



January 18, 2021

Mr. Gary Christie
Executive Director
Central Virginia Planning District Commission
828 Main Street
Lynchburg, Virginia 24504

Mr. Christie, *Gary*

The Berkley Group is pleased to provide the following report outlining the results of the central Virginia Planning District Commission, (CVPDC) Compensation Study requested in Task Order #3, Work Order #2 of October 30, 2020. We appreciate the opportunity to assist you and the Commission in completing this study.

Executive Summary

The Berkley Group gathered market pay range data for twenty-two positions. Nineteen comparable organizations provided pay range data including minimums, midpoints, if available, and maximums.

Each CVPDC position range was compared to the average market range to determine the market competitiveness of each position. Sufficient data was received for all but two positions with the following summary results:

- CVPDC positions are the most competitive with the market and generally lead the market with an overall average of 107% of the market average minimum.
- The Service Authority competitiveness varies significantly among jobs, with some as high as 115% of the market average and some as low as 70% with an overall average of 92% of market minimum.
- The Workforce Development Board has the fewest positions, and they all lag the market, although not significantly with an overall average of 88% of market minimum.

The current pay plan provides an adequate structure to assign or reassign positions based on market competitiveness and we do not recommend developing a new plan. We do recommend reassigning positions to pay ranges more competitive with market averages to support recruitment and retention of qualified employees. Jobs within the Service Authority tend to be more market sensitive and it may be harder to attract qualified applicants if the pay range lags the market, particularly at the minimum.

Background

The CVPDC provides services for member localities and identifies and develops opportunities for coordination among the region's local governments. Additionally, the CVPDC encourages and facilitates collaboration among local governments in addressing challenges and opportunities

of greater-than-local significance. The CVPDC engages the region in consolidated services, regional initiatives, community development and transportation. Specific initiatives include the Central Virginia Workforce Development Board and the Region 2000 Services Authority.

CVPDC has a formal pay plan that includes twenty grades, 101-120, with associated pay ranges. The highest grade currently being used is grade 116 leading us to believe that the pay plan was designed to accommodate reassignments based on factors such as adding new positions and market escalation. The Executive Director and the Director of Solid Waste are not included as the salary is negotiated with the Board and are not assigned to a pay grade.

Methodology

The Berkley Group was engaged to gather and analyze pay data to assess the competitiveness of the current pay grades, focusing on the pay structure and not on individual employee pay. Gathering actual average pay was not included in the study. No preferred market position was identified in advance. Rather, CVPDC expressed the preference of gathering and compiling the data before making any decisions.

This market study, the first since a major study in 2014, included all the positions under CVPDC's governance. Eight positions in the CVPDC administrative offices, 12 positions in the Services Authority and four positions in the Workforce Development Board are included.

The CVPDC Executive Director and staff categorized jobs into functional area and selected comparators for each group of positions as follows.

Comparators by service area:

Planning District Commission	Service Authority	Workforce Development:
Central Shenandoah PDC	VDOT	Piedmont Region WDB
West Piedmont PDC	New River Resource Authority	New River/Mount Rogers WDB
Thomas Jefferson PDC	Montgomery Regional Solid Waste Auth	West Piedmont Region WDB
Mount Rogers PDC	Roanoke Valley Resource Authority	Shenandoah Valley Region WDB
New River Valley PDC		Blue Ridge Regional Workforce Development Board (WDB)
Roanoke-Allegheny Regional Commission		
Amherst County		
City of Lynchburg		
Campbell County		
Commonwealth Regional Council		
Bedford County		

To complete the study, we used a combination of methods to solicit pay plan data from comparable organizations in Virginia. The response rate was generally good and sufficient data

was received for most positions. Despite multiple attempts, we were unable to gather relevant private sector data.

Pay grade minimums, midpoints and maximums from comparators were compiled and averaged to determine a market average for each point on the range. In some cases, the midpoint or range was calculated based on partial data received. The averages were then compared to the CVPDC pay ranges. Comparing the market average to CVPDC's current pay ranges results in a "CompRatio" – the market position of each job expressed as a percentage. Using 100% as "the market", variance from the market is expressed as a higher or lower percentage. For example, a pay range minimum CompRatio of 90% indicates that the CVPDC range minimum is at 90% of the market average or 10% below the average.

Assumptions/Definitions

General assumptions are used to determine the competitiveness of the pay plan. The closer to market the ranges are, the less difficulty is usually experienced in attracting and retaining qualified employees. Since the data from the comparators reflect a snapshot in time, broad assumptions allow for the potential volatility of the market as well situations where fewer market matches exist. Our analysis used the following assumptions to assess the market competitiveness of each position's range. Recommendations are also based on these definitions of market competitiveness:

- Significantly Lag the Market: <85% CompRatio at the range minimum,
- Lag the Market: > 85% - 95% CompRatio at the range minimum,
- At Market: >95% - 105% CompRatio at the range minimum,
- Lead the Market: > 105% CompRatio at the range minimum.

Results:

Market Competitiveness: The positions within the CVPDC are generally above the market with an overall average of 107% of market and a range of 92% - 126%. The Service Authority has the most positions and is less competitive with an overall average of 92% of market but a variance of 70% - 115%. The Workforce Development, with the fewest positions is on average 88% of market, ranging from 74% to 94%.

Market Matches: The number of matches for a particular job indicates data validity, as the higher number of matches, the higher the validity or reliability of the data. Due to the number of market sources and response rate, the PDC positions had the most matches with 10 responses for most jobs. The Workforce Development jobs were next highest with 5 market sources and 4 responses. The number of matches varied the most in the Service Authority, ranging from one to four. The Environmental Technician and Mechanic III were only matched by VDOT, resulting in insufficient data. While the majority of the Service Authority comparators are small entities with fewer different jobs, VDOT is the largest organization surveyed and as might be expected, has multiple levels of jobs and more complexity. However, these positions can be considered based on internal equity to the jobs where there is sufficient data.

The current pay plan, i.e., the grades and ranges, fits most jobs and will accommodate potential position reassignments to more competitive ranges. Therefore, a new pay plan is not needed.

Based on market responses, the following table includes all positions and the resulting comparison to range averages at the minimum, midpoint and maximum. The Market positioning was determined by the CompRatio at the minimum of the range. The range minimum is seen as the most important anchor to the market because the minimum is the point of staff attraction and recruitment. While the full range can influence retention, the progression through the range is usually more of an internal process based on resources. A pay plan of grades and ranges that is not dependent on years of service, such as your current plan, that can accommodate longer term employment growth will typically provide the right balance. **Attachment 1** includes the market averages and other defining information.

Market Comparison	Position	CompRatios		
		Min	Mid	Max
Significantly Lag Market				
	Environmental Compliance & Safety Manager	79%	69%	64%
	Mechanic	70%	87%	62%
	Solid Waste Business Manager	82%	77%	74%
	Workforce Administrative Technician	74%	83%	86%
Lag Market	Planning and Development Director	92%	108%	113%
	Environmental Technician	88%	65%	56%
	Mechanic III	88%	65%	56%
	Finance Associate	92%	86%	82%
	Scale Operator	94%	95%	96%
	Landfill Maintenance Worker	90%	83%	79%
	Director of Workforce Development	90%	97%	102%
	Workforce Development Operations Coordinator	94%	104%	111%
	Business Engagement and Outreach Coordinator	93%	102%	108%
At Market	Deputy Director of Finance	101%	120%	128%
	Sr. Planner of Transportation & GIS	100%	113%	121%
	Planner I	102%	118%	130%
Above Market	Financial Services Professional	126%	137%	144%
	Special Projects Manager	119%	102%	106%
	Office Manager	109%	102%	106%
	Solid Waste Operations Manager	115%	120%	123%
	Working Field Supervisor	107%	105%	104%
	Landfill Equipment Operator	108%	101%	96%

Considerations for Action:**Option 1:** Do Nothing.

- Impact:
 - Maintains status quo, 13 positions continue to lag the market, may impact recruitment and retention of qualified employees.

Option 2: Apply market adjustments, through grade reassignment, to the jobs that significantly lag the market average throughout the range. Adjust the following jobs to at least 85% of market average:

Position	Current Grade	Current CompRatios			Proposed Grade	Proposed CompRatios		
Environmental Compliance & Safety Mgr	111	79%	69%	64%	113	92%	80%	74%
Mechanic	102	70%	87%	62%	106	85%	105%	75%
Solid Waste Business Mgr	110	82%	77%	74%	111	87%	83%	80%
Workforce Administrative Technician	101	74%	83%	86%	104	85%	96%	100%

- Impact:
 - Least change, lowest potential cost, may result in increases to bring employees to at least the minimum of the new range, does not substantially change internal relationships, 9 positions continue to lag market.

Option 3: Apply market adjustments, through grade reassignment, to the jobs that lag the market throughout the range. Adjust the following jobs to at least 95% of market average:

Position	Current Grade	Current CompRatios			Proposed Grade	Proposed CompRatios		
Director of Workforce Development	116	90%	97%	102%	117	98%	106%	112%
Environmental Compliance & Safety Manager	111	79%	69%	64%	114	100%	88%	81%
Workforce Development Operations Coordinator	111	94%	104%	111%	112	101%	111%	119%
Business Engagement and Outreach Coordinator	111	93%	102%	108%	112	100%	109%	116%
Solid Waste Business Manager	110	82%	77%	74%	113	102%	96%	93%
Planning and Development Director	114	92%	108%	113%	115	101%	118%	123%

Environmental Technician	109	88%	65%	56%	111	100%	75%	64%
Mechanic III	109	88%	65%	56%	111	100%	75%	64%
Finance Associate	106	92%	86%	82%	107	97%	90%	87%
Scale Operator	102	94%	95%	96%	103	98%	100%	100%
Mechanic	102	70%	87%	62%	109	101%	124% %	89%
Landfill Maintenance Worker	101	90%	83%	79%	103	99%	91%	87%
Workforce Administrative Technician	101	74%	83%	86%	107	99%	111%	116%

- Impact:
 - Most market competitive, may be most costly, may result in increases to bring all employees to at least minimum of the new range, all ranges at market. Does not substantially disrupt the current relationships of one job to another. It does bring comparable jobs to the same pay grade such as WF Admin Tech, Office Manager and Financial Associate.

Conclusions:

The study gathered sufficient data to establish valid market comparisons. Data from 19 comparable organizations provided the basis for comparison. CompRatios range from a low of 70% to a high of 126% indicating a very wide variance in the market competitiveness of the positions within the organization. Positions with pay ranges that lag the market average tend to have trouble attracting qualified applicants and higher turnover among employees. We recommend action to increase the competitiveness of the ranges that currently lag the market.

Again, it has been our pleasure to assist you. You and your staff have been excellent to work with and have provided the needed clarity and support to ensure an effective study. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions or additional services.

Sincerely,

Karen Edmonds

Margaret M. Schmitt

Karen Edmonds, Berkley Group, Executive Manager

Margaret M. Schmitt, Berkley Group, Executive Manager

Attachment

Attachment 1

Position	Grade	Area	Current CVPDC Min	Current CVPDC Mid	Current CVPDC Max	Market Average Min	Market Average Mid	Market Average Max	Current CompRatio Min	Current CompRatio Mid	Current CompRatio Max
Financial Services Professional	111	PDC	44,863	57,200	69,537	35,496	41,639	48,276	126%	137%	144%
Special Projects Manager	109	PDC	39,185	49,961	60,737	40,303	48,929	57,425	119%	102%	106%
Office Manager	107	PDC	34,878	44,469	54,060	31,994	43,734	51,100	109%	102%	106%
Planner I	109	PDC	39,185	49,961	60,737	38,524	42,225	46,631	102%	118%	130%
Deputy Director of Finance	115	PDC	62,165	79,261	96,357	61,426	66,142	75,553	101%	120%	128%
Sr Planner of Transportation & GIS	112	PDC	48,003	61,204	74,405	46,557	54,397	61,436	100%	113%	121%
Planning and Development Director	114	PDC	57,033	72,717	88,400	61,855	67,450	78,367	92%	108%	113%
Average									107%		
Solid Waste Operations Manager	115	SA	62,165	79,261	96,357	53,943	66,297	78,651	115%	120%	123%
Landfill Equipment Operator	106	SA	33,217	42,351	51,486	30,782	42,108	53,433	108%	101%	96%
Working Field Supervisor	112	SA	48,003	61,204	74,405	45,006	58,283	71,560	107%	105%	104%
Scale Operator	102	SA	27,327	34,842	42,358	29,202	36,742	44,282	94%	95%	96%
Finance Associate	106	SA	33,217	42,351	51,486	36,103	49,262	62,422	92%	86%	82%
Landfill Maintenance Worker	101	SA	26,026	33,183	40,341	29,074	40,126	51,178	90%	83%	79%
Environmental Technician	109	SA	39,185	49,961	60,737	44,770	76,349	107,927	88%	65%	56%
Mechanic III	109	SA	39,185	49,961	60,737	44,770	76,349	107,927	88%	65%	56%
Solid Waste Business Manager	110	SA	41,928	53,458	64,988	51,335	69,291	87,248	82%	77%	74%
Environmental Compliance & Safety Mgr	111	SA	44,863	57,200	69,537	57,003	83,004	109,006	79%	69%	64%
Mechanic	102	SA	27,327	34,842	42,358	38,920	40,267	68,458	70%	87%	62%
Average									92%		
Workforce Development Operations Coord	111	WF	44,863	57,200	69,537	47,500	55,000	62,500	94%	104%	111%
Business Engagement and Outreach Coord	111	WF	44,863	57,200	69,537	48,000	56,125	64,250	93%	102%	108%
Director of Workforce Development	116	WF	65,203	86,394	107,586	72,500	88,750	105,000	90%	97%	102%
Workforce Administrative Technician	101	WF	26,026	33,183	40,341	35,400	40,000	46,667	74%	83%	86%
Average									88%		