



Executive Report
City of Sherwood, Oregon

Compensation Plan Study

By
McGrath Human Resources Group

January 2018





McGrath Consulting Group, Inc.
P.O. Box 190
Wonder Lake, IL 60097
Office (815) 728-9111
Fax (815) 331-0215
www.mcgrathconsulting.com

©Copyright 2017 McGrath Human Resources Group. All rights reserved.
No part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording or otherwise without the expressed written permission of McGrath Consulting Group, Inc.

Table of Contents

Study Overview	4
Methodology	6
Data Collection	6
Labor Market	7
Market Data Solicited	8
Pay Range Market Analysis	9
Minimum Salary Comparison	9
Market Rate Salary Comparison	10
Maximum Salary Analysis	11
Market Data Summary	11
Current Compensation Systems	11
Integrated Salary Schedules	12
Compression	12
Total Compensation	12
Recommendations	14
Compensation Philosophy	14
Position Considerations	15
Recommended Salary Schedule	15
Placement	16
Schedule Maintenance	17
Life Cycle of Salary Schedule	17
Benefit Statements	17
Appendix A: Non-Union 2017 Recommended Schedule	19
Table of Tables	
Table 1: Comparable Organizations	7
Table 2: Average Market Rate Summary Full-time Positions	10
Table 3: Total Compensation Comparables	13
Table 4: Total Compensation Analysis	13

Study Overview

McGrath Consulting Group, Inc., an organization that specializes in public sector consulting, was commissioned by the City of Sherwood to conduct a comprehensive total compensation study of all positions – union and non-union – within the City. The City requested an evaluation of all City positions in order to update the current compensation structure throughout the organization.

The purpose of this study is to:

- ✓ Obtain and establish compensation among the external comparable market.
- ✓ Establish internal equity among positions within the City.
- ✓ Integrate the data from the external market and internal market, into updated compensation systems.
- ✓ Obtain data, evaluate and recommend other pay practices and compensation-related benefits.
- ✓ Work with administration and the project team to implement the approved plan and policies in a manner and timeframe that fits the needs of the City.
- ✓ Provide implementation strategies for any compensation system updates including a projection of the ongoing budget commitments necessary to provide a sustainable and consistent compensation system.

The Consultant would like to extend appreciation to the City Manager, Assistant City Manager, and Human Resources Analyst for their time, cooperation, and sharing of information and perceptions with McGrath Human Resources Group.

Definitions

The following are definitions that helped guide the development of the compensation system for Sherwood.

Benchmark Position: A job that is commonly found and defined, used to make pay comparisons, either within the organization or to comparable jobs outside the organization.

Classifications: Job titles.

Compensation System: A system developed to compensate employees. This system includes a balance between internal equity and external competitiveness.

Compensation Data: Data derived from information regarding the salary range and the rate of pay of the incumbent(s) holding a benchmark position of the identified labor market.

Comp Ratio: The ratio of an actual pay range to the established position point (or average market rate). The Comp Ratio is used to measure and monitor an individual's actual rate of pay to the Position Point of the established pay range. In Sherwood, a 50% comp ratio (+/- 10%) indicates an individual is being paid approximate to the established position point (or average market rate).

Compression: Pay differentials too small to be considered equitable. The term may apply to differences between (1) the pay of supervisors and subordinates; (2) the pay of experienced and newly hired personnel of the same job; and (3) pay range midpoints in successive job grades or related grades across pay structures.

CPI-U: Consumer Price Index – Urban: A measure of the average change over time in the prices paid by urban consumers for a market of consumer goods and services. It reflects the spending pattern for three population groups: all urban consumers, urban wage earners, and clerical workers. This group represents approximately 87% of the total U.S. population.

Demotion: The (re)assignment of an employee to a position in a lower pay grade or range in the organization's salary structure.

Labor Market: A location where labor is exchanged for wages. These locations are identified and defined by a combination of the following factors: geography; industry; education, experience and licensing or certification required; and job responsibilities.

Market Data: The technique of creating the financial value of a position based on the “going rate” for benchmark positions in the relevant labor markets.

Minimum Salary Range (Minimum): The minimum amount of compensation the organization has deemed appropriate for a position.

Maximum Salary Range (Maximum): The highest amount of compensation the organization has deemed appropriate for a position.

Market Rate (Market): The organization's best estimate of the wage rate that is prevailing in the external market for a given position.

Market Average Compensation: A compensation philosophy to pay employees based upon the ‘average’ market rate; or the ‘average’ prevailing wage rate in the external market.

Market Average Range: A pay range in which the minimum and maximum of the range is established around the Average Market Rate.

Pay Grade: The grade, or placement of a position, within the salary structure.

Pay Grade Evaluation: The (re)assignment of a job to a higher or lower pay grade or pay range in the salary structure due to a job content (re)evaluation and/or significant change in the average market rate in the external labor market.

Performance Increase: An adjustment to an individual's base pay rate based on performance or some other individual measure.

Promotion: The (re)assignment of an employee to a position in a higher pay grade or range in the organization's salary structure.

Salary Schedule Adjustment: An adjustment to the salary structure; the increase or decrease of a pay range, minimum – maximum. This is a method to maintain the salary range in relation to external market conditions.

Step Schedule: Standardized progression pay rates that are established within a pay range. To move to the next step one must have met acceptable performance standards.

Salary Schedule: The hierarchy of job grades and pay ranges established within an organization.

Spread: The range of pay rates, from minimum to maximum, established for a pay grade. Typically used to set individual employee pay rates.

Methodology

Data Collection

The project involved several steps: collection of data, interviews, and data analysis. The first step of this study involved the gathering of data that pertains to current compensation practices within Sherwood. The Consultant received information relating to current salaries, collected market data, specific policies, and current job descriptions. This provided a basis on which to build a compensation system.

Interviews were conducted with the City's senior staff, including the City Manager and Department Heads. The purpose of these meetings was to first, gain an understanding of the City's current compensation practices and philosophy; second, solicit ideas and input from these stakeholders for future compensation methodologies and practices; and finally, determine if there were any positions within the City that were difficult to recruit, retain, or were otherwise unique in the position's responsibilities.

Labor Market

In order to gain information from the external market, the Consultant established a list of comparable cities from interviews with the Department Heads and City administration. Each of the comparable organizations were contacted initially via telephone and then were provided an online questionnaire. Salary data for specific positions was solicited from the comparable organizations. In addition to the comparable organizations a list of key organizations was identified to provide detailed benefit information so a “total” compensation study could be performed.

The following comparable organizations were contacted:

Table 1: Comparable Organizations

<u>Community/Municipal Body (Requested)</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Participated</u>	<u>Total Compensation Organizations</u>
City of Beaverton, OR	95,685	X	
City of Canby, OR	16,660	X	DNP
City of Forest Grove, OR	23,555	X	X
City of Gresham, OR	109,820	X	
City of Happy Valley, OR	19,985	DNP	DNP
City of Hillsboro, OR	100,865	X	
City of Keizer, OR	38,345	X	
City of Lake Oswego, OR	37,490	X	
City of McMinnville, OR	33,665	X	
City of Milwaukie, OR	20,550	X	
City of Newberg, OR	23,480	X	X
City of Oregon City, OR	34,610	X	
City of Tigard, OR	50,985	X	
City of Troutdale, OR	16,070	X	DNP
City of Tualatin, OR	26,960	X	X
City of West Linn, OR	25,695	X	X
City of Wilsonville, OR	24,315	X	X
City of Woodburn, OR	24,685	X	X
Washington County, OR	595,860	X	

The Consultant was pleased with the response to the survey. All but one (1) of the organizations contacted provided data. For the total compensation evaluation, three organizations did not participate in providing more detailed benefit information.

The collection of this compensation data was utilized to analyze the average market minimum, mid-point and maximum rates per defined benchmark positions, as well as a comparison of the average salary of the positions to the salary of incumbents within Sherwood. When necessary, evaluation of the comparable organization's job description, when available online, was utilized to resolve conflicts.

The labor market for Sherwood was determined based upon a number of factors including location, size, recruitment areas, and discussions with Department Heads. During interviews, each Department Head was asked if there were certain municipalities they felt had similar positions. If so identified, the Consultant sought the salary and benefit data.

The Consultant surveyed 83 positions within Sherwood. In addition to the current positions within Sherwood, the Consultant sought comparable data on positions that might have job responsibilities that are combined in Sherwood but might be separate in other organizations. Further, in some cases, the titles were altered to better align with the industry.

Market Data Solicited

The market surveys gathered the following information: Fiscal Year 2017 minimum, midpoint, and maximum salary for the position as well as the average salary of the incumbents. Positions with less than three (3) participants were excluded since it was considered an insufficient sample size. Further, salaries that were considered statistically too high or low (1-2 standard deviations from the average) were eliminated when determining the market average.

In addition to compensation data, the Consultant solicited data employer-provided benefits such as insurance and leave accrual.

Pay Range Market Analysis

Sherwood's minimum salary range was compared to the average market minimum salary; and the average incumbent salary of Sherwood employees was compared to the average market data for incumbents in a similar position.

Minimum Salary Comparison

The analysis of the minimum salary range gives the initial indication if starting salaries are within an acceptable market range. For this purpose, the closer to 50% (average minimum), the closer the match of the City's minimum to the average market minimum. Minimum starting salaries below 40% (called the comp-ratio) would require further evaluation, as this could be an indication the minimum of the salary range has fallen below the market average. A starting salary below the average market minimum may not necessarily be a problem depending upon the speed in which an individual advance to the established market rate.

Comp-ratio: $(\text{Sherwood Minimum Salary} / \text{Average Market Minimum Salary}) - 50\%$

When building a salary schedule, consultation of the average market minimums will ensure that the City's minimums are within an acceptable range to the average market minimum; however, this analysis is only the beginning in the development of a compensation schedule.

Overall there are minimal concerns, at first blush, with the minimum salaries of the current salary ranges because 22 positions out of 65 actual positions or 34% of the benchmark positions are below the average market minimum. What is concerning, is that there are an additional 20 positions or 31% of the benchmark positions below 45% that are of concern and need to be looked at as they could soon be below the average market rate. From the data, and looking at it from a compensation perspective only, there are either a number of positions or the salary schedule needs to be adjusted at the minimum salary data point in order to be effective in recruiting talented professionals to the City.

Market Rate Salary Comparison

The next step in developing a compensation structure is to compare the current incumbent's salaries to the average market rate. For this purpose, positions where there is more than one (1) incumbent, an *average* of the current employees is utilized. An analysis was conducted for each individual employee in relation to the recommended market rate, is considered confidential information and submitted under separate cover.

It is standard compensation practice to establish a range around the average market rate to determine if the employee is being fairly compensated. Employees often assume if the average market rate is \$25,000, then they should be earning \$25,000; however, compensation practices review a range around the average market rate that an employee should be at by the time the employee is fully functioning within their position. Public sector organizations traditionally establish a 5-10% range around the market rate; therefore, if an employee is earning between 40-60% of the market rate, the employee is fairly compensated. Overall, in comparing the average incumbent(s) salary to the average market rate, called the comp ratio, it appears that the City's past compensation practices maintained salaries with average market rate.

In summary, 37% of the City's positions are below the average market comp rate of 40%. There are an additional twelve (12) positions, or 23%, below 45% comp ratio range that should be evaluated.

To summarize:

Table 2: Average Market Rate Summary Full-time Positions

AVERAGE MARKET RATE COMP RATIO	NUMBER OF BENCHMARK POSITIONS	PERCENTAGE OF POSITIONS
10-29%	4	8%
30-39%	15	29%
40-49%	23	44%
50-59%	8	15%
60%+	2	4%

When evaluating all of the positions within the salary structure compared to surrounding comparable municipalities, the majority of the salary schedules are within the average market

rate for positions with similar education, skill, and experience. However, the proposed salary schedule presented later in this report has been created to address these concerns.

Maximum Salary Analysis

The Consultant has the information to compare the City's salary range maximum to the average market maximum. An analysis of the City's maximum salary range as compared to the average market maximum was completed. Slightly less than half – 48% of the City's maximums are less than the average market and fall below the acceptable comp ratio of 40%. The remaining positions are at market, or 52% are within the 40 – 60% comp ratio. It also should be noted that 15 of 19 positions (79%) with a comp ratio of 35% or less are in the management salary schedule. Additional analysis of the management schedule is warranted. In particular the management schedule will require the most adjustments to keep pace with the external market. The proposed salary schedule presented later in this report has been created to address these concerns.

Market Data Summary

Overall, the City has kept pace with the external market. However, the current schedules have fallen slightly behind the average market rate with some positions that need adjustment. Thus, there needs to be adjustment with some of the market minimums, and realignment of positions with placement of the pay grades. With that said, there is a concern with the number of positions that are in the lower 40% comp ratio that if not adjusted are likely to fall outside of an acceptable range within the near future. The proposed salary schedule presented later in this report has been created to address these concerns.

Current Compensation Systems

The City currently has three (3) separate compensation systems. Two of these compensation plans are union plans and are negotiated between the labor group and the City. One plan is for the non-represented employees of the City. Two employees – City Manager, and City Attorney are contract employees where the City Council determines the salary. Under the current system, there is no salary range provided for guidance in determining these salaries.

Integrated Salary Schedules

What does not often occur within an organization, is the evaluation of how the various salary schedules interrelate. When administration negotiate with one group, the concentration is on that salary schedule; not necessarily on how the changes to that schedule affect the other schedules. An analysis was conducted in which all three salary schedules were integrated into one, as well as the two major contracted employees – City Manager and Attorney – to evaluate internal equity.

This exercise illustrated a number of internal equity issues in which positions of similar titles are paid differently, and when looking at the internal hierarchy of the organization, there are a few compression problems between employee and supervisor positions.

These issues are common with multiple schedules as an organization rarely attempts to evaluate them as an integrated compensation plan. Rather, each schedule is negotiated or treated independently causing internal equity problems.

Compression

Compression is when salaries of job classifications of a higher rank or authority are paid less than positions of a lower rank or authority. This usually occurs in public safety departments where salary plus overtime of lower ranks exceeds the higher command ranks. Because of this issue, the Consultant asked for salary information (base plus overtime) for the entire 2016 fiscal year for all job classifications.

An analysis was conducted of all positions within the City. Compression due to overtime was not found to be a problem within the City.

Total Compensation

The City asked the Consultants to analyze total compensation. Thus, key cities were identified, as well as specified benefits. For all non-sworn positions, family health insurance, pension and a benefit common to the comparables – but not offered in Sherwood – a Voluntary Employee

Benefit Account (VEBA) was used as a comparison. The list of municipalities for comparison were:

Table 3: Total Compensation Comparables

Canby	DNP
Forest Grove	
Happy Valley	DNP
Newberg	
Oregon City	
Troutdale	DNP
West Linn	
Wilsonville	
Woodburn	

Considerable effort was taken to obtain and understand the health insurance and pension plans of the comparable municipalities. Based upon this information, an average of the family plan was determined and utilized in comparison with the Sherwood’s family health plan. The same analysis was conducted with the average pension contribution. West Linn and Troutdale did not provide a VEBA plan to employees; however, the other participating municipalities did; thus, it was utilized in the total compensation calculation.

Table 4: Total Compensation Analysis

	Family Health/Dental	Pension	VEBA/Other
Sherwood AFSCME	\$ 21,561.72	16.8100%	
Sherwood general	\$ 21,561.72	16.8100%	
Comparable City Average	\$ 22,209.50	14.29%	1%
Difference	-3.0%	2.5%	-1%

Table 4 is an illustration of the comparison of the Sherwood average incumbent total compensation compared to the average market incumbent total compensation. Only the total compensation municipalities were utilized, and no statistical analysis was utilized to eliminate any high/low salary data. Thus, the average incumbent data will be different than the market analysis described in the previous section.

The City's total compensation – evaluating salary and benefits are very similar with the surrounding comparables, with health insurance premiums being almost identical. Pension contributions, when compared to the average, are slightly above; however, one could say that is offset a bit, in that other communities offer a VEBA in which there is a mechanism to turn in unused leave into an account to be used at a later date for health care expenses. A benefit not offered in Sherwood.

Longevity pay – not counted in the total compensation calculated – was a benefit offered in the City of Sherwood, but only offered in one community in the communities that offered benefit information.

Recommendations

Compensation Philosophy

A pay philosophy is an organization's financial commitment to how it values its employees. The goal of a pay philosophy is to attract, retain, and motivate qualified people. A consistent philosophy provides a strong foundation in determining the type of total compensation package to offer employees.

The current compensation system is built on the average market rate. When adding the average benefits costs, the City remains around the average market rate; therefore, if the City's compensation philosophy is to be an average market payer – then the salary and benefits are in line with the average.

A recommended compensation philosophy developed by the Consultant to guide the City of Sherwood has been developed:

While maintaining fiscal responsibility, the City of Sherwood is committed to compensating in a manner that is reflective of the external market and provides recognition for individual advancement. Specifically, our goal is to achieve the following objectives:

- ***Internal equity among all employees***

- *Ensure employees reach the 50th percentile of the external market within a specific timeline*
- *Maintain Administrative efficiencies*

Position Considerations

During the course of the study, there was an opportunity to better align job titles and responsibilities. These have been presented within the compensation schedule and discussed with appropriate department directors. Criteria for positions should be incorporated into job descriptions.

Recommended Salary Schedule

The Consultant recommends a step system, similar to the current schedules. The Schedule, however, is a 13-step schedule where step 6 represents the external average market rate. Thirteen steps are recommended as the percentage between steps from the current schedule to the one recommended have been decreased for future cost savings. Steps from 1 – 6 are 2.5%.

Beginning at pay grade 1400, the steps have been greyed after the average market rate, step 6. There is a pay range to the maximum, rather than steps. This range will act similar to a step system, in that employees will still receive a ‘step’ increase if their performance is acceptable; or be denied a step if on a performance improvement plan. However, each year, the City can determine the percent of that step. It is strongly encouraged that the step increase should be similar to that received by the union employees. It is this range and group of employees that the City wished to employ more of a performance-based increase; thus, the step increase should be considered the minimum increase for acceptable performance. Appendix A is the Non-union salary schedule.

Note: Before implementing a performance-based program, it should be developed, understood by all employees who are involved; provided proper training; and adequately funded.

The union schedule is constructed in a similar manner; however, will need to be negotiated and is not illustrated within this report.

The City Manager and City Attorney have been placed on the salary schedule. Steps 2 – 5 have been greyed out. The Consultant understands that both of these positions are contractual positions; however, the pay ranges, and steps are on the classification system to be utilized by the City Council as a guideline in contract negotiations. Although the steps will probably not be utilized in negotiations with the incumbents of the positions, the Consultants recommend use of the minimum, step 6 which is the market (and the incumbent should be around that target within 3 – 5 years of service) and the maximum of the range as a guideline for determining wages. This not only keeps the salaries within a competitive market, but also assists with compression from subordinate personnel within the organization.

Placement

For purposes of implementation, the Consultant recommends employees currently below minimum of the new pay range Step 1 will be placed on Step 1. Employees above Step 1 are placed on the step closest to their current salary without a decrease. Employees above step 6 are not given an increase due to the implementation of the compensation schedule. The placement on the step or within the range may not be a significant increase or no increase and should only be viewed as a wage adjustment to move onto the new salary schedule. It is not considered a performance increase. The City can evaluate those individuals and give consideration if there are fiscal resources available.

In most organizations, the type of placement recommended proves problematic as employees feel that if they have more tenure in the position they should be higher within the salary range. Although there is merit to this argument, placement on the schedule by years in the position proves to be costlier – something most municipalities cannot afford without reducing overall staffing within the organization.

Schedule Maintenance

Each year, the City should continue to adjust the salary schedule, taking into consideration cost of living increases. The amount plus the percent step increase should be close to some defined index, or similar to the City's overall compensation adjustment. Without maintaining the schedule, salaries will fall behind the market, and the City will be in a position of expending dollars to keep up.

Life Cycle of Salary Schedule

One of the main concerns in any salary schedule is the ability to keep it current. Often, an organization spends a lot of time and resources to review and re-evaluate their Salary Schedule, resulting in providing employees or Pay Grades significant increases because either the position or the schedule is not in line with the external market. When developing a Salary Schedule, public sector organizations must build in some mechanism for maintaining the system with the average cost-of-living increases.

A Salary Schedule has a typical life span of five (5) years, at which time market conditions typically necessitate a review. The City can strive to prolong the life of the Schedule if it commits to maintaining its competitiveness with the external market by using the general guidelines outlined in this report.

Benefit Statements

Employees, especially in government where benefits are typically more generous than those in the private sector, do not realize the true cost to the municipality for providing benefits. The Consultant recommends the City create an annual benefit statement that details the total cost of compensation for an employee. This often has a dramatic effect on employees who only see their net pay, rather than the total cost an employer actually pays for an employee.

Typical benefits statements include:

- Gross Salary
- Employer cost of FICA, FUTA
- Employer cost of federal and state taxes

Employer cost of insurances (health, life, LTD, etc.)
Employer cost for employees to participate in a sponsored Employee Assistance Program
or a wellness program
Employer cost of unemployment
Employer cost of worker's compensation
Employer cost of pension fund(s)
Employer cost of other benefits provided
Total compensation for the employee

Appendix A: Non-Union 2017 Recommended Schedule

New PG	Recommended Title	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6M	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9	Step 10	Step 11	Step 12	Step 13
1100N	Admin Associate III-Conf	\$23.70	\$24.30	\$24.90	\$25.53	\$26.16	\$26.82	\$27.35	\$27.90	\$28.32	\$28.75	\$29.18	\$29.61	\$30.06
1100N	Admin Associate III-Legal	\$49,303	\$50,536	\$51,799	\$53,094	\$54,421	\$55,782	\$56,898	\$58,036	\$58,906	\$59,790	\$60,687	\$61,597	\$62,521
1100N	Payroll & Benefits Specialist													
1200N	Executive Assistant	\$25.60	\$26.24	\$26.90	\$27.57	\$28.26	\$28.96	\$29.54	\$30.13	\$30.59	\$31.04	\$31.51	\$31.98	\$32.46
		\$53,247	\$54,579	\$55,943	\$57,342	\$58,775	\$60,245	\$61,449	\$62,678	\$63,619	\$64,573	\$65,541	\$66,525	\$67,522
1300N	Business Process Analyst	\$28.42	\$29.13	\$29.85	\$30.60	\$31.37	\$32.15	\$32.79	\$33.45	\$33.95	\$34.46	\$34.98	\$35.50	\$36.03
1300N	Court Supervisor	\$59,105	\$60,582	\$62,097	\$63,649	\$65,240	\$66,871	\$68,209	\$69,573	\$70,617	\$71,676	\$72,751	\$73,842	\$74,950
1300N	Fleet Supervisor													
1400N	PW Program Analyst	\$30.40	\$31.16	\$31.94	\$32.74	\$33.56	\$34.40	\$35.09	\$35.79	\$36.33	\$36.87	\$37.42	\$37.99	\$38.56
1400N	System Administrator	\$63,242	\$64,823	\$66,444	\$68,105	\$69,807	\$71,552	\$72,983	\$74,443	\$75,560	\$76,693	\$77,844	\$79,011	\$80,196
1500N	Art Center Supervisor	\$32.84	\$33.66	\$34.50	\$35.36	\$36.25	\$37.15	\$37.90	\$38.65	\$39.23	\$39.82	\$40.42	\$41.03	\$41.64
1500N	Engineering Associate II	\$68,301	\$70,009	\$71,759	\$73,553	\$75,392	\$77,277	\$78,822	\$80,399	\$81,605	\$82,829	\$84,071	\$85,332	\$86,612
1500N	Human Resource Advisor													
1500N	PW Utility Supervisor													
1500N	Recreation Supervisor													
1500N	Senior Planner													
1600N	Civil Engineer	\$35.79	\$36.69	\$37.60	\$38.54	\$39.51	\$40.50	\$41.31	\$42.13	\$42.76	\$43.41	\$44.06	\$44.72	\$45.39
1500N	Library Operations Supervisor	\$74,448	\$76,310	\$78,217	\$80,173	\$82,177	\$84,231	\$85,916	\$87,634	\$88,949	\$90,283	\$91,637	\$93,012	\$94,407
1600N	PW Operations Manager													
1600N	Senior IT Analyst													
1700N	City Recorder	\$38.66	\$39.62	\$40.61	\$41.63	\$42.67	\$43.74	\$44.61	\$45.50	\$46.19	\$46.88	\$47.58	\$48.29	\$49.02

New PG	Recommended Title	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6M	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9	Step 10	Step 11	Step 12	Step 13
1700N	Planning Manager	\$80,404	\$82,414	\$84,475	\$86,587	\$88,751	\$90,970	\$92,789	\$94,645	\$96,065	\$97,506	\$98,968	\$100,453	\$101,960
1700N	Police Sergeant													
1700N	Senior Network Engineer													
1800N	Building Official	\$40.98	\$42.00	\$43.05	\$44.13	\$45.23	\$46.36	\$47.29	\$48.23	\$48.96	\$49.69	\$50.44	\$51.19	\$51.96
1800N	Library Manager	\$85,228	\$87,359	\$89,543	\$91,782	\$94,076	\$96,428	\$98,357	\$100,324	\$101,829	\$103,356	\$104,907	\$106,480	\$108,077
1800N	Utility Manager													
1900N	City Engineer	\$46.71	\$47.88	\$49.08	\$50.30	\$51.56	\$52.85	\$53.91	\$54.99	\$55.81	\$56.65	\$57.50	\$58.36	\$59.23
1900N	Police Captain	\$97,160	\$99,589	\$102,079	\$104,631	\$107,247	\$109,928	\$112,127	\$114,369	\$116,085	\$117,826	\$119,593	\$121,387	\$123,208
2000N	No Position	\$50.45	\$51.71	\$53.00	\$54.33	\$55.69	\$57.08	\$58.22	\$59.38	\$60.27	\$61.18	\$62.10	\$63.03	\$63.97
		\$104,933	\$107,557	\$110,246	\$113,002	\$115,827	\$118,722	\$121,097	\$123,519	\$125,372	\$127,252	\$129,161	\$131,098	\$133,065
2100N	Community Development Director	\$54.48	\$55.85	\$57.24	\$58.67	\$60.14	\$61.64	\$62.88	\$64.13	\$65.10	\$66.07	\$67.06	\$68.07	\$69.09
2100N	Community Services Director	\$113,328	\$116,161	\$119,065	\$122,042	\$125,093	\$128,220	\$130,785	\$133,400	\$135,401	\$137,432	\$139,494	\$141,586	\$143,710
2100N	Finance Director													
2100N	IT Director													
2100N	Public Works Director													
2200N	Assistant City Manager	\$57.21	\$58.64	\$60.11	\$61.61	\$63.15	\$64.73	\$66.02	\$67.34	\$68.35	\$69.38	\$70.42	\$71.47	\$72.55
AA	City Attorney	\$118,994	\$121,969	\$125,018	\$128,144	\$131,348	\$134,631	\$137,324	\$140,070	\$142,171	\$144,304	\$146,468	\$148,666	\$150,896
2200N	Police Chief													
BB	City Manager	\$62.93	\$64.50	\$66.12	\$67.77	\$69.46	\$71.20							\$79.80
		\$130,894	\$134,166	\$137,520	\$140,958	\$144,482	\$148,094							\$165,985

