

American River Flood Control District
District Pay Ranges
Staff Report

Discussion:

The District has worked with Grace Consulting many times over the years to perform Total Compensation and Salary Studies studies. These efforts look at the market average pay and benefits for all of our pay classifications. This helps the District establish pay ranges that reflect the current market and allow for competitive pay.

This year, the District had Grace Consulting perform a Salary Study that looked at updating the market average pay and developed new pay ranges for each job classification.

The Personnel Committee met in May to review the results, data, and recommendations from Grace Consulting (Attachment 1).

Based on the results and recommendations from the study, the Personnel Committee submits for the Board's approval, Resolution 2023-05 (Attachment 2) to adopt updated District Pay Ranges with pay range midpoints placed at the Market Average Midpoint +5%. This puts the District's pay at slightly above the Market Average. The Committee also proposes pay ranges with a spread of 35% centered on each pay range midpoint.

Recommendation:

The General Manager recommends that the Board approve the new pay ranges based on the results from the Salary Study from Grace Consulting.



PROJECT REPORT

BASE SALARY STUDY

CONDUCTED BY

GRACE CONSULTING

5108 COWELL BLVD.
DAVIS, CA 95618
(530) 756-5269
graceconsulting@earthlink.net

April 2023

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION:

The American River Flood Control District (ARFCD or District) commissioned Grace Consulting to conduct a base salary survey of comparable organizations within the relevant labor market for seven (7) exempt and non-exempt District job classifications.

Grace Consulting agreed to survey fourteen (14) comparable special districts and public sector organizations within the relevant labor market to collect base salary data for all District job classifications. Twelve (12) of the fourteen (14) organizations participated fully in the survey process (85.7%) and salary data was collected from the websites of the two non-respondent organizations. The organizations that were contacted are identified in Table 1 on page 5 of the full project report.

B. PURPOSE FOR THE STUDY:

The market study was initiated:

- To determine the comparability of the District's base pay, cash incentives and employee benefits to other comparable organization's within the relevant labor market

C. GENERAL FINDINGS:

The following information summarizes general findings pertinent to current pay and benefits comparability to surveyed organizations within the relevant labor market.

- Best practice research finds that competitive base pay enhances an organization's ability to recruit and retain qualified personnel; and employee benefits that gain value over time further enhance an organization's ability to retain qualified talent, especially in a dynamic labor market.
- The job of General Manager is more difficult to match due to variation in organizational size and structure. In such organizations the duties and responsibilities and respective salaries would typically fall at some level between Department Head and Division Manager in those departments with multiple program and operational units. It should be noted that most of the job matches for the General Manager to jobs in the larger organizations are at the mid-management/Division Manager level which helps to avoid overstating salary levels.
- The minimum, midpoint and maximum base pay provided to the District's Office Manager/Clerk of the Board significantly lags behind the market average and median base pay values. Though all comparable market jobs perform the majority of the duties performed by the Office Manager, many of the market jobs have additional duties and/or higher levels of responsibility, authority and/or discretionary decision making as a result of the size and/or structure of their respective organization.
- The **minimum** base pay for all seven (7) District jobs lags behind the market average minimum salary by a range of 6.4% to 16.74% and the minimum base pay of these jobs lags behind the market minimum median salary by a range of 2.99% to 14.48%. (Table 2 on page 6 of the project report).

- The **midpoint** base pay for all seven (7) District jobs lags behind the market average midpoint base pay by a range of 3.12% to 13.89%; and the midpoint base pay of six (6) of the jobs lags behind the market midpoint median base pay by a range of 4.11% to 13.39%% while the seventh job leads the market by 1.24% (Table 3 on page 7 of the project report).
- The **maximum** base pay for all seven (7) District jobs lags behind the market average maximum base pay by a range of 0.53% to 11.65%; and the maximum base pay of six (6) of the jobs lags behind the market maximum median base pay by a range of 2.02% to 12.62% while the maximum base pay of the seventh job leads the market median maximum base pay by 2.78% (Table 4 on page 7 of the project report).
- The District's compensation policy is to set the maximum of each salary range at approximately 5% above market average values. However, it was found that the structure developed based on the District's compensation philosophy resulted in minimum salaries for six (6) of the seven (7) jobs that lagged behind the market average minimum salaries by up to 3%.
- A second structure was developed using the market average midpoint values plus 5% as the basis for the structure that resulted in a structure that leads the market at the minimum, midpoint and maximum levels (Table 6, page 8).
- Five (5) surveyed organizations will be providing COLA adjustments that range from 2% to 4% later in 2023 for some or all of their bargaining units; five (5) organizations currently have no increases scheduled, but one is waiting for the results of a compensation study, three (3) are in negotiation with labor representatives and the fifth organization reports that 2023 increases are dependent upon budget discussions that will occur in May and/or June; and the remaining four (4) organizations provided COLA increases ranging from 0.9% to 5% In January that are reflected in the salary data collected.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION:

- Implement the recommended structure that is based on the market average midpoint values that have been adjusted upward by 5% to incorporate the District's policy to pay at 5% above the market. This structure enables the District pay to lead market average values at the minimum, midpoint and maximum of the salary ranges, but not to excess.
- The recommended structure establishes a range spread of 35% around the adjusted midpoint. The 35% range spread allows room for salary growth since upward progression is limited within a small organization.
- To stay aligned with the market, adjust the salary range by the cost of living annually by adjusting the midpoint by the cost of living and then setting the range spread around that midpoint value.
- To address the impact of organization size and structure on market jobs comparable to the Office Manager, the market data was adjusted to include only the most comparable jobs with the least amount of supervisory responsibility. Seven (7) market jobs were found to be most comparable to the District's Office Manager based on the nature and scope of work performed and levels of responsibility, authority, decision making and impact of error. Those jobs are

located in the City of Folsom, City of Woodland, El Dorado Irrigation District, Reclamation District 1000, Sacramento County, Sacramento Suburban Water District and the San Juan Water District. The midpoint average base salary for those jobs was calculated and used as the midpoint upon which the recommended salary range for the District Office Manager/Clerk of the Board job was established.

C. RECOMMENDED SALARY STRUCTURE:

The recommended salary structure was established by using the market average midpoints, adjusted upwards by 5% per District policy . A 35% salary range was then established around the adjusted midpoint values.

RECOMMENDED SALARY STRUCTURE
(2023-2024)

CLASSIFICATION	PROPOSED SALARY RANGE			RANGE SPREAD
	MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX	
General Manager	12,364	14,528	16,692	35.00%
Superintendent	8,765	10,299	11,833	35.00%
Field Supervisor	6,252	7,346	8,440	35.00%
Office Manager/Clerk to Board	6,783	7,970	9,157	35.00%
Vehicle & Equipment Specialist	5,311	6,241	7,170	35.00%
Maintenance Worker Range B	5,145	6,046	6,946	35.00%
Maintenance Worker Range A	4,349	5,111	5,872	35.00%

AMERICAN RIVER FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
REPORT
BASE SALARY STUDY
April 2023

Executive Summary i
 Table of Contents..... v
 List of Tables and Charts vi

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Scope..... 1
 B. Methodology..... 1

II. ANALYTICAL CONCEPTS

A. Introduction..... 3
 B. Relevant Labor Market 3
 C. Jobs Surveyed 4
 D. Statistics Calculated 4
 E. Internal Equity..... 4
 F. Summary Market Findings 4

III. BASE PAY COMPARABILITY & STRUCTURE ANALYSIS

A. Introduction..... 6
 B. Base Pay Comparability..... 6
 C. Salary Structure Analysis..... 7
 D. Job to Market Comparisons 8
 E. 2023 Salary Increases 9

IV. FINDINGS and RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Introduction..... 11
 B. General Findings 11
 C. Recommendations for Consideration 12
 D. Recommended Salary Structure 12

APPENDICES

A. Survey Contact List 14
 B. Detailed Base Pay Charts by Job 16

LIST OF TABLES and CHARTS

1. Surveyed Organizations3
2. Minimum Base Pay Comparisons6
3. Midpoint Base Pay Comparisons.....7
4. Maximum Base Pay Comparisons.....7
5. Salary Structure - Market Average Maximum Pay8
6. Salary Structure – Market Average Midpoint Pay9
7. 2023 Salary Increases.....10
8. Recommended Salary Structure.....13

I INTRODUCTION

A. SCOPE:

The American River Flood Control District (ARFCD or District) commissioned Grace Consulting to conduct a total compensation survey of comparable organizations within the relevant labor market for seven (7) exempt and non-exempt District job classifications.

Grace Consulting agreed to survey fourteen (14) comparable public sector organizations and special districts within the relevant labor market to collect base pay, cash incentives and employee benefits data for all job classifications studied. Twelve (12) of the fourteen (12) organizations participated fully in the survey process (85.71%). Some data was collected from the websites of the two non-respondent organizations. The surveyed organizations are identified in Table 1 on page 9 of this report.

B. METHODOLOGY:

The staff of Grace consulting performed the following activities to achieve the goals and objectives of the study:

- Conferred with the ARFCD General Manager (GM) to confirm the objectives, parameters and timelines of the study and to outline project activities; and conferred with the GM throughout the project to provide status updates and to discuss issues and findings.
- Developed a survey instrument and updated summary job descriptions to gather requisite salary information for all District jobs.
- Contacted potential survey participants to determine willingness to participate in the survey process and to identify a contact within each organization (Contact list for all surveyed organizations is included in Appendix A). The California Human Resources Department (Cal HR) did not provide a point of contact, but referred to the data posted on their website.
- Conducted online research to identify comparable jobs and related compensation information of all of the market organizations, completed a survey with on-line information and electronically transmitted the document to each organization to review for accuracy and to clarify and supplement information found on their websites.
- Developed an EXCEL spreadsheet for each District job to enable data compilation and market comparability analysis.
- Conducted comparative analyses of the maximum base pay rates for District jobs to comparable jobs in surveyed organizations.
- Developed summary charts to depict comparability of the minimum, midpoint and maximum base pay provided to each District job to the pay provided to comparable jobs in the relevant market (tables 2, 3 and 4 on pages 11 and 12).
- Developed detailed charts of base pay comparability for each District job to comparable jobs in the surveyed organizations (Appendix B).

- Developed recommendations for consideration by the District that are discussed in detail in Section IV of this report.
- Drafted and presented to the District for review and comment a report of all findings and recommendations and all summary and detailed tables and charts.
- Conferred with the District's Legal Counsel and General Manager to discuss the findings and recommendations before development of the draft report.
- Submitted draft report to the General Manager for discussion and input for the final project report
- Edited and finalized the project report based on District feedback and transmitted the final report to the General Manager for presentation to the District's Board of Trustees.

II ANALYTICAL CONCEPTS

A. INTRODUCTION:

The purpose of this section is to provide clarifying information on the concepts used in the data analysis to enhance understanding of the findings and observations contained within this report.

B. RELEVANT LABOR MARKET:

In determining comparability of pay and benefits, it is important that the relevant labor market be identified. The identification of this market is based on a variety of factors including geographic proximity; comparability of services provided; traditional recruitment patterns; availability of requisite knowledge, skills and competencies within the identified market; and historical market matching practices.

Fourteen (14) comparable organizations within the relevant labor market were surveyed. Each of these organizations was contacted during the survey process. Twelve (12) fully participated in the process and some data was collected from the websites of the two (2) no-respondent organizations. The surveyed organizations included five (5) comparable special districts, the State of California and eight (8) local public sector organizations.

**TABLE 1
SURVEYED ORGANIZATIONS**

ORGANIZATION	Pop. Served	Employee Pop.	Operating Budget
City of Folsom	79,201	(Public Works Dept.) 112.5	(Public Works Dept) 7.2M
City of Roseville	156,467	(Env. Utilities) 256	(Env. Utilities) 123.8M
City of Sacramento	1,576,618	(Water Ops.) 374	(Water Ops) 8.4M
City of West Sacramento	156,637	(City EE Pop) 417.05	(Citywide Budget) 147.5M
City of Woodland	61,398	(City EE Pop) 317	(City EE Pop) 61.2M
El Dorado Irrigation District	125,000	Not Provided	Not Provided
Placer County	412,300	(Public Works Dept.) 281	(Public Works Dept) 4.5M
Placer County Water Agency	41,000 Accts.	(Water Division) 147.6	(Water Division) 49.34M
Reclamation District 1000	100,000+	13	5.43M
Sacramento County	(Unincorporated) 610,442	(Water Resources) 133.6	(Water Resources) 46M
Sacramento Suburban WD	194,444	73	24.9M

ORGANIZATION	Pop. Served	Employee Pop.	Operating Budget
San Juan Water District	265,000	(Wholesale Div.) 18.8	(Wholesale Div.) 10.3M
State of California DWR	39.24M	Not Provided	(Flood Management) 15.7M
Yolo County	219,986	(Comm Services Dept.) 138	(Public Works Div.) 44.8M
American River Flood Control District	400,000	13	2.8M

C. JOBS SURVEYED:

The District requested that the market be surveyed for compensation and benefit information for jobs comparable to seven (7) exempt and non-exempt job classifications. The jobs surveyed are:

Office Administrative Classes

Office Manager/Clerk of the Board

System Maintenance Classes

Superintendent
Field Supervisor
Maintenance Worker, Range A
Maintenance Worker, Range B
Vehicle & Equipment Maintenance Specialist

Executive Management

General Manager

D. STATISTICS CALCULATED:

To determine market comparability, two statistics were calculated using all valid market data collected for each job:

- Market Average – the arithmetic average of all values collected for each job surveyed
- Market Median – the middle value of all values collected for each job surveyed.

E. INTERNAL EQUITY

The concept of internal pay equity recognizes differences in the levels of responsibility, authority, judgment, complexity of work, consequence of error and other compensable factors within an occupational group (job family). Generally, the actual difference is based on each organization's compensation philosophy pertinent to internal equity with consideration given to differentials found within the market data.

F. SUMMARY MARKET FINDINGS:

Summary charts depicting the comparability of base pay provided by surveyed organizations to their comparable jobs are contained and discussed in Section III of this report. Detailed charts depicting the market base pay value for each job studied are contained in Appendix B of this report.

**III
BASE PAY COMPARABILITY
and
SALARY STRUCTURE ANALYSIS**

A. INTRODUCTION:

The purpose of this section is to present and discuss the comparability of the District's base pay and total compensation for the seven (7) exempt and non-exempt jobs studied to comparable jobs within the relevant labor market.

B. BASE PAY COMPARABILITY:

Seven (7) exempt and non-exempt jobs were surveyed within the relevant regional labor market. A valid sample of comparable jobs was found in the market data for all District jobs. Comparability charts for the Districts minimum, midpoint and maximum salaries are displayed below and on page 7.

The minimum, midpoint and maximum base pay provided to the District's Office Manager/Clerk of the Board significantly lags behind the market average and median base pay values. The likely cause of this disparity and recommended salary structure for all District jobs are discussed in the salary structure analysis section that starts on page 7.

- The **minimum** base pay for all seven (7) District jobs lags behind the market average minimum salary by a range of 6.4% to 16.74% and the minimum base pay of these jobs lags behind the market minimum median salary by a range of 2.99% to 14.48%. (Table 2)

**TABLE 2
MINIMUM BASE PAY COMPARISONS**
(Full Market data effective 1/1/2023)

CLASSIFICATION	ARFCD MINIMUM PAY	MARKET AVERAGE MINIMUM	% DIFFERENCE	MARKET MEDIAN MINIMUM	% DIFFERENCE
General Manager	11,299	12,336	-8.40	12,080	-6.47
Superintendent	7,579	8,492	-10.75	8,285	-8.52
Field Supervisor	5,769	6,164	-6.40	5,947	-2.99
Office Manager/Clerk to the Board	5,724	6,875	-16.74	6,694	-14.48
Vehicle & Equipment Specialist	4,776	5,263	-9.25	5,286	-9.64
Maintenance Worker (Range B)	4,681	5,090	-8.04	4,879	-4.06
Maintenance Worker (Range A)	3,870	4,291	-9.83	4,184	-7.49

Note: Any district salary that is within the 5% (+/-) of the market is considered comparable to the market.

- The **midpoint** base pay for all seven (7) District jobs lags behind the market average midpoint base pay by a range of 3.12% to 13.89%; and the midpoint base pay of six (6) of the jobs

lags behind the market midpoint median base pay by a range of 4.11% to 13.39%% while the seventh job leads the market by 1.24% (Table 3).

TABLE 3
MID-POINT COMPARISONS
(Market data effective 1/1/2023)

CLASSIFICATION	ARFCD MIDPOINT PAY	MARKET AVERAGE MIDPOINT	% DIFFERENCE	MARKET MEDIAN MIDPOINT	% DIFFERENCE
General Manager	13,277	13,836	-4.04	13,862	-4.22
Superintendent	8,906	9,808	-9.20	9,471	-5.97
Field Supervisor	6,779	6,996	-3.12	6,696	1.24
Office Manager/Clerk to the Board	6,726	7,811	-13.89	7,766	-13.39
Vehicle & Equipment Specialist	5,612	5,943	-5.58	6,145	-8.69
Maintenance Worker (Range B)	5,501	5,758	-4.47	5,736	-4.11
Maintenance Worker (Range A)	4,545	4,867	-9.83	4,801	-5.29

- The **maximum** base pay for all seven (7) District jobs lags behind the market average maximum base pay by a range of 0.53% to 11.65%; and the maximum base pay of six (6) of the jobs lags behind the market maximum median base pay by a range of 2.02% to 12.62% while the maximum base pay of the seventh job leads the market median maximum base pay by 2.78% (Table 4)

TABLE 4
MAXIMUM BASE PAY COMPARISONS
(Market data effective 1/1/2023)

CLASSIFICATION	ARFCD MAXIMUM PAY	MARKET AVERAGE MAXIMUM	% DIFFERENCE	MARKET MEDIAN MAXIMUM	% DIFFERENCE
General Manager	15,254	15,429	-1.14	15,616	-2.32
Superintendent	10,232	11,125	-8.03	10,443	-2.02
Field Supervisor	7,788	7,829	-0.53	7,578	2.78
Office Manager/Clerk to the Board	7,728	8,747	-11.65	8,844	-12.62
Vehicle & Equipment Specialist	6,447	6,624	-2.67	6,815	-5.39
Maintenance Worker (Range B)	6,320	6,425	-1.64	6,604	-4.30
Maintenance Worker (Range A)	5,225	5,442	-3.99	5,476	-4.58

C. SALARY STRUCTURE ANALYSIS

The District's compensation philosophy states that the maximum salary for each classification will be at least 5% above the market average maximum salary. Table 5 on page 8 reflects this philosophy.

However, it was found that the structure developed based on the District's compensation philosophy resulted in minimum salaries for six (6) of the seven (7) jobs lagged behind the market by up to 3% and the minimum pay for the remaining job lead the market by 1.89%.

Therefore, a second analysis using the market average calculated midpoint plus 5% as the basis for the structure was also developed which results in a structure that leads the market at the minimum, midpoint and maximum levels (Table 6)

For the position of Office Manager, two sets of market data were analyzed. The full market was adjusted to identify a market sample of organizations with the most comparable jobs; those with limited supervisory responsibility and decision making authority. The results of the analyses of both data sets are presented for review in Tables 5 and 6 below.

TABLE 5
SALARY STRUCTURE ANALYSIS
MARKET AVERAGE MAXIMUMS +5%

CLASSIFICATION	CURRENT MAX PAY	PROPOSED SALARY RANGE			RANGE SPREAD
		MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX	
General Manager	15,254	12,001	14,101	16,201	35.00%
Superintendent	10,232	8,653	10,157	11,681	35.00%
Field Supervisor	7,788	6,089	7,155	8,221	35.00%
Office Manager/Clerk to Board (Full Mkt)*	7,728	6,803	7,994	9,184	35.00%
Office Manager/Clerk to Board (Adj Mkt)*	7,728	6,649	7,813	8,976	35.00%
Vehicle & Equipment Specialist	6,447	5,152	6,054	6,955	35.00%
Maintenance Worker Range B	6,320	4,998	5,872	6,747	35.00%
Maintenance Worker Range A	5,225	4,233	4,974	5,714	35.00%

TABLE 6
SALARY STRUCTURE ANALYSIS
MARKET AVERAGE MIDPOINTS +5%

CLASSIFICATION	CURRENT MAX PAY	PROPOSED SALARY RANGE			RANGE SPREAD
		MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX	
General Manager	15,254	12,364	14,528	16,692	35.00%
Superintendent	10,232	8,765	10,299	11,833	35.00%
Field Supervisor	7,788	6,252	7,346	8,440	35.00%
Office Manager/Clerk to Board (Full Mkt)*	7,728	6,980	8,201	9,423	35.00%
Office Manager/Clerk to Board (Adj. Mkt)	7,728	6,783	7,970	9,157	35.00%
Vehicle & Equipment Specialist	6,447	5,311	6,241	7,170	35.00%
Maintenance Worker Range B	6,320	5,145	6,046	6,946	35.00%
Maintenance Worker Range A	5,225	4,349	5,111	5,872	35.00%

D. JOB TO MARKET COMPARISONS:

Market comparability of base pay was determined for each job surveyed and matched in the relevant labor market. This analysis is depicted for each job in the charts contained in Appendix B.

E. 2023 SALARY INCREASES:

Table 7 on page 10 displays the salary increases that have occurred and/or are scheduled and reported by survey participants for calendar year 2023.

TABLE 7
2023 SALARY INCREASES

ORGANIZATION	\$/% Change	Date of Change
City of Folsom general unit	None Scheduled	
mid-management		pending negotiation
City of Roseville		pending study
City of Sacramento Exempt	None Scheduled	
Non Exempt	None Scheduled	
City of West Sacramento		
general unit	4.00%	7/1/2023
management	0.00%	
City of Woodland general unit		pending negotiation
mid-management	3.00%	7/1/2023
El Dorado Irrigation District	3%-5% COLA	1/1/23
Placer County	4.00%	7/1/2023
Placer County Water Agency	5%	1/1/23
Reclamation District 1000	None Scheduled	Pend Budget 6/2023
Sacramento County	4.00%	6/18/23
Sacramento Suburban WD	8.30%	1/9/23
San Juan Water District	0.9%*	1/25/23
State of California general unit		pending negotiation
supervisory/professional		pending negotiation
Yolo County general unit	2.00%	7/1/23
supervisory/professional		pending negotiation
management	2.00%	7/1/23
ARFCD	Pending	Study

*3.8% was issued in 7/2022- this is a supplemental COLA, total provided for FY 2022-2023.

IV FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION:

The purpose of this section is to present a summary of survey findings for consideration as they relate to District jobs and salaries.

B. GENERAL FINDINGS:

The following information summarizes general findings pertinent to current pay and benefits comparability to surveyed organizations within the relevant labor market.

- Best practice research finds that competitive base pay enhances an organization's ability to recruit qualified personnel; and employee benefits that gain value over time enhance an organization's ability to retain qualified talent, especially in a dynamic labor market.
- The District's current compensation policy is to set individual salaries at approximately 5% above market average maximum pay values.
- The job of General Manager is more difficult to match due to variation in organizational size and structure. In such organizations the duties and responsibilities and respective salaries would typically fall at some level between Department Head and Division Manager in those departments with multiple program and operational units. It should be noted that the most comparable job matches to the General Manager in the larger organizations are at the mid-management/Division Manager level.
- As a result of the survey process, it was found that the current minimum, midpoint and maximum base salary for the Office Manager/Clerk of the Board significantly lags behind the overall market average values by more than 11.65%. Though all comparable market jobs perform the majority of the duties performed by the District's position, many of the market jobs have additional duties and/or higher levels of responsibility, authority and/or discretionary decision making that are the result of the size and/or structure of their respective organization.
- The **minimum** base pay for all seven (7) District jobs lags behind the market average minimum salary by a range of 6.4% to 16.74% and the minimum base pay of these jobs lags behind the market minimum median salary by a range of 2.99% to 14.48%. (Table 2 on page 6 of the project report).
- The **midpoint** base pay for all seven (7) District jobs lags behind the market average midpoint base pay by a range of 3.12% to 13.89%; and the midpoint base pay of six (6) of the jobs lags behind the market midpoint median base pay by a range of 4.11% to 13.39%% while the seventh job leads the market by 1.24% (Table 3 on page 7 of the project report).
- The **maximum** base pay for all seven (7) District jobs lags behind the market average maximum base pay by a range of 0.53% to 11.65%; and the maximum base pay of six (6) of the jobs lags behind the market maximum median base pay by a range of 2.02% to 12.62% while the maximum base pay of the seventh job leads the market median maximum base pay by 2.78% (Table 4 on page 7 of the project report).

- Five (5) surveyed organizations will be providing COLA adjustments that range from 2% to 4% later in 2023 for some or all of their bargaining units; five (5) organizations currently have no increases scheduled, but one is waiting for the results of a compensation study, three (3) are in negotiation with labor representatives and the fifth organization reports that 2023 increases are dependent upon budget discussions that will occur in May and/or June; and the remaining four (4) organizations provided COLA increases ranging from 0.9% to 5% In January that are reflected in the salary data collected.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION:

- Implement the recommended structure that was developed based on the market average midpoint values that were adjusted upward by 5% to incorporate District policy to pay at 5% above market. This will allow the District to lead the market average minimum, midpoint, and maximum values, but not to excess.
- The recommended structure establishes a range spread of 35% around the adjusted midpoint. The 35% range spread allows room for salary growth since upward progression is limited in a small organization.
- To stay aligned with the market, adjust the salary range by the cost of living annually by adjusting the midpoint by the cost of living and then setting the range spread around that midpoint.
- To address the impact of organization size and structure on market jobs comparable to the Office Manager, the market data was adjusted to include only the most comparable jobs with the least amount of supervisory responsibility. Seven (7) market jobs were found to be most comparable to the District's Office Manager based on the nature and scope of work performed and levels of responsibility, authority, decision making and impact of error. Those jobs are located in the City of Folsom, City of Woodland, El Dorado Irrigation District, Reclamation District 1000, Sacramento County, Sacramento Suburban Water District and the San Juan Water District. The midpoint average base salary for those jobs was calculated and used as the midpoint upon which the recommended salary range for the District Office Manager/Clerk of the Board job was established.

E. RECOMMENDED SALARY STRUCTURE:

The recommended salary structure was established by adjusting the market average midpoint value for each job upwards by 5% per District policy and maintaining a 35% salary range spread around the adjusted midpoints (Table 8 on page 13).

TABLE 8
RECOMMENDED SALARY STRUCTURE
(2023-2024)

CLASSIFICATION	CURRENT MAX PAY	PROPOSED SALARY RANGE			RANGE SPREAD
		MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX	
General Manager	15,254	12,364	14,528	16,692	35.00%
Superintendent	10,232	8,765	10,299	11,833	35.00%
Field Supervisor	7,788	6,252	7,346	8,440	35.00%
Office Manager/Clerk to Board	7,728	6,783	7,970	9,157	35.00%
Vehicle & Equipment Specialist	6,447	5,311	6,241	7,170	35.00%
Maintenance Worker Range B	6,320	5,145	6,046	6,946	35.00%
Maintenance Worker Range A	5,225	4,349	5,111	5,872	35.00%

Appendix A
Survey Contact List

Survey Contact List

Name of Organization	Contact Name	Title	Phone	Email	Address
American River Flood Control Dist.	Tim Kerr	General Manager	(916) 929-4006	tkerr@arfed.org	185 Commerce Cr. Sacramento CA 95815
City of Folsom	Doris Phillips	Management Analyst HR	(916) 461-6055 (916) 461-6050	dphillips@folsom.ca.us	50 Natoma Street Folsom, CA 95630
City of Roseville	Linda Hampton Christal Webber	HR Analyst HR Analyst	(916) 774-5215 (916) 774-5475	lhampton@roseville.ca.us chwebber@roseville.ca.us	311 Vernon Street Roseville, CA. 95678
City of Sacramento	Jennifer Wilkinson	SR. Personnel Analyst HR	(916) 808-5295 (916) 808-5726	jwilkinson@cityofsacramento.org	915 I Street, Plaza Level Sacramento, CA. 95670
City of West Sacramento	Leanne Lee Kaitlyn Montez	HR Manager SR. HR Analyst	(916) 617-4510 (916) 617-4508	lianel@cityofwestsacramento.org kaitlynm@cityofwestsacramento.org	1110 W. Capital Ave West Sacramento, CA. 95691
City of Woodland	Rachael Smith	Sr. HR Analyst	(530) 661-5811	Rachael.Smith@cityofwoodland.org ' hr@cityofwoodland.org '	300 First Street Woodland, CA 95695
El Dorado Irrigation District	Leslie Voong website data used	HR Technician Main #	(530) 642-4074	lvoong@eid.org	2890 Mosquito Rd Placerville, CA 95667
Placer County	Laura Carucci	HR Analyst II HR	(530) 889-4087 (530) 889-4060	lcarucci@placer.ca.gov	145 Fulweiller Ave, Ste 200 Auburn CA 95603
Placer County Water Agency	Nicole Skarda	HR Manager Main #	(530) 823-4902 (530) 823-4850	nskarda@pcwa.net	144 Ferguson Rd Auburn, CA 95603
Reclamation District 1000	Joleen Gutierrez	Admin Services Mgr.	(916) 922-1449	jgutierrez@rd1000.org	1633 Garden Hwy Sacramento, CA 95833
Sacramento County	Rebecca Stuckert	HR Manager I HR	(916) 874-5073 (916) 874-5593	StuckertR@saccounty.net	609 9th Street Sacramento, CA 95814
San Juan Water District	Donna Silva	Finance Director	(916) 791-6907	dsilva@sjwd.org	9935 Auburn-Folsom Rd Granite Bay, CA 95746
Sacramento Suburban WD	Susan Schinnerer	HR Manager Main #	(916) 679-3972 (916) 972-7171	sschinnerer@sswd.org	3701 Marconi Ave Ste 100 Sacramento CA 95821-5346
State of California	no contact website data used			-	1416 9th Street Sacramento, CA 95648
Yolo County	Brody Lorda Khanida Hunter	HR Officer SR. Personnel Analyst	(530) 666-8055 (530) 666-8150	brody.lorda@yolocounty.org khanida.hunter@yolocounty.org	625 Court Street Room 101 Woodland, CA 95695

Appendix B
Base Pay
By
Job and Surveyed Organizations

GENERAL MANAGER

ORGANIZATION	CLASSIFICATION	MATCH	OT Eligible		MONTHLY BASE PAY			Range Spread	
			YES	NO	MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX		
Placer County Water Agency	Director Field Services	=		X	13,959	15,887	17,815	27.62%	
Reclamation District 1000	General Manager	=		X	12,372	14,855	17,337	40.13%	
El Dorado Irrigation District	Director of Operations	=		X			16,633		
San Juan Water District	Director of Operations	=		X	13,685	15,054	16,423	20.01%	
Sacramento County	Chief, Division of Water Resources	=		X	14,618	15,367	16,116	10.25%	
State of California	Principal Engineer, Water Resources	=		X	14,104	15,062	16,020	13.58%	
Sacramento Suburban WD	Assistant General Manager	=		X	12,080	13,957	15,834	31.08%	
Placer County	Assistant Director of Public Works	+		X	12,327	13,862	15,397	24.90%	
City of Roseville	Water Utility Manager	=		X	11,188	13,091	14,993	34.01%	
Yolo County	Director, Public Works Division	=		X	12,012	13,306	14,600	21.55%	
City of West Sacramento	Flood General Manager	=		X	11,667	12,906	14,145	21.24%	
City of Woodland	City Engineer	=		X	10,915	12,423	13,931	27.63%	
City of Sacramento	Utilities O &M Manager	=		X	10,414	12,039	13,664	31.21%	
City of Folsom	PW Utilities Section Mgr. (PE Req)	=		X	11,021	12,061	13,101	18.87%	
					MARKET MEDIAN	12,080	13,862	15,616	24.90%
					MARKET AVERAGE	12,336	13,836	15,429	24.78%
ARFCD	General Manager		X		11,299	13,277	15,254	35.00%	
					DIFFERENCE MEDIAN	-6.47%	-4.22%	-2.32%	40.55%
					DIFFERENCE AVERAGE	-8.40%	-4.04%	-1.14%	41.28%

SUPERINTENDENT

ORGANIZATION	CLASSIFICATION	MATCH	OT Eligible		MONTHLY BASE PAY			Range Spread
			YES	NO	MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX	
Reclamation District 1000	Operations Manager	=		X	10,870	12,939	15,008	38.07%
San Juan Water District	Field Services Manager	=		X	11,216	12,338	13,459	20.00%
Placer County Water Agency	Deputy Director, Field Services	+		X	9,760	11,108	12,456	27.62%
Sacramento Suburban WD	Superintendent, Field Services	=		X	7,881	10,065	12,249	55.42%
City of Sacramento	Utilities O & M Superintendent	+		X	8,939	10,334	11,728	31.20%
City of Roseville	Water Distribution Superintendent	=		X	8,187	9,661	11,135	36.01%
City of West Sacramento	Utilities Maintenance Superintendent	=		X	8,614	9,542	10,469	21.53%
State of California	Utility Craftworker Superintendent	=		X	8,383	9,400	10,417	24.26%
Yolo County	Public Works Superintendent	=		X	8,471	9,384	10,296	21.54%
City of Woodland	Infrastructure O & M Superintendent	=		X	7,918	9,012	10,106	27.63%
El Dorado Irrigation District	Water Construction Supervisor	=			6,227	8,114	10,000	60.59%
Sacramento County	Stormwater Utility Manager	=		X	7,868	8,716	9,563	21.54%
City of Folsom	Utilities Maintenance Supervisor	=		X	7,066	8,285	9,504	34.50%
Placer County	Utility Operations Supervisor	=		X	7,485	8,421	9,357	25.01%
MARKET MEDIAN					8,285	9,471	10,443	27.63%
MARKET AVERAGE					8,492	9,808	11,125	31.78%
ARFCD	Superintendent		X		7,579	8,906	10,232	35.00%
DIFFERENCE MEDIAN					-8.52%	-5.97%	-2.02%	26.70%
DIFFERENCE AVERAGE					-10.75%	-9.20%	-8.03%	10.14%

FIELD SUPERVISOR

ORGANIZATION	CLASSIFICATION	MATCH	OT Eligible		MONTHLY BASE PAY			Range Spread	
			YES	NO	MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX		
San Juan Water District	Distribution Lead Worker	=	X		8,746	9,621	10,495	19.99%	
Sacramento Suburban WD	Distribution Foreman	+	X		7,337	8,319	9,301	26.77%	
Placer County Water Agency	Field Maintenance Supervisor	=	X		6,956	7,917	8,877	27.62%	
State of California	Utility Craftswoman Supervisor	=	X		6,946	7,773	8,600	23.81%	
City of Folsom	Sr. Water Utility Worker	=	X		6,483	7,348	8,213	26.69%	
Reclamation District 1000	Lead Flood Operations Specialist	=	X		5,912	7,038	8,164	38.09%	
City of Sacramento	Utilities O & M Lead	=	X		5,431	6,536	7,641	40.69%	
Placer County	Utility Services Worker, Supervising	=	X		6,015	6,765	7,514	24.92%	
City of Roseville	Sr. Water Distribution Worker	=	X		5,178	6,232	7,286	40.71%	
El Dorado Irrigation District	SR. Construction/Maintenance Worker	=	X		5,982	6,627	7,271	21.55%	
City of Woodland	Utilities Maintenance Supervisor	=	X		5,491	6,250	7,008	27.63%	
Yolo County	Road Supervisor	=	X		5,616	6,221	6,826	21.55%	
City of West Sacramento	Chief Maintenance Worker	=	X		5,201	5,770	6,338	21.86%	
Sacramento County	Sr. Stormwater Utility Worker	=	X		4,998	5,536	6,074	21.53%	
					MARKET MEDIAN	5,947	6,696	7,578	25.80%
					MARKET AVERAGE	6,164	6,996	7,829	27.39%
ARFCD	Field Supervisor		X		5,769	6,779	7,788	35.00%	
					DIFFERENCE MEDIAN	-2.99%	1.24%	2.78%	35.63%
					DIFFERENCE AVERAGE	-6.40%	-3.12%	-0.53%	27.79%

OFFICE MANAGER/CLERK OF THE BOARD
 (full market data)

ORGANIZATION	CLASSIFICATION	MATCH	OT Eligible		MONTHLY BASE PAY			Range Spread	
			YES	NO	MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX		
Placer County	Clerk of the Board of Supervisors	=		X	7,951	8,941	9,930	24.89%	
City of West Sacramento	Senior Analyst	=		X	7,893	8,743	9,592	21.53%	
Reclamation District 1000	Administrative Services Manager	=		X	6,552	8,070	9,589	46.35%	
Yolo County	Business Services Manager	=	X		7,647	8,471	9,294	21.54%	
San Juan Water District	Admin. Assistant/Board Secretary	=	X		7,684	8,453	9,221	20.00%	
El Dorado Irrigation District	Executive Asst/Clerk to Board	-		X	7,449	8,252	9,054	21.55%	
City of Folsom	Management Analyst	=		X	6,726	7,886	9,046	34.49%	
City of Roseville	Management Analyst II	=		X	6,649	7,646	8,642	29.97%	
City of Woodland	Management Analyst II	=		X	6,661	7,581	8,501	27.62%	
Placer County Water Agency	Clerk to the Board*	=		X	6,851	7,550	8,249	20.41%	
City of Sacramento	Administrative Analyst	=		X	6,261	7,238	8,214	31.19%	
State of California	Staff Services Manager I	+		X	6,563	7,358	8,153	24.23%	
Sacramento Suburban WD	Executive Asst. To GM	=		X	5,470	6,643	7,816	42.89%	
Sacramento County	Admin. Services Officer I	=	X		5,888	6,523	7,158	21.57%	
					MARKET MEDIAN	6,694	7,766	8,844	24.56%
					MARKET AVERAGE	6,875	7,811	8,747	27.73%
ARFCD	Office Manager/Secretary to Board		X		5,724	6,726	7,728	35.01%	
					DIFFERENCE MEDIAN	-14.48%	-13.39%	-12.62%	42.56%
					DIFFERENCE AVERAGE	-16.74%	-13.89%	-11.65%	26.25%

OFFICE MANAGER/CLERK OF THE BOARD
 (adjusted market data – most comparable jobs)

ORGANIZATION	CLASSIFICATION	MATCH	OT Eligible		MONTHLY BASE PAY			Range		
			YES	NO	MIN	MIDPOIN T	MAX	Spread		
San Juan Water District	Admin Asst/Board Secretary	=	X		7,684	8,453	9,221	20.00%		
El Dorado Irrigation District	Exec. Asst/Clerk to Board	-		X	7,449	8,252	9,054	21.55%		
City of Folsom	Management Analyst	=		X	6,726	7,886	9,046	34.49%		
Reclamation District 1000	Admin. Services Manager	=		X	6,552	7,799	9,046	38.06%		
City of Woodland	Management Analyst II	=		X	6,661	7,581	8,501	27.62%		
Sacramento Suburban WD	Exec. Assistant to GM	=		X	5,470	6,643	7,816	42.89%		
Sacramento County	Admin. Services Officer I	=	X		5,888	6,523	7,158	21.57%		
					MARKET MEDIAN		6,661	7,799	9,046	27.62%
					MARKET AVERAGE		6,633	7,591	8,549	29.46%
ARFCD	Office Manager/Clerk of the Board		X		5,724	6,726	7,728	7,728	35.01%	
					DIFFERENCE MEDIAN		-14.07%	-13.76%	-14.57%	26.74%
					DIFFERENCE AVERAGE		-13.70%	-11.39%	-9.60%	18.86%

VEHICLE & EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE SPECIALIST

ORGANIZATION	CLASSIFICATION	MATCH	OT Eligible		MONTHLY BASE PAY			Range Spread
			YES	NO	MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX	
City of Roseville	Mechanic II	=	X		5,114	6,155	7,195	40.69%
Placer County Water Agency	Mechanic	=	X		5,583	6,354	7,125	27.62%
El Dorado Irrigation District	Heavy Equipment Mechanic	=	X		5,808	6,435	7,062	21.59%
City of Folsom	Mechanic II	=	X		5,466	6,195	6,924	26.67%
Sacramento County	Equipment Technician	=	X		6,248	6,569	6,890	10.28%
Placer County	Master Equipment Mechanic (Journey)	=	X		5,457	6,136	6,815	24.89%
City of Sacramento	Equipment Mechanic II (PW)	=	X		4,848	5,831	6,814	40.55%
Reclamation District 1000	Equipment Maintenance Specialist	=	X		4,794	5,709	6,623	38.15%
State of California	Heavy Equipment Mechanic (Range B)	=	X		5,748	6,186	6,623	15.22%
Yolo County	Auto & Heavy Equip. Mechanic	=	X		4,968	5,503	6,037	21.52%
City of Woodland	Heavy Equipment Mechanic	=	X		4,619	5,258	5,896	27.65%
City of West Sacramento	Equipment Mechanic II	=	X		4,501	4,992	5,483	21.82%
Sacramento Suburban WD	No Match							
San Juan Water District	No Match							
	MARKET MEDIAN				5,286	6,145	6,815	25.78%
	MARKET AVERAGE				5,263	5,943	6,624	26.39%
ARFCD	Vehicle & Equipment Specialist		X		4,776	5,612	6,447	34.99%
	DIFFERENCE MEDIAN				-9.64%	-8.69%	-5.39%	35.72%
	DIFFERENCE AVERAGE				-9.25%	-5.58%	-2.67%	32.59%

MAINTENANCE WORKER RANGE B

ORGANIZATION	CLASSIFICATION	MATCH	OT Eligible		MONTHLY BASE PAY			Range Spread
			YES	NO	MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX	
San Juan Water District	Distribution Operator II	=	X		6,235	6,859	7,483	20.02%
State of California	Utility Craftsworker, Water Resources	=	X		6,509	6,996	7,483	14.96%
Sacramento Suburban WD	Distribution Operator II	=	X		5,788	6,512	7,235	25.00%
City of Sacramento	Utilities O & M Service Worker	+	X		4,934	5,939	6,943	40.72%
City of Folsom	Water Utility Worker II	=	X		5,466	6,195	6,924	26.67%
City of Roseville	Water Distribution Worker II	=	X		4,708	5,666	6,624	40.70%
Reclamation District 1000	Flood Operations Specialist II	=	X		4,794	5,709	6,623	38.15%
El Dorado Irrigation District	Construction/Maintenance Worker II	=	X		5,418	6,002	6,585	21.54%
Placer County Water Agency	Maintenance Worker II	=	X		5,064	5,764	6,463	27.63%
Placer County	Utility Services Worker	=	X		4,824	5,426	6,027	24.94%
Sacramento County	Stormwater Utility Worker	=	X		4,597	5,093	5,589	21.58%
City of West Sacramento	Maintenance Worker, Senior	=	X		4,570	5,069	5,568	21.84%
City of Woodland	Utilities Maintenance Worker II	=	X		4,185	4,763	5,341	27.62%
Yolo County	Road Maintenance Worker	=	X		4,169	4,618	5,067	21.54%
MARKET MEDIAN					4,879	5,736	6,604	24.97%
MARKET AVERAGE					5,090	5,758	6,425	26.64%
ARFCD	Maintenance Worker Range B		X		4,681	5,501	6,320	35.01%
DIFFERENCE MEDIAN					-4.06%	-4.11%	-4.30%	40.23%
DIFFERENCE AVERAGE					-8.04%	-4.47%	-1.64%	31.45%

MAINTENANCE WORKER RANGE A

ORGANIZATION	CLASSIFICATION	MATCH	OT Eligible		MONTHLY BASE PAY			Range Spread	
			YES	NO	MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX		
San Juan Water District	Distribution Operator I	=	X		5,645	6,210	6,774	20.00%	
Sacramento Suburban WD	Distribution Operator I	=	X		5,262	5,920	6,578	25.01%	
City of Roseville	Water Distribution Worker I	=	X		4,280	5,151	6,022	40.70%	
City of Folsom	Water Utility Worker I (flex w/ll)	=	X		4,721	5,351	5,981	26.69%	
El Dorado Irrigation District	Construction/Maintenance Worker I	=	X		4,904	5,433	5,961	21.55%	
State of California	Utility Craftsworker Apprentice	-	X		4,231	5,045	5,858	38.45%	
Reclamation District 1000	Flood Operations Specialist I	=	X		3,983	4,743	5,502	38.14%	
Placer County Water Agency	Maintenance Worker I	=	X		4,270	4,860	5,450	27.63%	
Placer County	Maintenance Worker	=	X		4,072	4,579	5,086	24.90%	
City of West Sacramento	Maintenance Worker	=	X		4,136	4,588	5,039	21.83%	
City of Woodland	Utilities Maintenance Worker I	=	X		3,699	4,210	4,721	27.63%	
Yolo County	Asst. Road Maintenance Worker	-	X		3,727	4,128	4,529	21.52%	
Sacramento County	Maintenance Worker	=	X		3,621	4,011	4,400	21.51%	
City of Sacramento	Utilities O&M Worker Apprentice	=	X		3,538	3,914	4,290	21.25%	
					MARKET MEDIAN	4,184	4,801	5,476	24.96%
					MARKET AVERAGE	4,292	4,867	5,442	26.92%
ARFCD	Maintenance Worker Range A		X		3,870	4,548	5,225	35.01%	
					DIFFERENCE MEDIAN	-7.49%	-5.29%	-4.58%	40.30%
					DIFFERENCE AVERAGE	-9.83%	-6.57%	-3.99%	30.08%

American River Flood Control District

Resolution 2023-05

Adopting 2023 Pay Ranges

WHEREAS, the American River Flood Control District (the “District”) retained Grace Consulting to conduct a salary study of comparable organizations in the relevant labor market for all positions in the District; and

WHEREAS, the results of that study and specific recommendations for the District are contained in the Salary Study of April 2023 (the “Study”); and

WHEREAS, consistent with the recommendations contained in the Study, the Board determines that it is in the best interests of the District to adopt new pay ranges for each position at the District. The pay ranges are established using the following methodology:

1. Use the Grace Consulting Study’s Market Average Midpoint plus 5% as the Midpoint for the District’s pay range for each position;
2. Using the District’s Midpoint as calculated in 1 above, establish a range of 35% from Bottom of Range (Minimum) to Top of Range (Maximum) for each position.

Therefore, the Board resolves that:

1. The monthly pay ranges for each position at the District as set forth in Exhibit “A” attached are hereby established and adopted using the methodology described above; and
2. The Employee Compensation and Benefits Policy is revised and adopted as set forth in Exhibit “B”, attached.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 12th day of May, 2023.

ATTEST:

President
Board of Trustees

Secretary
Board of Trustees

American River Flood Control District
RECOMMENDED SALARY STRUCTURE
(2023-2024)

CLASSIFICATION	PROPOSED SALARY RANGE			RANGE SPREAD
	MIN	MIDPOINT	MAX	
General Manager	12,364	14,528	16,692	35.00%
Superintendent	8,765	10,299	11,833	35.00%
Field Supervisor	6,252	7,346	8,440	35.00%
Office Manager/Clerk to Board	6,783	7,970	9,157	35.00%
Vehicle & Equipment Specialist	5,311	6,241	7,170	35.00%
Maintenance Worker Range B	5,145	6,046	6,946	35.00%
Maintenance Worker Range A	4,349	5,111	5,872	35.00%

EXHIBIT "B"

American River Flood Control District Employee Compensation and Benefits Policy (Revised June 2020)

This Employee Compensation and Benefits Policy is intended to serve as a guideline for District Management and the Board. The District seeks to recruit, retain, and promote employees of the highest caliber in terms of skills and ethics. The District also seeks to apply principles of equity and fairness in establishing the compensation of its employees. At the same time, District Management and the Board remain responsible stewards of District funds, consistent with their fiscal and legal responsibilities.

The Board should consider retaining an independent consultant to review the District's employee compensation and benefits every four or five years, or more or less frequently if the Board deems it necessary or appropriate. Salary ranges may be established for each position based in part on the consultant's review. Management and the Board may also be guided by their own experience and knowledge of the specific positions at the District in establishing both salary ranges and goal compensation. Salary ranges may be increased or decreased each year by applying an appropriate index, such as the labor market movement established by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Consistent with its goal to recruit and retain the highest caliber employees, the Board may be guided by the market average midpoint salary for each position as established by the consultant's review. Salary caps and floors may be established by using a percentage, such as 10%, above and below the market average midpoint salary plus 5%. Alternatively, the Board may establish a range by using the market average midpoint salary plus 5% as the midpoint in the range, and then establishing a percentage range, such as 35%, between the bottom of the range (minimum) and the top of the range (maximum).

Management and the Board shall consider each individual employee's performance to determine the employee's actual salary within the approved ranges. Management and the Board may also take into consideration employee benefits, cost of living increases, merit increases, incentive bonuses, and longevity bonuses in establishing staff compensation.

The District guarantees every applicant for employment and every employee the right of equal treatment without regard to race, color, sex, age, religion, national origin, sexual preference, gender identity, disability or veteran status, or any other class protected by law. This policy extends to recruiting, hiring, working conditions, benefits, training programs, promotions, use of the District's facilities, and all other terms and conditions of employment. In recruiting, selecting and promoting employees, it is the policy of the District to further the principles of equal employment opportunity by seeking talented and competent persons who are suited for a specific position by reason of training, experience, character, personality, intelligence, and general ability. Such action shall occur without regard to the individual's protected status or class.