

**DOWNSTAIRS TRAINING ROOM
250 NORTH MAIN STREET
CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL WILL HOLD A SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING AT 5:00 PM ON MAY 8, 2018 AT THE DOWNSTAIRS TRAINING ROOM, 250 NORTH MAIN STREET, CENTERVILLE, UTAH. THE AGENDA IS SHOWN BELOW.

Meetings of the City Council of Centerville City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 52-4-207, as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meeting will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.

Centerville City, in compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens in need of assistance, including hearing devices. Persons requesting these accommodations for City-sponsored public meetings, services, programs, or events should call Jacob Smith, Centerville Management Services Director, at 801-295-3477, giving at least 24 hours notice prior to the meeting.

A notebook containing supporting materials for the business agenda items is available for public inspection and review at City Hall and will be available for review at the meeting. Upon request, a citizen may obtain (without charge) the City Manager's memo summarizing the agenda business, **or may read this memo on the City's website: <http://centerville.novusagenda.com/agendapublic>.**

A. ROLL CALL

B. BUSINESS

5:00 1. Work Session to discuss City Manager's FY 2019 Proposed Budget

Mackenzie Wood
Centerville City Recorder

CENTERVILLE

Staff Backup Report

5/8/2018

Item No. 1.

Short Title: Work Session to discuss City Manager's FY 2019 Proposed Budget

Initiated By: City Manager

Scheduled Time: 5:00

SUBJECT

RECOMMENDATION

See attached outline for this work session and future budget work session(s). Bring City Manager's Proposed Budget to the work session and review any other attached documents.

BACKGROUND

Police Chief Paul Child will take the first part of the work session to explain his request for additional police officer positions and higher pay for police officers. The Proposed Budget includes funding for one additional officer in FY 2019. The Management Services Director has compiled in-depth analysis of police officer pay in other cities compared with Centerville. The analysis provides some justification for increasing the pay grades for Police Officer I, II and III by one grade each, or a 5% increase in the pay ranges. That data is in one of the attachments mentioned below.

Compensation issues -- See the attached "2018 Salary Survey Summary" for this discussion. The first table compares the pay range midpoints for a number of non-management "benchmark" positions. The second table compares the same positions *after making an adjustment for Police Officer I, II and III each by one grade*. The third table is a comparison of management positions with similar positions in other cities. This management comparison continues to reveal a significant disparity in pay--i.e. all of the Centerville management position pay ranges are well below average.

Another attachment, "Police Officer Pay Comparison 2018", provides the in-depth analysis mentioned above. The first two pages compare Centerville's current pay ranges for police officers with other cities. The third and fourth pages make the same comparison after adjusting Centerville's police officer pay ranges up one grade each.

The work session outline includes a review of compensation for elected officials. According to the attached City Code provisions, this review is to occur every four years. The last year a comparison was done was 2014. Staff should have an updated comparative analysis ready for the work session.

Employee health insurance renewal -- Unfortunately the Select Health medical insurance renewal came in initially at a 15.2% increase. Staff directed the brokers to get other proposals for medical coverage, let Select Health know other quotes were being solicited, and see if Select Health would reduce the increase. It was subsequently reduced to a 10.5% increase. The brokers reviewed with staff the other proposals, none of which

were competitive enough to persuade staff to recommend switching to a different insurer. A summary/comparison of the competing proposals is being prepared by Jake Smith and will be available at the work session.

Salary Administration Guidelines -- The Guidelines approved *last year* are attached for reference during this discussion. The City Manager will recommend during this work session the percentages he believes are justified in the Pay Matrix for FY 2019.

It is unlikely the Council will go beyond #4 on the outline during this work session. Those topics not discussed will be carried over to the next budget work session on May 15 at 5:00 p.m., prior to the regular City Council meeting at 7:00 p.m.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- ▢ Budget Work Session Outline
- ▢ 2018 Salary Survey Summary
- ▢ Police Officer Pay Comparison 2018
- ▢ Code Provisions re Elected Officials' Salaries
- ▢ Salary Administration Guidelines FY2018

FY 2019 Budget Work Sessions

May 8 Work Session:

1. Police Chief request re additional police officers and compensation
2. Compensation issues
 - a. Elected officials comparative data
 - b. Management positions—benchmark analysis
 - c. Non-management positions—benchmark analysis
 - d. In-depth analysis of police officer compensation
 - e. Market adjustment recommendation
 - f. Position reviews/upgrades
3. Employee health insurance renewal
 - a. Medical insurance—Select Health and other proposals
 - b. Dental insurance
 - c. Life and disability insurance
4. Salary Administration Guidelines, including Pay Matrix
5. General Fund equipment replacement
6. Use of General Fund “yet to be allocated” amount of \$368,969
 - a. Pay raises
 - b. Health insurance cost increase
 - c. Personnel contingency (annual and retirement-related cash-out of accrued leave; employee advancements; etc)
 - d. CC contingency
 - e. Increase to General Fund reserve
7. Use of FY 2018 General Fund reserve

Future Work Session(s):

- Solid waste collection fees
- Water rate restructuring re fluoride component
- Administrative service charges paid by enterprise funds and RDA to General Fund
- RDA Proposed Budget
- Issues not addressed or resolved in May 8 work session
- Revisions, if any, to projected revenues and expenditures in Proposed Budget
- Any other budget issues/concerns from City Council

2018 Salary Survey Summary

Midpoint Comparison

Position	Survey 50th Percentile			Survey 75th Percentile			Centerville			\$ (50TH)	% (50TH)	\$ (75TH)	% (75TH)	
	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum					
Court Clerk I/II	\$ 13.43	\$ 16.04	\$ 18.99	\$ 14.41	\$ 17.67	\$ 20.55	\$ 14.45	\$ 17.70	\$ 20.96	\$ 1.67	9.41%	\$ 0.03	0.22%	
Court Clerk II/III	\$ 14.46	\$ 17.83	\$ 20.96	\$ 15.05	\$ 18.67	\$ 21.82	\$ 15.18	\$ 18.60	\$ 22.02	\$ 0.77	4.11%	\$ (0.07)	-0.38%	
Police Officer I	\$ 18.99	\$ 22.82	\$ 27.14	\$ 19.42	\$ 23.85	\$ 28.12	\$ 18.50	\$ 22.66	\$ 26.82	\$ (0.16)	-0.71%	\$ (1.19)	-5.22%	
Police Officer II	\$ 20.31	\$ 24.45	\$ 29.04	\$ 21.25	\$ 25.27	\$ 30.63	\$ 19.44	\$ 23.81	\$ 28.18	\$ (0.64)	-2.68%	\$ (1.46)	-5.96%	
Police Officer III	\$ 22.01	\$ 27.27	\$ 31.93	\$ 24.01	\$ 28.62	\$ 33.22	\$ 21.45	\$ 26.28	\$ 31.11	\$ (0.99)	-3.77%	\$ (2.34)	-8.59%	
Street/Water Operator I	\$ 13.78	\$ 17.42	\$ 20.79	\$ 14.67	\$ 18.41	\$ 21.82	\$ 15.18	\$ 18.60	\$ 22.02	\$ 1.18	6.35%	\$ 0.19	1.07%	
Street/Water Operator II	\$ 15.39	\$ 19.17	\$ 23.06	\$ 16.05	\$ 20.33	\$ 24.07	\$ 16.76	\$ 20.53	\$ 24.30	\$ 1.36	6.63%	\$ 0.20	1.04%	
Street/Water Operator III	\$ 17.35	\$ 21.14	\$ 25.23	\$ 18.00	\$ 22.33	\$ 26.78	\$ 18.50	\$ 22.71	\$ 26.82	\$ 1.57	6.89%	\$ 0.38	1.80%	
Parks Maintenance Spec. I	\$ 13.71	\$ 17.14	\$ 19.98	\$ 14.55	\$ 17.72	\$ 21.19	\$ 14.45	\$ 17.71	\$ 20.96	\$ 0.57	3.22%	\$ (0.02)	-0.11%	
Parks Maintenance Spec. II	\$ 14.81	\$ 18.16	\$ 21.72	\$ 15.70	\$ 19.42	\$ 23.03	\$ 15.95	\$ 19.54	\$ 23.13	\$ 1.38	7.04%	\$ 0.12	0.69%	
Parks Maintenance Spec. III	\$ 17.00	\$ 21.07	\$ 24.82	\$ 17.56	\$ 21.50	\$ 26.42	\$ 16.76	\$ 20.53	\$ 24.30	\$ (0.54)	-2.61%	\$ (0.97)	-4.62%	
										Average	\$ 0.56	\$ 3.08%	\$ (0.47)	-1.83%
										Median	\$ 0.77	\$ 4.11%	\$ (0.02)	-0.11%

The following cities participate in the Compensation Survey and were used to compare similar positions in Centerville. For each position, only those cities with a similar position were used for the salary comparison - not all the cities listed were used for every position.

AMERICAN FORK	COTTONWOOD	KAYSVILLE	NORTH LOGAN	RIVERTON	SOUTH OGDEN	TOOELE
BLUFFDALE	DRAPER	LAYTON	NORTH OGDEN	ROY	SOUTH SALT LAKE	TREMONTON
BOUNTIFUL	EAGLE MOUNTAIN	LEHI	NORTH SALT LAKE	SALT LAKE CITY	SOUTH WEBER CITY	WASHINGTON TERRACE
BRIGHAM CITY	FARMINGTON	LOGAN	OGDEN	SANDY	SPANISH FORK	WEST BOUNTIFUL
CEDAR CITY	HARRISVILLE	MAPLETON	PAYSON	SANTAQUIN	SPRINGVILLE	WEST JORDAN
CEDAR HILLS	HEBER CITY	MIDVALE	PRICE	SARATOGA SPRINGS	SUNSET	WEST POINT CITY
CLEARFIELD	HERRIMAN	MURRAY	RICHFIELD	SMITHFIELD	SYRACUSE	WEST VALLEY
CLINTON	HOLLADAY	NEPHI	RIVERDALE	SOUTH JORDAN	TAYLORSVILLE	WOODS CROSS

Police Officer Positions Increased by 1 Grade (no market adjustments)

Position	Survey 50th Percentile			Survey 75th Percentile			Centerville			\$ (50TH)	% (50TH)	\$ (75TH)	% (75TH)
	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum				
Court Clerk I/II	\$ 13.43	\$ 16.04	\$ 18.99	\$ 14.41	\$ 17.67	\$ 20.55	\$ 14.45	\$ 17.70	\$ 20.96	\$ 1.67	9.41%	\$ 0.03	0.22%
Court Clerk II/III	\$ 14.46	\$ 17.83	\$ 20.96	\$ 15.05	\$ 18.67	\$ 21.82	\$ 15.18	\$ 18.60	\$ 22.02	\$ 0.77	4.11%	\$ (0.07)	-0.38%
Police Officer I	\$ 19.25	\$ 22.99	\$ 27.28	\$ 19.44	\$ 23.88	\$ 28.24	\$ 19.44	\$ 23.81	\$ 28.18	\$ 0.82	3.43%	\$ (0.07)	-0.31%
Police Officer II	\$ 20.39	\$ 24.69	\$ 29.18	\$ 21.25	\$ 25.27	\$ 30.63	\$ 20.42	\$ 25.01	\$ 29.61	\$ 0.32	1.30%	\$ (0.26)	-1.04%
Police Officer III	\$ 22.29	\$ 27.59	\$ 32.01	\$ 24.01	\$ 28.62	\$ 33.22	\$ 22.54	\$ 27.61	\$ 32.68	\$ 0.02	0.08%	\$ (1.01)	-3.67%
Street/Water Operator I	\$ 13.78	\$ 17.42	\$ 20.79	\$ 14.67	\$ 18.41	\$ 21.82	\$ 15.18	\$ 18.60	\$ 22.02	\$ 1.18	6.35%	\$ 0.19	1.07%
Street/Water Operator II	\$ 15.39	\$ 19.17	\$ 23.06	\$ 16.05	\$ 20.33	\$ 24.07	\$ 16.76	\$ 20.53	\$ 24.30	\$ 1.36	6.63%	\$ 0.20	1.04%
Street/Water Operator III	\$ 17.35	\$ 21.14	\$ 25.23	\$ 18.00	\$ 22.33	\$ 26.78	\$ 18.50	\$ 22.71	\$ 26.82	\$ 1.57	6.89%	\$ 0.38	1.80%
Parks Maintenance Spec. I	\$ 13.71	\$ 17.14	\$ 19.98	\$ 14.55	\$ 17.72	\$ 21.19	\$ 14.45	\$ 17.71	\$ 20.96	\$ 0.57	3.22%	\$ (0.02)	-0.11%
Parks Maintenance Spec. II	\$ 14.81	\$ 18.16	\$ 21.72	\$ 15.70	\$ 19.42	\$ 23.03	\$ 15.95	\$ 19.54	\$ 23.13	\$ 1.38	7.04%	\$ 0.12	0.69%
Parks Maintenance Spec. III	\$ 17.00	\$ 21.07	\$ 24.82	\$ 17.56	\$ 21.50	\$ 26.42	\$ 16.76	\$ 20.53	\$ 24.30	\$ (0.54)	-2.61%	\$ (0.97)	-4.62%
									Average	\$ 0.83	4.17%	\$ (0.13)	-0.48%
									Median	\$ 0.82	4.11%	\$ (0.02)	-0.11%

7-May-18

Position	Survey 50th Percentile			Survey 75th Percentile			Centerville			\$ (50TH)	% (50TH)	\$ (75TH)	% (75TH)
	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum				
City Manager	\$ 46.48	\$ 58.28	\$ 68.35	\$ 51.60	\$ 62.72	\$ 72.13	\$ 40.77	\$ 49.94	\$ 59.11	\$ (8.35)	-16.71%	\$ (12.78)	-21.92%
M.S. Director	\$ 35.08	\$ 44.68	\$ 53.60	\$ 39.85	\$ 49.04	\$ 59.63	\$ 28.85	\$ 35.34	\$ 41.84	\$ (9.33)	-26.40%	\$ (13.70)	-30.66%
Police Chief	\$ 37.21	\$ 48.77	\$ 58.07	\$ 39.90	\$ 50.45	\$ 61.67	\$ 35.15	\$ 43.06	\$ 50.97	\$ (5.71)	-13.26%	\$ (7.38)	-15.14%
Public Works Director	\$ 36.67	\$ 47.81	\$ 58.80	\$ 39.42	\$ 50.30	\$ 61.29	\$ 31.85	\$ 39.01	\$ 46.18	\$ (8.80)	-22.55%	\$ (11.28)	-23.60%
Comm Dev Dir	\$ 34.80	\$ 42.90	\$ 51.69	\$ 37.57	\$ 46.82	\$ 55.97	\$ 31.85	\$ 39.01	\$ 46.18	\$ (3.89)	-9.98%	\$ (7.81)	-18.20%
Parks & Rec Director	\$ 31.46	\$ 38.95	\$ 46.45	\$ 35.67	\$ 44.67	\$ 53.67	\$ 27.46	\$ 33.64	\$ 39.82	\$ (5.31)	-15.79%	\$ (11.03)	-28.32%
Asst. Police Chief	\$ 34.89	\$ 42.25	\$ 50.47	\$ 36.97	\$ 45.58	\$ 54.19	\$ 28.85	\$ 35.34	\$ 41.84	\$ (6.91)	-19.55%	\$ (10.24)	-24.23%
									Average	\$ (6.90)	-17.75%	\$ (10.60)	-23.15%
									Median	\$ (6.91)	-16.71%	\$ (11.03)	-23.60%

The following cities participate in the Compensation Survey and were used to compare similar positions in Centerville. For each position, only those cities with a similar position were used for the salary comparison - not all the cities listed were used for every position.

AMERICAN FORK	28,770	EAGLE MOUNTAIN	29,202	LINDON	10,939	RIVERDALE	8,710	SPRINGVILLE	33,044
BLUFFDALE	11,809	FARMINGTON	23,140	MAPLETON	9,512	ROY	38,201	SYRACUSE	28,407
BRIGHAM CITY	18,975	HIGHLAND	18,647	MIDVALE	33,035	SOUTH OGDEN	17,094	WEST BOUNTIFUL	5,574
CLEARFIELD	30,855	HOLLADAY	30,831	NEPHI	5,784	SOUTH SALT LAKE	24,630	WEST POINT CITY	10,548
CLINTON	21,672	KAYSVILLE	31,243	NORTH SALT LAKE	20,301	SPANISH	38,861	WOODS CROSS	11,351
COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	34,285			PAYSON	19,810				

Management Pay Comparison 2018

7-May-18

CITY MANAGER			
Entity	Min	Range	
		Mid	Max
NORTH SALT LAKE	\$ 141,266	\$ 141,266	\$ 141,266
HIGHLAND	\$ 112,744	\$ 138,345	\$ 163,946
AMERICAN FORK	\$ 111,713	\$ 136,848	\$ 161,984
SPANISH FORK	\$ 107,437	\$ 134,296	\$ 161,156
WOODS CROSS	\$ 131,671	\$ 131,671	\$ 131,671
EAGLE MOUNTAIN	\$ 106,982	\$ 130,518	\$ 154,054
MIDVALE	\$ 100,006	\$ 130,249	\$ 160,492
CLEARFIELD	\$ 110,365	\$ 126,911	\$ 143,458
FARMINGTON	\$ 99,977	\$ 125,098	\$ 150,218
BRIGHAM CITY	\$ 99,272	\$ 124,090	\$ 148,907
SPRINGVILLE	\$ 95,698	\$ 122,583	\$ 149,468
ROY	\$ 95,909	\$ 119,881	\$ 143,853
RIVERDALE	\$ 90,521	\$ 116,792	\$ 143,062
LINDON	\$ 92,914	\$ 116,022	\$ 139,131
PAYSON	\$ 92,310	\$ 115,284	\$ 138,258
CLINTON	\$ 88,130	\$ 108,264	\$ 128,398
SYRACUSE	\$ 86,646	\$ 108,165	\$ 129,684
NEPHI	\$ 95,724	\$ 106,338	\$ 116,952
SOUTH OGDEN	\$ 72,592	\$ 106,288	\$ 139,983
CENTERVILLE	\$ 84,793	\$ 103,872	\$ 122,950
WEST POINT CITY	\$ 88,434	\$ 102,312	\$ 116,190
WEST BOUNTIFUL	\$ 97,460	\$ 97,460	\$ 97,460
Q2	96684.5	121232	142164
Q3	107323.25	130450.75	150030.5

PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR			
Entity	Min	Range	
		Mid	Max
SPANISH FORK	\$ 93,155	\$ 116,444	\$ 139,732
CLEARFIELD	\$ 99,154	\$ 114,026	\$ 128,898
RIVERDALE	\$ 80,662	\$ 106,870	\$ 133,078
MIDVALE	\$ 80,995	\$ 105,487	\$ 129,979
BRIGHAM CITY	\$ 82,998	\$ 103,747	\$ 124,496
NORTH SALT LAKE	\$ 83,337	\$ 103,372	\$ 123,407
SPRINGVILLE	\$ 80,598	\$ 101,446	\$ 122,294
SOUTH OGDEN	\$ 72,814	\$ 99,441	\$ 126,068
FARMINGTON	\$ 76,276	\$ 95,546	\$ 114,816
WOODS CROSS	\$ 74,125	\$ 93,133	\$ 112,141
SYRACUSE	\$ 72,814	\$ 90,390	\$ 107,966
CLINTON	\$ 69,139	\$ 84,926	\$ 100,714
KAYSVILLE	\$ 64,438	\$ 84,510	\$ 104,582
CENTERVILLE	\$ 66,242	\$ 81,146	\$ 96,050
WEST POINT CITY	\$ 62,612	\$ 77,024	\$ 91,436
Q2	76276	99441	122294
Q3	81996.5	104617	127483

<u>POLICE CHIEF</u>			
Entity	Min	Range	
		Mid	Max
NORTH SALT LAKE	\$ 135,232	\$ 135,232	\$ 135,232
SPANISH FORK	\$ 93,155	\$ 116,444	\$ 139,732
CLEARFIELD	\$ 99,154	\$ 113,714	\$ 128,274
COTTONWOOD HEIGI	\$ 86,845	\$ 105,192	\$ 123,539
RIVERDALE	\$ 78,770	\$ 104,926	\$ 131,082
BRIGHAM CITY	\$ 82,998	\$ 103,747	\$ 124,496
SOUTH SALT LAKE	\$ 77,393	\$ 103,696	\$ 130,000
AMERICAN FORK	\$ 82,851	\$ 101,492	\$ 120,133
SPRINGVILLE	\$ 80,598	\$ 101,446	\$ 122,294
KAYSVILLE	\$ 74,422	\$ 97,604	\$ 120,785
SYRACUSE	\$ 76,501	\$ 96,396	\$ 116,291
FARMINGTON	\$ 76,276	\$ 95,546	\$ 114,816
WOODS CROSS	\$ 74,125	\$ 93,133	\$ 112,141
SOUTH OGDEN	\$ 74,713	\$ 91,988	\$ 109,262
CENTERVILLE	\$ 73,118	\$ 89,570	\$ 106,021
CLINTON	\$ 69,139	\$ 84,926	\$ 100,714
WEST BOUNTIFUL	\$ 62,212	\$ 77,328	\$ 92,444
Q2	77393	101446	120785
Q3	82998	104926	128274

<u>ASSISTANT POLICE CHIEF</u>			
Entity	Min	Range	
		Mid	Max
CLEARFIELD	\$ 91,853	\$ 105,602	\$ 119,350
NORTH SALT LAKE	\$ 78,472	\$ 97,338	\$ 116,203
SYRACUSE	\$ 75,323	\$ 92,284	\$ 109,245
COTTONWOOD HEIGI	\$ 72,568	\$ 87,884	\$ 103,200
BRIGHAM CITY	\$ 69,978	\$ 87,473	\$ 104,968
CENTERVILLE	\$ 60,012	\$ 73,515	\$ 87,018
WEST BOUNTIFUL	\$ 54,454	\$ 67,685	\$ 80,916
Q2	72568	87884	104968
Q3	76897.5	94811	112724

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR				
Entity	Range			Max
	Min	Mid		
HOLLADAY	\$ 80,995	\$ 105,487	\$	129,979
ROY	\$ 82,992	\$ 103,740	\$	124,488
SPRINGVILLE	\$ 80,598	\$ 101,446	\$	122,294
SPANISH FORK	\$ 78,026	\$ 97,533	\$	117,040
NORTH SALT LAKE	\$ 78,472	\$ 97,338	\$	116,203
BRIGHAM CITY	\$ 76,488	\$ 95,610	\$	114,732
COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	\$ 76,001	\$ 92,957	\$	109,913
FARMINGTON	\$ 71,273	\$ 89,311	\$	107,349
CLINTON	\$ 72,592	\$ 89,170	\$	105,747
BLUFFDALE	\$ 72,145	\$ 88,765	\$	105,385
SYRACUSE	\$ 70,375	\$ 87,918	\$	105,462
SOUTH SALT LAKE	\$ 67,299	\$ 87,488	\$	107,678
WEST POINT CITY	\$ 72,162	\$ 87,279	\$	102,396
WOODS CROSS	\$ 69,284	\$ 86,954	\$	104,623
RIVERDALE	\$ 62,587	\$ 82,982	\$	103,376
CENTERVILLE	\$ 66,242	\$ 81,146	\$	96,050
Q2	72377	89240.5		107513.5
Q3	78137.5	97386.75		116412.25

MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIR.				
Entity	Range			Max
	Min	Mid		
NORTH SALT LAKE	\$ 93,992	\$ 116,588	\$	139,184
CLEARFIELD	\$ 99,154	\$ 114,026	\$	128,898
SPANISH FORK	\$ 84,455	\$ 105,568	\$	126,682
ROY	\$ 82,992	\$ 103,740	\$	124,488
BLUFFDALE	\$ 84,150	\$ 103,540	\$	122,931
AMERICAN FORK	\$ 82,851	\$ 101,492	\$	120,133
SOUTH OGDEN	\$ 66,768	\$ 100,802	\$	134,837
RIVERDALE	\$ 75,816	\$ 99,840	\$	123,864
SPRINGVILLE	\$ 76,123	\$ 95,259	\$	114,395
PAYSON	\$ 75,483	\$ 94,307	\$	113,131
BRIGHAM CITY	\$ 73,233	\$ 91,542	\$	109,850
HIGHLAND	\$ 72,687	\$ 89,013	\$	105,339
KAYSVILLE	\$ 67,641	\$ 88,712	\$	109,782
SYRACUSE	\$ 70,375	\$ 87,918	\$	105,462
MIDVALE	\$ 67,995	\$ 86,652	\$	105,310
WEST POINT CITY	\$ 68,434	\$ 81,458	\$	94,483
MAPLETON	\$ 69,607	\$ 78,207	\$	86,806
SPRINGVILLE	\$ 61,974	\$ 76,228	\$	90,483
CENTERVILLE	\$ 60,012	\$ 73,515	\$	87,018
WOODS CROSS	\$ 56,575	\$ 70,769	\$	84,963
Q2	72960	92924.5		111490.5
Q3	82886.25	102004		124020

Police Officer Pay Comparison 2018

7-May-18

Job # 1750 - POLICE OFFICER / DEPUTY SHERIFF I

Rank	Entity	Range			Actual			Entity	Rank
		Min	Mid	Max	Low	High	Avg		
1	LEHI	\$40,426	\$50,562	\$60,698	\$53,289	\$62,504	\$57,012	IVINS	1
2	ROY	\$40,310	\$50,367	\$60,424	\$40,147	\$55,814	\$49,352	WASHINGTON CITY	2
3	SPRINGVILLE	\$41,923	\$50,352	\$58,781	\$47,266	\$47,266	\$47,266	SPANISH FORK	3
4	WASHINGTON CITY	\$41,007	\$50,234	\$59,461	\$40,310	\$59,176	\$46,916	ROY	4
5	SPANISH FORK	\$40,100	\$50,124	\$60,149	\$41,923	\$46,405	\$44,164	SPRINGVILLE	5
6	BOUNTIFUL	\$38,958	\$49,722	\$60,486	\$42,848	\$42,848	\$42,848	CENTERVILLE	6
7	CLEARFIELD	\$41,080	\$49,296	\$57,512	\$40,834	\$46,982	\$42,741	HEBER CITY	7
8	HEBER CITY	\$40,435	\$48,714	\$56,992	\$40,830	\$47,795	\$42,596	LEHI	8
9	LAYTON	\$40,315	\$48,378	\$56,441	\$40,184	\$44,446	\$42,376	COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	9
10	SYRACUSE	\$40,040	\$48,131	\$56,222	\$39,520	\$45,427	\$42,324	MURRAY	10
11	MURRAY	\$38,022	\$47,518	\$57,013	\$40,315	\$45,001	\$41,735	LAYTON	11
12	FARMINGTON	\$38,387	\$47,430	\$56,472	\$40,497	\$42,848	\$41,672	SOUTH OGDEN	12
13	RIVERDALE	\$36,837	\$47,216	\$57,595	\$41,080	\$47,050	\$41,080	CLEARFIELD	13
14	CENTERVILLE	\$38,479	\$47,137	\$55,795	\$40,040	\$42,120	\$41,080	DRAPER	14
15	WOODS CROSS	\$37,723	\$46,877	\$56,031	\$38,958	\$43,035	\$40,647	BOUNTIFUL	15
16	IVINS	\$42,023	\$45,301	\$48,579	\$40,040	\$40,040	\$40,040	SYRACUSE	16
17	CEDAR CITY	\$36,952	\$44,340	\$51,727	\$40,040	\$40,040	\$40,040	BRIGHAM CITY	17
18	COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	\$38,704	\$42,028	\$45,352	\$38,855	\$40,705	\$39,780	WOODS CROSS	18
19	DRAPER	\$40,040	\$41,080	\$42,120	\$38,239	\$39,164	\$38,933	CEDAR CITY	19
20	SOUTH OGDEN	\$37,634	\$40,317	\$43,000	\$38,064	\$40,631	\$38,705	FARMINGTON	20
21	NORTH SALT LAKE	\$38,125	\$40,079	\$42,033	\$38,603	\$38,603	\$38,603	NORTH SALT LAKE	21
22	BRIGHAM CITY	\$33,798	\$39,762	\$45,727	\$0	\$0	\$0	RIVERDALE	22
Q2		39499	47474	56456.5					
Q3		40398.25	49615.5	58484.5					

Job # 1755 - POLICE OFFICER / DEPUTY SHERIFF II

Rank	Entity	Range			Actual			Entity	Rank
		Min	Mid	Max	Low	High	Avg		
1	COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	\$48,091	\$56,956	\$65,822	\$49,073	\$67,770	\$59,106	COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	1
2	WASHINGTON CITY	\$46,089	\$56,459	\$66,829	\$47,382	\$63,502	\$57,787	BOUNTIFUL	2
3	LEHI	\$46,410	\$56,314	\$66,218	\$47,923	\$57,221	\$51,503	MURRAY	3
4	CLEARFIELD	\$43,950	\$54,902	\$65,853	\$46,901	\$55,984	\$51,229	WASHINGTON CITY	4
5	SPRINGVILLE	\$44,202	\$54,535	\$64,868	\$46,901	\$55,984	\$51,229	CLEARFIELD	5
6	BOUNTIFUL	\$43,036	\$53,269	\$63,502	\$40,560	\$56,160	\$47,798	CENTERVILLE	6
7	CLINTON	\$42,598	\$52,332	\$62,067	\$46,389	\$49,824	\$47,796	LEHI	7
8	MURRAY	\$41,766	\$52,198	\$62,629	\$47,105	\$47,105	\$47,105	NORTH SALT LAKE	8
9	IVINS	\$49,483	\$52,081	\$54,680	\$42,598	\$58,469	\$46,750	CLINTON	9
10	KAYSVILLE	\$39,644	\$51,994	\$64,344	\$46,447	\$46,875	\$46,661	HEBER CITY	10
11	HEBER CITY	\$42,952	\$51,834	\$60,715	\$42,120	\$49,920	\$46,626	SOUTH OGDEN	11
12	RIVERDALE	\$39,811	\$50,876	\$61,942	\$43,722	\$46,322	\$45,677	RIVERDALE	12
13	SYRACUSE	\$42,162	\$50,846	\$59,530	\$43,430	\$50,856	\$45,501	SYRACUSE	13
14	LAYTON	\$42,331	\$50,800	\$59,269	\$45,406	\$45,406	\$45,406	WOODS CROSS	14
15	FARMINGTON	\$40,828	\$50,480	\$60,133	\$43,794	\$47,440	\$45,128	LAYTON	15
16	SOUTH OGDEN	\$40,027	\$50,360	\$60,694	\$44,200	\$55,348	\$44,749	DRAPER	16
17	WOODS CROSS	\$40,359	\$50,208	\$60,056	\$44,720	\$44,720	\$44,720	KAYSVILLE	17
18	DRAPER	\$44,200	\$49,774	\$55,349	\$42,551	\$44,841	\$43,806	IVINS	18
19	CENTERVILLE	\$40,427	\$49,533	\$58,620	\$41,354	\$51,344	\$43,317	CEDAR CITY	19
20	CEDAR CITY	\$39,015	\$46,830	\$54,644	\$41,658	\$43,332	\$42,700	FARMINGTON	20
21	NORTH SALT LAKE	\$45,396	\$46,530	\$47,665	\$42,494	\$42,494	\$42,494	BRIGHAM CITY	21
22	BRIGHAM CITY	\$39,195	\$46,112	\$53,029	\$38,241	\$41,867	\$41,375	MAPLETON	22
23	WEST BOUNTIFUL	\$34,091	\$42,372	\$50,653	\$39,157	\$43,233	\$40,767	WEST BOUNTIFUL	23
24	MAPLETON	\$37,080	\$41,818	\$46,556	\$53,185	\$56,451	\$0	SPRINGVILLE	24
Q2		42246.5	50861	60413.5					
Q3		44200.5	52566.25	63712.5					

Job # 1760 - POLICE OFFICER / DEPUTY SHERIFF III

Rank	Entity	Range			Actual			Entity	Rank
		Min	Mid	Max	Low	High	Avg		
1	LEHI	\$51,870	\$61,862	\$71,853	\$60,486	\$66,664	\$64,329	BOUNTIFUL	1
2	DRAPER	\$57,387	\$60,871	\$64,355	\$50,835	\$69,618	\$63,190	RIVERDALE	2
3	SOUTH OGDEN	\$55,000	\$60,666	\$66,331	\$57,375	\$69,129	\$61,941	CLEARFIELD	3
4	CLEARFIELD	\$50,315	\$60,382	\$70,450	\$52,268	\$66,053	\$61,139	SPANISH FORK	4
5	WASHINGTON CITY	\$48,861	\$59,855	\$70,849	\$60,320	\$60,320	\$60,320	SOUTH OGDEN	5
6	NORTH SALT LAKE	\$51,479	\$59,433	\$67,387	\$57,387	\$64,355	\$59,710	DRAPER	6
7	SPANISH FORK	\$47,446	\$59,308	\$71,169	\$47,154	\$65,853	\$59,565	ROY	7
8	BRIGHAM CITY	\$49,814	\$58,020	\$66,226	\$59,175	\$59,175	\$59,175	NORTH SALT LAKE	8
9	MURRAY	\$45,947	\$57,439	\$68,931	\$51,522	\$68,931	\$59,143	MURRAY	9
10	RIVERDALE	\$45,053	\$57,336	\$69,618	\$47,909	\$65,467	\$58,755	LAYTON	10
11	LAYTON	\$46,762	\$56,114	\$65,467	\$57,265	\$57,265	\$57,265	LEHI	11
12	BOUNTIFUL	\$45,157	\$55,910	\$66,664	\$51,289	\$63,008	\$56,837	HEBER CITY	12
13	ROY	\$44,366	\$55,442	\$66,518	\$53,602	\$57,387	\$55,484	SYRACUSE	13
14	SYRACUSE	\$45,490	\$55,318	\$65,146	\$46,571	\$62,213	\$55,361	WASHINGTON CITY	14
15	HEBER CITY	\$45,635	\$55,162	\$64,688	\$49,754	\$57,845	\$54,018	CENTERVILLE	15
16	CENTERVILLE	\$44,624	\$54,664	\$64,704	\$51,834	\$54,933	\$52,885	BRIGHAM CITY	16
17	KAYSVILLE	\$41,641	\$54,610	\$67,579	\$49,788	\$55,597	\$52,195	KAYSVILLE	17
18	WOODS CROSS	\$43,180	\$53,776	\$64,371	\$43,995	\$57,841	\$49,890	FARMINGTON	18
19	FARMINGTON	\$43,423	\$53,722	\$64,022	\$44,480	\$56,340	\$49,601	WOODS CROSS	19
20	MAPLETON	\$37,127	\$41,830	\$46,533	\$38,241	\$47,929	\$41,375	MAPLETON	20
Q2		45791	56725	66424.5					
Q3		49939.25	59538.5	69102.75					

Police Officer Pay Comparison 2018 (Grade +1)

7-May-18

Job # 1750 - POLICE OFFICER / DEPUTY SHERIFF I

Rank	Entity	Range			Actual			Entity	Rank
		Min	Mid	Max	Low	High	Avg		
1	LEHI	\$40,426	\$50,562	\$60,698	\$53,289	\$62,504	\$57,012	IVINS	1
2	ROY	\$40,310	\$50,367	\$60,424	\$40,147	\$55,814	\$49,352	WASHINGTON CITY	2
3	SPRINGVILLE	\$41,923	\$50,352	\$58,781	\$47,266	\$47,266	\$47,266	SPANISH FORK	3
4	WASHINGTON CITY	\$41,007	\$50,234	\$59,461	\$40,310	\$59,176	\$46,916	ROY	4
5	SPANISH FORK	\$40,100	\$50,124	\$60,149	\$41,923	\$46,405	\$44,164	SPRINGVILLE	5
6	BOUNTIFUL	\$38,958	\$49,722	\$60,486	\$42,848	\$42,848	\$42,848	CENTERVILLE	6
7	CENTERVILLE	\$40,427	\$49,524	\$58,620	\$40,834	\$46,982	\$42,741	HEBER CITY	7
8	CLEARFIELD	\$41,080	\$49,296	\$57,512	\$40,830	\$47,795	\$42,596	LEHI	8
9	HEBER CITY	\$40,435	\$48,714	\$56,992	\$40,184	\$44,446	\$42,376	COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	9
10	LAYTON	\$40,315	\$48,378	\$56,441	\$39,520	\$45,427	\$42,324	MURRAY	10
11	SYRACUSE	\$40,040	\$48,131	\$56,222	\$40,315	\$45,001	\$41,735	LAYTON	11
12	MURRAY	\$38,022	\$47,518	\$57,013	\$40,497	\$42,848	\$41,672	SOUTH OGDEN	12
13	FARMINGTON	\$38,387	\$47,430	\$56,472	\$41,080	\$47,050	\$41,080	CLEARFIELD	13
14	RIVERDALE	\$36,837	\$47,216	\$57,595	\$40,040	\$42,120	\$41,080	DRAPER	14
15	WOODS CROSS	\$37,723	\$46,877	\$56,031	\$38,958	\$43,035	\$40,647	BOUNTIFUL	15
16	IVINS	\$42,023	\$45,301	\$48,579	\$40,040	\$40,040	\$40,040	SYRACUSE	16
17	CEDAR CITY	\$36,952	\$44,340	\$51,727	\$40,040	\$40,040	\$40,040	BRIGHAM CITY	17
18	COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	\$38,704	\$42,028	\$45,352	\$38,855	\$40,705	\$39,780	WOODS CROSS	18
19	DRAPER	\$40,040	\$41,080	\$42,120	\$38,239	\$39,164	\$38,933	CEDAR CITY	19
20	SOUTH OGDEN	\$37,634	\$40,317	\$43,000	\$38,064	\$40,631	\$38,705	FARMINGTON	20
21	NORTH SALT LAKE	\$38,125	\$40,079	\$42,033	\$38,603	\$38,603	\$38,603	NORTH SALT LAKE	21
22	BRIGHAM CITY	\$33,798	\$39,762	\$45,727	\$0	\$0	\$0	RIVERDALE	22

Q2 40040 47824.5 56732

Q3 40426.945 49672.375 58740.633

Job # 1755 - POLICE OFFICER / DEPUTY SHERIFF II

Rank	Entity	Range			Actual			Entity	Rank
		Min	Mid	Max	Low	High	Avg		
1	COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	\$48,091	\$56,956	\$65,822	\$49,073	\$67,770	\$59,106	COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS	1
2	WASHINGTON CITY	\$46,089	\$56,459	\$66,829	\$47,382	\$63,502	\$57,787	BOUNTIFUL	2
3	LEHI	\$46,410	\$56,314	\$66,218	\$47,923	\$57,221	\$51,503	MURRAY	3
4	CLEARFIELD	\$43,950	\$54,902	\$65,853	\$46,901	\$55,984	\$51,229	WASHINGTON CITY	4
5	SPRINGVILLE	\$44,202	\$54,535	\$64,868	\$46,901	\$55,984	\$51,229	CLEARFIELD	5
6	BOUNTIFUL	\$43,036	\$53,269	\$63,502	\$40,560	\$56,160	\$47,798	CENTERVILLE	6
7	CLINTON	\$42,598	\$52,332	\$62,067	\$46,389	\$49,824	\$47,796	LEHI	7
8	MURRAY	\$41,766	\$52,198	\$62,629	\$47,105	\$47,105	\$47,105	NORTH SALT LAKE	8
9	IVINS	\$49,483	\$52,081	\$54,680	\$42,598	\$58,469	\$46,750	CLINTON	9
10	CENTERVILLE	\$42,474	\$52,031	\$61,587	\$46,447	\$46,875	\$46,661	HEBER CITY	10
11	KAYSVILLE	\$39,644	\$51,994	\$64,344	\$42,120	\$49,920	\$46,626	SOUTH OGDEN	11
12	HEBER CITY	\$42,952	\$51,834	\$60,715	\$43,722	\$46,322	\$45,677	RIVERDALE	12
13	RIVERDALE	\$39,811	\$50,876	\$61,942	\$43,430	\$50,856	\$45,501	SYRACUSE	13
14	SYRACUSE	\$42,162	\$50,846	\$59,530	\$45,406	\$45,406	\$45,406	WOODS CROSS	14
15	LAYTON	\$42,331	\$50,800	\$59,269	\$43,794	\$47,440	\$45,128	LAYTON	15
16	FARMINGTON	\$40,828	\$50,480	\$60,133	\$44,200	\$55,348	\$44,749	DRAPER	16
17	SOUTH OGDEN	\$40,027	\$50,360	\$60,694	\$44,720	\$44,720	\$44,720	KAYSVILLE	17
18	WOODS CROSS	\$40,359	\$50,208	\$60,056	\$42,551	\$44,841	\$43,806	IVINS	18
19	DRAPER	\$44,200	\$49,774	\$55,349	\$41,354	\$51,344	\$43,317	CEDAR CITY	19
20	CEDAR CITY	\$39,015	\$46,830	\$54,644	\$41,658	\$43,332	\$42,700	FARMINGTON	20
21	NORTH SALT LAKE	\$45,396	\$46,530	\$47,665	\$42,494	\$42,494	\$42,494	BRIGHAM CITY	21
22	BRIGHAM CITY	\$39,195	\$46,112	\$53,029	\$38,241	\$41,867	\$41,375	MAPLETON	22
23	WEST BOUNTIFUL	\$34,091	\$42,372	\$50,653	\$39,157	\$43,233	\$40,767	WEST BOUNTIFUL	23
24	MAPLETON	\$37,080	\$41,818	\$46,556	\$53,185	\$56,451	\$0	SPRINGVILLE	24

Q2 42402.34 51355 60704.5

Q3 44200.5 52566.25 63712.5

Job # 1760 - POLICE OFFICER / DEPUTY SHERIFF III

Rank	Entity	Range			Actual			Entity	Rank
		Min	Mid	Max	Low	High	Avg		
1	LEHI	\$51,870	\$61,862	\$71,853	\$60,486	\$66,664	\$64,329	BOUNTIFUL	1
2	DRAPER	\$57,387	\$60,871	\$64,355	\$50,835	\$69,618	\$63,190	RIVERDALE	2
3	SOUTH OGDEN	\$55,000	\$60,666	\$66,331	\$57,375	\$69,129	\$61,941	CLEARFIELD	3
4	CLEARFIELD	\$50,315	\$60,382	\$70,450	\$52,268	\$66,053	\$61,139	SPANISH FORK	4
5	WASHINGTON CITY	\$48,861	\$59,855	\$70,849	\$60,320	\$60,320	\$60,320	SOUTH OGDEN	5
6	NORTH SALT LAKE	\$51,479	\$59,433	\$67,387	\$57,387	\$64,355	\$59,710	DRAPER	6
7	SPANISH FORK	\$47,446	\$59,308	\$71,169	\$47,154	\$65,853	\$59,565	ROY	7
8	BRIGHAM CITY	\$49,814	\$58,020	\$66,226	\$59,175	\$59,175	\$59,175	NORTH SALT LAKE	8
9	MURRAY	\$45,947	\$57,439	\$68,931	\$51,522	\$68,931	\$59,143	MURRAY	9
10	CENTERVILLE	\$46,883	\$57,431	\$67,980	\$47,909	\$65,467	\$58,755	LAYTON	10
11	RIVERDALE	\$45,053	\$57,336	\$69,618	\$57,265	\$57,265	\$57,265	LEHI	11
12	LAYTON	\$46,762	\$56,114	\$65,467	\$51,289	\$63,008	\$56,837	HEBER CITY	12
13	BOUNTIFUL	\$45,157	\$55,910	\$66,664	\$53,602	\$57,387	\$55,484	SYRACUSE	13
14	ROY	\$44,366	\$55,442	\$66,518	\$46,571	\$62,213	\$55,361	WASHINGTON CITY	14
15	SYRACUSE	\$45,490	\$55,318	\$65,146	\$49,754	\$57,845	\$54,018	CENTERVILLE	15
16	HEBER CITY	\$45,635	\$55,162	\$64,688	\$51,834	\$54,933	\$52,885	BRIGHAM CITY	16
17	KAYSVILLE	\$41,641	\$54,610	\$67,579	\$49,788	\$55,597	\$52,195	KAYSVILLE	17
18	WOODS CROSS	\$43,180	\$53,776	\$64,371	\$43,995	\$57,841	\$49,890	FARMINGTON	18
19	FARMINGTON	\$43,423	\$53,722	\$64,022	\$44,480	\$56,340	\$49,601	WOODS CROSS	19
20	MAPLETON	\$37,127	\$41,830	\$46,533	\$38,241	\$47,929	\$41,375	MAPLETON	20
Q2		46354.5	57383.675	66591					
Q3		49939.25	59538.5	69102.75					

2-03-110. Bond.

Elected officers of the City before taking office shall be included within public employee blanket bonds of the City in the amount of \$10,000 conditioned for the faithful performance of the duties of the respective officers and the payment of all monies received by such officers according to the law and the ordinances of Centerville City. The premium charged for the public employee blanket bonds shall be paid by the City. The bonds of Council Members shall be approved by the Mayor, and the bond of the Mayor shall be approved by the City Council, at the first meeting of the City Council in January following a municipal election. All bonds of elected officers shall be filed with the City Recorder.

2-03-120. Salaries.

(a) Elected Officer Compensation. Elected officers shall receive such compensation for their services as set forth herein or as the City Council may fix or amend by ordinance in accordance with the notice and hearing requirements set forth in *Utah Code Ann.* § 10-3-818, as amended. The compensation of elected officers shall be paid at least monthly.

X [(b) Compensation Review. Every four (4) years, beginning in 2010, as part of the regular budget process, City staff should review the appropriateness of the compensation received by the Mayor and City Council members and recommend adjustments, taking into consideration the impact of inflation, and the compensation of elected officials in cities of similar size.

(c) Mayor. The total compensation to be received by the Mayor shall be \$1,200 per month, a portion of which may be funded by the RDA for the Mayor's role as the Chair of the RDA. The Mayor shall also be provided a vehicle allowance in the amount of \$100 per month.

(d) Council Members. The total compensation to be received by each member of the City Council shall be \$625 per month, a portion of which may be funded by the RDA for Council Member's role as a member of the RDA.

2-03-130. Return of Property.

Every officer of the City upon expiration of his or her term for any cause whatsoever shall deliver to the City Recorder all books, records, keys and any other items which are the property of the City.

2-03-140. Ethics Act.

All elected officers shall comply with the provisions, conditions and requirements of the Utah Municipal Officers' and Employees' Ethics Act as set forth in *Utah Code Ann.* §§ 10-3-1301, *et seq.*, as amended.

2-03-150. Political Activities.

Pursuant to the Political Activities of Public Entities Act, as set forth in *Utah Code Ann.* §§ 20A-11-1201, *et seq.*, as amended, unless specifically permitted by law, the City may not make expenditures from public funds for political purposes or to influence a ballot proposition. In addition to the restrictions set forth in the Political Activities of Public Entities Act, all elected officials of the City shall comply with and be subject to the political activities provisions of *Utah Code Ann.* § 10-3-1108, as amended.

CENTERVILLE CITY SALARY ADMINISTRATION GUIDELINES – FY 2018

The City's compensation program is designed to compensate employees fairly, to maintain a pay position which is competitive, and to reward for performance. To carry out this philosophy, the City seeks to establish salaries that are fair externally, internally, and individually.

External Fairness

External fairness means employees will be paid fairly compared to people doing comparable work in the local job market area. The City determines fairness by comparing its salaries for certain jobs, such as police officer or water system maintenance worker, with the salaries other employers pay for those jobs. Those jobs are grouped into levels of pay called salary grades. Each salary grade is assigned a pay range. In order to achieve a competitive advantage in the job market, the City generally bases the midpoint of pay ranges on the third quartile of the midpoints of pay ranges for related jobs in the job market, although this is subject to change by the City Council.

To keep salaries in line with its job market target, the City adjusts its salary ranges using data from local market salary surveys. The salary ranges (i.e., the minimum and maximum of each pay range) that were in effect for FY 2017 will be increased for FY 2018 by 1.0 percent.

Internal Fairness

Internal fairness means that jobs equivalent in value to the City are assigned similar salary grade levels, regardless of the department involved. Each position's salary grade level is based on the job description for that position, so accurate job descriptions are essential. Supervisors should update job descriptions when job duties change significantly and should review them at least annually in conjunction with performance appraisals. If there is a significant difference between the job description and current duties, the supervisor and the employee should normally rewrite the description for review so the City Manager can determine if the job is assigned the correct salary grade level, subject to Council approval. A revised job description does not mean that the assigned salary grade will change, only that it will be reviewed.

Individual Fairness

Individual fairness means an employee will be rewarded for individual performance relative to that of his/her peers. Based on that performance, an employee can move to higher positions in the current salary range or, if the employee earns a promotion, a higher salary range.

Salary Ranges

The City has assigned each job a salary range, with a minimum, midpoint, and maximum salary. The salary range allows employees to receive different salaries based on performance appraisals, levels of experience, and labor market conditions.

Note the following features of salary ranges:

1. Currently the Council's intent is to base the midpoints of salary ranges on the third quartile of the midpoints of pay ranges for related jobs in the job market. This will not be an exact match due to the need to maintain internal equity in the compensation plan.
2. Salary ranges are divided into four equal parts, called quartiles. The lowest salaries are in the first quartile, and the highest salaries are in the fourth quartile. For example, if a job has a minimum annual salary of \$30,000 and a maximum of \$42,000, the first quartile would range from \$30,000 to \$33,000; the second quartile would range from \$33,000 to \$36,000 and so on.
3. Salary ranges overlap extensively, so an experienced, high-performing employee in one grade level can earn the same as or more than a less-experienced or lower-performing employee in a higher grade level.
4. Normally salary ranges move higher each year to keep in line with conditions in the job market. Normally these adjustments do not result in cost-of-living raises for employees; however, the City Council reserves the right to approve cost-of-living increases in lieu of or in conjunction with merit increases.

Merit Increases

At the beginning of the Fiscal Year, an employee may receive a merit increase, or raise. This increase is based on the employee's performance and is affected by the quartile that the employee's salary is in, market salary conditions, and budget availability. The chart below shows the potential raise available in Fiscal Year 2018 (effective with the payroll period beginning July 2, 2017), depending on the employee's performance and where the employee's current salary falls within the pay range assigned to his/her position. **The percentages in this chart may change from year to year. An employee's base pay cannot exceed the maximum of the pay range for his position. Therefore, employees at or near the maximum may not be eligible for the percentages shown in the 4th quartile below.**

	1 st Quartile	2 nd Quartile	3 rd Quartile	4 th Quartile
Consistently Exceeds Expectations ("sustained outstanding performance")	>4.0%	>3.5%	>2.5%	>2.0%
Merit Range (most employees)	1.0 – 4.0%	1.0 – 3.5%	1.0 – 2.5%	1.0 – 2.0%
Needs Significant Improvement	0%	0%	0%	0%

Department heads are to use the following guidelines when determining an appropriate pay raise for each eligible employee:

Guidelines for Categories within the Pay Matrix

Consistently Exceeds Expectations (“sustained outstanding performance”)

- Overall performance is continually above the standard
- Performance has been exceptional and usually exceeds job requirements
- Consistently takes on additional assignments without affecting other work
- Makes suggestions for continuous improvement in both personal and organizational areas
- Requires minimal supervision and follow-up

Merit Range (most employees)

- Upper end of range:
 - o Overall performance consistently meets job requirements
 - o Good, solid performance that meets all critical requirements of the position
 - o Capable in all activities within the respective position
 - o Productive team member, can handle any assignment within the scope of the position
- Lower end of range:
 - o Overall performance occasionally falls below job requirements
 - o Needs improvement to meet standards
 - o Capable in most activities within the respective position
 - o Meets some, but not all position requirements; needs to improve in specified areas

Needs Significant Improvement

- Overall performance falls far below job requirements; unacceptable
- Only occasionally produces the quantity, quality and timeliness of work expected

“Consistently Exceeds Expectations” is funded with a sum equal to 0.5% of the department’s salaries (not including the department head). This 0.5% can be used to increase the amount of raise for one or more employees within the department, subject to approval of the City Manager and Mayor and limited by the funding made available by the 0.5%. This means an employee could possibly receive more than a 0.5% additional increment. The 0.5% can also be used to give lump sum bonuses. Bonuses could be given, for example, for the following purposes:

- to recognize sustained outstanding performance by an employee who is at the top of the pay range (i.e., “maxed out”)
- to compensate an employee for significant additional responsibility undertaken for a limited period, for which the employee was not otherwise adequately compensated
- to recognize significant efforts by employees to upgrade their knowledge and skills

When using the 0.5% for additional base pay increases, normally this would be for the purpose of rewarding employees who consistently or significantly exceed expectations (i.e., “sustained outstanding performance”), or who have significantly increased their value to the City through education or training beyond that required for their position. However, the 0.5% might also be used to address a salary inequity within a department. A department head may also request permission from the City Manager to use up to 10% of the 0.5% sum for minor incentive awards throughout the fiscal year.

Any part of an employee’s pay raise may be delayed or postponed as an incentive to improve performance. Likewise, the 0.5% departmental pool may be used at any time during the fiscal year to fund an additional increase in base pay or to award a lump sum bonus. However, base pay raises given later in the fiscal year and funded by the 0.5% pool would be annualized when determining how much of the 0.5% pool is consumed to fund that raise.

Department heads will be considered as a “department” under the City Manager and Mayor in regard to the guidelines above. In other words, the City Manager and Mayor will decide the amount of raise for each department head, subject to the guidelines and funding limitations. Any base pay increase or lump sum bonus for the City Manager will be determined by the Mayor and City Council.