

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

419



FROM: Human Resources Dept.

SUBMITTAL DATE:
December 4, 2003

SUBJECT: Recommendations concerning the Inspection and Technical Occupational Group Study as outlined in Resolution 440-8471.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board approve the recommendations contained in Resolution 440-8471 and Attachment "D". Attachments "A", "B" and "C" are included for informational purposes.

BACKGROUND: The County Human Resources Department is continuing to pursue a proactive review process whereby every job classification in the County is studied on a five-year cycle. Studies for the Courts, Law Library, Information Technology, Management, Health & Allied, Community and Human Services and Custodial, Maintenance and Trades have been completed over the past four years. Recommendations included in this document are based on the completed Classification and Compensation Study of the Inspection and Technical classifications.

Departmental Concurrence

Ron Komers
Asst. County Executive Officer/HR Director

FINANCIAL DATA	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ 249,109	In Current Year Budget:	Yes
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ 72,719	Budget Adjustment:	No
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$ 145,437	For Fiscal Year:	2004

SOURCE OF FUNDS: Departmental Budgets	Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

County Executive Office Signature

- Dep't Recomm.: Consent Policy
- Per Exec. Ofc.: Consent Policy

Prev. Agn. Ref.:

District:

ALL

Agenda Number:

3.13

OCCUPATIONAL GROUP STUDY OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of the Inspection and Technical Occupational Group Study were to: 1) evaluate every position and make sure that class specifications accurately and clearly describe the job and contain reasonable recruiting and job qualifying guidelines to be used as a framework for hiring, training, promoting and evaluating job performance; 2) compare the Inspection and Technical job classifications to the Southern California five-county labor market to ensure external pay equity; 3) review and evaluate these classifications within the County to insure internal pay equity; 4) insure incumbents are properly classified based upon an analysis of duties performed; 5) consolidate, create and/or eliminate job classifications where appropriate and 6) insure that the FLSA status is correct for all incumbents in the study.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

This study included 382 employees in 104 job classifications providing inspection and technical services throughout Riverside County. These classifications were in 17 different departments including: Agricultural Commission, Animal Control, Assessor/Clerk Recorder, Community Action Commission, Community Health Agency, Department of Public Social Services, Facilities Management, Fire, Purchasing/Fleet, Registrar of Voters, Riverside County Regional Medical Center, Sheriff, Transportation & Land Management Agency (TLMA), Building & Safety, Planning, Transportation and Waste Management Departments.

Position Description Questionnaires (PDQs) were sent to all 382 incumbents to assist the study team in understanding specific job responsibilities for each position. Human Resources Analysts met with management and supervision responsible for these classifications and performed 83 on-site job audits of positions where there was a possible classification issue. Management responsible for positions in the study were asked to complete a Workforce Planning Questionnaire developed as a tool to determine the skills and competencies that were vital to the accomplishment of the department's mission, goals and objectives.

As with other occupational studies, the study team applied the strategy of selecting representative job classifications in Riverside County to compare level of compensation to similar jobs in other jurisdictions. Fourteen classifications were selected to model all inspection and technical job classes with each department having representative classifications in the salary survey. All other Inspection and Technical classifications were benchmarked to one of the 14 classes surveyed. The standard five Southern California counties, San Bernardino, San Diego, Ventura, Orange and Los Angeles were surveyed for our benchmark data.

FINDINGS

Several actions have already been implemented as a result of this occupational group study. Two major class series consolidations have been accomplished: The Computer Mapping Technician and Cadastral Drafting class series were consolidated into the Geographic Information Systems Specialist (GIS) class series; and Records Management, Photo/Computer Imagery and Micrographics Technician class series have been consolidated into the new Archives & Records Technician series.

Based on the completed PDQs and on-site job audits, the vast majority of incumbents were found to be working within their defined class specification. However, ten incumbents in five classifications were found to be performing work outside the scope of their job classification. Employees found working out of class have either been reassigned more appropriate duties, had their positions reclassified into the proper existing job classification, or new classifications were created in order to recognize the unique work of their positions. Additionally, as a result of this study, there were eight classifications with FLSA/Exempt status changes, 46 classifications inactivated (see Attachment "C") and 88 job specifications updated.

On average, the 14 representative job classifications surveyed were compensated 11.3% below the salary median of the Southern California labor market. However, when benefits and the 3% at 60 retirement plan are considered in the "Total Compensation" comparison, the 14 representative classifications are only 7.6% behind the labor market. Eleven surveyed classifications were found to be behind market pay rates and three were found to be at or ahead of the market pay rates. Riverside County has two increases scheduled during 2004; a 4% general increase on March 18, 2004 and a 2.7% step increase on September 30, 2004, totaling 6.7% for the year. Other Southern California counties have reported average scheduled increases of 2.3% from mid-2003 through 2004. It is our recommendation that this 4.4% difference ($6.7\% - 2.3\% = 4.4\%$) be taken into consideration when computing parity adjustments resulting from this study.

The recommendations made in this study are primarily Parity Adjustments. To provide consistency in applying parity adjustments in this study, a two-step process has been applied in each case. In cases where a classification was found to be behind the surveyed market rate, 4.4% has been subtracted from the percent behind market and then that amount divided by two (to be consistent with the parity adjustment strategy developed for previous occupational group studies). If the result is 2% or more, a parity adjustment is recommended for that class or class series (e.g. 12.6% behind market - 4.4% = 8.2% X .5 = 4.1% parity adjustment).

STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

Agricultural Inspector Series: It is recommended that this class series be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 3.2%. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Agricultural Inspector – from salary plan/grade UPE 172 L10 (\$20,637 – 26,131) to UPE 193 L10 (\$21,294 – 26,980). There are nine incumbents.
2. Senior Agricultural Inspector – from salary plan/grade UPE 202 L10 (\$21,740 – 27,553) to UPE 220 L10 (\$22,440 – 28,444). There is one incumbent.

Agricultural & Standards Investigator (ASI) Series: It is recommended that this class series be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 2.6%. Additionally, it is recommended that a 6.0% difference be established between Supervising Agricultural Standards Investigator I and II in order to create an added incentive for those holding the Supervising ASI I level to obtain the additional licenses necessary to qualify for the fully functional Supervising ASI II level. Currently the salary difference is 3.1% between these two levels of supervision. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Agricultural & Standards Investigator I – from salary plan/grade SEU 187 L10 (\$27,846 – 35,293) to SEU 202 L10 (\$28,589 – 36,227). There are no incumbents.
2. Agricultural & Standards Investigator II – from salary plan/grade SEU 247 L10 (\$30,923 – 39,239) to SEU 262 L10 (\$31,771 – 40,279). There are three incumbents.
3. Agricultural & Standards Investigator III – from salary plan/grade SEU 301 L10 (\$34,360 – 43,610) to SEU 316 L10 (\$35,293 – 44,777). There are three incumbents.
4. Agricultural & Standards Investigator IV – from salary plan/grade SEU 373 L10 (\$38,200 – 48,447) to SEU 391 L10 (\$39,239 – 49,784). There are 17 incumbents.
5. Supervising Agricultural & Standards Investigator I – from salary plan/grade SEU 424 L10 (\$41,149 – 52,202) to SEU 451 L10 (\$42,252 – 53,581). There are two incumbents.
6. Supervising Agricultural & Standards Investigator II – from salary plan/grade SEU 457 L10 (\$42,464 – 53,878) to SEU 496 L10 (\$44,777 – 56,827). There are two incumbents.

Weights & Measure Inspector Series: Because this series is benchmarked to the Agricultural & Standards Investigator series, the same 2.6% parity adjustment is appropriate for this series. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Weights & Measure Inspector Trainee – from salary plan/grade UPE 310 L10 (\$25,877 – 32,793) to UPE 322 L10 (\$26,407 – 33,515). There are no incumbents.
2. Weights & Measure Inspector I – from salary plan/grade UPE 349 L10 (\$27,701 – 35,127) to UPE 364 L10 (\$28,444 – 36,082). There are no incumbents.
3. Weights & Measure Inspector II – from salary plan/grade UPE 406 L10 (\$30,120 – 38,224) to UPE 424 L10 (\$30,947 – 39,264). There is one incumbent.
4. Senior Weights & Measure Inspector – from salary plan/grade UPE 454 L10 (\$32,624 – 41,407) to UPE 472 L10 (\$33,515 – 42,510). There are no incumbents.

Animal Control Officer: It is recommended that this class series be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 8.1%. The Animal License Inspector class is benchmarked to the Animal Control Officer and is recommended to receive the same parity salary adjustment. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Animal License Inspector – from salary plan/grade UPE 190 L10 (\$21,167 – 26,832) to UPE 232 L10 (\$22,928 – 29,038). There are five incumbents.
2. Animal Control Officer Trainee – from salary plan/grade UPE 220 L10 (\$22,440 – 28,444) to UPE 265 L10 (\$24,286 – 30,778). There are two incumbents.
3. Animal Control Officer – from salary plan/grade UPE 277 L10 (\$24,816 – 31,435) to UPE 331 L10 (\$26,832 – 34,024). There are 26 incumbents.
4. Senior Animal Control Officer – from salary plan/grade UPE 346 L10 (\$27,553 – 34,936) to UPE 397 L10 (\$29,823 – 37,843). There are six incumbents.
5. Supervising Animal Control Officer – from salary plan/grade SEU 250 L10 (\$31,092 – 39,430) to SEU 290 L10 (\$33,622 – 42,640). There are two incumbents.

Kennel Attendant: It is recommended that this class be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 3.7% based on the parity study, from salary plan/grade UPE 190 L10 (\$21,167 – 26,832) to UPE 208 L10 (\$21,973 – 27,829). There are 17 incumbents in this class.

Veterinary Assistant-Spay & Neuter: It is recommended that this class be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 7.7%, from salary plan/grade UPE 310 L10 (\$25,877 – 32,793) to UPE 355 L10 (\$27,829 – 35,318). There are three incumbents in this class.

Building Inspector Series: It is recommended that this class series be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 5.4%. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Building Inspector Intern – from salary plan/grade UPE 211 L10 (\$22,079 – 27,977) to UPE 241 L10 (\$23,267 – 29,505). There are no incumbents.
2. Building Inspector I – from salary plan/grade UPE 433 L10 (\$31,605 – 40,113) to UPE 469 L10 (\$33,302 – 42,298). There are no incumbents.
3. Building Inspector II – from salary plan/grade UPE 520 L10 (\$37,227 – 47,263) to UPE 540 L10 (\$39,238 – 49,837). There are 36 incumbents.
4. Building Inspector III – C – from salary plan/grade MCO 265 L11 (\$41,835 – 54,430) to MCO 278 L10 (\$45,269 – 57,369). There are no incumbents.
5. Senior Building Inspector – from salary plan/grade UPE 565 L10 (\$41,831 – 53,118) to UPE 583 L10 (\$44,101 – 56,004). There are 20 incumbents.

Principal Building Inspector: It is recommended to add this class to the Class & Salary Listing at salary plan/grade SEU 574 L10 (\$49,253– 62,513). Incumbents in this advanced level class provide an expert level of knowledge and experience of building codes and ordinances and serve as specialists in functional areas of building inspection. Incumbents typically report to a Deputy Director and are responsible for the technical implementation of specific areas of codes and ordinances governing construction; conduct and arrange for the training of staff; scrutinize the division practices and work for quality and consistency; and review complaints of errors in the interpretation of the regulations and/or the law or the conduct of staff. There are three employees in positions currently classified as Building Inspection Supervisor that will be reclassified into this new class. The job specification is in Attachment “D”.

Code Enforcement Officer Series: It is recommended that this class series be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 5.4%. The Code Enforcement Officer series will have the same grade levels as the Building Inspector series to maintain this internal parity relationship. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Code Enforcement Technician – from salary plan/grade UPE 325 L10 (\$26,556 – 33,684) to UPE 357 L10 (\$27,991 – 35,526). There are five incumbents.
2. Code Enforcement Officer I – from salary plan/grade UPE 433 L10 (\$31,605 – 40,113) to UPE 469 L10 (\$33,302 – 42,298). There is one incumbent.
3. Code Enforcement Officer II – from salary plan/grade UPE 520 L10 (\$37,227 – 47,263) to UPE 540 L10 (\$39,238 – 49,837). There are 24 incumbents.
4. Senior Code Enforcement Officer – from salary plan/grade UPE 565 L10 (\$41,831 – 53,118) to UPE 583 L10 (\$44,101 – 56,004). There are three incumbents.

Principal Code Enforcement Officer: It is recommended to add this class to the Class & Salary Listing at salary plan/grade SEU 574 L10 (\$49,253– 62,513). Incumbents in this advanced level class are responsible for performing various administrative functions such as interpreting legislative and code enforcement administrative mandates and regulations; recommending the appropriate policies and procedures for implementation or change of current practices; monitoring the division expenses and budget; conducting and arranging for the training of staff; scrutinizing the division practices and work for quality and consistency; and reviewing complaints of errors in the interpretation of the regulations and/or the law or the conduct of staff. There are two employees currently classified as Supervising Code Enforcement Officer that will be reclassified into this new class. The job specification is in Attachment “D”.

Supervising Building Inspector & Supervising Code Enforcement Officer: It is recommended that these classes be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 8.3%, from salary plan/grade SEU 529 L10 (\$46,707 – 59,267) to SEU 592 L10 (\$50,569 – 64,189). This proposed parity adjustment is intended to create appropriate salary relationships with subordinate classifications and the newly created Principal Building Inspector and Principal Code Enforcement Officer classifications. There are six incumbents in the class of Building Inspection Supervisor and four incumbents in the Supervising Code Enforcement Officer class.

GIS Analyst Series: It is recommended that this class series be adjusted by approximately 11% in order to remove the Difficult to Recruit designation. There will be no cost to implement these changes as employees are already receiving the Difficult to Recruit premium pay. This is an adjustment in salary range only and is not intended to cause any parity increase for incumbents. Additionally, the Inspection and Technical Occupational Group Study review process revealed that Riverside County has an unusually sophisticated cutting-edge mapping and GIS operation, more sophisticated than that in place in our surrounding counties. When compared to the GIS Specialist I and II levels, the work performed by incumbents in the GIS Analyst and GIS Senior Analyst classifications are much more analytical and they exercise independent judgment over a wide range of assignments. Therefore, it is recommended the two “Analyst” classes be revised to FLSA Exempt status and be reassigned from the Technical Unit (LIUNA) to the Professional Unit (SEIU). Since this action is converting the Difficult to Recruit salary range

to a standard SEIU salary range, there will be no cost or change in salary for incumbents as part of this recommendation. These recommendations are supported by TLMA management. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. GIS Analyst – from salary plan/grade UPE 511 L12 (\$36,442 – 48,811) to SEU 460 L10 (\$42,676 – 54,175). There are four incumbents.
2. GIS Senior Analyst – from salary plan/grade UPE 559 L10 (\$41,407 – 52,567) to SEU 593 L10 (\$46,078 – 58,490). There are five incumbents.
3. GIS Supervising Analyst – from salary plan/grade SEU 568 L10 (\$48,977 – 62,195) to SEU 634 L10 (\$54,472 – 69,154). There is one incumbent.

Customer Support Representative Classification Series:

It is recommended that classifications in this series be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 3.7%. The Purchasing & Fleet Services Department supports these actions and recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Customer Support Representative I – from salary plan/grade UPE 148 L10 (\$19,491 – 24,668) to UPE 161 L10 (\$20,174 – 25,580). There are 15 incumbents.
2. Customer Support Representative II - from salary plan/grade UPE 205 (\$21,867 – 27,701) to UPE 226 (\$22,694 – 28,741). There are four incumbents.
3. Customer Support Representative III - from salary plan/grade UPE 250 L10 (\$23,649 – 29,972) to UPE 271 L10 (\$24,540 – 31,096). There are three incumbents.
4. Lead Customer Support Representative - from salary plan/grade UPE 292 L10 (\$25,198 – 31,945) to UPE 316 (\$26,131 – 33,133). There is one incumbent.
5. Supervising Customer Support Representative – from salary plan/grade SEU 193 L10 (\$28,143 – 35,654) to SEU 214 (\$29,204 – 37,012). There are two incumbents.

Fleet Services Assistant Series:

It is recommended that these classifications be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 3.2%. There is one incumbent in each of these two classifications and Purchasing & Fleet Services Department supports these actions. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Fleet Services Assistant - from salary plan/grade UPE 208 (\$21,973 – 27,829) to UPE 226 (\$22,694 – 28,741). There is one incumbent.
2. Senior Fleet Services Assistant – from salary plan/grade SEU 169 L10 (\$26,976 – 34,190) to SEU 187 L10 (\$27,846 – 35,293). There is one incumbent.

Graphics Arts Illustrator: It is recommended that this class be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 4.9%, from salary plan/grade UPE 376 L10 (\$28,890 – 36,633) to UPE 409 L10 (\$30,311 – 38,437). There are five incumbents in this classification in the Sheriff, DPSS and Purchasing departments. All departments support these recommendations.

Media Production Specialist Series: It is recommended that this class series be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 14.1%. Positions in this series are in the Sheriff, Fire and Community Health departments. Each department supports these recommendations. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Media Production Specialist – from salary plan/grade SEU 247 L10 (\$30,923 – 39,239) to SEU 316 L10 (\$35,293 – 44,777). There are two incumbents.
2. Senior Media Production Specialist – from salary plan/grade SEU 301 L10 (\$34,360 – 43,610) to SEU 391 L10 (\$39,239 – 49,784). There is one incumbent.
3. Media/Communications Coordinator – from salary plan/grade SEU 457 L10 (\$42,464 – 53,878) to SEU 559 L10 (\$48,447 – 61,516). There is one incumbent.

Medical Electronics Technician series: It is recommended that this class series be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 4.4% based on the parity study. RCRMC management supports these recommendations. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Medical Electronics Technician – from salary plan/grade UPE 493 L10 (\$37,418 – 45,057) to UPE 517 L10 (\$39,052 – 47,008). There are five incumbents in this class.
2. Senior Medical Electronics Technician – from salary plan/grade UPE 541 L10 (\$41,619 – 50,105) to UPE 556 L10 (\$43,422 – 52,291). There is one incumbent in this class.

Hazardous Waste Inspector Series: It is recommended that this class series be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 3.5% for the WRMD class series and 8.6% for the County class series. There are incumbents in each series paid different salaries for performing the same work. The recommended action will bring the two parallel series into salary conformity with each other. This series is responsible for controlling illegal hazardous waste disposal at County landfills. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Hazardous Waste Inspector I – from salary plan/grade UPE 286 L10 (\$24,965 – 31,648) to UPE 337 L10 (\$27,129 - 34,384). There is one incumbent.
2. Hazardous Waste Inspector II – from salary plan/grade UPE 352 L10 (\$27,744 – 35,191) to UPE 406 L10 (\$30,120 - 38,225). There is one incumbent.
3. Senior Hazardous Waste Inspector – from salary plan/grade UPE 421 L10 (\$30,820 – 39,116) to UPE 472 L10 (\$33,515 - 42,510). There are no incumbents.
4. Hazardous Waste Inspector I-WRMD – from salary plan/grade WMP 106 L10 (\$26,425 – 33,235) to WMP 110 L10 (\$27,094 - 34,384). There are no incumbents.
5. Hazardous Waste Inspector II-WRMD – from salary plan/grade WMP 112 L10 (\$29,268 – 36,863) to WMP 113 L10 (\$30,112 - 38,225). There are no incumbents.
6. Senior Hazardous Waste Inspector-WRMD – from salary plan/grade WMP 118 L10 (\$32,408 – 40,852) to WMP 126 L10 (\$33,480 - 42,510). There is one incumbent.

Supervising Hazardous Waste Inspector: It is recommended that this class be granted a parity adjustment of approximately 7.3%. It is intended that this class be at the same grade as the Landfill Supervisor-WRMD. Recommended adjustments to salary plan and grades are as follows:

1. Supervising Hazardous Waste Inspector – from salary plan/grade SEU 353 L11 (\$37,202 – 48,462) to SEU 422 L10 (\$39,909 - 52,000). There are no incumbents.
2. Supervising Hazardous Waste Inspector-WRMD – from salary plan/grade WMM 114 L11 (\$37,313 – 48,500) to WMM 119 L11 (\$41,053 - 52,000). There is one incumbent.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Inspection and Technical parity study analysis, as noted earlier, found most classifications to be paid below market rates. Salary ranges for 54 job classifications are recommended for adjustment upward. There are 244 incumbents in these classifications. However, 50 other job classifications (including 138 employees) are not recommended for a salary adjustment.

The total cost of implementing these recommendations will be \$498,217 annually, which represents a 3.9% increase overall. None of the recommended increases causes compaction that requires any additional action outside this proposal and the Difficult-to-Recruit designation has been removed from six classifications in this study. Although proposed salary increases may cause some hardships for some departments, Department Heads concur with these recommendations and indicate they have sufficient funds for implementation.

The annual cost for SEIU represented employee adjustments is \$129,086; \$366,378 for LIUNA represented employees and \$2,753 for WASTE Management employees. The County, by contractual agreement with SEIU and LIUNA, must spend the established Parity Pool amount. LIUNA has a remaining parity pool budget of \$597,000 and WASTE has a remaining budget of \$18,000. Costs for these units will be charged to the year LIUNA 2000 – 2006 Memorandum of Understanding parity pools. SEIU has utilized its budget for this contract period. Therefore, by agreement, costs related to SEIU represented classifications will be charged against their next contract period. Net Annual County Cost for these recommendations will be \$145,437 (\$72,719 for the remainder of 2004 fiscal year). Bargaining Unit and Departmental Cost Reports are shown in Attachment “B”. These reports show how much of the cost is Net County Cost as well.