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## EXECUIVE SUMMARY

## Background

October 2017 through January 2019 Koff \& Associates ("K\&A") conducted a comprehensive Total Compensation Study for the County of Mendocino (County). All compensation findings and recommendations are presented in this report.

This compensation review process was precipitated by:
$>$ The concern of management and the employee groups that employees should be recognized for the level and scope of work performed and that they are paid on a fair and competitive basis that allows the County to recruit and retain a high-quality staff;
$>$ The desire to have a compensation plan that can meet the needs of the County; and
$>$ The desire to ensure that internal relationships of salaries are based upon objective, non-quantitative evaluation factors, resulting in equity across the County.

The goals of the compensation study are to assist the County in developing a competitive pay and benefit plan, which is based upon market data, and to ensure that the plan is fiscally responsible and meets the needs of the County with regards to recruitment and retention of qualified staff.

## Summary of Findings

This report summarizes the study methodology, analytical tools, and the total compensation (salary and benefits) survey findings. The results of the total compensation study showed:
$>$ The County's base salaries, overall, in comparison to the market are $\mathbf{2 2 . 8 \%}$ below the market average and 23.1\% below the market median.
$>$ The County's total compensation, overall, in comparison to the market is $8.6 \%$ below the market average and $7.5 \%$ below the market median.
> The County's benefits package puts the County in a more competitive position compared to the market.
$>$ K\&A considers a classification falling within $5 \%$ of the market median or average to be competitive.

## STUDY PROCESS

## Benchmark Classific ations

The County currently has 380 active classifications, and of those 145 classifications were selected to collect related salary and benefits data within the defined labor market. Classifications expected to provide a sufficient sample for analysis were selected as "benchmarks" to use as the basis to build the compensation plan. Benchmark classifications
are those classifications that are compared to the market, and these classifications are used as a means of anchoring the County's overall compensation plan to the market. Other classifications not surveyed will be included in the compensation plan and aligned to the benchmark classifications using internal equity principles.

The benchmark classifications are listed in Table 1.
Table 1. Benchmark Classification

| Classification Title |
| :--- |
| 1. Accountant |
| 2. Account Specialist II |
| 3. Account Specialist Supervisor |
| 4. Administrative Analyst II |
| 5. Administrative Secretary |
| 6. Administrative Services Manager II |
| 7. Agricultural Measures and Standards Specialist III |
| 8. Agricultural Commissioner/ Sealer Weights \& Measures |
| 9. Air Pollution Control Officer |
| 10. Air Quality Specialist |
| 11. Animal Clinic Technician |
| 12. Animal Control Assistant |
| 13. Animal Control Officer |
| 14. Animal Control Shelter Supervisor |
| 15. Animal Facility Attendant |
| 16. Applications Development Analyst II |
| 17. Assessment Information Supervisor |
| 18. Assessor |
| 19. Auditor |
| 20. Auditor-Appraiser |
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| 21. Auditor-Controller Classification Title |
| :--- |
| 22. Auto Mechanic II |
| 23. Benefits Specialist |
| 24. Bookmobile Driver |
| 25. Building Inspector II |
| 26. Building Maintenance Mechanic II |
| 27. Cartographer Planner |
| 28. Chief District Attorney Investigator |
| 29. Chief Executive Officer |
| 30. Chief Fiscal Officer |
| 31. Chief Operations Officer HHSA |
| 32. Chief Planner |
| 33. Chief Probation Officer |
| 34. Child Support Accounting Specialist |
| 35. Child Support Specialist II |
| 36. Civil Engineer |
| 37. Code Enforcement Officer I |
| 38. Communications Coordinator |
| 39. Community Health Services Specialist II Counsel |
| 40. Community Health Worker II |
| 41. Cook |
| 42. Corrections Deputy |


| Classification Title |
| :---: |
| 45. Custodian |
| 46. Department Analyst II |
| 47. Department Application Specialist |
| 48. Deputy CEO |
| 49. Deputy Clerk II - Board of Supervisors |
| 50. Deputy County Counsel II |
| 51. Deputy Director Mental Health Clinical Services |
| 52. Deputy Director of Social Services |
| 53. Deputy Director Public Health Nursing |
| 54. Deputy Director Substance Use Disorder Treatment |
| 55. Deputy Director Transportation - Engineering |
| 56. Deputy Director Transportation MT Services |
| 57. Deputy District Attorney II |
| 58. Deputy Probation Officer II |
| 59. Deputy Public Defender II |
| 60. Deputy Public Guardian/Administrator |
| 61. Deputy Sheriff-Coroner II |
| 62. Director Animal Care |
| 63. Director Child Support Services |
| 64. Director Cultural Services |
| 65. Director Environmental Health |
| 66. Director Human Resources |
| 67. Director Planning and Building |
| 68. Director Transportation |


| 69. District Attorney Classification Title |
| :--- |
| 70. District Attorney Investigator |
| 71. Eligibility Specialist II |
| 72. Eligibility Specialist Supervisor |
| 73. Emergency Services Coordinator |
| 74. Employment \& Training Worker II |
| 75. Environmental Compliance Specialist |
| 76. Environmental Health Manager |
| 77. Environmental Health Specialist II |
| 78. Executive Coordinator |
| 79. Facility and Fleet Division Manager |
| 80. Facility Project Specialist II |
| 81. Food and Laundry Service Supervisor (Jail) |
| 82. GIS Coordinator |
| 83. Grounds Maintenance Technician II |
| 84. Hazardous Material Operations Specialist |
| 85. Health and Human Services Agency Director |
| 86. Heavy Equipment Mechanic |
| 87. HR Analyst II |
| 88. HR Technician |
| 89. Human Resources Manager |
| 90. Information Services Division Manager |


| 93. Inmate Services Coordinator |
| :--- |
| 94. Juvenile Corrections Officer |
| 95. Legal Clerk II |
| 96. Legal Secretary II |
| 97. Librarian II |
| 98. Library Associate |
| 99. Mail Technician II |
| 100. Mental Health Clinician II |
| 101. Mental Health Rehab Specialist |
| 102. Museum Curator |
| 103. Network Systems Analyst II |
| 104. Nutritionist |
| 105. Office Services Supervisor |
| 106. Parts Specialist |
| 107. Payroll Officer |
| 108. Physical Therapist |
| 109. Planner III |
| 110. Program Manager |
| 111. Program Specialist II |
| 112. Property Tax Technician Safety Dispatcher |
| 113. Public Defender |
| 114. Public Defender Investigator |


| Classification Title |
| :--- |
| 117. Real Property Appraiser III |
| 118. Registered Veterinary Technician |
| 119. Retirement Financial/Investment Officer |
| 120. Retirement Specialist II CONF |
| 121. Revenue Recovery Specialist |
| 122. Right of Way/Environmental Agent |
| 123. Risk Analyst |
| 124. Road Maintenance Supervisor I |
| 125. Road Maintenance Worker III |
| 126. Safety Officer |
| 127. Sheriff-Coroner |
| 128. Sheriff's Evidence Technician |
| 129. Sheriff's Lieutenant |
| 130. Sheriff's Sergeant |
| 131. Social Worker Assistant II |
| 132. Social Worker II |
| 133. Social Worker Supervisor I Treasurer-Tax Collector |
| 134. Spay Neuter Adoption Coordinator |
| 135. Staff Assistant II |
| 136. Staff Services Administrator |
| 137. Substance Abuse Counselor II |


| Classification Title |
| :--- |
| 141. Treasury Specialist |
| 142. Undersheriff |
| 143. Veteran's Services Representative |
| 144. Victim/Witness Advocate |
| 145. Vital Statistics Technician |

## ComparatorAgencies

Another important step in conducting a market salary study is the determination of appropriate agencies for comparison. For this study K\&A surveyed the County's established labor market of eight counties and two cities.

Table 2. Comparator Agencies

| 1. | Agency |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | City of Santa Rosa Ukiah |
| 3. | County of El Dorado |
| 4. | County of Lake |
| 5. | County of Humboldt |
| 6. | County of Napa |
| 7. | County of Nevada |
| 8. | County of Sonoma |
| 9. County of Sutter |  |
| 10. County of Yolo |  |

## Salary and Benefits Data

The last element requiring discussion prior to beginning a market survey is the specific benefit data that will be collected and analyzed. The following salary and benefits data was collected for each benchmark classification (the cost of these benefits to each agency was converted into dollar amounts and can be found in Appendix II [Benefit Detail] of this report; these amounts were added to base salaries for total compensation purposes).
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## 1. Monthly Base Salary

The top of the salary range and/or control point. All figures are presented on a monthly basis.

## 2. Employee Retirement

The retirement reflects the benefits offered to the classic tier of employees:
> Retirement Formula: The service retirement formula for each agency's Classic plan. For agencies with retirement systems established under the County Employees Retirement Law of 1937 (" 37 Act"), including the County of Mendocino, retirement formulas were converted to the equivalent PERS formula for purposes of comparison.
> Enhanced Formula Cost: K\&A uses a baseline PERS formula of 2\%@62 for miscellaneous employees and $2 \% @ 57$ for safety employees. There is typically a cost to the employer for offering a formula with a higher benefit than the baseline formula. For each enhanced formula, the cost to the employer is based on a percentage range calculated by PERS. K\&A took the midpoint of the range and multiplied the percentage by the top monthly salary to calculate the cost of the enhanced formula. K\&A utilizes the PERS enhanced cost data as the basis for comparison across all defined benefit plans as the system performs the actuarial analysis to support the cost analysis and the size of the PERS system allows for the largest set of data to base a comparison on. The percentage value for each standard enhanced formula is listed below, in instances where there is a non-standard formula K\&A aligns the benefit with the most comparable standard formula.

## - Miscellaneous Employees

- $2 \% @ 60$ : midpoint of range $=1.5 \%$
- $2 \% @ 55$ : midpoint of range $=2.7 \%$
- $2.5 \% @ 55$ : midpoint of range $=4.9 \%$
- $2.7 \% @ 55$ : midpoint of range $=6.4 \%$
- 3\%@60: midpoint of range = 7.4\%


## - Safety Employees

- $2 \% @ 55$ : midpoint of range $=0.3 \%$
- $2.5 \% @ 57$ : midpoint of range $=3.5 \%$
- $2.7 \% @ 57$ : midpoint of range $=4.6 \%$
- $2 \% @ 50$ : midpoint of range $=5.1 \%$
- $3 \% @ 55$ : midpoint of range = 7.1\%
- $3 \% @ 50$ : midpoint of range $=8.9 \%$
$>$ Employer Paid Member Contribution: The amount of the employee's contribution to PERS that is paid by the employer (Employer Paid Member Contribution).
> Single Highest Year: The period for determining the average monthly pay rate when calculating retirement benefits. The base period is 36 highest paid consecutive months. When final compensation is based on a shorter period of time, such as 12 months' highest paid consecutive months, there is a cost to the employer. Similar to the enhanced formula, the cost to the employer is based on a percentage range calculated by PERS. K\&A took the midpoint of the range and multiplied the percentage by the top monthly salary to calculate the cost of the final compensation.
> Social Security: If an employer participates in Social Security, then the employer contribution of $6.2 \%$ of the base salary up to the federally determined maximum contribution of $\$ 663.40$ per month was reported.
> Other: Any other retirement contributions made by the employer.


## 3. Deferred Compensation

Deferred compensation contributions provided to all employees of a classification with or without requiring the employee to make a contribution is reported.

## 4. Insurances

The employer paid premiums for an employee with family coverage was reported. The employer paid insurances included:
> Cafeteria/Flexible Benefit Plan
> Medical
> Dental
$>$ Vision
> Life and Accidental Death and Dismemberment ("AD\&D") Insurances
> Long-Term Disability Insurance
$>$ Short-Term Disability Insurance
> Other
5. Leaves

Other than sick leave, which is usage-based, the number of hours off for which the employer is obligated. All hours have been translated into direct salary costs.
$>$ Vacation: The number of paid time off (or vacation) hours available to all employees who have completed five years of employment.
$>$ Holidays: The number of holiday hours (including floating hours) available to employees.
$>$ Administrative: Administrative (or management) leave is normally the number of paid leave hours available to Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") Exempt and/or management to reward for extraordinary effort (in lieu of overtime). This leave category may also include personal leave which may be available to augment vacation or other time off.

## 6. Auto Allowance

This category includes either the provision of an auto allowance or the provision of an auto for personal use only. If a vehicle is provided to any classification for commuting and other personal use, the average monthly rate is estimated at $\$ 450$. Mileage reimbursement is not included.

## 7. Other

This category includes any additional other benefits not captured above available to all in the class such as uniform allowance provided to Public Safety employees.

All of the benefit elements are negotiated benefits provided to all employees in the classification. As such, they represent an ongoing cost for which an agency must budget. Other benefit costs, such as sick leave, tuition reimbursement, and reimbursable mileage are usagebased and cannot be quantified on an individual employee basis.

## Data Collection

Data was collected during the months of October 2017- January 2019, through comparator agency websites, conversations with human resources, accounting, and/or finance personnel, and careful review of agency documentation such as classification descriptions, memoranda of understanding, organization charts, and other documents.

## Matching Methodology

K\&A believes that the data collection step is the most critical for maintaining the overall credibility of any study and relied on the County's classification descriptions as the foundation for comparison.

When K\&A researches and collects data from the comparator agencies to identify possible matches for each of the benchmark classifications, there is an assumption that comparable matches may not be made that are $100 \%$ equivalent to the classifications at the County. Therefore, K\&A does not match based upon job titles, which can often be misleading, but rather analyzes class descriptions before a comparable match is determined.

K\&A's methodology is to analyze each class description and the whole position by evaluating factors such as:
> Definition and typical job functions;
> Distinguishing characteristics;
$>$ Level within a class series (i.e., entry, experienced, journey, specialist, lead, etc.);
> Reporting relationship structure (for example, manages through lower-level staff);
> Education and experience requirements;
> Knowledge, abilities, and skills required to perform the work;
$>$ The scope and complexity of the work;
> Independence of action/responsibility;
$>$ The authority delegated to make decisions and take action;
$>$ The responsibility for the work of others, program administration, and for budget dollars;
> Problem solving/ingenuity;
$>$ Contacts with others (both inside and outside of the organization);
> Consequences of action and decisions; and
> Working conditions.
In order for a match to be included, K\&A requires that a classification's "likeness" be at approximately $70 \%$ of the matched classification.

When an appropriate match is not identified for one classification, K\&A often uses "brackets" which can be functional or represent a span in scope of responsibility.
$>$ A functional bracket means that the job of one classification at the County is performed by two or more classifications at a comparator agency.
$>$ A span of control bracket means that the comparator agency has one class that is "bigger" in scope and responsibility and one class that is "smaller," where the County's class falls in the middle.

If an appropriate match could not be found, then no match was reported as a non-comparable (N/C).

## Data Spreadsheets

For each benchmark classification, there are three information pages:
> Top Monthly Salary Data
> Benefit Detail (Monthly Equivalent Values)
> Total Monthly Compensation
The average (mean) and median (midpoint) of the comparator agencies are reported on the top monthly base salary and total compensation data spreadsheets. The \% above or below that the County is compared to the average and median is also reported.

The average is the sum of the comparator agencies' salaries/total compensation divided by the number of matches. The median is the midpoint of all data with $50 \%$ of data points below and $50 \%$ of data points above.

In order to calculate the average and median, K\&A requires that there be a minimum of four (4) comparator agencies with matching classifications to the benchmark classification. The reason for requiring a minimum of four matches is so that no one classification has undue influence on
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the calculations. Sufficient data was collected from the comparator agencies for 117 of the 145 benchmark classifications.

When using survey data to make salary range recommendations and adjustments, K\&A recommends using the median, rather than the average, because the median is not skewed by extremely high or low salary values. However, the County has historically based market recommendations on the market average and, accordingly, we have used the average in our range placement recommendations to stay consistent with County practices.

## MARKETCOMPENSATION RNDINGS

The following table represents a summary of the market top monthly (base) salary and total compensation (base salary plus benefits [retirement, insurance, leaves, and allowances]) findings. For each benchmark classification, the number of matches (agencies with a comparable position) and percent above or below the top monthly salary market average and total compensation market average is listed. The table is sorted by top base salary in descending order from the most positive percentile (above market) to the most negative (below market).

Table 3. Market Average Compensation Results Summary

| Classification Title | Top <br> Matches | Total <br> Monthly \% <br> Above or <br> Below | Compensation <br> \% Above or <br> Below |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Deputy Clerk II - Board of Supervisors | 8 | $5.3 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |
| 2. Building Inspector II | 9 | $0.1 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ |
| 3. Social Worker Assistant II | 5 | $-0.2 \%$ | $12.3 \%$ |
| 4. Deputy Public Guardian/Administrator | 6 | $-0.5 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ |
| 5. Director Planning and Building | 40 | $-2.5 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| 6. Treasury Specialist | 10 | $-3.3 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ |
| 7. Administrative Secretary | 4 | $-4.1 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ |
| 8. Legal Clerk II | 8 | $-5.0 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ |
| 9. Office Services Supervisor | 8 | $-6.0 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| 10. Corrections Lieutenant | $4.9 \%$ |  |  |
| 11. Mental Health Clinician II | $8.4 \%$ |  |  |


| Classification Title | \# of Matches | Top Monthly \% Above or Below | Total Compensation \% Above or Below |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12. Treasurer-Tax Collector | 6 | -6.9\% | 9.1\% |
| 13. Revenue Recovery Specialist | 7 | -7.6\% | 4.1\% |
| 14. Auditor-Appraiser | 8 | -8.1\% | 3.4\% |
| 15. Deputy Probation Officer II | 8 | -8.1\% | 5.5\% |
| 16. Ag Measures and Standards Specialist III | 8 | -8.4\% | 1.5\% |
| 17. Social Worker Supervisor I | 8 | -8.9\% | -0.0\% |
| 18. Auditor | 8 | -9.7\% | 1.3\% |
| 19. Deputy Director Public Health Nursing | 8 | -9.9\% | -3.0\% |
| 20. Property Tax Technician | 6 | -10.2\% | 0.6\% |
| 21. Eligibility Specialist Supervisor | 8 | -10.3\% | 0.8\% |
| 22. Staff Assistant II | 8 | -11.4\% | 4.3\% |
| 23. Librarian II | 6 | -11.7\% | -0.2\% |
| 24. Social Worker II | 8 | -11.8\% | 0.7\% |
| 25. Sheriff's Evidence Technician | 7 | -11.9\% | 2.9\% |
| 26. Community Health Services Specialist II | 7 | -12.1\% | 2.4\% |
| 27. Library Associate | 4 | -12.2\% | 3.2\% |
| 28. Veteran's Services Representative | 7 | -12.4\% | 1.5\% |
| 29. Heavy Equipment Mechanic | 9 | -12.6\% | 1.0\% |
| 30. Auditor-Controller | 8 | -13.2\% | -0.7\% |
| 31. Chief Executive Officer | 8 | -13.2\% | -8.0\% |
| 32. Administrative Services Manager II | 6 | -13.4\% | -4.7\% |
| 33. Health and Human Services Agency Director | 6 | -13.4\% | -8.4\% |
| 34. Public Health Nurse | 8 | -13.6\% | -3.8\% |


| Classification Title | \# of Matches | Top <br> Monthly \% <br> Above or <br> Below | Total Compensation \% Above or Below |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35. Agricultural Commissioner/ Sealer Weights \& Measures | 8 | -13.8\% | -6.2\% |
| 36. Corrections Deputy | 8 | -14.0\% | 1.8\% |
| 37. Assessor | 8 | -14.3\% | 1.1\% |
| 38. Eligibility Specialist II | 8 | -14.3\% | 0.1\% |
| 39. Facility and Fleet Division Manager | 8 | -16.3\% | -6.2\% |
| 40. Victim/Witness Advocate | 8 | -16.3\% | -0.9\% |
| 41. Program Specialist II | 7 | -16.4\% | -3.7\% |
| 42. Code Enforcement Officer I | 7 | -16.9\% | -3.3\% |
| 43. Account Specialist II | 9 | -17.2\% | 0.4\% |
| 44. Legal Secretary II | 9 | -17.6\% | -1.8\% |
| 45. Road Maintenance Supervisor I | 8 | -17.9\% | -4.3\% |
| 46. Public Safety Dispatcher | 8 | -18.0\% | -2.6\% |
| 47. Chief Probation Officer | 8 | -18.2\% | -7.7\% |
| 48. Substance Abuse Counselor II | 6 | -18.6\% | -1.1\% |
| 49. Planner III | 9 | -19.2\% | -7.9\% |
| 50. Sheriff-Coroner | 8 | -20.0\% | -6.8\% |
| 51. Nutritionist | 7 | -20.3\% | -8.2\% |
| 52. District Attorney | 8 | -20.5\% | -4.2\% |
| 53. Employment \& Training Worker II | 7 | -20.7\% | -3.7\% |
| 54. Accountant | 9 | -20.8\% | -6.9\% |
| 55. Emergency Services Coordinator | 7 | -21.2\% | -12.5\% |
| 56. Right of Way/Environmental Agent | 4 | -21.2\% | -7.5\% |


| Classification Title | \# of Matches | Top <br> Monthly \% <br> Above or <br> Below | Total Compensation \% Above or Below |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 57. Road Maintenance Worker III | 9 | -21.7\% | -4.4\% |
| 58. HR Analyst II | 10 | -21.9\% | -8.7\% |
| 59. Environmental Health Specialist II | 8 | -22.1\% | -7.8\% |
| 60. HR Technician | 9 | -22.3\% | -8.5\% |
| 61. Information Systems Technician II | 9 | -22.9\% | -7.9\% |
| 62. Child Support Specialist II | 8 | -23.3\% | -4.9\% |
| 63. Risk Analyst | 7 | -23.4\% | -7.5\% |
| 64. Animal Control Officer | 7 | -23.6\% | -3.8\% |
| 65. Community Health Worker II | 6 | -23.9\% | -5.4\% |
| 66. Parts Specialist | 4 | -24.0\% | -2.4\% |
| 67. Environmental Compliance Specialist | 8 | -24.3\% | -9.4\% |
| 68. Public Defender | 7 | -25.1\% | -17.1\% |
| 69. Chief Planner | 10 | -25.3\% | -13.4\% |
| 70. Director Human Resources | 10 | -26.0\% | -16.1\% |
| 71. Custodian | 10 | -26.2\% | -4.4\% |
| 72. Mental Health Rehab Specialist | 4 | -26.7\% | -11.6\% |
| 73. Applications Development Analyst II | 9 | -26.8\% | -12.7\% |
| 74. Hazardous Material Operations Specialist | 5 | -26.9\% | -8.7\% |
| 75. Real Property Appraiser III | 8 | -27.2\% | -10.3\% |
| 76. Mail Technician II | 4 | -27.2\% | -0.9\% |
| 77. Account Specialist Supervisor | 5 | -27.9\% | -10.9\% |
| 78. Sheriff's Lieutenant | 10 | -28.2\% | -14.5\% |
| 79. Human Resources Manager | 6 | -28.5\% | -15.2\% |


| Classification Title | \# of Matches | Top <br> Monthly \% <br> Above or <br> Below | Total Compensation \% Above or Below |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80. Undersheriff | 7 | -28.6\% | -14.3\% |
| 81. Administrative Analyst II | 9 | -28.8\% | -12.9\% |
| 82. Cook | 8 | -29.0\% | -6.0\% |
| 83. Assessment Information Supervisor | 4 | -29.5\% | -16.9\% |
| 84. Retirement Specialist II CONF | 9 | -30.1\% | -13.1\% |
| 85. Staff Services Administrator | 5 | -30.3\% | -14.3\% |
| 86. Deputy Sheriff-Coroner II | 10 | -30.6\% | -11.8\% |
| 87. Substance Abuse Program \& Services Manager | 7 | -31.4\% | -16.5\% |
| 88. District Attorney Investigator | 8 | -31.5\% | -51.8\% |
| 89. Animal Facility Attendant | 4 | -31.5\% | -9.2\% |
| 90. Network Systems Analyst II | 9 | -31.6\% | -16.6\% |
| 91. Chief District Attorney Investigator | 8 | -31.6\% | -18.2\% |
| 92. Building Maintenance Mechanic II | 9 | -31.7\% | -9.9\% |
| 93. Program Manager | 8 | -32.2\% | -17.9\% |
| 94. Juvenile Corrections Officer | 8 | -32.7\% | -9.2\% |
| 95. Sheriff's Sergeant | 10 | -33.4\% | -15.5\% |
| 96. Food and Laundry Service Supervisor (Jail) | 5 | -34.1\% | -12.4\% |
| 97. Department Analyst II | 10 | -34.4\% | -16.4\% |
| 98. Grounds Maintenance Technician II | 10 | -35.0\% | -10.4\% |
| 99. Auto Mechanic II | 10 | -35.8\% | -12.6\% |
| 100. Deputy Director Transportation MT Services | 7 | -36.0\% | -21.4\% |
| 101. Deputy CEO | 7 | -36.1\% | -25.4\% |
| 102. Director Environmental Health | 5 | -36.5\% | -22.3\% |


| Classification Title | \# of Matches | Top Monthly \% Above or Below | Total Compensation \% Above or Below |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 103. Deputy District Attorney II | 8 | -36.8\% | -17.9\% |
| 104. Facility Project Specialist II | 4 | -37.2\% | -18.1\% |
| 105. Civil Engineer | 9 | -38.9\% | -21.5\% |
| 106. Director Child Support Services | 8 | -39.7\% | -26.2\% |
| 107. Director Transportation | 7 | -41.2\% | -28.4\% |
| 108. Deputy Director of Social Services | 7 | -41.4\% | -26.1\% |
| 109. Deputy County Counsel II | 9 | -41.7\% | -24.3\% |
| 110. Deputy Public Defender II | 6 | -43.3\% | -24.0\% |
| 111. Environmental Health Manager | 5 | -43.3\% | -28.0\% |
| 112. Deputy Director Mental Health Clinical Services | 6 | -44.9\% | -28.6\% |
| 113. Physical Therapist | 7 | -47.7\% | -28.2\% |
| 114. Information Systems Network Manager | 9 | -48.1\% | -31.5\% |
| 115. County Counsel | 9 | -53.1\% | -37.8\% |
| 116. Public Defender Investigator | 5 | -53.3\% | -31.6\% |
| 117. Deputy Director Transportation - Engineering | 6 | -70.6\% | -49.5\% |
| 118. Air Pollution Control Officer | 3 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 119. Air Quality Specialist | 2 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 120. Animal Clinic Technician | 3 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 121. Animal Control Assistant | 0 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 122. Animal Control Shelter Supervisor | 3 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 123. Benefits Specialist | 1 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 124. Bookmobile Driver | 1 | Insufficient Data |  |

## Total Compensation Study - Final Report County of Mendocino

| Classification Title | \# of Matches | Top Monthly \% Above or Below | Total <br> Compensation \% Above or Below |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 125. Cartographer Planner | 0 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 126. Chief Fiscal Officer | 3 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 127. Chief Operations Officer HHSA | 2 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 128. Child Support Accounting Specialist | 1 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 129. Communications Coordinator | 0 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 130. Department Application Specialist | 1 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 131. Deputy Director Substance Use Disorder Treatment | 3 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 132. Director Animal Care | 3 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 133. Director Cultural Services | 0 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 134. Executive Coordinator | 2 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 135. GIS Coordinator | 3 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 136. Information Services Division Manager | 0 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 137. Inmate Services Coordinator | 1 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 138. Museum Curator | 2 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 139. Payroll Officer | 1 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 140. Registered Veterinary Technician | 2 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 141. Retirement Financial/Investment Officer | 1 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 142. Safety Officer | 2 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 143. Spay Neuter Adoption Coordinator | 0 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 144. Surveyor II | 0 | Insufficient Data |  |
| 145. Vital Statistics Technician | 2 | Insufficient Data |  |

## Base Salary

Top monthly salary market results show that two (2) benchmark classifications are paid above the market average:
$>$ One (1) classification is paid above the market average by less than 5\%;
$>$ One (1) classification is paid above the market average by more than $5 \%$ and less than 10\%;

Top monthly salary market results show that one hundred fifteen (115) benchmark classifications are paid below the market average:
$>$ Six (6) classifications are paid below the market average by less than 5\%;
$>$ Eleven (11) classifications are paid below the market average by 5\% or more and less than 10\%;
$>$ Thirty (30) classifications are paid below the market average by more than $10 \%$ and less than 20\%;
$>$ Thirty-four (34) are paid below the market average by $20 \%$ or more and less than $30 \%$;
$>$ Thirty-four (34) are paid below the market average by more than $30 \%$.
There were twenty-eight (28) classifications in which K\&A was unable to find four (4) matches within the comparator agencies and are indicated by an Insufficient Data notation.

Of the 117 benchmarks that sufficient data was obtained, seven (7), or six percent (6\%) fell within $5 \%$ of the market average. Generally, a classification falling within $5 \%$ of the average is considered to be competitive in the labor market for salary survey purposes because of the differences in compensation policy, actual scope of work, and position requirements. However, the County can adopt a different standard.

## Total Compensation

Total compensation market results show that thirty (30) benchmark classifications are paid above the market average:
$>$ Twenty (20) classifications are paid above the market average by less than $5 \%$;
$>$ Seven (7) classifications are paid above the market average by more than $5 \%$ and less than 10\%; and
$>$ Three (3) classifications are paid above the market average by more than $10 \%$ and less than 20\%.

Total compensation market results show that eighty-six (86) benchmark classifications are paid below the market average:
> Twenty (20) classifications are paid below the market average by less than $5 \%$;
$>$ Twenty-two (22) classifications are paid below the market average by more than $5 \%$ and less than 10\%;
> Twenty-seven (27) classifications are paid below the market average by more than 10\% and less than $20 \%$.
$>$ Twelve (12) are paid below the market average by more than $20 \%$ and less than $30 \%$;
$>$ Five (5) are paid below the market average by more than $30 \%$.
$>$ One (1) classification is paid at market average.
Of the 117 benchmarks that sufficient data was obtained, forty (40), or thirty-four percent (34\%) fell within $5 \%$ of the market average. Overall, the differences between market base salaries and total compensation indicate that the County's benefits package puts the County at a more competitive advantage. Further analysis indicates that, on average, classifications are $22.8 \%$ below the market average for base salaries, while that figure changes to $8.6 \%$ below the market average for total compensation, which is a $14.2 \%$ difference (i.e., the County "gains" a $14.2 \%$ competitive advantage when taking benefits into consideration).

## Benefits

The market benefits data reveals the major contributing factor providing the competitive advantage is the County's contribution to healthcare. We found that the County contributed a dollar amount approximately $38 \%$ greater than the average of the ten comparator agencies.

## INIERNALSALARY RELATIONSHIPS

Building from the salary levels established for identified benchmark classes, internal salary relationships can be developed and consistently applied in order to develop specific salary recommendations for all non-benchmarked classifications. While analyzing internal relationships, the same factors analyzed when comparing the County's classifications to the labor market are used when making internal salary alignment recommendations.

In addition, the following are standard human resources practices that are commonly applied when making salary recommendations based upon internal relationships:
$>$ A salary within $5 \%$ of the market average or median is considered to be competitive in the labor market for salary survey purposes because of the differences in compensation policy and actual scope of the position and its requirements.
$>$ Certain internal percentages are often applied. Those that are the most common are:

- The differential between a trainee and experienced (or journey) class in a series (I/II or Trainee/Experienced) is generally $10 \%$ to $15 \%$.
- A lead or advanced journey-level (III or Senior-level) class is generally placed 10\% to $15 \%$ above the journey-level.
- A full supervisory class is normally placed at least $15 \%$ to $25 \%$ above the highest level supervised, depending upon the breadth and scope of supervision.
- Depending on the organizational structure and scope of responsibility midmanagement classifications would typically be aligned at least $15 \%$ to $40 \%$ above the highest level supervised.
> When a market or internal equity adjustment is granted to one class in a series, the other classes in the series are also adjusted accordingly to maintain internal equity.

Internal equity between certain levels of classifications is a fundamental factor to be considered when making salary decisions. When conducting a market compensation survey, results can often show that certain classifications that are aligned with each other are not the same in the outside labor market. However, as an organization, careful consideration should be given to these alignments because they represent internal value of classifications within job families, as well as across the organization.

For the purposes of this study, the County should utilize market data to develop the salary recommendations for all of the benchmarked classifications and use internal equity principles to make the salary recommendations for the classifications that were not benchmarked. For the non-benchmarked classifications, internal alignments with other classifications will need to be considered, either in the same class series or those classifications that have similar scope of work, level of responsibility, and "worth" to the County. Where it is difficult to ascertain internal relationships due to unique qualifications and responsibilities, reliance can be placed on past internal relationships. It is important for County management to carefully review these internal relationships and determine if they are still appropriate given the current market data.

It is also important to analyze market data and internal relationships within class series as well as across the organization, and make adjustments to salary range placements, as necessary, based on the needs of the organization.

The County may want to make internal equity adjustments or alignments, as it implements the compensation strategy. This market survey is only a tool to be used by the County to determine market indexing and salary determination.

## Pay Philosophy

The Country has many options regarding what type of compensation plan it wants to implement. This decision will be based on what the County's pay philosophy is, at which level it is able to pay its employees compared to the market, whether it is going to consider additional alternative compensation programs, and how great the competition is with other agencies over recruitment of a highly qualified workforce.

## O ptions for Implementation

Each organization will have to assess their ability and positioning relative to the market. While the County may be interested in bringing salaries to the desired market position, in most cases this goal may not be reached with a single adjustment. One option is to move employees into the salary range that is recommended for each class based on this market study and to the step within the new range that is closest to their current compensation. If employees' current
salaries are significantly below market so that their current compensation falls below the bottom of the newly recommended range, then larger adjustments would be needed to move those employees at least to the bottom of the new salary range.
Another option is to use a phased implementation approach. Normally, if the compensation implementation program must be carried over months or years, the classes that are farthest from the desired market position should receive the greatest equity increase (separate from any COLAs). If a class falls within $5 \%$ of the desired market position, it would be logical to not make an equity adjustment in the first round of changes. However, if a class is more than $5 \%$ below the desired market position, a higher percentage change may be initially warranted to reduce the disparity.

For example, if the County decided to implement the recommendations over a three-year period, then the following guidelines could be applied for the initial increase of the three-year implementation plan:
Table 4. Three-Year Implementation Proposal

| Market Disparity | \% Increase |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 to $4.99 \%$ | 0 to $2.49 \%$ |
| $5.0 \%$ to $9.99 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ to $4.99 \%$ |
| $10.0 \%$ to $14.99 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ to $7.49 \%$ |
| $15.0 \%$ to $19.99 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ to $9.99 \%$ |
| $20.0 \%$ and above | $10.0 \%$ |

The initial first year adjustment would provide a portion of the equity increase and place the class into the closest step (but not below) where they are now. Subsequent increases would be spaced on a similar schedule (at annual intervals) based upon the remaining disparity after each adjustment.
Please note that typically, for those classes that had a market disparity of 0 to $4.99 \%$, K\&A recommends a $0 \%$ increase in the first year and an adjustment in the second year. Depending upon the County's financial situation, which will have to be reviewed before each further adjustment is made, all market disparity adjustments are intended to be completed by the third year. The County may also consider a similar implementation plan over a longer period of time, like a five-year implementation plan.

The County will need to spend additional time to go through a process of deliberation and decision-making as to what compensation philosophy it should implement to attract, motivate, and retain a high-quality workforce. However, the County may want to consider adjusting those classifications' salaries that are currently below the desired market position as soon as possible, assuming that incumbents' performance meets the County's level of expectation.

When classifications are over market, K\&A typically recommends Y-rating employees whose current pay exceeds the maximum of the recommended range until the market numbers "catch up" with their current salary. To Y-rate an employee means to keep the employee's salary frozen and to provide no salary increases (including no cost of living adjustments) until the employee's current salary is within the recommended salary range. This will result in no immediate loss of income, but will delay any future increases until the incumbent's salary is within the salary range.

Other options to "freezing" a classification's salary in place until the market catches up are:
> "Grandfathering" of salary ranges: This means that the salary range for the classification is adjusted down to what the market numbers are. However, current incumbents would continue being paid at the current rate of pay (which would put them outside of the new and adjusted salary range for the class) until they separate from employment with County. Any new-hires would be paid within the newly established salary range.
$>$ Single-incumbent classes: If a class only has one incumbent, an option would be to wait until the employee separates from employment with County and then adjust the salary range for the class according to the market.
$>$ Recent hires: Some employees who have recently been hired may still be at one of the lower steps within their current salary range. So, even if the top of their current salary range is above market, the incumbents are currently still paid below the market maximum because they are not at the top of their current salary range. In this case, an immediate salary range adjustment could be made to bring the salary range within the market. This would bring the affected incumbents either to the top of the market range or very close to it, but they would not technically be Y-rated or lose any pay.

Another option, of course, is to actually reduce salaries down to the market. However, from an employee relations perspective this may not be a viable option.

## USING THE MARKETDATA ASA TOOL

K\&A would like to reiterate that this report and the findings are meant to be a tool for the County to create and implement an equitable compensation plan. Compensation strategies are designed to attract and retain excellent staff; however, financial realities and the County's expectations may also come into play when determining appropriate compensation philosophies and strategies. The collected data presented herein represents a market survey that will give the County an instrument to make future compensation decisions.

It has been a pleasure working with County on this critical project. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide any additional information or clarification regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted by,

## Koff \& Associates



Katie Kaneko
President
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