planner (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Firefighter / EMT | \$55,584 | \$40,164 |  | \$70,428 |  | \$30,264 | \$48,302 |  | \$67,882 |  | \$19,580 |
| Reserved | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - |
| AP Tax \& License Clerk (revised) | \$69,742 | \$37,482 |  | \$65,728 | X | \$28,246 | \$47,016 |  | \$63,407 | X | \$16,392 |
| AR / Utility Billing Clerk (revised) | \$47,487 | \$37,482 |  | \$65,728 |  | \$28,246 | \$46,170 |  | \$62,486 |  | \$16,316 |
| Utility Assistant II (proposed) | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fiscal Accounting / Fund Accounting Clerk | \$60,154 | - |  | - |  |  | \$55,004 |  | \$74,525 |  | \$19,521 |
| Deputy Clerk (proposed) | - | - |  | - |  |  | \$52,273 |  | \$71,721 |  | \$19,448 |
| Utility Assistant I | \$65,686 | \$42,180 |  | \$73,968 |  | \$31,788 | \$47,792 |  | \$65,653 | X | \$17,862 |
| Firefighter Recruit (proposed) | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Evidence Cust / Rec. Mgr / Archivist | \$46,093 | \$37,482 |  | \$65,728 |  | \$28,246 | \$47,383 | X | \$64,966 |  | \$17,583 |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Assistant (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$51,878 | - | \$70,208 | - | \$18,330 |
| Administrative Assistant PWD (proposed) | - | \$37,488 |  | \$65,736 |  |  | \$45,334 |  | \$62,218 |  | \$16,884 |
| Administrative Assistant Police | \$46,093 | \$37,488 |  | \$65,736 |  |  | \$44,432 |  | \$61,930 |  | \$17,499 |
| Administrative Assistant Fire | \$46,093 | \$37,488 |  | \$65,736 |  | \$28,248 | \$44,432 |  | \$61,930 |  | \$17,499 |
| Records Preparation Clerk | - | \$37,488 |  | \$65,736 |  | \$28,248 | \$46,189 |  | \$62,329 |  | \$16,140 |
| Reserved | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| General Laborer (Summer Help) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Receptionist Admin | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Reserved | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - |

## Salary Survey Results: Current, Market \& Proposed New Range (Management)



Salary Survey Results: Current, Market \& Proposed New Range (non-Mgmt)


## Appendix D: New Job Classifications and Proposed Pay Ranges

Management Pay Classifications: Existing vs. Proposed

| Management Positions | Total Points | PROPOSED <br> Range | Current Class <br> / Grade | PROPOSED <br> Grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reserved | 320 | 320 |  | 25 |
| Reserved | 310 | 310-319 |  | 24 |
| Reserved | 300 | 300-309 |  | 23 |
| Police Chief | 295 | 290-299 | 14 | 22 |
| Fire Chief | 295 |  | 14 |  |
| City Accountant / CFO | 295 |  | 14 |  |
| Deputy City Manager (proposed new) | 282.50 | 280-289 | 15 | 21 |
| Director of City Services | 282.50 |  | 14 |  |
| Reserved | 270 | 270-279 |  | 20 |
| City Clerk / HR Manager / PIO | 262.50 | 260-269 | NEW | 19 |
| HR Director / PIO (proposed new) | 262.50 |  | NEW |  |
| Deputy Fire Chief | 250 | 250-259 | 13 | 18 |
| Police Lieutenant | 250 |  | 13 |  |
| Senior Accountant (proposed new) | 245 | 240-249 | NEW | 17 |
| City Clerk (proposed new) | 232.50 | 230-239 | 14 | 16 |
| Police Sergeant | 221.25 | 220-229 | 12 | 15 |
| Reserved | 210 | 210-219 |  | 14 |
| Reserved | 200 | 200-209 |  | 13 |
| Reserved | 190 | 190-199 |  | 12 |
| Reserved | 180 | 180-189 |  | 11 |
| Reserved | 170 | 170-179 |  | 10 |
| Reserved | 160 | 160-169 |  | 9 |
| Reserved | 150 | 150-159 |  | 8 |
| Reserved | 140 | 140-149 |  | 7 |
| Reserved | 130 | 130-139 |  | 6 |
| Reserved | 120 | 120-129 |  | 5 |
| Reserved | 110 | 110-119 |  | 4 |
| Reserved | 100 | 100-109 |  | 3 |
| Reserved | 90 | 90-99 |  | 2 |
| Reserved | 80 | 80-89 |  | 1 |

Non-Management Pay Classifications: Existing vs. Proposed

| Non-Management Positions | Total <br> Points | PROPOSED <br> Range | Current Class <br> / Grade | PROPOSED <br> Grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Sergeant | 260 | 260 | 12 | 21 |
| Reserved | 250 | 250-259 | - | 20 |
| Utility Supervisor | 245 | 240-249 | 13 | 19 |
| Fire Captain | 245 |  | 6 | 19 |
| Reserved | 230 | 230-239 | - | 18 |
| Police Detective | 225 | 220-229 | 11 | 17 |
| Public Works Supervisor | 215 | 210-219 | 13 | 16 |
| Reserved | 200 | 200-209 |  | 15 |
| Utility Operator II (proposed) | 195 | 190-199 | - | 14 |
| Public Works Assistant | 190 |  | 8 | 14 |
| Police Officer | 190 |  | 10 | 14 |
| Fire Lieutenant | 190 |  | 5 | 14 |
| Building Technician | 185 | 180-189 | - | 13 |
| Police Officer Recruit | 177.50 | 170-179 | 3 | 12 |
| Utility Operator (Operator I \& II proposed) | 170 |  | - | 12 |
| Fire Engineer | 170 |  | 4 | 12 |
| City Planner (proposed) | 167.50 | 160-169 | - | 11 |
| Firefighter / EMT | 162.50 |  | 2 | 11 |
| Reserved | 150 | 150-159 |  | 10 |
| AP Tax \& License Clerk (revised) | 145 | 140-149 | 7 | 9 |
| AR / Utility Billing Clerk (revised) | 145 |  | 7 | 9 |
| Utility Assistant II (proposed) | 140 |  | - | 9 |
| Fiscal Accounting / Fund Accounting Clerk | 132.50 | 130-139 | 7 | 8 |
| Deputy Clerk (proposed) | 132.50 |  | - | 8 |
| Utility Assistant I | 132.50 |  | 8 | 8 |
| Firefighter Recruit (proposed) | 127.50 | 120-129 | 1 | 7 |
| Evidence Cust / Rec. Mgr / Archivist | 122.50 |  | 7 | 7 |
| Reserved | 110 | 110-119 | - | 6 |
| Executive Assistant (proposed) | 107.50 | 100-109 | - | 5 |
| Administrative Assistant PWD (proposed) | 107.50 |  | - | 5 |
| Administrative Assistant Police | 107.50 |  | - | 5 |
| Administrative Assistant Fire | 107.50 |  | - | 5 |
| Records Preparation Clerk | 107.50 |  | 7 | 5 |
| Reserved | 90 | 90-99 |  | 4 |
| General Laborer (Summer Help) | 87.50 | 80-89 | - | 3 |
| Receptionist Admin | 72.50 | 70-79 | - | 2 |
| Reserved | 60 | 60-69 |  | 1 |

## Management Pay Classifications: New Proposed



## Non-Management Pay Classifications: New Proposed



Management Pay Classifications: New Proposed (1.5\% \& 3\% examples)


## Non-Management Pay Classifications: New Proposed (1.5\% \& 3\% examples)




## Appendix E：Benefits Survey Results

Salary \＆Pay Increases

|  |  | 数 | ． |  |  | 你 |  | ． | ． |  | ． | ． | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | 棌 |  |  | ． |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 휼 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ～ | 㭸 |  |  | ． |  |  |
|  | dol |  |  |  |  |  |  | ． | ． |  | ． | ． |  | 受 |  |  | ． | \％ |  |
|  | 会 | 新 | ． |  |  |  | 咙 | ． | ． |  | ． | ． |  | ． |  | ． | ． | 骂 |  |
|  |  | 훌 |  |  |  |  |  | ． | ． |  | ． | ． |  | ． |  | ． | ． |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ． | ． | 㗝 | ． | ． |  | 磈 |  |  | ． |  |  |
|  |  | 聯 | ． | 吕 |  | ＊ | 登 | $\stackrel{4}{\sim}$ | ． | 㗝 |  |  | ＊ |  | \％．8． | 总 |  |  | 嵒 |
|  |  | 聯 | ． | 吕 |  | 㳫 | 䓵 | $\stackrel{3}{\sim}$ | ． | 采 | ． |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ |  | \％i¢ | 营 | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | 咙 |
|  |  |  |  | 号 |  | 总 |  | $\stackrel{3}{\sim}$ | ． | 硅 | ， |  | $\stackrel{8}{\sim}$ |  | ¢ \％ | $\stackrel{*}{6}$ | $\stackrel{3}{3}$ |  | 坒 |
|  |  | 妶 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{8}{4} \\ & \frac{8}{8} \\ & \frac{0}{6} \\ & 0 \\ & =0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 部 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{8}{\circ} \\ & \frac{8}{2} \\ & \frac{8}{8} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | ． |  |  |  |  |  |  | 嵒 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ． |  | ． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| SALARY \& PAY INCREASES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City / Town / County / Borough | \% Merit Increase |  |  | Longevity Pay |  |  | \% Total Increase |  |  | Other |
|  | Con. Emplorees | Palke | Ere | Com. Emploves | Police | Fire | Som. Enploveres | Palke | Eire |  |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Borough of Haines | . | . | . | . | . | . |  |  |  | . |
| City $\&$ Borough of Juneau | . |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | By Committee Decision (not active) | None | None | None | None | None | $1.50 \times$ | Varies By Position, Averages 2.48\% | $2{ }^{26}$ in 2020 | . |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | Upon Approval By Borough Manager | Upon Approval By Borough Manager | Upon Approval By Borough Manager | None | None | None | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per Table, } \\ \text { Averages } 1.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per Table, } \\ \text { Averages } 1.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per Table, } \\ \text { Averages } 1.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | . |
| City of Bethel | . | . | . | . | . | . |  | . |  |  |
| City of Cordova | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| City of Fairbanks | not defiried | not defined | mot defined | mot deftred | not deftred | not defined | . | . | . | Fairbanks has a rudamentary compensaiton system...consultants migh trefer to it as archaic. There is no predefined overarching pay system, rather, pre-set pay and $\$$ per hour calculation for Health Insurance, Pension and Legal Services; per month calculations for Life Insurance, and Holldays per 8 hours, |
| City of Homer | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  |
| City of Kenai | . |  |  | - | . | . | . | . |  | . |
| City of Ketchikan | . | . | - | . | . | . | $\cdot$ | . |  | Reimbursement agreement required. New employees who are assisted with their moving and travel expenses shall be required to sign an agreement prior to employment which provides that the employee shall reimburse the City for all such assistance in the event the employee leaves the city service voluntarity or is dismissed from the city service within three (3) years after their date of employment. The reimbur sem February 18, 2010, by Resolution No. 10-2320.) <br> $100 \%$ if termination occurs before completing 12 months service $80 \%$ if termination occurs after 12 months but before 18 months service $60 \%$ if termination occurs after 18 months but before 24 months service $40 \%$ if termination occurs after 24 months but bef ore 30 months service $20 \%$ if termination occurs after 30 months but bef ore 36 months service 0\% if termination occurs after 36 months service |
| City of Kodiak | $2.50 \times$ | 2.508 | 2.506 |  | Longevity only factored when considering lay-offs, not pay. |  | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | . |
| City of Palmer | . | . | . |  |  | There is a longenivity Stop plan with 6 stops that has a three year thresshold with a $3.5 \%$ increase with each step |  |  |  |  |
| City of Soldotna | . | . | . |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# Grades } 7 \text { setps } 2.5 \% \\ \text { each step } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# Grades } 7 \text { setps } 2.5 \% \text { each } \\ \text { step } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | 6 moths Proationay / Police 1y |
| City of Valdez | . | . | . | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 3.2 \text { Ye incerenent stops } \\ \text { 2xeach } \end{gathered}\right.$ | . | . |  |  |  |  |
| City of Wasilla | undeeermined | 1 step 2.5\% | 1 step | see intormatoon in stess | . | . | 3.5\% | ${ }^{3.50 \%}$ | 3.50\% |  |

[^0]Paid Vacation


|  |  | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{\underline{L}}$ | \％ |  |  | $\varepsilon$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 䘡 | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | \％ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\stackrel{3}{4}$ |  |  |  | 亳 |  |  |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\circ}{z}}$ |  |  |  | 票 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \frac{\text { O}}{1} \\ & \frac{4}{4} \\ & \frac{4}{8} \\ & \frac{0}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  | \％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{L}$ | ¢ | 隠 | 눈 | 咢 | 謍 |  |
|  |  | $\frac{\stackrel{\circ}{2}}{2}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\square}$ |  |  |  | 嗕 |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {¢ }}$ | 亨 |  |  | 䯧 | ． |
|  | 宕 | 数 |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Sick Leave

| SICK LEAVE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City / Town / County / Boroush | Months of Service Required |  |  | \# Days Earned Per Year |  |  | \# of Days Annual Carryover Allowed |  |  |
|  | Gen. Employees | Police | Fire | Gen. Employees | Police | Fire | Gen. Employees | Police | Fire |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | . | . | . | Combined | Combined | Combined | . | - | . |
| Borough of Haines | $\begin{gathered} \text { see paid vacation, City has } \\ \text { PTO } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | see paid vacation, City has PTO | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | Eligible From Date of Hire | Vacation and Sick Leave Combined Into Personal Leave | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eligible From Date of } \\ & \text { Hire } \end{aligned}$ | 18 Days | Vacation and Sick Leave Combined Into Personal Leave | 18 Days | 720 Hours | Vacation and Sick Leave Combined Into Personal Leave | 720 Hours |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | Eligible From Date of Hire | Eligible From Date of Hire | Eligible From Date of Hire | 12 | 12 | 12 | yes 480 HRS ? | yes 480 HRS ? | yes 480 HRS ? |
| City of Bethel | First biweekly pay period | First biweekly pay period | First biweekly pay period | 6 hours per month | 7 hours per month | 8 hours per month | 720 | 720 | 720 |
| City of Cordova | . | . | . | 12 | 12 | 12 | Yes 77.5 | Yes 77.5 | Yes 77.5 |
| City of Fairbanks | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined |
| City of Homer | . | - | . | 40 hrs | 40 hrs | 40 hrs | a max of 80 hrs | a max of 80 hrs | a max of 80 hrs |
| City of Kenai | $\begin{aligned} & \text { see paid vacation, City has } \\ & \text { PTO } \end{aligned}$ | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| City of Ketchikan | See Vacation | See Vacation | See Vacation | 12 Days | 12 | 12 | All | All | All |
| City of Kodiak | Available from Date of Hire, but must be taken before annual leave is taken to cover an illness | Available from Date of Hire, but must be taken before annual leave is taken to cover an illness | Available from Date of Hire, but must be taken before annual leave is taken to cover an illness | 4 hours per pay period | 4 hours per pay period | 4 hours per pay period, provided however that Fire Department employees on platoon system accrue sick leave at 1.33 times the norma rate | 480 non-combined 587 combined | 638 non-combined 779 combined | 638 non-combined 779 combined |
| City of Palmer | . | - | - | Combined | Combined | Combined | Combined | . | - |
| City of Soldotna | - | Ssee Previous Tab | Ssee Previous Tab | Combined | Combined | Combined | . | . | - |
| City of Valdez | 30 days | 30 days | 30 days | Combined | Combined | Combined | ? | ? | ? |
| City of Wasilla | - | . | $\cdot$ | Combined | Combined | Combined | Yes all | Yes All | Yes All |
| City of North Pole | 90 days, however hours accrue from first day of employment. | 90 days, however hours accrue from first day of employment. | 90 days, however hours accrue from first day of employment. | 320hrs combined w Sick Leave. <br> When an employee's leave accrual reaches the maximum limit they must elect either to receive monetary compens ation or take leave | 320hrs combined w Sick <br> Leave. <br> When an employee's leave accrual reaches the maximum limit they must elect either to receive monetary compensation or take leave | 420 hours combined w Sick Leave. <br> When an employee's leave accrual reaches the maximum limit they must elect either to receive monetary compensation or take leave | Option to cash-out max 80 hours / year, or donate to Emergency Leave Bank for other employee use. | Option to cash-out max 80 hours / year, or donate to Emergency Leave Bank for other employee use. | Option to cash-out $\max 120$ hours / year, or donate to Emergency Leave Bank for other employee use. |


| City / Town / County / Borough | Pay for Unused? |  |  | Other Benefits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gen. Employees | Police | Fire |  |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | . | . | . | Jury Duty not defined, Bereavement 5 days, Miltary. 15 days per year |
| Borough of Haines | . | . | . |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau |  | . | . |  |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | $\$ 1.00$ Per Hour Upon Seperation or Termination | Vacation and Sick Leave Combined Into Personal Leave | No | Maternity leave; Jury duty, Military leave, Bereavement - 5days, floating Holidays 2.5 days May convert maximum of 40 hours of sick leave to vacation each calendar year. |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | No | no | no | Jury Duty - 10 days, Funeral leave - 5 days |
| City of Bethel | Only if have worked 11 years + 1 day | Only if have worked 11 years + 1 day | Only if have worked 11 years + 1 day | BirthDay leave 40 hrs Breavment per yr hrs each for NY Eve and Christmas eve |
| City of Cordova | yes | yes | yes | Bereavement - 5 days, Jury duty, Military leave |
| City of Fairbanks | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | see paid vacation Hours are combined | Jury Duty - must tum over jury duty check, Military duty - depending on CBA- 216 hrs. .- 15 days - must tum over portion of check |
| City of Homer | No | No | No | BirthDay leave 40 hrs Breavment per yr hrs each for NY Eve and Christmas eve 1 day eacah for 20 \& 30 yr annivserary Voting leave if needed Jury duty |
| City of Kenai | . | . | . | Jury Duty, Bereavement 3 days |
| City of Ketchikan | No | no | no | Jury Duty - as needed. Military dutty -16 days, Bereavement - 5 days Matemity 18 weeks |
| City of Kodiak | EE may cash-in $2 x$ per year, must leave 80 hours balance. (emergency cash-in allowed) | EE may cash-in $2 \times$ per year, mus leave 80 hours balance. (emergency cash-in allowed) | EE may cash-in $2 x$ per year, must leave 80 hours balance. (emergency cash-in allowed) | Jury Duty, Military - 17 days 5 days of Breavment plus 2 days if required for travel PT Employees proportionally accrue sick leave at same rate as Fulltime. Temporary Employees do not accrue Leave. |
| City of Palmer | . | . | . | Jury Dut, Bereavement 3 days |
| City of Soldotna | no | no | no | Jury Duty, Bereavement - 40hrs in-state $¢ 6$ 64hrs days out of state |
| City of Valdez | ? | ? | ? | *8 hours volunteer leave, Military Leave, Wellness Program, Employee Christmas Party, 1 APT day per month. Jury Duty - as needed, I day voiunteer leave with approval from City Manager, FMLA- 75 hrs, |
| City of Wasilla | Yes 25\% | Yes 25\% | Yes 25\% | Jury \& Military Duty - as needed, Bereavement - 4 days |


|  |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Group Insurance - General Employees

| GROUP INSURANCE (GENERAL EMPLOYEES) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { City / Town / County / }}{\text { Borough }}$ | Medical |  |  | Dependent Medical |  | Dental |  |
|  | Medical Plan | City Contribution | EE Contribution | City Contribution | EE Contribution | City Contribution | EE Contribution |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | Premera | . | - | - |  |  |  |
| Borough of Haines | Union provided | \$1,542 | Yellow plan \$0 Blue plan \$136 / month | so | Yellow plan \$113 / month Blue plan \$220 / month | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | depending on union | 100\% | Economy plan EE S0, Standard plan $\$ 140 / \mathrm{mo}$ Flex Spending Plan available | so | Economy Plan $\$ 176.40 / \mathrm{mo}$ Standard Plan $\$ 310.80 / \mathrm{mo}$ | Included with Medical | Dental Buy Up $\$ 24.92$ /moEE \$48/mo Family |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | Blue Cross O Washington \& Alaska | 90\% | 10\% | 90\% | 10\% | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | Premera Blue Cross Blue Shield of Alaska Heritage plus plan | 855, 90\% If In Wellness Plan | 15\%, $10 \%$ If in Welluess Plan | 85\%, 90\% If In Wellness Plan | 15\%, 10 \% If In Welluess Plan | Included with Medical a $\$ 1500$ plan | Included with Mesical |
| City of Bethel | Premera Blue Cross Bue Shield of Alaska | 100\% | EE Only $\mathrm{S}^{25} / \mathrm{mo}$ | Included with Medical | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{EE}+1 \mathrm{~S} 50 / \mathrm{mo} \\ \mathrm{EE}+\text { Family } \$ 75 / \mathrm{mo} \end{gathered}$ | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City of Cordova | Selfff funded plan/medical Network is First Choice | not included in prem | not included in prem | not included in prem | not included in prem | 80\% | 20\% |
| City of Fairbanks | * Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | - Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | * Plans la rates vary Dending on Union Contract | - Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | * Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | - Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | * Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract |
| City of Homer | . | 0.885324308 | . | - | - |  | . |
| City of Kenai | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Premera Bue Cross Blue } \\ \text { Shield of Alaska } \\ \text { TT, PT over } 15 \text { hours a } \\ \text { week } \end{gathered}\right.$ | FT $\$ 949.59$ PT 559.00 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { FT } & 5123 \\ \text { PT } & 5519 \end{array}$ | FT EC $\$ 1,799.23$ FTES $\$ 1,975.06$ FT EF $\$ 2,694.41$ [PT - ES/EC/EF \$497 | PT EC $\$ 1,325$ PT ES $\$ 1,523$ PT EF \$2,331 | Included with Medical | Included with Mesical |
| City of Ketchikan | Blue Cross / Blue Shield | 90\% | 10\% | 90\% | 10\% | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City of Kodiak | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{c\|} \text { Aetna } \\ \text { FT and PT with } 30 \text { hours } \\ \text { per week } \end{array}\right.$ | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City of Palmer | Meritain Health | plas $\$ 2000$ per fT to an HRAinsurance deductible, copays, prescriptions but not over the counter meds | 0\% | 85\% | 15\% | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City of Soldotna | Aetna for Regular FT Regular PT \& Elected Officials | 90\% | 10\% | 75\% | 25\% | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City of Valdez | $\underset{\substack{\text { Meritain: } \\ \text { FT; permanent part } \\ \text { timeresular } \\ \text { pennane11t }}}{\substack{\text { pen } \\ \hline}}$ | 96\% | 48 | 96\% | 48 | 96\% | 48 |
| City of Wasilla | Yes varies by Agreement for FT Medical, Dental, Vision, Prescription, Cost varies by agreement | 1) Non-Reps, L302 - City pays $100 \%$ at a current rate of $\$ 1,622$ per month ( 18 L302 members and 45 Non-Reps belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) <br> 2) L341 - City pays $100 \%$ at a current rate of 1,487.16 ( 5 members belonging to the Alaska Laborers Trust) <br> 3) WPDA - City pays $\$ 1,739.52$ 99\%, Employee pays $\$ 15.48$, Total premium $\$ 1,755$ per month ( 50 members belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) | 2. $0 \%$ <br> 3. WPDA - City pays $\$ 1,739.52$ Employee pays $\$ 15.48$, Total premium \$1,755/mo.(50 members belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) 1\% | 1) Non-Reps, L302 - City pays $100 \%$ at a current rate of $\$ 1,622$ per month ( 18 L302 members and 45 Non-Reps belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) <br> 2 )L341 - City pays $100 \%$ at a current rate of $1,487.16$ ( 5 members belonging to the Alaska Laborers Trust) <br> 3) WPDA - City pays $\$ 1,739.52$ 99\%, Employee pays $\$ 15.48$, Total premium $\$ 1,755$ per month ( 50 members belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) | 1. $0 \%$ 2. $0 \%$ <br> 3. WPDA - City pays $51,739.52$ Employee pays S15.48, Total premium 51,755 per month ( 50 members belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) 1\% | 1) Non-Reps, L302 - City pays 100\% at a current rate of $\$ 1,622$ per month ( 18 L302 members and 45 Non-Reps belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) <br> 2) L341 - City pays $100 \%$ at a current rate of 1,487.16 ( 5 members belonging to the Alaska Laborers Trust) <br> 3) WPDA - City pays $\$ 1,739.5299 \%$, Employee pays $\$ 15.48$, Total premium $\$ 1,755$ per month ( 50 members belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) | 1. $0 \%$ <br> 2. $0 \%$ <br> 3. WPDA - City pays $\$ 1,739.52$, Employee pays $\$ 15.48$, Total premium $\$ 1,755$ per month ( 50 members belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) 1\% |
| City of North Pole | Combined Med-Dental- <br> Vision <br> Mericane - (Self-Insured) | \$850 per EE per Pay Pd. | $\$ 90$ per Coverage (no limit on \# of Dependents) | \$850 per EE per Pay Pd. | $\$ 23.08$ per pay pd EE only $\$ 90$ per pay pd for Dependent Coverage (no limit on \# of Dependents) | \$850 per EE per Pay Pd. | $\$ 23.08$ per pay pd EE only $\$ 90$ per pay pd for Dependent Coverage (no limit on \# of Dependents) |


| GROUP INSURANCE (GENERAL EMPLOYEES) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { City / Town / County / }}{\text { Borough }}$ | Vision |  | Life Insurance |  | Short Term Disability |  | Long Term Disability |  | Other |
|  | City Contribution | EE Contribution | City Contribution | EE Contribution | City Contribution | EE Contribution | City Contribution | EE Contribution | Medical for Council |
| Borough of Bristol Bay |  | - | . | - | - | . | - | - | - |
| Borough of Haines | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | \$0 | available | so | Available | \$0 | available | - |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | \$0 | 100\% up to $\$ 300,000$ | so | $100 \%$ | 0\% | 100\% | Hearing exam at $100 \%$ (up to $\$ 400$ ) \& hardware (hearing-aids) up to $\$ 3000$ every three years. |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | \$2,000 Life \$5,000 ADAD 100\% Premium Paid By Employer | None | Not Provided | Not Provided | Not Provided | Not Provided | Employee Assistance Plan Provides Free Mental Health Counseling |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | $\$ 30,000$ Life/AD\&D Policy 100\% Premium Paid By Employer | None | Not Provided | Not Provided | Not Provided | Not Provided | The borough also offers an HRA plan which the employees pay the first $\$ 1000$ of the medical deductible and the borough pay the other $\$ 2000$ |
| City of Bethel | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | - |
| City of Cordova | included in Dental | Included in Dental | - | - | . | - | - | . | - |
| City of Fairbanks | * Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | - Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | * Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | * Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | * Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | * Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | * Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | * Plans \& rates vary Dending on Union Contract | - |
| City of Homer |  | - | - | . | - | - | . |  | . |
| City of Kenai | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | 100\% | supplemental available | \%\% | Available | - | - | Flexible Spending Account funded by EE |
| City of Ketchikan | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | - | - | - | - | - | . |  |
| City of Kodiak Included with Medical |  | Included with Medical | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Palmer | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |
| City of Soldotna | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | City provides 57000 | employee can purchase additional up to $\$ 60 \mathrm{k}$ |  | - | - | - | - |
| City of Valdez | 96\% | 48 |  | Portable options life insurance | - | - | . | . | Elected Officials |
| City of Wasilla | 1. $0 \%$ <br> 2. $0 \%$ <br> 3. WPDA - City pays $\$ 1,739.52$, Employee pays $\$ 15.48$, Total premium $\$ 1,755$ per month ( 50 members belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) 1\% | 0 | Life Insurance up to $\$ 50,000$ paid by City | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of North Pole | \$850 per EE per Pay Pd. | \$23.08 per pay pd EE only \$90 per pay pd for Dependen Coverage (no limit on \# of Dependents) | City provides $\$ 50,000$ policy to each EE. May elect to get more. | Only if EE elects for dependents of greater coverage. | City pays $100 \%$. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EE pays so. } \\ & \text { Limit_ _days. } \end{aligned}$ | City pays $100 \%$. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EE pays so. } \\ & \text { Limit _ days. } \end{aligned}$ | No benefits for Council. Mayor only. |


| GROUP INSURANCE (Police) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City / Town / County / Borough | Type (Employer Paid, Cost) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vision |  | Life Insurance |  | Short Term Disability |  | Long Term Disability |  | Other Benefits |
|  | City Contribution | EE Contribution | City Contribution | EE Contribution | City Contribution | EE Contribution | City Contribution | EE Contribution |  |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | - | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | . |
| Borough of Haines | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | \$0 | available | \$0 | Available | \$0 | available |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | Included with Medical | Dental Buy Up \$24.92 mo EE $\$ 48 / \mathrm{mo}$ Family | \$0 | 100\% up to $\$ 300,000$ | \$0 | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | Hearing exam at $100 \%$ (up to $\$ 400$ ) \& hardware (hearing-aids) up to $\$ 3000$ every three years. |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 100\% | 0\% | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \$ 2,000 \\ \text { Life } \$ 5,000 \text { AD\&D } \\ \text { 100\% Premium Paid By } \\ \text { Employer } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | None | Not Provided | Not Provided | Not Provided | Not Provided | Employee Assistance Plan Provides Free Mental Health Counseling |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees |
| City of Bethel | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |  |
| City of Cordova | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Fairbanks | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ |
| City of Homer | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Kenai | - | . | - | $\cdot$ | . | - | - | - | . |
| City of Ketchikan | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | including in insurece all get $\$ 50 \mathrm{k}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Kodiak | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - |
| City of Palmer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Soldotna | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Valdez | 96\% | 4\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Wasilla | WPDA - City pays $\$ 1,739.52$ 99\%, Employee pays $\$ 15.48$, Total premium \$1,755 per month ( 50 members belong to the L302/612 Operating Engineers Health Fund) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3. WPDA - City pays } \\ & \$ 1,739.52, \text { Employee } \\ & \text { pays } \$ 15.48, \text { Total } \\ & \text { premium } \$ 1,755 \text { per } \\ & \text { month (50 members } \\ & \text { belong to the L. L302/612 } \\ & \text { Operating Engineers } \\ & \text { Health Fund) } 1 \% \end{aligned}$ | Life Insurance up to $\$ 50,000$ paid by City | - | - | - | - | - | EAP Available - paid by City |
| City of North Pole | Included in Medical | Included in Medical | Pays for 50,000 of coverage per employee | Can elect for more coverage | 100\% | 0 | 100\% | 0 |  |

Group Insurance - Fire

| GROUP INSURANCE (Fire) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City / Town / County / Boroush | Type(Employer Paid, Cost) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Employee Medical |  |  | Dependent Medical |  | Dental |  |
|  | Medical | City <br> Contribution | EE Contribution | City Contribution | EE Contribution | City Contribution | EE Contribution |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | - | - | . | . | - | - | - |
| Borough of Haines | Union provided | \$1,542 | Yellow plan \$0 Blue plan \$136 / month | \$0 | Yellow plan \$113 / month Blue plan \$220 / month | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | Premera Blue Cross Blue Shield of Alaska | 100\% | Economy plan EE $\$ 0$, <br> Standard plan $\$ 140 / \mathrm{mo}$ <br> Flex Spending Plan <br> available |  | Economy Plan \$176.40/mo Standard Plan \$310.80/mo | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | Blue Cross Of Washington \& Alaska | 90\% | 10\% | 90\% | 10\% | 90\% | 10\% |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees |
| City of Bethel | Premera Blue Cross Blue Shield of Alaska | 100\% | EE Only \$25 /mo | Included with Medical | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{EE}+1 \$ 50 / \mathrm{mo} \\ \mathrm{EE}+\text { Family } \$ 75 / \mathrm{mo} \end{gathered}$ | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City of Cordova | - | - | . | - | - | - | - |
| City of Fairbanks | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Homer | - |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| City of Kenai | - | - | . | - | - | - | - |
| City of Ketchikan | International Assiciation of Fire Fighters NWFFT | 82\% | 18\% | 95\% | 5\% | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City of Kodiak | Aetna FT and PT with 30 hrs per week | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | Included with Medical | Included with Medical |
| City of Palmer | - | - | . | . | - | - | - |
| City of Soldotna | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Valdez | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Wasilla | - | . | . | - | - | - | - |
| City of North Pole | SAMPLE | 60\% | 40\% | 60\% | 40\% | 60 | 40 |


| GROUP INSURANCE (Fire) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City / Town / County / Borough | Type <br> (Employer Paid, Cost) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vision |  | Life |  | Short Term Disability |  | Long Term Disability |  | Other |
|  | City Contribution | EE Contribution | City <br> Contribution | EE Contribution | City <br> Contribution | EE <br> Contribution | City <br> Contribution | EE <br> Contribution |  |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | . | - | - | - | - | . | - | - | - |
| Borough of Haines | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | \$0 | available | \$0 | Available | \$0 | available |  |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | Included with Medical | Dental Buy Up \$24.92 / mo EE $\quad \$ 48 / \mathrm{mo}$ Family | \$0 | 100\% up to $\$ 300,000$ | \$0 | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | Hearing exam at $100 \%$ (up to $\$ 400$ ) \& hardware (hearing-aids) up to $\$ 3000$ every three years. |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 90\% | 10\% | \$2,000 Life \$5,000 AD\&D 100\% Premium Paid By Employer | None | Not Provided | Not Provided | Not Provided | Not Provided | Employee Assistance Plan Provides Free Mental Health Counseling |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees | Same as General Employees |
| City of Bethel | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |  |
| City of Cordova | . | - | - | - | - | . | - | - | - |
| City of Fairbanks | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Homer | . | . | . | - | - | . | - | . | - |
| City of Kenai | . | - | 100\% | If want supplemental | 0\% | 100\% | - | - | - |
| City of Ketchikan | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | - | - | - | . | - | - | - |
| City of Kodiak | Included with Medical | Included with Medical | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Palmer | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - |
| City of Soldotna | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| City of Valdez | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | . | - |
| City of Wasilla | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - |
| City of North Pole | 60\% | 40\% | 60\% | 40\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Flexible Savings Account |

Paid Holidays


General Employee Retirement

RETIREMENT \& OTHER BENEFITS

| City / Town / County / Borough | Retirement System |  |  | Defined Benefit Plan |  |  | Defined Contribution 401(a) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | G.EE. | Police | Fire | G.EE. | Police | Fire | G.EE. | Police | Fire |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | . | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | . |
| Borough of Haines | PERS | PERS | PERS | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employes Hired Before $7 / 1 / 2006$ | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employes Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | PERS | PERS | PERS | . | . | - | \$5 up to 5\% | \$5 up to 5\% | \$5 up to 5\% |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | PERS | PERS | PERS | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | PERS | PERS | PERS | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before $7 / 1 / 2006$ | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employes Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 |
| City of Bethel | PERS | PERS | PERS | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 |
| City of Cordova | PERS | PERS | PERS | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before $7 / 1 / 2006$ | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before $7 / 1 / 2006$ | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 |
| City of Fairbanks | - | PERS | PERS | . | . | - | Varies | Varies | Varies |
| City of Homer | . | . | - | . | - | - | . | - | . |
| City of Kenai | PERS | PERS | PERS | - | - | - | $\begin{gathered} \text { Paid by ER } \\ \text { 4\% of first } \$ 37,500 \text { of } \\ \text { wages }(\$ 1,500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Paid by ER } \\ \text { 4\% of first } \$ 37,500 \\ \text { of wages }(\$ 1,500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Paid by ER } \\ 4 \% \text { of first } \$ 37,500 \\ \text { of wages }(\$ 1,500) \end{gathered}$ |
| City of Ketchikan | PiERS |  |  | . |  | . |  |  |  |
| City of Kodiak | PERS | PERS | PERS | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employes Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 |
| City of Palmer | PERS | PERS | PERS | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before $7 / 1 / 2006$ | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employes Hired After 7/1/2006 |
| City of Soldotna | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  |
| City of Valdez | PERS | PERS | PERS | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier $1 / 2 / 3$ Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 |
| City of Wasilla | PERS | PERS | PERS | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 1/2/3 Employees Hired Before $7 / 1 / 2006$ | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 | PERS Tier 4 Employees Hired After 7/1/2006 |


| City of North Pole | SAMPLE | PERS, Plan 5 | PERS, <br> Fire Plan 5 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Available, but City <br> does not contribute. <br> No match. | Avilable, but City <br> does not contribute. <br> No match. | Available, but City <br> does not oontribute. <br> No match. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| RETIREMENT \& OTHER BENEFITS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City / Town / County / Boroush | City Contribution |  |  | Employee Contribution |  |  | Vesting Years |  |  | Other/Notes |
|  | g.EE. | Police | Fire | G.EE | Police | Fire | g.EE | Police | Fire |  |
| Borough of Bristol Bay | - | . | . | . | - | - | . | . | . | . |
| Borough of Haines | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | . |
| City \& Borough of Juneau | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | . |
| City \& Borough of Sitka | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 8\% | 8\% | $8 \%$ | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | . |
| City \& Borough of Wrangell | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | . |
| City of Bethel | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | . |
| City of Cordova | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 8\% | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | 8\% | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | . |
| City of Fairbanks | Pension Per hour Range of \$15-\$6 | 22\% | 22\% | . | - | - | Varies | Varies | Varies | Survey indicates other plans offered but Varies |
| City of Homer | . | - |  | - | - | - | . | . | - | . |
| City of Kenai | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | . |
| City of Ketchikan | . | . | . | - | - | - | . | . | . |  |
| City of Kodiak | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 8\% | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | 8\% | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | . |
| City of Palmer | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | - |
| City of Soldotna | . | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | - | . |
| City of Valdez | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | 8\% | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | . |
| City of Wasilla | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 5 years | 5 years | 5 years | . |
| City of North Pole | City pays $22 \%$ for each EE salary. | City pays $22 \%$ for each EE salary | $\begin{array}{\|c} \begin{array}{c} \text { City pays } 228 \text { for each EE } \\ \text { salary } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tier 1: 5yrs } \\ & \text { Tier 2: 8yrs } \end{aligned}$ | Tier 1: 5yrs Tier 2: 6yrs | Tier 1: 5yrs Tier 2: 6yrs | Tier 2 are EEs hired after July 1,2013 |

## Appendix F. Proposed Incentive Pay Examples

## Overview

Career development is an important factor which should be an integral part of any personnel program and budget. Facilitating the career and skills development of staff has the potential to create a better educated staff, making them more qualified and capable to meet a higher quality and quantity of work. As part of the evaluation feedback and work planning process, the City should consider implementing a system for rewarding employees who acquire certain licenses, achieve professional designations, and achieve other specified objectives pertaining to professional development.

The following examples are sited for consideration. Communities with more departments (Fire, Police, Library, etc) should develop similar goals and values for as appropriate.

## (SAMPLE)

## ADMINISTRATIVE

Option 1
Hourly Rate Increase \% or Step Increase

## Clerk or Deputy Clerk

25 points - Municipal Clerk's Certification $\$ 0.25$.25\%
50 points - Municipal Clerk's Certification
\$0.50
.25\%
75 points - Municipal Clerk's Certification
IIMC Certification
Other incentive goals as appropriate.

## Finance Director or Accounting Staff

Certified Public Finance (CPFO) Officer Exams
$\$ 0.50$
1.5\%

Certified Public Finance Officer (CPFO) Designation
Unqualified Audit Opinion
GFOA Recognized Outstanding Budget
GFOA Recognized Outstanding Financial Statements
Training towards Risk Manager Certification
Risk Manager Certification
Other incentive goals as appropriate.
Administrative Assistants / Secretaries / Office Support
MOUS Cerlifatio
MOUS Certification - Excel
$\$ 0.25$
.5\%
MOUS Certification - Word
MOUS Certification - Power Point
Other incentive goals as appropriate.
City Administrator / Department Heads
Accomplishment of Annual Council Goals
Expenditures <95\% of Budgeted Expenditures
Tax Revenues > 20\% Above Budgeted Revenue
Annual Council Goals Achievement - Bonus
Other incentive goals as appropriate.
\$ undetermined
\$ undetermined
\$ undetermined
\$ undetermined

Option 1
Hourly Rate Increase \% or Step Increase

## GENERAL / WATER / SEWER / STREETS / PARK

## General

Commercial Drivers License (CDL) \$0.50 .5\%
Commercial Pesticide Applicator
Water
D Water Treatment License
$\$ 0.25$
5\%
C Water Treatment License
$\$ 0.75$
5\%
B Water Treatment License
A Water Treatment License
Class I Water Distribution Certificate
Class II Water Distribution Certificate
Class III Water Distribution Certificate
Back Flow Testor Certificate
Waste Water
D Waste Water Treatment License
C Waste Water Treatment License
B Waste Water Treatment License
A Waster Water Treatment License

## OTHER

40 hours Continuing Education
New Service Implementation
Grant Revenue ( $\$ 5,000$ to $\$ 12,000$ ) - Bonus
Grant Revenue (>\$12,500) - Bonus
Recreation Program Enrollment - 10\% Increase Bonus
Building Inspection Inquiry Response Time - 24-hours (monthly avg)
Plan Review - 15 day Average Response Time per planset
$\$ 0.25$25\%
$\$ 0.10 \quad .75 \%$
$2 \%$ of Revenue . $75 \%$
$\$ 250$ or \% of Revenue .50\%
\$ undetermined .75\%
\$ undetermined . $50 \%$
\$ undetermined . $50 \%$

## Appendix G: Proposed $360^{\circ}$ Performance Evaluation

## The $360^{\circ}$ Evaluation

360 degree feedback is a method and a tool that provides each employee the opportunity to receive performance feedback from his or her supervisor and four to eight peers, reporting staff members, or co-workers. Most 360 degree feedback tools are also responded to by each individual in a self assessment. 360 degree feedback allows each individual to understand how his or her effectiveness as an employee, co-worker, or staff member is viewed by others. The most effective processes provide feedback that is based on behaviors and performance that other employees can see. The feedback provides insight about the skills, attributes and behaviors desired in the organization to accomplish the mission, vision, and goals and live the values that are important to most any organization. The feedback is firmly planted in behaviors needed to exceed customer and organizational expectations. With that said, this tool has many positive aspects and many proponents which are outlined below.

The 1999 State of the Industry Report, from the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), reviewed the training practices of more than 750 firms. Fifty-five firms, described by ASTD as leading edge in their training approaches, rely heavily on employee feedback, including 360 degree feedback and peer review, for individual development plans and annual performance reviews. Seventy-five percent of these companies provided individual development plans, and 33 percent provided 360 degree feedback for most of their employees in 1998, compared to 50 percent and 10 percent in 1997, according to ASTD.

## Using the Evaluation

There are four essentials to benefiting from the $360^{\circ}$ evaluation method:

- Selecting the Evaluators: People who are chosen as Evaluators, usually choices shared by the organization and employee, generally interact routinely with the person receiving feedback.
- The Evaluation Process: One of the key purposes of the $360^{\circ}$ Evaluation is the opportunity to address the misperceptions employees and supervisors have regarding the importance a position's skills and attributes requires. The overall purpose of the feedback evaluation tool is to assist each individual to understand his or her strengths and weaknesses, to contribute insights into aspects of his or her work needing professional development, and to facilitate a productive dialogue between employee and supervisor. Each evaluation contains a series of 15 questions, and the evaluator is asked to respond to what he or she feels is the Relevant Importance of a certain skill or attribute to the position, then respond to what they feel is the Performance Level Tables $1 \& 2$ illustrates how this is done.

Table 1: Weighted Factors \& Performance Rating

| PERFORMANCE RATING |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| WEIGHT | LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE |
| 0=Does not apply to position | 1=Unsatisfactory |
| 1=Relevant to position | 2=Needs Improvement |
| 2=Important to position | $3=$ Good |
| 3=Crucial to position | 4=Very Good |
|  | 5=Excellent |

Table 2: Evaluating the Position and the Employee
A. PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE OF WORK - Understands routine methods and procedures required for effective job perform ance.

Comments:

B. THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE OF WORK - Understands technical background and scientific principals behind work methods and procedures. Demonstrates this knowledge in problem solving or quality control measures. Comments:


- Using / reviewing the feedback report: Employee and manager have the opportunity to discuss perceived and actual performance, identify areas of excellence and areas of improvement, and develop a work plan by establishing specific performance expectations and goals that are to be achieved within a defined timeframe.


## Table 3: Evaluation Report: Individual \& Supervisor



- Managing / integrating the report into performance management: Generally, each organization already has a defined pay and incentive program. Rather than completely modify this system, the $360^{*}$ evaluation tool can be integrated into the existing salary and compensation plan with little or no changes whatsoever. It is generally recommended that organizations without a pay-for-performance standard adopt a pay incentive or reward system to increase effectiveness of this tool. See Incentive Pay Goals and Values in the next section.

The following sections will describe the pros and cons of the 360 degree feedback evaluation tool.

## Positive Attributes of the $360^{\circ}$ Evaluation Tool

Organizations that are happy with the 360 degree component of their performance management systems identify these positive features of the process. These features will manifest themselves in well-managed, wellintegrated 360 degree processes.

- Improved Feedback From More Sources: Provides well-rounded feedback from peers, reporting staff, co-workers, and supervisors. This can be a definite improvement over feedback from a single individual. 360 feedback can also save managers' time in that they can spend less energy providing feedback as more people participate in the process. Co-worker perception is important and the process helps people understand how other employees view their work.
- Team Development: Helps team members learn to work more effectively together. (Teams know more about how team members are performing than their supervisor.) Multirater feedback makes team members more accountable to each other as they share the knowledge that they will provide input on each members' performance. A well-planned process can improve communication and team development.

Table 4: Evaluation Report: Team Development

| TOTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM 360* EVALUATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Department Head |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average Score Received |
| Finance Dir | 2.0 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 3.6 |
| City Attorney | 3.6 | 4.0 | 4.8 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 4.0 |
| Public Works Director | 2.4 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.6 |
| Police Chief | 3.7 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.2 |
| Fire Chief | 3.4 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| Library Director | 3.2 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.6 |
| Planning Director | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Recreation Director | 3.3 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.7 |
| Town Manager | 3.1 | 3.8 | 4.0 | X | 3.7 | 2.6 | 4.6 | X | 3.3 | 3.6 |
| Avg All Evaluations | 3.1 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.7 |  |

- Personal and Organizational Performance Development: 360 degree feedback is one of the best methods for understanding personal and organizational developmental needs.
- Responsibility for Career Development: For many reasons, organizations are no longer responsible for developing the careers of their employees, if they ever were. Multirater feedback can provide excellent information to an individual about what she needs to do to enhance her career. Additionally, many employees feel 360 degree feedback is more accurate, more reflective of their performance, and more validating than prior feedback from the supervisor alone. This makes the information more useful for both career and personal development. See Incentive Pay Goals and Values in the next section.
- Reduced Discrimination Risk: When feedback comes from a number of individuals in various job functions, discrimination because of race, age, gender, and so on, is reduced. The "horns and halo"
effect, in which a supervisor rates performance based on her most recent interactions with the employee, is also minimized.
- Improved Customer Service: Especially in feedback processes that involve the internal or external customer, each person receives valuable feedback about the quality of his product or services. This feedback should enable the individual to improve the quality, reliability, promptness, and comprehensiveness of these products and services.
- Training Needs Assessment: Multirater feedback provides comprehensive information about organization training needs and thus allows planning for classes, cross-functional responsibilities, and cross-training.


## Drawbacks of the $360^{\circ}$ Evaluation Tool

For every good point about 360 degree feedback systems, detractors and people who have had bad experiences with such systems, can offer the down side. Understanding the down side is important because it gives you a roadmap of the things to avoid when you implement a 360 degree evaluation process. Helping an organization determine if such a tool will be effective in improving the overall performance or an organization and its personnel is important when considering any performance measurement tool.

Following are potential problems with 360 degree feedback processes and a recommended solution for each.

- Exceptional Expectations for the Process: 360 degree feedback is not the same as a performance management system. It is merely a part of the feedback and development that such a system offers within an organization. Additionally, proponents may lead participants to expect too much from this feedback system in their efforts to obtain organizational support for implementation. Make sure the 360 feedback is integrated into a complete performance management system.
- Design Process Downfalls: Often, a 360 process arrives as a recommendation from the HR department or is shepherded in by an executive who learned about the process at a seminar or in a book. Just as an organization implements any planned change, the implementation of 360 feedback should follow effective change management guidelines. A cross-section of the people who will have to live with and utilize the process should explore and develop the process for your organization.
- Failure to Connect the Process: For a 360 feedback process to work, it must be connected with the overall strategic aims of your organization. If you have identified competencies or have comprehensive job descriptions, give people feedback on their performance of the expected competencies and job duties. The system will fail if it is an add-on rather than a supporter of your organization's fundamental direction and requirements. It must function as a measure of your accomplishment of your organization's big and long term picture.
- Insufficient Training and Process Understanding: Employees who will participate in a 360 process need training about the process, how to provide constructive feedback, how to interpret results, and more. Failure to provide the appropriate amount of training and information can sink a process quickly.
- Insufficient Information: Since 360 degree feedback processes are currently usually anonymous, people receiving feedback have no recourse if they want to further understand the feedback. They
have no one to ask for clarification of unclear comments or more information about particular ratings and their basis. For this reason and for the points listed in the several bullet points following this one, developing 360 process coaches is important. Supervisors, HR staff people, interested managers and others are taught to assist people to understand their feedback. They are trained to help people develop action plans based upon the feedback.
- Focus on Negatives and Weaknesses: At least one recent book, First Break All the Rules: What Great Managers Do Differently, advises that great managers focus on employee strengths, not weaknesses. The authors said, "People don't change that much, Don't waste time trying to put in what was left out. Try to draw out what was left in. That is hard enough."
- Rater Inexperience and Ineffectiveness: In addition to the insufficient training organizations provide both people receiving feedback and people providing feedback, there are numerous ways raters go wrong. They may inflate ratings to make an employee look good. They may deflate ratings to make an individual look bad. They may informally band together to make the system artificially inflate everyone's performance. Checks and balances must prevent these pitfalls.
- Paperwork / Computer Data Entry Overload: Need I say much more here? Traditional evaluations required two people and one form. Multirater feedback ups the sheer number of people participating in the process and the consequent organization time invested.


## Conclusion

As with any performance feedback process, it can provide you with a profoundly supportive, organization affirming method for promoting employee growth and development. In rare cases, the results of this type of evaluation process saps morale, destroys motivation, enables disenfranchised employees to go for the jugular or plot and scheme revenge scenarios. Most often, however, it can increase positive, powerful problem solving for customers or set people off on journeys to identify the guilty, the feedback provider who rated their performance less than perfect.

Which scenario will your organization choose? It's all in the details. Think profoundly before you move forward; learn from the mistakes of others; assess your organization's readiness. Apply effective change management strategies to planning and implementation. Do the right things right and you will add a powerful tool to your performance management and enhancement toolkit!

Performance Evaluation for Professional Development
For $360^{\circ}$ Evaluation, see attached information.

|  | PERFORMANCE RATING |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Employee Name: | WEIGHT | LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE |
| Position Title: | 0=Does not apply to position | 1=Unsatisfactory |
| Department: | 1=Relevant to position | 2=Needs Improvement |
| In Position Since: | 2=Important to position | $3=$ Good |
| Hire Date: | 3=Crucial to position | $4=$ Very Good |
| Evaluator: |  | 5=Excellent |

A. PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE OF WORK - Understands routine methods and procedures required for effective job performance.

Comments:

B. THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE OF WORK - Understands technical background and scientific principals behind work methods and procedures. Demonstrates this knowledge in problem solving or quality control measures. Comments:

C. JUDGEMENT - Understands impact of actions in advance; includes the degree to which the employee's decisions are sound.

Comments:

D. QUANTITY OF WORK - Volume of acceptable work produced.

Comments:

E. QUALITY OF WORK - Effective application of work knowledge to produce accurate, repeatable results.
Comments:

F. FOLLOW-THROUGH - Takes independent action as needed to move assigned projects to completion, constantly monitors work in progress.

Comments:

G. INITIATIVE / MOTIVATION - Independantly seeks ways to improve efficiency of unit and its contribution to the goals of the entire organization; works with supervisor on implementation or improvements.

Comments:

H. PROBLEM SOLVING - Identifies problems, gathers and analyzes facts to determine probable causes; proposes viable solutions to supervisor.

Comments:

I. COOPERATION - Relates effectively to co-workers and supervisors in all units to maximize efficient achievement of Department and organization-wide goals.

Comments:

J. PLANNING / ORGANIZATION - Ability to establish in advancean appropriate course of action to accomplish assigned tasks within the limits of time and budget.

Comments:
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K. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS - Ability to effectively express ideas in individual or group situations. Ideas are clear, concise, and easily understood.

Comments:

L. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS - Written work conveys message in clear, concise language with proper grammatical form.

Comments:

M. LEADERSHIP - In a supervisory role, the employee is effective in getting work accomplished through others.

Comments:

N. ATTENTION TO SAFETY - Understands and applies safe working practices. Observes work methods to detect and correct unsafe practices.

Comments:

O. DEPENDABILITY - Can be relied upon to be punctual to work; is flexible in adjusting to changing priorities and willingly makes self available for extra work at critical times.

Comments:



OVERALL PERFORMANCE (B/A Rounded to the nearest tenth)

| SCORE | OVERALL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE DEFINED |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | UNSATISFACTORY - Extended unacceptable performance calling for immediate and substantial <br> improvement, or serving as grounds for disciplinary action, up to and including grounds for <br> dismissal |
| 2 | NEEDS IMPROVEMENT - Performance which does not meet minimum level of acceptability, and is <br> not good enough to warrant recognition or greater responsibity. |
| 3 | GOOD - Consistantly dependable and compotent performance of the job. |
| 4 | VERY GOOD - Significant and clearly identifiable contributions to the job. Overall performance is <br> noticeably better than good. |
| 5 | EXCELLENT - Demonstrably distinguished performance of all aspects of the job responsibilities. An <br> extremely valuable performer. |


| EMPLOYEE POST-EVALUATION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN <br> (TO BE FILLED OUT BY SUPERVISOR \& EMPLOYEE) |
| :--- |
| APPraiser's Comments on Overall Level of Performance: |
| II. EMPLOYEE'S PRESENT POSITION: Is the employee properly placed? |
| If no, please explain: |

IV. SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES: Indicate specific performance objectives to be accomplished by the employee before the next appraisal.
V. DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Indicate formal training and / or projects required of employee during the next 12 months or Budget Year.

|  |
| :---: |
| SPECIAL NOTE |
| $\square$ |

In signing this form, the employee acknowledges only that this appraisal has been reviewed by the employee and the supervisor. This signature does not imply that the employee agrees with the appraisal, either in whole or in part.

| EMPLOYEE'S SIGNATURE | DATE |
| :--- | :---: |
| SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE | DATE |
| CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR'S SIGNATURE | DATE |

*Employee comments (optional):
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