

Memorandum

City of Lawrence

Administrative Services Department

TO: Dave Corliss, City Manager

FROM: Karen Reed, Management Analyst
Lori Carnahan, Personnel Manager

CC: Debbie Van Saun, Assistant City Manager
Frank Reeb, Administrative Services Director
Casey Liebst, Budget Manager

Date: March 27, 2007

RE: 2007 Compensation Survey Results
2008 Pay Plan Recommendations

In accordance with the Compensation Objectives contained in the 2003 Compensation Study and Final Report, the City has committed to survey our primary market on an annual basis. The objectives state that “Currently the City of Lawrence will attempt to position its pay grades at approximately the median level of the primary market pay for positions contained within a particular pay grade.....” In March 2007, staff conducted this year’s salary survey which included seven market cities: Olathe, Overland Park, Lenexa, Lee’s Summit, Shawnee, Topeka, and the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas. The findings from the survey are presented below.

Survey Objectives

- Compare compensation data between Lawrence and market cities.
- Provide management with an overview of survey findings.
- Analyze Lawrence’s position relative to market cities.

Significant Findings

- Data presented represents 2007 pay ranges for Lawrence and market cities.
- Projections for 2008 range movement are currently unavailable for all of the market cities. Such data will likely become available over the next quarter as budgets are being completed in those cities.

- The attached spreadsheet contains summaries of the data obtained for the primary, police, and fire pay plans. The 2007 ranges of the Lawrence pay plans are compared to the median ranges of the market cities.

Primary Pay Plan

- Approximately 61% of the City's positions within the primary pay plan were originally selected as benchmark positions to represent not only pay grade but also job family. In 2006 a total of 16 positions were removed from the survey in order to improve the quality and distribution of the matches received from market organizations. In 2007 three additional positions were removed leaving a total of 85 positions or 57% of the City's Primary pay plan positions represented in the survey results.
- Positions were removed if their variance between our pay and the market city's median pay was 20% or greater (either high or low), and had less than 50% of the market responding with salaries for those positions. We consider these positions poor matches to compare our pay plan with for market competitiveness.
 - The three positions removed in this survey included Golf Course Manager (-21.43%), Field Supervisor/Collection/Distribution (-21.47%) and Water Quality Technician (+28.23%).
 - Removal of the positions from the primary plan data did not make a significant change to the overall position of their respective pay grades to the market.
- Seven of our twelve (58.3%) pay grades in use have range minimums below the median minimums of our market. Standard deviation from the market median ranged from -0.369% (911) to +4.77% (909) in all cases except two. Pay grades 910 (+10.04%) and 913 (+17.73) starting pay are notably higher than the market median.
- Six of our twelve (50%) pay grades in use have range maximums below the median maximums of our market. Standard deviation from the market median ranged from -0.76% (903) to +0.88% (901). Exceptions to the standard deviation include three levels 904 (-10.78%), 908 (-8.18%), and 911 (-8.72) below salary range maximums. Pay grades 905 (+8.4%) and 913 (+12.35%) range maximums are notably higher than the market median.
- Level 913 is the only level that is above the median in both the range minimum and maximum. However, our single incumbent within this range has an actual salary presently below the median of -6.44 percent.

Fire Pay Plan

- All positions in the Fire pay plan were surveyed. Like 2006, Firefighter, Engineer and Lieutenant with a three-level pay structure were difficult to match. Therefore focus on one of the three levels within each FF, Eng, Lt levels that had the highest number of matches was made.
- Removing the positions as noted above and Deputy Chief (not in use) from the analysis, the minimums of the ranges in the fire pay plan went from -10.4% to +12.91%. Like 2006, the same two positions were the only positions above the standard deviation of the median. The minimum of our ranges as compared to the median fall into three groups:
 - Within standard deviation: Eng EMTI (+3.51%), Dvsn Chief (+1.6%), and Chief (-4.69)
 - Below median standard deviation: Captain (-7.54), Lt PM (-10.4%)
 - Above median standard deviation: FF PM (+12.91), FF EMTI (+11.42%)
- The maximum of fire pay ranges are below the market median 71% of the time. The maximums range variance is from -11.89% to +3.95%. Three positions are significantly below the range median which includes all managers, Division Chief (-6.91), Captain (-9.47) and Chief (-11.89%).

Police Pay Plan

- All positions in the Police pay plan were surveyed.
- Police Officer was compared to the minimum for the entry level position in each market city and the maximum of the highest level Police Officer position with each city (e.g. Master Patrol Officer). Other positions were surveyed with like titles in the market cities.
- With two exceptions, all of our range minimums and maximums are above the median of the market.
 - Range minimums +5.02% (Police Officer) to +15.36% (Police Sergeant)
 - Range maximums +3.75% (Police Officer) to +21.44% (Police Sergeant)
- Captain is the first exception; however, the minimum range is only -0.14% below the median. Additionally, the maximum of range is +11.71% above the median and actual wages are +15.20% above the primary market.
- Chief is the only exception and in all cases is below the median. Range minimum is -6.93%, range maximum -5.02% and actual wages are presently -2.11% below the market median.

Analysis

- The survey data is for the point in time we surveyed (January 2007). Based on the historical actions of other cities, they will likely make range adjustments for 2008; however, we are not likely to know what those amounts will be until after the 2008 budget process is completed.
 - If we do not adjust our ranges for 2008 we will fall further behind our stated objective of being at the median of our market cities.
 - If we adjust our ranges the same as our market cities we will remain below our stated objective for 72% of our workforce.
 - Since not all pay grades have the same variance to the market data, we will need to make targeted adjustments to specified pay ranges in addition to an across the board range adjustment in order to meet our stated objective.

- Range minimums are important to attract talented individuals to our organization.
 - We hire into all pay grades in the Primary plan. We are currently below our stated target range minimums for 7 of 12 used pay grades in the primary pay plan, therefore meeting our objective 42% of the time (34% in 2006, 42% in 2005).
 - Only entry level positions in Fire and Police are used to hire individuals from outside the organization. For those positions in the Fire and Police pay plan minimums are above the current market, therefore meeting objective 100% of the time both in 2006 and 2007. (88% for Fire and 100% for Police in 2005).

- Range maximums are important for retention of current staff to the organization.
 - We are currently below the target for range maximums for 1/2 of the Primary pay plan pay grades, therefore meeting our objective 50% of the time (we met our objective 34% of the time in 2006 and 50% in 2005).
 - We are currently below the target in 71% of the Fire pay grades, meeting our objective 29% of the time (we met our objective 34% of the time in 2006 and 63% in 2005).
 - We are currently above the target in all grades within the Police pay plan with the exception of one (level 912, Chief). Therefore we are meeting our objective 99% for impacted staff in that area (we were at 100% in both 2006 and 2005).

- 66% of our work force is in the Primary pay plan with 39% in pay grades 904 and 905. 17% of our work force is in the Fire pay plan and 17% in the Police pay plan.

- Pay Grade concerns in the Primary pay plan:
 - 901 and 903 houses all Admin Support I-II staff and is currently -17.29% and -9.55% below the market actual median wages respectively. Additionally, the Lawrence wage floor is \$10.73 compared to our 901 entry wage of \$10.30 (step 3 is \$10.82).
 - 904, 906 and 908 were below median market minimums in 2005 and 2006. This trend remains true for 904 and 908, with 904 being the only pay grade (16.3% of our workforce) behind the median in all four areas surveyed (range min/max, actual and median salaries).
 - 909 doubled in size with number of employees in this range from 9 in 2006 to 18 in 2007. Although range min/max are within standard deviations it is interesting to note above actual salaries are +14.14% and +18.94% the primary market median.
 - 911 was below median market maximums in 2005 and 2006. This trend continues being -6.89% below standard deviation in 2007.

- Position concerns in the Primary pay plan:
 - Communications Manager: We had three different positions that were significantly below market data (20% or greater) in both 2006 and 2007. There were ten positions in 2005 that were on a similar list. Of those positions the Communications Manager has remained for two consecutive years and presently is -19% below the median in both maximum of range and actual salary.

 - Information Systems: This department (plus GIS Analyst) has the highest below market returns on 8 of the 9 technology positions surveyed at all levels. The only position above market was Network Technician. A summary follows:

| Level | Position | Range Min | Range Max | Actual Wage | Actual Median |
|-------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| 905 | Computer Programmer | -28.41 | -10.96 | -52.93 | -52.93 |
| 905 | IS Tech (Prev HelpDesk) | +1.66 | +0.01 | -10.22 | -13.21 |
| 906 | GIS Analyst | -6.44 | -9.73 | -3.07 | +4.12 |
| 906 | Network Technician | +3.74 | +1.47 | +11.9 | +4.17 |
| 907 | Network Administrator | -20.38 | -25.8 | -24.51 | -25.95 |
| 907 | Network Analyst | -1.65 | -4.69 | -9.05 | -11.69 |
| 908 | GIS Coordinator | -7.69 | -12.41 | +5.06 | -1.05 |
| 909 | Network Manager | -8.86 | -12.41 | +5.06 | -1.05 |
| 911 | IS Director | -8.83 | -10.41 | -0.98 | -2.06 |

The IS Director has the highest combined range min/max discrepancy of all director positions. The most significant IS positions below the medians are Computer Programmer and Network Administrator.

- One measure of the effectiveness of a compensation and benefits program is turnover. The City's turnover has been decreasing over the past several years from a high of 11.50% in 1999 to a low of 7.55% in 2005. Turnover continued to decline in 2006 to a new low of 4.99 percent.

- A second measure is the level of employee satisfaction, the City measured employee satisfaction in 2002 and again in 2005. Compensation and benefits was the category with the greatest importance to employees. It was placed in the category of "Continued Emphasis" in the Importance-Agreement Assessment Matrix meaning that changes in this area will have a high impact on employee satisfaction and overall employees were satisfied with the programs.

Recommendations for 2008 Pay Plan

Range and wage adjustments

These are across the board adjustments to both pay ranges and employee wages at a given point in time. We have traditionally made those adjustments the first full pay period of the calendar year.

The City has fallen further behind its stated objective of remaining at the median of the market since 2005. It is critical that we match and, if possible, exceed market city adjustments in 2007. It is recommended that we be as aggressive as fiscally possible in 2008 so that we can recover lost ground in the market and at a minimum not slip further away from our goal. A 3% range and wage adjustment to all pay plans is recommended, if not fiscally possible, a minimum of 2% is recommended.

Target adjustments

Target adjustments to specific pay ranges are used only to address specific areas of concern in the pay plan. Employee salaries would only be increased at the time of implementation if they fall below the new range minimums. All other increases would come in the form of merit increases at the time of an employee's performance review. Adjustments of this nature may lead to salary compression within the pay grade for employees assigned to the targeted pay range and may lead to salary compression between the pay grades. Affects of any targeted adjustments should therefore be monitored closely.

- It is recommended steps 1 and 2 of pay grade 901 be essentially blocked out from use. This would ensure starting salaries at or above the wage floor and assist with the below market actual wage median.
- It is recommended the City target pay grades 904, 908 and 911 for individual range adjustments. Ranges are currently 12% apart in the Primary pay plan. Adjustments to the pay grade or possibly combining with the next higher pay grades should be considered before implementation of the 2008 pay plan. A 5% adjustment would put these pay grades 17% above the pay grade below them and 7% below the pay grades above them. These pay grades are in the most need of individual adjustment either at the minimum or maximum of the ranges. All have appeared for the past 3 years as areas of concern.

- It is recommended the City add two steps to Fire Captain and Division Chief pay grades (F11, F12, F13 and F14). These pay grades are currently 13 steps and would align them to the remainder of the department as well as correct the balance the market deviations of -6.91% and -9.47 percent. This recommendation was previously made in 2006 as well.
- It is recommended to continue monitoring level 912 for market competitiveness in attracting top talent for executive level positions. Presently range maximums are below median for Fire Chief (-11.89%), Public Works (-6.75%), Police Chief (-5.02%), Finance (-3.24%); and the remaining three director positions are in danger of falling below the median as well with a current range of +0.49% to +2.82 percent. Pursuit of other executive salary incentives is encouraged.
- For all of the target adjustments, incumbents at the maximum of the current pay range or those who fall below the minimum of the 2008 pay range will need to be identified. Additional merit increases will need to be budgeted for the first group and the appropriate base wage will need to be budgeted for the second group.

Target adjustments to pay grade assignment should be determined by the Job Evaluation Committee (JEC). Technology positions and those that have a 20% or greater variance with the market for their individual position should be sent to the JEC for review and prior to implementation of the next year's pay plan.

- Communications Manager position
- Information Systems as a whole or most specifically Computer Programmer and Network Administrator.

Conclusion

This is the fifth consecutive year to monitor the City's pay ranges compared to our market cities' ranges. With better market data and analysis of that data compared to our pay plans, along with continual monitoring of the internal equity components of our pay plans, we will be able to continue the discussion, research and design of compensation strategies that will support the City's organizational performance goals as outlined in the Compensation Objectives contained in the 2003 Compensation Study and Final Report.

Primary Pay Plan Ranges with 2%, 2.5% and 3% Range Adjustments **UPDATED 3/25/07 KMR**

Minimum

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R |
|-----------|---------------|--------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Pay Grade | Number of FTE | % FTE | Lawrence Range Minimum | Proposed 2% Range Minimum | Proposed 2.5% Range Minimum | Proposed 3% Range Minimum | Survey Range Minimum | Diff. b/w Lawrence and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 2% and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 2.5% and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 3% and Survey | % Difference | Pay Grade | Number of Matches |
| 901 | 3 | 0.38% | 10.30 | 10.51 | 10.56 | 10.61 | 10.55 | (0.25) | -2.35% | (0.04) | -0.40% | 0.01 | 0.09% | 0.06 | 0.58% | 901 | 5 |
| 902 | 0 | 0.00% | 11.54 | 11.77 | 11.83 | 11.88 | | | | | | | | | | 902 | 0 |
| 903 | 52 | 6.57% | 12.92 | 13.18 | 13.25 | 13.31 | 12.36 | 0.56 | 4.55% | 0.82 | 6.64% | 0.89 | 7.16% | 0.95 | 7.69% | 903 | 14 |
| 904 | 129 | 16.29% | 14.47 | 14.76 | 14.83 | 14.91 | 15.17 | (0.69) | -4.56% | (0.40) | -2.65% | (0.33) | -2.18% | (0.26) | -1.70% | 904 | 52 |
| 905 | 177 | 22.35% | 16.21 | 16.53 | 16.62 | 16.70 | 16.74 | (0.53) | -3.15% | (0.20) | -1.22% | (0.12) | -0.73% | (0.04) | -0.25% | 905 | 62 |
| 906 | 61 | 7.70% | 18.16 | 18.52 | 18.61 | 18.70 | 18.72 | (0.56) | -2.99% | (0.20) | -1.05% | (0.11) | -0.57% | (0.02) | -0.08% | 906 | 53 |
| 907 | 31 | 3.91% | 20.33 | 20.74 | 20.84 | 20.94 | 20.68 | (0.34) | -1.65% | 0.06 | 0.31% | 0.17 | 0.80% | 0.27 | 1.30% | 907 | 52 |
| 908 | 30 | 3.79% | 22.77 | 23.23 | 23.34 | 23.46 | 23.71 | (0.94) | -3.95% | (0.48) | -2.03% | (0.37) | -1.55% | (0.25) | -1.07% | 908 | 45 |
| 909 | 18 | 2.27% | 25.51 | 26.02 | 26.14 | 26.27 | 24.35 | 1.16 | 4.77% | 1.67 | 6.86% | 1.80 | 7.39% | 1.93 | 7.91% | 909 | 41 |
| 910 | 8 | 1.01% | 28.57 | 29.14 | 29.28 | 29.42 | 25.96 | 2.61 | 10.04% | 3.18 | 12.24% | 3.32 | 12.80% | 3.46 | 13.35% | 910 | 19 |
| 911 | 3 | 0.38% | 32.00 | 32.64 | 32.80 | 32.96 | 32.11 | (0.12) | -0.36% | 0.52 | 1.63% | 0.68 | 2.13% | 0.84 | 2.62% | 911 | 14 |
| 912 | 7 | 0.88% | 35.84 | 36.55 | 36.73 | 36.91 | 35.27 | 0.57 | 1.60% | 1.28 | 3.63% | 1.46 | 4.14% | 1.64 | 4.65% | 912 | 26 |
| 913 | 1 | 0.13% | 40.14 | 40.94 | 41.14 | 41.34 | 34.09 | 6.05 | 17.73% | 6.85 | 20.09% | 7.05 | 20.68% | 7.25 | 21.27% | 913 | 5 |

Maximum

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R |
|-----------|---------------|--------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Pay Grade | Number of FTE | % FTE | Lawrence Range Maximum | Proposed 2% Range Maximum | Proposed 2.5% Range Maximum | Proposed 3% Range Maximum | Survey Range Maximum | Diff. b/w Lawrence and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 2% and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 2.5% and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 3% and Survey | % Difference | Pay Grade | Number of Matches |
| 901 | 3 | 0.38% | 15.29 | 15.60 | 15.68 | 15.75 | 15.16 | 0.13 | 0.88% | 0.44 | 2.89% | 0.52 | 3.40% | 0.59 | 3.90% | 901 | 5 |
| 902 | 0 | 0.00% | 17.13 | 17.47 | 17.56 | 17.64 | | | | | | | | | | 902 | 0 |
| 903 | 52 | 6.57% | 19.18 | 19.57 | 19.66 | 19.76 | 19.33 | (0.15) | -0.76% | 0.24 | 1.23% | 0.33 | 1.72% | 0.43 | 2.22% | 903 | 14 |
| 904 | 129 | 16.29% | 21.49 | 21.92 | 22.02 | 22.13 | 24.08 | (2.60) | -10.78% | (2.17) | -9.00% | (2.06) | -8.55% | (1.95) | -8.11% | 904 | 52 |
| 905 | 177 | 22.35% | 24.06 | 24.55 | 24.67 | 24.79 | 22.20 | 1.86 | 8.40% | 2.35 | 10.56% | 2.47 | 11.11% | 2.59 | 11.65% | 905 | 62 |
| 906 | 61 | 7.70% | 26.95 | 27.49 | 27.63 | 27.76 | 26.83 | 0.12 | 0.46% | 0.66 | 2.47% | 0.80 | 2.97% | 0.93 | 3.47% | 906 | 53 |
| 907 | 31 | 3.91% | 30.19 | 30.79 | 30.94 | 31.09 | 29.93 | 0.26 | 0.85% | 0.86 | 2.87% | 1.01 | 3.38% | 1.16 | 3.88% | 907 | 52 |
| 908 | 30 | 3.79% | 33.81 | 34.48 | 34.65 | 34.82 | 36.82 | (3.01) | -8.18% | (2.34) | -6.34% | (2.17) | -5.89% | (2.00) | -5.43% | 908 | 45 |
| 909 | 18 | 2.27% | 37.86 | 38.62 | 38.81 | 39.00 | 38.49 | (0.62) | -1.61% | 0.14 | 0.36% | 0.33 | 0.85% | 0.52 | 1.34% | 909 | 41 |
| 910 | 8 | 1.01% | 42.41 | 43.26 | 43.47 | 43.68 | 43.89 | (1.48) | -3.38% | (0.63) | -1.44% | (0.42) | -0.96% | (0.21) | -0.48% | 910 | 19 |
| 911 | 3 | 0.38% | 47.50 | 48.45 | 48.68 | 48.92 | 52.04 | (4.54) | -8.72% | (3.59) | -6.89% | (3.35) | -6.44% | (3.11) | -5.98% | 911 | 14 |
| 912 | 7 | 0.88% | 53.20 | 54.26 | 54.53 | 54.79 | 52.94 | 0.26 | 0.49% | 1.32 | 2.50% | 1.59 | 3.00% | 1.85 | 3.50% | 912 | 26 |
| 913 | 1 | 0.13% | 59.58 | 60.77 | 61.07 | 61.37 | 53.03 | 6.55 | 12.35% | 7.74 | 14.60% | 8.04 | 15.16% | 8.34 | 15.72% | 913 | 5 |

Below Median

**PRIMARY
Pay Plan**

Police Pay Plan Ranges with 2%, 2.5% and 3% Range Adjustments UPDATED 032707 KMR

Minimum

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R |
|----------------|-----------|---------------|--------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Position | Pay Grade | Number of FTE | % FTE | Lawrence Range Minimum | Proposed 2% Range Minimum | Proposed 2.5% Range Minimum | Proposed 3% Range Minimum | Survey Range Minimum | Diff. b/w Lawrence and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 2% and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 2.5% and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 3% and Survey | % Difference | Number of Matches |
| Police Officer | 301 | 97 | 12.25% | \$18.70 | \$19.08 | \$19.17 | \$19.26 | \$17.81 | \$0.89 | 5.02% | \$1.27 | 7.12% | \$1.36 | 7.64% | \$1.45 | 8.17% | 7 |
| Detective | 302 | 17 | 2.15% | 24.54 | \$25.03 | \$25.15 | \$25.28 | 22.35 | 2.19 | 9.80% | \$2.68 | 12.00% | 2.80 | 12.55% | \$2.93 | 13.10% | 3 |
| Sergeant | 303 | 15 | 1.89% | 28.46 | \$29.03 | \$29.17 | \$29.31 | 24.67 | 3.79 | 15.36% | \$4.36 | 17.67% | 4.50 | 18.25% | \$4.64 | 18.82% | 7 |
| Captain | 304 | 6 | 0.76% | 32.20 | \$32.84 | \$33.00 | \$33.17 | 32.25 | (0.05) | -0.14% | \$0.60 | 1.86% | 0.76 | 2.36% | \$0.92 | 2.86% | 6 |
| Chief | 912 | 1 | 0.13% | 35.84 | \$36.55 | \$36.73 | \$36.91 | 38.51 | (2.67) | -6.93% | (\$1.95) | -5.07% | (1.77) | -4.61% | (\$1.59) | -4.14% | 6 |

Maximum

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R |
|----------------|-----------|---------------|--------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Position | Pay Grade | Number of FTE | % FTE | Lawrence Range Maximum | Proposed 2% Range Minimum | Proposed 2.5% Range Maximum | Proposed 3% Range Minimum | Survey Range Maximum | Diff. b/w Lawrence and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 2% and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 2.5% and Survey | % Difference | Diff. b/w Proposed 3% and Survey | % Difference | Number of Matches |
| Police Officer | 301 | 97 | 12.25% | \$31.41 | \$32.04 | \$32.20 | \$32.36 | \$30.28 | \$1.13 | 3.75% | \$1.76 | 5.82% | \$1.92 | 6.34% | \$2.08 | 6.86% | 7 |
| Detective | 302 | 17 | 2.15% | 36.43 | \$37.16 | \$37.34 | \$37.52 | 32.08 | 4.35 | 13.56% | \$5.08 | 15.83% | 5.26 | 16.40% | \$5.44 | 16.97% | 3 |
| Sergeant | 303 | 15 | 1.89% | 42.25 | \$43.09 | \$43.30 | \$43.52 | 34.79 | 7.46 | 21.44% | \$8.30 | 23.87% | 8.51 | 24.48% | \$8.73 | 25.08% | 7 |
| Captain | 304 | 6 | 0.76% | 47.80 | \$48.76 | \$49.00 | \$49.23 | 42.79 | 5.01 | 11.71% | \$5.97 | 13.94% | 6.21 | 14.50% | \$6.44 | 15.06% | 6 |
| Chief | 912 | 1 | 0.13% | 53.20 | \$54.26 | \$54.53 | \$54.79 | 56.01 | (2.81) | -5.02% | (\$1.75) | -3.12% | (1.48) | -2.65% | (\$1.22) | -2.17% | 6 |
| TOTAL PD | | 136 | 17.17% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Primary Pay Plan: Actual Pay UPDATED 3/24/07 KMR*Actual Average*

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I |
|-----------|---------------|--------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Pay Grade | Number of FTE | % FTE | Lawrence Actual Average of Positions Surveyed | Survey Actual Average | Diff. b/w Lawrence and Survey | % Difference | Pay Grade | Number of Matches |
| 901 | 3 | 0.38% | \$12.31 | \$11.34 | \$0.97 | 8.58% | 901 | 3 |
| 902 | 0 | | | | | | 902 | 0 |
| 903 | 52 | 6.57% | 15.07 | 15.28 | (0.21) | -1.35% | 903 | 10 |
| 904 | 129 | 16.29% | 17.06 | 18.35 | (1.29) | -7.01% | 904 | 32 |
| 905 | 177 | 22.35% | 20.75 | 19.97 | 0.78 | 3.91% | 905 | 40 |
| 906 | 61 | 7.70% | 25.68 | 23.66 | 2.02 | 8.55% | 906 | 38 |
| 907 | 31 | 3.91% | 28.11 | 25.81 | 2.30 | 8.90% | 907 | 35 |
| 908 | 30 | 3.79% | 32.18 | 30.63 | 1.55 | 5.06% | 908 | 31 |
| 909 | 18 | 2.27% | 37.86 | 33.18 | 4.69 | 14.14% | 909 | 29 |
| 910 | 8 | 1.01% | 39.38 | 38.83 | 0.55 | 1.41% | 910 | 18 |
| 911 | 3 | 0.38% | 47.50 | 44.25 | 3.25 | 7.34% | 911 | 11 |
| 912 | 7 | 0.88% | 53.20 | 51.88 | 1.32 | 2.54% | 912 | 26 |
| 913 | 1 | 0.13% | 53.98 | 57.38 | (3.40) | -5.92% | 913 | 6 |
| TOTAL PP | 520 | 65.66% | | | | | | |

Actual Median

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I |
|-----------|---------------|--------|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Pay Grade | Number of FTE | % FTE | Lawrence Actual Median | Survey Actual Median | Diff. b/w Lawrence and Survey | % Difference | Pay Grade | Number of Matches |
| 901 | 3 | 0.38% | \$10.82 | \$13.09 | (\$2.26) | -17.29% | 901 | 3 |
| 902 | 0 | 0.00% | | | | | 902 | 0 |
| 903 | 52 | 6.57% | 14.26 | 15.77 | (1.51) | -9.55% | 903 | 10 |
| 904 | 129 | 16.29% | 16.78 | 18.86 | (2.08) | -11.01% | 904 | 32 |
| 905 | 177 | 22.35% | 20.30 | 20.62 | (0.32) | -1.54% | 905 | 40 |
| 906 | 61 | 7.70% | 26.29 | 23.45 | 2.84 | 12.13% | 906 | 38 |
| 907 | 31 | 3.91% | 28.11 | 25.93 | 2.18 | 8.40% | 907 | 35 |
| 908 | 30 | 3.79% | 32.18 | 29.87 | 2.31 | 7.75% | 908 | 31 |
| 909 | 18 | 2.27% | 37.86 | 31.84 | 6.03 | 18.94% | 909 | 29 |
| 910 | 8 | 1.01% | 39.38 | 40.60 | (1.22) | -3.00% | 910 | 18 |
| 911 | 3 | 0.38% | 47.50 | 44.68 | 2.82 | 6.31% | 911 | 11 |
| 912 | 7 | 0.88% | 50.63 | 52.63 | (2.00) | -3.79% | 912 | 26 |
| 913 | 1 | 0.13% | 53.98 | 57.69 | (3.71) | -6.44% | 913 | 6 |

Fire Actual Pay (Figures current as of March 2007) UPDATED 032707 KMR*Average Pay*

| Position | Pay Grade | Number of FTE | % FTE | Lawrence Average Pay | Survey Average Pay | Diff. b/w Lawrence and Survey | % Difference | Number of Matches |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------------|-------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| FF | F01 | 1 | 0.13% | \$24.66 | | | | 0 |
| FF EMT-I | F02 | 17 | 2.15% | 14.26 | 16.82 | (2.56) | -15.22% | 3 |
| FF Paramedic | F03 | 11 | 1.39% | 15.63 | 18.47 | (2.84) | -15.36% | 3 |
| Eng | F04 | 8 | 1.01% | 18.50 | | | | 0 |
| Eng-EMTI | F05 | 32 | 4.04% | 19.33 | | | | 0 |
| Eng Paramedic | F06 | 19 | 2.40% | 20.92 | | | | 0 |
| Lt w/0 FO | F07 | 1 | 0.13% | 23.21 | | 23.21 | | 1 |
| LT-EMTI | F08 | 7 | 0.88% | 21.85 | | 21.85 | | 1 |
| LT Paramedic | F09 | 13 | 1.64% | 23.74 | 22.55 | 1.19 | 5.28% | 1 |
| Fire LT Inspection 2080 | F10 | 1 | 0.13% | 32.92 | | 32.92 | | 0 |
| Fire Captain 2912 | F11 | 15 | 1.89% | 27.76 | 30.06 | (2.30) | -7.64% | 3 |
| Fire Captain 2080 | F12 | 2 | 0.25% | 39.63 | | 39.63 | | 0 |
| Div Chief 2912 | F13 | 3 | 0.38% | 30.84 | | 30.84 | | 0 |
| Div Chief 2080 | F14 | 5 | 0.63% | 44.58 | 43.26 | 1.32 | 3.04% | 5 |
| Chief 2080 | 912 | 1 | 0.13% | 51.90 | 53.79 | (1.89) | -3.51% | 6 |

Actual Median Pay

| Position | Pay Grade | Number of FTE | % FTE | Lawrence Median Pay | Survey Median Pay | Diff. b/w Lawrence and Survey | % Difference | Number of Matches |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------------|-------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| FF | F01 | 1 | 0.13% | \$24.66 | | \$24.66 | | 0 |
| FF EMT-I | F02 | 17 | 2.15% | 14.08 | 14.31 | (0.23) | -1.63% | 3 |
| FF Paramedic | F03 | 11 | 1.39% | 15.26 | 17.64 | (2.38) | -13.52% | 3 |
| Eng | F04 | 8 | 1.01% | 18.50 | | 18.50 | | 0 |
| Eng-EMTI | F05 | 32 | 4.04% | 19.89 | 16.37 | 3.52 | 21.51% | 0 |
| Eng Paramedic | F06 | 19 | 2.40% | 21.56 | | 21.56 | | 0 |
| Lt w/0 FO | F07 | 1 | 0.13% | 23.21 | | 23.21 | | 1 |
| LT-EMTI | F08 | 7 | 0.88% | 21.85 | | 21.85 | | 1 |
| LT Paramedic | F09 | 13 | 1.64% | 24.27 | 21.80 | 2.47 | 11.33% | 1 |
| Fire LT Inspection 2080 | F10 | 1 | 0.13% | 32.92 | | 32.92 | | 0 |
| Fire Captain 2912 | F11 | 15 | 1.89% | 28.31 | 26.88 | 1.43 | 5.32% | 3 |
| Fire Captain 2080 | F12 | 2 | 0.25% | 36.58 | | 36.58 | | 0 |
| Div Chief 2912 | F13 | 3 | 0.38% | 30.41 | | 30.41 | | 0 |
| Div Chief 2080 | F14 | 5 | 0.63% | 42.58 | 41.54 | 1.04 | 2.50% | 5 |
| Chief 2080 | 912 | 1 | 0.13% | 51.90 | 52.21 | (0.31) | -0.59% | 6 |

Police Pay Plan Actual Pay (Current as of March 2007) UPDATED 032707 KMR*Average Pay*

| Position | Pay Grade | Number of FTE | % FTE | Lawrence Average Pay | Survey Average Pay | Diff b/w Lawrence and Survey | % Difference | # of matches |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Police Officer | 301 | 97 | 12.25% | 26.64 | 23.15 | 3.49 | 15.08% | 5 |
| Detective | 302 | 17 | 2.15% | 33.23 | 27.99 | 5.24 | 18.72% | 3 |
| Sergeant | 303 | 15 | 1.89% | 39.40 | 32.72 | 6.68 | 20.42% | 5 |
| Captain | 304 | 6 | 0.76% | 47.23 | 41.00 | 6.23 | 15.20% | 4 |
| Chief | 912 | 1 | 0.13% | 53.20 | 54.35 | (1.15) | -2.11% | 6 |

Median Pay

| Position | Pay Grade | Number of FTE | % FTE | Lawrence Median Pay | Survey Median Pay | Diff b/w Lawrence and Survey | % Difference | # of matches |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Police Officer | 301 | 97 | 12.25% | 27.77 | 22.26 | 5.52 | 24.78% | 5 |
| Detective | 302 | 17 | 2.15% | 33.00 | 27.99 | 5.02 | 17.92% | 3 |
| Sergeant | 303 | 15 | 1.89% | 42.25 | 33.43 | 8.82 | 26.38% | 5 |
| Captain | 304 | 6 | 0.76% | 47.80 | 40.52 | 7.28 | 17.97% | 4 |
| Chief | 912 | 1 | 0.13% | 53.20 | 54.39 | (1.19) | -2.19% | 6 |