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## I. Executive Summary

## Introduction

Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) retained CPS HR Consulting (CPS HR) to conduct a base compensation study. The objective of the study was to collect and analyze base salary data for selected study classifications from comparable labor market agencies to determine the competitiveness of the organization's base salaries and to develop salary range recommendations that incorporated appropriate labor market data.

This report provides documentation of the methodologies used in the data collection, analysis, and development of base compensation-related findings. Our findings yield valuable information as the how the agency can best combine external competitiveness factors with the internal value of jobs.

Please note that this report is accompanied by one (1) supplemental document (excel workbook) depicting:

- The salary summary and individual salary datasheets with specific job matches for each benchmark classification
- Salary range recommendations for the classifications covered under study


## Project Scope

The scope of work included (17) comparable labor market agencies, (21) benchmark classifications and salary range recommendations. The data for this report was collected from September 2023 through October 2023. For consistency in labor market comparisons, all base salary data is represented as in effect on September 1, 2023. Therefore, this report analysis is a snapshot of how the organization's compensation program measured against the labor market at this point in time.

## Study Findings

The overall findings of this study can be summarized as follows:

## Labor Market Competitiveness

VCTC base salaries are primarily aligned below the market as seen in Table 1.

■ (2) benchmark classifications are aligned (+/-5\%) with the labor market median

- (2) benchmark classifications are below market (between $5.1 \%-9.9 \%$ below the market median)
- (15) benchmark classifications are significantly below market ( $10 \%$ or more below the market median)
- (1) benchmark classifications have base salary ranges that are above market (between $5.1 \%-9.9 \%$ over the labor market median)
- (0) benchmark classifications have salary ranges that are significantly above market (10\% or more above the labor market median)

Table 1: Number of Benchmark Classifications by Labor Market Competitiveness Category


## Pay Structure

VCTC currently has an open-range pay structure with pay ranges from $38.0 \%$ to $95.2 \%$ in width (spread from minimum to maximum control points of a range). The majority of the VCTC salary ranges have a wider spread than those of the similar benchmarks in the relevant labor market. For example, the Project Manager family has a bandwidth of $90.6 \%$, compared to the labor market ranges of $35.5 \%-41.9 \%$ wide. The VCTC benchmark of Transportation Planner-Transit Services has a range of $95.2 \%$ wide, versus labor market's $44.5 \%$ range.

This inconsistent range bandwidth practice resulted in misalignment of the VCTC range minimums and maximums with the same labor market parameters. For example, the VCTC benchmark of Transportation Planner-Transit Services is found to be $50.4 \%$ below the labor market range in minimum control point, and only $11.4 \%$ below market in maximum control point. That type of misalignment is found in most of the twenty-one (21) studied benchmarks.

The practice of aligning VCTC minimums with the relevant labor market may improve VCTC competitiveness during hiring new staff, while the practice of aligning maximums with the relevant labor market may improve VCTC's employee retention, satisfaction, and overall motivation. An example of inconsistent minimum and maximum market alignments for VCTC Administrative Assistant job classification is shown in Table 2. In this example, the Administrative Assistant job is lagging the market in minimum and is aligned with the market in maximum.

Table 2: Example of Inconsistent Minimum and Maximum Salaries


Another structural issue observed during analysis was an inconsistent separation between VCTC pay ranges. Systematic separation of the ranges is important for internal equity, promotional practices, and leveling jobs within job families and series. To address all the structural issues, CPS HR developed a model of a pay structure that reflects relevant labor market trends and patterns with $40 \%$ bandwidth for most jobs and $55 \%$ bandwidth for executive job classifications starting from Grade 125, as shown in Table 3. All grades have a fixed grade separation of $5 \%$.

Table 3: Recommended Pay Structure

| Grades 107-124 Grades 125-140 | Bandwidth 1 <br> Bandwidth 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 45.5 \% \\ & 55.0 \% \end{aligned}$ |  | Grade Separation 5.0\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Hourly Minimum | Hourly Midpoint | Hourly Maximum | Monthly Minimum | Monthly Midpoint | Monthly Maximum |
| 107 | \$21.44 | \$26.32 | \$31.20 | \$3,716.53 | \$4,562.04 | \$5,407.55 |
| 108 | \$22.51 | \$27.64 | \$32.76 | \$3,902.36 | \$4,790.15 | \$5,677.93 |
| 109 | \$23.64 | \$29.02 | \$34.40 | \$4,097.48 | \$5,029.65 | \$5,961.83 |
| 110 | \$24.82 | \$30.47 | \$36.11 | \$4,302.35 | \$5,281.13 | \$6,259.92 |
| 111 | \$26.06 | \$31.99 | \$37.92 | \$4,517.47 | \$5,545.19 | \$6,572.92 |
| 112 | \$27.37 | \$33.59 | \$39.82 | \$4,743.34 | \$5,822.45 | \$6,901.56 |
| 113 | \$28.73 | \$35.27 | \$41.81 | \$4,980.51 | \$6,113.57 | \$7,246.64 |
| 114 | \$30.17 | \$37.03 | \$43.90 | \$5,229.53 | \$6,419.25 | \$7,608.97 |
| 115 | \$31.68 | \$38.89 | \$46.09 | \$5,491.01 | \$6,740.22 | \$7,989.42 |
| 116 | \$33.26 | \$40.83 | \$48.40 | \$5,765.56 | \$7,077.23 | \$8,388.89 |
| 117 | \$34.93 | \$42.87 | \$50.82 | \$6,053.84 | \$7,431.09 | \$8,808.34 |
| 118 | \$36.67 | \$45.02 | \$53.36 | \$6,356.53 | \$7,802.64 | \$9,248.75 |
| 119 | \$38.51 | \$47.27 | \$56.03 | \$6,674.36 | \$8,192.77 | \$9,711.19 |
| 120 | \$40.43 | \$49.63 | \$58.83 | \$7,008.08 | \$8,602.41 | \$10,196.75 |
| 121 | \$42.45 | \$52.11 | \$61.77 | \$7,358.48 | \$9,032.53 | \$10,706.59 |
| 122 | \$44.58 | \$54.72 | \$64.86 | \$7,726.40 | \$9,484.16 | \$11,241.92 |
| 123 | \$46.80 | \$57.45 | \$68.10 | \$8,112.72 | \$9,958.37 | \$11,804.01 |
| 124 | \$49.14 | \$60.32 | \$71.51 | \$8,518.36 | \$10,456.29 | \$12,394.21 |
| 125 | \$48.57 | \$61.92 | \$75.28 | \$8,418.14 | \$10,733.13 | \$13,048.12 |
| 126 | \$50.99 | \$65.02 | \$79.04 | \$8,839.05 | \$11,269.79 | \$13,700.53 |
| 127 | \$53.54 | \$68.27 | \$82.99 | \$9,281.00 | \$11,833.28 | \$14,385.55 |
| 128 | \$56.22 | \$71.68 | \$87.14 | \$9,745.05 | \$12,424.94 | \$15,104.83 |
| 129 | \$59.03 | \$75.27 | \$91.50 | \$10,232.31 | \$13,046.19 | \$15,860.07 |
| 130 | \$61.98 | \$79.03 | \$96.08 | \$10,743.92 | \$13,698.50 | \$16,653.08 |
| 131 | \$65.08 | \$82.98 | \$100.88 | \$11,281.12 | \$14,383.42 | \$17,485.73 |
| 132 | \$68.34 | \$87.13 | \$105.92 | \$11,845.17 | \$15,102.60 | \$18,360.02 |
| 133 | \$71.75 | \$91.49 | \$111.22 | \$12,437.43 | \$15,857.73 | \$19,278.02 |
| 134 | \$75.34 | \$96.06 | \$116.78 | \$13,059.30 | \$16,650.61 | \$20,241.92 |
| 135 | \$79.11 | \$100.86 | \$122.62 | \$13,712.27 | \$17,483.14 | \$21,254.02 |
| 136 | \$83.06 | \$105.91 | \$128.75 | \$14,397.88 | \$18,357.30 | \$22,316.72 |
| 137 | \$87.22 | \$111.20 | \$135.19 | \$15,117.78 | \$19,275.16 | \$23,432.55 |
| 138 | \$91.58 | \$116.76 | \$141.95 | \$15,873.66 | \$20,238.92 | \$24,604.18 |
| 139 | \$96.16 | \$122.60 | \$149.04 | \$16,667.35 | \$21,250.87 | \$25,834.39 |
| 140 | \$100.97 | \$128.73 | \$156.50 | \$17,500.72 | \$22,313.41 | \$27,126.11 |

## II. Project Parameters \& Methodology

The initial step in conducting a base compensation study is to determine the basic parameters for the study, which include:

1. Selection of comparable labor market agencies
2. Identification of benchmark classifications
3. Confirmation of desired labor market position
4. Determination of the appropriate statistical techniques used for aggregating and analyzing the data (e.g., aging data, leveling, trimming, interpolation, extrapolation, multiple regression, etc.)

There are multiple options of the base compensation study that depend on project objectives and specific market conditions, such as data availability, influences of local private and nonprofit sectors, differentiations based on the on geographic location or industry standards. The typical options are \#1 The client selects comparable labor market agencies, \#2 CPS researches and provides recommendations for comparable labor market agencies, \#3 use of published salary surveys, or \#4 a combination of the aforementioned sources.

## Selection of Comparable Labor Market Agencies

The comparable labor market agencies provided by the VCTC for this study are listed below.

1. City of Camarillo
2. City of Fillmore
3. City of Moorpark
4. City of Ojai
5. City of Oxnard
6. City of Port Hueneme
7. City of San Buenaventura
8. City of Santa Paula
9. City of Simi Valley
10. City of Thousand Oaks
11. County of Ventura
12. Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG)
13. Los Angeles Metro Transportation Authority (LAMTA)
14. Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA/Metrolink)
15. Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)
16. Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTA)
17. San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA)

For this study, CPS HR was able to obtain data from all labor market agencies. Please note, matches were not established for the City of Fillmore as the city currently does not have any classification specifications or positions descriptions on file.

Typical criteria that may help defining the relevant labor market includes the following:

- Agency Size - In general, agencies that employ relatively similar numbers of employees may have similar economic demographics. Since it is rare to find agencies that are exactly the same size, the goal is to provide a balanced mix of larger and smaller agencies, thereby minimizing the "skewing" effect when either of these are used exclusively.

■ Organizational Metrics - i.e., revenue/budget, number of employees, enrollment figures, size of service area, population size, etc.

■ Geographic Proximity - When considering selection of a labor market, it is important to consider the geographic proximity of potential agencies since they may be competitors in the recruitment market. If there are not enough agencies within the local market to conduct a study, then the geographic area may be expanded to include agencies in other closer areas, which are similar in other aspects.

- Industry - In general, agencies that provide similar services are more likely to have similar job classifications and recruit from the same labor pool.
- Competing Organizations - Organizations or agencies from which the VCTC has lost employees to or recruited employees from is also useful for selecting labor market agencies.
- Transparency and Availability of Data - Lack of availability of data or inability for an agency to participate in the study may disqualify a potential comparator agency from the viable list.

■ Past Labor Market Agency Selection Practices - History of using certain agencies which managers/employees expect to use again for consistency.

■ Cost of Wages/Cost of Living - Cost of Wages includes year over year increases in employment cost for compensation, benefits and payroll taxes paid by an employer. The Cost of Living is based on the Consumer Price Index which is the increase in prices for goods and services over a one-year period. The Cost of Living is often used to compare how expensive it is to live in one city versus another.

## Identification of Benchmark Classifications

A benchmark is a selected job classification that is common across other comparator agencies and/or labor markets. Benchmark job classifications are typically selected collaboratively with the VCTC agency HR department and/or leadership and are subsequently matched to similar jobs in the comparator agencies classification systems.

For this project, the VCTC recommended a selection of the specific benchmark classifications based on the VCTC business practices and/or specific conditions, and a principle of adequate representation of various occupational groups, job families, and levels within job series.

The benchmark classifications for this study are presented below. Job summary descriptions for all benchmark classifications were based on the current job descriptions provided by VCTC.

1. Administrative Assistant - Shared Transit/Programming
2. Clerk of the Commission/Executive Assistant
3. Customer Service Representative
4. Finance Director
5. Planning and Sustainability Director
6. Program Analyst
7. Program Manager, Accounting
8. Program Manager, Government and Community Relations
9. Program Manager, Information Technology
10. Program Manager, Programming
11. Program Manager, Regional Transit Planning
12. Program Manager, Transit Contracts
13. Program Manager, Transportation Data and Services
14. Program Manager, Transportation Planning
15. Programming Director
16. Public Transit Director
17. Receptionist/Secretary
18. Senior Accountant/Analyst
19. Transit Information Center and Technology Specialist
20. Transit Planner
21. Transit Planner, Transit Services

## Confirmation of the Desired Labor Market Position

The labor market position allows the VCTC to set salary ranges at the desired point in the labor market. Ultimately, the VCTC selected the desired labor market position based on affordability, recruitment and retention goals, and business strategy.

There are typically three labor market position options:

1. Lead the market - positioning pay parameters higher than the market (i.e., 60th percentile or 70th percentile etc.)
2. Meet the market - positioning pay parameters at the median of the market (i.e., exactly at the 50th percentile)
3. Lag the market - positioning pay parameters below the market (i.e., 40th percentile or lower)

For this project, VCTC selected to meet the relevant labor market based on their business objectives and employment practices. The VCTC selected a meet the market strategy to align to the VCTC pay structure and ranges to $Y$ percentiles. CPS HR considered this strategy during the data collection, analysis, and recommendations.

Because labor market job values vary by job classifications and/or job families, some situations require use of a "mixed" labor market position option where lead the market strategies are used for hard to fill job classifications while for other job classifications a "match to market" approach can be used.

## Determination of the Appropriate Statistical Techniques

For this study, CPS HR provided labor market data analysis based on the median of the market. The labor market median is the value separating the higher half of the data sample (in this case, salaries) from the lower half of the data sample. It may be thought of as the middle value of the market in a compensation study.

While both the mean and the median can be useful statistical tools to describe where the center of a data set is located, the median does a better job than the mean of capturing a "typical" value. This is because the median is not as heavily influenced by skewed data or data with outliers. Since many labor market pools are normally based on a relatively small number of data, skewing and outliers are a common phenomenon.

Among the common statistical techniques used in CPS HR studies are the following:

- Identifying specific percentile of the wage market ranges, such as $10^{\text {th }}, 25^{\text {th }}, 50^{\text {th }}, 75^{\text {th }}$, and $90^{\text {th }}$ percentiles
- Calculating weighted average of the data to minimize the influence of sources that are less related to the VCTC or has a smaller data sample
- Trimming, interpolating, or extrapolating to optimize the accuracy of the collected data
- Leveling data to adjust wage parameters for slight mismatch in the level of authority, complexity, requirements, or operational scope of the matching benchmark
- Data visualization techniques, such as charts, graphs, scatter plot diagrams, or other tools to better understand and present collected data


## Benchmark Classification Matching Process

When conducting a base salary study, the intent is to provide general market trends by comparing job duties and responsibilities, level of authority and autonomy, nature and complexity of work, and knowledge, skill, and ability requirements to determine whether these are comparable enough to utilize as a match. With a balanced labor market and the use of whole job analysis, it is reasonable to assume that some matches will have slightly higher responsibilities and some matches will have slightly lower responsibilities, yet the overall scope of duties and responsibilities of the combined matches will be balanced.

In the process of matching from other agencies, CPS HR did not make a job match based only on a similar title or rely solely on classification specifications. CPS HR also referenced position control documents, organizational charts, allocation lists, and other information, when available, to specifically identify which classification, and what level of classification, performed the duties of the VCTC benchmark classification. In addition, budgets or other fiscal tools provided greater understanding of the classification structure than what was evident in the content of classification specifications. To the extent possible, CPS HR identified the operational use of a classification in determining whether it is a comparable job match.

## Required Number of Comparable Classifications

CPS HR's best practice and methodology is that benchmark positions must have a minimum of three (3) classification matches to make a salary recommendation based on the labor market data. In most studies, it is common to have some classes for which limited market data exists.

There are many reasons a benchmark class may not have enough comparable data including:
Differences in the delivery of services

Differences in span of authority

- Differences in organizational structure
- Differences in operational size
- The benchmark classification is not commonly found in other agencies

The labor market agency does not provide that service

In this study, the majority of the (21) benchmark classifications met the requirement of a minimum of three (3) comparable matching classifications, except for the following:

1. Transit Information Center and Technology Specialist

It is important to note that when examining data, results with fewer than three matches may not be a valid indicator of where the organization stands in comparison to the labor market. For that reason, while data has been presented for review, caution should be used when using data for survey classes with fewer than three matches for salary setting purposes. Salary recommendations for these classes should be based more heavily on the internal equity/relationships with other job classes.

Benchmarks that did not have at least three (3) matching classifications were placed within the salary structure based on the internal relationship between VCTC job families or benchmark classifications within the same salary band. For example, Transit Information Center and Technology Specialist benchmark had no comparable job matches. Since there was insufficient comparable labor market data (ISD) for this benchmark, CPS HR anchored the Transit Information Center and Technology Specialist to the Administrative Assistant, a benchmark within the same job family to make a salary recommendation.

## Labor Market Data Collected

CPS HR collected base salary data from the labor market to generate the minimum, midpoint, and maximum salaries within the labor market. When analyzing the labor market, the goal is to identify the VCTC competitive position within the labor market to attract, develop, motivate, and retain talent.

## IV. Work Plan

To complete the base compensation study, CPS HR completed the following tasks:

- Sent a list of required documents needed to begin the study to the VCTC
- Reviewed the VCTC background materials, including classification specifications, salary schedules, policies, and organization charts
- Conducted a VCTC kick-off meeting to finalize the project scope and explain methodology
- Developed a data collection method and approach
- Sent a project parameters letter and received approval from the VCTC
- Researched and collected salary data from the identified labor market agencies, including current salary schedules, classification specifications, budgets, position control documents, and other documents as available
- Communicated with the comparable agencies to request further information or clarification on job matching/data
- Developed and sent a comprehensive job matching review spreadsheet for the VCTC review, feedback, and final approval
Entered, reported on, and analyzed all data for a discussion of preliminary findings with the VCTC


## V. Study Results

CPS HR studied (21) VCTC benchmark job classifications, of which (20) were matched to corresponding labor market benchmarks. The remaining (1) benchmark job classification had no comparable matches due to their unique set of duties, responsibilities, and requirements. The appropriate pay grade within the VCTC pay structure for these jobs was determined by their internal relationship with the studied benchmarks.

It was noted that some job classifications were significantly lagging the relevant labor market in minimum control point and less significantly lagging the labor market in maximum control point of the range. This can be explained by the misalignment of the VCTC range bandwidth (spread from the grade minimum to maximum) with the average range bandwidth of the corresponding benchmarks in the relevant labor market.

Please note that the term "No Comparable Class" (NCC) is used if CPS HR did not find a comparable classification within an agency to a specific benchmark classification. The term "Data Not Available" (DNA) is used when CPS HR could not obtain the required data from an agency after numerous attempts.

VCTC overall position within the labor market and the medians or means for each classification are presented in the base salary individual datasheets under separate cover. However, in Table 4 below, we have provided a summary of the VCTC position within the labor market by classification. It illustrates the following information for each benchmark classifications:

- The VCTC classification title
- The number of comparable classifications found in the labor market
- The control points of current monthly salary (minimum, midpoint, maximum) for the study classifications
- The labor market median of the control points which is calculated using the same control point for each of the comparable classes; that range of data is then computed to provide the median amount. The VCTC salary is not included in the median or mean calculations because the labor market parameters data will be skewed with the inclusion of the client's data.

CPS HR used the labor market medians in market comparisons presented in the salary summary (Table 1) since the market median eliminates high and low outliers which can skew data and outcomes. The median tends to provide a more stable representation of trends in the market. Please note, that a negative (-) percentile variance figures indicate where the VCTC is above the median and leads the market and a positive (+) percentile variance indicates the VCTC is lagging the market.

## Overall Summary of Labor Market Position

The data in Table 4 shows that the results of the comparison between the VCTC salaries to those in the relevant labor market are below the labor market. The degree of variance depends on whether the minimum, midpoint, or maximum salaries are compared.

## Table 4: VCTC Percent (\%) Above/Below Labor Market Listed by Classification

A negative (-) number indicates that the VCTC is above the Labor Market. A positive (+) number means that the VCTC salaries are below the Labor Market and need the indicated percentage to reach the Labor Market. VCTC base salary is not included in the median and mean calculations.

| Classification Title | \# of matches | Base Salary <br> Minimum | Base Salary Midpoint | Base Salary <br> Maximum | LM Base Salary Minimum | LM Base <br> Salary <br> Midpoint | LM Base <br> Salary <br> Maximum | Mrkt <br> Variance from Min | Mrkt <br> Variance from Mid | Mrkt <br> Variance from Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Assistant - Shared Transit/Programming | 16 | \$3,652.17 | \$4,748.50 | \$5,844.83 | \$4,374.07 | \$5,150.60 | \$5,870.28 | 19.77\% | 8.47\% | 0.44\% |
| Clerk of the Commission/Executive Assistant | 12 | \$5,844.00 | \$8,491.00 | \$11,138.00 | \$6,669.09 | \$7,737.49 | \$8,709.59 | 14.12\% | -8.87\% | -21.80\% |
| Customer Service Representative | 6 | \$2,686.67 | \$3,197.13 | \$3,707.58 | \$3,811.05 | \$4,432.23 | \$4,939.19 | 41.85\% | 38.63\% | 33.22\% |
| Finance Director | 16 | \$9,092.00 | \$12,404.50 | \$15,717.00 | \$13,679.51 | \$17,213.12 | \$20,188.29 | 50.46\% | 38.77\% | 28.45\% |
| Planning and Sustainability Director | 12 | \$9,092.00 | \$12,404.50 | \$15,717.00 | \$13,036.27 | \$15,188.76 | \$18,294.41 | 43.38\% | 22.45\% | 16.40\% |
| Program Analyst | 11 | \$4,175.58 | \$6,162.88 | \$8,150.17 | \$6,654.53 | \$8,040.07 | \$9,433.30 | 59.37\% | 30.46\% | 15.74\% |
| Program Manager, Accounting | 14 | \$5,844.00 | \$8,491.00 | \$11,138.00 | \$8,981.17 | \$10,711.64 | \$12,594.66 | 53.68\% | 26.15\% | 13.08\% |
| Program Manager, Government and Community Relations | 6 | \$5,844.00 | \$8,491.00 | \$11,138.00 | \$9,819.33 | \$11,876.31 | \$13,933.30 | 68.02\% | 39.87\% | 25.10\% |
| Program Manager, Information Technology | 7 | \$5,844.00 | \$8,491.00 | \$11,138.00 | \$9,191.76 | \$10,754.44 | \$12,455.77 | 57.29\% | 26.66\% | 11.83\% |
| Program Manager, Programming | 5 | \$5,844.00 | \$8,491.00 | \$11,138.00 | \$9,316.00 | \$10,320.00 | \$11,670.54 | 59.41\% | 21.54\% | 4.78\% |
| Program Manager, Regional Transit Planning | 5 | \$5,844.00 | \$8,491.00 | \$11,138.00 | \$8,951.00 | \$10,517.00 | \$12,083.00 | 53.17\% | 23.86\% | 8.48\% |
| Program Manager, Transit Contracts | 5 | \$5,844.00 | \$8,491.00 | \$11,138.00 | \$8,986.08 | \$11,906.58 | \$14,722.00 | 53.77\% | 40.23\% | 32.18\% |
| Program Manager, Transportation Data and Services | 5 | \$5,844.00 | \$8,491.00 | \$11,138.00 | \$8,183.90 | \$10,229.88 | \$12,275.85 | 40.04\% | 20.48\% | 10.22\% |
| Program Manager, Transportation Planning | 7 | \$5,844.00 | \$8,491.00 | \$11,138.00 | \$7,663.08 | \$9,329.17 | \$11,324.00 | 31.13\% | 9.87\% | 1.67\% |
| Programming Director | 5 | \$9,092.00 | \$12,404.50 | \$15,717.00 | \$13,276.58 | \$15,431.52 | \$19,432.28 | 46.02\% | 24.40\% | 23.64\% |
| Public Transit Director | 7 | \$9,092.00 | \$12,404.50 | \$15,717.00 | \$11,074.00 | \$12,294.54 | \$14,752.40 | 21.80\% | -0.89\% | -6.14\% |
| Receptionist/Secretary | 9 | \$3,652.17 | \$4,748.50 | \$5,844.83 | \$3,909.00 | \$4,556.94 | \$5,236.40 | 7.03\% | -4.03\% | -10.41\% |
| Senior Accountant/Analyst | 14 | \$4,175.58 | \$6,162.88 | \$8,150.17 | \$6,395.57 | \$7,785.16 | \$9,197.67 | 53.17\% | 26.32\% | 12.85\% |
| Transit Information Center and Technology Specialist | 0 | \$3,652.17 | \$4,748.50 | \$5,844.83 | NO COMPARABLE CLASSES |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transit Planner | 4 | \$4,175.58 | \$6,162.88 | \$8,150.17 | \$6,905.62 | \$8,051.04 | \$9,077.87 | 65.38\% | 30.64\% | 11.38\% |
| Transit Planner - Transit Services | 4 | \$4,175.58 | \$6,162.88 | \$8,150.17 | \$6,281.45 | \$7,857.60 | \$9,077.87 | 50.43\% | 27.50\% | 11.38\% |

# VII. Salary Recommendations 

## Salary Range Recommendation Guiding Principals

## Aligning Jobs with Relevant Labor Market

After completing wage market analysis and developing a model of a new pay structure, CPS HR team assigned all studied job classifications with the ranges found in relevant labor markets for similar jobs as seen in Table 5 . The main objective was to align new VCTC minimums and midpoints to similar range parameters in the relevant labor market. For example, VCTC job classification of Program Analyst currently has a minimum of $\$ 4,176$ and it was assigned to pay grade 119 in the new pay structure with the minimum of $\$ 6,674$, which is based on the market minimum of $\$ 6,655$. Once studied job classifications are assigned to the market-based pay grades, VCTC may assign remaining (non-studied) jobs to pay grades based on the current internal job relationships. That will establish internal job equity and ensure that the ranges for all jobs are externally competitive and internally consistent. This final structure is seen in Table 6.

Table 5: Job Grade Assignment Based on Labor Market Data

| Classification Title | Base Salary Minimum | LM Base Salary Minimur | Base Salary Midpoint | LM Base <br> Salary Midpoin - | Base Salary Maximum | LM Base <br> Salary <br> Maximu | Recommended Grade $\qquad$ | Monthly Min | Monthly <br> Midpoint | Monthly Max | Annual Min | Annual Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Customer Service Representative | \$2,687 | \$3,811 | \$3,197 | \$4,432 | \$3,708 | \$4,939 | 107 | \$3,716.53 | \$4,562.04 | \$5,407.55 | \$44,598.38 | \$64,890.65 |
| Administrative Assistant - Shared Transit/Programming | \$3,652 | \$4,374 | \$4,749 | \$5,151 | \$5,845 | \$5,870 | 110 | \$4,302.35 | \$5,281.13 | \$6,259.92 | \$51,628.20 | \$75,119.04 |
| Receptionist/Secretary | \$3,652 | \$3,909 | \$4,749 | \$4,557 | \$5,845 | \$5,236 | 110 | \$4,302.35 | \$5,281.13 | \$6,259.92 | \$51,628.20 | \$75,119.04 |
| Transit Information Center and Technology Specialist | \$3,652 |  | \$4,749 |  | \$5,845 |  | 110 | \$4,302.35 | \$5,281.13 | \$6,259.92 | \$51,628.20 | \$75,119.04 |
| Program Analyst | \$4,176 | \$6,655 | \$6,163 | \$8,040 | \$8,150 | \$9,433 | 119 | \$6,674.36 | \$8,192.77 | \$9,711.19 | \$80,092.29 | \$116,534.28 |
| Senior Accountant/Analyst | \$4,176 | \$6,396 | \$6,163 | \$7,785 | \$8,150 | \$9,198 | 119 | \$6,674.36 | \$8,192.77 | \$9,711.19 | \$80,092.29 | \$116,534.28 |
| Transit Planner | \$4,176 | \$6,906 | \$6,163 | \$8,051 | \$8,150 | \$9,078 | 119 | \$6,674.36 | \$8,192.77 | \$9,711.19 | \$80,092.29 | \$116,534.28 |
| Transit Planner - Transit Services | \$4,176 | \$6,281 | \$6,163 | \$7,858 | \$8,150 | \$9,078 | 119 | \$6,674.36 | \$8,192.77 | \$9,711.19 | \$80,092.29 | \$116,534.28 |
| Clerk of the Commission/Executive Assistant | \$5,844 | \$6,669 | \$8,491 | \$7,737 | \$11,138 | \$8,710 | 126 | \$8,839.05 | \$11,269.79 | \$13,700.53 | \$106,068.60 | \$164,406.34 |
| Program Manager, Accounting | \$5,844 | \$8,981 | \$8,491 | \$10,712 | \$11,138 | \$12,595 | 126 | \$8,839.05 | \$11,269.79 | \$13,700.53 | \$106,068.60 | \$164,406.34 |
| Program Manager, Government and Community Relations | \$5,844 | \$9,819 | \$8,491 | \$11,876 | \$11,138 | \$13,933 | 126 | \$8,839.05 | \$11,269.79 | \$13,700.53 | \$106,068.60 | \$164,406.34 |
| Program Manager, Information Technology | \$5,844 | \$9,192 | \$8,491 | \$10,754 | \$11,138 | \$12,456 | 126 | \$8,839.05 | \$11,269.79 | \$13,700.53 | \$106,068.60 | \$164,406.34 |
| Program Manager, Programming | \$5,844 | \$9,316 | \$8,491 | \$10,320 | \$11,138 | \$11,671 | 126 | \$8,839.05 | \$11,269.79 | \$13,700.53 | \$106,068.60 | \$164,406.34 |
| Program Manager, Regional Transit Planning | \$5,844 | \$8,951 | \$8,491 | \$10,517 | \$11,138 | \$12,083 | 126 | \$8,839.05 | \$11,269.79 | \$13,700.53 | \$106,068.60 | \$164,406.34 |
| Program Manager, Transit Contracts | \$5,844 | \$8,986 | \$8,491 | \$11,907 | \$11,138 | \$14,722 | 126 | \$8,839.05 | \$11,269.79 | \$13,700.53 | \$106,068.60 | \$164,406.34 |
| Program Manager, Transportation Data and Services | \$5,844 | \$8,184 | \$8,491 | \$10,230 | \$11,138 | \$12,276 | 126 | \$8,839.05 | \$11,269.79 | \$13,700.53 | \$106,068.60 | \$164,406.34 |
| Program Manager, Transportation Planning | \$5,844 | \$7,663 | \$8,491 | \$9,329 | \$11,138 | \$11,324 | 126 | \$8,839.05 | \$11,269.79 | \$13,700.53 | \$106,068.60 | \$164,406.34 |
| Finance Director | \$9,092 | \$13,680 | \$12,405 | \$17,213 | \$15,717 | \$20,188 | 133 | \$12,437.43 | \$15,857.73 | \$19,278.02 | \$149,249.18 | \$231,336.23 |
| Planning and Sustainability Director | \$9,092 | \$13,036 | \$12,405 | \$15,189 | \$15,717 | \$18,294 | 133 | \$12,437.43 | \$15,857.73 | \$19,278.02 | \$149,249.18 | \$231,336.23 |
| Programming Director | \$9,092 | \$13,277 | \$12,405 | \$15,432 | \$15,717 | \$19,432 | 133 | \$12,437.43 | \$15,857.73 | \$19,278.02 | \$149,249.18 | \$231,336.23 |
| Public Transit Director | \$9,092 | \$11,074 | \$12,405 | \$12,295 | \$15,717 | \$14,752 | 133 | \$12,437.43 | \$15,857.73 | \$19,278.02 | \$149,249.18 | \$231,336.23 |

## Table 6: Job Grade Assignments (Annual Rates)

| Classification Title |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## VIII. CPS HR Consulting Contact Information

It has been a pleasure collaborating with VCTC on this project. Any questions and comments with respect to this report should be directed to Ellen Fishel, Classification and Compensation Manager, efishel@cpshr.us.

