

# Wages and Salary Scale Study for Washington County, Maryland

## REPORT



Evergreen Solutions, LLC

April 10, 2018

# Table of Contents

|   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|---|-------------|
| <b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>                                    | <b>1-1</b>  |
| 1.1 Study Methodology.....                                      | 1-2         |
| 1.2 Report Organization.....                                    | 1-3         |
| <b>2.0 SUMMARY OF EMPLOYEE OUTREACH .....</b>                   | <b>2-1</b>  |
| 2.1 General Feedback .....                                      | 2-1         |
| 2.2 Compensation.....   | 2-1         |
| 2.3 Classification.....   | 2-2         |
| 2.4 Benefits .....  | 2-2         |
| 2.5 Market Peers .....  | 2-3         |
| 2.6 Recruitment and Retention .....                             | 2-3         |
| 2.7 Performance Evaluation.....                                 | 2-3         |
| 2.8 Summary .....   | 2-4         |
| <b>3.0 ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT CONDITIONS.....</b>                | <b>3-1</b>  |
| 3.1 Pay Plan Analysis.....                                      | 3-1         |
| 3.2 Employee Salary Placement by Grade .....                    | 3-3         |
| 3.3 Salary Quartile Analysis.....                               | 3-7         |
| 3.4 Employees by Department.....                                | 3-9         |
| 3.5 Summary .....   | 3-11        |
| <b>4.0 MARKET SUMMARY.....</b>                                  | <b>4-1</b>  |
| 4.1 Salary Survey Results.....                                  | 4-1         |
| 4.2 Salary Survey Summary .....                                 | 4-7         |
| 4.3 Benefits Survey Results .....                               | 4-7         |
| 4.4 Benefits Summary .....                                      | 4-17        |
| 4.5 Market Summary .....  | 4-17        |
| <b>5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>                                | <b>5-1</b>  |
| 5.1 Classification System .....                                 | 5-1         |
| 5.2 Compensation System .....                                   | 5-3         |
| 5.3 Compensation and Classification System Administration ..... | 5-6         |
| 5.4 Summary .....   | 5-8         |



## Chapter 1 - Introduction

Evergreen Solutions conducted a Wages and Salary Scale Study for Washington County, MD (County) beginning in March 2017. The purpose of the study was to analyze its classification and compensation system and make recommendations to improve the County's competitive position in the market. The study activities involved analyzing the internal and external equity of the County's system and making recommendations in response to those findings. Study tasks involved:

- leading orientation and focus group sessions for employees and conducting interviews with department heads;
- evaluating the County's current salary structure to determine its strengths and weaknesses;
- collecting classification information through the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) to analyze the internal equity of the County's classifications;
- developing recommendations for improvements to classification titles and the creation of new titles as appropriate;
- facilitating discussions with the study team to develop an understanding of the County's compensation philosophy;
- conducting market salary and benefits surveys to assess the market competitiveness of the County's current pay plan and to determine common benefits offered by peer organizations;
- recommending a competitive compensation structure that balances both internal and external equity;
- providing the County with information and strategies regarding compensation and classification administration;
- providing recommendations for the revision of job descriptions to reflect recommended classification changes, employee responses to the JAT, and Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) status recommendations; and
- developing and submitting draft and final reports that summarize the study findings and recommendations.



## 1.1 STUDY METHODOLOGY

Evergreen Solutions used a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to develop recommendations to improve the County’s competitive position for its classification and compensation system. Study activities included the following:

### **Kick-off Meeting**

The kick-off meeting allowed members of the study team from the County and Evergreen Solutions to discuss different aspects of the study. During the meeting, information about the County’s compensation and classification structure and pay philosophies was shared and the work plan for the study was finalized. The meeting also provided an opportunity for Evergreen Solutions to explain the types of data needed to begin the study.

### **Employee Outreach**

The orientation sessions, which occurred in May 2017, provided an opportunity for employees and supervisors to learn more information about the purpose of the study, and receive specific information related to their participation in the study process. The focus group meetings and department head interviews followed the orientation meetings and allowed County employees, supervisors, and senior management to identify practices that were working well at the County, as well as to suggest areas of opportunities for improvement regarding compensation, classification, benefits, and performance evaluation. The feedback received during these sessions is summarized in **Chapter 2** of this report.

### **Classification Analysis**

To perform an analysis of the County’s classification system, all employees were asked to complete a JAT in which they had the opportunity to describe the work they performed in their own words. Supervisors were then asked to review their employees’ JATs and provide additional information as needed about the position. The information provided in the completed JATs was utilized in the classification analysis in two ways. First, the work described was reviewed to ensure that classification titles were appropriate. Second, the JATs were evaluated to quantify, by a scoring method, each classification’s relative value within the organization. Each classification’s score was based on employee and supervisor responses to the JAT, and the scores allowed for a comparison of classifications across the County.

### **Analysis of Current Conditions**

This analysis provided an overall assessment of the County’s current pay structure (plans) and related employee data at the time the study. The current pay plans, the progression of employees’ salaries through the pay grades, and the distribution of employees among the County’s departments were all examined during this process. The findings of this analysis are summarized in **Chapter 3** of this report. It should be noted that subsequent to this analysis, during the course of the study, the County made several changes to its structure (plans).



## Compensation Philosophy

Evergreen Solutions conducted meetings with the County’s study team to develop an understanding of its position with regard to employee compensation. Several key factors were examined and provided the framework for the recommended classification and compensation system and related pay practices.

## Salary and Benefits Surveys

For the salary survey, peers were identified that compete with the County for human resources and provide similar services. Classifications were selected as benchmarks representing a cross-section of the departments and levels of work at the County. After the selection of peers and benchmarks, a survey tool was developed for the collection of salary range data for each benchmark. A survey tool was also developed to collect detailed data about the core and fringe benefits offered by the peer organizations. The salary and benefits data collected during these surveys were analyzed, and a summary of the data can be found in **Chapter 4** of this report.

## Recommendations

During the review of the compensation philosophy, the County identified its desired market position as an organization. Using this information, and the analysis of both internal and external equity, revisions to the classification and compensation structure were developed. Information was also provided on how to execute the recommended salary adjustments, as well as how to maintain the recommended classification and compensation system going forward. A summary of all study findings and recommendations can be found in **Chapter 5** of this report.

## 1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report includes the following additional chapters:

- Chapter 2 – Summary of Employee Outreach
- Chapter 3 – Assessment of Current Conditions
- Chapter 4 – Market Summary
- Chapter 5 – Recommendations



## Chapter 2 - Summary of Employee Outreach

This chapter provides a summary of feedback received from participants in employee outreach sessions. An Evergreen consultant visited the County in May 2017 to conduct orientation meetings, interviews with senior leaders, and focus group sessions with employees and supervisors. The orientation meetings provided employees an opportunity to learn about the study process and their role in the study. During the focus groups and interviews, questions were asked that were designed to gather feedback on several topics related to the study.

Outreach participant responses provided the study team with valuable information regarding the County employees' and leaders' perceptions of the current compensation and classification system. The outreach sessions were well attended and participants actively provided valuable feedback to the consultant. For those who were unable to attend the focus groups sessions, an online survey process and feedback tool was provided which allowed employees to provide responses to the same questions asked in the focus groups. As well, additional phone interviews were conducted with senior leaders that could not be held during the consultant's on-site visit. Summarized below are the comments and perceptions from all approaches.

### **2.1 GENERAL FEEDBACK**

Overall, employees in focus group meetings expressed that they were dedicated to their jobs and providing quality services for the citizens of the County. Several of their stated reasons for deciding to work for and remain with the County were:

- proximity to their home and/or that they grew up in the local area;
- the County's benefits and retirement were very good;
- the potential for their career advancement; and
- employment stability.

However, employee outreach meeting participants also expressed some concerns about and suggested areas of improvement for the County's compensation and classification system.

### **2.2 COMPENSATION**

Participants in employee outreach related the following opinions regarding compensation:

- it's challenging in some areas to attract and successfully recruit new employees due to starting pay;

- job duties and responsibilities have increased over time without corresponding increases in compensation;
- in some cases, new hires were being hired at salaries close to more experienced employees causing salary compression;
- some employees stated they would like to receive incentive pay for degree or certification attainment beyond minimal qualifications; and
- employees would like to see more consistency throughout the County when comparing salaries for similar positions.

### 2.3 CLASSIFICATION

General opinions provided by participants related to the classification structure included:

- job titles did not always reflect the roles and responsibilities of the position, and should reflect the current work performed;
- there should be a review of classifications and when appropriate, additional levels added to provide additional opportunities for growth; and
- job descriptions need to be updated to adequately reflect current duties and responsibilities.

### 2.4 BENEFITS

Employees were asked to provide general feedback in this area. In response, participants stated that:

- health insurance benefits were very good and were perceived as a strong contributor to employee retention;
- vacation leave and holiday schedule were viewed very positively;
- some employees commented that the vacation accrual rate should be reviewed for consideration of providing more vacation beyond 15 years of tenure; and
- some employees who are closer to retirement stated they would like to see health insurance (at a reasonable cost) offered at a retirement.



## 2.5 MARKET PEERS

Outreach participants were asked to name organizations they considered to be market peers competing for employees performing similar work. The most common responses are listed below and were considered when developing the list of peers for the salary survey:

- City of Frederick, MD;
- City of Hagerstown, MD;
- Allegany County, MD;
- Berkeley County, WV;
- Carroll County, MD;
- Franklin County, PA;
- Frederick County, MD;
- Loudon County, VA;
- Montgomery County, MD;
- Federal Correctional Institution, Cumberland, MD;
- Maryland Correctional Institution-Hagerstown, MD;
- Roxbury Correctional Institution, MD; and
- State of Maryland.

## 2.6 RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

Focus group participants were also asked to name positions and or functional areas in which the County was having challenges with recruitment and/or retention of employees. Below are the positions and areas that were identified:

- 911 Call Takers;
- 911 Communications Specialist;
- Accounting positions;
- Attorney;
- Deputy Sheriff – Patrol;
- Deputy Sheriff – Detention;
- Equipment Operators; and
- Water Plant Operators.

## 2.7 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Outreach participants were asked for general input about the current performance evaluation system. Their responses are summarized below:

- most stated they would like to have a tool with more rating levels; as the current is restrictive with three;
- some stated the form was too generic, and should include goals/objectives; and





- most stated they would like to have an incentive for/increases linked to outstanding performance.

## 2.8 SUMMARY

The concerns expressed and reported above are relatively common in many organizations today. In total, the feedback received by Evergreen during outreach was positive. Employees generally believed that the County was a good place to work; benefits were viewed as particularly good, though most employees were concerned that their compensation had not kept pace with peers. The information received during outreach provided an understanding of the employees and leaders' perceptions of the current compensation and classification system. This aided Evergreen when conducting the remainder of the study and in the development of the recommendations for a new system which can be found in **Chapter 5** of this report.



## Chapter 3 – Assessment of Current Conditions

The purpose of this evaluation was to provide an overall assessment of the County's compensation structure, employee salary progression, and employee counts in each department. Data included here reflect the conditions when the study began, and should be considered, as such, a snapshot in time. The insights gained from this evaluation provided the basis for further analysis through the course of this study and were not considered sufficient cause for recommendations independently. Instead, the results of this evaluation were considered during the analysis of internal equity and peer market data. Subsequently, appropriate compensation related recommendations were developed for the County and are described later in this report. It should be noted that the County made some changes to its compensation structure during the course of the study that are not reflected below. Again, the following is an analysis of the data at the time the study began, and does not reflect the proactive changes the County made to its compensation structure during the study.

### 3.1 PAY PLAN ANALYSIS

The County administered three distinct pay plans at the time the data were collected (July 2017); one for General employees, one for Sheriff Detention employees, and one for Sheriff Patrol/Judiciary employees. **Exhibits 3A, 3B, and 3C** illustrate these plans at a summary level. All three plans were designed as step plans with each pay grade/range within the plans having established minimum and maximum salaries, and varied numbers of steps. Within each plan, each pay grade had an established range spread, or the percentage difference between the minimum and maximum of the pay grades, relative to the grade's minimum.

**Exhibit 3A** displays the General Employee step plan which had 22 pay grades. Four grades within this plan did not have classifications assigned to them. This plan utilized a 14-step progression that increased by 3.5 percent on average. Pay range spreads were a constant 56 percent throughout the plan. **Exhibit 3B** displays the Sheriff Detention play which had seven grades and operated with a ten-step progression with one grade set to a five-step progression. The step increase in this plan was also a consistent 3.5 percent. Lastly, **Exhibit 3C** shows the Sheriff Patrol/Judiciary step plan with 11 pay grades. Two grades did not have classifications assigned. This plan had 10 grades with 10 step progressions and one grade with a five-step progression; all with step increments of 3.5 percent. Pay range spreads varied in this plan from 15 percent to 43 percent.

The County had two employees in positions that were not assigned to a pay plan/grade; State's Attorney and Sheriff. Thus, these are not included in the following analyses.



**EXHIBIT 3A  
GENERAL EMPLOYEE STEP PLAN**

| Grade                  | Minimum   | Midpoint   | Maximum    | Range Spread | # of Steps | Employees  |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| 1                      | \$ 19,320 | \$ 24,765  | \$ 30,210  | 56%          | 14         | 0          |
| 2                      | \$ 20,860 | \$ 26,750  | \$ 32,640  | 56%          | 14         | 0          |
| 3                      | \$ 22,530 | \$ 28,875  | \$ 35,220  | 56%          | 14         | 0          |
| 4                      | \$ 24,340 | \$ 31,195  | \$ 38,050  | 56%          | 14         | 11         |
| 5                      | \$ 26,280 | \$ 33,690  | \$ 41,100  | 56%          | 14         | 0          |
| 6                      | \$ 28,390 | \$ 36,385  | \$ 44,380  | 56%          | 14         | 45         |
| 7                      | \$ 30,660 | \$ 39,300  | \$ 47,940  | 56%          | 14         | 42         |
| 8                      | \$ 33,110 | \$ 42,440  | \$ 51,770  | 56%          | 14         | 51         |
| 9                      | \$ 35,760 | \$ 45,855  | \$ 55,950  | 56%          | 14         | 103        |
| 10                     | \$ 38,620 | \$ 49,510  | \$ 60,400  | 56%          | 14         | 59         |
| 11                     | \$ 41,710 | \$ 53,470  | \$ 65,230  | 56%          | 14         | 65         |
| 12                     | \$ 45,050 | \$ 57,755  | \$ 70,460  | 56%          | 14         | 39         |
| 13                     | \$ 48,650 | \$ 62,360  | \$ 76,070  | 56%          | 14         | 42         |
| 14                     | \$ 52,540 | \$ 67,350  | \$ 82,160  | 56%          | 14         | 17         |
| 15                     | \$ 56,740 | \$ 72,750  | \$ 88,760  | 56%          | 14         | 20         |
| 16                     | \$ 61,290 | \$ 78,580  | \$ 95,870  | 56%          | 14         | 24         |
| 17                     | \$ 66,190 | \$ 84,860  | \$ 103,530 | 56%          | 14         | 10         |
| 18                     | \$ 71,480 | \$ 91,630  | \$ 111,780 | 56%          | 14         | 12         |
| 19                     | \$ 77,210 | \$ 98,980  | \$ 120,750 | 56%          | 14         | 7          |
| 20                     | \$ 83,380 | \$ 106,900 | \$ 130,420 | 56%          | 14         | 2          |
| 21                     | \$ 90,050 | \$ 115,440 | \$ 140,830 | 56%          | 14         | 0          |
| 22                     | \$ 97,260 | \$ 124,675 | \$ 152,090 | 56%          | 14         | 1          |
| <b>Average / Total</b> |           |            |            | <b>56%</b>   | <b>-</b>   | <b>550</b> |

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by County as of July 2017.

**EXHIBIT 3B  
SHERIFF DETENTION PLAN**

| Grade                  | Minimum   | Midpoint  | Maximum    | Range Spread | # of Steps | Employees  |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| 1                      | \$ 36,690 | \$ 39,395 | \$ 42,100  | 15%          | 5          | 27         |
| 2                      | \$ 43,580 | \$ 51,485 | \$ 59,390  | 36%          | 10         | 66         |
| 3                      | \$ 51,740 | \$ 61,125 | \$ 70,510  | 36%          | 10         | 1          |
| 4                      | \$ 57,380 | \$ 67,795 | \$ 78,210  | 36%          | 10         | 14         |
| 5                      | \$ 63,620 | \$ 75,165 | \$ 86,710  | 36%          | 10         | 5          |
| 6                      | \$ 70,530 | \$ 83,325 | \$ 96,120  | 36%          | 10         | 2          |
| 7                      | \$ 78,190 | \$ 92,370 | \$ 106,550 | 36%          | 10         | 1          |
| <b>Average / Total</b> |           |           |            | <b>33%</b>   | <b>-</b>   | <b>116</b> |

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by County as of July 2017.



**EXHIBIT 3C**  
**SHERIFF PATROL/JUDICIARY STEP PLAN**

| Grade                  | Minimum   | Midpoint   | Maximum    | Range Spread | # of Steps | Employees  |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| 1                      | \$ 34,940 | \$ 42,465  | \$ 49,990  | 43%          | 10         | 0          |
| 2                      | \$ 42,680 | \$ 51,035  | \$ 59,390  | 39%          | 10         | 4          |
| 3                      | \$ 42,050 | \$ 45,150  | \$ 48,250  | 15%          | 5          | 26         |
| 4                      | \$ 49,940 | \$ 59,005  | \$ 68,070  | 36%          | 10         | 46         |
| 5                      | \$ 59,310 | \$ 70,070  | \$ 80,830  | 36%          | 10         | 1          |
| 6                      | \$ 65,760 | \$ 77,690  | \$ 89,620  | 36%          | 10         | 0          |
| 7                      | \$ 65,760 | \$ 77,690  | \$ 89,620  | 36%          | 10         | 15         |
| 8                      | \$ 72,910 | \$ 86,140  | \$ 99,370  | 36%          | 10         | 7          |
| 9                      | \$ 80,840 | \$ 95,515  | \$ 110,190 | 36%          | 10         | 3          |
| 10                     | \$ 89,630 | \$ 105,900 | \$ 122,170 | 36%          | 10         | 2          |
| 11                     | \$ 99,370 | \$ 117,410 | \$ 135,450 | 36%          | 10         | 1          |
| <b>Average / Total</b> |           |            |            | <b>35%</b>   | <b>-</b>   | <b>105</b> |

*Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by County as of July 2017.*

### 3.2 EMPLOYEE SALARY PLACEMENT BY GRADE

When assessing the effectiveness of the County's pay plans and practices, it is important to analyze where employees' salaries placed within each pay range. Identifying those areas where there may have been clusters of employees' salaries could illuminate potential pay progression concerns within the current pay plan. It should be noted that employees' salaries, and the progression of the same, is associated with an organization's compensation philosophy – specifically, the method of salary progression and the availability of resources. Therefore, the placement of employees' salaries should be viewed with this context in mind.

**Exhibit 3D** illustrates the placement of employees' salaries relative to pay grade minimums and maximums for all three plans. The exhibit contains the following:

- the pay grades,
- the number of employees in classifications assigned to the pay grade,
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries at the minimum,
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries at the maximum, and
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries above the maximum.



**EXHIBIT 3D**  
**SALARY PLACEMENT**  
**BELOW MINIMUM AND ABOVE MAXIMUM BY GRADE**

| Grade        | Employees  | # = Min   | % = Min     | # = Max  | % = Max     | # > Max   | % > Max     |
|--------------|------------|-----------|-------------|----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| 1            | 0          | 0         | -           | 0        | -           | 0         | -           |
| 2            | 0          | 0         | -           | 0        | -           | 0         | -           |
| 3            | 0          | 0         | -           | 0        | -           | 0         | -           |
| 4            | 11         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 5            | 0          | 0         | -           | 0        | -           | 0         | -           |
| 6            | 45         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 7         | 15.6%       |
| 7            | 42         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 10        | 23.8%       |
| 8            | 51         | 15        | 29.4%       | 0        | 0.0%        | 2         | 3.9%        |
| 9            | 103        | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 3         | 2.9%        |
| 10           | 59         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 6         | 10.2%       |
| 11           | 65         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 12           | 39         | 4         | 10.3%       | 0        | 0.0%        | 1         | 2.6%        |
| 13           | 42         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 2         | 4.8%        |
| 14           | 17         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 15           | 20         | 1         | 5.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 1         | 5.0%        |
| 16           | 24         | 7         | 29.2%       | 0        | 0.0%        | 2         | 8.3%        |
| 17           | 10         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 18           | 12         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 3         | 25.0%       |
| 19           | 7          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 1         | 14.3%       |
| 20           | 2          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 2         | 100.0%      |
| 21           | 0          | 0         | -           | 0        | -           | 0         | -           |
| 22           | 1          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 1         | 100.0%      |
| 1            | 27         | 16        | 59.3%       | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 2            | 66         | 11        | 16.7%       | 0        | 0.0%        | 10        | 15.2%       |
| 3            | 1          | 1         | 100.0%      | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 4            | 14         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 5         | 35.7%       |
| 5            | 5          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 6            | 2          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 2         | 100.0%      |
| 7            | 1          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 1            | 0          | 0         | -           | 0        | -           | 0         | -           |
| 2            | 4          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 1         | 25.0%       |
| 3            | 26         | 9         | 34.6%       | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 4            | 46         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 4         | 8.7%        |
| 5            | 1          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 6            | 0          | 0         | -           | 0        | -           | 0         | -           |
| 7            | 15         | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 8            | 7          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 9            | 3          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 10           | 2          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| 11           | 1          | 0         | 0.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 0         | 0.0%        |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>771</b> | <b>64</b> | <b>8.3%</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>63</b> | <b>8.2%</b> |

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by County as of July 2017.



Employees with salaries at the grade minimum are typically new hires or are new to their particular classification following a recent promotion; on the other hand, employees with salaries at the grade maximum are typically highly experienced and proficient in their classification. In the pay plan at the time of this study, there were 64 employees with a salary at their grade minimum and 63 employees with a salary above their grade maximum. These employees reached the final step of their classification's step plan and qualified for a longevity adjustment placing them slightly above their classification's salary range.

**Exhibit 3E** illustrates the placement of employees' salaries relative to pay grade midpoints. The exhibit contains the following:

- the pay grades,
- the number of employees in classifications assigned to the pay grade,
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries below the midpoint,
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries at the midpoint, and
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries above the midpoint of each pay grade.



**EXHIBIT 3E  
SALARY PLACEMENT AROUND MIDPOINT  
BY GRADE**

| Grade        | Employees  | # < Mid    | % < Mid      | # at Mid | % at Mid    | # > Mid    | % > Mid      |
|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| 1            | 0          | 0          | -            | 0        | -           | 0          | -            |
| 2            | 0          | 0          | -            | 0        | -           | 0          | -            |
| 3            | 0          | 0          | -            | 0        | -           | 0          | -            |
| 4            | 11         | 5          | 45.5%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 6          | 54.5%        |
| 5            | 0          | 0          | -            | 0        | -           | 0          | -            |
| 6            | 45         | 36         | 80.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 9          | 20.0%        |
| 7            | 42         | 31         | 73.8%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 11         | 26.2%        |
| 8            | 51         | 44         | 86.3%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 7          | 13.7%        |
| 9            | 103        | 74         | 71.8%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 29         | 28.2%        |
| 10           | 59         | 38         | 64.4%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 21         | 35.6%        |
| 11           | 65         | 53         | 81.5%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 12         | 18.5%        |
| 12           | 39         | 19         | 48.7%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 20         | 51.3%        |
| 13           | 42         | 22         | 52.4%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 20         | 47.6%        |
| 14           | 17         | 13         | 76.5%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 4          | 23.5%        |
| 15           | 20         | 9          | 45.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 11         | 55.0%        |
| 16           | 24         | 16         | 66.7%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 8          | 33.3%        |
| 17           | 10         | 6          | 60.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 4          | 40.0%        |
| 18           | 12         | 2          | 16.7%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 10         | 83.3%        |
| 19           | 7          | 3          | 42.9%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 4          | 57.1%        |
| 20           | 2          | 0          | 0.0%         | 0        | 0.0%        | 2          | 100.0%       |
| 21           | 0          | 0          | -            | 0        | -           | 0          | -            |
| 22           | 1          | 0          | 0.0%         | 0        | 0.0%        | 1          | 100.0%       |
| 1            | 27         | 26         | 96.3%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 1          | 3.7%         |
| 2            | 66         | 35         | 53.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 31         | 47.0%        |
| 3            | 1          | 1          | 100.0%       | 0        | 0.0%        | 0          | 0.0%         |
| 4            | 14         | 6          | 42.9%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 8          | 57.1%        |
| 5            | 5          | 2          | 40.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 3          | 60.0%        |
| 6            | 2          | 0          | 0.0%         | 0        | 0.0%        | 2          | 100.0%       |
| 7            | 1          | 1          | 100.0%       | 0        | 0.0%        | 0          | 0.0%         |
| 1            | 0          | 0          | -            | 0        | -           | 0          | -            |
| 2            | 4          | 2          | 50.0%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 2          | 50.0%        |
| 3            | 26         | 26         | 100.0%       | 0        | 0.0%        | 0          | 0.0%         |
| 4            | 46         | 22         | 47.8%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 24         | 52.2%        |
| 5            | 1          | 1          | 100.0%       | 0        | 0.0%        | 0          | 0.0%         |
| 6            | 0          | 0          | -            | 0        | -           | 0          | -            |
| 7            | 15         | 8          | 53.3%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 7          | 46.7%        |
| 8            | 7          | 3          | 42.9%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 4          | 57.1%        |
| 9            | 3          | 2          | 66.7%        | 0        | 0.0%        | 1          | 33.3%        |
| 10           | 2          | 0          | 0.0%         | 0        | 0.0%        | 2          | 100.0%       |
| 11           | 1          | 0          | 0.0%         | 0        | 0.0%        | 1          | 100.0%       |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>771</b> | <b>506</b> | <b>65.6%</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>265</b> | <b>34.4%</b> |

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by County as of July 2017.



Employees with salaries close to the midpoint of a pay range should be fully proficient in their classification and require minimal supervision to complete their job duties while performing satisfactorily. Within this framework, grade midpoint is commonly considered to be the salary an individual could reasonably expect for similar work in the market. Therefore, it is important to examine the percentage and number of employees with salaries above and below the calculated midpoint. Of the 771 employees assigned to classifications in the County's pay plans, 506 employees (65.6 percent) had salaries below the midpoint of their respective range, while 265 employees (34.4 percent) had salaries above the midpoint. There were no employees being paid at exactly the midpoint of their respective grades.

### **3.3 SALARY QUARTILE ANALYSIS**

This section provides an additional analysis of the distribution of employees' salaries across the pay grades at the time of this study. Examining employee salary placement by grade quartile provided insight into whether clustering of employees' salaries existed within each pay grade. For this analysis, employees' salaries were slotted within one of four equal distributions. The first quartile (0-25) represents the lowest 25 percent of the pay range. The second quartile (26-50) represents the segment of the pay range above the first quartile up to the pay range's midpoint. The third quartile (51-75) represents the part of the pay range above the midpoint up to the 75th percentile of the pay range. The fourth quartile (76-100) is the highest 25 percent of the pay range. This analytical method provided an opportunity to assess how employees' salaries are disbursed throughout each grade (pay range).

**Exhibit 3D** provides a breakdown of placement of employees' salaries relative to salary quartile and provides the following:

- the pay grades,
- the number of employees per pay grade, and
- the location (by quartile) of the employees' salaries within each grade.

The County's employees' salaries were generally more concentrated in the first two quartiles below the midpoints of their respective classifications' assigned grades/ranges. In order of employee concentration, 326 employees or 42.3 percent had salaries in the first quartile of their respective pay ranges. The next largest cluster of employees' salaries was found in the second quartile with 180 employees or 23.3 percent of all employees. Additionally, 136 employees or 17.6 percent had salaries in the third quartile of their respective pay ranges, while 129 or 16.7 percent of employees earned in the fourth quartile of their respective pay ranges. It is important to note that it appears the County seems to have some success progressing employees' salaries toward and beyond the midpoints of the three plans' salary ranges. The cluster of employees at or above their respective maximums was examined further in the context of the external equity analysis; specifically with regard to the competitiveness of the plans' salary ranges.





**EXHIBIT 3F  
SALARY QUARTILE ANALYSIS**

| GRADE                | Total Employees | 1st Quartile | 2nd Quartile | 3rd Quartile | 4th Quartile |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                      |                 | # Employees  | # Employees  | # Employees  | # Employees  |
| 1                    | 0               | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| 2                    | 0               | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| 3                    | 0               | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| 4                    | 11              | 0            | 5            | 4            | 2            |
| 5                    | 0               | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| 6                    | 45              | 29           | 7            | 2            | 7            |
| 7                    | 42              | 18           | 13           | 1            | 10           |
| 8                    | 51              | 27           | 17           | 5            | 2            |
| 9                    | 103             | 51           | 23           | 13           | 16           |
| 10                   | 59              | 23           | 15           | 8            | 13           |
| 11                   | 65              | 33           | 20           | 7            | 5            |
| 12                   | 39              | 13           | 6            | 13           | 7            |
| 13                   | 42              | 10           | 12           | 14           | 6            |
| 14                   | 17              | 9            | 4            | 4            | 0            |
| 15                   | 20              | 7            | 2            | 6            | 5            |
| 16                   | 24              | 11           | 5            | 6            | 2            |
| 17                   | 10              | 3            | 3            | 2            | 2            |
| 18                   | 12              | 0            | 2            | 5            | 5            |
| 19                   | 7               | 1            | 2            | 2            | 2            |
| 20                   | 2               | 0            | 0            | 0            | 2            |
| 21                   | 0               | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| 22                   | 1               | 0            | 0            | 0            | 1            |
| 1                    | 27              | 23           | 3            | 1            | 0            |
| 2                    | 66              | 25           | 10           | 14           | 17           |
| 3                    | 1               | 1            | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| 4                    | 14              | 5            | 1            | 1            | 7            |
| 5                    | 5               | 1            | 1            | 2            | 1            |
| 6                    | 2               | 0            | 0            | 0            | 2            |
| 7                    | 1               | 0            | 1            | 0            | 0            |
| 1                    | 0               | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| 2                    | 4               | 0            | 2            | 1            | 1            |
| 3                    | 26              | 17           | 9            | 0            | 0            |
| 4                    | 46              | 9            | 13           | 15           | 9            |
| 5                    | 1               | 1            | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| 6                    | 0               | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| 7                    | 15              | 7            | 1            | 5            | 2            |
| 8                    | 7               | 2            | 1            | 2            | 2            |
| 9                    | 3               | 0            | 2            | 0            | 1            |
| 10                   | 2               | 0            | 0            | 2            | 0            |
| 11                   | 1               | 0            | 0            | 1            | 0            |
| <b>Overall Total</b> | <b>771</b>      | <b>326</b>   | <b>180</b>   | <b>136</b>   | <b>129</b>   |

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by County as of July 2017.



### 3.4 EMPLOYEES BY DEPARTMENT

At the time the study commenced, the County employed 773 individuals across 67 departments. **Exhibit 3G** depicts the number of employees and the number of classifications in each department and is intended only to provide basic information regarding how employees are distributed among departments. Also provided is the percentage breakdown of employees by department. Included in this exhibit are the two employees in classifications not assigned to a pay grade.

**EXHIBIT 3G  
EMPLOYEES BY DEPARTMENT**

| Department                             | Employees | Classes | % of Total |
|--|-----------|---------|------------|
| 40 West Landfill                       | 10        | 4       | 1.3%       |
| 911 System                             | 49        | 11      | 6.3%       |
| Airline Services                       | 1         | 1       | 0.1%       |
| Antietam Treatment Plant               | 3         | 2       | 0.4%       |
| Black Rock Club House Operations       | 1         | 1       | 0.1%       |
| Black Rock Golf Course Maintenance     | 5         | 4       | 0.6%       |
| Black Rock Restaurant                  | 1         | 1       | 0.1%       |
| Budget & Finance                       | 14        | 12      | 1.8%       |
| Cascade Towne Center                   | 3         | 3       | 0.4%       |
| Central Booking                        | 10        | 2       | 1.3%       |
| Circuit Court                          | 19        | 8       | 2.5%       |
| Community Grant Management             | 4         | 4       | 0.5%       |
| Composting                             | 1         | 1       | 0.1%       |
| Conococheague Treatment Plant          | 9         | 4       | 1.2%       |
| County Administrator                   | 3         | 3       | 0.4%       |
| County Attorney                        | 5         | 5       | 0.6%       |
| County Clerk                           | 1         | 1       | 0.1%       |
| County District Lines Operations       | 1         | 1       | 0.1%       |
| Day Reporting Center                   | 2         | 2       | 0.3%       |
| Department of Construction             | 21        | 15      | 2.7%       |
| Department of Engineering              | 19        | 14      | 2.5%       |
| Department of Business Development     | 5         | 5       | 0.6%       |
| Department of Plan Review & Permitting | 16        | 12      | 2.1%       |
| Emergency Management                   | 2         | 2       | 0.3%       |
| Fire & Rescue Operations               | 10        | 3       | 1.3%       |
| Facilities                             | 5         | 4       | 0.6%       |
| Fleet Management                       | 11        | 7       | 1.4%       |
| Gaming-General Operations              | 2         | 2       | 0.3%       |
| Highway Maintenance                    | 69        | 7       | 8.9%       |
| Highways Administration                | 4         | 4       | 0.5%       |
| Human Resources                        | 7         | 7       | 0.9%       |
| Information Technologies               | 14        | 13      | 1.8%       |
| Land Preservation General Operations   | 2         | 2       | 0.3%       |
| Museum and Administration              | 1         | 1       | 0.1%       |



**EXHIBIT 3G  
EMPLOYEES BY DEPARTMENT (CONTINUED)**

| Department                           | Employees  | Classes    | % of Total    |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Narcotics Task Force                 | 6          | 6          | 0.8%          |
| Parks & Facilities                   | 21         | 10         | 2.7%          |
| Planning & Zoning                    | 7          | 7          | 0.9%          |
| Public Relations & Community Affairs | 3          | 3          | 0.4%          |
| Public Works                         | 2          | 2          | 0.3%          |
| Purchasing                           | 6          | 5          | 0.8%          |
| Recreation & Fitness                 | 5          | 3          | 0.6%          |
| Recycling Operations                 | 1          | 1          | 0.1%          |
| Regional Airport                     | 9          | 8          | 1.2%          |
| Ride Assistance Program              | 1          | 1          | 0.1%          |
| Sewer General Operations             | 1          | 1          | 0.1%          |
| Sewer-Engineering                    | 5          | 5          | 0.6%          |
| Sharpsburg Treatment Plant           | 2          | 2          | 0.3%          |
| Sheriff - Judicial                   | 25         | 8          | 3.2%          |
| Sheriff - Patrol                     | 97         | 21         | 12.5%         |
| Sheriff Detention Center             | 119        | 15         | 15.4%         |
| Sheriff Process Server Department    | 1          | 1          | 0.1%          |
| Smithsburg Treatment Plant           | 4          | 3          | 0.5%          |
| Solid Waste Administration           | 4          | 4          | 0.5%          |
| States Attorney                      | 38         | 15         | 4.9%          |
| Stormwater & Watershed Service       | 2          | 2          | 0.3%          |
| Traffic Control                      | 4          | 2          | 0.5%          |
| Transfer Stations                    | 4          | 1          | 0.5%          |
| Transit Department                   | 17         | 9          | 2.2%          |
| Treasurer                            | 5          | 4          | 0.6%          |
| Winebrenner Treatment Plant          | 3          | 3          | 0.4%          |
| Wireless Communications              | 4          | 3          | 0.5%          |
| Water Quality Collections            | 13         | 3          | 1.7%          |
| Water Quality Contract Operations    | 2          | 2          | 0.3%          |
| Water Quality Lab                    | 5          | 4          | 0.6%          |
| Water Quality Maintenance            | 19         | 15         | 2.5%          |
| Water Quality Utility Administration | 8          | 8          | 1.0%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>773</b> | <b>346</b> | <b>100.0%</b> |

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by County as of July 2017.

As the exhibit illustrates, the largest department in the County was the Sheriff Detention Center, with 119 employees representing 15.4 percent of the County's workforce. The next largest was the Sheriff Patrol with 97 employees representing 12.5 percent of the workforce. Several departments only had a single incumbent. Those departments collectively make up 1.6 percent of the County's workforce.



### 3.5 SUMMARY

Overall, the County's compensation structure offered a firm foundation on which to improve. The key points of the current structure were:

- Pay grade range spreads were a consistent 56 percent in the General Employee pay plan, while the Sheriff Patrol/Judiciary and Sheriff Detention pay plans had average range spreads of 35 percent and 33 percent respectively. The County's existing pay plans were identical in terms of their incremental step progression of 3.5 percent.
- The majority of the employees' salaries fell below the midpoint; furthermore, the majority of employees' salaries were observed in the first quartile of their classifications assigned respective pay ranges.
- Approximately a third of County employees' salaries were distributed above their respective midpoint throughout the pay grades indicating the County was successful in providing employees salary growth opportunities at some point in time.

The County's pay plan provided employees with a clear pay structure, and it appears that some number of employees' salaries had progressed successfully over time. As a pay system is intended to encourage employee salary growth based on an organization's compensation philosophy, this analysis revealed that the County awarded increases to many of its employees. However, it also appears that many employees' salaries were compressed in the first quartile indicating a need for further examination of the pay system including the County's pay practices.

The information gained from this review of current conditions was used in conjunction with the market analysis data and internal equity review to develop recommendations for a competitive compensation plan that would best align with the County's compensation philosophy moving forward. These recommendations can be found in **Chapter 5** of this report.



## Chapter 4 – Market Summary

This chapter provides a market analysis in which the County's salary ranges and benefit offerings were compared to the salary ranges and benefit offerings at peer organizations. The data from targeted market peers were used to evaluate the overall compensation and benefits at the County at the time of this study. It is important to note that the market comparisons contained herein do not translate well at the individual employee level and are instead used to provide an overall analysis.

This is not intended to evaluate salaries paid to individuals as this compensation (including benefits) is determined through a combination of factors, which could typically include: the demand for a particular job, a candidate's prior experience, or an individual's negotiation skills during the hiring process. Furthermore, it should be noted that market comparisons are best thought of as a snapshot of current market conditions. In other words, market conditions change, and in some cases, change quickly; so, while market surveys are useful for making updates to salary structures or benefits provided to employees, they must be done at regular intervals if the County wishes to remain current with its market peers and market salary trends.

### 4.1 SALARY SURVEY RESULTS

Evergreen Solutions collected pay range information from target organizations utilizing a salary survey tool. This included selecting benchmark classifications to be surveyed. The desired outcome of benchmarking was to select a cross-section of the County's classifications, so that the surveyed positions made up a subset of all work areas and job levels in the County. The job title, a description of assigned duties, and the education and experience requirements were provided in the survey tool for each benchmarked classification.

The target peers were then selected by Evergreen Solutions with concurrence from the County's project team. Several factors were utilized when developing this peer list, including geographic proximity to the County, organization size, and the relative population being served by the organization. All collected data were adjusted for cost of living using a national cost of living index factor which allowed salary dollars from organizations outside of the immediate recruiting area to be adjusted for the cost of living relative to the County. **Exhibit 4A** provides the list of 15 market peers from which data were collected for 88 benchmark classifications.



**EXHIBIT 4A  
MARKET PEERS**

| Peer Data Collected      |
|--------------------------|
| City of Annapolis, MD    |
| City of Baltimore, MD    |
| City of Bowie, MD        |
| City of Frederick, MD    |
| City of Hagerstown, MD   |
| City of Harrisburg, PA   |
| City of Rockville, MD    |
| City of Westminster, MD  |
| Allegany County, MD      |
| Anne Arundel County, MD  |
| Carroll County, MD       |
| Franklin County, PA      |
| Frederick County, MD     |
| Loudoun County, VA       |
| Prince George County, MD |

As an outcome of this study, the County expressed a desire to have a salary structure competitive with the market. To determine the position of the structure currently, Evergreen ranked the County's salary range midpoints for each benchmark classification within the collected data (salary range midpoints) for the peers. **Exhibit 4B** provides a summary of these results and contains the following information:

- The market midpoint for each classification for each peer; identified as Peer A through Peer O (representing the peers in the exhibit above, in random order).
- The County's midpoint ranking in relation to the peers' midpoints for each classification (with 1 being the highest and 15 being the lowest). Displayed are rankings for the midpoints effective January 1, 2017, and those effective January 13, 2018.



**EXHIBIT 4B  
MARKET RANGES BY ORGANIZATION AT THE MIDPOINT**

| Classification                     | Peer A   | Peer B    | Peer C   | Peer D    | Peer E   | Peer F    | Peer G    | Peer H    | Peer I    | Peer J    | Peer K    | Peer L    | Peer M    | Peer N   | Peer O    | Washington County, MD as of 1/1/17 | Rank | Washington County, MD as of 1/13/18 | Rank | # Resp. |
|------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|------|---------|
| Accountant                         | \$59,767 | \$67,123  | \$38,974 | \$80,243  | \$59,753 | \$51,290  | \$66,839  | \$74,183  | \$53,059  | \$70,744  | \$57,909  | \$58,367  | \$68,678  | \$50,645 | \$60,600  | \$62,360                           | 7    | \$64,584                            | 7    | 15      |
| Accounting Supervisor              |          |           | \$68,742 | \$75,064  |          | \$61,548  | \$93,073  |           | \$63,769  |           | \$63,630  |           | \$93,909  | \$74,826 | \$78,473  | \$72,750                           | 6    | \$75,317                            | 4    | 9       |
| Accounts Receivable Specialist     | \$39,956 | \$46,756  | \$27,245 | \$44,016  | \$43,917 | \$51,290  |           |           | \$44,142  |           | \$48,138  | \$50,915  |           | \$37,792 | \$38,931  | \$42,440                           | 8    | \$43,950                            | 7    | 11      |
| Administrative Assistant           |          | \$46,756  |          | \$50,299  |          | \$61,548  | \$48,060  | \$45,623  | \$40,268  | \$50,992  | \$43,899  | \$50,915  |           | \$50,681 | \$46,251  | \$45,855                           | 9    | \$47,435                            | 7    | 11      |
| Advanced Life Support Technician I |          | \$68,517  | \$43,939 |           |          |           |           |           | \$53,059  |           |           |           | \$65,692  |          |           | \$53,470                           | 3    | \$55,349                            | 3    | 4       |
| Airport Operations Manager         |          |           |          |           |          |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |          | \$97,478  | \$62,360                           | 2    | \$64,584                            | 2    | 1       |
| Allocation/Permit Specialist       |          | \$43,494  | \$28,902 |           |          |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |          | \$42,446  | \$45,855                           | 1    | \$47,435                            | 1    | 3       |
| Assistant County Administrator     |          | \$72,158  |          | \$136,845 |          |           | \$132,337 |           |           |           | \$127,039 |           | \$137,828 |          |           | \$98,980                           | 5    | \$102,430                           | 5    | 5       |
| Assistant County Attorney          |          | \$96,364  |          |           | \$87,802 | \$71,806  | \$97,727  |           |           | \$114,904 |           | \$100,945 | \$106,721 | \$90,952 | \$78,473  | \$84,860                           | 8    | \$87,828                            | 7    | 9       |
| Assistant Solid Waste Director     |          |           | \$78,678 | \$80,068  |          |           |           |           |           |           |           |           | \$106,721 |          | \$66,057  | \$72,750                           | 4    | \$75,317                            | 4    | 4       |
| Auto Services Technician           |          | \$54,032  | \$33,915 | \$61,312  |          | \$40,520  | \$44,500  |           | \$43,127  |           |           |           |           |          | \$50,407  | \$45,855                           | 4    | \$47,435                            | 4    | 7       |
| Benefits Manager                   |          | \$77,569  | \$68,742 | \$80,243  |          | \$61,548  |           |           | \$63,769  |           |           | \$73,092  | \$93,909  | \$82,495 | \$78,473  | \$67,350                           | 8    | \$69,763                            | 7    | 9       |
| Building Maintenance Supervisor    |          | \$67,123  | \$37,395 |           | \$64,540 | \$61,548  | \$63,055  |           | \$69,913  |           |           | \$66,914  | \$68,678  |          | \$60,600  | \$49,510                           | 9    | \$51,272                            | 9    | 9       |
| Building Inspector I               | \$49,101 | \$54,032  | \$38,974 |           | \$69,696 | \$45,800  | \$59,487  |           | \$44,142  | \$50,143  |           | \$54,510  |           |          | \$50,407  | \$53,470                           | 5    | \$55,349                            | 3    | 10      |
| Bus Operator                       |          | \$37,637  | \$25,818 | \$38,433  |          |           | \$38,153  |           | \$33,506  |           |           |           |           |          |           | \$36,385                           | 4    | \$37,679                            | 3    | 5       |
| Buyer                              |          | \$50,262  | \$44,227 |           | \$59,753 |           | \$56,119  |           |           | \$43,968  |           | \$58,367  | \$49,808  | \$55,670 | \$54,952  | \$57,755                           | 3    | \$59,780                            | 1    | 9       |
| Call Taker                         |          | \$50,262  | \$37,395 |           |          |           |           |           |           |           | \$48,138  |           | \$38,828  | \$47,828 | \$46,251  | \$42,440                           | 5    | \$43,950                            | 5    | 6       |
| Caseworker                         |          |           |          |           |          |           |           | \$48,397  | \$43,968  | \$45,958  |           |           | \$38,828  |          |           | \$42,440                           | 4    | \$43,950                            | 4    | 4       |
| Chemist                            |          |           |          |           |          |           |           | \$50,379  |           |           |           |           |           | \$62,980 |           | \$62,360                           | 2    | \$64,584                            | 1    | 2       |
| Chief Building Inspector           |          |           |          |           |          | \$71,806  | \$70,849  |           |           | \$82,047  |           | \$66,919  | \$52,030  |          | \$60,600  | \$67,350                           | 4    | \$69,763                            | 4    | 6       |
| Chief Financial Officer            |          | \$111,361 |          | \$128,012 |          | \$107,710 | \$132,337 |           | \$110,719 |           |           | \$132,844 |           |          |           | \$106,900                          | 7    | \$110,635                           | 6    | 6       |
| Chief Plans Examiner               |          |           |          |           |          | \$61,548  |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |          |           | \$78,580                           | 1    | \$81,318                            | 1    | 1       |
| Chief Plant Operator               |          | \$58,085  |          | \$80,068  |          |           | \$59,487  | \$61,003  | \$63,769  |           |           | \$71,658  |           |          |           | \$57,755                           | 7    | \$59,780                            | 5    | 6       |
| Civil Engineer                     | \$83,012 | \$67,123  | \$68,742 |           |          | \$82,065  | \$66,839  |           | \$63,769  | \$70,744  |           |           | \$78,046  | \$82,249 | \$66,057  | \$72,750                           | 5    | \$75,317                            | 5    | 10      |
| Collection Operator                |          |           | \$32,721 | \$50,190  |          |           |           | \$41,411  | \$36,733  |           |           | \$38,770  |           |          | \$38,931  | \$45,855                           | 2    | \$47,435                            | 2    | 6       |
| Communications Coordinator         |          | \$62,440  | \$40,625 |           |          |           | \$59,487  |           |           |           |           | \$54,510  |           |          | \$42,446  | \$45,855                           | 4    | \$47,435                            | 4    | 5       |
| County Administrator               |          | \$137,182 |          |           |          |           |           | \$130,568 |           | \$149,429 | \$132,827 | \$170,895 |           |          | \$128,990 | \$124,675                          | 7    | \$129,033                           | 6    | 6       |
| County Attorney                    |          | \$111,361 |          |           |          | \$84,629  |           |           |           | \$139,652 |           | \$159,716 |           |          | \$128,990 | \$106,900                          | 5    | \$110,635                           | 5    | 5       |
| County Clerk                       | \$65,319 | \$83,388  |          | \$75,064  |          | \$71,806  |           | \$67,171  |           |           |           |           |           |          |           | \$57,755                           | 6    | \$59,780                            | 6    | 5       |

**EXHIBIT 4B  
MARKET RANGES BY ORGANIZATION AT THE MIDPOINT (CONTINUED)**

| Classification                              | Peer A   | Peer B    | Peer C   | Peer D    | Peer E    | Peer F   | Peer G    | Peer H    | Peer I    | Peer J    | Peer K    | Peer L    | Peer M    | Peer N    | Peer O    | Washington County, MD as of 1/1/17 | Rank | Washington County, MD as of 1/13/18 | Rank | # Resp. |
|---|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|------|---------|
| Court Reporter                              |          |           |          |           |           |          |           |           |           | \$50,992  | \$60,764  |           |           |           |           | \$49,510                           | 3    | \$51,272                            | 2    | 2       |
| Database Administrator                      |          | \$83,388  | \$68,742 | \$80,243  |           | \$84,629 |           |           |           | \$76,186  |           |           | \$78,046  |           | \$71,995  | \$72,750                           | 6    | \$75,317                            | 6    | 7       |
| Deputy Director - Human Resources           |          | \$77,569  |          |           |           |          |           | \$74,183  |           |           |           |           |           |           |           | \$72,750                           | 3    | \$75,317                            | 2    | 2       |
| Deputy Sheriff First Class                  | \$50,453 | \$57,573  | \$56,653 | \$61,312  | \$56,110  | \$58,365 | \$63,055  | \$50,379  | \$48,397  | \$61,253  | \$41,908  |           | \$63,342  | \$57,165  |           | \$59,005                           | 5    | \$61,069                            | 5    | 13      |
| Deputy Sheriff Captain                      | \$83,012 | \$93,645  |          | \$111,776 | \$100,569 | \$84,629 |           | \$74,183  |           | \$101,610 |           | \$84,089  | \$106,623 | \$96,295  |           | \$95,515                           | 6    | \$98,862                            | 5    | 10      |
| Deputy Sheriff Corporal                     |          | \$66,534  |          | \$80,068  |           | \$73,703 | \$70,849  | \$55,406  | \$53,059  | \$64,880  |           | \$63,169  | \$69,722  | \$67,830  |           | \$70,070                           | 4    | \$72,551                            | 3    | 10      |
| Deputy Sheriff Lieutenant                   | \$73,030 | \$81,034  | \$81,176 | \$97,812  | \$91,217  | \$84,411 | \$88,641  | \$67,171  | \$63,769  | \$83,998  |           | \$76,444  | \$94,010  | \$88,263  |           | \$86,140                           | 6    | \$89,180                            | 4    | 13      |
| Deputy Sheriff Major                        |          | \$100,668 |          |           |           | \$97,452 | \$102,613 | \$97,959  |           | \$114,904 |           | \$92,497  | \$119,838 | \$105,924 |           | \$105,900                          | 4    | \$109,627                           | 3    | 8       |
| Deputy Sheriff Sergeant                     |          | \$71,523  | \$71,310 | \$85,593  |           | \$80,591 | \$80,400  | \$61,003  | \$58,169  | \$77,157  | \$45,958  | \$69,491  | \$80,295  | \$80,239  |           | \$77,690                           | 6    | \$80,444                            | 3    | 12      |
| Director Community Grant Management         |          |           |          | \$98,026  |           |          |           |           |           |           | \$67,913  |           |           |           | \$78,473  | \$78,580                           | 2    | \$81,318                            | 2    | 3       |
| Director of Construction                    |          |           |          | \$112,020 |           |          | \$88,641  |           |           |           |           | \$108,114 | \$121,282 |           | \$88,396  | \$91,630                           | 4    | \$94,848                            | 4    | 5       |
| Director of Engineering                     |          | \$96,364  |          | \$128,012 |           | \$79,500 | \$97,727  |           | \$92,116  |           |           |           |           |           | \$88,396  | \$91,630                           | 5    | \$94,848                            | 4    | 6       |
| Director of Golf                            |          |           |          |           |           |          |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           | \$67,350                           | 1    | \$69,763                            | 1    | 0       |
| Director of Plan Review & Permitting        |          |           |          |           |           |          | \$88,641  | \$97,959  | \$69,913  | \$123,586 |           | \$96,137  | \$93,909  |           | \$88,396  | \$91,630                           | 5    | \$94,848                            | 4    | 7       |
| Director of Transit                         |          | \$111,361 |          |           |           |          | \$97,727  |           | \$84,025  | \$114,904 |           |           |           |           |           | \$78,580                           | 5    | \$81,318                            | 5    | 4       |
| Director Public Works                       | \$92,366 | \$111,361 |          | \$128,012 |           | \$84,629 | \$132,337 | \$113,583 | \$110,719 | \$139,652 |           | \$149,266 | \$137,828 |           | \$128,990 | \$98,980                           | 10   | \$102,430                           | 10   | 11      |
| Director Purchasing                         |          | \$96,364  |          |           |           | \$61,548 |           |           |           | \$102,465 |           | \$100,945 | \$106,721 |           | \$88,396  | \$78,580                           | 6    | \$81,318                            | 6    | 6       |
| Director Recreation & Fitness               | \$53,909 | \$83,388  |          |           |           | \$61,548 |           |           |           | \$123,586 |           |           | \$137,828 |           | \$128,990 | \$78,580                           | 5    | \$81,318                            | 5    | 6       |
| Director, Airport                           |          |           |          |           |           |          |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           | \$91,630                           | 1    | \$94,848                            | 1    | 0       |
| Director, Budget & Finance                  |          | \$111,361 |          | \$112,020 |           | \$71,806 | \$108,770 | \$113,583 |           | \$139,652 | \$109,489 | \$100,945 | \$137,828 |           | \$128,990 | \$91,630                           | 10   | \$94,848                            | 10   | 10      |
| Director, Business Development              |          |           |          | \$104,790 |           | \$58,984 |           |           | \$92,116  |           |           |           | \$137,828 |           | \$128,990 | \$84,860                           | 5    | \$87,828                            | 5    | 5       |
| Director, Division Environmental Management |          | \$89,642  |          |           |           |          | \$97,727  |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           | \$98,980                           | 1    | \$102,430                           | 1    | 2       |
| Director, Emergency Services                |          |           |          | \$91,699  |           | \$87,194 |           |           | \$92,116  | \$114,904 | \$74,619  | \$142,292 | \$106,721 |           | \$128,990 | \$98,980                           | 5    | \$102,430                           | 5    | 8       |
| Director, Human Resources                   |          | \$111,361 | \$78,678 | \$104,790 |           | \$71,806 | \$127,247 |           |           | \$123,586 | \$109,489 | \$149,266 | \$137,828 |           | \$128,990 | \$91,630                           | 9    | \$94,848                            | 9    | 10      |
| Director, Highways                          |          |           |          | \$112,020 |           |          |           |           |           | \$95,148  |           | \$108,114 | \$106,721 |           | \$88,396  | \$91,630                           | 5    | \$94,848                            | 5    | 5       |
| Director, Parks & Facilities                |          | \$83,388  |          |           |           | \$52,829 | \$93,073  |           |           |           |           |           | \$137,828 |           | \$88,396  | \$91,630                           | 3    | \$94,848                            | 2    | 5       |
| Director, Planning & Zoning                 |          | \$111,361 |          | \$119,749 |           | \$61,548 | \$127,247 |           | \$76,643  | \$123,586 | \$104,310 |           | \$137,828 |           | \$128,990 | \$91,630                           | 8    | \$94,848                            | 8    | 9       |
| Electrician                                 |          |           | \$35,057 |           |           |          |           |           | \$53,059  | \$45,435  |           | \$44,423  |           | \$55,836  | \$46,251  | \$53,470                           | 2    | \$55,349                            | 2    | 6       |
| Emergency Communications Supervisor         |          |           | \$40,625 | \$61,446  |           |          |           | \$55,406  | \$69,913  |           | \$63,630  | \$58,365  | \$52,030  | \$70,665  | \$60,600  | \$53,470                           | 8    | \$55,349                            | 8    | 9       |
| Emergency Communications Specialist         |          | \$50,262  | \$37,395 |           |           |          | \$56,119  | \$41,411  | \$48,397  |           | \$48,138  | \$47,559  | \$38,828  | \$52,731  | \$46,251  | \$45,855                           | 8    | \$47,435                            | 7    | 10      |





**EXHIBIT 4B  
MARKET RANGES BY ORGANIZATION AT THE MIDPOINT (CONTINUED)**

| Classification                 | Peer A   | Peer B   | Peer C   | Peer D   | Peer E   | Peer F   | Peer G   | Peer H   | Peer I   | Peer J   | Peer K   | Peer L    | Peer M   | Peer N   | Peer O   | Washington County, MD as of 1/1/17 | Rank | Washington County, MD as of 1/13/18 | Rank | # Resp. |
|--------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|------|---------|
| Engineering Technician I       |          |          | \$27,985 |          |          | \$45,800 | \$59,487 |          | \$40,268 |          |          |           | \$44,948 | \$39,682 | \$42,446 | \$39,300                           | 7    | \$40,675                            | 5    | 7       |
| Equipment Operator I           |          | \$40,460 |          | \$46,950 |          | \$48,791 |          |          | \$40,319 | \$37,294 |          | \$41,497  | \$33,539 | \$28,201 | \$38,931 | \$36,385                           | 8    | \$37,679                            | 7    | 9       |
| Firefighter                    |          | \$51,306 | \$39,910 |          |          | \$49,431 |          |          |          |          |          |           | \$58,664 | \$50,399 |          | \$49,510                           | 4    | \$51,272                            | 3    | 5       |
| Fleet Manager                  |          | \$83,388 |          |          |          | \$61,548 | \$80,409 |          | \$63,769 | \$95,148 |          |           | \$78,046 |          | \$88,396 | \$67,350                           | 6    | \$69,763                            | 6    | 8       |
| GIS Analyst                    |          |          | \$68,742 |          |          |          | \$66,839 | \$67,171 |          | \$59,133 | \$57,909 | \$66,919  | \$68,678 |          | \$60,600 | \$53,470                           | 9    | \$55,349                            | 9    | 8       |
| GIS Manager                    |          | \$77,569 | \$98,379 |          |          |          | \$88,641 |          | \$63,769 |          | \$71,178 | \$100,945 |          |          | \$66,057 | \$72,750                           | 5    | \$75,317                            | 5    | 7       |
| GIS Technician                 |          | \$58,085 | \$37,395 |          | \$55,325 |          |          |          |          | \$48,535 |          | \$47,549  |          |          | \$50,407 | \$45,855                           | 6    | \$47,435                            | 6    | 6       |
| Grant Analyst                  |          |          | \$51,002 |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | \$55,353 |           |          |          | \$60,600 | \$45,855                           | 4    | \$47,435                            | 4    | 3       |
| Investigator                   |          |          |          |          |          | \$73,187 |          |          |          | \$56,282 | \$41,908 | \$50,918  |          | \$51,948 |          | \$49,510                           | 5    | \$51,272                            | 4    | 5       |
| IT Services Specialist I       |          | \$54,032 | \$45,330 | \$47,053 |          | \$46,161 |          |          | \$53,059 | \$56,282 |          |           | \$33,539 |          | \$50,407 | \$53,470                           | 3    | \$55,349                            | 2    | 8       |
| Laboratory Technician I        |          |          | \$28,027 | \$57,355 |          |          |          |          |          | \$45,435 |          | \$58,355  |          |          |          | \$39,300                           | 4    | \$40,675                            | 4    | 4       |
| Landfill Attendant             |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | \$26,806 |          |          |           |          |          |          | \$31,195                           | 1    | \$32,292                            | 1    | 1       |
| Legal Assistant                |          | \$50,262 | \$33,266 |          | \$51,231 | \$45,802 | \$59,487 |          |          | \$46,198 |          |           | \$44,948 |          | \$46,251 | \$49,510                           | 4    | \$51,272                            | 2    | 8       |
| Maintenance Superintendent     |          | \$83,388 |          | \$80,068 |          |          | \$93,073 |          | \$63,769 | \$76,186 |          |           |          |          | \$66,057 | \$72,750                           | 5    | \$75,317                            | 5    | 6       |
| Maintenance Worker             | \$29,675 | \$35,011 | \$25,345 | \$38,433 |          | \$44,634 | \$38,153 |          | \$44,142 | \$32,148 | \$38,245 |           | \$36,244 |          | \$38,931 | \$36,385                           | 7    | \$37,679                            | 7    | 11      |
| Marketing Specialist           | \$51,571 | \$67,123 |          |          | \$59,753 | \$51,290 |          |          |          |          |          |           |          |          | \$50,407 | \$57,755                           | 3    | \$59,780                            | 2    | 5       |
| Network Engineer               | \$62,467 | \$77,569 | \$68,742 | \$75,064 | \$69,696 | \$71,806 |          |          |          |          |          |           | \$78,046 | \$60,136 | \$71,995 | \$67,350                           | 8    | \$69,763                            | 6    | 9       |
| Office Manager                 |          |          | \$33,266 | \$65,686 |          |          | \$56,119 |          | \$48,397 |          | \$50,440 | \$50,915  |          |          |          | \$49,510                           | 5    | \$51,272                            | 3    | 6       |
| Payroll Manager                |          |          | \$68,742 |          |          | \$61,548 | \$63,055 | \$45,623 | \$53,059 |          | \$63,630 |           |          |          | \$66,057 | \$49,510                           | 7    | \$51,272                            | 7    | 7       |
| Permit Technician              | \$37,911 | \$43,494 | \$28,902 |          | \$47,441 | \$43,028 | \$51,905 |          | \$48,397 | \$39,291 |          | \$38,770  | \$49,808 | \$34,279 | \$42,446 | \$45,855                           | 5    | \$47,435                            | 5    | 12      |
| Plans Examiner I               |          |          | \$37,395 |          |          |          | \$66,839 |          | \$58,169 |          |          | \$58,367  | \$49,808 | \$43,908 | \$54,952 | \$57,755                           | 4    | \$59,780                            | 2    | 7       |
| Plant Operator                 |          |          |          | \$50,190 |          |          | \$56,119 | \$37,499 | \$44,142 |          |          | \$44,423  |          |          | \$46,251 | \$45,855                           | 4    | \$47,435                            | 3    | 6       |
| Plumbing Inspector I           |          | \$62,440 |          |          |          | \$48,791 |          |          |          | \$50,143 |          | \$58,365  | \$38,828 |          | \$50,407 | \$57,755                           | 3    | \$59,780                            | 2    | 6       |
| Project Manager                |          |          |          | \$80,243 |          | \$51,290 |          |          |          |          |          | \$66,919  |          |          | \$66,057 | \$57,755                           | 4    | \$59,780                            | 4    | 4       |
| Recreation Program Coordinator |          | \$62,440 | \$42,378 |          |          | \$35,903 | \$56,119 | \$37,499 |          | \$70,744 |          | \$50,918  |          |          | \$50,407 | \$53,470                           | 4    | \$55,349                            | 4    | 8       |
| Senior Accountant              |          | \$77,569 | \$64,733 | \$80,243 |          |          | \$80,409 |          | \$69,913 | \$82,047 |          | \$62,495  |          | \$67,870 | \$71,995 | \$72,750                           | 5    | \$75,317                            | 5    | 9       |
| Senior Planner                 |          | \$77,569 | \$68,742 | \$80,243 |          |          | \$66,839 |          |          | \$82,047 |          |           | \$78,046 | \$74,826 | \$66,057 | \$62,360                           | 9    | \$64,584                            | 9    | 8       |
| Skilled Tradesworker           |          | \$43,494 |          |          | \$47,441 | \$45,714 | \$48,060 |          | \$48,397 |          |          |           |          |          | \$42,446 | \$45,855                           | 4    | \$47,435                            | 4    | 6       |



**EXHIBIT 4B  
MARKET RANGES BY ORGANIZATION AT THE MIDPOINT (CONTINUED)**

| Classification                    | Peer A   | Peer B   | Peer C   | Peer D   | Peer E | Peer F   | Peer G   | Peer H | Peer I   | Peer J   | Peer K | Peer L    | Peer M   | Peer N   | Peer O   | Washington County, MD as of 1/1/17 | Rank | Washington County, MD as of 1/13/18 | Rank | # Resp. |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|----------|----------|--------|----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|------|---------|
| Stormwater Management Coordinator |          | \$77,569 |          |          |        |          | \$84,420 |        |          |          |        |           |          |          | \$78,473 | \$62,360                           | 4    | \$64,584                            | 4    | 3       |
| Survey Technician                 |          |          | \$29,883 |          |        |          |          |        | \$53,059 | \$56,282 |        |           |          | \$39,682 | \$50,407 | \$45,855                           | 4    | \$47,435                            | 4    | 5       |
| Systems Mechanic I                | \$42,896 | \$58,085 |          |          |        |          |          |        | \$44,142 | \$45,435 |        |           |          | \$37,792 | \$50,407 | \$45,855                           | 3    | \$47,435                            | 3    | 6       |
| Technical Support Analyst I       |          | \$54,032 |          | \$61,446 |        | \$53,855 |          |        | \$53,059 | \$56,282 |        |           |          | \$43,531 | \$60,600 | \$57,755                           | 3    | \$59,780                            | 3    | 7       |
| Transit Fleet Technician          |          | \$54,032 |          | \$61,312 |        | \$40,520 | \$44,500 |        | \$44,142 | \$43,267 |        |           |          |          | \$42,446 | \$45,855                           | 3    | \$47,435                            | 3    | 7       |
| Transportation Engineer           |          | \$67,123 |          |          |        |          | \$66,839 |        |          | \$70,744 |        | \$88,007  | \$78,046 | \$82,249 | \$66,057 | \$72,750                           | 4    | \$75,317                            | 4    | 7       |
| Treasurer                         |          |          |          |          |        | \$71,806 |          |        |          |          |        | \$100,945 |          |          |          | \$78,580                           | 2    | \$81,318                            | 2    | 2       |
| Utility Worker I                  | \$42,896 | \$35,011 | \$25,345 | \$38,433 |        | \$37,198 |          |        | \$36,733 | \$32,148 |        | \$38,770  |          |          | \$38,931 | \$31,195                           | 9    | \$32,292                            | 8    | 9       |
| Victim/Witness Coordinator        |          |          |          |          |        |          |          |        |          | \$56,080 |        | \$50,915  |          |          |          | \$53,470                           | 2    | \$55,349                            | 2    | 2       |
| Watershed Specialist              |          |          |          |          |        |          |          |        |          |          |        |           |          |          | \$66,057 | \$72,750                           | 1    | \$75,317                            | 1    | 1       |
| Welder                            |          |          | \$33,915 |          |        |          |          |        |          | \$45,435 |        |           |          | \$34,279 |          | \$49,510                           | 1    | \$51,272                            | 1    | 3       |
| Work Crew Supervisor              |          |          |          |          |        | \$52,829 |          |        | \$48,397 |          |        |           |          |          |          | \$39,300                           | 3    | \$40,675                            | 3    | 2       |
| Zoning Inspector                  |          | \$67,123 | \$37,395 |          |        |          | \$59,487 |        | \$44,142 | \$49,896 |        |           | \$49,808 |          | \$46,251 | \$53,470                           | 3    | \$55,349                            | 3    | 7       |



## 4.2 SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY

The County's salary midpoints for the benchmarked classifications in some instances were ranked below its desired market position. However, in multiple instances the midpoint rankings improved as a result of the County's action to put into place more competitive pay plans effective January 13, 2018. Given the data discussed above, the County could further benefit from a review of each classification to determine if additional specific pay grade changes would improve its ranking (competitive position) among its peers.

## 4.3 BENEFITS SURVEY RESULTS

Concurrent with the salary survey, Evergreen Solutions conducted a limited employee benefits survey to compare the County's current benefits to those of its peers. The information provided in this section is a result of this analysis. Benefit plans have many intricacies that are not represented in this data. The comparisons below should be considered carefully since benefits can be weighted differently depending on the importance to an organization. It should also be noted that benefits are usually negotiated and acquired through third parties, so one-to-one comparisons can be difficult. The analysis below highlights the results of the benefits survey. Data were collected from the eight peer organizations shown in **Exhibit 4C**.

### EXHIBIT 4C BENEFITS RESPONDENTS

| Peer Data Collected  |
|----------------------|
| Annapolis, MD        |
| Bowie, MD            |
| Frederick, MD        |
| Harrisburg, PA       |
| Rockville, MD        |
| Westminster, MD      |
| Alleghany County, MD |
| Frederick County, MD |

### General Benefits

**Exhibit 4D** provides counts and a percentage breakdown of the peers and the County's full-time and part-time employees. The number of full-time and part-time employees can influence the benefits provided by an organization. The peer organizations were made up of, 73.9 percent full-time employees and 26.1 percent part-time employees. For the County, this percentage was 62.0 percent full-time, and 38.0 percent part-time employees as displayed in **Exhibit 4D** below:



**EXHIBIT 4D  
PERCENT OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME EMPLOYEES**

| Organization Demographics | Peer Average |       | Washington County, MD |       |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|
| Full-Time Employees       | 592          | 73.9% | 775                   | 62.0% |
| Part-Time Employees       | 209          | 26.1% | 475                   | 38.0% |

The percentage of benefits in relation to total compensation is a common broad indicator that organizations use to assess how generous the discretionary benefits are at individual organizations. Total compensation refers to the compensation package (salary and benefits) an employee receives from its organization. Therefore, benefits as a percentage of total compensation is calculated by dividing benefits expressed as a dollar amount by the amount of total compensation (salary plus benefits).

As seen in **Exhibit 4E**, the market average for benefits as a percentage of total compensation was approximately 35.9 percent based on the information provided, while for the County, this percentage was 34.0. It is typical to see benefits as a percent of total compensation for the public sector in the 30.0 to 40.0 percent range. It is not uncommon for this number to vary within this range depending on the compensation philosophy of the organization and the relative cost of benefits.

**EXHIBIT 4E  
BENEFITS AS PERCENT OF TOTAL COMPENSATION**

| Total Compensation                             | Peer Average | Washington County, MD |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|
| Benefits as a percentage of total compensation | 35.9%        | 34.0%                 |

**Employee Health Plans**

**Exhibit 4F** shows the number of health plans provided to current employees by the responding peers and the County. The average number of health plans provided (any combination of HMO, HDHP/HSA, PPO, or other) was 2.8 based on the market data. The County offered two health plan options; one PPO plan and one EPO plan.

**EXHIBIT 4F  
NUMBER OF HEALTH PLANS**

| Number of Plans                | Peer Average | Washington County, MD |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Number of health plans offered | 2.8          | 2.0                   |



**Exhibit 4G** displays information regarding the health plans of peers compared to the County’s plans. Regarding health plan premiums, the County’s employee paid portion of the premium for individual coverage and family coverage was less than the peer’s average for PPO plans. Therefore, the County paid a higher portion of the health plan premiums than the surveyed peers. Like the County, there were a few peers (Alleghany County, Frederick, and Harrisburg) that offered PPO plans. From this exhibit, one can also observe that 62.5 % of peers offered HMO health insurance plans 37.5 % of peers offered PPO plans, 25.0 % of peers offered HSA plans, and 42.9 % of peers offered some other type of insurance plan such as a POS plans.

**EXHIBIT 4G  
HEALTH PLAN PREMIUMS AND DEDUCTIBLES**

| Health Plan Premiums & Deductibles                                      | Peer HMO Average | Peer PPO Average | Peer HSA Average | Other Plans Average | Washington County, MD | Washington County, MD |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Percentage of peers offering each plan                                  | 62.5%            | 37.5%            | 25.0%            | 42.9%               | EPO                   | PPO                   |
| DOLLAR AMOUNT (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer            | \$446.24         | \$534.71         | \$467.50         | \$436.66            | \$654.99              | \$660.92              |
| PERCENTAGE (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer               | 78.4%            | 87.0%            | 85.5%            | 73.5%               | 92.5%                 | 87.5%                 |
| DOLLAR AMOUNT (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee            | \$122.75         | \$90.60          | \$80.73          | \$169.11            | \$53.11               | \$94.42               |
| PERCENTAGE (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee               | 21.6%            | 13.0%            | 14.5%            | 26.5%               | 7.5%                  | 12.5%                 |
| Individual Maximum Deductible In Network                                | \$1,050.00       | \$125.00         | \$1,275.00       | \$280.00            | \$0.00                | \$0.00                |
| Individual Maximum Deductible Out of Network                            | \$1,325.00       | \$400.00         | \$1,275.00       | \$280.00            | No OON Benefit        | \$250.00              |
| DOLLAR AMOUNT (monthly) of employee plus child premium paid by employer | \$882.82         | \$1,058.84       | \$949.50         | \$874.05            | \$1,192.00            | \$1,202.90            |
| PERCENTAGE (monthly) of employee plus child premium paid by employer    | 78.3%            | 81.8%            | 85.5%            | 73.2%               | 92.5%                 | 87.5%                 |
| DOLLAR AMOUNT (monthly) of employee plus child premium paid by employee | \$245.61         | \$248.82         | \$167.02         | \$346.21            | \$96.66               | \$171.84              |
| PERCENTAGE (monthly) of employee plus child premium paid by employee    | 21.7%            | 18.2%            | 14.5%            | 26.8%               | 7.5%                  | 12.5%                 |
| Employee Plus Child Maximum Deductible In Network                       | \$2,066.67       | \$250.00         | \$2,550.00       | \$560.00            | \$0.00                | \$750.00              |
| Employee Plus Child Maximum Deductible Out of Network                   | \$2,600.00       | \$800.00         | \$2,550.00       | \$560.00            | \$0.00                | \$750.00              |



**EXHIBIT 4G  
HEALTH PLAN PREMIUMS AND DEDUCTIBLES (CONTINUED)**

| Health Plan Premiums & Deductibles                                       | Peer HMO Average | Peer PPO Average | Peer HSA Average | Other Plans Average | Washington County, MD | Washington County, MD |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| DOLLAR AMOUNT (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer | \$978.55         | \$1,201.21       | \$949.50         | \$874.05            | \$1,283.80            | \$1,295.43            |
| PERCENTAGE (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer    | 78.3%            | 80.5%            | 85.5%            | 73.2%               | 92.5%                 | 87.5%                 |
| DOLLAR AMOUNT (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee | \$287.64         | \$288.98         | \$167.02         | \$346.21            | \$104.09              | \$185.06              |
| PERCENTAGE (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee    | 21.7%            | 19.5%            | 14.5%            | 26.8%               | 7.5%                  | 12.5%                 |
| Employee Plus Spouse Maximum Deductible In Network                       | \$2,066.67       | \$250.00         | \$2,550.00       | \$560.00            | \$0.00                | \$750.00              |
| Employee Plus Spouse Maximum Deductible Out of Network                   | \$2,600.00       | \$800.00         | \$2,550.00       | \$560.00            | \$0.00                | \$750.00              |
| DOLLAR AMOUNT (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer | \$1,295.86       | \$1,340.78       | \$1,263.00       | \$1,273.20          | \$1,847.12            | \$1,863.84            |
| PERCENTAGE (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer    | 78.3%            | 80.2%            | 85.5%            | 73.2%               | 92.5%                 | 87.5%                 |
| DOLLAR AMOUNT (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee | \$361.50         | \$333.14         | \$201.67         | \$509.47            | \$149.77              | \$266.26              |
| PERCENTAGE (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee    | 21.7%            | 19.8%            | 14.5%            | 26.8%               | 7.5%                  | 12.5%                 |
| Employee Plus Family Maximum Deductible In Network                       | \$2,066.67       | \$250.00         | \$2,550.00       | \$560.00            | \$0.00                | \$750.00              |
| Employee Plus Family Maximum Deductible Out of Network                   | \$2,600.00       | \$800.00         | \$2,550.00       | \$560.00            | \$0.00                | \$750.00              |

**Other Insurance Plans**

Exhibit 4H displays information from the responding peers regarding provided or offered dental and vision insurance plans. The County, as did most of its peers, provided employer paid dental insurance plans. Like majority of their peers, the County provided employee paid vision insurance plans.



**EXHIBIT 4H  
DENTAL AND VISION PLANS**

| Dental and Vision Offerings |                       | Peer Percentage Offered | Average Number of Plans Offered | Average maximum monthly amount that the employee pays for employee only | Average maximum monthly amount that the employee pays for employee | Average maximum monthly amount the employer pays for employee only | Average maximum monthly amount the employer pays for employee plus |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Dental Insurance            | Employer Paid         | 62.5%                   | 1.0                             | -   | -  | \$18.76  | \$25.60  |
|                             | Washington County, MD | Yes                     | 2.0                             |   |  | \$5.74 Low Option/\$7.20 High Option                               | \$15.80 Low Option/\$20.69 High Option                             |
|                             | Employee Paid         | 37.5%                   | 0.0                             | \$20.90   | \$55.00  | -  | -  |
|                             | Washington County, MD | Yes                     | 2.0                             | \$13.42 Low Option/\$16.79 High Option                                  | \$36.87 Low Option/\$48.27 High Option                             |  |  |
| Vision Plan                 | Employer Paid         | 37.5%                   | 1.0                             | -   | -  | \$4.00   | \$5.30   |
|                             | Washington County, MD | No                      |                                 |   |  |  |  |
|                             | Employee Paid         | 50.0%                   | 1.0                             | \$10.90   | \$25.30  | -  | -  |
|                             | Washington County, MD | Yes                     | 2.0                             | \$5.58 Low Option/\$7.14 High Option                                    | \$12.25 Low Option/\$17.77 High Option                             |  |  |

**Exhibit 4I** displays the percentage of responding peers who provided short and long-term disability insurance. Of the responding peers, 57.1 percent provided employer paid short-term disability insurance. Unlike most of the peers, the County provided employee paid options for short-term disability, employer paid options for long term disability, and employee paid options for long term disability.

**EXHIBIT 4I  
DISABILITY INSURANCE**

| Disability Insurance  |                       | Peer Percentage Offered | Average maximum monthly amount that the employee pays for coverage | Average maximum monthly amount the employer pays for coverage | Percentage of salary the employee receives |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| Short-Term Disability | Employer Paid         | 57.1%                   | -  | \$1.00  | 61.5%                                      |
|                       | Washington County, MD | Yes                     | No Charge  | Self Admin  | 70.0%                                      |
|                       | Employee Paid         | 0.0%                    | -  | -   | -  |
|                       | Washington County, MD | Yes                     | No Charge  | Self Admin  | 70.0%                                      |
| Long-Term Disability  | Employer Paid         | 42.9%                   | No Charge  | \$0.39  | 58.7%                                      |
|                       | Washington County, MD | Yes                     | No Charge (40% of Pay)   | Based on Salary   | 40.0%                                      |
|                       | Employee Paid         | 14.3%                   | No Charge  | Based on Salary   | 60.0%                                      |
|                       | Washington County, MD | Yes                     | Based on Age (20% of Pay)  | Based on Age/Salary   | \$0.20                                     |



**Life Insurance**

**Exhibit 4J** summarizes the life insurance offerings of responding peers and the County. Employer-paid life insurance is provided by 100.0 percent of the peers as well as the County. Most of the peers, as well as the County, offer the option of optional dependent coverage, additional employee paid life insurance. Unlike most of the peers, the County provided accidental death insurance to employees.

**EXHIBIT 4J  
LIFE INSURANCE**

| Life Insurance  | Peer Percentage Yes | Peer Average | Washington County, MD                |
|---|---------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Is employer-paid life insurance offered?                          | 100.0%              | -            | Yes                                  |
| Cost (monthly) to employer for individual coverage                | -                   | \$6,616.19   | No Charge                            |
| Dollar amount of death benefit                                    | -                   | \$123,333.33 | 1 x Salary Rounded to the next 1,000 |
| Is Optional dependent coverage offered?                           | 75.0%               | -            | Yes                                  |
| Can the employee purchase (additional) life insurance if desired? | 75.0%               | -            | Yes                                  |
| Is accidental death insurance provided?                           | 28.6%               | -            | Yes                                  |

**Exhibit 4K** summarizes the Employee Assistance Programs (EAP) offering. EAP is provided by 66.7 percent of responding peers and 66.7 percent of those same peers offer these benefits to employees’ families. On average, 4.0 annual visits are provided by peers. The County offers Employee Assistance Programs (EAP) with benefits to the employee’s families and the County provides 3.0 annual visits.

**EXHIBIT 4K  
EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**

| EAP   | Peer Percentage Yes | Peer Average | Washington County, MD |
|---|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Is an EAP offered?  | 66.7%               | -            | Yes                   |
| Are benefits available to family members as well as the employee? | 66.7%               | -            | Yes                   |
| Number of Annual EAP Visits Provided                              | -                   | 4.0          | 3                     |

**Exhibit 4L** shows tuition reimbursement among peers and the County. Tuition reimbursement for employees is provided by 33.3 percent of responding peers with an average reimbursement limit of \$2000.00 per calendar year. The County offers tuition reimbursement to their employees with an average of \$2500.00 per calendar year.





**EXHIBIT 4L  
TUITION REIMBURSEMENT BENEFITS**

| Tuition Reimbursement             | Peer Percentage Yes | Peer Average | Washington County, MD    |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Is Tuition Reimbursement offered? | 33.3%               | -            | Yes                      |
| Tuition Reimbursement Limit       | -                   | \$2,000.00   | \$2500 per calendar year |

**Employee Leave and Holidays**

**Exhibit 4M** provides the average accrual rates for personal, sick, annual/vacation, and paid time off for employees for both responding peers and the County. Responding peers provided an average minimum monthly accrual rate for sick leave of 6.1 hours and a maximum rate of 6.3. Furthermore, the peers provided an average minimum monthly accrual rate for annual/vacation leave of 6.9 hours and a maximum rate of 15.9. The County provided a minimum monthly accrual amount of 9.2 hours for sick leave. The County’s annual/vacation leave had a minimum accrual rate of 6.2 hours and a maximum accrual rate of 12.3 hours. The County and most of the peers did not offer Paid Time Off (PTO) leave.

**EXHIBIT 4M  
LEAVE TIME ACCRUAL**

| Leave Accrual         | Organization                | Offered? | Minimum Accrual Rate (Monthly) | How many years of service does it require to begin to accrue the minimum rate? | Maximum Accrual Rate (Monthly) | Years to Achieve Maximum Accrual Rate | Maximum Allowed to Roll Over to Following Year |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Sick Leave            | Peer Percentage Yes/Average | 100.0%   | 6.1                            | 4 months   | 6.3                            | 2.4                                   | 106.7  |
|                       | Washington County, MD       | Yes      | 9.2                            | Begin accruing hire date; but 3 month waiting period                           | None - Unlimited               | -                                     | Unlimited                                      |
| Annual/Vacation Leave | Peer Percentage Yes/Average | 100.0%   | 6.9                            | 3 months   | 15.9                           | 15.9                                  | 253.3  |
|                       | Washington County, MD       | Yes      | 6.2                            | Begin accruing hire date; but 6 month waiting period                           | 12.3                           | 15.0                                  | 200 hours                                      |
| Personal Leave        | Peer Percentage Yes/Average | 71.4%    | 2.4                            | 0.0  | 3.0                            | 4.6                                   | 37.3   |
|                       | Washington County, MD       | Yes      | 4.0                            | None   | 4.0                            | -                                     | 48 hours                                       |
| Paid-Time Off         | Peer Percentage Yes/Average | 0.0%     | -                              | -  | -                              | -                                     | -  |
|                       | Washington County, MD       | No       |                                |  |                                |                                       |  |



**Exhibit 4N** summarizes respondents’ policies regarding the payout of sick leave upon employee termination. Unlike the County, most of its peers did not payout sick leave upon voluntary or involuntary separation. Like the County, most of the peers allowed unused sick leave to count towards retirement and the average of the maximum hours paid out was 120.0 hours.

**EXHIBIT 4N  
SICK LEAVE PAYOUT**

| Sick Leave Policies  | Peer Percentage Yes | Peer Average | Washington County, MD        |
|--|---------------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| Is unused sick leave paid out upon voluntary separation?     | 37.5%               | -            | Yes                          |
| Max hours of sick leave paid out upon voluntary separation   | -                   | 120.0        | \$10.00 per day up to \$1300 |
| Is unused sick leave paid out upon involuntary separation?   | 12.5%               | -            | Yes                          |
| Max hours of sick leave paid out upon involuntary separation | -                   | -            | \$10.00 per day up to \$1300 |
| Can unused sick leave count towards retirement?              | 87.5%               | -            | Yes                          |
| Max hours of sick leave that can count towards retirement    | -                   | 120.0        | 100% of hours                |

**Exhibit 4O** summarizes respondents’ policies regarding annual/vacation leave payout. Annual/vacation leave was paid out by 100.0 percent of respondents for voluntary separation and 100.0 percent of respondents for involuntary separation. The County also paid out vacation leave for voluntary and involuntary separation. The average max hours paid out for voluntary separation was 292.5 hours and average max hours paid out for involuntary separation was 292.5 hours.

**EXHIBIT 4O  
ANNUAL/VACATION LEAVE PAYOUT**

| Vacation Leave Policies   | Peer Percentage Yes | Peer Average | Washington County, MD |
|---|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Is unused annual/vacation leave paid out upon voluntary               | 100.0%              | -            | Yes                   |
| Max hours of annual/vacation leave paid out upon voluntary separation | -                   | 292.5        | 100% of hours         |
| Is unused annual/vacation leave paid out upon involuntary             | 100.0%              | -            | Yes                   |
| paid out upon involuntary separation                                  | -                   | 292.5        | 100% of hours         |



The percentages of peers recognizing various holidays and the holidays at the County are shown in **Exhibit 4P**. All peers recognized New Year’s Day, Martin Luther King Jr. Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day. The County recognizes these days as well as President’s Day, Good Friday, Veteran’s Day, Thanksgiving Friday, and Christmas Eve for a total of 13 paid holidays each year, which was more than the peer average of 11.

**EXHIBIT 4P  
RECOGNIZED HOLIDAYS**

| Paid Holiday observed by peer organizations | Peer Percentage Yes | Washington County, MD |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| New Year's Day                              | 100.0%              | Yes                   |
| New Year's Eve                              | 0.0%                | Yes                   |
| Martin Luther King, Jr. Day                 | 100.0%              | Yes                   |
| Lincoln's Birthday                          | 0.0%                | No                    |
| Washington's Birthday                       | 50.0%               | No                    |
| Presidents Day                              | 25.0%               | Yes                   |
| Good Friday                                 | 37.5%               | Yes                   |
| Memorial Day                                | 100.0%              | Yes                   |
| Independence Day                            | 100.0%              | Yes                   |
| Labor Day                                   | 100.0%              | Yes                   |
| Veteran's Day                               | 87.5%               | Yes                   |
| Thanksgiving Day                            | 100.0%              | Yes                   |
| Day after Thanksgiving                      | 87.5%               | Yes                   |
| Christmas Eve                               | 25.0%               | Yes                   |
| Christmas Day                               | 100.0%              | Yes                   |
| Personal Holiday                            | 25.0%               | No                    |
| Employee Birthday                           | 25.0%               | No                    |
| Other                                       | 37.5%               | No                    |

| Holiday Policies   | Peer Total/Percentage Yes | Washington County, MD |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Total Number of holidays observed                                | 11.0                      | 13.0                  |
| How are employees paid for holidays?                             |                           |                       |
| Straight time  | 37.5%                     | Yes                   |
| Time and a Half if hours worked exceed maximum for straight time | 62.5%                     | No                    |
| Time and a Half regardless of hours worked during the pay period |                           | Yes                   |



**Retired Employee Benefits**

Exhibit 4Q displays the number of retirement plans provided and whether peers and the County participated in or provided retirement options other than the state plan. Of the peer respondents, 62.5 percent participated in the state retirement system, and 87.5 percent provided other plans.

**EXHIBIT 4Q  
RETIREMENT**

| Number of Plans                    | Peer Average | Washington County, MD |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Number of retirement plans offered | 2.0          | 1.0                   |

| Retirement Participation   | Peer Percentage Yes | Washington County, MD |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Does the organization participate in a State Retirement System?            | 62.5%               | No                    |
| Is a retirement option other than a state plan offered?                    | 87.5%               | Yes                   |
| Is D.R.O.P. offered?   | 37.5%               | Yes                   |
| Is a 401k, 401a, 403(b), or 457 offered?                                   | 100.0%              | Yes                   |
| Is a type of plan other than a 401k, 401a, 403(b) or 457 offered?          | 12.5%               | No                    |
| Does the employer contribute to any of these non-state retirement options? | 87.5%               | Yes                   |

| Retirement Details   | Peer Average | Washington County, MD |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|
| Years to Fully Vest  | 10.0         | 5.0                   |
| COLA Offered to Retiree Pensions   | 50.0%        | Yes                   |
| Does the organization's retirement plan offer a disability provision?          | 100.0%       | Yes                   |
| What percent of salary does the organization contribute to this                | 10.0%        | 17.0%                 |
| What percent of salary does the employee contribute to this retirement option? | 5.3%         | Varies 5.5% or 6%     |



#### 4.4 BENEFITS SUMMARY

The peer benefit data summarized in this chapter indicate that the County provided/offered very competitive benefits for both current and retired employees. The County was comparable and slightly ahead in some categories of benefits such as providing employer paid dental and vision plans, higher accrual rates for sick leave, providing more paid holidays, and offering more tuition reimbursement to employees.

#### 4.5 MARKET SUMMARY

From the analysis of the data gathered in the external market assessment discussed above, the benchmark classifications' salary midpoints were generally found to be below the County's peers in the market. The review of data for both public and private sectors indicates the County could benefit from the development and implementation of more competitive pay plans (salary ranges) structured more similarly to its peers. When reviewing employee benefits, however, it appeared the County compared favorably to its peers. Subsequent study recommendations can be found in the next chapter of this report.



## Chapter 5 – Recommendations

The analysis of the County’s classification and compensation systems revealed several areas of opportunities for improvement. Evergreen Solutions worked to build on areas of strength within these systems. Focus was placed on developing a more competitive compensation system and a sound classification structure. Study findings and recommendations in this regard are discussed below.

### 5.1 CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

An organization’s classification system establishes how its human resources are employed to perform its core services. The classification system consists of the titles and descriptions of the different classifications, or positions, which define how work is organized and assigned. It is essential that the titles and descriptions of an organization’s classifications accurately depict the work being performed by employees in the classifications in order to ensure equity within the organization and to enable comparisons with positions at peer organizations. The purpose of a classification analysis is to identify such issues as incorrect titles, outdated job descriptions, and inconsistent titles across departments.

In the analysis of the County’s classification system, Evergreen Solutions collected classification data through the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) and Management Issues Tool (MIT) processes. The JATs, which were completed by employees and reviewed by their supervisors, provided information about the type and level of work being performed for each of the County’s classifications. The MIT process provided supervisors an opportunity to provide specific recommendations regarding the pay or classification of positions in their areas. Evergreen Solutions reviewed and utilized the data provided in the JATs and MITs as a basis for the classification recommendations below.

#### FINDING

Overall, the classification system utilized by the County was generally accurate and well organized. There were instances, however, of titles that could be modified to better reflect the tasks assigned to the position.

**RECOMMENDATION 1: Revise the titles of some classifications and establish unique titles as needed based on the work performed by employees.**

**Exhibit 5A** provides a list of the recommended changes to the classification system. Not listed are minor changes e.g., spelling out abbreviated words; however, listed are modifications to entire classifications and those that had unique changes for one or two employees (listed as New Title) in a classification. The foundation for all recommendations was the work performed by employees in these classifications as described in their JATs, best practices in the Human Resources field, or unique needs which required a specific titling method.



**EXHIBIT 5A**  
**PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES**

| Current Class Title            | Recommended Class Title                                  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Accounting Supervisor          | Accounting Manager                                       |
| Accounts Payable Supervisor    | Accounts Payable Supervisor                              |
| Accounts Receivable Supv.      | Accounting Supervisor                                    |
| Accounts Receivable Tech.      | Accounting Technician                                    |
| Administrative Assistant       | Office Manager   |
| Airport Maint Wkr/Firefight    | Airport Facility Manager                                 |
| Assignment Clerk I             | Assistant Assignment Clerk                               |
| Asst Section Supervisor        | Assistant Section Supervisor                             |
| Asst. Dir. Emer. Communication | Emergency Communications Assistant Director              |
| Deputy Dir. B&F                | Deputy Director, Budget & Finance                        |
| Dir F&R, Emergency Mgmt        | Emergency Services Director                              |
| Dir. of Community Grant Mgmt.  | Director of Community Grant Management                   |
| Dir. Training QA/QC            | Emergency Services Training and Quality Control Director |
| Driver Supervisor              | Operations Manager                                       |
| Emerg Comm-Dep Dir of Admin    | Emergency Communications Administrative Manager          |
| Equipment Oper II/Crew Coord   | Crew Leader  |
| Equipment Operator Mechanic    | Equipment Operator/Maintenance Worker                    |
| Golf Course Mechanic           | Mechanic   |
| Golf Maintenance Worker        | Golf Maintenance Worker I                                |
| Golf Maintenance Worker        | Golf Maintenance Worker II                               |
| Grill Cook I                   | Food Service Worker                                      |
| HR Administrator               | HR Coordinator   |
| Inform. Tech. Svcs. Spec. II   | IT Services Specialist III                               |
| IT Administrator - Emerg. Comm | Emergency Communications Systems Administrator           |
| Operations Manager             | Emergency Communications Operations Manager              |
| Personnel & Training Coord.    | Public Safety HR Coordinator                             |
| Prof Svcs Admin - Emerg Comm   | Emergency Communications Administrative Supervisor       |
| Risk Management Admin          | Risk Management Administrator                            |
| Safety Compliance Admin        | Safety Compliance Administrator                          |
| Transit Fleet & Facility Mgr   | Operations Manager                                       |
| Weigh Clerk/Recycling Asst.    | Recycling Assistant                                      |



## FINDING

When comparing the County's current job descriptions to the work described by employees in the JATs, Evergreen Solutions noted some tasks that were either missing from the job descriptions or were inappropriate to the current title. It is common for the tasks outlined in job descriptions to be reassigned to different classifications over time. As such, it is necessary for an organization to update its job descriptions regularly to ensure each job description accurately reflects the work performed.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: Revise all job descriptions to include updated classification information provided in the JAT and review job descriptions annually for accuracy.**

The process of reviewing and updating the County's job descriptions, as well as comments received from employees and supervisors during outreach, revealed they did not always accurately reflect current work performed in some cases. To minimize this becoming a concern again in the future, Evergreen Solutions recommends a regular review of these descriptions and FLSA status determinations. To the extent possible, a review of the employee's assigned job classification (description) should occur concurrent with his/her annual performance evaluation.

This would be an appropriate time to review the job description as it should accurately represent the work the employee has and will perform during the evaluation periods. Review of the FLSA determination as well as other aspects of the job, such as physical requirements required to perform essential functions of the job, will ensure consistent, continuous compliance with the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) protection. Updated, draft job descriptions will be provided to the County under separate cover.

## 5.2 COMPENSATION SYSTEM

The compensation system analysis consisted of two parts: an external market assessment and an internal equity assessment. During the external market assessment, the County's pay ranges for selected benchmark classifications were compared to the average of the identified market. Details regarding the external market assessment were provided in **Chapter 4** of this report.

During the internal equity assessment, consideration of the relationships between and the type of work being performed by the County's employees were reviewed and analyzed. Specifically, a composite score was assigned to each of the County's classifications that quantified the classification's level of five separate compensatory factors. The level for each factor was determined based on responses to the JAT.

## FINDING

The results of both internal and external assessments indicated that the County's salary ranges for some classifications should be revised to be more competitive. During the course of this study, the County made an appropriate market correction by adjusting its pay structure by 3.5 percent. Thus, the structure did not at the time the study concluded require another





scale adjustment. Rather, individual pay grade assignments could be made to some classifications to bring them more in line with the competitive labor market.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** Review all classifications into the County’s adjusted structure (plans effective 1/13/2018) based on external and internal equity; and implement the new structure by transitioning employees’ salaries into these plans which are shown below.

**Exhibit 5B** shows the General Employee plan, **Exhibit 5C** the Sheriff Detention plan, **Exhibit 5D** the Sheriff Patrol/Judiciary step plan, and **Exhibit 5E** the Emergency Services plan. The steps are not shown in these exhibits, though remain unchanged in design from the plans at the beginning of the study.

**EXHIBIT 5B  
PAY PLAN  
GENERAL EMPLOYEE**

| Grade | Minimum      | Midpoint     | Maximum      |
|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1     | \$20,009.60  | \$25,646.40  | \$31,283.20  |
| 2     | \$21,590.40  | \$27,684.80  | \$33,779.20  |
| 3     | \$23,337.60  | \$29,920.80  | \$36,504.00  |
| 4     | \$25,188.80  | \$32,292.00  | \$39,395.20  |
| 5     | \$27,206.40  | \$34,871.20  | \$42,536.00  |
| 6     | \$29,390.40  | \$37,679.20  | \$45,968.00  |
| 7     | \$31,740.80  | \$40,674.40  | \$49,608.00  |
| 8     | \$34,278.40  | \$43,950.40  | \$53,622.40  |
| 9     | \$37,003.20  | \$47,434.40  | \$57,865.60  |
| 10    | \$39,977.60  | \$51,272.00  | \$62,566.40  |
| 11    | \$43,180.80  | \$55,348.80  | \$67,516.80  |
| 12    | \$46,633.60  | \$59,779.20  | \$72,924.80  |
| 13    | \$50,356.80  | \$64,584.00  | \$78,811.20  |
| 14    | \$54,392.00  | \$69,763.20  | \$85,134.40  |
| 15    | \$58,760.00  | \$75,316.80  | \$91,873.60  |
| 16    | \$63,440.00  | \$81,317.60  | \$99,195.20  |
| 17    | \$68,515.20  | \$87,828.00  | \$107,140.80 |
| 18    | \$73,985.60  | \$94,848.00  | \$115,710.40 |
| 19    | \$79,913.60  | \$102,429.60 | \$124,945.60 |
| 20    | \$86,299.20  | \$110,635.20 | \$134,971.20 |
| 21    | \$93,225.60  | \$119,516.80 | \$145,808.00 |
| 22    | \$100,672.00 | \$129,032.80 | \$157,393.60 |



**EXHIBIT 5C  
PAY PLAN  
SHERIFF DETENTION**

| Grade | Minimum     | Midpoint    | Maximum      |
|-------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| D1    | \$37,981.00 | \$40,778.50 | \$43,576.00  |
| D2    | \$45,115.00 | \$53,300.00 | \$61,485.00  |
| D3    | \$53,560.00 | \$63,284.00 | \$73,008.00  |
| D4    | \$59,405.00 | \$70,189.50 | \$80,974.00  |
| D5    | \$65,853.00 | \$77,813.00 | \$89,773.00  |
| D6    | \$73,008.00 | \$86,257.50 | \$99,507.00  |
| D7    | \$80,954.00 | \$95,628.00 | \$110,302.00 |

**EXHIBIT 5D  
PAY PLAN  
SHERIFF PATROL/JUDICIARY**

| Grade | Minimum      | Midpoint     | Maximum      |
|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| P1    | \$37,981.00  | \$44,865.50  | \$51,750.00  |
| P2    | \$45,115.00  | \$53,300.00  | \$61,485.00  |
| P3    | \$43,534.00  | \$46,737.50  | \$49,941.00  |
| P4    | \$51,688.00  | \$61,069.00  | \$70,450.00  |
| P5    | \$61,402.00  | \$72,550.50  | \$83,699.00  |
| P6    | \$68,078.00  | \$80,444.00  | \$92,810.00  |
| P7    | \$68,078.00  | \$80,444.00  | \$92,810.00  |
| P8    | \$75,483.00  | \$89,180.00  | \$102,877.00 |
| P9    | \$83,678.00  | \$98,862.00  | \$114,046.00 |
| P10   | \$92,789.00  | \$109,626.50 | \$126,464.00 |
| P11   | \$102,856.00 | \$121,524.00 | \$140,192.00 |



**EXHIBIT 5E  
PAY PLAN  
EMERGENCY SERVICES**

| Grade | Minimum     | Midpoint    | Maximum      |
|-------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| E2    | \$32,650.80 | \$52,383.24 | \$72,115.68  |
| E3    | \$35,249.76 | \$56,554.68 | \$77,859.60  |
| E4    | \$38,067.12 | \$61,075.56 | \$84,084.00  |
| E5    | \$41,124.72 | \$66,022.32 | \$90,919.92  |
| E6    | \$44,400.72 | \$71,318.52 | \$98,236.32  |
| E7    | \$47,938.80 | \$76,931.40 | \$105,924.00 |
| E8    | \$51,782.64 | \$83,123.04 | \$114,463.44 |

Evergreen then reviewed the individual pay grades of classifications based on the internal and external analyses, the County's desired market position, and recruitment and retention concerns. The County was in the process of reviewing this information at the time of this report.

#### **FINDING**

The results of the salary placement analyses and the internal and external assessments indicated that many employees' salaries could be improved by more progression toward competitive midpoints. As these issues were discovered during the study, the County took proactive action and made an appropriate market correction by adjusting its pay structure by 3.5 percent (as displayed in the exhibits above) and provided across the board employee salary increases. In addition, it began departmental reviews of employees' salaries in classifications to determine if adjustments should be made toward the recommended midpoints. These were underway at the time of this study.

**RECOMMENDATION 4: Continue departmental review of employees' salaries and when feasible, make appropriate adjustments toward market competitive midpoints.**

### **5.3 COMPENSATION AND CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION**

The County's compensation and classification system will need periodic maintenance. The recommendations provided to improve the competitiveness of the classification and compensation structure were developed based on conditions at the time the data were collected. Without proper upkeep, the potential for recruitment and retention issues may increase as the compensation and classification system becomes dated and less competitive.

**RECOMMENDATION 5: Conduct small-scale salary surveys as needed to assess the market competitiveness of hard-to-fill classifications and/or classifications with retention issues and make adjustments to pay grade assignments if necessary.**

While it is unlikely that the pay plans as a whole will need to be adjusted for several years, a small number of classifications' pay grades may need to be reassigned more frequently. If one or more classifications are exhibiting high turnover or are having difficulty with recruitment, the County should collect salary range data from peer organizations to determine whether an adjustment is needed for the pay grade of the classification(s). If increasing a classification's pay grade based on market data does not help with the recruitment and/or retention issues, it may be necessary for the County to offer incentives to attract employees to the position and/or to encourage employees to remain in the position.

**RECOMMENDATION 6: Conduct a comprehensive classification and compensation study every three to five years.**

Small-scale salary surveys can improve the market position of specific classifications, but it is recommended that a full classification and compensation study be conducted every three to five years to preserve both internal and external equity for the County. Changes to classification and compensation do occur, and while the increments of change may seem minor, they can compound over time. A failure to react to these changes quickly has the potential to place the County in less than desirable position for recruiting and retaining quality employees.

While the previous two recommendations are intended to maintain the competitiveness over time of particular classifications and the classification and compensation structure as a whole, it is also necessary to review and if necessary establish guidelines for determining equitable pay practices for employees.

**RECOMMENDATION 7: Review and revise, as appropriate, guidelines for progressing employee salaries through the pay plan, including procedures for determining salaries of newly hired employees and employees who have been promoted or transferred to a different classification or department.**

The method of moving salaries through the pay plan and setting new salaries for new hires, promotions, and transfers depends largely on an organization's compensation philosophy. It is important for the County to have established guidelines for each of these situations, and to ensure that they are followed consistently for all employees. Common practices for progressing and establishing employee salaries are outlined below.

Salary Progression

There are several common methods for salary progression including cost of living adjustments (COLA)/across the board, time based, and employee performance based. The County intends to utilize both across the board and individual performance based methods to progress employees' salaries in his or her classification's assigned pay range. As it is the County's desire to continue to link employee's performance with eligibility for salary advancement, it will be important to continue to review this process and as appropriate, make improvements. Training staff, for example, regarding the purpose of performance evaluation and its desired results is important in order to maintain consistency and impartiality of this method of salary progression.

### New Hires

A new employee's starting salary typically depends on the amount of education and experience the employee possesses beyond the minimum requirements for the job. Typically, an employee holding only the minimum education and experience requirements for a classification is hired at or near the classification's pay grade minimum. However, for recruiting and retention purposes the County needs the ability to offer salaries to new employees that consider prior related experience. It is recommended that the County maintain this flexibility when establishing new employee salaries.

### Promotions

When an employee is promoted to a new classification, it is important to have guidelines for calculating the employee's new salary that rewards the employee for his or her new responsibilities, moving the salary into the new pay grade, and ensuring internal equity in the new classification. For example, a range of three to seven percent increase is common today, with consideration given to preserving the internal equity of employees' salaries within the classification.

### Transfers

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

## **5.4 SUMMARY**

The recommendations in this chapter establish a total compensation system that places the County at its desired market position. While the upkeep of these recommended systems will continue to require review, the County will find that having a competitive compensation and classification system that encourages strong recruitment and employee retention is well worth this commitment.

