



CITY OF SNOQUALMIE
CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION STUDY

FINAL REPORT

JANUARY 2023



Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	Scope of Work	1
	Job Evaluation Analysis and Job Classification System	1
	Salary and Benefit Survey	2
	Draft and Final Report Preparation	2
II.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
A.	Internal Equity - Classification Plan Development	3
B.	Job Title Changes	4
C.	External Equity – Market Competitiveness	4
	Salary Data	5
	Proposed Classification and Compensation Plan	5
	Future Administration of the Classification and Compensation Plan	6
III.	JOB EVALUATION	6
IV.	THE CLASSIFICATION PLAN	8
V.	SALARY AND BENEFIT DATA	9
A.	Selection of Comparable Jurisdictions for Data Purposes	9
B.	Selection of Benchmark Positions for Survey Purposes	11
C.	Salary Survey	12
D.	Appraisal and Use of Salary Data	13
E.	The Benefits Survey and Findings	14
VI.	COMPENSATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
A.	Development of the Compensation Plan	15
B.	Compensation Plan Options for the City’s Consideration	16
	Defined Increment Plan	16
	Open Range Merit Plan	17
	Blended Merit Plan	17
C.	Recommendation: Continuation of the Defined Increment Plan	18
D.	Pay Philosophy	18
E.	Proposed Compensation Plan and Structure	19
F.	Implementation and Administration of the Compensation Plan	19

Employee Advancement through the Ranges	20
G. Future Administration of the Compensation Plan	22
H. Future Administration of the Classification Plan	22
Appreciation	23

TABLES

Table 1: Classification Plan	Page 24
Table 2: Comprehensive Table	Page 26
Table 3: Proposed Compensation Ranges	Page 28

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Job Analysis Questionnaire	Page 29
Appendix B: Comparable Community Analysis	Page 37
Appendix C: Detailed Salary Survey Data	Page 43
Appendix D: Detailed Benefit Survey Data	Page 92

I. INTRODUCTION

GovHR USA, LLC (GovHR) is pleased to have had the opportunity to work with the City of Snoqualmie on this Classification and Compensation Study. Human resource management is a significant concern as governmental services continue to increase in cost and complexity, and the resources to fund local governments are constrained. Day-to-day operations present challenging administrative problems in planning, organizing, and directing human resource functions in order to achieve maximum efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of municipal services. A properly developed and administered Classification and Compensation Plan forms the foundation for meeting these challenges. It helps to ensure that the City can not only recruit the best and brightest employees but can also retain those employees, even in a competitive marketplace. By retaining qualified, experienced employees the City avoids the costs of re-recruitments and lost productivity, while maximizing the benefits of the investments it has made in employees and the institutional and community knowledge acquired by those employees over their tenures.

GovHR understands the high expectations that have been established in Snoqualmie for service delivery and competitiveness in recruiting and retaining excellent employees. These factors have been taken into consideration in the analysis and reflected in the Study results.

A. Scope of Work

The scope of work called for GovHR to carry out the following:

Job Evaluation Analysis and Job Classification System

Below is a list of tasks included in this component of the Study (listed in the order that the work was performed):

- **Study preparation and project meetings.** Met with City Administration to discuss Study methods and expectations, and to review the current Classification and Compensation Plan and organizational structure. Determined problem areas, answered questions, and reviewed the scope and schedule of work.
- **Material distribution.** Prepared a memorandum of explanation, which was distributed to employees. Held meetings with employees to discuss the Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) and to explain the scope and purpose of the Study. Employees were allowed about ten (10) days to complete the questionnaire. The completed questionnaires were then reviewed by each employee's Supervisor and/or Department Head and City Administration. The JAQs were returned to GovHR within approximately five (5) weeks of distribution.

- **Determined comparable communities and collected compensation data.** GovHR, along with the City, determined a logical survey sample of “like” communities that impact the compensation market of Snoqualmie. Then, GovHR designed and sent out the survey for the benchmark positions and benefits covered in the Study.
- **Job Evaluation Analysis and Establishment of a Classification Plan.** Upon return of the JAQs by the City, GovHR performed the following:
 - Read each JAQ and corresponding Job Description in its entirety.
 - Conducted virtual interviews with at least one (1) employee in each position covered by the Study to further understand the scope of duties and responsibilities of the position.
 - Applied a measurement system of Job Evaluation Factors to all positions, which formed the basis for internal rankings (equity) of positions.
 - Upon completion of the Job Evaluation measurements, a new Classification Plan was developed.

Salary and Benefit Survey

The following tasks were included in this component of the Study:

- Tabulated, summarized, and analyzed comparative compensation information obtained from the comparable communities. Prepared pay tabulations that compared the salary ranges of the City of Snoqualmie to the salary ranges of its comparable communities. Prepared comparison calculations at the 50th, 60th, 65th, 75th and 80th percentiles. Displayed data for each jurisdiction and for each position and summarized the data in table form. Based on discussions with the City and the gathered data, developed salary ranges that would allow Snoqualmie to consider a pay philosophy at the 50th, 60th, or 75th percentile of the salary data from the comparable communities.
- Based on the above data, developed, and recommended new salary schedules and recommended new Job Titles for some positions.
- Analyzed and summarized the benefit information.

Draft and Final Report Preparation

- A preliminary analysis of the data and recommended Classification and Compensation Plan was shared with the City. Feedback from City Administration was reviewed and incorporated into the recommendations.
- A draft report was prepared by GovHR and sent electronically to the City.
- Presentations of the draft findings were conducted for the City.
- Once review comments were returned by the City this final report was prepared and transmitted electronically.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Classification and Compensation Study encompasses a significant amount of information that can be time consuming to condense and organize into an abbreviated format. Therefore, GovHR has compiled this Executive Summary in order to provide a quick synopsis regarding the major components, findings and recommendations of this Study. The purpose of a well-designed Classification and Compensation Study is twofold. First, it establishes internal equity (ranking) among employees across Departments in the City. Second, it assures external equity/competitiveness by comparing the compensation of Snoqualmie employees against market data.

A. Internal Equity - Classification Plan Development

The Study developed a new Classification Plan for sixty-six (66) positions in the City. To complete this task, the Consultant completed a Job Evaluation. The Job Evaluation included the completion of a questionnaire by all employees covered in the Study and interviews with at least one (1) employee working in each position covered by the Study (see Appendix A). Upon the completion of those tasks, the Consultants assigned a numerical value to each position so that like positions within the organization would be grouped together in a classification to produce an internal equity hierarchy. Nine (9) factors were used for the evaluation of Snoqualmie's positions:

- 1) Preparation and Training
- 2) Experience Required
- 3) Decision Making and Independent Judgment
- 4) Responsibility for Policy Development
- 5) Planning of Work
- 6) Contact with Others
- 7) Work of Others (Supervision Exercised)
- 8) Working Conditions
- 9) Use of Technology/Specialized Equipment

The product of this internal ranking is shown in Table 1, which lists the City's positions with their numerical Job Evaluation score, also known as a Classification Plan. The higher the Job Evaluation Score, the higher the position is within the Classification Plan.

B. Job Title Changes

After conducting the Job Evaluation noted above, the Consultants observed some inconsistencies with the market and the actual duties assigned to some positions. Therefore, the following Job Title changes have been recommended based on clarification of duties and market trends.

Current Title

Administrative Assistant – Parks & Public Works
Administrative Assistant II (Part-time)
Account Clerk – Utility Billing
Deputy Parks/Public Works Director/City Engineer
Facilities Technician II
Facility/Fleet Supervisor
Financial Services Manager
Forestry/Stormwater Supervisor
Human Resources Analyst/Human Resources Assistant
Information Technology Director
Lab Analyst
Lead Operator – Wastewater
Maintenance Technician II/Irrigation
Maintenance Technician II – Streets & Stormwater
Maintenance Technician II – Water
Operator II – Wastewater
Parks and Public Works Director
Parks Lead Worker
Parks Maintenance Worker
Parks/Street Maintenance Supervisor
Receptionist – Office Assistant
Senior Industrial Maint. Technician – Wastewater
Senior Maintenance Technician/Operator – Water
Senior Operator – Wastewater
Urban Forester
Wastewater Supervisor
Water District Supervisor

Proposed New Title

Parks and Public Works Assistant
Administrative Coordinator
Finance Assistant
Assistant Director of P&PW – City Engineer
Maintenance Technician II – Facilities
Facility and Fleet Superintendent
Financial Ops. Manager – Accounting Mgr.
Stormwater and Urban Forestry Supt.
Human Resources Analyst
Director of Information Technology
Utilities Sanitation Indust. Maint. Tech
Utilities Sanitation Operator IV
Stormwater & Urban Forestry Tech II
Parks & Street Tech II
Utilities Water Tech II
Utilities Sanitation Operator II
Director of Parks and Public Works
Parks & Street Tech III
Parks & Street Tech I
Parks & Street Superintendent
Finance Assistant
Utilities Sanitation Sr. Indust. Maint. Tech
Utilities Water Operator IV
Utilities Sanitation Operator III
Stormwater & Urban Forestry Tech III
Utilities Sanitation Superintendent
Utilities Water Superintendent

C. External Equity – Market Competitiveness

The next component of the Classification and Compensation Study involved establishing external competitiveness. A group of communities comparable to the City was established. The Consultants started with Washington communities in King, Pierce and Snohomish Counties with populations between approximately 7,000 and 30,000. After that, a specific set of comparison criteria (e.g., total assessed value, total expenditures, income per capita, etc.) was applied to each community (see Appendix B). Based on the results of this analysis, fifteen (15) communities with a total compatibility score of eighty percent

(80%) or greater were deemed to be most comparable to the City. At the request of the City, Bellevue, Issaquah, North Bend and Redmond were also selected as comparable communities. The full list of the nineteen (19) chosen comparable communities is listed below.

<i>Arlington</i>	<i>Kenmore</i>	<i>Newcastle</i>
<i>Bellevue</i>	<i>Lake Forest Park</i>	<i>North Bend</i>
<i>Bonney Lake</i>	<i>Maple Valley</i>	<i>Redmond</i>
<i>Covington</i>	<i>Mill Creek</i>	<i>Sumner</i>
<i>Enumclaw</i>	<i>Monroe</i>	<i>Woodinville</i>
<i>Gig Harbor</i>	<i>Mountlake Terrace</i>	
<i>Issaquah</i>	<i>Mukilteo</i>	

Salary Data

GovHR then prepared and distributed a salary survey to the nineteen (19) comparable communities. Thirteen (13) responded by either by completing the survey or supplying GovHR with copies of or links to their most recent Compensation Plan(s), Employee Manuals and/or Collective Bargaining Agreements. Data for the remaining six (6) comparable communities were obtained from their websites or the Association of Washington Cities surveys as available. The salary summary results can be found in Table 2 and the detailed salary data can be found in Appendix C. To provide external competitiveness for the City's salaries, the salary ranges derived from this data collection were used to help establish the proposed Compensation Plan. In some cases where there was not enough salary range data, actual salaries were used. The recommended pay ranges are contained within Table 3 of the report.

Proposed Classification and Compensation Plan

The goal of this Study was to recommend a Classification and Compensation Plan that is internally equitable and externally competitive. To accomplish this, a Compensation Plan was developed using the 50th, 60th, and 75th percentile comparison of the salary ranges that were acquired through the salary survey. The resulting Classification and Compensation Plan consists of thirteen (13) pay grades; one (1) being lowest and thirteen (13) being highest and is broken down into the following three (3) bands:

Grades 1 – 4: Administrative and Technical Staff

Grades 5 – 10: Supervisors and Advanced Technical Staff

Grades 11 – 13: Directors and Senior Managers

All proposed pay ranges are open ranges. There is a 7.5% gradation between Grades 1 – 4 and 5 – 10 and a 7% gradation between Grades 11 – 13. All grades have a 35% range spread from minimum to maximum. The City will calculate a pay plan based on the open ranges recommended.

Future Administration of the Classification and Compensation Plan

Within the body of this report, GovHR has outlined how the City can maintain the Classification and Compensation Plan. GovHR will supply the City with a User's Manual and all associated documents to maintain the Classification and Compensation Plan and the steps to ensure the City remains competitive with the market in the years to come.

III. JOB EVALUATION

GovHR's approach to Job Evaluation involves a quantitative point and factor comparison method, which cross-compares all positions in the organization against numerous factors such as educational requirements, experience, work conditions, etc. Therefore, all jobs in each organizational unit (e.g., Police, Administration, Finance, etc.) may be compared against each other, based upon the same factors.

In conducting the Job Evaluation exercise, it must be emphasized that the position, and not the incumbent's qualifications, performance, or years of service in the position, is evaluated. An incumbent employee may feel he/she should be placed in a higher level (i.e., receive more points) because the individual performs well, has a long tenure with the organization, and/or has additional education or skills not required to perform that job, or may feel he/she does more tasks than a similar employee in another Department, but these are not valid determinants for a position.

Before reviewing the results of the evaluation of the positions, it is important to note that the purpose of a Job Evaluation is to identify whether a job is more or less advanced than, or equal to, other jobs in the organization, based on nine (9) objective factors. While these factor definitions are guidelines, they are constructed to allow limited flexibility of interpretation while at the same time providing a strict framework and structure for comparison. The nine (9) factors used for the evaluation of Snoqualmie's positions are as follows:

- 1) Preparation and Training
- 2) Experience Required
- 3) Decision Making and Independent Judgment

- 4) Responsibility for Policy Development
- 5) Planning of Work
- 6) Contact with Others
- 7) Work of Others (Supervision Exercised)
- 8) Working Conditions
- 9) Use of Technology/Specialized Equipment

As part of the Job Evaluation process, the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements for each position were reviewed via a thorough reading of the incumbent's current job description and a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) completed by each employee (Appendix A). In addition, GovHR conducted interviews with at least one (1) employee in each of the positions covered by the Study. Points were then assigned to each factor by selecting the description that best fit the appropriate level of compliance. In other words, a position that requires a master's degree would receive more points under the "Preparation and Training" factor than positions that did not require this advanced degree. Points for each factor were then totaled for each position. Using this method, the positions were found to fall into distinguishable Job Factor Analysis (JFA) scores. Table 1 contains the Classification Plan, including the Position Title, the Proposed New Title (if applicable), the JFA Score, Skill Level and proposed Grade for the evaluated positions.

As part of the service provided in the Compensation Study, GovHR makes Job Title change recommendations to either reflect a better description of the job being performed or to be consistent with trends in the organization or the marketplace. Based on this, GovHR recommends the following Job Title changes:

Current Title

Administrative Assistant – Parks & Public Works
 Administrative Assistant II (Part-time)
 Account Clerk – Utility Billing
 Deputy Parks/Public Works Director/City Engineer
 Facilities Technician II
 Facility/Fleet Supervisor
 Financial Services Manager
 Forestry/Stormwater Supervisor
 Human Resources Analyst/Human Resources Assistant
 Information Technology Director
 Lab Analyst

Proposed New Title

Parks and Public Works Assistant
 Administrative Coordinator
 Finance Assistant
 Assistant Director of P&PW – City Engineer
 Maintenance Technician II – Facilities
 Facility and Fleet Superintendent
 Financial Ops. Manager – Accounting Mgr.
 Stormwater and Urban Forestry Supt.
 Human Resources Analyst
 Director of Information Technology
 Utilities Sanitation Indust. Maint. Tech

Lead Operator – Wastewater
Maintenance Technician II/Irrigation
Maintenance Technician II – Streets & Stormwater
Maintenance Technician II – Water
Operator II – Wastewater
Parks and Public Works Director
Parks Lead Worker
Parks Maintenance Worker
Parks/Street Maintenance Supervisor
Receptionist – Office Assistant
Senior Industrial Maint. Technician – Wastewater
Senior Maintenance Technician/Operator – Water
Senior Operator – Wastewater
Urban Forester
Wastewater Supervisor
Water District Supervisor

Utilities Sanitation Operator IV
Stormwater & Urban Forestry Tech II
Parks & Street Tech II
Utilities Water Tech II
Utilities Sanitation Operator II
Director of Parks and Public Works
Parks & Street Tech III
Parks & Street Tech I
Parks & Street Superintendent
Finance Assistant
Utilities Sanitation Sr. Indust. Maint. Tech
Utilities Water Operator IV
Utilities Sanitation Operator III
Stormwater & Urban Forestry Tech III
Utilities Sanitation Superintendent
Utilities Water Superintendent

IV. THE CLASSIFICATION PLAN

A Classification Plan provides for a systematic arrangement of positions into classifications. A position, often referred to as a job (e.g., Office Assistant), contains a specific set of duties and responsibilities and that is the objective of the classification process – not the person currently holding that job. A classification is a grouping of positions which have similar levels of knowledge, skills and abilities needed to perform the job. The positions are also similar in nature of work, level of work difficulty and responsibilities. Positions allocated to the same classification are sufficiently similar with respect to the types of factors enumerated above to permit them to be compensated at the same general level of pay. The positions do not have to be identical, they can be in different departments, dealing with different subject matters and performing different duties.

It is this arrangement of positions and resulting classification structure that forms the basis for the Classification Plan. As noted in the previous section, a Job Evaluation and Classification Plan is not intended to assess individual performance. To that end, a position that belongs in a certain classification is not entitled to be placed in a higher classification simply because the individual performs with a high degree of success and efficiency, nor is it placed in a lower classification simply because the incumbent performs with low competence or productivity. Variations in individual performance are not recognized by differences in classifications, instead they are management issues. Similarly, there is a tendency in some work forces to use the Classification Plan to reward longevity, even though the duties and

responsibilities of individual positions may not have changed over time. Longevity is not a classification factor and the Classification Plan should not be used in this manner.

As an assessment of duties performed and of responsibilities exercised, a Classification Plan is an exceedingly useful managerial tool. It provides the fundamental rationale for the Compensation Plan and helps management identify positions which have taken on (or in some cases reduced) duties and responsibilities. Through proper maintenance of the Classification Plan, employees are assured of management's continuing concern about the nature of work that they carry out and its reward in the form of appropriate pay levels and relationships. The Classification Plan also provides the basis for recruitment, screening, and selection of employees in direct relationship to job content. Promotional ladders as well as opportunities for lateral career development are also evidenced by the logical grouping of allied occupational classifications and hierarchies.

V. SALARY AND BENEFIT DATA

The City initiated this Study with the objective of assuring that its Compensation Plan is both internally equitable and externally competitive. The Job Evaluation System (outlined in Section III) is performed to address the issue of internal equity. To achieve external competitiveness, a market survey of comparable jurisdictions was conducted. The following explains the labor market review and collection of salary data.

A. Selection of Comparable Jurisdictions for Data Purposes

Selecting jurisdictions for the comparison group is an important element in a Classification and Compensation Study. When selecting jurisdictions to serve as comparable communities, it is important to use particular criteria to evaluate the other jurisdictions to assure that those chosen as comparable communities will be the most similar to Snoqualmie.

To determine which municipalities should be used for survey purposes, GovHR first considered all Washington communities in King, Pierce and Snohomish Counties with populations between approximately 7,000 and 30,000. After that, a specific set of comparison criteria was applied to each community:

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Total Possible Points</u>	<u>Factor Weight</u>
1. Population	20	20%

2. Per Capita Income	15	15%
3. Total Assessed Value	15	15%
4. General Fund Tax Levy	10	10%
5. Sales Tax	10	10%
6. State Distribution	5	5%
7. Total Expenditures	20	20%
8. Proximity	5	5%
	100	100%

The eight (8) categories listed above were selected to mirror important criteria that reflected the following:

- 1) Similar Financial Conditions: 75% of the criteria involved financial benchmarks.
- 2) Population: 20% of the criteria involved a population comparison.
- 3) Proximity: 5% of the criteria involved the proximity of the communities to Snoqualmie.

Within each of the eight (8) categories, ranges of compatibility were established. For example, the closer a community was to matching the Snoqualmie's estimated population, the closer the community would be to receiving the maximum of twenty (20) points. A community whose population was significantly larger or smaller than the City's population would receive fewer or even zero (0) points. Thus, a municipality achieving a total of one hundred (100) points would be considered most comparable to the City of Snoqualmie. A community with zero (0) points was therefore determined to be the least comparable to Snoqualmie. A more detailed explanation of the methodology used to determine the comparable communities is included in Appendix B.

A cutoff of eighty (80) points was established to select the communities most similar to Snoqualmie across the eight (8) categories. After applying the eight (8) criteria, fifteen (15) communities achieved eighty (80) or more compatibility points on the comparison scale with Snoqualmie. At the request of the City, Bellevue, Issaquah, North Bend and Redmond were also selected as comparable communities. The full list of the nineteen (19) comparable communities is below:

Arlington
Bellevue

Kenmore
Lake Forest Park

Newcastle
North Bend

Bonney Lake

Maple Valley

Redmond

Covington

Mill Creek

Sumner

Enumclaw

Monroe

Woodinville

Gig Harbor

Mountlake Terrace

Issaquah

Mukilteo

B. Selection of Benchmark Positions for Survey Purposes

When developing the salary survey, it is important to select positions that are likely to have data available from the surveyed municipalities. These positions are referred to as benchmark positions. Based on the size of the Study and number of positions in Snoqualmie, GovHR recommended limiting the benchmark positions in the survey to approximately forty (40) positions. This is because as the number of positions surveyed increases there tends to be a decline the number of organizations responding to the survey. This decline in response rates is thought to be due to the amount of work organizations need to devote to completing a lengthier survey. Positions recommended as benchmarks are those that:

- 1) Are representative of each occupational grouping (e.g., Administration, Finance, Police, etc.).
- 2) Include multiple numbers of City employees, when possible.
- 3) Can be described in a concise manner that accurately identifies the nature of work and level of difficulty.
- 4) Are known to commonly exist in other communities.

After discussion with City Administration forty (40) positions were selected as benchmark positions for the survey. Below is a list of all the surveyed positions:

Account Clerk – Utility Billing

Human Resources Analyst

Accountant

Human Resources Manager

Administrative Assistant – P&PW

Information Technology Director

Administrative Assistant II – Fire

IT Systems Support

Assistant Planner

Maintenance Tech II – Street

Associate Planner

Management Analyst

Budget Analyst

Mechanic II

Budget Manager

Operator II – Wastewater

Building Inspector

Parks Lead Worker

City Attorney

Parks Maintenance Worker

<i>City Clerk</i>	<i>Parks/Street Maint. Superintendent</i>
<i>Communications Coordinator/PIO</i>	<i>Permit Technician</i>
<i>Community Liaison</i>	<i>Planning Manager</i>
<i>Deputy City Clerk</i>	<i>Police Captain</i>
<i>Dep. Dtr. of P&PW/City Engineer</i>	<i>Police Chief</i>
<i>Deputy Fire Chief</i>	<i>Police Support Officer</i>
<i>Director of Finance & Human Resources</i>	<i>Project Engineer</i>
<i>Director of Parks & Public Works</i>	<i>Senior Account Clerk</i>
<i>Evidence/Records Technician</i>	<i>Senior Planner</i>
<i>GIS Analyst</i>	<i>Service Desk Technician</i>

C. Salary Survey

After identifying the benchmark positions, the Consultants then prepared and distributed a salary survey to the forty (40) comparable communities. Thirteen (13) responded by either by completing the survey or supplying GovHR with copies of or links to their most recent Compensation Plan(s), Employee Manuals and/or Collective Bargaining Agreements. Data for the remaining six (6) comparable communities were obtained from their websites or the Association of Washington Cities surveys as available. Table 2 is a summary of the benchmark salary survey data. The detailed salary survey data for each position is contained in Appendix C.

It is important to make a few of observations regarding Table 2 and Appendix C.

- 1) The salary data is information that was available as of August – September 2022. The new recommended salary ranges for the City were developed using this salary data from the comparable communities.
- 2) Some of the comparable municipalities provided salary range minimums and maximums for comparison purposes, while others (those that do not utilize salary ranges as part of their pay plans) provided actual salaries for surveyed positions. The salary range minimums and maximums were analyzed to determine the 50th, 60th, 65th, 75th and 80th percentiles to identify wage ranges for “average” and “above average” payers. Any actual salaries provided by the comparable municipalities were only analyzed in a few instances when there was not enough salary range information. Salary ranges are a better gauge of market salaries than an actual salary and are thus preferred to conduct analysis.

- 3) Salary ranges associated with positions that have been reclassified may not be consistent with other salary ranges in a particular Grade.
- 4) Data contained within Appendix C has been thoroughly reviewed. If the Consultants determined the data was not relevant, it was removed. Thus, if a specific position within the salary survey has two worksheets associated with it in Appendix C, then data was removed. The second data sheet will have the word "Edited" after the title of the position surveyed. If a specific data point was removed, it is highlighted on the first and second worksheets and then removed on the second worksheet associated with the position.

D. Appraisal and Use of Salary Data

While comparing Snoqualmie's current salaries to those paid by other employers in the comparable communities, it must be noted that variations in compensation may be due to several factors, including:

- 1) Organizational size and economic conditions can have an impact on positions. In smaller organizations, employees are often asked to "wear many hats" and therefore take on more duties and responsibilities than would normally be required of a certain position. In addition, the economic downturn forced organizations to "do more with less", compelling staff to take on more duties and responsibilities than they have in the past. Therefore, it becomes increasingly harder to compare "like" positions within organizations.
- 2) Some employers place a different relative worth on certain groups of employees. For example, some employers are forced to place a higher value on certain employees or groups of employees because of the market, and therefore, pay them more. Overall, the policies and value judgments of different employers in compensating the same kind of work can vary widely. There is rarely a single prevailing rate for any particular kind of work, even within the same labor market.
- 3) It can be difficult to make exact comparisons among the different employers of the duties and responsibilities of ostensibly similar jobs.

Nevertheless, comparative salary data is widely recognized as a good measure of the appropriate compensation rates with respect to the prevailing market. This data is also useful as an indication of prevailing opinions concerning the compensation relationships that should exist among different classifications of work. Of equal importance, however, are the internal relationships for the various positions that were accomplished in the Job Evaluation portion of this Study.

E. The Benefits Survey and Findings

The benefits portion of the survey collected data related to the following benefits:

Medical Insurance: Health – Dental – Orthodontia – Vision – HRA Contribution

Other Insurance: Life – Short-Term Disability – Long-Term Disability

Leave: Sick Leave – Holidays – Vacation

Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) Participation

Deferred Compensation - Performance Bonus

Compensatory Time

A review of the benefits offered in Snoqualmie versus the comparable communities shows that the City's benefits are competitive with the other entities surveyed. However, there are some differences that are noted below:

Medical Insurance: Health – Dental – Orthodontia – Vision – HRA Contribution – For all insurance, Snoqualmie pays 100% of the coverage for employees, the average of the other communities was between 90% and 100% depending upon the coverage. For the HRA contribution, Snoqualmie contributes \$3,000 per employee or \$6,000 for a family, which is more generous than the other communities surveyed.

Other Insurance: Life – Short-Term Disability – Long-Term Disability – For Life Insurance, Snoqualmie offers coverage of \$50,000 at no cost to the employee. The average coverage in the other communities is \$36,000 and the average contribution is 93%. Short-term Disability Insurance is offered by a few communities, while Long-term Disability is offered by most. Snoqualmie does not offer this benefit for all employees; however, the City Council approved short-term and long-term disability benefits for the non-represented Management and Professional employee group beginning Jan 2023.

Leave: Sick Leave – Holidays – Vacation – Snoqualmie offers twelve (12) sick days per year, which is the same as the other communities. The maximum accrual of sick days varies widely from no accrual allowed to 1,440 hours. Snoqualmie allows for 720 hours which is right in the middle. Snoqualmie is generally on par with the other communities as it relates to Holiday and Vacation leave, there are only slight variations.

Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) Participation – All communities, including Snoqualmie, participate in PERS.

Deferred Compensation - Performance Bonus – For Deferred Compensation, about half of the communities offer the benefit and a match, which is a flat dollar amount in all cases except one. Snoqualmie offers Deferred Compensation with a cash match that is similar to the other communities that offer the benefit. Only three (3) communities responded to offering a Performance Bonus. Snoqualmie also offers a Performance Bonus.

Compensatory Time – The communities offer Compensatory Time in lieu of overtimes, which is similar to Snoqualmie, although the maximum amounts of allowed accruals vary.

Appendix D contains tables summarizing the detailed data related to the benefits survey.

VI. COMPENSATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Development of the Compensation Plan

A basic element in any human resources management program is adequate and equitable employee compensation. A Compensation Plan of this nature is essential if qualified employees are to be recruited and retained. To achieve this goal, there must be a reasonable and widely accepted model of Job Factors upon which the Compensation Plan rests. Application of this model was the purpose of the Job Evaluation aspect of this Study. The Plan presented in this report is designed to accomplish the Study goals by:

- 1) Providing for equal compensation for work of equivalent job content and responsibility.
- 2) Facilitating adjustments to compensation levels based on changing economic and employment conditions that impact these interrelationships.
- 3) Establishing compensation ranges that compare favorably with those of other equivalent jurisdictions within the appropriate labor market.

In preparing this Plan, the Study only looked at base compensation. The compensation associated with longevity or other fringe benefits was not analyzed or factored into the Compensation Plan.

B. Compensation Plan Options for the City's Consideration

One of the purposes of this Study was to provide an updated Compensation Plan that relates to the external market and is internally equitable. Below is a detailed explanation of three (3) different Compensation Plans:

- 1) **Defined Increment Plan:** This is a Compensation Plan that has salary ranges with a minimum and a maximum with defined percentage increments (e.g., 3%) in between. If an employee has a satisfactory performance evaluation, he/she systematically advances through the compensation range. The performance evaluation and resulting salary increment increase occurs annually.
- 2) **Open Range Merit Plan:** This is a Compensation Plan that also has salary ranges with minimums and maximums, but without defined percentage increments in between. Employees are advanced through the compensation range based on an annual satisfactory performance evaluation, with the percentage of their increase determined annually by City Administration.
- 3) **Blended Merit Plan:** This is a Compensation Plan that uses techniques from both a Defined Increment Plan and an Open Range Merit Plan.

In considering which Plan to use, it is important to understand that employees at various levels of responsibility may react differently toward, and be motivated differently by, the Compensation Plan they work under. Management personnel that are goal-oriented may have a higher acceptance of the Open Range Merit Plan, and thus tend to be more comfortable with this method of compensation. Mid to lower-level positions may want the assurance of a defined salary increase based on satisfactory performance. Possible advantages and disadvantages of each Plan are summarized below.

Defined Increment Plan

Advantages

City: A Defined Increment Plan has the advantage of creating financial predictability because it is easier for management to predict and plan for salary increases on an annual basis.

Employees: Employees like a Defined Increment Plan because it offers security and predictability for advancement through the range. Another advantage of this Plan is that it offers a high degree of internal equity and fairness – the expectation that fellow workers in this Plan are all being treated the same.

Disadvantages

City: The City may feel that a Defined Increment Plan simply rewards compensation increases on a routine basis. However, by tying the increase to a satisfactory performance evaluation, the City can be assured that only employees with acceptable performance will receive a salary increase.

Employees: Employees may feel unmotivated to perform at an above average or at a superior level, knowing their salary increase amount is pre-determined. One way to remove this negative notion is to allow an employee with a superior performance evaluation to get a two (2) increment increase. This, however, would be the exception and not the rule. Most employees would be considered “average” performers and receive a one (1) increment increase.

Open Range Merit Plan

Advantages

City: The Open Range Merit Plan tends to motivate employees to perform at a higher level, thereby achieving greater production/benefit for the City. This Plan also enables the supervising authority to reward high-performing employees with a salary increase greater than a defined increment.

Employees: Employees who are high performers like working under this Plan as they can earn a higher percentage salary increase.

Disadvantages

City: Anticipating the cost of merit increases has less financial predictability, as it is not always possible to know how many employees will be high performers in any given year. However, the City can fund a “merit increase pool” for all Open Range Merit Plan employees to receive an average percentage (i.e., a 2-3% increase), knowing that some employees will receive less (or no) increase and some employees will earn more.

Employees: An Open Range Merit Plan can create a perceived inequity regarding how individuals are granted salary increases. It is incumbent upon management to use an equitable performance evaluation system when implementing this Plan. It is also incumbent on management to ensure that the performance evaluation system is applied fairly and that supervisors receive appropriate training on conducting the evaluation and using the evaluation tool properly.

Blended Merit Plan

There are positives and negatives for both Defined Increment and Open Range Merit Plans. However, it is also possible to design a pragmatic salary system that uses elements of both Defined Increment

and Open Range Merit Plans. It is becoming increasingly common for organizations to have a Blended Merit Plan for various levels of positions that reflects the particular circumstances and culture of the organization. A Plan of this type is customizable to the needs of the organization. It is also the preferred Plan for organizations that are transitioning from a Defined Increment Plan to an Open Range Merit Plan. The following is one example of a Blended Merit Plan:

Exempt: All exempt employees are in an Open Range Merit Plan.

Non-exempt: Non-exempt employees are in a Blended Merit Plan. In this Plan, salary ranges begin at the minimum with, for example, three (3) defined increments and then transition into an open range. The initial increment of the assigned range is intended as the normal hiring/promoting rate. Increments two (2) and three (3) would be awarded upon successful completion of the employee's initial evaluation period and/or after another period that is set by the City (e.g., increment two (2) after the initial evaluation and increment three (3) after an additional year of employment.) After that, the employee may advance through the open range as a result of a successful performance evaluation.

C. Recommendation: Continuation of the Defined Increment Plan

GovHR is recommending that the City continue with the Defined Increment Plan. The City has established this type of pay plan and the employees are familiar with its use. It allows for certainty for both the City and its Employees relative to compensation.

D. Pay Philosophy

An important component in the process of developing a Compensation Plan is understanding and applying the pay philosophy of the City. In Snoqualmie, the City is considering its pay philosophy. GovHR has provided three options for consideration, the 50th, 60th and 75th percentiles. In order to be able to attract and retain employees, it is recommended the City consider at least the 60th percentile as its pay philosophy, with the goal of moving to the 75th percentile in the future if it is not established now.

E. Proposed Compensation Plan and Structure

The next step in this process is to combine the JFA scores included in Tables 1 and 2 with the proposed salary ranges in Table 3. The Classification and Compensation Plan consists of thirteen (13) pay grades; one (1) being lowest and thirteen (13) being highest and is broken down into the following three (3) bands:

Grades 1 – 4: Administrative and Technical Staff

Grades 5 – 10: Supervisors and Advanced Technical Staff

Grades 11 – 13: Directors and Senior Managers

All proposed pay ranges are open ranges. There is a 7.5% gradation between Grades 1 – 4 and 5 – 10 and a 7% gradation between Grades 11 – 13. All grades have a 35% range spread from minimum to maximum.

Note 1: Different compensation grades may have different ranges from minimum to maximum compensation. It is appropriate for the lower grades in a Compensation Plan to have a smaller spread from minimum to maximum as it is likely that new employees would start at the minimum compensation of the range. Conversely, it is more likely that more experienced employees or Department Head level employees may be hired at a rate above the minimum compensation of a range, thus it is necessary to have a greater spread from minimum to maximum compensation.

Note 2: Gradation refers to the relationship between the minimum compensation of one grade to the minimum compensation of the next grade. In this case, the starting compensation for employees in Grade 2 is 7.5% higher than Grade 1 and so on. The gradation will vary depending upon the relationship between the salary data for the grade, the number of grades in the compensation band and the established compensation range.

Table 2 combines all of the classification and compensation data at the 50th, 60th, and 75th percentiles.

F. Implementation and Administration of the Compensation Plan

Implementation of the Compensation Plan, as it affects individual employees, should be under the following pattern of adjustments:

- 1) Employees whose present compensation is below the minimum compensation of the range for their classification should be raised to the minimum of the range.

- 2) The compensation of employees whose present compensation is within the range for their classification should be slotted into the new Compensation Plan at their current pay rate of pay to the closest defined increment or step without a reduction in pay.
- 3) The compensation of employees whose present compensation is above the maximum compensation of the range should be held at their present rate, without a reduction in compensation, until such time that further market analysis indicates commensurate alignment with the marketplace. However, the City can consider lump sum increases for these employees, which does not impact base compensation levels, until the ranges adjust to include the individual employee compensation rates.

In other studies, GovHR has been asked for ideas on how to address the situation of long-term employees whose current compensation falls near the bottom (within 5 - 10%) of the proposed range. If this occurs, it illustrates that the position has been compensated at less than the market rate for someone with similar tenure. Thus, some communities elect to make additional adjustments for those employees at implementation. This program is discretionary for the City to adopt and only occurs one time, at the implementation of the new Classification and Compensation Plan. If the City wishes to consider such a program, an example is illustrated below:

Service	Adjustment
1 - 3 Years	0%
Over 3 and up to 8 Years	1%
Over 8 and up to 15 Years	2%
Over 15 Years	3%

Employee Advancement through the Ranges

To implement the new Compensation Plan, GovHR recommends that the starting salary of the range (minimum) is the normal hiring/promoting rate. Exceptions to this starting point should be limited to hiring situations involving:

- 1) Applicants with exceptional background and qualifications.
- 2) A promotion in which the employee's current compensation is higher than the minimum of the new range.

- 3) In the case of a labor market situation where it is impossible to recruit qualified candidates at the minimum.

In these cases, employees may be appointed to their positions anywhere within the defined range (generally up to the midpoint), depending on their experience and qualifications, and based on the provisions of the City's policies (if applicable). Employees should not be hired below the minimum of their compensation range.

Salary advancement between the hiring rate and the top of the range (maximum) is done throughout the employee's tenure with the organization. Advancement through the range would be done on an annual basis and be dependent on a satisfactory performance evaluation. Incumbents progressing through the range should understand that standards of performance would become more exacting or controlling as compensation levels advance. Typical movement through the range could be in increments of 1% to 3%, depending on the employee's performance evaluation and goal attainment, as well as the financial resources of the City.

The City may also wish to provide a merit bonus for exemplary performance after an employee reaches the maximum compensation for the range. If this option is exercised, then an employee would be eligible to receive a payment after a successful performance evaluation each year. This payment should not be worked into the base salary. It can be in the form of a lump sum payment that is a set amount calculated each year and the same for all employees, such as \$500 for meeting expectations and \$1,000 for exceeding expectations. Another option is to calculate a percentage of the employee's base compensation and provide a lump sum payment equivalent to that amount, such as 1% for meeting expectations and 2% for exceeding expectations.

It is recommended that the City set aside a "merit pool" every year, to fund increases for employees in this Plan. This money would then serve as the pool for merit payments, knowing that some employees will be high performers, getting a higher percentage, and some employees will be lower performers, getting a lower percentage.

Again, it should also be noted that the implementation and use of a formal performance evaluation process for all staff members is a key component to the success of this Plan. Equally, if not more

important, is that supervisors are adequately trained to perform the formal performance evaluation process.

G. Future Administration of the Compensation Plan

To maintain competitive salary levels there should be an annual review of the City's salary ranges. The nineteen (19) communities used in the survey group for this Study have been determined to be comparable jurisdictions to the City. Therefore, Snoqualmie can continue to use these jurisdictions as a comparable salary survey group for annual salary comparison purposes, until it is determined that they are no longer valid comparables. As mentioned earlier, the salary levels for these comparables are current as of August – September 2022. It is GovHR's recommendation that an annual survey of these communities be conducted to determine the percentage increase each organization in the comparable group is granting, either as an annual across-the-board increase to their employees or as a general adjustment to their compensation ranges. The City may wish to provide an across-the-board increase to all employees based on the information received from the comparable communities. If this is the case, then the increases would be granted separately from any merit increase that would be awarded as a result of a successful performance evaluation.

It is the further recommendation of GovHR that the compensation ranges for each grade be increased by the average percentage increase of the comparable group, even if an across-the-board increase is not given to all employees. Employees would continue to advance through the compensation ranges (provided that the employee is not at the maximum of the compensation range) by virtue of a merit increase granted for satisfactory or above satisfactory performance of their job duties. Finally, it is recommended that the City review the compatibility of the municipalities after five (5) years.

H. Future Administration of the Classification Plan

The administration of a Classification Plan is an ongoing process. It must be recognized that it is not static and is not intended to affix positions permanently into classifications. Instead, the Plan must be administered continually to adapt it to changing conditions.

Three (3) specific types of changes in the Plan itself are possible: abolition of a position, creation of a position, or a revision of a position.

- 1) When a position in a classification is eliminated or when a position has significantly changed work duties and responsibilities to the extent that the position becomes inappropriate or inaccurate, the position should be abolished.
- 2) New positions should be created when new work situations arise that are not covered by the established positions. However, caution should be exercised in this respect, particularly to assure that new positions are justified, are not merely duplicating established positions, cannot be accommodated through changes in existing positions, and reflect substantially permanent rather than temporary situations.
- 3) The adjustment or revision of a position should be done when there are substantial changes to the requirements of the position or to the nature and complexities of the duties being performed. In this instance, a position may need to be re-scored and move up or down into a new classification.

All changes should be thoroughly evaluated for their effect on employee morale and the integrity of the classification relationships established in the Classification and Compensation Plan. City Administration has been provided with the Job Analysis Questionnaire as well as the Job Factor Scoring Sheet, enabling the City to grade a newly created or revised position. GovHR provides scoring assistance in such cases free of charge for one (1) year after the delivery of this report.

Appreciation

GovHR has appreciated the opportunity to work with the City of Snoqualmie on this Classification and Compensation Study. A special thank you to the employees for all of the information provided to allow for the analysis and to the City Administration for the significant amount of work and support dedicated to the project.

Table 1 - Classification Plan

Current Job Title	Recommended Job Title Change	JFA Score	Skill Level	New Grade
Directors and Senior Managers				
Director of Finance and Human Resources		770	750 to 785	13
Fire Chief		765	(35 points)	
Parks and Public Works Director	Director of Parks and Public Works	765		
Police Chief		760		
City Attorney		760		
Information Technology Director	Director of Information Technology	750		
No Positions in Grade			710 to 745	12
Deputy Fire Chief		695	670 to 705	11
Deputy Parks/Public Works Director/City Engineer	Assistant Director of P&PW - City Engineer	695		
Police Captain		690		
Community Development Director		670		
Supervisors and Advanced Technical				
Financial Operations Manager - Budget Manager		660	630 to 665	10
Financial Services Manager	Financial Operations Manager - Accounting Manager	660		
Forestry/Stormwater Supervisor	Stormwater and Urban Forestry Superintendent	660		
Parks/Street Maintenance Supervisor	Park & Street Superintendent	645		
Facility/Fleet Supervisor	Facility and Fleet Superintendent	635		
Wastewater Supervisor	Utilities Sanitation Superintendent	635		
Water District Supervisor	Utilities Water Superintendent	635		
Assistant City Attorney		630		
City Clerk		615	590 to 625	9
Human Resources Manager		600		
Building Official/Fire Marshall/Plans Examiner		580	550 to 585	8
Project Engineer		565		
Planning Manager		560		
Communications Coordinator/Public Information Officer		550		
Systems Engineer		550		
Urban Forester	Stormwater & Urban Forestry Tech III	540	510 to 545	7
Lead Operator - Wastewater	Utilities Sanitation Operator IV	530		
Management Analyst		525		
Senior Planner		520		
Police Support Officer		480	470 to 505	6
Senior Maintenance Technician/Operator - Water	Utilities Water Operator IV	475		
Human Resources Analyst/Human Resources Asst.	Human Resources Analyst	475		
Budget Analyst		475		
Senior Operator - Wastewater	Utilities Sanitation Operator III	470		

Table 1 - Classification Plan

Current Job Title	Recommended Job Title Change	JFA Score	Skill Level	New Grade
Senior Industrial Maintenance Technician - Wastewater	Utilities Sanitation Sr. Industrial Maintenance Technician	470		
Deputy Building Official		450	430 to 465	5
Information Technology Systems Support		450		
Legal Assistant/Deputy City Clerk		450		
Parks Lead Worker	Parks & Streets Tech III	450		
Geographic Information Systems Analyst		440		
Mechanic II		435		
Associate Planner		430		
Administrative and Technical				
Facilities Technician II	Maintenance Technician II - Facilities	425	400 to 425	4
Maintenance Technician II/Irrigation	Stormwater & Urban Forestry Tech II	425	(25 points)	
Stormwater	Parks & Street Tech II	425		
Maintenance Technician II - Water	Utilities Water Tech II	425		
Operator II - Wastewater	Utilities Sanitation Operator II	425		
Lab Analyst	Utilities Sanitation Industrial Maintenance Technician	425		
Administrative Assistant II (Part-time)	Administrative Coordinator	425		
Administrative Coordinator		425		
Accountant		425		
Service Desk Technician		415		
Evidence/Records Technician		415		
Senior Account Clerk		415		
Building Inspector		410		
Community Liaison		410		
Communications Assistant		385	370 to 395	3
Administrative Assistant - Parks & Public Works	Parks and Public Works Assistant	380		
HR Assistant		375		
Assistant Planner		370		
Records Technician		365	340 to 365	2
Permit Technician		355		
Planning Technician		355		
Parks Maintenance Worker	Parks & Street Tech I	350		
Account Clerk - Utility Billing	Finance Assistant	350		
Receptionist - Office Assistant	Finance Assistant	350		
No Positions in Grade			To 335	1

Job Title	JFA Score	Skill Level	New Grade	50th Percentile Salary Survey Data		60th Percentile Salary Survey Data		75th Percentile Salary Survey Data		Current Salary Range		Current Salary	Proposed Salary Range 50th Percentile		Proposed Salary Range 60th Percentile		Proposed Salary Range 75th Percentile	
Directors and Senior Managers																		
Director of Finance and Human Resources	770	750 to 785	13	131,760	165,948	132,416	168,843	138,236	177,977	153,840	170,928	170,928	131,091	176,973	133,381	180,064	141,395	190,883
Fire Chief	765	(35 points)								146,520	162,780	162,780						
Parks and Public Works Director	765			133,152	170,412	133,709	172,898	143,513	185,541	153,840	170,928	170,928						
Police Chief	760			139,812	180,684	149,040	190,944	150,304	199,172	153,840	170,928	170,928						
City Attorney	760			138,960	177,710	140,408	184,364	142,581	194,346	171,276	190,296	190,296						
Information Technology Director	750			129,447	172,777	132,078	176,706	135,529	195,053	136,596	151,752	151,752						
No Positions in Grade		710 to 745	12										122,515	165,395	124,655	168,284	132,145	178,396
Deputy Fire Chief	695	670 to 705	11							123,576	137,304	137,304	114,500	154,575	116,500	157,275	123,500	166,725
Deputy Parks/Public Works Director/City Engineer	695			116,568	147,316	119,262	157,150	123,913	160,992	112,044	124,488	137,304						
Police Captain	690			133,752	154,844	141,987	164,678	148,181	172,353	130,080	144,528	137,304						
Community Development Director	670									136,596	151,752	144,180						
Supervisors and Advanced Technical																		
Financial Operations Manager - Accounting Manager	660	630 to 665	10							102,204	113,556	113,556	96,905	130,822	99,776	134,698	105,519	142,450
Financial Operations Manager - Budget Manager	660			105,670	145,821	106,696	146,595	108,233	147,757	102,204	113,556	113,556						
Forestry/Stormwater Supervisor	660									81,336	96,996	86,304						
Parks/Street Maintenance Supervisor	645			84,898	111,274	86,657	114,471	90,915	116,180	81,336	96,996							
Facility/Fleet Supervisor	635									81,336	96,996	96,996						
Wastewater Supervisor	635									81,336	96,996	93,264						
Water District Supervisor	635									81,336	96,996	96,996						
Assistant City Attorney	630									120,444	133,836	133,836						
City Clerk	615	590 to 625	9	85,884	109,608	88,639	111,958	92,032	113,102	101,856	113,172	101,856	90,144	121,695	92,815	125,300	98,157	132,512
Human Resources Manager	600			103,608	128,436	106,980	141,269	118,203	152,219	102,204	113,556							
Building Official/Fire Marshall/Plans Examiner	580	550 to 585	8							102,204	113,556	113,556	83,855	113,204	86,340	116,559	91,309	123,267
Project Engineer	565			90,596	118,620	94,517	123,516	100,109	129,168	96,312	114,852	109,896						
Planning Manager	560			96,738	123,108	99,526	126,874	105,348	139,832	102,204	113,556							
Communications Coordinator/Public Information Officer	550			83,792	108,915	86,657	111,941	90,031	117,669	94,716	105,228	105,228						
Systems Engineer	550									74,616	88,980	88,980						
Urban Forester	540	510 to 545	7							72,360	86,304	86,304	78,005	105,306	80,316	108,427	84,938	114,667
Lead Operator - Wastewater	530									72,360	86,304							
Management Analyst	525			73,800	96,216	74,059	97,574	74,448	99,612	86,100	95,664	95,664						
Senior Planner	520			85,884	109,458	87,151	111,755	87,888	116,297	93,516	111,516	111,516						
Police Support Officer	480	470 to 505	6	57,522	73,596	59,088	73,987	60,177	74,791	68,148	82,812	75,156	72,563	97,959	74,713	100,862	79,013	106,667
Senior Maintenance Technician/Operator - Water	475									72,360	86,304	82,980						
Human Resources Analyst/Human Resources Asst.	475			72,724	94,568	75,305	94,938	75,990	95,596	86,100	95,664							
Budget Analyst	475			70,292	95,299	72,419	96,719	75,609	98,848	86,100	95,664							
Senior Operator - Wastewater	470									72,360	86,304	82,560						
Senior Industrial Maintenance Techncian - Wastewater	470									72,360	86,304	86,304						
Deputy Building Official	450	430 to 465	5							81,336	96,996		67,500	91,125	69,500	93,825	73,500	99,225
Information Technology Systems Support	450			74,721	101,119	77,389	102,885	78,759	104,839	70,116	83,592	83,592						
Legal Assistant/Deputy City Clerk	450			70,699	90,966	70,920	94,322	75,073	95,717	76,536	85,044	85,044						
Parks Lead Worker	450			69,666	89,633	72,088	90,989	73,894	92,801	72,360	86,304	82,980						
Geographic Information Systems Analyst	440			72,149	92,999	73,606	94,545	79,670	100,449	70,116	83,592	83,592						
Mechanic II	435			66,788	82,678	67,126	82,969	69,105	85,498	66,528	79,308	79,308						
Associate Planner	430			70,828	90,072	73,462	94,268	74,678	100,212	78,240	93,288	89,244						

Job Title	JFA Score	Skill Level	New Grade	50th Percentile Salary Survey Data	60th Percentile Salary Survey Data	75th Percentile Salary Survey Data	Current Salary Range	Current Salary	Proposed Salary Range 50th Percentile	Proposed Salary Range 60th Percentile	Proposed Salary Range 75th Percentile
Administrative and Technical											
Facilities Technician II	425	400 to 425	4					66,528 79,308 79,308	62,115 83,855	66,463 89,725	68,947 93,079
Maintenance Technician II/Irrigation	425	(25 points)						66,528 79,308 76,260			
Maintenance Technician II - Streets and Stormwater	425			60,719 76,713	60,804 77,568	61,941 78,787	66,528 79,308 79,308				
Maintenance Technician II - Water	425						66,528 79,308 72,612				
Operator II - Wastewater	425			66,358 82,443	67,981 83,654	69,933 85,049	66,528 79,308 66,528				
Lab Analyst	425						72,360 86,304 86,304				
Administrative Coordinator	425						67,260 80,208				
Administrative Assistant II (Part-time)	425			58,125 75,723	59,980 80,987	64,977 87,495	59,772 71,268 35,634				
Accountant	425			70,560 92,166	73,065 94,529	74,931 96,080	73,584 87,756 87,756				
Service Desk Technician	415			60,480 79,565	61,217 80,688	62,834 83,031	60,396 72,048 72,048				
Evidence/Records Technician	415			56,202 73,100	57,229 73,590	58,603 76,635	59,772 71,268 68,208				
Senior Account Clerk	415			60,792 81,169	61,500 81,996	64,499 83,019	66,528 79,308 79,308				
Building Inspector	410			73,027 91,032	74,986 95,016	75,768 99,840	74,616 88,980				
Community Liaison	410			63,726 84,372	70,297 91,642	75,468 99,633	76,536 85,044 85,044				
Communications Assistant	385	370 to 395	3					53,100 63,312 50,649	57,781 78,005	61,826 83,465	64,137 86,585
Administrative Assistant - Parks & Public Works	380			56,159 72,076	58,139 73,227	58,749 80,261	56,640 67,536 67,536				
HR Assistant	375							77,328			
Assistant Planner	370			64,371 84,538	65,199 84,770	65,940 86,823	64,371 84,538				
Records Technician	365	340 to 365	2					56,640 67,536 67,536	53,750 72,563	57,513 77,642	59,663 80,544
Permit Technician	355			59,307 77,688	60,488 79,622	61,569 80,261	59,772 71,268 71,268				
Planning Technician	355						59,772 71,268 59,772				
Parks Maintenance Worker	350			59,781 76,219	60,789 76,654	61,564 77,429	66,528 79,308 79,308				
Account Clerk - Utility Billing	350			56,688 74,172	58,271 74,660	59,424 76,308	56,640 67,536 61,836				
Receptionist - Office Assistant	350						51,240 61,104 61,104				
No Positions in Grade		To 335	1						50,000 67,500	53,500 72,225	55,500 74,925

City of Snoqualmie, WA
Table 3 - Proposed Pay Ranges

50th Percentile - Proposed Pay Ranges		
Administrative and Technical <i>7.5% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread</i>		
	Minimum	Maximum
1	50,000	67,500
2	53,750	72,563
3	57,781	78,005
4	62,115	83,855

60th Percentile - Proposed Pay Ranges		
Administrative and Technical <i>7.5% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread</i>		
	Minimum	Maximum
1	53,500	72,225
2	57,513	77,642
3	61,826	83,465
4	66,463	89,725

75th Percentile - Proposed Pay Ranges		
Administrative and Technical <i>7.5% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread</i>		
	Minimum	Maximum
1	55,500	74,925
2	59,663	80,544
3	64,137	86,585
4	68,947	93,079

Supervisors and Advanced Technical <i>7.5% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread</i>		
	Minimum	Maximum
5	67,500	91,125
6	72,563	97,959
7	78,005	105,306
8	83,855	113,204
9	90,144	121,695
10	96,905	130,822

Supervisors and Advanced Technical <i>7.5% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread</i>		
	Minimum	Maximum
5	69,500	93,825
6	74,713	100,862
7	80,316	108,427
8	86,340	116,559
9	92,815	125,300
10	99,776	134,698

Supervisors and Advanced Technical <i>7.5% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread</i>		
	Minimum	Maximum
5	73,500	99,225
6	79,013	106,667
7	84,938	114,667
8	91,309	123,267
9	98,157	132,512
10	105,519	142,450

Directors and Senior Managers <i>7% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread</i>		
	Minimum	Maximum
11	114,500	154,575
12	122,515	165,395
13	131,091	176,973

Directors and Senior Managers <i>7% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread</i>		
	Minimum	Maximum
11	116,500	157,275
12	124,655	168,284
13	133,381	180,064

Directors and Senior Managers <i>7% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread</i>		
	Minimum	Maximum
11	123,500	166,725
12	132,145	178,396
13	141,395	190,883

APPENDIX A

EMPLOYEE JOB ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE (JAQ)

City of Snoqualmie, Washington

NAME:	DATE:
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE WITH EMPLOYER:	JOB TITLE:
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE ON THIS JOB:	YOUR JOB IS: FULL TIME ☐ PART TIME ☐
YOUR YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN THIS FIELD:	YOUR EDUCATION: ☐ High Sch. ☐ Assoc. Deg. ☐ Bach. Deg. ☐ Mas. Deg.
NAME OF IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR:	HIS/HER TITLE:

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain additional information about your job that may not be included in your current job description. Please answer each question thoughtfully and frankly. After you have finished your portion of the questionnaire, give it to your immediate supervisor, who will complete his/her section.

General Summary: In three or four sentences, please summarize the major purpose or primary function of your job.

Please indicate if you have reviewed your current job description.

If you have any changes to your current job description, please mark them on the JD and attach it to this JAQ, or indicate changes here:

If you do not have a job description available to review, please list your job duties. Try to place your duties in order of importance and group "like" tasks together (e.g., "clerical duties including word processing, opening mail, filing, etc." or "front desk responsibilities including greeting visitors, answering telephones and routing calls, etc."). Job duties:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.

- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
- 13.
- 14.
- 15.

Feel free to add more numbers/duties if necessary.

FACTOR 1. Education & Training: In your opinion, what kind of education and training is necessary to perform your job?

- ☐ LEVEL 1: Level of knowledge that is below what is normally attained through high school graduation.
- ☐ LEVEL 2: High school diploma (GED) or equivalent.
- ☐ LEVEL 3: High school, plus elementary technical training, acquired on the job or through one year or less of technical or business school.
- ☐ LEVEL 4: Extensive technical or specialized training such as would be acquired by an Associate's Degree or two years of technical or business school.
- ☐ LEVEL 5: Completion of four-year college degree program.
- ☐ LEVEL 6: Additional professional level of education beyond a four-year college program, such as a CPA or Professional Engineer (P.E.) training.
- ☐ LEVEL 7: Completion of graduate coursework equal to a Master's Degree or higher.

What specific degree/coursework is NECESSARY?

What specific degree/coursework is PREFERRED?

If a specific certificate or license is mandated by an outside agency to perform your duties, name the certificate or license:

What special skills, knowledge, and abilities are required to perform your job? Please list:

FACTOR 2. Years of Experience: How much previous work experience do you feel is necessary to perform your job?

- | LEVEL 1: | LEVEL 2: | LEVEL 3: | LEVEL 4: | LEVEL 5: |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| ☐ Less Than 1 Year | ☐ 1 to 3 Years | ☐ 4 to 6 Years | ☐ 7 to 10 Years | ☐ More than 10 Years |

What is the minimum number of years required?

What specific experience is necessary?

FACTOR 3. Independent Judgment and Decision Making

Part 1: How much discretion do you have in making decisions with or without the input or direction of your supervisor?

- ☐ LITTLE: Little discretion or independent judgment exercised.
- ☐ SOME: Some discretion or judgment exercised, but supervisor is normally available.
- ☐ OFTEN: Job often requires making decisions in absence of specific policies and/or guidance from supervisors, but some direct guidance is received from supervisors.
- ☐ HIGH: High level of discretion with decisions restricted only by Departmental policies and little direct guidance from supervisors.
- ☐ VERY HIGH: Very high level of discretion with decisions only restricted by the broadest policies of the Organization.

Part 2: If you make an erroneous decision, what impact would this decision have on your work unit, department, and/or the Organization?

- ☐ MINOR: Some inconvenience and delays but minor costs in terms of time, money, or public/employee good will.
- ☐ MODERATE: Moderate costs in time, money, or public/employee good will would be incurred. Delays in important projects/schedules likely.
- ☐ SERIOUS: Important goals would not be achieved and the financial, employee, or public relations posture of the Organization would be seriously affected.
- ☐ CRITICAL: Critical goals and objectives of the Organization would be adversely and very seriously affected. Error could likely result in critical financial loss, property damage, or bodily harm/loss of life.

FACTOR 4. Responsibility for Policy Development: Does your job require you to participate in the development of policies for your unit/division/department/the Organization?

- ☐ LEVEL 1: Position involves only the execution of policies or use of existing procedures.
- ☐ LEVEL 2: May provide some input to supervisor when policies and procedures are updated.
- ☐ LEVEL 3: Position involves some development of policies/procedures for the Department and/or the interpretation or explanation of departmental policies for others in the organization or residents.
- ☐ LEVEL 4: Position involves significant or primary responsibility for the development of policies and procedures for a division or organizational component of a department, as well as the interpretation, execution and recommendation of changes to department policies.
- ☐ LEVEL 5: Position involves significant or primary responsibility for the development of policies and procedures for an entire department, plus occasional participation in the development of policies which affect other departments in the organization.
- ☐ LEVEL 6: Position involves the primary responsibility for the development of departmental policies and procedures and regular participation in the development of policies that affect other departments and occasionally involves participation in the development of organization-wide policies.

Give some examples of the types of policies you've written or been a part of creating:

FACTOR 5. Planning: How much latitude do you have to set your own daily work schedule and priorities for a given workday?

- ☐ LEVEL 1: Position requires that my daily work load and activities are assigned to me by my supervisor.

- ☐ LEVEL 2: Position requires that I plan my own daily work load and work independently according to established procedures or standards.
- ☐ LEVEL 3: Position requires that I plan my own daily work load and those of others in the department (first-level supervision).
- ☐ LEVEL 4: Position requires an above average ability to analyze data and develop departmental plans, including plans where a number of difficult, technical and/or administrative problems must be addressed (Manager/Division level planning).
- ☐ LEVEL 5: Position requires a high level of analytical ability to develop plans for a department or complex situation, including plans that involve integrating/involving/impacting other departments (Department Head level planning).

FACTOR 6. Contacts with Others: In the course of performing your job, what contacts with people in your department, other departments within the organization, and/or people from outside the organization are you required to make?

- ☐ LEVEL 1: Position involves interaction with fellow workers on routine matters with relatively little public contact.
- ☐ LEVEL 2: Position involves frequent internal and external contact, but generally on routine matters such as furnishing or obtaining information.
- ☐ LEVEL 3: Position involves frequent internal contact and regular contact with outsiders generally on routine matters, including contacts with irate outsiders which require some public relations skill for taking complaints for others to follow up upon.
- ☐ LEVEL 4: Position involves frequent internal and external contacts which require public relations skills in handling complaints. Contacts involve non-routine problems and require in-depth discussion and/or persuasion in order to resolve the problem. Handles more difficult contacts that are referred by front line employees.
- ☐ LEVEL 5: Position involves frequent internal and external contacts which require skill in dealing with, and influencing others, and initiating changes in policy/procedures to address the issue so as to avoid having to deal with the issue again in the future.
- ☐ LEVEL 6: Position involves frequent internal and external contacts in which I act as the spokesperson for the department and am authorized to make commitments of significant resources on behalf of the department.
- ☐ LEVEL 7: Position involves frequent internal and external contacts where I represent the entire organization and am authorized to make commitments in matters of broad or critical interest to the entire organization.

With which internal individuals or groups do you have the most contact?

With which external individuals or groups do you have the most contact?

FACTOR 7. Supervision Given:

Do you supervise or assign work to other employees? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes:

- ☐ LEVEL 1: Position is regularly responsible for assigning work to an employee or employees, without acting in a supervisory role. To whom does this position assign work?
- ☐ LEVEL 2: Position is responsible for the supervision of one full time or several part time employees.
- ☐ LEVEL 3: Position is responsible for the supervision of two to five full time (or full time equivalent) employees.

- ☐ LEVEL 4: Position is responsible for the supervision of six to 15 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- ☐ LEVEL 5: Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of 16 to 29 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- ☐ LEVEL 6: Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of 30 to 50 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- ☐ LEVEL 7: Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of more than 51 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.

Actual number of full-time (or full-time equivalent) employees supervised:

FACTOR 8. Physical Demands: Please describe any physical demands required to perform your job.

Demand	No	Yes	How often? (Rarely, Occasionally or Daily)
Lifting to 20 pounds	☐	☐	
Lifting 20-50 pounds	☐	☐	
Lifting 50+ pounds	☐	☐	
Climbing	☐	☐	
Walking	☐	☐	
Kneeling	☐	☐	
Crouching	☐	☐	
Crawling	☐	☐	
Bending	☐	☐	
Sitting	☐	☐	
Prolonged Standing	☐	☐	
Prolonged Visual Concentration	☐	☐	

Unpleasant or Hazardous Conditions: Please describe any unpleasant or hazardous conditions you are exposed to in performing your job and how often you are exposed to those conditions. Include only those conditions which are directly related to your work rather than specific work area conditions.

Condition	No	Yes	How Often? (Rarely, Occasionally or Daily)
Lighting-dimness or brightness	☐	☐	
Dust	☐	☐	
Heat	☐	☐	
Cold	☐	☐	
Odors	☐	☐	
Noise	☐	☐	
Vibration	☐	☐	
Wetness/Humidity	☐	☐	
Toxic Agents	☐	☐	
Electrical Currents	☐	☐	
Heavy Machinery	☐	☐	
Violence	☐	☐	
Disease	☐	☐	
Smoke	☐	☐	
Other	☐	☐	

FACTOR 9. Use of Technology/Specialized Equipment: Please check the level of technology or specialized equipment use needed for you to perform your job.

- ☐ LEVEL 1: Position has no responsibility for, or use of, technology.
- ☐ LEVEL 2: Position has some basic use of computers for data entry and some use of the telephone, copier, etc.
- ☐ LEVEL 3: Position has daily use of computers for data entry and use of the telephone, fax machine, copier, etc. Position has daily use of light equipment such as push mowers, weed whackers, pole saws, custodial equipment, etc.
- ☐ LEVEL 4: Position has daily use of computers, the Internet, Smartphones, etc. to create databases, spreadsheets, or reports. Position designs and creates customized reports, presentations, and/or documents using advanced software skills.
- ☐ LEVEL 5A: Position provides routine consultation and technology support for everyday computer programming and/or software requests/questions to others in the organization; is an applications super user; or uses specialized software such as GIS, SCADA or telecommunications software.
- ☐ LEVEL 5B: Position uses, troubleshoots, and/or repairs various pieces of specialized equipment such as HVAC, lighting, gas flares, blowers, engines, heavy equipment, diagnostic equipment, large vehicles (vacuum trucks, street sweepers, fire apparatus) and/or medical or public safety equipment.
- ☐ LEVEL 6: Position is responsible for advanced computer programming, system security, maintenance, training, and purchasing of items such as computers, printers, scanners, etc., for the computer system for the organization (IT personnel).
- ☐ LEVEL 7: Position is responsible for the overall direction and supervision of the staff that are responsible for the computer and technology needs of the organization, including responsibility for developing technology policies for the organization (IT personnel).

10. Comments/Additional Information: Feel free to add additional information below. If using a printed copy of this form, use the back of the form to add your comments.

Type your name and the date below, then save this form as a Word document with the file name of "JobTitle.LastName.FirstName" and email it to your supervisor. If using a printed copy of this form, sign and date it and then deliver to your supervisor.

EMPLOYEE'S SIGNATURE OR TYPED NAME

DATE

THIS SECTION TO BE COMPLETED BY IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR AND/OR DEPARTMENT HEAD

Please provide your comments below. If using a printed copy of the form and additional space is needed, please use the back of this form or attach an additional sheet. **Please do not mark in employee's portion of the questionnaire.**

1. Do you agree with the employee's answers to all of the above questions? If not, please explain.
2. List any job duties or assignments which the employee performs which are in addition to those listed on the job description or this form.
3. How long has this employee worked for you?

4. Additional comments from the employee's immediate supervisor:

Type your name and the date below, then email this form to your Department Head (if applicable) or to the Human Resources Director. If using a printed copy of this form, sign and date it before forwarding.

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE OR TYPED NAME

DATE

If Supervisor isn't Department Head, Department Head should review this form as well.

- ☐ I have read the above and substantially concur.
☐ I have read the above and have the following comments:

Type your name and the date below, and then email this form to Human Resources. If using a printed copy of this form, sign and date it before forwarding.

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE OR TYPED NAME

DATE

IMPORTANT DATES:

August 12th: Employees complete and submit the JAQs to their Supervisors. Please save file as follows: JobTitle.LastName.FirstName

August 22nd: Supervisors and Department Heads review and then submit the JAQs to Human Resources.

September 2nd: Human Resources reviews and then submits the JAQs to GovHR USA.

Week of September 12th: GovHR USA conducts virtual interviews with employees.

APPENDIX B

CITY OF SNOQUALMIE, WASHINGTON
Criteria Used to Determine Survey Comparables

1. 2021 Population ~ Maximum 15 points

14,490					
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.50	9,660	14,490	14,490	21,735	20
2.00	7,245	9,659	21,736	28,980	15
2.50	5,796	7,244	28,981	36,225	10
3.00	4,830	5,795	36,226	43,470	5
All Others					0

2. 2020 Income Per Capita ~ Maximum 15 Points

\$59,174					
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.50	\$39,449	\$59,174	\$59,174	\$88,761	15
2.00	\$29,587	\$39,448	\$88,762	\$118,348	11
2.50	\$23,670	\$29,586	\$118,349	\$147,935	7
3.00	\$19,725	\$23,669	\$147,936	\$177,522	3
All Others					0

3. 2020 Total Assessed Value ~ Maximum 15 Points

\$3,467					
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.50	2,311	3,467	3,467	5,201	15
2.00	1,734	2,310	5,202	6,934	11
2.50	1,387	1,733	6,935	8,668	7
3.00	1,156	1,386	8,669	10,401	3
All Others					0

4. 2020 General Fund Tax Levy ~ Maximum 15 Points

\$8.1 Million					
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.50	\$5.4	\$8.1	\$8.1	\$12.2	10
2.00	\$4.1	\$5.3	\$12.3	\$16.2	8
2.50	\$3.2	\$4.0	\$16.3	\$20.3	6
3.00	\$2.7	\$3.1	\$20.4	\$24.3	2
All Others					0

5. 2020 Sales Tax ~ Maximum 15 Points

\$2.7 Million					
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.50	\$1.8	\$2.7	\$2.7	\$4.1	10
2.00	\$1.4	\$1.7	\$4.2	\$5.4	8
2.50	\$1.1	\$1.3	\$5.5	\$6.8	6
3.00	\$0.9	\$1.0	\$6.9	\$8.1	2
All Others					0

CITY OF SNOQUALMIE, WASHINGTON

Criteria Used to Determine Survey Comparables

6. 2021 State Distributions ~ Maximum 5 Points

\$0.50 Million					
Factor	Minimum	Range	Maximum	Range	Points
1.50	\$0.33	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.75	5
2.00	\$0.25	\$0.32	\$0.76	\$1.00	4
2.50	\$0.20	\$0.24	\$1.01	\$1.25	3
3.00	\$0.17	\$0.19	\$1.26	\$1.50	1
All Others					0

7. 2020 Total Expenditures ~ Maximum 15 Points

\$27.0 Million					
Factor	Minimum	Range	Maximum	Range	Points
1.50	\$18.0	\$27.0	\$27.0	\$40.5	20
2.00	\$13.5	\$17.9	\$40.6	\$54.0	15
2.50	\$10.8	\$13.4	\$54.1	\$67.5	10
3.00	\$9.0	\$10.7	\$67.6	\$81.0	5
All Others					0

8. Proximity in Miles ~ Maximum 5 Points

Factor	Points
1 to 30 miles	5
31 to 60 miles	3
60 miles or more	0

Data Sources:

Municipal Research & Service Center (MRSC) of Washington's "City/town tax & population trends" for Population, Assessed Value, General Fund Tax Levy and Sales Tax: <https://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Finance/Data/Tax-and-Population-Data.aspx#populationtax>

Office of the Washington State Auditor's Financial Intelligence Tool for Total Expenditures: <https://portal.sao.wa.gov/FIT/>

Washington State Distributions to Local Entities: <http://fiscal.wa.gov/TaxDistributions.aspx>

U.S. Census QuickFacts for Income Per Capita: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045221>

Google Maps for proximity (lowest mileage listed)

Note:

Each of the eight criterion contain ranges to assess comparability with the City's data. For example, each of the four factor ranges for City population is developed using a factor of .5 percent (+/-). To determine the population range that will receive a score of 20 (most similar to the City), the City's population is multiplied by 1.5 (maximum range) and divided by 1.5 (minimum range). The City's population is then multiplied and divided by 2.0, 2.5 and 3.0 to determine ranges of decreasing similarity (and subsequently decreasing "comparability points")

CITY OF SNOQUALMIE, WA
Criteria Comparisons -- Sorted by Rank
(All municipalities meeting initial screening criteria*)

Municipality	Population	Max. Points	Income Per Capita	Max. Points	Total Asstd. Value (millions)	Max. Points	General Fund Tax Levy (millions)	Max. Points	Sales Tax (millions)	Max. Points	State Dist. (millions)	Max. Points	Total Expenditures (millions)	Max. Points	Proximity Miles	Max. Points	Total Points
Snoqualmie	14,490	20	\$59,174	15	\$3,467	15	\$8.1	10	\$2.7	10	\$0.50	5	\$27.0	20	0	5	100
Mukilteo	21,560	20	\$53,006	15	\$5,444	11	\$5.7	10	\$3.1	10	\$0.95	4	\$21.8	20	43	3	93
Mill Creek	20,930	20	\$53,109	15	\$4,454	15	\$6.4	10	\$3.6	10	\$0.75	5	\$16.7	15	37	3	93
Maple Valley	28,640	15	\$43,324	15	\$4,316	15	\$4.1	8	\$4.0	10	\$1.05	3	\$19.0	20	17	5	91
Mountlake Terrace	21,980	15	\$39,711	15	\$3,566	15	\$4.8	8	\$3.5	10	\$0.87	4	\$31.5	20	42	3	90
Covington	20,890	20	\$41,927	15	\$2,854	15	\$2.9	2	\$5.3	8	\$0.85	4	\$18.1	20	21	5	89
Newcastle	13,310	20	\$77,950	15	\$3,680	15	\$5.6	10	\$1.6	8	\$0.49	5	\$10.9	10	22	5	88
Monroe	19,900	20	\$29,664	11	\$2,885	15	\$3.3	6	\$5.5	6	\$0.80	4	\$29.2	20	29	5	87
Arlington	20,690	20	\$36,540	11	\$3,007	15	\$4.3	8	\$6.4	6	\$1.10	3	\$31.4	20	58	3	86
Woodinville	13,100	20	\$58,956	15	\$4,494	15	\$3.4	6	\$6.8	6	\$0.76	4	\$14.0	15	27	5	86
Lake Forest Park	13,630	20	\$58,615	15	\$2,432	15	\$3.3	6	\$1.3	6	\$0.49	5	\$13.6	15	34	3	85
Bonney Lake	23,510	15	\$41,866	15	\$3,304	15	\$3.3	6	\$6.7	6	\$0.77	4	\$32.0	20	41	3	84
Enumclaw	12,830	20	\$40,819	15	\$1,674	7	\$2.2	0	\$3.6	10	\$0.46	5	\$23.6	20	30	5	82
Sumner	10,700	20	\$36,402	11	\$3,493	15	\$3.8	6	\$7.1	2	\$0.72	5	\$23.0	20	37	3	82
Gig Harbor	12,200	20	\$51,048	15	\$3,184	15	\$3.0	2	\$7.4	2	\$0.49	5	\$20.8	20	52	3	82
Kenmore	24,050	15	\$56,878	15	\$5,290	11	\$5.3	8	\$2.9	10	\$0.93	4	\$16.8	15	37	3	81
Fife	11,150	20	\$32,869	11	\$2,791	15	\$3.4	6	\$9.4	0	\$1.10	3	\$26.9	20	37	3	78
University Place	35,100	10	\$41,979	15	\$4,644	15	\$4.4	8	\$3.3	10	\$1.91	0	\$15.7	15	47	3	76
DuPont	10,180	20	\$46,678	15	\$1,786	11	\$2.0	0	\$1.4	8	\$0.53	5	\$12.0	10	57	3	72
North Bend	7,685	15	\$51,763	15	\$1,713	7	\$1.9	0	\$2.7	10	\$0.28	4	\$15.6	15	3	5	71
Snohomish	10,260	20	\$36,717	11	\$1,676	7	\$1.3	0	\$4.8	8	\$0.40	5	\$14.1	15	37	3	69
Edgewood	13,110	20	\$42,603	15	\$1,998	11	\$1.9	0	\$1.5	8	\$0.55	5	\$9.1	5	35	3	67
Mercer island	25,790	15	\$95,368	11	\$15,160	0	\$13.9	8	\$4.6	8	\$0.95	4	\$48.1	15	23	5	66
Duvall	8,125	15	\$61,012	15	\$1,466	7	\$1.9	0	\$1.2	6	\$0.30	4	\$11.9	10	20	5	62
Milton	8,695	15	\$36,190	11	\$1,093	0	\$1.5	0	\$1.5	8	\$0.30	4	\$12.6	10	35	3	51
Tukwila	22,000	15	\$32,216	11	\$7,333	7	\$16.0	8	\$16.8	0	\$1.96	0	\$77.3	5	32	3	49
Stanwood	7,980	15	\$34,244	11	\$1,045	0	\$1.7	0	\$2.4	10	\$0.28	4	\$8.0	0	69	0	40
Pacific	7,255	15	\$26,784	7	\$905	0	\$1.0	0	\$1.1	6	\$0.26	4	\$9.6	5	32	3	40
Issaquah	40,640	5	\$68,492	15	\$11,966	0	\$9.6	10	\$15.6	0	\$1.91	0	\$77.4	5	13	5	40
Fircrest	7,195	10	\$40,264	15	\$985	0	\$1.6	0	\$0.6	0	\$0.39	5	\$8.6	0	45	3	33
Bellevue	152,600	0	\$71,633	15	\$68,090	0	\$61.3	0	\$67.2	0	\$10.03	0	\$430.8	0	23	5	20
Redmond	73,910	0	\$66,031	15	\$25,806	0	\$28.2	0	\$38.8	0	\$2.76	0	\$185.2	0	20	5	20

*Initial screening criteria: Washington municipalities within King, Pierce and Snohomish Counties and with populations between approximately 7,000 and 30,000.

CITY OF SNOQUALMIE, WA
Criteria Comparisons -- Sorted by Name
(All municipalities meeting initial screening criteria*)

Municipality	Population	Max. Points	Income Per Capita	Max. Points	Total Asstd. Value	Max. Points	General Fund Tax Levy	Max. Points	Sales Tax	Max. Points	State Dist.	Max. Points	Total Expenditures	Max. Points	Proximity Miles	Max. Points	Total Points
					(millions)		(millions)		(millions)		(millions)		(millions)				
Snoqualmie	14,490	20	\$59,174	15	\$3,467	15	\$8.1	10	\$2.7	10	\$0.50	5	\$27.0	20	0	5	100
Arlington	20,690	20	\$36,540	11	\$3,007	15	\$4.3	8	\$6.4	6	\$1.10	3	\$31.4	20	58	3	86
Bellevue	152,600	0	\$71,633	15	\$68,090	0	\$61.3	0	\$67.2	0	\$10.03	0	\$430.8	0	23	5	20
Bonney Lake	23,510	15	\$41,866	15	\$3,304	15	\$3.3	6	\$6.7	6	\$0.77	4	\$32.0	20	41	3	84
Covington	20,890	20	\$41,927	15	\$2,854	15	\$2.9	2	\$5.3	8	\$0.85	4	\$18.1	20	21	5	89
DuPont	10,180	20	\$46,678	15	\$1,786	11	\$2.0	0	\$1.4	8	\$0.53	5	\$12.0	10	57	3	72
Duvall	8,125	15	\$61,012	15	\$1,466	7	\$1.9	0	\$1.2	6	\$0.30	4	\$11.9	10	20	5	62
Edgewood	13,110	20	\$42,603	15	\$1,998	11	\$1.9	0	\$1.5	8	\$0.55	5	\$9.1	5	35	3	67
Enumclaw	12,830	20	\$40,819	15	\$1,674	7	\$2.2	0	\$3.6	10	\$0.46	5	\$23.6	20	30	5	82
Fife	11,150	20	\$32,869	11	\$2,791	15	\$3.4	6	\$9.4	0	\$1.10	3	\$26.9	20	37	3	78
Fircrest	7,195	10	\$40,264	15	\$985	0	\$1.6	0	\$0.6	0	\$0.39	5	\$8.6	0	45	3	33
Gig Harbor	12,200	20	\$51,048	15	\$3,184	15	\$3.0	2	\$7.4	2	\$0.49	5	\$20.8	20	52	3	82
Issaquah	40,640	5	\$68,492	15	\$11,966	0	\$9.6	10	\$15.6	0	\$1.91	0	\$77.4	5	13	5	40
Kenmore	24,050	15	\$56,878	15	\$5,290	11	\$5.3	8	\$2.9	10	\$0.93	4	\$16.8	15	37	3	81
Lake Forest Park	13,630	20	\$58,615	15	\$2,432	15	\$3.3	6	\$1.3	6	\$0.49	5	\$13.6	15	34	3	85
Maple Valley	28,640	15	\$43,324	15	\$4,316	15	\$4.1	8	\$4.0	10	\$1.05	3	\$19.0	20	17	5	91
Mercer island	25,790	15	\$95,368	11	\$15,160	0	\$13.9	8	\$4.6	8	\$0.95	4	\$48.1	15	23	5	66
Mill Creek	20,930	20	\$53,109	15	\$4,454	15	\$6.4	10	\$3.6	10	\$0.75	5	\$16.7	15	37	3	93
Milton	8,695	15	\$36,190	11	\$1,093	0	\$1.5	0	\$1.5	8	\$0.30	4	\$12.6	10	35	3	51
Monroe	19,900	20	\$29,664	11	\$2,885	15	\$3.3	6	\$5.5	6	\$0.80	4	\$29.2	20	29	5	87
Mountlake Terrace	21,980	15	\$39,711	15	\$3,566	15	\$4.8	8	\$3.5	10	\$0.87	4	\$31.5	20	42	3	90
Mukilteo	21,560	20	\$53,006	15	\$5,444	11	\$5.7	10	\$3.1	10	\$0.95	4	\$21.8	20	43	3	93
Newcastle	13,310	20	\$77,950	15	\$3,680	15	\$5.6	10	\$1.6	8	\$0.49	5	\$10.9	10	22	5	88
North Bend	7,685	15	\$51,763	15	\$1,713	7	\$1.9	0	\$2.7	10	\$0.28	4	\$15.6	15	3	5	71
Pacific	7,255	15	\$26,784	7	\$905	0	\$1.0	0	\$1.1	6	\$0.26	4	\$9.6	5	32	3	40
Redmond	73,910	0	\$66,031	15	\$25,806	0	\$28.2	0	\$38.8	0	\$2.76	0	\$185.2	0	20	5	20
Snohomish	10,260	20	\$36,717	11	\$1,676	7	\$1.3	0	\$4.8	8	\$0.40	5	\$14.1	15	37	3	69
Stanwood	7,980	15	\$34,244	11	\$1,045	0	\$1.7	0	\$2.4	10	\$0.28	4	\$8.0	0	69	0	40
Sumner	10,700	20	\$36,402	11	\$3,493	15	\$3.8	6	\$7.1	2	\$0.72	5	\$23.0	20	37	3	82
Tukwila	22,000	15	\$32,216	11	\$7,333	7	\$16.0	8	\$16.8	0	\$1.96	0	\$77.3	5	32	3	49
University Place	35,100	10	\$41,979	15	\$4,644	15	\$4.4	8	\$3.3	10	\$1.91	0	\$15.7	15	47	3	76
Woodinville	13,100	20	\$58,956	15	\$4,494	15	\$3.4	6	\$6.8	6	\$0.76	4	\$14.0	15	27	5	86

*Initial screening criteria: Washington municipalities within King, Pierce and Snohomish Counties and with populations between approximately 7,000 and 30,000.

CITY OF SNOQUALMIE, WA

Top Comparables

(Total Comparability Points of 80 or Greater, Plus Bellevue, Issaquah, North Bend and Redmond)

Municipality	Population	Max. Points	Income Per Capita	Max. Points	Total Assd. Value (millions)	Max. Points	General Fund Tax Levy (millions)	Max. Points	Sales Tax (millions)	Max. Points	State Dist. (millions)	Max. Points	Total Expenditures (millions)	Max. Points	Proximity Miles	Max. Points	Total Points
Snoqualmie	14,490	20	\$59,174	15	\$3,467	15	\$8.1	10	\$2.7	10	\$0.50	5	\$27.0	20	0	5	100
Mukilteo	21,560	20	\$53,006	15	\$5,444	11	\$5.7	10	\$3.1	10	\$0.95	4	\$21.8	20	43	3	93
Mill Creek	20,930	20	\$53,109	15	\$4,454	15	\$6.4	10	\$3.6	10	\$0.75	5	\$16.7	15	37	3	93
Maple Valley	28,640	15	\$43,324	15	\$4,316	15	\$4.1	8	\$4.0	10	\$1.05	3	\$19.0	20	17	5	91
Mountlake Terrace	21,980	15	\$39,711	15	\$3,566	15	\$4.8	8	\$3.5	10	\$0.87	4	\$31.5	20	42	3	90
Covington	20,890	20	\$41,927	15	\$2,854	15	\$2.9	2	\$5.3	8	\$0.85	4	\$18.1	20	21	5	89
Newcastle	13,310	20	\$77,950	15	\$3,680	15	\$5.6	10	\$1.6	8	\$0.49	5	\$10.9	10	22	5	88
Monroe	19,900	20	\$29,664	11	\$2,885	15	\$3.3	6	\$5.5	6	\$0.80	4	\$29.2	20	29	5	87
Arlington	20,690	20	\$36,540	11	\$3,007	15	\$4.3	8	\$6.4	6	\$1.10	3	\$31.4	20	58	3	86
Woodinville	13,100	20	\$58,956	15	\$4,494	15	\$3.4	6	\$6.8	6	\$0.76	4	\$14.0	15	27	5	86
Lake Forest Park	13,630	20	\$58,615	15	\$2,432	15	\$3.3	6	\$1.3	6	\$0.49	5	\$13.6	15	34	3	85
Bonney Lake	23,510	15	\$41,866	15	\$3,304	15	\$3.3	6	\$6.7	6	\$0.77	4	\$32.0	20	41	3	84
Enumclaw	12,830	20	\$40,819	15	\$1,674	7	\$2.2	0	\$3.6	10	\$0.46	5	\$23.6	20	30	5	82
Sumner	10,700	20	\$36,402	11	\$3,493	15	\$3.8	6	\$7.1	2	\$0.72	5	\$23.0	20	37	3	82
Gig Harbor	12,200	20	\$51,048	15	\$3,184	15	\$3.0	2	\$7.4	2	\$0.49	5	\$20.8	20	52	3	82
Kenmore	24,050	15	\$56,878	15	\$5,290	11	\$5.3	8	\$2.9	10	\$0.93	4	\$16.8	15	37	3	81
North Bend	7,685	15	\$51,763	15	\$1,713	7	\$1.9	0	\$2.7	10	\$0.28	4	\$15.6	15	3	5	71
Issaquah	40,640	5	\$68,492	15	\$11,966	0	\$9.6	10	\$15.6	0	\$1.91	0	\$77.4	5	13	5	40
Bellevue	152,600	0	\$71,633	15	\$68,090	0	\$61.3	0	\$67.2	0	\$10.03	0	\$430.8	0	23	5	20
Redmond	73,910	0	\$66,031	15	\$25,806	0	\$28.2	0	\$38.8	0	\$2.76	0	\$185.2	0	20	5	20

APPENDIX C

City Attorney				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue		132,078	210,981	
Bonney Lake	None - contract out services			
Covington		138,960	165,948	
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor		146,202	177,710	
Issaquah				
Kenmore	Contracted service			
Lake Forest Park	Contracted service			
Maple Valley	Contracted position			
Mill Creek				
Monroe	Contract out for this position			
Mountlake Terrace	Contracted			
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	Contracted City Attorney			
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond				
Sumner				185,952
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		171,276	190,296	190,296
Range Data				
Average		139,080.07	184,879.81	
50th Percentile		138,960.00	177,710.00	
60th Percentile		140,408.40	184,364.29	
65th Percentile		141,132.60	187,691.43	
70th Percentile		141,856.80	191,018.57	
75th Percentile		142,581.00	194,345.72	
80th Percentile		143,305.20	197,672.86	

City Clerk				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	City Clerk/Executive Assistant	78,113	100,989	
Bellevue				
Bonney Lake		85,884	107,328	
Covington	City Clerk/Executive Assistant	92,424	110,352	
Enumclaw		76,608	99,384	
Gig Harbor		92,451	112,375	
Issaquah		93,513	126,925	
Kenmore		81,312	112,188	
Lake Forest Park		81,660	108,864	
Maple Valley		103,391	130,823	
Mill Creek		74,796	98,424	
Monroe		81,792	105,708	
Mountlake Terrace		85,524	106,920	
Mukilteo		69,946	85,020	
Newcastle		88,713	113,344	
North Bend		88,620	111,900	
Redmond		99,528	134,328	
Sumner		85,884	107,328	
Woodinville		90,857	116,297	
Snoqualmie		101,856	113,172	101,856
Range Data				
Average		86,167.54	110,472.05	
50th Percentile		85,884.00	109,608.00	
60th Percentile		88,638.60	111,957.60	
65th Percentile		88,820.20	112,197.35	
70th Percentile		90,642.60	112,356.30	
75th Percentile		92,032.25	113,101.75	
80th Percentile		92,440.20	115,115.80	

Deputy City Clerk				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington		66,969	86,851	
Bellevue		74,678	103,046	
Bonney Lake	N/A			
Covington	Senior Deputy Clerk	77,592	92,652	
Enumclaw		57,000	73,932	
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah		77,227	104,860	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park		66,204	88,272	
Maple Valley		76,258	96,489	
Mill Creek		67,848	89,280	
Monroe				
Mountlake Terrace	Deputy City Clerk/Executive Assistant	63,264	79,080	
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	Records Specialist but not same as Deputy Clerk			
North Bend		71,064	86,460	
Redmond		70,704	95,460	
Sumner				
Woodinville	Executive Assistant/Deputy City Clerk	70,693	95,436	
Snoqualmie		76,536	85,044	
Range Data				
Average		69,958.40	90,984.84	
50th Percentile		70,698.50	90,966.00	
60th Percentile		70,920.00	94,322.40	
65th Percentile		71,606.11	95,439.60	
70th Percentile		73,593.83	95,452.80	
75th Percentile		75,073.03	95,717.25	
80th Percentile		75,942.01	96,283.20	

Communications Coordinator/PIO				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue	Communications Manager	86,657	119,578	
Bonney Lake	N/A			
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah	Communications Manager	93,513	126,925	
Kenmore	Communications Specialist	76,512	105,888	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Communications Specialist (no PIO duties)	80,927	102,398	
Mill Creek				
Monroe				
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	Communications Manager	91,155	111,941	
North Bend	Communications Manager	79,140	104,040	
Redmond				
Sumner	Communications Director	99,864	124,800	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		94,716	105,228	105,228
Range Data				
Average		86,823.98	113,652.81	
50th Percentile		86,657.22	111,941.00	
60th Percentile		89,355.89	116,523.01	
65th Percentile		90,705.22	118,814.02	
70th Percentile		91,626.53	120,622.15	
75th Percentile		92,333.82	122,188.85	
80th Percentile		93,041.11	123,755.54	

Communications Coordinator/PIO (Edited)				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue	Communications Manager	86,657	119,578	
Bonney Lake	N/A			
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah	Communications Manager	93,513	126,925	
Kenmore	Communications Specialist	76,512	105,888	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Communications Specialist (no PIO duties)	80,927	102,398	
Mill Creek				
Monroe				
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	Communications Manager	91,155	111,941	
North Bend	Communications Manager	79,140	104,040	
Redmond				
Sumner	Communications Director			
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		94,716	105,228	105,228
Range Data				
Average		84,650.64	111,794.94	
50th Percentile		83,792.11	108,914.50	
60th Percentile		86,657.22	111,941.00	
65th Percentile		87,781.67	113,850.17	
70th Percentile		88,906.11	115,759.35	
75th Percentile		90,030.56	117,668.52	
80th Percentile		91,155.00	119,577.69	

Management Analyst				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Executive Analyst	66,969	86,851	
Bellevue				
Bonney Lake	N/A			
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah		70,292	95,299	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe		74,448	96,216	
Mountlake Terrace		72,780	90,948	
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	N/A			
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond	Management Analyst	73,800	99,612	
Sumner				
Woodinville		79,805	107,738	
Snoqualmie		86,100	95,664	95,664
Range Data				
Average		73,015.65	96,110.62	
50th Percentile		73,290.00	95,757.36	
60th Percentile		73,800.00	96,216.00	
65th Percentile		73,962.00	97,065.00	
70th Percentile		74,124.00	97,914.00	
75th Percentile		74,286.00	98,763.00	
80th Percentile		74,448.00	99,612.00	

Management Analyst (Edited)				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Executive Analyst			
Bellevue				
Bonney Lake	N/A			
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah		70,292	95,299	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe		74,448	96,216	
Mountlake Terrace		72,780	90,948	
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	N/A			
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond	Management Analyst	73,800	99,612	
Sumner				
Woodinville		79,805	107,738	
Snoqualmie		86,100	95,664	95,664
Range Data				
Average		74,224.98	97,962.54	
50th Percentile		73,800.00	96,216.00	
60th Percentile		74,059.20	97,574.40	
65th Percentile		74,188.80	98,253.60	
70th Percentile		74,318.40	98,932.80	
75th Percentile		74,448.00	99,612.00	
80th Percentile		75,519.40	101,237.20	

Director of Finance and Human Resources				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Director of Finance	143,513	185,541	
Bellevue	Director, Finance & Asset Management	132,078	210,981	
Bonney Lake	Chief Financial Officer (not over HR)	148,056	185,952	
Covington	Finance Director	138,960	165,948	
Enumclaw	Finance Director (HR not in Finance)	106,068	137,628	
Gig Harbor	Finance Director	129,002	156,803	
Issaquah	Chief Financial Officer	150,566	204,362	
Kenmore	Finance & Administration Director	123,480	170,412	
Lake Forest Park	Finance Director	110,484	147,300	
Maple Valley	Finance/IT Director (no HR)	132,501	167,656	
Mill Creek	Finance Director	116,040	152,700	
Monroe	Finance Dtr. (HR Dtr sep, same range)	126,816	163,884	
Mountlake Terrace	Finance Director	133,944	157,584	
Mukilteo	Finance Director (just Finance not HR)	124,568	151,413	
Newcastle	Finance Director (only)	126,471	162,146	
North Bend	Finance Director	131,760	169,380	
Redmond	Director of Finance	143,700	201,168	
Sumner	Chief Financial Officer	128,832	160,992	
Woodinville	Finance Director	137,512	169,140	
Snoqualmie		153,840	170,928	170,928
Range Data				
Average		130,755.32	169,525.80	
50th Percentile		131,760.00	165,948.00	
60th Percentile		132,416.44	168,843.20	
65th Percentile		133,511.10	169,308.00	
70th Percentile		136,084.80	169,999.20	
75th Percentile		138,236.00	177,976.50	
80th Percentile		140,781.20	185,705.40	

Human Resources Manager				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	HR Director	130,170	168,291	
Bellevue	Human Resources Division Manager	116,668	161,050	
Bonney Lake		103,368	129,168	
Covington		103,848	123,984	
Enumclaw		83,736	108,648	
Gig Harbor	Human Resources Director	122,810	149,276	
Issaquah	Human Resources Director	136,907	185,764	
Kenmore		92,544	127,704	
Lake Forest Park	Human Resources Director	92,100	122,796	
Maple Valley	HR/Risk Manager Director	132,501	167,656	
Mill Creek		95,460	125,616	
Monroe				
Mountlake Terrace		81,372	101,712	
Mukilteo		96,171	116,896	
Newcastle	HR & Risk Management Dtr. No other HR emp	110,752	141,269	
North Bend	Administrative Services Director	114,840	156,840	
Redmond		106,980	144,420	
Sumner		99,864	124,800	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		102,204	113,556	
Range Data				
Average		107,064.13	138,581.76	
50th Percentile		103,848.00	129,168.00	
60th Percentile		109,243.20	143,159.60	
65th Percentile		112,387.20	146,362.40	
70th Percentile		115,205.54	150,788.80	
75th Percentile		116,667.68	156,840.00	
80th Percentile		121,581.54	160,207.69	

Human Resources Manager (Edited)				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	HR Director	130,170	168,291	
Bellevue	Human Resources Division Manager	116,668	161,050	
Bonney Lake		103,368	129,168	
Covington		103,848	123,984	
Enumclaw		83,736	108,648	
Gig Harbor	Human Resources Director	122,810	149,276	
Issaquah	Human Resources Director	136,907	185,764	
Kenmore		92,544	127,704	
Lake Forest Park	Human Resources Director	92,100	122,796	
Maple Valley	HR/Risk Manager Director	132,501	167,656	
Mill Creek		95,460	125,616	
Monroe				
Mountlake Terrace		81,372	101,712	
Mukilteo		96,171	116,896	
Newcastle	HR & Risk Management Dtr. No other HR empls	110,752	141,269	
North Bend	Administrative Services Director			
Redmond		106,980	144,420	
Sumner		99,864	124,800	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		102,204	113,556	
Range Data				
Average		106,578.14	137,440.62	
50th Percentile		103,608.00	128,436.00	
60th Percentile		106,980.00	141,269.00	
65th Percentile		109,809.00	143,632.25	
70th Percentile		113,709.84	146,848.00	
75th Percentile		118,203.26	152,219.40	
80th Percentile		122,810.00	161,049.61	

HR Analyst				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue		67,626	93,334	
Bonney Lake	HR Generalist	75,900	94,848	
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor		77,571	94,288	
Issaquah		70,292	95,299	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley		76,258	96,489	
Mill Creek				
Monroe	HR Coordinator	64,563	82,389	
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	No HR employees other than Director			
North Bend	Human Resources Assistant	69,840	90,840	
Redmond		75,156	101,472	
Sumner				
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		86,100	95,664	
Range Data				
Average		72,150.79	93,619.83	
50th Percentile		72,723.96	94,568.00	
60th Percentile		75,304.80	94,938.14	
65th Percentile		75,565.20	95,095.90	
70th Percentile		75,825.60	95,253.65	
75th Percentile		75,989.50	95,596.29	
80th Percentile		76,114.80	96,012.89	

Budget Manager				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue	Budget Division Manager	105,670	145,821	
Bonney Lake	N/A			
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah				
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe	Finance Manager	95,508	123,432	
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle				
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond	Financial Planning Manager	110,796	149,692	
Sumner				
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		102,204	113,556	113,556
Range Data				
Average		103,991.47	139,648.41	
50th Percentile		105,670.41	145,821.23	
60th Percentile		106,695.53	146,595.38	
65th Percentile		107,208.09	146,982.46	
70th Percentile		107,720.65	147,369.54	
75th Percentile		108,233.21	147,756.62	
80th Percentile		108,745.76	148,143.69	

Budget Analyst				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue		67,626	93,334	
Bonney Lake	N/A			
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah		70,292	95,299	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Senior Financial Analyst	80,927	102,398	
Mill Creek				
Monroe				
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle				
North Bend				
Redmond	N/A. This work mostly performed by Sr. Financial Analysts			
Sumner				
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		86,100	95,664	
Range Data				
Average		72,948.37	97,010.29	
50th Percentile		70,291.92	95,298.72	
60th Percentile		72,418.94	96,718.58	
65th Percentile		73,482.44	97,428.50	
70th Percentile		74,545.95	98,138.43	
75th Percentile		75,609.46	98,848.36	
80th Percentile		76,672.97	99,558.29	

Accountant				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Finance Accountant	78,113	100,989	
Bellevue				
Bonney Lake	Accounting Specialist I-III	51,833.16	74,660	
Covington	Accountant	75,336	89,952	
Enumclaw		70,104	90,948	
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah		70,292	95,299	
Kenmore		69,036	95,292	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley		70,828	89,619	
Mill Creek	Staff Accountant	74,796	98,424	
Monroe				
Mountlake Terrace		74,556	93,384	
Mukilteo	Staff Accountant	67,855	82,749	
Newcastle				
North Bend	Accounting Operations Manager	85,920	109,140	
Redmond		64,932	87,660	
Sumner				
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		73,584	87,756	87,756
Range Data				
Average		71,133.43	92,342.99	
50th Percentile		70,560.00	92,166.00	
60th Percentile		73,064.80	94,528.80	
65th Percentile		74,592.00	95,293.05	
70th Percentile		74,724.00	95,296.90	
75th Percentile		74,931.00	96,080.25	
80th Percentile		75,228.00	97,799.00	

Senior Account Clerk				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Payroll Finance Coordinator	56,904	74,247	
Bellevue	Financial Analyst	67,626	93,336	
Bonney Lake	Accounting Specialist III	57,430	74,660	
Covington	Senior Accounting Specialist	69,036	82,416	
Enumclaw	Accounting Tech III	61,164	74,412	
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah	Fiscal Specialist II	60,419	81,565	
Kenmore	Payroll & Benefits Coordinator	58,524	80,772	
Lake Forest Park	Utility & Payroll Analyst	61,500	81,996	
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek	Payroll Clerk	55,812	73,452	
Monroe	AP/AR	59,604	76,068	
Mountlake Terrace	Financial Services Technician	54,787	68,099	
Mukilteo	Payroll Coordinator	58,434	71,027	
Newcastle				
North Bend	Staff Accountant	71,076	86,484	
Redmond	Sr. Accounting Specialist	63,456	82,512	
Sumner	Finance Specialist-Payroll	69,912	87,360	
Woodinville	Accounting Specialist	62,621	84,538	
Snoqualmie		66,528	79,308	79,308
Range Data				
Average		61,769.08	79,559.02	
50th Percentile		60,791.64	81,168.60	
60th Percentile		61,500.00	81,996.00	
65th Percentile		62,340.75	82,311.00	
70th Percentile		63,038.50	82,464.00	
75th Percentile		64,498.55	83,018.50	
80th Percentile		67,626.20	84,538.00	

Account Clerk - Utility Billing				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Finance Technician I and II	47,656	67,947	
Bellevue	Account Representative-Utility Billing	58,271	80,391	
Bonney Lake	Accounting Specialist I-III	51,833	74,660	
Covington				
Enumclaw	Accounting Tech II	56,688	68,940	
Gig Harbor	Utility Billing Technician	59,243	74,108	
Issaquah	Fiscal Specialist I	54,943	74,172	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park	Accounting Clerk	50,592	67,452	
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe		59,604	76,068	
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	N/A-Utilities are via other organizations			
North Bend	Utilities Coordinator	62,916	76,548	
Redmond	Accounting Specialist	49,596	64,476	
Sumner	Finance Specialist - Utility Billing	69,912	87,360	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		56,640	67,536	61,836
Range Data				
Average		56,477.70	73,829.26	
50th Percentile		56,688.00	74,172.00	
60th Percentile		58,271.37	74,659.92	
65th Percentile		58,757.19	75,363.96	
70th Percentile		59,243.00	76,068.00	
75th Percentile		59,423.50	76,308.00	
80th Percentile		59,604.00	76,548.00	

Information Technology Director				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington		136,679	176,706	
Bellevue	Chief Information Officer	132,078	210,981	
Bonney Lake	Information Services Manager	111,480	137,280	
Covington	Information Technology Manager	103,848	123,984	
Enumclaw	Information Services Director	109,248	141,756	
Gig Harbor	Information Systems Manager	105,118	131,495	
Issaquah	Chief Information Officer	124,508	168,848	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park	Information Systems Manager	95,028	126,708	
Maple Valley	IT/IS Manager	111,576	141,179	
Mill Creek	Info. Systems & Technology Manager	90,912	119,640	
Monroe	HR Dtr also serves as IT Director	126,816	163,884	
Mountlake Terrace	IT Systems Administrator	103,848	122,172	
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle				
North Bend	N/A - in process of creating a JD & hiring for IT			
Redmond	Director Technology & Information Svcs.	143,700	201,168	
Sumner	Information Systems Manager	103,368	129,168	
Woodinville	Information Systems Manager	97,354	124,614	
Snoqualmie		136,596	151,752	151,752
Range Data				
Average		113,037.43	147,972.22	
50th Percentile		109,248.00	137,280.00	
60th Percentile		111,518.40	141,409.80	
65th Percentile		112,869.23	143,968.80	
70th Percentile		121,921.82	159,458.40	
75th Percentile		125,662.14	166,365.96	
80th Percentile		127,868.44	170,419.54	

Information Technology Director (Edited)				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington		136,679	176,706	
Bellevue	Chief Information Officer	132,078	210,981	
Bonney Lake	Information Services Manager			
Covington	Information Technology Manager			
Enumclaw	Information Services Director	109,248	141,756	
Gig Harbor	Information Systems Manager			
Issaquah	Chief Information Officer	124,508	168,848	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park	Information Systems Manager			
Maple Valley	IT/IS Manager			
Mill Creek	Info. Systems & Technology Manager			
Monroe	HR Dtr also serves as IT Director	126,816	163,884	
Mountlake Terrace	IT Systems Administrator			
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle				
North Bend	N/A - in process of creating a JD & hiring for IT			
Redmond	Director Technology & Information Svcs.	143,700	201,168	
Sumner	Information Systems Manager			
Woodinville	Information Systems Manager			
Snoqualmie		136,596	151,752	151,752
Range Data				
Average		128,838.25	177,223.89	
50th Percentile		129,447.11	172,776.96	
60th Percentile		132,078.22	176,706.00	
65th Percentile		133,228.42	182,821.50	
70th Percentile		134,378.61	188,937.00	
75th Percentile		135,528.81	195,052.50	
80th Percentile		136,679.00	201,168.00	

GIS Analyst				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	GIS Analyst I and II	60,370	91,315	
Bellevue	GIS Analyst	67,626	93,334	
Bonney Lake		70,512	91,663	
Covington	GIS Coordinator	84,648	101,076	
Enumclaw	GIS Administrator	81,276	105,444	
Gig Harbor	GIS Coordinator	71,277	89,162	
Issaquah	GIS Coordinator	85,002	115,367	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	GIS Manager	80,927	102,398	
Mill Creek				
Monroe	GIS/CAD Specialist	70,512	91,128	
Mountlake Terrace	GIS Specialist	62,754	78,437	
Mukilteo	GIS Coordinator	70,605	85,851	
Newcastle				
North Bend		73,752	92,664	
Redmond		73,020	98,568	
Sumner	AutoCAD/GIS Specialist	75,900	94,848	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		70,116	83,592	83,592
Range Data				
Average		73,441.49	95,089.68	
50th Percentile		72,148.50	92,999.08	
60th Percentile		73,605.60	94,545.23	
65th Percentile		74,718.60	96,522.00	
70th Percentile		76,402.70	98,818.80	
75th Percentile		79,670.25	100,449.00	
80th Percentile		81,066.60	101,604.80	

IT Systems Support				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Systems Administrator I	70,025	99,839	
Bellevue	IT Network/Systems Administrator II	71,054	98,047	
Bonney Lake	N/A			
Covington				
Enumclaw	Sr. Information Services Tech	72,216	93,684	
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah	Network Systems Analyst	77,227	104,860	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Systems Administrator	80,927	102,398	
Mill Creek				
Monroe				
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	Network Engineer	67,184	81,662	
Newcastle				
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond	Technical Systems Coordinator	78,036	105,360	
Sumner	Information Systems Administrator	83,892	104,832	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		70,116	83,592	83,592
Range Data				
Average		75,070.08	98,835.29	
50th Percentile		74,721.36	101,118.50	
60th Percentile		77,388.58	102,884.80	
65th Percentile		77,671.82	103,736.70	
70th Percentile		77,955.07	104,588.60	
75th Percentile		78,758.75	104,839.02	
80th Percentile		79,770.60	104,848.85	

Service Desk Technician				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	IT Technician	56,904	74,247	
Bellevue	IT End User Support I	61,217	84,497	
Bonney Lake	PC/Network Specialist	57,430	74,654	
Covington				
Enumclaw	Information Services Tech	60,480	78,468	
Gig Harbor	Information Systems Assistant	63,231	79,097	
Issaquah	PC Technician II	60,419	81,565	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe	IT Desktop Support	62,436	80,688	
Mountlake Terrace	Computer Support Technician	55,869	69,826	
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle				
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond	Systems Support Specialist	69,396	93,696	
Sumner	Information Systems Technician	75,900	94,848	
Woodinville	Information Services Technician	58,937	79,565	
Snoqualmie		60,396	72,048	72,048
Range Data				
Average		62,019.89	81,013.71	
50th Percentile		60,480.00	79,565.00	
60th Percentile		61,217.06	80,688.00	
65th Percentile		61,826.53	81,126.60	
70th Percentile		62,436.00	81,565.20	
75th Percentile		62,833.50	83,031.13	
80th Percentile		63,231.00	84,497.05	

Planning Manager				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington		91,111	117,793	
Bellevue		100,565	138,752	
Bonney Lake	Planning & Building Supervisor	103,368	129,168	
Covington	Principal Planner	97,968	116,952	
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor	Principal Planner	93,331	116,750	
Issaquah		113,161	153,508	
Kenmore	Principal Planner	88,980	122,784	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Community Development Manager	111,576	141,179	
Mill Creek				
Monroe		95,508	123,432	
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo		91,494	111,211	
Newcastle				
North Bend	Comm. & Economic Development Dtr.	131,760	169,380	
Redmond		111,288	150,240	
Sumner		90,960	113,676	
Woodinville		111,776	143,074	
Snoqualmie		102,204	113,556	
Range Data				
Average		102,346.09	131,992.72	
50th Percentile		99,266.26	126,300.00	
60th Percentile		102,807.30	136,834.83	
65th Percentile		106,932.00	139,843.90	
70th Percentile		111,316.80	141,368.50	
75th Percentile		111,504.00	142,600.25	
80th Percentile		111,656.00	145,940.40	

Planning Manager (Edited)				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington		91,111	117,793	
Bellevue		100,565	138,752	
Bonney Lake	Planning & Building Supervisor	103,368	129,168	
Covington	Principal Planner	97,968	116,952	
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor	Principal Planner	93,331	116,750	
Issaquah		113,161	153,508	
Kenmore	Principal Planner	88,980	122,784	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Community Development Manager			
Mill Creek				
Monroe		95,508	123,432	
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo		91,494	111,211	
Newcastle				
North Bend	Comm. & Economic Development Dtr.			
Redmond		111,288	150,240	
Sumner		90,960	113,676	
Woodinville		111,776	143,074	
Snoqualmie		102,204	113,556	
Range Data				
Average		99,125.77	128,111.60	
50th Percentile		96,738.00	123,108.00	
60th Percentile		99,525.91	126,873.60	
65th Percentile		100,985.03	130,605.53	
70th Percentile		102,526.95	135,876.48	
75th Percentile		105,348.00	139,832.16	
80th Percentile		109,704.00	142,209.51	

Senior Planner				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Planner III	78,814	112,370	
Bellevue		86,657	119,578	
Bonney Lake	N/A			
Covington				
Enumclaw		83,736	108,648	
Gig Harbor		87,502	109,458	
Issaquah		93,513	126,925	
Kenmore		80,316	110,832	
Lake Forest Park		77,916	103,896	
Maple Valley		93,747	118,620	
Mill Creek		74,796	98,424	
Monroe		81,792	105,708	
Mountlake Terrace		92,364	115,476	
Mukilteo		77,230	93,874	
Newcastle		83,718	107,095	
North Bend		87,480	106,428	
Redmond		87,888	118,644	
Sumner		85,884	107,328	
Woodinville		90,857	116,297	
Snoqualmie		93,516	111,516	111,516
Range Data				
Average		84,953.52	110,564.74	
50th Percentile		85,884.00	109,458.00	
60th Percentile		87,150.89	111,754.80	
65th Percentile		87,488.80	113,612.40	
70th Percentile		87,579.20	115,640.20	
75th Percentile		87,888.00	116,297.00	
80th Percentile		90,263.20	118,155.40	

Associate Planner				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Planner II	62,216	88,706	
Bellevue		74,678	103,046	
Bonney Lake		74,224	96,488	
Covington				
Enumclaw		68,088	88,344	
Gig Harbor		70,012	87,580	
Issaquah		77,227	104,860	
Kenmore		72,612	100,212	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley		70,828	89,619	
Mill Creek		61,536	80,976	
Monroe		67,512	87,252	
Mountlake Terrace		68,578	90,938	
Mukilteo		67,855	82,479	
Newcastle	Unfunded-prev. Assoc. promoted to Sr.	70,365	89,507	
North Bend		74,028	90,072	
Redmond	Planner	77,208	104,232	
Sumner		79,896	99,840	
Woodinville		75,111	101,400	
Snoqualmie		78,240	93,288	89,244
Range Data				
Average		71,292.56	93,267.68	
50th Percentile		70,828.00	90,072.00	
60th Percentile		73,461.60	94,267.72	
65th Percentile		74,106.48	97,828.68	
70th Percentile		74,314.97	99,914.40	
75th Percentile		74,678.04	100,212.00	
80th Percentile		75,024.41	101,162.40	

Assistant Planner				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue		64,371	88,782	
Bonney Lake		63,636	82,726	
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor		60,762	76,008	
Issaquah		70,292	95,299	
Kenmore		61,140	84,372	
Lake Forest Park		59,004	78,672	
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe				
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo		65,199	79,250	
Newcastle		65,448	84,770	
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond		66,432	89,700	
Sumner		67,908	84,864	
Woodinville		62,621	84,538	
Snoqualmie		70,260	83,820	
Range Data				
Average		64,255.73	84,452.80	
50th Percentile		64,371.29	84,538.00	
60th Percentile		65,199.00	84,770.00	
65th Percentile		65,323.50	84,817.00	
70th Percentile		65,448.00	84,864.00	
75th Percentile		65,940.00	86,822.85	
80th Percentile		66,432.00	88,781.70	

Community Development Liaison				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Community Development Liaison	78,769	102,776	
Bellevue	Community Relations Coordinator	74,678	103,046	
Bonney Lake	Recreation & Special Events Manager	83,892	104,852	
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah				
Kenmore	Volunteer & Events Supervisor	61,140	84,372	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Community Resource Coordinator	76,258	96,489	
Mill Creek				
Monroe	Events & Tourism Coordinator	59,604	76,068	
Mountlake Terrace	Community Relations Specialist	50,523	63,107	
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	Events & Recreation Coordinator	63,726	83,401	
North Bend	Economic Development Manager	89,460	112,380	
Redmond				
Sumner				
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		76,536	85,044	85,044
Range Data				
Average		70,894.47	91,832.36	
50th Percentile		74,678.04	96,489.00	
60th Percentile		75,942.01	101,518.60	
65th Percentile		76,760.20	102,830.01	
70th Percentile		77,764.60	102,938.02	
75th Percentile		78,769.00	103,046.04	
80th Percentile		80,818.20	103,768.42	

Community Development Liaison (Edited)					
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual	Salary:
Arlington	Community Development Liaison	78,769	102,776		
Bellevue	Community Relations Coordinator	74,678	103,046		
Bonney Lake	Recreation & Special Events Manager				
Covington					
Enumclaw					
Gig Harbor					
Issaquah					
Kenmore	Volunteer & Events Supervisor	61,140	84,372		
Lake Forest Park					
Maple Valley	Community Resource Coordinator	76,258	96,489		
Mill Creek					
Monroe	Events & Tourism Coordinator	59,604	76,068		
Mountlake Terrace	Community Relations Specialist	50,523	63,107		
Mukilteo	N/A				
Newcastle	Events & Recreation Coordinator	63,726	83,401		
North Bend	Economic Development Manager				
Redmond					
Sumner					
Woodinville					
Snoqualmie		76,536	85,044		85,044
Range Data					
Average		66,385.46	87,037.03		
50th Percentile		63,726.00	84,372.00		
60th Percentile		70,297.22	91,642.20		
65th Percentile		73,582.84	95,277.30		
70th Percentile		74,994.03	97,746.40		
75th Percentile		75,468.02	99,632.50		
80th Percentile		75,942.01	101,518.60		

Building Inspector				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Building Inspector/Plans Examiner	60,370	78,769	
Bellevue	Inspector	90,041	99,387	
Bonney Lake	Building Inspector I	63,634	82,726	
Covington	Plans Examiner/Building Inspector	89,724	107,136	
Enumclaw	Building Official	83,736	108,648	
Gig Harbor	Building Inspector/Plans Reviewer	68,308	85,449	
Issaquah	Building Inspector	66,434	89,685	
Kenmore	Building Inspector/Plans Examiner	75,768	104,568	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley		70,828	89,619	
Mill Creek				
Monroe		70,512	91,128	
Mountlake Terrace		66,560	83,242	
Mukilteo		65,856	80,048	
Newcastle	Building Inspector/Code Enforcement	73,027	89,969	
North Bend		74,820	91,032	
Redmond		75,096	97,608	
Sumner	Building Fire Safety Inspector	79,896	99,840	
Woodinville	Building Inspector II	75,111	101,400	
Snoqualmie		74,616	88,980	
Range Data				
Average		73,513.01	92,956.12	
50th Percentile		73,027.00	91,032.00	
60th Percentile		74,985.60	95,016.00	
65th Percentile		75,102.00	98,319.60	
70th Percentile		75,242.40	99,477.61	
75th Percentile		75,768.00	99,840.00	
80th Percentile		79,070.40	101,088.00	

Permit Technician				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Permit Technician I and II	52,076	72,085	
Bellevue	Permit Processing Technician	58,271	80,391	
Bonney Lake	Permit Technician I and II	51,883	74,660	
Covington	Building Permit Specialist	59,676	71,256	
Enumclaw	Permit Specialist	58,716	76,188	
Gig Harbor	Permit Coordinator	60,762	76,008	
Issaquah		60,419	81,565	
Kenmore	Permit Coordinator	58,524	80,772	
Lake Forest Park		53,424	71,220	
Maple Valley		76,258	96,489	
Mill Creek				
Monroe		61,812	79,872	
Mountlake Terrace		55,869	69,826	
Mukilteo	Permit Service Assistant (cert. not req'd)	51,841	63,013	
Newcastle	Development Permit Coordinator	63,790	79,848	
North Bend		64,104	78,000	
Redmond		60,840	82,128	
Sumner	Permit Specialist	61,920	77,376	
Woodinville	Permit Technician II	58,937	79,565	
Snoqualmie		59,772	71,268	71,268
Range Data				
Average		59,395.70	77,236.76	
50th Percentile		59,306.50	77,688.00	
60th Percentile		60,487.82	79,621.60	
65th Percentile		60,765.90	79,849.20	
70th Percentile		60,832.20	79,869.60	
75th Percentile		61,569.00	80,261.18	
80th Percentile		61,876.80	80,619.56	

Deputy Fire Chief				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue		122,615	169,208	
Bonney Lake	City does not have FD			
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah				
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe	Fire Dept is not part of the City anymore			
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	N/A - contract through Bellevue Fire			
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond		139,500	188,316	
Sumner				
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		123,576	137,304	137,304
Range Data				
Average		131,057.32	178,762.16	
50th Percentile		131,057.32	178,762.16	
60th Percentile		132,745.86	180,672.92	
65th Percentile		133,590.12	181,628.31	
70th Percentile		134,434.39	182,583.69	
75th Percentile		135,278.66	183,539.08	
80th Percentile		136,122.93	184,494.46	

Administrative Assistant II - Fire				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue	Senior Administrative Assistant	61,217	84,497	
Bonney Lake	City does not have FD			
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah				
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Administrative Assistant III-Police	76,258	96,489	
Mill Creek				
Monroe	Fire Dept is not part of the City anymore			
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	Senior Dept. Assistant	54,497	66,241	
Newcastle	N/A			
North Bend	Admin. Assistant - for City Hall staff	55,032	66,948	
Redmond				
Sumner				
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		59,772	71,268	35,634
Range Data				
Average		61,751.02	78,543.76	
50th Percentile		58,124.53	75,722.53	
60th Percentile		59,980.05	80,987.24	
65th Percentile		60,907.81	83,619.60	
70th Percentile		62,721.15	85,696.25	
75th Percentile		64,977.30	87,495.04	
80th Percentile		67,233.44	89,293.83	

Police Chief				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington		150,043	193,983	
Bellevue		132,078	210,981	
Bonney Lake		155,136	190,944	
Covington				
Enumclaw		119,364	154,872	
Gig Harbor		137,602	167,256	
Issaquah		150,566	204,362	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park		121,836	160,332	
Maple Valley	Contracted position			
Mill Creek				
Monroe		139,812	180,684	
Mountlake Terrace		160,344	170,892	
Mukilteo		127,067	154,451	
Newcastle	N/A - contract through KCSO			
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond		149,040	208,656	
Sumner				190,944
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		153,840	170,928	170,928
Range Data				
Average		140,262.55	181,583.01	
50th Percentile		139,812.00	180,684.00	
60th Percentile		149,040.00	190,944.00	
65th Percentile		149,541.50	192,463.50	
70th Percentile		150,043.00	193,983.00	
75th Percentile		150,304.40	199,172.34	
80th Percentile		150,565.80	204,361.68	

Police Captain				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Deputy Police Chief	130,170	168,291	
Bellevue	Police Major	147,477	154,844	
Bonney Lake	Assistant Police Chief	148,884	175,968	
Covington				
Enumclaw	Police Commander	109,248	141,756	
Gig Harbor	Police Lieutenant	122,810	149,276	
Issaquah	Police Commander	126,268	171,234	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe	Deputy Chief	126,816	163,884	
Mountlake Terrace	Police Commander	133,752	143,844	
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	N/A - contract through KCSO			
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond		157,680	173,472	
Sumner	Deputy Chief (also Lt. at \$85608-\$93120)	140,808	175,968	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		130,080	144,528	137,304
Range Data				
Average		134,391.27	161,853.69	
50th Percentile		131,961.00	166,087.50	
60th Percentile		136,574.40	169,468.15	
65th Percentile		139,749.60	170,792.45	
70th Percentile		142,808.70	171,905.32	
75th Percentile		145,809.75	172,912.47	
80th Percentile		147,758.40	173,971.20	

Police Captain (Edited)				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Deputy Police Chief			
Bellevue	Police Major	147,477	154,844	
Bonney Lake	Assistant Police Chief	148,884	175,968	
Covington				
Enumclaw	Police Commander	109,248	141,756	
Gig Harbor	Police Lieutenant	122,810	149,276	
Issaquah	Police Commander	126,268	171,234	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe	Deputy Chief			
Mountlake Terrace	Police Commander	133,752	143,844	
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	N/A - contract through KCSO			
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond		157,680	173,472	
Sumner	Deputy Chief (also Lt. at \$85608-\$93120)			
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		130,080	144,528	
Range Data				
Average		135,159.82	158,627.70	
50th Percentile		133,752.00	154,844.00	
60th Percentile		141,987.00	164,677.93	
65th Percentile		146,104.50	169,594.89	
70th Percentile		147,758.40	171,681.50	
75th Percentile		148,180.50	172,352.94	
80th Percentile		148,602.60	173,024.38	

Police Support Officer				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington		56,904	74,247	
Bellevue		57,522	73,203	
Bonney Lake	Community Service Officer	67,056	78,072	
Covington				
Enumclaw				
Gig Harbor	Community Services Officer	60,222	75,334	
Issaquah				
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park	Support Services Officer	56,508	68,712	
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe				
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	Support Services Technician	54,174	65,849	
Newcastle	N/A - contract through KCSO			
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond				
Sumner	Community Service officer	60,132	73,596	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		68,148	82,812	75,156
Range Data				
Average		58,931.08	72,716.11	
50th Percentile		57,521.54	73,596.00	
60th Percentile		59,087.82	73,986.60	
65th Percentile		59,870.95	74,181.90	
70th Percentile		60,150.00	74,464.40	
75th Percentile		60,177.00	74,790.50	
80th Percentile		60,204.00	75,116.60	

Evidence/Records Technician				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Police Services Technician II	55,247	72,085	
Bellevue	Police Property Evidence Technician	56,917	72,630	
Bonney Lake	Records Clerk	55,488	66,072	
Covington				
Enumclaw	Evidence Custodian	57,696	73,620	
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah	Evidence Technician	52,000	83,200	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek	Police Support Services Technician	53,160	69,948	
Monroe		61,812	79,872	
Mountlake Terrace	Property Room Technician	58,906	73,570	
Mukilteo		48,555	59,019	
Newcastle	N/A - contract through KCSO			
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond	Prop./Evidence Tech (no records)	59,748	77,640	
Sumner				
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		59,772	71,268	68,208
Range Data				
Average		55,952.85	72,765.52	
50th Percentile		56,202.47	73,099.60	
60th Percentile		57,228.56	73,589.76	
65th Percentile		57,579.14	73,612.44	
70th Percentile		58,058.88	74,826.00	
75th Percentile		58,603.20	76,635.00	
80th Percentile		59,074.08	78,086.40	

Director of Parks & Public Works				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington		143,513	185,541	
Bellevue	Dtr. Transportation or Dtr. Utilities	132,078	210,981	
Bonney Lake	Public Svc Dtr. Also administrator for Plar	148,056	185,952	
Covington				
Enumclaw	Public Works Director	112,524	146,004	
Gig Harbor	Public Works Director	129,002	156,803	
Issaquah	PW Director	150,566	204,362	
Kenmore	Public Works Director	123,480	170,412	
Lake Forest Park	Public Works Director	124,464	160,248	
Maple Valley	PW/Comm Dev Dtr. (Parks is separate)	132,501	167,656	
Mill Creek	Director of Public Works & Dev. Services	116,040	152,700	
Monroe	PW Dtr. Parks Dtr is \$126816-163884	133,152	172,080	
Mountlake Terrace	Public Works Director	133,944	157,584	
Mukilteo	Public Works Director (incl. Parks maint.)	124,568	151,413	
Newcastle	PW Dtr.-CCUD provides Water/Sewer	133,356	173,443	
North Bend	PW Director	144,300	178,680	
Redmond	Parks Director (PW Dtr is separate job)	143,700	201,168	
Sumner	Public Works Director			185,952
Woodinville	Public Works Director	137,512	169,140	
Snoqualmie		153,840	170,928	170,928
Range Data				
Average		133,103.30	173,186.30	
50th Percentile		133,152.00	170,412.00	
60th Percentile		133,708.80	172,897.80	
65th Percentile		135,371.20	175,537.80	
70th Percentile		138,712.20	180,052.20	
75th Percentile		143,513.00	185,541.00	
80th Percentile		143,662.60	185,869.80	

Deputy Director of Parks & Public Works/City Engineer				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Deputy Public Works Director	123,913	160,201	
Bellevue	DD-Utilities; or Parks/Comm Svcs; or Trar	122,615	169,208	
Bonney Lake	City Engineer	128,832	160,992	
Covington	City Engineer	113,280	135,252	
Enumclaw	Assistant Public Works Director	97,068	125,964	
Gig Harbor	City Engineer	105,118	131,495	
Issaquah	Engineering Manager	124,508	168,848	
Kenmore	City Engineer	118,500	163,548	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Dep. Dtr. Parks & Rec. (no PW duties)	111,576	141,179	
Mill Creek	City Engineer	90,912	119,640	
Monroe	City Engineer	108,396	140,088	
Mountlake Terrace	City Engineer	124,416	133,812	
Mukilteo	City Engineer	116,180	141,218	
Newcastle	N/A - PW Director is City Engineer			
North Bend	Deputy PW Director	114,840	156,840	
Redmond	Deputy Dtr-Parks (PW is separate)	116,568	157,356	
Sumner	City Engineer	128,832	160,992	
Woodinville	Assistant Public Works Director	119,770	147,316	
Snoqualmie		112,044	124,488	137,304
Range Data				
Average		115,607.29	147,879.37	
50th Percentile		116,568.00	147,316.00	
60th Percentile		119,262.00	157,149.60	
65th Percentile		120,907.86	158,494.00	
70th Percentile		122,874.31	160,359.20	
75th Percentile		123,913.00	160,992.00	
80th Percentile		124,315.40	160,992.00	

Project Engineer				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Civil Engineer II	78,814	112,370	
Bellevue	Senior Engineer	95,673	132,057	
Bonney Lake	Assistant City Engineer	103,368	129,168	
Covington				
Enumclaw	City Engineer			
Gig Harbor		87,778	109,803	
Issaquah	Senior Engineer	102,864	139,533	
Kenmore	Senior Engineer	88,980	122,784	
Lake Forest Park	Senior Project Manager	87,384	115,236	
Maple Valley	Senior Project Engineer	93,747	118,620	
Mill Creek		74,676	98,424	
Monroe	Engineering Services Manager	104,340	134,844	
Mountlake Terrace	Civil Engineer II	77,230	93,874	
Mukilteo	Capital Project Engineer	90,596	110,121	
Newcastle	Assistant City Engineer	90,123	114,279	
North Bend	City Engineer			
Redmond				
Sumner	Public Works Project Manager	103,368	129,168	
Woodinville	Engineer II	97,354	124,614	
Snoqualmie	Actual average of 3 incumbents	96,312	114,852	109,896
Range Data				
Average		91,752.97	118,993.01	
50th Percentile		90,596.00	118,620.00	
60th Percentile		94,517.34	123,516.00	
65th Percentile		95,840.97	125,069.40	
70th Percentile		97,017.77	128,257.20	
75th Percentile		100,108.88	129,168.00	
80th Percentile		102,964.61	129,745.75	

Project Engineer (Edited)				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Civil Engineer II	78,814	112,370	
Bellevue	Senior Engineer	95,673	132,057	
Bonney Lake	Assistant City Engineer	103,368	129,168	
Covington				
Enumclaw	City Engineer			
Gig Harbor		87,778	109,803	
Issaquah	Senior Engineer	102,864	139,533	
Kenmore	Senior Engineer	88,980	122,784	
Lake Forest Park	Senior Project Manager	87,384	115,236	
Maple Valley	Senior Project Engineer	93,747	118,620	
Mill Creek		74,676	98,424	
Monroe	Engineering Services Manager	104,340	134,844	
Mountlake Terrace	Civil Engineer II	77,230	93,874	
Mukilteo	Capital Project Engineer	90,596	110,121	
Newcastle	Assistant City Engineer	90,123	114,279	
North Bend	City Engineer			
Redmond				
Sumner	Public Works Project Manager	103,368	129,168	
Woodinville	Engineer II	97,354	124,614	
Snoqualmie	Actual average of 3 incumbents	96,312	114,852	109,896
Range Data				
Average		91,752.97	118,993.01	
50th Percentile		90,596.00	118,620.00	
60th Percentile		94,517.34	123,516.00	
65th Percentile		95,840.97	125,069.40	
70th Percentile		97,017.77	128,257.20	
75th Percentile		100,108.88	129,168.00	
80th Percentile		102,964.61	129,745.75	

Administrative Assistant - PW				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Administrative Specialist II	52,076	72,085	
Bellevue	Administrative Assistant	58,271	80,391	
Bonney Lake	N/A			
Covington	Office Technician II/Receptionist	54,708	65,316	
Enumclaw	PW Administrative Manager	66,084	85,740	
Gig Harbor	Public Works Assistant	57,610	72,066	
Issaquah	Administrative Specialist	49,916	67,385	
Kenmore	Administrative Specialist	58,524	80,772	
Lake Forest Park	Public Works Administrative Assistant	52,824	70,416	
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe		61,812	79,872	
Mountlake Terrace	Administrative Assistant	52,021	65,000	
Mukilteo	Senior Dept. Assistant	54,497	66,241	
Newcastle	N/A - City only has one Admin. Asst. (Receptionist) for entire city			
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond	Admin. Asst. Job is same across depts.	52,859	71,364	
Sumner	Public Works Specialist	58,824	73,512	
Woodinville	Senior Administrative Assistant - PW	62,621	84,538	
Snoqualmie		56,640	67,536	67,536
Range Data				
Average		56,617.66	73,906.99	
50th Percentile		56,159.00	72,075.50	
60th Percentile		58,139.10	73,226.60	
65th Percentile		58,385.05	76,374.00	
70th Percentile		58,554.00	79,923.89	
75th Percentile		58,749.00	80,261.18	
80th Percentile		60,019.20	80,543.35	

Parks/Street Maintenance Superintendent				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Maintenance & Operations Manager	98,400	127,217	
Bellevue	Transportation Superintendent	86,657	119,578	
Bonney Lake	Public Works Superintendent	128,832	160,992	
Covington				
Enumclaw	Operations Manager	83,736	108,648	
Gig Harbor	Public Works Superintendent	89,874	112,426	
Issaquah	PW Streets Supervisor	85,002	115,367	
Kenmore	Streets & Surface Water Maint. Supv.	69,648	96,108	
Lake Forest Park	Public Works Superintendent	70,800	94,392	
Maple Valley	Infrastructure Maintenance Manager	93,747	118,620	
Mill Creek				
Monroe	Parks Supervisor	80,316	107,616	
Mountlake Terrace	PW Supervisor (Streets/Stormwater)	74,556	93,384	
Mukilteo	Public Works Superintendent	90,596	110,121	
Newcastle	Infrastructure Maintenance Manager	84,340	108,768	
North Bend	Senior Lead Technician	82,257	100,079	
Redmond				
Sumner	Public Works Manager	91,872	114,816	
Woodinville	Maintenance Supervisor	84,794	114,471	
Snoqualmie		81,336	96,996	
Range Data				
Average		87,214.21	112,662.67	
50th Percentile		84,897.88	111,273.50	
60th Percentile		86,657.22	114,471.00	
65th Percentile		89,069.81	114,729.75	
70th Percentile		90,235.00	115,091.64	
75th Percentile		90,915.00	116,180.46	
80th Percentile		91,872.00	118,620.00	

Parks Lead Worker				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Maintenance & Operations Crew Chief	65,968	86,073	
Bellevue	Crew Leader	73,139	91,858	
Bonney Lake	Parks & Forestry Lead	70,512	92,695	
Covington				
Enumclaw	Parks Maintenance Worker II	61,752	72,924	
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah	Parks Operations Lead	66,434	89,685	
Kenmore	Parks Lead Maintenance Worker	64,536	89,052	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Parks Manager	88,054	111,416	
Mill Creek				
Monroe		68,820	87,840	
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo		67,173	81,558	
Newcastle	N/A - All Maintenance Technician are at the same range			
North Bend		73,629	89,581	
Redmond	Lead Maintenance Worker	74,688	100,824	
Sumner	Parks Field Supervisor	85,608	93,120	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		72,360	86,304	82,980
Range Data				
Average		71,692.79	90,552.21	
50th Percentile		69,666.18	89,633.28	
60th Percentile		72,088.06	90,989.06	
65th Percentile		73,212.14	91,983.67	
70th Percentile		73,482.03	92,443.76	
75th Percentile		73,893.93	92,801.04	
80th Percentile		74,476.25	93,034.94	

Parks Maintenance Worker				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue	Skilled Worker	60,804	76,417	
Bonney Lake	Maintenance Worker I	49,241	65,043	
Covington				
Enumclaw	Parks Worker I	53,388	64,944	
Gig Harbor				
Issaquah	Park Operations Worker	69,419	81,565	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Parks Maintenance Worker I	54,627	69,199	
Mill Creek				
Monroe		60,780	77,568	
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	Maintenance Worker II (CDL req'd)	58,781	68,926	
Newcastle	Maintenance Tech. (PW, Streets, SWM)	61,818	77,010	
North Bend		62,484	76,021	
Redmond	Maintenance Technician	58,488	87,744	
Sumner				
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie	Actual average of 5 incumbents	66,528	79,308	79,308
Range Data				
Average		58,982.96	74,443.74	
50th Percentile		59,780.50	76,219.08	
60th Percentile		60,789.41	76,654.03	
65th Percentile		60,800.00	76,921.01	
70th Percentile		61,107.87	77,177.40	
75th Percentile		61,564.38	77,428.50	
80th Percentile		61,951.25	78,367.40	

Maintenance Tech II - Streets				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Maintenance Worker II	60,370	78,769	
Bellevue	Skilled Worker	60,804	76,417	
Bonney Lake	Maintenance Worker II	57,430	75,691	
Covington	Maintenance Worker II-IV	65,148	95,352	
Enumclaw	Street Worker II	66,168	78,156	
Gig Harbor	Maintenance Technician	57,178	76,251	
Issaquah	PW Maintenance Worker III	60,658	81,887	
Kenmore	Maintenance Worker	54,960	75,840	
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	Public Works Maintenance Worker II	62,310	78,842	
Mill Creek	Maintenance Worker	55,812	73,452	
Monroe		60,780	77,568	
Mountlake Terrace	Maintenance Worker II	61,672	74,090	
Mukilteo	Maintenance Worker II	58,781	68,926	
Newcastle	Maintenance Tech. (PW, Streets, SWM)	61,818	77,010	
North Bend	N/A			
Redmond				
Sumner	Public Works Operator II	72,264	80,304	
Woodinville	Maintenance Worker II	49,710	71,638	
Snoqualmie		66,528	79,308	79,308
Range Data				
Average		60,366.37	77,512.04	
50th Percentile		60,718.92	76,713.36	
60th Percentile		60,803.53	77,568.00	
65th Percentile		61,454.88	78,009.00	
70th Percentile		61,745.00	78,462.50	
75th Percentile		61,941.00	78,787.25	
80th Percentile		62,310.00	78,842.00	

Operator II - Wastewater				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington	Wastewater Treatment Plan Operator II	62,181	81,132	
Bellevue	Skilled Worker	60,804	76,417	
Bonney Lake	Maintenance Worker II	57,430	75,691	
Covington				
Enumclaw		70,596	83,364	
Gig Harbor	Wastewater Operator	65,168	81,521	
Issaquah				
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe		67,548	86,220	
Mountlake Terrace				
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	N/A			
North Bend		69,712	84,815	
Redmond				
Sumner	WWTF Operator II	75,876	85,752	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		66,528	79,308	66,528
Range Data				
Average		66,164.22	81,863.97	
50th Percentile		66,358.00	82,442.50	
60th Percentile		67,980.72	83,654.16	
65th Percentile		68,737.98	84,161.94	
70th Percentile		69,495.24	84,669.72	
75th Percentile		69,932.70	85,049.10	
80th Percentile		70,242.24	85,377.12	

Mechanic II				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Arlington				
Bellevue	Mechanical Services Technician	66,266	83,333	
Bonney Lake		60,453	82,726	
Covington				
Enumclaw	Mechanic	69,624	82,236	
Gig Harbor	Mechanic	66,055	82,629	
Issaquah	PW Heavy Equipment Mechanic	66,733	90,088	
Kenmore				
Lake Forest Park				
Maple Valley	N/A			
Mill Creek				
Monroe		67,548	86,220	
Mountlake Terrace	Mechanic	58,531	73,133	
Mukilteo	N/A			
Newcastle	N/A			
North Bend		66,844	81,326	
Redmond	Mechanic (only one level)	74,928	97,416	
Sumner		72,264	80,304	
Woodinville				
Snoqualmie		66,528	79,308	79,308
Range Data				
Average		66,924.62	83,941.09	
50th Percentile		66,788.40	82,677.54	
60th Percentile		67,125.65	82,968.95	
65th Percentile		67,442.41	83,242.18	
70th Percentile		68,170.80	84,199.28	
75th Percentile		69,105.00	85,498.32	
80th Percentile		70,152.00	86,993.52	

APPENDIX D

Comparable Community	Health Insurance	
	Employee Only - Muni Contribution	Family - Muni Contribution
Arlington	80%-100% dep. on plan chosen	80%-100% dep. on plan chosen
Bellevue		
Bonney Lake	95.00%	95.00%
Covington		
Enumclaw	85.00%	N/R
Gig Harbor	100.00%	100% . Teamsters in low deductible plans: 90-95%
Issaquah	100.00%	90%-100% of partner & dependents
Kenmore	100.00%	90.00%
Lake Forest Park	Non-rep: 100% of Group Health \$10 co-pay plan; empl pays diff. for other plans. Teamsters: 90%	Non-rep: 100% of Group Health \$10 co-pay plan; empl pays diff. for other plans. Teamsters: 90%
Maple Valley	100.00%	80.00%
Mill Creek	AFSCME: 90% of non-HDHP; 100% of HDHP	AFSCME: 90% of non-HDHP; 100% of HDHP
Monroe	93.00%	93.00%
Mountlake Terrace	100.00%	93%-96%
Mukilteo	100.00%	90% of dependents
Newcastle	92%-100%	82%-100%
North Bend	95.00%	95% Empl & 90% spouse/dependents
Redmond	100.00%	87%-95%. Per CBAs: employee pays 20% of dependent coverage
Sumner	100.00%	100.00%
Woodinville	100% (HDHP plan)	100% (HDHP plan)
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	100.00%	100.00%
Average:	97.3%	91.6%

Comparable Community	Dental Coverage		Orthodontia Coverage	
	Employee Only-Muni Contribution	Family-Muni Contribution	Employee Only-Muni Contribution	Family-Muni Contribution
Arlington	90.00%	90.00%		
Bellevue				
Bonney Lake	100.00%	100.00%		
Covington				
Enumclaw	100.00%	N/R	100.00%	N/R
Gig Harbor	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Issaquah	100.00%	Exempt: 100% for partner & dependents. Non-exempt: 80%	100.00%	Exempt: 100% for partner & dependents. Non-exempt: 80%
Kenmore	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Lake Forest Park	100.00%	100.00%		
Maple Valley	100.00%	100.00%	n/a	n/a
Mill Creek	AFSCME: 100%	AFSCME: 100%		
Monroe	100.00%	100.00%		
Mountlake Terrace	96.00%	97.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Mukilteo	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Newcastle	100.00%	90.00%	100.00%	90.00%
North Bend	95.00%	95.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Redmond	100.00%	85%-92%. Per CBAs: employee pays 20% of dependent coverage	Included in dental coverage	
Sumner	100.00%	100.00%		
Woodinville	90%-100% (w. HDHP plan)	90%-100% (w. HDHP plan)		
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Average:	98.7%	97.7%	93.8%	90.0%

Comparable Community	Vision Coverage	
	Employee Only-Muni Contribution	Family-Muni Contribution
Arlington	100.00%	100.00%
Bellevue		
Bonney Lake	100.00%	100.00%
Covington		
Enumclaw	100.00%	N/R
Gig Harbor	100.00%	100.00%
Issaquah	100.00%	100.00%
Kenmore	100.00%	100.00%
Lake Forest Park	100.00%	100.00%
Maple Valley	100.00%	100.00%
Mill Creek	AFSCME: 100%	AFSCME: 100%
Monroe	100.00%	100.00%
Mountlake Terrace	100.00%	100.00%
Mukilteo	100.00%	100.00%
Newcastle	100.00%	100.00%
North Bend	100.00%	100.00%
Redmond	100.00%	87-94%. Per CBAs: employee pays 20% of dependent coverage
Sumner	100.00%	100.00%
Woodinville	100.00%	100.00%
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	100.00%	100.00%
Average:	100.0%	100.0%

Comparable Community	HRA Contribution	
	Employee Only-Muni Contribution	Family-Muni Contribution
Arlington	\$900 w. HDHP	50% of premium savings vs. non-HDHP
Bellevue		
Bonney Lake	\$2,000 (seed money)	\$3,500 (seed money)
Covington		
Enumclaw	\$100/mo. non-rep; \$180/mo. AFSCME	
Gig Harbor	\$3,450 for Teamsters in HDHP	\$3,900 for Teamsters in HDHP
Issaquah	No	No
Kenmore	\$450 (+\$221.88 if on AHN plan)	\$900 (+1) or \$1350 (+2 or more), and add'l \$321-\$604 if on AHN plan
Lake Forest Park		
Maple Valley	none	none
Mill Creek	AFSCME: 50% of premium savings vs. non-HDHP	AFSCME: 50% of premium savings vs. non-HDHP
Monroe	1% of monthly salary or \$105	
Mountlake Terrace	N/A	N/A
Mukilteo	\$1,500	\$3,000
Newcastle	N/A we have an HSA if employee selects HDHP plan	
North Bend	N/A	N/A
Redmond	City does not provide HRA contribution, employee only	
Sumner	HSA: \$1500. Plus HRA bridge: \$1400 (\$2400 CBA empls.) Teamsters-N/A	HSA: \$3000 Plus HRA bridge: \$4800 (Teamsters-N/A)
Woodinville	HSA: \$1955 w. HDHP plan	HSA: \$2890-\$5635 w. HDHP plan
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	\$3,000	\$6,000
Average:	150000.0%	300000.0%

Comparable Community	Life Insurance		Short-Term/Long-Term Disability Insurance
	Amount of Coverage	Employer Contribution	Type, Coverage %, Elimination Period
Arlington	\$26,000	100%	Yes offered, details unspecified
Bellevue	80% of salary up to \$50,000	100%	Long-term; 60% up to \$5,000/mo.; 180 days
Bonney Lake	\$50,000	100%	67%/90 day
Covington			
Enumclaw	\$0	0%	
Gig Harbor	Yes offered, details unspecified		Yes offered, details unspecified
Issaquah	\$50,000	100%	Long-term; 90 days
Kenmore	1X annual salary	100%	Long-term; 60% up to \$8,000/mo.; 90 days
Lake Forest Park	\$50,000	100%	Long-term; 67%; 90 days
Maple Valley	1X annual salary	up to \$50,000	Long-term, 60%, 90 day
Mill Creek	\$10,000	100%	Yes offered, details unspecified
Monroe	\$50,000	100%	
Mountlake Terrace	3X salary up to \$250,000	100%	Long-term; 2/3 replacement of salary; 90 days
Mukilteo	Up to \$100,000	100%	
Newcastle	\$50,000	100%	Long-term, 60%, 90 day
North Bend	\$50,000		.331%of Salary
Redmond	\$50,000 (DHs=1Xsalary up to \$150k)	100% for Basic Life	Short-term: from 3 to up to 6 mos. 40%-60% (dep. on tenure) of salary less Workers Comp payments Long-term: 60%, 180 days; \$7800/Mo. max
Sumner	\$50,000	100%	Yes offered, details unspecified
Woodinville	\$10,000	100%	
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	\$50,000	100%	None
Average:	\$36,000	93%	

Comparable Community	How many Sick Days granted per year?	Maximum accrual of Sick Days?
Arlington	12	1000 hours
Bellevue	12	
Bonney Lake	12	720 hours
Covington	12	368 hours
Enumclaw	12	1096 hours
Gig Harbor	12	1440 hours
Issaquah	8 or 12, as chosen by employee	1280 hours
Kenmore	12	None
Lake Forest Park	12	720 hours
Maple Valley	12	None
Mill Creek	12	1040 hours (AFSCME)
Monroe	12	None
Mountlake Terrace	12	None
Mukilteo	12	None
Newcastle	12	960 hours
North Bend	10 to 12	960 hours
Redmond	12 (Regular Sick Leave. Non-exempt employees also accrue WA State Paid Sick Leave at 52 hrs/yr which must be exhausted before Regular is used)	960 hours (Regular Sick Leave)
Sumner	12	None (Only up to 720 hrs may be reimbursed according to schedule at separation)
Woodinville	12	None
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	12.0	720 hours
Average:	12.0	

Comparable Community	How many Holidays granted per year?
Arlington	13
Bellevue	12
Bonney Lake	13
Covington	14
Enumclaw	13
Gig Harbor	12
Issaquah	14
Kenmore	12
Lake Forest Park	12
Maple Valley	13
Mill Creek	11. AFSCME also get 1-3 floating holidays dep. on tenure
Monroe	12.5
Mountlake Terrace	11 + 1 floating
Mukilteo	13
Newcastle	12
North Bend	12
Redmond	13 (For RCHEA Town Hall union: 12)
Sumner	13
Woodinville	11
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	13.0
Average:	12.4

Comparable Community	Vacation Time
Arlington	0-2 yrs=12 day; 3-4 yrs=15 days; 5-6 yrs=18 days; 7-8 yrs=21 days; 9-10 yrs=24 days; 11-15 yrs=27 days; 15+yrs=30 days
Bellevue	
Bonney Lake	1st year=11 days; 2nd year= 11 days; 3rd year=13 days; 4th year=14 days; 5th year=15 days; etc., to 22 days/12th yr
Covington	
Enumclaw	0-12 mos.=6 days; 13-24 mos.=12 days; 25-120 mos.=18 days; 121-240 mos.=21 days; 241+ mos.=24 days
Gig Harbor	1st yr-10 days. Then 1 add'l day per year up to a max of 26 days
Issaquah	2 vacation schedules dep. on whether 8 or 12 sick days/yr. Vacation schedule for 12 sick days follows: 0-4 years=12 days; 5-9 years=16 days; 10-14 years=20 days; 15-19 years=22 days; 20+ years=24 days
Kenmore	1st year=10 days; 5th year=15 days; 8th year=20 days; 12th year=25 days
Lake Forest Park	1st yr-10 days; 2nd-5th yr=12 days; 6th-10th yr=15 days; 11th-15th yr=17 days; 16th-20 yrs=20 days; 21+ yrs=23 days
Maple Valley	1-2 years = 12 days; then add one day per year until reach a max of 25 days/year at 15 years
Mill Creek	Non-rep: 1st yr=10 days; 2nd-4th yr=13 days; 5th-7th yr=15 days; 8th-11th yr=18 days; 12th yr+=24 days AFSCME: 0-5 yrs=12 days; 6-10 yrs=16 days; 11-13 yrs=19 days; 14-16 yrs=20; 17-20 yrs=21 days; 20+ yrs = 22 days
Monroe	Teamsters: 0-2 yrs=11 days; 3 yrs=13 days; 5 yrs=17 days; 6 yrs=18 days; 7 yrs=19 days; 8 yrs=20 days; 9 yrs=21 days; 10-11 yrs=24 days; 12-13 days=25 days; 14 yrs or more=26 days
Mountlake Terrace	1st 3 yrs=12 days; 4-6 yrs=15 days; 7-10 yrs=18 days; 11-15 yrs=21 days; 16+ yrs=24 days. Teamsters: 21+ yrs=25.5
Mukilteo	Non-rep: 0-5 yrs=13 days; 6-10 yrs=15 days; 11-15 yrs=18 days; 16+yrs=20 days Teamsters: 1st 5 yrs=13 days; 6-10 yrs=15days; 11-15 yrs=18 days; 16+yrs=20 days
Newcastle	0-2 years=12 days; 3-4 years=14 days; 5-6 years=15 days; 7-8 years=17 days; 9-10 years=19 days; 11-14 years=21 days; 15+ years=23 days
North Bend	1-4 yrs=12 days; 5-9 yrs=17 days; 10 yrs=20 days; 11+ yrs=1 add'l day per year to max o 25
Redmond	1st & 2nd yr=12 days; 3rd yr=13 days; 4th yr=14 days; 5th yr=16 days; 7th yr=17 days; 9th yr=18 days; 11th yr=19 days; 13th yr=20 days; 15th yr=21; 17th yr=22 days; 20th yr=23 days. Police Supp./Teamsters union: 23 yrs=24 days
Sumner	1st yr=12 days; then add 1 day/yr to 23 days in 12th yr; 14th yr=24 days; 17th yr=25 days; 20th yr=26 days; 23rd yr=27 days; 25+ yrs=28 days
Woodinville	1st yr=10 days; 2nd-4th yr=13 days; 5th-7th yr=15 days; 8th-11th yr=18 days; 12th yr+=24 days
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	0-3 years=10 days; 4-8 years=15 days; 9-14 years=20 days; 15+ year=Add 1 day per year until max benefit of 25 days per year is reached in year 19
Average:	

Comparable Community	Participates in PERS? If not, what retirement benefit is offered?	Deferred Compensation Match
Arlington	Yes	1% match starting 7/1/24 per AFSCME CBA
Bellevue	Yes	
Bonney Lake	Yes	Match up to \$150/mo.
Covington		
Enumclaw	Yes	\$50 if \$100 contributed
Gig Harbor	Yes	Teamsters: 10-20 yrs=\$75/mo.; 20+yrs=\$100/mo.
Issaquah	Yes	1-to-1 match up to \$200 for FT employees
Kenmore	Yes	None
Lake Forest Park	Yes	None
Maple Valley	Yes	None
Mill Creek	Yes	None
Monroe	Yes	2 or 3% depending on if represented
Mountlake Terrace	Yes. And LEOFF	None
Mukilteo	Yes. And LEOFF	None
Newcastle	Yes	None
North Bend	At hire can choose betw. PERS 2 and 3	\$150/mo.
Redmond	Yes	None
Sumner	Yes. And LEOFF	\$185/mo. (\$250/mo. for Non-Comm Police CBA)
Woodinville	Yes	None
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	Yes	\$200/month, including \$50/month automatically for Teamsters
Average:		

Comparable Community	Performance Bonus
Arlington	
Bellevue	
Bonney Lake	None
Covington	
Enumclaw	
Gig Harbor	
Issaquah	
Kenmore	Merit increases every year separate from COLAs up to 4% based on performance
Lake Forest Park	
Maple Valley	None
Mill Creek	
Monroe	
Mountlake Terrace	N/A
Mukilteo	None
Newcastle	If employee has a positive annual evaluation eligible for a 3% Merit increase
North Bend	Exempt employees are given up to a 3% performance bonus based on annual review
Redmond	N/A
Sumner	
Woodinville	
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	Up to 4% salary bonus 2X/yr for M&P positions
Average:	

Comparable Community	Comp Time
Arlington	May be taken in lieu of OT and scheduled w. approval of supv.; max of 40 hrs may be accrued
Bellevue	
Bonney Lake	AFSCME Laborers: May accrue up to 72 hrs comp time; hours in excess of 72 paid at OT rate
Covington	
Enumclaw	Union employees can accumulate, but anything over 96 hrs. is paid out once/year
Gig Harbor	May be arranged in lieu of OT by mutual agreement. Max accrual of 80 hrs specified for Teamsters
Issaquah	
Kenmore	Available for non-exempt employees, time and a half comp for hours over 40/week
Lake Forest Park	Teamsters: Max accrual is 80 hrs
Maple Valley	See "Policy" tab for details
Mill Creek	AFSCME: Max accrual is 60 hrs
Monroe	Teamsters: can accrue in lieu of OT pay at rate of 1 1/2 times hours worked; max accumulation is 180 hours. City will buy out accrued comp time down to 80 hrs in June and 40 hrs in Nov
Mountlake Terrace	Non-rep (w. DH approval) and Teamsters can elect comp time. 40 hrs max carried over
Mukilteo	General overview: can use comp time in lieu of getting paid for OT. Max carryover is 40 hours
Newcastle	Comp time in lieu of Overtime is 55 hours max. If exceeds max, paid at OT rate
North Bend	For comp time, employees accrue 1.5 hrs of comp time for every hour of OT worked. Comp time can be used in place of vacation & may not exceed 80 hrs
Redmond	Comp time in lieu of Overtime with supervisor approval. Max accumulation is 80 hours. Some variation by CBA
Sumner	Up to 240 hrs may be accrued (50 Non-Comm Police CBA); must be used by end of year
Woodinville	
<i>Snoqualmie</i>	M&P: hour for hour bank maxed at 40). Teamsters: choice of overtime 1 ½ x hourly rate or comp time accrual
Average:	