

Agenda

Sacramento Suburban Water District Facilities and Operations Committee

3701 Marconi Avenue, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95821

Thursday, October 1, 2009
4:00 p.m.

Public documents relating to any open session item listed on this agenda that are distributed to the Committee members less than 72 hours before the meeting are available for public inspection in the customer service area of the District's Administrative Office at the address listed above.

The public may address the Committee concerning any item of interest. Persons who wish to comment on either agenda or non-agenda items should fill out a Comment Card and give it to the General Manager. The Committee Chair will call for comments at the appropriate time. Comments will be subject to reasonable time limits (3 minutes).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you have a disability, and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, then please contact Sacramento Suburban Water District Human Resources at 679-3972. Requests must be made as early as possible and at least one-full business day before the start of the meeting.

Call to Order

Roll Call

Public Comment

This is an opportunity for the public to comment on non-agenda items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee. Comments are limited to 3 minutes.

Items for Discussion and Action

1. **Employee Compensation Study**
Review report from consultant.
2. **Facility Consolidation and Potential Property Acquisition**
Review updated report on additional property options for District facility consolidation.
3. **Potential Grant Funding for North Service Area (NSA) Fluoridation Facilities**
Review report from District staff.
4. **Federal Recovery Act Grant**
Review report on District service areas included in the grant for water meter retrofits.

Adjournment

Upcoming Meetings:

Monday, October 19, 2009 at 6:30 p.m., Regular Board Meeting

Monday, November 16, 2009 at 6:30 p.m., Regular Board Meeting

I certify that the foregoing agenda for the October 1, 2009 meeting of the Sacramento Suburban Water District Facilities and Operations Committee was posted by September 28, 2009 at the Sacramento Suburban Water District office, 3701 Marconi Avenue, Suite 100, Sacramento, California, and was made available to the public during normal business hours.

Robert S. Roscoe
Secretary/General Manager
Sacramento Suburban Water District



Facilities and Operations Committee Agenda Item: 1

Date: September 28, 2009

Subject: 2009 Compensation Study Update

Staff Contact: Lynne Yost, Human Resources Coordinator

In response to concerns expressed about the current economic climate and its impact on the local job market, and pursuant to Board Policy, Bryce Consulting was retained to conduct a 2009 Compensation Study Update. A copy of the draft study prepared by the consultant, Shellie Anderson, is attached for the Committee's review prior to presenting it to the full Board in October 2009. Any additional updated information received from the consultant will be provided at the meeting.

The updated study focuses on total compensation with surveyed agencies in the local area that were included in the original study since those agencies remain the most comparable and competitive. Furlough and layoff information was also included to obtain information on salary/pay saving measures taken by the surveyed agencies.

Sacramento Suburban Water District

Compensation Study Draft Final Report



Submitted by:

Bryce Consulting, Inc.
3436 American River Drive, Suite 7A
Sacramento, CA 95864

September 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I	Project Overview	3
Section II	Compensation Survey Parameters	4
Section III	Compensation Survey Results	9
Section IV	Salary/Pay Recommendations	20
Appendix A	Compensation Survey Data Sheets	A
Appendix B	Miscellaneous Benefit Data	B
Appendix C	Salary/Pay Recommendations	C

SECTION I - PROJECT OVERVIEW

Bryce Consulting was retained by the Sacramento Suburban Water District to update the compensation study that was conducted in 2007 for District classifications. This report presents the compensation survey results and salary/pay recommendations. The report includes:

- Section I Project Overview
- Section II Compensation Survey Parameters
- Section III Compensation Survey Results
- Section IV Salary/Pay Recommendations

STUDY OBJECTIVES

The study consisted of the following objectives:

- Collect and analyze base salary/pay and benefit survey data for the selected survey classes.
- Update the salary/pay plan for all classes in the District using market data and internal relationships to ensure parity to the labor market and internal equity within the organization.

SECTION II – COMPENSATION SURVEY PARAMETERS

This section of the report presents the compensation survey parameters and includes:

- Selection of labor market employers and survey classes
- Survey scope
- Survey methodology

SURVEY EMPLOYERS

The overall objective in selecting survey employers is to define as accurately as possible the District's "Labor Market". A labor market consists of those employers with whom the District competes for employees. The criteria typically utilized in identifying those employers includes the following:

- **EMPLOYER SIZE** - As a general rule, the more similar employers are in size and complexity, the greater the likelihood that comparable positions exist within both organizations. Specifically, agencies of similar size to Sacramento Suburban Water District are likely to have departmental structures and organization of positions more similar to the District than organizations that are significantly larger or smaller in size.
- **GEOGRAPHIC PROXIMITY** - Geographic proximity is another factor utilized in identifying an appropriate labor market. This factor is particularly important because it identifies those employers that the District must directly compete with to recruit and retain quality staff. It is expected that for management classifications, the recruitment area will be broader as the candidate pool is smaller. Therefore, five additional agencies were selected for management survey classifications.
- **NATURE OF SERVICES PROVIDED** - As a general rule similar organizations are selected as survey employers, because they provide similar services. This is important for the following reasons:
 - Employers who provide similar services are most likely to compete with one another for employees.
 - These employers are most likely to have comparable jobs.
 - These employers are most likely to have similar organizational characteristics.

While some survey agencies may not meet all of the criteria, it is important to have a balanced labor market.

RECOMMENDED LABOR MARKET

Table 1 displays the survey agencies, which were also surveyed in 2007, based on the above considerations. These agencies are geographically proximate, are competitors for staff and/or provide similar services.

Table 1

Survey Agencies	
<i>Survey Agencies</i>	<i>Classifications Surveyed</i>
Carmichael Water District	All Classes
Citrus Heights Water District	All Classes
City of Davis	All Classes
City of Folsom	All Classes
City of Roseville	All Classes
City of Sacramento	All Classes
City of West Sacramento	All Classes
City of Woodland	All Classes
El Dorado Irrigation District	All Classes
Elk Grove Water District	All Classes
Fair Oaks Water District	All Classes
Placer County Water Agency	All Classes
Sacramento County	All Classes
San Juan Water District	All Classes
Amador Water Agency	Management Classes
San Luis and Delta Mendota Water	Management Classes
Solano Irrigation District	Management Classes
Stockton East Water District	Management Classes
Stockton Municipal Utility	Management Classes

SURVEY CLASSES

Survey classes are a representative sample of all classes within the District’s classification plan, and provide a reference point for the subsequent salary/pay determinations of classifications not surveyed. Survey classifications should generally be selected utilizing the following criteria:

- The survey classifications should have a significant relationship to other classes in

their occupational group. This ensures that they will make good reference points in relating and establishing salaries for other classes within their occupational group.

- They should be reasonably well known and able to be clearly and concisely described. This enables the employer to more easily communicate with survey employers in establishing accurate comparabilities for the survey classes.
- They should be classes for which counterparts can readily be found in other agencies so that sufficient compensation data can be gathered.

Table 2, on the following page, displays the survey classifications based on the above criteria. It should be noted that if insufficient data was found for a survey classification in 2007, it was not surveyed in 2009.

SURVEY SCOPE

The scope of the survey included the labor market agencies presented in this report. The data collected for each survey class included:

- Title of each comparable class
- Entry and top step monthly salary/pay
- Cash add-ons to base salary/pay including:
 - Deferred compensation contribution made by the employer
 - Employer pick-up of the employee contribution for retirement
- Employer contributions for insurances (health, dental, vision, life)
- Social security
- Cost of living information including date and amount of last and next increase
- Paid leave benefits
- Retirement practices including employer's share, benefit, formula and plan
- Retiree health benefits
- Information related to layoffs/furloughs and reduction in benefits to deal with current economic climate.

Table 2

Survey Classifications
Accountant
Administrative Assistant II
Assistant Controller
Assistant General Manager
Associate Registered Engineer
Customer Service Representative II
Director of Finance
Distribution Operator II
Electrical and Instrumentation Technician
Engineering Manager
GIS/IT Technician (GIS Technician)
GIS/IT Technician (IT Technician)
Human Resources Coordinator
Maintenance Technician II
Mgr, Information Technology
Operations Manager
Production Operator II
Senior Inspector
Superintendent, Distribution
Water Conservation Coordinator
Water Conservation Technician II

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey methodology utilized by Bryce Consulting included:

- A survey was sent to each labor market employer that included the information provided in 2007 asking the agency to update the salary/pay and benefit information. In addition, Bryce reviewed the job descriptions to ensure the survey agency's classifications were still a comparable.

In addition to the collection of base salary/pay and benefit information, careful efforts were made to document the full-range of duties and requirements of all job classes in determining comparability to the District's corresponding survey classes. This included the collection of:

- Reporting relationships

- Functional areas of responsibility
- The class's relationship to other classes in the series

The District's compensation policy, adopted in July 2004 and revised in September 2006, states that the District will target the third quartile of total compensation in the local labor market when setting total compensation for District positions. Consistent with the District's compensation policy, the data was analyzed to produce the 62.5th percentile, the middle of the third quartile, for each classification using maximum base salary/pay, total cash, and total compensation as the basis of comparison. The District's position was then compared to the labor market, for each survey classification, which produced the percentage that District is above or below the labor market.

SECTION III – COMPENSATION SURVEY RESULTS

This section of the report presents the compensation survey findings including base salary/pay, total cash and total compensation. In addition, miscellaneous benefit data is presented including cost of living information, retirement practices, retiree health benefits, and leave benefits

As indicated in the previous section, the survey involved the collection of compensation information for each of the survey classes from the labor market employers identified. Of the 19 public employers surveyed, all were able to participate in the study process. **Table 3**, on the following page, displays the comparability for each survey classification.

It should be noted that the District has a few classification titles that are not consistent with the work being performed. The duties performed by the District's classification of Accountant are consistent with a journey level Accounting Technician in the market. The classification is responsible for accounts payable, accounts receivable, daily cash receipts, and journal entries. In addition, the classification requires an Associate's degree which is consistent with a technical classification, not a professional Accountant classification. The labor market data for this classification consists of journey level classifications performing technical accounting duties.

The duties performed by the District's classification of Assistant Controller is consistent with a journey level professional Accountant in that the classification is responsible for establishing and maintaining chart of accounts, ensuring the accuracy of ledger postings, preparing month-end journals, preparing monthly financial reports and statements, and assisting with budget preparation and maintenance. The labor market data for this classification consists of journey level classifications performing a variety of professional accounting duties.

The District's classification of Senior Inspector is consistent with a journey level inspector rather than an advanced journey level inspector, as the title denotes. The classification does not have lead responsibilities; therefore, the labor market data consists of classifications performing journey level construction inspection duties.

The District also has the classification of GIS/Information Technology Technician. It is not uncommon for smaller organizations to blend classifications that require similar skill sets. For the purpose of collecting accurate compensation data, data for journey level Engineering Technician and journey level Information Technology Technician was collected.

With respect to Manager, Information Technology, while the position does not supervise professional staff, the scope and responsibility level for the District's information technology

program is comparable to a supervisor. Therefore, the classifications that were determined to be comparable were either a supervisory classification, if the agency had such a level, or the highest level professional information technology classification in the absence of a supervisor.

Lastly, with respect to Water Conservation Technician and Water Conservation Coordinator, the classifications that were determined to be comparable are somewhat different than in 2007. The area of water conservation has been involving over the past few years and many agencies have the position that is responsible for developing and implementing the conservation program also heavily involved in legislation review. In addition, many of the classifications also require a Bachelor's degree as much of the work is analytical in nature. The District's Water Conservation Technician II is mostly a field position responsible for interacting with the public whereas the Water Conservation Coordinator is responsible for planning, organizing, managing, coordinating and promoting the program but does not have the same analytical responsibility as many of the survey agencies' classifications and does not have an equivalent education requirement.

Table 3

Comparability	
Survey Classification	Number of Comparable Matches
Accountant	10
Administrative Assistant II	9
Assistant Controller	11
Assistant General Manager	6
Associate Registered Engineer	10
Customer Service Representative II	13
Director of Finance	8
Distribution Operator II	11
Electrical and Instrumentation Technician	9
Engineering Manager	16
GIS/IT Technician (GIS Technician)	12
GIS/IT Technician (IT Technician)	11
Human Resources Coordinator	10
Maintenance Technician II	6
Mgr, Information Technology	9
Operations Manager	8
Production Operator II	12
Senior Inspector	10
Superintendent, Distribution	8
Water Conservation Coordinator	4
Water Conservation Technician II	6

BASE SALARY/PAY SURVEY RESULTS

The data has been organized into a series of tables that summarize the District's relationship to the labor market for each class. The compensation survey data sheets are presented in **Appendix A** of this report. **Table 4** summarizes, for each classification, how the District's base salaries compare to the labor market. The following data is presented:

- Title of the District's classification
- The District's current maximum monthly base salary/pay for each classification
- The 62.5th percentile of the labor market for maximum monthly base salary/pay
- Percentage the District's maximum base salary/pay is above or below the 62.5th percentile of the labor market

Table 4
Maximum Base Salary/pay

SSWD Classification	SSWD Max Base	Labor Market Max Base (62.5th percentile)	% SSWD is above or below market (62.5th percentile)
Accountant	\$4,978	\$4,542	8.77%
Administrative Assistant II	\$4,301	\$3,832	10.90%
Assistant Controller	\$6,358	\$6,188	2.67%
Assistant General Manager	\$11,380	\$12,196	-7.17%
Associate Registered Engineer	\$7,699	\$8,062	-4.71%
Customer Service Representative II	\$4,096	\$4,130	-0.82%
Director of Finance	\$10,318	\$10,917	-5.80%
Distribution Operator II	\$4,520	\$4,948	-9.46%
Electrical and Instrumentation Technician	\$5,761	\$6,090	-5.71%
Engineering Manager	\$9,825	\$10,794	-9.87%
GIS/IT Technician (GIS Technician)	\$4,978	\$5,158	-3.62%
GIS/IT Technician (IT Technician)	\$4,978	\$5,394	-8.35%
Human Resources Coordinator	\$6,647	\$6,861	-3.22%
Maintenance Technician II	\$4,096	\$4,547	-11.00%
Mgr, Information Technology	\$7,330	\$8,004	-9.20%
Operations Manager	\$9,356	\$9,328	0.30%
Production Operator II	\$4,742	\$5,100	-7.55%
Senior Inspector	\$5,226	\$5,607	-7.30%
Superintendent, Distribution	\$6,979	\$6,865	1.64%
Water Conservation Coordinator	\$5,761	\$6,026	-4.59%
Water Conservation Technician II	\$4,520	\$4,846	-7.21%

TOTAL CASH SURVEY RESULTS

Total cash represents the maximum base salary/pay plus the employee’s share of retirement paid by the agency as well as the agency’s contribution towards deferred compensation. **Table 5** displays, for each classification, how the District compares to the labor market with respect to total cash. The following data is presented:

- Title of the District’s classification
- The District’s current total cash for each classification
- The 62.5th percentile of the labor market for total cash
- Percentage the District’s total cash is above or below the 62.5th percentile of the labor market

**Table 5
Total Cash**

SSWD Classification	SSWD Total Cash	Labor Market Total Cash (62.5th percentile)	% SSWD is above or below market (62.5th percentile)
Accountant	\$5,326	\$4,790	10.07%
Administrative Assistant II	\$4,602	\$4,139	10.07%
Assistant Controller	\$6,803	\$6,677	1.85%
Assistant General Manager	\$12,177	\$13,066	-7.30%
Associate Registered Engineer	\$8,238	\$8,550	-3.79%
Customer Service Representative II	\$4,383	\$4,367	0.36%
Director of Finance	\$11,040	\$11,767	-6.59%
Distribution Operator II	\$4,836	\$5,284	-9.25%
Electrical and Instrumentation Technician	\$6,164	\$6,421	-4.16%
Engineering Manager	\$10,513	\$11,404	-8.48%
GIS/IT Technician (GIS Technician)	\$5,326	\$5,430	-1.95%
GIS/IT Technician (IT Technician)	\$5,326	\$5,667	-6.40%
Human Resources Coordinator	\$7,112	\$7,515	-5.67%
Maintenance Technician II	\$4,383	\$4,889	-11.54%
Mgr, Information Technology	\$7,843	\$8,885	-13.28%
Operations Manager	\$10,011	\$10,224	-2.12%
Production Operator II	\$5,074	\$5,455	-7.52%
Senior Inspector	\$5,592	\$5,958	-6.55%
Superintendent, Distribution	\$7,468	\$7,368	1.34%
Water Conservation Coordinator	\$6,164	\$6,051	1.84%
Water Conservation Technician II	\$4,836	\$5,227	-8.07%

TOTAL COMPENSATION SURVEY RESULTS

Total compensation represents the maximum base salary/pay, the employee's share of retirement paid by the agency, the agency's contribution towards deferred compensation, and the agency's contribution towards health, dental and vision insurance, life insurance and social security. **Table 6** displays, for each classification, how the District compares to the labor market with respect to total compensation. The following data is presented:

- Title of the District's classification
- The District's current total compensation for each classification
- The 62.5th percentile of the labor market for total compensation

- Percentage the District's total compensation is above or below the 62.5th percentile of the labor market

**Table 6
Total Compensation**

SSWD Classification	SSWD Total Compensation	Labor Market Total Compensation (62.5th percentile)	% SSWD is above or below market (62.5th percentile)
Accountant	\$7,126	\$6,700	5.98%
Administrative Assistant II	\$6,348	\$5,738	9.60%
Assistant Controller	\$8,713	\$8,482	2.66%
Assistant General Manager	\$14,464	\$15,156	-4.78%
Associate Registered Engineer	\$10,256	\$10,402	-1.43%
Customer Service Representative II	\$6,112	\$6,219	-1.75%
Director of Finance	\$13,309	\$14,082	-5.81%
Distribution Operator II	\$6,599	\$6,982	-5.79%
Electrical and Instrumentation Technician	\$8,027	\$8,461	-5.42%
Engineering Manager	\$12,772	\$13,909	-8.90%
GIS/IT Technician (GIS Technician)	\$7,126	\$7,425	-4.19%
GIS/IT Technician (IT Technician)	\$7,126	\$7,655	-7.42%
Human Resources Coordinator	\$9,046	\$9,185	-1.54%
Maintenance Technician II	\$6,112	\$6,280	-2.75%
Mgr, Information Technology	\$9,831	\$10,268	-4.44%
Operations Manager	\$12,262	\$12,179	0.68%
Production Operator II	\$6,855	\$7,196	-4.97%
Senior Inspector	\$7,411	\$7,830	-5.64%
Superintendent, Distribution	\$9,428	\$8,972	4.84%
Water Conservation Coordinator	\$8,027	\$7,759	3.33%
Water Conservation Technician II	\$6,599	\$7,144	-8.26%

MISCELLANEOUS BENEFIT DATA

Appendix B presents the miscellaneous benefit data that was collected including cost of living information, retirement practices, retiree health benefits, and leave benefits. Overall, the District is consistent with the labor market with respect to the miscellaneous benefits collected.

COST OF LIVING INCREASE

With respect to cost of living, four of the responding agencies received their last cost of living increase in either January or July 2008. Of those agencies that received an increase in 2009, five received the increase in either January or February, one received an increase in April, and six received an increase in July. The amount of the increases ranged from 1% to 6%.

Four of the responding agencies indicated they have a cost of living increase scheduled for January 2010, one has an increase scheduled for April, and three have an increase scheduled for July. While the City of Roseville has an increase scheduled for IBEW in January 2010, the next increase scheduled for management is January 2011. Three of the responding survey agencies do not have a cost of living increase scheduled and six indicated that the next cost of living increase date was yet to be determined. For the most part, the amount of the next cost of living increase is still yet to be determined for the survey agencies. It should be noted that two of the survey agencies do not provide cost of living increases as salaries are either merit based or set by the Board of Directors

The District's last cost of living increase was 1% in February 2009 and the next increase is scheduled for February 2010. Like most of the survey agencies, the District does not yet know the amount of the next cost of living increase.

RETIREMENT PRACTICES

With respect to retirement plan, 17 of the survey agencies are in CalPERS, one is an Act 37 agency and one offers a 401(a) plan. With respect to retirement benefit, eight have a benefit of 2%@55, 2 have a benefit of 2.5%@55, six have a benefit of 2.7%@55, one has a benefit of 2%@55 1/2, and one has a benefit of 3%@60. 11 agencies have a formula of single highest year, six have a formula of average of three highest years and one has a formula of final three years.

Like most of the survey agencies, the District has a CalPERS retirement plan with a benefit of 2%@55. The District's formula is an average of the three highest years.

RETIREE MEDICAL, DENTAL AND VISION BENEFITS

With respect to retiree medical benefits, two agencies do not provide retiree medical benefits. 16

offer retiree medical benefits ranging from \$25 per pay period to benefits equal to those of active employees. One agency has a trust where the employee contributes 3% and the City contributes 2%. Eight agencies have a vesting policy of five years. Four of the responding survey agencies provide an amount towards retiree health that is based on years of service.

With respect to retiree dental benefits, four agencies offer retiree dental benefits with the cost being included in the amount provided for health insurance. One agency contributes \$51.50 for retiree only, \$89.69 for retiree plus one, and \$148.87 for retiree plus family. With respect to retiree vision benefits, one agency offers a contribution towards vision with the cost being included in the amount provided for health insurance and one agency provides \$8.31 for retiree only, \$16.16 for retiree plus one and \$21.60 for retiree plus family..

The District's contribution to retiree health, dental and vision is based on years of service as well as years of PERS service. With 10 years of PERS service and 5 years of District service, the District pays 50% of the health premiums. The amount contributed by the District increases by 5% with each additional year of service. The contribution for dental and vision is included in the amount provided for retiree health benefits.

LEAVE BENEFITS – MANAGEMENT

With respect to vacation, for the first year of service, the labor market average is 11 days, for 5 years it is 15 days, for 10 years it is 18 days, for 15 years it is 21 days and for 20 years of service, the labor market average is 24 days.

With respect to sick leave, 15 agencies provide 12 days and 13 have unlimited accrual. One agency has annual leave where vacation and sick leave are combined.

With respect to holidays, the labor market average is 12 holidays per year. In regards to administrative leave, 15 agencies provide administrative leave ranging from 5 days to 12 days. One agency offers 20-100 hours at the department head's discretion.

The District's vacation accrual is somewhat consistent with the market with 12 days after the first year of service, 12 days with 5 years of service, 15 days with 10 years of service, 19 days with 15 years of service, and 24 days with 20 years of service. Between 5 years and 15 years of service, the District falls slightly behind market but is again consistent with the market after 20 years of service.

The District offers 12 days of sick leave per year, which is consistent with the labor market. The

maximum accrual for the District is 240 hours, where most of the survey agencies have unlimited sick leave accrual.

The District observes 13 holidays per year and provides 5 days of administrative leave which is consistent with the market.

LEAVE BENEFITS – PROFESSIONAL

With respect to vacation, for the first year of service, the labor market average is 11 days, for 5 years it is 15 days, for 10 years it is 18 days, for 15 years it is 22 days and for 20 years of service, the labor market average is 24 days.

With respect to sick leave, 11 agencies provide 12 days and 10 have unlimited accrual. One agency has annual leave where vacation and sick leave are combined.

With respect to holidays, the labor market average is 12 holidays per year. In regards to administrative leave, 7 agencies provide administrative leave ranging from 5 days to 12 days. One agency offers up to 100 hours at the department head's discretion.

The District's vacation accrual is consistent with the market with 12 days after the first year of service, 12 days with 5 years of service, 15 days with 10 years of service, 19 days with 15 years of service, and 24 days with 20 years of service. Between 5 years and 15 years of service, the District falls slightly behind market but is again consistent with the market after 20 years of service.

The District offers 12 days of sick leave per year, which is consistent with the labor market. The maximum accrual for the District is 240 hours, where most of the survey agencies have unlimited sick leave accrual.

The District observes 13 holidays per year and provides 5 days of administrative leave which is consistent with the market.

LEAVE BENEFITS – GENERAL

With respect to vacation, for the first year of service, the labor market average is 11 days, for 5 years it is 15 days, for 10 years it is 18 days, for 15 years it is 22 days and for 20 years of service, the labor market average is 24 days.

With respect to sick leave, 11 agencies provide 12 days and 10 have unlimited accrual. One agency

has annual leave where vacation and sick leave are combined.

With respect to holidays, the labor market average is 13 holidays per year. In regards to administrative leave, one agency provides hours of administrative leave for general employees who are exempt from overtime.

The District's vacation accrual is 12 days after the first year of service, 12 days with 5 years of service, 15 days with 10 years of service, 19 days with 15 years of service, and 24 days with 20 years of service. This District is consistent with the market at year 1 and year 20 and slightly ahead of market at years 5, 10 and 15.

The District offers 12 days of sick leave per year, which is consistent with the labor market. The maximum accrual for the District is 240 hours, where most of the survey agencies have unlimited sick leave accrual.

COST SAVING MEASURES

The survey agencies were asked if they have taken steps to save costs in light of the current economy with respect to salary/pay and benefits. When asked if the survey agency has reduced pay or benefits, 13 of the responding agencies indicated no; however, the current salaries may be frozen in some of those agencies. The City of Roseville indicated that they reduced overall salaries by 5% using a combination reducing the City's contribution to deferred compensation and reduction to EPMC and medical, depending on the bargaining unit. The City of West Sacramento is not providing additional money towards career enhancement and there will be not salary/pay increase for Fiscal Year 09/10 and 10/11 for non-represented classes. San Juan Water District has implemented a second tier affecting retiree health contributions and the retirement formula.

With respect to layoffs, seven agencies indicated that they have experience layoffs. Six agencies have implemented furloughs.

When asked about future reductions, nine agencies indicated the potential decreases including salary/pay and/or benefit reductions pending negotiations, no additional money towards career enhancements, reduction in post retirement benefits, and increase to the employees' share of health.

SECTION IV – SALARY/PAY RECOMMENDATIONS

This section of the report presents the salary/pay recommendations for all District classes and includes the salary/pay setting methodology and the salary/pay range recommendations.

SALARY/PAY SETTING METHODOLOGY

In setting salary/pay levels, both market data and internal relationships are taken into consideration so that the District's compensation plan is both competitive with the market and internally balanced. The District's policy with respect to setting salary/pay levels is to utilize the third quartile of total compensation. If the District's total compensation is within the third quartile, a salary/pay change is not recommended; however, the District does have some classifications that are either at the bottom of the third quartile or near the top of the third quartile that are worth discussing. Administrative Assistant II is near the top of the third quartile, 9.60% above the 62.5th percentile. This classification was near the top in 2007 as well, 11.71% above the 62.5th percentile. This District may consider adjusting this salary/pay range as over the past two years, it has remained above the third quartile. In addition, the classification of Engineering Manager and Water Conservation Technician II are at the bottom of the third quartile. Engineering Manager is nearly 9% below the 62.5th percentile and Water Conservation Technician II is 8.26% below the 62.5th percentile. Water Conservation Technician II was near the bottom of the third quartile in 2007 as well. While the salaries meet the District's compensation policy, adjustments may be necessary to ensure the District's competitiveness in the labor market.

The classifications that were not surveyed were then set to the benchmarks using internal relationship guidelines consistent with the District's past practices.

SALARY/PAY RECOMMENDATIONS

Using the above methodology, Bryce Consulting prepared salary/pay recommendations for all District classes. The recommended salary/pay plan is presented in **Appendix C**.

APPENDIX A

COMPENSATION SURVEY DATA SHEETS

Appendix A
Summary
62.5th Percentile

SSWD Classification	SSWD Max Base	Labor Market		SSWD Total Cash	Labor Market		SSWD Total Compensation	Labor Market		Comparability
		Max Base (62.5th percentile)	% SSWD is above or below market (62.5th percentile)		Total Cash (62.5th percentile)	% SSWD is above or below market (62.5th percentile)		Total Compensation (62.5th percentile)	% SSWD is above or below market (62.5th percentile)	
Accountant	\$4,978	\$4,542	8.77%	\$5,326	\$4,790	10.07%	\$7,126	\$6,700	5.98%	10
Administrative Assistant II	\$4,301	\$3,832	10.90%	\$4,602	\$4,139	10.07%	\$6,348	\$5,738	9.60%	9
Assistant Controller	\$6,358	\$6,188	2.67%	\$6,803	\$6,677	1.85%	\$8,713	\$8,482	2.66%	11
Assistant General Manager	\$11,380	\$12,196	-7.17%	\$12,177	\$13,066	-7.30%	\$14,464	\$15,156	-4.78%	6
Associate Registered Engineer	\$7,699	\$8,062	-4.71%	\$8,238	\$8,550	-3.79%	\$10,256	\$10,402	-1.43%	10
Customer Service Representative II	\$4,096	\$4,150	-0.82%	\$4,383	\$4,367	0.36%	\$6,112	\$6,219	-1.75%	13
Director of Finance	\$10,318	\$10,917	-5.80%	\$11,040	\$11,767	-6.59%	\$13,509	\$14,082	-5.81%	8
Distribution Operator II	\$4,520	\$4,948	-9.46%	\$4,836	\$5,284	-9.25%	\$6,599	\$6,982	-5.79%	11
Electrical and Instrumentation Technician	\$5,761	\$6,090	-5.71%	\$6,164	\$6,421	-4.16%	\$8,027	\$8,461	-5.42%	9
Engineering Manager	\$9,825	\$10,794	-9.87%	\$10,513	\$11,404	-8.48%	\$12,712	\$13,909	-8.90%	16
GIS/IT Technician (GIS Technician)	\$4,978	\$5,158	-3.62%	\$5,326	\$5,430	-1.95%	\$7,126	\$7,425	-4.19%	12
GIS/IT Technician (IT Technician)	\$4,978	\$5,394	-8.35%	\$5,326	\$5,667	-6.40%	\$7,126	\$7,655	-7.42%	11
Human Resources Coordinator	\$6,647	\$6,861	-3.22%	\$7,112	\$7,515	-5.67%	\$9,046	\$9,185	-1.54%	10
Maintenance Technician II	\$4,096	\$4,547	-11.00%	\$4,383	\$4,889	-11.54%	\$6,112	\$6,280	-2.75%	6
Mgr, Information Technology	\$7,330	\$8,004	-9.20%	\$7,843	\$8,885	-13.28%	\$9,831	\$10,268	-4.44%	9
Operations Manager	\$9,356	\$9,328	0.30%	\$10,011	\$10,224	-2.12%	\$12,262	\$12,179	0.68%	8
Production Operator II	\$4,742	\$5,100	-7.55%	\$5,074	\$5,455	-7.52%	\$6,855	\$7,196	-4.97%	12
Senior Inspector	\$5,226	\$5,607	-7.30%	\$5,592	\$5,958	-6.53%	\$7,411	\$7,830	-5.64%	10
Superintendent, Distribution	\$6,979	\$6,865	1.64%	\$7,468	\$7,368	1.34%	\$9,428	\$8,972	4.84%	8
Water Conservation Coordinator	\$5,761	\$6,026	-4.59%	\$6,164	\$6,051	1.84%	\$8,027	\$7,759	3.33%	4
Water Conservation Technician II	\$4,520	\$4,846	-7.21%	\$4,836	\$5,227	-8.07%	\$6,599	\$7,144	-8.26%	6



Surveyed Agency	Classification Title	Maximum Salary	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (%)	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (\$)	Deferred Comp	Total Cash	Health	Dental	Vision	Life Insurance	Social Security	Total Compensation	Comments
Sacramento Suburban Water District	Accountant	\$4,278	7.00%	\$308	\$0	\$3,320	\$1,231	\$148	\$22	\$18	\$381	\$7,226	
Carmichael Water District	No Comparable Class												
City of Davis	Financial Assistant II	\$3,412	8.00%	\$273	\$0	\$3,685	\$1,511	inc	inc	inc	\$49	\$5,246	
City of Polson	Accounting Technician II	\$5,142	8.00%	\$411	\$0	\$5,553	\$1,138	\$142	\$21	\$9	\$193	\$7,257	
City of Roseville	Accounting Technician II	\$4,914	8.00%	\$393	\$147	\$5,455	\$1,191	inc	inc	\$15	\$71	\$6,731	
City of Sacramento	Accounting Technician	\$4,194	3.00%	\$126	\$0	\$4,320	\$1,050	inc	inc	\$3	\$21	\$5,693	
City of West Sacramento	Accounting Technician	\$4,069	7.00%	\$283	\$0	\$4,354	\$1,224	\$94	\$19	\$6	\$59	\$5,755	
City of Woodland	No Comparable Class												
El Dorado Irrigation District	Finance Technician	\$4,605	4.00%	\$184	\$0	\$4,789	\$1,950	\$125	\$31	\$42	\$332	\$7,290	
Elk Grove Water Service	Finance Services Specialist II	\$6,684	7.00%	\$468	\$0	\$7,152	\$1,402	\$120	\$21	\$21	\$97	\$8,814	
Fair Oaks Water District	No Comparable Class												
Placer County Water Agency	Accounting Technician II	\$4,436	8.00%	\$355	\$0	\$4,791	\$1,214	\$54	\$20	\$21	\$339	\$6,440	
Sacramento County	Accounting Technician	\$4,176	0.00%	\$0	\$0	\$4,176	\$940	\$98	\$0	\$1	\$319	\$5,534	
San Juan Water District	Accounting Technician II	\$4,386	8.00%	\$351	\$0	\$4,737	\$1,398	\$144	\$8	\$37	\$336	\$6,649	
Labor Market (62.5th percentile)		\$4,542				\$4,790						\$6,700	
% SSWD is above or below labor (62.5th percentile)		8.77%				10.07%						5.98%	
Comparability:		10											

SSWD's duties are consistent with a Journey level Accounting Technician including, accounts payable, accounts receivable, daily cash receipts, and journal entries. In addition, the classification requires an Associate's degree which is consistent with a technical classification, not a professional Accountant classification.



Surveyed Agency	Classification Title	Maximum Salary	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (%)	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employee (\$)	Deferred Total Cash Comp	Health	Dental	Vision	Life Insurance	Social Security	Total Compensation	Comments
<i>Sacramento Suburban Water District</i>	<i>Assistant Controller</i>	<i>\$6,538</i>	<i>7.00%</i>	<i>\$475</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$1,231</i>	<i>\$148</i>	<i>\$22</i>	<i>\$23</i>	<i>\$386</i>	<i>\$8,713</i>	
Carmichael Water District	Staff Accountant	\$5,120	4.11%	\$210	\$0	\$1,428	\$116	\$22	\$21	\$392	\$7,309	
Citrus Heights Water District	No Comparable Class											
City of Davis	Financial Analyst II	\$6,393	8.00%	\$511	\$0	\$1,511	inc	inc	inc	\$93	\$8,309	
City of Folsom	No Comparable Class											
City of Roseville	Accountant II	\$5,991	8.00%	\$479	\$180	\$1,191	inc	inc	\$18	\$87	\$7,946	
City of Sacramento	Accountant-Auditor	\$6,516	7.00%	\$456	\$261	\$1,050	inc	inc	\$13	\$498	\$8,794	
City of West Sacramento	Accountant	\$6,317	7.00%	\$442	\$0	\$710	inc	inc	inc	\$92	\$7,561	
City of Woodland	Accountant II	\$5,279	8.00%	\$422	\$106	\$1,355	inc	inc	\$14	\$177	\$7,232	
El Dorado Irrigation District	Accountant	\$6,145	4.00%	\$246	\$0	\$1,950	\$125	\$31	\$42	\$470	\$9,009	
Elk Grove Water Service	No Comparable Class											
Fair Oaks Water District	Senior Financial Analyst	\$6,417	7.00%	\$449	\$0	\$1,362	\$120	\$22	\$27	\$491	\$8,888	
Placer County Water Agency	Accountant	\$5,392	8.00%	\$431	\$0	\$1,214	\$54	\$20	\$26	\$412	\$7,550	
Sacramento County	Accountant II	\$5,561	0.00%	\$0	\$0	\$940	\$98	\$0	\$1	\$410	\$6,810	
San Juan Water District	Accountant	\$5,955	8.00%	\$476	\$0	\$1,398	\$144	\$8	\$36	\$456	\$8,473	
Labor Market (62.5th percentile)		\$6,188									\$8,482	
% SSWD is above or below labor (62.5th percentile)		2.67%									2.66%	
Comparability		11										

SSWD's classification is consistent with a journey level professional Accountant classification including establishing and maintaining chart of accounts, ensuring the accuracy of ledger posting, preparing month-end journals, preparing monthly financial reports and statements, and assisting with budget preparation and maintenance.



Surveyed Agency	Classification Title	Maximum Salary	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (%)	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (\$)	Deferred Comp	Total Cash	Health	Dental	Vision	Life Insurance	Social Security	Total Compensation	Comments
<i>Sacramento Suburban Water District</i>	<i>Assistant General Manager</i>	<i>\$12,880</i>	<i>7.00%</i>	<i>\$907</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$12,977</i>	<i>\$1,227</i>	<i>\$146</i>	<i>\$22</i>	<i>\$47</i>	<i>\$846</i>	<i>\$7,466</i>	
Camanchea Water District	Assistant General Manager	\$9,500	4.11%	\$390	\$0	\$9,890	\$1,428	\$16	\$22	\$51	\$690	\$12,197	
Cluna Heights Water District	Assistant General Manager	\$12,137	7.00%	\$850	\$0	\$12,987	\$1,180	\$16	\$12	\$15	\$728	\$15,038	
City of Davis	No Comparable Class												
City of Folsom	No Comparable Class												
City of Roseville	No Comparable Class												
City of Sacramento	No Comparable Class												
City of West Sacramento	No Comparable Class												
City of Woodland	No Comparable Class												
El Dorado Irrigation District	No Comparable Class												
Elk Grove Water Service	No Comparable Class												
Fair Oaks Water District	No Comparable Class												
Placer County Water Agency	Director of Administrative Services/Assistant GM	\$11,999	8.00%	\$960	\$0	\$12,959	\$1,214	\$54	\$20	\$58	\$726	\$15,030	
Sacramento County	No Comparable Class												
San Juan Water District	Assistant General Manager	\$12,610	8.00%	\$1,009	\$0	\$13,619	\$1,398	\$144	\$8	\$77	\$735	\$15,980	
Arnador Water Agency	No Comparable Class												
San Luis Delta Mendota Water	Assistant Executive Director	\$12,894	8.00%	\$1,032	\$645	\$14,570	\$1,151	\$158	\$22	\$0	\$187	\$16,089	
Solano Irrigation District	No Comparable Class												
Stockton East Water District	Assistant General Manager	\$9,204	7.00%	\$644	\$506	\$10,355	\$1,362	\$1,116	\$21	\$69	\$133	\$13,056	
Stockton Municipal Utility Department	No Comparable Class												
Labor Market (62.5th percentile)		\$12,196				\$13,066						\$15,156	
% SSWD is above or below labor (62.5th percentile) Comparability		-7.17%	6			-7.30%						-4.78%	

San Luis Delta Mendota Water - Retirement is 401(a)



Surveyed Agency	Classification Title	Maximum Salary	Employees' Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (%)	Employees' Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (\$)	Deferred Comp	Total Cash	Health	Dental	Vision	Life Insurance	Social Security	Total Compensation	Comments
<i>Sacramento Suburban Water District</i>	<i>Customer Service Representative II</i>	<i>\$4,098</i>	<i>7.00%</i>	<i>\$287</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$4,385</i>	<i>\$7,291</i>	<i>\$148</i>	<i>\$22</i>	<i>\$15</i>	<i>\$313</i>	<i>\$6,312</i>	
Camichael Water District	Billing Specialist	\$4,713	4.11%	\$194	\$0	\$4,907	\$1,428	\$116	\$22	\$19	\$361	\$6,852	
Chico Heights Water District	Accounts Receivable Specialist	\$4,869	7.00%	\$341	\$0	\$5,210	\$1,180	\$116	\$12	\$15	\$372	\$6,906	
City of Davis	Office Assistant II	\$3,124	8.00%	\$230	\$0	\$3,374	\$1,511	inc	inc	inc	\$45	\$4,931	
City of Folsom	Office Assistant II	\$4,231	8.00%	\$338	\$0	\$4,570	\$1,138	\$142	\$21	\$9	\$324	\$6,204	
City of Roseville	Utilities Billing Specialist II	\$4,473	8.00%	\$358	\$134	\$4,965	\$1,191	inc	inc	\$13	\$65	\$6,234	
City of Sacramento	Customer Service Representative	\$4,028	3.00%	\$121	\$0	\$4,149	\$1,050	inc	inc	\$3	\$308	\$5,510	
City of West Sacramento	No Comparable Class												
City of Woodland	Administrative Clerk II	\$3,074	8.00%	\$246	\$0	\$3,320	\$1,335	inc	inc	\$14	\$45	\$1,639	
El Dorado Irrigation District	Finance Assistant II	\$3,774	4.00%	\$151	\$0	\$3,925	\$1,950	\$125	\$31	\$42	\$289	\$6,662	
Elk Grove Water Service	Utility Billing Specialist	\$6,211	7.00%	\$435	\$0	\$6,646	\$1,402	\$120	\$21	\$21	\$90	\$8,300	
Fair Oaks Water District	Customer Service Representative	\$3,561	7.00%	\$249	\$0	\$3,810	\$1,362	\$120	\$22	\$15	\$272	\$5,602	
Placer County Water Agency	Customer Service Representative I	\$3,832	8.00%	\$307	\$0	\$4,139	\$1,214	\$54	\$20	\$18	\$293	\$5,738	11 level performs higher level duties
Sacramento County	Utilities Billing Services Representative II	\$3,537	0.00%	\$0	\$0	\$3,537	\$940	\$98	\$0	\$1	\$271	\$4,847	
San Juan Water District	Customer Service Technician II	\$3,856	3.00%	\$308	\$0	\$4,165	\$1,394	\$144	\$8	\$24	\$295	\$6,029	
Labor Market (62.5th percentile)		\$4,130				\$4,367						\$6,219	
% SSWD is above or below labor Comparability		-0.82%				0.36%						-1.75%	



Surveyed Agency	Classification Title	Maximum Salary	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (%)	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (\$)	Deferred Comp	Total Cash	Health	Dental	Vision	Life Insurance	Social Security	Total Compensation	Comments
<i>Sacramento Suburban Water District</i>	<i>Director of Finance</i>	<i>\$16,348</i>	<i>7.00%</i>	<i>\$722</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$17,070</i>	<i>\$1,231</i>	<i>\$148</i>	<i>\$22</i>	<i>\$37</i>	<i>\$830</i>	<i>\$13,809</i>	
Carmichael Water District	No Comparable Class												
Citrus Heights Water District	No Comparable Class												
City of Davis	No Comparable Class												
City of Folsom	No Comparable Class												
City of Roseville	No Comparable Class												
City of Sacramento	No Comparable Class												
City of West Sacramento	No Comparable Class												
City of Woodland	No Comparable Class												
El Dorado Irrigation District	Director of Finance	\$11,583	4.00%	\$463	\$0	\$12,046	\$1,950	\$125	\$31	\$42	\$849	\$13,043	
Elk Grove Water Service	Finance Manager	\$10,888	7.00%	\$762	\$0	\$11,650	\$1,402	\$120	\$21	\$21	\$158	\$13,372	
Fair Oaks Water District	No Comparable Class												
Placer County Water Agency	Director of Financial Services	\$12,101	8.00%	\$968	\$0	\$13,069	\$1,214	\$54	\$20	\$38	\$856	\$15,272	
Sacramento County	No Comparable Class												
San Juan Water District	Finance and Administrative Services Manager	\$10,964	8.00%	\$877	\$0	\$11,841	\$1,398	\$144	\$8	\$67	\$840	\$14,298	
Amador Water Agency	Financial Services Manager	\$10,800	7.00%	\$756	\$167	\$11,723	\$1,177	\$116	\$22	\$78	\$837	\$13,993	
San Luis Delta Mendota Water	Director of Finance	\$8,424	8.00%	\$674	\$431	\$9,519	\$1,151	\$158	\$72	\$0	\$172	\$10,973	
Soloado Irrigation District	Administrative Services Manager	\$9,580	8.00%	\$766	\$0	\$10,346	\$802	\$104	\$0	\$33	\$139	\$11,424	
Stockton East Water District	Finance Director	\$7,950	7.00%	\$557	\$437	\$8,944	\$1,362	\$116	\$21	\$69	\$115	\$10,627	
Stockton Municipal Utility Department	No Comparable Class												
Labor Market (62.5th percentile)		\$10,917				\$11,767						\$14,082	
% SSWD is above or below labor (62.5th percentile) comparability		-5.80%	8			-6.59%						-5.81%	

San Luis Delta Mendota Water - Retirement is 401(a)



Surveyed Agency	Classification Title	Maximum Salary	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (%)	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (\$)	Deferred Comp	Total Cash	Health	Dental	Vision	Life Insurance	Social Security	Total Compensation	Comments
Sacramento Suburban Water District	Distribution Operator II	\$4,310	7.00%	\$316	\$0	\$4,836	\$1,231	\$148	\$22	\$16	\$346	\$6,899	DII, TII
Camichel Water District	Distribution Operator II	\$4,463	4.11%	\$183	\$0	\$4,646	\$1,428	\$116	\$22	\$18	\$341	\$6,572	DII
Citrus Heights Water District	No Comparable Class												Maintenance/Construction Worker II - DI, TI desirable
City of Davis	No Comparable Class												Maintenance/Construction Worker II - DI
City of Folsom	Water Distribution System Operator II	\$4,897	8.00%	\$392	\$0	\$5,289	\$1,138	\$142	\$21	\$9	\$375	\$6,973	DII
City of Roseville	Water Distribution Worker II	\$5,171	3.00%	\$155	\$155	\$5,481	\$1,159	\$96	\$11	\$16	\$75	\$6,872	DII
City of Sacramento	Utilities Field Services Serviceworker	\$6,952	3.00%	\$209	\$0	\$7,161	\$1,000	inc	inc	\$1	\$352	\$8,694	DI or II
City of West Sacramento	Senior Maintenance Worker	\$4,376	7.00%	\$306	\$0	\$4,682	\$1,274	\$94	\$19	\$6	\$63	\$6,088	Senior MW is journey. \$50 added to base for DI
City of Woodland	Utilities Maintenance Worker II	\$3,839	8.00%	\$307	\$0	\$4,146	\$1,335	inc	inc	\$14	\$56	\$5,550	DII and Grade I Wastewater Collection System Maintenance cert
El Dorado Irrigation District	Distribution Operator II	\$4,559	4.00%	\$182	\$0	\$4,741	\$1,950	\$125	\$31	\$42	\$349	\$7,238	DII
Elk Grove Water Service	Water Distribution Operator II	\$5,109	7.00%	\$358	\$0	\$5,467	\$1,402	\$120	\$21	\$21	\$74	\$7,105	DII, TII
Fair Oaks Water District	No Comparable Class												Distribution System Operator requires DI
Placer County Water Agency	Distribution Operator II	\$4,891	8.00%	\$391	\$0	\$5,282	\$1,214	\$54	\$20	\$23	\$374	\$6,968	DII
Sacramento County	Underground Const and Maint Specialist	\$5,100	0.00%	\$0	\$0	\$5,100	\$940	\$98	\$0	\$1	\$390	\$6,529	DII
San Juan Water District	Distribution Operator II	\$4,694	8.00%	\$376	\$0	\$5,070	\$1,398	\$144	\$8	\$29	\$359	\$7,007	DII
Labor Market (62.5th percentile)		\$4,948				\$5,284						\$6,982	
% SSWD is above or below labor Comparability						-9.46%						-9.25%	



Surveyed Agency	Classification Title	Maximum Salary	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (%)	Employee's Portion of Retirement Paid by Employer (\$)	Deferred Comp	Total Cash Comp	Health	Dental	Vision	Life Insurance	Social Security	Total Compensation	Comments
<i>Sacramento Suburban Water District</i>	<i>Engineering Manager</i>	<i>\$9,825</i>	<i>7.00%</i>	<i>\$688</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$10,513</i>	<i>\$1,221</i>	<i>\$748</i>	<i>\$22</i>	<i>\$35</i>	<i>\$823</i>	<i>\$12,772</i>	
Camanche Water District	No Comparable Class												
Chico Heights Water District	Assistant City Engineer	\$9,256	8.00%	\$740	\$0	\$9,997	\$1,511	inc	inc	\$27	\$134	\$11,669	Div. Mgr. reports to City Eng.
City of Davis	Senior Civil Engineer	\$9,180	8.00%	\$734	\$413	\$10,328	\$1,138	\$142	\$21	\$13	\$814	\$12,456	Highest level; reports to PW Dir
City of Eureka	Engineering Manager	\$11,773	8.00%	\$942	\$0	\$12,715	\$1,176	\$148	\$20	\$33	\$171	\$14,264	Div Mgr. reports to Dept Head
City of Sacramento	Engineering Manager	\$13,247	7.00%	\$972	\$530	\$14,704	\$1,050	inc	inc	\$13	\$873	\$16,640	Div. Mgr
City of West Sacramento	Supervising Civil Engineer	\$9,453	8.00%	\$756	\$142	\$10,351	\$710	inc	inc	inc	\$137	\$11,198	Highest level; reports to Development Services Manager and Capital Facilities Manager
City of Woodland	Deputy Director of PW/City Engineer	\$9,787	8.00%	\$783	\$196	\$10,766	\$1,335	inc	inc	\$17	\$142	\$12,260	Div. Mgr
El Dorado Irrigation District	Director of Engineering	\$10,833	4.00%	\$433	\$0	\$11,266	\$1,950	\$125	\$31	\$42	\$661	\$14,075	Dept Head
Elk Grove Water Service	No Comparable Class												
Fair Oaks Water District	Operations Manager	\$9,167	7.00%	\$642	\$0	\$9,809	\$1,362	\$120	\$22	\$39	\$814	\$12,165	Dept Head
Placer County Water Agency	Deputy Director of Technical Services	\$10,771	8.00%	\$862	\$0	\$11,633	\$1,214	\$34	\$20	\$52	\$837	\$13,809	Over inspection and drafting
Sacramento County	Director of District Engineering	\$13,249	0.00%	\$0	\$132	\$13,382	\$940	\$98	\$0	\$1	\$873	\$15,294	Div. Head within Water Resources
San Juan Water District	Engineering Services Manager	\$9,392	8.00%	\$751	\$0	\$10,143	\$1,398	\$144	\$8	\$57	\$812	\$12,568	Dept Head
Armadour Water Agency	Mgr of Engineering and Planning	\$11,004	7.00%	\$770	\$167	\$11,941	\$1,177	\$116	\$22	\$79	\$840	\$14,176	Dept Head
San Luis Delta Mendota Water	Manager, Plant Engineering & Maintenance	\$8,854	8.00%	\$708	\$443	\$10,005	\$1,151	\$158	\$22	\$0	\$128	\$11,465	PE desirable; Also have Manager, Engineering and Maintenance - \$8854
Solano Irrigation District	Engineering and Planning Manager	\$9,580	8.00%	\$766	\$0	\$10,346	\$802	\$104	\$0	\$33	\$139	\$11,424	Dept Head
Stockton East Water District	District Engineer	\$7,387	7.00%	\$531	\$417	\$8,535	\$1,362	\$116	\$21	\$69	\$110	\$10,213	Dept Head
Stockton Municipal Utility Department	Engineering Manager/Assistant MUD	\$12,039	7.00%	\$843	\$0	\$12,882	\$1,266	inc	inc	\$109	\$175	\$14,432	Dept Head
Labor Market (62.5th percentile)		\$10,794		\$708	\$443	\$11,404						\$13,909	
% SSWD is above or below labor comparability		-9.87%				-8.48%						-8.90%	

San Luis Delta Mendota Water - Retirement is 401(a)

