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## CPS HR Project Team

- Suzanne Ansari-Project Manager
- Igor Shegolev-Senior Human Resources Consultant
- Jan Bentley-Project Consultant
- Leena Rai, PhD.-Senior Human Resources Consultant
- Layla Mansfield, PhD.-Project Consultant/Technical Writer
- Michelle Pellegrino-Senior Human Resources Consultant
- Lynda Guerra-Administrative Technician


## Santa Clarita Valley Water Project/Advisory Team

- Eric Campbell, Chief Financial and Administrative Officer
- Rochelle Patterson-Director of Finance \& Administration
- Aristea (Ari) Mantis-Human Resources Supervisor
- JoAnna Brison-Administrative Technician
- Linda Pointer-Human Resources Analyst


## Background \& Scope of Work

## Classification Study

- 115 classifications with 215 incumbents
- FLSA analysis


## Base Compensation Study

- 40 benchmark classifications
- 12 labor market agencies


## Classification Study

CPS HR CONSULTING"

## Classification Study Outcomes Included:

No changes to positions

Reclassification of positions

Change in the title of positions
Revision of class specifications

Consolidation of classifications

Establishment of new classifications

## Compensation Study

CPS HR CONSULTING ${ }^{\prime \prime}$

## Compensation Structure Strategic Goals



## Labor Market Agencies

1. Burbank Water and Power
2. California Water Service Group (Cal Water)*
3. Calleguas Municipal Water District
4. Cucamonga Valley Water District
5. Eastern Municipal Water District
6. Glendale Water \& Power
7. Golden State Water Company*
8. Irvine Ranch Water District
9. LA Department of Water-Power
10. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
11. Metropolitan Water District
12. San Gabriel Water Company*
*Please note that the following agencies declined to participate in the study: California Water Service Group (Cal Water) and Golden State Water Company. San Gabriel Water Company did provide some information but was deemed insufficient to fully validate the job matches and confirm the base minimum/maximum salaries.

## Appendix A-Salary Survey Datasheets (Sample)

CPS HR CONSULTING
Client Benchmark: Accountant

| Labor Market Agency | Comparable Classification Title | Base Salary Minimum | Base Salary Midpoint | Base Salary <br> Maximum | Bandwidth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency | Accountant | \$6,070.00 | \$6,733.00 | \$7,396.00 | 21.85\% |
| Burbank Water and Power | Accountant | \$5,031.78 | \$5,984.08 | \$6,936.37 | 37.85\% |
| Calleguas Municipal Water District | No Comparable Class |  |  |  |  |
| Cucamonga Valley Water District | Accountant | \$5,606.16 | \$6,446.92 | \$7,287.67 | 29.99\% |
| Eastern Municipal Water District | Accountant II | \$6,408.13 | \$7,182.07 | \$7,956.00 | 24.15\% |
| Glendale Water and Power | Accountant II | \$5,363.26 | \$6,790.75 | \$8,218.23 | 53.23\% |
| Irvine Ranch Water District | Accountant | \$5,478.00 | \$6,636.00 | \$7,794.00 | 42.28\% |
| Las Virgenes Municipal Water District | Accountant | \$6,787.73 | \$7,806.07 | \$8,824.40 | 30.01\% |
| Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Utility Accountant | \$6,894.00 | \$8,068.50 | \$9,243.00 | 34.07\% |
| Metropolitan Water District of Southern California | Accountant | \$5,685.00 | \$6,581.50 | \$7,478.00 | 31.54\% |
| Torrance Municipal Water | Accountant | \$5,200.00 | \$6,256.47 | \$7,312.93 | 40.63\% |
|  | Total Matches |  | 9 |  |  |
|  | Base Salary Medians (Min, Mid, Max) | \$5,606.16 | \$6,636.00 | \$7,794.00 | 34.07\% |
|  | Base Salary Means (Min, Mid, Max) | \$5,828.23 | \$6,861.37 | \$7,894.51 | 35.97\% |
|  | Percentage Needed to Reach LM Median* | -7.64\% | -1.44\% | 5.38\% |  |
|  | Percentage Needed to Reach LM Mean* | At Market | 1.91\% | 6.74\% |  |
|  | Additional Percentile (or Control Point) |  |  |  |  |

## Salary Survey Summary-Sample

| Classification Title | \# of Matches | SCVWA <br> Base <br> Salary <br> Minimum | SCVWA <br> Base <br> Salary <br> Midpoint | SCVWA <br> Base <br> Salary <br> Maximum | Labor <br> Market <br> Base <br> Salary <br> Minimum | Labor <br> Market <br> Base <br> Salary <br> Midpoint | Labor Market Base Salary Maximum | Market <br> Variance from Minimum | Market <br> Variance from Midpoint | Market <br> Variance from Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accountant | 9 | \$6,070.00 | \$6,733.00 | \$7,396.00 | \$5,606.16 | \$6,636.00 | \$7,794.00 | -7.64\% | -1.44\% | 5.38\% |

*A positive number represents SCVWA salaries are below Labor Market and need the indicated percentage to reach the Labor Market, a negative number means SCVWA is above the Labor Market.

## Economic Research Institute (ERI)

- ERI compiles the most robust compensation survey data available, with current market data for more than 1,100 industry sectors.
- ERI subscribers include the majority of the Fortune 500 and thousands of other public and private organizations.
- ERI collects salary survey data from internal surveys, third party salary surveys, and public sources to establish benchmark compensation and calculate geographic salary differentials.
- CPS HR Consulting expanded the original ERI survey salary survey to include all 40 identified benchmark classifications.
- The ERI data was provided to validate salary data but was not blended into our final salary range recommendations of the labor market.


## ERI Combined with the Labor Market Salary Survey Datasheet Sample

CPS HR CONSULTING
Client Benchmark: Accountant

| Labor Market Agency | Comparable Classification Title | Base Salary Minimum | Base Salary Midpoint | Base Salary Maximum | Bandwidth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency | Accountant | \$6,070.00 | \$6,733.00 | \$7,396.00 | 21.85\% |
| ERI-All Diversified Agencies (Los Angeles County) | Accountant | \$6,182.00 | \$7,504.00 | \$8,826.00 | 42.77\% |
| ERI-Private Water Utilities (Los Angeles County) | Accountant | \$6,022.00 | \$7,254.50 | \$8,487.00 | 40.93\% |
| Burbank Water and Power | Accountant | \$5,031.78 | \$5,984.08 | \$6,936.37 | 37.85\% |
| Calleguas Municipal Water District | No Comparable Class |  |  |  |  |
| Cucamonga Valley Water District | Accountant | \$5,606.16 | \$6,446.92 | \$7,287.67 | 29.99\% |
| Eastern Municipal Water District | Accountant II | \$6,408.13 | \$7,182.07 | \$7,956.00 | 24.15\% |
| Glendale Water and Power | Accountant II | \$5,363.26 | \$6,790.75 | \$8,218.23 | 53.23\% |
| Irvine Ranch Water District | Accountant | \$5,478.00 | \$6,636.00 | \$7,794.00 | 42.28\% |
| Las Virgenes Municipal Water District | Accountant | \$6,787.73 | \$7,806.07 | \$8,824.40 | 30.01\% |
| Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Utility Accountant | \$6,894.00 | \$8,068.50 | \$9,243.00 | 34.07\% |
| Metropolitan Water District of Southern California | Accountant | \$5,685.00 | \$6,581.50 | \$7,478.00 | 31.54\% |
| Torrance Municipal Water | Accountant | \$5,200.00 | \$6,256.47 | \$7,312.93 | 40.63\% |
|  | Total Matches |  | 11 |  |  |
|  | Base Salary Medians (Min, Mid, Max) | \$5,685.00 | \$6,790.75 | \$7,956.00 | 37.85\% |
|  | Base Salary Means (Min, Mid, Max) | \$5,878.01 | \$6,955.53 | \$8,033.05 | 37.04\% |
|  | Percentage Needed to Reach LM Median* | -6.34\% | 0.86\% | 7.57\% |  |
|  | Percentage Needed to Reach LM Mean* | At Market | 3.31\% | 8.61\% |  |
|  | Additional Percentile (or Control Point) |  |  |  |  |

## ERI Salary Summary-Sample

|  |  | CPS HR - Compensation Study |  |  | Reference 1 <br> ERI Data incorported in Market Median |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Classification Title | \# of matches ${ }^{1}$ | SCV Water Salary Midpoint | Market Base Median | Market <br> Variance | SCV Water Salary Midpoint | Incl ERI Median Salary | SCV Water Salary/ ERI Median |
| Accountant | 9 | \$6,733.00 | \$6,636.00 | -1.44\% | \$6,733.00 | 6,790.75 | 0.86\% |

- From the Labor Market study of the 40 benchmark positions, $70 \%$ are either under market, or over market by no more than $5 \%$.
- When incorporating the ERI data with the Labor Market data, 69\% of the forty (40) benchmark classifications (including classifications that are not comparable) fell within 5\% (one range) of the Agency's current midpoint salary.
- Overall, adding the ERI data sets would not have significantly changed the salary range recommendations

[^0]
## PUC No. 77-M Report

- CPS HR reviewed PUC General Order No. 77-M report as suggested by the Committee but was not able to use the data due to the lack of ability to validate job descriptions, salary schedules, position allocations and the report does not cover all classifications.
- Agency staff also reviewed examples of PUC General Order PUC General Order 77-M reports for several PUC regulated water utilities and does not feel comfortable relying on this data given the different purpose for these reports and the limited additional depth of information upon which to make or infer a valid comparison.
- There are significant limitations to this data.
- They represent individual compensation rather than a published salary range (one data point per instance).
- The rule only requires reporting for compensation greater than $\$ 85,000$ per year.


## Compensation Implementation Options

Apply to each of the classifications the recommended 3\% market pay increase

Move a position to nearest step if less than 2.5\% and move the position to the next consecutive step unless more is required to get to step one in the new grade.

## CPS HR CONSULTING

## Santa Clarita Valley Water Classification \& Compensation Study

## Got Questions?

Please contact us at:

- Suzanne Ansari - sansari@cpshr.us
- Jan Bentley-ibentley@cpshr.us


[^0]:    All ranges are separated by $5 \%$ on the classification plan

