

Nov. 9, 2021

Dear Town Council members,

As you know, the issue of salaries at the AMO is on the agenda for Wednesday. The staff and I have been working hard on understanding where we stand in amending the budget and what our options might be about the Marshal's office wages.

Here are some facts and some suggestions.

See the attached salary info table. On the upper left is my best understanding of the current wages for agencies in SL County, including police officer starting and senior wages, and for more senior positions. I've included what I understand about Park City wages, too. Just below those numbers are VECC's numbers for dispatchers. On the upper right is the same table with the values increased by a factor of 10% -- less than is likely to occur. (This is almost surely less for UPD because I have been told that the mayors of UPD municipalities want the UPD to be in the mid-range.) On the lower left is the data from Alta. You can see that our current average wage is well below even the entry level wages for SL County, even though our officers have years or decades of experience (they are way below the high end of the seniority distribution). As you may know, we are going to lose one and likely two officers to other opportunities. I don't see how we can successfully hire new marshals or perhaps even retain current employees given our wage range.

I propose a \$5/hour increase across the board. That would bring our marshals to the red boxed number on average and the dispatchers to the green boxed number. These numbers are still low compared to SL County comparables (with the same-colored boxes to the upper right), but they are a significant improvement.

In terms of how to pay for these increases, please see the Budget Update table. This table shows, on the left in green, expected revenues compared to budgeted revenues. The sources of the differences are in the columns and the account number shows just where we expect a deviation from the current budget. The current difference is \$61,560 more in revenues than we budgeted. Much of this difference originates with expected revenues from our new parking plan, which will also increase the burden on the AMO. The right top section, in salmon, shows expected expenditures compared to budgeted expenditures. The current difference is \$5575 more in expenses than we budgeted. The difference between the current budget and what we will propose as a 2022 amended budget is that we are receiving a net \$55,985 more than expected.

The box on the lower right of this table (salmon, with the border) includes proposed increases to the Marshals office for the remainder of the budget year. My proposed wage increase will incur an expected \$ 64,275, additional cost to our budget. This increase would be offset by about 84% by the expected gains described in the previous paragraph. I propose that the

remaining difference of about \$19,000 be generated by a slightly less conservative sales tax assumption in our topline revenues.

Additional adjustment in the sales tax revenue assumptions may be in order after consultation with ASL and lodges about their projections for the year. In that case, and if updated revenue projections warrant, I will likely return with an updated budget amendment proposal next month with data about administrative and other staff compensation. They, like staff in the AMO, are paid much less than their peers.

I hope you will support our AMO and this proposal.

Sincerely, Harris

Salary Info Table

Current

	<u>PO Start</u>	<u>PO End</u>	<u>Sgt Start</u>	<u>Sgt End</u>	<u>Lt Start</u>	<u>Lt End</u>
South Salt Lake	\$ 28.34	\$ 43.64	\$ 45.69	\$ 49.42	\$ 52.48	\$ 56.76
Sandy	\$ 28.36	\$ 42.01	\$ 44.53	\$ 48.66	\$ 51.57	\$ 56.36
Cottonwood Heigl	\$ 27.97	\$ 41.83	\$ 45.09	\$ 48.56	\$ 51.84	\$ 55.83
West Valley City	\$ 27.15	\$ 41.90	\$ 44.41	\$ 47.57	\$ 51.85	\$ 55.01
Herriman	\$ 27.15	\$ 39.11	\$ 44.41	\$ 45.57	\$ 43.32	\$ 52.15
Taylorsville	\$ 27.40	\$ 37.06	\$ 42.36	\$ 45.20	\$ 52.41	\$ 52.41
South Jordan	\$ 27.04	\$ 39.72	\$ 43.21	\$ 47.22	\$ 43.78	\$ 62.17
West Jordan	\$ 27.00	\$ 39.00	\$ 41.64	\$ 44.85	\$ 49.77	\$ 54.94
Salt Lake City	\$ 26.93	\$ 39.29	\$ 43.24	\$ 46.00	\$ 50.92	\$ 54.16
Draper	\$ 26.77	\$ 39.60	\$ 41.58	\$ 46.77	\$ 49.11	\$ 53.11
Murray	\$ 23.82	\$ 39.18	\$ 38.96	\$ 46.31	\$ 46.40	\$ 55.14
UPD	\$ 22.92	\$ 35.38	\$ 36.70	\$ 43.18	\$ 45.95	\$ 51.22
Average	\$ 26.74	\$ 39.81	\$ 42.65	\$ 46.61	\$ 49.12	\$ 54.94
Park City		\$ 38.46				
VECC	Supervisor	\$ 28.49				
	Mid Level	\$ 24.35				

Assumes Raises

<u>Plus 10%</u>	<u>PO Start</u>	<u>PO End</u>	<u>Sgt Start</u>	<u>Sgt End</u>	<u>Lt Start</u>	<u>Lt End</u>
South Salt Lake	\$ 31.17	\$ 48.00	\$ 50.26	\$ 54.36	\$ 57.73	\$ 62.44
Sandy	\$ 31.20	\$ 46.21	\$ 48.98	\$ 53.53	\$ 56.73	\$ 62.00
Cottonwood Heights	\$ 30.77	\$ 46.01	\$ 49.60	\$ 53.42	\$ 57.02	\$ 61.41
West Valley City	\$ 29.87	\$ 46.09	\$ 48.85	\$ 52.33	\$ 57.04	\$ 60.51
Herriman	\$ 29.87	\$ 43.02	\$ 48.85	\$ 50.13	\$ 47.65	\$ 57.37
Taylorsville	\$ 30.14	\$ 40.77	\$ 46.60	\$ 49.72	\$ 57.65	\$ 57.65
South Jordan	\$ 29.74	\$ 43.69	\$ 47.53	\$ 51.94	\$ 48.16	\$ 68.39
West Jordan	\$ 29.70	\$ 42.90	\$ 45.80	\$ 49.34	\$ 54.75	\$ 60.43
Salt Lake City	\$ 29.62	\$ 43.22	\$ 47.56	\$ 50.60	\$ 56.01	\$ 59.58
Draper	\$ 29.45	\$ 43.56	\$ 45.74	\$ 51.45	\$ 54.02	\$ 58.42
Murray	\$ 26.20	\$ 43.10	\$ 42.86	\$ 50.94	\$ 51.04	\$ 60.65
UPD	\$ 25.21	\$ 38.92	\$ 40.37	\$ 47.50	\$ 50.55	\$ 56.34
Average	\$ 29.41	\$ 43.79	\$ 46.92	\$ 51.27	\$ 54.03	\$ 60.43
		\$ 31.33				
		\$ 26.79				

Alta	Current	Plus \$5
Marshals	\$ 32.99	\$ 37.99
	\$ 22.17	\$ 27.17
	\$ 22.17	\$ 27.17
	\$ 20.37	\$ 25.37
	\$ 19.15	\$ 24.15
	\$ 17.45	\$ 22.45
Dispatchers	\$ 23.21	\$ 28.21
	\$ 18.95	\$ 23.95
	\$ 17.51	\$ 22.51
	\$ 17.45	\$ 22.45
	\$ 15.84	\$ 20.84

Average		
Marshals	\$ 22.38	\$ 27.38
Dispatchers	\$ 18.59	\$ 23.59

Budget Update

Revenues		Licenses	State Grant	Plan Check	Fines	Vehicles	SUM
Non AMO Account #		10-32-100-220	10-33-400	10-34-430	10-35-100	10-36-400	
Expected Receivable	\$	90,740	6,589	10,522	25,000	54,149	
Budget	\$	46,100	5,000	6,340	23,000	45,000	
Difference	\$	44,640	1,589	4,182	2,000	9,149	61,560

AMO Account #

Expenses		Victim Rep	PI Comm	PI Comm	PI Comm	SUM	TOTAL (Receivable - Expenditure)
		10-42-481	10-53-120	10-53-310			
Budget	\$	6,000	4,125	2,400	4,450		
Expected Expenditure	\$	11,000	2,750	5,000	3,800		
Difference	\$	(5,000)	1,375	(2,600)	650	(5,575)	\$ 55,985

	Salaries	Benefits	Taxes	URS	
	10-54-110	10-54-130	10-54-131	10-54-133	
Budget	525000	7000	42000	81000	
Expected Expenditure	581800	9719	43614	84842	
Difference	\$ (56,800)	\$ (2,719)	\$ (1,614)	\$ (3,842)	\$ (64,975)