

To: Claudia Hazelhurst, HR Director  
From: Shelley Caskey, HR Analyst   
Re: Transportation Support Technician  
Date: August 29, 2012

**Background:**

As part of the 2013 Budget Process, the Public Works and Planning Director submitted an audit request for the Transportation Support Technician position.

In the request, it states that the position has changed over the past few years from an administrative assistant position entering data into GBA to a position that is responsible for extracting data from multiple sources to provide reports and maps for operational and business needs in addition to providing technical support to field crews.

The position in question was reviewed during the Classification and Compensation study initiated by the City in 2008. The consultant hired to conduct the study reviewed all JAQs and provided the City with a list of recommended classifications. The incumbent completed a JAQ in October of 2008 and based on the consultant's recommendation was placed in the Administrative Support job family merged with the Administrative Assistant level of work.

The classification recommendations were reviewed by Human Resources in order to ensure accuracy and consistency with goals outlined as part of the study. In the case of this position, Human Resources disagreed with the recommendation and removed the position from Administrative Support and placed it internally within the Engineering Support job family. An updated job description was created 2/1/2011 and the position was aligned 20% below Engineering Technician (as it was prior to the Classification and Compensation study).

**Changes in Job Duties and Internal Alignment:**

Presently, the Transportation Support Technician is aligned 20% below Engineering Technician. Should the City be able to implement internal alignment and market data for 2013, the position would receive an increase.

In reviewing the duties of the position, a comparison of the audit request to the current job description was done. According to the information received, the position is responsible for building customized forms for ease of data entry by field crews; upgrading, re-installing, and purchasing software applications as well as making initial assessments of hardware issues for field laptops, GPS units, and traffic counters. These duties in addition to those listed above in the background section appear to be covered within the job description dated 2/1/2011. The position is defined as being responsible for a wide variety of technical duties and responsibilities in support of the Transportation Engineering Division; collect and download data from various sources; convert data to usable formats, create technical and statistical reports; perform technical tasks including installing, upgrading, testing, repairing, servicing, and customizing computer

hardware, peripherals, laptops, etc.; and provide technical support and training to field crews and other employees.

Based on this comparison, it appears that the job description is still accurate and there have not been any job duty changes since the creation of the description in 2011.

Currently, the Transportation Support Technician is aligned in the Engineering Technician benchmark, 20% below Engineering Technician. The positions in this benchmark provide technical support to professional positions in planning and engineering. Compared with the IT Support Specialist, this position has a narrower, more specialized scope of responsibility. It works primarily with the LUCITY database software and supports a limited number of systems users. The IT Support Specialist positions have a city-wide scope and require a broader knowledge of applications, programs, software and networks. The IT Department is ultimately responsible for the PCs, peripherals, laptops, applications and networks within the traffic and engineering division. While the duties of the position have expanded to include more functions in oversight of the system software, hardware and electronic devices used by the traffic and engineering division, they are not the same level as IT Support Specialist. In fact, there appears to be some potential for overlap into areas which belong centralized under the IT division.

The Engineering Support benchmark is still appropriate for this job because of its role in providing support to the division's supervisor and manager. The current internal alignment at 20% below Engineering Technician was based on the level of public contact and broader scope of responsibilities of the other positions in the benchmark. It appears that the primary function of this position is to streamline the utilization of data and produce reports and maps for operational and business needs. In looking across the organization, there is not another position providing this level of support nor is there market data to assist with internal alignment. GIS Technicians are responsible for entering data, extracting information, and creating reports and maps for operational and business needs; however, it too has a broader scope and provides services to a larger group of users including the public. Therefore, the Transportation Support Technician should remain aligned below this position. The GIS Technician position is currently paid equivalent to the Engineering Technician position.

### **Recommendations:**

Because this position is unique, its alignment within the pay plan can only be based on internal worth of the position compared with others in the organization. Based on the support the position is providing, the current alignment within the Engineering Support job family is appropriate. It appears that the current internal alignment of 20% below Engineering Technician is applicable as the changes in job duties from Administrative Support to Technician have been addressed through the creation of a unique one incumbent technical position and alignment within a technical job family. The position was originally aligned within the benchmark based on the level of public contact and broader scope of responsibilities of the other positions within the benchmark. It does not appear that those items have changed. Therefore, no change in current alignment is recommended.

As noted earlier, this position will receive an increase should the City be able to implement internal alignment and market adjustments in 2013.

To: Claudia Hazelhurst, HR Director

From: Laura Conant, HR Supervisor

Re: Internal Alignment of the Environmental Laboratory Manager

Date: August 29, 2012

**Background:**

The Utility and Street Systems Director has requested a review of the internal alignment of the Environmental Laboratory Manager as part of the 2013 new position and reclassification discussion. He asks for explanation as to why the position is internally aligned below other managers that report directly to him.

**Market Data and Internal Alignment:**

A comparison of both the Environmental Laboratory Manager and the Facilities Manager to the other managers reporting to the Director shows that two positions are not managers in the way we have defined “manager” for our classification structure. A manager is a second line supervisor that supervises other supervisory staff. The title of manager is used for these two positions as exceptions based on a request from the Director. The level of supervisory responsibility and scope of management oversight are stronger considerations for compensation than the fact that a position reports to a department head. Neither of these positions manage other supervisors. In comparison, the Streets and Solid Waste Manager supervises 3 supervisors, Water Services 3, and the Wastewater Services 3.

We used market data in determining the internal alignment of the Environmental Laboratory Manager. Market data shows that our position is currently paid 7% above market. This has been the trend for many years but our higher level pay is justified by the expanded level of knowledge required for two labs compared with market matches responsible for only one lab.

Currently, the Environmental Laboratory Manager is aligned in the Public Works and Utilities Management benchmark at a rate that is 5% below the Streets and Solid Waste Manager. Once we implement internal alignment the position will be 10% below Streets and Solid Waste Manager which is a level 8.5% above market. It will be 10% above the Facilities Manager.

**Recommendations:**

Internal alignments are selected based on both available market data and looking at the differences between responsibilities of other positions in the benchmark. An above market position can be defended in this case. The change from a 5% to a 10% differential is reflective of higher rates being paid for Streets Managers. I recommend keeping the internal alignment (once implemented) at 10% below the benchmark based on market data and difference in management responsibility.