



**WORK SESSION  
RICHFIELD MUNICIPAL CENTER, BARTHOLOMEW ROOM  
APRIL 9, 2024  
6:00 PM**

Call to order

1. Consider options to implement the Baker Tilly Compensation and Classification Study.

Adjournment

**Auxiliary aids for individuals with disabilities are available upon request. Requests must be made at least 96 hours in advance to the City Clerk at 612-861-9739.**



## **STAFF REPORT NO. 10**

### **WORK SESSION**

**4/9/2024**

REPORT PREPARED BY: Sack Thongvanh, Assistant City Manager

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR REVIEW:

OTHER DEPARTMENT REVIEW: Jamie Haefner - HR Kumud Verma - Finance Katie Rodriguez - Executive

CITY MANAGER REVIEW: Katie Rodriguez, City Manager  
4/4/2024

### **ITEM FOR WORK SESSION:**

**Consider options to implement the Baker Tilly Compensation and Classification Study.**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The compensation review process began last fall when staff completed the Position Analysis Questionnaires. Baker Tilly then collected compensation and benefit data from 11 peer cities, which was used by the consultant to recommend pay grades and a corresponding pay plan for each position. These recommendations underwent review by supervisors, department directors, and Human Resources. The questionnaires, market analysis and reviews did result in 35 positions being placed in higher grades. The overarching objective has been to place all positions in the appropriate pay grade based on job responsibilities and to align position pay ranges with market levels while establishing a consistent pay grade and step system to facilitate staff progression based on experience. Notably, all options being considered provide a greater increase for employees in lower pay grades compared to those at the higher end of the pay scale.

Below are three options to implement the Baker Tilly findings, which staff have analyzed. Attached to this report are some examples of how various positions would be impacted by the different options under consideration.

Option 1: This option brings all employees' salaries in line with market rates. Specifically, employees currently under the General Services Pay Plan would transition to the next highest step within their new pay grade. Most employees under the current Management Pay Plan would maintain their current wage until their anniversary under this option.

Option 1 Plus: Option 1 Plus encompasses Option 1, with an additional provision of a 1% minimum increase for all staff under the General Pay Plan upon implementation. Specifically, this entails granting a 1% raise to 32 out of 40 staff in pay grades 13-21 who would otherwise receive a 0% increase. Additionally, 22 out of 87 staff in pay grades 6-12 would receive a lump sum payment to ensure their increase upon implementation reaches at least 1%, as their proposed increase under Option 1 is currently below this threshold.

Option 2 (Years in Position): This option provides a 3% increase for each year in your current position, for up to 8 years in the General Pay Plan. After reviewing this option more carefully, it does not achieve the goal of better placing long-tenured staff at the appropriate starting salary. The vast majority of staff would still be placed as described above in Option 1. Why? Because, due to COLAs and merit increases over the past decade, most people with long tenure are already making more than they would if this scenario was to be

implemented. This option benefits only 24 people in the General Pay Plan, and only half of those 24 employees have more than 2 years in their position.

The City Manager sent a comprehensive email last week to all staff summarizing the proposed pay plans and implementation options. Staff then had time to submit comments to Human Resources. Three employees provided feedback which is summarized in the attached document. Staff can appeal their placement on the pay grades if they believe Baker Tilly made a mistake in assessing their questionnaire or if their job responsibilities have significantly changed since completing the questionnaire.

Based on a thorough analysis of the options and alignment with City goals to recruit and retain a high-quality workforce, staff recommends Option 1 Plus for implementation. Since there are always some timing challenges and frustration in implementing a significant change to compensation, Option 1 Plus is the most fair option since it provides a minimum of a 1% increase upon transition. Although it is more costly than Option 1, it is not a significant relative cost of maintaining competitive pay plans. We know we must be competitive and hope that our generous benefit package (which we believe is better than our peers), and our strong culture will continue to recruit and retain excellent staff.

### **DIRECTION NEEDED:**

**Council should consider the three options presented and provide feedback on the staff recommendation to implement Option 1 Plus, including whether to present this option for approval at the April 23 City Council Meeting.**

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

#### **A. HISTORICAL CONTEXT**

While the City has not conducted a comprehensive review of its entire compensation structure in over two decades, it has regularly conducted targeted market analyses for specific positions. Recent adjustments for liquor store associates and seasonal recreation staff demonstrate the City's responsiveness to evolving market conditions. In addition, negotiations with represented employees include compensation comparisons to peer cities which are then implemented via collective bargaining agreements. The City also regularly researches market comparisons when there is turnover in non-represented positions.

#### **B. EQUITABLE OR STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS OR IMPACTS**

The compensation and class study plays an important role in ensuring that the City maintains competitiveness in the marketplace by aligning with the strategic priority for a high-quality workforce. This study evaluates the compensation structure of positions within the organization to ensure that they are in line with industry standards and comparable to those offered by other peer employers in the market.

The development of the proposed pay plan is based in Systematic Analysis and Factor Evaluation (SAFE) scores for each position. The SAFE scores provide a more objective and consistent method to evaluate how positions are assigned to pay grades. This ensures better pay equity and will allow the City a better system to use for future job evaluations so that pay equity is maintained.

In sum, investing in a high-quality workforce through competitive and equitable compensation and classification practices is essential for the City to achieve its strategic priorities and deliver high-quality services to its residents.

#### **C. POLICIES (resolutions, ordinances, regulations, statutes, exc):**

#### **D. CRITICAL TIMING ISSUES:**

If there are no significant concerns or changes following the April 9 discussion, the recommended Pay Plans and implementation plans will be presented for approval at the April 23 Regular City Council Meeting.

Following approval, staff anticipate implementing changes in time for the May 5 to May 19 payroll, which will be paid on May 24. This schedule may change if there are unforeseen challenges in implementation.

**E. FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

It is the historically tight labor market, especially for some positions, that is driving most of the projected financial impact. Staffing shortages are particularly acute in law enforcement and public finance, pushing up average wages in the region. The upward wage pressure is also evident for our part-time and seasonal employees, and the lower pay grades in the General Plan. The average increase over the 3% COLA for the Specialized Plan is 4.2% compared to the General Plan at 1.6% for Option 1 and 2% for Options 1+ and 2. The dollar impact is less since we had already budgeted for some of these increases and the wages and hours are lower than for other groups. Please note that we had already increased wages for Liquor store employees so this is an additional market adjustment. The proportional gains for lower paid staff is also evident in the General Pay Plan. Staff broke out the average increase in the General Pay Plan for grades 6-10 at 2.3%, versus a .9% increase for grades 11-22 for Option 1. The market adjustment for grades 11-22 increases to 1.3% for Option 1+ since it would provide a 1% increase to 32 higher level staff who will not receive anything upon implementation for Option 1.

Presented below are the costs of the 3 options for the General and Specialized Pay Plans which include preliminary estimates to update the 5 union pay plans that are currently being negotiated. The estimates include PERA and FICA costs.

Options	Estimated Total Cost	Over Budgeted Reserves
Option 1	\$766,000	\$367,000
Option 1 Plus	\$801,000	\$402,000
Option 2 (Years in Position)	\$799,000	\$400,000

Again, the estimated cost to implement the new pay plans, including those being negotiated with our represented staff, is largely driven by the tight labor market. We will recommend using a combination of reserves and Public Safety Aid funding to close the gap in 2024 (note that the aid funding is limited to public safety related costs).

The levy impact for 2025 is expected to be 6-6.2% and this assumes a 3% COLA. If we levied to cover the 40% fund balance reserve requirement it would be 8-8.2%. The impact on the levy for the following few years is estimated to be 7%. We are working with our financial advisors, Ehlers, to refine these estimates as 2026-2028 are complicated due to the decertification of tax increment finance (TIF) districts which helps lessen the impact of levy increases on residents, the resulting loss in Local Government Aid and the impact of the higher personnel costs. The financial analysis will include using reserves and one-time funding to smooth out levy increases.

**F. LEGAL CONSIDERATION:**

**ALTERNATIVE(S):**

**PRINCIPAL PARTIES EXPECTED AT MEETING:**

Sack Thongvanh, Assistant City Manager Jamie Haefner, Human Resources Manager

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Description	Type
☐ Pay Plan_2024 (General)	Exhibit
☐ Pay Plan_2024 (Specialized)	Exhibit
☐ Pay Grades_2024 (General)	Exhibit
☐ Pay Grades_2024 (Specialized)	Exhibit
☐ Comp Class Implementation Scenarios	Exhibit
☐ Summary of Employee Feedback on Comp and Class Options	Backup Material

**Pay Plan - General**

City of Richfield, MN

Grade	Minimum					Midpoint	Maximum				
	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	\$34,053.01	\$34,989.46	\$35,951.67	\$36,940.34	\$37,956.20	\$39,000.00	\$40,072.50	\$41,174.49	\$42,306.79	\$43,470.23	\$44,665.66
2	\$36,436.72	\$37,438.73	\$38,468.29	\$39,526.17	\$40,613.14	\$41,730.00	\$42,877.58	\$44,056.71	\$45,268.27	\$46,513.15	\$47,792.26
3	\$38,987.20	\$40,059.35	\$41,160.98	\$42,292.91	\$43,455.96	\$44,651.00	\$45,878.90	\$47,140.57	\$48,436.94	\$49,768.95	\$51,137.60
4	\$41,716.68	\$42,863.89	\$44,042.64	\$45,253.82	\$46,498.30	\$47,777.00	\$49,090.87	\$50,440.87	\$51,827.99	\$53,253.26	\$54,717.72
5	\$44,845.19	\$46,078.43	\$47,345.59	\$48,647.59	\$49,985.40	\$51,360.00	\$52,772.40	\$54,223.64	\$55,714.79	\$57,246.95	\$58,821.24
6	\$48,208.58	\$49,534.31	\$50,896.51	\$52,296.16	\$53,734.31	\$55,212.00	\$56,730.33	\$58,290.41	\$59,893.40	\$61,540.47	\$63,232.83
7	\$51,824.31	\$53,249.48	\$54,713.84	\$56,218.47	\$57,764.48	\$59,353.00	\$60,985.21	\$62,662.30	\$64,385.51	\$66,156.12	\$67,975.41
8	\$55,710.72	\$57,242.76	\$58,816.94	\$60,434.40	\$62,096.35	\$63,804.00	\$65,558.61	\$67,361.47	\$69,213.91	\$71,117.29	\$73,073.02
9	\$59,888.76	\$61,535.70	\$63,227.93	\$64,966.70	\$66,753.28	\$68,589.00	\$70,475.20	\$72,413.27	\$74,404.63	\$76,450.76	\$78,553.15
10	\$64,380.26	\$66,150.72	\$67,969.87	\$69,839.04	\$71,759.61	\$73,733.00	\$75,760.66	\$77,844.08	\$79,984.79	\$82,184.37	\$84,444.44
11	\$69,208.81	\$71,112.05	\$73,067.63	\$75,076.99	\$77,141.61	\$79,263.00	\$81,442.73	\$83,682.41	\$85,983.67	\$88,348.22	\$90,777.80
12	\$74,399.71	\$76,445.70	\$78,547.95	\$80,708.02	\$82,927.49	\$85,208.00	\$87,551.22	\$89,958.88	\$92,432.75	\$94,974.65	\$97,586.45
13	\$81,095.92					\$92,877.00					\$106,369.55
14	\$88,394.62					\$101,236.00					\$115,942.89
15	\$99,001.69					\$113,384.00					\$129,855.67
16	\$107,912.23					\$123,589.00					\$141,543.19
17	\$116,005.49					\$132,858.00					\$152,158.73
18	\$121,805.86					\$139,501.00					\$159,766.78
19	\$127,896.11					\$146,476.00					\$167,755.06
20	\$134,291.09					\$153,800.00					\$176,143.04
21	\$141,005.64					\$161,490.00					\$184,950.19
22	\$148,056.36					\$169,565.00					\$194,198.27

### Pay Plan - Specialized

City of Richfield, MN

Grade	Minimum		Midpoint	Maximum	
	1	2	3	4	5
101	\$29,783.39	\$30,602.43	\$31,444.00	\$32,308.71	\$33,197.20
102	\$32,016.86	\$32,897.32	\$33,802.00	\$34,731.56	\$35,686.67
103	\$34,417.98	\$35,364.48	\$36,337.00	\$37,336.27	\$38,363.01
104	\$36,999.07	\$38,016.55	\$39,062.00	\$40,136.21	\$41,239.95
105	\$39,774.33	\$40,868.13	\$41,992.00	\$43,146.78	\$44,333.32

1	2	3	4	5
\$14.32	\$14.71	\$15.12	\$15.53	\$15.96
\$15.39	\$15.82	\$16.25	\$16.70	\$17.16
\$16.55	\$17.00	\$17.47	\$17.95	\$18.44
\$17.79	\$18.28	\$18.78	\$19.30	\$19.83
\$19.12	\$19.65	\$20.19	\$20.74	\$21.31

**GENERAL PAY GRADE  
2024 Proposed Pay Grades**

Department	Division	Title	Proposed Title	Grade
EXECUTIVE	City Manager	CITY MANAGER		22
POLICE	Police Operations	PUBLIC SAFETY DIRECTOR		21
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Administration	ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER		20
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR		20
FINANCE	Finance	FINANCE DIRECTOR		20
FIRE	Fire	FIRE SERVICES DIRECTOR		20
PUBLIC WORKS	Public Works Admin	PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR		20
RECREATION	Recreation	RECREATION SERVICES DIRECTOR		20
POLICE	Police Operations	DEPUTY PUBLIC SAFETY DIRECTOR		18
PUBLIC WORKS	Street	DEPUTY PW DIRECTOR		18
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Human Resources	HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER		17
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	HOUSING/REDEVELOPMENT MANAGER/ ASSISTANT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR	ASSISTANT CD DIRECTOR	17
FIRE	Fire	ASST FIRE CHIEF		17
PUBLIC WORKS	Engineering	CITY ENGINEER		17
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Building Services	GOVERNMENT BLDGS SUPERINTENDNT		16
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Information Technology	IT MANAGER		16
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Liquor Operations	LIQUOR OPERATIONS MANAGER		16
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL		16
PUBLIC WORKS	Water	UTILITY SUPERINTENDENT		16
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Communication	COMMUNICATIONS MANAGER		15
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	CITY PLANNER		15
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MANAGER		15
FINANCE	Finance	ASSISTANT FINANCE DIRECTOR		15
PUBLIC WORKS	Engineering	TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER		15
PUBLIC WORKS	Water	ASSISTANT UTILITIES SUPERINTD		15
RECREATION	Recreation	FACILITY/PROGRAM MANAGER - POOL/ARENA		15
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	City Clerk	CITY CLERK		14
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Information Technology	ASST IT MANAGER/BUS ANALYST		14
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	HRA	MULTI FAMILY HOUSING PRGM ADMN		14
FINANCE	Finance	PAYROLL ACCOUNTANT		14
POLICE	Support Services	SUPPORT SERVICES SUPERVISOR		14
PUBLIC WORKS	Central Garage	OPERATIONS SUPERVISOR		14
PUBLIC WORKS	Engineering	PROJECT ENGINEER		14
PUBLIC WORKS	Water	UTILITIES SUPERVISOR		14

**GENERAL PAY GRADE  
2024 Proposed Pay Grades**

RECREATION	Recreation	FACILITY/PROGRAM MANAGER		14
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	SENIOR BUILDING TRADE INSPECTOR		13
EXECUTIVE/PUBLIC WORKS	City Manager/PW Admin	MANAGEMENT ANALYST	SENIOR ANALYST	13
PUBLIC WORKS	Engineering	CIVIL ENGINEER		13
PUBLIC WORKS	Water	WATER RESOURCE ENGINEER		13
RECREATION	Recreation	RECREATION SUPERVISOR - FACILITIES		13
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Deputy Registrar	MOTOR VEHICLE/LIC SUPERVISOR		12
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Information Technology/Police Operations	IT TECHNICIAN II		12
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Liquor Operations	LIQUOR STORE MANAGER		12
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	PLANNER II		12
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	BUILDING/TRADE INSPECTOR		12
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	MECHANICAL/PLUMBING INSPECTOR		12
EXECUTIVE	City Manager	EQUITY COORDINATOR		12
POLICE	Police Operations	RECORDS SUPERVISOR		12
POLICE/RECREATION	Police Operations/Recreation	EXECUTIVE AIDE/ANALYST	ANALYST	12
PUBLIC WORKS	Public Works Admin	GIS COORDINATOR		12
RECREATION	Recreation	RECREATION SUPERVISOR		12
RECREATION	Recreation	SUSTAINABILITY SPECIALIST		12
RECREATION	Wood Lake Nature Center	NATURALIST		12
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Human Resources	HUMAN RESOURCES SPECIALIST		11
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Information Technology	IT TECHNICIAN I/HELP DESK		11
CD/FINANCE	CD(HRA)/Finance	CD ACCOUNTANT	ACCOUNTANT	11
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	HOUSING SPECIALIST		11
POLICE	Support Services	CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER		11
PUBLIC WORKS	Engineering	ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN		11
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Communication	COMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST		10
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	PLANNER I		10
POLICE	Police Operations	CRIME PREVENTION SPECIALIST		10
POLICE	Police Operations	POLICE DATA & MEDIA SPECIALIST		10
POLICE	Police Operations	RECORDS TECHNICIAN		10
PUBLIC WORKS	Engineering	ENGINEERING ASSISTANT		10
PUBLIC WORKS	Street	FORESTER		10
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Deputy Registrar	LEAD LICENSING CLERK	LEAD LICENSING TECHNICIAN	9
CD/EXECUTIVE	CD/City Manager/Fire	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT		9
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	ASSISTANT PLANNER	PLANNING TECHNICIAN	9
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	PERMIT TECHNICIAN		9
POLICE	Support Services	HEALTH/LICENSING SPECIALIST		9
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Deputy Registrar	LICENSING CLERK	LICENSING TECHNICIAN	8



**GENERAL PAY GRADE**  
**2024 Proposed Pay Grades**

CD/Rec/WLNC/PW	CD/Rec/WLNC/PW	SENIOR OFFICE ASST		<b>8</b>
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Community Development	HOUSING INSPECTIONS CLERK	HOUSING INSPECTIONS TECHNICIAN	<b>8</b>
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	HRA	MULTI FAMILY HOUSING ASST		<b>8</b>
FINANCE	Finance	ACCOUNTING CLERK	ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN	<b>8</b>
FINANCE	Finance	UTILITY BILLING CLERK	UTILITY BILLING TECHNICIAN	<b>8</b>
POLICE	Police Operations	SENIOR OFFICE ASST		<b>8</b>
POLICE	Support Services	COMMUNITY SERVICE OFFICER		<b>8</b>
POLICE	Support Services	LICENSING CLERK	BUSINESS LICENSING TECHNICIAN	<b>8</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Liquor Operations	LIQUOR OPERATIONS SHIFT LEADER		<b>7</b>
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	HRA	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TECH		<b>7</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Building Services	CUSTODIAN - PT		<b>6</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Deputy Registrar	CITY SERVICES RECEPTIONIST - PT		<b>6</b>

**SPECIALIZED PAY GRADE  
2024 Proposed Pay Grades**

<b>Department</b>	<b>Division</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Proposed Title</b>	<b>Grade</b>
RECREATION	Swimming Pool	POOL SUPERVISOR		<b>105</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	PLAYGROUND COORDINATOR		<b>105</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	ADAPTIVE COORDINATOR		<b>105</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	FARMERS MARKET COORDINATOR		<b>105</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	TENNIS COORDINATOR		<b>105</b>
RECREATION	Ice Arena	ICE RESURFACER OPERATOR		<b>104</b>
RECREATION	Swimming Pool	HEAD LIFEGUARD		<b>104</b>
RECREATION	Wood Lake Nature Center	NATURALIST I	SEASONAL NATURALIST	<b>104</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Communication	VIDEO PRODUCTION ASSISTANT		<b>103</b>
RECREATION	Ice Arena	AUDIO TECHNICIAN		<b>103</b>
RECREATION	Wood Lake Nature Center	CLERK TYPIST	OFFICE ASSISTANT	<b>103</b>
RECREATION	Wood Lake Nature Center	OFFICE AIDE	OFFICE ASSISTANT	<b>103</b>
PUBLIC WORKS	Park Maintenance	MAINTENANCE LABORER		<b>103</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Liquor Operations	LIQUOR SALES ASSOCIATE		<b>103</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	FARMERS MARKET CASHIER		<b>103</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	RECREATION ATTENDANT		<b>103</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	ADAPTIVE LEADER/SPECIALIST		<b>103</b>
RECREATION	Swimming Pool	LIFEGUARD		<b>103</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	PLAYGROUND LEADER		<b>102</b>
RECREATION	Ice Arena	ARENA EVENT ATTENDANT		<b>102</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	CONCESSION I		<b>102</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	INCLUSION FACILITATOR		<b>102</b>
RECREATION	Swimming Pool	POOL LEAD CASHIER/CONCESSION		<b>102</b>
RECREATION	Recreation	WINTER SPORTS ATTENDANT		<b>102</b>
RECREATION	Ice Arena	FACILITY CASHIER		<b>101</b>

Comp Class Implementation Scenarios Position Examples	Current	Option 1	Option 1+	YIP
<p><b>EXAMPLE 1</b> Part-time employee now at SP7-NE in the Specialized Pay Plan with 8 years in the position.</p> <p>Moves to Pay Grade 103 Step 5 in the Specialized Pay Plan.</p>	\$18.00/HR	\$18.44/HR	\$18.44/HR	\$18.44/HR
<p><b>EXAMPLE 2</b> Part-time employee now at GS2 Step 3 in the General Services Pay Plan with 1 year in the position.</p> <p>Moves to Pay Grade 8 and starts at Step 1 since currently below the Grade 8 range.</p>	\$25.77/HR	\$26.78/HR	\$26.78/HR	\$26.78/HR
<p><b>EXAMPLE 3</b> Employee now at GS4 Step 6 in the General Services Pay Plan with 9 years in the position (currently at max).</p> <p>Moves to Pay Grade 9 at Step 10.</p> <p>Option 1+: Would get a lump sum payment of \$105.34 to bring up to a 1% increase when implemented and move to next step at their next anniversary date.</p>	\$75,795.20	\$76,450.76	Option 1 + lump payment of \$105.34	\$76,450.76
<p><b>EXAMPLE 4</b> Employee now at GS6E at Step 2 in the General Services Pay Plan with 1 year in the position.</p> <p>Moves to Pay Grade 12 at Step 7.</p>	\$85,404.80	\$87,551.22	\$87,551.22	\$87,551.22
<p><b>EXAMPLE 5</b> Employee now at M-3 in the Management Pay Plan with 8 years in the position.</p> <p>Moves to Pay Grade 16.</p>	\$133,021.62	\$133,021.62	\$134,351.84	\$133,811.17

## **Summary of Employee Feedback**

On March 29<sup>th</sup>, staff were provided details on the options being presented for implementation of our compensation and classification study. With that communication, they were also encouraged to provide any comments on any of the options under consideration. Three employees emailed feedback directly to Human Resources and are summarized below:

- Some staff feel retention is an issue at the City and that higher pay would likely help resolve this issue, staff also shared while they appreciate our benefit offerings they would prefer higher pay over rich benefits.
- Some individuals expressed we could not properly compare their position to other cities properly as they believe they have many unique nuances in their job responsibilities that other cities positions do not have.
- There was concern over not considering “years in position” because individuals believe they would be placed higher in the new steps using this scenario versus the other two options.
- All other employee feedback involved explaining in more detail how each option would affect them individually with no specific opinions.