



STAFF REPORT

City Council

Meeting Date:

6/21/2016

Staff Report Number:

16-105-CC

Regular Business:

Consider approval of amendments to the agreement between the City of Menlo Park and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Local 829

Recommendation

Approve amendments to the collective bargaining agreement between the City of Menlo Park and American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Local 829 (AFSCME), and authorize the Administrative Services Director to execute a Side Letter Agreement which shall expire coterminous with the current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on June 30, 2017.

Policy Issues

This recommendation aligns with the City's goals of balancing continued fiscal prudence in planning for potential impacts of employee retirement benefits, while also continuing to align the City as a competitive employer in the increasingly robust job market of the Silicon Valley.

Background

In June 2015, City Council awarded a contract to Koff & Associates for the purposes of conducting a comprehensive classification and compensation study of all non-sworn City of Menlo Park classifications. Preliminary results were provided to the City Council in February 2016, at which time the Council communicated the following guiding principles for upcoming labor negotiations with AFSCME:

- Using our 13 City labor market, the market median shall be the target for City of Menlo Park benchmark employees' total compensation; and
- For those employees whose total compensation is found to be below the market median, provide market-based adjustments to bring those employees up to the market median

The guiding principles were founded on general practices and the importance of recruiting and retaining talented employees, during a competitive public and private sector job market.

On October 20, 2015, City Council approved the terms of an agreement between the City of Menlo Park and AFSCME and authorized the City Manager to execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with a term of October 21, 2015 through June 30, 2017. Those terms included an agreement to reopen the MOU on March 1, 2016 on the single issue of wage increases, and stipulated that no special wage increases will be implemented without mutual agreement between the City and AFSCME. The agreement further stipulated that if no agreement is reached on special wage increases, all AFSCME classifications would receive an across the board salary increase of 2% effective the first full pay period after July 1,

2016. The reopener on March 1, 2016 was intended to coincide with the completion of a Classification and Compensation Study conducted by Koff & Associates, which included surveying our labor market for comparison purposes to certain Menlo Park job classifications' salary ranges. While the study narrative has not yet been finalized, the Study provided the City with data that concluded nine of the 22 classifications in AFSCME have a total compensation package below the labor market median.

AFSCME represents 36.25 non-sworn supervisory/managerial employees throughout the City. The City's and AFSCME's negotiation teams commenced negotiations on April 7, 2016. The parties met three times and reached a Tentative Agreement (TA) on wages on June 2, 2016. AFSCME notified the City that the TA was ratified by the membership on June 6, 2016.

Analysis

The Tentative Agreement, Attachment A, is on wages only, between the City and AFSCME and, if approved by the City Council, adjusts the salary ranges for all AFSCME represented classifications effective July 10, 2016, the first day of the first full pay period in July.

In addition to the previously agreed to 2% across the board adjustment, the Tentative Agreement provides special wage adjustments to correct for positions that are currently below market median total compensation as calculated by Koff and Associates. In all cases the market based adjustments apply to existing classifications and no new classifications are required to implement the Tentative Agreement. While no new classifications are required, there are instances where Koff recommends new job titles to reflect the current operating structure of the City while also achieving greater consistency with job titles in other cities.

The Tentative Agreement for special wage adjustments is consistent with the City's goal of maintaining a competitive total compensation package to attract and retain quality employees. When surveyed across 13 comparator agencies, Koff & Associates identified 9 of the 22 classifications represented by AFSCME as receiving a total compensation package less than market median. Total compensation incorporates all aspects of compensation that accrue to the benefit of an individual employees such as base salary, pension, medical, dental, and paid time off. In order to correct for the under market compensation packages, the Tentative Agreement provides adjustments to classifications ranging from 3.4% to 15.0% as detailed in the Tentative Agreement. The significant variance from market median is primarily seen in the Public Works Supervisor classifications (between 7% and 15% below market) which were previously internally aligned at the same salary. When the market survey was conducted, Koff and Associates found that the Public Works Supervisor classifications are not typically paid at the same level with specialized skills resulting in higher pay for operationally specific positions such as Fleet and Facilities management.

As mentioned earlier, the current MOU between AFSCME and the City contains language that provides a 2.0% across the board salary increase. The Tentative Agreement implements the 2% across the board salary increase to ensure that the City maintains its standing in the labor market total compensation. Since the date of Koff & Associates' survey, several comparator cities have provided cost-of-living-adjustments (COLA) to their employees. COLAs are generally intended to offset the impact of inflation on an employee's wages. To arrive at inflation for the Bay Area region, the City relies on calculations by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, specifically the Consumer Price Index – All Urban Consumers. For the

12 month period measured from February 2015 to February 2016, the Consumer Price Index All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose region was +3.02%.

On June 6, 2016, in accordance with Council's Public Input and Outreach Regarding Labor Negotiations policy, this staff report was posted to provide an opportunity for public comment prior to and during Council's consideration of these amendments on June 21, 2016.

Pursuant to Resolution 6177, adopted by City Council on December 10, 2013, if this agreement is ratified by council, the same wage adjustments would apply to members in the "confidential" class of employees (Executive Assistant to the City Manager, Senior Management Analyst and Human Resources Technician), as they are unrepresented by a labor group due to the nature of their assignments. The salary schedule for "confidential" employees can be found in Attachment D.

Impact on City Resources

This Tentative Agreement results in new cost to the City totaling \$156,200. Of this amount, \$84,500 is attributed to the special wage adjustments to bring 9 classifications up to market median total compensation. The balance, \$71,700, results from an across the board salary adjustment of 2% which was provided for in the current MOU. Given that the across the board adjustment was contained in the current MOU, \$71,700 is included in the City Manager's Proposed Budget for 2016-17 and the 10-year forecast. The balance, \$84,500, will require the use of anticipated operating surplus.

The impact of the across the board adjustments and market rate adjustments for the confidential positions totals \$26,400 and was included in the City Manager's Proposed Budget for 2016-17.

Environmental Review

No environmental review is required.

Public Notice

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Attachments

- A. Compensation Study
- B. Compensation Study Appendix "I"
- C. Tentative Agreement between the City of Menlo Park and AFSCME
- D. AFSCME MOU Appendix A update
- E. AFSCME MOU Appendix B update
- F. Confidential Employee Salary Schedule

Report prepared by:

Lenka Diaz, Human Resources Manager

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Compensation Study

City of Menlo Park

March 2016

Koff & Associates

Georg Krammer
Chief Executive Officer

2835 Seventh Street
Berkeley, CA 94710
www.koffassociates.com

E: gkrammer@koffassociates.com
P: 510.658.5633
F: 510.652.5633





BACKGROUND

In June 2015, the City of Menlo Park contracted with Koff & Associates to conduct a comprehensive classification and compensation study for all classifications.

This compensation review process was precipitated by:

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

STUDY PROCESS

Benchmarking Classifications

The study included approximately one hundred (100) classifications and of those, fifty-eight (58) classifications were selected in order to collect compensation data within the defined labor market. Survey classes that had the most consistent and useful survey data were used as “benchmarks” in building the compensation plan. Benchmark classes are those classes that are tied directly to market salary data during the salary setting process. These classes are used as a means of anchoring the City’s overall compensation plan to the market. Other job classifications not surveyed would be aligned on the proposed compensation plan using internal equity principles.

Survey or benchmark classifications included classes that are reasonably well known, and clearly and concisely described. They are commonly used classes such that other like classes may readily be found in other agencies in order to ensure that sufficient compensation data will be compiled.

These survey classifications included:

1. Accountant II
2. Accounting Assistant II
3. Administrative Assistant
4. Administrative Services Director
5. Assistant City Manager
6. Associate Civil Engineer
7. Associate Planner
8. Building Custodian
9. Building Inspector

10. City Arborist
11. City Clerk
12. Code Enforcement Officer
13. Communications Dispatcher
14. Community Development Director
15. Community Services Director
16. Community Services Officer
17. Construction Inspector
18. Contract Specialist



19. Custodial Services Supervisor
20. Engineering Technician II
21. Environmental Program Specialist
22. Environmental Services Manager
23. Executive Assistant
24. Facilities Maintenance Technician II
25. Facilities Supervisor
26. Finance & Budget Manager
27. Financial Analyst
28. Fleet Supervisor
29. Gymnastics Program Coordinator
30. Housing & Economic Development Manager
31. Human Resources Analyst
32. Human Resources Assistant
33. Human Resources Manager
34. Information Tech Specialist II
35. Information Technology Manager
36. Librarian II
37. Library Assistant II
38. Library Services Director

39. Literacy Program Manager
40. Maintenance Worker II Parks
41. Maintenance Worker II - Streets
42. Maintenance Worker II - Trees
43. Management Analyst
44. Office Assistant
45. Permit Technician
46. Plan Examiner
47. Police Records Specialist
48. Police Services Manager
49. Property and Court Specialist
50. Public Works Director
51. Public Works Maint Supervisor
52. Public Works Superintendent
53. Recreation Program Coordinator
54. Transportation Manager
55. Water Quality Specialist
56. Water System Operator II
57. Water System Supervisor
58. Youth Services Coordinator

When we contact the comparator agencies to identify possible matches for each of the benchmarked classifications, there is an assumption that we will not be able to find comparators that are 100% equivalent to the classifications at the City. Therefore, we do not match based upon job titles, which can often be misleading, but we analyze each class description before we consider it as a comparator. Our methodology is to analyze each class description according to the factors listed on page 6 and we require that a position’s “likeness” be at approximately 70% of the matched position to be included.

When we do not find an appropriate match with one class, we often use “brackets” which can be functional or represent a span in scope of responsibility. A functional bracket means that the job of one classification at the City is performed by two classifications at a comparator agency. A “bracket” representing a span in scope means that the comparator agency has one class that is “bigger” in scope and responsibility and one position that is “smaller,” where the City’s class falls in the middle.

In all, of the fifty-eight (58) benchmarked classifications identified, we were able to collect sufficient data from the comparator agencies for fifty-four (54) benchmark classifications. We consider fewer than four comparison matches to be insufficient for analysis because fewer matches make variations in salaries more significant and results may not accurately reflect the market. Four (4) benchmarked classification had fewer than four comparison matches:

1. Custodial Services Supervisor
2. Environmental Program Specialist
3. Environmental Services Manager



4. Literacy Program Manager

Benchmarking Comparator Agencies

The second, most important step in conducting a market salary study is the determination of appropriate agencies for comparison.

In considering the selection of valid agencies for salary comparator purposes, a number of factors should be taken into consideration:

1. **Organizational type and structure** – We generally recommend that agencies of a similar size, providing similar services to that of the City be used as comparators.
2. **Similarity of population, staff, and operational budgets** – These elements provide guidelines in relation to resources required (staff and funding) and available for the provision of services.
3. **Scope of services provided and geographic location** – Organizations providing the same services are ideal for comparators and most comparator agencies surveyed provide similar services to the City of Menlo Park.
4. **Labor market** – In the reality that is today's labor market, many agencies are in competition for the same pool of qualified employees. Individuals often do not live in the communities they serve. As mentioned above, the geographic labor market area, where the City of Menlo Park may be recruiting from or losing employees to, was taken into consideration when selecting comparator organizations. Furthermore, by selecting employers within a geographic proximity to the City, the resulting labor market data generally reflects the region's cost of living, housing costs, growth rate, and other demographic characteristics to the same extent as competing employers to the City.
5. **Compensation Philosophy** – Does the organization regularly conduct a market survey, and, once completed, how is this information applied? Many agencies pay to the median, some pay to the average, others may pay to a higher percentile. In addition, salary ranges may be set strictly upon market base salary values or may include the total value of salary and benefits when developing a compensation policy.

All of the above elements should be considered in selecting the group of comparator agencies. The City agreed on a list of comparator agencies and the following thirteen (13) agencies were used as comparators for the purposes of this market study:

1. City of Belmont
2. City of Burlingame
3. City of East Palo Alto
4. City of Foster City
5. City of Los Altos
6. City of Mountain View



7. City of Palo Alto
8. City of Redwood City
9. City of San Bruno
10. City of San Mateo
11. City of South San Francisco
12. City of Sunnyvale
13. Town of Los Gatos

Benchmarking Benefit Data Collection

The last element requiring discussion prior to beginning a market survey is the specific benefit data that will be collected and analyzed. The following information was collected for each of the benchmarked classifications:

1. **Monthly Base Salary:** The top of the salary range and/or control point. All figures are presented on a monthly basis.
2. **Employee Retirement** – This includes several figures, 1) the amount of the employee's State retirement contribution that is contributed by each agency, 2) the amount of the agency's Social Security contribution, and 3) any alternative retirement plan, either private or public where the employee's contribution is made by the agency on behalf of the employee.

In addition to the amount of the employer paid member contribution, we collected information on enhanced benefits. The value for each enhanced benefit is based on the midpoint of the impact on total employer contribution rate. For example, the impact on total employer contribution rate for the enhanced benefit of final compensation based on single highest year (CalPERS Optional Benefits Listing Section 20042) ranges from 0.9% to 1.8% for miscellaneous employees. We report the value of single highest year as 1.35%.

Below is a complete listing of the enhanced benefits and values reflected in the total compensation spreadsheets:

- Formulas for Miscellaneous (base formula is 2% at age 55):
 - 2% at age 60 (CalPERS Optional Benefits Listing Section 21354): this formula provides to local miscellaneous members 2% of pay at age 60 for each year of eligible service credited with that employer; midpoint of range = -3.05%
 - 2.5% at age 55 (CalPERS Optional Benefits Listing Section 21354.4): this formula provides to local miscellaneous members 2.5% of pay at age 55 for each year of eligible service credited with that employer; midpoint of range = 4.95%
 - 2.7% at age 55 (CalPERS Optional Benefits Listing Section 21354.5): this formula provides to local miscellaneous members 2.7% of pay at age 55 for each year of eligible service credited with that employer; midpoint of range = 8.05%



- 3% at age 60 (CalPERS Optional Benefits Listing Section 21354.3): this formula provides to local miscellaneous members 3% of pay at age 60 for each year of eligible service credited with that employer; midpoint of range = 9.80%.
- Additional Optional Enhanced Benefit Provisions:
 - One-Year Final Compensation (Section 20042): the period determining the average monthly pay rate when calculating retirement benefits; base period is thirty-six (36) highest paid consecutive months; one-year final compensation is based on twelve (12) months highest paid consecutive months; midpoint of range for miscellaneous = 1.35%.
 - Employer Paid Member Contribution (Section 20636(c)(4)): the reporting of the value of the employer paid member contribution to CalPERS as special compensation; average value = employer paid member contribution multiplied by employer paid member contribution.

The point of comparison to capture pension benefits was the classic tier at the City, as well as the comparator agencies. This means that for agencies with a multi-tier retirement system, the tier was captured that is currently available to classic members transferring from another PERS-agency to the City.

3. **Insurance** – This is the maximum amount paid by the agency for employees and dependents for a cafeteria or flexible benefit plan and/or health, dental, vision, life, long-term and short-term disability, and employee assistance insurance.
4. **Leave** – Other than sick leave, which is usage-based, the number of days off for which the agency is obligated. All days have been translated into direct salary costs.
 - **Vacation** – The number of vacation days available to all employees after five years of employment.
 - **Holidays** – The number of holidays (including floating) available to employees on an annual basis.
 - **Administrative/Personal Leave** – Administrative leave is normally the number of days available to management to reward for extraordinary effort (in lieu of overtime). Personal leave may be available to other groups of employees to augment vacation or other time off.
5. **Automobile** – This category includes either the provision of an auto allowance or the provision of an auto for personal use. If a car is provided to any classification for commuting and other personal use, the average monthly rate is estimated at \$450.
6. **Deferred Compensation** – We captured deferred compensation provided to all members of a classification with or without the requirement for an employee to provide a matching or minimum contribution.
7. **Other** – This category includes any additional benefits available to all in the class.



Please note that all of the above benefit elements are negotiated benefits provided to all members of each comparator class. As such, they represent an on-going cost for which an agency must budget. Other benefit costs, such as sick leave, tuition reimbursement, and reimbursable mileage are usage-based and cannot be quantified on an individual employee basis.

Data Collection

Data was collected during the months of January through March, 2016, through websites, planned telephone conversations with human resources, accounting, and/or finance personnel at each comparator agency, and careful review of agency documentation of classification descriptions, memoranda of understanding, organization charts, and other documents.

We believe that the salary data collection step is the most critical for maintaining the overall credibility of any study. We rely very heavily on the City's classification descriptions developed and approved during the classification part of the study, as they are the foundation for our comparison. Personnel staff of the comparator agencies were interviewed by telephone, whenever possible, to understand their organizational structure and possible classification matches.

In identifying appropriate comparisons for the City's classifications, we use the same factors and criteria that we analyze when updating the City's classification plan structure and determining the proper allocation of each position during the classification study process. Factors that we consider include:

- Education and experience requirements;
- Knowledge, abilities, and skills required to perform the work;
- The scope and complexity of the work;
- The authority delegated to make decisions and take action;
- The responsibility for the work of others, program administration, and for budget dollars;
- Problem solving/ingenuity;
- Contacts with others (both inside and outside of the organization);
- Consequences of action and decisions; and
- Working conditions.

For each surveyed class, there are three (3) information pages:

- Market Base (Top Step) Salary Summary Data
- Benefit Detail (Monthly Equivalent Values)
- Monthly Total Compensation Cost Summary Data

Our analysis includes the mean (average), and median (midpoint), comparator data for each benchmarked classification (assuming we were able to identify at least four (4) matches). Our firm recommends reviewing the median, rather than the average, when evaluating the data. The median is the exact midpoint of all the market data we collected, with 50% of market data below and 50% of market data



above. We recommend using the median methodology because it is not skewed by extremely high or low salary values (unlike the mean).

MARKET COMPENSATION FINDINGS

Overall, the market results show that the City's base salaries are 0.9% above market with a variance for individual classifications of 22.4% below market to 13.2% above market. Of the 58 benchmark classifications surveyed, 29 fall within 5% of the market median (+/-), which we consider competitive with the market. Thirteen classifications fall below the market median and twelve fall above the market median. As mentioned above, four classifications yielded insufficient market data.

Total compensation results show that the City falls 0.5% above market when taking the median of all benchmark classifications combined.

Overall, these differences between market base salaries and total compensation indicate that the City's benefits package, in terms of cost, is competitive with the market since the difference between base salaries and total compensation is less than half a percentage point.

USING MARKET DATA AND THIS REPORT AS A TOOL

We wish to point out that our findings in the market study are meant to be a tool for the City to create and implement an equitable compensation plan. Compensation strategies are designed to attract and retain excellent staff. However, financial realities and the City's expectations may also come into play when determining appropriate compensation philosophies and strategies. The collected data represents a market survey that will give the City an instrument to make future compensation decisions.

It has been a pleasure working with City of Menlo Park on this critical project. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide any additional information or clarification regarding the data or this memo.

Sincerely,

Georg Krammer
Chief Executive Officer
Koff & Associates

Menlo Park
Appendix I - Results Summary
May 2016

	Classification	Top Monthly Salary Data					Total Monthly Compensation Data					# of Matches	Bargaining Unit
		Top Monthly Salary	Average	% above or below	Median	% above or below	Total Monthly Comp	Average	% above or below	Median	% above or below		
1	Accountant	\$7,339	\$7,602	-3.6%	\$7,549	-2.9%	\$10,380	\$11,159	-7.5%	\$11,380	-9.6%	12	SEIU
2	Accounting Assistant II	\$5,681	\$5,563	2.1%	\$5,823	-2.5%	\$8,578	\$8,506	0.8%	\$8,583	-0.1%	13	SEIU
3	Administrative Assistant	\$6,521	\$5,984	8.2%	\$5,663	13.2%	\$9,491	\$8,980	5.4%	\$9,146	3.6%	10	SEIU
4	Associate Civil Engineer	\$9,959	\$9,232	7.3%	\$9,474	4.9%	\$13,229	\$12,909	2.4%	\$13,067	1.2%	12	SEIU
5	Associate Planner	\$8,813	\$8,020	9.0%	\$8,147	7.6%	\$11,983	\$11,516	3.9%	\$11,676	2.6%	12	SEIU
6	Building Custodian	\$5,681	\$4,673	17.7%	\$4,822	15.1%	\$8,578	\$7,386	13.9%	\$7,511	12.4%	6	SEIU
7	Building Inspector	\$8,540	\$7,766	9.1%	\$7,758	9.2%	\$11,687	\$11,086	5.1%	\$10,933	6.5%	13	SEIU
8	City Arborist	\$7,886	\$8,624	-9.4%	\$8,782	-11.4%	\$10,982	\$12,266	-11.7%	\$12,340	-12.4%	7	AFSCME
9	Code Enforcement Officer	\$7,339	\$7,270	0.9%	\$7,212	1.7%	\$10,380	\$10,626	-2.4%	\$10,339	0.4%	9	SEIU
10	Communications Dispatcher	\$7,339	\$7,424	-1.2%	\$7,483	-2.0%	\$10,380	\$10,560	-1.7%	\$10,530	-1.4%	12	SEIU
11	Community Services Officer	\$6,094	\$5,898	3.2%	\$5,981	1.9%	\$9,027	\$8,921	1.2%	\$8,794	2.6%	11	SEIU
12	Construction Inspector	\$8,057	\$7,415	8.0%	\$7,469	7.3%	\$11,161	\$10,925	2.1%	\$10,879	2.5%	10	SEIU
13	Contracts Specialist	\$6,094	\$6,500	-6.7%	\$6,464	-6.1%	\$9,027	\$9,765	-8.2%	\$9,536	-5.6%	4	SEIU
14	Custodial Services Supervisor	\$5,968	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	\$8,885	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	2	AFSCME
15	Engineering Technician II	\$7,517	\$6,664	11.4%	\$6,678	11.2%	\$10,574	\$9,886	6.5%	\$9,628	8.9%	12	SEIU
16	Environmental Program Specialist	\$6,228	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	\$9,172	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	2	SEIU
17	Environmental Services Manager	\$9,075	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	\$12,283	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	2	AFSCME
18	Executive Assistant	\$6,521	\$6,561	-0.6%	\$6,556	-0.5%	\$9,491	\$9,638	-1.6%	\$9,359	1.4%	11	CONFIDENTIAL
19	Facilities Maintenance Technician II	\$6,094	\$5,954	2.3%	\$5,992	1.7%	\$9,027	\$8,983	0.5%	\$8,856	1.9%	13	SEIU
20	Facilities Supervisor	\$7,886	\$8,692	-10.2%	\$8,860	-12.4%	\$10,982	\$12,304	-12.0%	\$12,433	-13.2%	5	AFSCME
21	Financial Analyst	\$8,057	\$8,536	-6.0%	\$8,539	-6.0%	\$11,161	\$11,928	-6.9%	\$12,375	-10.9%	10	SEIU
22	Fleet Supervisor	\$7,886	\$9,023	-14.4%	\$9,148	-16.0%	\$10,982	\$12,541	-14.2%	\$12,635	-15.0%	4	AFSCME
23	Gymnastics Program Coordinator	\$6,248	\$5,915	5.3%	\$5,995	4.1%	\$9,192	\$8,932	2.8%	\$9,055	1.5%	12	AFSCME
24	Human Resources Analyst	\$8,288	\$8,110	2.2%	\$8,024	3.2%	\$11,422	\$11,596	-1.5%	\$11,499	-0.7%	10	CONFIDENTIAL
25	Human Resources Assistant	\$5,306	\$6,468	-21.9%	\$6,319	-19.1%	\$8,161	\$9,425	-15.5%	\$9,277	-13.7%	10	CONFIDENTIAL
26	Information Tech Specialist II	\$6,834	\$7,060	-3.8%	\$6,572	3.8%	\$9,831	\$10,250	-4.3%	\$10,138	-3.1%	8	SEIU
27	Librarian II	\$7,005	\$6,699	4.4%	\$6,700	4.4%	\$10,017	\$9,807	2.1%	\$9,723	2.9%	9	SEIU
28	Library Assistant II	\$6,306	\$5,155	2.9%	\$5,297	0.2%	\$8,169	\$8,056	1.4%	\$8,129	0.5%	9	SEIU
29	Literacy Program Manager	\$7,182	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	\$10,213	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	Insufficient Data	3	AFSCME
30	Maintenance Worker II Parks	\$5,815	\$5,708	1.8%	\$5,620	3.4%	\$8,723	\$8,695	0.3%	\$8,492	2.7%	13	SEIU
31	Maintenance Worker II - Streets	\$5,815	\$5,564	4.3%	\$5,611	3.5%	\$8,723	\$8,520	2.3%	\$8,480	2.8%	12	SEIU
32	Maintenance Worker II - Trees	\$5,815	\$5,985	-2.9%	\$6,074	-4.4%	\$8,723	\$9,088	-4.2%	\$8,700	0.3%	9	SEIU
33	Management Analyst	\$8,057	\$8,642	-7.3%	\$8,539	-6.0%	\$11,161	\$12,121	-8.6%	\$12,211	-9.4%	12	SEIU
34	Office Assistant	\$4,734	\$4,896	-3.4%	\$4,943	-4.4%	\$7,547	\$7,704	-2.1%	\$7,578	-0.4%	12	SEIU
35	Permit Technician	\$5,948	\$6,277	-5.5%	\$6,389	-7.4%	\$8,868	\$9,452	-6.6%	\$9,273	-4.6%	9	SEIU
36	Plan Examiner	\$10,053	\$9,313	7.4%	\$9,220	8.3%	\$13,332	\$12,407	6.9%	\$12,346	7.4%	4	SEIU
37	Police Records Specialist	\$5,815	\$5,435	6.5%	\$5,413	6.9%	\$8,723	\$8,479	2.8%	\$8,419	3.5%	12	SEIU
38	Police Services Manager	\$10,223	\$9,632	5.8%	\$9,379	8.3%	\$13,539	\$13,490	0.4%	\$13,346	1.4%	8	AFSCME
39	Property and Court Specialist	\$6,094	\$5,855	3.9%	\$5,390	11.6%	\$9,027	\$9,018	0.1%	\$8,373	7.2%	6	SEIU
40	Public Works Maint Supervisor	\$7,886	\$8,393	-6.4%	\$8,413	-6.7%	\$11,024	\$11,895	-7.9%	\$11,793	-7.0%	8	AFSCME
41	Public Works Superintendent	\$9,488	\$11,393	-20.1%	\$11,616	-22.4%	\$14,357	\$14,982	-4.4%	\$15,232	-6.1%	6	AFSCME
42	Recreation Program Coordinator	\$6,248	\$6,217	0.5%	\$6,046	3.2%	\$9,192	\$9,254	-0.7%	\$9,146	0.5%	11	AFSCME
43	Water Quality Specialist	\$7,159	\$6,776	5.4%	\$6,783	5.3%	\$10,185	\$9,966	2.1%	\$9,560	6.1%	6	SEIU
44	Water System Operator II	\$5,948	\$6,249	-5.1%	\$6,052	-1.7%	\$8,868	\$9,295	-4.8%	\$9,263	-4.5%	6	SEIU
45	Water System Supervisor	\$8,263	\$8,507	-2.9%	\$8,344	-1.0%	\$11,395	\$12,168	-6.8%	\$11,783	-3.4%	6	AFSCME
46	Youth Services Coordinator	\$6,248	\$6,126	2.0%	\$6,046	3.2%	\$9,192	\$9,135	0.6%	\$9,146	0.5%	11	AFSCME
			Median	1.9%	Median	1.8%		Median	-0.3%	Median	0.5%		

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

City/AFSCME Negotiations | 2016

Tentative Agreement – Article 7: Pay Rates and Practices

Effective the first full pay period after July 1, 2016, the following job classifications shall receive the following market based adjustments:

<u>Job Title</u>	<u>% Adjustment to Base</u>
	<u>Salary</u>
Public Works Supervisor - Fleet	15.0%
Public Works Supervisor - Facilities	13.2%
Public Works Supervisor - City Arborist	12.4%
Business Manager	9.777%*
Revenue & Claims Manager	7.049%*
Public Works Supervisor - Parks	7.0%
Public Works Supervisor – Streets	7.0%
Permit Manager	4.6%
Water System Supervisor	3.4%

*Salary range adjustment equal to Management Analyst II salary range.

Effective the first full pay period after July 1, 2016, all classifications will receive an overall wage adjustment of 2.0%.

FOR CITY:

FOR AFSCME:

Nick Pegueros
 Nick Pegueros
 Administrative Services Director

Nadia Bledsoe
 Nadia Bledsoe
 Business Agent, AFSCME Council 57

June 2, 2016
 Date

6/2/16
 Date

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX "A"
CLASSIFICATIONS REPRESENTED BY
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES,
LOCAL 829, AFL-CIO

Branch Library Manager
Business Manager
Communications and Records Manager
Community Services Manager
Custodial Services Supervisor
Information Technology Supervisor
Literacy Program Manager
Management Analyst II
Permit Manager
Principal Planner
Public Works Supervisor - City Arborist
Public Works Supervisor - Facilities
Public Works Supervisor - Fleet
Public Works Supervisor - Parks
Public Works Supervisor - Streets
Recreation Coordinator
Recreation Supervisor
Revenue and Claims Manager
Senior Building Inspector
Senior Civil Engineer
Senior Librarian
Senior Transportation Engineer
Sustainability Manager
Water System Supervisor

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX "B"
AFSCME SALARY SCHEDULE
Effective July 10, 2016

ATTACHMENT E

Current Classification Title	New Classification Title	Hours	Minimum (Step A)	Step B	Step C	Step D	Maximum (Step E)
Branch Library Manager		2,080	86,879.00	91,020.00	95,372.00	99,925.00	104,685.00
		80	3,341.50	3,500.77	3,668.15	3,843.27	4,026.35
		1	41,768.8	43,759.6	45,851.9	48,040.9	50,329.3
Business Manager - Development Serv.	Business Manager	2,080	87,905.00	92,120.00	96,509.00	101,120.00	105,958.00
		80	3,380.96	3,543.08	3,711.88	3,889.23	4,075.31
		1	42,262.0	44,288.5	46,398.6	48,615.4	50,941.3
City Arborist	Public Works Supervisor - City Arborist	2,080	90,006.00	94,321.00	98,815.00	103,536.00	108,490.00
		80	3,461.77	3,627.73	3,800.58	3,982.15	4,172.69
		1	43,272.1	45,346.6	47,507.2	49,776.9	52,158.7
Community Services Manager		2,080	102,153.00	107,022.00	112,192.00	117,627.00	123,326.00
		80	3,928.96	4,116.23	4,315.08	4,524.12	4,743.31
		1	49,112.0	51,452.9	53,938.5	56,551.4	59,291.3
Custodial Services Supervisor		2,080	61,456.00	64,300.00	67,306.00	70,463.00	73,774.00
		80	2,363.69	2,473.08	2,588.69	2,710.12	2,837.46
		1	29,546.2	30,913.5	32,358.7	33,876.4	35,468.3
Environmental Programs Manager	Sustainability Manager	2,080	93,035.00	97,486.00	102,153.00	107,022.00	112,192.00
		80	3,578.27	3,749.46	3,928.96	4,116.23	4,315.08
		1	44,728.4	46,868.3	49,112.0	51,452.9	53,938.5
Facilities Supervisor	Public Works Supervisor - Facilities	2,080	90,646.00	94,992.00	99,518.00	104,273.00	109,262.00
		80	3,486.38	3,653.54	3,827.62	4,010.50	4,202.38
		1	43,579.8	45,669.2	47,845.2	50,131.3	52,529.8
Fleet Supervisor	Public Works Supervisor - Fleet	2,080	92,088.00	96,503.00	101,101.00	105,931.00	110,999.00
		80	3,541.85	3,711.65	3,888.50	4,074.27	4,269.19
		1	44,273.1	46,395.7	48,606.3	50,928.4	53,364.9
Gymnastics Program Coordinator	Recreation Coordinator	2,080	64,300.00	67,306.00	70,463.00	73,774.00	77,245.00
		80	2,473.08	2,588.69	2,710.12	2,837.46	2,970.96
		1	30,913.5	32,358.7	33,876.4	35,468.3	37,137.0
Information Technology Supervisor		2,080	86,537.00	96,188.00	101,251.00	106,580.00	112,189.00
		80	3,328.35	3,699.54	3,894.27	4,099.23	4,314.96
		1	41,604.3	46,244.2	48,678.4	51,240.4	53,937.0
Librarian III		2,080	82,893.00	86,879.00	91,020.00	95,372.00	99,925.00
		80	3,188.19	3,341.50	3,500.77	3,668.15	3,843.27
		1	39,852.4	41,768.8	43,759.6	45,851.9	48,040.9
Literacy Program Manager		2,080	73,774.00	77,245.00	80,877.00	84,755.00	88,793.00
		80	2,837.46	2,970.96	3,110.65	3,259.81	3,415.12
		1	35,468.3	37,137.0	38,883.2	40,747.6	42,688.9
Parks and Trees Supervisor	Public Works Supervisor - Parks	2,080	85,682.00	89,789.00	94,068.00	98,562.00	103,278.00
		80	3,295.46	3,453.42	3,618.00	3,790.85	3,972.23
		1	41,193.3	43,167.8	45,225.0	47,385.6	49,652.9
Permit Manager		2,080	101,804.00	106,675.00	111,781.00	117,109.00	122,767.00
		80	3,915.54	4,102.88	4,299.27	4,504.19	4,721.81
		1	48,944.2	51,286.1	53,740.9	56,302.4	59,022.6
Principal Planner		2,080	109,150.00	115,984.00	121,536.00	127,329.00	131,626.00
		80	4,198.08	4,460.92	4,674.46	4,897.27	5,062.54
		1	52,476.0	55,761.5	58,430.8	61,215.9	63,281.7
Program Supervisor - Title 22	Recreation Coordinator	2,080	64,300.00	67,306.00	70,463.00	73,774.00	77,245.00
		80	2,473.08	2,588.69	2,710.12	2,837.46	2,970.96
		1	30,913.5	32,358.7	33,876.4	35,468.3	37,137.0
Program Supervisor - Title 5	Recreation Coordinator	2,080	64,300.00	67,306.00	70,463.00	73,774.00	77,245.00
		80	2,473.08	2,588.69	2,710.12	2,837.46	2,970.96
		1	30,913.5	32,358.7	33,876.4	35,468.3	37,137.0
Recreation Program Coordinator	Recreation Coordinator	2,080	64,300.00	67,306.00	70,463.00	73,774.00	77,245.00
		80	2,473.08	2,588.69	2,710.12	2,837.46	2,970.96
		1	30,913.5	32,358.7	33,876.4	35,468.3	37,137.0
Recreation Supervisor		2,080	79,158.00	82,893.00	84,349.00	91,020.00	95,372.00
		80	3,044.54	3,188.19	3,244.19	3,500.77	3,668.15
		1	38,056.7	39,852.4	40,552.4	43,759.6	45,851.9
Revenue and Claims Manager		2,080	87,857.00	92,082.00	96,471.00	101,084.00	105,910.00
		80	3,379.12	3,541.62	3,710.42	3,887.85	4,073.46
		1	42,238.9	44,270.2	46,380.3	48,598.1	50,918.3
Senior Building Inspector		2,080	98,300.00	103,003.00	107,934.00	113,078.00	118,541.00
		80	3,780.77	3,961.65	4,151.31	4,349.15	4,559.27
		1	47,259.6	49,520.7	51,891.3	54,364.4	56,990.9
Senior Civil Engineer		2,080	112,373.00	117,801.00	123,509.00	129,493.00	135,803.00
		80	4,322.04	4,530.81	4,750.35	4,980.50	5,223.19
		1	54,025.5	56,635.1	59,379.3	62,256.3	65,289.9
Senior Transportation Engineer		2,080	112,373.00	117,801.00	123,509.00	129,493.00	135,803.00
		80	4,322.04	4,530.81	4,750.35	4,980.50	5,223.19
		1	54,025.5	56,635.1	59,379.3	62,256.3	65,289.9
Streets Supervisor	Public Works Supervisor - Streets	2,080	85,682.00	89,789.00	94,068.00	98,562.00	103,278.00
		80	3,295.46	3,453.42	3,618.00	3,790.85	3,972.23
		1	41,193.3	43,167.8	45,225.0	47,385.6	49,652.9
Support Services Manager	DELETE						
Technical Services Manager	Communications and Records Manager	2,080	104,685.00	109,764.00	115,037.00	120,584.00	126,383.00
		80	4,026.35	4,221.69	4,424.50	4,637.85	4,860.88
		1	50,329.3	52,771.2	55,306.3	57,973.1	60,761.1
Water System Supervisor		2,080	86,768.00	90,903.00	95,246.00	99,803.00	104,580.00
		80	3,337.23	3,496.27	3,663.31	3,838.58	4,022.31
		1	41,715.4	43,703.4	45,791.3	47,982.2	50,278.8
Youth Services Coordinator	DELETE						

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Confidential Salary Schedule
Effective July 10, 2016**

ATTACHMENT F

Current Classification Title	New Classification Title	Hours	Minimum (Step A)	Step B	Step C	Step D	Maximum (Step E)
Executive Secretary to the City Mgr		2080	\$ 71,471.00	Open Range			\$ 86,873.00
		80	2,748.88				3,341.27
		1	34.3611				41.7659
Human Resources Analyst		2080	\$ 86,337.00	Open Range			\$ 102,156.00
		80	3,320.65				3,929.08
		1	41.5082				49.1135
Human Resources Assistant	Human Resources Technician	2080	\$ 61,465.00	\$ 64,373.00	\$ 67,247.00	\$ 70,528.00	\$ 73,845.00
		80	2,364.04	2,475.88	2,586.42	2,712.62	2,840.19
		1	29.5505	30.9486	32.3303	33.9077	35.5024
Management Analyst-Confidential	Senior Management Analyst	Exempt	\$ 93,734.00	Open Range			\$ 121,520.00