

TABLE OF CONTENTS  
FOR CITY COUNCIL PACKET  
FEBRUARY 7, 2012

**\*\*\* The February 7, 2012 Policy Session will begin at 2:00 p.m. \*\*\***

**POLICY SESSION AGENDA**

1. Council Information and Follow-up Requests/Consent Agenda/Call for an Executive Session/Reports and Budget Updates by the City Manager
2. Compensation and Benefits Update
  - A. Pay and Benefits Study – The Segal Company
  - B. Pay and Benefits Study – Supplemental Report
3. Legislative Update

**BACKUP INFORMATION FOR THE WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2012 FORMAL AGENDA**

Item 7 Citywide	Page 13	Cloud Email Project
--------------------	---------	---------------------

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

- Liquor License Applications Received for the Period of January 25, 2012 through January 31, 2012
- Follow-up: February 1, 2012 Formal City Council Meeting

**RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FROM CITIZENS**

**Mr. Ruben Lara**

At the January 18, 2012 City Council Formal Meeting, Mr. Ruben Lara expressed concern that the use of oil based paint from 1992-2003, caused himself and a fellow coworker to become ill.

Mr. Luis Acosta

At the January 18, 2012 City Council Formal meeting, Mr. Luis Acosta expressed concern with a perceived misuse of public funds eight months ago by the Neighborhood Services Department (NSD).

Ms. Greta Rogers

At the January 18, 2012 City Council Formal meeting, Ms. Greta Rogers requested a citizens' panel to review the Request for Proposal (RFP) and the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process and to update the City Code to expedite both processes.

Ms. Greta Rogers

At the January 18, 2012 City Council citizen request, Ms. Rogers expressed concern regarding the two-minute limit required of residents wishing to speak at City Council meetings.

Packet Date: February 2, 2012



**CITY OF PHOENIX  
CITY COUNCIL POLICY SESSION  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2012 - 2:00 P.M.  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
200 WEST JEFFERSON**

---

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38.431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the City Council and to the general public that the City Council will hold a meeting open to the public on Tuesday, February 7, 2012, at 2:00 P.M. located in the City Council Chambers, 200 West Jefferson, Phoenix, Arizona.

---

1:00 P.M. - AN EXECUTIVE SESSION WAS CALLED FOR THIS TIME AT THE POLICY MEETING OF FEBRUARY 7, 2012.

**THE TIMES LISTED FOR AGENDA ITEMS ARE ESTIMATED. ITEMS MAY BE DISCUSSED EARLIER OR IN A DIFFERENT SEQUENCE.**

ESTIMATED COUNCIL INFORMATION AND  
1. 2:00 P.M.- FOLLOW-UP REQUESTS.

This item is scheduled to give City Council members an opportunity to publicly request information or follow-up on issues of interest to the community. If the information is available, staff will immediately provide it to the City Council member. No decisions will be made or action taken.

CONSENT AGENDA.

This item is scheduled to allow the City Council to act on the Mayor's recommendations on the Consent Agenda. The Consent Agenda has been publicly posted.

CALL FOR AN EXECUTIVE SESSION.

A vote to call an Executive Session may be held.

REPORTS AND BUDGET UPDATES BY THE CITY MANAGER.

This item is scheduled to allow the City Manager to report on changes in the City Council Agenda and provide brief informational reports on urgent issues. The City Council may discuss these reports but no action will be taken.

**THE TIMES LISTED FOR AGENDA ITEMS ARE ESTIMATED.  
ITEMS MAY BE DISCUSSED EARLIER OR IN A DIFFERENT  
SEQUENCE.**

**POLICY SESSION AGENDA**

**-2-**

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2012**

---

ESTIMATED

2. 2:30 P.M.-

COMPENSATION AND  
BENEFITS UPDATE  
A. Pay & Benefits Study – The  
Segal Company  
B. Pay and Benefits Study –  
Supplemental Report

Staff: Cavazos, Smith  
(Presentation 60 min.)

This report requests City Council acceptance of the findings of the City's pay and benefits study recently completed by The Segal Company.

Backup included in Council packet/City Clerk's Office.

This item is for discussion and possible action.

ESTIMATED

3. 3:30 P.M.-

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Staff: Peters  
(Presentation 60 min.)

This report seeks approval, guidance and direction from the Mayor and Council on state legislation of interest to the City.

This item is for information, discussion and possible action.

Backup included in Council packet/City Clerk's Office.

ESTIMATED

5:10 P.M. - ADJOURNMENT

For further information, please call the Management Intern, City Manager's Office, at 602-262-4449.

For reasonable accommodations, call the Management Intern at Voice/602-262-4449 or TTY/602-534-5500 as early as possible to coordinate needed arrangements.

Si necesita traducción en español, por favor llame a la oficina del gerente de la Ciudad de Phoenix, 602-262-4449 tres días antes de la fecha de la junta.

**THE TIMES LISTED FOR AGENDA ITEMS ARE ESTIMATED.  
ITEMS MAY BE DISCUSSED EARLIER OR IN A DIFFERENT  
SEQUENCE.**

**POLICY SESSION AGENDA**

**-3-**

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2012**

---

**PHOENIX CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Councilman DiCiccio  
Councilman Gates  
Councilman Nowakowski  
Councilman Simplot  
Councilman Valenzuela  
Councilman Waring  
Councilwoman Williams  
Vice Mayor Johnson  
Mayor Stanton

# CITY OF PHOENIX

## 2011 TOTAL COMPENSATION STUDY FINAL REPORT

January 18, 2012

Copyright © 2012 by The Segal Group, Inc., parent of The Segal Company. All rights reserved. 5165415v3/02120.017





THE SEGAL COMPANY  
1230 W. Washington Street, Suite 501 Tempe, AZ 85281  
T 602.381.4045 F 602.381.4090 www.segalco.com

January 18, 2012

Janet Smith  
Human Resources Director  
City of Phoenix  
135 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Dear Janet:

This report contains the total compensation market assessment for the City of Phoenix's (City) workforce. We surveyed and examined the City's current compensation and benefits programs for all occupational groups, including:

- Base pay
- Pay practices (such as structure design, longevity, differentials and tuition reimbursements)
- Paid leave
- Other benefits (disability insurance)
- Retirement plans
- Retiree health
- Health benefits (medical, dental and vision)

When looking at the aggregate market data, we found the City of Phoenix's current pay ranges are competitive with the public sector, and are below the private sector. However, when looking at individual job titles, we found that some are below market, some at market, and some above market.

When considering total compensation (base salaries, medical benefits and retirement plans), in aggregate we found the City is slightly more generous at 1 percentage point above the market.

We look forward to talking with you regarding this study's findings.

Sincerely,

Carol L. Mercer, CCP  
Vice President

Elliot R. Susseles, CCP  
Senior Vice President



Benefits, Compensation and HR Consulting Offices throughout the United States and Canada

Founding Member of the Multinational Group of Actuaries and Consultants, a global affiliation of independent firms

# Table of Contents

## 2011 Total Compensation Report

*FINAL*

January 18, 2012

Executive Summary .....	1
Data Collected and Assumptions .....	1
Data Collected.....	1
Data Sources .....	1
Assumptions.....	2
Market Assessment of Compensation.....	2
Base Pay.....	2
Pay Practices .....	2
Market Assessment of Benefits Programs .....	3
Combined Paid Time Off.....	3
Long-term Disability .....	3
Retirement Benefit .....	4
Health Benefits.....	4
Market Assessment of Total Compensation.....	5
Assumptions.....	5
Total Compensation Comparison .....	5
Methodology.....	6
Scope of Work .....	6
Survey Peers .....	7
Published Survey Sources .....	9
Adjustments for Geographic Differences in the Cost of Labor .....	9
Survey Topics.....	10
Survey Benchmarks .....	11
Detailed Study Findings .....	12
Market Assessment of Base Pay.....	12
Assumptions.....	12
Base Pay.....	12
Union Representation in the Market Place .....	13
Competitiveness by Peer Type and Occupational Group.....	17
Competitiveness by Employee Category .....	17
Pay Practices.....	18
Pay Schedule Design.....	18
Pay Progression.....	19
Pay Schedule Adjustments .....	19
Salary Increases for Fiscal Year 2011/2012.....	19

Shift Differentials .....	20
Weekend Differentials .....	20
Longevity Pay.....	20
Performance-based Pay .....	21
Tuition Reimbursements .....	21
Additional Perquisites .....	22
Paid Leave.....	23
Vacation Leave .....	23
Sick Leave.....	25
Paid Holidays/Personal Leave .....	26
Disability Insurance .....	28
Short-term Disability.....	28
Long-term Disability .....	28
Retirement Program .....	31
Defined Benefit Program.....	31
Defined Contribution Program .....	31
Retiree Health.....	32
Retiree Health Employer Contributions .....	32
Health Benefits .....	34
PPO/POS Plans .....	34
HMO/EPO Plans .....	36
Dental Plans.....	38
Vision Plan .....	39
Total Compensation Calculation.....	40
Methodology.....	40
Total Compensation Costs.....	40
Observations & Implementation Steps.....	41
Observations and Considerations .....	41
Proactive Total Compensation Program Design Measures.....	42
Potential Need for Job Analysis .....	42
Total Compensation.....	42
Compensation Program Design Changes .....	43
Implementation Steps.....	45

## Appendices

A – Detailed Pay Practice Tables

B – Detailed Compensation Tables

C – Detailed Benefits Tables

# Executive Summary

In 2011, the City of Phoenix's Human Resources Department at the direction of the City Council developed a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for conducting a total compensation study. In July, The City of Phoenix engaged The Segal Company to determine the competitiveness of the overall total compensation package employer cost, including both pay and benefits. This report summarizes our methodology and findings.

In collecting and analyzing data from a wide variety of sources, and in the development of our report, it is important to identify data sources and assumptions that have been made.

## Data Collected and Assumptions

### Data Collected

Data collected covered:

- 601 benchmarks
- Pay practices (longevity, shift differentials, structure design, etc.)
- Paid leave (vacation, sick, holiday and personal days)
- Disability programs
- Retirement benefits - Defined Benefit (DB)<sup>1</sup> and Defined Contribution (DC)
- Retiree health
- Health benefits (medical, dental and vision)

### Data Sources

- A custom survey
  - National public sector employers, including the Arizona State government and comparable cities outside the State of Arizona (250 jobs)
  - Local private sector entities within the State of Arizona (145 jobs)
- Local public sector employers within the State of Arizona (601 jobs)
- Published data representing the private sector labor market (601 jobs)

---

<sup>1</sup> This study reviewed at a high level DB plans in the market with the understanding The Pension Reform Task Force reviewed the defined benefit plan extensively in order to make recommendations.

## Assumptions

- Total compensation is the primary consideration for determining the City's overall market competitiveness. Data reported is current data which is reflective of concessions taken in 2011
- Labor markets vary by type and level of job; labor markets identified include national public sector and private sector, local public sector, and local private sector
- According to compensation standards for public sector entities, Segal defines market competitive ("**at market**") as being within 10 percentage points of the market average – that is between, 5 percent below (-5%) and 5 percent above (+5%) the market average. A competitive range is important in that the market pay rates can fluctuate on an annual basis dependent on the supply and demand of labor<sup>1</sup>.

## Market Assessment of Compensation

### Base Pay

Overall (*public and private sectors*), we found the City to be *at market* (within the competitive range). When considering Phoenix's base pay to each specific labor market, we found:

- *The City is slightly above national public sector employers* by 2 percentage points
- *The City is significantly below local private sector* entities by 19 percentage points
- *The City is at market compared to local public sector employers* (within the competitive range)
- *The City is at market* (within the competitive range) compared to published data

In addition, we found:

- Sworn Public Safety Employees are *slightly above* market by 1 percentage point
- General Employees are *at market* (within the competitive range)

Naturally, we found that when looking at individual job titles, that there are jobs below, jobs at and jobs above market. Detailed findings are located starting on page 12.

### Pay Practices

The study covered the following pay practices:

- Additions to base pay
- Pay adjustments

---

<sup>1</sup> Private sector entities consider competitive range to be between 90% and 110% of market

- Pay plan design (i.e. open ranges, step and grade and/or flat rates)
- Salary budget increases
- Pay progression (i.e. step increases and pay for performance)
- Tuition reimbursement
- Perquisites (i.e. sabbaticals, car allowances, executive physicals, etc.)

In general, the City's *pay practices are consistent* with what is found in the market.

Outliers identified include:

- Weekend differentials which are not commonly found in the market place
- Tuition Reimbursements (\$9,208) which is high compared to the most common maximum of \$5,000
- Executive and Middle Manager perquisites of which Phoenix offers two (2) of the six (6) perquisites (car allowances and relocation allowances) surveyed which is consistent with the public sector

## Market Assessment of Benefits Programs

Overall, we found the *City of Phoenix's benefits programs are consistent* with employers in the local area and nationwide, and are most similar to other public sector employers.

### Combined Paid Time Off

We found **combined paid time off (vacation, sick, holidays and personal leave) is slightly higher** than the market for all employee groups with the exception of Fire.

Days provided compared to the market show:

- Vacation – *Slightly below market*
- Sick\* – *Slightly above market*
- Holidays – *Slightly above market*
- Personal leave – *Slightly above market*

\*It is important to note the City does not offer short-term disability and has intentionally increased the number of sick days to account for this.

### Long-term Disability

The City pays the full cost for long-term disability insurance provided to employees for a replacement benefit of 66 2/3 of salary, *which is consistent with the market*.

We found in the market:

- Employer contributions range from 47% - 100% of the total cost for long-term disability

## Retirement Benefit

### *Defined Benefit Plan*

The City's defined benefit plan was under separate review by the Pension Reform Task Force and was reviewed in this study simply to provide a current total compensation cost to the City. An in-depth review and analysis of the plan has been completed as part of the Pension Reform Task Force's initiative.

### *Defined Contribution Plan*

The *City offers a defined contribution plan and provides non-matching contributions* to Executives and Middle Managers as well as certain collectively bargained General Employee groups, Police and Fire. Contributions rates vary by group in that each group has negotiated different amounts in lieu of other benefits.

We found in the market:

- *Public sector employers do not typically provide a required (non-matching) contribution*
- *Public and private employers may make a matching contribution* to employee contribution

## Health Benefits

### *Retiree Health*

The City's retiree health program is *similar and costs less* than what other peers are paying.

### *PPO Plan*

The City *pays slightly less for single coverage and more for family coverage* than the average contribution rate of its peer employers.

Note: The City pays a smaller percentage of total costs for single coverage (80% vs 85%), but pays a higher percentage for family coverage (80% vs 73%)

### *HMO Plan*

The City is *market competitive for both single coverage and for family coverage*.

Note: The City pays a smaller percentage of total costs for single coverage (80% vs 92%) and for family coverage (80% vs 81%).

## Market Assessment of Total Compensation

### Assumptions

- Total compensation is the primary consideration for determining the City's overall market competitiveness. Data reported is current data which is reflective of concessions taken in 2011
- According to compensation standards for public sector entities, Segal defines market competitive ("**at market**") as being within 10 percentage points of the market average – that is between, 5 percent below (-5%) and 5 percent above (+5%) the market average. A competitive range is important in that the market pay rates can fluctuate on an annual basis dependent on the supply and demand of labor<sup>1</sup>.

### Total Compensation Comparison

We compared a representative sample of benchmarks (149 jobs) to the overall market (**public and private sector**) and found the majority of jobs to be either at or above market.

Given that overall direct compensation is **at market**, the City's current generous retirement benefits contribute to the number of benchmark jobs whose total compensation is above market. Additional detail can be found in **Tables B10-A and B10-B**.

*Note: However, the City should not lose sight that proposed changes to the City's defined benefit retirement program that reduce the City's contribution rate will affect the total compensation numbers in the future.*

When reviewing sworn public safety employees and general employees total compensation, we found:

- **Sworn Public Safety is above market** by 5 percentage points
- **General Employees are slightly above market** by 1 percentage point

The remainder of this report describes our methodology and detailed findings for both pay and benefits. Each section in the detailed findings outlines where the City stands against public and private sector employers.

---

<sup>1</sup> Private sector entities consider competitive range to be between 90% and 110% of market

# Methodology

In July 2011, The Segal Company conducted a total compensation study to evaluate the market competitiveness of employer costs of pay and benefits offered to City of Phoenix employees.

## Scope of Work

The market survey included:

- 601 benchmark jobs (pay data) which represent 95% of City employees
- Pay practices (longevity, shift differentials, structure design, etc.)
- Paid leave (vacation, sick, holiday and personal days)
- Disability insurance
- Retirement benefits (DB<sup>1</sup> and DC)
- Retiree health
- Health benefits (medical, dental and vision)

Competitive market information was gathered from a variety of sources as follows:

- A comprehensive custom market survey including:
  - **National public and local private sector peer employers** were identified. These were determined as either similar in size and/or services provided, or as an entity the City competes with for talent
  - Pay information covering 25% of the City's job titles (250)
  - Pay practices and benefits (paid time off, pay practices, health benefits, defined benefit and defined contribution retirement plans, disability insurance and retiree health plans)
- The Job Information Management System (JIMS) database (601 benchmarks), which is a database where **local public sector entities** report their job titles, salary ranges and job descriptions
- A Segal Phoenix database covering pay practices and benefits (paid time off, pay practices, health benefits, defined benefit, defined contribution plans, disability insurance and retiree health plans) for those entities identified in JIMS
- Published survey sources for private data on 601 benchmarks and benefit data for employers of comparable size (**primarily private sector data**)

---

<sup>1</sup> This study reviewed at a high level DB plans in the market with the understanding The Pension Reform Task Force reviewed the defined benefit plan extensively in order to make recommendations.

## Survey Peers

- The Segal Company surveyed *25 public and 13 private sector organizations*, both locally and nationally
- *29 out of 38 entities responded* to the survey
  - **Public sector:**
    - Three (3) did not participate
    - Four (4) of the 25 were unable to participate in full due to the size of the study and availability of staff to commit to completing the survey<sup>1</sup>
  - **Private sector:**
    - Seven (7) of the 13 responded (The names of private sector respondents have been de-identified in order to protect each individual company's confidential information.)

Details by survey participant can be found in **Table 1** shown on the following pages.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Segal Company supplemented partial responses by collecting data from these public sector organizations' websites.

**TABLE 1**  
**SURVEYED EMPLOYERS**

Comparator*	Responded to Survey	
	Compensation	Benefits
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>		
State of Arizona (6.4M)	Yes	Yes
City of Austin, TX (790,000)	Partial	No
City of Dallas, TX (1.2M)	Yes	Yes
City of Houston, TX (2M)	Yes	Yes
City of Indianapolis, IN (820,000)	No	No
City of Jacksonville, FL (820,000)	Yes	Yes
City of Los Angeles, CA (3.8M)	Partial	Partial
City of Philadelphia, PA (1.5M)	Yes	Yes
City of San Antonio, TX (1.3M)	No	No
City of San Diego, CA (1.3M)	Yes	Yes
City and County of San Francisco, CA (805,000)	Yes	Yes
City of San Jose, CA (946,000)	No	No
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>		
City of Avondale (76,000)	Partial	No
City of Chandler (236,000)	Yes	Yes
City of Flagstaff (66,000)	Yes	Yes
Town of Gilbert (208,000)	Yes	Yes
City of Glendale (227,000)	Yes	Yes
City of Goodyear (65,000)	Yes	Yes
Maricopa County (3.8M)	Partial	No
City of Mesa (439,000)	Yes	Yes
City of Peoria (154,000)	Yes	Yes
City of Scottsdale (217,000)	Yes	Yes
City of Surprise (118,000)	Yes	Yes
City of Tempe (162,000)	Yes	Yes
City of Tucson (520,000)	Yes	Yes
<b>City of Phoenix (1.4M)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>

Comparator*	Responded to Survey	
	Compensation	Benefits
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>		
Private Employer 1 (NA)	Yes	Yes
Private Employer 2 (NA)	Yes	Yes
Private Employer 3 (NA)	Yes	Yes
Private Employer 4 (NA)	Yes	Yes
Private Employer 5 (NA)	Yes	Yes
Private Employer 6 (NA)	Yes	Yes
Private Employer 7 (NA)	Yes	Yes
Private Employer 8 (NA)	No	No
Private Employer 9 (NA)	No	No
Private Employer 10 (NA)	No	No
Private Employer 11 (NA)	No	No
Private Employer 12 (NA)	No	No
Private Employer 13 (NA)	No	No

## Published Survey Sources

In order to supplement the custom survey data, Segal collected data from a number of published survey sources and databases, including:

- Airports Council International Compensation Survey
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)
- CompTrack (Towers Watson)
- Economic Research Institute
- JIMS (Job Information Management System)
- Milliman Arizona Compensation Survey
- PayMonitor (Mercer)
- Segal's Phoenix Office Benefits Database

## Adjustments for Geographic Differences in the Cost of Labor

To reflect the geographic differences in salaries between the metropolitan areas of surveyed peer entities/surveys and Phoenix, Arizona, we adjusted the reported salaries using the Geographic Wage & Salary Differentials reported by the Economic Research Institute (ERI) Geographic Assessor, effective as of July 2011. Each quarter, ERI updates its Geographic Wage & Salary Differentials to reflect differences in the supply and demand for labor between geographic areas.

This allows organizations to compare pay based on unique labor market conditions in a given location.

**Appendix A, Table A-1** shows the specific geographic adjustments that were applied to the pay data for employers located outside the Phoenix metropolitan area.

## Survey Topics

Segal worked with the City to develop a customized market survey document that included questions that would allow for a review of total compensation. Topics included questions related to the subjects found below in **Table 2**.

**TABLE 2  
SURVEYED TOPICS**

Survey Categories	
<p><b>Compensation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of Full-time Equivalencies (FTEs)</li> <li>• Actual Average Salaries</li> <li>• FLSA Status</li> <li>• Range Minimums &amp; Maximums</li> <li>• Union Status</li> </ul>	<p><b>Paid Time Off</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holidays</li> <li>• Personal Leave</li> <li>• Sick Leave</li> <li>• Vacation/Annual Leave</li> <li>• Carry Over/Cash-out of Paid Time Off</li> </ul>
<p><b>Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical Benefits</li> <li>• Dental Benefits</li> <li>• Vision Benefits</li> </ul>	<p><b>Pay Practices</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additions to Base Pay</li> <li>• Pay Adjustments</li> <li>• Pay Plan Design</li> <li>• Pay Progression</li> <li>• Perquisites</li> <li>• Salary Budget Increases</li> <li>• Tuition Reimbursement</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-Term Disability</li> <li>• Long-Term Disability</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Retirement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defined Benefit Plans</li> <li>• Defined Contribution Plans<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• Retiree Medical Insurance</li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> Defined benefit programs are under review by the Pension Reform Task Force.

## Survey Benchmarks

Working with the City's Human Resources Department, we identified 601 job titles that are representative of the City as illustrated below:

- **Benchmark Representation by Employee Category**
  - There are 11 employee categories, including bargaining units and other groups such as Confidential Staff, Middle Managers, Executives, etc.; all are represented
- **Benchmark Representation by FLSA Status**
  - Exempt – 2,066 employees (95% of Exempt staff)
  - Non-Exempt – 12,454 employees (98% of Non-Exempt Staff)
- **Benchmark Representation by Occupational Group**
  - 32 occupational groups (i.e. Administrative Support, Engineering, Fiscal, etc.) were created to cover all the City's job titles; each group is represented
- **Benchmark Representation by Job Title**
  - 601/1,000 (60% by job code; 79% when considering title/role such as Secretary II which may be found in multiple job codes due to union representation)
- **Benchmark Representation by Salary Grade**
  - 109/122 (89%; nine (9) of these pay grades do not have jobs assigned to them)

**Tables in Appendix B** show market position for not only benchmarks by occupational group, employee category, and job title but are also differentiated between public sector and private sector data.

# Detailed Study Findings

## Market Assessment of Base Pay

### Assumptions

- Total compensation is the primary consideration for determining the City's overall market competitiveness. Data reported is current data which is reflective of concessions taken in 2011
- Labor markets vary by type and level of job; labor markets identified include national public sector and private sector, local public sector, and local private sector
- According to compensation standards for public sector entities, Segal defines market competitive ("**at market**") as being within 10 percentage points of the market average – that is between, 5 percent below (-5%) and 5 percent above (+5%) the market average. A competitive range is important in that the market pay rates can fluctuate on an annual basis dependent on the supply and demand of labor<sup>1</sup>.

### Base Pay

Overall (*public and private sectors*), we found the City to be **at market** (within the competitive range.) When considering Phoenix's base pay to each specific labor market, we found:

- **The City is slightly above national public sector employers** by 2 percentage points
- **The City is at market compared to local public sector employers** (within the competitive range)
- **The City is significantly below local private sector employers** by 19 percentage points
- **The City is at market** (within the competitive range) compared to private published data

In addition, we found:

- Sworn Public Safety Employees are **slightly above** market by 1 percentage point
- General Employees are **at market** (within the competitive range)

---

<sup>1</sup> Private sector entities consider competitive range to be between 90% and 110% of market

## Union Representation in the Market Place

One of the concerns of the City and Union Representatives was the comparability of data to other entities that have collectively bargained employee groups, as does the City of Phoenix.

Based on responses received, 16 of 29 reported having either collective bargaining units or employee associations within their organization (**Table 3**). The City of Phoenix has both collective bargaining units and employee associations.

**TABLE 3  
UNIONS AT PEER EMPLOYERS**

Comparator	General Employees	Police	Fire
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>			
State of Arizona	American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees	Arizona Highway Patrol Association	N/A
City of Austin, TX	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Dallas, TX	Employee Associations	Employee Association	Employee Association
City of Houston, TX	Houston Organization of Municipal Employees	Houston Police Officers' Union	Houston Professional Fire Fighters Association
City of Jacksonville, FL	American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees, Communications Workers of America, Jacksonville Supervisor Association, and Laborers' International Union of North America	Fraternal Order of Police	International Association of Fire Fighters
City of Los Angeles, CA	American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees, Engineers and Architects Association, International Longshore and Warehouse Union, International Union of Operating Engineers, Laborer's International Union of North America, Los Angeles County Building & Construction Trades Council, Municipal Construction Inspectors Association, and Service Employees International Union	Los Angeles Police Command Officers Association and Los Angeles Police Protective League	Los Angeles Fire Chief Officers Association and United Firefighters of Los Angeles City
City of Philadelphia, PA	American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees, District Council 33 & District Council 47	Fraternal Order of Police	International Association of Fire Fighters

Comparator	General Employees	Police	Fire
City of San Diego, CA	American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees Local 127, San Diego Deputy City Attorney Association, and San Diego Municipal Employees Association	San Diego Police Officers Association	International Association of Fire Fighters and Teamsters Local 911 – (Lifeguards)
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Various	San Francisco Police Officers Association	Firefighters, Local 798
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>			
Private Employer 1	Yes- unions are industry specific	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	N/A		
Private Employer 3	N/A		
Private Employer 4	N/A		
Private Employer 5	Yes- unions are industry specific		
Private Employer 6	Yes- unions are industry specific		
Private Employer 7	Information not provided		
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>			
City of Avondale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Chandler	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Flagstaff	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
Town of Gilbert	Service Employees International Union	Gilbert Police Leadership Association	International Association of Fire Fighters
City of Glendale	N/A	Glendale Police Officer’s Coalition	Glendale Chapter of the United Phoenix Fire Fighters Association, Local 493 of the International Association of Fire Fighters
City of Goodyear	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
Maricopa County	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided

Comparator	General Employees	Police	Fire
City of Peoria	American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees	Peoria Police Officers Association and Peoria Police Supervisors Association	United Phoenix Fire Fighters Association
City of Scottsdale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Surprise	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tempe	Service Employees International Union Local 5 and The Tempe Supervisors' Association	Tempe Officers Association	City of Tempe Firefighters' Unit
City of Tucson	American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees and Communications Workers of America/Tucson Association of City Employees	Tucson Police Officers Association	International Association of Fire Fighters
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Field Unit 1: Local 777 – Laborers' International Union of North America;</b> <b>Field Unit 2: Local 2384 – American Federation of State, County &amp; Municipal Employees;</b> <b>Field Unit 3: Local 2960 – American Federation of State, County &amp; Municipal Employees</b> <b>Unit 7: Administrative, Supervisory, Professional &amp; Technical Employees Association</b>	<b>Unit 4: Phoenix Law Enforcement Association</b> <b>Unit 6: Phoenix Police Sergeants and Lieutenants Association</b>	<b>Unit 5: International Association of Firefighters – Local 493</b>

## Competitiveness by Peer Type and Occupational Group

While the City's pay ranges are competitive on an aggregate basis, competitiveness varies when examining peer type and occupational groups. At the pay range midpoint, Segal found:

- When measured against the *aggregate peer group (public and private)*:
  - **Five (5)** occupational groups are *above the market*
  - The remaining **27** occupational groups are *at market* (within the competitive range)
- When measured against the *public sector peers*:
  - **Seven (7)** occupational groups are *above the market*
  - The remaining **25** occupational are *at market* (within the competitive range)
- Out of the 17 occupational groups compared to the *private sector (custom survey data and published sources)*, we found:
  - **Two (2)** are *above the market*
  - **11** are *below the market*
  - **Four (4)** are *at market* (within the competitive range)

Additional detail can be found in **Appendix B, Tables B-1 and B-2**.

## Competitiveness by Employee Category

Employees at the City of Phoenix can be grouped into 11 categories, seven (7) of which are collective bargaining units. These are identified as:

- Field Unit 1: Local 777 (Ee's = 1,434) - Laborers' International Union of North America (Unit 1)
- Field Unit 2: Local 2384 (Ee's = 1,323) - American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees (Unit 2)
- Field Unit 3: Local 2960 (Ee's = 3,590) - American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees (Unit 3)
- Unit 4 (Ee's = 2,638): Phoenix Law Enforcement Association (Unit 4)
- Unit 5 (Ee's = 1,082): Local 493 – International Association of Firefighters (Unit 5)
- Unit 6 (Ee's = 458): Phoenix Police Sergeants and Lieutenants Association (Unit 6)
- Unit 7 (Ee's = 2,897): Administrative, Supervisor, Professional & Technical Employees' Association (ASPTEA)
- Confidential Staff (Ee's = 167)
- Middle Managers (Ee's = 317)
- Executives (Ee's = 63)
- Council (Ee's = 12)

Each of these groups is compared to the market place:

➤ ***Public and private sector:***

- 11 employee categories ***are at market*** (within competitive range)
- One (Unit 6) is ***slightly above the market by 1 percentage point***. This is due to the fact that Career Enhancement Pay was rolled into base pay for this group during negotiations

➤ ***Public sector peers:***

- 11 employee categories ***are at market*** (within competitive range)
- Two (Unit 6 and Executives) ***slightly above the market by 1 percentage point***

➤ ***Private sector peers:***

- Four (Unit 2, Confidential Staff, Middle Managers and Executives) are ***substantially below market*** by greater than 10 percentage points
- Three (3) ***are at market*** (within competitive range)

Additional detail regarding employee category can be found in **Appendix B, Tables B-3 and B-4**, as well as detail, regarding relative market positioning and market averages by benchmark job title in **Appendix B, Tables B-5 and B-6**.

## Pay Practices

### Pay Schedule Design

We found a mixture of pay schedule designs across and within the peer groups. In general, we found:

- The majority of survey responses show ***Sworn Public Safety (police and fire) have grade and step structures***
- The majority of both public sector and private sector responses indicate ***open ranges for Executives and Managers***
- In the ***general employee*** group, responses ***show grades and steps in unionized*** workforces and ***open ranges in non-unionized workforces*** in both the public and private sectors

This is ***consistent*** with what is found at the City of Phoenix.

## Pay Progression

We found individuals move through salary structures in a variety of ways. In general, we found:

- In the *general employee grouping, unionized workforces are based on step increases* whereas *non-unionized workforces are based on individual performance*
- Pay progression for *Sworn Public Safety (police and fire) is based on step increases*
- Majority of both public sector and all of private sector responses indicate pay progression for *Managers and Executives is based on individual performance*

This is *consistent* with what is found at the City of Phoenix.

## Pay Schedule Adjustments

In general, survey responses indicated:

- In the *public sector*, approximately 50% of employers adjust manager and executive salary schedules based on market equity and affordability of increases; sworn public safety structures have yearly increases built into the collective bargaining agreements
- In the *private sector*, the majority of respondents' base structural increases are based on market equity and budget affordability

This is *consistent* with what is found at the City of Phoenix.

## Salary Increases for Fiscal Year 2011/2012

As one would expect, *very few public sector* employers gave base salary increases this fiscal year.

- Four (4) of the respondents gave salary increases to *General Employees ranging from 0.6% to 4.25%*
- Five (5) respondents gave salary increases to *Sworn Public Safety ranging from 0.6% to 5%*

In the *private sector*, employers on average gave *3-4% increases*.

At the City of Phoenix, *Middle Managers and Executives did not receive increases; General Employees and Sworn Public Safety received approximately 1.86% merit increases.*

## Shift Differentials

The majority of all respondents offer shift differentials for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> shifts.

### ➤ *Public sector:*

- *2<sup>nd</sup> shift rates range from \$0.25 - \$1.00 an hour, or 2%-10% of base pay*
- *3<sup>rd</sup> shift rates range from \$0.35 - \$1.00 an hour, or 3.5%-15% of base pay*

Rates vary by collective bargaining agreement.

### ➤ *Private sector:*

- *2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> shifts rates range from \$1.00 - \$1.20 an hour, or 10% of base pay for 2<sup>nd</sup> shift and 15% of base pay for 3<sup>rd</sup> shift.*

Rates vary by collective bargaining agreement.

The City of Phoenix's shift differentials range *from \$0.50 - \$1.30 an hour for 2<sup>nd</sup> shift, and \$0.75 - \$1.30 an hour for 3<sup>rd</sup> shift.* Rates vary by collective bargaining agreement. Overall Phoenix is *slightly higher at the minimum and maximum of the range of rates* compared to the public sector. When comparing to *private sector, Phoenix's minimum rates are lower and maximum rates are higher.*

## Weekend Differentials

*Two (2) of the 29 respondents offer weekend differentials, one (1) private and one (1) public sector entity.*

The *City of Phoenix offers weekend differentials for four (4) of its employee groups;* differentials range from \$.40 - \$.60 an hour. Weekend differentials are typically not found in the market place.

## Longevity Pay

Longevity pay has been of particular concern due to publicity in the press, locally and nationally. In reviewing the survey data, we found it is still common in the public sector, although not in the private sector. Specifically, we found in the public sector that:

- Approximately 65% of respondents offer longevity pay to *Sworn Public Safety Employees*
- Approximately 44% of respondents offer longevity to *General Employees* (a few even within management groups)
- Four (4) of the respondents have longevity only for employees that are hired before a specific date; indicating that longevity may no longer be offered to new employees

- Longevity pay is provided in a variety of forms ranging from a percentage of pay to a lump-sum payment based on years of service and paid in a number of ways at varying points in time.

The *City provides longevity to Sworn Public Safety groups and General Employees*, but does not for Middle Managers and Executives *which is consistent with the market*. Longevity varies by collective bargaining unit.

Detail information on longevity can be found in **Appendix A, Table A-5**.

## Performance-based Pay

Performance-based pay can be found in a variety of forms within the market.

- **Public sector:**
  - Approximately 50% of Middle Managers and Executives receive increases to base salary based on individual performance
  - Less than 50% of General Employees and those in Sworn Public Safety receive increases to base salary based on individual performance
  - Very few employers offer “bonuses” for either individual or group performance
- **Private sector:**
  - Approximately 50% of all employee groups receive increases either to base salary or through bonuses based on individual performance

*This City has pay for performance for Executives and Middle Managers.*

## Tuition Reimbursements

In the *public and private sectors*, we found the majority of respondents provide a tuition reimbursement for all employees.

- **Public sector** maximum reimbursements *range from approximately \$1,000 - \$8,700 per year*
- **Private sector** maximum reimbursements *range from approximately \$1,000 - \$11,800 per year*
- The *most common amount reported is \$5,000*.

The City of Phoenix offers *approximately \$9,200, which is generous, particularly* when the most common amount reported is \$5,000 and the federal limit that is excludable from taxable income for an employee’s grant-in-aid is \$5,250.

## Additional Perquisites

The *public sector* offers very few perquisites for Middle Managers and Executives. In reviewing prevalent perquisites, we found:

- Three (3) offer sabbaticals for Executives and Middle Managers
- Eight (8) offer car allowances for Executives, three (3) for Middle Managers
- Six (6) offer some form of relocation allowance for Executives, four (4) for Middle Managers

In general, *public sector* entities are rolling what may have typically been considered perquisites into base salaries.

The *private sector*, with the exception of relocation allowances, of which the majority offers, perquisites are reserved for Executives. Specifically, we found:

- One (1) offers a sabbatical
- Four (4) offer car allowances
- Four (4) offer executive physicals
- Four (4) offer stock options

Further detail regarding perquisites can be found in **Appendix A, Table A-11**.

## Paid Leave

Paid leave is a valuable benefit to both the employer and the employee. Paid leave can be found in the form of a Paid Time Off (PTO) Policy where vacation and sick days are combined, or as a traditional leave program that allow for separate allotments.

### ➤ *Public sector:*

- Three (3) public sector respondents have a PTO policy
- One (1) respondent has a PTO policy for uniformed police

### ➤ *Private sector:*

- Two (2) entities have a PTO policy

The majority of the respondents have traditional paid time off programs that provide for separate allotments for vacation, sick, holiday and personal leave

Published survey sources validate these responses in that the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) reports 63% of workers have traditional programs and Towers Watson reports that 84% of employers offer traditional programs.

## Vacation Leave

### *Vacation Accrual*

Vacation accrual is dependent on years of services.

**Tables 4A-4D** illustrates the *City of Phoenix, overall, is below the averages for both the public and private sectors* when reviewing vacation accrual for each employee group.

**TABLE 4A  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE ACCRUAL FOR EXECUTIVES/MANAGERS**

Market Sector	1 – 5	6 – 10	11 – 15	16 – 20	21+
Public Sector Custom	Execs: 16 Mgrs: 15	Execs:18 Mgrs: 17	19	22	23
Private Sector Custom	15/14	19	20	23	23
Local Public Sector	15	18	20	21	22
Published Data	16	22	23	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>

**TABLE 4B  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE ACCRUAL FOR GENERAL EMPLOYEES**

Market Sector	1 – 5	6 – 10	11 – 15	16 – 20	21+
Public Sector Custom	14	18	20	22	23
Private Sector Custom	14	19	20	23	23
Local Public Sector	14	17	19	21	21
Published Data	16	22	23	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>

**TABLE 4C  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE ACCRUAL FOR SWORN POLICE**

Market Sector	1 – 5	6 – 10	11 – 15	16 – 20	21+
Public Sector Custom	14	18	20	23	24
Private Sector Custom	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Local Public Sector	14	17	20	21	22
Published Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>

**TABLE 4D  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE ACCRUAL FOR SWORN FIRE**

Market Sector	1 – 5	6 – 10	11 – 15	16 – 20	21+
Public Sector Custom	13	16	19	21	22
Private Sector Custom	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Local Public Sector	16	20	23	25	26
Published Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>

## Vacation Carry Over and Cash-Out

The majority of public and private sector entities allows for carry over and cash-out of unused vacation time at separation and/or at retirement.

### ➤ **Public sector:**

- **Vacation carry over ranges from 30 – unlimited days**; for some employers maximum number of days varies by employee group
- **Vacation cash-out ranges from 0 – unlimited days**; for some employers cash-out at separation and retirement vary across employee groups

### ➤ **Private sector:**

- **Vacation carry over ranges from 8 – unlimited days** where maximum number of days remains consistent across all employee groups
- **Five (5) of seven (7) allow vacation cash-out at retirement that is unlimited**

City of **Phoenix** vacation carry over ranges from 24-45 days; cash-out at separation is 45 days and cash-out for retirement has a maximum of 56.25 days, which is consistent across employee groups. In this respect, the **City of Phoenix is more conservative** than the market.

## Sick Leave

Unlike vacation accrual, sick leave is typically given as a set number of days regardless of years of service.

### Sick Accrual

- **Public sector**, sick leave accrual averages range from 8-20 days dependent on employee group
- **Private sector**, sick leave accrual ranges from 5-12 days

The City of Phoenix accrues 15 days regardless of employee group which is **slightly higher**; however, **the City does not provide short-term disability insurance**.

### Sick Leave Carry Over and Cash-out

The majority of employers allow for the carryover of sick leave, while less than half allow sick time to be cashed out.

### ➤ **Public sector:**

- **Sick leave carry over ranges from 52 – unlimited days**
- **Sick leave cash-out** at separation ranges from 0 – unlimited and **at retirement** ranges from 60 – unlimited days

➤ **Private sector:**

- Sick leave carry over ranges from **0 – unlimited**
- Sick leave cash-out at separation ranges from **80 – unlimited days**, and at retirement ranges from **90 – unlimited days**

The City of **Phoenix does not allow cash-out at separation, and limits the amount that can be cashed out at retirement.** This varies by employee group and ranges from 20%-25% for General Employees and 35% - 60% for Sworn Public Safety depending on employee group.

## **Paid Holidays/Personal Leave**

### *Holidays*

All of public and private employers provide holidays.

- **Public sector employees receive 11 holidays**
- **Private sector receive 9 holidays**

The City of **Phoenix has 11.5 holidays.**

### *Personal Leave*

Approximately, one half of public and private employers provide for personal days.

- On average, in the **public sector and private sector** employees receive one (1) personal day

The City of Phoenix offers **3 for Middle Managers, Executives and General Employees; 2.5 for uniformed Police; and, 0 for Fire which is more generous** than the market.

### *Combined Paid Time Off Calculation*

In that some employers have a combined paid time off policy, it is important to consider a combined time off calculation. It is important to note that combined paid time off calculations will vary based on years of service due to varying vacation accruals. **Table 5** on the following page illustrates the total numbers for combined paid time off based on the different market sectors for six (6) to ten (10) years of service.

For this calculation, 6-10 years of service is shown, as it is representative of a large number of employees.

**TABLE 5  
COMBINED PAID TIME OFF**

Market Sector	Vacation 6-10 years	Sick*	Holiday	Personal	Total
<b>Public Sector</b>					
Executives	18	11	10	2	41
Managers	17	11	10	2	40
General Employees	17	11	10	1	39
Police	17	12	11	1	41
Fire	18	13	11	2	44
<b>Private Sector</b>					
Executives	19	11	9	1	40
Managers	19	11	9	1	40
General Employees	19	9	9	1	38
<b>Published Data</b>					
Executives	22	9	9	3	43
Managers	22	9	9	3	43
General Employees	22	10	9	3	44
<b>OVERALL</b>					
Executives	18	11	10	1	40
Managers	18	11	10	1	40
General Employees	17	11	10	1	39
Police	17	12	11	1	41
Fire	18	13	11	2	44
<b>Phoenix</b>					
Executives	15	15	11.5	3	44.5
Managers	15	15	11.5	3	44.5
General Employees	15	15	11.5	3	44.5
Police	15	15	11.5	2.5	44
Fire	15	15	11.5	0	41.5

*\*Phoenix does not offer short-term disability.*

## Disability Insurance

### Short-term Disability

In general, the majority of *public sector* respondents in the national data set do not provide short-term disability; whereas, in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the majority do provide short-term disability with a replacement ratio ranging from 50% – 100% of salary.

When reviewing *private sector* responses, we found that all of the entities surveyed provide short-term disability insurance (60-100% replacement ratio).

According to BLS, 63% of employees have access to coverage replacing 66% of earnings. Towers Watson reports a slightly higher number at 83% of employees with access to coverage replacing 66% of earnings.

The *City of Phoenix does not offer short-term disability*, which is attributable to the ability to bank unused sick leave as insurance against short-term disability.

See **Table 6** on page 29 for more detail.

### Long-term Disability

Long-term Disability insurance prevalence varies greatly across both public and private sector entities.

#### **Public sector:**

- Three (3) employers pay 100% for basic coverage
- One (1) pays 50% for basic coverage
- Two (2) pay 47% for basic coverage
- Four (4) report that they do not offer long-term disability

#### **Private sector:**

- Four (4) employers pay 100% for basic coverage, while two (2) do not offer long-term disability

The City of Phoenix *offers long-term disability insurance*. Contribution detail by employee group and market sector can be found in **Table 7** on page 30.

Additional detail can be found in **Appendix C, Tables C-10 through C-14** for short-term disability insurance and **Tables C-15 through C-20** for long-term disability insurance.

**TABLE 6**  
**SHORT TERM DISABILITY INSURANCE – EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Comparators	Short-term Disability Insurance Prevalence & Employer Contribution (% of premium)				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
Custom – Public Sector	1 employer: 0% N/A: 6 employers	1 employer: 0% N/A: 6 employers	1 employer: 0% N/A: 6 employers	1 employer: 0% N/A: 6 employers	1 employer: 0% N/A: 6 employers
Custom – Private Sector	4 employers: 100% 3 employers: 0%:	4 employers: 100% 3 employers: 0%:	4 employers: 100% 3 employers: 0%:	N/A	N/A
Local Public Sector	3 employers: 100% N/A: 2 employers	3 employers: 100% N/A: 2 employers	3 employers: 100% N/A: 2 employers	3 employers: 100% N/A: 2 employers	3 employers: 100% N/A: 2 employers
Published Data	77 – 88% of employers (depending on data source): 100%	100%: 77 – 88% of employers (depending on data source)	100%: 77 – 88% of employers (depending on data source)	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

*Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question.*

**TABLE 7**  
**LONG TERM DISABILITY INSURANCE – EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Comparators	Long Term Disability Insurance Prevalence and Employer Contribution (% of premium)				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
Custom – Public Sector	2 employers: 100% 1 employer: 0% N/A: 3 employers	2 employers: 100% 1 employer: 0% N/A: 3 employers	2 employers: 100% 1 employer: 0% N/A: 3 employers	2 employers: 100% N/A: 2 employers	2 employers: 100% 1 employer: 0%: N/A: 2 employers
Custom – Private Sector	4 employers: 100% 2 employers: 0%:	4 employers: 100% 2 employers: 0%:	4 employers: 100% 2 employers: 0%:	N/A	N/A
Local Public Sector	1 employer: 100%: 1 employer: 50% 2 employers: 47% 2 employers: Other N/A: 1 employer	1 employer: 100%: 1 employer: 50% 2 employers: 47% 2 employers: Other N/A: 1 employer	1 employer: 100%: 1 employer: 50% 2 employers: 47% 2 employers: Other N/A: 1 employer	2 employers: 100% 2 employers: Other N/A: 1 employer	2 employers: 100% 2 employers: Other N/A: 1 employer
Published Data	Varies by source	Varies by source	Varies by source	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

*Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question.*

## Retirement Program

### Defined Benefit Program

The City's defined benefit plan was under separate review by the Pension Reform Task Force and is being reviewed in this study simply to provide a current total compensation cost to the City. An in-depth review and analysis of the plan has been completed as part of the Pension Reform Task Force's initiative.

Additional detail data gathered can be found in **Appendix C, Tables C21-C23.**

### Defined Contribution Program

The majority of both *public and private sector entities* offer a Defined Contribution (DC) plan. *Public sector entities* typically *offer this as a supplement* to the defined benefit retirement plan. In the both the *public and private sector*, there typically is not a required employer contribution; rather employer contributions are typically matches to employee voluntary contributions.

#### ➤ *Public sector:*

- *Four (4) of 16 respondents* contribute to the fund
- Employer contributions for *General Employee jobs* nationwide average approximately 4 percent.
- In general, *Sworn Public Safety employees* do not receive contributions to a DC plan in addition to the defined benefit program

#### ➤ *Private sector:*

- One (1) of the seven (7) private sector respondents provides a required employer contribution
- Four (4) others provide a matching contribution

Towers Watson reports that median employer contributions are at 4% of base pay.

*The City currently contributes 9.6% to a defined contribution plan for Middle Managers and Executives, 0-6% for General Employees, .18% for Police, and 5% for Fire.* Contribution rates vary by group in that each group has negotiated different amounts in lieu of other benefits.

Additional detail can be found in **Appendix C, Tables C-24 and C-25.**

## Retiree Health

Over half of respondents offer retiree health for its retirees.

- 19 respondents offer retiree health for retirees *under the age of 65* to General Employees, 14 to uniformed Police and 15 to uniformed Fire
- 15 respondents offer retiree health for retirees *over the age of 65* to General Employees, 10 to uniformed Police and 11 to uniformed Fire
- Six (6) of the respondents **do not** offer retiree health to General Employees, and two (2) specifically to Police and Fire

*The City of Phoenix offers retiree health under the age of 65 as well as over the age of 65.*

## Retiree Health Employer Contributions

### Single Coverage

Table 8 provides monthly average employer contribution rates for retirees.

**TABLE 8  
MONTHLY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	< 65: \$369 > 65: \$190	< 65: \$369 > 65: \$190	< 65: \$517 > 65: \$199	< 65: \$431 > 65: \$166
Private Sector Custom	< 65: \$441 > 65: \$203	< 65: \$441 > 65: \$203	N/A	N/A
Local Public	< 65: \$119 > 65: \$53	< 65: \$119 > 65: \$53	< 65: \$119 > 65: \$53	< 65: \$119 > 65: \$53
Published Data	< 65: \$467 > 65: \$293	< 65: \$467 > 65: \$293	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$272 &gt; 65: \$145</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$272 &gt; 65: \$145</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$261 &gt; 65: \$120</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$244 &gt; 65: \$105</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$105 &gt; 65: \$90</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$105 &gt; 65: \$90</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$105 &gt; 65: \$90</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$105 &gt; 65: \$90</b>

Overall, *the City pays less than the market* for all employee categories.

Dual Coverage

Table 9 provides monthly average employer contribution rates for retirees.

**TABLE 9  
MONTHLY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	< 65: \$452 > 65: \$327	< 65: \$452 > 65: \$327	< 65: \$632 > 65: \$390	< 65: \$527 > 65: \$325
Private Sector Custom	< 65: \$899 > 65: \$406	< 65: \$899 > 65: \$406	N/A	N/A
Local Public	< 65: \$258 > 65: \$143	< 65: \$258 > 65: \$143	< 65: \$258 > 65: \$143	< 65: \$258 > 65: \$143
Published Data	< 65: \$293 > 65: \$472	< 65: \$293 > 65: \$472	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$424 &gt; 65: \$294</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$424 &gt; 65: \$294</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$392 &gt; 65: \$246</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$366 &gt; 65: \$211</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$105 &gt; 65: \$90</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$105 &gt; 65: \$90</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$105 &gt; 65: \$90</b>	<b>&lt; 65: \$105 &gt; 65: \$90</b>

Overall, *the City pays less than the market* for all employee categories.

Additional detail on retiree health can be found in **Appendix C, Tables C-26 through C-29.**

## Health Benefits

The most popular health plans for the surveyed population are PPO/POS plans followed by HMO/EPOS plans.

The majority of respondents, whether public or private sector offer health benefits to part-time employees working over 20-30 hours.

### PPO/POS Plans

Employer contributions vary not only by coverage, but by employee group as well. Review of survey responses indicate there is less variation between public and private sector data when considering single coverage plans.

#### Single Coverage

Monthly averages for employer contributions as well as percentage of employer contributions are compared by employee group in **Tables 10A and 10B**. The City of Phoenix is *slightly below market* in employer contribution costs.

**TABLE 10A  
PPO PLAN MONTHLY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	\$585	\$585	\$607	\$680
Private Sector Custom	\$427/\$428	\$429	N/A	N/A
Local Public	\$423	\$423	\$423	\$423
Published Data	\$385	\$385	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>\$463/464</b>	<b>\$464</b>	<b>\$493</b>	<b>\$533</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>\$415</b>	<b>\$415</b>	<b>\$415</b>	<b>\$415</b>

**TABLE 10B  
PPO PLAN EMPLOYER COST SHARING**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	78%	90%	95%	93%
Private Sector Custom	85%	85%	N/A	N/A
Local Public	80%	80%	80%	80%
Published Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>91%</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>

## Family Coverage

Monthly averages for employer contributions as well as percentage of employer contributions are compared by employee group in **Tables 11A and 11B**. The City of Phoenix is *slightly above market* for employer contribution costs.

**TABLE 11A  
PPO MONTHLY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	\$1,184	\$1,184	\$821	\$1,057
Private Sector Custom	\$1,201/\$1,206	\$1,208	N/A	N/A
Local Public	\$913	\$913	\$913	\$913
Published Data	\$1,058	\$1,058	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>\$1,084/\$1,085</b>	<b>\$1,086</b>	<b>\$878</b>	<b>\$974</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>\$1,195</b>	<b>\$1,195</b>	<b>\$1,195</b>	<b>\$1,195</b>

**TABLE 11B  
PPO PLAN EMPLOYER COST SHARING**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	61%	65%	57%	64%
Private Sector Custom	78%	78%	N/A	N/A
Local Public	76%	76%	76%	76%
Published Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>70%</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>

## HMO/EPO Plans

Employer contributions vary not only by coverage, but by employee group as well. Review of survey responses indicates HMO plans are less popular in the private sector. *The City of Phoenix is competitive when comparing to both single coverage and family coverage.*

### Single Coverage

Monthly averages for employer contributions as well as percentage of employer contributions are compared by employee group in **Tables 12A and 12B.**

**TABLE 12A  
HMO MONTHLY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	\$427	\$427	\$392	\$432
Private Sector Custom	\$446*	\$446*	N/A	N/A
Local Public	\$405	\$405	\$405	\$405
Published Data	\$376	\$376	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>\$410</b>	<b>\$410</b>	<b>\$402</b>	<b>\$413</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>\$377</b>	<b>\$377</b>	<b>\$377</b>	<b>\$377</b>

\* Only one private sector entity reported having an HMO/EPO.

**TABLE 12B  
HMO PLAN EMPLOYER COST SHARING**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	92%	95%	95%	95%
Private Sector Custom	95%	95%	N/A	N/A
Local Public	90%	90%	90%	90%
Published Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>91%</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>

\* Only one private sector entity reported having an HMO/EPO.

## Family Coverage

Monthly averages for employer contributions as well as percentage of employer contributions are compared by employee group in **Tables 13A and 13B**.

**TABLE 13A  
HMO MONTHLY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	\$1,077	\$1,077	\$931	\$1,050
Private Sector Custom	\$1,622*	\$1,622*	N/A	N/A
Local Public	\$1,038	\$1,038	\$1,038	\$1,038
Published Data	\$1,025	\$1,025	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>\$1,082</b>	<b>\$1,082</b>	<b>\$1,011</b>	<b>\$1,042</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>\$1,085</b>	<b>\$1,085</b>	<b>\$1,085</b>	<b>\$1,085</b>

\* Only one private sector entity reported having an HMO/EPO.

**TABLE 13B  
HMO PLAN EMPLOYER COST SHARING**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	73%	81%	74%	78%
Private Sector Custom	82%	82%	N/A	N/A
Local Public	81%	81%	81%	81%
Published Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>

\* Only one private sector entity reported having an HMO/EPO.

## Dental Plans

Based on survey responses for this question, 100% of respondents provide a stand-alone dental plan. *The City of Phoenix's Dental PPO* is the most populated plan and *is above market when comparing to both single coverage and family coverage*. It is important to note that the City also offers a less expensive DHMO plan as well.

### Single Coverage

Monthly averages for employer contributions as well as percentage of employer contributions are compared by employee group in **Tables 14A and 14B**.

**TABLE 14A  
DENTAL MONTHLY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	\$9	\$9	\$7	\$6
Private Sector Custom	\$30	\$30	N/A	N/A
Local Public	\$37	\$37	\$37	\$37
Published Data	\$16	\$16	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>\$27</b>	<b>\$27</b>	<b>\$28</b>	<b>\$26</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>\$52</b>	<b>\$52</b>	<b>\$52</b>	<b>\$52</b>

**TABLE 14B  
DENTAL EMPLOYER COST SHARING**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	45%	47%	47%	33%
Private Sector Custom	75%	75%	N/A	N/A
Local Public	93%	93%	93%	93%
Published Data	61%	61%	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Family Coverage

Monthly averages for employer contributions as well as percentage of employer contributions are compared by employee group in **Tables 15A and 15B**.

**TABLE 15A  
DENTAL MONTHLY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION PERCENTAGES**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	\$26	\$26	\$16	\$16
Private Sector Custom	\$92	\$92	N/A	N/A
Local Public	\$70	\$70	\$70	\$70
Published Data	\$48	\$48	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>\$64</b>	<b>\$64</b>	<b>\$53</b>	<b>\$51</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>\$107</b>	<b>\$107</b>	<b>\$107</b>	<b>\$107</b>

**TABLE 15B  
DENTAL EMPLOYER COST SHARING**

Employee Category	Executives/ Managers	General Employees	Police	Fire
Public Sector Custom	42%	45%	44%	30%
Private Sector Custom	66%	66%	N/A	N/A
Local Public	61%	61%	61%	61%
Published Data	61%	61%	N/A	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>75%</b>

The City of *Phoenix* pays more for both single coverage and family coverage when compared to the market.

## Vision Plan

The majority of the survey respondents offer a vision plan; however, the cost is borne by the employee.

*The City of Phoenix does not offer a stand-alone vision plan to employees*

## Total Compensation Calculation

### Methodology

While the prior tables identify the competitiveness of individual components of total compensation (base pay, health and retirement benefits), it is important to evaluate the competitiveness of total compensation. To calculate total compensation, we did the following:

1. Identified approximately 150 job titles that represented the bulk of the City's employees. Our approach was to compare the market pay range midpoint with the midpoint of the City's current pay ranges for each of these job titles.
2. Compared the City's weighted total cost of health benefits (medical and dental) to the market weighted average total cost of health benefits, assuming the same mix of participation by plan and tier of coverage as City employees. This approach standardized our comparisons using a fixed population base to facilitate an apples-to-apples cost comparison.
3. Compared the City's contributions to both defined benefit and defined contribution retirement plans to the average contribution rates found in the market on a percent of pay basis as well as on a percent of total compensation basis.

**Appendix B10-A and B10-B** displays the competitiveness of *current pay and benefits* on a selected benchmark job title basis and compares total benefit costs as a percent of pay as well as a percent of total compensation.

While direct compensation on average is at market (within the competitive range) at the pay range midpoint, the comparison of benefits as a percent of pay demonstrates that the City's *health benefits package overall costs approximately 1 percentage point above the market*. Furthermore,

The City's *retirement benefit program (defined benefit and defined contribution)* is

- *25 percentage points above market for Sworn Public Safety*
- *32 percentage points above market for General Employees*

### Total Compensation Costs

Overall, when looking at costs of pay and major benefits (health and retirement – DB and DC), we found for *General Employees the total compensation costs are 1 percentage point above the competitive range*.

When we specifically look at *Sworn Public Safety*, we found that the total compensation costs are *5 percentage points above the competitive range*.

# Observations & Implementation Steps

## Observations and Considerations

In reviewing the City's compensation program and subsequent relevant data in the market place, we found that Phoenix's aggregate pay is market competitive, but the cost of the benefits package is slightly above market. We found the City's compensation policies are in alignment with compensation standards.

While we found many total compensation components that are, *at market*, we did discover outliers (offerings above and below) as well as best practices that exist within the City of Phoenix's total compensation program. Each of these should be reviewed by the City of Phoenix to determine the added value to the City and its employees when revising its total compensation program. Observations include:

- The City is already taking proactive measures to ensure the City's benefit offerings and wellness programs provide added value to the City and its employees
- In reviewing the City of Phoenix's job titles and market data, a number of potential classification changes have been identified. The City might benefit from classification studies which might lead to job title consolidation and identification of industry appropriate job titles
- Total compensation costs which include major benefits (medical and defined benefit and defined contribution retirement plans) place the City slightly above market by 1 percentage point
- The need to determine whether the City wants to lead, lag, or be at market when compared to its peers
- While overall, the City is at market when looking at aggregate pay data, the City does have some jobs where pay ranges need to be adjusted to market; this required additional work by the City and Segal to determine recruiting labor markets and internal equity considerations so that jobs are placed in the appropriate pay grades
- Health benefit costs appear to be slightly more expensive than in the market. Benefit plan design should be reviewed in the future to determine if there are program design changes that will benefit the City and its employees
- Currently the City's defined retirement benefit program is more generous and costly than found in the market place. The City does recognize this and has appointed a Pension Reform Task Force that has recommended changes to the current retirement program to ensure sustainability for the City's active and retired employees

- The City offers a defined contribution retirement program that has historically been considered by the City as a component of pay as opposed to an element of the City's overall retirement program. In the market place, most employers require a contribution by employees before the employer makes a required contribution
- As part of compensation program redesign, the City will need to consider modification and/or additional pay practices and compensation policies to ensure the City continues to remain competitive in its recruitment and retention of City employees
- In order to continue to recruit and retain high performing professionals, the City should consider implementing pay for performance for employee categories other than Middle Managers and Executives

More detail on each of these areas can be found in the following sections.

### **Proactive Total Compensation Program Design Measures**

Meeting with stakeholders, employee representatives, and the Compensation & Benefits Working Group reveal there are measures the City is currently taking that allows the City to be proactive, rather than reactive to managing total compensation costs. Opinion surveys and biometric measures are both proactive and are measures that can have potential future savings by 1) teaching employees to be more active in their own healthcare, and 2) provide an overall total compensation package that employees appreciate and provide added value to the overall total compensation package.

### **Potential Need for Job Analysis**

A review of the job summaries used to gather market data for the benchmark jobs suggests that there may be duplication of duties and required skill sets under multiple job titles. While reviewing job titles during the market study, the City has already identified many job titles that can be abolished and are working to abolish them. We suggest the City continue to review its classification structure and consolidate certain job titles where appropriate.

### **Total Compensation**

#### *Total Compensation Cost*

While currently the City's cost for total compensation across all employee groups (General Employees and Sworn Public Safety Employees) is 1 percentage point above the competitive range, the City must take into consideration the impact of the recommendations from the Pension Reform Task Force will have on the cost of total compensation in the future.

## *Base Pay*

When considering aggregate pay data, both public and private sector, the City's salary ranges are market competitive (2 percentage points in comparison to national data and at market for local data). Nonetheless, the competitiveness of pay varies by occupational group, and job series within occupational group. Not all benchmark jobs reflect data from each of the survey sources as some jobs may be specific to the public sector and have no counterpart in the private sector. For those jobs that can be found in the Phoenix private sector labor market, the City's pay rates are significantly below market at 19 percentage points below market.

## *Medical Benefits*

The City's health benefit offerings are comparable to those offered in the market. Health benefit costs appear to be slightly more expensive than the market average. This may be the result of differences in workforce demographics, claims experience or plan design. We were not asked to address these factors in our analysis. The City's contributions to health insurance are slightly below market for single coverage and are above market for family coverage.

## *Defined Benefit Retirement Program*

The City provides its employees with a defined benefit retirement plan. The City's contribution to its defined benefit retirement plan as a percent of pay is higher than the market average for all employee groups. We understand the Pension Reform Task Force has evaluated and will make recommendations as to the appropriateness of the plan design and associated costs.

## *Defined Contribution Program*

The City's contribution to the defined contribution benefit varies by employee group and in some cases is the subject of collective bargaining. In the case of supervisors, managers, and executives the contribution rates appear to be generous compared to prevailing market contribution rates. Unlike what we typically see in the market, the City's contribution is not based on any required employee contribution to the plan. However, it is important to note this is a benefit that for some employee groups was agreed upon in lieu of increases to base salary.

## **Compensation Program Design Changes**

Compensation program redesign includes ensuring an organization has compensation practices and policies in place that promote stability of the compensation program today, and into the future, based on compensation redesign changes. Discussions with the City revealed a strong desire by leadership and other stakeholders to move towards a pay for performance system for employee groups other than Middle Managers and Executives. Moving to a pay for performance program requires cultural change, methods and tools for measuring performance, skill sets in setting goals and reviewing performance, and the desire and commitment to differentiating performance.

Many organizations implement pay for performance over a number of years starting with management and moving down through the organization over a period of years. The City should consider implementing pay for performance with the next level down which might include ASPTEA and other professional, exempt jobs. The City should also consider exploring pay for performance with the unions in order to determine members' willingness to move towards this type of a pay system.

Depending on changes to the compensation program, existing pay practices and compensation policies may need to be changed. For example, should the City move to a pay for performance system for other employee groups the City would need to change pay policies that are affected by this such as longevity.

The City should also explore other pay practices that will provide flexibility to Human Resources and hiring managers in order to attract and retain high quality staff.

Suggested pay policy considerations include:

- Changes to the **new hire policy** that will allow hiring managers flexibility, with the permission of Human Resources and the City Manager to hire a candidate slightly above the candidate's current salary provided it is within the pay range of the City's job classification. This should of course take into consideration internal equity issues within the department so as not to create inequity
- Changes to the **promotional policy** so that hiring managers can provide increases, with the permission of Human Resources and the City Manager, that provide sufficient incentive for employees to take on additional responsibility. This may vary by level employee. For example, World at Work reports a mode of 5% for Nonexempt staff and 10% for Exempt and Executives.
- Consider implementing a mechanism for compensating for **hot skills** (set of skills presently in a high labor-market demand and in short supply relative to demand). For critical jobs that the City is having difficulty recruiting and retaining, the City may want to consider an incentive, with the permission of Human Resources and the City Manager that will provide the City with flexibility in recruiting and retaining valuable employees. Such incentives might include hiring bonuses, salary supplements, or project completion bonuses as determined by the market for identified hot skills.

## Implementation Steps

Taking the appropriate steps to implement the results of a compensation study require a thoughtful strategy and consideration of implications on the overall total compensation program. This is even more important when considering the many moving parts of an organization that is considering multiple initiatives for organizational improvement and change.

In order to ensure successful implementation we propose the following steps:

1. Define the City's market position to either lead, lag or be at market
2. Implement the pay ranges that are reflective of market data, defined recruiting markets, and defined career paths within the City (see pages 51-66 for a list of recommended grade changes)
3. Determine estimated costs/savings of the proposed salary structure
4. Model effects of pension reform recommendation on the overall total compensation cost
5. Continue to review and monitor health benefits to determine appropriate proactive changes
6. Modify compensation practices and policies to ensure the City can continue to recruit and retain qualified staff
7. Based on need, identify departments and/or occupational groups that may require further job analysis to ensure job duties/responsibilities, minimum qualifications, and requisite skill sets have been identified

These can be found in more detail in the following sections.

### *1. Determine/Define Competitive Market Positioning*

A major component of determining an organization's competitiveness of its compensation program is to determine where the organization desires to be in relation to the market. This is often described as the desire to be either at market average, or at a percentage level above market average (such as 10%, 15%, etc.) in order to recruit and retain well-qualified staff in organizations that desire to be a high performing organization.

This philosophical question must be resolved in order for the newly designed program to be successful.

### *2. Determine Competitive Ranges and Assign Jobs to Pay Grades*

Although pay ranges on average across all benchmark jobs appear to be market competitive, we note that certain individual job titles within occupational groups may be above or below market. We recommend the City adjust pay range for these jobs to bring them more in line with the market. Segal's proposed grades take into consideration the relationship between rank and file,

supervisor, manager and executive pay within and across jobs series, occupational groups and organizational units, prevailing market pay rates, and defined recruiting labor markets.

Based on the above methodology, Segal found the following 73 jobs should receive grade increases. These can be found in **Table 16A** as shown below.

**TABLE 16A**  
**JOB TITLES WITH GRADE INCREASES**

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
24	25	18	Court/Legal Clerk III
27	28	1	Asst Ticket Services Supv
27	28	2	Library Support Services Supervisor
30	31	4	Contracts Specialist I
30	31	14	Court Supervisor
30	31	4	Police Property Supervisor
30	31	7	Tax Auditor
30	31	1	Ticket Services Supervisor
31	32	4	Buyer
31	32	11	Solid Waste Supervisor
31	32	1	Tax Enforcement Supervisor
32	33	2	Operations Analyst
32	33	6	Senior Buyer
32	33	15	Senior GIS Technician
31	33	13	Utility Supervisor
33	34	0	Business Systems Analyst
33	34	6	Senior Tax Auditor
33	34	8	Water Customer Services Supervisor II
35	37	1	Energy Management Engineer
32	35	2	Energy Management Specialist
33	36	7	Internal Auditor II
35	36	22	Contracts Specialist II
35	36	6	Human Resources Officer
35	36	14	Public Information Officer
36	37	7	Solid Waste Superintendent
37	38	10	Department Budget Supervisor
37	38	0	Finance Supervisor
37	38	1	Human Services Planning Supv
37	38	5	Human Services Program Coordinator
38	39	0	Lead Business Systems Analyst
39	40	2	Investment Manager
41	42	2	Asst Crime Lab Administrator
41	42	1	Investment and Debt Manager
111	112	26	Equipment Operator I
111	112	32	Greenskeeper
110	113	57	Semiskilled Worker
113	114	51	Equipment Operator II
116A	117A	10	Cement Finisher
218A	219A	50	Auto Technician
209	210	7	Equipment Service Worker I

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
214	215	3	Materials Technician
214	215	108	Utility Technician
213	216	51	Equipment Service Worker II
215	216	42	Utility Specialty Technician
215	216	81	Water Services Technician
216	218	31	Water Services Specialist
218	219	62	Senior Utility Technician
218	219	5	Utility TV Technician
320	321	19	Court/Legal Clerk I
320	321	53	Customer Service Clerk
322	323	111	Court/Legal Clerk II
324	325	27	Engineering Technician
324	325	16	Fingerprint Technician
723	724	41	Human Resources Clerk II
838	M09	4	Solid Waste Administrator
842	M13	8	Deputy Aviation Director
845	M15	5	Assistant Chief Counsel (NC)
845	M15	2	Deputy City Prosecutor (NC)
845	M15	1	Public Defender (NC)
903	E10	1	Labor Relations Administrator (NC)
903	E10	1	Municipal Court Executive Officer
904	E10	1	Retirement Program Administrator
907	E11	2	Assistant Aviation Director
905	E11	2	Assistant Chief Information Officer
908	E12	0	Chief Asst City Attorney (NC)
908	E12	1	Executive Assistant to the City Manager (NC)
911	E13	1	Aviation Director (NC)
909	E13	1	Chief Information Officer (NC)
909	E13	1	Finance Director (NC)
912	E14	1	City Attorney (NC)
912	E14	3	Deputy City Manager (NC)
914	E15	1	Assistant City Manager (NC)
940	E40*	1	City Manager

*\*The City Manager's pay is negotiated directly with the Council; the survey shows this job is below market.*

Based on the above methodology, Segal found the following 63 jobs should receive grade decreases:

**TABLE 16B  
JOB TITLES WITH GRADE DECREASES**

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
25	23	5	Meal Delivery Supervisor
26	25	78	Library Assistant
26	25	40	Park Ranger II
28	27	9	Park Ranger III
31	28	1	Environmental Programs Asst
30	29	2	Lead Computer Operator
32	31	2	Computer Production Scheduler
32	31	11	Multimedia Specialist
32	31	5	Treasury Collections Supervisor
33	32	1	Facilities Service Coordinator
33	32	1	Legal Assistant Supervisor
35	32	1	Property Records Supervisor
34	33	1	Equipment Parts Supervisor
34	33	5	Supplies Supervisor
35	34	23	Information Technology Analyst/Programmer I
36	34	1	Printing Services Supervisor
35	34	127	User Technology Specialist
37	35	4	Polygraph Examiner
40	37	6	Environmental Programs Coordinator
81	80	3	Municipal Court Hearing Officer (NC)
86	85	1	Presiding Court Hrng Off (NC)
112	111	28	Supplies Clerk I
115	114	36	Supplies Clerk II
117	116	19	Parks Maintenance Mechanic
117	116	8	Supplies Clerk III
120	119	114	Building Maintenance Worker
214	213	1	Building Equip Op Appr (NC)
222A	220A	1	Body Repair Specialist
220	221	5	Senior Materials Technician
222A	221A	49	Building Equipment Operator I
317	315	308	Lifeguard
322	320	12	Cook
322	320	15	Senior Center Assistant
323	322	102	Municipal Security Guard
325	324	1	Computer Operator
328	327	55	Solid Waste Environmental Specialist
328	327	26	Treasury Collections Representative
332	331	2	Planning Graphic Designer
333	332	0	Const Permit Spec I
333	332	0	Electrical Plans Examiner I
333	332	0	Mechanical Plans Examiner I
333	332	0	Structural Plans Examiner I

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
334	333	8	Construction Permit Specialist II
335	334	4	Building Code Examiner
335	334	2	Electrical Plans Examiner II
335	334	4	Mechanical Plans Examiner II
335	334	1	Structural Plans Examiner II
851	850	68	Fire Battalion Chief
840	M09	2	Administrative Assistant III
840	M09	5	Management Assistant III
841	M10	3	Deputy City Clerk
841	M10	1	Fire 911 Administrator
841	M10	1	Management Assistant III*IP
842	M10	1	Police R & I Bureau Administrator
842	M11	0	Asst Water Resources Mgt Advsr
904	E08	1	Assistant to the City Manager (NC)
904	E08	0	Assistant to the Mayor (a) (NC)
903	E08	1	Environmental Programs Manager
903	E08	0	Water Resources Management Advisor (NC)
905	E09	1	RWC Director (prev: Asst CIO)
908	E10	1	Intergovernmental Affairs Coordinator (NC)
956	E13	1	Fire Chief (NC)
C22	C21	6	Council Assistant (NC)

In the future, we recommend the City consider using a subset of the 601 benchmarks to maintain the City’s compensation program. With the assistance of the HR Project Team, Segal identified a subset of anchor benchmarks, which is representative of the greater group of the 601 jobs, surveyed. These anchor benchmarks are jobs that cover large numbers of employees, cross employee categories, represent departments across the organization and jobs in a variety of pay grades. This identified list of job titles should be considered benchmarks for future analysis for conducting future market studies and for the addition of new jobs into assigned grades based on market data.

A complete list of Phoenix job titles can be found on pages 51-66.

### *3. Determine costs/savings estimate for implementing a market-based salary structure*

Based on the proposed grade assignments, it will be necessary to estimate potential costs of the proposed salary structure.

#### *4. Model Potential Changes Retirement Costs*

In order to ensure the recommendations from the Pension Reform Task Force, and other programmatic changes, do not adversely affect the overall total compensation program, the City needs to model the impacts of potential changes to the overall total compensation costs.

In addition to the City's defined benefit retirement plan, the City provides certain employee groups with a contribution into a defined contribution plan. Typically, defined contribution arrangements reflect an employer match to an employee contribution. The City does not require any employee contribution to this plan. Additionally, the City's contribution rate for certain employee groups (supervisors, managers, and executives) exceeds the average rate we typically found in the market place.

While we recognize that this supplemental defined contribution plan was negotiated by some groups in lieu of salary increases, and has served as a retention tool for supervisors, manager, and executives, we suggest that the City consider the following alternatives and whether or not alternatives would bring total compensation more in line with the market:

- Implement a program whereby the City's contribution is based on a match to an employee contribution
- Reduce the amount of the City's defined contribution to be more in line with prevailing market practices
- Consider rolling the defined contribution amount into base pay as implemented with other groups

#### *5. Continue to monitor health benefits and future programmatic changes*

The City appears to be high in dental coverage employer contributions; we recommend that the City review dental benefits along with plan design and total compensation costs.

Furthermore, we recommend the City consider reviewing medical program design offerings and programs that provide added value to both the City and employees.

#### *6. Modify compensation practices and policies*

Based on compensation program redesign, draft and implement new compensation pay practices and policies such as new hire, promotional and hot skills policies.

#### *7. Conduct classification studies in identified areas*

The compensation study has identified several areas where it might be beneficial to the City to conduct further job analysis. These areas should be reviewed and determine the appropriateness of conducting job analysis work.

*Proposed Grade List:*

The following proposed grade list is sorted by proposed grade.

**TABLE 16C  
PROPOSED GRADES**

<b>Current Grade</b>	<b>Proposed Grade</b>	<b>No. of Incs</b>	<b>Job Title</b>
23	23	19	Event Services Lead
23	23	5	Community Worker III
25	23	5	Meal Delivery Supervisor
24	25	18	Court/Legal Clerk III
25	25	6	Custodial Supervisor I
25	25	1	Lead Key Entry Operator
26	25	78	Library Assistant
26	25	40	Park Ranger II
25	25	122	Secretary III
25	25	8	Street Maint Foreman I
26	26	2	Admin Intern (NC)
26	26	6	Event Services Supervisor
26	26	18	Head Start Educator
26	26	15	Housing Program Assistant
26	26	2	Inventory Control Specialist
26	26	6	Records Clerk III
27	27	3	Account Clerk Supervisor
27	27	29	Administrative Secretary
27	27	20	Aviation Supervisor I
27	27	5	Clerical Supervisor
27	27	1	Custodial Supervisor II
27	27	0	Housing Investigator
27	27	1	Mail Service Supervisor
27	27	2	Management Intern (NC)
28	27	9	Park Ranger III
27	27	0	Parking Meter Repair Supv
27	27	43	Parks Foreman I
27	27	0	Printing Services Foreman
27	27	4	Production Assistant
27	27	2	Records Supervisor
27	27	26	Street Maintenance Foreman II
27	27	1	Telecommunications Center Supervisor
27	27	4	Traffic Maintenance Foreman II
27	28	1	Asst Ticket Services Supv
28	28	79	Caseworker II
28	28	4	Council Reporter
31	28	1	Environmental Programs Asst
27	28	2	Library Support Services Supervisor
28	28	0	Recreation Coordinator I
28	28	4	Retirement Assistant

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
29	29	1	Asst Transportation Supervisor
29	29	0	Fuel Management Specialist
30	29	2	Lead Computer Operator
29	29	6	Museum Assistant
29	29	1	Neighborhood Maint Tech III
29	29	16	Parks Foreman II
29	29	2	Secretarial Supervisor
29	29	34	Solid Waste Foreman
29	29	3	Solid Waste Landfill Foreman
29	29	5	Street Maintenance Foreman III
29	29	2	Traffic Maintenance Frmn III
29	29	30	Utility Foreman
30	30	31	Accountant I
30	30	79	Administrative Assistant I
30	30	0	Benefits Analyst I
30	30	10	Human Resources Analyst I
30	30	0	Internal Auditor I
30	30	15	Librarian I
30	30	1	Office Systems Technology Specialist
30	30	36	Recreation Coordinator II
30	30	4	Safety Analyst I
30	30	12	Senior Programs Supervisor I
30	30	7	Training Specialist
30	30	22	Water Customer Services Supervisor I
31	31	31	Aviation Supervisor II
31	31	24	Building Maintenance Foreman
31	31	26	Chemist I
32	31	2	Computer Production Scheduler
30	31	4	Contracts Specialist I
30	31	14	Court Supervisor
31	31	3	Equal Opportunity Progrms Asst
31	31	0	Equipment Fabrication Foreman
31	31	20	Equipment Shop Foreman
31	31	6	Events Coordinator
31	31	13	Management Assistant I
32	31	11	Multimedia Specialist
31	31	1	Noise Abatement Specialist
31	31	2	Parks Specialized Maint Frmn
30	31	4	Police Property Supervisor
31	31	9	Police R & I Bureau Shift Supervisor
31	31	20	Project Management Assistant
30	31	7	Tax Auditor
30	31	1	Ticket Services Supervisor
31	31	0	Tire Program Supervisor
31	31	0	Traffic Engineer I
32	31	5	Treasury Collections Supervisor
31	31	4	Workforce Development Specialist
32	32	2	Asst Housing Supervisor
32	32	1	Asst Security Systems Supv

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
32	32	6	Budget Analyst I
32	32	16	Building Equipment Supervisor
31	32	4	Buyer
32	32	32	Caseworker III
32	32	1	Community Outreach Supervisor
32	32	0	Contract Compliance Supervisor
32	32	4	Elections/Annexation Specialist II
32	32	15	Electrical Maintenance Foreman
33	32	1	Facilities Service Coordinator
32	32	6	Fire Communications Supervisor
32	32	22	Forensic Scientist II
33	32	1	Legal Assistant Supervisor
32	32	32	Librarian II
32	32	23	Ops & Maintenance Supervisor
32	32	31	Police Communications Supervisor
35	32	1	Property Records Supervisor
32	32	13	Property Specialist
32	32	5	Senior Programs Supervisor II
32	32	0	Senior Property Records Specialist
32	32	0	Senior Workers Program Coord
32	32	5	Signal Systems Specialist I
31	32	11	Solid Waste Supervisor
31	32	1	Tax Enforcement Supervisor
32	32	1	Telecommunications Svcs Asst
32	32	2	Traffic Signal Technician Foreman
33	33	44	Accountant II
33	33	4	Arts Specialist
33	33	1	Asst Event Services Manager
33	33	4	Building Maintenance Supervisor
33	33	0	Civil Engineer I
33	33	3	Claims Adjuster II
33	33	10	Criminal Intelligence Analyst
33	33	15	Curriculum/Training Coordinator
33	33	1	Dietitian
33	33	4	Economic Development Specialist
34	33	1	Equipment Parts Supervisor
33	33	4	Head Start Education Specialist
33	33	24	Human Resources Analyst II
33	33	6	Information Technology Service Specialist
33	33	5	Landscape Architect I
33	33	1	Neighborhood Svcs Prog Coord
32	33	2	Operations Analyst
33	33	8	Park Manager
33	33	7	Planner I
33	33	1	Police Alarm Coordinator
33	33	1	Police Public Relations Representative
33	33	6	Police Research Analyst
33	33	5	Production Coordinator
33	33	12	Public Information Specialist

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
33	33	30	Recreation Coordinator III
33	33	4	Relocation Specialist
33	33	10	Safety Analyst II
33	33	6	Sales Manager
32	33	6	Senior Buyer
32	33	15	Senior GIS Technician
33	33	1	Senior Utility Supervisor
33	33	4	Solid Waste Admin Analyst
33	33	5	Street Maintenance Supervisor
34	33	5	Supplies Supervisor
31	33	13	Utility Supervisor
33	33	2	Video Services Unit Supervisor
33	33	4	Volunteer Coordinator
33	33	3	Water Resource Specialist
33	33	0	Youth Services Coordinator
33	33	4	Benefits Analyst II
33	34	0	Business Systems Analyst
34	34	0	Communications Supervisor
34	34	2	Electrical Facilities Supervisor
34	34	1	Forestry Supervisor
34	34	4	Golf Course Supervisor
34	34	1	Horticulturist
35	34	23	Information Technology Analyst/Programmer I
34	34	0	Information Technology Supervisor
34	34	1	Instrumentation & Cont Supervisor
34	34	2	Museum Curator
34	34	9	Neighborhood Preserv Insp II
34	34	1	Paramedic Training Coordinator
34	34	1	Parks Special Maintenance Supv
34	34	0	Petroleum Supplies Supervisor
34	34	5	Police Comm. Shift Supervisor
36	34	1	Printing Services Supervisor
34	34	1	Procurement Supervisor
34	34	3	Security Systems Supervisor
34	34	2	Senior Building Equipment Supv
33	34	6	Senior Tax Auditor
34	34	1	Substance Abuse Screening Supervisor
34	34	2	Traffic Signal Supervisor
35	34	127	User Technology Specialist
33	34	8	Water Customer Services Supervisor II
35	35	38	Accountant III
35	35	55	Administrative Assistant II
35	35	0	Administrative Assistant to the Mayor (NC)
35	35	2	Asst Court Administrator
35	35	1	Asst Production Services Mgr
35	35	10	Aviation Supervisor III
35	35	28	Budget Analyst II
35	35	2	Casework Services Coordinator
35	35	7	Chemist II

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
35	35	4	Chief Water Quality Inspector
35	35	17	Civil Engineer II
35	35	5	Crime Scene Shift Supervisor
35	35	3	Elections Coordinator
32	35	2	Energy Management Specialist
35	35	29	Environmental Quality Specialist
35	35	10	Equal Opportunity Specialist
35	35	9	Equipment Maintenance Supervisor
35	35	1	Event Services Manager
35	35	0	Fire Prevention Supervisor
35	35	15	Forensic Scientist III
35	35	0	Head Golf Professional
35	35	3	Head Start Area Supervisor
35	35	9	Housing Development Specialist
35	35	3	Housing Supervisor
35	35	4	Industrial Hygienist
35	35	8	Librarian III
35	35	2	Materials Supervisor
35	35	8	Neighborhood Specialist
35	35	8	Parks Supervisor
35	35	25	Planner II
35	35	2	Police R & I Operations Supervisor
37	35	4	Polygraph Examiner
35	35	29	Principal Engineering Technician
35	35	2	Quality Assurance Engineer
35	35	5	Recreation Supervisor
35	35	1	Secretary to City Manager (NC)
35	35	1	Senior Workforce Dev Spec
35	35	1	Survey Supervisor
35	35	3	Traffic Engineer II
35	35	0	Traffic Safety Coordinator
35	35	1	Transit Ops Contract Supv
35	35	5	Video Productions Coordinator
35	35	2	Water & Wastewtr Econ Anlst
35	35	7	Water Services Process Control Specialist
36	36	1	Aircraft Maintenance Supervisor
36	36	0	City Archaeologist
36	36	1	Civil Inspections Field Supervisor
36	36	7	Construction Inspector Supervisor
36	36	0	Construction Permit Supervisor
35	36	22	Contracts Specialist II
36	36	2	Electrical Inspector Field Supervisor
36	36	1	Elevator Inspector Field Supervisor
36	36	3	Equal Opportunity Spec*Lead
36	36	6	Facility Coordinator
36	36	2	General Inspections Field Supervisor
36	36	4	GIS Coordinator
36	36	1	Housing Rehabilitation Supervisor
35	36	6	Human Resources Officer

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
36	36	3	Human Services Center Supervisor
33	36	7	Internal Auditor II/III (Combined classes)
36	36	9	Internal Auditor II/III (Combined classes)
36	36	1	Labor Compliance Supervisor
36	36	5	Landscape Architect II
36	36	1	Neighborhood Preservation Supervisor
36	36	2	Plumbing/Mechanical Inspector Field Supervisor
36	36	56	Project Manager
35	36	14	Public Information Officer
36	36	1	Rate Analyst
36	36	1	Sales Supervisor
36	36	0	Senior Business Systems Analyst
36	36	1	Signal Systems Specialist II
36	36	1	Site Development Supervisor
36	36	2	Structural Inspector Field Supervisor
36	36	1	Transportation Supervisor
37	37	17	Accountant IV
37	37	2	Asst Customer Svcs Adm
37	37	1	Asst Protocol Program Adm (NC)
37	37	5	Chemist III
37	37	3	Communications Engineer
35	37	1	Energy Management Engineer
37	37	1	EAP/Wellness Coordinator
40	37	6	Environmental Programs Coordinator
37	37	3	Equipment Analyst
37	37	3	Fire Performance Auditor
37	37	1	General Inspections Supervisor
37	37	46	Information Technology Analyst/Programmer II
37	37	2	Inventory Management Coordinator
37	37	9	Librarian IV
37	37	61	Management Assistant II
37	37	1	Modernization Manager
37	37	0	Parks Special Operations Supv
37	37	1	Payroll Supervisor
37	37	4	Plan Review Coordinator
37	37	9	Planner III
37	37	1	Police Research Supervisor
37	37	1	Production Services Manager
37	37	1	Property Management Supervisor
37	37	2	Property Manager
37	37	2	Public Works Operations Manager
37	37	1	Pueblo Grande Administrator
37	37	3	Review Appraiser
37	37	3	Risk Management Coordinator
37	37	1	Senior Arts Specialist
37	37	57	Senior User Technology Specialist
36	37	7	Solid Waste Superintendent
37	37	1	Structural Inspections Supervisor
37	37	0	Title Records Supervisor

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
37	37	1	Traffic Signal Superintendent
37	37	1	Transit Field Operations Manager
37	37	8	Water Facilities Supervisor
37	37	14	Water Services Project Coordinator
37	37	2	Workforce Development Supervisor
38	38	7	Asst to the Water Supt
38	38	1	Asst Water Distribution Supt
38	38	2	Aviation Marketing Supervisor
38	38	4	Budget Analyst III
38	38	4	Building Facilities Superintendent
37	38	10	Department Budget Supervisor
38	38	23	Economic Development Program Manager
38	38	1	Event Operations Manager
37	38	0	Finance Supervisor
38	38	0	Fire Prevention Manager
38	38	6	Fire Protection Engineer
38	38	1	Grants Compliance Supervisor
38	38	15	Human Resources Supervisor
37	38	1	Human Services Planning Supv
37	38	5	Human Services Program Coordinator
38	38	11	Information Technology Systems Specialist
38	38	5	Internal Auditor IV
38	38	3	Procurement Manager
38	38	2	Senior Sales/Marketing Supv
39	39	1	Accounting Supervisor
39	39	4	Architect
39	39	24	Assistant City Attorney II (NC)
39	39	2	Asst Real Estate Admin
39	39	1	Asst Risk Management Admin
39	39	1	Asst Tax & License Adm
39	39	0	Asst Water Services Supt
39	39	3	Business Assistance Coordinator
39	39	49	Civil Engineer III
39	39	1	Convention Center Maint Supt
39	39	0	Crime Scene Section Supervisor
39	39	0	Electrical Engineer
39	39	1	Electrical Plans Engineer
39	39	1	Equipment Maintenance Superintendent
39	39	24	Forensic Scientist IV
39	39	2	Housing Development Manager
39	39	1	Housing Manager
39	39	1	Hydrologist
39	39	49	Information Technology Analyst/Programmer III
38	39	0	Lead Business Systems Analyst
39	39	32	Lead User Technology Specialist
39	39	1	Mechanical Engineer
39	39	1	Mechanical Plans Engineer
39	39	1	Medical Billing Supervisor
39	39	2	Principal Landscape Architect

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
39	39	9	Principal Planner
39	39	5	Structural Plans Engineer
39	39	1	Survey Engineer
39	39	1	Tax Hearing Officer
39	39	5	Traffic Engineer III
39	39	1	Transit Superintendent
40	40	1	Assistant Laboratory Superintendent
40	40	11	Aviation Superintendent
40	40	4	Development Services Team Leader
40	40	10	Forensic Science Section Supervisor
39	40	2	Investment Manager
40	40	1	Natural Resources Historian
40	40	35	Senior Information Technology Systems Specialist
40	40	1	Senior Structural Plans Eng
40	40	1	Street Maintenance Superintendent
41	41	7	Civil Engineer III*Team Leader
41	41	32	Information Technology Project Manager
41	41	0	Traffic Engineer III*Team Leader
41	41	1	Water Services Tech Sup Coord
41	42	2	Asst Crime Lab Administrator
41	42	1	Investment and Debt Manager
42	42	17	Lead Information Technology Systems Specialist
81	80	3	Municipal Court Hearing Officer (NC)
86	85	1	Presiding Court Hrng Off (NC)
100	100	0	Municipal Worker Trainee (NC)
103	103	0	Service Trainee (NC)
108	108	25	Custodial Worker I
108	108	1	Golf Ranger
108	108	207	Groundskeeper
108	108	25	Laborer
110	110	0	Urban Forestry Tech Trnee (NC)
111	111	12	Courier
111	111	124	Gardener
111	111	5	Mail Service Worker
111	111	3	Sign Specialist I
111	111	7	Solid Waste Worker
111	111	51	Street Maintenance Worker I
112	111	28	Supplies Clerk I
111	112	26	Equipment Operator I
111	112	32	Greenskeeper
113	113	1	Equipment Maintenance Helper
113	113	29	Minibus Operator
110	113	57	Semiskilled Worker
113	113	73	Trades Helper
113A	113A	31	Street Maintenance Worker II
113	114	51	Equipment Operator II
114	114	4	Landscape Equipment Operator
115	114	36	Supplies Clerk II
115	115	2	Parking Meter Specialist

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
115	115	5	Sign Specialist II
115	115	22	Traffic Maintenance Worker
115	115	8	Urban Forestry Technician
116	116	2	Backhoe/Loader Op
117	116	19	Parks Maintenance Mechanic
116	116	290	Solid Waste Equipment Operator
117	116	8	Supplies Clerk III
116A	116A	41	Equipment Operator III
116A	116A	33	Motor Broom Operator
116A	117A	10	Cement Finisher
118	118	44	Equipment Operator IV
118	118	2	Field Inspector
118	118	14	Landfill Equipment Operator
120	119	114	Building Maintenance Worker
119	119	13	Parks Equipment Mechanic
122	122	9	Welder
205	205	0	Technical Trainee (NC)
207	207	2	Convention Center Worker
209	209	23	Airport Security Guard
210	210	4	Custodial Worker II
209	210	7	Equipment Service Worker I
210	210	51	Event Services Worker
210	210	1	Trades Trainee (NC)
210	210	33	Utility Technician Trainee(NC)
211	211	18	Airfield Maintenance Worker I
211	211	3	Survey Aide
212	212	3	Auto Parts Clerk I
212	212	13	Utility Helper
212	212	1	Water Services Tech Trnee (NC)
213	213	2	Airfield Maintenance Worker II
214	213	1	Building Equip Op Appr (NC)
213	213	6	Water Meter Technician I
214	214	0	Electrician Apprentice (NC)
214	214	13	Ops & Maint Tech Trnee (NC)
215	215	13	Auto Parts Clerk II
214	215	3	Materials Technician
214	215	108	Utility Technician
215	215	1	Water Meter Technician II
215A	215A	14	Electrician Helper
216	216	17	Airport Operations Technician
216	216	6	Auto Parts Clerk III
213	216	51	Equipment Service Worker II
216	216	0	Fire Equip Svc Wkr Trnee (NC)
216	216	6	Instrument Technician
215	216	42	Utility Specialty Technician
215	216	81	Water Services Technician
217	217	0	Construction Inspector
217	217	1	Fuel System Support Technician
217A	217A	3	Locksmith

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
218	218	4	Communications Technician
218	218	9	Fire Equipment Service Worker
216	218	31	Water Services Specialist
219	219	2	Construction Drafting Technician
218	219	62	Senior Utility Technician
218	219	5	Utility TV Technician
219	219	15	Water Quality Inspector
218A	219A	50	Auto Technician
222A	220A	1	Body Repair Specialist
221	221	206	Ops & Maintenance Technician
221	221	4	Party Chief
220	221	5	Senior Materials Technician
222A	221A	49	Building Equipment Operator I
222	222	26	Senior Water Quality Inspector
222A	222A	113	Electrician
222A	222A	6	Equipment Repair Specialist
222A	222A	24	Heavy Duty Maintenance Mechanic
222A	222A	78	Heavy Equip Mechanic
222A	222A	19	Instrumentation & Cont Specialist
222A	222A	2	Machinist
222A	222A	4	Methods & Standards Analyst
222A	222A	25	Traffic Signal Technician
223	223	1	Chief Materials Plant Inspector
223	223	2	Chief Materials Technician
223	223	2	Senior Party Chief
223A	223A	22	Building Equipment Operator II
223A	223A	4	Telecommunications Specialist
224	224	7	Aircraft Technician
225	225	8	Facilities Projects Planner
225	225	37	Senior Construction Inspector
225A	225A	8	Electronic Systems Specialist
226	226	24	Chief Construction Inspector
300	300	0	Public Service Trainee (NC)
311	311	80	Library Page
311	311	57	Parks & Recreation Aide
314	314	0	Clerical Trainee (NC)
317	315	308	Lifeguard
316	316	32	Clerk I
316	316	26	Library Clerk I
318	318	11	Clerk II
318	318	59	Library Circulation Attendant I
318	318	14	Library Clerk II
318	318	34	Police Aide
318	318	172	Recreation Instructor
318	318	26	Utilities Service Trainee (NC)
319	319	0	Information Clerk
319	319	0	Key Entry Operator
319	319	2	Meter Collection Clerk
320	320	21	Casework Aide

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
320	320	10	Clerk III
322	320	12	Cook
320	320	6	Firefighter Trainee (NC)
320	320	22	Library Circulation Attendant II
320	320	3	Library Clerk III
320	320	6	Remote Comp Term Operator
320	320	4	Repro & Bindery Equip Operator
322	320	15	Senior Center Assistant
320	320	13	Ticket Seller
320	320	3	Transportation Clerk
320	320	9	Weigh Station Clerk
321	321	34	Account Clerk II
321	321	31	Asst Pool Manager
321	321	2	Community Worker II
320	321	19	Court/Legal Clerk I
320	321	53	Customer Service Clerk
321	321	0	Police Cadet II (NC)
321	321	208	Recreation Leader
321	321	173	Secretary II
321	321	2	Telecommunications Operator
322	322	30	Communications Dispatcher
322	322	1	Data Control Specialist
322	322	25	Elections/Annexation Aide
322	322	11	Equipment Service Aide
323	322	102	Municipal Security Guard
322	322	60	Police Records Clerk
322	322	33	Records Clerk II
323	323	1	Computer Systems Librarian
322	323	111	Court/Legal Clerk II
323	323	24	Housing Program Representative
323	323	0	Mobile Dispatcher
323	323	48	Police Automated System Secretary
323	323	28	Youth Counselor
324	324	43	Bailiff
324	324	5	Business License Service Clerk
325	324	1	Computer Operator
324	324	2	Desktop Publisher
324	324	0	Drafting Technician
324	324	6	Library Technical Assistant
324	324	10	Neighborhood Maintenance Technician I
324	324	3	Offset Press Operator
324	324	1	Planning Technician
324	324	5	Police Coding Clerk
324	324	34	Pool Manager
324	324	0	Public Information Aide
324	324	4	Rehabilitation Loan Processor
324	324	81	Support Services Aide
324	324	76	Utilities Service Specialist
325	325	86	Account Clerk III

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
325	325	83	Caseworker I
324	325	27	Engineering Technician
324	325	16	Fingerprint Technician
325	325	17	Laboratory Technician
325	325	0	Museum Aide
325	325	146	Police Assistant
325	325	19	Police Property Technician
325	325	5	Workforce Development Aide
326	326	86	Administrative Aide
326	326	68	Airport Operations Assistant
326	326	0	Auditor Intern (NC)
326	326	3	Buyer Aide
326	326	3	Crime Scene Specialist I
326	326	6	Events Representative
326	326	16	Facility Contract Compliance Specialist
326	326	1	Fire Prevention Spec Trnee(NC)
326	326	6	Police Statistical Research Aide
326	326	19	Recreation Programmer
326	326	2	Telecommunications Aide
327	327	5	Elections/Annexation Specialist I
327	327	10	Forensic Photo Specialist
327	327	5	Housing Inspector
327	327	25	Legal Secretary
327	327	7	License Inspector
327	327	3	Property Records Specialist
327	327	1	Senior Planning Technician
328	327	55	Solid Waste Environmental Specialist
328	327	26	Treasury Collections Representative
328	328	32	Crime Scene Specialist II
328	328	2	Emergency Dispatcher
328	328	86	Fire Emergency Dispatcher
328	328	3	Landlord/Tenant Counselor
328	328	1	Neighborhood Maintenance Technician II
328	328	254	Police Communications Operator
328	328	6	Senior Drafting Technician
328	328	32	Senior Engineering Technician
328	328	4	Substance Abuse Screener
328	328	3	Utilities Credit Counselor
329	329	6	Court Interpreter
329	329	11	Legal Assistant
329	329	7	Water Systems Operator
330	330	10	Crime Scene Specialist III
330	330	3	Equipment Control Specialist
330	330	13	Forensic Scientist I (NC)
330	330	18	GIS Technician
330	330	5	Sign Inspector
330	330	14	User Support Specialist
331	331	1	Chief Drafting Technician
331	331	23	Chief Engineering Technician

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
331	331	0	Civil Inspector I
331	331	0	Electrical Inspector I
331	331	1	Elevator Inspector I
331	331	0	Fire Prevention Spec I
331	331	0	General Inspector I
331	331	11	Housing Rehabilitation Specialist
331	331	55	Neighborhood Preservation Inspector I
332	331	2	Planning Graphic Designer
331	331	3	Plumbing/Mech Insp I
331	331	0	Structural Inspector I
333	332	0	Const Permit Spec I
333	332	0	Electrical Plans Examiner I
333	332	0	Mechanical Plans Examiner I
333	332	0	Structural Plans Examiner I
333	333	8	Civil Inspector II
334	333	8	Construction Permit Specialist II
333	333	11	Electrical Inspector II
333	333	5	Elevator Inspector II
333	333	31	Fire Prevention Specialist II
333	333	16	General Inspector II
333	333	11	Plumbing/Mechanical Inspector II
333	333	10	Structural Inspector II
335	334	4	Building Code Examiner
334	334	2	Civil Inspector III
335	334	2	Electrical Plans Examiner II
335	334	4	Mechanical Plans Examiner II
335	334	1	Structural Plans Examiner II
400	400	0	Police Recruit (NC)
428	428	2638	Police Officer
551	551	821	Firefighter
552	552	180	Fire Engineer
555	555	81	Fire Captain
634	634	369	Police Sergeant
638	638	89	Police Lieutenant
721	721	5	Human Resources Clerk I
723	723	1	Word Processing Secretary
723	724	41	Human Resources Clerk II
726	726	2	Benefits Aide
726	726	4	Council Aide (NC)
726	726	30	Human Resources Aide
727	727	0	Motion Picture Assistant
731	731	3	Labor Compliance Specialist
851	850	68	Fire Battalion Chief
862	862	28	Police Commander
880	M80*	50	City Judge (NC)
980	E80*	1	Chief Presiding Judge (NC)
838	M08	1	Environmental Programs Specialist
838	M08	1	Protocol Program Administrator (NC)
840	M09	2	Administrative Assistant III

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
840	M09	5	Management Assistant III
838	M09	4	Solid Waste Administrator
841	M10	3	Deputy City Clerk
841	M10	1	Fire 911 Administrator
840	M10	1	Historic Preservation Officer
841	M10	1	Management Assistant III*IP
842	M10	1	Police R & I Bureau Administrator
840	M10	5	Special Projects Administrator
840	M10	1	Video Station Manager
842	M11	0	Asst Water Resources Mgt Advsr
841	M11	0	Deputy Equal Opportunity Director
841	M11	3	Enterprise Technology Manager
841	M11	1	Library Services Administrator
841	M11	8	Management Services Administrator
841	M11	1	Municipal Court Administrator
841	M11	1	Municipal Court Controller
842	M12	1	Assistant to Fire Chief*P & R
842	M12	19	Assistant City Attorney III (NC)
842	M12	0	Crime Lab Administrator
842	M12	3	Deputy Budget & Research Director
842	M12	2	Deputy City Auditor
842	M12	4	Deputy Convention Center Director
842	M12	2	Deputy Development Services Director
842	M12	2	Deputy Economic Development Director
842	M12	8	Deputy Finance Director
842	M12	3	Deputy Housing Director
842	M12	4	Deputy Human Resources Director
842	M12	4	Deputy Human Services Director
842	M12	4	Deputy Neighborhood Services Director
842	M12	7	Deputy Parks & Recreation Director
842	M12	1	Deputy Planning Director
842	M12	4	Deputy Public Transit Director
842	M12	4	Deputy Public Works Director
842	M12	4	Deputy Street Transportation Director
842	M12	10	Deputy Water Services Director
842	M12	1	Police Fiscal Administrator
842	M13	8	Deputy Aviation Director
843	M13	4	Deputy Chief Information Officer
844	M14	30	Assistant City Attorney IV (NC)
844	M14	1	Forensic Toxicology Expert (NC)
845	M15	5	Assistant Chief Counsel (NC)
845	M15	2	Deputy City Prosecutor (NC)
845	M15	1	Public Defender (NC)
903	E08	0	Arts & Culture Administrator
903	E08	0	Assistant City Clerk
904	E08	1	Assistant to the City Manager (NC)
903	E08	1	Assistant to the Fire Chief
904	E08	0	Assistant to the Mayor (a) (NC)
903	E08	1	Environmental Programs Manager

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
903	E08	0	Water Resources Management Advisor (NC)
903	E09	0	Assistant City Librarian
904	E09	2	Assistant Development Services Director
904	E09	0	Assistant Housing Director
904	E09	0	Assistant Public Transit Director
903	E09	1	Municipal Court Information Systems Officer
905	E09	1	RWC Director (prev: Asst CIO)
904	E10	0	Assistant City Auditor
906	E10	1	Assistant Community/Economic Development Director
906	E10	2	Assistant Finance Director
906	E10	0	Assistant Parks & Recreation Director
906	E10	2	Assistant Public Works Director
905	E10	1	Assistant Street Transportation Director
906	E10	1	Assistant Water Services Director-Administration
906	E10	1	Assistant Water Services Director-Operation
906	E10	1	Assistant Water Services Director-Technical
908	E10	1	Intergovernmental Affairs Coordinator (NC)
903	E10	1	Labor Relations Administrator (NC)
903	E10	1	Municipal Court Executive Officer
906	E10	1	Public Information Director (NC)
904	E10	1	Retirement Program Administrator
907	E11	2	Assistant Aviation Director
905	E11	2	Assistant Chief Information Officer
908	E11	1	Budget & Research Director (NC)
907	E11	0	Chief Counsel (NC)
908	E11	1	City Auditor (NC)
907	E11	1	City Clerk (NC)
908	E11	0	City Engineer (NC)
907	E11	1	City Librarian (NC)
907	E11	1	City Prosecutor (NC)
908	E11	0	Convention Center Director (NC)
908	E11	2	Development Services Director (NC)
907	E11	0	Equal Opportunity Director (NC)
907	E11	2	Executive Assistant to Mayor (NC)
907	E11	1	Housing Director (NC)
908	E11	1	Human Resources Director (NC)
908	E11	1	Human Services Director (NC)
908	E11	1	Neighborhood Services Director (NC)
908	E11	1	Public Transit Director (NC)
908	E12	0	Chief Asst City Attorney (NC)
909	E12	2	Community & Economic Development Director (NC)
908	E12	1	Executive Assistant to the City Manager (NC)
910	E12	1	Parks & Recreation Director (NC)
910	E12	1	Public Works Director (NC)
909	E12	1	Street Transportation Director (NC)
910	E12	1	Water Services Director (NC)
911	E13	1	Aviation Director (NC)
909	E13	1	Chief Information Officer (NC)

Current Grade	Proposed Grade	No. of Incs	Job Title
909	E13	1	Finance Director (NC)
956	E13	1	Fire Chief (NC)
912	E14	1	City Attorney (NC)
912	E14	3	Deputy City Manager (NC)
966	E14	1	Police Chief (NC)
914	E15	1	Assistant City Manager (NC)
940	E40**	1	City Manager (NC)
C11	C11	4	Council Secretary (NC)
C14	C14	1	Council Admin Specialist (NC)
C17	C17	8	Council Research Analyst (NC)
C22	C21	6	Council Assistant (NC)
C22	C22	2	Mayor's Assistant (NC)

*\*Judges salaries are set by City ordinance; the survey shows these jobs are above market.*

*\*\* The City Manager's pay is negotiated directly with the Council; the survey shows this job is below market.*

**TABLE A-1  
GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENTS  
FOR CUSTOM SURVEY PARTICIPANTS**

Comparator	Geographic Adjustment (to Phoenix, AZ)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>	
State of Arizona	None
City of Austin, TX	None
City of Dallas, TX	96%
City of Houston, TX	96%
City of Jacksonville, FL	101%
City of Los Angeles, CA	87%
City of Philadelphia, PA	92%
City of San Diego, CA	89%
City and County of San Francisco, CA	80%
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>	
Private Employer 1	None
Private Employer 2	None
Private Employer 3	None
Private Employer 4	None
Private Employer 5	None
Private Employer 6	None
Private Employer 7	None
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>	
City of Avondale	None
City of Chandler	None
City of Flagstaff	108%
Town of Gilbert	None
City of Glendale	None
City of Goodyear	None
Maricopa County	None
City of Mesa	None
City of Peoria	None
City of Scottsdale	None
City of Surprise	None

**TABLE A-1  
GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENTS  
FOR CUSTOM SURVEY PARTICIPANTS**

Comparator	Geographic Adjustment (to Phoenix, AZ)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>	
City of Tempe	None
City of Tucson	105%
<b>Published Data</b>	
Airports Council International Comp Survey	99%
Economic Research Institute 2011 (Phoenix Area)	None
Economic Research Institute 2011 (Nationwide)	99%
Mercer	99%
Towers Watson 2010 (Phoenix Area)	None
Towers Watson 2010 (Nationwide)	99%
Milliman AZ Comp Survey 2011	None

**Note: Data adjusted to Phoenix, as necessary, based on Geographic Wage & Salary Differentials as reported by the Economic Research Institute Geographic Assessor, 2011.**

**TABLE A-2  
PAY SCHEDULE DESIGN**

Pay Schedule Design Types	Pay Schedule Design Prevalence Count of Respondents				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
Grade and step	Public Sector: 1 of 12 Private Sector: 1 of 7	Public Sector: 2 of 12 Private Sector: 1 of 7	Public Sector: 8 of 13 Private Sector: 4 of 7	Public Sector: 11 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 11 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
Open ranges	Public Sector: 10 of 12 Private Sector: 4 of 7	Public Sector: 10 of 12 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 7 of 13 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 2 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 3 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
Single, flat rate	Public Sector: 0 of 12 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 0 of 12 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 1 of 13 Private Sector: 1 of 7	Public Sector: 0 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 0 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
No formal plan	Public Sector: 3 of 12 Private Sector: 2 of 7	Public Sector: 2 of 12 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 1 of 13 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 1 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 1 of 13 Private Sector: N/A

*Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question.*

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Open Range (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Open Range (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Grade and Step (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Grade and Step (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Grade and Step (Ees: 1,082)</b>
------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------	--	--	--

**TABLE A-3  
PAY PROGRESSION**

Pay Progression Policies	Pay Progression Prevalence Count of Respondents				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
Step Progression (such as step increase)	Public Sector: 1 of 11 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 3 of 12 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 6 of 13 Private Sector: 1 of 7	Public Sector: 10 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 10 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
Individual performance	Public Sector: 7 of 11 Private Sector: 7 of 7	Public Sector: 8 of 12 Private Sector: 7 of 7	Public Sector: 8 of 13 Private Sector: 7 of 7	Public Sector: 6 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 6 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
No formal plan	Public Sector: 5 of 11 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 4 of 12 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 2 of 13 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 0 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 1 of 13 Private Sector: N/A

*Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question.*

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Individual Performance (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Individual Performance (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Step Progression (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Step Progression (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Step Progression (Ees: 1,082)</b>
------------------------	---	--	--	--	--

**TABLE A-4  
LONGEVITY PAY DIFFERENTIAL**

Longevity Pay Prevalence Count of Respondents				
Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
Public Sector: 7 of 17 Private Sector: 0 of 6	Public Sector: 8 of 18 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 9 of 19 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 12 of 18 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 12 of 19 Private Sector: N/A

*Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question. Three (3) peer employers offer longevity pay to some or all employee groups hired before a specific date. See Table A-5 for more detailed explanation.*

**City of Phoenix**

<b>No</b> (Ees: 63)	<b>No</b> (Ees: 317)	<b>Yes</b> (Ees: 9,423)	<b>Yes</b> (Ees: 3,096)	<b>Yes</b> (Ees: 1,082)
------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

**TABLE A-5  
LONGEVITY PAY BY PEER ORGANIZATION**

Comparator	Executives (Yes/No)	Managers (Yes/No)	General Employees (Yes/No)	Uniformed Police (Yes/No)	Uniformed Fire/ Rescue (Yes/No)	Policy
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>						
State of Arizona	No	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Austin, TX	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Dallas, TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Civilians hired before 2002 receive \$48 per year of service.
City of Houston, TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Executives, Managers & General Employees receive \$2 bi-weekly for each year of service.  Uniformed Police & Fire receive \$2 bi-weekly for each year of service not to exceed \$50.
City of Jacksonville, FL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Information not provided
City of Los Angeles, CA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Police and Fire receive additional biweekly longevity pay for service over 10 years, service over 15 years, and service over 20 years.

**TABLE A-5  
LONGEVITY PAY BY PEER ORGANIZATION**

Comparator	Executives (Yes/No)	Managers (Yes/No)	General Employees (Yes/No)	Uniformed Police (Yes/No)	Uniformed Fire/Rescue (Yes/No)	Policy
City of Philadelphia, PA	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 years of service: \$625 10 years of service: \$825 15 years of service: \$1,025 20 years of service: \$1,225 25 years of service: \$1,425 30 years of service: \$1,625 35 years of service: \$1,825 40 years of service: \$2,025 45 years of service: \$2,225
City of San Diego, CA	No	No	No	No	No	N/A
City and County of San Francisco, CA	No	No	Yes**	Yes	Yes	While most General Employees do not receive longevity pay, one union provides employees that have completed 10 years of service receive an additional \$0.30/hour longevity payment.  Police officers that have completed at least 23 years of service as a sworn member of the Department or Airport Bureau receive 2% longevity pay, and 6% after completing at least 30 years of service.  Fire employees who have completed at least 26 years or more as a uniformed member of the department receive 4% longevity pay.

**TABLE A-5  
LONGEVITY PAY BY PEER ORGANIZATION**

Comparator	Executives (Yes/No)	Managers (Yes/No)	General Employees (Yes/No)	Uniformed Police (Yes/No)	Uniformed Fire/ Rescue (Yes/No)	Policy
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>						
Private Employer 1	No	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	No	No	No			
Private Employer 3	No	No	No			
Private Employer 4	No	No	No			
Private Employer 5	No	No	No			
Private Employer 6	No	No	No			
Private Employer 7	Information not provided	No	No			
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>						
City of Avondale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Chandler	No	No	No	Yes (PO & Sgt only)	Yes (FF, FE & FC only)	Police Officers receive 1.7% paid twice per year after 1 year at the top of the pay range. Police Sergeants receive 2% paid twice per year after 1 year at the top of the pay range.  FF, FE & FC receive 2% in two equal installments twice per year after one year at the top of the pay range.
City of Flagstaff	No	No	No	No	No	N/A
Town of Gilbert	No	No	No	No	No	N/A

**TABLE A-5  
LONGEVITY PAY BY PEER ORGANIZATION**

Comparator	Executives (Yes/No)	Managers (Yes/No)	General Employees (Yes/No)	Uniformed Police (Yes/No)	Uniformed Fire/Rescue (Yes/No)	Policy
City of Glendale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Excluding Uniformed Fire covered under the MOU, employees hired before 5/1/1992 with at least 5 years of service are paid \$80 per year for each year of service.</p> <p>Uniformed Fire covered under the MOU receive the following semi-annual payments based on the years of service:</p> <p>3-4 years: \$200                      5-6 years: \$400                      6-7 years: \$500                      7-8 years: \$600                      8-9 years: \$700                      9+ years: \$800</p>
City of Goodyear	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	<p>5 years of service: \$100                      6 years of service: \$200                      7 years of service: \$300                      8 years of service: \$400                      9 years of service: \$500                      10 years of service: \$600                      11 years of service: \$700                      12 years of service: \$800                      13 years of service: \$900                      14+ years of service: \$1,000</p>

**TABLE A-5  
LONGEVITY PAY BY PEER ORGANIZATION**

Comparator	Executives (Yes/No)	Managers (Yes/No)	General Employees (Yes/No)	Uniformed Police (Yes/No)	Uniformed Fire/Rescue (Yes/No)	Policy
Maricopa County	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Employees hired before 7/1/1988 with at least 5 years of service receive 2.5% of annual salary. This then increases by 1/2% for each year of service up to a max of 10%</p> <p>Employees hired on or after 7/1/1988 with at least 5 years of service receive 2.5% of annual salary. This then increases by 1/2% for every other year of service up to a max of 5%</p>
City of Peoria	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Non-public safety employees hired before July 1, 1989 receive \$420 per year.
City of Scottsdale	No	No	No	No	No	N/A
City of Surprise	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Employees receive 2% of base pay after 8 years of service and 4% of base pay after 10 years.
City of Tempe	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Police and fire sworn employees receive the following retention pay based on years of service:</p> <p>5-9 years: ½%</p> <p>10-14 years: 1%</p> <p>15-19 years: 1 ½%</p> <p>20-24 years: 2%</p> <p>25+ years: 2 ½%</p>
City of Tucson	No	No	No	No	No	Employees hired prior to January, 1977 may be eligible for longevity pay. Additional information not provided.

**TABLE A-5  
LONGEVITY PAY BY PEER ORGANIZATION**

Comparator	Executives (Yes/No)	Managers (Yes/No)	General Employees (Yes/No)	Uniformed Police (Yes/No)	Uniformed Fire/ Rescue (Yes/No)	Policy
<b>Published Data</b>						
Bureau of Labor Statistics, March 2010	2% of workers may eligible for a longevity bonus			N/A		
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>See details below</b>
<b>Field Unit 1 (Ees: 1,434)</b>	<p><b>Qualify: 6 yrs continuous service. 1 yr at top step. Performance meets job requirements.</b></p> <p><b>Amount: \$50 semi-annually (\$65 semi-annually for employees with 20 or more yrs of service) for each yr in excess of 5 up to 19<sup>th</sup> yr.</b></p> <p><b>Annual Maximum: \$1,400/\$1,820</b></p>					
<b>Field Unit 2 (Ees: 1,323)</b>	<p><b>Qualify: 6 yrs continuous service. 1 yr at top step. Performance meets job requirements.</b></p> <p><b>Amount: Employees with up to and including 22 yrs of service receive \$103 semi-annually for each yr of service in excess of 5 yrs.</b></p> <p><b>Employees with 23 or more yrs of service receive \$138.89 semi-annually for each yr of service in excess of 5 yrs.</b></p> <p><b>Annual Maximum: \$3,502/\$6,112</b></p>					
<b>Field Unit 3 (Ees: 3,590)</b>	<p><b>Qualify: 6 years continuous service. 1 yr at top step. Performance meets job requirements.</b></p> <p><b>Amount: \$100 semi-annually (\$125 semi-annually for employees with 20 yr up to the 29<sup>th</sup> yr) for each yr in excess of 5 yrs up to and including the 19<sup>th</sup> yr.</b></p> <p><b>Annual Maximum: \$2,800/\$6,000</b></p>					

**TABLE A-5  
LONGEVITY PAY BY PEER ORGANIZATION**

Comparator	Executives (Yes/No)	Managers (Yes/No)	General Employees (Yes/No)	Uniformed Police (Yes/No)	Uniformed Fire/ Rescue (Yes/No)	Policy
<b>Unit 4</b> (Ees: 2,638)	<i>Qualify: 7 yrs continuous service. 1 yr at top step. Performance meets job requirements.</i> <i>Amount: \$80 semi-annually (\$125 semi-annually for employees at 20 yrs up to the 22<sup>nd</sup> yr) for each yr in excess of 6 yrs up to 19<sup>th</sup> yr.</i> <i>Annual Maximum: \$2,080/\$4,000</i>					
<b>Unit 5</b> (Ees: 1,082)	<i>Qualify: 7 yrs continuous service. Performance meets job requirements.</i> <i>Amount: \$80 semi-annually for each yr in excess of 5 up to 30<sup>th</sup> yr.</i> <i>Annual Maximum: \$4,000</i>					
<b>Unit 6</b> (Ees: 458)	<i>Qualify: 7 yrs continuous service. Performance meets expectations.</i> <i>Amount: Employees with up to 19 yrs of service receive \$80 semi-annually for each yr of service in excess of 5 yrs up to and including the 19<sup>th</sup> yr.</i> <i>Annual Maximum: \$2,240</i> <i>Employees with 20 yrs or more of service receive \$4,000</i>					
<b>Unit 7</b> (Ees: 2,897)	<i>Qualify: 7 yrs continuous service. 1 yr at top step. Performance meets expectations.</i> <i>Amount: Employees with up to and including 19 yrs of service receive \$100 semi-annually for each yr of service in excess of 5 yrs.</i> <i>Employees with 20 yrs or more of service receive \$120 semi-annually for each yr of service in excess of 5 yrs up to and including the 30<sup>th</sup> yr.</i> <i>Annual Maximum: \$2,800/\$6,000</i>					
<b>Confidential</b> (Ees: 167)	<i>Qualify: 6 yrs continuous service. 1 yr at top step. Performance meets expectations.</i> <i>Amount: \$100 semi-annually (\$125 semi-annually for employees with 20 yrs up to the 29<sup>th</sup> yr) for each yr in excess of 5 yrs up to and including 19<sup>th</sup> yr.</i> <i>Annual Maximum: \$2,800/\$6,000</i>					

\* Benefit is currently suspended

**TABLE A-6  
PERFORMANCE BASED PAY**

Types of Performance Based Pay		Performance Based Pay Prevalence Count of Respondents				
		Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
Individual	<b>Base salary</b> increases that vary by individual performance	Public Sector: 6 of 11 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 7 of 12 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 5 of 13 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 4 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 4 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
	<b>Bonuses</b> related to individual performance	Public Sector: 2 of 11 Private Sector: 4 of 7	Public Sector: 3 of 12 Private Sector: 4 of 7	Public Sector: 1 of 12 Private Sector: 4 of 7	Public Sector: 1 of 11 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 1 of 12 Private Sector: N/A
Group	<b>Bonuses</b> related to group/team/organizational performance	Public Sector: 1 of 11 Private Sector: 4 of 7	Public Sector: 1 of 12 Private Sector: 5 of 7	Public Sector: 1 of 13 Private Sector: 5 of 7	Public Sector: 1 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 1 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
	<b>Gainsharing</b> (group incentives for cost savings)	Public Sector: 0 of 11 Private Sector: 0 of 5	Public Sector: 0 of 12 Private Sector: 1 of 6	Public Sector: 0 of 13 Private Sector: 1 of 6	Public Sector: 0 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 0 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
Other	<b>Other</b>	Public Sector: 0 of 11 Private Sector: 1 of 7	Public Sector: 0 of 12 Private Sector: 1 of 7	Public Sector: 0 of 13 Private Sector: 1 of 7	Public Sector: 0 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 0 of 13 Private Sector: N/A

*Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question.*

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Yes</b> (Ees: 63)	<b>Yes</b> (Ees: 317)	<b>No</b> (Ees: 9,423)	<b>No</b> (Ees: 3,096)	<b>No</b> (Ees: 1,082)
------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

**TABLE A-7  
PAY SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENTS**

Pay Schedule Adjustments Policies	Pay Schedule Adjustments Prevalence Count of Respondents				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
Based on inflation or cost-of-living measurement	Public Sector: 2 of 11 Private Sector: 1 of 7	Public Sector: 2 of 11 Private Sector: 1 of 7	Public Sector: 5 of 13 Private Sector: 1 of 7	Public Sector: 5 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 5 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
Based on market studies or estimates of market changes	Public Sector: 7 of 11 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 7 of 11 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 9 of 13 Private Sector: 5 of 7	Public Sector: 9 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 9 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
Based on affordability/budget determinations	Public Sector: 7 of 11 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 7 of 11 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 8 of 13 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 7 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 7 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
As defined in Collective Bargaining Agreements	Public Sector: N/A Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: N/A Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 6 of 13 Private Sector: 2 of 7	Public Sector: 9 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 9 of 13 Private Sector: N/A
No formal plan	Public Sector: 4 of 11 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 4 of 11 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 2 of 13 Private Sector: 0 of 7	Public Sector: 1 of 12 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 2 of 13 Private Sector: N/A

*Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question.*

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>No</b> (Ees: 63)	<b>No</b> (Ees: 317)	<b>Yes</b> (Ees: 9,423)	<b>Yes</b> (Ees: 3,096)	<b>Yes</b> (Ees: 1,082)
------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

**TABLE A-8**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012 PAY INCREASE BUDGET (% OF PAY)**

Comparator	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	0%	0%	0%	N/A	0%
City of Austin, TX	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Dallas, TX	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Houston, TX	4.25%	4.25%	4.25%	0%	0%
City of Jacksonville, FL	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Varies based on MOUs	0%	0%
City of Philadelphia, PA	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%
City of San Diego, CA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Information not provided	0%	0%	5%	4%
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	3%	3%	3%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	3%	3%	3%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	4%	4%	4%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	3%	3%	3%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	0%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Avondale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Chandler	2.25%	2.25%	2.25%	N/A	N/A
City of Flagstaff	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Town of Gilbert	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Glendale	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Goodyear	0%	0%	0%	2.5%	2.5% (FC, FE & Fire Dep. Chief)
Maricopa County	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Peoria	0%	0%	Varies*	Varies*	Varies*

**TABLE A-8  
FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012 PAY INCREASE BUDGET (% OF PAY)**

Comparator	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
City of Scottsdale	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Surprise	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Tempe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Tucson	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

*\* Union employees that are at the top step of their pay grade and have satisfactory performance will receive a lump sum bonus of \$850 or the quotient of \$104,000 divided equally between these eligible employees, depending on their union.*

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>0%</b> <b>(Ees: 63)</b>	<b>0%</b> <b>(Ees: 317)</b>	<b>1.86%</b> <b>(Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>1.86%</b> <b>(Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>1.86%</b> <b>(Ees: 1,082)</b>
------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**TABLE A-9  
TUITION REIMBURSEMENT**

Tuition Reimbursement Prevalence Count of Respondents				
Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
Public Sector: 7 of 11 Private Sector: 7 of 7	Public Sector: 8 of 12 Private Sector: 7 of 7	Public Sector: 8 of 12 Private Sector: 7 of 7	Public Sector: 9 of 11 Private Sector: N/A	Public Sector: 8 of 12 Private Sector: N/A

*Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question.*

**City of Phoenix**

Yes (Ees: 63)	Yes (Ees: 317)	Yes (Ees: 9,423)	Yes (Ees: 3,096)	Yes (Ees: 1,082)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

**TABLE A-10**  
**TUITION REIMBURSEMENT MAXIMUM ANNUAL AMOUNT**

Comparator	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Austin, TX	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Dallas, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
City and County of San Francisco, CA	\$2,000	\$2,000	Varies	\$5,000	\$5,000
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000		
Private Employer 3	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250		
Private Employer 4	\$5,500	\$5,500	\$5,500		
Private Employer 5	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000		
Private Employer 6	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000		
Private Employer 7	\$11,844*	\$11,844*	\$11,844*		
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Avondale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Chandler	N/A	N/A	\$3,200	\$3,200	\$3,200
City of Flagstaff	\$8,723	\$8,723	\$8,723	\$8,723	\$8,723
Town of Gilbert	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
City of Glendale	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500
City of Goodyear	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Maricopa County	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	\$6,684	\$6,684	\$6,684	\$6,684	\$6,684
City of Peoria	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
City of Scottsdale	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Surprise	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000

**TABLE A-10  
TUITION REIMBURSEMENT MAXIMUM ANNUAL AMOUNT**

<b>Comparator</b>	<b>Executives</b>	<b>Managers</b>	<b>General Employees</b>	<b>Uniformed Police</b>	<b>Uniformed Fire/Rescue</b>
City of Tempe	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
City of Tucson	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500
<p><i>* Maximum annual tuition is based on reimbursement rate of \$658/undergraduate credit hour for maximum 18 credit hours. Graduate classes are reimbursed a rate of \$694/credit hour.</i></p>					
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>\$9,208</b> <i>(Ees: 63)</i>	<b>\$9,208</b> <i>(Ees: 317)</i>	<b>\$9,208</b> <i>(Ees: 9,423)</i>	<b>\$9,208</b> <i>(Ees: 3,096)</i>	<b>\$9,208</b> <i>(Ees: 1,082)</i>

**TABLE A-11  
EXECUTIVE AND MANAGER BENEFITS/PERQUISITES**

Perquisites	Executive Benefits/Perquisites Prevalence Count of Respondents	
	Executives	Managers
Sabbaticals	Public Sector: 3 of 10 Private Sector: 1 of 6	Public Sector: 3 of 11 Private Sector: 0 of 5
Car Allowances	Public Sector: 8 of 11 Private Sector: 4 of 7	Public Sector: 3 of 12 Private Sector: 0 of 6
Expense Accounts	Public Sector: 1 of 11 Private Sector: 2 of 7	Public Sector: 1 of 12 Private Sector: 1 of 6
Executive Physicals	Public Sector: 2 of 11 Private Sector: 4 of 7	Public Sector: 0 of 11 Private Sector: 0 of 6
Relocation Allowance	Public Sector: 6 of 11 Private Sector: 6 of 7	Public Sector: 4 of 12 Private Sector: 4 of 6
Stock Options	Public Sector: 0 of 11 Private Sector: 4 of 7	Public Sector: N/A Private Sector: 1 of 6

**Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question.**

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Car Allowance Relocation Allowance (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Car Allowance Relocation Allowance (Ees: 317)</b>
------------------------	---	--

**TABLE A-12  
SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL  
FOR GENERAL EMPLOYEES (EXCLUDING MANAGERS AND EXECUTIVES)**

Comparator	2 <sup>nd</sup> Shift Differential		3 <sup>rd</sup> Shift Differential		Weekend Shift Differential	
	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>						
State of Arizona	Yes	5% of base	Yes	10% of base	No	N/A
City of Austin, TX	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Dallas, TX	Yes	2% of base	Yes	3.5% of base	No	N/A
City of Houston, TX	Yes	\$0.50/hour	Yes	\$1.00/hour	No	N/A
City of Jacksonville, FL	Yes	3% of base	Yes	6% of base	No	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Yes	5.5% of base	Yes	5.5% of base	No	N/A
City of Philadelphia, PA	Yes	\$0.25 - \$0.30/hour	Yes	\$0.35 - \$0.40/hour	No	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Yes	5% of base	Yes	5% of base	No	N/A
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Yes	8%-10% of base	Yes	10%-15% of base	No	N/A
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>						
Private Employer 1	Yes	\$1.20 per hour	Yes	\$1.20/hour	No	N/A
Private Employer 2	Yes	10%	Yes	15%	No	N/A
Private Employer 3	Yes	\$1.00/hour	Yes	\$1.10/hour	No	N/A
Private Employer 4	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
Private Employer 5	Yes	\$1.00/hour	Yes	\$1.00/hour	No	N/A
Private Employer 6	Yes	Varies by workgroup	Yes	Varies by workgroup	Yes	Varies by workgroup
Private Employer 7	Yes	\$1.00/hour	No	N/A	No	N/A

**TABLE A-13  
SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL  
FOR GENERAL EMPLOYEES (EXCLUDING MANAGERS AND EXECUTIVES)**

Comparator	2 <sup>nd</sup> Shift Differential		3 <sup>rd</sup> Shift Differential		Weekend Shift Differential	
	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>						
City of Avondale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Chandler	Yes (SEIU only)	\$0.30/hour	Yes (SEIU only)	\$0.50-\$0.70/hour	No	N/A
City of Flagstaff	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Glendale	Yes	\$0.50/hour	Yes	\$0.60/hour	No	N/A
Town of Gilbert	Yes	\$0.35/hour	Yes	\$0.45-0.55/hour	No	N/A
City of Goodyear	Yes	\$0.50/hour	Yes	\$0.65/hour	No	N/A
Maricopa County	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	Yes	Information not provided	N/A (there is only 2 shifts)	N/A	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Peoria	Yes	\$0.25/hour or \$0.35/hour	Yes	\$0.35/hour or \$0.45/hour	No	N/A
City of Scottsdale	Yes	5% of base	Yes	5% of base	No	N/A
City of Surprise	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Tempe	Yes (SEIU & supervisors only)	\$0.65/hour	Yes (SEIU & supervisors only)	\$0.80/hour	No	N/A
City of Tucson	Yes	\$1.00/hour	Yes	\$1.00/hour	Yes	\$1.70/hour (AFSCME only)

**TABLE A-13  
SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL  
FOR GENERAL EMPLOYEES (EXCLUDING MANAGERS AND EXECUTIVES)**

Comparator	2 <sup>nd</sup> Shift Differential		3 <sup>rd</sup> Shift Differential		Weekend Shift Differential	
	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)
City of Phoenix (Ees: 9,423)	Yes	Unit 1: \$0.50/hour Unit 2: \$0.90/hour Unit 3: \$0.60/hour Unit 7: \$1.30/hour (\$52/week for salaried employee) Confidential: \$0.80/hour	Yes	Unit 1: \$0.75/hour Unit 2: \$1.25/hour Unit 3: \$0.80/hour (\$0.60/hour for Library staff) Unit 7: \$1.30/hour (\$52/week for salaried employees) Confidential: \$0.80/hour	Yes	Unit 1: \$0.45/hour Unit 2: \$0.40/hour Unit 3: N/A Unit 7: \$0.60/hour (\$4.80/shift for salaried employees) Confidential: N/A

**TABLE A-14  
SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL FOR UNIFORMED POLICE**

Comparator	2 <sup>nd</sup> Shift Differential		3 <sup>rd</sup> Shift Differential		Weekend Shift Differential	
	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>						
State of Arizona	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Austin, TX	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Dallas, TX	Yes	2% of base	Yes	3.5% of base	No	N/A
City of Houston, TX	Yes	\$69.23/shift	Yes	\$69.23/shift	No	N/A
City of Jacksonville, FL	Yes	3.75% of base	Yes	3.5% of base	No	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Philadelphia, PA	Yes	4% of base	Yes	4% of base	No	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Yes	3.8% of base	Yes	5.3% of base	No	N/A
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Yes	6.25% of base	Yes	6.25% of base	No	N/A
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>						
City of Avondale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Chandler	Yes (PO & Sgt only)	\$0.30/hour	Yes (PO & Sgt only)	\$0.40-\$0.50/hour	No	N/A
City of Flagstaff	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
Town of Gilbert	Yes	\$0.35/hour	Yes	\$0.45-\$0.55/hour	No	N/A
City of Glendale	Yes	\$0.50/hour	Yes	\$0.60/hour	No	N/A
City of Goodyear	Yes	\$0.50/hour	Yes	\$0.65/hour	No	N/A
Maricopa County	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	Yes	Information not provided	N/A (there is only 2 shifts)	N/A	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Peoria	Yes	\$0.25/hour	Yes	\$0.35/hour	No	N/A

**TABLE A-14  
SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL FOR UNIFORMED POLICE**

Comparator	2 <sup>nd</sup> Shift Differential		3 <sup>rd</sup> Shift Differential		Weekend Shift Differential	
	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)
City of Scottsdale	Yes	\$0.55/hour	Yes	\$0.60-\$0.65/hour	No	N/A
City of Surprise	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Tempe	Yes	\$0.65/hour	Yes	\$0.80/hour	No	N/A
City of Tucson	Yes	\$1.00/hour	Yes	\$1.00/hour	No	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Unit 4: \$0.60/hour Unit 6: \$0.80/hour</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Unit 4: \$0.60/hour Unit 6: \$0.80/hour</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Unit 4: \$0.25/hour Unit 6: \$0.35/hour</b>

**TABLE A-15**  
**SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL FOR UNIFORMED FIRE/RESCUE**

Comparator	2 <sup>nd</sup> Shift Differential		3 <sup>rd</sup> Shift Differential		Weekend Shift Differential	
	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>						
State of Arizona	Yes	5% of base	Yes	10% of base	No	N/A
City of Austin, TX	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Dallas, TX	Yes	2% of base	Yes	3.5% of base	No	N/A
City of Houston, TX	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Jacksonville, FL	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Philadelphia, PA	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Yes	6.25% of base	Yes	6.25% of base	No	N/A
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>						
City of Avondale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Chandler	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Flagstaff	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
Town of Gilbert	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Glendale	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Goodyear	Yes	\$0.50/hour	Yes	\$0.65/hour	No	N/A
Maricopa County	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	Yes	Information not provided	N/A (there is only day shift and night shift)	N/A	Information not provided	Information not provided

**TABLE A-15  
SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL FOR UNIFORMED FIRE/RESCUE**

Comparator	2 <sup>nd</sup> Shift Differential		3 <sup>rd</sup> Shift Differential		Weekend Shift Differential	
	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)	Shift Differential (Yes/No)	Amount (\$ or %)
City of Peoria	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Scottsdale	Yes	5% of base	Yes	5% of base	N	N/A
City of Surprise	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Tempe	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A
City of Tucson	Yes	\$0.85-\$0.90/hour	Yes	\$1.00/hour	No	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix (Ees: 1,082)</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**Table B-1**  
**City of Phoenix as a Percent of Market Average By Occupational Group**

Occupational Group	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Administrative Support	825	105%	104%	104%
Audit	21	99%	95%	92%
Aviation	59	97%	99%	99%
Community & Economic Development	83	95%	96%	96%
Convention Center	27	102%	102%	102%
Council Staff	8	103%	106%	107%
Courts	196	106%	102%	99%
Engineering	230	98%	99%	100%
Environmental	39	109%	107%	105%
Executives	53	99%	100%	101%
Facilities	515	107%	104%	101%
Fiscal	375	101%	100%	97%
Fleet	267	104%	101%	98%
Food Services	12	120%	124%	124%
Human Resources	184	99%	98%	97%
Information Technology	501	105%	103%	101%
Inspections	118	102%	102%	101%
Legal	62	100%	100%	98%
Library	351	99%	101%	102%
Middle Managers	309	103%	102%	102%
Neighborhood Services	45	100%	102%	104%
Parks & Recreation	1089	102%	103%	104%
Planning & Development	72	106%	108%	109%
Printing	4	112%	113%	113%
Procurement	140	103%	101%	99%
Public Information/Relations	44	104%	105%	106%
Public Safety	5076	99%	102%	104%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-1**  
**City of Phoenix as a Percent of Market Average By Occupational Group**

Occupational Group	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Public Works	556	98%	98%	97%
Social Services	100	97%	98%	99%
Street Transportation	208	100%	99%	98%
Transit	31	100%	99%	99%
Water	855	100%	99%	98%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-2**  
**City of Phoenix as a Percent of Market Average By Occupational Group**  
**Within Market Sector**

Occupational Group	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Public Sector</i>				
Administrative Support	822	104%	104%	104%
Audit	21	103%	102%	102%
Aviation	48	98%	101%	103%
Community & Economic Development	83	94%	96%	98%
Convention Center	21	100%	100%	100%
Council Staff	8	104%	107%	109%
Courts	196	106%	102%	99%
Engineering	196	99%	101%	102%
Environmental	35	117%	118%	119%
Executives	53	105%	106%	107%
Facilities	504	110%	107%	105%
Fiscal	368	103%	103%	104%
Fleet	260	104%	102%	100%
Human Resources	171	99%	101%	103%
Information Technology	492	106%	106%	106%
Inspections	107	100%	100%	100%
Legal	61	100%	102%	103%
Library	325	100%	101%	103%
Middle Managers	301	105%	105%	105%
Neighborhood Services	45	100%	102%	104%
Parks & Recreation	1052	101%	103%	103%
Planning & Development	72	107%	108%	109%
Printing	4	111%	112%	113%
Procurement	138	103%	104%	104%
Public Information/Relations	44	103%	105%	107%
Public Safety (non-sworn)	5070	98%	101%	103%
Public Works	556	99%	98%	98%
Social Services	100	97%	98%	99%
Street Transportation	200	99%	99%	98%
Transit	31	100%	100%	99%
Water	853	99%	99%	98%
<b>Overall Average</b>		<b>103%</b>	<b>104%</b>	<b>104%</b>

**Table B-2**  
**City of Phoenix as a Percent of Market Average By Occupational Group**  
**Within Market Sector**

Occupational Group	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Private Sector/Published Data</i>				
Administrative Support	512	102%	99%	96%
Audit	21	94%	86%	81%
Community & Economic Development	56	106%	92%	83%
Engineering	140	95%	94%	91%
Executives	9	55%	58%	58%
Facilities	269	98%	94%	88%
Fiscal	298	104%	100%	95%
Fleet	114	68%	77%	76%
Food Services	12	128%	130%	131%
Human Resources	147	96%	87%	81%
Information Technology	459	105%	100%	95%
Legal	60	96%	91%	81%
Middle Managers	64	96%	88%	83%
Procurement	117	101%	92%	85%
Public Safety (non-sworn)	102	140%	140%	139%
Public Works	51	86%	92%	86%
Water	2	116%	105%	99%
<b>Overall Average</b>		<b>89%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>82%</b>

**Table B-3**  
**City of Phoenix as a Percent of Market Average By Bargaining Unit**

Employee Category	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Unit 1- LIUNA 777	1339	108%	103%	99%
Unit 2- AFSCME 2384	1154	105%	99%	95%
Unit 3- AFSCME 2960	2732	99%	101%	102%
Unit 4- Police	2638	92%	99%	103%
Unit 5- Fire	1082	107%	104%	102%
Unit 6- Police Supervisory & Professional*	458	103%	106%	109%
Unit 7- ASPTEA	2516	101%	102%	102%
Confidential Staff	166	103%	99%	96%
Middle Managers	309	103%	102%	102%
Executives	53	99%	100%	101%
Council	8	100%	102%	103%

\* Includes Career Enhancement Pay (CEP).

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-4**  
**City of Phoenix as a Percent of Market Average By Bargaining Unit Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Employee Category	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Public Sector</i>				
Unit 1- LIUNA 777	1303	109%	104%	101%
Unit 2- AFSCME 2384	1130	105%	100%	96%
Unit 3- AFSCME 2960	2683	99%	101%	103%
Unit 4- Police	2638	92%	99%	103%
Unit 5- Fire	1082	107%	104%	102%
Unit 6- Police Supervisory & Professional*	458	103%	106%	109%
Unit 7- ASPTEA	2419	101%	103%	104%
Confidential Staff	162	103%	102%	101%
Middle Managers	301	105%	105%	105%
Executives	53	105%	106%	107%
Council	8	100%	102%	103%

\* Includes Career Enhancement Pay (CEP).

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-4**  
**City of Phoenix as a Percent of Market Average By Bargaining Unit Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Employee Category	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Private Sector/Published Data</i>				
Unit 1- LIUNA 777	263	109%	104%	98%
Unit 2- AFSCME 2384	266	90%	89%	85%
Unit 3- AFSCME 2960	737	101%	98%	93%
Unit 7- ASPTEA	940	101%	96%	92%
Confidential Staff	154	96%	86%	79%
Middle Managers	64	96%	88%	83%
Executives	9	55%	58%	58%

\* Includes Career Enhancement Pay (CEP).

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Account Clerk II	34	93%	93%	92%
Account Clerk III	86	104%	103%	102%
Account Clerk Supervisor	3	96%	98%	98%
Accountant I	31	113%	109%	107%
Accountant II	44	112%	109%	106%
Accountant III	38	108%	104%	102%
Accountant IV	17	110%	106%	104%
Accounting Supervisor	1	107%	100%	96%
Administrative Aide	86	109%	105%	103%
Administrative Assistant I	79	103%	105%	106%
Administrative Assistant II	55	141%	134%	129%
Administrative Assistant III	2	131%	115%	106%
Administrative Assistant to the Mayor (NC)	0	113%	116%	116%
Administrative Secretary	29	101%	102%	102%
Aircraft Technician	7	105%	105%	104%
Architect	4	107%	106%	106%
Arts & Culture Administrator	0	101%	102%	103%
Assistant Aviation Director	2	84%	85%	85%
Assistant Chief Information Officer	2	95%	90%	88%
Assistant City Attorney II (NC)	24	94%	91%	87%
Assistant City Attorney III (NC)	19	100%	97%	96%
Assistant City Attorney IV (NC)	30	97%	95%	94%
Assistant City Auditor	0	128%	99%	86%
Assistant City Clerk	0	124%	121%	118%
Assistant City Librarian	0	103%	103%	103%
Assistant City Manager (NC)	1	93%	95%	96%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Assistant Community/Economic Development Director	1	106%	103%	99%
Assistant Development Services Director	2	117%	104%	97%
Assistant Finance Director	2	109%	103%	98%
Assistant Housing Director	0	99%	100%	101%
Assistant Laboratory Superintendent	1	106%	105%	105%
Assistant Parks & Recreation Director	0	123%	111%	105%
Assistant Public Works Director	2	129%	111%	102%
Assistant Street Transportation Director	1	106%	104%	103%
Assistant to the City Manager (NC)	1	102%	112%	118%
Assistant to the Mayor (a) (NC)	0	142%	126%	117%
Assistant Water Services Director-Administration	1	111%	104%	100%
Assistant Water Services Director-Operation	1	105%	100%	96%
Assistant Water Services Director-Technical	1	109%	95%	88%
Auto Parts Clerk II	13	103%	100%	98%
Auto Parts Clerk III	6	104%	99%	95%
Auto Technician	50	101%	97%	94%
Aviation Director (NC)	1	86%	94%	100%
Aviation Superintendent	11	95%	95%	95%
Aviation Supervisor II	31	93%	96%	98%
Aviation Supervisor III	10	97%	101%	104%
Bailiff	43	99%	99%	99%
Benefits Analyst II	4	107%	102%	101%
Body Repair Specialist	1	129%	116%	106%
Budget & Research Director (NC)	1	113%	108%	100%
Budget Analyst I	6	104%	106%	106%
Budget Analyst II	28	107%	105%	104%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Budget Analyst III	4	106%	108%	108%
Building Code Examiner	4	104%	108%	110%
Building Equipment Operator I	49	133%	118%	108%
Building Equipment Operator II	22	116%	108%	101%
Building Facilities Superintendent	4	97%	98%	97%
Building Maintenance Foreman	24	104%	105%	105%
Building Maintenance Supervisor	4	93%	97%	98%
Building Maintenance Worker	114	133%	121%	114%
Business Systems Analyst	0	106%	101%	97%
Buyer	4	111%	107%	104%
Buyer Aide	3	100%	102%	105%
Caseworker II	79	95%	95%	95%
Cement Finisher	10	98%	94%	91%
Chemist I	26	99%	100%	100%
Chemist II	7	106%	107%	108%
Chemist III	5	103%	106%	108%
Chief Asst City Attorney (NC)	0	88%	89%	88%
Chief Construction Inspector	24	100%	99%	98%
Chief Drafting Technician	1	84%	90%	94%
Chief Engineering Technician	23	99%	100%	98%
Chief Information Officer (NC)	1	83%	84%	83%
Chief Materials Technician	2	102%	98%	95%
Chief Presiding Judge (NC)	1	149%	120%	100%
Chief Video Engineer	1	114%	118%	120%
Chief Water Quality Inspector	4	102%	103%	104%
City Attorney (NC)	1	81%	90%	97%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
City Auditor (NC)	1	101%	104%	105%
City Clerk (NC)	1	103%	112%	119%
City Engineer (NC)	0	112%	110%	108%
City Judge (NC)	50	140%	120%	105%
City Librarian (NC)	1	100%	103%	105%
City Manager (NC)	1	45%	55%	65%
City Prosecutor (NC)	1	91%	100%	107%
Civil Engineer I	0	92%	95%	96%
Civil Engineer II	17	95%	98%	100%
Civil Engineer III	49	102%	103%	104%
Civil Engineer III*Team Leader	7	102%	102%	102%
Claims Adjuster II	3	104%	105%	105%
Clerical Supervisor	5	100%	101%	102%
Clerk I	32	96%	95%	94%
Clerk II	11	95%	97%	100%
Clerk III	10	99%	99%	103%
Communications Dispatcher	30	98%	99%	101%
Communications Engineer	3	95%	98%	100%
Communications Supervisor	0	89%	94%	97%
Communications Technician	4	102%	95%	88%
Community & Economic Development Director (NC)	2	116%	114%	113%
Community Outreach Supervisor	1	96%	101%	104%
Computer Operator	1	113%	110%	104%
Construction Inspector	0	89%	86%	84%
Construction Inspector Supervisor	7	100%	99%	99%
Construction Permit Supervisor	0	107%	111%	113%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Contracts Specialist I	4	99%	92%	87%
Contracts Specialist II	22	102%	97%	94%
Convention Center Director (NC)	0	103%	106%	107%
Cook	12	120%	124%	124%
Council Assistant (NC)	6	107%	110%	112%
Courier	12	116%	112%	108%
Court Interpreter	6	102%	103%	103%
Court Supervisor	14	91%	93%	95%
Court/Legal Clerk I	19	93%	93%	93%
Court/Legal Clerk II	111	90%	91%	92%
Crime Lab Administrator	0	106%	103%	101%
Crime Scene Section Supervisor	0	109%	110%	111%
Crime Scene Shift Supervisor	5	93%	95%	97%
Crime Scene Specialist I	3	94%	99%	102%
Crime Scene Specialist II	32	99%	98%	97%
Crime Scene Specialist III	10	94%	97%	100%
Criminal Intelligence Analyst	10	110%	111%	111%
Curriculum/Training Coordinator	15	95%	99%	101%
Customer Service Clerk	53	95%	94%	94%
Department Budget Supervisor	10	100%	100%	98%
Deputy Aviation Director	8	78%	79%	80%
Deputy Budget & Research Director	3	106%	101%	98%
Deputy Chief Information Officer	4	105%	102%	100%
Deputy City Auditor	2	111%	114%	115%
Deputy City Clerk	3	128%	128%	128%
Deputy City Manager (NC)	3	112%	109%	106%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Deputy City Prosecutor (NC)	2	92%	103%	111%
Deputy Convention Center Director	4	96%	93%	91%
Deputy Development Services Director	2	102%	99%	98%
Deputy Economic Development Director	2	101%	100%	100%
Deputy Finance Director	8	104%	94%	89%
Deputy Housing Director	3	100%	101%	101%
Deputy Human Resources Director	4	100%	96%	93%
Deputy Human Services Director	4	95%	98%	100%
Deputy Neighborhood Services Director	4	110%	101%	97%
Deputy Parks & Recreation Director	7	101%	100%	99%
Deputy Planning Director	1	96%	95%	94%
Deputy Public Works Director	4	93%	89%	86%
Deputy Street Transportation Director	4	105%	101%	99%
Deputy Water Services Director	10	103%	103%	103%
Development Services Director (NC)	2	103%	104%	105%
Development Services Team Leader	4	110%	110%	110%
Economic Development Program Manager	23	101%	100%	99%
Economic Development Specialist	4	89%	92%	93%
Electrical Engineer	0	105%	104%	103%
Electrical Inspector II	11	115%	112%	110%
Electrical Maintenance Foreman	15	105%	109%	112%
Electrical Plans Examiner II	2	105%	106%	107%
Electrician	113	108%	102%	98%
Electronic Systems Specialist	8	131%	124%	118%
Emergency Dispatcher	2	108%	110%	113%
Energy Management Specialist	2	84%	82%	80%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Engineering Technician	27	94%	94%	92%
Enterprise Technology Manager	3	93%	101%	105%
Environmental Programs Coordinator	6	120%	120%	120%
Environmental Programs Manager	1	112%	108%	105%
Environmental Programs Specialist	1	121%	131%	139%
Environmental Quality Specialist	29	111%	105%	102%
Equal Opportunity Spec*Lead	3	102%	99%	100%
Equal Opportunity Specialist	10	109%	108%	105%
Equipment Maintenance Superintendent	1	96%	99%	100%
Equipment Maintenance Supervisor	9	99%	103%	106%
Equipment Operator II	51	100%	96%	93%
Equipment Operator III	41	102%	97%	94%
Equipment Operator IV	44	105%	99%	95%
Equipment Parts Supervisor	1	108%	110%	102%
Equipment Repair Specialist	6	110%	101%	94%
Equipment Service Aide	11	98%	99%	99%
Equipment Service Worker I	7	95%	90%	86%
Equipment Service Worker II	51	97%	94%	90%
Equipment Shop Foreman	20	95%	97%	97%
Event Operations Manager	1	114%	114%	114%
Events Coordinator	6	97%	98%	98%
Executive Assistant to Mayor (NC)	2	152%	146%	142%
Facilities Projects Planner	8	101%	96%	89%
Facilities Service Coordinator	1	103%	105%	105%
Facility Contract Compliance Specialist	16	101%	102%	103%
Facility Coordinator	6	102%	103%	102%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Finance Director (NC)	1	96%	94%	91%
Finance Supervisor	0	99%	87%	80%
Fingerprint Technician	16	92%	92%	92%
Fire 911 Administrator	1	106%	108%	110%
Fire Battalion Chief	68	99%	114%	125%
Fire Captain	81	107%	102%	97%
Fire Chief (NC)	1	103%	110%	114%
Fire Communications Supervisor	6	95%	97%	99%
Fire Engineer	180	112%	108%	105%
Fire Equipment Service Worker	9	107%	102%	99%
Fire Prevention Manager	0	89%	100%	108%
Fire Prevention Specialist II	31	100%	105%	108%
Fire Prevention Supervisor	0	97%	111%	123%
Fire Protection Engineer	6	118%	121%	121%
Firefighter	821	102%	103%	104%
Forensic Photo Specialist	10	96%	98%	99%
Forensic Science Section Supervisor	10	100%	103%	105%
Forensic Scientist I (NC)	13	100%	106%	110%
Forensic Scientist II	22	104%	107%	108%
Forensic Scientist III	15	96%	99%	101%
Forensic Scientist IV	24	93%	98%	102%
Gardener	124	100%	100%	100%
General Inspections Supervisor	1	99%	100%	101%
General Inspector II	16	106%	110%	113%
GIS Coordinator	4	94%	95%	96%
GIS Technician	18	105%	106%	107%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Golf Course Supervisor	4	82%	89%	93%
Grants Compliance Supervisor	1	105%	105%	106%
Greenskeeper	32	94%	94%	92%
Groundskeeper	207	105%	100%	95%
Head Golf Professional	0	116%	112%	110%
Heavy Equip Mechanic	78	114%	103%	97%
Horticulturist	1	117%	118%	117%
Housing Director (NC)	1	106%	109%	110%
Housing Inspector	5	94%	96%	98%
Housing Manager	1	106%	104%	103%
Housing Program Assistant	15	96%	99%	102%
Housing Rehabilitation Specialist	11	96%	102%	106%
Housing Supervisor	3	101%	105%	108%
Human Resources Aide	30	95%	97%	99%
Human Resources Analyst I	10	101%	98%	96%
Human Resources Analyst II	24	97%	94%	93%
Human Resources Clerk I	5	87%	91%	94%
Human Resources Clerk II	41	91%	86%	83%
Human Resources Director (NC)	1	94%	95%	96%
Human Resources Officer	6	97%	93%	90%
Human Resources Supervisor	15	103%	98%	94%
Human Services Director (NC)	1	85%	99%	109%
Human Services Program Coordinator	5	94%	93%	92%
Hydrologist	1	101%	102%	102%
Industrial Hygienist	4	96%	96%	93%
Information Clerk	0	99%	98%	97%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer I	23	122%	118%	115%
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer II	46	112%	112%	112%
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer III	49	104%	105%	105%
Information Technology Project Manager	32	109%	103%	100%
Information Technology Service Specialist	6	105%	104%	94%
Information Technology Supervisor	0	97%	97%	92%
Information Technology Systems Specialist	11	107%	99%	95%
Instrument Technician	6	102%	98%	94%
Instrumentation & Cont Specialist	19	107%	98%	92%
Intergovernmental Affairs Coordinator (NC)	1	133%	132%	132%
Internal Auditor II	7	101%	99%	96%
Internal Auditor III	9	103%	100%	97%
Internal Auditor IV	5	93%	88%	84%
Inventory Control Specialist	2	107%	109%	110%
Inventory Management Coordinator	2	108%	112%	107%
Investment Manager	2	90%	90%	69%
Labor Compliance Specialist	3	102%	104%	105%
Labor Relations Administrator (NC)	1	86%	89%	92%
Laboratory Technician	17	96%	95%	94%
Laborer	25	113%	105%	99%
Landfill Equipment Operator	14	109%	102%	97%
Landscape Architect I	5	97%	100%	101%
Landscape Architect II	5	95%	99%	100%
Landscape Equipment Operator	4	102%	97%	93%
Lead Business Systems Analyst	0	97%	94%	92%
Lead Computer Operator	2	107%	108%	110%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Lead Information Technology Systems Specialist	17	106%	107%	106%
Lead User Technology Specialist	32	110%	108%	105%
Legal Assistant	11	100%	100%	99%
Legal Assistant Supervisor	1	104%	107%	107%
Legal Secretary	25	102%	102%	102%
Librarian I	15	98%	100%	101%
Librarian II	32	103%	104%	104%
Librarian III	8	109%	111%	112%
Librarian IV	9	107%	107%	107%
Library Assistant	78	103%	107%	109%
Library Circulation Attendant I	59	94%	98%	101%
Library Circulation Attendant II	22	93%	95%	97%
Library Clerk I	26	93%	96%	98%
Library Clerk II	14	94%	96%	97%
Library Page	80	90%	91%	92%
Library Services Administrator	1	100%	105%	108%
Library Support Services Supervisor	2	88%	91%	93%
Library Technical Assistant	6	98%	101%	103%
License Inspector	7	100%	101%	102%
Lifeguard	308	108%	120%	130%
Locksmith	3	101%	95%	91%
Machinist	2	116%	105%	99%
Mail Service Supervisor	1	112%	117%	120%
Mail Service Worker	5	118%	111%	106%
Management Assistant I	13	104%	104%	103%
Management Assistant II	61	114%	114%	114%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Management Assistant III	5	121%	119%	118%
Management Services Administrator	8	121%	110%	103%
Materials Technician	3	87%	86%	86%
Mayor's Assistant (NC)	2	93%	95%	96%
Mechanical Plans Examiner II	4	106%	107%	108%
Minibus Operator	29	101%	100%	98%
Multimedia Specialist	11	106%	108%	109%
Municipal Court Administrator	1	95%	96%	97%
Municipal Court Hearing Officer (NC)	3	132%	117%	105%
Municipal Security Guard	102	108%	109%	109%
Museum Curator	2	107%	113%	117%
Neighborhood Maintenance Technician II	1	99%	101%	103%
Neighborhood Services Director (NC)	1	102%	106%	110%
Neighborhood Specialist	8	101%	102%	102%
Office Systems Technology Specialist	1	94%	98%	90%
Offset Press Operator	3	101%	104%	106%
Operations & Maintenance Supervisor	23	98%	100%	101%
Operations & Maintenance Technician	206	105%	97%	91%
Operations Analyst	2	103%	102%	101%
Park Manager	8	102%	99%	97%
Park Ranger II	40	106%	110%	112%
Parks & Recreation Director (NC)	1	100%	104%	107%
Parks Equipment Mechanic	13	107%	100%	99%
Parks Maintenance Mechanic	19	118%	110%	104%
Parks Supervisor	8	98%	100%	102%
Party Chief	4	106%	102%	98%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Planner I	7	115%	115%	115%
Planner II	25	108%	109%	110%
Planner III	9	105%	107%	108%
Planning Administrator	1	102%	101%	100%
Planning Graphic Designer	2	108%	110%	111%
Plumbing/Mechanical Inspector II	11	108%	108%	108%
Police Aide	34	99%	101%	102%
Police Assistant	146	99%	99%	100%
Police Cadet II (NC)	0	58%	61%	63%
Police Chief (NC)	1	97%	105%	110%
Police Comm. Shift Supervisor	5	102%	106%	109%
Police Commander	28	82%	100%	114%
Police Communications Operator	254	102%	104%	106%
Police Communications Supervisor	31	94%	96%	97%
Police Computer Services Bureau Administrator	0	104%	106%	107%
Police Fiscal Administrator	1	112%	101%	95%
Police Lieutenant	89	105%	106%	107%
Police Officer	2638	92%	99%	103%
Police Property Supervisor	4	90%	91%	92%
Police Property Technician	19	102%	102%	103%
Police Public Relations Representative	1	99%	99%	97%
Police R & I Bureau Administrator	1	121%	125%	127%
Police R & I Bureau Shift Supervisor	9	97%	102%	105%
Police Records Clerk	60	93%	95%	96%
Police Research Analyst	6	98%	101%	102%
Police Sergeant	369	100%	106%	112%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Polygraph Examiner	4	106%	112%	116%
Pool Manager	34	99%	99%	99%
Principal Engineering Technician	29	105%	103%	101%
Principal Landscape Architect	2	103%	109%	113%
Principal Planner	9	100%	98%	97%
Printing Services Supervisor	1	119%	118%	117%
Procurement Manager	3	97%	96%	96%
Procurement Supervisor	1	84%	80%	77%
Project Manager	56	96%	96%	96%
Property Manager	2	105%	100%	96%
Property Specialist	13	100%	102%	97%
Public Information Director (NC)	1	98%	105%	108%
Public Information Officer	14	100%	100%	100%
Public Information Specialist	12	100%	103%	105%
Public Transit Director (NC)	1	70%	83%	94%
Public Works Director (NC)	1	100%	104%	107%
Public Works Operations Manager	2	94%	99%	102%
Quality Assurance Engineer	2	94%	94%	92%
Rate Analyst	1	110%	116%	119%
Records Clerk II	33	104%	100%	97%
Records Clerk III	6	101%	105%	107%
Records Supervisor	2	97%	98%	98%
Recreation Coordinator II	36	102%	106%	108%
Recreation Coordinator III	30	101%	103%	104%
Recreation Leader	208	96%	98%	100%
Recreation Programmer	19	94%	94%	95%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Recreation Supervisor	5	107%	107%	108%
Retirement Program Administrator	1	89%	85%	82%
Risk Management Coordinator	3	104%	103%	98%
Safety Analyst I	4	100%	105%	107%
Safety Analyst II	10	100%	100%	101%
Sales Manager	6	105%	102%	101%
Secretarial Supervisor	2	95%	97%	99%
Secretary II	173	97%	95%	94%
Secretary III	122	95%	99%	102%
Secretary to City Manager (NC)	1	110%	111%	109%
Security Systems Supervisor	3	104%	105%	104%
Semiskilled Worker	57	112%	101%	93%
Senior Business Systems Analyst	0	102%	99%	96%
Senior Buyer	6	100%	96%	93%
Senior Center Assistant	15	110%	112%	113%
Senior Construction Inspector	37	108%	103%	98%
Senior Drafting Technician	6	95%	96%	96%
Senior Engineering Technician	32	96%	96%	94%
Senior GIS Technician	15	96%	97%	98%
Senior Information Technology Systems Specialist	35	104%	100%	96%
Senior Materials Technician	5	100%	93%	89%
Senior Party Chief	2	104%	101%	97%
Senior Tax Auditor	6	93%	96%	98%
Senior User Technology Specialist	57	120%	118%	116%
Senior Utility Technician	62	103%	99%	96%
Senior Water Quality Inspector	26	103%	98%	95%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Sign Specialist II	5	102%	100%	98%
Solid Waste Administrator	4	93%	90%	89%
Solid Waste Environmental Specialist	55	111%	116%	120%
Solid Waste Equipment Operator	290	102%	101%	100%
Solid Waste Foreman	34	91%	97%	100%
Solid Waste Superintendent	7	92%	91%	90%
Solid Waste Supervisor	11	89%	92%	93%
Solid Waste Worker	7	100%	95%	91%
Special Projects Administrator	5	96%	97%	98%
Street Maintenance Foreman II	26	92%	95%	98%
Street Maintenance Foreman III	5	91%	95%	97%
Street Maintenance Superintendent	1	95%	99%	101%
Street Maintenance Supervisor	5	97%	100%	101%
Street Maintenance Worker I	51	102%	97%	94%
Street Maintenance Worker II	31	102%	95%	91%
Street Transportation Director (NC)	1	110%	108%	106%
Structural Inspections Supervisor	1	95%	96%	97%
Structural Inspector II	10	102%	104%	105%
Structural Plans Engineer	5	106%	110%	112%
Structural Plans Examiner II	1	104%	105%	106%
Supplies Clerk I	28	116%	110%	105%
Supplies Clerk II	36	116%	110%	105%
Supplies Clerk III	8	112%	115%	116%
Supplies Supervisor	5	113%	112%	106%
Survey Aide	3	111%	103%	96%
Survey Supervisor	1	98%	104%	101%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Tax Auditor	7	92%	94%	96%
Tax Enforcement Supervisor	1	83%	84%	85%
Telecommunications Specialist	4	119%	105%	94%
Ticket Seller	13	99%	101%	102%
Ticket Services Supervisor	1	90%	91%	92%
Trades Helper	73	112%	108%	104%
Traffic Engineer II	3	97%	99%	101%
Traffic Engineer III	5	97%	100%	102%
Traffic Engineer III*Team Leader	0	101%	102%	101%
Traffic Maintenance Foreman II	4	91%	95%	97%
Traffic Signal Supervisor	2	98%	100%	101%
Traffic Signal Technician	25	116%	106%	100%
Traffic Signal Technician Foreman	2	95%	98%	100%
Training Specialist	7	99%	100%	97%
Transit Superintendent	1	98%	98%	98%
Transportation Supervisor	1	101%	101%	102%
Treasury Collections Representative	26	104%	108%	111%
Treasury Collections Supervisor	5	100%	102%	100%
User Support Specialist	14	107%	107%	107%
User Technology Specialist	127	117%	118%	119%
Utilities Service Specialist	76	100%	101%	102%
Utility Foreman	30	94%	96%	98%
Utility Specialty Technician	42	90%	87%	84%
Utility Supervisor	13	96%	99%	100%
Utility Technician	108	102%	96%	92%
Utility TV Technician	5	92%	90%	89%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-5**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Video Productions Coordinator	5	103%	105%	107%
Video Station Manager	1	117%	104%	97%
Water Customer Services Supervisor I	22	104%	104%	103%
Water Customer Services Supervisor II	8	89%	92%	91%
Water Facilities Supervisor	8	100%	102%	103%
Water Meter Technician I	6	99%	94%	89%
Water Meter Technician II	1	95%	91%	87%
Water Quality Inspector	15	95%	93%	92%
Water Resource Specialist	3	99%	101%	103%
Water Resources Management Advisor (NC)	0	117%	113%	110%
Water Services Director (NC)	1	94%	99%	103%
Water Services Specialist	31	91%	86%	83%
Water Services Technician	81	96%	94%	92%
Water Systems Operator	7	98%	101%	102%
Welder	9	121%	115%	110%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Public Sector</i>				
Account Clerk II	34	94%	95%	97%
Account Clerk III	86	104%	105%	106%
Account Clerk Supervisor	3	98%	100%	102%
Accountant I	31	114%	116%	116%
Accountant II	44	115%	116%	116%
Accountant III	38	112%	113%	113%
Accountant IV	17	110%	110%	110%
Accounting Supervisor	1	115%	108%	105%
Administrative Aide	86	108%	106%	105%
Administrative Assistant I	79	99%	101%	103%
Administrative Assistant II	55	142%	133%	128%
Administrative Assistant III	2	148%	137%	130%
Administrative Assistant to the Mayor (NC)	0	116%	120%	123%
Administrative Secretary	29	102%	102%	103%
Aircraft Technician	7	105%	107%	108%
Architect	4	107%	107%	107%
Arts & Culture Administrator	0	102%	101%	101%
Assistant Aviation Director	2	88%	88%	88%
Assistant Chief Information Officer	2	112%	106%	103%
Assistant City Attorney II (NC)	24	90%	90%	90%
Assistant City Attorney III (NC)	19	102%	101%	100%
Assistant City Attorney IV (NC)	30	99%	99%	99%
Assistant City Auditor	0	128%	99%	86%
Assistant City Clerk	0	124%	121%	118%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Assistant City Librarian	0	103%	103%	103%
Assistant City Manager (NC)	1	110%	112%	114%
Assistant Community/Economic Development Dire	1	113%	109%	106%
Assistant Development Services Director	2	117%	104%	97%
Assistant Finance Director	2	118%	113%	111%
Assistant Housing Director	0	99%	100%	101%
Assistant Laboratory Superintendent	1	102%	102%	102%
Assistant Parks & Recreation Director	0	123%	111%	105%
Assistant Public Works Director	2	129%	111%	102%
Assistant Street Transportation Director	1	106%	104%	103%
Assistant to the City Manager (NC)	1	102%	112%	118%
Assistant to the Mayor (a) (NC)	0	142%	126%	117%
Assistant Water Services Director-Administration	1	131%	119%	113%
Assistant Water Services Director-Operation	1	123%	113%	108%
Assistant Water Services Director-Technical	1	148%	117%	103%
Auto Parts Clerk II	13	118%	109%	103%
Auto Parts Clerk III	6	100%	95%	92%
Auto Technician	50	114%	106%	100%
Aviation Director (NC)	1	88%	98%	105%
Aviation Supervisor II	31	92%	95%	97%
Aviation Supervisor III	10	99%	102%	105%
Bailiff	43	99%	99%	99%
Benefits Analyst II	4	111%	113%	114%
Budget & Research Director (NC)	1	116%	120%	122%
Budget Analyst I	6	103%	104%	104%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Budget Analyst II	28	106%	105%	104%
Budget Analyst III	4	106%	109%	110%
Building Code Examiner	4	104%	108%	110%
Building Equipment Operator I	49	131%	120%	112%
Building Equipment Operator II	22	126%	117%	110%
Building Facilities Superintendent	4	95%	95%	95%
Building Maintenance Foreman	24	105%	106%	107%
Building Maintenance Supervisor	4	91%	95%	98%
Building Maintenance Worker	114	134%	125%	119%
Business Systems Analyst	0	105%	103%	102%
Buyer	4	117%	118%	119%
Buyer Aide	3	100%	103%	105%
Caseworker II	79	95%	95%	95%
Cement Finisher	10	97%	92%	89%
Chemist I	26	100%	101%	101%
Chemist II	7	109%	111%	112%
Chemist III	5	100%	104%	107%
Chief Asst City Attorney (NC)	0	91%	93%	94%
Chief Construction Inspector	24	98%	98%	97%
Chief Drafting Technician	1	96%	107%	115%
Chief Engineering Technician	23	99%	100%	101%
Chief Information Officer (NC)	1	103%	105%	107%
Chief Materials Technician	2	102%	98%	95%
Chief Presiding Judge (NC)	1	149%	120%	100%
Chief Video Engineer	1	114%	118%	120%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Chief Water Quality Inspector	4	102%	103%	104%
City Attorney (NC)	1	83%	96%	106%
City Auditor (NC)	1	102%	108%	112%
City Clerk (NC)	1	103%	112%	119%
City Engineer (NC)	0	115%	111%	110%
City Judge (NC)	50	140%	120%	105%
City Librarian (NC)	1	100%	103%	105%
City Manager (NC)	1	84%	102%	117%
City Prosecutor (NC)	1	91%	100%	107%
Civil Engineer I	0	92%	96%	98%
Civil Engineer II	17	94%	97%	99%
Civil Engineer III	49	103%	105%	106%
Civil Engineer III*Team Leader	7	103%	103%	103%
Claims Adjuster II	3	103%	105%	106%
Clerical Supervisor	5	106%	107%	108%
Clerk I	32	95%	94%	94%
Clerk II	11	93%	96%	97%
Clerk III	10	99%	100%	102%
Communications Dispatcher	30	99%	100%	101%
Communications Engineer	3	94%	98%	100%
Communications Supervisor	0	84%	92%	97%
Communications Technician	4	97%	91%	86%
Community & Economic Development Director (N	2	116%	114%	113%
Community Outreach Supervisor	1	96%	101%	104%
Computer Operator	1	117%	115%	114%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Construction Inspector	0	88%	85%	83%
Construction Inspector Supervisor	7	100%	99%	99%
Construction Permit Supervisor	0	107%	111%	113%
Contracts Specialist I	4	104%	101%	99%
Contracts Specialist II	22	103%	100%	98%
Convention Center Director (NC)	0	103%	106%	107%
Council Assistant (NC)	6	107%	110%	112%
Courier	12	125%	118%	113%
Court Interpreter	6	102%	103%	103%
Court Supervisor	14	91%	93%	95%
Court/Legal Clerk I	19	93%	93%	93%
Court/Legal Clerk II	111	90%	91%	92%
Crime Lab Administrator	0	106%	103%	101%
Crime Scene Section Supervisor	0	109%	110%	111%
Crime Scene Shift Supervisor	5	93%	95%	97%
Crime Scene Specialist I	3	94%	99%	102%
Crime Scene Specialist II	32	99%	98%	97%
Crime Scene Specialist III	10	94%	97%	100%
Criminal Intelligence Analyst	10	110%	111%	111%
Curriculum/Training Coordinator	15	91%	96%	100%
Customer Service Clerk	53	92%	93%	93%
Department Budget Supervisor	10	101%	100%	99%
Deputy Budget & Research Director	3	109%	101%	96%
Deputy Chief Information Officer	4	105%	103%	102%
Deputy City Auditor	2	111%	114%	115%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Deputy City Clerk	3	128%	128%	128%
Deputy City Manager (NC)	3	112%	109%	106%
Deputy City Prosecutor (NC)	2	92%	103%	111%
Deputy Convention Center Director	4	96%	93%	91%
Deputy Development Services Director	2	102%	99%	98%
Deputy Economic Development Director	2	101%	100%	100%
Deputy Finance Director	8	109%	102%	99%
Deputy Housing Director	3	100%	101%	101%
Deputy Human Resources Director	4	99%	98%	98%
Deputy Human Services Director	4	95%	98%	100%
Deputy Neighborhood Services Director	4	110%	101%	97%
Deputy Parks & Recreation Director	7	101%	100%	99%
Deputy Planning Director	1	96%	95%	94%
Deputy Public Works Director	4	93%	89%	86%
Deputy Street Transportation Director	4	105%	101%	99%
Deputy Water Services Director	10	107%	107%	107%
Development Services Director (NC)	2	103%	104%	105%
Development Services Team Leader	4	110%	110%	110%
Economic Development Program Manager	23	101%	100%	99%
Economic Development Specialist	4	89%	92%	93%
Electrical Engineer	0	105%	112%	116%
Electrical Maintenance Foreman	15	106%	110%	113%
Electrical Plans Examiner II	2	105%	106%	107%
Electrician	113	121%	111%	104%
Electronic Systems Specialist	8	133%	127%	123%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Emergency Dispatcher	2	108%	110%	113%
Energy Management Specialist	2	84%	82%	80%
Engineering Technician	27	97%	97%	97%
Enterprise Technology Manager	3	92%	101%	108%
Environmental Programs Coordinator	6	120%	120%	120%
Environmental Programs Manager	1	112%	108%	105%
Environmental Programs Specialist	1	121%	131%	139%
Environmental Quality Specialist	29	114%	116%	117%
Equipment Maintenance Superintendent	1	98%	101%	103%
Equipment Maintenance Supervisor	9	98%	103%	107%
Equipment Operator II	51	103%	98%	94%
Equipment Operator III	41	102%	98%	95%
Equipment Operator IV	44	104%	99%	94%
Equipment Parts Supervisor	1	106%	110%	114%
Equipment Service Aide	11	98%	98%	98%
Equipment Service Worker I	7	104%	95%	89%
Equipment Service Worker II	51	113%	104%	97%
Equipment Shop Foreman	20	94%	95%	96%
Event Operations Manager	1	114%	114%	114%
Events Coordinator	6	98%	99%	99%
Executive Assistant to Mayor (NC)	2	152%	146%	142%
Facilities Service Coordinator	1	103%	106%	108%
Facility Contract Compliance Specialist	16	101%	102%	103%
Facility Coordinator	6	107%	108%	109%
Finance Director (NC)	1	98%	103%	105%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Finance Supervisor	0	110%	109%	108%
Fingerprint Technician	16	92%	92%	92%
Fire 911 Administrator	1	106%	108%	110%
Fire Battalion Chief	68	99%	114%	125%
Fire Captain	81	107%	102%	97%
Fire Chief (NC)	1	103%	110%	114%
Fire Communications Supervisor	6	95%	97%	99%
Fire Engineer	180	112%	108%	105%
Fire Equipment Service Worker	9	107%	102%	99%
Fire Prevention Manager	0	89%	100%	108%
Fire Prevention Specialist II	31	100%	105%	108%
Fire Prevention Supervisor	0	97%	111%	123%
Firefighter	821	102%	103%	104%
Forensic Photo Specialist	10	96%	98%	99%
Forensic Science Section Supervisor	10	100%	103%	105%
Forensic Scientist I (NC)	13	94%	101%	105%
Forensic Scientist II	22	103%	105%	107%
Forensic Scientist III	15	94%	97%	100%
Forensic Scientist IV	24	93%	98%	102%
Gardener	124	98%	98%	97%
General Inspections Supervisor	1	99%	100%	101%
General Inspector II	16	106%	110%	113%
GIS Coordinator	4	94%	95%	96%
GIS Technician	18	108%	110%	111%
Golf Course Supervisor	4	80%	86%	91%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Grants Compliance Supervisor	1	105%	105%	106%
Groundskeeper	207	103%	98%	95%
Head Golf Professional	0	116%	112%	110%
Heavy Equip Mechanic	78	114%	104%	97%
Housing Director (NC)	1	106%	109%	110%
Housing Inspector	5	94%	96%	98%
Housing Manager	1	106%	104%	103%
Housing Program Assistant	15	96%	99%	102%
Housing Rehabilitation Specialist	11	96%	102%	106%
Housing Supervisor	3	101%	105%	108%
Human Resources Aide	30	92%	95%	97%
Human Resources Analyst I	10	101%	102%	103%
Human Resources Analyst II	24	99%	100%	100%
Human Resources Clerk I	5	85%	89%	92%
Human Resources Clerk II	41	94%	95%	95%
Human Resources Director (NC)	1	101%	104%	106%
Human Resources Officer	6	98%	99%	100%
Human Resources Supervisor	15	110%	110%	110%
Human Services Director (NC)	1	85%	99%	109%
Human Services Program Coordinator	5	94%	93%	92%
Information Clerk	0	95%	94%	93%
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer I	23	124%	122%	121%
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer II	46	118%	118%	118%
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer III	49	114%	117%	119%
Information Technology Project Manager	32	108%	106%	105%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Information Technology Supervisor	0	96%	95%	94%
Information Technology Systems Specialist	11	109%	104%	100%
Instrument Technician	6	104%	99%	96%
Instrumentation & Cont Specialist	19	107%	98%	92%
Intergovernmental Affairs Coordinator (NC)	1	133%	132%	132%
Internal Auditor II	7	104%	106%	107%
Internal Auditor III	9	106%	106%	106%
Internal Auditor IV	5	98%	97%	95%
Inventory Control Specialist	2	99%	101%	102%
Labor Relations Administrator (NC)	1	87%	94%	99%
Laboratory Technician	17	94%	94%	93%
Laborer	25	113%	104%	98%
Landfill Equipment Operator	14	109%	102%	97%
Landscape Architect I	5	95%	97%	99%
Landscape Architect II	5	94%	97%	99%
Lead Business Systems Analyst	0	98%	98%	98%
Lead Information Technology Systems Specialist	17	110%	111%	111%
Lead User Technology Specialist	32	111%	112%	112%
Legal Assistant	11	103%	104%	105%
Legal Assistant Supervisor	1	110%	114%	116%
Legal Secretary	25	105%	109%	111%
Librarian I	15	97%	99%	101%
Librarian II	32	103%	104%	104%
Librarian III	8	108%	111%	112%
Librarian IV	9	107%	107%	107%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Library Assistant	78	106%	110%	113%
Library Circulation Attendant I	59	95%	98%	100%
Library Circulation Attendant II	22	94%	95%	96%
Library Clerk II	14	95%	95%	95%
Library Page	80	90%	91%	92%
Library Services Administrator	1	102%	106%	109%
Library Support Services Supervisor	2	88%	91%	93%
Library Technical Assistant	6	99%	102%	104%
License Inspector	7	100%	101%	102%
Lifeguard	308	112%	126%	137%
Locksmith	3	100%	97%	94%
Mail Service Supervisor	1	113%	117%	120%
Mail Service Worker	5	116%	113%	110%
Management Assistant I	13	106%	106%	105%
Management Assistant II	61	116%	116%	116%
Management Assistant III	5	125%	133%	138%
Management Services Administrator	8	138%	128%	122%
Materials Technician	3	87%	86%	86%
Mayor's Assistant (NC)	2	93%	95%	96%
Mechanical Plans Examiner II	4	106%	107%	108%
Minibus Operator	29	101%	98%	97%
Multimedia Specialist	11	106%	108%	110%
Municipal Court Administrator	1	95%	96%	97%
Municipal Court Hearing Officer (NC)	3	132%	117%	105%
Municipal Security Guard	102	102%	103%	104%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Museum Curator	2	110%	116%	121%
Neighborhood Maintenance Technician II	1	99%	101%	103%
Neighborhood Services Director (NC)	1	102%	106%	110%
Neighborhood Specialist	8	101%	102%	102%
Offset Press Operator	3	102%	105%	107%
Operations & Maintenance Supervisor	23	98%	100%	101%
Operations & Maintenance Technician	206	104%	96%	91%
Operations Analyst	2	93%	93%	93%
Park Manager	8	102%	99%	97%
Park Ranger II	40	106%	110%	112%
Parks & Recreation Director (NC)	1	100%	104%	107%
Parks Equipment Mechanic	13	108%	103%	99%
Parks Maintenance Mechanic	19	118%	110%	104%
Parks Supervisor	8	98%	100%	102%
Planner I	7	116%	116%	116%
Planner II	25	108%	109%	110%
Planner III	9	106%	108%	109%
Planning Administrator	1	102%	101%	100%
Planning Graphic Designer	2	112%	114%	116%
Plumbing/Mechanical Inspector II	11	108%	108%	108%
Police Aide	34	99%	101%	102%
Police Assistant	146	99%	99%	100%
Police Cadet II (NC)	0	58%	61%	63%
Police Chief (NC)	1	97%	105%	110%
Police Comm. Shift Supervisor	5	102%	106%	109%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Police Commander	28	82%	100%	114%
Police Communications Operator	254	102%	104%	106%
Police Communications Supervisor	31	94%	96%	97%
Police Computer Services Bureau Administrator	0	109%	109%	109%
Police Fiscal Administrator	1	112%	101%	95%
Police Lieutenant	89	105%	106%	107%
Police Officer	2638	92%	99%	103%
Police Property Supervisor	4	90%	91%	92%
Police Property Technician	19	102%	102%	103%
Police Public Relations Representative	1	96%	97%	98%
Police R & I Bureau Administrator	1	121%	125%	127%
Police R & I Bureau Shift Supervisor	9	97%	102%	105%
Police Records Clerk	60	93%	95%	96%
Police Research Analyst	6	98%	101%	102%
Police Sergeant	369	100%	106%	112%
Polygraph Examiner	4	106%	112%	116%
Pool Manager	34	99%	99%	99%
Principal Landscape Architect	2	102%	109%	114%
Principal Planner	9	100%	98%	97%
Printing Services Supervisor	1	117%	117%	117%
Procurement Manager	3	96%	97%	98%
Procurement Supervisor	1	88%	92%	95%
Project Manager	56	93%	97%	100%
Property Specialist	13	102%	103%	103%
Public Information Director (NC)	1	101%	110%	117%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Public Information Officer	14	102%	102%	101%
Public Information Specialist	12	100%	103%	105%
Public Transit Director (NC)	1	70%	83%	94%
Public Works Director (NC)	1	100%	104%	107%
Public Works Operations Manager	2	94%	99%	102%
Rate Analyst	1	112%	117%	120%
Records Clerk II	33	102%	101%	101%
Records Clerk III	6	98%	100%	101%
Records Supervisor	2	96%	96%	96%
Recreation Coordinator II	36	98%	102%	104%
Recreation Coordinator III	30	98%	100%	101%
Recreation Leader	208	96%	98%	100%
Recreation Programmer	19	94%	94%	95%
Recreation Supervisor	5	107%	107%	108%
Retirement Program Administrator	1	89%	85%	82%
Risk Management Coordinator	3	96%	97%	97%
Safety Analyst I	4	99%	104%	107%
Safety Analyst II	10	100%	101%	102%
Secretarial Supervisor	2	94%	96%	98%
Secretary II	173	97%	97%	98%
Secretary III	122	95%	98%	99%
Semiskilled Worker	57	120%	115%	111%
Senior Business Systems Analyst	0	104%	104%	104%
Senior Buyer	6	105%	104%	104%
Senior Center Assistant	15	110%	112%	113%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Senior Construction Inspector	37	107%	101%	98%
Senior Drafting Technician	6	102%	102%	102%
Senior Engineering Technician	32	97%	96%	96%
Senior GIS Technician	15	104%	105%	106%
Senior Information Technology Systems Specialist	35	103%	104%	104%
Senior Materials Technician	5	100%	93%	89%
Senior Party Chief	2	105%	102%	100%
Senior Tax Auditor	6	91%	95%	97%
Senior User Technology Specialist	57	127%	125%	124%
Senior Utility Technician	62	103%	99%	96%
Senior Water Quality Inspector	26	103%	98%	95%
Sign Specialist II	5	102%	100%	98%
Solid Waste Administrator	4	93%	91%	89%
Solid Waste Environmental Specialist	55	111%	116%	120%
Solid Waste Equipment Operator	290	102%	101%	100%
Solid Waste Foreman	34	91%	97%	100%
Solid Waste Superintendent	7	92%	91%	90%
Solid Waste Supervisor	11	89%	92%	93%
Solid Waste Worker	7	100%	95%	91%
Special Projects Administrator	5	96%	104%	111%
Street Maintenance Foreman II	26	92%	95%	98%
Street Maintenance Foreman III	5	91%	95%	97%
Street Maintenance Superintendent	1	95%	99%	101%
Street Maintenance Supervisor	5	97%	100%	101%
Street Maintenance Worker I	51	102%	97%	94%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Street Maintenance Worker II	31	102%	95%	91%
Street Transportation Director (NC)	1	110%	108%	106%
Structural Inspections Supervisor	1	95%	96%	97%
Structural Inspector II	10	102%	104%	105%
Structural Plans Engineer	5	106%	110%	112%
Structural Plans Examiner II	1	104%	105%	106%
Supplies Clerk I	28	113%	109%	105%
Supplies Clerk II	36	115%	111%	107%
Supplies Clerk III	8	107%	112%	116%
Supplies Supervisor	5	110%	110%	110%
Tax Auditor	7	92%	94%	96%
Tax Enforcement Supervisor	1	83%	84%	85%
Telecommunications Specialist	4	120%	108%	101%
Ticket Seller	13	101%	102%	103%
Ticket Services Supervisor	1	84%	84%	85%
Trades Helper	73	112%	108%	105%
Traffic Engineer II	3	98%	100%	101%
Traffic Engineer III	5	98%	101%	104%
Traffic Engineer III*Team Leader	0	99%	100%	101%
Traffic Maintenance Foreman II	4	91%	95%	97%
Traffic Signal Supervisor	2	98%	100%	101%
Traffic Signal Technician	25	116%	106%	100%
Traffic Signal Technician Foreman	2	95%	98%	100%
Training Specialist	7	99%	103%	106%
Transit Superintendent	1	98%	98%	98%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Transportation Supervisor	1	102%	102%	102%
Treasury Collections Representative	26	103%	107%	110%
User Support Specialist	14	103%	105%	106%
User Technology Specialist	127	118%	121%	122%
Utilities Service Specialist	76	100%	102%	103%
Utility Foreman	30	94%	96%	98%
Utility Specialty Technician	42	88%	84%	81%
Utility Supervisor	13	97%	99%	100%
Utility Technician	108	102%	96%	92%
Utility TV Technician	5	92%	90%	89%
Video Productions Coordinator	5	103%	105%	107%
Video Station Manager	1	117%	104%	97%
Water Customer Services Supervisor I	22	106%	105%	104%
Water Customer Services Supervisor II	8	89%	92%	94%
Water Facilities Supervisor	8	100%	102%	103%
Water Meter Technician I	6	100%	94%	90%
Water Meter Technician II	1	95%	91%	88%
Water Quality Inspector	15	95%	93%	92%
Water Resource Specialist	3	99%	101%	103%
Water Resources Management Advisor (NC)	0	117%	113%	110%
Water Services Director (NC)	1	103%	110%	114%
Water Services Specialist	31	91%	86%	83%
Water Services Technician	81	96%	94%	92%
Water Systems Operator	7	98%	101%	102%
Welder	9	130%	122%	116%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Private Sector/Published Data</i>				
Account Clerk II	34	92%	87%	83%
Account Clerk III	86	104%	98%	94%
Account Clerk Supervisor	3	93%	95%	91%
Accountant I	31	110%	100%	92%
Accountant II	44	107%	99%	93%
Accountant III	38	102%	94%	89%
Accountant IV	17	109%	100%	94%
Accounting Supervisor	1	94%	88%	84%
Administrative Aide	86	113%	102%	95%
Administrative Secretary	29	100%	101%	100%
Assistant City Attorney II (NC)	24	102%	95%	83%
Assistant City Attorney III (NC)	19	95%	88%	84%
Assistant City Attorney IV (NC)	30	88%	81%	77%
Assistant Finance Director	2	95%	86%	79%
Auto Parts Clerk II	13	70%	77%	84%
Auto Technician	50	73%	79%	78%
Benefits Analyst II	4	103%	92%	91%
Budget & Research Director (NC)	1	107%	86%	68%
Budget Analyst I	6	106%	109%	109%
Budget Analyst II	28	107%	106%	104%
Budget Analyst III	4	107%	107%	104%
Building Equipment Operator II	22	103%	94%	88%
Building Maintenance Worker	114	127%	108%	96%
Business Systems Analyst	0	108%	97%	89%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Buyer	4	103%	93%	85%
Chief Information Officer (NC)	1	55%	55%	53%
City Manager (NC)	1	23%	28%	33%
Civil Engineer II	17	99%	103%	102%
Civil Engineer III	49	99%	100%	99%
Civil Engineer III*Team Leader	7	100%	96%	94%
Claims Adjuster II	3	105%	106%	103%
Clerical Supervisor	5	86%	89%	86%
Clerk I	32	98%	97%	95%
Clerk III	10	101%	98%	106%
Communications Engineer	3	97%	100%	99%
Computer Operator	1	107%	104%	92%
Contracts Specialist I	4	91%	80%	74%
Contracts Specialist II	22	100%	93%	88%
Cook	12	128%	130%	131%
Courier	12	100%	100%	99%
Customer Service Clerk	53	99%	97%	95%
Deputy Budget & Research Director	3	100%	102%	102%
Deputy Human Resources Director	4	103%	89%	80%
Electrical Engineer	0	104%	92%	85%
Electrician	113	81%	83%	84%
Engineering Technician	27	80%	84%	77%
Equipment Operator II	51	86%	92%	86%
Equipment Service Worker II	51	61%	75%	68%
Facilities Projects Planner	8	101%	97%	89%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Finance Director (NC)	1	91%	77%	66%
Human Resources Aide	30	104%	101%	104%
Human Resources Analyst I	10	97%	82%	72%
Human Resources Analyst II	24	91%	82%	76%
Human Resources Clerk II	41	87%	76%	69%
Human Resources Director (NC)	1	82%	80%	80%
Human Resources Officer	6	96%	86%	79%
Human Resources Supervisor	15	90%	79%	71%
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer I	23	120%	113%	107%
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer II	46	103%	103%	102%
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer III	49	94%	93%	92%
Information Technology Project Manager	32	110%	98%	91%
Information Technology Service Specialist	6	105%	104%	94%
Information Technology Supervisor	0	98%	99%	90%
Information Technology Systems Specialist	11	102%	92%	86%
Internal Auditor II	7	97%	90%	84%
Internal Auditor III	9	99%	92%	87%
Internal Auditor IV	5	88%	80%	75%
Labor Relations Administrator (NC)	1	86%	85%	85%
Lead Business Systems Analyst	0	95%	87%	81%
Lead Computer Operator	2	109%	108%	110%
Lead Information Technology Systems Specialist	17	99%	99%	98%
Lead User Technology Specialist	32	109%	102%	95%
Legal Assistant	11	90%	92%	84%
Legal Secretary	25	93%	85%	76%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Locksmith	3	103%	93%	86%
Machinist	2	116%	105%	99%
Mail Service Worker	5	122%	110%	100%
Management Assistant I	13	95%	95%	93%
Management Assistant II	61	107%	106%	105%
Management Services Administrator	8	95%	84%	77%
Municipal Security Guard	102	140%	140%	139%
Procurement Manager	3	98%	93%	88%
Procurement Supervisor	1	79%	68%	62%
Project Manager	56	106%	92%	83%
Public Information Director (NC)	1	93%	96%	94%
Quality Assurance Engineer	2	91%	93%	92%
Records Clerk II	33	110%	96%	88%
Risk Management Coordinator	3	117%	112%	101%
Safety Analyst II	10	98%	98%	96%
Secretary II	173	99%	92%	88%
Senior Business Systems Analyst	0	99%	91%	85%
Senior Buyer	6	92%	83%	77%
Senior Drafting Technician	6	87%	87%	87%
Senior Engineering Technician	32	92%	91%	84%
Senior Information Technology Systems Specialist	35	105%	97%	90%
Senior User Technology Specialist	57	106%	104%	101%
Supplies Clerk I	28	133%	117%	106%
Supplies Clerk II	36	117%	106%	99%
Supplies Clerk III	8	124%	121%	117%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-6**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Supplies Supervisor	5	118%	116%	100%
Telecommunications Specialist	4	119%	100%	87%
Training Specialist	7	99%	97%	89%
User Support Specialist	14	118%	116%	110%
User Technology Specialist	127	115%	115%	115%
Welder	9	90%	90%	89%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Account Clerk II	34	\$29,768	\$36,759	\$43,800
Account Clerk III	86	\$32,223	\$40,019	\$47,876
Account Clerk Supervisor	3	\$37,504	\$45,966	\$54,845
Accountant I	31	\$37,387	\$48,015	\$58,793
Accountant II	44	\$43,447	\$55,901	\$68,547
Accountant III	38	\$49,957	\$64,417	\$79,207
Accountant IV	17	\$54,361	\$69,942	\$85,919
Accounting Supervisor	1	\$61,822	\$81,895	\$102,168
Administrative Aide	86	\$32,344	\$41,113	\$49,883
Administrative Assistant I	79	\$40,865	\$49,853	\$59,188
Administrative Assistant II	55	\$38,162	\$50,052	\$62,175
Administrative Assistant III	2	\$52,960	\$77,639	\$102,519
Administrative Assistant to the Mayor (NC)	0	\$47,503	\$57,813	\$69,138
Administrative Secretary	29	\$35,645	\$44,158	\$52,903
Aircraft Technician	7	\$46,298	\$53,652	\$61,708
Architect	4	\$61,582	\$77,074	\$92,922
Arts & Culture Administrator	0	\$79,366	\$100,980	\$123,169
Assistant Aviation Director	2	\$115,998	\$148,718	\$181,437
Assistant Chief Information Officer	2	\$93,427	\$126,051	\$158,674
Assistant City Attorney II (NC)	24	\$70,365	\$89,734	\$112,671
Assistant City Attorney III (NC)	19	\$76,017	\$100,721	\$125,675
Assistant City Attorney IV (NC)	30	\$86,645	\$113,545	\$140,874
Assistant City Auditor	0	\$66,040	\$110,019	\$153,998
Assistant City Clerk	0	\$64,505	\$85,610	\$106,715
Assistant City Librarian	0	\$78,174	\$100,270	\$122,367
Assistant City Manager (NC)	1	\$148,403	\$187,369	\$226,335

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Assistant Community/Economic Development Direct	1	\$87,453	\$116,856	\$148,050
Assistant Development Services Director	2	\$72,362	\$104,319	\$136,276
Assistant Finance Director	2	\$85,151	\$116,314	\$148,908
Assistant Housing Director	0	\$84,864	\$108,152	\$131,440
Assistant Laboratory Superintendent	1	\$65,419	\$82,232	\$98,692
Assistant Parks & Recreation Director	0	\$75,710	\$107,663	\$139,615
Assistant Public Works Director	2	\$72,195	\$107,714	\$143,232
Assistant Street Transportation Director	1	\$83,187	\$109,305	\$135,423
Assistant to the City Manager (NC)	1	\$82,455	\$97,367	\$112,279
Assistant to the Mayor (a) (NC)	0	\$59,336	\$86,300	\$113,264
Assistant Water Services Director-Administration	1	\$84,062	\$115,586	\$147,111
Assistant Water Services Director-Operation	1	\$88,238	\$120,082	\$151,926
Assistant Water Services Director-Technical	1	\$85,766	\$126,315	\$166,865
Auto Parts Clerk II	13	\$33,203	\$39,275	\$45,460
Auto Parts Clerk III	6	\$33,913	\$41,173	\$48,727
Auto Technician	50	\$40,237	\$46,855	\$53,794
Aviation Director (NC)	1	\$137,858	\$162,408	\$186,958
Aviation Superintendent	11	\$72,780	\$90,490	\$109,301
Aviation Supervisor II	31	\$47,629	\$57,258	\$67,447
Aviation Supervisor III	10	\$55,494	\$66,416	\$77,521
Bailiff	43	\$32,081	\$39,470	\$46,859
Benefits Analyst II	4	\$45,632	\$59,908	\$72,034
Body Repair Specialist	1	\$37,469	\$46,212	\$55,589
Budget & Research Director (NC)	1	\$90,614	\$122,081	\$161,370
Budget Analyst I	6	\$44,395	\$54,587	\$65,450
Budget Analyst II	28	\$50,532	\$63,820	\$77,265

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Budget Analyst III	4	\$58,874	\$72,150	\$86,084
Building Code Examiner	4	\$51,585	\$61,677	\$71,769
Building Equipment Operator I	49	\$36,506	\$45,536	\$54,674
Building Equipment Operator II	22	\$43,297	\$52,010	\$60,873
Building Facilities Superintendent	4	\$64,477	\$79,952	\$96,659
Building Maintenance Foreman	24	\$42,466	\$52,324	\$62,424
Building Maintenance Supervisor	4	\$52,509	\$62,976	\$74,074
Building Maintenance Worker	114	\$32,982	\$41,271	\$49,253
Business Systems Analyst	0	\$46,176	\$60,387	\$75,182
Buyer	4	\$39,718	\$51,256	\$63,517
Buyer Aide	3	\$35,361	\$42,450	\$48,733
Caseworker II	79	\$39,903	\$49,939	\$59,974
Cement Finisher	10	\$38,025	\$45,232	\$52,811
Chemist I	26	\$44,659	\$55,212	\$66,056
Chemist II	7	\$50,878	\$62,501	\$74,620
Chemist III	5	\$58,014	\$69,847	\$82,474
Chief Asst City Attorney (NC)	0	\$116,387	\$148,684	\$183,895
Chief Construction Inspector	24	\$51,432	\$64,498	\$77,846
Chief Drafting Technician	1	\$52,589	\$61,178	\$70,199
Chief Engineering Technician	23	\$44,768	\$54,805	\$66,605
Chief Information Officer (NC)	1	\$130,657	\$165,673	\$205,043
Chief Materials Technician	2	\$45,352	\$55,072	\$64,792
Chief Presiding Judge (NC)	1	\$111,541	\$138,763	\$165,984
Chief Video Engineer	1	\$47,106	\$57,004	\$66,902
Chief Water Quality Inspector	4	\$52,842	\$65,018	\$77,195
City Attorney (NC)	1	\$154,434	\$178,275	\$203,717

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
City Auditor (NC)	1	\$102,071	\$126,886	\$154,313
City Clerk (NC)	1	\$94,771	\$112,274	\$129,777
City Engineer (NC)	0	\$91,725	\$120,522	\$149,908
City Judge (NC)	50	\$103,403	\$121,031	\$138,659
City Librarian (NC)	1	\$97,577	\$122,245	\$146,914
City Manager (NC)	1	\$359,723	\$380,022	\$398,470
City Prosecutor (NC)	1	\$107,877	\$125,632	\$143,386
Civil Engineer I	0	\$53,221	\$64,324	\$75,668
Civil Engineer II	17	\$56,823	\$68,462	\$80,641
Civil Engineer III	49	\$64,454	\$79,334	\$94,344
Civil Engineer III*Team Leader	7	\$71,423	\$89,180	\$106,792
Claims Adjuster II	3	\$47,067	\$57,916	\$69,169
Clerical Supervisor	5	\$36,258	\$44,643	\$53,052
Clerk I	32	\$23,115	\$28,326	\$33,745
Clerk II	11	\$25,615	\$30,600	\$35,309
Clerk III	10	\$26,701	\$32,812	\$37,315
Communications Dispatcher	30	\$29,962	\$36,046	\$42,175
Communications Engineer	3	\$62,910	\$75,678	\$89,022
Communications Supervisor	0	\$57,836	\$67,821	\$78,561
Communications Technician	4	\$37,153	\$46,597	\$57,022
Community & Economic Development Director (NC)	2	\$93,029	\$121,579	\$150,128
Community Outreach Supervisor	1	\$48,101	\$57,378	\$66,654
Computer Operator	1	\$29,840	\$37,353	\$46,820
Construction Inspector	0	\$40,826	\$49,230	\$57,853
Construction Inspector Supervisor	7	\$56,847	\$71,069	\$85,291
Construction Permit Supervisor	0	\$52,841	\$63,822	\$74,804

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Contracts Specialist I	4	\$42,659	\$57,060	\$71,653
Contracts Specialist II	22	\$52,993	\$69,338	\$85,917
Convention Center Director (NC)	0	\$99,629	\$125,233	\$150,838
Cook	12	\$24,350	\$28,854	\$34,082
Council Assistant (NC)	6	\$59,715	\$72,691	\$85,667
Courier	12	\$25,477	\$30,663	\$35,933
Court Interpreter	6	\$39,389	\$48,296	\$57,385
Court Supervisor	14	\$46,274	\$56,180	\$66,087
Court/Legal Clerk I	19	\$28,470	\$34,963	\$41,457
Court/Legal Clerk II	111	\$32,652	\$39,341	\$46,030
Crime Lab Administrator	0	\$72,218	\$95,312	\$118,406
Crime Scene Section Supervisor	0	\$60,552	\$74,387	\$88,223
Crime Scene Shift Supervisor	5	\$57,879	\$70,572	\$83,265
Crime Scene Specialist I	3	\$37,436	\$43,779	\$50,123
Crime Scene Specialist II	32	\$38,748	\$48,558	\$58,369
Crime Scene Specialist III	10	\$45,204	\$53,839	\$62,474
Criminal Intelligence Analyst	10	\$44,489	\$55,065	\$65,640
Curriculum/Training Coordinator	15	\$51,478	\$61,445	\$72,402
Customer Service Clerk	53	\$28,080	\$34,427	\$40,877
Department Budget Supervisor	10	\$59,290	\$74,490	\$90,766
Deputy Aviation Director	8	\$97,401	\$124,180	\$150,959
Deputy Budget & Research Director	3	\$71,661	\$97,023	\$123,013
Deputy Chief Information Officer	4	\$76,529	\$101,548	\$126,034
Deputy City Auditor	2	\$68,847	\$86,416	\$103,986
Deputy City Clerk	3	\$56,869	\$73,056	\$89,243
Deputy City Manager (NC)	3	\$111,325	\$148,465	\$185,606

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Deputy City Prosecutor (NC)	2	\$96,135	\$110,497	\$124,858
Deputy Convention Center Director	4	\$79,685	\$105,522	\$131,358
Deputy Development Services Director	2	\$75,079	\$99,069	\$123,059
Deputy Economic Development Director	2	\$75,706	\$97,702	\$119,698
Deputy Finance Director	8	\$73,111	\$103,950	\$134,790
Deputy Housing Director	3	\$75,997	\$97,637	\$119,277
Deputy Human Resources Director	4	\$76,427	\$102,616	\$129,757
Deputy Human Services Director	4	\$80,068	\$100,348	\$120,628
Deputy Neighborhood Services Director	4	\$69,418	\$96,887	\$124,357
Deputy Parks & Recreation Director	7	\$75,316	\$98,514	\$121,712
Deputy Planning Director	1	\$79,560	\$103,738	\$127,916
Deputy Public Works Director	4	\$81,746	\$110,515	\$139,284
Deputy Street Transportation Director	4	\$72,680	\$96,921	\$121,162
Deputy Water Services Director	10	\$74,304	\$95,313	\$116,322
Development Services Director (NC)	2	\$99,314	\$126,720	\$154,125
Development Services Team Leader	4	\$62,946	\$78,310	\$93,674
Economic Development Program Manager	23	\$62,374	\$78,148	\$93,923
Economic Development Specialist	4	\$54,916	\$66,510	\$78,103
Electrical Engineer	0	\$62,812	\$79,072	\$95,591
Electrical Inspector II	11	\$42,613	\$53,745	\$65,624
Electrical Maintenance Foreman	15	\$44,293	\$52,860	\$61,736
Electrical Plans Examiner II	2	\$51,395	\$62,628	\$73,861
Electrician	113	\$44,922	\$52,474	\$60,130
Electronic Systems Specialist	8	\$41,669	\$49,243	\$57,078
Emergency Dispatcher	2	\$35,805	\$43,014	\$50,224
Energy Management Specialist	2	\$55,235	\$70,729	\$86,224

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Engineering Technician	27	\$34,044	\$41,818	\$50,388
Enterprise Technology Manager	3	\$78,112	\$92,585	\$108,552
Environmental Programs Coordinator	6	\$57,484	\$71,776	\$86,069
Environmental Programs Manager	1	\$71,795	\$95,830	\$119,866
Environmental Programs Specialist	1	\$51,781	\$61,527	\$71,273
Environmental Quality Specialist	29	\$48,680	\$63,877	\$79,075
Equal Opportunity Spec*Lead	3	\$55,321	\$71,440	\$84,798
Equal Opportunity Specialist	10	\$49,297	\$62,016	\$76,609
Equipment Maintenance Superintendent	1	\$68,631	\$83,246	\$98,657
Equipment Maintenance Supervisor	9	\$54,332	\$64,904	\$75,926
Equipment Operator II	51	\$31,422	\$38,118	\$45,271
Equipment Operator III	41	\$36,750	\$43,747	\$50,829
Equipment Operator IV	44	\$38,235	\$46,253	\$54,608
Equipment Parts Supervisor	1	\$47,698	\$58,369	\$75,007
Equipment Repair Specialist	6	\$44,064	\$52,944	\$62,626
Equipment Service Aide	11	\$30,052	\$36,235	\$42,742
Equipment Service Worker I	7	\$30,584	\$35,604	\$40,864
Equipment Service Worker II	51	\$33,131	\$38,722	\$45,432
Equipment Shop Foreman	20	\$46,566	\$56,991	\$67,821
Event Operations Manager	1	\$54,900	\$68,515	\$82,129
Events Coordinator	6	\$45,433	\$56,148	\$67,333
Executive Assistant to Mayor (NC)	2	\$64,193	\$86,232	\$108,271
Facilities Projects Planner	8	\$49,794	\$61,536	\$75,465
Facilities Service Coordinator	1	\$47,453	\$58,029	\$69,183
Facility Contract Compliance Specialist	16	\$34,834	\$42,417	\$49,999
Facility Coordinator	6	\$55,508	\$68,717	\$82,879

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Finance Director (NC)	1	\$112,108	\$147,331	\$187,177
Finance Supervisor	0	\$59,881	\$85,520	\$111,159
Fingerprint Technician	16	\$34,742	\$42,682	\$50,621
Fire 911 Administrator	1	\$68,741	\$86,352	\$103,964
Fire Battalion Chief	68	\$74,536	\$83,668	\$92,800
Fire Captain	81	\$67,389	\$74,340	\$81,291
Fire Chief (NC)	1	\$120,608	\$146,376	\$172,143
Fire Communications Supervisor	6	\$48,574	\$59,357	\$70,140
Fire Engineer	180	\$58,006	\$63,057	\$68,109
Fire Equipment Service Worker	9	\$35,356	\$43,164	\$50,973
Fire Prevention Manager	0	\$70,226	\$78,310	\$86,393
Fire Prevention Specialist II	31	\$49,110	\$57,771	\$66,432
Fire Prevention Supervisor	0	\$55,650	\$60,412	\$65,175
Fire Protection Engineer	6	\$53,231	\$64,727	\$77,451
Firefighter	821	\$45,270	\$54,059	\$62,847
Forensic Photo Specialist	10	\$38,534	\$46,396	\$54,258
Forensic Science Section Supervisor	10	\$69,541	\$84,011	\$98,481
Forensic Scientist I (NC)	13	\$42,329	\$49,349	\$56,819
Forensic Scientist II	22	\$44,457	\$54,103	\$63,995
Forensic Scientist III	15	\$56,224	\$67,659	\$79,363
Forensic Scientist IV	24	\$71,077	\$83,611	\$96,145
Gardener	124	\$29,535	\$34,109	\$38,800
General Inspections Supervisor	1	\$60,296	\$74,027	\$87,757
General Inspector II	16	\$45,938	\$54,891	\$63,844
GIS Coordinator	4	\$60,613	\$74,463	\$88,312
GIS Technician	18	\$40,510	\$49,481	\$58,452

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Golf Course Supervisor	4	\$62,385	\$72,048	\$82,143
Grants Compliance Supervisor	1	\$59,705	\$74,098	\$88,490
Greenskeeper	32	\$31,529	\$36,578	\$42,021
Groundskeeper	207	\$25,910	\$31,060	\$36,305
Head Golf Professional	0	\$46,375	\$59,818	\$73,260
Heavy Equip Mechanic	78	\$42,468	\$51,971	\$60,702
Horticulturist	1	\$43,942	\$54,190	\$65,491
Housing Director (NC)	1	\$92,409	\$115,972	\$139,534
Housing Inspector	5	\$39,318	\$47,139	\$54,960
Housing Manager	1	\$62,357	\$78,740	\$95,124
Housing Program Assistant	15	\$36,088	\$43,119	\$50,150
Housing Rehabilitation Specialist	11	\$46,192	\$53,971	\$61,749
Housing Supervisor	3	\$53,091	\$63,900	\$74,709
Human Resources Aide	30	\$37,242	\$45,346	\$53,262
Human Resources Analyst I	10	\$41,840	\$53,270	\$65,042
Human Resources Analyst II	24	\$50,371	\$64,452	\$78,699
Human Resources Clerk I	5	\$32,134	\$37,740	\$43,489
Human Resources Clerk II	41	\$33,547	\$44,105	\$54,301
Human Resources Director (NC)	1	\$109,211	\$138,931	\$168,464
Human Resources Officer	6	\$55,569	\$71,855	\$89,166
Human Resources Supervisor	15	\$60,834	\$79,927	\$99,645
Human Services Director (NC)	1	\$120,544	\$134,205	\$147,866
Human Services Program Coordinator	5	\$63,489	\$79,915	\$96,341
Hydrologist	1	\$64,981	\$80,051	\$96,326
Industrial Hygienist	4	\$55,813	\$69,644	\$86,064
Information Clerk	0	\$25,521	\$31,686	\$38,150

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer I	23	\$44,203	\$56,942	\$70,243
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer II	46	\$53,031	\$66,366	\$79,750
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer III	49	\$63,119	\$77,938	\$93,250
Information Technology Project Manager	32	\$67,186	\$87,971	\$108,729
Information Technology Service Specialist	6	\$46,668	\$58,796	\$77,356
Information Technology Supervisor	0	\$52,778	\$65,924	\$83,501
Information Technology Systems Specialist	11	\$58,755	\$78,610	\$98,649
Instrument Technician	6	\$34,447	\$41,753	\$49,434
Instrumentation & Cont Specialist	19	\$45,310	\$54,647	\$63,984
Intergovernmental Affairs Coordinator (NC)	1	\$77,448	\$100,234	\$123,020
Internal Auditor II	7	\$48,259	\$61,723	\$75,827
Internal Auditor III	9	\$54,957	\$70,840	\$86,971
Internal Auditor IV	5	\$67,064	\$88,818	\$110,627
Inventory Control Specialist	2	\$32,225	\$39,390	\$46,555
Inventory Management Coordinator	2	\$55,285	\$66,539	\$82,929
Investment Manager	2	\$73,354	\$91,505	\$141,951
Labor Compliance Specialist	3	\$44,459	\$52,949	\$62,306
Labor Relations Administrator (NC)	1	\$92,742	\$115,803	\$138,109
Laboratory Technician	17	\$34,986	\$43,417	\$52,034
Laborer	25	\$24,030	\$29,485	\$35,111
Landfill Equipment Operator	14	\$36,934	\$45,243	\$53,552
Landscape Architect I	5	\$50,535	\$61,187	\$72,152
Landscape Architect II	5	\$59,418	\$71,685	\$84,286
Landscape Equipment Operator	4	\$31,960	\$39,169	\$47,036
Lead Business Systems Analyst	0	\$64,428	\$82,612	\$101,160
Lead Computer Operator	2	\$39,417	\$48,557	\$57,233

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Lead Information Technology Systems Specialist	17	\$72,072	\$89,497	\$107,398
Lead User Technology Specialist	32	\$59,878	\$76,140	\$93,473
Legal Assistant	11	\$40,415	\$49,591	\$59,563
Legal Assistant Supervisor	1	\$46,937	\$57,001	\$68,171
Legal Secretary	25	\$36,034	\$44,456	\$52,780
Librarian I	15	\$42,991	\$52,267	\$61,789
Librarian II	32	\$45,064	\$55,680	\$66,459
Librarian III	8	\$49,621	\$60,504	\$71,601
Librarian IV	9	\$55,788	\$69,303	\$82,818
Library Assistant	78	\$33,460	\$40,173	\$47,199
Library Circulation Attendant I	59	\$25,805	\$30,278	\$35,003
Library Circulation Attendant II	22	\$28,472	\$34,070	\$39,858
Library Clerk I	26	\$23,933	\$28,113	\$32,598
Library Clerk II	14	\$25,803	\$30,994	\$36,438
Library Page	80	\$19,649	\$23,665	\$27,681
Library Services Administrator	1	\$72,451	\$88,818	\$106,061
Library Support Services Supervisor	2	\$41,066	\$49,619	\$58,171
Library Technical Assistant	6	\$32,463	\$38,679	\$45,080
License Inspector	7	\$36,736	\$44,796	\$52,856
Lifeguard	308	\$21,554	\$23,632	\$25,890
Locksmith	3	\$38,750	\$45,967	\$53,351
Machinist	2	\$41,779	\$51,009	\$59,801
Mail Service Supervisor	1	\$32,321	\$38,570	\$44,996
Mail Service Worker	5	\$25,070	\$30,811	\$36,694
Management Assistant I	13	\$42,381	\$52,989	\$63,816
Management Assistant II	61	\$52,038	\$64,966	\$78,053

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Management Assistant III	5	\$57,149	\$74,699	\$92,249
Management Services Administrator	8	\$59,770	\$84,646	\$110,529
Materials Technician	3	\$37,868	\$43,809	\$49,749
Mayor's Assistant (NC)	2	\$68,793	\$84,168	\$99,544
Mechanical Plans Examiner II	4	\$51,016	\$62,120	\$73,224
Minibus Operator	29	\$30,997	\$36,802	\$42,954
Multimedia Specialist	11	\$43,781	\$53,561	\$63,341
Municipal Court Administrator	1	\$76,525	\$96,940	\$117,354
Municipal Court Hearing Officer (NC)	3	\$76,703	\$86,641	\$96,578
Municipal Security Guard	102	\$28,391	\$34,574	\$40,835
Museum Curator	2	\$47,971	\$56,572	\$65,692
Neighborhood Maintenance Technician II	1	\$38,914	\$46,922	\$54,929
Neighborhood Services Director (NC)	1	\$101,118	\$124,228	\$147,338
Neighborhood Specialist	8	\$53,280	\$65,886	\$78,493
Office Systems Technology Specialist	1	\$44,653	\$53,715	\$69,913
Offset Press Operator	3	\$31,448	\$37,618	\$44,016
Operations & Maintenance Supervisor	23	\$47,172	\$57,777	\$68,383
Operations & Maintenance Technician	206	\$40,733	\$49,556	\$58,742
Operations Analyst	2	\$45,159	\$56,697	\$68,511
Park Manager	8	\$47,932	\$61,621	\$75,310
Park Ranger II	40	\$32,619	\$39,120	\$45,621
Parks & Recreation Director (NC)	1	\$113,574	\$140,468	\$167,361
Parks Equipment Mechanic	13	\$39,137	\$47,853	\$54,657
Parks Maintenance Mechanic	19	\$32,962	\$40,351	\$47,740
Parks Supervisor	8	\$54,846	\$66,814	\$78,783
Party Chief	4	\$40,064	\$48,768	\$58,290

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Planner I	7	\$42,542	\$52,852	\$63,303
Planner II	25	\$49,718	\$61,451	\$73,184
Planner III	9	\$56,567	\$69,297	\$82,180
Planning Administrator	1	\$71,006	\$92,675	\$114,343
Planning Graphic Designer	2	\$43,334	\$52,124	\$61,476
Plumbing/Mechanical Inspector II	11	\$45,197	\$55,906	\$66,615
Police Aide	34	\$24,642	\$29,613	\$34,584
Police Assistant	146	\$34,081	\$41,533	\$48,984
Police Cadet II (NC)	0	\$47,831	\$55,709	\$63,587
Police Chief (NC)	1	\$135,417	\$161,183	\$186,948
Police Comm. Shift Supervisor	5	\$50,445	\$60,230	\$70,014
Police Commander	28	\$104,409	\$116,914	\$129,420
Police Communications Operator	254	\$37,880	\$45,536	\$53,192
Police Communications Supervisor	31	\$49,158	\$60,091	\$71,024
Police Computer Services Bureau Administrator	0	\$77,149	\$96,876	\$117,387
Police Fiscal Administrator	1	\$68,028	\$97,478	\$126,927
Police Lieutenant	89	\$81,385	\$95,695	\$110,005
Police Officer	2638	\$49,548	\$59,584	\$69,619
Police Property Supervisor	4	\$46,934	\$57,380	\$67,825
Police Property Technician	19	\$33,028	\$40,342	\$47,656
Police Public Relations Representative	1	\$49,241	\$61,710	\$75,083
Police R & I Bureau Administrator	1	\$62,825	\$78,561	\$94,296
Police R & I Bureau Shift Supervisor	9	\$45,404	\$54,048	\$62,693
Police Records Clerk	60	\$31,501	\$37,921	\$44,340
Police Research Analyst	6	\$49,765	\$60,500	\$71,236
Police Sergeant	369	\$71,743	\$79,730	\$87,718

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Polygraph Examiner	4	\$56,364	\$66,450	\$76,536
Pool Manager	34	\$32,303	\$39,766	\$47,230
Principal Engineering Technician	29	\$51,487	\$65,047	\$79,679
Principal Landscape Architect	2	\$64,200	\$75,377	\$87,156
Principal Planner	9	\$65,556	\$83,405	\$101,254
Printing Services Supervisor	1	\$47,538	\$59,661	\$72,222
Procurement Manager	3	\$64,936	\$80,882	\$97,596
Procurement Supervisor	1	\$60,951	\$79,838	\$98,927
Project Manager	56	\$59,280	\$73,723	\$88,494
Property Manager	2	\$56,513	\$73,936	\$92,871
Property Specialist	13	\$46,188	\$56,635	\$71,149
Public Information Director (NC)	1	\$95,003	\$114,102	\$135,127
Public Information Officer	14	\$53,661	\$67,229	\$80,798
Public Information Specialist	12	\$48,667	\$59,097	\$69,527
Public Transit Director (NC)	1	\$146,080	\$158,825	\$171,570
Public Works Director (NC)	1	\$113,602	\$140,530	\$167,458
Public Works Operations Manager	2	\$63,134	\$75,140	\$87,146
Quality Assurance Engineer	2	\$57,189	\$71,090	\$87,139
Rate Analyst	1	\$51,446	\$61,129	\$71,226
Records Clerk II	33	\$28,297	\$35,902	\$43,568
Records Clerk III	6	\$34,056	\$40,890	\$48,047
Records Supervisor	2	\$37,241	\$45,929	\$55,185
Recreation Coordinator II	36	\$41,458	\$49,589	\$57,932
Recreation Coordinator III	30	\$48,526	\$59,231	\$70,107
Recreation Leader	208	\$29,071	\$34,760	\$40,449
Recreation Programmer	19	\$37,426	\$45,811	\$54,196

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Recreation Supervisor	5	\$50,432	\$62,540	\$74,648
Retirement Program Administrator	1	\$95,007	\$128,165	\$161,323
Risk Management Coordinator	3	\$57,043	\$72,239	\$90,418
Safety Analyst I	4	\$42,220	\$50,129	\$58,406
Safety Analyst II	10	\$49,083	\$60,605	\$72,512
Sales Manager	6	\$46,684	\$59,464	\$72,243
Secretarial Supervisor	2	\$42,098	\$51,062	\$60,228
Secretary II	173	\$28,533	\$35,749	\$42,912
Secretary III	122	\$34,245	\$41,096	\$48,114
Secretary to City Manager (NC)	1	\$49,100	\$60,250	\$74,105
Security Systems Supervisor	3	\$49,139	\$60,665	\$73,587
Semiskilled Worker	57	\$25,753	\$32,949	\$40,312
Senior Business Systems Analyst	0	\$55,329	\$71,542	\$87,987
Senior Buyer	6	\$46,307	\$60,278	\$74,460
Senior Center Assistant	15	\$26,713	\$32,135	\$37,557
Senior Construction Inspector	37	\$46,670	\$57,530	\$68,604
Senior Drafting Technician	6	\$40,477	\$49,718	\$59,141
Senior Engineering Technician	32	\$40,036	\$49,719	\$60,225
Senior GIS Technician	15	\$48,183	\$59,547	\$70,911
Senior Information Technology Systems Specialist	35	\$66,376	\$86,494	\$107,846
Senior Materials Technician	5	\$40,880	\$51,061	\$61,242
Senior Party Chief	2	\$44,629	\$53,546	\$63,164
Senior Tax Auditor	6	\$52,511	\$63,321	\$74,657
Senior User Technology Specialist	57	\$49,721	\$63,053	\$76,838
Senior Utility Technician	62	\$36,636	\$44,463	\$52,291
Senior Water Quality Inspector	26	\$43,218	\$52,595	\$61,972

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Sign Specialist II	5	\$32,680	\$39,561	\$46,442
Solid Waste Administrator	4	\$67,128	\$89,459	\$110,407
Solid Waste Environmental Specialist	55	\$34,648	\$40,938	\$47,228
Solid Waste Equipment Operator	290	\$33,995	\$40,843	\$47,691
Solid Waste Foreman	34	\$43,711	\$51,511	\$59,312
Solid Waste Superintendent	7	\$61,533	\$77,540	\$93,548
Solid Waste Supervisor	11	\$49,540	\$60,082	\$70,625
Solid Waste Worker	7	\$29,538	\$35,992	\$42,445
Special Projects Administrator	5	\$72,344	\$91,755	\$111,165
Street Maintenance Foreman II	26	\$39,399	\$47,182	\$54,965
Street Maintenance Foreman III	5	\$43,938	\$52,584	\$61,231
Street Maintenance Superintendent	1	\$73,091	\$87,528	\$101,964
Street Maintenance Supervisor	5	\$50,154	\$61,096	\$72,037
Street Maintenance Worker I	51	\$29,097	\$35,207	\$41,317
Street Maintenance Worker II	31	\$32,839	\$39,584	\$46,330
Street Transportation Director (NC)	1	\$98,450	\$129,168	\$159,887
Structural Inspections Supervisor	1	\$62,677	\$77,199	\$91,720
Structural Inspector II	10	\$47,933	\$58,091	\$68,249
Structural Plans Engineer	5	\$61,954	\$74,721	\$87,488
Structural Plans Examiner II	1	\$51,753	\$63,094	\$74,434
Supplies Clerk I	28	\$26,333	\$32,198	\$38,121
Supplies Clerk II	36	\$28,966	\$36,143	\$43,400
Supplies Clerk III	8	\$31,518	\$38,867	\$46,313
Supplies Supervisor	5	\$45,479	\$57,088	\$72,479
Survey Aide	3	\$27,452	\$33,124	\$39,280
Survey Supervisor	1	\$55,147	\$64,310	\$79,532

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Tax Auditor	7	\$45,862	\$55,451	\$65,040
Tax Enforcement Supervisor	1	\$53,556	\$65,685	\$77,813
Telecommunications Specialist	4	\$42,289	\$53,523	\$65,255
Ticket Seller	13	\$26,913	\$32,184	\$37,791
Ticket Services Supervisor	1	\$46,789	\$57,430	\$68,372
Trades Helper	73	\$28,081	\$34,155	\$40,229
Traffic Engineer II	3	\$55,386	\$67,505	\$79,889
Traffic Engineer III	5	\$67,909	\$81,671	\$95,897
Traffic Engineer III*Team Leader	0	\$72,531	\$89,313	\$107,001
Traffic Maintenance Foreman II	4	\$39,575	\$47,441	\$55,307
Traffic Signal Supervisor	2	\$52,226	\$63,937	\$75,647
Traffic Signal Technician	25	\$41,782	\$50,524	\$59,267
Traffic Signal Technician Foreman	2	\$48,754	\$58,873	\$68,991
Training Specialist	7	\$42,674	\$52,630	\$64,641
Transit Superintendent	1	\$67,317	\$83,597	\$99,878
Transportation Supervisor	1	\$56,093	\$70,124	\$83,200
Treasury Collections Representative	26	\$36,889	\$43,834	\$50,901
Treasury Collections Supervisor	5	\$46,365	\$56,612	\$69,185
User Support Specialist	14	\$39,684	\$48,708	\$58,289
User Technology Specialist	127	\$46,085	\$56,737	\$67,619
Utilities Service Specialist	76	\$32,039	\$38,867	\$45,537
Utility Foreman	30	\$42,333	\$51,616	\$60,898
Utility Specialty Technician	42	\$37,862	\$45,343	\$53,018
Utility Supervisor	13	\$45,924	\$55,836	\$66,041
Utility Technician	108	\$32,324	\$39,189	\$46,161
Utility TV Technician	5	\$41,277	\$48,986	\$56,695

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-7**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Video Productions Coordinator	5	\$52,239	\$63,658	\$75,077
Video Station Manager	1	\$58,869	\$85,500	\$112,130
Water Customer Services Supervisor I	22	\$40,317	\$50,539	\$61,132
Water Customer Services Supervisor II	8	\$54,756	\$66,081	\$80,517
Water Facilities Supervisor	8	\$59,826	\$72,997	\$86,167
Water Meter Technician I	6	\$32,349	\$38,823	\$45,624
Water Meter Technician II	1	\$35,989	\$43,373	\$50,960
Water Quality Inspector	15	\$41,170	\$49,157	\$57,144
Water Resource Specialist	3	\$49,243	\$60,040	\$70,836
Water Resources Management Advisor (NC)	0	\$68,788	\$91,726	\$114,665
Water Services Director (NC)	1	\$121,080	\$147,115	\$173,150
Water Services Specialist	31	\$38,851	\$47,484	\$56,118
Water Services Technician	81	\$35,445	\$41,870	\$48,295
Water Systems Operator	7	\$41,082	\$49,485	\$57,887
Welder	9	\$39,696	\$47,336	\$55,083

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
<i>Public Sector</i>				
Account Clerk II	34	\$29,610	\$35,718	\$41,826
Account Clerk III	86	\$32,209	\$39,233	\$46,257
Account Clerk Supervisor	3	\$37,014	\$45,028	\$53,042
Accountant I	31	\$36,842	\$45,353	\$53,863
Accountant II	44	\$42,315	\$52,669	\$63,023
Accountant III	38	\$48,054	\$59,595	\$71,136
Accountant IV	17	\$54,110	\$67,398	\$80,686
Accounting Supervisor	1	\$57,360	\$75,631	\$93,903
Administrative Aide	86	\$32,684	\$40,713	\$48,742
Administrative Assistant I	79	\$42,362	\$51,753	\$61,145
Administrative Assistant II	55	\$37,989	\$50,494	\$62,998
Administrative Assistant III	2	\$46,568	\$65,076	\$83,585
Administrative Assistant to the Mayor (NC)	0	\$46,317	\$55,804	\$65,292
Administrative Secretary	29	\$35,474	\$43,931	\$52,388
Aircraft Technician	7	\$46,174	\$52,760	\$59,345
Architect	4	\$61,265	\$76,447	\$91,629
Arts & Culture Administrator	0	\$78,852	\$101,832	\$124,812
Assistant Aviation Director	2	\$111,011	\$143,319	\$175,627
Assistant Chief Information Officer	2	\$78,994	\$107,237	\$135,480
Assistant City Attorney II (NC)	24	\$73,576	\$91,472	\$109,368
Assistant City Attorney III (NC)	19	\$74,706	\$97,278	\$119,849
Assistant City Attorney IV (NC)	30	\$84,490	\$109,059	\$133,628
Assistant City Auditor	0	\$66,040	\$110,019	\$153,998
Assistant City Clerk	0	\$64,505	\$85,610	\$106,715
Assistant City Librarian	0	\$78,174	\$100,270	\$122,367

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Assistant City Manager (NC)	1	\$125,653	\$157,983	\$190,313
Assistant Community/Economic Development Dire	1	\$82,431	\$110,136	\$137,841
Assistant Development Services Director	2	\$72,362	\$104,319	\$136,276
Assistant Finance Director	2	\$79,116	\$105,770	\$132,425
Assistant Housing Director	0	\$84,864	\$108,152	\$131,440
Assistant Laboratory Superintendent	1	\$67,909	\$84,645	\$101,381
Assistant Parks & Recreation Director	0	\$75,710	\$107,663	\$139,615
Assistant Public Works Director	2	\$72,195	\$107,714	\$143,232
Assistant Street Transportation Director	1	\$83,187	\$109,305	\$135,423
Assistant to the City Manager (NC)	1	\$82,455	\$97,367	\$112,279
Assistant to the Mayor (a) (NC)	0	\$59,336	\$86,300	\$113,264
Assistant Water Services Director-Administration	1	\$70,849	\$100,572	\$130,295
Assistant Water Services Director-Operation	1	\$75,621	\$105,709	\$135,797
Assistant Water Services Director-Technical	1	\$63,070	\$102,722	\$142,374
Auto Parts Clerk II	13	\$28,888	\$36,132	\$43,377
Auto Parts Clerk III	6	\$35,375	\$42,867	\$50,358
Auto Technician	50	\$35,687	\$43,098	\$50,509
Aviation Director (NC)	1	\$135,372	\$156,991	\$178,611
Aviation Supervisor II	31	\$48,346	\$58,028	\$67,710
Aviation Supervisor III	10	\$54,470	\$65,655	\$76,840
Bailiff	43	\$32,081	\$39,470	\$46,859
Benefits Analyst II	4	\$43,811	\$53,867	\$63,923
Budget & Research Director (NC)	1	\$88,458	\$110,514	\$132,569
Budget Analyst I	6	\$44,804	\$55,666	\$66,528
Budget Analyst II	28	\$50,738	\$63,969	\$77,201
Budget Analyst III	4	\$59,083	\$71,818	\$84,553

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Building Code Examiner	4	\$51,585	\$61,677	\$71,769
Building Equipment Operator I	49	\$36,923	\$44,882	\$52,841
Building Equipment Operator II	22	\$40,114	\$47,895	\$55,676
Building Facilities Superintendent	4	\$65,701	\$81,935	\$98,170
Building Maintenance Foreman	24	\$42,223	\$51,986	\$61,750
Building Maintenance Supervisor	4	\$53,568	\$63,995	\$74,423
Building Maintenance Worker	114	\$32,650	\$39,926	\$47,201
Business Systems Analyst	0	\$46,693	\$59,056	\$71,418
Buyer	4	\$37,890	\$46,652	\$55,415
Buyer Aide	3	\$35,245	\$41,983	\$48,722
Caseworker II	79	\$39,903	\$49,939	\$59,974
Cement Finisher	10	\$38,670	\$46,360	\$54,049
Chemist I	26	\$44,095	\$54,690	\$65,285
Chemist II	7	\$49,448	\$60,599	\$71,750
Chemist III	5	\$59,295	\$71,117	\$82,939
Chief Asst City Attorney (NC)	0	\$112,329	\$142,316	\$172,304
Chief Construction Inspector	24	\$52,077	\$65,552	\$79,026
Chief Drafting Technician	1	\$45,966	\$51,593	\$57,220
Chief Engineering Technician	23	\$44,837	\$54,822	\$64,807
Chief Information Officer (NC)	1	\$104,672	\$131,825	\$158,979
Chief Materials Technician	2	\$45,352	\$55,072	\$64,792
Chief Presiding Judge (NC)	1	\$111,541	\$138,763	\$165,984
Chief Video Engineer	1	\$47,106	\$57,004	\$66,902
Chief Water Quality Inspector	4	\$52,842	\$65,018	\$77,195
City Attorney (NC)	1	\$150,573	\$168,340	\$186,106
City Auditor (NC)	1	\$101,127	\$122,774	\$144,420

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
City Clerk (NC)	1	\$94,771	\$112,274	\$129,777
City Engineer (NC)	0	\$89,674	\$118,692	\$147,709
City Judge (NC)	50	\$103,403	\$121,031	\$138,659
City Librarian (NC)	1	\$97,577	\$122,245	\$146,914
City Manager (NC)	1	\$194,543	\$206,971	\$219,399
City Prosecutor (NC)	1	\$107,877	\$125,632	\$143,386
Civil Engineer I	0	\$52,852	\$63,579	\$74,305
Civil Engineer II	17	\$57,592	\$69,419	\$81,246
Civil Engineer III	49	\$63,858	\$78,454	\$93,049
Civil Engineer III*Team Leader	7	\$71,034	\$87,974	\$104,914
Claims Adjuster II	3	\$47,228	\$58,000	\$68,772
Clerical Supervisor	5	\$34,232	\$41,957	\$49,682
Clerk I	32	\$23,365	\$28,615	\$33,866
Clerk II	11	\$26,099	\$31,204	\$36,309
Clerk III	10	\$26,926	\$32,413	\$37,900
Communications Dispatcher	30	\$29,660	\$35,874	\$42,089
Communications Engineer	3	\$63,468	\$76,081	\$88,695
Communications Supervisor	0	\$61,144	\$69,863	\$78,582
Communications Technician	4	\$38,798	\$48,566	\$58,335
Community & Economic Development Director (N	2	\$93,029	\$121,579	\$150,128
Community Outreach Supervisor	1	\$48,101	\$57,378	\$66,654
Computer Operator	1	\$28,820	\$35,910	\$42,999
Construction Inspector	0	\$41,607	\$50,125	\$58,643
Construction Inspector Supervisor	7	\$56,847	\$71,069	\$85,291
Construction Permit Supervisor	0	\$52,841	\$63,822	\$74,804
Contracts Specialist I	4	\$40,556	\$51,909	\$63,263

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Contracts Specialist II	22	\$52,442	\$67,309	\$82,176
Convention Center Director (NC)	0	\$99,629	\$125,233	\$150,838
Council Assistant (NC)	6	\$59,715	\$72,691	\$85,667
Courier	12	\$23,673	\$29,066	\$34,458
Court Interpreter	6	\$39,397	\$48,468	\$57,539
Court Supervisor	14	\$46,274	\$56,180	\$66,087
Court/Legal Clerk I	19	\$28,470	\$34,963	\$41,457
Court/Legal Clerk II	111	\$32,652	\$39,341	\$46,030
Crime Lab Administrator	0	\$72,218	\$95,312	\$118,406
Crime Scene Section Supervisor	0	\$60,552	\$74,387	\$88,223
Crime Scene Shift Supervisor	5	\$57,879	\$70,572	\$83,265
Crime Scene Specialist I	3	\$37,436	\$43,779	\$50,123
Crime Scene Specialist II	32	\$38,748	\$48,558	\$58,369
Crime Scene Specialist III	10	\$45,204	\$53,839	\$62,474
Criminal Intelligence Analyst	10	\$44,489	\$55,065	\$65,640
Curriculum/Training Coordinator	15	\$53,927	\$63,277	\$72,626
Customer Service Clerk	53	\$28,954	\$35,098	\$41,243
Department Budget Supervisor	10	\$58,695	\$74,213	\$89,731
Deputy Budget & Research Director	3	\$70,086	\$97,435	\$124,785
Deputy Chief Information Officer	4	\$76,193	\$100,183	\$124,174
Deputy City Auditor	2	\$68,847	\$86,416	\$103,986
Deputy City Clerk	3	\$56,869	\$73,056	\$89,243
Deputy City Manager (NC)	3	\$111,325	\$148,465	\$185,606
Deputy City Prosecutor (NC)	2	\$96,135	\$110,497	\$124,858
Deputy Convention Center Director	4	\$79,685	\$105,522	\$131,358
Deputy Development Services Director	2	\$75,079	\$99,069	\$123,059

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Deputy Economic Development Director	2	\$75,706	\$97,702	\$119,698
Deputy Finance Director	8	\$70,024	\$95,952	\$121,881
Deputy Housing Director	3	\$75,997	\$97,637	\$119,277
Deputy Human Resources Director	4	\$77,345	\$99,949	\$122,552
Deputy Human Services Director	4	\$80,068	\$100,348	\$120,628
Deputy Neighborhood Services Director	4	\$69,418	\$96,887	\$124,357
Deputy Parks & Recreation Director	7	\$75,316	\$98,514	\$121,712
Deputy Planning Director	1	\$79,560	\$103,738	\$127,916
Deputy Public Works Director	4	\$81,746	\$110,515	\$139,284
Deputy Street Transportation Director	4	\$72,680	\$96,921	\$121,162
Deputy Water Services Director	10	\$71,478	\$91,943	\$112,408
Development Services Director (NC)	2	\$99,314	\$126,720	\$154,125
Development Services Team Leader	4	\$62,946	\$78,310	\$93,674
Economic Development Program Manager	23	\$62,374	\$78,148	\$93,923
Economic Development Specialist	4	\$54,916	\$66,510	\$78,103
Electrical Engineer	0	\$62,475	\$73,411	\$84,346
Electrical Maintenance Foreman	15	\$43,857	\$52,460	\$61,063
Electrical Plans Examiner II	2	\$51,395	\$62,628	\$73,861
Electrician	113	\$40,049	\$48,451	\$56,853
Electronic Systems Specialist	8	\$41,154	\$48,051	\$54,948
Emergency Dispatcher	2	\$35,805	\$43,014	\$50,224
Energy Management Specialist	2	\$55,235	\$70,729	\$86,224
Engineering Technician	27	\$32,757	\$40,471	\$48,185
Enterprise Technology Manager	3	\$78,790	\$92,530	\$106,271
Environmental Programs Coordinator	6	\$57,484	\$71,776	\$86,069
Environmental Programs Manager	1	\$71,795	\$95,830	\$119,866

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Environmental Programs Specialist	1	\$51,781	\$61,527	\$71,273
Environmental Quality Specialist	29	\$47,348	\$57,938	\$68,529
Equipment Maintenance Superintendent	1	\$67,186	\$81,041	\$94,897
Equipment Maintenance Supervisor	9	\$55,175	\$65,298	\$75,420
Equipment Operator II	51	\$30,523	\$37,579	\$44,635
Equipment Operator III	41	\$36,491	\$43,541	\$50,591
Equipment Operator IV	44	\$38,523	\$46,695	\$54,867
Equipment Parts Supervisor	1	\$48,378	\$57,883	\$67,388
Equipment Service Aide	11	\$29,824	\$36,613	\$43,401
Equipment Service Worker I	7	\$27,774	\$33,638	\$39,501
Equipment Service Worker II	51	\$28,255	\$35,012	\$41,769
Equipment Shop Foreman	20	\$47,077	\$57,886	\$68,695
Event Operations Manager	1	\$54,900	\$68,515	\$82,129
Events Coordinator	6	\$44,999	\$55,874	\$66,748
Executive Assistant to Mayor (NC)	2	\$64,193	\$86,232	\$108,271
Facilities Service Coordinator	1	\$47,593	\$57,674	\$67,755
Facility Contract Compliance Specialist	16	\$34,834	\$42,417	\$49,999
Facility Coordinator	6	\$53,054	\$65,181	\$77,307
Finance Director (NC)	1	\$109,823	\$135,470	\$161,116
Finance Supervisor	0	\$54,144	\$68,374	\$82,604
Fingerprint Technician	16	\$34,742	\$42,682	\$50,621
Fire 911 Administrator	1	\$68,741	\$86,352	\$103,964
Fire Battalion Chief	68	\$74,536	\$83,668	\$92,800
Fire Captain	81	\$67,389	\$74,340	\$81,291
Fire Chief (NC)	1	\$120,608	\$146,376	\$172,143
Fire Communications Supervisor	6	\$48,574	\$59,357	\$70,140

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Fire Engineer	180	\$58,006	\$63,057	\$68,109
Fire Equipment Service Worker	9	\$35,356	\$43,164	\$50,973
Fire Prevention Manager	0	\$70,226	\$78,310	\$86,393
Fire Prevention Specialist II	31	\$49,110	\$57,771	\$66,432
Fire Prevention Supervisor	0	\$55,650	\$60,412	\$65,175
Firefighter	821	\$45,270	\$54,059	\$62,847
Forensic Photo Specialist	10	\$38,534	\$46,396	\$54,258
Forensic Science Section Supervisor	10	\$69,541	\$84,011	\$98,481
Forensic Scientist I (NC)	13	\$45,009	\$52,066	\$59,123
Forensic Scientist II	22	\$45,019	\$54,897	\$64,775
Forensic Scientist III	15	\$57,220	\$68,927	\$80,634
Forensic Scientist IV	24	\$71,077	\$83,611	\$96,145
Gardener	124	\$30,322	\$35,068	\$39,814
General Inspections Supervisor	1	\$60,296	\$74,027	\$87,757
General Inspector II	16	\$45,938	\$54,891	\$63,844
GIS Coordinator	4	\$60,613	\$74,463	\$88,312
GIS Technician	18	\$39,109	\$47,620	\$56,131
Golf Course Supervisor	4	\$64,242	\$74,108	\$83,974
Grants Compliance Supervisor	1	\$59,705	\$74,098	\$88,490
Groundskeeper	207	\$26,313	\$31,488	\$36,663
Head Golf Professional	0	\$46,375	\$59,818	\$73,260
Heavy Equip Mechanic	78	\$42,638	\$51,810	\$60,983
Housing Director (NC)	1	\$92,409	\$115,972	\$139,534
Housing Inspector	5	\$39,318	\$47,139	\$54,960
Housing Manager	1	\$62,357	\$78,740	\$95,124
Housing Program Assistant	15	\$36,088	\$43,119	\$50,150

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Housing Rehabilitation Specialist	11	\$46,192	\$53,971	\$61,749
Housing Supervisor	3	\$53,091	\$63,900	\$74,709
Human Resources Aide	30	\$38,374	\$46,302	\$54,230
Human Resources Analyst I	10	\$41,509	\$51,118	\$60,727
Human Resources Analyst II	24	\$49,276	\$61,178	\$73,080
Human Resources Clerk I	5	\$33,049	\$38,714	\$44,379
Human Resources Clerk II	41	\$32,591	\$39,953	\$47,314
Human Resources Director (NC)	1	\$102,153	\$127,528	\$152,903
Human Resources Officer	6	\$55,038	\$67,673	\$80,308
Human Resources Supervisor	15	\$56,840	\$70,906	\$84,972
Human Services Director (NC)	1	\$120,544	\$134,205	\$147,866
Human Services Program Coordinator	5	\$63,489	\$79,915	\$96,341
Information Clerk	0	\$26,669	\$33,122	\$39,575
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer I	23	\$43,534	\$55,040	\$66,545
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer II	46	\$50,324	\$62,962	\$75,600
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer III	49	\$57,626	\$69,954	\$82,283
Information Technology Project Manager	32	\$67,644	\$85,328	\$103,011
Information Technology Supervisor	0	\$53,204	\$67,338	\$81,472
Information Technology Systems Specialist	11	\$57,334	\$75,237	\$93,140
Instrument Technician	6	\$33,965	\$41,071	\$48,177
Instrumentation & Cont Specialist	19	\$45,310	\$54,647	\$63,984
Intergovernmental Affairs Coordinator (NC)	1	\$77,448	\$100,234	\$123,020
Internal Auditor II	7	\$46,765	\$57,553	\$68,340
Internal Auditor III	9	\$53,348	\$66,394	\$79,441
Internal Auditor IV	5	\$63,700	\$80,763	\$97,826
Inventory Control Specialist	2	\$34,779	\$42,447	\$50,115

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Labor Relations Administrator (NC)	1	\$91,801	\$109,589	\$127,378
Laboratory Technician	17	\$35,552	\$44,122	\$52,691
Laborer	25	\$24,141	\$29,782	\$35,423
Landfill Equipment Operator	14	\$36,934	\$45,243	\$53,552
Landscape Architect I	5	\$51,494	\$62,475	\$73,456
Landscape Architect II	5	\$60,284	\$72,835	\$85,386
Lead Business Systems Analyst	0	\$63,646	\$79,443	\$95,240
Lead Information Technology Systems Specialist	17	\$69,346	\$86,164	\$102,983
Lead User Technology Specialist	32	\$59,564	\$73,545	\$87,526
Legal Assistant	11	\$39,018	\$47,670	\$56,323
Legal Assistant Supervisor	1	\$44,391	\$53,582	\$62,774
Legal Secretary	25	\$35,160	\$41,752	\$48,343
Librarian I	15	\$43,335	\$52,789	\$62,242
Librarian II	32	\$44,864	\$55,578	\$66,291
Librarian III	8	\$49,693	\$60,709	\$71,725
Librarian IV	9	\$55,788	\$69,303	\$82,818
Library Assistant	78	\$32,405	\$38,865	\$45,326
Library Circulation Attendant I	59	\$25,685	\$30,537	\$35,388
Library Circulation Attendant II	22	\$28,256	\$34,215	\$40,174
Library Clerk II	14	\$25,683	\$31,492	\$37,301
Library Page	80	\$19,649	\$23,665	\$27,681
Library Services Administrator	1	\$71,382	\$88,187	\$104,992
Library Support Services Supervisor	2	\$41,066	\$49,619	\$58,171
Library Technical Assistant	6	\$32,315	\$38,574	\$44,833
License Inspector	7	\$36,736	\$44,796	\$52,856
Lifeguard	308	\$20,726	\$22,619	\$24,512

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Locksmith	3	\$39,342	\$45,307	\$51,273
Mail Service Supervisor	1	\$31,930	\$38,349	\$44,768
Mail Service Worker	5	\$25,661	\$30,426	\$35,192
Management Assistant I	13	\$41,644	\$52,139	\$62,633
Management Assistant II	61	\$51,240	\$63,908	\$76,576
Management Assistant III	5	\$55,321	\$67,100	\$78,880
Management Services Administrator	8	\$52,542	\$73,208	\$93,873
Materials Technician	3	\$37,868	\$43,809	\$49,749
Mayor's Assistant (NC)	2	\$68,793	\$84,168	\$99,544
Mechanical Plans Examiner II	4	\$51,016	\$62,120	\$73,224
Minibus Operator	29	\$31,248	\$37,382	\$43,517
Multimedia Specialist	11	\$43,692	\$53,261	\$62,830
Municipal Court Administrator	1	\$76,525	\$96,940	\$117,354
Municipal Court Hearing Officer (NC)	3	\$76,703	\$86,641	\$96,578
Municipal Security Guard	102	\$29,898	\$36,385	\$42,873
Museum Curator	2	\$46,678	\$54,925	\$63,173
Neighborhood Maintenance Technician II	1	\$38,914	\$46,922	\$54,929
Neighborhood Services Director (NC)	1	\$101,118	\$124,228	\$147,338
Neighborhood Specialist	8	\$53,280	\$65,886	\$78,493
Offset Press Operator	3	\$31,207	\$37,457	\$43,706
Operations & Maintenance Supervisor	23	\$47,172	\$57,777	\$68,383
Operations & Maintenance Technician	206	\$41,088	\$50,122	\$59,156
Operations Analyst	2	\$49,629	\$61,945	\$74,260
Park Manager	8	\$47,932	\$61,621	\$75,310
Park Ranger II	40	\$32,619	\$39,120	\$45,621
Parks & Recreation Director (NC)	1	\$113,574	\$140,468	\$167,361

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Parks Equipment Mechanic	13	\$38,843	\$46,731	\$54,620
Parks Maintenance Mechanic	19	\$32,962	\$40,351	\$47,740
Parks Supervisor	8	\$54,846	\$66,814	\$78,783
Planner I	7	\$42,179	\$52,579	\$62,979
Planner II	25	\$49,733	\$61,432	\$73,130
Planner III	9	\$56,175	\$68,893	\$81,611
Planning Administrator	1	\$71,006	\$92,675	\$114,343
Planning Graphic Designer	2	\$41,655	\$50,271	\$58,886
Plumbing/Mechanical Inspector II	11	\$45,197	\$55,906	\$66,615
Police Aide	34	\$24,642	\$29,613	\$34,584
Police Assistant	146	\$34,081	\$41,533	\$48,984
Police Cadet II (NC)	0	\$47,831	\$55,709	\$63,587
Police Chief (NC)	1	\$135,417	\$161,183	\$186,948
Police Comm. Shift Supervisor	5	\$50,445	\$60,230	\$70,014
Police Commander	28	\$104,409	\$116,914	\$129,420
Police Communications Operator	254	\$37,880	\$45,536	\$53,192
Police Communications Supervisor	31	\$49,158	\$60,091	\$71,024
Police Computer Services Bureau Administrator	0	\$73,496	\$94,411	\$115,327
Police Fiscal Administrator	1	\$68,028	\$97,478	\$126,927
Police Lieutenant	89	\$81,385	\$95,695	\$110,005
Police Officer	2638	\$49,548	\$59,584	\$69,619
Police Property Supervisor	4	\$46,934	\$57,380	\$67,825
Police Property Technician	19	\$33,028	\$40,342	\$47,656
Police Public Relations Representative	1	\$50,848	\$62,589	\$74,331
Police R & I Bureau Administrator	1	\$62,825	\$78,561	\$94,296
Police R & I Bureau Shift Supervisor	9	\$45,404	\$54,048	\$62,693

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Police Records Clerk	60	\$31,501	\$37,921	\$44,340
Police Research Analyst	6	\$49,765	\$60,500	\$71,236
Police Sergeant	369	\$71,743	\$79,730	\$87,718
Polygraph Examiner	4	\$56,364	\$66,450	\$76,536
Pool Manager	34	\$32,303	\$39,766	\$47,230
Principal Landscape Architect	2	\$64,383	\$75,383	\$86,384
Principal Planner	9	\$65,556	\$83,405	\$101,254
Printing Services Supervisor	1	\$48,371	\$60,304	\$72,237
Procurement Manager	3	\$65,136	\$80,080	\$95,023
Procurement Supervisor	1	\$58,158	\$69,351	\$80,543
Project Manager	56	\$61,089	\$72,775	\$84,460
Property Specialist	13	\$45,182	\$56,114	\$67,046
Public Information Director (NC)	1	\$92,488	\$108,658	\$124,828
Public Information Officer	14	\$52,766	\$66,017	\$79,267
Public Information Specialist	12	\$48,667	\$59,097	\$69,527
Public Transit Director (NC)	1	\$146,080	\$158,825	\$171,570
Public Works Director (NC)	1	\$113,602	\$140,530	\$167,458
Public Works Operations Manager	2	\$63,134	\$75,140	\$87,146
Rate Analyst	1	\$50,627	\$60,585	\$70,544
Records Clerk II	33	\$28,844	\$35,420	\$41,996
Records Clerk III	6	\$35,214	\$42,880	\$50,546
Records Supervisor	2	\$37,505	\$46,803	\$56,101
Recreation Coordinator II	36	\$42,835	\$51,494	\$60,154
Recreation Coordinator III	30	\$49,655	\$60,912	\$72,168
Recreation Leader	208	\$29,071	\$34,760	\$40,449
Recreation Programmer	19	\$37,426	\$45,811	\$54,196

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Recreation Supervisor	5	\$50,432	\$62,540	\$74,648
Retirement Program Administrator	1	\$95,007	\$128,165	\$161,323
Risk Management Coordinator	3	\$61,751	\$76,814	\$91,877
Safety Analyst I	4	\$42,635	\$50,561	\$58,487
Safety Analyst II	10	\$48,858	\$60,280	\$71,703
Secretarial Supervisor	2	\$42,403	\$51,553	\$60,704
Secretary II	173	\$28,795	\$35,032	\$41,269
Secretary III	122	\$34,384	\$41,740	\$49,096
Semiskilled Worker	57	\$24,094	\$28,851	\$33,609
Senior Business Systems Analyst	0	\$54,301	\$67,952	\$81,604
Senior Buyer	6	\$44,167	\$55,452	\$66,738
Senior Center Assistant	15	\$26,713	\$32,135	\$37,557
Senior Construction Inspector	37	\$47,186	\$58,168	\$69,150
Senior Drafting Technician	6	\$37,877	\$46,543	\$55,210
Senior Engineering Technician	32	\$39,701	\$49,238	\$58,775
Senior GIS Technician	15	\$44,689	\$55,110	\$65,531
Senior Information Technology Systems Specialist	35	\$67,151	\$83,049	\$98,947
Senior Materials Technician	5	\$40,880	\$51,061	\$61,242
Senior Party Chief	2	\$43,963	\$52,633	\$61,302
Senior Tax Auditor	6	\$53,680	\$64,373	\$75,066
Senior User Technology Specialist	57	\$47,040	\$59,443	\$71,847
Senior Utility Technician	62	\$36,636	\$44,463	\$52,291
Senior Water Quality Inspector	26	\$43,218	\$52,595	\$61,972
Sign Specialist II	5	\$32,680	\$39,561	\$46,442
Solid Waste Administrator	4	\$67,128	\$88,767	\$110,407
Solid Waste Environmental Specialist	55	\$34,648	\$40,938	\$47,228

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Solid Waste Equipment Operator	290	\$33,995	\$40,843	\$47,691
Solid Waste Foreman	34	\$43,711	\$51,511	\$59,312
Solid Waste Superintendent	7	\$61,533	\$77,540	\$93,548
Solid Waste Supervisor	11	\$49,540	\$60,082	\$70,625
Solid Waste Worker	7	\$29,538	\$35,992	\$42,445
Special Projects Administrator	5	\$72,186	\$85,338	\$98,489
Street Maintenance Foreman II	26	\$39,399	\$47,182	\$54,965
Street Maintenance Foreman III	5	\$43,938	\$52,584	\$61,231
Street Maintenance Superintendent	1	\$73,091	\$87,528	\$101,964
Street Maintenance Supervisor	5	\$50,154	\$61,096	\$72,037
Street Maintenance Worker I	51	\$29,097	\$35,207	\$41,317
Street Maintenance Worker II	31	\$32,839	\$39,584	\$46,330
Street Transportation Director (NC)	1	\$98,450	\$129,168	\$159,887
Structural Inspections Supervisor	1	\$62,677	\$77,199	\$91,720
Structural Inspector II	10	\$47,933	\$58,091	\$68,249
Structural Plans Engineer	5	\$61,954	\$74,721	\$87,488
Structural Plans Examiner II	1	\$51,753	\$63,094	\$74,434
Supplies Clerk I	28	\$27,005	\$32,565	\$38,125
Supplies Clerk II	36	\$29,088	\$35,835	\$42,583
Supplies Clerk III	8	\$32,902	\$39,705	\$46,507
Supplies Supervisor	5	\$46,693	\$58,299	\$69,906
Tax Auditor	7	\$45,862	\$55,451	\$65,040
Tax Enforcement Supervisor	1	\$53,556	\$65,685	\$77,813
Telecommunications Specialist	4	\$42,170	\$51,571	\$60,973
Ticket Seller	13	\$26,297	\$31,804	\$37,310
Ticket Services Supervisor	1	\$50,153	\$62,134	\$74,115

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Trades Helper	73	\$28,066	\$34,001	\$39,936
Traffic Engineer II	3	\$54,995	\$67,171	\$79,347
Traffic Engineer III	5	\$67,258	\$81,000	\$94,742
Traffic Engineer III*Team Leader	0	\$73,768	\$90,666	\$107,563
Traffic Maintenance Foreman II	4	\$39,575	\$47,441	\$55,307
Traffic Signal Supervisor	2	\$52,226	\$63,937	\$75,647
Traffic Signal Technician	25	\$41,782	\$50,524	\$59,267
Traffic Signal Technician Foreman	2	\$48,754	\$58,873	\$68,991
Training Specialist	7	\$42,722	\$50,977	\$59,232
Transit Superintendent	1	\$67,317	\$83,597	\$99,878
Transportation Supervisor	1	\$55,452	\$69,076	\$82,700
Treasury Collections Representative	26	\$37,347	\$44,428	\$51,509
User Support Specialist	14	\$41,133	\$50,024	\$58,914
User Technology Specialist	127	\$45,472	\$55,656	\$65,840
Utilities Service Specialist	76	\$31,884	\$38,601	\$45,317
Utility Foreman	30	\$42,333	\$51,616	\$60,898
Utility Specialty Technician	42	\$38,703	\$46,649	\$54,595
Utility Supervisor	13	\$45,682	\$55,686	\$65,691
Utility Technician	108	\$32,292	\$39,241	\$46,189
Utility TV Technician	5	\$41,277	\$48,986	\$56,695
Video Productions Coordinator	5	\$52,239	\$63,658	\$75,077
Video Station Manager	1	\$58,869	\$85,500	\$112,130
Water Customer Services Supervisor I	22	\$39,732	\$50,131	\$60,530
Water Customer Services Supervisor II	8	\$54,909	\$66,265	\$77,620
Water Facilities Supervisor	8	\$59,826	\$72,997	\$86,167
Water Meter Technician I	6	\$32,004	\$38,639	\$45,274

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Water Meter Technician II	1	\$35,791	\$43,295	\$50,800
Water Quality Inspector	15	\$41,170	\$49,157	\$57,144
Water Resource Specialist	3	\$49,243	\$60,040	\$70,836
Water Resources Management Advisor (NC)	0	\$68,788	\$91,726	\$114,665
Water Services Director (NC)	1	\$110,268	\$133,215	\$156,161
Water Services Specialist	31	\$38,851	\$47,484	\$56,118
Water Services Technician	81	\$35,445	\$41,870	\$48,295
Water Systems Operator	7	\$41,082	\$49,485	\$57,887
Welder	9	\$36,741	\$44,488	\$52,234

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
<i>Private Sector/Published Data</i>				
Account Clerk II	34	\$30,152	\$39,287	\$48,594
Account Clerk III	86	\$32,261	\$42,115	\$52,194
Account Clerk Supervisor	3	\$38,728	\$47,530	\$59,352
Accountant I	31	\$38,416	\$52,541	\$68,104
Accountant II	44	\$45,460	\$61,646	\$78,368
Accountant III	38	\$52,706	\$71,381	\$90,864
Accountant IV	17	\$54,790	\$74,302	\$94,890
Accounting Supervisor	1	\$70,108	\$93,528	\$117,518
Administrative Aide	86	\$31,152	\$42,515	\$53,877
Administrative Secretary	29	\$35,987	\$44,611	\$53,933
Assistant City Attorney II (NC)	24	\$64,745	\$86,692	\$118,450
Assistant City Attorney III (NC)	19	\$79,950	\$111,050	\$143,151
Assistant City Attorney IV (NC)	30	\$95,982	\$132,984	\$172,276
Assistant Finance Director	2	\$98,429	\$139,509	\$185,171
Auto Parts Clerk II	13	\$49,026	\$50,800	\$53,097
Auto Technician	50	\$55,707	\$57,499	\$64,964
Benefits Analyst II	4	\$47,454	\$65,948	\$80,144
Budget & Research Director (NC)	1	\$96,363	\$152,928	\$238,171
Budget Analyst I	6	\$43,739	\$52,860	\$63,726
Budget Analyst II	28	\$50,146	\$63,540	\$77,386
Budget Analyst III	4	\$58,413	\$72,879	\$89,452
Building Equipment Operator II	22	\$49,026	\$59,418	\$70,226
Building Maintenance Worker	114	\$34,477	\$46,116	\$58,486
Business Systems Analyst	0	\$45,227	\$62,827	\$82,081
Buyer	4	\$42,917	\$59,311	\$77,696

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Chief Information Officer (NC)	1	\$197,477	\$252,710	\$323,492
City Manager (NC)	1	\$717,612	\$754,965	\$786,456
Civil Engineer II	17	\$54,259	\$65,270	\$78,623
Civil Engineer III	49	\$66,538	\$82,414	\$98,877
Civil Engineer III*Team Leader	7	\$73,238	\$94,809	\$115,552
Claims Adjuster II	3	\$46,420	\$57,581	\$70,754
Clerical Supervisor	5	\$41,830	\$50,553	\$62,318
Clerk I	32	\$22,656	\$27,871	\$33,524
Clerk III	10	\$26,364	\$33,212	\$36,437
Communications Engineer	3	\$61,236	\$74,469	\$90,006
Computer Operator	1	\$31,540	\$39,759	\$53,189
Contracts Specialist I	4	\$46,026	\$65,303	\$85,078
Contracts Specialist II	22	\$53,749	\$72,128	\$91,062
Cook	12	\$22,869	\$27,632	\$32,258
Courier	12	\$29,536	\$34,257	\$39,252
Customer Service Clerk	53	\$26,957	\$33,564	\$40,406
Deputy Budget & Research Director	3	\$76,388	\$95,786	\$117,697
Deputy Human Resources Director	4	\$73,858	\$110,085	\$149,932
Electrical Engineer	0	\$63,403	\$88,980	\$115,268
Electrician	113	\$59,539	\$64,542	\$69,958
Engineering Technician	27	\$40,050	\$46,533	\$60,669
Equipment Operator II	51	\$36,367	\$40,096	\$48,768
Equipment Service Worker II	51	\$52,638	\$48,616	\$60,084
Facilities Projects Planner	8	\$50,114	\$61,062	\$75,907
Finance Director (NC)	1	\$118,309	\$179,526	\$257,914
Human Resources Aide	30	\$33,845	\$43,433	\$50,357

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Human Resources Analyst I	10	\$43,492	\$64,031	\$86,621
Human Resources Analyst II	24	\$53,657	\$74,274	\$95,556
Human Resources Clerk II	41	\$35,049	\$49,815	\$65,281
Human Resources Director (NC)	1	\$124,896	\$164,271	\$203,044
Human Resources Officer	6	\$56,366	\$78,128	\$102,453
Human Resources Supervisor	15	\$69,393	\$99,256	\$131,087
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer I	23	\$45,040	\$59,320	\$74,865
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer II	46	\$57,670	\$72,201	\$86,865
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer III	49	\$69,987	\$87,918	\$106,959
Information Technology Project Manager	32	\$66,336	\$92,881	\$119,347
Information Technology Service Specialist	6	\$46,668	\$58,796	\$77,356
Information Technology Supervisor	0	\$52,353	\$64,510	\$85,530
Information Technology Systems Specialist	11	\$61,312	\$84,681	\$108,567
Internal Auditor II	7	\$50,393	\$67,681	\$86,523
Internal Auditor III	9	\$57,103	\$76,767	\$97,012
Internal Auditor IV	5	\$70,909	\$98,024	\$125,256
Labor Relations Administrator (NC)	1	\$93,684	\$122,016	\$148,841
Lead Business Systems Analyst	0	\$66,214	\$89,854	\$114,691
Lead Computer Operator	2	\$38,773	\$48,365	\$56,835
Lead Information Technology Systems Specialist	17	\$77,524	\$96,164	\$116,227
Lead User Technology Specialist	32	\$60,426	\$80,681	\$103,881
Legal Assistant	11	\$45,073	\$54,391	\$70,363
Legal Secretary	25	\$39,529	\$53,109	\$70,527
Locksmith	3	\$37,863	\$46,957	\$56,470
Machinist	2	\$41,779	\$51,009	\$59,801
Mail Service Worker	5	\$24,312	\$31,243	\$38,624

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
Management Assistant I	13	\$46,559	\$57,808	\$70,515
Management Assistant II	61	\$55,762	\$69,906	\$84,947
Management Services Administrator	8	\$76,633	\$111,336	\$149,394
Municipal Security Guard	102	\$21,863	\$26,724	\$32,005
Procurement Manager	3	\$64,269	\$83,556	\$106,173
Procurement Supervisor	1	\$64,674	\$93,822	\$123,439
Project Manager	56	\$53,249	\$76,884	\$101,941
Public Information Director (NC)	1	\$100,033	\$124,989	\$155,725
Quality Assurance Engineer	2	\$59,216	\$71,948	\$87,543
Records Clerk II	33	\$26,763	\$37,252	\$47,972
Risk Management Coordinator	3	\$50,766	\$66,138	\$88,472
Safety Analyst II	10	\$49,983	\$61,904	\$75,750
Secretary II	173	\$28,040	\$37,104	\$46,016
Senior Business Systems Analyst	0	\$57,092	\$77,696	\$98,929
Senior Buyer	6	\$50,587	\$69,929	\$89,904
Senior Drafting Technician	6	\$44,376	\$54,480	\$65,039
Senior Engineering Technician	32	\$41,712	\$52,127	\$67,479
Senior Information Technology Systems Specialist	35	\$65,730	\$89,364	\$115,263
Senior User Technology Specialist	57	\$55,976	\$71,475	\$88,483
Supplies Clerk I	28	\$22,972	\$30,366	\$38,102
Supplies Clerk II	36	\$28,519	\$37,270	\$46,397
Supplies Clerk III	8	\$28,403	\$36,983	\$45,877
Supplies Supervisor	5	\$43,457	\$55,068	\$76,767
Telecommunications Specialist	4	\$42,442	\$56,031	\$70,759
Training Specialist	7	\$42,626	\$54,282	\$70,051
User Support Specialist	14	\$35,818	\$45,200	\$56,624

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-8**  
**Overall Market Average Pay Ranges Within Market Sector**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Market Average Minimum	Market Average Midpoint	Market Average Maximum
User Technology Specialist	127	\$46,945	\$58,252	\$70,110
Welder	9	\$53,482	\$60,627	\$68,381

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Confidential Staff</i>				
Assistant City Attorney II (NC)	24	94%	91%	87%
Benefits Analyst II	4	107%	102%	101%
Human Resources Aide	30	95%	97%	99%
Human Resources Analyst I	10	101%	98%	96%
Human Resources Analyst II	24	97%	94%	93%
Human Resources Clerk I	5	87%	91%	94%
Human Resources Clerk II	41	91%	86%	83%
Human Resources Officer	6	97%	93%	90%
Human Resources Supervisor	15	103%	98%	94%
Labor Compliance Specialist	3	102%	104%	105%
Municipal Court Hearing Officer (NC)	3	132%	117%	105%
Secretary to City Manager (NC)	1	110%	111%	109%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Council</i>				
Council Assistant (NC)	6	107%	110%	112%
Mayor's Assistant (NC)	2	93%	95%	96%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Executives</i>				
Arts & Culture Administrator	0	101%	102%	103%
Assistant Aviation Director	2	84%	85%	85%
Assistant Chief Information Officer	2	95%	90%	88%
Assistant City Auditor	0	128%	99%	86%
Assistant City Clerk	0	124%	121%	118%
Assistant City Librarian	0	103%	103%	103%
Assistant City Manager (NC)	1	93%	95%	96%
Assistant Community/Economic Development Direct	1	106%	103%	99%
Assistant Development Services Director	2	117%	104%	97%
Assistant Finance Director	2	109%	103%	98%
Assistant Housing Director	0	99%	100%	101%
Assistant Parks & Recreation Director	0	123%	111%	105%
Assistant Public Works Director	2	129%	111%	102%
Assistant Street Transportation Director	1	106%	104%	103%
Assistant to the City Manager (NC)	1	102%	112%	118%
Assistant to the Mayor (a) (NC)	0	142%	126%	117%
Assistant Water Services Director-Administration	1	111%	104%	100%
Assistant Water Services Director-Operation	1	105%	100%	96%
Assistant Water Services Director-Technical	1	109%	95%	88%
Aviation Director (NC)	1	86%	94%	100%
Budget & Research Director (NC)	1	113%	108%	100%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Chief Asst City Attorney (NC)	0	88%	89%	88%
Chief Information Officer (NC)	1	83%	84%	83%
Chief Presiding Judge (NC)	1	149%	120%	100%
City Attorney (NC)	1	81%	90%	97%
City Auditor (NC)	1	101%	104%	105%
City Clerk (NC)	1	103%	112%	119%
City Engineer (NC)	0	112%	110%	108%
City Librarian (NC)	1	100%	103%	105%
City Manager (NC)	1	45%	55%	65%
City Prosecutor (NC)	1	91%	100%	107%
Community & Economic Development Director (NC)	2	116%	114%	113%
Convention Center Director (NC)	0	103%	106%	107%
Deputy City Manager (NC)	3	112%	109%	106%
Development Services Director (NC)	2	103%	104%	105%
Environmental Programs Manager	1	112%	108%	105%
Executive Assistant to Mayor (NC)	2	152%	146%	142%
Finance Director (NC)	1	96%	94%	91%
Fire Chief (NC)	1	103%	110%	114%
Housing Director (NC)	1	106%	109%	110%
Human Resources Director (NC)	1	94%	95%	96%
Human Services Director (NC)	1	85%	99%	109%
Intergovernmental Affairs Coordinator (NC)	1	133%	132%	132%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Labor Relations Administrator (NC)	1	86%	89%	92%
Neighborhood Services Director (NC)	1	102%	106%	110%
Parks & Recreation Director (NC)	1	100%	104%	107%
Police Chief (NC)	1	97%	105%	110%
Public Information Director (NC)	1	98%	105%	108%
Public Transit Director (NC)	1	70%	83%	94%
Public Works Director (NC)	1	100%	104%	107%
Retirement Program Administrator	1	89%	85%	82%
Street Transportation Director (NC)	1	110%	108%	106%
Water Resources Management Advisor (NC)	0	117%	113%	110%
Water Services Director (NC)	1	94%	99%	103%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Middle Managers</i>				
Administrative Assistant III	2	131%	115%	106%
Assistant City Attorney III (NC)	19	100%	97%	96%
Assistant City Attorney IV (NC)	30	97%	95%	94%
City Judge (NC)	50	140%	120%	105%
Crime Lab Administrator	0	106%	103%	101%
Deputy Aviation Director	8	78%	79%	80%
Deputy Budget & Research Director	3	106%	101%	98%
Deputy Chief Information Officer	4	105%	102%	100%
Deputy City Auditor	2	111%	114%	115%
Deputy City Clerk	3	128%	128%	128%
Deputy City Prosecutor (NC)	2	92%	103%	111%
Deputy Convention Center Director	4	96%	93%	91%
Deputy Development Services Director	2	102%	99%	98%
Deputy Economic Development Director	2	101%	100%	100%
Deputy Finance Director	8	104%	94%	89%
Deputy Housing Director	3	100%	101%	101%
Deputy Human Resources Director	4	100%	96%	93%
Deputy Human Services Director	4	95%	98%	100%
Deputy Neighborhood Services Director	4	110%	101%	97%
Deputy Parks & Recreation Director	7	101%	100%	99%
Deputy Planning Director	1	96%	95%	94%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Deputy Public Works Director	4	93%	89%	86%
Deputy Street Transportation Director	4	105%	101%	99%
Deputy Water Services Director	10	103%	103%	103%
Enterprise Technology Manager	3	93%	101%	105%
Environmental Programs Specialist	1	121%	131%	139%
Fire 911 Administrator	1	106%	108%	110%
Fire Battalion Chief	68	99%	114%	125%
Library Services Administrator	1	100%	105%	108%
Management Assistant III	5	121%	119%	118%
Management Services Administrator	8	121%	110%	103%
Municipal Court Administrator	1	95%	96%	97%
Planning Administrator	1	102%	101%	100%
Police Commander	28	82%	100%	114%
Police Computer Services Bureau Administrator	0	104%	106%	107%
Police Fiscal Administrator	1	112%	101%	95%
Police R & I Bureau Administrator	1	121%	125%	127%
Solid Waste Administrator	4	93%	90%	89%
Special Projects Administrator	5	96%	97%	98%
Video Station Manager	1	117%	104%	97%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Unit 1- LIUNA 777</i>				
Building Maintenance Worker	114	133%	121%	114%
Cement Finisher	10	98%	94%	91%
Courier	12	116%	112%	108%
Equipment Operator II	51	100%	96%	93%
Equipment Operator III	41	102%	97%	94%
Equipment Operator IV	44	105%	99%	95%
Gardener	124	100%	100%	100%
Greenskeeper	32	94%	94%	92%
Groundskeeper	207	105%	100%	95%
Laborer	25	113%	105%	99%
Landfill Equipment Operator	14	109%	102%	97%
Landscape Equipment Operator	4	102%	97%	93%
Mail Service Worker	5	118%	111%	106%
Minibus Operator	29	101%	100%	98%
Parks Equipment Mechanic	13	107%	100%	99%
Parks Maintenance Mechanic	19	118%	110%	104%
Semiskilled Worker	57	112%	101%	93%
Sign Specialist II	5	102%	100%	98%
Solid Waste Equipment Operator	290	102%	101%	100%
Solid Waste Worker	7	100%	95%	91%
Street Maintenance Worker I	51	102%	97%	94%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Street Maintenance Worker II	31	102%	95%	91%
Supplies Clerk I	28	116%	110%	105%
Supplies Clerk II	36	116%	110%	105%
Supplies Clerk III	8	112%	115%	116%
Trades Helper	73	112%	108%	104%
Welder	9	121%	115%	110%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Unit 2- AFSCME 2384</i>				
Aircraft Technician	7	105%	105%	104%
Auto Parts Clerk II	13	103%	100%	98%
Auto Parts Clerk III	6	104%	99%	95%
Auto Technician	50	101%	97%	94%
Body Repair Specialist	1	129%	116%	106%
Building Equipment Operator I	49	133%	118%	108%
Building Equipment Operator II	22	116%	108%	101%
Chief Construction Inspector	24	100%	99%	98%
Chief Materials Technician	2	102%	98%	95%
Communications Technician	4	102%	95%	88%
Construction Inspector	0	89%	86%	84%
Electrician	113	108%	102%	98%
Electronic Systems Specialist	8	131%	124%	118%
Equipment Repair Specialist	6	110%	101%	94%
Equipment Service Worker I	7	95%	90%	86%
Equipment Service Worker II	51	97%	94%	90%
Facilities Projects Planner	8	101%	96%	89%
Fire Equipment Service Worker	9	107%	102%	99%
Heavy Equip Mechanic	78	114%	103%	97%
Instrument Technician	6	102%	98%	94%
Instrumentation & Cont Specialist	19	107%	98%	92%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Locksmith	3	101%	95%	91%
Machinist	2	116%	105%	99%
Materials Technician	3	87%	86%	86%
Operations & Maintenance Technician	206	105%	97%	91%
Party Chief	4	106%	102%	98%
Senior Construction Inspector	37	108%	103%	98%
Senior Materials Technician	5	100%	93%	89%
Senior Party Chief	2	104%	101%	97%
Senior Utility Technician	62	103%	99%	96%
Senior Water Quality Inspector	26	103%	98%	95%
Survey Aide	3	111%	103%	96%
Telecommunications Specialist	4	119%	105%	94%
Traffic Signal Technician	25	116%	106%	100%
Utility Specialty Technician	42	90%	87%	84%
Utility Technician	108	102%	96%	92%
Utility TV Technician	5	92%	90%	89%
Water Meter Technician I	6	99%	94%	89%
Water Meter Technician II	1	95%	91%	87%
Water Quality Inspector	15	95%	93%	92%
Water Services Specialist	31	91%	86%	83%
Water Services Technician	81	96%	94%	92%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Unit 3- AFSCME 2960</i>				
Account Clerk II	34	93%	93%	92%
Account Clerk III	86	104%	103%	102%
Administrative Aide	86	109%	105%	103%
Bailiff	43	99%	99%	99%
Building Code Examiner	4	104%	108%	110%
Buyer Aide	3	100%	102%	105%
Chief Drafting Technician	1	84%	90%	94%
Chief Engineering Technician	23	99%	100%	98%
Clerk I	32	96%	95%	94%
Clerk II	11	95%	97%	100%
Clerk III	10	99%	99%	103%
Communications Dispatcher	30	98%	99%	101%
Computer Operator	1	113%	110%	104%
Cook	12	120%	124%	124%
Court Interpreter	6	102%	103%	103%
Court/Legal Clerk I	19	93%	93%	93%
Court/Legal Clerk II	111	90%	91%	92%
Crime Scene Specialist I	3	94%	99%	102%
Crime Scene Specialist II	32	99%	98%	97%
Crime Scene Specialist III	10	94%	97%	100%
Customer Service Clerk	53	95%	94%	94%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Electrical Inspector II	11	115%	112%	110%
Electrical Plans Examiner II	2	105%	106%	107%
Emergency Dispatcher	2	108%	110%	113%
Engineering Technician	27	94%	94%	92%
Equipment Service Aide	11	98%	99%	99%
Facility Contract Compliance Specialist	16	101%	102%	103%
Fingerprint Technician	16	92%	92%	92%
Fire Prevention Specialist II	31	100%	105%	108%
Forensic Photo Specialist	10	96%	98%	99%
Forensic Scientist I (NC)	13	100%	106%	110%
General Inspector II	16	106%	110%	113%
GIS Technician	18	105%	106%	107%
Housing Inspector	5	94%	96%	98%
Housing Rehabilitation Specialist	11	96%	102%	106%
Information Clerk	0	99%	98%	97%
Laboratory Technician	17	96%	95%	94%
Legal Assistant	11	100%	100%	99%
Legal Secretary	25	102%	102%	102%
Library Circulation Attendant I	59	94%	98%	101%
Library Circulation Attendant II	22	93%	95%	97%
Library Clerk I	26	93%	96%	98%
Library Clerk II	14	94%	96%	97%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Library Page	80	90%	91%	92%
Library Technical Assistant	6	98%	101%	103%
License Inspector	7	100%	101%	102%
Lifeguard	308	108%	120%	130%
Mechanical Plans Examiner II	4	106%	107%	108%
Municipal Security Guard	102	108%	109%	109%
Neighborhood Maintenance Technician II	1	99%	101%	103%
Offset Press Operator	3	101%	104%	106%
Planning Graphic Designer	2	108%	110%	111%
Plumbing/Mechanical Inspector II	11	108%	108%	108%
Police Aide	34	99%	101%	102%
Police Assistant	146	99%	99%	100%
Police Cadet II (NC)	0	58%	61%	63%
Police Communications Operator	254	102%	104%	106%
Police Property Technician	19	102%	102%	103%
Police Records Clerk	60	93%	95%	96%
Pool Manager	34	99%	99%	99%
Records Clerk II	33	104%	100%	97%
Recreation Leader	208	96%	98%	100%
Recreation Programmer	19	94%	94%	95%
Secretary II	173	97%	95%	94%
Senior Center Assistant	15	110%	112%	113%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Senior Drafting Technician	6	95%	96%	96%
Senior Engineering Technician	32	96%	96%	94%
Solid Waste Environmental Specialist	55	111%	116%	120%
Structural Inspector II	10	102%	104%	105%
Structural Plans Examiner II	1	104%	105%	106%
Ticket Seller	13	99%	101%	102%
Treasury Collections Representative	26	104%	108%	111%
User Support Specialist	14	107%	107%	107%
Utilities Service Specialist	76	100%	101%	102%
Water Systems Operator	7	98%	101%	102%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Unit 4- Police</i>				
Police Officer	2638	92%	99%	103%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Unit 5- Fire</i>				
Fire Captain	81	107%	102%	97%
Fire Engineer	180	112%	108%	105%
Firefighter	821	102%	103%	104%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Unit 6- Police Supervisory &amp; Professional*</i>				
Police Lieutenant	89	105%	106%	107%
Police Sergeant	369	100%	106%	112%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
<i>Unit 7- ASPTEA</i>				
Account Clerk Supervisor	3	96%	98%	98%
Accountant I	31	113%	109%	107%
Accountant II	44	112%	109%	106%
Accountant III	38	108%	104%	102%
Accountant IV	17	110%	106%	104%
Accounting Supervisor	1	107%	100%	96%
Administrative Assistant I	79	103%	105%	106%
Administrative Assistant II	55	141%	134%	129%
Administrative Assistant to the Mayor (NC)	0	113%	116%	116%
Administrative Secretary	29	101%	102%	102%
Architect	4	107%	106%	106%
Assistant Laboratory Superintendent	1	106%	105%	105%
Aviation Superintendent	11	95%	95%	95%
Aviation Supervisor II	31	93%	96%	98%
Aviation Supervisor III	10	97%	101%	104%
Budget Analyst I	6	104%	106%	106%
Budget Analyst II	28	107%	105%	104%
Budget Analyst III	4	106%	108%	108%
Building Facilities Superintendent	4	97%	98%	97%
Building Maintenance Foreman	24	104%	105%	105%
Building Maintenance Supervisor	4	93%	97%	98%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Business Systems Analyst	0	106%	101%	97%
Buyer	4	111%	107%	104%
Caseworker II	79	95%	95%	95%
Chemist I	26	99%	100%	100%
Chemist II	7	106%	107%	108%
Chemist III	5	103%	106%	108%
Chief Video Engineer	1	114%	118%	120%
Chief Water Quality Inspector	4	102%	103%	104%
Civil Engineer I	0	92%	95%	96%
Civil Engineer II	17	95%	98%	100%
Civil Engineer III	49	102%	103%	104%
Civil Engineer III*Team Leader	7	102%	102%	102%
Claims Adjuster II	3	104%	105%	105%
Clerical Supervisor	5	100%	101%	102%
Communications Engineer	3	95%	98%	100%
Communications Supervisor	0	89%	94%	97%
Community Outreach Supervisor	1	96%	101%	104%
Construction Inspector Supervisor	7	100%	99%	99%
Construction Permit Supervisor	0	107%	111%	113%
Contracts Specialist I	4	99%	92%	87%
Contracts Specialist II	22	102%	97%	94%
Court Supervisor	14	91%	93%	95%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Crime Scene Section Supervisor	0	109%	110%	111%
Crime Scene Shift Supervisor	5	93%	95%	97%
Criminal Intelligence Analyst	10	110%	111%	111%
Curriculum/Training Coordinator	15	95%	99%	101%
Department Budget Supervisor	10	100%	100%	98%
Development Services Team Leader	4	110%	110%	110%
Economic Development Program Manager	23	101%	100%	99%
Economic Development Specialist	4	89%	92%	93%
Electrical Engineer	0	105%	104%	103%
Electrical Maintenance Foreman	15	105%	109%	112%
Energy Management Specialist	2	84%	82%	80%
Environmental Programs Coordinator	6	120%	120%	120%
Environmental Quality Specialist	29	111%	105%	102%
Equal Opportunity Spec*Lead	3	102%	99%	100%
Equal Opportunity Specialist	10	109%	108%	105%
Equipment Maintenance Superintendent	1	96%	99%	100%
Equipment Maintenance Supervisor	9	99%	103%	106%
Equipment Parts Supervisor	1	108%	110%	102%
Equipment Shop Foreman	20	95%	97%	97%
Event Operations Manager	1	114%	114%	114%
Events Coordinator	6	97%	98%	98%
Facilities Service Coordinator	1	103%	105%	105%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Facility Coordinator	6	102%	103%	102%
Finance Supervisor	0	99%	87%	80%
Fire Communications Supervisor	6	95%	97%	99%
Fire Prevention Manager	0	89%	100%	108%
Fire Prevention Supervisor	0	97%	111%	123%
Fire Protection Engineer	6	118%	121%	121%
Forensic Science Section Supervisor	10	100%	103%	105%
Forensic Scientist II	22	104%	107%	108%
Forensic Scientist III	15	96%	99%	101%
Forensic Scientist IV	24	93%	98%	102%
General Inspections Supervisor	1	99%	100%	101%
GIS Coordinator	4	94%	95%	96%
Golf Course Supervisor	4	82%	89%	93%
Grants Compliance Supervisor	1	105%	105%	106%
Head Golf Professional	0	116%	112%	110%
Horticulturist	1	117%	118%	117%
Housing Manager	1	106%	104%	103%
Housing Program Assistant	15	96%	99%	102%
Housing Supervisor	3	101%	105%	108%
Human Services Program Coordinator	5	94%	93%	92%
Hydrologist	1	101%	102%	102%
Industrial Hygienist	4	96%	96%	93%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer I	23	122%	118%	115%
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer II	46	112%	112%	112%
Information Technology Analyst/Programmer III	49	104%	105%	105%
Information Technology Project Manager	32	109%	103%	100%
Information Technology Service Specialist	6	105%	104%	94%
Information Technology Supervisor	0	97%	97%	92%
Information Technology Systems Specialist	11	107%	99%	95%
Internal Auditor II	7	101%	99%	96%
Internal Auditor III	9	103%	100%	97%
Internal Auditor IV	5	93%	88%	84%
Inventory Control Specialist	2	107%	109%	110%
Inventory Management Coordinator	2	108%	112%	107%
Investment Manager	2	90%	90%	69%
Landscape Architect I	5	97%	100%	101%
Landscape Architect II	5	95%	99%	100%
Lead Business Systems Analyst	0	97%	94%	92%
Lead Computer Operator	2	107%	108%	110%
Lead Information Technology Systems Specialist	17	106%	107%	106%
Lead User Technology Specialist	32	110%	108%	105%
Legal Assistant Supervisor	1	104%	107%	107%
Librarian I	15	98%	100%	101%
Librarian II	32	103%	104%	104%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Librarian III	8	109%	111%	112%
Librarian IV	9	107%	107%	107%
Library Assistant	78	103%	107%	109%
Library Support Services Supervisor	2	88%	91%	93%
Mail Service Supervisor	1	112%	117%	120%
Management Assistant I	13	104%	104%	103%
Management Assistant II	61	114%	114%	114%
Multimedia Specialist	11	106%	108%	109%
Museum Curator	2	107%	113%	117%
Neighborhood Specialist	8	101%	102%	102%
Office Systems Technology Specialist	1	94%	98%	90%
Operations & Maintenance Supervisor	23	98%	100%	101%
Operations Analyst	2	103%	102%	101%
Park Manager	8	102%	99%	97%
Park Ranger II	40	106%	110%	112%
Parks Supervisor	8	98%	100%	102%
Planner I	7	115%	115%	115%
Planner II	25	108%	109%	110%
Planner III	9	105%	107%	108%
Police Comm. Shift Supervisor	5	102%	106%	109%
Police Communications Supervisor	31	94%	96%	97%
Police Property Supervisor	4	90%	91%	92%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Police Public Relations Representative	1	99%	99%	97%
Police R & I Bureau Shift Supervisor	9	97%	102%	105%
Police Research Analyst	6	98%	101%	102%
Polygraph Examiner	4	106%	112%	116%
Principal Engineering Technician	29	105%	103%	101%
Principal Landscape Architect	2	103%	109%	113%
Principal Planner	9	100%	98%	97%
Printing Services Supervisor	1	119%	118%	117%
Procurement Manager	3	97%	96%	96%
Procurement Supervisor	1	84%	80%	77%
Project Manager	56	96%	96%	96%
Property Manager	2	105%	100%	96%
Property Specialist	13	100%	102%	97%
Public Information Officer	14	100%	100%	100%
Public Information Specialist	12	100%	103%	105%
Public Works Operations Manager	2	94%	99%	102%
Quality Assurance Engineer	2	94%	94%	92%
Rate Analyst	1	110%	116%	119%
Records Clerk III	6	101%	105%	107%
Records Supervisor	2	97%	98%	98%
Recreation Coordinator II	36	102%	106%	108%
Recreation Coordinator III	30	101%	103%	104%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Recreation Supervisor	5	107%	107%	108%
Risk Management Coordinator	3	104%	103%	98%
Safety Analyst I	4	100%	105%	107%
Safety Analyst II	10	100%	100%	101%
Sales Manager	6	105%	102%	101%
Secretarial Supervisor	2	95%	97%	99%
Secretary III	122	95%	99%	102%
Security Systems Supervisor	3	104%	105%	104%
Senior Business Systems Analyst	0	102%	99%	96%
Senior Buyer	6	100%	96%	93%
Senior GIS Technician	15	96%	97%	98%
Senior Information Technology Systems Specialist	35	104%	100%	96%
Senior Tax Auditor	6	93%	96%	98%
Senior User Technology Specialist	57	120%	118%	116%
Solid Waste Foreman	34	91%	97%	100%
Solid Waste Superintendent	7	92%	91%	90%
Solid Waste Supervisor	11	89%	92%	93%
Street Maintenance Foreman II	26	92%	95%	98%
Street Maintenance Foreman III	5	91%	95%	97%
Street Maintenance Superintendent	1	95%	99%	101%
Street Maintenance Supervisor	5	97%	100%	101%
Structural Inspections Supervisor	1	95%	96%	97%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Structural Plans Engineer	5	106%	110%	112%
Supplies Supervisor	5	113%	112%	106%
Survey Supervisor	1	98%	104%	101%
Tax Auditor	7	92%	94%	96%
Tax Enforcement Supervisor	1	83%	84%	85%
Ticket Services Supervisor	1	90%	91%	92%
Traffic Engineer II	3	97%	99%	101%
Traffic Engineer III	5	97%	100%	102%
Traffic Engineer III*Team Leader	0	101%	102%	101%
Traffic Maintenance Foreman II	4	91%	95%	97%
Traffic Signal Supervisor	2	98%	100%	101%
Traffic Signal Technician Foreman	2	95%	98%	100%
Training Specialist	7	99%	100%	97%
Transit Superintendent	1	98%	98%	98%
Transportation Supervisor	1	101%	101%	102%
Treasury Collections Supervisor	5	100%	102%	100%
User Technology Specialist	127	117%	118%	119%
Utility Foreman	30	94%	96%	98%
Utility Supervisor	13	96%	99%	100%
Video Productions Coordinator	5	103%	105%	107%
Water Customer Services Supervisor I	22	104%	104%	103%
Water Customer Services Supervisor II	8	89%	92%	91%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**Table B-9**  
**City of Phoenix Pay Ranges as a Percent of Overall Market Average**  
**Sorted by Bargaining Unit**

Benchmark Title	Number of Phoenix Incumbents	Phoenix as a % of Market Minimum	Phoenix as a % of Market Midpoint	Phoenix as a % of Market Maximum
Water Facilities Supervisor	8	100%	102%	103%
Water Resource Specialist	3	99%	101%	103%

Benchmarks with fewer than three (3) matches have insufficient data and therefore are excluded. As a result, the total number of Phoenix incumbents in this report does not reflect the total number of incumbents in the benchmark jobs.

**B10A - City of Phoenix**  
**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
(Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)

Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Base Salary		Annual Employer Cost of Benefits				Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
				Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits	Phoenix		Market	Phoenix	Market	
Administrative Support	3	Administrative Aide	Phoenix	\$ 43,275	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,867	-	7,867	\$ 62,872	45%		31%		
			Market	\$ 41,113	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,891	1,645	7,536	\$ 59,714		45%		31%	
			Phx as % Mkt	105%	106%	134%	0%	104%	105%					
Administrative Support	7	Administrative Secretary	Phoenix	\$ 45,001	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,181	2,700	10,881	\$ 67,612	50%		33%		
			Market	\$ 44,158	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,328	1,766	8,094	\$ 63,317		43%		30%	
			Phx as % Mkt	102%	106%	129%	153%	134%	107%					
Administrative Support	2	Courier	Phoenix	\$ 34,237	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,224	240	6,464	\$ 52,431	53%		35%		
			Market	\$ 30,663	\$ 11,065	\$ 4,394	1,227	5,621	\$ 47,348		54%		35%	
			Phx as % Mkt	112%	106%	142%	20%	115%	111%					
Administrative Support	3	Elections Aide	Phoenix	\$ 35,849	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,517	-	6,517	\$ 54,096	51%		34%		
			Market	\$ 30,236	\$ 11,065	\$ 4,333	1,209	5,542	\$ 46,843		55%		35%	
			Phx as % Mkt	119%	106%	150%	0%	118%	115%					
Administrative Support	7	Management Assistant I	Phoenix	\$ 55,048	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,008	3,303	13,311	\$ 80,088	45%		31%		
			Market	\$ 52,989	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,593	2,120	9,713	\$ 73,767		39%		28%	
			Phx as % Mkt	104%	106%	132%	156%	137%	109%					
Administrative Support	7	Management Assistant II	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%		
			Market	\$ 64,966	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,310	2,599	11,908	\$ 87,939		35%		26%	
			Phx as % Mkt	114%	106%	145%	171%	151%	118%					
Administrative Support	3	Records Clerk II	Phoenix	\$ 35,849	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,517	-	6,517	\$ 54,096	51%		34%		
			Market	\$ 35,902	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,145	1,436	6,581	\$ 53,548		49%		33%	
			Phx as % Mkt	100%	106%	127%	0%	99%	101%					
Administrative Support	3	Secretary II	Phoenix	\$ 34,092	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,198	-	6,198	\$ 52,019	53%		34%		
			Market	\$ 35,749	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,123	1,430	6,553	\$ 53,367		49%		33%	
			Phx as % Mkt	95%	106%	121%	0%	95%	97%					
Audit	7	Internal Auditor II	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%		
			Market	\$ 61,723	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,845	2,469	11,314	\$ 84,102		36%		27%	
			Phx as % Mkt	99%	106%	125%	148%	130%	104%					
Aviation	7	Aviation Supervisor II	Phoenix	\$ 55,048	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,008	3,303	13,311	\$ 80,088	45%		31%		
			Market	\$ 57,538	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,245	2,302	10,547	\$ 79,150		38%		27%	
			Phx as % Mkt	96%	106%	121%	144%	126%	101%					
Convention Center	7	Events Coordinator	Phoenix	\$ 55,048	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,008	3,303	13,311	\$ 80,088	45%		31%		
			Market	\$ 56,148	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,046	2,246	10,292	\$ 77,505		38%		28%	
			Phx as % Mkt	98%	106%	124%	147%	129%	103%					
Courts	3	Bailiff*	Phoenix	\$ 39,239	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,134	-	7,134	\$ 58,102	48%		32%		
			Market	\$ 39,470	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,656	1,579	7,235	\$ 57,770		46%		32%	
			Phx as % Mkt	99%	106%	126%	0%	99%	101%					
Courts	3	Court Interpreter	Phoenix	\$ 49,796	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,053	-	9,053	\$ 70,578	42%		29%		
			Market	\$ 48,296	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,921	1,932	8,853	\$ 68,213		41%		29%	
			Phx as % Mkt	103%	106%	131%	0%	102%	103%					
Courts	7	Court Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 52,395	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,525	3,144	12,669	\$ 76,794	47%		32%		
			Market	\$ 56,180	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,051	2,247	10,298	\$ 77,543		38%		28%	
			Phx as % Mkt	93%	106%	118%	140%	123%	99%					
Courts	3	Court/Legal Clerk II	Phoenix	\$ 35,849	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,517	-	6,517	\$ 54,096	51%		34%		
			Market	\$ 39,341	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,638	1,574	7,211	\$ 57,617		46%		32%	
			Phx as % Mkt	91%	106%	116%	0%	90%	94%					
Elected/Council Staff	7	Council Assistant (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 79,862	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,519	4,792	19,311	\$ 110,902	39%		28%		
			Market	\$ 72,691	\$ 11,065	\$ 10,417	2,908	13,324	\$ 97,080		34%		25%	
			Phx as % Mkt	110%	106%	139%	165%	145%	114%					
Engineering	7	Architect	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%		
			Market	\$ 77,074	\$ 11,065	\$ 11,045	3,083	14,128	\$ 102,266		33%		25%	
			Phx as % Mkt	106%	106%	135%	160%	140%	111%					
Engineering	7	Civil Engineer III	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%		
			Market	\$ 79,334	\$ 11,065	\$ 11,369	3,173	14,542	\$ 104,941		32%		24%	
			Phx as % Mkt	103%	106%	131%	155%	136%	108%					
Engineering	7	Landscape Architect II	Phoenix	\$ 70,627	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,840	4,238	17,078	\$ 99,434	41%		29%		
			Market	\$ 71,685	\$ 11,065	\$ 10,272	2,867	13,140	\$ 95,890		34%		25%	
			Phx as % Mkt	99%	106%	125%	148%	130%	104%					
Engineering	3	Senior Engineering Technician	Phoenix	\$ 47,508	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,637	-	8,637	\$ 67,875	43%		30%		
			Market	\$ 49,719	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,125	1,989	9,113	\$ 69,897		41%		29%	
			Phx as % Mkt	96%	106%	121%	0%	95%	97%					

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage

\*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare

**B10A - City of Phoenix  
Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees  
(Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)**

Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits					Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
				Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Environmental	7	Environmental Quality Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 63,877	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,154	2,555	11,709	\$ 86,650		36%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	105%	106%	133%	158%	139%	110%				
Environmental	7	Industrial Hygienist	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 69,644	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,980	2,786	12,766	\$ 93,475		34%		25%
			Phx as % Mkt	96%	106%	122%	145%	127%	102%				
Executives	9	Arts & Culture Administrator	Phoenix	\$ 103,293	\$ 11,730	\$ 18,779	9,916	28,695	\$ 143,717	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 100,980	\$ 11,065	\$ 14,470	4,039	18,510	\$ 130,554		29%		23%
			Phx as % Mkt	102%	106%	130%	245%	155%	110%				
Executives	9	Aviation Director (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 153,369	\$ 11,730	\$ 27,882	14,723	42,606	\$ 207,704	35%		26%	
			Market	\$ 162,408	\$ 11,065	\$ 23,273	6,496	29,769	\$ 203,242		25%		20%
			Phx as % Mkt	94%	106%	120%	227%	143%	102%				
Executives	9	Chief Information Officer (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 138,944	\$ 11,730	\$ 25,260	13,339	38,599	\$ 189,272	36%		27%	
			Market	\$ 165,673	\$ 11,065	\$ 23,741	6,627	30,368	\$ 207,106		25%		20%
			Phx as % Mkt	84%	106%	106%	201%	127%	91%				
Executives	9	City Attorney (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 161,117	\$ 11,730	\$ 29,291	15,467	44,758	\$ 217,605	35%		26%	
			Market	\$ 178,275	\$ 11,065	\$ 25,547	7,131	32,678	\$ 222,018		25%		20%
			Phx as % Mkt	90%	106%	115%	217%	137%	98%				
Executives	9	City Auditor (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 132,236	\$ 11,730	\$ 24,041	12,695	36,735	\$ 180,701	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 126,886	\$ 11,065	\$ 18,183	5,075	23,258	\$ 161,209		27%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	104%	106%	132%	250%	158%	112%				
Executives	9	City Clerk (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 125,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 22,885	12,085	34,970	\$ 172,582	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 112,274	\$ 11,065	\$ 16,089	4,491	20,580	\$ 143,919		28%		22%
			Phx as % Mkt	112%	106%	142%	269%	170%	120%				
Executives	9	City Librarian (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 125,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 22,885	12,085	34,970	\$ 172,582	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 122,245	\$ 11,065	\$ 17,518	4,890	22,408	\$ 155,717		27%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	103%	106%	131%	247%	156%	111%				
Executives	9	Development Services Director (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 132,236	\$ 11,730	\$ 24,041	12,695	36,735	\$ 180,701	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 126,720	\$ 11,065	\$ 18,159	5,069	23,228	\$ 161,013		27%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	104%	106%	132%	250%	158%	112%				
Executives	9	Environmental Programs Manager	Phoenix	\$ 103,293	\$ 11,730	\$ 18,779	9,916	28,695	\$ 143,717	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 95,830	\$ 11,065	\$ 13,732	3,833	17,566	\$ 124,460		30%		23%
			Phx as % Mkt	108%	106%	137%	259%	163%	115%				
Executives	9	Finance Director (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 138,944	\$ 11,730	\$ 25,260	13,339	38,599	\$ 189,272	36%		27%	
			Market	\$ 147,331	\$ 11,065	\$ 21,113	5,893	27,006	\$ 185,402		26%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	94%	106%	120%	226%	143%	102%				
Executives	9	Human Resources Director (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 132,236	\$ 11,730	\$ 24,041	12,695	36,735	\$ 180,701	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 138,931	\$ 11,065	\$ 19,909	5,557	25,466	\$ 175,462		26%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	95%	106%	121%	228%	144%	103%				
Executives	9	Parks & Recreation Director (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 145,964	\$ 11,730	\$ 26,536	14,013	40,549	\$ 198,242	36%		26%	
			Market	\$ 140,468	\$ 11,065	\$ 20,129	5,619	25,748	\$ 177,281		26%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	104%	106%	132%	249%	157%	112%				
Executives	9	Public Information Director (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 119,839	\$ 11,730	\$ 21,787	11,505	33,291	\$ 164,860	38%		27%	
			Market	\$ 114,102	\$ 11,065	\$ 16,351	4,564	20,915	\$ 146,082		28%		22%
			Phx as % Mkt	105%	106%	133%	252%	159%	113%				
Executives	9	Water Services Director (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 145,964	\$ 11,730	\$ 26,536	14,013	40,549	\$ 198,242	36%		26%	
			Market	\$ 147,115	\$ 11,065	\$ 21,082	5,885	26,966	\$ 185,146		26%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	99%	106%	126%	238%	150%	107%				
Facilities	2	Building Equipment Operator I	Phoenix	\$ 53,737	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,769	376	10,146	\$ 75,612	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 45,536	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,525	1,821	8,347	\$ 64,948		43%		30%
			Phx as % Mkt	118%	106%	150%	21%	122%	116%				
Facilities	7	Building Maintenance Foreman	Phoenix	\$ 55,048	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,008	3,303	13,311	\$ 80,088	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 52,324	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,498	2,093	9,591	\$ 72,980		39%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	105%	106%	133%	158%	139%	110%				
Facilities	1	Building Maintenance Worker	Phoenix	\$ 50,014	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,093	225	9,318	\$ 71,061	42%		30%	
			Market	\$ 41,271	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,914	1,651	7,565	\$ 59,901		45%		31%
			Phx as % Mkt	121%	106%	154%	14%	123%	119%				
Facilities	2	Electrician	Phoenix	\$ 53,737	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,769	376	10,146	\$ 75,612	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 52,474	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,520	2,099	9,618	\$ 73,157		39%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	102%	106%	130%	18%	105%	103%				
Facilities	2	Electronic Systems Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 61,090	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,106	428	11,534	\$ 84,353	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 49,243	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,057	1,970	9,026	\$ 69,334		41%		29%
			Phx as % Mkt	124%	106%	157%	22%	128%	122%				
Facilities	1	Welder	Phoenix	\$ 54,330	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,877	244	10,122	\$ 76,181	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 47,336	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,783	1,893	8,677	\$ 67,078		42%		29%
			Phx as % Mkt	115%	106%	146%	13%	117%	114%				

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage

\*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare

Doc#: 5170351v2

01/18/2012

**B10A - City of Phoenix**  
**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
**(Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)**

Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits					Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
				Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Fiscal	3	Account Clerk III	Phoenix	\$ 41,257	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,501	-	7,501	\$ 60,487	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 40,019	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,735	1,601	7,335	\$ 58,419	46%		31%	
			Phx as % Mkt	103%	106%	131%	0%	102%	104%				
Fiscal	7	Accountant II	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 55,901	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,011	2,236	10,247	\$ 77,212	38%		28%	
			Phx as % Mkt	109%	106%	138%	163%	144%	113%				
Fiscal	7	Accountant IV	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 69,942	\$ 11,065	\$ 10,023	2,798	12,820	\$ 93,827	34%		25%	
			Phx as % Mkt	106%	106%	135%	159%	140%	111%				
Fiscal	7	Budget Analyst II	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 63,820	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,145	2,553	11,698	\$ 86,583	36%		26%	
			Phx as % Mkt	105%	106%	133%	158%	139%	110%				
Fiscal	7	Claims Adjuster II	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 57,916	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,299	2,317	10,616	\$ 79,597	37%		27%	
			Phx as % Mkt	105%	106%	133%	158%	139%	110%				
Fiscal	7	Senior Tax Auditor	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 63,321	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,074	2,533	11,607	\$ 85,993	36%		26%	
			Phx as % Mkt	96%	106%	122%	144%	127%	102%				
Fiscal	3	Treasury Collections Representative	Phoenix	\$ 47,508	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,637	-	8,637	\$ 67,875	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 43,834	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,281	1,753	8,035	\$ 62,934	44%		30%	
			Phx as % Mkt	108%	106%	138%	0%	107%	108%				
Fleet	2	Auto Parts Clerk II	Phoenix	\$ 39,323	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,149	275	7,424	\$ 58,477	49%		33%	
			Market	\$ 39,275	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,628	1,571	7,199	\$ 57,539	47%		32%	
			Phx as % Mkt	100%	106%	127%	18%	103%	102%				
Fleet	2	Auto Technician	Phoenix	\$ 45,573	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,285	319	8,604	\$ 65,907	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 46,855	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,714	1,874	8,589	\$ 66,508	42%		30%	
			Phx as % Mkt	97%	106%	123%	17%	100%	100%				
Fleet	7	Equipment Maintenance Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 64,904	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,301	2,596	11,897	\$ 87,866	35%		26%	
			Phx as % Mkt	103%	106%	131%	155%	136%	108%				
Fleet	2	Equipment Service Worker II	Phoenix	\$ 36,369	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,612	255	6,866	\$ 54,965	51%		34%	
			Market	\$ 38,722	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,549	1,549	7,098	\$ 56,885	47%		32%	
			Phx as % Mkt	94%	106%	119%	16%	97%	97%				
Fleet	2	Heavy Equipment Mechanic	Phoenix	\$ 53,737	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,769	376	10,146	\$ 75,612	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 51,971	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,447	2,079	9,526	\$ 72,562	40%		28%	
			Phx as % Mkt	103%	106%	131%	18%	107%	104%				
Food Services	3	Cook	Phoenix	\$ 35,849	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,517	-	6,517	\$ 54,096	51%		34%	
			Market	\$ 28,854	\$ 11,065	\$ 4,135	1,154	5,289	\$ 45,208	57%		36%	
			Phx as % Mkt	124%	106%	158%	0%	123%	120%				
Human Resources	7	Curriculum/Training Coordinator	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 61,445	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,805	2,458	11,263	\$ 83,773	36%		27%	
			Phx as % Mkt	99%	106%	126%	149%	131%	104%				
Human Resources	7	Equal Opportunity Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 62,016	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,887	2,481	11,368	\$ 84,448	36%		27%	
			Phx as % Mkt	108%	106%	137%	162%	143%	113%				
Human Resources	7	Human Resources Analyst II	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 64,452	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,236	2,578	11,814	\$ 87,331	35%		26%	
			Phx as % Mkt	94%	106%	120%	142%	125%	100%				
Human Resources	8	Human Resources Clerk II	Phoenix	\$ 37,908	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,892	227	7,119	\$ 56,757	50%		33%	
			Market	\$ 44,105	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,320	1,764	8,084	\$ 63,254	43%		30%	
			Phx as % Mkt	86%	106%	109%	13%	88%	90%				
Human Resources	7	Human Resources Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 78,042	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,188	4,683	18,871	\$ 108,642	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 79,927	\$ 11,065	\$ 11,454	3,197	14,651	\$ 105,642	32%		24%	
			Phx as % Mkt	98%	106%	124%	146%	129%	103%				
Information Technology	7	Information Technology Analyst/Programmer III	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 77,938	\$ 11,065	\$ 11,169	3,118	14,286	\$ 103,289	33%		25%	
			Phx as % Mkt	105%	106%	134%	158%	139%	110%				
Information Technology	7	Information Technology Project Manager	Phoenix	\$ 90,740	\$ 11,730	\$ 16,497	5,444	21,941	\$ 124,410	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 87,971	\$ 11,065	\$ 12,606	3,519	16,125	\$ 115,161	31%		24%	
			Phx as % Mkt	103%	106%	131%	155%	136%	108%				
Information Technology	7	Senior Business Systems Analyst	Phoenix	\$ 70,627	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,840	4,238	17,078	\$ 99,434	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 71,542	\$ 11,065	\$ 10,252	2,862	13,114	\$ 95,720	34%		25%	
			Phx as % Mkt	99%	106%	125%	148%	130%	104%				
Information Technology	7	Senior GIS Technician	Phoenix	\$ 57,772	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,503	3,466	13,969	\$ 83,471	44%		31%	
			Market	\$ 59,547	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,533	2,382	10,915	\$ 81,527	37%		27%	
			Phx as % Mkt	97%	106%	123%	146%	128%	102%				

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage

\*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare

**B10A - City of Phoenix**  
**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
**(Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)**

Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits					Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
				Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Information Technology	7	Senior Information Technology Systems Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 86,310	\$ 11,730	\$ 15,691	5,179	20,870	\$ 118,909	38%		27%	
			Market	\$ 86,494	\$ 11,065	\$ 12,395	3,460	15,854	\$ 113,413		31%		24%
			Phx as % Mkt		100%	106%	127%	150%	132%				
Information Technology	3	User Support Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 52,333	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,514	-	9,514	\$ 73,577	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 48,708	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,980	1,948	8,928	\$ 68,701		41%		29%
			Phx as % Mkt		107%	106%	136%	0%	107%				
Information Technology	7	User Technology Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 56,737	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,130	2,269	10,400	\$ 78,202			38%	27%
			Phx as % Mkt		118%	106%	150%	178%	156%				
Inspections	2	Senior Construction Inspector	Phoenix	\$ 58,989	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,724	413	11,137	\$ 81,856	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 57,530	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,244	2,301	10,545	\$ 79,140			38%	27%
			Phx as % Mkt		103%	106%	130%	18%	106%				
Inspections	3	Structural Inspector II	Phoenix	\$ 60,424	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,985	-	10,985	\$ 83,139	38%		27%	
			Market	\$ 59,908	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,585	2,396	10,981	\$ 81,954			37%	27%
			Phx as % Mkt		101%	106%	128%	0%	100%				
Legal	7	Assistant City Attorney II (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 89,734	\$ 11,065	\$ 12,859	3,589	16,448	\$ 117,247			31%	23%
			Phx as % Mkt		91%	106%	116%	137%	121%				
Legal	3	Legal Secretary	Phoenix	\$ 45,334	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,242	-	8,242	\$ 65,305	44%		31%	
			Market	\$ 44,456	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,371	1,778	8,149	\$ 63,670			43%	30%
			Phx as % Mkt		102%	106%	129%	0%	101%				
Library	7	Librarian II	Phoenix	\$ 57,772	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,503	3,466	13,969	\$ 83,471	44%		31%	
			Market	\$ 55,680	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,979	2,227	10,206	\$ 76,951			38%	28%
			Phx as % Mkt		104%	106%	132%	156%	137%				
Library	7	Librarian IV	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 69,303	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,931	2,772	12,703	\$ 93,071			34%	26%
			Phx as % Mkt		107%	106%	136%	161%	141%				
Library	7	Library Assistant	Phoenix	\$ 42,890	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,797	2,573	10,371	\$ 64,990	52%		34%	
			Market	\$ 40,173	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,757	1,607	7,364	\$ 58,602			46%	31%
			Phx as % Mkt		107%	106%	135%	160%	141%				
Library	3	Library Circulation Attendant II	Phoenix	\$ 32,532	\$ 11,730	\$ 5,914	-	5,914	\$ 50,176	54%		35%	
			Market	\$ 34,070	\$ 11,065	\$ 4,882	1,363	6,245	\$ 51,380			51%	34%
			Phx as % Mkt		95%	106%	121%	0%	95%				
Middle Managers	9	Assistant City Attorney III (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 98,145	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,843	9,422	27,265	\$ 137,139	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 100,721	\$ 11,065	\$ 14,433	4,029	18,462	\$ 130,248			29%	23%
			Phx as % Mkt		97%	106%	124%	234%	148%				
Middle Managers	9	Deputy Chief Information Officer	Phoenix	\$ 103,075	\$ 11,730	\$ 18,739	9,895	28,634	\$ 143,439	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 101,548	\$ 11,065	\$ 14,552	4,062	18,614	\$ 131,227			29%	23%
			Phx as % Mkt		102%	106%	129%	244%	154%				
Middle Managers	9	Deputy City Clerk	Phoenix	\$ 93,424	\$ 11,730	\$ 16,984	8,969	25,953	\$ 131,107	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 73,056	\$ 11,065	\$ 10,469	2,922	13,391	\$ 97,512			33%	25%
			Phx as % Mkt		128%	106%	162%	307%	194%				
Middle Managers	9	Deputy Development Services Director	Phoenix	\$ 98,145	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,843	9,422	27,265	\$ 137,139	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 99,069	\$ 11,065	\$ 14,197	3,963	18,159	\$ 128,293			29%	23%
			Phx as % Mkt		99%	106%	126%	238%	150%				
Middle Managers	9	Deputy Finance Director	Phoenix	\$ 98,145	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,843	9,422	27,265	\$ 137,139	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 103,950	\$ 11,065	\$ 14,896	4,158	19,054	\$ 134,069			29%	22%
			Phx as % Mkt		94%	106%	120%	227%	143%				
Middle Managers	9	Deputy Human Resources Director	Phoenix	\$ 98,145	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,843	9,422	27,265	\$ 137,139	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 102,616	\$ 11,065	\$ 14,705	4,105	18,810	\$ 132,490			29%	23%
			Phx as % Mkt		96%	106%	121%	230%	145%				
Middle Managers	9	Deputy Parks & Recreation Director	Phoenix	\$ 98,145	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,843	9,422	27,265	\$ 137,139	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 98,514	\$ 11,065	\$ 14,117	3,941	18,058	\$ 127,636			30%	23%
			Phx as % Mkt		100%	106%	126%	238%	151%				
Middle Managers	9	Deputy Public Works Director	Phoenix	\$ 98,145	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,843	9,422	27,265	\$ 137,139	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 110,515	\$ 11,065	\$ 15,837	4,421	20,257	\$ 141,837			28%	22%
			Phx as % Mkt		89%	106%	113%	213%	135%				
Middle Managers	9	Deputy Water Services Director	Phoenix	\$ 98,145	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,843	9,422	27,265	\$ 137,139	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 95,313	\$ 11,065	\$ 13,658	3,813	17,471	\$ 123,849			30%	23%
			Phx as % Mkt		103%	106%	131%	247%	156%				
Middle Managers	9	Municipal Court Administrator	Phoenix	\$ 93,424	\$ 11,730	\$ 16,984	8,969	25,953	\$ 131,107	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 96,940	\$ 11,065	\$ 13,892	3,878	17,769	\$ 125,774			30%	23%
			Phx as % Mkt		96%	106%	122%	231%	146%				
Middle Managers	9	Solid Waste Administrator	Phoenix	\$ 80,746	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,680	7,752	22,431	\$ 114,907	42%		30%	
			Market	\$ 89,459	\$ 11,065	\$ 12,819	3,578	16,398	\$ 116,922			31%	23%
			Phx as % Mkt		90%	106%	115%	217%	137%				

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage

\*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare

Doc#: 5170351v2

01/18/2012

**B10A - City of Phoenix**  
**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
**(Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)**

Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits					Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
				Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Neighborhood Services	7	Housing Program Assistant	Phoenix	\$ 42,890	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,797	2,573	10,371	\$ 64,990	52%		34%	
			Market	\$ 43,119	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,179	1,725	7,904	\$ 62,088		44%		31%
			Phx as % Mkt		99%	106%	126%	149%	131%		105%		
Parks & Recreation	1	Groundskeeper	Phoenix	\$ 30,940	\$ 11,730	\$ 5,625	139	5,764	\$ 48,434	57%		36%	
			Market	\$ 31,060	\$ 11,065	\$ 4,451	1,242	5,693	\$ 47,818		54%		35%
			Phx as % Mkt		100%	106%	126%	11%	101%		101%		
Parks & Recreation	7	Park Ranger II	Phoenix	\$ 42,890	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,797	2,573	10,371	\$ 64,990	52%		34%	
			Market	\$ 39,120	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,606	1,565	7,171	\$ 57,356		47%		32%
			Phx as % Mkt		110%	106%	139%	164%	145%		113%		
Parks & Recreation	7	Recreation Coordinator II	Phoenix	\$ 52,395	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,525	3,144	12,669	\$ 76,794	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 49,589	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,106	1,984	9,090	\$ 69,743		41%		29%
			Phx as % Mkt		106%	106%	134%	158%	139%		110%		
Planning & Development	7	Planner II	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 61,451	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,806	2,458	11,264	\$ 83,780		36%		27%
			Phx as % Mkt		109%	106%	139%	164%	144%		114%		
Planning & Development	7	Principal Planner	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 83,405	\$ 11,065	\$ 11,952	3,336	15,288	\$ 109,758		32%		24%
			Phx as % Mkt		98%	106%	125%	148%	130%		103%		
Planning & Development	3	Structural Plans Examiner II	Phoenix	\$ 66,404	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,072	-	12,072	\$ 90,206	36%		26%	
			Market	\$ 63,094	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,041	2,524	11,565	\$ 85,724		36%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt		105%	106%	134%	0%	104%		105%		
Printing	3	Offset Press Operator	Phoenix	\$ 39,239	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,134	-	7,134	\$ 58,102	48%		32%	
			Market	\$ 37,618	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,391	1,505	6,895	\$ 55,578		48%		32%
			Phx as % Mkt		104%	106%	132%	0%	103%		105%		
Procurement	7	Contracts Specialist II	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 69,338	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,936	2,774	12,710	\$ 93,112		34%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt		97%	106%	123%	145%	128%		102%		
Procurement	1	Supplies Clerk II	Phoenix	\$ 39,603	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,200	178	7,378	\$ 58,711	48%		33%	
			Market	\$ 36,143	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,179	1,446	6,625	\$ 53,833		49%		33%
			Phx as % Mkt		110%	106%	139%	12%	111%		109%		
Procurement	7	Supplies Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 63,929	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,622	3,836	15,458	\$ 91,117	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 57,088	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,181	2,284	10,464	\$ 78,617		38%		27%
			Phx as % Mkt		112%	106%	142%	168%	148%		116%		
Public Information/Relations	7	Multimedia Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 57,772	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,503	3,466	13,969	\$ 83,471	44%		31%	
			Market	\$ 53,561	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,675	2,142	9,818	\$ 74,444		39%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt		108%	106%	137%	162%	142%		112%		
Public Information/Relations	7	Public Information Officer	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 67,229	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,634	2,689	12,323	\$ 90,617		35%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt		100%	106%	127%	150%	132%		105%		
Public Safety	7	Criminal Intelligence Analyst	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 55,065	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,891	2,203	10,093	\$ 76,223		38%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt		111%	106%	140%	166%	146%		115%		
Public Safety	7	Crime Scene Section Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 74,387	\$ 11,065	\$ 10,660	2,975	13,635	\$ 99,087		33%		25%
			Phx as % Mkt		110%	106%	140%	165%	145%		115%		
Public Safety	3	Crime Scene Specialist II	Phoenix	\$ 47,508	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,637	-	8,637	\$ 67,875	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 48,558	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,958	1,942	8,901	\$ 68,524		41%		29%
			Phx as % Mkt		98%	106%	124%	0%	97%		99%		
Public Safety	3	Fire Prevention Specialist II	Phoenix	\$ 60,424	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,985	-	10,985	\$ 83,139	38%		27%	
			Market	\$ 57,771	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,279	2,311	10,589	\$ 79,425		37%		27%
			Phx as % Mkt		105%	106%	133%	0%	104%		105%		
Public Safety	7	Fire Protection Engineer	Phoenix	\$ 78,042	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,188	4,683	18,871	\$ 108,642	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 64,727	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,275	2,589	11,864	\$ 87,656		35%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt		121%	106%	153%	181%	159%		124%		
Public Safety	7	Forensic Science Section Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 86,310	\$ 11,730	\$ 15,691	5,179	20,870	\$ 118,909	38%		27%	
			Market	\$ 84,011	\$ 11,065	\$ 12,039	3,360	15,399	\$ 110,475		32%		24%
			Phx as % Mkt		103%	106%	130%	154%	136%		108%		
Public Safety	7	Forensic Scientist II	Phoenix	\$ 57,772	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,503	3,466	13,969	\$ 83,471	44%		31%	
			Market	\$ 54,103	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,753	2,164	9,917	\$ 75,085		39%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt		107%	106%	135%	160%	141%		111%		
Public Safety	3	Municipal Security Guard	Phoenix	\$ 37,544	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,825	-	6,825	\$ 56,099	49%		33%	
			Market	\$ 34,574	\$ 11,065	\$ 4,954	1,383	6,337	\$ 51,976		50%		33%
			Phx as % Mkt		109%	106%	138%	0%	108%		108%		
Public Safety	3	Police Assistant	Phoenix	\$ 41,257	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,501	-	7,501	\$ 60,487	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 41,533	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,952	1,661	7,613	\$ 60,211		45%		31%
			Phx as % Mkt		99%	106%	126%	0%	99%		100%		

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage

\*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare

Doc#: 5170351v2

01/18/2012

**B10A - City of Phoenix**  
**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
 (Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)

Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits					Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
				Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Public Safety	3	Police Communications Operator	Phoenix	\$ 47,508	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,637	-	8,637	\$ 67,875	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 45,536	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,525	1,821	8,347	\$ 64,948	43%		30%	
			Phx as % Mkt	104%	106%	132%	0%	103%	105%				
Public Safety	3	Police Records Clerk	Phoenix	\$ 35,849	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,517	-	6,517	\$ 54,096	51%		34%	
			Market	\$ 37,921	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,434	1,517	6,951	\$ 55,937	48%		32%	
			Phx as % Mkt	95%	106%	120%	0%	94%	97%				
Public Safety	7	Polygraph Examiner	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 66,450	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,522	2,658	12,180	\$ 89,695	35%		26%	
			Phx as % Mkt	112%	106%	142%	168%	147%	116%				
Public Works	1	Equipment Operator III	Phoenix	\$ 42,630	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,750	192	7,942	\$ 62,302	46%		32%	
			Market	\$ 43,747	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,269	1,750	8,019	\$ 62,831	44%		30%	
			Phx as % Mkt	97%	106%	124%	11%	99%	99%				
Public Works	3	Solid Waste Environ Spec.	Phoenix	\$ 47,508	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,637	-	8,637	\$ 67,875	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 40,938	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,866	1,638	7,504	\$ 59,507	45%		31%	
			Phx as % Mkt	116%	106%	147%	0%	115%	114%				
Public Works	1	Solid Waste Equipment Operator	Phoenix	\$ 41,278	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,504	186	7,690	\$ 60,698	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 40,843	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,853	1,634	7,487	\$ 59,394	45%		31%	
			Phx as % Mkt	101%	106%	128%	11%	103%	102%				
Public Works	7	Solid Waste Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 55,048	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,008	3,303	13,311	\$ 80,088	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 60,082	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,610	2,403	11,013	\$ 82,160	37%		27%	
			Phx as % Mkt	92%	106%	116%	137%	121%	97%				
Social Services	7	Caseworker II	Phoenix	\$ 47,362	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,610	2,842	11,452	\$ 70,544	49%		33%	
			Market	\$ 49,939	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,156	1,998	9,154	\$ 70,158	40%		29%	
			Phx as % Mkt	95%	106%	120%	142%	125%	101%				
Social Services	7	Headstart Educator	Phoenix	\$ 47,508	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,637	2,850	11,487	\$ 70,725	49%		33%	
			Market	\$ 40,938	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,866	1,638	7,504	\$ 59,507	45%		31%	
			Phx as % Mkt	116%	106%	147%	174%	153%	119%				
Social Services	7	Human Services Program Coordinator	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 79,915	\$ 11,065	\$ 11,452	3,197	14,648	\$ 105,628	32%		24%	
			Phx as % Mkt	93%	106%	118%	139%	123%	98%				
Social Services	3	Senior Center Assistant	Phoenix	\$ 35,849	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,517	-	6,517	\$ 54,096	51%		34%	
			Market	\$ 32,135	\$ 11,065	\$ 4,605	1,285	5,890	\$ 49,090	53%		35%	
			Phx as % Mkt	112%	106%	142%	0%	111%	110%				
Street Transportation	1	Cement Finisher	Phoenix	\$ 42,630	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,750	192	7,942	\$ 62,302	46%		32%	
			Market	\$ 45,232	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,482	1,809	8,291	\$ 64,588	43%		30%	
			Phx as % Mkt	94%	106%	120%	11%	96%	96%				
Street Transportation	2	Instrument Technician	Phoenix	\$ 40,789	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,415	286	7,701	\$ 60,220	48%		32%	
			Market	\$ 41,753	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,983	1,670	7,653	\$ 60,471	45%		31%	
			Phx as % Mkt	98%	106%	124%	17%	101%	100%				
Street Transportation	1	Sign Specialist II	Phoenix	\$ 39,603	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,200	178	7,378	\$ 58,711	48%		33%	
			Market	\$ 39,561	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,669	1,582	7,252	\$ 57,877	46%		32%	
			Phx as % Mkt	100%	106%	127%	11%	102%	101%				
Street Transportation	7	Street Maintenance Foreman II	Phoenix	\$ 45,001	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,181	2,700	10,881	\$ 67,612	50%		33%	
			Market	\$ 47,182	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,761	1,887	8,648	\$ 66,895	42%		29%	
			Phx as % Mkt	95%	106%	121%	143%	126%	101%				
Street Transportation	7	Street Maintenance Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 61,096	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,755	2,444	11,199	\$ 83,360	36%		27%	
			Phx as % Mkt	100%	106%	126%	149%	131%	105%				
Street Transportation	1	Street Maintenance Worker II	Phoenix	\$ 37,752	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,863	170	7,033	\$ 56,515	50%		33%	
			Market	\$ 39,584	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,672	1,583	7,256	\$ 57,905	46%		32%	
			Phx as % Mkt	95%	106%	121%	11%	97%	98%				
Street Transportation	7	Traffic Maintenance Foreman II	Phoenix	\$ 45,001	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,181	2,700	10,881	\$ 67,612	50%		33%	
			Market	\$ 47,441	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,798	1,898	8,696	\$ 67,202	42%		29%	
			Phx as % Mkt	95%	106%	120%	142%	125%	101%				
Street Transportation	2	Traffic Signal Technician	Phoenix	\$ 53,737	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,769	376	10,146	\$ 75,612	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 50,524	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,240	2,021	9,261	\$ 70,850	40%		29%	
			Phx as % Mkt	106%	106%	135%	19%	110%	107%				
Water	7	Chemist II	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 62,501	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,956	2,500	11,456	\$ 85,022	36%		26%	
			Phx as % Mkt	107%	106%	136%	161%	142%	112%				
Water	7	Chief Water Quality Inspector	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 65,018	\$ 11,065	\$ 9,317	2,601	11,918	\$ 88,001	35%		26%	
			Phx as % Mkt	103%	106%	131%	155%	136%	108%				
Water	2	Instrumentation & Cont Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 53,737	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,769	376	10,146	\$ 75,612	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 54,647	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,831	2,186	10,017	\$ 75,729	39%		28%	
			Phx as % Mkt	98%	106%	125%	17%	101%	100%				

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage

\*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare

**B10A - City of Phoenix**  
**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
**(Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)**

Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Base Salary	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits				Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
				Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Water	3	Laboratory Technician	Phoenix	\$ 41,257	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,501	-	7,501	\$ 60,487	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 43,417	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,222	1,737	7,958	\$ 62,440		44%		30%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>		<b>95%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>121%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>94%</b>				
Water	7	Ops & Maintenance Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 57,772	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,503	3,466	13,969	\$ 83,471	44%		31%	
			Market	\$ 57,777	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,279	2,311	10,591	\$ 79,432		37%		27%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>		<b>100%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>127%</b>	<b>150%</b>	<b>132%</b>				
Water	2	Ops & Maintenance Technician	Phoenix	\$ 48,173	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,758	337	9,095	\$ 68,998	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 49,556	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,101	1,982	9,084	\$ 69,704		41%		29%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>		<b>97%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>123%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>100%</b>				
Water	3	Utilities Service Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 39,239	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,134	-	7,134	\$ 58,102	48%		32%	
			Market	\$ 38,867	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,570	1,555	7,124	\$ 57,056		47%		32%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>		<b>101%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>128%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>				
Water	7	Utility Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 55,048	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,008	3,303	13,311	\$ 80,088	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 55,836	\$ 11,065	\$ 8,001	2,233	10,235	\$ 77,136		38%		28%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>		<b>99%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>125%</b>	<b>148%</b>	<b>130%</b>				
Water	2	Utility Technician	Phoenix	\$ 37,804	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,873	265	7,137	\$ 56,671	50%		33%	
			Market	\$ 39,189	\$ 11,065	\$ 5,616	1,568	7,183	\$ 57,437		47%		32%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>		<b>96%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>122%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>99%</b>				
Water	7	Water Customer Services Supervisor I	Phoenix	\$ 52,395	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,525	3,144	12,669	\$ 76,794	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 50,539	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,242	2,022	9,264	\$ 70,868		40%		29%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>		<b>104%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>132%</b>	<b>156%</b>	<b>137%</b>				
Water	2	Water Services Technician	Phoenix	\$ 39,323	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,149	275	7,424	\$ 58,477	49%		33%	
			Market	\$ 41,870	\$ 11,065	\$ 6,000	1,675	7,675	\$ 60,610		45%		31%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>		<b>94%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>119%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>97%</b>				
Water	3	Water Systems Operator	Phoenix	\$ 49,796	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,053	-	9,053	\$ 70,578	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 49,485	\$ 11,065	\$ 7,091	1,979	9,071	\$ 69,620		41%		29%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>		<b>101%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>128%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>				
<b>Average</b>				<b>101%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>129%</b>	<b>145%</b>	<b>132%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>27%</b>

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage

\*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare

**B10B - City of Phoenix**  
**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - Sworn Public Safety**  
**(Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)**

Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Base Salary	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits				Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
				Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Executives	9	Fire Chief (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 160,769	\$ 11,730	\$ 41,414	15,434	56,848	\$ 229,346	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 146,376	\$ 11,065	\$ 32,817	5,855	38,673	\$ 196,113		34%		25%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>	<b>110%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>126%</b>	<b>264%</b>	<b>147%</b>	<b>117%</b>				
Executives	9	Police Chief (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 168,897	\$ 11,730	\$ 43,288	16,214	59,502	\$ 240,129	42%		30%	
			Market	\$ 161,183	\$ 11,065	\$ 38,055	6,447	44,503	\$ 216,750		34%		26%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>	<b>105%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>114%</b>	<b>251%</b>	<b>134%</b>	<b>111%</b>				
Middle Managers	9	Fire Battalion Chief	Phoenix	\$ 95,141	\$ 11,730	\$ 24,508	9,134	33,642	\$ 140,512	48%		32%	
			Market	\$ 83,668	\$ 11,065	\$ 18,758	3,347	22,105	\$ 116,838		40%		28%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>	<b>114%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>131%</b>	<b>273%</b>	<b>152%</b>	<b>120%</b>				
Middle Managers	9	Police Commander	Phoenix	\$ 116,441	\$ 11,730	\$ 29,844	11,178	41,022	\$ 169,193	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 111,349	\$ 11,065	\$ 26,289	4,454	30,743	\$ 153,157		38%		27%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>	<b>105%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>114%</b>	<b>251%</b>	<b>133%</b>	<b>110%</b>				
Public Safety	5	Fire Captain	Phoenix	\$ 75,525	\$ 11,730	\$ 19,455	3,776	23,231	\$ 110,486	46%		32%	
			Market	\$ 74,340	\$ 11,065	\$ 16,667	2,974	19,641	\$ 105,045		41%		29%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>	<b>102%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>117%</b>	<b>127%</b>	<b>118%</b>	<b>105%</b>				
Public Safety	5	Fire Engineer	Phoenix	\$ 68,330	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,602	3,417	21,018	\$ 101,078	48%		32%	
			Market	\$ 63,057	\$ 11,065	\$ 14,137	2,522	16,660	\$ 90,781		44%		31%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>	<b>108%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>125%</b>	<b>135%</b>	<b>126%</b>	<b>111%</b>				
Public Safety	5	Firefighter	Phoenix	\$ 55,726	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,355	2,786	17,141	\$ 84,597	52%		34%	
			Market	\$ 54,059	\$ 11,065	\$ 12,120	2,162	14,282	\$ 79,406		47%		32%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>	<b>103%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>118%</b>	<b>129%</b>	<b>120%</b>	<b>107%</b>				
Public Safety	6	Police Lieutenant	Phoenix	\$ 101,723	\$ 11,730	\$ 26,072	-	26,072	\$ 139,524	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 95,695	\$ 11,065	\$ 22,594	3,828	26,421	\$ 133,181		39%		28%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>	<b>106%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>115%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>105%</b>				
Public Safety	4	Police Officer	Phoenix	\$ 58,740	\$ 11,730	\$ 15,055	106	15,161	\$ 85,630	46%		31%	
			Market	\$ 59,584	\$ 11,065	\$ 14,068	2,383	16,451	\$ 87,100		46%		32%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>	<b>99%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>107%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>98%</b>				
Public Safety	6	Police Sergeant	Phoenix	\$ 84,864	\$ 11,730	\$ 21,751	-	21,751	\$ 118,344	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 79,730	\$ 11,065	\$ 18,824	3,189	22,013	\$ 112,808		41%		29%
			<i>Phx as % Mkt</i>	<b>106%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>116%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>105%</b>				
<b>Average</b>				<b>106%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>118%</b>	<b>167%</b>	<b>125%</b>	<b>110%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>29%</b>

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage

\*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare

**TABLE C-1  
TYPE OF PAID LEAVE PROGRAM**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	N/A	Traditional Accrual
City of Dallas, TX	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of Houston, TX	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	PTO	Traditional Accrual
City of Jacksonville, FL	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of Philadelphia, PA	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of San Diego, CA	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	PTO	PTO	PTO	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2.	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	PTO	PTO	PTO	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-1  
TYPE OF PAID LEAVE PROGRAM**

<b>Comparators</b>	<b>Executives</b>	<b>Managers</b>	<b>General Employees</b>	<b>Uniformed Police</b>	<b>Uniformed Fire/Rescue</b>
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of Flagstaff	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
Town of Gilbert	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of Glendale	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of Goodyear	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of Mesa	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of Peoria	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of Scottsdale	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of Surprise	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO
City of Tempe	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
City of Tucson	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual	Traditional Accrual
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	63% of workers have Traditional Accrual; 37% have PTO	63% of workers have Traditional Accrual; 37% have PTO	63% of workers have Traditional Accrual; 37% have PTO	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	48% of employers have PTO plans 84% of employers offer paid vacation separately from pooled leave (PTO)	48% of employers have PTO plans 84% of employers offer paid vacation separately from pooled leave (PTO)	48% of employers have PTO plans 84% of employers offer paid vacation separately from pooled leave (PTO)	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Traditional Accrual (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Traditional Accrual (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Traditional Accrual (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Traditional Accrual (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Traditional Accrual (Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-2  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE ACCRUAL**

Comparators	PTO/Vacation Accrual (Days/Year)				
	Years of Service				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
Custom – Public Sector	15	18	20	23	25
Custom – Private Sector	14	19	20	23	23
Local Public Sector	15	18	20	22	23
Published Data	18	22	23	25	26
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>24</i>

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>
------------------------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-------------

**TABLE C-3  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE ACCRUAL (DAYS/YEAR)**

Comparators	Years of Service				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 12 Police: N/A Fire: 12	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 15 Police: N/A Fire: 15	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 18 Police: N/A Fire: 18	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 21 Police: N/A Fire: 21	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 21 Police: N/A Fire: 21
City of Dallas, TX	Exec: 13 Mgr: 13 Gen Ee: 13 Police: 15 Fire: 15-23	Exec: 13 Mgr: 13 Gen Ee: 13 Police: 15 Fire: 15-23	Exec: 13 Mgr: 13 Gen Ee: 13 Police: 15 Fire: 15-23	Exec: 13 Mgr: 13 Gen Ee: 13 Police: 15 Fire: 15-23	Exec: 13 Mgr: 13 Gen Ee: 13 Police: 15 Fire: 15-23
City of Houston, TX	Exec: 10 Mgr: 10 Gen Ee: 10 Police: 10 Fire: 10	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15 Police: 15 Fire: 15	Exec: 18 Mgr: 18 Gen Ee: 18 Police: 18 Fire: 18	Exec: 22 Mgr: 22 Gen Ee: 22 Police: 22 Fire: 22	Exec: 25 Mgr: 25 Gen Ee: 25 Police: 25 Fire: 25
City of Jacksonville, FL	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 20 Fire: 20	Exec: 23 Mgr: 23 Gen Ee: 23 Police: 23 Fire: 23	Exec: 26 Mgr: 26 Gen Ee: 26 Police: 26 Fire: 26	Exec: 29 Mgr: 29 Gen Ee: 29 Police: 29 Fire: 29	Exec: 32 Mgr: 32 Gen Ee: 32 Police: 32 Fire: 32
City of Los Angeles, CA	Varies based on MOU				
City of Philadelphia, PA	Exec: 15 Mgr: 10 Gen Ee: 10-15 Police: 10-15 Fire: 12	Exec: 15 Mgr: 10 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 17 Fire: 18	Exec: 20 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 25 Police: 22 Fire: 24	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 25 Police: 22 Fire: 24	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 25 Police: 22 Fire: 24
City of San Diego, CA	Exec: 22 Mgr: 22 Gen Ee: 17 Police: 17 Fire: 7	Exec: 22 Mgr: 22 Gen Ee: 22 Police: 22 Fire: 10	Exec: 22 Mgr: 22 Gen Ee: 22 Police: 22 Fire: 10	Exec: 27 Mgr: 27 Gen Ee: 27 Police: 27 Fire: 12	Exec: 27 Mgr: 27 Gen Ee: 27 Police: 27 Fire: 12
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Exec: 10 Mgr: 10 Gen Ee: 10 Police: 10 Fire: 10	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15 Police: 15 Fire: 15	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15 Police: 15 Fire: 15	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 20 Fire: 20	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 20 Fire: 20

**TABLE C-3  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE ACCRUAL (DAYS/YEAR)**

Comparators	Years of Service				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses (continued)</b>					
<i>Market Average</i>	Exec: 16 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 14 Police: 14 Fire: 13	Exec: 18 Mgr: 17 Gen Ee: 18 Police: 18 Fire: 16	Exec: 19 Mgr: 19 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 20 Fire: 19	Exec: 22 Mgr: 22 Gen Ee: 22 Police: 23 Fire: 21	Exec: 23 Mgr: 23 Gen Ee: 23 Police: 24 Fire: 22
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	Exec: 18 Mgr: 18 Gen Ee: 18	Exec: 25 Mgr: 25 Gen Ee: 25	Exec: 25 Mgr: 25 Gen Ee: 25	Exec: 30 Mgr: 30 Gen Ee: 30	Exec: 30 Mgr: 30 Gen Ee: 30
Private Employer 2.	Exec: 10 Mgr: 10 Gen Ee: 10	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20
Private Employer 3	Exec: 12 Mgr: 12 Gen Ee: 12	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15	Exec: 18 Mgr: 18 Gen Ee: 18	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 21	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 21
Private Employer 4	Exec: 20 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20
Private Employer 5	Exec: 10 Mgr: 10 Gen Ee: 10	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20
Private Employer 6	Exec: 10 Mgr: 10 Gen Ee: 10	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20
Private Employer 7	Exec: 23.6 Mgr: 23.6 Gen Ee: 23.6	Exec: 25.9 Mgr: 25.9 Gen Ee: 25.9	Exec: 29.3 Mgr: 29.3 Gen Ee: 29.3	Exec: 31.5 Mgr: 31.5 Gen Ee: 31.5	Exec: 31.5 Mgr: 31.5 Gen Ee: 31.5
<i>Market Average</i>	Exec: 15 Mgr: 14 Gen Ee: 14	Exec: 19 Mgr: 19 Gen Ee: 19	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20	Exec: 23 Mgr: 23 Gen Ee: 23	Exec: 23 Mgr: 23 Gen Ee: 23

**TABLE C-3**  
**PTO/VACATION LEAVE ACCRUAL (DAYS/YEAR)**

Comparators	Years of Service				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Exec: 18-21 Mgr: 18-21 Gen Ee: 15-18 (ex), 12-14 (ne) Police: 13-15 Fire: 12-14	Exec: 21-24 Mgr: 21-24 Gen Ee: 18-21 (ex), 14-17 (ne) Police: 15-17 Fire: 14-17	Exec: 24-27 Mgr: 24-27 Gen Ee: 21-24 (ex), 17-19 (ne) Police: 17-20 Fire: 17-19	Exec: 27-30 Mgr: 27-30 Gen Ee: 24-27 (ex), 19-20 (ne) Police: 20-25 Fire: 19-20	Exec: 30 Mgr: 30 Gen Ee: 27 (ex), 20 (ne) Police: 25 Fire: N/A
City of Flagstaff	Exec: 16 Mgr: 16 Gen Ee: 11 Police: 11 Fire: 11	Exec: 18 Mgr: 18 Gen Ee: 13 Police: 13 Fire: 13	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 16 Police: 16 Fire: 16	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 18 Police: 18 Fire: 18	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 21 Police: 21 Fire: 21
Town of Gilbert	Exec: 10 Mgr: 10 Gen Ee: 10 Police: 10 Fire: 5.8	Exec: 12.5 Mgr: 12.5 Gen Ee: 12.5 Police: 12.5 Fire: 7.3	Exec: 14.4 Mgr: 14.4 Gen Ee: 14.4 Police: 14.4 Fire: 8.4	Exec: 16.3 Mgr: 16.3 Gen Ee: 16.3 Police: 16.3 Fire: 8.4	Exec: 17.7 Mgr: 17.7 Gen Ee: 17.7 Police: 17.7 Fire: 10.3
City of Glendale	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 12 Police: 12 Fire: 13	Exec: 18 Mgr: 18 Gen Ee: 15 Police: 15 Fire: 16	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 21 Police: 21 Fire: 23	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 21 Police: 21 Fire: 23	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 21 Police: 21 Fire: 23
City of Goodyear	Exec: 12-16 Mgr: 12-16 Gen Ee: 12-16 Police: 12-16 Fire: 17-22	Exec: 16-18 Mgr: 16-18 Gen Ee: 16-18 Police: 16-18 Fire: 22-25	Exec: 18-20 Mgr: 18-20 Gen Ee: 18-20 Police: 18-20 Fire: 25-28	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 20 Fire: 28	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 20 Fire: 28
City of Mesa	Exec: 12-16 Mgr: 12-16 Gen Ee: 12-18 Police: 12-18 Fire: 11-25	Exec: 16 Mgr: 16 Gen Ee: 18 Police: 18 Fire: 25	Exec: 16 Mgr: 16 Gen Ee: 18 Police: 18 Fire: 25	Exec: 16 Mgr: 16 Gen Ee: 18 Police: 18 Fire: 25	Exec: 16 Mgr: 16 Gen Ee: 18 Police: 18 Fire: 25
City of Peoria	Exec: 10 Mgr: 10 Gen Ee: 8 Police: 10 Fire: 9	Exec: 11.3 Mgr: 11.3 Gen Ee: 10.6 Police: 13 Fire: 10.2	Exec: 12.7 Mgr: 12.7 Gen Ee: 12 Police: 15 Fire: 13	Exec: 14 Mgr: 14 Gen Ee: 14 Police: 17 Fire: 17.7	Exec: 14.7 Mgr: 14.7 Gen Ee: 14.7 Police: 20 Fire: 21.7

**TABLE C-3**  
**PTO/VACATION LEAVE ACCRUAL (DAYS/YEAR)**

Comparators	Years of Service				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
<b>Local Public Sector Responses (continued)</b>					
City of Scottsdale	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15 Police: 15 Fire: 21	Exec: 16-20 Mgr: 16-20 Gen Ee: 16-20 Police: 16-20 Fire: 22-28	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 20 Fire: 28	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 20 Fire: 28	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 20 Fire: 28
City of Surprise	Exec: 21-26 Mgr: 21-26 Gen Ee: 21-26 Police: 21-26 Fire: 33-41	Exec: 27-31 Mgr: 27-31 Gen Ee: 27-31 Police: 27-31 Fire: 42-48	Exec: 31 Mgr: 31 Gen Ee: 31 Police: 31 Fire: 48	Exec: 31 Mgr: 31 Gen Ee: 31 Police: 31 Fire: 48	Exec: 31 Mgr: 31 Gen Ee: 31 Police: 31 Fire: 48
City of Tempe	Exec: 14-17 Mgr: 14-17 Gen Ee: 14-17 Police: 14-17 Fire: 17-20	Exec: 17-20 Mgr: 17-20 Gen Ee: 17-20 Police: 17-20 Fire: 20-24	Exec: 20-25 Mgr: 20-25 Gen Ee: 20-25 Police: 20-25 Fire: 24-30	Exec: 25-27 Mgr: 25-27 Gen Ee: 25-27 Police: 25 Fire: 30-32	Exec: 27 Mgr: 27 Gen Ee: 27 Police: 25 Fire: 32
City of Tucson	Exec: 13 Mgr: 13 Gen Ee: 13 Police: 13 Fire: 13	Exec: 13 Mgr: 13 Gen Ee: 13 Police: 15 Fire: 15	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15 Police: 19.5 Fire: 19.5	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 22.75 Fire: 22.75	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 20 Police: 26 Fire: 26
<i>Market Average</i>	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 14 Police: 14 Fire: 16	Exec: 18 Mgr: 18 Gen Ee: 17 Police: 17 Fire: 20	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 19 Police: 20 Fire: 23	Exec: 21 Mgr: 21 Gen Ee: 21 Police: 21 Fire: 25	Exec: 22 Mgr: 22 Gen Ee: 21 Police: 22 Fire: 26
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	12 (average)	17 (average)	20 (average)	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	18 - 23 (average)	26 (average)	26 (average)	N/A	N/A

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Exec: 12</b>	<b>Exec: 15</b>	<b>Exec: 16.5</b>	<b>Exec: 19.5</b>	<b>Exec: 22.5</b>
<b>Execs: 63</b>	<b>Mgr: 12</b>	<b>Mgr: 15</b>	<b>Mgr: 16.5</b>	<b>Mgr: 19.5</b>	<b>Mgr: 22.5</b>
<b>Mgrs: 317</b>	<b>Gen Ee: 12</b>	<b>Gen Ee: 15</b>	<b>Gen Ee: 16.5</b>	<b>Gen Ee: 19.5</b>	<b>Gen Ee: 22.5</b>
<b>GE: 9,423</b>	<b>Police: 12</b>	<b>Police: 15</b>	<b>Police: 16.5</b>	<b>Police: 19.5</b>	<b>Police: 22.5</b>
<b>Police: 3,096</b>	<b>Fire: 12</b>	<b>Fire: 15</b>	<b>Fire: 16.5</b>	<b>Fire: 19.5</b>	<b>Fire: 22.5</b>
<b>Fire: 1,082</b>					

**TABLE C-4  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>						
State of Arizona	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: N/A Fire: Yes	Exec: 40 Mgr: 40 Gen Ee: 30 Police: N/A Fire: 30	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: N/A Fire: Yes	Exec: Varies by agency Mgr: Varies by agency Gen Ee: Varies by agency Police: N/A Fire: Varies by agency	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: N/A Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: N/A Fire: Unlimited
City of Dallas, TX	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 2x annual accrual rate Mgr: 2x annual accrual rate Gen Ee: 2x annual accrual rate Police: 2x annual accrual rate Fire: 2x annual accrual rate	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
City of Houston, TX	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 360 Mgr: 360 Gen Ee: 360 Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 360 Mgr: 360 Gen Ee: 360 Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited

**TABLE C-4  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses (continued)</b>						
City of Jacksonville, FL	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 60 Mgr: 60 Gen Ee: 60 Police: 75 Fire: 120	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
City of Los Angeles, CA	Exec: info not provided Mgr: info not provided Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Information not provided	Exec: info not provided Mgr: info not provided Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: info not provided Mgr: info not provided Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: info not provided Mgr: info not provided Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: info not provided Mgr: info not provided Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
City of Philadelphia, PA	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of San Diego, CA	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 43.75 Mgr: 43.75 Gen Ee: 43.75 Police: 43.75 Fire: 43.75	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Information not provided	Information not provided

**TABLE C-4  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>						
Private Employer 1	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: 8 Mgr: 8 Gen Ee: 8	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited
Private Employer 2.	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited
Private Employer 3	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: 30 Mgr: 30 Gen Ee: 30	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited
Private Employer 4	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: 15 Mgr: 15 Gen Ee: 15	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A
Private Employer 5	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited
Private Employer 6	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A
Private Employer 7	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: 640 Mgr: 640 Gen Ee: 640	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited

**TABLE C-4  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>						
City of Chandler	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 30 Mgr: 30 Gen Ee: 30 Police: 30 Fire: 30	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
City of Flagstaff	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A
Town of Gilbert	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 35 Mgr: 35 Gen Ee: 35 Police: 35 Fire: 20.4	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 35 Mgr: 35 Gen Ee: 35 Police: 35 Fire: 20.4	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 35 Mgr: 35 Gen Ee: 35 Police: 35 Fire: 20.4
City of Glendale	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 45 Mgr: 45 Gen Ee: 44 or 33.8 Police: 45 Fire: 45	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Varies Mgr: Varies Gen Ee: Varies Police: Varies Fire: Varies	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 20 Mgr: 20 Gen Ee: 0 Police: 0 Fire: 0
City of Goodyear	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 40 Mgr: 40 Gen Ee: 40 Police: 40 Fire: 56	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited

**TABLE C-4  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Local Public Sector Responses (continued)</b>						
City of Mesa	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 30 Mgr: 30 Gen Ee: 30 Police: 30 Fire: 42	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
City of Peoria	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 32 Mgr: 32 Gen Ee: 32 Police: 34 Fire: 22.7	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 32 Mgr: 32 Gen Ee: 32 Police: 34 Fire: 22.7
City of Scottsdale	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 30-50 Mgr: 30-50 Gen Ee: 30-50 Police: 30-50 Fire: 42-70	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
City of Surprise	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 70 Mgr: 70 Gen Ee: 70 Police: 70 Fire: 105	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 70 Mgr: 70 Gen Ee: 70 Police: 70 Fire: 105	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 70 Mgr: 70 Gen Ee: 70 Police: 70 Fire: 105
City of Tempe	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 56 Mgr: 56 Gen Ee: 56 Police: 56 Fire: 56	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited

**TABLE C-4  
PTO/VACATION LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Vacation Time? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Local Public Sector Responses (continued)</b>						
City of Tucson	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 36 Mgr: 36 Gen Ee: 36 Police: 36 Fire: 36	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
<b>Published Data</b>						
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	<u>PTO</u> : 26% of employers do not allow carryover, 63% allow for limited carryover, and 11% allow for Unlimited carryover  <u>Vacation</u> : 40% of employers do not allow carryover, 53% allow for limited carryover, and 7% allow for Unlimited carryover	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>  <b>Execs: 63</b> <b>Mgrs: 317</b> <b>GE: 9,423</b> <b>Police: 3,096</b> <b>Fire: 1,082</b>	<b>Exec: Yes</b> <b>Mgr: Yes</b> <b>Gen Ee: Yes</b> <b>Police: Yes</b> <b>Fire: Yes</b>	<b>Exec: 24-45</b> <b>Mgr: 24-45</b> <b>Gen Ee: 24-45</b> <b>Police: 24-45</b> <b>Fire: 24-45</b>	<b>Exec: Yes</b> <b>Mgr: Yes</b> <b>Gen Ee: Yes</b> <b>Police: Yes</b> <b>Fire: Yes</b>	<b>Exec: 56.26</b> <b>Mgr: 56.25</b> <b>Gen Ee: 56.25</b> <b>Police: 56.25</b> <b>Fire: 56.25</b>	<b>Exec: Yes</b> <b>Mgr: Yes</b> <b>Gen Ee: Yes</b> <b>Police: Yes</b> <b>Fire: Yes</b>	<b>Exec: 56.26</b> <b>Mgr: 56.25</b> <b>Gen Ee: 56.25</b> <b>Police: 56.25</b> <b>Fire: 56.25</b>

**TABLE C-5**  
**SICK LEAVE ACCRUAL RATE (DAYS/YEAR)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	12	12	12	N/A	12
City of Dallas, TX	12	12	12	18 (op); 12 (non-op)	12
City of Houston, TX	8.25	8.25	8.25	8.25	8.25
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Varies based on MOU	Varies based on MOU	Varies based on MOU	Varies based on MOU	Varies based on MOU
City of Philadelphia, PA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of San Diego, CA	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO
City and County of San Francisco, CA	13	13	13	13	13
<i>Market Average</i>	11	11	11	13	11
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	PTO	PTO	PTO	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2.	10	10	6	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	10	10	10	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Non-exempt: 5	Non-exempt: 5	Non-exempt: 5	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	12	12	12	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Unlimited	10	10	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	PTO	PTO	PTO	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	9	9	9	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-5  
SICK LEAVE ACCRUAL RATE (DAYS/YEAR)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	12	12	12	12	12
City of Flagstaff	12	12	12	12	12
Town of Gilbert	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	5.7
City of Glendale	12	12	12	12	13
City of Goodyear	12	12	12	12	17
City of Mesa	12	12	12	12	17
City of Peoria	8	8	8	8	5.6
City of Scottsdale	12	12	12	12	17
City of Surprise	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO
City of Tempe	12	12	12	12	14
City of Tucson	13	13	13	13-20	13-20
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>13</i>
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	11 (average)	12 (average)	13 (average)	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	4-9 (average, dependent on length of service)	4-9 (average, dependent on length of service)	4-9 (average, dependent on length of service)	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>15 (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>15 (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>15 (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>15 (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>15 (Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-6  
SICK LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT COUNTS**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
Custom – Public Sector	Offered by 4 employers	90 Days to Unlimited	Offered by 2 employers	90 Days to Unlimited	Offered by 3 employers	90 Days to Unlimited
Custom – Private Sector	Offered by 3 employers	130 Days to Unlimited	Offered by 2 employers	Greater than 80 Days to Unlimited	Offered by 2 employers	90 Days to Unlimited
Local Public Sector	Offered by 10 employers	52 Days to Unlimited	Offered by 5 employers	60 Days to Unlimited	Offered by 7 employers	60 Days to Unlimited
Published Data	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	Offered 6 employers	91 Days to Unlimited	Offered by 3 employers	77 Days to Unlimited	Offered by 4 employers	66 Days to Unlimited

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Unlimited</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Amount Varies</b>
------------------------	------------	------------------	-----------	------------	------------	----------------------

**TABLE C-7  
SICK LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>						
State of Arizona	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: N/A Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: N/A Fire: Unlimited	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: N/A Fire: No	Exec: 0 Mgr: 0 Gen Ee: 0 Police: N/A Fire: 0	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: N/A Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: N/A Fire: Unlimited
City of Dallas, TX  <i>(Must have 20 years of service &amp; hired prior to 10/1/2003)</i>	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Information not provided	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 90 Mgr: 90 Gen Ee: 90 Police: 135 Fire: 135	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: 90 Mgr: 90 Gen Ee: 90 Police: 135 Fire: 135
City of Houston, TX	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Varies based on MOU	Varies based on MOU	Varies based on MOU	Varies based on MOU	Varies based on MOU	Varies based on MOU
City of Philadelphia, PA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of San Diego, CA	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 130 Mgr: 130 Gen Ee: 130 Police: 130 Fire: 130	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A

**TABLE C-7  
SICK LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>						
Private Employer 1	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: 0 Mgr: 0 Gen Ee: Unlimited	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: 0 Mgr: 0 Gen Ee: Amount over 80 for non-exempt	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: 0 Mgr: 0 Gen Ee: 0
Private Employer 3	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: 90 Mgr: 90 Gen Ee: 90	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited
Private Employer 4	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A
Private Employer 5	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: 90 Mgr: 90 Gen Ee: 90	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes	Exec: 90 Mgr: 90 Gen Ee: 90
Private Employer 6	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A
Private Employer 7	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO

**TABLE C-7  
SICK LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>						
City of Chandler	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	At retirement, 50% of sick leave would be placed into the employee's Retiree Health Savings Account
City of Flagstaff	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 130 Mgr: 130 Gen Ee: 130 Police: 130 Fire: 130	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 50% after 20 years of service Mgr: 50% after 20 years of service Gen Ee: 50% after 20 years of service Police: 50% after 20 years of service Fire: 50% after 20 years of service	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 50% Mgr: 50% Gen Ee: 50% Police: 50% Fire: 50%
Town of Gilbert	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 52 Mgr: 52 Gen Ee: 52 Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 30.8 Mgr: 30.8 Gen Ee: 30.8 Police: 30.8 Fire: 18	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 61.6 Mgr: 61.6 Gen Ee: 61.6 Police: 61.6 Fire: 18
City of Glendale	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	At retirement, 100% of sick leave would be placed into the employee's Retiree Health Savings Account

**TABLE C-7  
SICK LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Local Public Sector Responses (continued)</b>						
City of Goodyear	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 60 Mgr: 60 Gen Ee: 60 Police: 60 Fire: 60	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 60 Mgr: 60 Gen Ee: 60 Police: 60 Fire: 60
City of Mesa	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 130 Mgr: 130 Gen Ee: 130 Police: 130 Fire: 182	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
City of Peoria	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 96 Mgr: 96 Gen Ee: 96 Police: 144 Fire: 69	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: 86.7 Mgr: 86.7 Gen Ee: 86.7 Police: 86.7 Fire: 69
City of Scottsdale	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A
City of Surprise	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO	PTO

**TABLE C-7  
SICK LEAVE CARRY OVER AND CASH-OUT**

Comparator	Carry Over		Cash-Out at Non-Retirement Separation		Cash-Out at Retirement	
	Carry Over Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Carry Over (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)	Cash-Out Unused Sick Leave? (Y/N)	Maximum Days Employees Can Cash-Out (Days/Year)
<b>Local Public Sector Responses (continued)</b>						
City of Tempe	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
City of Tucson	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited	Exec: No Mgr: No Gen Ee: No Police: No Fire: No	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: Yes Mgr: Yes Gen Ee: Yes Police: Yes Fire: Yes	Exec: Unlimited Mgr: Unlimited Gen Ee: Unlimited Police: Unlimited Fire: Unlimited
<b>Published Data</b>						
Neither BLS nor Towers Watson contained data on this benefit detail.						

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Exec: Yes</b>	<b>Exec: Unlimited</b>	<b>Exec: No</b>	<b>Exec: N/A</b>	<b>Exec: Yes</b>	<b>Exec: Varies</b>
<b>Execs: 63</b>	<b>Mgr: Yes</b>	<b>Mgr: Unlimited</b>	<b>Mgr: No</b>	<b>Mgr: N/A</b>	<b>Mgr: Yes</b>	<b>Mgr: Varies</b>
<b>Mgrs: 317</b>	<b>Gen Ee: Yes</b>	<b>Gen Ee: Unlimited</b>	<b>Gen Ee: No</b>	<b>Gen Ee: N/A</b>	<b>Gen Ee: Yes</b>	<b>Gen Ee: Varies</b>
<b>GE: 9,423</b>	<b>Police: Yes</b>	<b>Police: Unlimited</b>	<b>Police: No</b>	<b>Police: N/A</b>	<b>Police: Yes</b>	<b>Police: Varies</b>
<b>Police: 3,096</b>	<b>Fire: Yes</b>	<b>Fire: Unlimited</b>	<b>Fire: No</b>	<b>Fire: N/A</b>	<b>Fire: Yes</b>	<b>Fire: Varies</b>
<b>Fire: 1,082</b>						

**TABLE C-8  
PAID HOLIDAYS (DAYS/YEAR)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	10	10	10	N/A	10
City of Dallas, TX	9	9	9	9	9
City of Houston, TX	10	10	10	10	10
City of Jacksonville, FL	12	12	12	12	12
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of San Diego, CA	10	10	10	10	10
City and County of San Francisco, CA	13	13	13	13	13
<i>Market Average</i>	11	11	11	11	11
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	9	9	9	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	11	11	11	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	9	9	9	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	10	10	10	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	8	8	8	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	7	7	7	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	11	11	11	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	9	9	9	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-8  
PAID HOLIDAYS (DAYS/YEAR)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	10	10	10	10	Receive holiday pay
City of Flagstaff	11	11	11	11	11
Town of Gilbert	11	11	11	11	10
City of Glendale	12	12	12	12	12
City of Goodyear	10	10	10	10	14
City of Mesa	10	10	10	10	Paid at 11.2 hours when working 24 hour shift
City of Peoria	10	10	10	10	10
City of Scottsdale	9	9	9	9	Receive additional 11.2 hours in pay period in which holiday falls
City of Surprise	10	10	10	10	17
City of Tempe	11	11	11	11	12
City of Tucson	10	10	10	10	10
<i>Market Average</i>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	9 (average)	9 (average)	9 (average)	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	19% reported 6 18% reported 9 17% reported 10	19% reported 6 18% reported 9 17% reported 10	19% reported 6 18% reported 9 17% reported 10	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>11.5</b> <b>(Ees: 63)</b>	<b>11.5</b> <b>(Ees: 317)</b>	<b>11.5</b> <b>(Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>11.5</b> <b>(Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>11.5</b> <b>(Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-9  
PERSONAL DAYS (DAYS/YEAR)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	0	0	0	N/A	0
City of Dallas, TX	0	0	0	0	0
City of Houston, TX	1	1	1	1	1
City of Jacksonville, FL	1	1	1	1	1
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of San Diego, CA	1	1	1	1	1
City and County of San Francisco, CA	4	4	4-5	4	4-8
<i>Market Average</i>	1	1	1	1	2
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	2	2	2	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	2	2	2	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	1	1	1	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-9  
PERSONAL DAYS (DAYS/YEAR)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	1	1	1	1	1
City of Flagstaff	2	2	2	2	2
Town of Gilbert	0	0	0	0	0
City of Glendale	0	0	0	0	0
City of Goodyear	1	1	1	1	1
City of Mesa	3	3	2	2	2
City of Peoria	7	7	2	2	2
City of Scottsdale	1	1	1	1	1
City of Surprise	1	1	1	1	1
City of Tempe	1	1	1	1	4
City of Tucson	3	3	3	3	3
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	2 – 3 (average, depending on length of service)	2 – 3 (average, depending on length of service)	2 – 3 (average, depending on length of service)	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>3</b> <b>(Ees: 63)</b>	<b>3</b> <b>(Ees: 317)</b>	<b>3</b> <b>(Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>2.5</b> <b>(Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>0</b> <b>(Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-10**  
**SHORT TERM DISABILITY BENEFIT PREVALENCE AND AMOUNT (\$ OR % OF PREMIUM)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	Yes, \$769 per week	Yes, \$769 per week	Yes, \$769 per week	N/A	Yes, \$769 per week
City of Dallas, TX	No	No	No	No	No
City of Houston, TX	No	No	No	No	No
City of Jacksonville, FL	No	No	No	No	No
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	No	No	No	No	No
City and County of San Francisco, CA	No	No	No	No	No
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	Yes, 100%	Yes, 100%	Yes, 100%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Yes, 100%	Yes, 100%	Yes, 100%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Yes, 67% up to max of \$3,500/week	Yes, 67% up to max of \$3,500/week	Yes, 67% up to max of \$3,500/week	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-10**  
**SHORT TERM DISABILITY BENEFIT PREVALENCE AND AMOUNT (\$ OR % OF PREMIUM)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%
City of Flagstaff	No	No	No	No	No
Town of Gilbert	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%
City of Glendale	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%
City of Goodyear	Yes, 100%	Yes, 100%	Yes, 100%	Yes, 100%	Yes, 100%
City of Mesa	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%	Yes, 67%
City of Peoria	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	Yes, 60%	No	No
City of Scottsdale	Yes, 50%-70%	Yes, 50%-70%	Yes, 50%-70%	Yes, 50%-70%	Yes, 50%-70%
City of Surprise	Yes, 75%	Yes, 75%	Yes, 75%	Yes, 75%	Yes, 75%
City of Tempe	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tucson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	63% of employees have access; average of 66% of earnings	63% of employees have access; average of 66% of earnings	63% of employees have access; average of 66% of earnings	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	83% of employers offer STD; average of 66% of earnings	83% of employers offer STD; average of 66% of earnings	83% of employers offer STD; average of 66% of earnings	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>No</b> <b>(Ees: 63)</b>	<b>No</b> <b>(Ees: 317)</b>	<b>No</b> <b>(Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>No</b> <b>(Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>No</b> <b>(Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-11**  
**SHORT TERM DISABILITY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION (% OF PREMIUM)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	0%	0%	0%	N/A	0%
City of Dallas, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City and County of San Francisco, CA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-11  
SHORT TERM DISABILITY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION (% OF PREMIUM)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Flagstaff	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Town of Gilbert	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
City of Glendale	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
City of Goodyear	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Peoria	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
City of Scottsdale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Surprise	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tempe	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tucson	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	88% of employers offering STD pay 100%	88% of employers offering STD pay 100%	88% of employers offering STD pay 100%	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	23% of employers offering STD require employee contributions	23% of employers offering STD require employee contributions	23% of employers offering STD require employee contributions	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**TABLE C-12**  
**SHORT TERM DISABILITY PLAN FUNDING**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	Insured
City of Dallas, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City and County of San Francisco, CA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded (exempt); Insured (nonexempt)	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	N/A	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-12  
SHORT TERM DISABILITY PLAN FUNDING**

<b>Comparators</b>	<b>Executives</b>	<b>Managers</b>	<b>General Employees</b>	<b>Uniformed Police</b>	<b>Uniformed Fire/Rescue</b>
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Flagstaff	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Town of Gilbert	Insured	Insured	Insured	Insured	Insured
City of Glendale	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Goodyear	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Mesa	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Peoria	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A
City of Scottsdale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Surprise	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tempe	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tucson	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	60% of plans are self-funded; 29% are insured	60% of plans are self-funded; 29% are insured	60% of plans are self-funded; 29% are insured	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**TABLE C-13**  
**SHORT TERM DISABILITY WAITING PERIOD**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	N/A	90 Days
City of Dallas, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City and County of San Francisco, CA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	5 Days	5 Days	5 Days	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	14 Days	14 Days	7 Days (nonexempt); 14 Days (exempt)	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	8 Days	8 Days	8 Days	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Once all sick leave is exhausted	Once all sick leave is exhausted	Once all sick leave is exhausted	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	N/A	5 Days	5 Days	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	30 Days	30 Days	30 Days	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-13  
SHORT TERM DISABILITY WAITING PERIOD**

<b>Comparators</b>	<b>Executives</b>	<b>Managers</b>	<b>General Employees</b>	<b>Uniformed Police</b>	<b>Uniformed Fire/Rescue</b>
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	59 Days	59 Days	59 Days	59 Days	59 Days
City of Flagstaff	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Town of Gilbert	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days
City of Glendale	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days
City of Goodyear	30 Days	30 Days	30 Days	30 Days	30 Days
City of Mesa	14-44 Days	14-44 Days	14-44 Days	14-44 Days	14-44 Days
City of Peoria	30 Days	30 Days	30 Days	N/A	N/A
City of Scottsdale	7 Days	7 Days	7 Days	7 Days	7 Days
City of Surprise	14 Days	14 Days	14 Days	14 Days	14 Days
City of Tempe	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tucson	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	12 Days (average)	12 Days (average)	12 Days (average)	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**TABLE C-14**  
**SHORT TERM DISABILITY MAXIMUM BENEFIT**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	N/A	26 Weeks
City of Dallas, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City and County of San Francisco, CA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	11 Weeks	11 Weeks	12 Weeks	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	24 Weeks	24 Weeks	24 Weeks	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	13 Weeks	13 Weeks	13 Weeks	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	N/A	25 Weeks	25 Weeks	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	22 Weeks	22 Weeks	22 Weeks	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-14  
SHORT TERM DISABILITY MAXIMUM BENEFIT**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	36 Weeks	36 Weeks	36 Weeks	36 Weeks	36 Weeks
City of Flagstaff	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Town of Gilbert	13 Weeks	13 Weeks	13 Weeks	13 Weeks	13 Weeks
City of Glendale	12 Weeks	12 Weeks	12 Weeks	12 Weeks	12 Weeks
City of Goodyear	22 Weeks	22 Weeks	22 Weeks	22 Weeks	22 Weeks
City of Mesa	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	26 Weeks
City of Peoria	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	N/A	N/A
City of Scottsdale	18 Weeks	18 Weeks	18 Weeks	18 Weeks	18 Weeks
City of Surprise	24 Weeks	24 Weeks	24 Weeks	24 Weeks	24 Weeks
City of Tempe	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tucson	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only	N/A, individual policy only
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	26 Weeks	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	23 Weeks (average)	23 Weeks (average)	23 Weeks (average)	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**TABLE C-15  
LONG TERM DISABILITY ELIGIBILITY**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes
City of Dallas, TX	No	No	No	No	No
City of Houston, TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Jacksonville, FL	No	No	No	No	No
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-15  
LONG TERM DISABILITY ELIGIBILITY**

<b>Comparators</b>	<b>Executives</b>	<b>Managers</b>	<b>General Employees</b>	<b>Uniformed Police</b>	<b>Uniformed Fire/Rescue</b>
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Flagstaff	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Town of Gilbert	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Glendale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Goodyear	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	No	No	No	No	No
City of Peoria	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
City of Scottsdale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Surprise	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tempe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Tucson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	61% of employees have access to an LTD plan	61% of employees have access to an LTD plan	61% of employees have access to an LTD plan	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	100% of employers offer LTD coverage	100% of employers offer LTD coverage	100% of employers offer LTD coverage	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-16  
LONG TERM DISABILITY MAXIMUM BENEFIT (\$ OR % OF PAY)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	\$10K/ month	\$10K/ month	\$10K/ month	N/A	\$10K/ month
City of Dallas, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston, TX	70% of monthly salary offsets or 50% of monthly salary, whichever is lowest	70% of monthly salary offsets or 50% of monthly salary, whichever is lowest	70% of monthly salary offsets or 50% of monthly salary, whichever is lowest	70% of monthly salary offsets or 50% of monthly salary, whichever is lowest	70% of monthly salary offsets or 50% of monthly salary, whichever is lowest
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%
City and County of San Francisco, CA	67%	67%	67%	N/A	N/A
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	65%	65%	65%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	60% up to \$20K/ month	60% up to \$20K/ month	60% up to \$20K/ month	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	67%	67%	67%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	60% of base salary to max of \$25,000/ month	60% of base salary to max of \$25,000/ month	60% of base salary to max of \$25,000/ month	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	\$5,000/ month (hourly); \$6,000/ month (salaried)	\$5,000/ month (hourly); \$6,000/ month (salaried)	\$5,000/ month (hourly); \$6,000/ month (salaried)	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	67%, up to max of \$20K/ month	67%	67%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	67%	67%	67%	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-16  
LONG TERM DISABILITY MAXIMUM BENEFIT (\$ OR % OF PAY)**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	66% of base up to \$5,000/ month	66% of base up to \$5,000/ month	66% of base up to \$5,000/ month	66% of base up to \$5,000/ month	66% of base up to \$5,000/ month
City of Flagstaff	67%	67%	67%	N/A	N/A
Town of Gilbert	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%
City of Glendale	67%	67%	67%	67% up to \$3,500/ month	67% up to \$3,500/ month
City of Goodyear	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Peoria	67%	67%	67%	N/A	N/A
City of Scottsdale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Surprise	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tempe	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%
City of Tucson	60% up to \$4K/ month	60% up to \$4K/ month	60% up to \$4K/ month	60% up to \$4K/ month	60% up to \$4K/ month
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	\$10,000/ month (median)	\$10,000/ month (median)	\$10,000/ month (median)	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	\$11,596/ month (average)	\$11,596/ month (average)	\$11,596/ month (average)	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>67%</b> <b>(Ees: 63)</b>	<b>67%</b> <b>(Ees: 317)</b>	<b>67%</b> <b>(Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>67%</b> <b>(Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>67%</b> <b>(Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-17**  
**LONG TERM DISABILITY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	0%	0%	0%	N/A	0%
City of Dallas, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston, TX	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	0%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	0%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-17**  
**LONG TERM DISABILITY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	\$0.36 per \$100	\$0.36 per \$100	\$0.36 per \$100	\$0.36 per \$100	\$0.36 per \$100
City of Flagstaff	50%	50%	50%	N/A	N/A
Town of Gilbert	47%	47%	47%	100%	100%
City of Glendale	Covered under ASRS, Employer pays 0.23% of employee's pay towards this benefit	Covered under ASRS, Employer pays 0.23% of employee's pay towards this benefit	Covered under ASRS, Employer pays 0.23% of employee's pay towards this benefit	Covered under ASRS, Employer pays 0.23% of employee's pay towards this benefit	Covered under ASRS, Employer pays 0.23% of employee's pay towards this benefit
City of Goodyear	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Peoria	47%	47%	47%	N/A	N/A
City of Scottsdale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Surprise	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tempe	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tucson	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**TABLE C-17  
LONG TERM DISABILITY EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Published Data					
BLS	89% of employers offering LTD pay 100%	89% of employers offering LTD pay 100%	89% of employers offering LTD pay 100%	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	24% of employers offering LTD require an employee contribution	24% of employers offering LTD require an employee contribution	24% of employers offering LTD require an employee contribution	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(Ees: 63)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(Ees: 317)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-18**  
**LONG TERM DISABILITY PLAN FUNDING**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	Insured
City of Dallas, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston, TX	Self-funded	Self-funded	Self-funded	Self-funded	Self-funded
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Self-funded	Self-funded	Self-funded	Self-funded	Self-funded
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	Self-funded	Self-funded	Self-funded	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-18  
LONG TERM DISABILITY PLAN FUNDING**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Flagstaff	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A
Town of Gilbert	Self-funded	Self-funded	Self-funded	Insured	Insured
City of Glendale	Insured	Insured	Insured	Self-funded	Self-funded
City of Goodyear	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Peoria	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A
City of Scottsdale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Surprise	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tempe	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tucson	Insured	Insured	Insured	Insured	Insured
<b>Published Data</b>					
Neither BLS nor Towers Watson contained data on this benefit detail.					
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Self-funded (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Self-funded (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Self-funded (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Self-funded (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Self-funded (Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-19  
LONG TERM DISABILITY WAITING PERIOD**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days	N/A	180 Days
City of Dallas, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston, TX	180 Days after 1 year of service	180 Days after 1 year of service	180 Days after 1 year of service	180 Days after 1 year of service	180 Days after 1 year of service
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of San Diego, CA	30 Days	30 Days	30 Days	30 Days	30 Days
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	130 Days	130 Days	130 Days	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	130 Days	130 Days	130 Days	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-19  
LONG TERM DISABILITY WAITING PERIOD**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days
City of Flagstaff	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days	N/A	N/A
Town of Gilbert	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days
City of Glendale	168 Days	168 Days	168 Days	168 Days	168 Days
City of Goodyear	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Peoria	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days	N/A	N/A
City of Scottsdale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Surprise	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tempe	90 Days (or 1 year for new employees)	90 Days (or 1 year for new employees)	90 Days (or 1 year for new employees)	90 Days (or 1 year for new employees)	90 Days (or 1 year for new employees)
City of Tucson	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days	180 Days
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	150 Days (average)	150 Days (average)	150 Days (average)	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>90 Days (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>90 Days (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>90 Days (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>90 Days (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>90 Days (Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-20**  
**LONG TERM DISABILITY BUY-UP PLAN AVAILABILITY**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	No	No	No	N/A	No
City of Dallas, TX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston, TX	No	No	No	No	No
City of Jacksonville, FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	No	No	No	No	No
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	No	No
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	No	No	No	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-20  
LONG TERM DISABILITY BUY-UP PLAN AVAILABILITY**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Flagstaff	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
Town of Gilbert	No	No	No	No	No
City of Glendale	No	No	No	No	No
City of Goodyear	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Mesa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Peoria	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
City of Scottsdale	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Surprise	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tempe	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tucson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	30% of employers offer supplemental LTD coverage	30% of employers offer supplemental LTD coverage	30% of employers offer supplemental LTD coverage	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

**TABLE C-21**  
**DEFINED BENEFIT PLAN CONTRIBUTION RATES**  
**FOR GENERAL EMPLOYEES (INCLUDING MANAGERS AND EXECUTIVES)**

Comparators	Employer Contribution (% of Pay)*	Employee Contribution (% of Pay)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>		
State of Arizona	10.10%	11.39%
City of Dallas, TX	18.37%	10.79%
City of Houston, TX	22.36%	0%
City of Jacksonville, FL	13.50%	8%
City of Los Angeles, CA	21.48%	6.73%
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	42.68%	11.97%
City and County of San Francisco, CA	18.09%	7.5%
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>		
Private Employer 1	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	16.00%	0%
Private Employer 3	9.87%	11.13%
Private Employer 4	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	10.10%	11.4%

\* *Employer Contribution Percentage of pay may not fully reflect the actuarially determined contribution requirement*

**TABLE C-21  
DEFINED BENEFIT PLAN CONTRIBUTION RATES  
FOR GENERAL EMPLOYEES (INCLUDING MANAGERS AND EXECUTIVES)**

Comparators	Employer Contribution (% of Pay)*	Employee Contribution (% of Pay)
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>		
City of Chandler	10.10%	11.39%
City of Flagstaff	10.10%	11.39%
Town of Gilbert	10.10%	11.39%
City of Glendale	10.10%	11.39%
City of Goodyear	10.10%	11.39%
City of Mesa	10.10%	11.39%
City of Peoria	10.10%	11.39%
City of Scottsdale	10.10%	11.39%
City of Surprise	10.10%	11.39%
City of Tempe	10.10%	11.39%
City of Tucson	17.43%	11.62%
<b>Published Data</b>		
BLS	Data not available	3% of workers are required to contribute towards a DB plan
Towers Watson	40% of employers contribute 10% or more	Data not available
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>14.33%</b>	<b>9.73%</b>

<b>City of Phoenix Execs: 63 Mgrs - 317 GE: 9,423)</b>	<b>18.18%</b>	<b>5%</b>
--	---------------	-----------

\* Employer Contribution Percentage of pay may not fully reflect the actuarially determined contribution requirement

**TABLE C-22**  
**DEFINED BENEFIT PLAN CONTRIBUTION RATES**  
**FOR UNIFORMED POLICE**

Comparators	Defined Benefit Plan Contributions for Uniformed Police	
	Employer Contribution (% of Pay)	Employee Contribution (% of Pay)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>		
City of Dallas, TX	27.5%	8.5%
City of Houston, TX	19.8%	29.4%
City of Jacksonville, FL	32%	7%
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Varies	Varies
City and County of San Francisco, CA	18.09%	7.5%
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>		
City of Flagstaff	24.54%	8.65%
Town of Gilbert	14.64%	8.65%
City of Glendale	21.25%	7.65%
City of Peoria	N/A	N/A
City of Tucson	31.04%	8.65%
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>23.61%</b>	<b>10.75%</b>
<b>City of Phoenix (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>25.63%</b>	<b>8.65%</b>

**TABLE C-23**  
**DEFINED BENEFIT PLAN CONTRIBUTION RATES**  
**FOR UNIFORMED FIRE/RESCUE**

Comparators	Defined Benefit Plan Contributions for Uniformed Fire/Rescue	
	Employer Contribution (% of Pay)	Employee Contribution (% of Pay)
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>		
State of Arizona	10.10%	11.39%
City of Dallas, TX	27.5%	8.5%
City of Houston, TX	Lump sum % of pay	9%
City of Jacksonville, FL	32%	7%
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Varies	Varies
City and County of San Francisco, CA	18.09%	7.5%
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>		
City of Flagstaff	31.28%	8.65%
Town of Gilbert	10.85%	8.65%
City of Glendale	18.66%	7.65%
City of Peoria	N/A	N/A
City of Tucson	30.88%	8.65%
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>22.42%</b>	<b>8.55%</b>
<b>City of Phoenix (Ees: 1,082)</b>	<b>25.76%</b>	<b>8.65%</b>

**TABLE C-24**  
**DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLAN AVAILABILITY FOR NEW HIRES**

Comparators	General Employees (including Managers and Executives)	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>			
State of Arizona	Yes	N/A	Yes
City of Dallas, TX	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Houston, TX	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Jacksonville, FL	Yes	No	No
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of San Diego, CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>			
Private Employer 1	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Yes	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-24**  
**DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLAN AVAILABILITY FOR NEW HIRES**

Comparators	General Employees (including Managers and Executives)	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>			
City of Chandler	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Flagstaff	No	No	No
Town of Gilbert	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Glendale	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Goodyear	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Mesa	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Peoria	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Scottsdale	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Surprise	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Tempe	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Tucson	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Published Data</b>			
BLS	75% of new hires have access to a DC plan	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	91% of employers offer a 401(k), 457, or 403(b) DC plan	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>(Execs – 63; Mgrs - 317, GE: 9,423)</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>(Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>(Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-25  
DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLAN EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Comparators	Required Employer Contribution (% of Pay)	Maximum Employer Matching (% of Pay)	Match Policy
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>			
State of Arizona	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: N/A Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: N/A Fire: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match Police: N/A Fire: no match
City of Dallas, TX	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match Police: no match Fire: no match
City of Houston, TX	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match Police: no match Fire: no match
City of Jacksonville, FL	Exec: 7.7% Mgr: 7.7% Gen Ee: 7.7% Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: 7.7% Mgr: 7.7% Gen Ee: 7.7% Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Information not provided
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided

**TABLE C-25**  
**DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLAN EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Comparators	Required Employer Contribution (% of Pay)	Maximum Employer Matching (% of Pay)	Match Policy
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses (continued)</b>			
City of Philadelphia, PA	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match Police: no match Fire: no match
City of San Diego, CA	Varies based on employee hire date	Varies based on employee hire date	Varies based on employee hire date
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match Police: no match Fire: no match

**TABLE C-25**  
**DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLAN EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Comparators	Required Employer Contribution (% of Pay)	Maximum Employer Matching (% of Pay)	Match Policy
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>			
Private Employer 1	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0%	Exec: 75% of first 6% of pay Mgr: 75% of first 6% of pay Gen Ee: 75% of first 6% of pay	Exec: 180 day waiting period Mgr: 180 day waiting period Gen Ee: 180 day waiting period
Private Employer 2	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match
Private Employer 3	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0%	Exec: 50% up to 6% Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match
Private Employer 4	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0%	Exec: 4% Mgr: 4% Gen Ee: 4%	Exec: match first 4% Mgr: match first 4% Gen Ee: match first 4%
Private Employer 5	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0%	Exec: 5.1% Mgr: 5.1% Gen Ee: 5.1%	Exec: 85% of the first 6% Mgr: 85% of the first 6% Gen Ee: 85% of the first 6%
Private Employer 6	Exec: 3% Mgr: 3% Gen Ee: N/A	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match
Private Employer 7	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match

**TABLE C-25  
DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLAN EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Comparators	Required Employer Contribution (% of Pay)	Maximum Employer Matching (% of Pay)	Match Policy
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>			
City of Chandler	Non-bargaining 0.5% base pay with employee contribution	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match Police: no match Fire: no match
City of Flagstaff	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A
Town of Gilbert	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 13.6% only on Private Security Comp. Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A
City of Glendale	Exec: suspended Mgr: suspended Gen Ee: suspended Police: suspended Fire: suspended	Exec: suspended Mgr: suspended Gen Ee: suspended Police: suspended Fire: suspended	Exec: N/A Mgr: N/A Gen Ee: N/A Police: N/A Fire: N/A
City of Goodyear	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match Police: no match Fire: no match

**TABLE C-25**  
**DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLAN EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Comparators	Required Employer Contribution (% of Pay)	Maximum Employer Matching (% of Pay)	Match Policy
<b>Local Public Sector Responses (continued)</b>			
City of Mesa	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	0.5% when employee contributes at least \$10/pp	0.5% when employee contributes at least \$10/pp
City of Peoria	Exec: 4% Mgr: 4% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Information not provided
City of Scottsdale	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match Police: no match Fire: no match
City of Surprise	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match Police: no match Fire: no match
City of Tempe	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided

**TABLE C-25  
DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLAN EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION**

Comparators	Required Employer Contribution (% of Pay)	Maximum Employer Matching (% of Pay)	Match Policy
<b>Local Public Sector Responses (continued)</b>			
City of Tucson	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: 0% Mgr: 0% Gen Ee: 0% Police: 0% Fire: 0%	Exec: no match Mgr: no match Gen Ee: no match Police: no match Fire: no match
<b>Published Data</b>			
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
Towers Watson	4%	Data not available	Data not available

<b>City of Phoenix</b> <i>Execs: 63 Mgrs: 317 GE: 9,423 Police: 3,096 Fire: 1,082</i>	<b>Exec: 9.6%</b> <b>Mgr: 9.6%</b> <b>Gen Ee: 0-6%</b> <b>Police: 0.18%</b> <b>Fire: 5%</b>	<b>Exec: 9.6%</b> <b>Mgr: 9.6%</b> <b>Gen Ee: 0-6%</b> <b>Police: 0.18%</b> <b>Fire: 5%</b>	<b>Exec:</b> <b>Mgr:</b> <b>Gen Ee: per MOU</b> <b>Police: per MOU</b> <b>Fire: per MOU</b>
--	---	---	---

**TABLE C-26  
RETIREE HEALTH PLAN AVAILABILITY**

Comparators	Retiree Health Plan Availability Count of Employers				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
Plans for Retirees Under the Age of 65	19	19	19	14	15
Plans for Retirees Age 65 and Above	15	15	15	10	11
No Plans Offered	6	6	6	2	2

**Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question.**

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 1,082)</b>
------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

**TABLE C-27  
RETIREE HEALTH PLAN AVAILABILITY**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	N/A	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
City of Dallas, TX	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
City of Houston, TX	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
City of Jacksonville, FL	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
City and County of San Francisco, CA	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-27  
RETIREE HEALTH PLAN AVAILABILITY**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
City of Flagstaff	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No
Town of Gilbert	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No
City of Glendale	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
City of Goodyear	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Mesa	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
City of Peoria	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Scottsdale	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No
City of Surprise	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
City of Tempe	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes	< 65: Yes > 65: Yes
City of Tucson	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No	< 65: Yes > 65: No

**TABLE C-27  
RETIREE HEALTH PLAN AVAILABILITY**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	< 65: Offered by 61% of employers  > 65: Offered by 45% of employers	< 65: Offered by 61% of employers  > 65: Offered by 45% of employers	< 65: Offered by 61% of employers  > 65: Offered by 45% of employers	N/A	N/A
<i>City of Phoenix</i>	<b>&lt; 65: Yes</b> <b>&gt; 65: No</b> <b>(Ees: 63)</b>	<b>&lt; 65: Yes</b> <b>&gt; 65: No</b> <b>(Ees: 317)</b>	<b>&lt; 65: Yes</b> <b>&gt; 65: No</b> <b>(Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>&lt; 65: Yes</b> <b>&gt; 65: No</b> <b>(Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>&lt; 65: Yes</b> <b>&gt; 65: No</b> <b>(Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-28**  
**RETIREE HEALTH PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS (\$) FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Retiree Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	< 65: \$593 > 65: \$442	< 65: \$593 > 65: \$442	< 65: \$593 > 65: \$442	N/A	< 65: \$593 > 65: \$442
City of Dallas, TX	< 65: \$328 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$328 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$328 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$328 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$328 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$408 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$408 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$408 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$408 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$408 > 65: \$111
City of Houston, TX	< 65: \$136 > 65: \$200	< 65: \$136 > 65: \$200	< 65: \$136 > 65: \$200	< 65: \$136 > 65: \$200	< 65: \$136 > 65: \$200	< 65: \$404 > 65: \$241	< 65: \$404 > 65: \$241	< 65: \$404 > 65: \$241	< 65: \$404 > 65: \$241	< 65: \$404 > 65: \$241
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$234 > 65: \$234	< 65: \$234 > 65: \$234	< 65: \$234 > 65: \$234	< 65: \$234 > 65: \$234	< 65: \$234 > 65: \$234
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$335	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$335	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$335	N/A	N/A	< 65: \$14 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$14 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$14 > 65: \$0	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$307	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$307	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$307	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$307	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$307	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$0
City and County of San Francisco, CA	< 65: \$1,266 > 65: \$379	< 65: \$1,266 > 65: \$379	< 65: \$1,266 > 65: \$379	< 65: \$1,266 > 65: \$379	< 65: \$1,266 > 65: \$379	Information not provided	< 65: \$43 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$43 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$43 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$43 > 65: \$0
<i>Market Average</i>	< 65: \$369 > 65: \$190	< 65: \$369 > 65: \$190	< 65: \$369 > 65: \$190	< 65: \$517 > 65: \$199	< 65: \$431 > 65: \$166	< 65: \$275 > 65: \$171	< 65: \$242 > 65: \$147	< 65: \$242 > 65: \$147	< 65: \$218 > 65: \$117	< 65: \$280 > 65: \$171

**TABLE C-28**  
**RETIREE HEALTH PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS (\$) FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Retiree Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	< 65: \$798 > 65: \$303	< 65: \$798 > 65: \$303	< 65: \$798 > 65: \$303	N/A	N/A	< 65: \$141 > 65: \$53	< 65: \$141 > 65: \$53	< 65: \$141 > 65: \$53	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	< 65: \$551 > 65: \$414	< 65: \$551 > 65: \$414	< 65: \$551 > 65: \$414	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	< 65: \$526 > 65: \$306	< 65: \$526 > 65: \$306	< 65: \$526 > 65: \$306	N/A	N/A	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	< 65: \$441 > 65: \$203	< 65: \$441 > 65: \$203	< 65: \$441 > 65: \$203	N/A	N/A	< 65: \$231 > 65: \$156	< 65: \$231 > 65: \$156	< 65: \$231 > 65: \$156	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-28**  
**RETIREE HEALTH PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS (\$) FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Retiree Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Flagstaff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$473 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$473 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$473 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$473 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$473 > 65: N/A
Town of Gilbert	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$291 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$291 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$291 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$291 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$291 > 65: N/A
City of Glendale	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$369-\$396 > 65: \$287-\$308	< 65: \$369-\$396 > 65: \$287-\$308	< 65: \$369-\$396 > 65: \$287-\$308	< 65: \$369-\$396 > 65: \$287-\$308	< 65: \$369-\$396 > 65: \$287-\$308
City of Goodyear	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Mesa	< 65: \$368* > 65: \$368* * w/ 10 YOS	< 65: \$368* > 65: \$368* * w/ 10 YOS	< 65: \$368* > 65: \$368* * w/ 10 YOS	< 65: \$368* > 65: \$368* * w/ 10 YOS	< 65: \$368* > 65: \$368* * w/ 10 YOS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Peoria	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Scottsdale	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$348 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$348 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$348 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$348 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$348 > 65: N/A
City of Surprise	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$793* > 65: N/A	< 65: \$793* > 65: N/A	< 65: \$793* > 65: N/A	< 65: \$793* > 65: N/A	< 65: \$793* > 65: N/A
City of Tempe	< 65: \$379 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$379 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$379 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$379 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$379 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$0 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$0 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$0 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$0 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$0 > 65: N/A
City of Tucson	< 65: \$325 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$325 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$325 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$325 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$325 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$108 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$108 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$108 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$108 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$108 > 65: N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	< 65: \$119 > 65: \$53	< 65: \$119 > 65: \$53	< 65: \$119 > 65: \$53	< 65: \$119 > 65: \$53	< 65: \$119 > 65: \$53	< 65: \$300 > 65: \$149	< 65: \$300 > 65: \$149	< 65: \$300 > 65: \$149	< 65: \$300 > 65: \$149	< 65: \$300 > 65: \$149

**TABLE C-28  
RETIREE HEALTH PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS (\$) FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Retiree Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	< 65: \$467 (average) > 65: \$293 (average)	< 65: \$467 (average) > 65: \$293 (average)	< 65: \$467 (average) > 65: \$293 (average)	N/A	N/A	< 65: \$468 (average) > 65: \$257 (average)	< 65: \$468 (average) > 65: \$257 (average)	< 65: \$468 (average) > 65: \$257 (average)	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>  <b>Execs: 63</b> <b>Mgrs: 317</b> <b>GE: 9,423</b> <b>Police: 3,096</b> <b>Fire: 1,082</b>	< 65: \$105 > 65: \$90	< 65: \$105 > 65: \$90	< 65: \$105 > 65: \$90	< 65: \$105 > 65: \$90	< 65: \$105 > 65: \$90	< 65: \$582 > 65: \$497	< 65: \$582 > 65: \$497	< 65: \$582 > 65: \$497	< 65: \$582 > 65: \$497	< 65: \$582 > 65: \$497

**TABLE C-29  
RETIREE HEALTH PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS (\$) FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Retiree Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	< 65: \$1,387 > 65: \$878	< 65: \$1,387 > 65: \$878	< 65: \$1,387 > 65: \$878	N/A	< 65: \$1,387 > 65: \$878
City of Dallas, TX	< 65: \$327 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$327 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$327 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$327 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$327 > 65: \$111	< 65: \$1,025 > 65: \$323	< 65: \$1,025 > 65: \$323	< 65: \$1,025 > 65: \$323	< 65: \$1,025 > 65: \$323	< 65: \$1,025 > 65: \$323
City of Houston, TX	< 65: \$419 > 65: \$965	< 65: \$419 > 65: \$965	< 65: \$419 > 65: \$965	< 65: \$419 > 65: \$965	< 65: \$419 > 65: \$965	< 65: \$630 > 65: \$722	< 65: \$630 > 65: \$722	< 65: \$630 > 65: \$722	< 65: \$630 > 65: \$722	< 65: \$630 > 65: \$722
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$483 > 65: \$483	< 65: \$483 > 65: \$483	< 65: \$483 > 65: \$483	< 65: \$483 > 65: \$483	< 65: \$483 > 65: \$483
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$335	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$335	< 65: \$0 > 65: \$335	N/A	N/A	< 65: \$29 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$29 > 65: \$0	< 65: \$29 > 65: \$0	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$307	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$307	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$307	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$307	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$307	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$856	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$856	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$856	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$856	< 65: \$856 > 65: \$856
City and County of San Francisco, CA	< 65: \$1,560 > 65: \$568	< 65: \$1,560 > 65: \$568	< 65: \$1,560 > 65: \$568	< 65: \$1,560 > 65: \$568	< 65: \$1,560 > 65: \$568	Information not provided	< 65: \$337 > 65: \$189	< 65: \$337 > 65: \$189	< 65: \$337 > 65: \$189	< 65: \$337 > 65: \$189
<i>Market Average</i>	< 65: \$452 > 65: \$327	< 65: \$452 > 65: \$327	< 65: \$452 > 65: \$327	< 65: \$632 > 65: \$390	< 65: \$527 > 65: \$325	< 65: \$735 > 65: \$544	< 65: \$678 > 65: \$493	< 65: \$678 > 65: \$493	< 65: \$666 > 65: \$515	< 65: \$786 > 65: \$575

**TABLE C-29**  
**RETIREE HEALTH PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS (\$) FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Retiree Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	< 65: \$1,596 > 65: \$605	< 65: \$1,596 > 65: \$605	< 65: \$1,596 > 65: \$605	N/A	N/A	< 65: \$282 > 65: \$107	< 65: \$282 > 65: \$107	< 65: \$282 > 65: \$107	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	< 65: \$1345 > 65: \$1009	< 65: \$1345 > 65: \$1009	< 65: \$1345 > 65: \$1009	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	< 65: \$1,102 > 65: \$612	< 65: \$1,102 > 65: \$612	< 65: \$1,102 > 65: \$612	N/A	N/A	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	< 65: \$899 > 65: \$406	< 65: \$899 > 65: \$406	< 65: \$899 > 65: \$406	N/A	N/A	< 65: \$542 > 65: \$372	< 65: \$542 > 65: \$372	< 65: \$542 > 65: \$372	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-29  
RETIREE HEALTH PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS (\$) FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Retiree Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Flagstaff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$1,204 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,204 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,204 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,204 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,204 > 65: N/A
Town of Gilbert	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$1,017 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,017 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,017 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,017 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,017 > 65: N/A
City of Glendale	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$782-\$839 > 65: \$581-\$623	< 65: \$782-\$839 > 65: \$581-\$623	< 65: \$782-\$839 > 65: \$581-\$623	< 65: \$782-\$839 > 65: \$581-\$623	< 65: \$782-\$839 > 65: \$581-\$623
City of Goodyear	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Mesa	< 65: \$1,001* > 65: \$1,001*  * w/ 20 YOS	< 65: \$1,001* > 65: \$1,001*  * w/ 20 YOS	< 65: \$1,001* > 65: \$1,001*  * w/ 20 YOS	< 65: \$1,001* > 65: \$1,001*  * w/ 20 YOS	< 65: \$1,001* > 65: \$1,001*  * w/ 20 YOS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Peoria	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Scottsdale	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$755 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$755 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$755 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$755 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$755 > 65: N/A
City of Surprise	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	< 65: \$1,585 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,585 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,585 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,585 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$1,585 > 65: N/A
City of Tempe	< 65: \$639 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$639 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$639 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$639 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$639 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$158 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$158 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$158 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$158 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$158 > 65: N/A
City of Tucson	< 65: \$682 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$682 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$682 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$682 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$682 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$227 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$227 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$227 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$227 > 65: N/A	< 65: \$227 > 65: N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	< 65: \$258 > 65: \$143	< 65: \$258 > 65: \$143	< 65: \$258 > 65: \$143	< 65: \$258 > 65: \$143	< 65: \$258 > 65: \$143	< 65: \$720 > 65: \$301	< 65: \$720 > 65: \$301	< 65: \$720 > 65: \$301	< 65: \$720 > 65: \$301	< 65: \$720 > 65: \$301

**TABLE C-29  
RETIREE HEALTH PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS (\$) FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Retiree Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	< 65: \$293 (average)  > 65: \$472 (average)	< 65: \$293 (average)  > 65: \$472 (average)	< 65: \$293 (average)  > 65: \$472 (average)	N/A	N/A	< 65: \$968 (average)  > 65: \$541 (average)	< 65: \$968 (average)  > 65: \$541 (average)	< 65: \$968 (average)  > 65: \$541 (average)	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>  <b>Execs: 63</b> <b>Mgrs: 317</b> <b>GE: 9,423</b> <b>Police: 3,096</b> <b>Fire: 1,082</b>	< 65: \$375  > 65: \$235	< 65: \$375  > 65: \$235	< 65: \$375  > 65: \$235	< 65: \$375  > 65: \$235	< 65: \$375  > 65: \$235	< 65: \$1,604  > 65: \$940	< 65: \$1,604  > 65: \$940	< 65: \$1,604  > 65: \$940	< 65: \$1,604  > 65: \$940	< 65: \$1,604  > 65: \$940

**TABLE C-30  
ACTIVE EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLANS OFFERED**

Plan Types	Active Employee Health Plan Type Prevalence Count of Employers				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
PPO/POS Plans	22	22	22	13	14
HMO/EPO Plans	16	16	16	13	14
High Deductible Plans	8	8	8	6	7

*Note: Not all public sector respondents provided responses to this question.*

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 1,082)</b>
------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

**TABLE C-31  
HEALTH BENEFITS FOR PART-TIME EMPLOYEES**

Comparators	Part-Time Employees Eligible for Benefits? (Y/N)	Hours Thoureshold for Benefits Eligibility	Is Benefit Cost-Sharing Prorated?	Briefly Explain Proration Policy
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>				
State of Arizona	Yes	20	No	N/A
City of Dallas, TX	Yes	32	No	N/A
City of Houston, TX	Yes	30	No	N/A
City of Jacksonville, FL	Yes	N/A, available to only AFSCME temp/pt	No	N/A
City of Los Angeles, CA	Yes	20	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Yes	20	Yes	½ time gets ½ allotment, ¾ time gets ¾ allotment (all bargaining units except MEA and Local 127)
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Yes	20/week or 1040 in any 12 month consecutive period	No	N/A
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>				
Private Employer 1	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Yes	20	No	N/A
Private Employer 3	Yes	30	No	N/A
Private Employer 4	Yes	20	No	N/A
Private Employer 5	Yes	20	Yes	Half time employees pay 50% of the total rate
Private Employer 6	Yes	N/A	Yes	PT employees pay 2x the employee rate
Private Employer 7	No	N/A	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-31  
HEALTH BENEFITS FOR PART-TIME EMPLOYEES**

Comparators	Part-Time Employees Eligible for Benefits? (Y/N)	Hours Thoureshold for Benefits Eligibility	Is Benefit Cost-Sharing Prorated?	Briefly Explain Proration Policy
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>				
City of Flagstaff	Yes	20	No	N/A
Town of Gilbert	Yes	30	Yes	Employer contribution is 75% of employer contribution to FT employee premiums
City of Glendale	Yes	20 (no more than 30)	Yes	51% for employee; 19% for family
City of Peoria	Yes	20	No	N/A
City of Tucson	Yes	20	No	N/A
<b>Published Data</b>				
Neither BLS nor Towers Watson contained data on this benefit detail.				
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Employer contribution is ½ the level of full-time employees</b>

**TABLE C-32  
PPO/POS PLAN FUNDING**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	N/A	Insured
City of Dallas, TX	Insured	Insured	Insured	Insured	Insured
City of Houston, TX	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Jacksonville, FL	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Insured	Insured	Insured	Insured	Insured
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Insured	Insured	Insured	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-32  
PPO/POS PLAN FUNDING**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Flagstaff	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
Town of Gilbert	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Glendale	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Goodyear	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Mesa	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Peoria	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Scottsdale	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Surprise	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Tempe	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded	Self-Funded
City of Tucson	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
<b>Published Data</b>					
Neither BLS nor Towers Watson contained data on this benefit detail.					

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Self-Funded (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Self-Funded (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Self-Funded (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Self-Funded (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Self-Funded (Ees: 1,082)</b>
------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**TABLE C-33  
PPO/POS PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$741	\$741	\$741	N/A	\$741	\$155	\$155	\$155	N/A	\$155
City of Dallas, TX	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$75	\$75	\$75	\$75	\$75
City of Houston, TX	\$367	\$367	\$367	\$367	\$367	\$70	\$70	\$70	\$70	\$70
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$255	\$255	\$255	\$255	\$255	\$13	\$13	\$13	\$13	\$13
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	\$702	\$702	\$702	\$965	\$1,270	\$90	\$90	\$90	\$0	\$0
City of San Diego, CA	Varies based on employee group	Varies based on employee group	Varies based on employee group	Varies based on employee group	Varies based on employee group	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City and County of San Francisco, CA	\$1,111	\$1,111	\$1,111	\$1,111	\$1,111	\$607	\$607	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$585</i>	<i>\$585</i>	<i>\$585</i>	<i>\$607</i>	<i>\$680</i>	<i>\$168</i>	<i>\$168</i>	<i>\$67</i>	<i>\$32</i>	<i>\$52</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	\$410	\$410	\$410	N/A	N/A	\$117	\$117	\$117	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	\$430	\$436	\$438	N/A	N/A	\$82	\$76	\$74	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	\$469	\$469	\$469	N/A	N/A	\$83	\$83	\$83	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	\$318	\$318	\$318	N/A	N/A	\$79	\$79	\$79	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	\$500	\$500	\$500	N/A	N/A	\$26	\$26	\$26	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	\$453	\$453	\$453	N/A	N/A	\$109	\$109	\$109	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	\$412	\$412	\$412	N/A	N/A	\$46	\$46	\$46	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$427</i>	<i>\$428</i>	<i>\$429</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$77</i>	<i>\$77</i>	<i>\$76</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-33  
PPO/POS PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$620	\$620	\$620	\$620	\$620	\$73	\$73	\$73	\$73	\$73
City of Flagstaff	\$473	\$473	\$473	\$473	\$473	\$473	\$473	\$473	\$473	\$42
Town of Gilbert	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Glendale	\$334-\$339	\$334-\$339	\$334-\$339	\$334-\$339	\$334-\$339	\$30-\$35	\$30-\$35	\$30-\$35	\$30-\$35	\$30-\$35
City of Goodyear	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Mesa	\$368	\$368	\$368	\$368	\$368	\$112	\$112	\$112	\$112	\$112
City of Peoria	\$426	\$426	\$426	\$426	\$426	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Scottsdale	\$302	\$302	\$302	\$302	\$302	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Surprise	\$429	\$429	\$429	\$429	\$429	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50
City of Tempe	\$427	\$427	\$427	\$427	\$427	\$80 (Wellness participant)	\$80 (Wellness participant)	\$80 (Wellness participant)	\$80 (Wellness participant)	\$80 (Wellness participant)
City of Tucson	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$423</i>	<i>\$423</i>	<i>\$423</i>	<i>\$423</i>	<i>\$423</i>	<i>\$103</i>	<i>\$103</i>	<i>\$103</i>	<i>\$103</i>	<i>\$103</i>
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	\$331*	\$331*	\$331*	N/A	N/A	\$89*	\$89*	\$89*	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	\$439 (average)	\$439 (average)	\$439 (average)	N/A	N/A	\$118 (average)	\$118 (average)	\$118 (average)	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$385</i>	<i>\$385</i>	<i>\$385</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$104</i>	<i>\$104</i>	<i>\$104</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>\$463</b>	<b>\$464</b>	<b>\$464</b>	<b>\$493</b>	<b>\$533</b>	<b>\$112</b>	<b>\$112</b>	<b>\$85</b>	<b>\$75</b>	<b>\$50</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b> <i>Execs: 63 Mgrs: 317 GE: 9,423 Police: 3,096 Fire: 1,082</i>	<b>\$415</b>	<b>\$415</b>	<b>\$415</b>	<b>\$415</b>	<b>\$415</b>	<b>\$104</b>	<b>\$104</b>	<b>\$104</b>	<b>\$104</b>	<b>\$104</b>

\* A monthly premium/contribution for plans requiring an employee contribution.

**TABLE C-34  
PPO/POS PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE (%)**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	83%	83%	83%	N/A	83%	17%	N/A	17%	17%	17%
City of Dallas, TX	82%	82%	82%	82%	82%	18%	18%	18%	18%	18%
City of Houston, TX	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%
City of Jacksonville, FL	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	89%	89%	89%	100%	100%	11%	11%	11%	0%	0%
City of San Diego, CA	Varies based on employee group	Varies based on employee group	Varies based on employee group	Varies based on employee group	Varies based on employee group	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City and County of San Francisco, CA	65%	65%	100%	100%	100%	35%	35%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>78%</i>	<i>78%</i>	<i>90%</i>	<i>95%</i>	<i>93%</i>	<i>22%</i>	<i>22%</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>7%</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	78%	78%	78%	N/A	N/A	22%	22%	22%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	84%	85%	86%	N/A	N/A	16%	15%	14%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	85%	85%	85%	N/A	N/A	15%	15%	15%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	80%	80%	80%	N/A	N/A	20%	20%	20%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	95%	95%	95%	N/A	N/A	5%	5%	5%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	81%	81%	81%	N/A	N/A	19%	19%	19%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	90%	90%	90%	N/A	N/A	10%	10%	10%	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>85%</i>	<i>85%</i>	<i>85%</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>15%</i>	<i>15%</i>	<i>15%</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-34  
PPO/POS PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE (%)**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	89%	89%	89%	89%	89%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%
City of Flagstaff	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%
Town of Gilbert	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Glendale	91%	91%	91%	91%	91%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%
City of Goodyear	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Mesa	77%	77%	77%	77%	77%	23%	23%	23%	23%	23%
City of Peoria	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Scottsdale	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Surprise	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
City of Tempe	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%
City of Tucson	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>80%</i>	<i>80%</i>	<i>80%</i>	<i>80%</i>	<i>80%</i>	<i>20%</i>	<i>20%</i>	<i>20%</i>	<i>20%</i>	<i>20%</i>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b> <i>Execs: 63 Mgrs: 317 GE: 9,423 Police: 3,096 Fire: 1,082</i>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>

**TABLE C-35  
PPO/POS PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$1,506	\$1,506	\$1,506	N/A	\$1,506	\$350	\$350	\$350	N/A	\$350
City of Dallas, TX	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$421	\$421	\$421	\$421	\$421
City of Houston, TX	\$709	\$709	\$709	\$709	\$709	\$280	\$280	\$280	\$280	\$280
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$397	\$397	\$397	\$397	\$397	\$155	\$155	\$155	\$155	\$155
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	\$1,298	\$1,298	\$1,298	\$956	\$1,270	\$164	\$164	\$164	\$0	\$0
City of San Diego, CA	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City and County of San Francisco, CA	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,675	\$1,675	\$983	\$983	\$983
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$907</i>	<i>\$907</i>	<i>\$907</i>	<i>\$719</i>	<i>\$902</i>	<i>\$508</i>	<i>\$508</i>	<i>\$392</i>	<i>\$368</i>	<i>\$365</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	\$812	\$812	\$812	N/A	N/A	\$268	\$268	\$268	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	\$656	\$676	\$686	N/A	N/A	\$280	\$260	\$251	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	\$985	\$985	\$985	N/A	N/A	\$361	\$361	\$361	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	\$716	\$716	\$716	N/A	N/A	\$178	\$178	\$178	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	\$882	\$882	\$882	N/A	N/A	\$220	\$220	\$220	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	\$207	\$207	\$207	N/A	N/A	\$218	\$218	\$218	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	\$778	\$778	\$778	N/A	N/A	\$137	\$137	\$137	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$719</i>	<i>\$722</i>	<i>\$724</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$237</i>	<i>\$235</i>	<i>\$233</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-35  
PPO/POS PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$1,035	\$1,035	\$1,035	\$1,035	\$1,035	\$121	\$121	\$121	\$121	\$121
City of Flagstaff	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
Town of Gilbert	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Glendale	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Goodyear	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Mesa	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Peoria	\$698	\$698	\$698	\$698	\$698	\$153	\$153	\$153	\$153	\$153
City of Scottsdale	\$610	\$610	\$610	\$610	\$610	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Surprise	\$775	\$775	\$775	\$775	\$775	\$183	\$183	\$183	\$183	\$183
City of Tempe	\$723	\$723	\$723	\$723	\$723	\$290 (Wellness participant)	\$290 (Wellness participant)	\$290 (Wellness participant)	\$290 (Wellness participant)	\$290 (Wellness participant)
City of Tucson	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$768</i>	<i>\$768</i>	<i>\$768</i>	<i>\$768</i>	<i>\$768</i>	<i>\$149</i>	<i>\$149</i>	<i>\$149</i>	<i>\$149</i>	<i>\$149</i>
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	No data available	No data available	No data available	N/A	N/A	No data available	No data available	No data available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	\$894 (average)	\$894 (average)	\$894 (average)	N/A	N/A	\$254 (average)	\$254 (average)	\$254 (average)	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$894</i>	<i>\$894</i>	<i>\$894</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$254</i>	<i>\$254</i>	<i>\$254</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>\$801</b>	<b>\$802</b>	<b>\$802</b>	<b>\$743</b>	<b>\$841</b>	<b>\$300</b>	<b>\$299</b>	<b>\$262</b>	<b>\$259</b>	<b>\$267</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**TABLE C-36  
PPO/POS PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$1,929	\$1,929	\$1,929	N/A	\$1,929	\$486	\$486	\$486	N/A	\$486
City of Dallas, TX	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$539	\$539	\$539	\$539	\$539
City of Houston, TX	\$1,079	\$1,079	\$1,079	\$1,079	\$1,079	\$420	\$420	\$420	\$420	\$420
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$532	\$532	\$532	\$532	\$532	\$290	\$290	\$290	\$290	\$290
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	\$2,035	\$2,035	\$2,035	\$965	\$1,270	\$261	\$261	\$261	\$0	\$0
City of San Diego, CA	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City and County of San Francisco, CA	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$2,552	\$2,552	\$1,860	\$1,860	\$1,860
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$1,184</i>	<i>\$1,184</i>	<i>\$1,184</i>	<i>\$821</i>	<i>\$1,057</i>	<i>\$758</i>	<i>\$758</i>	<i>\$643</i>	<i>\$622</i>	<i>\$599</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	\$1,061	\$1,061	\$1,061	N/A	N/A	\$361	\$361	\$361	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	\$947	\$976	\$990	N/A	N/A	\$401	\$372	\$358	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	\$1,286	\$1,286	\$1,286	N/A	N/A	\$523	\$523	\$523	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	\$1,018	\$1,018	\$1,018	N/A	N/A	\$254	\$254	\$254	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	\$1496	\$1496	\$1496	N/A	N/A	\$316	\$316	\$316	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	\$1,495	\$1,495	\$1,495	N/A	N/A	\$360	\$360	\$360	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	\$1,107	\$1,107	\$1,107	N/A	N/A	\$220	\$220	\$220	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$1,201</i>	<i>\$1,206</i>	<i>\$1,208</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$348</i>	<i>\$344</i>	<i>\$342</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-36  
PPO/POS PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$1,441	\$1,441	\$1,441	\$1,441	\$1,441	\$241	\$241	\$241	\$241	\$241
City of Flagstaff	\$254	\$254	\$254	\$254	\$254	\$477	\$477	\$477	\$477	\$477
Town of Gilbert	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Glendale	\$755-\$760	\$755-\$760	\$755-\$760	\$755-\$760	\$755-\$760	\$240-\$245	\$240-\$245	\$240-\$245	\$240-\$245	\$240-\$245
City of Goodyear	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Mesa	\$1,001	\$1,001	\$1,001	\$1,001	\$1,001	\$390	\$390	\$390	\$390	\$390
City of Peoria	\$1,047	\$1,047	\$1,047	\$1,047	\$1,047	\$230	\$230	\$230	\$230	\$230
City of Scottsdale	\$864	\$864	\$864	\$864	\$864	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Surprise	\$1,049	\$1,049	\$1,049	\$1,049	\$1,049	\$293	\$293	\$293	\$293	\$293
City of Tempe	\$887	\$887	\$887	\$887	\$887	\$405 (Wellness participant)	\$405 (Wellness participant)	\$405 (Wellness participant)	\$405 (Wellness participant)	\$405 (Wellness participant)
City of Tucson	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$913</i>	<i>\$913</i>	<i>\$913</i>	<i>\$913</i>	<i>\$913</i>	<i>\$285</i>	<i>\$285</i>	<i>\$285</i>	<i>\$285</i>	<i>\$285</i>
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	\$884*	\$884*	\$884*	N/A	N/A	\$301*	\$301*	\$301*	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	\$1,231 (average)	\$1,231 (average)	\$1,231 (average)	N/A	N/A	\$365 (average)	\$365 (average)	\$365 (average)	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$1,058</i>	<i>\$1,058</i>	<i>\$1,058</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$333</i>	<i>\$333</i>	<i>\$333</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>\$1,084</b>	<b>\$1,085</b>	<b>\$1,086</b>	<b>\$878</b>	<b>\$974</b>	<b>\$432</b>	<b>\$430</b>	<b>\$400</b>	<b>\$414</b>	<b>\$420</b>

\* Average monthly premium/contribution for plans requiring an employee contribution

<b>City of Phoenix</b> <i>Execs - 63; Mgrs - 317; GE - 9,423 Police: 3,096 Fire: 1,082</i>	<b>\$1,195</b>	<b>\$1,195</b>	<b>\$1,195</b>	<b>\$1,195</b>	<b>\$1,195</b>	<b>\$299</b>	<b>\$299</b>	<b>\$299</b>	<b>\$299</b>	<b>\$299</b>
---	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

**TABLE C-37**  
**PPO/POS PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE (%)**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	80%	80%	80%	N/A	80%	20%	20%	20%	N/A	20%
City of Dallas, TX	38%	38%	38%	38%	38%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%
City of Houston, TX	72%	72%	72%	72%	72%	28%	28%	28%	28%	28%
City of Jacksonville, FL	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	35%	35%	35%	35%	35%
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	89%	89%	89%	100%	100%	11%	11%	11%	0%	0%
City of San Diego, CA	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City and County of San Francisco, CA	32%	32%	39%	39%	39%	68%	68%	61%	61%	61%
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>61%</i>	<i>61%</i>	<i>65%</i>	<i>57%</i>	<i>64%</i>	<i>39%</i>	<i>39%</i>	<i>35%</i>	<i>43%</i>	<i>36%</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	75%	75%	75%	N/A	N/A	25%	25%	25%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	70%	72%	73%	N/A	N/A	30%	28%	27%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	71%	71%	71%	N/A	N/A	29%	29%	29%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	80%	80%	80%	N/A	N/A	20%	20%	20%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	83%	83%	83%	N/A	N/A	17%	17%	17%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	81%	81%	81%	N/A	N/A	19%	19%	19%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	83%	83%	83%	N/A	N/A	17%	17%	17%	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>78%</i>	<i>78%</i>	<i>78%</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>22%</i>	<i>22%</i>	<i>22%</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-37  
PPO/POS PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE (%)**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	14%	14%	14%	14%	14%
City of Flagstaff	35%	35%	35%	35%	35%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%
Town of Gilbert	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Glendale	76%	76%	76%	76%	76%	24%	24%	24%	24%	24%
City of Goodyear	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Mesa	72%	72%	72%	72%	72%	28%	28%	28%	28%	28%
City of Peoria	82%	82%	82%	82%	82%	18%	18%	18%	18%	18%
City of Scottsdale	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Surprise	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	22%	22%	22%	22%	22%
City of Tempe	69%	69%	69%	69%	69%	31%	31%	31%	31%	31%
City of Tucson	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>76%</i>	<i>76%</i>	<i>76%</i>	<i>76%</i>	<i>76%</i>	<i>24%</i>	<i>24%</i>	<i>24%</i>	<i>24%</i>	<i>24%</i>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>30%</b>

<i>City of Phoenix</i>										
<i>Execs: 63 Mgrs: 317 GE: 9,423 Police: 3,096 Fire: 1,082</i>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>

**TABLE C-38**  
**PPO/POS PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE**

<b>Comparator</b>	<b>Executives (Y/N)</b>	<b>Managers (Y/N)</b>	<b>General Employees (Y/N)</b>	<b>Uniformed Police (Y/N)</b>	<b>Uniformed Fire/Rescue (Y/N)</b>
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes
City of Dallas, TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Houston, TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Jacksonville, FL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-38  
PPO/POS PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE**

<b>Comparator</b>	<b>Executives (Y/N)</b>	<b>Managers (Y/N)</b>	<b>General Employees (Y/N)</b>	<b>Uniformed Police (Y/N)</b>	<b>Uniformed Fire/Rescue (Y/N)</b>
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Flagstaff	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Gilbert	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Glendale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Goodyear	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Mesa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Peoria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Scottsdale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Surprise	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Tempe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Tucson	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
<b>Published Data</b>					
Neither BLS nor Towers Watson contained data on this benefit detail.					

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 1,082)</b>
------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

**TABLE C-39  
HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$550	\$550	\$550	N/A	\$550	\$40	\$40	\$40	N/A	\$40
City of Dallas, TX	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Houston, TX	\$365	\$365	\$365	\$365	\$365	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$223	\$223	\$223	\$223	\$223	\$12	\$12	\$12	\$12	\$12
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	\$410	\$410	\$410	N/A	N/A	\$14	\$14	\$14	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City and Co. of San Francisco	\$589	\$589	\$589	\$589	\$589	\$85	\$85	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$427</i>	<i>\$427</i>	<i>\$427</i>	<i>\$392</i>	<i>\$432</i>	<i>\$39</i>	<i>\$39</i>	<i>\$22</i>	<i>\$19</i>	<i>\$24</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	\$446	\$446	\$446	N/A	N/A	\$24	\$24	\$24	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$446</i>	<i>\$446</i>	<i>\$446</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$24</i>	<i>\$24</i>	<i>\$24</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-39  
HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$462	\$462	\$462	\$462	\$462	\$54	\$54	\$54	\$54	\$54
City of Flagstaff	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
Town of Gilbert	\$353	\$353	\$353	\$353	\$353	\$88	\$88	\$88	\$88	\$88
City of Glendale	\$356-\$361	\$356-\$361	\$356-\$361	\$356-\$361	\$356-\$361	\$35-\$40	\$35-\$40	\$35-\$40	\$35-\$40	\$35-\$40
City of Goodyear	\$470	\$470	\$470	\$470	\$470	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Mesa	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Peoria	\$447	\$447	\$447	\$447	\$447	\$41	\$41	\$41	\$41	\$41
City of Scottsdale	\$314	\$314	\$314	\$314	\$314	\$55	\$55	\$55	\$55	\$55
City of Surprise	\$445	\$445	\$445	\$445	\$445	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50
City of Tempe	\$425	\$425	\$425	\$425	\$425	\$35 (Wellness participant)	\$35 (Wellness participant)	\$35 (Wellness participant)	\$35 (Wellness participant)	\$35 (Wellness participant)
City of Tucson	\$368	\$368	\$368	\$368	\$368	\$65	\$65	\$65	\$65	\$65
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$405</i>	<i>\$405</i>	<i>\$405</i>	<i>\$405</i>	<i>\$405</i>	<i>\$47</i>	<i>\$47</i>	<i>\$47</i>	<i>\$47</i>	<i>\$47</i>

**TABLE C-39  
HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	\$331*	\$331*	\$331*	N/A	N/A	\$89*	\$89*	\$89*	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	\$420 (average)	\$420 (average)	\$420 (average)	N/A	N/A	\$96 (average)	\$96 (average)	\$96 (average)	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	\$376	\$376	\$376	N/A	N/A	\$93	\$93	\$93	N/A	N/A
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>\$410</b>	<b>\$410</b>	<b>\$410</b>	<b>\$402</b>	<b>\$413</b>	<b>\$49</b>	<b>\$49</b>	<b>\$44</b>	<b>\$40</b>	<b>\$40</b>
<i>City of Phoenix</i> <i>Execs: 63</i> <i>Mgrs: 317</i> <i>GE: 9,423</i> <i>Police: 3,096</i> <i>Fire: 1,082</i>	\$377	\$377	\$377	\$377	\$377	\$94	\$94	\$94	\$94	\$94

\* Average monthly premium/contribution for plans requiring an employee contribution

**TABLE C-40**  
**HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE (%)**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	93%	93%	93%	N/A	93%	7%	7%	7%	N/A	7%
City of Dallas, TX	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Houston, TX	89%	89%	89%	89%	89%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%
City of Jacksonville, FL	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	97%	97%	97%	N/A	N/A	3%	3%	3%	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City and Co. of San Francisco	87%	87%	100%	100%	100%	13%	13%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>92%</i>	<i>92%</i>	<i>95%</i>	<i>95%</i>	<i>95%</i>	<i>8%</i>	<i>8%</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>5%</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	95%	95%	95%	N/A	N/A	5%	5%	5%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>95%</i>	<i>95%</i>	<i>95%</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-40**  
**HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE (%)**

Comparator	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
City of Flagstaff	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
Town of Gilbert	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
City of Glendale	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
City of Goodyear	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
City of Mesa	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Peoria	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
City of Scottsdale	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%
City of Surprise	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
City of Tempe	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
City of Tucson	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>90%</i>	<i>90%</i>	<i>90%</i>	<i>90%</i>	<i>90%</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>10%</i>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>

<b>City of Phoenix</b> <i>Execs: 63 Mgrs: 317 GE: 9,423 Police: 3,096 Fire: 1,082</i>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>
--	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

**TABLE C-41**  
**HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$1,133	\$1,133	\$1,133	N/A	\$1,133	\$119	\$119	\$119	N/A	\$119
City of Dallas, TX	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Houston, TX	\$746	\$746	\$746	\$746	\$746	\$180	\$180	\$180	\$180	\$180
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$347	\$347	\$347	\$347	\$347	\$136	\$136	\$136	\$136	\$136
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	\$759	\$759	\$759	N/A	N/A	\$29	\$29	\$29	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City and County of San Francisco, CA	\$1,092	\$1,092	\$1,092	\$1,092	\$1,092	\$674	\$674	\$85	\$85	\$85
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$815</i>	<i>\$815</i>	<i>\$815</i>	<i>\$728</i>	<i>\$830</i>	<i>\$228</i>	<i>\$228</i>	<i>\$110</i>	<i>\$134</i>	<i>\$130</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	\$988	\$988	\$988	N/A	N/A	\$246	\$246	\$246	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$988</i>	<i>\$988</i>	<i>\$988</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$246</i>	<i>\$246</i>	<i>\$246</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-41**  
**HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$772	\$772	\$772	\$772	\$772	\$91	\$91	\$91	\$91	\$91
City of Flagstaff	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
Town of Gilbert	\$1,002	\$1,002	\$1,002	\$1,002	\$1,002	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250
City of Glendale	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Goodyear	\$1,039	\$1,039	\$1,039	\$1,039	\$1,039	\$104	\$104	\$104	\$104	\$104
City of Mesa	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Peoria	\$799	\$799	\$799	\$799	\$799	\$176	\$176	\$176	\$176	\$176
City of Scottsdale	\$540	\$540	\$540	\$540	\$540	\$130	\$130	\$130	\$130	\$130
City of Surprise	\$799	\$799	\$799	\$799	\$799	\$192	\$192	\$192	\$192	\$192
City of Tempe	\$723	\$723	\$723	\$723	\$723	\$199 (Wellness participant)	\$199 (Wellness participant)	\$199 (Wellness participant)	\$199 (Wellness participant)	\$199 (Wellness participant)
City of Tucson	\$712	\$712	\$712	\$712	\$712	\$197	\$197	\$197	\$197	\$197
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$798</i>	<i>\$798</i>	<i>\$798</i>	<i>\$798</i>	<i>\$798</i>	<i>\$167</i>	<i>\$167</i>	<i>\$167</i>	<i>\$167</i>	<i>\$167</i>
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	No data available	No data available	No data available	N/A	N/A	No data available	No data available	No data available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	\$864 (average)	\$864 (average)	\$864 (average)	N/A	N/A	\$205 (average)	\$205 (average)	\$205 (average)	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$864</i>	<i>\$864</i>	<i>\$864</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$205</i>	<i>\$205</i>	<i>\$205</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>\$821</b>	<b>\$821</b>	<b>\$821</b>	<b>\$779</b>	<b>\$809</b>	<b>\$195</b>	<b>\$195</b>	<b>\$156</b>	<b>\$158</b>	<b>\$155</b>
<i>City of Phoenix</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-42  
HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$1,405	\$1,405	\$1,405	N/A	\$1,405	\$221	\$221	\$221	N/A	\$221
City of Dallas, TX	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Houston, TX	\$1,133	\$1,133	\$1,133	\$1,133	\$1,133	\$270	\$270	\$270	\$270	\$270
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$464	\$464	\$464	\$464	\$464	\$253	\$253	\$253	\$253	\$253
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	\$1,189	\$1,189	\$1,189	N/A	N/A	\$42	\$42	\$42	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City and Co. of San Francisco	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,196	\$1,162	\$1,162	\$470	\$470	\$470
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$1,077</i>	<i>\$1,077</i>	<i>\$1,077</i>	<i>\$931</i>	<i>\$1,050</i>	<i>\$390</i>	<i>\$390</i>	<i>\$251</i>	<i>\$331</i>	<i>\$304</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	\$1,622	\$1,622	\$1,622	N/A	N/A	\$364	\$364	\$364	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$1,622</i>	<i>\$1,622</i>	<i>\$1,622</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$364</i>	<i>\$364</i>	<i>\$364</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-42  
HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$1,123	\$1,123	\$1,123	\$1,123	\$1,123	\$132	\$132	\$132	\$132	\$132
City of Flagstaff	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
Town of Gilbert	\$1,002	\$1,002	\$1,002	\$1,002	\$1,002	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250
City of Glendale	\$807-\$812	\$807-\$812	\$807-\$812	\$807-\$812	\$807-\$812	\$356-\$361	\$356-\$361	\$356-\$361	\$356-\$361	\$356-\$361
City of Goodyear	\$1,284	\$1,284	\$1,284	\$1,284	\$1,284	\$128	\$128	\$128	\$128	\$128
City of Mesa	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Peoria	\$1,199	\$1,199	\$1,199	\$1,199	\$1,199	\$263	\$263	\$263	\$263	\$263
City of Scottsdale	\$896	\$896	\$896	\$896	\$896	\$249	\$249	\$249	\$249	\$249
City of Surprise	\$1,081	\$1,081	\$1,081	\$1,081	\$1,081	\$306	\$306	\$306	\$306	\$306
City of Tempe	\$888	\$888	\$888	\$888	\$888	\$288 (Wellness participant)	\$288 (Wellness participant)	\$288 (Wellness participant)	\$288 (Wellness participant)	\$288 (Wellness participant)
City of Tucson	\$1,060	\$1,060	\$1,060	\$1,060	\$1,060	\$238	\$238	\$238	\$238	\$238
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$1,038</i>	<i>\$1,038</i>	<i>\$1,038</i>	<i>\$1,038</i>	<i>\$1,038</i>	<i>\$246</i>	<i>\$246</i>	<i>\$246</i>	<i>\$246</i>	<i>\$246</i>
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	\$884*	\$884*	\$884*	N/A	N/A	\$301*	\$301*	\$301*	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	\$1,165 (average)	\$1,165 (average)	\$1,165 (average)	N/A	N/A	\$309 (average)	\$309 (average)	\$309 (average)	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$1,025</i>	<i>\$1,025</i>	<i>\$1,025</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$305</i>	<i>\$305</i>	<i>\$305</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>\$1,082</b>	<b>\$1,082</b>	<b>\$1,082</b>	<b>\$1,011</b>	<b>\$1,042</b>	<b>\$302</b>	<b>\$302</b>	<b>\$261</b>	<b>\$267</b>	<b>\$264</b>
<b>City of Phoenix</b> <i>Execs – 63; Mgrs: 317; GE – 9,423; Police: 3,096 Fire: 1,082</i>	<b>\$1,085</b>	<b>\$1,085</b>	<b>\$1,085</b>	<b>\$1,085</b>	<b>\$1,085</b>	<b>\$271</b>	<b>\$271</b>	<b>\$271</b>	<b>\$271</b>	<b>\$271</b>

\* Average monthly premium/contribution for plans requiring an employee contribution.

**TABLE C-43  
HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE (%)**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	86%	86%	86%	N/A	86%	14%	14%	14%	N/A	14%
City of Dallas, TX	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Houston, TX	81%	81%	81%	81%	81%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%
City of Jacksonville, FL	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	35%	35%	35%	35%	35%
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	97%	97%	97%	N/A	N/A	3%	3%	3%	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Varies by group	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City and Co. of San Francisco	51%	51%	72%	72%	72%	49%	49%	28%	28%	28%
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>73%</i>	<i>73%</i>	<i>81%</i>	<i>74%</i>	<i>78%</i>	<i>27%</i>	<i>27%</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>26%</i>	<i>22%</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	82%	82%	82%	N/A	N/A	18%	18%	18%	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>82%</i>	<i>82%</i>	<i>82%</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-43  
HMO/EPO PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE (%)**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	89%	89%	89%	89%	89%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%
City of Flagstaff	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
Town of Gilbert	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
City of Glendale	69%	69%	69%	69%	69%	31%	31%	31%	31%	31%
City of Goodyear	91%	91%	91%	91%	91%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%
City of Mesa	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Peoria	82%	82%	82%	82%	82%	18%	18%	18%	18%	18%
City of Scottsdale	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	22%	22%	22%	22%	22%
City of Surprise	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	22%	22%	22%	22%	22%
City of Tempe	76%	76%	76%	76%	76%	24%	24%	24%	24%	24%
City of Tucson	82%	82%	82%	82%	82%	18%	18%	18%	18%	18%
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>81%</i>	<i>81%</i>	<i>81%</i>	<i>81%</i>	<i>81%</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>19%</i>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>20%</b>

<b>City of Phoenix</b> <i>Execs: 63 Mgrs: 317 GE: 9,423 Police: 3,096 Fire: 1,082</i>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>
--	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

**TABLE C-44**  
**HMO/EPO PLAN –PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes
City of Dallas, TX	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Houston, TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Jacksonville, FL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City and County of San Francisco, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-44**  
**HMO/EPO PLAN –PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Flagstaff	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
Town of Gilbert	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Glendale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Goodyear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Mesa	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Peoria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Scottsdale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Surprise	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Tempe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Tucson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Published Data</b>					
Neither BLS nor Towers Watson contained data on this benefit detail.					

<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>(Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>(Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>(Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>(Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>(Ees: 1, 082)</b>
------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

**TABLE C-45  
STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
State of Arizona	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes
City of Dallas, TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Houston, TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Jacksonville, FL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City and Co. of San Francisco, CA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>					
Private Employer 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-45  
STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN**

Comparators	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>					
City of Chandler	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Flagstaff	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Gilbert	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Glendale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Goodyear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Mesa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Peoria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Scottsdale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Surprise	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Tempe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Tucson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Published Data</b>					
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	Offered by 100% of employers	Offered by 100% of employers	Offered by 100% of employers	N/A	N/A
<b>City of Phoenix</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 63)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 317)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 9,423)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 3,096)</b>	<b>Yes (Ees: 1,082)</b>

**TABLE C-46**  
**STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$5	\$5	\$5	N/A	\$5	\$31	\$31	\$31	N/A	\$31
City of Dallas, TX	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8	\$8	\$8	\$8	\$8
City of Houston, TX	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9	\$9	\$9	\$9	\$9
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2	\$2	\$2	\$2	\$2
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	\$28	\$28	\$28	N/A	N/A	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18	\$18	\$18	\$18	\$18
City and Co. of San Francisco	\$33	\$33	\$33	\$33	\$33	Information not provided	\$2	\$2	\$2	\$2
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$9</i>	<i>\$9</i>	<i>\$9</i>	<i>\$7</i>	<i>\$6</i>	<i>\$11</i>	<i>\$10</i>	<i>\$10</i>	<i>\$8</i>	<i>\$12</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	\$31	\$31	\$31	N/A	N/A	\$10	\$10	\$10	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	\$24	\$24	\$24	N/A	N/A	\$21	\$21	\$21	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	\$26	\$26	\$26	N/A	N/A	\$7	\$7	\$7	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	\$23	\$23	\$23	N/A	N/A	\$16	\$16	\$16	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	\$40	\$40	\$40	N/A	N/A	\$2	\$2	\$2	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	\$24-\$27	\$24-\$27	\$24-\$27	N/A	N/A	\$3-\$6	\$3-\$6	\$3-\$6	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	\$40	\$40	\$40	N/A	N/A	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$30</i>	<i>\$30</i>	<i>\$30</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$9</i>	<i>\$9</i>	<i>\$9</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-46**  
**STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$51	\$51	\$51	\$51	\$51	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Flagstaff	\$33	\$33	\$33	\$33	\$33	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Town of Gilbert	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$7	\$7	\$7	\$7	\$7
City of Glendale	\$8-\$35	\$8-\$35	\$8-\$35	\$8-\$35	\$8-\$35	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Goodyear	\$37	\$37	\$37	\$37	\$37	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Mesa	\$86	\$86	\$86	\$86	\$86	\$0-\$25	\$0-\$25	\$0-\$25	\$0-\$25	\$0-\$25
City of Peoria	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City of Scottsdale	\$35	\$35	\$35	\$35	\$35	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5
City of Surprise	\$28	\$28	\$28	\$28	\$28	\$4	\$4	\$4	\$4	\$4
City of Tempe	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$0-\$13	\$0-\$13	\$0-\$13	\$0-\$13	\$0-\$13
City of Tucson	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$3	\$3	\$3	\$3	\$3
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$37</i>	<i>\$37</i>	<i>\$37</i>	<i>\$37</i>	<i>\$37</i>	<i>\$3</i>	<i>\$3</i>	<i>\$3</i>	<i>\$3</i>	<i>\$3</i>

**TABLE C-46  
STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SINGLE COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	\$16 (average)	\$16 (average)	\$16 (average)	N/A	N/A	\$10 (average)	\$10 (average)	\$10 (average)	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<b>\$16</b>	<b>\$16</b>	<b>\$16</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$10</b>	<b>\$10</b>	<b>\$10</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>\$27</b>	<b>\$27</b>	<b>\$27</b>	<b>\$28</b>	<b>\$26</b>	<b>\$7</b>	<b>\$7</b>	<b>\$7</b>	<b>\$5</b>	<b>\$6</b>

<i>City of Phoenix</i>										
<i>Execs: 63 Mgrs: 317 GE: 9,423 Police: 3,096 Fire: 1,082</i>	<b>\$52</b>	<b>\$52</b>	<b>\$52</b>	<b>\$52</b>	<b>\$52</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**TABLE C-47**  
**STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$10	\$10	\$10	N/A	\$10	\$71	\$71	\$71	N/A	\$71
City of Dallas, TX	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15
City of Houston, TX	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19	\$19	\$19	\$19	\$19
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9	\$9	\$9	\$9	\$9
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	\$57	\$57	\$57	N/A	N/A	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$34	\$34	\$34	\$34	\$34
City and Co. of San Francisco	Information not provided	\$53	\$53	\$53	\$53	Information not provided	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$11</i>	<i>\$17</i>	<i>\$17</i>	<i>\$11</i>	<i>\$11</i>	<i>\$25</i>	<i>\$22</i>	<i>\$22</i>	<i>\$16</i>	<i>\$26</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	\$23	\$23	\$23	N/A	N/A	\$68	\$68	\$68	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	\$27	\$27	\$27	N/A	N/A	\$64	\$64	\$64	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	\$62	\$62	\$62	N/A	N/A	\$30	\$30	\$30	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	\$65	\$65	\$65	N/A	N/A	\$44	\$44	\$44	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	\$66	\$66	\$66	N/A	N/A	\$22	\$22	\$22	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	\$47-\$52	\$47-\$52	\$47-\$52	N/A	N/A	\$6-\$12	\$6-\$12	\$6-\$12	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	\$93	\$93	\$93	N/A	N/A	\$18	\$18	\$18	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$55</i>	<i>\$55</i>	<i>\$55</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$36</i>	<i>\$36</i>	<i>\$36</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-47**  
**STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$58	\$58	\$58	\$58	\$58	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$25
City of Flagstaff	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
Town of Gilbert	\$84	\$84	\$84	\$84	\$84	\$21	\$21	\$21	\$21	\$21
City of Glendale	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Goodyear	\$73	\$73	\$73	\$73	\$73	\$22	\$22	\$22	\$22	\$22
City of Mesa	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered	Not offered
City of Peoria	\$35	\$35	\$35	\$35	\$35	\$27	\$27	\$27	\$27	\$27
City of Scottsdale	\$41	\$41	\$41	\$41	\$41	\$47	\$47	\$47	\$47	\$47
City of Surprise	\$49	\$49	\$49	\$49	\$49	\$14	\$14	\$14	\$14	\$14
City of Tempe	\$36	\$36	\$36	\$36	\$36	\$26-\$41	\$26-\$41	\$26-\$41	\$26-\$41	\$26-\$41
City of Tucson	\$61	\$61	\$61	\$61	\$61	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$55</i>	<i>\$55</i>	<i>\$55</i>	<i>\$55</i>	<i>\$55</i>	<i>\$24</i>	<i>\$24</i>	<i>\$24</i>	<i>\$24</i>	<i>\$24</i>

**TABLE C-47  
STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR DUAL COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	\$32 (average)	\$32 (average)	\$32 (average)	N/A	N/A	\$21 (average)	\$21 (average)	\$21 (average)	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	\$32	\$32	\$32	N/A	N/A	\$21	\$21	\$21	N/A	N/A
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>\$42</b>	<b>\$42</b>	<b>\$42</b>	<b>\$38</b>	<b>\$36</b>	<b>\$28</b>	<b>\$27</b>	<b>\$27</b>	<b>\$21</b>	<b>\$25</b>
City of Phoenix Execs: 63 Mgrs: 317 GE: 9,23 Police: 3,096 Fire: 1,082	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**TABLE C-48  
STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Public Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
State of Arizona	\$14	\$14	\$14	N/A	\$14	\$123	\$123	\$123	N/A	\$123
City of Dallas, TX	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21	\$21	\$21	\$21	\$21
City of Houston, TX	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27	\$27	\$27	\$27	\$27
City of Jacksonville, FL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13	\$13	\$13	\$13	\$13
City of Los Angeles, CA	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided	Information not provided
City of Philadelphia, PA	\$88	\$88	\$88	N/A	N/A	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A
City of San Diego, CA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$34	\$34	\$34	\$34	\$34
City and Co. of San Francisco	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$80	Information not provided	\$7	\$7	\$7	\$7
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$26</i>	<i>\$26</i>	<i>\$26</i>	<i>\$16</i>	<i>\$16</i>	<i>\$36</i>	<i>\$32</i>	<i>\$32</i>	<i>\$20</i>	<i>\$38</i>
<b>Private Sector Custom Survey Responses</b>										
Private Employer 1	\$95	\$95	\$95	N/A	N/A	\$32	\$32	\$32	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 2	\$30	\$30	\$30	N/A	N/A	\$112	\$112	\$112	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 3	\$98	\$98	\$98	N/A	N/A	\$54	\$54	\$54	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 4	\$93	\$93	\$93	N/A	N/A	\$62	\$62	\$62	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 5	\$156	\$156	\$156	N/A	N/A	\$39	\$39	\$39	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 6	\$77-\$86	\$77-\$86	\$77-\$86	N/A	N/A	\$10-\$19	\$10-\$19	\$10-\$19	N/A	N/A
Private Employer 7	\$93	\$93	\$93	N/A	N/A	\$18	\$18	\$18	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$92</i>	<i>\$92</i>	<i>\$92</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$47</i>	<i>\$47</i>	<i>\$47</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**TABLE C-48**  
**STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Local Public Sector Responses</b>										
City of Chandler	\$68	\$68	\$68	\$68	\$68	\$68	\$68	\$68	\$68	\$68
City of Flagstaff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56
Town of Gilbert	\$84	\$84	\$84	\$84	\$84	\$21	\$21	\$21	\$21	\$21
City of Glendale	\$16-\$42	\$16-\$42	\$16-\$42	\$16-\$42	\$16-\$42	\$5-62	\$5-62	\$5-62	\$5-62	\$5-62
City of Goodyear	\$136	\$136	\$136	\$136	\$136	\$41	\$41	\$41	\$41	\$41
City of Mesa	\$136	\$136	\$136	\$136	\$136	\$3-\$17	\$3-\$17	\$3-\$17	\$3-\$17	\$3-\$17
City of Peoria	\$65	\$65	\$65	\$65	\$65	\$49	\$49	\$49	\$49	\$49
City of Scottsdale	\$44	\$44	\$44	\$44	\$44	\$75	\$75	\$75	\$75	\$75
City of Surprise	\$73	\$73	\$73	\$73	\$73	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$30
City of Tempe	\$51	\$51	\$51	\$51	\$51	\$52-\$67	\$52-\$67	\$52-\$67	\$52-\$67	\$52-\$67
City of Tucson	\$89	\$89	\$89	\$89	\$89	\$7	\$7	\$7	\$7	\$7
<i>Market Average</i>	<i>\$70</i>	<i>\$70</i>	<i>\$70</i>	<i>\$70</i>	<i>\$70</i>	<i>\$44</i>	<i>\$44</i>	<i>\$44</i>	<i>\$44</i>	<i>\$44</i>

**TABLE C-48  
STAND-ALONE DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FAMILY COVERAGE**

Comparators	Employer Contribution					Employee Contribution				
	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue	Executives	Managers	General Employees	Uniformed Police	Uniformed Fire/Rescue
<b>Published Data</b>										
BLS	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	N/A	N/A
Towers Watson	\$48 (average)	\$48 (average)	\$48 (average)	N/A	N/A	\$31 (average)	\$31 (average)	\$31 (average)	N/A	N/A
<i>Market Average</i>	<b>\$48</b>	<b>\$48</b>	<b>\$48</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$31</b>	<b>\$31</b>	<b>\$31</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>\$64</b>	<b>\$64</b>	<b>\$64</b>	<b>\$53</b>	<b>\$51</b>	<b>\$41</b>	<b>\$40</b>	<b>\$40</b>	<b>\$35</b>	<b>\$40</b>
<i>City of Phoenix</i> <i>Execs: 63</i> <i>Mgrs: 317</i> <i>GE: 9,423</i> <i>Police: 3,096</i> <i>Fire: 1,082</i>	<b>\$107</b>	<b>\$107</b>	<b>\$107</b>	<b>\$107</b>	<b>\$107</b>	<b>\$36</b>	<b>\$36</b>	<b>\$36</b>	<b>\$36</b>	<b>\$36</b>

5152634v3/02120.017

---

## CITY COUNCIL REPORT

---

### POLICY AGENDA

---

TO: David Cavazos  
City Manager

AGENDA DATE: February 7, 2011

FROM: Janet Smith  
Human Resources Director

ITEM:2

SUBJECT: PAY AND BENEFITS STUDY – SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

---

---

This report requests City Council acceptance of the findings of the City's pay and benefits study recently completed by The Segal Company.

#### THE ISSUE

A summary of the results from the pay and benefits study was provided to the City Council on January 24, 2012. As noted during that presentation:

- City of Phoenix employees wages and salaries are 19 percentage points less than similar jobs in comparable local private sector companies;
- General employees have a total compensation package (pay with benefits) valued at 1 percentage point above the combined market of private and public sector employers;
- Total compensation falls within the competitive market range for general employees if the Pension Reform recommendations of the Pension Reform Task Force are implemented;
- Sworn public safety jobs lead the public sector market by 5% in total compensation compared to other local and national public sector employers.

Originally, Segal provided an analysis of 42 comparable jobs, as a subset of all local and national private sector matches. Their original analysis indicated that for this particular subset of jobs, City of Phoenix pay was below private sector pay, yet within market for total compensation. Since the January 24<sup>th</sup> Policy meeting, staff has analyzed all jobs with appropriate matches to the local and national private sector (105 jobs). From that further review, the analysis indicates that pay remains below the private sector market, and total compensation dropped below the private sector market. (See attached chart All Private Sector and Published Market Data Matches).

#### OTHER INFORMATION

Using customized or nationally recognized surveys to benchmark compensation levels ensures that the pay determined by the organization is not misaligned with the labor market, i.e. pay is not too low or too high. Paying too high relative to the labor market wastes financial resources; while paying too low risks increased turnover and higher training-related costs that are associated with turnover.

The term "competitive market range" is defined as the average of pay range midpoints. If the midpoint of a particular job falls between 95% and 105% of the average of pay

range midpoints found elsewhere, the job is considered within the “competitive market range”. “Leading the market” means jobs are placed at 106% or higher of the competitive market range and “lagging the market” means jobs are placed at or below 94% of the competitive market range.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council accept the findings of The Segal Company's pay and benefits study (titled “*City of Phoenix 2011 Total Compensation Study*”), provided to the City Council in its entirety on January 24 and supplemented with the attached revised data matches chart. The methodology and findings are consistent with industry standards and the data collected from both private and public sector employees will be helpful in evaluating pay, benefits and pay related practices for the City of Phoenix.

Staff will return to Council with a plan to address benefit changes and pay ranges identified as most significantly outside of the competitive market range. Some changes must be addressed through the current labor negotiations process while others can be adjusted with Council approval.

Attachment

**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
**All Private Sector and Published Market Data Matches**  
 (Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)

		Additional PrS/PD JOBS		Base Salary	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits				Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Administrative Support	3	Administrative Aide	Phoenix	\$ 43,275	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,967	-	7,867	\$ 62,872	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 42,515	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,102	1,701	6,802	\$ 61,411		44%		31%
			Phx as % Mkt	102%	97%	154%	0%	116%	102%				
Administrative Support	7	Administrative Secretary	Phoenix	\$ 45,001	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,181	2,700	10,881	\$ 67,612	50%		33%	
			Market	\$ 44,611	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,353	1,784	7,138	\$ 63,843		43%		30%
			Phx as % Mkt	101%	97%	153%	152%	106%					
Administrative Support	7	Clerical Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 45,001	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,181	2,700	10,881	\$ 67,612	50%		33%	
			Market	\$ 50,553	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,066	2,022	8,088	\$ 70,735		40%		29%
			Phx as % Mkt	89%	97%	135%	134%	135%	96%				
Administrative Support	3	Clerk I	Phoenix	\$ 27,019	\$ 11,730	\$ 4,912	-	4,912	\$ 43,661	62%		38%	
			Market	\$ 27,871	\$ 12,094	\$ 3,345	1,115	4,459	\$ 44,424		59%		37%
			Phx as % Mkt	97%	97%	147%	0%	110%	98%				
Administrative Support	3	Clerk III	Phoenix	\$ 32,532	\$ 11,730	\$ 5,914	-	5,914	\$ 50,176	54%		35%	
			Market	\$ 33,212	\$ 12,094	\$ 3,985	1,328	5,314	\$ 50,620		52%		34%
			Phx as % Mkt	98%	97%	148%	0%	111%	99%				
Administrative Support	2	Courier	Phoenix	\$ 34,237	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,224	240	6,464	\$ 52,431	53%		35%	
			Market	\$ 34,257	\$ 12,094	\$ 4,111	1,370	5,481	\$ 51,832		51%		34%
			Phx as % Mkt	100%	97%	151%	17%	118%	101%				
Administrative Support	3	Customer Service Clerk	Phoenix	\$ 32,532	\$ 11,730	\$ 5,914	-	5,914	\$ 50,176	54%		35%	
			Market	\$ 33,564	\$ 12,094	\$ 4,028	1,343	5,370	\$ 51,028		52%		34%
			Phx as % Mkt	97%	97%	147%	0%	110%	98%				
Administrative Support	1	Mail Service Worker	Phoenix	\$ 34,237	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,224	154	6,378	\$ 52,345	53%		35%	
			Market	\$ 31,243	\$ 12,094	\$ 3,749	1,250	4,999	\$ 48,336		55%		35%
			Phx as % Mkt	110%	97%	166%	12%	128%	108%				
Administrative Support	7	Management Assistant I	Phoenix	\$ 55,048	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,008	3,303	13,311	\$ 80,088	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 57,808	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,937	2,312	9,249	\$ 79,151		37%		27%
			Phx as % Mkt	95%	97%	144%	143%	101%					
Administrative Support	7	Management Assistant II	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 69,906	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,389	2,796	11,185	\$ 93,185		33%		25%
			Phx as % Mkt	106%	97%	161%	159%	161%	112%				
Administrative Support	3	Records Clerk II	Phoenix	\$ 35,849	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,517	-	6,517	\$ 54,096	51%		34%	
			Market	\$ 37,252	\$ 12,094	\$ 4,470	1,490	5,960	\$ 55,306		48%		33%
			Phx as % Mkt	96%	97%	146%	0%	109%	98%				
Administrative Support	3	Secretary II	Phoenix	\$ 34,092	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,198	-	6,198	\$ 52,019	53%		34%	
			Market	\$ 37,104	\$ 12,094	\$ 4,452	1,484	5,937	\$ 55,134		49%		33%
			Phx as % Mkt	92%	97%	139%	0%	104%	94%				
Audit	7	Internal Auditor II	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 67,681	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,122	2,707	10,829	\$ 90,604		34%		25%
			Phx as % Mkt	90%	97%	136%	135%	136%	96%				
Audit	7	Internal Auditor III	Phoenix	\$ 70,627	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,840	4,238	17,078	\$ 99,434	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 76,767	\$ 12,094	\$ 9,212	3,071	12,283	\$ 101,144		32%		24%
			Phx as % Mkt	92%	97%	139%	138%	139%	98%				
Audit	7	Internal Auditor IV	Phoenix	\$ 78,042	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,188	4,683	18,871	\$ 108,642	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 98,024	\$ 12,094	\$ 11,763	3,921	15,684	\$ 125,802		28%		22%
			Phx as % Mkt	80%	97%	121%	119%	120%	86%				
Community & Economic Development	7	Project Manager	Phoenix	\$ 70,627	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,840	4,238	17,078	\$ 99,434	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 76,884	\$ 12,094	\$ 9,226	3,075	12,301	\$ 101,279		32%		24%
			Phx as % Mkt	92%	97%	139%	138%	139%	98%				
Engineering	7	Civil Engineer II	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 65,270	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,832	2,611	10,443	\$ 87,807		35%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	103%	97%	156%	154%	155%	108%				
Engineering	7	Civil Engineer III	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 82,414	\$ 12,094	\$ 9,890	3,297	13,186	\$ 107,694		31%		23%
			Phx as % Mkt	100%	97%	151%	149%	150%	105%				
Engineering	7	Civil Engineer III*Team Ldr	Phoenix	\$ 90,740	\$ 11,730	\$ 16,497	5,444	21,941	\$ 124,410	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 94,809	\$ 12,094	\$ 11,377	3,792	15,169	\$ 122,072		29%		22%
			Phx as % Mkt	96%	97%	145%	144%	145%	102%				
Engineering	7	Electrical Engineer	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 88,980	\$ 12,094	\$ 10,678	3,559	14,237	\$ 115,311		30%		23%
			Phx as % Mkt	92%	97%	140%	138%	139%	99%				

ALL PRIVATE SECTOR JOBS

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage  
 \*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare  
 Doc#: 5172211v1; 01/31/12

**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
**All Private Sector and Published Market Data Matches**  
 (Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)

		Additional PrS/PD JOBS		Base Salary	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits				Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Engineering	3	Engineering Technician	Phoenix	\$ 39,239	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,134	-	7,134	\$ 58,102	48%		32%	
			Market	\$ 46,533	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,584	1,861	7,445	\$ 66,072		42%		30%
			Phx as % Mkt	84%	97%	128%	0%	96%	88%				
Engineering	7	Quality Assurance Engineer	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 71,948	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,634	2,878	11,512	\$ 95,553		33%		25%
			Phx as % Mkt	93%	97%	141%	140%	141%	100%				
Engineering	3	Senior Drafting Technician	Phoenix	\$ 47,508	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,637	-	8,637	\$ 67,875	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 54,490	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,538	2,179	8,717	\$ 75,291		38%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	87%	97%	132%	0%	99%	90%				
Engineering	3	Senior Engineering Technician	Phoenix	\$ 47,508	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,637	-	8,637	\$ 67,875	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 52,127	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,255	2,085	8,340	\$ 72,561		39%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	91%	97%	138%	0%	104%	94%				
Executives	9	Assistant Finance Director	Phoenix	\$ 119,839	\$ 11,730	\$ 21,787	11,505	33,291	\$ 164,860	38%		27%	
			Market	\$ 139,509	\$ 12,094	\$ 16,741	5,580	22,321	\$ 173,924		25%		20%
			Phx as % Mkt	86%	97%	130%	206%	149%	95%				
Executives	9	Budget & Research Director	Phoenix	\$ 132,236	\$ 11,730	\$ 24,041	12,695	36,735	\$ 180,701	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 152,928	\$ 12,094	\$ 18,351	6,117	24,468	\$ 189,490		24%		19%
			Phx as % Mkt	86%	97%	131%	208%	150%	95%				
Executives	9	City Manager (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 210,631	\$ 11,730	\$ 38,293	20,221	58,513	\$ 280,874	33%		25%	
			Market	\$ 754,965	\$ 12,094	\$ 90,596	30,199	120,794	\$ 887,853		18%		15%
			Phx as % Mkt	28%	97%	42%	67%	48%	32%				
Executives	9	Chief Information Officer (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 138,944	\$ 11,730	\$ 25,260	13,339	38,599	\$ 189,272	36%		27%	
			Market	\$ 252,710	\$ 12,094	\$ 30,325	10,108	40,434	\$ 305,237		21%		17%
			Phx as % Mkt	55%	97%	83%	132%	95%	62%				
Executives	9	Finance Director (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 138,944	\$ 11,730	\$ 25,260	13,339	38,599	\$ 189,272	36%		27%	
			Market	\$ 179,526	\$ 12,094	\$ 21,543	7,181	28,724	\$ 220,344		23%		19%
			Phx as % Mkt	77%	97%	117%	186%	134%	86%				
Executives	9	Human Resources Director (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 132,236	\$ 11,730	\$ 24,041	12,695	36,735	\$ 180,701	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 164,271	\$ 12,094	\$ 19,713	6,571	26,283	\$ 202,648		23%		19%
			Phx as % Mkt	80%	97%	122%	193%	140%	89%				
Executives	9	Labor Relations Administrator (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 103,293	\$ 11,730	\$ 18,779	9,916	28,695	\$ 143,717	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 122,016	\$ 12,094	\$ 14,642	4,881	19,523	\$ 153,632		26%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	85%	97%	128%	203%	147%	94%				
Executives	9	Public Information Director (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 119,839	\$ 11,730	\$ 21,787	11,505	33,291	\$ 164,860	38%		27%	
			Market	\$ 124,989	\$ 12,094	\$ 14,999	5,000	19,998	\$ 157,081		26%		20%
			Phx as % Mkt	96%	97%	145%	230%	166%	105%				
Facilities	2	Building Equipment Operator II	Phoenix	\$ 55,952	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,172	392	10,564	\$ 78,245	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 59,418	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,130	2,377	9,507	\$ 81,019		36%		27%
			Phx as % Mkt	94%	97%	143%	16%	111%	97%				
Facilities	1	Building Maintenance Worker	Phoenix	\$ 46,116	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,093	225	9,318	\$ 71,061	42%		30%	
			Market	\$ 46,116	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,534	1,845	7,379	\$ 65,588		42%		30%
			Phx as % Mkt	108%	97%	164%	12%	126%	108%				
Facilities	2	Electrician	Phoenix	\$ 53,737	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,769	376	10,146	\$ 75,612	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 64,542	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,745	2,582	10,327	\$ 86,963		35%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	83%	97%	126%	15%	98%	87%				
Facilities	2	Facilities Projects Planner	Phoenix	\$ 58,989	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,724	413	11,137	\$ 81,856	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 61,062	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,327	2,442	9,770	\$ 82,926		36%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	97%	97%	146%	17%	114%	99%				
Facilities	2	Locksmith	Phoenix	\$ 43,774	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,958	306	8,265	\$ 63,768	46%		31%	
			Market	\$ 46,957	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,635	1,878	7,513	\$ 66,564		42%		29%
			Phx as % Mkt	93%	97%	141%	16%	110%	96%				
Facilities	1	Welder	Phoenix	\$ 54,330	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,877	244	10,122	\$ 76,181	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 60,627	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,275	2,425	9,700	\$ 82,421		36%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	90%	97%	136%	10%	104%	92%				
Fiscal	3	Account Clerk II	Phoenix	\$ 34,092	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,198	-	6,198	\$ 52,019	53%		34%	
			Market	\$ 39,287	\$ 12,094	\$ 4,714	1,571	6,286	\$ 57,667		47%		32%
			Phx as % Mkt	87%	97%	131%	0%	99%	90%				
Fiscal	3	Account Clerk III	Phoenix	\$ 41,257	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,501	-	7,501	\$ 60,487	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 42,115	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,054	1,685	6,738	\$ 60,947		45%		31%
			Phx as % Mkt	98%	97%	148%	0%	111%	99%				
Fiscal	7	Account Clerk Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 45,001	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,181	2,700	10,881	\$ 67,612	50%		33%	
			Market	\$ 47,530	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,704	1,901	7,605	\$ 67,229		41%		29%
			Phx as % Mkt	95%	97%	143%	142%	143%	101%				

ALL PRIVATE SECTOR JOBS

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage  
 \*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare  
 Doc#: 5172211v1; 01/31/12

**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
**All Private Sector and Published Market Data Matches**  
 (Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)

		Additional PrS/PD JOBS	Phoenix Vs. Market	Base Salary	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits				Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title		Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Fiscal	7	Accountant I	Phoenix	\$ 52,395	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,525	3,144	12,669	\$ 76,794	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 52,541	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,305	2,102	8,407	\$ 73,041		39%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	100%	97%	151%	150%	151%	105%				
Fiscal	7	Accountant II	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 61,646	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,398	2,466	9,863	\$ 83,603		36%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	99%	97%	150%	149%	104%					
Fiscal	7	Accountant III	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 71,381	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,566	2,855	11,421	\$ 94,896		33%		25%
			Phx as % Mkt	94%	97%	143%	141%	142%	100%				
Fiscal	7	Accountant IV	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 74,302	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,916	2,972	11,888	\$ 98,284		32%		24%
			Phx as % Mkt	100%	97%	151%	150%	151%	106%				
Fiscal	7	Accounting Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 93,528	\$ 12,094	\$ 11,223	3,741	14,964	\$ 120,586		29%		22%
			Phx as % Mkt	88%	97%	133%	132%	133%	94%				
Fiscal	7	Budget Analyst I	Phoenix	\$ 57,772	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,503	3,466	13,969	\$ 83,471	44%		31%	
			Market	\$ 52,860	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,343	2,114	8,458	\$ 73,411		39%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	109%	97%	166%	164%	165%	114%				
Fiscal	7	Budget Analyst II	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 63,540	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,625	2,542	10,166	\$ 85,800		35%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	106%	97%	160%	159%	160%	111%				
Fiscal	7	Budget Analyst III	Phoenix	\$ 78,042	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,188	4,683	18,871	\$ 108,642	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 72,879	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,745	2,915	11,661	\$ 96,633		33%		25%
			Phx as % Mkt	107%	97%	162%	161%	162%	112%				
Fiscal	7	Claims Adjuster II	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 57,581	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,910	2,303	9,213	\$ 78,888		37%		27%
			Phx as % Mkt	106%	97%	160%	159%	160%	111%				
Fiscal	7	Risk Management Coordinator	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 66,138	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,937	2,646	10,582	\$ 88,814		34%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	112%	97%	170%	168%	170%	117%				
Fleet	2	Auto Parts Clerk II	Phoenix	\$ 39,323	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,149	275	7,424	\$ 58,477	49%		33%	
			Market	\$ 50,800	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,096	2,032	8,128	\$ 71,022		40%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	77%	97%	117%	14%	91%	82%				
Fleet	2	Auto Technician	Phoenix	\$ 45,573	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,285	319	8,604	\$ 65,907	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 57,499	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,900	2,300	9,200	\$ 78,793		37%		27%
			Phx as % Mkt	79%	97%	120%	14%	94%	84%				
Fleet	2	Equipment Service Worker II	Phoenix	\$ 36,369	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,612	255	6,866	\$ 54,965	51%		34%	
			Market	\$ 48,616	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,834	1,945	7,779	\$ 68,488		41%		29%
			Phx as % Mkt	75%	97%	113%	13%	88%	80%				
Food Services	3	Cook	Phoenix	\$ 35,849	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,517	-	6,517	\$ 54,096	51%		34%	
			Market	\$ 27,632	\$ 12,094	\$ 3,316	1,105	4,421	\$ 44,147		60%		37%
			Phx as % Mkt	130%	97%	197%	0%	147%	123%				
Human Resources	7	Benefits Analyst II	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 65,948	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,914	2,638	10,552	\$ 88,593		34%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	92%	97%	140%	136%	140%	99%				
Human Resources	8	Human Resources Aide	Phoenix	\$ 43,920	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,985	264	8,248	\$ 63,898	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 43,433	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,212	1,737	6,949	\$ 62,476		44%		30%
			Phx as % Mkt	101%	97%	153%	15%	119%	102%				
Human Resources	7	Human Resources Analyst I	Phoenix	\$ 52,395	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,525	3,144	12,669	\$ 76,794	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 64,031	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,684	2,561	10,245	\$ 86,370		35%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	82%	97%	124%	123%	124%	89%				
Human Resources	7	Human Resources Analyst II	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 74,274	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,913	2,971	11,884	\$ 98,252		32%		24%
			Phx as % Mkt	82%	97%	124%	123%	124%	89%				
Human Resources	8	Human Resources Clerk II	Phoenix	\$ 37,908	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,892	227	7,119	\$ 56,757	50%		33%	
			Market	\$ 49,815	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,978	1,993	7,970	\$ 69,879		40%		29%
			Phx as % Mkt	76%	97%	115%	11%	89%	81%				
Human Resources	7	Human Resources Officer	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 78,128	\$ 12,094	\$ 9,375	3,125	12,500	\$ 102,722		31%		24%
			Phx as % Mkt	86%	97%	130%	129%	130%	93%				
Human Resources	7	Human Resources Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 78,042	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,188	4,683	18,871	\$ 108,642	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 99,256	\$ 12,094	\$ 11,911	3,970	15,881	\$ 127,231		28%		22%
			Phx as % Mkt	79%	97%	119%	118%	119%	85%				

ALL PRIVATE SECTOR JOBS

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage  
 \*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare  
 Doc#: 5172211v1; 01/31/12

**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
**All Private Sector and Published Market Data Matches**  
 (Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)

		Additional PrS/PD JOBS		Base Salary	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits				Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Overall Market Midpoint	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
Human Resources	7	Safety Analyst II	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 61,904	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,428	2,476	9,905	\$ 83,902	36%	26%		
			Phx as % Mkt	98%	97%	149%	148%	149%	104%				
Human Resources	7	Training Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 52,395	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,525	3,144	12,669	\$ 76,794	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 54,282	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,514	2,171	8,685	\$ 75,061	38%	28%		
			Phx as % Mkt	97%	97%	146%	145%	146%	102%				
Information Technology	7	Business Systems Analyst	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 62,827	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,539	2,513	10,052	\$ 84,973	35%	26%		
			Phx as % Mkt	97%	97%	147%	145%	146%	103%				
Information Technology	7	Communications Engineer	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 74,469	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,936	2,979	11,915	\$ 98,478	32%	24%		
			Phx as % Mkt	100%	97%	151%	150%	151%	106%				
Information Technology	3	Computer Operator	Phoenix	\$ 41,257	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,501	-	7,501	\$ 60,487	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 39,759	\$ 12,094	\$ 4,771	1,590	6,361	\$ 58,214	46%	32%		
			Phx as % Mkt	104%	97%	157%	0%	118%	104%				
Information Technology	7	Information Technology Analyst/Programmer I	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 59,320	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,118	2,373	9,491	\$ 80,905	36%	27%		
			Phx as % Mkt	113%	97%	171%	170%	171%	118%				
Information Technology	7	Information Technology Analyst/Programmer II	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 72,201	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,664	2,888	11,552	\$ 95,847	33%	25%		
			Phx as % Mkt	103%	97%	156%	154%	155%	108%				
Information Technology	7	Information Technology Analyst/Programmer III	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 87,918	\$ 12,094	\$ 10,550	3,517	14,067	\$ 114,079	30%	23%		
			Phx as % Mkt	93%	97%	141%	140%	141%	100%				
Information Technology	7	Information Technology Project Manager	Phoenix	\$ 90,740	\$ 11,730	\$ 16,497	5,444	21,941	\$ 124,410	37%		27%	
			Market	\$ 92,881	\$ 12,094	\$ 11,146	3,715	14,861	\$ 119,836	29%	22%		
			Phx as % Mkt	98%	97%	148%	147%	148%	104%				
Information Technology	7	Information Technology Service Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 60,882	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,068	3,653	14,721	\$ 87,333	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 58,796	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,056	2,352	9,407	\$ 80,297	37%	27%		
			Phx as % Mkt	104%	97%	157%	155%	156%	109%				
Information Technology	7	Information Technology Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 63,929	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,622	3,836	15,458	\$ 91,117	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 64,510	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,741	2,580	10,322	\$ 86,925	35%	26%		
			Phx as % Mkt	99%	97%	150%	149%	150%	105%				
Information Technology	7	Information Technology Systems Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 78,042	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,188	4,683	18,871	\$ 108,642	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 84,681	\$ 12,094	\$ 10,162	3,387	13,549	\$ 110,324	30%	23%		
			Phx as % Mkt	92%	97%	140%	138%	139%	98%				
Information Technology	7	Lead Business Systems Analyst	Phoenix	\$ 78,042	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,188	4,683	18,871	\$ 108,642	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 89,854	\$ 12,094	\$ 10,782	3,594	14,377	\$ 116,324	29%	23%		
			Phx as % Mkt	87%	97%	132%	130%	131%	93%				
Information Technology	7	Lead Computer Operator	Phoenix	\$ 52,395	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,525	3,144	12,669	\$ 76,794	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 48,365	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,804	1,935	7,738	\$ 68,197	41%	29%		
			Phx as % Mkt	108%	97%	164%	162%	164%	113%				
Information Technology	7	Lead Information Technology Systems Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 95,368	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,338	5,722	23,060	\$ 130,158	36%		27%	
			Market	\$ 96,164	\$ 12,094	\$ 11,540	3,847	15,386	\$ 123,644	29%	22%		
			Phx as % Mkt	99%	97%	150%	149%	150%	105%				
Information Technology	7	Lead User Technology Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 80,681	\$ 12,094	\$ 9,682	3,227	12,909	\$ 105,684	31%	24%		
			Phx as % Mkt	102%	97%	154%	152%	154%	107%				
Information Technology	7	Senior Business Systems Analyst	Phoenix	\$ 70,627	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,840	4,238	17,078	\$ 99,434	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 77,696	\$ 12,094	\$ 9,324	3,108	12,431	\$ 102,221	32%	24%		
			Phx as % Mkt	91%	97%	138%	136%	137%	97%				
Information Technology	7	Senior Information Technology Systems Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 86,310	\$ 11,730	\$ 15,691	5,179	20,870	\$ 118,909	38%		27%	
			Market	\$ 89,364	\$ 12,094	\$ 10,724	3,575	14,298	\$ 115,756	30%	23%		
			Phx as % Mkt	97%	97%	146%	145%	146%	103%				
Information Technology	7	Senior User Technology Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 74,267	\$ 11,730	\$ 13,502	4,456	17,958	\$ 103,954	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 71,475	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,577	2,859	11,436	\$ 95,005	33%	25%		
			Phx as % Mkt	104%	97%	157%	156%	157%	109%				
Information Technology	2	Telecommunications Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 55,952	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,172	392	10,564	\$ 78,245	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 56,031	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,724	2,241	8,965	\$ 77,090	38%	27%		
			Phx as % Mkt	100%	97%	151%	17%	118%	101%				
Information Technology	3	User Support Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 52,333	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,514	-	9,514	\$ 73,577	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 45,200	\$ 12,094	\$ 5,424	1,808	7,232	\$ 64,526	43%	30%		
			Phx as % Mkt	116%	97%	175%	0%	132%	114%				
Information Technology	7	User Technology Specialist	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 58,252	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,990	2,330	9,320	\$ 79,666	37%	27%		
			Phx as % Mkt	115%	97%	175%	173%	174%	119%				

ALL PRIVATE SECTOR JOBS

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage  
 \*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare  
 Doc#: 5172211v1; 01/31/12

**Total Compensation Cost Comparison - General Employees**  
**All Private Sector and Published Market Data Matches**  
 (Market Competitiveness defined as 95% - 105% of market average)

ALL PRIVATE SECTOR JOBS

Job Family	Employee Group	Benchmark Title	Phoenix Vs. Market	Annual Employer Cost of Benefits					Total Compensation Costs**	Benefits as % Pay		Benefits as % Total Compensation	
				Base Salary	Weighted Total Health Cost*	DB Retirement Benefit	DC Retirement Benefit	Total Retirement Benefits		Phoenix	Market	Phoenix	Market
				Overall Market Midpoint									
Legal	7	Assistant City Attorney II (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 82,025	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,912	4,922	19,834	\$ 113,588	38%		28%	
			Market	\$ 86,692	\$ 12,094	\$ 10,403	3,468	13,871	\$ 112,657		30%		23%
			Phx as % Mkt	95%	97%	143%	142%	143%	101%				
Legal	3	Legal Assistant	Phoenix	\$ 49,796	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,053	-	9,053	\$ 70,578	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 54,391	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,527	2,176	8,703	\$ 75,187		38%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	92%	97%	139%	0%	104%	94%				
Legal	3	Legal Secretary	Phoenix	\$ 45,334	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,242	-	8,242	\$ 65,305	44%		31%	
			Market	\$ 53,109	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,373	2,124	8,497	\$ 73,700		39%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	85%	97%	129%	0%	97%	89%				
Middle Managers	9	Assistant City Attorney III (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 98,145	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,843	9,422	27,265	\$ 137,139	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 111,050	\$ 12,094	\$ 13,326	4,442	17,768	\$ 140,912		27%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	88%	97%	134%	212%	153%	97%				
Middle Managers	9	Assistant City Attorney IV (NC)	Phoenix	\$ 108,202	\$ 11,730	\$ 19,671	10,387	30,059	\$ 149,990	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 132,984	\$ 12,094	\$ 15,958	5,319	21,277	\$ 166,355		25%		20%
			Phx as % Mkt	81%	97%	123%	195%	141%	90%				
Middle Managers	9	Deputy Budget & Research Director	Phoenix	\$ 98,145	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,843	9,422	27,265	\$ 137,139	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 95,786	\$ 12,094	\$ 11,494	3,831	15,326	\$ 123,206		29%		22%
			Phx as % Mkt	102%	97%	155%	246%	178%	111%				
Middle Managers	9	Deputy Human Resources Director	Phoenix	\$ 98,145	\$ 11,730	\$ 17,843	9,422	27,265	\$ 137,139	40%		28%	
			Market	\$ 110,085	\$ 12,094	\$ 13,210	4,403	17,614	\$ 139,792		27%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	89%	97%	135%	214%	155%	98%				
Middle Managers	9	Management Services Administrator	Phoenix	\$ 93,424	\$ 11,730	\$ 16,984	8,969	25,953	\$ 131,107	40%		29%	
			Market	\$ 111,336	\$ 12,094	\$ 13,360	4,453	17,814	\$ 141,244		27%		21%
			Phx as % Mkt	84%	97%	127%	201%	146%	93%				
Procurement	7	Buyer	Phoenix	\$ 55,048	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,008	3,303	13,311	\$ 80,088	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 59,311	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,117	2,372	9,490	\$ 80,895		36%		27%
			Phx as % Mkt	93%	97%	141%	139%	140%	99%				
Procurement	7	Contracts Specialist I	Phoenix	\$ 52,395	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,525	3,144	12,669	\$ 76,794	47%		32%	
			Market	\$ 65,303	\$ 12,094	\$ 7,836	2,612	10,448	\$ 87,845		35%		26%
			Phx as % Mkt	80%	97%	122%	120%	121%	87%				
Procurement	7	Contracts Specialist II	Phoenix	\$ 67,143	\$ 11,730	\$ 12,207	4,029	16,235	\$ 95,108	42%		29%	
			Market	\$ 72,128	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,655	2,885	11,540	\$ 95,762		33%		25%
			Phx as % Mkt	93%	97%	141%	140%	141%	99%				
Procurement	7	Procurement Manager	Phoenix	\$ 78,042	\$ 11,730	\$ 14,188	4,683	18,871	\$ 108,642	39%		28%	
			Market	\$ 83,556	\$ 12,094	\$ 10,027	3,342	13,369	\$ 109,019		30%		23%
			Phx as % Mkt	93%	97%	142%	140%	141%	100%				
Procurement	7	Procurement Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 63,929	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,622	3,836	15,458	\$ 91,117	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 93,822	\$ 12,094	\$ 11,259	3,753	15,012	\$ 120,927		29%		22%
			Phx as % Mkt	68%	97%	103%	102%	103%	75%				
Procurement	7	Senior Buyer	Phoenix	\$ 57,772	\$ 11,730	\$ 10,503	3,466	13,969	\$ 83,471	44%		31%	
			Market	\$ 69,929	\$ 12,094	\$ 8,391	2,797	11,189	\$ 93,211		33%		25%
			Phx as % Mkt	83%	97%	125%	124%	125%	90%				
Procurement	1	Supplies Clerk I	Phoenix	\$ 35,402	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,436	159	6,595	\$ 53,727	52%		34%	
			Market	\$ 30,366	\$ 12,094	\$ 3,644	1,215	4,859	\$ 47,318		56%		36%
			Phx as % Mkt	117%	97%	177%	13%	136%	114%				
Procurement	1	Supplies Clerk II	Phoenix	\$ 39,603	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,200	178	7,378	\$ 58,711	48%		33%	
			Market	\$ 37,270	\$ 12,094	\$ 4,472	1,491	5,963	\$ 55,327		48%		33%
			Phx as % Mkt	106%	97%	161%	12%	124%	106%				
Procurement	1	Supplies Clerk III	Phoenix	\$ 44,575	\$ 11,730	\$ 8,104	201	8,304	\$ 64,609	45%		31%	
			Market	\$ 36,983	\$ 12,094	\$ 4,438	1,479	5,917	\$ 54,994		49%		33%
			Phx as % Mkt	121%	97%	183%	14%	140%	117%				
Procurement	7	Supplies Supervisor	Phoenix	\$ 63,929	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,622	3,836	15,458	\$ 91,117	43%		30%	
			Market	\$ 55,068	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,608	2,203	8,811	\$ 75,973		38%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	116%	97%	176%	174%	175%	120%				
Public Safety	3	Municipal Security Guard	Phoenix	\$ 37,544	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,825	-	6,825	\$ 56,099	49%		33%	
			Market	\$ 26,724	\$ 12,094	\$ 3,207	1,069	4,276	\$ 43,094		61%		38%
			Phx as % Mkt	140%	97%	213%	0%	160%	130%				
Public Works	1	Equipment Operator II	Phoenix	\$ 36,723	\$ 11,730	\$ 6,676	165	6,841	\$ 55,294	51%		34%	
			Market	\$ 40,096	\$ 12,094	\$ 4,812	1,604	6,415	\$ 58,605		46%		32%
			Phx as % Mkt	92%	97%	139%	10%	107%	94%				
Water	2	Machinist	Phoenix	\$ 53,737	\$ 11,730	\$ 9,769	376	10,146	\$ 75,612	41%		29%	
			Market	\$ 51,009	\$ 12,094	\$ 6,121	2,040	8,161	\$ 71,264		40%		28%
			Phx as % Mkt	105%	97%	160%	18%	124%	106%				
Average				86%	97%	130%	120%	128%	92%	43%	36%	30%	26%

\*Weighted by Phoenix employees enrollment in PPO and HMO plans by tier of coverage  
 \*\*Does not include Social Security or Medicare  
 Doc#: 5172211v1; 01/31/12

---

## CITY COUNCIL REPORT

---

### POLICY AGENDA

---

TO: David Cavazos  
City Manager

AGENDA DATE: February 7, 2012

FROM: Karen Peters  
Government Relations Director

ITEM: 3

SUBJECT: STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

---

---

This report seeks approval, guidance and direction from the Mayor and Council on state legislation of interest to the City. The report has three parts: Part I provides brief descriptions of bills and other legislation with staff recommendations regarding the City's policy position for the Mayor and Council's consideration; Part II, for information only, provides an update on bills and other legislation on which the Mayor and Council have previously given policy direction to staff; and Part III, also for information, lists bills and other legislation that staff is monitoring.

February 7 is the 30th day of the Second Regular Session of the 50th Legislature. As of the submittal date of this report, 1406 bills have been introduced.

#### SURCHARGE INFORMATION

This report also responds to City Council's request of the January 24, 2011 Work Study meeting, that the Office of Government Relations return with information regarding the potential revenue generated by a possible City surcharge on particular cases handled in Phoenix's Municipal Court. The monies collected from the new surcharge would be completely dedicated to cover jail costs. After meeting with Courts administration and Budget and Research staff, the following outlines potential revenue scenarios:

Number of driving under the influence (DUI) cases in FY 2010-2011: 5117  
\$100 surcharge per case would yield up to \$511,700  
\$300 surcharge per case would yield up to \$1,535,100

Combined number of DUI and Non-DUI misdemeanor cases in FY 2010-2011: 32,173  
\$100 surcharge per case would yield up to \$3,217,300 maximum  
\$300 surcharge per case would yield up to \$9,651,900 maximum

Legislation can be drafted to give the Mayor and Council authority to impose a surcharge solely on DUI cases or DUI and Non-DUI misdemeanor cases up to a specific dollar amount. As is customary on these items, staff requests direction on whether to pursue this legislation.

## I. POLICY DIRECTION ON STATE LEGISLATION OF INTEREST TO THE CITY

Bold type indicates a change since the prior state legislative update report.

### PUBLIC SAFETY

#### **Bills to Support**

- A. **SB 1034: Electronic; Digital Devices; Stalking; Threatening (Sen. Linda Gray, R-Phoenix)** prohibits use of any electronic device to threaten, harass, annoy or offend a person. The penalty would be a class 1 misdemeanor. Staff supports this effort to help address cyber bullying. This bill awaits action in the Senate Public Safety and Human Services Committee.
- B. **SB 1043: Dangerous Drugs; Definition (Sen. Linda Gray, R-Phoenix)** adds specific substances to the list of dangerous drugs. Staff is supportive of keeping the statutory list as up to date as possible to address substance abuse. SB 1043 passed the Senate by a vote of 28-0 and now awaits House Committee assignments.
- C. **SB 1056: Class G Licensees; Communication Devices (Sen. John McComish, R-Phoenix)** prohibits minors with a class D or G drivers license from using a wireless communication device while driving a vehicle. An initial violation would result in a civil fine of \$75 and a curfew restriction of 30 days. The penalty increases to a \$100 civil fine and 30-day suspended license on the third offense. This bill passed the Senate by a vote of 23-6 and now awaits House Committee assignments.
- D. **SB 1072: Minors; Reporting Duty; Missing; Deceased (Sen. Linda Gray, R-Phoenix)** creates a criminal offense (class 5 felony) for failing to report the death of a child or vulnerable adult within 2 hours or as soon as possible. The bill also establishes new penalties (class 6 felony) for making false statements related to the disappearance of a child or vulnerable adult and for failing to file a missing persons report for children under the age of 13 within 24 hours of their disappearance. This bill was approved in the Senate Rules Committee and now awaits Senate Floor action.
- E. **HB 2018: Missing Child; Reporting; Offense (Rep. Michelle Ugenti, R-Scottsdale)** requires that a parent, stepparent, guardian, or caretaker of a minor report a missing child that is less than six years of age and the person knows or has reason to know that the child has been missing for 24 hours. A violation is classified as a class 5 felony. HB 2018 was approved in the House Rules Committee and now awaits House Floor action.
- F. **HB 2034: Hookah Use; Minors; Prohibition (Rep. Kimberly Yee, R-Phoenix)** adds a hookah or water pipe to the list of items that may not be sold to or possessed by a minor. Minors found in possession of a hookah or water pipe would be

subject to a fine of \$100 or thirty hours of community supervision. Providing or selling one of these instruments to a minor would be a petty offense. HB 2034 passed the House Health and Human Services Committee with 5-0 vote and now awaits action in the House Rules Committee.

- G. HB 2046: License Plate Covers; Prohibition (Rep. Steve Farley, D-Tucson) bans use of an electronic device or electrochromatic film to obscure a vehicle license plate. The Police Department recommends supporting this legislation as it would assist officers in clearly identifying vehicles that may be stolen or calling in plate information during a pursuit. This bill awaits a hearing in the House Transportation Committee.
- H. HB 2094: Prepaid Wireless E911 Excise Tax (Rep. Rob Robson, R-Chandler) imposes an eight tenths of one percent excise tax on the gross proceeds of sales or gross income derived from the retail sale of prepaid wireless telecommunication services (e.g. \$100=\$0.08). The monies would be deposited in the telecommunications services revolving fund which supports 911 services. The bill was amended to allow a vendor to retain three percent of the tax before remitting the tax to the Arizona Department of Revenue. This bill passed the House Employment and Regulatory Affairs Committee by a vote of 8-1 and now awaits action in the House Rules Committee.
- I. HB 2130: Disease Testing; Public Safety Employees (Rep. Justin Pierce, R-Mesa) permits a public safety employee or volunteer to petition the court to order blood tests on a person that bit, scratched, spat, or transferred blood or other bodily fluids on or through the skin or membranes of the public safety employee or volunteer in performance of official duties. This bill passed the House Military Affairs and Public Safety Committee by a vote of 8-0 and now awaits action in the House Rules Committee.
- J. **HB 2224: Unrestrained Minors; Motor Vehicles; Prohibition (Rep. Doris Goodale, R-Kingman) prohibits minors from riding unrestrained in the bed of a truck or similar vehicle. The bill contains several exceptions (i.e. emergency transport, parades). HB 2224 awaits a hearing in the House Transportation Committee.**
- K. HB 2311: Communication Devices; Class G Licenses (Rep. Steve Farley, D-Tucson) prohibits persons with a G drivers license from using a wireless communication device while driving a vehicle. Exceptions are made for making calls to report emergency situations. Those found guilty would be subject to an extra six months of restricted driving, meaning that the minor could not drive with passengers under 18 years of age after midnight and before 5 a.m. This bill awaits action in the House Transportation Committee.

- L. **HB 2349: Medical Marijuana; Cardholder; Campuses; Prohibition (Rep. Amanda Reeve, R-Phoenix)** prohibits use or possession of marijuana on a school campus, private or public university, community college, or in a child care facility by a person with a medical marijuana card. HB 2349 passed the House Higher Education, Innovation and Reform Committee by a vote of 7-0. The bill now awaits a hearing in the House Education Committee.
- M. **HB 2356: Drugs; Definition (Rep. Karen Fann, R-Prescott)** adds chemical compounds comprising “bath salts” to the list of dangerous drugs in A.R.S. § 13-3401. This bill was approved in the House Rules Committee and awaits action on the House Floor.
- N. **HB 2361: Consumer Fireworks; Regulation (Rep. Karen Fann, R-Prescott)** grants cities the authority to regulate sales of permissible consumer fireworks. This bill awaits a hearing in the House Military Affairs and Public Safety Committee.
- O. **HB 2446: Liquefied Petroleum Gas; Emergency Aid (Rep. David Gowan, R-Sierra Vista)** exempts persons with expertise in handling liquefied petroleum gas from liability when assisting public safety personnel during an emergency situation involving this fuel. The Fire Department recommends supporting this measure. HB 2446 passed House Government Committee by a vote of 7-0 and awaits action in the House Rules Committee.

#### **Bills to Oppose**

- P. **SB 1065: Leash Law Exemption; Liability Insurance (Rep. Lori Klein, R-Anthem)** preempts application of local leash laws and or homeowners associations/condominium regulations if the owner of an unleashed dog has canine liability insurance of at least \$100K. The Police Department is concerned about the bill because leash laws are in place to protect the public; having insurance does not prevent injury. SB 1065 awaits a hearing in the Senate Government Reform Committee.
- Q. **SB 1304: Firearms Regulation; Political Subdivisions (Sen. Frank Antenori, R-Tucson)** amends A.R.S. § 13-3108 to remove the ability of cities to prohibit the discharge of firearms within 1/4 mile of an occupied structure. The language being stricken was implemented last session as a compromise to the SB 1334: Hunting in City Limits (2011) as an attempt to protect residents from those hunting on state trust lands near urban areas. This bill awaits a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

- R. **SB 1474: Weapons; University; College Grounds (Sen. Ron Gould, R-Lake Havasu City)** requires public universities and community colleges to create protocols to allow persons with a valid permit listed in A.R.S. § 13-3112 to carry a firearm on campus. If an educational institution decides to restrict firearms in its buildings, gun storage lockers with easy accessibility, and specific signage would be required. This bill awaits a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee.
- S. **SB 1479: Firearms; State Regulation; Preemption (Sen. Ron Gould, R-Lake Havasu City)** makes a number of revisions to Arizona gun laws. Under this bill, a city that prohibits firearms in its buildings, would be required to post a sign at all public entrances, provide secure firearm lockers within reasonable proximity of the main entrance and under the control of the City or its agents, and allow for immediate retrieval upon exit from the building. Public events (those needing a permit from a political subdivision) are also included. This bill awaits a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee.
- T. **HB 2074: Motorcycles; Lane Advancement (Rep. Jerry Weiers, R-Glendale)** allows motorcycles to drive in between lanes of traffic and pass another vehicle in the same lane of the vehicle being overtaken, if traffic is slower than twenty-five miles per hour. The experience reported by the Police Department is that during rush hour traffic car drivers tend to change lanes quickly, often resulting in accidents requiring Police response where the driver just did not see the motorcycle. The injuries in those cases are usually severe head trauma resulting in death. The legislation does not limit the speed of the passing motorcyclist. As an example of the increased danger, if traffic is moving at 10 m.p.h. and a motorcycle is weaving in and out at 55 or 35 m.p.h., when a car driver decides to move into the next lane when there is a gap in traffic and the motorcycle is in a blind spot, the likely resulting accident is severe. Motorcycles are already allowed in the carpool lane on the freeway. HB 2074 awaits a hearing in the House Transportation Committee.
- U. **HB 2077: Motorcycle Operations; Riding Between Lanes (Rep. Jerry Weiers, R-Glendale)** allows motorcycles to pass cars in the same lane and weave in and out of traffic. Police Department concerns are identical to those described for HB 2074. This bill awaits a hearing in the House Transportation Committee.
- V. **HB 2285: DUI; Ignition Interlock Device (Rep. David Smith, R-Carefree)** eliminates the requirement for ignition interlock devices for those convicted of DUI crimes under A.R.S. § 28-1381. This bill awaits a hearing in the House Judiciary Committee.
- W. **HB 2288: DUI; Drugs; Driver License Revocation (Rep. David Smith, R-Carefree)** eliminates the requirement for revocation of a drivers license for those convicted of DUI/drug crimes under A.R.S. § 28-1381 or A.R.S. § 13-3401. This bill awaits a hearing in the House Judiciary Committee.

- X. **HB2458: Wildfire First Responders; State Primacy: (Rep. Brenda Barton, R-Safford)** requires the Arizona State Forester to be the incident commander for all wildland fires regardless of jurisdiction. Staff is concerned that if a wildfire took place within the City's boundaries that the incident commander would not be a Phoenix Fire Command Officer. This bill awaits a vote in the House Energy and Natural Resource Committee.

## REVENUE & TAXES

### Bills to Oppose

- Y. **HB 2466: Local Sales Tax; Payments; DOR (Rep. Rick Gray, R-Sun City)** allows taxpayers who are required to pay transaction privilege and affiliated excise taxes to a city or town, to instead pay the required tax to the State in cases where the state has not entered into an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with the relevant city or town to provide a coordinated method of collecting transaction privilege and affiliated excise taxes under A.R.S. § 42-6001. Staff is concerned that there may be instances where state-initiated revisions to existing IGA's necessitate the execution of replacement IGA's. If, in such instances, the revisions negatively impact the City and the City does not execute a replacement IGA, the City may not receive the sales tax revenues due to Phoenix. League of Arizona Cities and Towns staff is working with the bill sponsor on amendments that may make the bill acceptable. Until that happens, staff recommends opposition. HB 2466 awaits a hearing in the House Ways and Means Committee.
- Z. **HCR 2043: Tax Increases; Ballots; Vote Requirement (Rep. David Stevens, R-Sierra Vista)** proposes to amend the Arizona Constitution, Article IX by adding section 25 to provide for an affirmative vote requirement of at least two-thirds of the qualified electors in an initiative or referendum election that involves state and local taxation measures. The measure also contains a retroactive application to measures adopted since November 5, 2002. HCR 2043 awaits a hearing in the House Ways and Means Committee.

## NEIGHBORHOODS

### Bills to Support

- AA. **HB 2201: Graffiti; Unlawful Possession; Minors (Rep. Chad Campbell, D-Phoenix)** prohibits minors from possessing graffiti implements (defined as aerosol/pressurized paint containers, etching tools) on public or private property without consent of the property owner. Exceptions are made if the parent or guardian is immediately supervising the youth, if the minor has written permission from their parent or guardian, or if the implements are work related or being transported between home and school. Violations are deemed a petty offense. HB 2201 awaits a hearing in the House Judiciary Committee.

- BB. **HB 2709: Juveniles; Disposition; Criminal Damage (Rep. Steve Urie, R-Gilbert)** mandates 100 hours of community service for a minor found guilty of committing graffiti crime. This bill awaits a hearing in the House Judiciary Committee.

## **PLANNING & ZONING**

### **Bills to Support**

- CC. **SB 1001: Military Preservation; Land Exchanges (Sen. John Nelson, R-Litchfield Park)** changes the process for exchange of state trust land for other public lands. The intention of the legislation is to provide new options to protect lands from encroachment around Luke Air Force Base or other military installations . SB 1001 was approved in the Senate Rules Committee and now awaits Senate Floor action.
- DD. **SCR 1001: Military Preservation; Land Exchanges (Sen. John Nelson, R-Litchfield Park)** would be placed on the ballot and if approved, amend the Arizona Constitution to permit the sale of state trust lands without auction and allow for land exchanges that are related to protecting military installations from encroachment. The companion piece to SB 1001, the resolution would assist ongoing operations at Luke Air Force Base and other military installations. SCR 1001 was approved in the Senate Rules Committee and now awaits Senate Floor Action.

### **Bills to Oppose**

- EE. **HB 2168: Building Permits; Self-Certification Process (Rep. Jeff Dial, R-Chandler)** mandates the establishment of a self-certification process for every permit issued by municipality and must identify which occupations would be competent to certify. A city must issue a permit within 48 hours when proof of insurance or a surety bond is provided along with a sworn statement by a person that has been identified as being competent that all of the regulatory prerequisites of the permit have been met. Phoenix has a self-certification program that has minimum standards for participating design professionals, mandatory training, and project eligibility requirements. Self-certification essentially delegates the City's plan review responsibilities to a qualified design professional. Program requirements ensure participation by reputable and practiced design professionals and reduce the risk of injury or failure by excluding complex projects like hospitals, schools, ball parks, high rises, and hazardous occupancies. This bill would override our current self-certification program's requirements and would mandate the city allow self-certification of all projects. HB 2168 awaits action in the House Government Committee.

## ELECTIONS

### Bills to Oppose

- FF. HB 2043: Election Dates; Even-numbered Years (John Fillmore, R-Apache Junction) requires all local elections to be conducted in August or November of even-numbered years, beginning in 2014. The bill removes the option of conducting spring elections and elections held concurrently with any special county or statewide elections. Staff is concerned that the bill would require city elections to be held concurrently with the elections held by the county, in violation of the City Charter. In addition, only having elections in August or November of even-numbered years severely limits the Mayor and Council's ability to call special elections to address items such as bond measures or to fill a vacant Council seat. HB 2043 awaits a hearing in the House Judiciary Committee.
- GG. HB 2320: Consolidated Election Dates; Municipalities (Rep. David Burnell Smith, R-Carefree) requires all elections to be held on the August or November election dates, removing the option of spring elections. The bill severely limits the Mayor and Council's ability to call special elections to address matters of strictly local concern, including bond measures and recall or vacancy elections. This bill awaits a hearing in the House Judiciary Committee.

## WATER & ENVIRONMENT

### Bills to Support

- HH. **SB 1288: Municipal Water Fees; Repeal; Appropriation (Sen. Gail Griffin, R-Hereford)** repeals the \$7 million municipal fee that was enacted last year and place that portion of the Arizona Department of Water Resources budget back on the general fund. The City position has been consistent that the fee was only a one-time payment and not permanent. The bill passed the Senate Water, Land Use and Rural Development Committee by a 4-0 vote and awaits a hearing in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

### Bills to Oppose

- II. **SB 1319: Corporation Commission; Municipal Water; Jurisdiction (Sen. Frank Antenori, R-Tucson)** grants the Arizona Corporation Commission jurisdiction over municipalities that provide water services to unincorporated areas. Staff is concerned that the bill would negatively affect the City's ability to recover costs and set rates and thus have an impact on City finances. This bill awaits a hearing in the Senate Water, Land Use and Rural Development Committee.

## HUMAN RESOURCES

### Bills to Support

- JJ. **HB 2155: Controlled Substances; Workers' Compensation (Rep. Nancy McLain, R-Bullhead City)** allows independent medical examiners to access the Arizona State Board of Pharmacy's Controlled Substances Database and share that information with the employee, employer, insurance carrier, and Industrial Commission. The information will help monitor whether doctors who prescribe Schedule 2 narcotics for workers' compensation patients are adhering to current agreements. HB 2155 was approved by the House Rules Committee and now awaits action on the House Floor.

### Bills to Oppose

- KK. **SB 1485: Unions; Public Employees; Prohibitions (Sen. Rick Murphy, R-Glendale)** would prohibit political subdivisions from entering into any collective bargaining agreements or meet and confer process with any union. This bill passed the Senate Government Reform Committee by a vote of 4-2 and now awaits a hearing in the Senate Rules Committee.

## MISCELLANEOUS

### Bills to Oppose

- LL. **HB 2570: Political Subdivisions; Proceedings; Governing Bodies (Rep. Justin Olsen, R-Mesa)** stipulates that for any law a political subdivision wants to adopt, the municipality must provide related materials and information at least 14 days before a city council vote and that it must provide three separate public meetings on the ordinance or the law is invalid. Additionally, the bill gives legal standing for anyone to sue the city if they believe this process was compromised. Staff is concerned that it would impact the ability of the Council to approve measures in a timely fashion. Also, there are no exemptions for public safety laws, health needs, or other emergency problems that the public could need immediate help with. HB 2570 awaits a hearing in the House Government Committee.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff requests City Council approval, guidance and direction on the state legislative issues impacting the City described above.

## **II: UPDATE ON LEGISLATION PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY COUNCIL**

Bold type indicates a change since the prior state legislative update report.

## **WATER & ENVIRONMENT**

### **Bills Supported**

- MM. HB 2492: White Mountain Apache; Settlement; Appropriation (Rep. Russ Jones, R-Yuma) appropriates \$2 million from the state general fund in order to comply with the White Mountain Apache water rights settlement. The bill awaits a hearing in the House Appropriations Committee.

### **III: BILLS TO WATCH**

Staff is monitoring the following legislation. New items are indicated with the title in bold type, as are changes from the last legislative report. No position is recommended at this time.

- NN. HB2605: Law Enforcement Dogs; Biting (Rep. J.D. Mesnard, R-Chandler) exempts law enforcement dogs from the biting animals statute (A.R.S. § 11-1014) if the dog bite occurred under the supervision of a law enforcement officer and if the dog is under the care of a licensed veterinarian. The measure also requires a law enforcement agency to notify the county animal control department if the law enforcement dog is acting abnormally after a bite and must make the dog available for examination. This bill passed the House Military Affairs and Public Safety Committee by a vote of 9-0 and now awaits action in the House Rules Committee.

## **REVENUE & TAXES**

- OO. HB 2120: Internal Revenue Code Conformity (Rep. Jack Harper, R-Surprise) brings the state into internal revenue code conformity and makes changes in effective dates for definitions pertaining to income tax. This bill was approved in the House Rules Committee and now awaits action on the House Floor.
- PP. HB 2123: Transaction Privilege Tax Reform Committee (Rep. Steve Court, R-Mesa) establishes a study committee charged to discuss phasing out the state individual and corporate income tax and broadening the state transaction privilege tax creating a revenue neutral fiscal impact for the state. The committee is also charged to recommend an approach that minimizes revenue impact of any recommended changes for cities and counties. A committee report is due by October 31, 2012. HB 2123 was approved by the House Rules Committee and now awaits House Floor action.

## **WATER & ENVIRONMENT**

- QQ. HB 2025: Home Sales; Water Supply Disclosure (Rep. Eddie Ableser, D-Tempe) requires the developer of a subdivision outside of an active management area to provide documentation of an assured water supply. This bill passed the House

Agriculture and Water Committee and now awaits action in the House Rules Committee.

- RR. HB 2073: Emissions Testing; Motorcycles; Extension (Rep. Jerry Weiers, R-Glendale) extends vehicle emissions testing for motorcycles to 2014. This bill passed the House by a vote of 45-10 and now awaits Senate Committee assignments.

## **TRANSPORTATION & AVIATION**

- SS. SB 1131: Transportation Project Advancement Notes (Sen. Steve Yarbrough, R-Chandler) provides authority for political subdivisions to accelerate construction of projects funded in a Regional Transportation Plan through the issuance of Transportation Project Advancement Notes (TPANs). Political subdivisions could issue and sell TPANs upon entering into a transportation project advancement agreement with ADOT, a regional association of governments or a designated grant recipient. The political subdivision will pledge its excise taxes to the repayment of the principal, premium, if any, and interest on the TPANs. In some cases accelerating projects saves inflation costs associated with waiting for years until the project is funded in the RTP. Advancing projects also can provide an opportunity to take advantage of favorable market conditions when land prices and construction costs are lower. This legislation mirrors the existing statute that provides authority to cities and counties to finance acceleration of highway projects using Highway Project Advancement Notes (HPANs). The bill was approved by the Senate Rules Committee and now awaits Senate Floor action.
- TT. HB 2354: Phoenix Airport; Study Committee (Rep. Eddie Ableser, R-Tempe) establishes a legislative study committee to review aspects of Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport, such as expansion, capacity to serve the region, and the role of regional hubs. This bill awaits a hearing in the House Technology and Infrastructure Committee.

## **HUMAN RESOURCES**

- UU. **SB 1484: Paycheck Deductions; Employee Authorization (Sen. Andy Biggs, R-Gilbert)** restricts a public employer from deducting third party payments from an employee's paycheck without annual written/electronic authorization. Violations would result in a civil penalty of \$10,000 per violation. This bill passed the Senate Government Reform Committee by a vote of 4-2 and now awaits action in the Senate Rules Committee.
- VV. **SB 1486: Public Employees; Activities; Unions; Compensation (Sen. Rick Murphy, R-Glendale)** prohibits public employers from entering into any agreement that compensates public employees or third parties for union activities. This bill passed the Senate Government Reform Committee by a vote of 4-2 and now awaits a hearing in the Senate Rules Committee.

WW. **SB 1487: Government Employees; Union Dues; Withholding (Sen. Rick Murphy, R-Glendale)** prohibits the state and political subdivisions from withholding or diverting any portion of an employee's wages to pay for union dues. This bill passed the Senate Government Reform Committee by a vote of 4-2 and now awaits action in the Senate Rules Committee.

## **ELECTIONS**

XX. **HB 2214: Campaign Finance; Individual Annual Total (Rep. Terri Proud, R-Tucson)** allows individuals to make unlimited total contributions in a calendar year to state and local candidates as well as political action committees. The bill would not change limits on amounts that can be given toward an individual candidate. HB 2214 awaits House Committee assignments.

YY. **HB 2385: Campaigns; Independent Expenditures; Corporations (Rep. Eddie Farnsworth, R-Gilbert)** requires independent expenditure organizations that make expenditures above the threshold as defined in A.R.S. § 16-901 to file campaign finance reports pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-913 to disclose those contributions in the format prescribed by the filing officer. In addition, the bill provides guidelines for determining whether an independent expenditure organization has been organized for the "primary purpose of influencing elections." Any qualified elector may file an action alleging a violation of the provisions. The provisions in HB 2385 would apply to independent expenditure organizations involved with candidates for city office. This measure awaits action in the House Judiciary Committee.

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

ZZ. **SB 1044: Cities; Towns; Residential Rental License (Sen. Michele Reagan, R-Scottsdale)** prohibits cities from imposing a requirement for a license to operate, own or manage residential rental properties. The City does not currently require a business license for these purposes. This bill awaits action in the Senate Veterans, Military and Government Affairs Committee.

AAA. **SB 1064: Municipalities; Local Liberty Charter (Sen. Lori Klein, R-Anthem)** grants cities the authority to adopt a series of charter reforms, including:

- Automatic approval for building and other permits if review extends beyond city established timelines
- New definition for vested rights
- Authorized zoning free areas
- Impact fee limits
- Mandatory arbitration of disputes with the city
- Expanded jurisdiction of city courts
- Additional crime statistical reporting and performance standards
- Limits on taxation and expenditures
- Mandatory competition for city services

- Prohibits subsidies to private enterprise
- Requirement that public employees be held personally accountable for their acts and omissions, with a website for public complaints of city employees and allowing the public to evaluate public employee performance with retention as long as employee still employed with city
- Website posting of all public expenditures
- Mandatory "none of the above" spot on election ballot
- Conditions that would trigger a mandatory municipal bankruptcy filing
- Mandate for local governments to exhaust all legal options against federal or state regulation or regulatory policy that is more strict than existing municipal policies and plans

This bill was approved in the Senate Government Reform Committee by a vote of 4-1 and now awaits action in the Senate Rules Committee.

**BBB. SB 1221: Precious Items Dealer; Permanent Residence (Sen. Michele Reagan, R-Scottsdale) clarifies that the dealers of precious items may only make purchases from their permanent place of business. This bill is aimed to prevent remote sales and sales from temporary tents on street corners and out of vehicles. SB 1221 passed the Senate Commerce and Energy Committee by a vote of 6-0 and now awaits action in the Senate Rules Committee.**

**CCC. HB 2021: Municipalities; Residential Rental Property (Rep. Jack Harper, R-Surprise) clarifies that municipalities are prohibited from requiring licenses to operate a residential rental business and from requiring business registration from residential rental properties, property owners, or managers. Additional language prohibits municipalities that utilize the Arizona Department of Revenue (ADOR) to collect transaction privilege taxes (TPT) on such activity from requiring a TPT license and a fingerprint clearance card for the municipality from the residential rental business. Since the City does not license lessors of residential rental property or use ADOR to collect sales tax on the rent this bill does not impact the City. HB 2021 awaits a hearing in the House Government Committee.**

**DDD. HB 2103: Taxis and Limousines; Maintenance Records (Rep. Judy Burges, R-Skull Valley) mandates retention of minimum vehicle maintenance records, including brakes and tires by the owner of a taxi or limousine. This measure was introduced to assist the Arizona Department of Weights and Measures with oversight of these vehicles. HB 2103 passed the House Transportation Committee by a vote of 7-0 and now awaits action in the House Rules Committee.**

---

## CITY COUNCIL REPORT

---

### FORMAL AGENDA

---

TO: Lisa Takata  
Executive Assistant To The City  
Manager

AGENDA DATE: February 8, 2012

FROM: Rob Sweeney  
Acting Chief Information Officer

ITEM: 7 PAGE: 13

SUBJECT: CLOUD EMAIL PROJECT

---

---

This report provides information to City Council regarding a rightsourcing strategy to replace the City's email system and to seek an amendment to staff's recommendation on the February 8, 2012 Formal Agenda.

#### THE ISSUE

The City of Phoenix currently operates two email systems: Microsoft Exchange for Police Department staff; Lotus Notes for all other City employees. The existing Lotus Notes email system is antiquated with several software components no longer supported by the manufacturer. Additionally, the hardware that supports the Lotus Notes email system has reached the end of support and the City is at significant risk with respect to data loss in the event of system failure.

Owning and operating two separate email systems requires redundancy in our support structures. The two email systems are incompatible with each other, adding technical complexity to email delivery and calendar scheduling.

The Lotus Notes email system is unable to comply with a number of regulatory requirements regarding email archiving and security. The City's ability to respond to court-ordered discovery and Public Records requests is currently unfunded and is required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records Division of the Secretary of State.

#### BACKGROUND

The Innovation and Efficiency Task Force recommended City staff consider consolidating the email systems into one, and seek a cloud-based provider for email as a lower cost option to our current solutions. Five options for replacement of the email system were presented to the Information Technology Governance Board and Operational Committees in November. Both committees unanimously recommended soliciting for a dedicated public cloud solution. Such an environment will satisfy the operational, compliance and regulatory issues while avoiding a large capital expenditure

which the City cannot afford. This solution enables the City to upgrade antiquated technologies in the most cost-effective manner and ensure they are sustainable.

#### OTHER INFORMATION

The project is anticipated to begin in June 2012 after the selection of a qualified provider via the competitive procurement process, inclusive of applicable transparency language. Staff believed an Invitation for Bid (IFB) procurement process would be appropriate in selection of a new email system. The Transportation, Infrastructure and Sustainability Subcommittee approved this approach at its December 12, 2011 meeting. City Council considered the same recommendation at its January 18, 2012 Formal Meeting, but approved a motion to continue the item to the February 8, 2012 Formal Meeting.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Upon review of additional information available to staff through our advisory service contract, further research and consulting with other jurisdictions, staff believes procurement of a cloud-based email solution would best be served via a Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Staff also met with members of the public who expressed concerns regarding an IFB approach. While staff originally believed the IFB approach would meet the City's needs, we have since recognized there are operational and procedural challenges using this approach and believe an RFP process would provide the best opportunity for the City to determine a solution in meeting our email requirements.

Staff recommends City Council amend and approve the continued item from the January 18, 2012 meeting to read, "Request authorization for the City Manager to issue an ~~Invitation for Bid (IFB)~~ Request for Proposal (RFP) to replace the City's email system."

---

## CITY COUNCIL REPORT

---

### GENERAL INFORMATION

---

TO: Lisa Takata  
Executive Assistant to the City  
Manager

PACKET DATE: February 2, 2012

FROM: Cris Meyer  
City Clerk

SUBJECT: LIQUOR LICENSE APPLICATIONS RECEIVED FOR THE PERIOD OF  
JANUARY 25, 2012 THROUGH JANUARY 31, 2012

---

This report provides advance notice of liquor license applications that were received by the City Clerk during the period of Wednesday, January 25, 2012 through Tuesday, January 31, 2012.

#### INFORMATION

The liquor license application process includes the posting of a public notice of the application at the proposed location for twenty days and the distribution of an application copy or a copy of this report to the following departments for their review: Finance, Planning and Development, Police, Fire, and Street Transportation. Additionally, License Services mails a notice to all registered neighborhood organizations within a one-mile radius of each proposed business location (excluding Special Events).

Additional information on the items listed below is generally not available until the twenty-day posting/review period has expired.

#### LIQUOR LICENSE APPLICATIONS

<u>Application Type Legend</u>					
<u>O</u> - Ownership	<u>L</u> - Location	<u>N</u> - New	<u>OL</u> - Ownership & Location	<u>AOC</u> - Acquisition of Control	<u>SE</u> - Special Event

#### Liquor License Series Definitions

---

1	In State Producer	*7	On sale-beer & wine	11	Hotel/Motel-all liquor on premises
3	Microbrewery	8	Conveyance license-sale of all liquor on board planes & trains	12	Restaurant-all liquor on premises
4	Wholesaler	9	Off sale-all liquor	14	Clubs-all liquor on premises
5	Government	9S	Sampling Privileges	15	Special Event
*6	On sale-all liquor	10	Off sale-beer & wine		
		10S	Sampling Privileges		

---

\*On-sale retailer means any person operating an establishment where spirituous liquors are sold in the original container for consumption on or off the premises and in individual portions for consumption on the premises.

Dist	App. Type	Agent/Owner Name Business Name/Address Phone	Lic. Type	Approx. Protest End Date	Within 2,000 Feet of Light Rail	Proposed Agenda Date
1	N	David Merrill, Agent Daddy-O's Grill 4163 West Thunderbird Road 602-695-0940	12	2/24/12	No	3/14/12
2	AOC	H.J. Lewkowitz, Agent California Pizza Kitchen 21001 North Tatum Blvd., Ste. 40-1370 602-200-7222	12	2/21/12	No	3/14/12
2	SE	Rob Cimato Courtney's Place (2/25/12) 7125 East Chauncey Lane 623-635-1456	15	N/A	N/A	*2/25/12
2	SE	Andrew Buswell The Ethiopia Project (2/16/12) 7077 East Mayo Blvd. 360-607-1783	15	N/A	N/A	*2/16/12
2	SE	Andrew Buswell The Ethiopia Project (3/15/12) 7077 East Mayo Blvd. 360-607-1783	15	N/A	N/A	2/29/12
2	N	Jay Beskind, Agent Mellow Mushroom Pizza Bakers 5350 East High Street, #115 480-998-8475	12	2/17/12	No	3/14/12
3	N	Gerald Salko, Agent Corleones Philly Steaks 10637 North Tatum Blvd., Ste. 101A 602-697-4151	12	2/17/12	No	3/14/12
6	SE	Michael Lugo Cursillo Movement of Phoenix, Inc (4/28/12) 4633 North 54 <sup>th</sup> Street 602-418-8885	15	N/A	N/A	3/14/12

Dist	App. Type	Agent/Owner Name Business Name/Address Phone	Lic. Type	Approx. Protest End Date	Within 2,000 Feet of Light Rail	Proposed Agenda Date
6	AOC	H.J. Lewkowitz, Agent California Pizza Kitchen 2400 East Camelback Road, #112 602-200-7222	12	2/21/12	No	3/14/12
7	N	La'Mar Harmon, Agent B17 Limited 431 North 47 <sup>th</sup> Avenue 940-642-1262	4	2/17/12	No	3/14/12
7	N	Yagnesh Thanki King's Convenience 2811 North Central Avenue 714-423-9787	10	2/24/12	Yes	3/14/12
8	N	Dean Thomas, Agent Cornish Pasty Co. 3 West Monroe Street 480-332-7596	12	2/24/12	Yes	3/14/12
8	O	Nawar Yosif, Agent Empire Liquor 3939 East Indian School Road 602-509-1313	9	2/24/12	No	3/14/12
8	SE	Richard Bauer United Phoenix Fire Fighters Association (3/17/12) 1 East Washington Street 602-363-6129	15	N/A	N/A	3/14/12

\*Event Date – Application not received in time for Council review.

For further information regarding any of the above applications, please contact the City Clerk Department, License Services Section, at 602-534-3365.

#### RECOMMENDATION

This report is provided for information only. No Council action is required.

---

**CITY COUNCIL REPORT**

---

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

---

TO: Mayor And Council

PACKET DATE: February 2, 2012

FROM: David Cavazos  
City Manager

SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP: FEBRUARY 1, 2012 FORMAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

---

---

Attached are the February 1, 2012 Citizen Requests/Comments.

**CITIZEN REQUESTS/COMMENTS  
CITY COUNCIL FORMAL SESSION  
February 1, 2012**

**Ms. Beth Payne**

Ms. Payne expressed support for the City of Phoenix Human Relations Commission's resolution calling for Maricopa County Sheriff Arpaio's resignation.

**FOLLOW-UP: None**

**Mr. Patrick Solomon**

Mr. Solomon expressed concern with a proposed Arizona State Legislature bill that would end current meet and confer laws.

**FOLLOW-UP: None**

**Ms. Greta Rogers**

Ms. Rogers requested all who speak during the Formal City Council meetings to speak directly into their microphones to ensure they are heard clearly in the back of the Council Chambers. Ms. Rogers recommended the City Council initiate a study session prior to their meetings to ensure they have the necessary information and background on each of the agenda items. Ms. Rogers also expressed concern with the complex language utilized in some of the narratives in the City Council Agenda. She recommended the use of more common language so it would be easier for the public to understand.

**FOLLOW-UP: Takata**

**Mr. Leonard Clark**

Mr. Clark expressed support for the City of Phoenix Human Relations Commission's resolution calling for Maricopa County Sheriff Arpaio's resignation and requested the City Council join him.

**FOLLOW-UP: None**

Mr. Clark expressed concern with the Formal City Council meetings not being televised.

**FOLLOW-UP: None**

**Mr. Craig Slomin**

Mr. Slomin expressed support for Sheriff Arpaio's resignation and requested City Council join him.

**FOLLOW-UP: None**

**CITY COUNCIL AND CITIZEN REQUESTS**  
**Unanswered as of February 1, 2012**

**CITY COUNCIL INFORMATION REQUESTS**

<b>INFORMATION REQUESTS</b>	<b>DATE AND COUNCIL PERSON</b>	<b>DUE DATE</b>	<b>ASSIGNED TO</b>
There Are No Council Requests At This Time			

**CITIZENS REQUESTS**

<b>REQUEST</b>	<b>REQUEST DATE AND NAME OF CITIZEN</b>	<b>DUE DATE</b>	<b>ASSIGNED TO</b>
<p>Ms. Rogers requested all who speak during the Formal City Council meetings to speak directly into their microphones to ensure they are heard clearly in the back of the Council Chambers. Ms. Rogers recommended the City Council initiate a study session prior to their meetings to ensure they have the necessary information and background on each of the agenda items. Ms. Rogers also expressed concern with the complex language utilized in some of the narratives in the City Council Agenda. She recommended the use of more common language so it would be easier for the public to understand.</p>	<p>Ms. Greta Rogers February 1, 2012</p>	<p>February 15, 2012</p>	<p>Takata</p>

---

**CITY COUNCIL REPORT**

---

**CITIZEN REQUEST**

---

TO: Jerome Miller  
Deputy City Manager

PACKET DATE: February 2, 2012

FROM: James P. Burke  
Acting Parks and Recreation  
Director

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO COUNCIL QUESTION FROM MR. RUBEN LARA

---

---

This report provides City Council with information responding to Ruben Lara's comments at the January 18, 2012 Formal Meeting regarding the use of oil based paint from 1992-2003, that he believes caused himself and a fellow coworker to become ill.

Response:

Mr. Lara has contacted various City departments on numerous occasions regarding his concerns. The city has responded to Mr. Lara's request for information on seven occasions over the last two years. Findings do not support his claims.

The Parks and Recreation Department takes safety very seriously and follows all Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), State and City requirements to ensure worker safety. Additionally, Department safety training records show, Mr. Lara was trained on the proper use of Personal Protective Equipment, and Material Safety Data Sheets.

Recommendation:

This report is for information only.

---

## CITY COUNCIL REPORT

---

### CITIZEN REQUEST

---

TO: Jerome E. Miller  
Deputy City Manager

PACKET DATE: February 2, 2012

FROM: Chris Hallett  
Neighborhood Services Director

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO COUNCIL COMMENTS FROM MR. LUIS ACOSTA

---

---

This report provides City Council with information in response to comments made by Mr. Luis Acosta at the January 18, 2012 Formal City Council meeting.

#### THE ISSUE

Mr. Acosta expressed concern with a perceived misuse of public funds eight months ago by the Neighborhood Services Department (NSD).

#### OTHER INFORMATION

In July 2011, Mr. Acosta met with Deputy City Manager Jerome E. Miller, Neighborhood Services Director Chris Hallett, representatives from the union, and a resident regarding his concerns with Graffiti Busters use of assets. Additionally, Mr. Acosta met with City Manager David Cavazos to express the same concerns. As result of the two meetings significant follow up occurred after the internal meetings with Law, Human Resources, the City Manager, the union representative and NSD staff. As a follow-up to these meetings, Mr. Acosta was provided a written memo dated September 13, 2011 answering his questions and providing him direction on how to proceed on any future concerns.

If Mr. Acosta has further concerns that have not been addressed, he is encouraged to continue working with his supervisor and NSD Management so that they may address them.

#### RECOMMENDATION

This report is for information only.

---

## CITY COUNCIL REPORT

---

### CITIZEN REQUEST

---

TO: David Cavazos  
City Manager

PACKET DATE: February 2, 2012

FROM: Jeff Dewitt  
Finance Director

SUBJECT: CITIZEN REQUEST FROM JANUARY 18, 2012 FORMAL MEETING -  
RESPONSE TO MS. GRETA ROGERS

---

---

This report responds to the January 18, 2012 Citizen Request from Ms. Greta Rogers.

#### THE ISSUE

Ms. Rogers requested a citizen panel to review the Request for Proposal (RFP) and the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process and to update the City Code to expedite both processes.

#### OTHER INFORMATION

Last fall, the City Manager established the Procurement Process Work Group to review current procurement policies and to identify improvements to the overall procurement process. This would include the current RFP and RFQ process. The work group is comprised of City Executives from the Finance, Street Transportation, Public Transit, City Auditor and Law Departments along with representatives from the Arizona Chamber of Commerce, Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, Local First Arizona and the Innovation and Efficiency Task Force.

This group has recently completed an online survey to gather feedback from current vendors and members of the business community and is in the process of developing and scheduling vendor and public workshops for additional input. This information, along with a review of best practices, will be used to develop recommended changes to the current procurement process. Status updates will be provided to the Finance Efficiency and Innovation Subcommittee with any recommended changes in place by June 30, 2012. Once the date of the workshops are established, the information will be made available to the business community and the general public to attend and provide input on potential improvements to the procurement process.

#### RECOMMENDATION

This report is for information purposes only. No Council action is required.

---

## CITY COUNCIL REPORT

---

### CITIZEN REQUEST

---

TO: Lisa Takata  
Executive Assistant To The City  
Manager

PACKET DATE: February 2, 2012

FROM: Cris Meyer  
City Clerk

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO CITIZEN REQUEST FROM MS. GRETA ROGERS

---

---

This report responds to the January 18, 2012 citizen request from Ms. Greta Rogers.

#### THE ISSUE

Ms. Rogers expressed concern regarding the two-minute limit required of residents wishing to speak at City Council meetings. She requested the time be increased to three minutes on items of wide public interest.

#### OTHER INFORMATION

An allotted time for citizens to speak before public bodies or the City Council is not specified in the Arizona Open Meeting Law or the Rules of Council Proceedings outlined in the Phoenix City Code. Therefore, according to Rule 1 of the Rules of Council Proceedings, the latest standard edition of Robert's Rules of Order should be referenced.

According to Robert's Rules of Order, the Chair's duties are to enforce the rules relating to debate and decorum within the assembly, and expedite business in every way compatible with the rights of members. In order to accomplish these duties, the Chair has the ability to set the amount of time an item can be debated.

#### RECOMMENDATION

This report is for information only.