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## Executive Summary

## Background

The City of Fort Lauderdale engaged Segal Waters Consulting to evaluate the competitiveness of both pay and benefits for general employee positions. To gather this information, Segal Waters, in consultation with the City's Human Resources team, developed a customized survey instrument that was distributed to public sector employers found to be representative of its competitive labor market. Additionally, Segal Waters referenced published market data to represent the private sector. All data is effective as of February 1, 2017 and has been aged to April 1, 2018. Data is shown at the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile of market per the request of the City of Fort Lauderdale.

The thirty (30) peer employers selected for participation in the study are shown in Table 1. Of the thirty (30) surveyed employers, eleven (11) employers submitted both the pay and benefits sections of the survey, one (1) employer responded only to the benefits portion of the survey, and two (2) employers responded only to the pay portion of the survey. Segal Waters completed the pay portion of the survey for five (5) additional comparables, including the comparable mentioned previously who only submitted the benefits portion of the survey, based on job descriptions and pay data provided on the comparables' websites. As a result, Broward County, the City of Boca Raton, the City of Coral Springs, the City of Sunrise, the City of West Palm Beach, and Miami-Dade County will not be included in Table 12 through Table 49, as they did not complete the benefits portion of the survey. Overall, eighteen (18) employers participated in at least one portion of the survey providing a $60 \%$ response rate.

## TABLE 1

SURVEYED EMPLOYERS

| Peer Employers Surveyed |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Cities |  |
| City of Boca Raton | $\checkmark$ (Segal matched pay data) |
| City of Coral Springs | $\checkmark$ (Submitted pay portion only) |
| City of Delray Beach | $\sqrt{ }$ (Segal matched pay data, comparable submitted only benefit data) |
| City of Hialeah |  |
| City of Hollywood | $\checkmark$ |
| City of Miami | $\checkmark$ |
| City of Miami Beach | $\checkmark$ |
| City of Miami Gardens |  |
| City of Miramar | $\checkmark$ |
| City of Pembroke Pines |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | $\checkmark$ |
| City of Sunrise | $\checkmark$ (Segal matched pay data) |
| City of West Palm Beach | $\checkmark$ (Segal matched pay data) |
| Counties |  |
| Broward County | $\checkmark$ (Segal matched pay data) |
| Miami-Dade County | $\checkmark$ (Submitted pay portion only) |
| Palm Beach County |  |
| School Districts |  |
| Broward County School District |  |
| Miami-Dade County School District |  |
| Palm Beach County School District | $\checkmark$ |
| Transportation |  |
| Florida Department of Transportation |  |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority | $\checkmark$ |
| Miami Executive Airport | $\checkmark$ |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | $\checkmark$ |
| Universities |  |
| Barry University |  |
| Florida International University |  |
| Miami-Dade College | $\checkmark$ |
| University of Miami |  |
| Utilities |  |
| South Florida Water Management District |  |
| Orange County Utilities |  |
| Toho Water Authority | $\checkmark$ |

The study covers ninety-two (92) benchmark jobs, representing approximately $50 \%{ }^{1}$ of the City of Fort Lauderdale's workforce shown in Table 2. The benchmark jobs are listed by department in Table 3 and by occupational category in Table 5. To assist survey respondents in making job matches based on duties and qualifications rather than title, the survey instrument contained job summaries. The job summaries for each benchmark job are detailed in Appendix A.

TABLE 2
BENCHMARK JOB TITLES BY DEPARTMENT - COMPOSITION OF WORKFORCE


[^0]TABLE 3
BENCHMARK JOB TITLES BY DEPARTMENT

| City Attorney's Office (2) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| > Assistant City Attorney III | > Legal Assistant III |
| City Clerk's Office (1) |  |
| > Assistant City Clerk II |  |
| City Commission's Office (1) |  |
| > Commission Assistant IV |  |
| City Manager's Office (3) |  |
| > Assistant City Manager <br> > Construction Review Specialist | > Senior Financial Management Analyst |
| Crosses Multiple Departments (19) |  |
| > Accounting Clerk <br> > Administrative Aide <br> > Administrative Assistant II <br> > Clerk III <br> > Code Compliance Officer <br> > Construction Worker II <br> > Customer Service Representative I <br> > Deputy Director <br> > Electrician <br> > Event Worker | > Heavy Equipment Operator <br> > Municipal Maintenance Worker II <br> > Planner III <br> > Principal Planner <br> > Project Manager II <br> > Secretary 1 <br> > Senior Accounting Clerk <br> > Senior Project Manager <br> > Service Clerk |

Finance (6)
> Senior Accountant
> Senior Procurement Specialist
> Treasurer

## Fire Rescue (3)

| $>$ | Battalion Chief |
| :--- | :--- |
| $>$ | $>$ Beach Patrol Lieutenant |

## Human Resources Department (5)

> Claims Adjuster
> Human Resources Assistant
> Insurance Benefits Specialist
> Risk Manager
> Senior Claims Adjuster

## Information Technology Services (10)

| > Application Developer <br> > Assistant Database Administrator <br> > Computer Operator II <br> > Data Warehouse Analyst <br> > Geographic Information System Analyst | > Network Support Analyst <br> > Senior Tech Support Analyst <br> > Systems Administrator <br> > Technical Support Analyst <br> > Technology Strategist |
| :---: | :---: |
| Parks and Recreation (12) |  |
| > Apprentice Municipal Maintenance Worker <br> > Community Program Supervisor <br> > Field Operating Technician (Level IV) <br> > Head Groundskeeper <br> > Municipal Maintenance Worker III (Parks/Facilities) <br> > Parks Foreman | > Pool Equipment Mechanic <br> > Pool Lifeguard I <br> > Recreation Instructor II <br> > Recreation Program Coordinator <br> > Recreation Programmer I <br> > Recreation Worker |

TABLE 3
BENCHMARK JOB TITLES BY DEPARTMENT

| Police (6) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| > Accident Investigator II <br> > Crime Analyst II <br> > Police Aide II | > Police Records Clerk <br> > Public Safety Aide <br> > Senior Police Records Clerk |
| Public Works / Building Services (12) |  |
| > Distribution \& Collection Chief <br> > Electro Technician <br> > Engineering Aide II <br> > Engineering Technician II <br> > Environmental Lab Technician <br> > Industrial Electrician | > Municipal Maintenance Worker III (Public Services) <br> > Public Service Maintenance Chief <br> > Utilities Mechanic I <br> > Utilities Service Worker <br> > Utility Field Representative <br> > Water Treatment Plant Operator II |
| Sustainable Development (7) |  |
| > Building Inspector <br> > Chief Building Inspector <br> > Economic and Business Development Manager <br> > Electrical Inspector | > Plumbing Inspector <br> > Senior Code Compliance Officer <br> > Structural Plans Examiner |
| Transportation and Mobility (5) |  |
| > Airport Operations Aide <br> > Parking Enforcement Shift Coordinator <br> > Parking Enforcement Specialist | > Parking Meter Technician <br> > Parking Operations Supervisor |

TABLE 4
BENCHMARK JOB TITLES BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY - COMPOSITION OF WORKFORCE

| Occupational Category | Benchmark <br> Titles Being <br> Evaluated in <br> Study | Number of <br> Employees <br> within | Employees in <br> Benchmark <br> Bitles Being <br> Evaluated |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | | itles Evaluated <br> As a Percent of <br> the Total <br> Workforce |
| :---: |
| Administrative \& Support Services |
| Managerial \& Supervisory |
| Paraprofessional |
| Professional |
| Service Maintenance |
| Skilled Crafts |
| Technical |
| Total: |

[^1]
## TABLE 5 <br> BENCHMARK JOB TITLES BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY

## Administrative and Support Services (11)

| $>$ | Administrative Aide | $>$ | Police Aide II |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $>$ | Administrative Assistant II | $>$ | Police Records Clerk |
| $>$ | Assistant City Clerk II | $>$ | Secretary I |
| $>$ | Clerk III | $>$ | Senior Police Records Clerk |
| $>$ | Customer Service Representative I | $>$ | Service Clerk |
| $>$ | Parking Enforcement Specialist |  |  |

## Managerial and Supervisory (6)

| $>$ Beach Patrol Lieutenant | $>$ Manager - Procurement \& Contracts |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $>$ Deputy Director | $>$ | Risk Manager |
| $>$ Economic and Business Development Manager | $>$ Treasurer |  |

Paraprofessional (8)

|  | Accident Investigator II Accounting Clerk Airport Operations Aide Insurance Benefits Specialist | Legal Assistant III <br> Public Safety Aide <br> Recreation Programmer I <br> Senior Accounting Clerk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional (31) |  |  |
| > | Accountant II | > Planner III |
| > | Application Developer | > Principal Planner |
| > | Assistant City Attorney III | > Procurement Specialist II |
| > | Assistant City Manager | > Project Manager II |
| > | Assistant Database Administrator | > Recreation Instructor II |
| > | Battalion Chief | > Recreation Program Coordinator |
| > | Claims Adjuster | > Senior Accountant |
| > | Commission Assistant IV | > Senior Claims Adjuster |
| > | Community Program Supervisor | > Senior Financial Management Analyst |
|  | Crime Analyst II | > Senior Procurement Specialist |
| > | Data Warehouse Analyst | > Senior Project Manager |
| > | Environmental Lab Technician | > Senior Tech Support Analyst |
| > | Geographic Information System Analyst | > Systems Administrator |
| > | Human Resources Assistant | > Technical Support Analyst |
|  | Network Support Analyst | > Technology Strategist |

> Parking Operations Supervisor

## Service Maintenance (13)

| $>$ | Apprentice Municipal Maintenance Worker | $>$ | Municipal Maintenance Worker III (Public Services) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $>$ | Construction Worker II | $>$ | Pool Equipment Mechanic |
| $>$ | Event Worker | $>$ | Pool Lifeguard I |
| $>$ | Field Operating Technician (Level IV) | $>$ | Recreation Worker |
| $>$ | Head Groundskeeper | $>$ | Utilities Service Worker |
| $>$ | Municipal Maintenance Worker II | $>$ | Utility Field Representative |
| $>$ | Municipal Maintenance Worker III (Parks/Facilities) |  |  |
| Skilled Craft (10) |  |  |  |
|  | Beach Lifeguard | $>$ | Parking Meter Technician |
| $>$ | Distribution \& Collection Chief | $>$ | Parks Foreman |
| $>$ | Electrician | $>$ | Public Service Maintenance Chief |
| $>$ | Heavy Equipment Operator | $>$ | Utilities Mechanic I |
| $>$ | Industrial Electrician | $>$ | Water Treatment Plant Operator II |

## TABLE 5 BENCHMARK JOB TITLES BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY

| Technical (13) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| > Building Inspector | > Engineering Aide II |
| > Chief Building Inspector | > Engineering Technician II |
| > Code Compliance Officer | > Parking Enforcement Specialist |
| > Computer Operator II | > Plumbing Inspector |
| > Construction Review Specialist | > Senior Code Compliance Officer |
| > Electrical Inspector | > Structural Plans Examiner |
| > Electro Technician |  |

## Summary of Findings

This analysis is based on market data covering both the public sector, encompassing cities, counties, school districts, transportation entities, universities, and utilities, and the private sector. Public sector information was gathered through a custom market survey. Private sector information was derived from published data sources. The City of Fort Lauderdale's overall market position is based on an equal weighting of the two market sector averages and is relative to the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile of market.

Based on overall market data, including custom survey peer employers and published data representative of the private sector, the City of Fort Lauderdale's pay structure is at the market average at the pay range midpoint and maximum and below market at the pay range minimum. The City of Fort Lauderdale's market position is shown below in Table 6A as an overall to market, in Table 6B by department, and in Table 6C by occupational group.

We define market competitiveness as being between $95 \%$ and $105 \%$ of the market average at the minimum, midpoint, and maximum. Market comparisons that fall within this competitive corridor are noted in black, below $95 \%$ are noted in red, and above $105 \%$ are noted in blue.

## TABLE 6A

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE OVERALL - PAY ONLY ${ }^{6}$

\left.|  | City of Fort Lauderdale as a Percent of the 75th Percentile of the |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Average |  |  |  |$\right]$ Pay Range Maximum

Figures shown in red are below market (less than 95\% of the market average)
Figures shown in black within the market range ( $95 \%$ to $105 \%$ of the market average)
Figures shown in blue are above market (more than 105\% of the market average)

[^2]TABLE 6B
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL MARKET POSITION AT THE 75TH PERCENTILE BY DEPARTMENT - PAY ONLY7

|  | City of Fort Lauderdale as a Percent of the $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile of the Market Average |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pay Range Minimum | Pay Range Midpoint | Pay Range Maximum |
| City Attorney's Office | 108\% | 106\% | 106\% |
| City Clerk's Office | 113\% | 121\% | 110\% |
| City Commission's Office | 116\% | 112\% | 110\% |
| City Manager's Office | 90\% | 89\% | 87\% |
| Crosses Multiple Departments | 100\% | 96\% | 93\% |
| Finance Department | 111\% | 104\% | 100\% |
| Fire Department | 95\% | 97\% | 95\% |
| Human Resources Department | 97\% | 96\% | 95\% |
| Information Technology Department | 103\% | 96\% | 90\% |
| Parks and Recreation Department | 97\% | 95\% | 93\% |
| Police | 93\% | 86\% | 81\% |
| Public Works / Building Services Department | 99\% | 94\% | 90\% |
| Sustainable Development Department | 90\% | 87\% | 86\% |
| Transportation and Mobility Department | 108\% | 100\% | 94\% |
| Overall | 100\% | 96\% | 93\% |

Figures shown in red are below market (less than $95 \%$ of the market average)
Figures shown in black within the market range ( $95 \%$ to $105 \%$ of the market average)
Figures shown in blue are above market (more than 105\% of the market average)

[^3]TABLE 6C
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP- PAY ONLY ${ }^{8}$

|  | ONLY ${ }^{8}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City of Fort Lauderdale as a Percent of the $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile of the Market Average |  |  |
|  | Pay Range Minimum | Pay Range Midpoint | Pay Range Maximum |
| Administrative \& Support Services | 105\% | 98\% | 93\% |
| Managerial \& Supervisory | 101\% | 98\% | 95\% |
| Paraprofessional | 97\% | 91\% | 87\% |
| Professional | 102\% | 99\% | 96\% |
| Service Maintenance | 95\% | 95\% | 94\% |
| Skilled Crafts | 103\% | 97\% | 93\% |
| Technical | 91\% | 86\% | 82\% |
| Overall | 100\% | 96\% | 93\% |

Figures shown in red are below market (less than 95\% of the market average)
Figures shown in black within the market range ( $95 \%$ to $105 \%$ of the market average)
Figures shown in blue are above market (more than $105 \%$ of the market average)

[^4]We did find variation in the competitiveness of individual benchmark job titles (see Table 11). Overall, at the midpoint of the pay range:
> 39 benchmark job titles are below market (less than $95 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 34 benchmark job titles are at market (between $95 \%$ and $105 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 17 benchmark job titles are above market (above $105 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 2 benchmark job titles did not garner sufficient matches to be statistically significant
On a total compensation basis, taking into consideration base pay, employer health benefit costs, and retirement plan contributions, the City's market position relative to the base pay improves slightly from $96 \%$ to $98 \%$, as shown below in Table 7.

Overall, a total compensation analysis indicates:
> 33 benchmark job titles are below market (less than $95 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 37 benchmark job titles are at market (between $95 \%$ and $105 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 20 benchmark job titles are above market (above $105 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 2 benchmark job titles did not garner sufficient matches to be statistically significant
Health and retirement benefits used in the total compensation analysis reflect the Public Sector peer employers only.

TABLE 7
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE MARKET POSITION ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS - TOTAL COMPENSATION

|  | Base Pay ${ }^{9}$ (Range Midpoint) | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs <br> (Pay and Benefits) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs (Medical, Dental, \& Vision) | Total Retirement Benefits (Defined Benefit \& Deferred Compensation) |  |
| Overall Average | 96\% | 71\% | 137\% | 98\% |
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## Methodology

## Peer Employers

Table 8 shows the demographic characteristics of the 18 comparable employers participating in the study, a combination of cities, counties, school districts, transportation entities, universities, and utilities identified by the City as representative of its competitive labor market.

TABLE 8
PEER EMPLOYER CHARACTERISTICS

| Peer Employers | Population Change <br> Since 2010 | Median Household <br> Income as of 2014 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cities | $10.5 \%$ | $\$ 354,800$ |
| City of Boca Raton | $6.9 \%$ | $\$ 269,600$ |
| City of Coral Springs | $9.5 \%$ | $\$ 176,900$ |
| City of Delray Beach | $6.4 \%$ | $\$ 172,800$ |
| City of Hollywood | $10.4 \%$ | $\$ 211,400$ |
| City of Miami | $5.2 \%$ | $\$ 341,000$ |
| City of Miami Beach | $12.4 \%$ | $\$ 194,000$ |
| City of Miramar | $7.9 \%$ | $\$ 154,900$ |
| City of Pompano Beach | $9.8 \%$ | $\$ 137,300$ |
| City of Sunrise | $6.9 \%$ | $\$ 173,000$ |
| City of West Palm Beach | $8.5 \%$ |  |
| Counties | $7.9 \%$ | $\$ 177,300$ |
| Broward County | $7.8 \%$ | $\$ 194,100$ |
| Miami-Dade County |  | $\$ 194,600$ |
| School Districts | $13.7 \%$ |  |
| Palm Beach County School District | $10.4 \%$ | $\$ 158,600$ |
| Transportation | $8.0 \%$ | $\$ 211,400$ |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando <br> Executive Airport | $\$ 188,666^{10}$ |  |
| Miami Executive Airport |  |  |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | $10.4 \%$ | $\$ 30,858$ |
| Universities |  | $\$ 44,551$ |
| Miami-Dade College | $\mathbf{2 0 . 6 \%}$ | $\$ 243,600$ |
| Utilities | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ |  |
| Toho Water Authority |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale |  |  |
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## Published Data Sources

Additionally, Segal Waters referenced three (3) published data sources to reflect private sector pay levels. The sources are:

## Economic Research Institute (ERI)

The ERI Salary Assessor compiles pay data from hundreds of published data sources for thousands of job titles. The database is updated quarterly and provides salary information for nearly any geographic area in the United States. The information in this database reflects base salaries at the 10th and 90th percentiles, applicable to data sources and locations near Fort Lauderdale, Florida. The midpoint was calculated from the 10th and 90th percentiles. The geographic data cut used was Fort Lauderdale, Florida and the data was effective as of July 1, 2016.

## Towers Watson Data Services, Compensation Surveys

Towers Watson Data Services publishes multiple compensation surveys throughout the year. We compiled data from Towers Watson's General Industry compensation surveys. This report reflects the $10^{\text {th }}$ and $90^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of base salaries and the midpoint was calculated from these percentiles. The geographic cut used was the Southeast Region. Due to general proximity, data was not geographically adjusted. The data was effective as of February 1, 2015.

## Mercer US Benchmark Database Survey 2015

The 2015 Mercer Compensation Survey Report complies pay data from over 3,000 organizations across a variety of industries throughout the United States. The information in this report reflects base salary and pay range data for all responding organizations in the Southeast region. This report reflects the $25^{\text {th }}$ and $75^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of base salaries and the midpoint was calculated from these percentiles. The data was effective as of March 1, 2015.

Data from the three published data sources above were aged to the data effective date of April 1, 2018.

## Data Adjustments

## Geographic Adjustments

To adjust for geographic difference in the cost-of-labor between the City of Fort Lauderdale and peer locations, we used the cost-of-labor differentials report by the Economic Research Institute (ERI) for each peer location.

It is important to note that the cost-of-labor differentials do not necessarily reflect cost-of-living differences. ERI has found that cost-of-living differences (which reflect the supply and demand for goods and services) are not a good predictor of salary levels. In other words, while the cost of housing (or other goods and services) in the City of Fort Lauderdale may differ from the cost of housing in another peer location by a certain percentage, the prevailing salaries may not differ by the same percentage. ERI emphasizes that - for adjusting salaries in a market study such as this one - the cost-of-labor differentials provide a more accurate method of determining whether employers are paying a competitive wage appropriate to a given geographic area.

The geographic adjustments applied are shown in Table 9. A negative adjustment means that the cost-of-labor in a comparator location is higher than in the City of Fort Lauderdale. For example, the cost of labor in the City of Boca Raton is higher than in the City of Fort Lauderdale, shown as $-1.1 \%$. Conversely, a positive adjustment means that the cost-of-labor in a comparator location is lower than in the City of Fort Lauderdale. For example, the cost of labor in the City of Miami is lower than in the City of Fort Lauderdale, shown as an adjustment of $0.1 \%$.

TABLE 9
GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENTS

| Peer Employer | Geographic <br> Adjustment |
| :--- | :---: |
| Broward County | $0.0 \%$ |
| City of Boca Raton | $-1.1 \%$ |
| City of Coral Springs | $0.3 \%$ |
| City of Delray Beach | $-0.8 \%$ |
| City of Hollywood | $0.2 \%$ |
| City of Miami | $0.1 \%$ |
| City of Miami Beach | $-0.3 \%$ |
| City of Miramar | $0.3 \%$ |
| City of Pompano Beach | $0.4 \%$ |
| City of Sunrise | $1.1 \%$ |
| City of West Palm Beach | $-1.4 \%$ |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | $5.0 \%$ |
| Miami Executive Airport | $0.1 \%$ |
| Miami-Dade College | $0.1 \%$ |
| Miami-Dade County | $0.1 \%$ |
| Palm Beach County School District | $-1.4 \%$ |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | $0.1 \%$ |
| Toho Water Authority | $5.4 \%$ |

 in Table 10, there were some differences in workweeks for the peer employers.

|  | 40 HOUR WORKWEEK |  | 48 HOUR WORKWEEK |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | Hours Worked by Employees in Comparable Positions | Workweek Adjustment by Employees in Comparable Positions | Hours Worked by Employees in Comparable Positions | Workweek Adjustment by Employees in Comparable Positions |
| Broward County | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 48.0 | 0.0\% |
| City of Boca Raton | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| City of Coral Springs | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 48.0 | 0.0\% |
| City of Delray Beach | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| City of Hollywood | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| City of Miami | $\begin{aligned} & 40.0 \\ & 29.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \% \\ 35.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| City of Miami Beach | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| City of Miramar | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| City of Pompano Beach | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 48.0 | 0.0\% |
| City of Sunrise | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| City of West Palm Beach | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 48.0 | 0.0\% |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| Miami Executive Airport | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| Miami-Dade College | $\begin{aligned} & 37.5 \\ & 25.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.7 \% \\ 60.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| Miami-Dade County | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| Palm Beach County School District | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| Toho Water Authority | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 40.0 | 20.0\% |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | 40.0 | 0.0\% | 48.0 | 0.0\% |

## Study Findings - Base Pay

## Pay Ranges - Overall

Based on overall market data the City of Fort Lauderdale's pay structure is at the market average midpoint. We define market competitiveness as being between $95 \%$ and $105 \%$ of the market average. We did find variation in the competitiveness of individual benchmark job titles.

Specifically:
> 39 benchmark job titles are below market (less than $95 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 34 benchmark job titles are at market (between $95 \%$ and $105 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 17 benchmark job titles are above market (above $105 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 2 benchmark job titles did not garner sufficient matches to be statistically significant
Table 11 shows all benchmark jobs and their respective pay range market competitiveness based on the market data. "Insufficient Data" indicates that a specific benchmark job did not have three or more matches, as noted in the second column of the table. Segal Waters requires three or more matches for the data to be statistically significant; if a benchmark job does not garner enough matches Segal Waters will remove the position from analysis.

## TABLE 11

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
OVERALL MARKET POSITION - 75 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE - PAY ONLY BY DEPARTMENT


## TABLE 11

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
OVERALL MARKET POSITION - 75 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE - PAY ONLY BY DEPARTMENT

| OVERALL MARKET POSITION |  | City of Fort Lauderdale Pay Ranges as a Percent of the $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benchmark Title | \# of Matches | Pay Range Minimum | Pay Range Midpoint | Pay Range Maximum |
| Procurement Specialist II | 13 | 123\% | 112\% | 105\% |
| Senior Accountant | 17 | 118\% | 110\% | 109\% |
| Senior Procurement Specialist | 10 | 122\% | 117\% | 112\% |
| Treasurer | 10 | 94\% | 90\% | 87\% |
| Finance Department Average |  | 111\% | 104\% | 100\% |
| Fire Department (3) |  |  |  |  |
| Battalion Chief | 12 | 85\% | 98\% | 102\% |
| Beach Lifeguard | 7 | 98\% | 90\% | 85\% |
| Beach Patrol Lieutenant | 7 | 113\% | 101\% | 92\% |
| Fire Department Average |  | 95\% | 97\% | 95\% |
| Human Resources Department (5) |  |  |  |  |
| Claims Adjuster | 11 | 87\% | 89\% | 87\% |
| Human Resources Assistant | 6 | 112\% | 109\% | 111\% |
| Insurance Benefits Specialist | 8 | 99\% | 92\% | 88\% |
| Risk Manager | 8 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Senior Claims Adjuster | 10 | 92\% | 93\% | 91\% |
| Human Resources Department Average |  | 97\% | 96\% | 95\% |
| Information Technology Department (10) |  |  |  |  |
| Application Developer | 10 | 108\% | 107\% | 102\% |
| Assistant Database Administrator | 10 | 100\% | 96\% | 90\% |
| Computer Operator II | 6 | 94\% | 80\% | 71\% |
| Data Warehouse Analyst | 4 | 104\% | 102\% | 95\% |
| Geographic Information Systems Analyst | 6 | 111\% | 101\% | 93\% |
| Network Support Analyst | 9 | 100\% | 96\% | 90\% |
| Senior Tech Support Analyst | 9 | 111\% | 101\% | 97\% |
| Systems Administrator | 13 | 112\% | 103\% | 97\% |
| Technical Support Analyst | 11 | 103\% | 96\% | 91\% |
| Technology Strategist | 6 | 87\% | 80\% | 75\% |
| Information Technology Department Average |  | 103\% | 96\% | 90\% |
| Parks and Recreation Department (12) |  |  |  |  |
| Apprentice Municipal Maintenance Worker | 9 | 90\% | 83\% | 80\% |
| Community Program Supervisor | 7 | 92\% | 94\% | 95\% |
| Field Operations Technician - Level IV | 4 | 108\% | 98\% | 91\% |
| Head Groundskeeper | 4 | 98\% | 94\% | 91\% |
| Municipal Maintenance Worker III (Parks/Facilities) | 10 | 92\% | 89\% | 85\% |
| Parks Foreman | 7 | 112\% | 105\% | 102\% |
| Pool Equipment Mechanic | 4 | 110\% | 108\% | 107\% |
| Pool Lifeguard I | 11 | 98\% | 91\% | 85\% |
| Recreation Instructor II | 5 | 64\% | 82\% | 94\% |

## TABLE 11

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
OVERALL MARKET POSITION - 75 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE - PAY ONLY BY DEPARTMENT

|  |  | City of Fort Lauderdale Pay Ranges as a Percent of the $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benchmark Title | \# of Matches | Pay Range Minimum | Pay Range Midpoint | Pay Range Maximum |
| Recreation Program Coordinator | 7 | 116\% | 113\% | 108\% |
| Recreation Programmer I | 7 | 96\% | 87\% | 81\% |
| Recreation Worker | 7 | 62\% | 75\% | 84\% |
| Parks and Recreation Department Average |  | 97\% | 95\% | 93\% |
| Police Department (6) |  |  |  |  |
| Accident Investigator II | 2 | Insufficient Data |  |  |
| Crime Analyst II | 8 | 103\% | 93\% | 86\% |
| Police Aide II | 1 | Insufficient Data |  |  |
| Police Records Clerk | 8 | 98\% | 91\% | 86\% |
| Public Safety Aide | 6 | 86\% | 84\% | 78\% |
| Senior Police Records Clerk | 4 | 91\% | 82\% | 76\% |
| Police Department Average |  | 93\% | 86\% | 81\% |
| Public Works / Building Services Department (12) |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution And Collection Chief | 6 | 97\% | 94\% | 92\% |
| Electro Technician | 7 | 101\% | 96\% | 92\% |
| Engineering Aide II | 6 | 85\% | 83\% | 75\% |
| Engineering Technician II | 6 | 106\% | 100\% | 93\% |
| Environmental Laboratory Technician | 6 | 99\% | 95\% | 93\% |
| Industrial Electrician | 18 | 102\% | 97\% | 93\% |
| Municipal Maintenance Worker III (Public Services) | 4 | 95\% | 88\% | 83\% |
| Public Service Maintenance Chief | 9 | 100\% | 96\% | 92\% |
| Utilities Mechanic I | 10 | 105\% | 98\% | 90\% |
| Utilities Service Worker | 8 | 83\% | 88\% | 91\% |
| Utility Field Representative | 3 | 105\% | 99\% | 94\% |
| Water Treatment Plant Operator II | 8 | 103\% | 95\% | 90\% |
| Public Works / Building Services Department Average |  | 99\% | 94\% | 90\% |
| Sustainable Development Department (7) |  |  |  |  |
| Building Inspector | 10 | 80\% | 82\% | 85\% |
| Chief Building Inspector | 10 | 87\% | 85\% | 86\% |
| Economic And Business Development Manager | 10 | 106\% | 106\% | 106\% |
| Electrical Inspector | 8 | 87\% | 83\% | 80\% |
| Plumbing Inspector | 9 | 88\% | 83\% | 80\% |
| Senior Code Compliance Officer | 10 | 88\% | 80\% | 75\% |
| Structural Plans Examiner | 8 | 89\% | 83\% | 80\% |
| Sustainable Development Department Average |  | 90\% | 87\% | 86\% |
| Transportation and Mobility Department (5) |  |  |  |  |
| Airport Operations Aide | 3 | 100\% | 88\% | 81\% |
| Parking Enforcement Shift Coordinator | 3 | 114\% | 106\% | 99\% |

TABLE 11
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
OVERALL MARKET POSITION - 75 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE - PAY ONLY BY DEPARTMENT
City of Fort Lauderdale Pay Ranges as a
Percent of the $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile

| Benchmark Title | \# of <br> Matches | Pay Range <br> Minimum | Pay Range <br> Midpoint | Pay Range <br> Maximum |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parking Enforcement Specialist | 5 | $95 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| Parking Meter Technician | 5 | $107 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| Parking Operations Supervisor | 5 | $120 \%$ | $118 \%$ | $117 \%$ |
| Transportation and Mobility Department Average |  | $\mathbf{1 0 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 4 \%}$ |
| Overall | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 \%}$ |  |

Figures shown in red are below market (less than $95 \%$ of the market average)
Figures shown in black within the market range ( $95 \%$ to $105 \%$ of the market average)
Figures shown in blue are above market (more than 105\% of the market average)

## Study Findings - Pay Practices

## Pay Schedule Design \& Increases

Tables 12 through 49 detail characteristics of peer employer pay plans for general employee positions including:
> Pay Schedule Design
> Pay Progression
> Pay Increase Amounts
> Type of Base Pay Increases
> Pay Progression and Pay Increase Policies
Questions to which a comparable employer provided no response display an 'NR' in the associated field, and questions where an answer was not applicable display an 'NA' in the associated field.

Survey Question: What type of pay schedule design(s) covers employees?
TABLE 12
PAY SCHEDULE DESIGN - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Grade and <br> Step | Open <br> Ranges | Flat Rates | Other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | No | Yes | No | No |
| City of Hollywood | No | Yes | No | No |
| City of Miami | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| City of Miami Beach | No | Yes | No | No |
| City of Miramar | No | Yes | No | No |
| City of Pompano Beach | No | Yes | No | No |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Miami-Dade College | NR | Yes | NR | No |
| Palm Beach County School District | No | Yes | No | No |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No | Yes | No | No |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | No | No | No |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | No | No | No |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable

Survey Question: What determines how employees progress though the pay range (that is, moves from the minimum to the maximum of the range)?

TABLE 13
PAY PROGRESSION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Steps (Time in <br> Position) | Individual <br> Performance | Other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | No | Yes | NA |
| City of Hollywood | No | Yes | No |
| City of Miami | Yes | Yes | No |
| City of Miami Beach | No | Yes | NA |
| City of Miramar | No | Yes | No |
| City of Pompano Beach | No | Yes | No |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | No | No | Yes - General Increase |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | Yes | NA |
| Miami-Dade College | Yes | NR | NA |
| Palm Beach County School District | No | No | Yes |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No | Yes | Yes |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | No | NA |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | Yes | NA |
| NR Nespose |  |  |  |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable

Survey Question: What type(s) / amount of base pay increases were applied in FY 2017 for employees? If other, please explain.
TABLE 14
FY 2017 TYPE OF BASE PAY INCREASES - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | COLA | Amount (\$ or \%) | Merit/ Performance | Amount <br> (\$ or \%) | Other | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Amount (\$ } \\ & \text { or \%) } \end{aligned}$ | If other, please explain: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | No | NA | Yes | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \%- \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | 2.5\% | Yes | 1.5\% | No | NA | NA |
| City of Miami | No | NA | Yes | 5.0\% | Yes | 5.0\% | Contract Step Increases |
| City of Miami Beach | Yes | 3.0\% | Yes | TBD | NA | NA | Merit/Performance percentage is pending Commission approval |
| City of Miramar | Yes | 2.5\% | No | NA | No | NA | NA |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | 3.0\% | Yes | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \%- \\ 3.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | No | NA | NA |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | No | NA | No | NA | Yes | 3.5\% | General Increase |
| Miami Executive Airport | Pending Labor Agreement Negotiations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miami-Dade College | No | NA | No | NA | Yes | 2.0\% | As approved by the Board of Trustees, for FY 2016/2017 |
| Palm Beach County School District | No | NA | Yes | See Comment | Yes | See Comment | PBCSD has 6 bargaining units and 6 non-bargaining units. Union negotiations determine increases. |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No | NA | No | NA | Yes | 3.0\% | Across the board increase |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | 1.5\% | Yes | 2.5\% | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | 0.5\% | Yes | $\begin{gathered} 1.5 \%- \\ 3.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | NA | NA | NA |

[^7]
## Survey Questions:

(A) Do adjustments to the pay schedule automatically result in increases to employees' base pay?
(B) Do you have a minimum guaranteed pay increase for promotions?
(C) Do you have a policy on hiring practices? If yes, please provide any relevant detail.

TABLE 15
PAY PROGRESSION AND PAY INCREASE POLICIES - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Question A | Question B | Question C | If Yes, please detail any relevant information. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | No | Yes | Yes | NR |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | Yes | Yes | Minimum of 5\% for promotion |
| City of Miami | Yes | Yes | Yes | NR |
| City of Miami Beach | No | Yes | Yes | NR |
| City of Miramar | Yes | No | Yes | Varies by department, HR has a blanket policy on hiring polices |
| City of Pompano Beach | No | Yes | Yes | All newly appointed employees should be appointed at the minimum entrance salary. A department head may hire above salary with the City Manager's approval. A promoted employee's salary will be increased to the minimum of the new pay grade or $15 \%$ of their base pay, whichever is the greater. |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | No | Yes | Yes | NR |
| Miami Executive Airport | No | Yes | Yes | Minimum guaranteed pay increase is approximately $5 \%$ or to the minimum of the pay grade, greater of amount. |
| Miami-Dade College | NR | NR | NR | NR |
| Palm Beach County School District | No | Yes | Yes | Previous identical experience may apply for purposes of initial salary appointment, depending on the bargaining or non-bargaining unit of assignment. |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No | No | Yes | It is the policy of SFRTA to be an Equal Opportunity employer. |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | Yes | Yes | Question B: Yes - A promotion to a higher salary grade is $7 \%$ or the minimum of the new pay grade. A promotion from non-supervisor to a supervisor position is 10\%. <br> Question C: Yes - We have a policy on recruitment and appointment, transfers, promotions and demotions, and pay for performance. |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | No | Yes | Yes | For exam positions: Must be a job posting (Teamsters requires a two week post), examination process that will make up half of the candidates' overall score. Candidates must be ranked and placed on an eligibility list and the top 5 scores are sent to the hiring department for interviews and selection. Non-exam positions: Must be a job posting and the overall score is based on the interview panel. |

## Survey Question:

(D) Do you have a minimum guaranteed pay increases for reclassification to a higher grade?

TABLE 16
PAY PROGRESSION AND PAY INCREASE POLICIES CONTINUED - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Question D | If Yes, please describe below. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | 4.0\% per grade |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | Minimum of 5.0\% for reclassification |
| City of Miami | Yes | Minimum 10.0\% increase |
| City of Miami Beach | No | $5.0 \%$ |
| City of Miramar | Yes | NA |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | $5.0 \%$ |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | No | $6.0 \%$ |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | NA |
| Miami-Dade College | Yes | NR |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | Employees transferred to a job in a higher salary range will be paid <br> at least the minimum of the new range and no greater than 10.0\% <br> above the minimum range. |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Yes | A promotion to a higher salary grade is 7.0\% or the minimum of the <br> new pay grade. A promotion from non-supervisory to supervisor is <br> $10.0 \%$. |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | 5.0\% increase or the minimum of the pay grade, whichever is <br> higher. |
| City of Fort Lauderdale |  |  |

NR $=$ No Response
NA $=$ Not Applicable

Survey Question: What types of pay supplements are offered to any employees (e.g. \$0.10/hour for trades workers)? If you do not offer one or more of the following pay supplements, enter "Not Applicable."

TABLE 17A
PAY SUPPLEMENTS OFFERED - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Evening Shift | Amount <br> (\$ or \%) | Overnight Shift Differential | Amount (\$ or \%) | Weekend Differential | Amount (\$ or \%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | NR | Yes | NR | No | NA |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | \$0.60/hr | Yes | \$1.00/hr | No | NA |
| City of Miami | No | NA | Yes | \$0.60/hr | No | NA |
| City of Miami Beach | Yes | Varies | Yes | Varies | No | NA |
| City of Miramar | Yes | NR | Yes | NR | No | NA |
| City of Pompano Beach | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Yes | \$0.60/hr | Yes | \$0.85/hr | No | NA |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | 5.0\% | Yes | 5.0\% | No | NA |
| Miami-Dade College | Yes | 5.0\% | Yes | 10.0\% | No | NA |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | \$0.25/hr | No | NA | No | NA |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No | NA | Yes | \$1.00/hr | No | NA |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | 1.5x for NonExempt Employees | Yes | $1.5 x$ for NonExempt Employees | No | NA |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | No | NA | Yes | 2.5\% or 5.0\% above pay range depending on the position. | Yes | 2.5\% or 5.0\% above pay range depending on the position. |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable

Survey Question: What types of pay supplements are offered to any employees (e.g. \$0.10/hour for trades workers)? If you do not offer one or more of the following pay supplements, enter "Not Applicable."

TABLE 17B

| PAY SUPPLEMENTS OFFERED - GENERAL EMPLOYEES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | On-Call or StandBy Pay | Amount (\$ or \%) | Call-Back Pay | Amount (\$ or \%) |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | NR | Yes | NR |
| City of Hollywood | No | NA | Yes | NR |
| City of Miami | Yes | Receive a $7.5 \%$ pay supplement added to their base rate of pay should they be continually assigned to on-call rotation. | Yes | If recalled to duty during off-duty hours, receive a minimum of three (3) hours plus one (1) hour travel time, paid at the overtime rate |
| City of Miami Beach | Yes | 2 Hours | Yes | 4 Hours Minimum |
| City of Miramar | No | NA | Yes | NR |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | Additional \$1.00/hr | Yes | \$100 monthly only for Zoning Techs |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Yes | 2/10 of one hour | Yes | 4 Hrs Min |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | Amount dependent on employee's individual pay rate | Yes | Min. 4 Hrs Pay |
| Miami-Dade College | No | NA | No | NA |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | NR | No | NA |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No | NA | No | NA |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | Paid overtime for the actual hours called out and a flat $\$ 140$ for serving standby duty | Yes | Minimum 2 hrs. and a minimum of 15 minutes of work for responses from a remote location, at the applicable rate of pay |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | Non-duty day employee receives 2 hr straight time, on duty day is 1 hr | Yes | Call back pay is time and one-half with a minimum of 3 hours |

NR = No Response
NA $=$ Not Applicable

Survey Question: What types of pay supplements are offered to any employees (e.g. \$0.10/hour for trades workers)? If you do not offer one or more of the following pay supplements, enter "Not Applicable."

TABLE 17C
PAY SUPPLEMENTS OFFERED - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Holiday Pay | Amount (\$ or \%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | NR |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | NR |
| City of Miami | Yes | 1.5x the Hourly Rate |
| City of Miami Beach | Yes | NR |
| City of Miramar | Yes | NR |
| City of Pompano Beach | No | NA |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando <br> Executive Airport | Yes | Holiday + Regular |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | One day of pay, amount dependent on employee's individual pay rate |
| Miami-Dade College | No | NA |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | NR |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Yes | 8/4 hr FT/PT |
| Toho Water Authority | NR | NR |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | Employees not scheduled receive 8 hours pay at straight time. If <br> scheduled on a holiday, employee receive holiday compensatory <br> time off calculated at 1-1/2 times the hours worked |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable

Survey Question: What types of pay supplements are offered to any employees (e.g. \$0.10/hour for trades workers)? If you do not offer one or more of the following pay supplements, enter "Not Applicable."

TABLE 17D
PAY SUPPLEMENTS OFFERED - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Bi-Lingual Pay | Amount (\$ or \%) | Special Skills | Amount (\$ or \%) | Sign-On Bonus | Amount (\$ or \%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | NR | No | NA | No | NA |
| City of Hollywood | No | NA | NR | NR | No | NA |
| City of Miami | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| City of Miami Beach | No | NR | Yes | NR | No | NR |
| City of Miramar | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| City of Pompano Beach | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| Miami Executive Airport | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| Miami-Dade College | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR |
| Palm Beach County School District | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| Toho Water Authority | No | NA | NR | NR | No | NA |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |

Survey Question: What types of pay supplements are offered to any employees (e.g. \$0.10/hour for trades workers)? If you do not offer one or more of the following pay supplements, enter "Not Applicable."

TABLE 17E
PAY SUPPLEMENTS OFFERED- GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Referral Bonus | Amount (\$ or \%) | Profess. Edu. Diff. | Amount (\$ or \%) | Educational Stipend | Amount (\$ or \%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| City of Hollywood | No | NA | No | NA | NR | NR |
| City of Miami | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| City of Miami Beach | No | NR | NR | NR | Yes | UNDERGRADUATE COURSES: <br> $80 \%$ for courses where employee earns an $A$ $60 \%$ for courses where employee earns a B $40 \%$ for courses where employee earns a C GRADUATE COURSES: <br> 80\% for courses where employee earns an A $60 \%$ for courses where employee earns a B |
| City of Miramar | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| City of Pompano Beach | No | NA | Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Only for } \\ & \text { Zoning } \\ & \text { Technician } \end{aligned}$ | No | NA |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| Miami Executive Airport | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| Miami-Dade College | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR |
| Palm Beach County School District | No | NA | Yes | NR | No | NA |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No | NA | No | NA | No | NA |
| Toho Water Authority | No | NA | No | NA | Yes | \$4,690 per fiscal year, reimbursement of courses associated with attaining a degree in a field related to the employee's role at TWA |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | No | NA | No | NA | Yes | Differs based on bargaining group and classification |

NR = No Response, NA = Not Applicable

Survey Question: What types of pay supplements are offered to any employees (e.g. \$0.10/hour for trades workers)? If you do not offer one or more of the following pay supplements, enter "Not Applicable."

TABLE 17F1
PAY SUPPLEMENTS OFFERED- GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Other | Amount (\$ or \%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | NR | NR | NR |
| City of Hollywood | NR | NR | NR |
| City of Miami | Yes | See <br> Comment | - Emergency Dispatchers who are actively assigned the duty of training new Emergency Dispatchers shall be entitled to receive a five percent (5\%) per pay period pay supplement for the actual full pay period they are assigned in a training capacity by their supervisor. <br> - All Police Emergency Dispatchers, Emergency Dispatcher Supervisors, and Police and Emergency Dispatch Assistants assigned to Police Communications shall receive a five percent (5\%) pay supplement if the employee holds and maintains the Quality Assurance Proficiency (QAP) rating in accordance with Police Standards after a period of three (3) months. <br> -Fire Garage Mechanics and Supervisors who obtain Emergency Vehicle Technicians certificates, shall receive a one percent (1\%) pay supplement for every two (2) licenses that mechanics and supervisors obtain and maintain, up to a maximum of five percent (5\%) for holding a minimum of ten (10) approved licenses. <br> -All fleet employees and supervisors in the Department of General Services Administration, who obtain Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) certification, shall receive a one percent (1\%) pay supplement for every two (2) licenses obtained and maintained, up to a maximum of five percent ( $5 \%$ ) for holding a minimum of ten (10) approved licenses. |
| City of Miami Beach | NR | NR | NR |
| City of Miramar | No | NA | NR |
| City of Pompano Beach | No | NA | NR |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | No | NA | NR |

TABLE 17F2

## PAY SUPPLEMENTS OFFERED- GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Other | Amount (\$ or \%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Miami Executive Airport | No | NA | Lead worker is a pay supplement provided to employees that are determined to be performing extraordinary duties within their classification, such as providing direction, issuing work assignments to other employees within their same classification, performing added duties outside their classification, etc. For employees in the Purchasing or Contracting Profession there is a certification available to employees in the purchasing \& contract procurement area such as Certified Public Procurement Officer (CPPO); the supplement is for attaining the certification. |
| Miami-Dade College | Yes | 3\% | Lead workers are provided a pay supplement of 3\% of their base pay. |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | NR | NR |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No | NA | Pay differential of $\$ 1.00$ per hour for hours between 10 pm and 6 am . Holiday pay is paid at rate of 8 hours for full time employees and 4 hours for part time employees. |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | 7\% | Field Services has a Skill Based Pay program that incentivizes progression of skills and knowledge. The employee's job title advances and their pay grade increases by meeting the requirements. |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | No | NA | NR |

NA = Not Applicable

## Survey Questions:

(A) Do you offer longevity pay to any employees?
(B) If Yes, which employee groups receive longevity pay?

TABLE 18
LONGEVITY PAY - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Offered? | Employee Groups which Receive <br> Longevity Pay |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Nity of Delray Beach | No | NA |
| City of Hollywood | Nes | Genal, Professional, Supervisory, <br> and Non-Represented |
| City of Miami | No | NA |
| City of Miami Beach | Yes | Employees with 15 Years of Full-time <br> Service or More |
| City of Miramar | No | NA |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | All Employee Groups |
| Greater Orlando Aviation <br> Authority / Orlando Executive <br> Airport | Yes | NA Employee Groups |
| Miami Executive Airport | No | NA |
| Miami-Dade College | No | Nes |
| Palm Beach County School <br> District | Yes | All Full-time and Permanent |
| South Florida Regional <br> Transportation Authority | Employees hired before 10/1/2004 |  |
| Toho Water Authority |  |  |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable

Survey Question: How much longevity pay do general employees receive for each year of service?
TABLE 19A
AMOUNT OF LONGEVITY PAY BY YEARS OF SERVICE - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | 1 < 5 Years | $5<10$ Years | $10<15$ Years | $15<20$ Years | $20<25$ Years | $25<30$ Years | 30+ Years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Amount (\$/hour or \% of pay) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Delray Beach | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Hollywood | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.0\% | 3.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% |
| City of Miami | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Miami Beach | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Miramar | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR |
| City of Pompano Beach | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greater Orlando Aviation <br> Authority / Orlando <br> Executive Airport | \$0.00 | \$425.00 | \$825.00 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,600.00 | \$1,600.00 | \$1,600.00 |
| Miami Executive Airport | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \text { Yrs - 1.5\% } \\ & 16 \text { Yrs - } 1.6 \% \\ & 17 \text { Yrs - } 1.7 \% \\ & 18 \text { Yrs - } 1.8 \% \\ & 19 \text { Yrs - } 1.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \text { Yrs - } 2.0 \% \\ & 21 \text { Yrs - } 2.1 \% \\ & 22 \text { Yrs - } 2.2 \% \\ & 23 \text { Yrs - } 2.3 \% \\ & 24 \text { Yrs - } 2.4 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \text { Yrs - 2.5\% } \\ & 26 \text { Yrs - 2.6\% } \\ & 27 \text { Yrs - 2.7\% } \\ & 28 \text { Yrs - 2.8\% } \\ & 29 \text { Yrs - } 2.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | 30 Yr. Cap at 3.0\% |
| Miami-Dade College | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Palm Beach County School District | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Toho Water Authority | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 300.00- \\ \$ 450.00 \end{gathered}$ | \$450.00-\$600.00 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 600.00- \\ \$ 750.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 750.00- \\ \$ 900.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 900.00- \\ & \$ 1,020.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | NA | 2.5\% | 5.0\% | 7.5\% | 10.0\% | 12.5\% | 12.5\% |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable

Survey Question: How much longevity pay do management employees receive for each year of service?
TABLE 19B
AMOUNT OF LONGEVITY PAY BY YEARS OF SERVICE - MANAGEMENT - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | $1<5$ Years | $5<10$ Years | $10<15$ Years | $15<20$ Years | $20<25$ Years | 25<30 Years | 30+ Years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Amount (\$/hour or \% of pay) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Delray Beach | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Hollywood | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.0\% | 3.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% |
| City of Miami | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Miami Beach | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Miramar | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR |
| City of Pompano Beach | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greater Orlando Aviation <br> Authority / Orlando <br> Executive Airport | \$0.00 | \$425.00 | \$825.00 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,600.00 | \$1,600.00 | \$1,600.00 |
| Miami Executive Airport | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \text { Yrs - 1.5\% } \\ & 16 \text { Yrs - 1.6\% } \\ & 17 \text { Yrs - 1.7\% } \\ & 18 \text { Yrs - 1.8\% } \\ & 19 \text { Yrs - 1.9\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \text { Yrs - 2.0\% } \\ & 21 \text { Yrs - 2.1\% } \\ & 22 \text { Yrs - 2.2\% } \\ & 23 \text { Yrs - 2.3\% } \\ & 24 \text { Yrs - } 2.4 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \text { Yrs - 2.5\% } \\ & 26 \text { Yrs - 2.6\% } \\ & 27 \text { Yrs - 2.7\% } \\ & 28 \text { Yrs - 2.8\% } \\ & 29 \text { Yrs - } 2.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | 30 Yr. Cap at 3.0\% |
| Miami-Dade College | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Palm Beach County School District | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Toho Water Authority | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 300.00- \\ \$ 450.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 450.00- \\ \$ 600.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 600.00- \\ \$ 750.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 750.00- \\ \$ 900.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 900.00- \\ & \$ 1,020.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$0.00 | Starting at 5 years of service employees will earn \$264 for each year of continuous service |  |  |  |  |  |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable

Survey Questions: What is the maximum amount of longevity pay an employee can receive? Is longevity pay included in pension calculations?

TABLE 20
MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF LONGEVITY PAY - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Maximum Amount | Included in Pension Benefit Calculations? | Use this space below for additional comments regarding longevity pay. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Hollywood | Capped at 2.0\% of Pay at 20 years of Service | Yes | NR |
| City of Miami | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Miami Beach | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Miramar | NR | NR | NR |
| City of Pompano Beach | NA | NA | NA |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Capped at \$1,600.00 | No | The years are slightly off compared to Greater Orlando Aviation Authority |
| Miami Executive Airport | Capped at 3.0\% of Pay | NR | NR |
| Miami-Dade College | No | NA | NA |
| Palm Beach County School District | NA | NA | NA |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | NA | NA | NA |
| Toho Water Authority | Capped at \$1,020.00 | Yes | NR |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | 12.5\% | NR | Annual dollar amount for Longevity pay differs based on bargaining group. Annual rates listed for general employees are from Teamsters bargaining union. <br> Employees must be hired prior to April 10, 1983 and must have served continuous for 5 years. For Federation employees: must be employed on or before Feb. 28, 1987. For management: must be employed on or before March 1, 1987 and 5 years of continuous serves. |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable

## Survey Question:

(A) Do you offer performance-based rewards?
(B) If yes, what types of performance-based rewards do you offer to any employees?

TABLE 21
PERFORMANCE-BASED REWARDS - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Offered? | Organization Wide Pay Increases | Organization Wide Lump Sum Bonuses | Department/ Team Pay Increases | Department/ Team Lump Sum Bonuses | Individual Pay Increases | Individual Lump Sum Bonuses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| City of Hollywood | No | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Miami | No | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Miami Beach | No | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Miramar | No | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Greater Orlando Aviation <br> Authority / Orlando <br> Executive Airport | No | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Miami-Dade College | No | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |

NR = No Response
NA $=$ Not Applicable

Survey Question: Which employee groups are eligible for any performance-based rewards?
TABLE 22
PERFORMANCE-BASED REWARDS - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Eligible Employee Groups |
| :--- | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | All |
| City of Hollywood | Only general employees currently, management just received a |
| COLA |  |

Survey Question: Do you reimburse employees for expense associated with education, such as getting a college degree, continuing education, or certifications?
TABLE 23
SUPPLEMENTAL PAY - TUITION ASSISTANCE - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Offered? | Amount (\% of base or \$ per hour) | Frequency (Annual or One Time) | Additional Policy Information | Additional Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | State Rate | Annual | 12 Credits per Year | None |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | NR | NR | NR | None |
| City of Miami | Yes | \$4,000 Maximum | Annual | NR | None |
| City of Miami Beach | Yes | Grade A: 80\% reimburse. Grade B: 60\% reimburse. Grade C: $40 \%$ reimburse. | Limited to 6 credit hours per semester | Tuition assistance shall be based upon and not exceed the established credit hour tuition rate in the State university system at the time of enrollment | None |
| City of Miramar | Yes | Undergraduate: Up to $\$ 5,000.00$ Graduate: Up to $\$ 7,000.00$ | Annual | NR | None |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | 100\% | Annual | NR | None |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Yes | \$2,500.00 | Annual | Grade "C" or Better Required | None |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | 50\% | Annual | Grade "C" or Better Required | None |
| Miami-Dade College | NR | NR | NR | NR | None |
| Palm Beach County School District | No | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Yes | \$200 / credit hr for undergraduate $\$ 590$ / credit hr for graduate | Annual | Annual Max \$7,000 | $\$ 200$ credit hour for undergraduate. $\$ 590$ credit hour for graduate. Annual max \$7,000 <br> Grade of " B " or higher $=100 \%$ reimbursement. Grade of " C " = 75\% reimbursement <br> Less than a "C" = 0\% reimbursement |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | \$4,690.00 | Annual | NR | None |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | \% Based on Grade | Annual | \% of tuition cost up to a max of $\mathbf{2 4}$ sem hrs annually | $\begin{aligned} \text { Grade } A=100 \% ; \text { Grade } B=75 \% ; \text { Grade } C=50 \%, D \text { or } \\ \text { below }=\text { None } \end{aligned}$ |

Survey Question: Do you have a traditional leave or paid time off (PTO) program?

| Peer Employer |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | Type of Program |
| City of Hollywood | Traditional Leave |
| City of Miami | Traditional Leave |
| City of Miami Beach | Paid Time Off (PTO) |
| City of Miramar | Traditional Leave |
| City of Pompano Beach | NR |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / | Traditional Leave |
| Orlando Executive Airport | Traditional Leave |
| Miami Executive Airport | Paid Time Off (PTO) |
| Miami-Dade College | Traditional Leave |
| Palm Beach County School District | Traditional Leave |
| South Florida Regional | Traditional Leave |
| Transportation Authority | Traditional Leave |
| Toho Water Authority | Traditional Leave |
| City of Fort Lauderdale |  |
| NR=No Response |  |
| NA = Not Applicable |  |


| ＋${ }_{\text {＋}}^{\text {OTo }}$ |  | N ${ }^{\circ}$ N | ํ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | กัก | $\backsim$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO－ | N $\sim^{\text {N }}$ | N® | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | － | ำก | ぃ |
| NO웅 |  | N | $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{1}{\sim}$ | － | ลัก | $\sim$ |
| － | N | N | 2 | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{1}{\sim}$ | － | ํ $\sim$ N | $\sim$ |
| － | N | N® | $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | \％ | ลัన | $\sim$ |
| － | N N | Nセ～ | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | \％ | ลัన | $\sim$ |
| のロ゚～ |  | Noic | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | － | $\wedge$ ®on | $\wedge$ |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | N | Noin | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | 안 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{1}{\sim}$ |  | $\wedge \sim_{\sim}^{\infty}$ | $\wedge$ |
|  |  | 구N | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ |  |  | $\wedge$ |
|  | ～N | Noin | $\stackrel{\square}{\curvearrowleft}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{1}{\sim}$ |  |  | $\wedge$ |
| $\stackrel{n}{\sim} \stackrel{\infty}{\square} \underset{\sim}{\infty}$ |  | － | $\stackrel{セ}{\curvearrowleft}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | － | へA | $\infty$ |
|  | － | －${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | － | ำ～ | $\infty$ |
|  |  |  | $\stackrel{セ}{\leftarrow}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | －¢ | ¢ A | $N$ |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}{ }_{\sim}^{\circ}{ }_{-}^{\infty}$ | － | ㄱํㅇ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | － | คค A | $\bullet$ |
| Ơ |  | －\％¢ | $\stackrel{セ}{\curvearrowleft}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ～ | ¢คำ | ぃ |
|  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | 구ํ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | $\bigcirc$ | ㄴํํㅊ | $\backsim$ |
|  |  | ำ | $\stackrel{ }{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{10}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ 군 | $\bullet$ |
| $\infty \stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |  | ำセセ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 꿍 | $\checkmark$ |
| ~ợ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{ }{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\square}{6}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \sim$ | n |
| ロو̛ォ |  | Nセセ ¢ | ～ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{セ}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{セ}{\square}$ | ก |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ＋ | ำํํ | $\stackrel{ }{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | N | $\stackrel{ }{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\bigcirc$ | ำํ | $\checkmark$ |
| － 0 |  | ำํํ | 안 | $\bigcirc$ | ～ | $\sim$ | $\bigcirc$ | 응 |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{O}$ | Nㅜㅇㅇ |  | $\bigcirc$ | N | $\sim$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\checkmark$ |
| $0^{\circ}$ | $\mathfrak{\sim}$ | 구으앙 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ƠN | $0 \mathfrak{O}$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ธ̇o |  | № 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | N | － | 안 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered},$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Survey Question: How many Vacation OR Paid Time Off (PTO) leave days do part-time employees accrue in a year? If you have PTO days instead of vacation days, enter the number of PTO days.


| $\begin{gathered} \text { TABLE 25B } \\ \text { PART-TIME EMPLOYEES } \\ \text { VACATION / PAID TIME OFF DAYS OFFERED - GENERAL EMPLOYEES } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employer | $\begin{gathered} 0-1 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{1}{\text { YOS }}$ | $\stackrel{2}{\mathrm{YOS}}$ | $\stackrel{3}{\text { YOS }}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{5}{Y O S}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{7}{\text { YOS }}$ | $\stackrel{8}{\text { YOS }}$ | $\stackrel{9}{\mathrm{YOS}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & \text { YOS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{22}{\text { YOS }}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ \mathrm{YOS} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25+ \\ & \text { YOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| City of Delray Beach | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Hollywood | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| City of Miami | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miami Beach | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| City of Miramar | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 13 |
| Miami Executive Airport | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miami-Dade College | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palm Beach County School District | 0 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Toho Water Authority | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Market Average | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Difference between Fort Lauderdale and the Market Average | -2 | -3 | -3 | -3 | -3 | -4 | -4 | -4 | -4 | -4 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -7 | -7 | -7 | -7 | -7 | -7 |

Survey Question: How many of the following paid leave days are employees allowed each year? Please provide any relevant notes or comments on other paid leave days.

Survey Question: Please provide any relevant notes or comments on other paid leave days.

| Peer Employer | Notes |
| :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | None |
| City of Hollywood | Sick accruals are the same as vacation accruals either $50 \%$ or $75 \%$ based on hours worked. Holidays are 8 for employees working $30+$ hours or 5 for employees working 15-29 hours. |
| City of Miami | None |
| City of Miami Beach | None |
| City of Miramar | None |
| City of Pompano Beach | None |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | None |
| Miami Executive Airport | None |
| Miami-Dade College | Twelve days per year are earned. Personal days are taken from sick leave. No limit on sick leave; use when needed. Sick leave at retirement is based on a percentage; an employee must have at least 10 years of service at which point eligible for $50 \%$. For each year above 10 years, $1.5 \%$ is added to a maximum of $100 \%$ of the average final compensation for the 3 highest years' salary. |
| Palm Beach County School District | None |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Sick leave accrual is 3.69 hours per pay period for full time and 1.845 hours per pay period for part time. |
| Toho Water Authority | None |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | None |
| NR = No Response NA $=$ Not Applicable |  |

The table below details the total paid time off days allotted to full-time employees encompassing vacation days / paid time off (PTO) days, sick leave, holidays, and personal/floating days.

| FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES <br> TOTAL VACATION / PAID TIME OFF AND PAID LEAVE DAYS ACCRUED / ALLOTTED - GENERAL EMPLOYEES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employer | $\begin{aligned} & 0-1 \\ & \text { Yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{2}{\mathrm{YOS}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{4}{\text { yos }}$ | $\stackrel{5}{y_{0}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ \text { yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ \text { yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{8}{y_{0 S}}$ | $\stackrel{9}{\text { yos }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & \text { Yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & \text { Yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & \text { Yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & \text { Yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & \text { Yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & \text { Yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ \text { yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & \text { Yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ \text { Yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ \mathrm{yOS} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25+ \\ & \text { YOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| City of Delray Beach | 24 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 |
| City of Hollywood | 20 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 34 | 34 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 |
| City of Miami | 23 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 |
| City of Miami Beach | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 |
| City of Miramar | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 |
| City of Pompano Beach | 26 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | 34 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 49 |
| Miami Executive Airport | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
| Miami-Dade College | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 |
| Palm Beach County School District | 24 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | 34 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 |
| Toho Water Authority | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 |
| Market Average | 30 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 37 | 38 | 38 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 41 | 41 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 |
| Difference between Fort Lauderdale and the Market Average | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

The table below details the total paid time off days allotted to part-time employees encompassing vacation days / paid time off (PTO) days, sick leave, holidays, and personal/floating days.
TOTAL VACATION / PAID TIME OFF AND PAID LEAVE DAYS ACCRUED / ALLOTTED - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Employer | $\begin{gathered} 0-1 \\ \text { Yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{1}{\mathrm{y}}$ | $\stackrel{2}{\text { yos }}$ | $\stackrel{3}{\text { yos }}$ | $\stackrel{4}{\text { yos }}$ | $\stackrel{5}{y o s}$ | $\stackrel{6}{\text { yos }}$ | $\stackrel{7}{y^{\prime}}$ | $\stackrel{8}{\mathrm{yos}_{8}}$ | $\stackrel{9}{\text { yos }}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ \text { YOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & \text { yOS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ \text { yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & \text { Yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ \text { yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ \text { yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ \text { yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ \text { yos } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ \mathrm{yOS} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25+ \\ & \text { yos } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days or Offered Sick Leave, Holidays, and/or Persona/F/oating Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Hollywood | 11 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| City of Miami | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days or Offered Sick Leave, Holidays, and/or Persona/F/oating Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miami Beach | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 |
| City of Miramar | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days or Offered Sick Leave, Holidays, and/or Persona/Floating Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days or Offered Sick Leave, Holidays, and/or Persona//Floating Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 30 |
| Miami Executive Airport | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days or Offered Sick Leave, Holidays, and/or Persona//Floating Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miami-Dade College | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days or Offered Sick Leave, Holidays, and/or Persona//Floating Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palm Beach County School District | 24 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 |
| Toho Water Authority | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| Market Average | 10 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 16 |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Part-Time Employees Do Not Accrue Vacation / Paid Time (PTO) Leave Days or Offered Sick Leave, Holidays, and/or Personal/Floating Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Difference between Fort Lauderdale and the Market Average | -10 | -12 | -12 | -12 | -12 | -12 | -12 | -12 | -12 | -12 | -13 | -13 | -13 | -13 | -13 | -14 | -14 | -14 | -14 | -14 | -15 | -15 | -15 | -15 | -15 | -16 |

## Survey Questions:

(A) Can employees carry-over unused vacation/PTO days?
(B) If "Yes," enter the maximum number of days per year that an employee can "bank" into the space below. If there is no limit, please write "unlimited."

TABLE 28
VACATION/ PTO CARRY-OVER POLICIES - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Question A | Question B |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | 36 Days |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | Must be used in the <br> following 15 months |
| City of Miami | Yes | 500 Hours / Year |
| City of Miami Beach | No | NA |
| City of Miramar | Yes | Same as Accrued |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | 40 Days |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando <br> Executive Airport | Yes | 440 Hours / Year <br> 220 Hours / Year |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | 500 Hours <br> 44 Days |
| Miami-Dade College | Yes | Rolls over to max 60 <br> days |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | 480 Hours <br> South Florida Regional Transportation Authority <br> Toho Water Authority |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | Up to three times <br> their annual accrual <br> rate |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable

## Survey Questions:

(A) Can employees cash-out unused vacation/PTO leave days?
(B) If "Yes," enter the maximum number of days an employee can cash out at the events listed below. If there is no limit, please write "unlimited."

TABLE 29
VACATION / PTO CASH-OUT RATES - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

|  | Question A | Question B |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | Yes / No | At Year End | At Termination | At <br> Retirement |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | 0 Days | 36 Days | 36 Days |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | 0 Days | All | All |
| City of Miami | Yes | 5 Days | All | All |
| City of Miami Beach | Yes | 62.5 Days | 77.5 Days | 77.5 Days |
| City of Miramar | No | NA | NA | NA |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | 0 Days | 20 Days | 40 Days |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Yes | NR | NR | NR |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | 0 Days | All | All |
| Miami-Dade College | Yes | 0 Days | 30 Days | 62 Days |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | NR | 60 Days | 60 Days |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Yes | 50\% of Days | Unlimited | Unlimited |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | Balance over three times their annual accrual rate | NR | NR |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | NR | All Unused | All Unused |
| NR = No Response <br> NA $=$ Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |

## Survey Questions:

(A) Can employees carry-over unused sick leave days?
(B) If "Yes," enter the maximum number of days per year that an employee can "bank" into the space below. If there is no limit, please write "unlimited."

TABLE 30
UNUSED SICK LEAVE CARRY OVER - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Question A | Question B |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | Unlimited |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | Unlimited |
| City of Miami | Yes | 93.75 Days |
| City of Miami Beach | Yes | Varies |
| City of Miramar | Yes | NR |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | Unlimited |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando | Yes | Unlimited |
| Executive Airport | Yes | Unlimited |
| Miami Executive Airport | No | NA |
| Miami-Dade College | Yes | Unlimited |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | Unlimited |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Yes | 240 Days |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | $\mathbf{8 1 6}$ Days |
| City of Fort Lauderdale |  |  |

[^8]Survey Questions:
(A) Can employees cash-out unused sick leave days?
(B) If "Yes," enter the maximum number of days an employee can cash out at the events listed below. If there is no limit, please write "unlimited."

|  |  | Question A |  | Question B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Peer Employer | Yes / No | At Year End | At Termination | At Retirement |
|  | City of Delray Beach | Yes | 5 | 140 Days | 140 Days |
|  | City of Hollywood | Yes | A Percentage based on years of service at retirement or termination |  |  |
|  | City of Miami | No | NA | NA | NA |
|  | City of Miami Beach | Yes | NA | 75 Days | 75 Days |
|  | City of Miramar | NR | NR | NR | NR |
|  | City of Pompano Beach | Yes | None | 62.5 Days | 125 Days |
|  | Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Yes | NR | NR | One Third the Number Accrued each calendar year |
|  | Miami Executive Airport | Yes | None | After 15 years, a percentage of sick hours will be paid at termination or retirement. | After 15 years, a percentage of sick hours will be paid at termination or retirement. |
|  | Miami-Dade College | Yes | None | 0 Days | \% of Days |
|  | Palm Beach County School District | Yes | None | A pro-rated share of the accumulated sick is paid based on service, with 10 YOS equaling $100 \%$ pay out. | Unlimited |
|  | South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Yes | None | Balance Less 10 Days Prorated | Balance Less 10 Days Prorated |
|  | Toho Water Authority | Yes | NR | Unused leave above 240 Days | NR |
|  | City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | NR | 28\% of unused if in good standing | 28\% of unused if in good standing |
|  | NR = No Response NA = Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |

Study Findings - Health Benefits

## Total Health

 average, as shown in Table 33.The City's total monthly costs for all health-related benefits (medical, prescription drugs, dental, and vision plans) are higher than the survey average, as shown in Tables 32, however the City contributes a smaller percentage in regard to cost sharing arrangements than the survey

TABLE 32
(AVERAGE OF PPO, HMO, AND HDHP MEDICAL PLAN, RX, DENTAL, AND VISION)

TABLE 33
TOTAL HEALTH COST SHARING
(AVERAGE OF PPO, HMO, AND HDHP MEDICAL PLAN, RX, DENTAL, AND VISION)

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | 95\% | 80\% | 73\% | 65\% | 5\% | 20\% | 27\% | 35\% |
| City of Hollywood | 90\% | 90\% | 89\% | 90\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 10\% |
| City of Miami | 84\% | 84\% | 84\% | 83\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| City of Miami Beach | 59\% | 59\% | 59\% | 58\% | 41\% | 41\% | 41\% | 42\% |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | 100\% | 70\% | 70\% | 70\% | 0\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | 90\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 10\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% |
| Miami Executive Airport | 99\% | 67\% | 64\% | 54\% | 1\% | 33\% | 36\% | 46\% |
| Miami-Dade College | 80\% | 46\% | 43\% | 37\% | 20\% | 54\% | 57\% | 63\% |
| Palm Beach County School District | 84\% | 78\% | 76\% | 70\% | 16\% | 22\% | 24\% | 30\% |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | 90\% | 85\% | 85\% | 84\% | 10\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% |
| Toho Water Authority | 99\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% | 1\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| Market Average | 88\% | 74\% | 72\% | 70\% | 12\% | 26\% | 28\% | 30\% |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | 82\% | 70\% | 68\% | 60\% | 18\% | 30\% | 32\% | 40\% |

We collected data regarding most populous medical plan coverage, as well as prescription drug, dental, and vision benefits. Most of the peer employers offer a PPO medical plan. While all peers also offer other health-related benefits, the dental and vision programs are typically provided as a separate benefit election.

Survey Question: Please provide the following information for your most populous HMO, PPO, and HDHP health plan.
Medical
TABLE 34
MOST POPULOUS PPO MEDICAL PLAN MONTHLY COST

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | The City of Delray Beach Does Not Have a PPO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Hollywood | \$612.86 | \$2,158.29 | \$1,301.55 | \$2,158.29 | \$119.17 | \$184.17 | \$162.50 | \$184.17 |
| City of Miami | \$638.45 | \$1,181.16 | \$1,404.59 | \$1,819.63 | \$87.86 | \$162.52 | \$193.29 | \$250.38 |
| City of Miami Beach | \$534.28 | \$1,122.00 | \$1,122.00 | \$1,311.18 | \$534.28 | \$1,122.00 | \$1,122.00 | \$1,311.18 |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | \$906.30 | \$1,506.11 | \$1,506.11 | \$1,506.11 | \$0.00 | \$599.82 | \$599.82 | \$599.82 |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Greater Orlando Aviation Authority Does Not Have a PPO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miami Executive Airport | Miami Executive Airport Does Not Have a PPO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miami-Dade College | \$766.21 | \$766.21 | \$766.21 | \$766.21 | \$348.16 | \$1,156.34 | \$1,300.25 | \$1,610.25 |
| Palm Beach County School District | Palm Beach County School District Does Not Have a PPO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | \$642.84 | \$1,379.60 | \$1,379.60 | \$1,379.60 | \$50.00 | \$180.00 | \$180.00 | \$180.00 |
| Toho Water Authority | Toho Water Authority Does Not Have a PPO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Average | \$683.49 | \$1,352.23 | \$1,246.68 | \$1,490.17 | \$189.91 | \$567.48 | \$592.98 | \$689.30 |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$675.00 | \$675.00 | \$675.00 | \$675.00 | \$154.37 | \$300.54 | \$337.08 | \$476.40 |

TABLE 35
MOST POPULOUS PPO MEDICAL PLAN MONTHLY COST - COST SHARING

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | The City of Delray Beach Does Not Have a PPO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Hollywood | 84\% | 92\% | 89\% | 92\% | 16\% | 8\% | 11\% | 8\% |
| City of Miami | 88\% | 88\% | 88\% | 88\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| City of Miami Beach | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | 100\% | 72\% | 72\% | 72\% | 0\% | 28\% | 28\% | 28\% |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Greater Orlando Aviation Authority Does Not Have a PPO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miami Executive Airport | Miami Executive Airport Does Not Have a PPO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miami-Dade College | 69\% | 40\% | 37\% | 32\% | 31\% | 60\% | 63\% | 68\% |
| Palm Beach County School District | Palm Beach County School District Does Not Have a PPO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | 93\% | 88\% | 88\% | 88\% | 7\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| Toho Water Authority | Toho Water Authority Does Not Have a PPO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Average | 78\% | 70\% | 68\% | 68\% | 22\% | 30\% | 32\% | 32\% |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | 76\% | 63\% | 61\% | 53\% | 24\% | 37\% | 39\% | 47\% |

TABLE 36
MOST POPULOUS HMO MEDICAL PLAN MONTHLY COST

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | \$719.68 | \$719.68 | \$719.68 | \$719.68 | \$0.00 | \$166.01 | \$207.31 | \$351.74 |
| City of Hollywood | \$655.41 | \$1,953.11 | \$1,245.28 | \$1,953.11 | \$0.00 | \$144.19 | \$65.54 | \$144.19 |
| City of Miami | City of Miami Does Not Have a HMO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miami Beach | \$466.54 | \$979.74 | \$979.74 | \$1,249.16 | \$147.70 | \$310.16 | \$310.16 | \$532.14 |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | \$626.27 | \$1,161.12 | \$1,161.12 | \$1,161.12 | \$0.00 | \$534.14 | \$534.14 | \$534.14 |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | \$796.41 | \$1,233.44 | \$1,325.82 | \$1,915.62 | \$88.49 | \$308.36 | \$331.45 | \$478.91 |
| Miami Executive Airport | \$668.07 | \$668.07 | \$668.07 | \$668.07 | \$0.00 | \$305.50 | \$359.67 | \$511.33 |
| Miami-Dade College | \$766.21 | \$766.21 | \$766.21 | \$766.21 | \$0.00 | \$554.75 | \$653.56 | \$866.45 |
| Palm Beach County School District | \$430.00 | \$730.00 | \$763.00 | \$931.00 | \$50.00 | \$136.00 | \$178.00 | \$308.00 |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | \$642.84 | \$1,379.60 | \$1,379.60 | \$1,379.60 | \$50.00 | \$180.00 | \$180.00 | \$180.00 |
| Toho Water Authority | \$625.12 | \$1,191.53 | \$1,191.53 | \$1,191.53 | \$0.00 | \$340.00 | \$340.00 | \$340.00 |
| Market Average | \$639.66 | \$1,078.25 | \$1,020.01 | \$1,193.51 | \$33.62 | \$297.91 | \$315.98 | \$424.69 |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$675.00 | \$675.00 | \$675.00 | \$675.00 | \$204.17 | \$390.40 | \$434.62 | \$611.55 |

TABLE 37
MOST POPULOUS HMO MEDICAL PLAN MONTHLY COST - COST SHARING

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | 100\% | 81\% | 78\% | 67\% | 0\% | 19\% | 22\% | 33\% |
| City of Hollywood | 100\% | 93\% | 95\% | 93\% | 0\% | 7\% | 5\% | 7\% |
| City of Miami | City of Miami Does Not Have a HMO Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miami Beach | 76\% | 76\% | 76\% | 70\% | 24\% | 24\% | 24\% | 30\% |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | 100\% | 68\% | 68\% | 68\% | 0\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | 90\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 10\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% |
| Miami Executive Airport | 100\% | 69\% | 65\% | 57\% | 0\% | 31\% | 35\% | 43\% |
| Miami-Dade College | 100\% | 58\% | 54\% | 47\% | 0\% | 42\% | 46\% | 53\% |
| Palm Beach County School District | 90\% | 84\% | 81\% | 75\% | 10\% | 16\% | 19\% | 25\% |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | 93\% | 88\% | 88\% | 88\% | 7\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| Toho Water Authority | 100\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 0\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% |
| Market Average | 95\% | 78\% | 76\% | 74\% | 5\% | 22\% | 24\% | 26\% |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | 72\% | 58\% | 56\% | 48\% | 28\% | 42\% | 44\% | 52\% |

TABLE 38
MOST POPULOUS HDHP MEDICAL PLAN MONTHLY COST

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | \$719.68 | \$719.68 | \$719.68 | \$719.68 | \$0.00 | \$26.04 | \$154.98 | \$195.82 |
| City of Hollywood | City of Hollywood Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miami | City of Miami Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miami Beach | City of Miami Beach Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | City of Pompano Beach Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | \$671.44 | \$1,039.87 | \$1,117.77 | \$1,615.00 | \$74.60 | \$259.97 | \$279.44 | \$408.75 |
| Miami Executive Airport | Miami Executive Airport Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miami-Dade College | Miami-Dade College Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palm Beach County School District | \$370.00 | \$630.00 | \$670.00 | \$810.00 | \$60.00 | \$156.00 | \$198.00 | \$332.00 |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | South Florida Regional Transportation Authority Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Toho Water Authority | Toho Water Authority Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Average | \$587.04 | \$796.52 | \$835.82 | \$1,048.23 | \$44.87 | \$147.34 | \$210.81 | \$312.19 |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$675.00 | \$675.00 | \$675.00 | \$675.00 | \$154.37 | \$300.54 | \$337.08 | \$476.40 |

TABLE 39
MOST POPULOUS HDHP MEDICAL PLAN MONTHLY COST - COST SHARING

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | 100\% | 97\% | 82\% | 79\% | 0\% | 3\% | 18\% | 21\% |
| City of Hollywood | City of Hollywood Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miami | City of Miami Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miami Beach | City of Miami Beach Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | City of Pompano Beach Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | 90\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 10\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% |
| Miami Executive Airport | Miami Executive Airport Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miami-Dade College | Miami-Dade College Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palm Beach County School District | 86\% | 80\% | 77\% | 71\% | 14\% | 20\% | 23\% | 29\% |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | South Florida Regional Transportation Authority Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Toho Water Authority | Toho Water Authority Does Not Have a HDHP Plan Offering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Average | 93\% | 84\% | 80\% | 77\% | 7\% | 16\% | 20\% | 23\% |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | 83\% | 71\% | 70\% | 62\% | 17\% | 29\% | 30\% | 38\% |

## Survey Questions:

(A) Are Rx benefits included in the medical premium?
(B) Are dental benefits included in the medical premium?
(C) Are vision benefits included in the medical premium?
(D) Are part-time employees eligible to participate in the medical plan?

TABLE 40
TYPE OF HEALTH PLANS OFFERED - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Included in Medical Premium? |  |  | PT Employees Eligible? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rx | Dental | Vision |  |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | No | No | No |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| City of Miami | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| City of Miami Beach | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| City of Miramar | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| Miami Executive Airport | NR | NR | NR | NR |
| Miami-Dade College | Yes | No | No | No |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | No | No | No |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

NR = No Response, NA = Not Applicable

Dental
TABLE 41
MOST POPULOUS DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY COST

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$34.36 | \$75.05 | \$67.88 | \$108.79 |
| City of Hollywood | \$19.00 | \$19.00 | \$19.00 | \$19.00 | \$10.27 | \$49.16 | \$30.49 | \$49.16 |
| City of Miami | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$33.37 | \$68.12 | \$68.73 | \$121.51 |
| City of Miami Beach | \$21.94 | \$42.28 | \$42.28 | \$64.82 | \$21.94 | \$42.28 | \$42.28 | \$64.82 |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | Dental Benefits for City of Pompano Beach are Encompassed in the Medical Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | \$11.83 | \$21.91 | \$18.26 | \$30.78 | \$2.09 | \$7.30 | \$6.08 | \$10.26 |
| Miami Executive Airport | \$31.22 | \$31.22 | \$31.22 | \$31.22 | \$0.00 | \$30.53 | \$30.53 | \$68.32 |
| Miami-Dade College | \$14.41 | \$14.41 | \$14.41 | \$14.41 | \$0.00 | \$16.36 | \$16.36 | \$16.36 |
| Palm Beach County School District | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$15.72 | \$33.36 | \$27.48 | \$43.18 |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | \$14.01 | \$14.01 | \$14.01 | \$14.01 | \$14.01 | \$56.41 | \$47.31 | \$72.06 |
| Toho Water Authority | \$26.70 | \$31.57 | \$31.57 | \$31.57 | \$0.00 | \$53.40 | \$53.40 | \$53.40 |
| Market Average | \$13.91 | \$17.44 | \$17.08 | \$20.58 | \$13.18 | \$43.20 | \$39.05 | \$60.79 |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$48.60 | \$93.60 | \$91.06 | \$117.98 |

TABLE 42
MOST POPULOUS DENTAL PLAN MONTHLY COST - COST SHARING

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| City of Hollywood | 65\% | 28\% | 38\% | 28\% | 35\% | 72\% | 62\% | 72\% |
| City of Miami | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| City of Miami Beach | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | Dental Benefits for City of Pompano Beach are Encompassed in the Medical Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | 85\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% | 15\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| Miami Executive Airport | 100\% | 51\% | 51\% | 31\% | 0\% | 49\% | 49\% | 69\% |
| Miami-Dade College | 100\% | 47\% | 47\% | 47\% | 0\% | 53\% | 53\% | 53\% |
| Palm Beach County School District | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | 50\% | 20\% | 23\% | 16\% | 50\% | 80\% | 77\% | 84\% |
| Toho Water Authority | 100\% | 37\% | 37\% | 37\% | 0\% | 63\% | 63\% | 63\% |
| Market Average | 51\% | 29\% | 30\% | 25\% | 49\% | 71\% | 70\% | 75\% |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |

Vision
TABLE 43
MOST POPULOUS VISION PLAN MONTHLY COST

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$4.37 | \$8.91 | \$12.70 | \$12.70 |
| City of Hollywood | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$6.09 | \$19.57 | \$12.16 | \$19.57 |
| City of Miami | Vision Benefits for City of Miami are Encompassed in the Medical Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miami Beach | Vision Benefits for City of Miami Beach are Encompassed in the Medical Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | Vision Benefits for City of Pompano Beach are Encompassed in the Medical Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | \$1.29 | \$2.45 | \$2.45 | \$2.45 | \$0.23 | \$0.81 | \$0.81 | \$0.81 |
| Miami Executive Airport | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$4.14 | \$8.30 | \$8.30 | \$15.23 |
| Miami-Dade College | \$14.41 | \$14.41 | \$14.41 | \$14.41 | \$19.74 | \$73.45 | \$73.45 | \$73.45 |
| Palm Beach County School District | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$5.46 | \$14.00 | \$14.00 | \$14.00 |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$6.32 | \$12.34 | \$12.48 | \$19.38 |
| Toho Water Authority | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$6.57 | \$18.37 | \$12.49 | \$18.37 |
| Market Average | \$1.96 | \$2.11 | \$2.11 | \$2.11 | \$6.62 | \$19.47 | \$18.30 | \$21.69 |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$4.58 | \$9.28 | \$8.76 | \$14.36 |

TABLE 44
MOST POPULOUS VISION PLAN MONTHLY COST - COST SHARING

|  | Employer Cost (\$) |  |  |  | Employee Cost (\$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employer | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family | EE Only | EE + Children | EE + Spouse | Family |
| City of Delray Beach | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| City of Hollywood | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| City of Miami | Vision Benefits for City of Miami are Encompassed in the Medical Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miami Beach | Vision Benefits for City of Miami Beach are Encompassed in the Medical Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Miramar | Health / Benefits Information Provided was Unable to be Validated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Pompano Beach | Vision Benefits for City of Pompano Beach are Encompassed in the Medical Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | 85\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% | 15\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| Miami Executive Airport | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Miami-Dade College | 42\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 58\% | 84\% | 84\% | 84\% |
| Palm Beach County School District | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Toho Water Authority | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Market Average | 23\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 77\% | 90\% | 90\% | 91\% |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |

## Survey Questions:

(A) Do you reimburse employees for expenses associated with wellness activities?
(B) Do you offer lower employee medical contributions for participation in wellness programs?
(C) Are part-time employees eligible for wellness benefits?

## TABLE 45 - GENERAL EMPLOYEES WELLNESS

| Peer Employer | Question A | Question B | Question C |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | No | No | No |
| City of Hollywood | NR | No | NR |
| City of Miami | No | No | No |
| City of Miami Beach | No | No | No |
| City of Miramar | Yes | No | Yes |
| City of Pompano Beach | No | No | No |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive <br> Airport | Yes | No | Yes |
| Miami Executive Airport | No | No | NR |
| Miami-Dade College | No | No | NR |
| Palm Beach County School District | No | Yes | Yes |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No | No | No |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | Yes | No |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | No | Yes |

NR = No Response, NA = Not Applicable

## Study Findings - Retirement Benefits

Survey Question: Do you participate in Social Security?

TABLE 46
SOCIAL SECURITY / MEDICARE PARTICIPATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Participate? |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | OASDI? | Medicare? |
| City of Delray Beach | Yes | Yes |
| City of Hollywood | Yes | Yes |
| City of Miami | Yes | Yes |
| City of Miami Beach | No | Yes |
| City of Miramar | Yes | Yes |
| City of Pompano Beach | Yes | Yes |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | Yes | Yes |
| Miami Executive Airport | Yes | Yes |
| Miami-Dade College | Yes | Yes |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | Yes |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Yes | Yes |
| Toho Water Authority | Yes | Yes |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | Yes | Yes |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable
Survey Question: Please answer the following questions regarding retirement plans offered to current employees.

The total employer contribution for each peer includes the defined benefit employer total cost, deferred compensation automatic employer contributions and employer match, and social security contributions as shown below.
TABLE 47
RETIREMENT BENEFITS - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

|  | Defined Benefit |  |  | Deferred Compensation 457(b) |  | Social Security | Total Employer Contribution |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peer Employers | Employer Normal Cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Employer } \\ \text { Contributions } \\ (\% \text { of pay }) \end{gathered}$ | TotalEmployee <br> Contributions <br> $(\%$ of pay $)$ | Automatic Employer Contributions | Employer Match | Social Security Contributions |  |
|  | (\% of pay) |  |  | (\% of pay) | (\% of pay) | (\%) | (\% of pay) |
| City of Delray Beach | 10.65\% | 14.00\% | 3.00\% | 0.00\% | 3.00\% | 7.65\% | 21.30\% |
| City of Hollywood | 6.65\% | 66.08\% | 8.00\% | NA | NA | 7.65\% | 14.30\% |
| City of Miami (Employer picks up the 10\% Employee Contributions to Defined Benefit Plan) | 2.60\% | 45.72\% | 10.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 7.65\% | 20.25\% |
| City of Miami Beach | 9.00\% | 36.00\% | 10.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 1.45\% | 10.45\% |
| City of Miramar | 12.21\% | 22.33\% | 7.36\% | NA | 3.00\% | 7.65\% | 22.86\% |
| City of Pompano Beach | 24.00\% | 24.00\% | 10.00\% | NA | NA | 7.65\% | 31.65\% |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Miami Executive Airport | 2.75\% | 8.00\% | 3.00\% | NA | NA | 7.65\% | 10.40\% |
| Miami-Dade College (Employer picks up the 3\% Employee Contributions to Defined Benefit Plan) | 2.75\% | 8.00\% | 3.00\% | NA | NA | 7.65\% | 13.40\% |
| Palm Beach County School District (Employer picks up the 3\% Employee Contributions to Defined Benefit Plan) | 2.75\% | 8.00\% | 3.00\% | NA | NA | 7.65\% | 13.40\% |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | 2.75\% | 8.00\% | 3.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 7.65\% | 10.40\% |
| Toho Water Authority | 21.50\% | 22.66\% | 16.70\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 7.65\% | 29.15\% |
| Overall Market Average |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.96\% |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | 18.00\% | 24.60\% | 8.60\% | NA | 0.00\% | 7.65\% | 25.65\% |

NR $=$ No Response
$N A=$ Not Applicable

Survey Question: Please answer the following questions regarding retirement plans offered to current employees.

TABLE 48
RETIREMENT BENEFITS - DEFINED BENEFIT (PENSION) - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Are employee <br> contributions picked <br> up by the employers? |
| :--- | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | No |
| City of Hollywood | No |
| City of Miami | Yes |
| City of Miami Beach | No |
| City of Miramar | No |
| City of Pompano Beach | No |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive <br> Airport | NR |
| Miami Executive Airport | No |
| Miami-Dade College | Yes |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | No |
| Toho Water Authority | NR |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | No |

NR = No Response
NA = Not Applicable

Survey Question: Are part-time employees eligible to participate in any of the plans below?
TABLE 49
RETIREMENT BENEFITS - PART TIME ELIGIBILITY IN RETIREMENT BENEFITS - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Peer Employer | Defined Benefit <br> Retirement | Deferred Compensation <br> 457(b) Retirement Plan |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| City of Delray Beach | No | No |
| City of Hollywood | NR | Yes |
| City of Miami | No | No |
| City of Miami Beach | No | Yes |
| City of Miramar | No | No |
| City of Pompano Beach | No | No |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority / Orlando Executive Airport | NR | Yes |
| Miami Executive Airport | No | No |
| Miami-Dade College | No | No |
| Palm Beach County School District | Yes | NR |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | Yes | Yes |
| Toho Water Authority | No | No |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | No | Yes |
| NR = No Response, NA = Not Applicable |  |  |

NR = No Response, NA = Not Applicable

## Study Findings - Total Compensation

The total compensation costs for each benchmark are the sum of the following:
> The calculated midpoint of the base pay range (average of the minimum and maximum base pay rates)
> Total employer costs for all health related benefits (medical, prescription drug, dental, and vision), weighted by City of Fort Lauderdale's current enrollment distribution among coverage tiers across all plans
> The current total employer contribution associated with the defined benefit retirement plan
> Maximum employer contribution to deferred compensation plans

TABLE 50
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION

|  |  | Employer Cost of Benefits |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Base Pay <br> (Range Midpoint) | Weighted <br> Total Health <br> Costs (Medical, <br> Dental, \& Vision) | Total <br> Retirement <br> Benefits <br>  <br> Deferred <br> Compensation) | Employer Total <br> Compensation <br> Costs <br> (Pay and Benefits) |
| Overall <br> Average | $96 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $137 \%$ | $98 \%$ |

As previously displayed in Table 7, the values in Table 50 show the City of Fort Lauderdale's market position across all benchmarks and peer employers from a total compensation standpoint. Table 51 shows all benchmark jobs and their respective total compensation market competitiveness. "Insufficient Data" indicates that the job did not garner three or more matches. Market findings with three or more matches provide a more reliable indication of the City's market position amongst the peer employers. Job matches are defined as a peer employer having a job comparable to the benchmark job.

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Benchmark Title | Base Pay | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs | Total Retirement Benefits |  |
| City Attorney's Office |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant City Attorney III |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$139,038 | \$8,100 | \$35,663 | \$182,801 |
| Market | \$130,323 | \$11,431 | \$23,406 | \$165,160 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 107\% | 71\% | 152\% | 111\% |
| Legal Assistant III |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$64,043 | \$8,100 | \$16,427 | \$88,570 |
| Market | \$60,963 | \$11,431 | \$10,949 | \$83,343 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 105\% | 71\% | 150\% | 106\% |
| City Clerk's Office |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant City Clerk II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$52,333 | \$8,100 | \$13,423 | \$73,856 |
| Market | \$43,207 | \$11,431 | \$7,760 | \$62,398 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 121\% | 71\% | 173\% | 118\% |
| City Commission's Office |  |  |  |  |
| Commission Assistant IV |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$71,677 | \$8,100 | \$18,385 | \$98,162 |
| Market | \$63,909 | \$11,431 | \$11,478 | \$86,818 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 112\% | 71\% | 160\% | 113\% |
| City Manager's Office |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant City Manager |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$149,791 | \$8,100 | \$38,421 | \$196,312 |
| Market | \$167,149 | \$11,431 | \$30,020 | \$208,600 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 90\% | 71\% | 128\% | 94\% |
| Construction Review Specialist |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$57,200 | \$8,100 | \$14,672 | \$79,972 |
| Market | \$60,342 | \$11,431 | \$10,837 | \$82,610 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 95\% | 71\% | 135\% | 97\% |
| Senior Financial Management Analyst |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$73,507 | \$8,100 | \$18,855 | \$100,462 |
| Market | \$86,810 | \$11,431 | \$15,591 | \$113,832 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 85\% | 71\% | 121\% | 88\% |

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Benchmark Title | Base Pay | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs | Total Retirement Benefits |  |
| Crosses Multiple Departments |  |  |  |  |
| Accounting Clerk |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$40,518 | \$8,100 | \$10,393 | \$59,011 |
| Market | \$45,145 | \$11,431 | \$8,108 | \$64,684 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 90\% | 71\% | 128\% | 91\% |
| Administrative Aide |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$49,306 | \$8,100 | \$12,647 | \$70,053 |
| Market | \$51,755 | \$11,431 | \$9,295 | \$72,481 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 95\% | 71\% | 136\% | 97\% |
| Administrative Assistant II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$74,308 | \$8,100 | \$19,060 | \$101,468 |
| Market | \$74,243 | \$11,431 | \$13,334 | \$99,008 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 100\% | 71\% | 143\% | 102\% |
| Clerk III |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$48,578 | \$8,100 | \$12,460 | \$69,138 |
| Market | \$43,107 | \$11,431 | \$7,742 | \$62,280 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 113\% | 71\% | 161\% | 111\% |
| Code Compliance Officer |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$51,802 | \$8,100 | \$13,287 | \$73,189 |
| Market | \$56,365 | \$11,431 | \$10,123 | \$77,919 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 92\% | 71\% | 131\% | 94\% |
| Construction Worker II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$49,306 | \$8,100 | \$12,647 | \$70,053 |
| Market | \$46,505 | \$11,431 | \$8,352 | \$66,288 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 106\% | 71\% | 151\% | 106\% |
| Customer Service Representative I |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$39,530 | \$8,100 | \$10,139 | \$57,769 |
| Market | \$44,785 | \$11,431 | \$8,043 | \$64,259 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 88\% | 71\% | 126\% | 90\% |
| Deputy Director |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$129,137 | \$8,100 | \$33,124 | \$170,361 |
| Market | \$133,023 | \$11,431 | \$23,891 | \$168,345 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 97\% | 71\% | 139\% | 101\% |

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Benchmark Title | Base Pay | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs | Total Retirement Benefits |  |
| Electrician |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$57,200 | \$8,100 | \$14,672 | \$79,972 |
| Market | \$58,819 | \$11,431 | \$10,564 | \$80,813 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 97\% | 71\% | 139\% | 99\% |
| Event Worker |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$36,005 | \$8,100 | \$9,235 | \$53,340 |
| Market | \$30,483 | \$11,431 | \$5,475 | \$47,388 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 118\% | 71\% | 169\% | 113\% |
| Heavy Equipment Operator |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$48,235 | \$8,100 | \$12,372 | \$68,707 |
| Market | \$50,878 | \$11,431 | \$9,138 | \$71,446 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 95\% | 71\% | 135\% | 96\% |
| Municipal Maintenance Worker II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$39,530 | \$8,100 | \$10,139 | \$57,769 |
| Market | \$41,628 | \$11,431 | \$7,476 | \$60,535 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 95\% | 71\% | 136\% | 95\% |
| Planner III |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$78,073 | \$8,100 | \$20,026 | \$106,199 |
| Market | \$82,609 | \$11,431 | \$14,837 | \$108,876 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 95\% | 71\% | 135\% | 98\% |
| Principal Planner |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$89,575 | \$8,100 | \$22,976 | \$120,651 |
| Market | \$92,457 | \$11,431 | \$16,605 | \$120,493 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 97\% | 71\% | 138\% | 100\% |
| Project Manager II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$86,154 | \$8,100 | \$22,099 | \$116,353 |
| Market | \$97,142 | \$11,431 | \$17,447 | \$126,019 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 89\% | 71\% | 127\% | 92\% |
| Secretary I |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$42,526 | \$8,100 | \$10,908 | \$61,534 |
| Market | \$45,152 | \$11,431 | \$8,109 | \$64,692 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 94\% | 71\% | 135\% | 95\% |

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Benchmark Title | Base Pay | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs | Total Retirement Benefits |  |
| Senior Accounting Clerk |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$49,306 | \$8,100 | \$12,647 | \$70,053 |
| Market | \$53,568 | \$11,431 | \$9,621 | \$74,619 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 92\% | 71\% | 131\% | 94\% |
| Senior Project Manager |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$96,481 | \$8,100 | \$24,747 | \$129,328 |
| Market | \$99,026 | \$11,431 | \$17,785 | \$128,242 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 97\% | 71\% | 139\% | 101\% |
| Service Clerk |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$42,526 | \$8,100 | \$10,908 | \$61,534 |
| Market | \$43,644 | \$11,431 | \$7,838 | \$62,913 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 97\% | 71\% | 139\% | 98\% |
| Finance Department |  |  |  |  |
| Accountant II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$76,170 | \$8,100 | \$19,538 | \$103,808 |
| Market | \$70,661 | \$11,431 | \$12,691 | \$94,782 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 108\% | 71\% | 154\% | 110\% |
| Manager - Procurement \& Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$105,373 | \$8,100 | \$27,028 | \$140,501 |
| Market | \$108,606 | \$11,431 | \$19,506 | \$139,542 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 97\% | 71\% | 139\% | 101\% |
| Procurement Specialist II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$74,308 | \$8,100 | \$19,060 | \$101,468 |
| Market | \$66,260 | \$11,431 | \$11,900 | \$89,591 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 112\% | 71\% | 160\% | 113\% |
| Senior Accountant |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$89,575 | \$8,100 | \$22,976 | \$120,651 |
| Market | \$81,160 | \$11,431 | \$14,576 | \$107,167 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 110\% | 71\% | 158\% | 113\% |
| Senior Procurement Specialist |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$87,391 | \$8,100 | \$22,416 | \$117,907 |
| Market | \$74,781 | \$11,431 | \$13,431 | \$99,642 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 117\% | 71\% | 167\% | 118\% |

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Benchmark Title | Base Pay | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs | Total Retirement Benefits |  |
| Treasurer |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$102,804 | \$8,100 | \$26,369 | \$137,273 |
| Market | \$113,941 | \$11,431 | \$20,464 | \$145,835 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 90\% | 71\% | 129\% | 94\% |
| Fire Department |  |  |  |  |
| Battalion Chief |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$102,804 | \$8,100 | \$26,369 | \$137,273 |
| Market | \$104,571 | \$11,431 | \$18,781 | \$134,783 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 98\% | 71\% | 140\% | 102\% |
| Beach Lifeguard |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$43,638 | \$8,100 | \$11,193 | \$62,931 |
| Market | \$48,350 | \$11,431 | \$8,684 | \$68,464 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 90\% | 71\% | 129\% | 92\% |
| Beach Patrol Lieutenant |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$61,578 | \$8,100 | \$15,795 | \$85,473 |
| Market | \$61,095 | \$11,431 | \$10,973 | \$83,498 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 101\% | 71\% | 144\% | 102\% |
| Human Resources Department |  |  |  |  |
| Claims Adjuster |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$60,882 | \$8,100 | \$15,616 | \$84,598 |
| Market | \$68,693 | \$11,431 | \$12,337 | \$92,461 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 89\% | 71\% | 127\% | 91\% |
| Human Resources Assistant |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$59,374 | \$8,100 | \$15,229 | \$82,703 |
| Market | \$54,538 | \$11,431 | \$9,795 | \$75,764 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 109\% | 71\% | 155\% | 109\% |
| Insurance Benefits Specialist |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$54,964 | \$8,100 | \$14,098 | \$77,162 |
| Market | \$59,959 | \$11,431 | \$10,769 | \$82,158 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 92\% | 71\% | 131\% | 94\% |
| Risk Manager |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$102,804 | \$8,100 | \$26,369 | \$137,273 |
| Market | \$103,250 | \$11,431 | \$18,544 | \$133,224 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 100\% | 71\% | 142\% | 103\% |

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Benchmark Title | Base Pay | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs | Total Retirement Benefits |  |
| Senior Claims Adjuster |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$71,677 | \$8,100 | \$18,385 | \$98,162 |
| Market | \$76,989 | \$11,431 | \$13,827 | \$102,247 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 93\% | 71\% | 133\% | 96\% |
| Information Technology Services Department |  |  |  |  |
| Application Developer |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$90,501 | \$8,100 | \$23,214 | \$121,815 |
| Market | \$84,818 | \$11,431 | \$15,233 | \$111,482 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 107\% | 71\% | 152\% | 109\% |
| Assistant Database Administrator |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$86,154 | \$8,100 | \$22,099 | \$116,353 |
| Market | \$89,891 | \$11,431 | \$16,144 | \$117,466 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 96\% | 71\% | 137\% | 99\% |
| Computer Operator II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$48,235 | \$8,100 | \$12,372 | \$68,707 |
| Market | \$60,617 | \$11,431 | \$10,887 | \$82,934 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 80\% | 71\% | 114\% | 83\% |
| Data Warehouse Analyst |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$90,501 | \$8,100 | \$23,214 | \$121,815 |
| Market | \$88,312 | \$11,431 | \$15,861 | \$115,603 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 102\% | 71\% | 146\% | 105\% |
| Geographic Information System Analyst |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$75,088 | \$8,100 | \$19,260 | \$102,448 |
| Market | \$74,381 | \$11,431 | \$13,359 | \$99,170 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 101\% | 71\% | 144\% | 103\% |
| Network Support Analyst |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$82,867 | \$8,100 | \$21,255 | \$112,222 |
| Market | \$86,484 | \$11,431 | \$15,533 | \$113,447 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 96\% | 71\% | 137\% | 99\% |
| Senior Tech Support Analyst |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$80,818 | \$8,100 | \$20,730 | \$109,648 |
| Market | \$79,863 | \$11,431 | \$14,343 | \$105,637 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 101\% | 71\% | 145\% | 104\% |

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Benchmark Title | Base Pay | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs | Total Retirement Benefits |  |
| Systems Administrator |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$92,747 | \$8,100 | \$23,790 | \$124,637 |
| Market | \$89,648 | \$11,431 | \$16,101 | \$117,179 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 103\% | 71\% | 148\% | 106\% |
| Technical Support Analyst |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$71,448 | \$8,100 | \$18,326 | \$97,874 |
| Market | \$74,814 | \$11,431 | \$13,437 | \$99,681 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 96\% | 71\% | 136\% | 98\% |
| Technology Strategist |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$78,894 | \$8,100 | \$20,236 | \$107,230 |
| Market | \$98,733 | \$11,431 | \$17,732 | \$127,896 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 80\% | 71\% | 114\% | 84\% |
| Parks and Recreation Department |  |  |  |  |
| Apprentice Municipal Maintenance Worker |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$32,406 | \$8,100 | \$8,312 | \$48,818 |
| Market | \$39,102 | \$11,431 | \$7,023 | \$57,555 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 83\% | 71\% | 118\% | 85\% |
| Community Program Supervisor |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$75,348 | \$8,100 | \$19,327 | \$102,775 |
| Market | \$80,378 | \$11,431 | \$14,436 | \$106,244 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 94\% | 71\% | 134\% | 97\% |
| Field Operating Technician (Level IV) |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$51,802 | \$8,100 | \$13,287 | \$73,189 |
| Market | \$52,621 | \$11,431 | \$9,451 | \$73,502 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 98\% | 71\% | 141\% | 100\% |
| Head Groundskeeper |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$48,235 | \$8,100 | \$12,372 | \$68,707 |
| Market | \$51,273 | \$11,431 | \$9,209 | \$71,912 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 94\% | 71\% | 134\% | 96\% |
| Municipal Maintenance Worker III (Parks/Facilities) |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$42,526 | \$8,100 | \$10,908 | \$61,534 |
| Market | \$47,905 | \$11,431 | \$8,604 | \$67,939 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 89\% | 71\% | 127\% | 91\% |

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES


TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Benchmark Title | Base Pay | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs | Total Retirement Benefits |  |
| Police Aide II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale |  |  |  |  |
| Market | Insufficient Data |  |  |  |
| FL as \% Mkt |  |  |  |  |
| Police Records Clerk |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$39,530 | \$8,100 | \$10,139 | \$57,769 |
| Market | \$43,571 | \$11,431 | \$7,825 | \$62,827 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 91\% | 71\% | 130\% | 92\% |
| Public Safety Aide |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$42,526 | \$8,100 | \$10,908 | \$61,534 |
| Market | \$50,552 | \$11,431 | \$9,079 | \$71,062 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 84\% | 71\% | 120\% | 87\% |
| Senior Police Records Clerk |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$45,916 | \$8,100 | \$11,777 | \$65,793 |
| Market | \$56,107 | \$11,431 | \$10,077 | \$77,614 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 82\% | 71\% | 117\% | 85\% |
| Public Works / Building Services Department |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution \& Collection Chief |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$66,331 | \$8,100 | \$17,014 | \$91,445 |
| Market | \$70,590 | \$11,431 | \$12,678 | \$94,699 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 94\% | 71\% | 134\% | 97\% |
| Electro Technician |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$57,200 | \$8,100 | \$14,672 | \$79,972 |
| Market | \$59,381 | \$11,431 | \$10,665 | \$81,476 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 96\% | 71\% | 138\% | 98\% |
| Engineering Aide II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$43,638 | \$8,100 | \$11,193 | \$62,931 |
| Market | \$52,502 | \$11,431 | \$9,429 | \$73,362 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 83\% | 71\% | 119\% | 86\% |
| Engineering Technician II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$60,154 | \$8,100 | \$15,430 | \$83,684 |
| Market | \$60,207 | \$11,431 | \$10,813 | \$82,451 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 100\% | 71\% | 143\% | 101\% |

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Benchmark Title | Base Pay | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs | Total Retirement Benefits |  |
| Environmental Lab Technician |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$54,517 | \$8,100 | \$13,984 | \$76,601 |
| Market | \$57,501 | \$11,431 | \$10,327 | \$79,259 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 95\% | 71\% | 135\% | 97\% |
| Industrial Electrician |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$57,200 | \$8,100 | \$14,672 | \$79,972 |
| Market | \$58,819 | \$11,431 | \$10,564 | \$80,813 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 97\% | 71\% | 139\% | 99\% |
| Municipal Maintenance Worker III (Public Services) |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$44,689 | \$8,100 | \$11,463 | \$64,252 |
| Market | \$50,877 | \$11,431 | \$9,138 | \$71,445 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 88\% | 71\% | 125\% | 90\% |
| Public Service Maintenance Chief |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$67,995 | \$8,100 | \$17,441 | \$93,536 |
| Market | \$70,707 | \$11,431 | \$12,699 | \$94,837 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 96\% | 71\% | 137\% | 99\% |
| Utilities Mechanic I |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$50,523 | \$8,100 | \$12,959 | \$71,582 |
| Market | \$51,492 | \$11,431 | \$9,248 | \$72,171 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 98\% | 71\% | 140\% | 99\% |
| Utilities Service Worker |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$40,102 | \$8,100 | \$10,286 | \$58,488 |
| Market | \$45,459 | \$11,431 | \$8,164 | \$65,054 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 88\% | 71\% | 126\% | 90\% |
| Utility Field Representative |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$48,235 | \$8,100 | \$12,372 | \$68,707 |
| Market | \$48,606 | \$11,431 | \$8,730 | \$68,766 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 99\% | 71\% | 142\% | 100\% |
| Water Treatment Plant Operator II |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$53,165 | \$8,100 | \$13,637 | \$74,902 |
| Market | \$56,123 | \$11,431 | \$10,080 | \$77,633 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 95\% | 71\% | 135\% | 96\% |
| Sustainable Development Department |  |  |  |  |
| Building Inspector |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$64,792 | \$8,100 | \$16,619 | \$89,511 |
| Market | \$78,833 | \$11,431 | \$14,158 | \$104,422 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 82\% | 71\% | 117\% | 86\% |

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Benchmark Title | Base Pay | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs | Total Retirement Benefits |  |
| Chief Building Inspector |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$77,158 | \$8,100 | \$19,791 | \$105,049 |
| Market | \$90,442 | \$11,431 | \$16,243 | \$118,116 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 85\% | 71\% | 122\% | 89\% |
| Economic and Business Development Manager |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$108,014 | \$8,100 | \$27,706 | \$143,820 |
| Market | \$101,655 | \$11,431 | \$18,257 | \$131,343 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 106\% | 71\% | 152\% | 109\% |
| Electrical Inspector |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$63,180 | \$8,100 | \$16,206 | \$87,486 |
| Market | \$75,882 | \$11,431 | \$13,628 | \$100,941 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 83\% | 71\% | 119\% | 87\% |
| Plumbing Inspector |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$63,180 | \$8,100 | \$16,206 | \$87,486 |
| Market | \$76,163 | \$11,431 | \$13,679 | \$101,272 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 83\% | 71\% | 118\% | 86\% |
| Senior Code Compliance Officer |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$54,517 | \$8,100 | \$13,984 | \$76,601 |
| Market | \$68,438 | \$11,431 | \$12,291 | \$92,160 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 80\% | 71\% | 114\% | 83\% |
| Structural Plans Examiner |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$71,479 | \$8,100 | \$18,334 | \$97,913 |
| Market | \$86,090 | \$11,431 | \$15,462 | \$112,982 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 83\% | 71\% | 119\% | 87\% |
| Transportation and Mobility Department |  |  |  |  |
| Airport Operations Aide |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$50,523 | \$8,100 | \$12,959 | \$71,582 |
| Market | \$57,337 | \$11,431 | \$10,298 | \$79,065 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 88\% | 71\% | 126\% | 91\% |
| Parking Enforcement Shift Coordinator |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$54,517 | \$8,100 | \$13,984 | \$76,601 |
| Market | \$51,560 | \$11,431 | \$9,260 | \$72,251 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 106\% | 71\% | 151\% | 106\% |
| Parking Enforcement Specialist |  |  |  |  |
| City of Fort Lauderdale | \$40,518 | \$8,100 | \$10,393 | \$59,011 |
| Market | \$47,458 | \$11,431 | \$8,523 | \$67,412 |
| FL as \% Mkt | 85\% | 71\% | 122\% | 88\% |

TABLE 51
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL
MARKET POSITION AT THE $75^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTILE ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS
TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

|  |  | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benchmark Title | Base Pay |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Weighted } \\ \text { Total Health } \\ \text { Costs }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\ \text { Retirement } \\ \text { Benefits }\end{array}$ |
| Compensation |  |  |  |  |
| Costs |  |  |  |  |$]$

Figures shown in red are below market (less than $95 \%$ of the market average)
Figures shown in black within the market range ( $95 \%$ to $105 \%$ of the market average)
Figures shown in blue are above market (more than 105\% of the market average)

## Conclusions

Our conclusions cover the following areas:
> Pay Range Competitiveness
> Total Compensation Competitiveness

## Pay Range Competitiveness

This study found that across the majority of benchmark jobs, the City's pay structure is at the market average at the pay range midpoint and maximum and above market at the pay range minimum.

Overall, at the midpoint of the pay range:
> The City's overall average pay range midpoint is $96 \%$ of the overall market average.
> 39 benchmark job titles are below market (less than $95 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 34 benchmark job titles are at market (between $95 \%$ and $105 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 17 benchmark job titles are above market (above $105 \%$ at the midpoint)
> 2 benchmark job titles did not garner sufficient matches to be statistically significant

## Total Compensation Competitiveness

On a total compensation basis (taking into consideration base pay, employer health benefit costs, social security participation and retirement plan contributions) the City's average total compensation costs are:
> $98 \%$ of the overall market average
While the City's contributions to health care costs compared to its peer are below the overall market average at $71 \%$, its retirement contributions are at market at $164 \%$ of the market average. On a Total Compensation basis, the City is at $103 \%$ of the overall market average.


[^0]:    1 'Other' includes positions in Pension and Community Redevelopment Agency departments as noted in the 12.09.17 census file.
    ${ }^{2}$ No benchmark titles were selected from the Pension and Community Redevelopment Agency departments.
    ${ }^{3}$ The column 'Titles Being Evaluated' does not add to the 92 benchmark positions as 18 positions cross multiple departments, encompassing 467 employees.
    ${ }^{4}$ The percentage of total workforce value is based upon the 12.09 .16 census provided by the client, which included a total of 3,024 job incumbents. These values are subject to change with workforce fluctuations.

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ The percentage of total workforce value is based upon the 12-09-16 census provided by the client, which included a total of 3,024 job incumbents. These values are subject to change with workforce fluctuations.

[^2]:    ${ }^{6}$ Base pay rates have been adjusted for geographic differences in the cost-of-labor

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ Base pay rates have been adjusted for geographic differences in the cost-of-labor

[^4]:    ${ }^{8}$ Base pay rates have been adjusted for geographic differences in the cost-of-labor

[^5]:    ${ }^{9}$ Base pay rates have been adjusted for geographic differences in the cost-of-labor

[^6]:    ${ }^{10}$ Average of Broward, Miami-Dade and Palm Beach Counties 2014 Median Household Value data.

[^7]:    NR = No Response
    NA = Not Applicable

[^8]:    NR = No Response
    NA = Not Applicable

