## 2022 Annual Report

## Citizens' Compensation Advisory Committee (CCAC)



## Purpose \& Introduction

The Citizens' Compensation Advisory Committee (CCAC) was formed with the purpose of "...evaluating the total compensation levels of the city's elected officials, executives and employees and making recommendations to the human resources department, mayor and the city council..." (City Code Title 2, Chapter 2.35.050).

Each year the committee is responsible for preparing and submitting a written report to the mayor and city council containing, among other things, recommendations on the "appropriate competitive position for the city relative to the compensation practices of comparable employers," "wages and benefits of the city's elected officials, executives and employees" and "general recommendations regarding the mix of compensation for the city's employees, e.g., base salary, benefits, incentives" (City Code Title 2, Chapter 2.35.050.A.6)

To provide city officials with the most valuable and relevant information, this year's report is more streamlined to include a primary focus on the direct impact of current economic conditions on salary budgets and overview of the city's latest local area market pay analysis.

Finally, a grouping of informational appendices intended to provide city leaders with insight to key measures and indicators impacting the city's workforce are also incorporated at the end of this year's report.

Respectfully,

Citizens' Compensation Advisory Committee<br>Ray Schelble, Chair<br>Mike Terry, Vice-chair<br>Jana Bake<br>Brandon Dew<br>Jeff Herring<br>Casey Lund<br>Jeff Worthington

## Section One: Impact of the current labor market and inflation on 2022 salary budgets

Historically, this committee has relied upon data obtained from employer salary budget surveys conducted by WorldatWork when formulating recommendations to help city leaders determine the annual salary budget, including amounts for employee pay increases.

Results of WorldatWork's "2021-2022 Salary Budget Survey," which were released in August 2021, reported $3.3 \%$ average and $3.0 \%$ median for 2022 planned salary budget increases. However, given the onset of hyperinflation not seen for decades and the extreme recruitment and retention challenges employers face nationwide, WorldatWork's "Salary Budget Quick Polf" (conducted December 14, 2021 through January 3, 2022) confirmed organizations have re-evaluated the environment and are increasing their previously planned salary budgets to a $4 \%$ average and 5\% median.


Reports of similar indicators were cited by WorldatWork's Brett Christie, as follows-

- Pearl Meyer's "2022 Projected Base Salary Increase Quick Poll" of 339 companies found that 2022 increases to base salaries will surpass 4\% for all employee groups combined. Of the organizations with higher projected increases than was originally expected earlier in 2021, 40\% reported increases greater than 5\%. Approximately half of respondents anticipate 2022 base pay increases to be higher than what was originally expected earlier in the year, with $12 \%$ expecting increases to be significantly higher.
- Gallagher's Labor Market Inflation Indicators for 2021-2022 report notes: "Wage and salary increase models which gradually taper salary growth throughout 2022 from its current $4.6 \%$ rate down to a 12-month $3.0 \%$ rate (equivalent to that experienced in Q1 of 2021) yield an overall average 12-month percent change rate of $3.7 \%$ for 2022. Given these models, we advise 2022 salary budgeting in the 3.5\% to 4.0\% range and structure increases a percentage point below the salary budget increase rate."
- Mercer's research found that the percentage of employers providing increases of 3.5\% or more doubled between its August and November pulse surveys from 13\% to 27\%


## RECOMMENDATION:

Considering the impact of the current labor market conditions and inflation on employer salary budgets in 2022, the Committee recommends leaders increase the City's overall salary budget, including employee base wage and salary adjustments, at a rate equal to at least 4\% average or 5\% median.

## Section Two: Local area market pay comparison



The ability to effectively attract and retain key talent is based first and foremost on management, adaptability, and administration of the city's pay structures and employee base wage and salary rates.

To this end, the committee reviewed market pay data obtained primarily from multiple locally based private or public employers with operations along the Wasatch Front. This approach is due to the fact recruitment and applicant pool data reviewed by the committee overwhelmingly suggest the city draws its talent from the local area.

Results of the market pay analysis conducted this year were presented by the city's human resources staff using the compensation management tool offered by Payfactors to aggregate the latest sources of market pay information available.

To facilitate this review, the city organized its job titles into 99 distinct benchmark groups. The committee reviewed job pricing information obtained for each of the 99 benchmark job titles highlighted in this report. In total, these benchmarks cover 1,247 employees which represents approximately $\mathbf{4 1 \%}$ of the city's regular, full-time workforce. Because market data is not available to price all jobs, it is important to note that if a job title is not shown as a
benchmark title it is instead tied to a benchmark for pricing purposes. For example, Accountant III is designated as the benchmark job for related titles in the same job family, including:

- Accountant I
- Accountant II
- Accountant III (benchmark)
- Accountant IV

If market pay data indicates a particular benchmark job is significantly below market, then all levels of the job should be reviewed for potential pay adjustments-not just the benchmark job. This way the pay differences between levels of the same or similar jobs are appropriately maintained.

The results of this year's local market pay analysis are displayed in three separate work groups. This is done not only to account for the differences in each group's unique wage structure and pay practices, but to also gauge the City's success more effectively at positioning itself as a pay leader. These three work groups include:

- AFSCME
- Public Safety (including Firefighters, Police Officers and Public Safety Dispatchers)
- Non-Represented Employees

In addition to the regular local market pay analysis presented for consideration as part of this annual report, the Committee also received results of the special market study conducted by NFP in January 2022 of the City's non-represented group of benchmark jobs. It is the Committee's understanding that_NFP's full report, including their detailed benchmark analyses, conclusions and recommendations, will be transmitted to be considered separate and apart from this report. Among the recommendations cited in their report, however, NFP concluded the City would be better suited to maintain its competitive advantage by adjusting and setting pay scales within $+/-2 \%$ of the market base $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile to be considered competitive amid the highly dynamic market conditions that exist today.

The Committee also agreed that the previous standard of maintaining $+/-5 \%$ as a competitive pay position compared to market is no longer an effective or desirable approach. Instead, the Committee has now adopted the following new guidelines when determining an individual benchmark job's compensation position relative to the market:

- Significantly lagging when data indicates the benchmark job's position relative to market is less than or equal to $90 \%$.
- Slightly lagging when data indicates the benchmark job's position relative to market is between 90.1\% and 98\%.
- Competitive when data indicates the benchmark job's position relative to market is between $98.1 \%$ and 109.9\%.
- Significantly leading when data indicates the benchmark job's position relative to market is greater than or equal to $110 \%$.


## GROUP FINDINGS \& OVERALL SUMMARIES:

Among the AFSCME workgroup, a total of 41 benchmark jobs, covering 338 employees, were evaluated (representing $41 \%$ of the total jobs surveyed). Market median ( $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile) pay rates were compared to the Salt Lake City's wage schedule top rate.


| AFSCME Summary |  | Overall <br> Average <br> Market <br> Position |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Significantly Lagging (Less than or equal to 90\% of market) | 2 | $82 \%$ |
| Slightly Lagging (Between 90.1\% and 98\% of market) | 10 | $92 \%$ |
| Competitive (Between 98.1\% and 109.9\% of market) | 16 | $101 \%$ |
| Significantly Leading (Greater than or equal to 110\% of market) | 13 | $109 \%$ |
| Overall Market Comparison | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 9 . 1 8 \%}$ |

The following list includes all related benchmark jobs sorted by those which are most significantly lagging to most significantly leading.

| AFSCME Breakout |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021 - Job Title (Job Code) | SLC Top Rate (union only) | \# SLC Incumbents | Market Salary <br> (50th Percentile) | Market Comparison (SLC Top Rate vs Market Median |
| AIRFIELD MAINT ELECTRICIAN (002618)* | \$80,080 | 15 | \$97,700 | 82\% |
| LABORATORY CHEMIST UNION (001806) | \$66,498 | 2 | \$75,300 | 88\% |
| BUILDING EQUIP. OP. II (006071) | \$52,458 | 0 | \$57,900 | 91\% |
| ENVIRON SPECIALIST II UNION (000720) | \$73,320 | 1 | \$80,800 | 91\% |
| AIR OPER SPECIALIST AIR UNION (002440)* | \$66,498 | 3 | \$71,900 | 92\% |
| WRF OP II (002134) | \$57,325 | 9 | \$61,800 | 93\% |
| WATER METER TECHNICIAN II (000997) | \$50,835 | 2 | \$54,500 | 93\% |
| PLANS EXAMINER I (002127) | \$69,846 | 3 | \$74,000 | 94\% |
| FLEET MECHANIC (001952) | \$57,325 | 40 | \$60,400 | 95\% |
| CRIME SCENE TECH II UNION (001779) | \$52,354 | 9 | \$55,100 | 95\% |
| WATER METER READER II (006326) | \$42,578 | 0 | \$43,700 | 97\% |
| MAINT. ELECTRICIAN IV (000168) | \$62,754 | 8 | \$64,200 | 98\% |
| PLUMBER II (000854) | \$59,051 | 1 | \$59,900 | 99\% |
| POLICE INTELLIGENCE SPEC.UNION (001539) | \$57,450 | 3 | \$57,700 | 100\% |
| EVIDENCE TECHNICIAN II (002277) | \$50,232 | 5 | \$49,900 | 101\% |
| HVAC TEC. II (006050) | \$60,798 | 9 | \$60,300 | 101\% |
| ASPHALT EQUIP OPERATOR II (000909) | \$52,458 | 32 | \$52,000 | 101\% |
| BUSINESS LICENSING PROCESS II (001964) | \$55,869 | 4 | \$54,400 | 103\% |
| WASTE \& RECYCLING EQUIP OP II (002347) | \$52,458 | 26 | \$50,800 | 103\% |
| CARPENTER II (001349) | \$55,578 | 7 | \$52,700 | 105\% |
| ENGINEERING TECH IV UNION (000829) | \$63,315 | 10 | \$59,600 | 106\% |
| SR UTILITIES REP CUST SVC (000199) | \$50,690 | 6 | \$47,600 | 106\% |
| METAL FABRICATION TECHNICIAN (001925) | \$62,754 | 5 | \$58,800 | 107\% |
| GENERAL MAINTENANCE WORKER II (002489) | \$52,458 | 1 | \$48,900 | 107\% |
| JUDICIAL ASSISTANT II (002084) | \$55,869 | 8 | \$51,800 | 108\% |
| FORENSIC SCIENTIST I (001973) | \$63,315 | 2 | \$58,700 | 108\% |
| PAINTER II (001347) | \$55,578 | 6 | \$51,100 | 109\% |
| WATER PLANT OPERATOR II (000966) | \$60,798 | 24 | \$55,600 | 109\% |
| CUSTODIAN II (006090) | \$36,670 | 2 | \$33,400 | 110\% |
| POLICE INFORMATION SPECIALIST (002463) | \$50,690 | 12 | \$45,800 | 111\% |
| ACCESS CONTROL SPECIALIST (002340)* | \$52,520 | 7 | \$47,200 | 111\% |
| ARBORIST II (001375) | \$53,976 | 4 | \$48,100 | 112\% |
| BUILDING INSPECTOR III (001967) | \$76,981 | 10 | \$67,600 | 114\% |
| PARKS GROUNDSKEEPER (001813) | \$39,042 | 9 | \$33,800 | 116\% |
| SENIOR SECRETARY (003030) | \$50,690 | 1 | \$43,800 | 116\% |
| WAREHSE SUP WORKER-AIRPORT (002022) | \$48,963 | 1 | \$42,200 | 116\% |
| WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE OP II (000975) | \$53,976 | 16 | \$45,100 | 120\% |
| CONCRETE FINISHER (001852) | \$57,325 | 9 | \$46,700 | 123\% |
| CIVIL ENFORCEMENT OFFICER I (001893) | \$57,782 | 4 | \$46,900 | 123\% |
| OFFICE TECHNICIAN II (001191) | \$50,690 | 18 | \$39,200 | 129\% |
| CITY PAYMENTS PROCESSOR (000263) | \$52,520 | 4 | \$31,500 | 167\% |

[^0]Among the Public Safety workgroup, a total of 10 benchmark jobs, covering 722 employees, were evaluated (representing $10 \%$ of the total jobs surveyed). Market top pay rates of pay were compared to the Salt Lake City's wage schedule top rate.

| Public Safety Summary |  | Overall <br> Average <br> Market <br> Position |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Significantly Lagging (Less than or equal to 90\% of market) | 3 | $88 \%$ |
| Slightly Lagging (Between 90.1\% and 98\% of market) | 2 | $93 \%$ |
| Competitive (Between 98.1\% and 109.9\% of market) | 4 | $101 \%$ |
| Significantly Leading (Greater than or equal to 110\% of market) | 1 | $111 \%$ |
| Overall Market Comparison | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 \%}$ |

The following list includes all related benchmark jobs sorted by those which are most significantly lagging to most significantly leading.

| Public Safety Breakout |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021- Job Title (Job Code) |  |  |  |  |



Among the non-represented employee workgroup, a total of 48 benchmark jobs, covering 187 employees, were evaluated (representing $48 \%$ of the total jobs surveyed). Market median ( $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile) pay rates were compared to the non-represented employee actual median wages/salaries.

| Non-Represented Summary |  | Overall <br> Average <br> Market <br> Position |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Significantly Lagging (Less than or equal to 90\% of market) | 15 | $86 \%$ |
| Slightly Lagging (Between 90.1\% and 98\% of market) | 13 | $95 \%$ |
| Competitive (Between 98.1\% and 109.9\% of market) | 15 | $103 \%$ |
| Significantly Leading (Greater than or equal to 110\% of market) | 5 | $116 \%$ |
| Overall Market Comparison | $\mathbf{4 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 \%}$ |



As with the other groups, the following list ranks all related benchmark jobs sorted by those which are most significantly lagging to most significantly leading.

| Non-Represented Breakout |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021 - Job Title (Job Code) | SLC Median Employee Salary | \#SLC <br> Incumbents | Market Salary (50th Percentile) | Market Comparison (SLC Median vs Market Median) |
| SYSTEMS ENGINEER III (002571) | \$97,760 | 1 | \$131,600 | 74\% |
| CYBERSECURITY ENGINEER II (002573) | \$98,488 | 2 | \$127,100 | 77\% |
| NETWORK ENGINEER II (002576) | \$91,666 | 1 | \$107,900 | 85\% |
| FINANCIAL ANALYST III (001670) | \$74,797 | 6 | \$86,000 | 87\% |
| LICENSED ARCHITECT (000752) | \$83,200 | 1 | \$95,600 | 87\% |
| GIS SPECIALIST (002154) | \$57,595 | 1 | \$65,500 | 88\% |
| AUDITOR III (001684) | \$71,261 | 1 | \$80,700 | 88\% |
| FORENSIC SCIENTIST II (001974) | \$66,227 | 4 | \$74,800 | 89\% |
| MANAGEMENT ANALYST (001092) | \$65,062 | 3 | \$72,900 | 89\% |
| REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY PROP MGR (002509) | \$79,165 | 1 | \$88,600 | 89\% |
| SR BENEFITS ANALYST (002122)^ | \$75,337 | 0 | \$84,300 | 89\% |
| EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT (001989) | \$65,062 | 12 | \$72,800 | 89\% |
| HR LEAVE SPECIALIST (002451) | \$78,957 | 1 | \$88,200 | 90\% |
| SAFETY PROGRAM MGR (002286) | \$91,666 | 2 | \$102,100 | 90\% |
| OFFICE FACILITATOR II NON UNIO (001232) | \$51,334 | 30 | \$57,000 | 90\% |
| SOCIAL SERVICE WORKER (001921)^ | \$51,362 | 0 | \$56,300 | 91\% |
| PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR (001890) | \$71,739 | 1 | \$78,100 | 92\% |
| BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST II (002338) | \$87,277 | 6 | \$93,900 | 93\% |
| GOLF PROFESSIONAL II (002503) | \$76,523 | 2 | \$81,500 | 94\% |
| HR BUSINESS PARTNER II (002591) | \$85,197 | 6 | \$90,000 | 95\% |
| SENIOR CITY ATTORNEY (002319) | \$144,456 | 12 | \$152,500 | 95\% |
| SENIOR HUMAN RESOURCE TECHNICIAN (001866) | \$49,358 | 4 | \$51,700 | 95\% |
| PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST I (000533) | \$61,558 | 2 | \$63,900 | 96\% |
| CLAIMS ADJUSTER (001995)^ | \$65,056 | 0 | \$67,200 | 97\% |
| SOFTWARE ENGINEER III (002145) | \$97,448 | 2 | \$100,500 | 97\% |
| HRIS ANALYST (002155) | \$89,471 | 2 | \$91,900 | 97\% |
| PARALEGAL (002201) | \$60,746 | 6 | \$62,300 | 98\% |
| ENGINEER IV (002198) | \$87,069 | 13 | \$89,000 | 98\% |
| REAL PROPERTY AGENT (000370) | \$68,016 | 2 | \$69,000 | 99\% |
| COLLECTIONS OFFICER (001376) | \$45,978 | 4 | \$46,500 | 99\% |
| NETWORK SYSTEMS ENGINEER II (001394)^ | \$91,661 | 0 | \$92,700 | 99\% |
| ACCOUNTANT III (001666) | \$75,338 | 13 | \$75,700 | 100\% |
| PRINCIPAL PLANNER (001733) | \$69,867 | 9 | \$69,500 | 101\% |
| HR RECRUITER (002297) | \$65,000 | 1 | \$64,500 | 101\% |
| GOLF SUPERINTENDENT 18 HOLES (000936) | \$71,573 | 3 | \$70,800 | 101\% |
| EMPLOYEE MARKETING \& COMM (002225)^ | \$68,295 | 0 | \$65,500 | 104\% |
| SOFTWARE SUPPORT ADMIN II (001729) | \$82,909 | 8 | \$79,300 | 105\% |
| LEGAL SECRETARY III (003136) | \$57,200 | 3 | \$54,700 | 105\% |
| TECH SYSTEM ANALYST III (002203)^ | \$75,337 | 0 | \$71,400 | 106\% |
| CITY PAYROLL ADMINISTRATOR (001945) | \$63,492 | 2 | \$59,900 | 106\% |
| CIVIC ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM SPEC. (001821) | \$60,798 | 2 | \$57,200 | 106\% |
| EMPLOYEE TRAINING \& DEVELOPMEN (000491)^ | \$65,056 | 0 | \$60,600 | 107\% |
| VICTIM ADVOCATE (001765) | \$47,310 | 4 | \$43,900 | 108\% |
| VIDEO PRODUCTION MGR (002217)^ | \$91,661 | 0 | \$82,800 | 111\% |
| GRAPHIC DESING SPECIALIST II (002607)^ | \$68,295 | 0 | \$60,700 | 113\% |
| JUSTICE COURT JUDGE (001601) | \$160,306 | 5 | \$140,200 | 114\% |
| PROG COOR ARTS COUNCIL (001799) | \$65,884 | 2 | \$55,900 | 118\% |
| NET SUP ADM II (001396) | \$61,942 | 7 | \$47,800 | 130\% |

${ }^{\wedge}=$ Comparing against pay grade midpoint in lieu of median wage as job is currently vacant.

## RECOMMENDATION:

The Committee wishes to express its support for the City's compensation strategy to position Salt Lake City as an area pay leader for employees. The Committee has long recognized that Salt Lake City employees deal with a volume of diverse situations and problems not seen by most other municipal entities in the state. Therefore, it is in the City's best interest to attract the most capable employees to all positions and to encourage them to stay. The Committee believes that compensation should be an important factor in this equation and that this policy will prove beneficial to the City's citizens in the future.

Furthermore, as funds permit, the committee recommends the mayor and city council appropriate financial resources necessary to grant market salary adjustments for employees in benchmark jobs identified in this report as lagging market.

1. First priority should be given to those lagging significantly; and,
2. Second priority should be given to those lagging slightly behind market.

## Appendix A - Salt Lake City 2021 Overall Recruitment Statistics

(as reported 1/24/22)

- Total \# of job postings = 510 (compared to 348 in 2020)
- Total \# of applicants = 17,051 (compared to 13,818 in 2020)
- Total \# regular, full-time employees hired (excluding seasonal and part-time workers) $=412$ (compared to 379 in 2020)

| APPOINTMENT | 4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| NEW HIRE | 357 |
| REHIRE | 51 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{4 1 2}$ |

2021 Turnover rates by department Voluntary turnover includes resignations, retirements, and job abandonments. Involuntary turnover includes probationary releases, dismissals, separations, and deaths.
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Department } & \text { \# of Employees } & \begin{array}{c}\text { \# total } \\ \text { Terminations }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Overall } \\ \text { Turnover Rate }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Retention } \\ \text { Turnoluntary }\end{array} \\ \text { Involuntary } \\ \text { Turnover }\end{array}\right]$

2020

| Department | \# of <br> Employees | \# total <br> Terminations | Overall <br> Turnover Rate | Retention | Voluntary <br> Turnover | Involuntary <br> Turnover |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 911 BUREAU | 85 | 25 | $31 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| AIRPORT | 491 | 32 | $7 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| ATTORNEY | 56 | 12 | $23 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| CITY COUNCIL | 23 | 0 | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| COMMUNITY \& NEIGHBORHOODS | 192 | 13 | $7 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT | 14 | 2 | $15 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| FINANCE | 68 | 3 | $4 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| FIRE | 344 | 21 | $6 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| HUMAN RESOURCES | 25 | 6 | $28 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SERVICES | 62 | 7 | $11 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| JUSTICE COURTS | 38 | 2 | $5 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| MAYOR | 22 | 8 | $43 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| POLICE | 632 | 78 | $13 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| PUBLIC SERVICES | 384 | 24 | $6 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| PUBLIC UTILITIES | 404 | 36 | $9 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY | 23 | 1 | $4 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| SUSTAINABILITY | 61 | 5 | $9 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

## APPENDIX B - Salt Lake City 2021 Union Job Recruitment Statistics

Unless otherwise noted, the following statistics account for the total number of external applicants and hires made between January 1, 2021 - December 31, 2021.

## AFSCME

- Trade \& Craft (100 Series) - Of 2,161 external applicants, 1,954 (or 90\%) were from Utah. Out of 124 hires, 122 (or, $98 \%$ ) were from Utah. 19 were rehires.
- Clerical \& Administrative Support (200 Series) - Of 1,112 external applicants, 998 (or, 90\%) were from Utah. Out of 44 hires, 43 ( $98 \%$ ) were from Utah. Four were rehires.
- Paraprofessional ( 330 Series) - Of 848 external applicants, 676 (or, 80\%) were from Utah. Out of 63 hires, $100 \%$ were from Utah. Six were rehires.

In total approximately $86 \%$ of all external applicants and $99 \%$ of new hires for all AFSCME bargaining units were from the state of Utah.

## Police Officers

- Of 1,468 external applicants, 1,085 (or, 74\%) were from Utah. Of 65 hires made in 2020, 59 (or, $91 \%$ ) were from Utah. 14 police officers were rehired.


## Firefighters*

- Of 766 external applicants, 446 were from Utah (58\%). Out of 27 hires, 25 (or, $\mathbf{9 3} \%$ were from Utah. One firefighter was rehired.
*Note - Fire department hiring rosters typically have a hiring delay of up to two years. Applicants from 2021 may still be in the pipeline for 2022 or later.


## APPENDIX C - SLCPD SWORN PUBLIC SAFETY TURNOVER DATA

## POLICE

| 2021 Total SLCPD Sworn Employees | Voluntary | Involuntary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 511 | 64 | 5 |
| TOTAL SWORN TURNOVER \% | $12.52 \%$ | $0.98 \%$ |

Voluntary Turnover includes:
46 Resignations

- 44 Police Officers
- 2 Police Sergeants

18 Retirements

- 1 Deputy Chief
- 1 Police Captain
- 2 Police Lieutenants
- 3 Police Sergeants
- 11 Police Officers

Involuntary Turnover includes:
1 Death

- 1 Police Sergeant

4 Probationary Releases

- 4 Police Officers

51 Total New Hires in 2021:

- 5 Lateral (experienced LEO) Officer New Hires
- Former agency listed below:
- 1 came from Tooele Country Sheriff's
- 1 came from Tooele City Police Dept.
- 1 came from Layton City Police Dept.
- 1 came from Santa Clara County Sheriff's in California
- 1 came from Utah Highway Patrol
- Number of years in law enforcement when hired by SLCPD
- 2 laterals had less than 2 years of experience
- 1 lateral had between 2 to 5 years of experience
- 2 laterals more than 5 years of experience
- 46 Entry Level Police Officer New Hires
- 1 new hire moved from Idaho
- 1 new hire moved from California
- 1 new hire moved from Tennessee
- 1 new hire moved from Oregon
- 1 new hire moved from New Jersey


## 14 Rehires in 2021:

- 13 Police Officers came back after being gone for less than 1 year
- 1 Police Officer came back after being gone for more than 1 year


## FIRE

| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ Total SLCFD Sworn Employees | Voluntary | Involuntary |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 338 | 19 | 2 |
| TOTAL SWORN TURNOVER \% | $\mathbf{5 . 6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 9 \%}$ |

Voluntary Turnover includes:
5 Resignations

- 3 Firefighters
- 1 Fire Captain
- 1 Firefighter Heavy Rescue Technician II

14 Retirements

- 3 Airport Rescue Firefighter III's
- 1 Battalion Chief
- 6 Fire Captains
- 2 Firefighter Engineer III's
- 1 Firefighter/Paramedic II
- 1 Firefighter III

Involuntary Turnover includes:
1 Death

- 1 Airport Rescue Firefighter III

1 Probationary Release

- 1 Firefighter

27 New Hire Firefighters in 2021

Prepared for and on behalf of the Committee by:


349 South 200 East, Suite 500
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5464
(801) 535-7900

Deb Alexander, Chief Human Resources Officer
David Salazar, Compensation Program Manager
Michael Jenson, Compensation Analyst


[^0]:    * = Market salary normalized to Salt Lake City

