



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Survey Process</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Salary Survey</b>	
• <b>Salary Budget Planning</b>	<b>3</b>
• <b>Summary of Benchmark Comparisons</b>	<b>3</b>
• <b>Cash Incentive/Bonus Pay</b>	<b>7</b>
• <b>Summary of Findings</b>	<b>8</b>
• <b>Other System Costs</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Group Benefit Plans Survey</b>	
• <b>Medical</b>	<b>9</b>
• <b>Dental</b>	<b>11</b>
• <b>Life</b>	<b>12</b>
• <b>Total New Cost of Contributions</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
• <b>A – Published Survey Sources</b>	<b>13</b>
• <b>B – Salary Survey References</b>	<b>14</b>
• <b>C – System Maintenance Study</b>	<b>24</b>
• <b>D – Benefit Plan Comparisons</b>	<b>25</b>

## INTRODUCTION

The Division of Human Resources (Division) within the Department of Personnel and Administration (DPA) conducted its FY 2010-2011 annual compensation survey and is reporting the findings as mandated by statute. The purpose of the annual compensation survey is to determine any necessary adjustments to the two major components of total compensation that require increased dollars year to year: employee salaries and employer contributions to group benefit plans for the state personnel system. A summary of the survey process, findings, and estimated costs resulting from the findings are highlighted in the body of this report.

*The State of Colorado's policy is to provide competitive total compensation to employees in the state personnel system to ensure the recruitment, motivation and retention of a qualified and competent workforce.*

A summary of findings on the salary survey for employees in the state personnel system can be found on page 8, including costs resulting from other system changes; estimated costs for employer contributions to group benefit plans can be found on page 12. Statute also requires the state personnel director (Director) to submit budget increase recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly. While the findings in this report are considered, the Director's recommendations also consider other factors, including but not limited to, fiscal constraints and recruitment and retention, that will reflect budgetary estimates separate from the findings in this report. All changes resulting from the survey and other system studies included in this report would be for implementation on July 1, 2010, subject to funding by the General Assembly.

## SURVEY PROCESS

A summary and highlights of the process used by the Division to conduct the annual compensation survey are provided in this report with the findings of the survey. The annual compensation survey process document published prior to conducting the survey may be found on the Division's Web site at <http://www.colorado.gov/cs/Satellite/DPA-DHR/DHR/1185870964539>.

Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-50-104 (4)(a), the annual compensation survey is to be based on an analysis of surveys published by public or private organizations that include a fair sample of public and private sector employers. The three primary third-party survey sources used to conduct the FY 2010-2011 compensation survey are the Mountain States Employers Council (MSEC), the Colorado Municipal League (CML), and the Central States Compensation Association (CSCA). Other survey sources used include the Institute of Management and Administration (IOMA), Economic Research Institute (ERI), WorldatWork (WAW), Hewitt Associates, and The Segal Company. Appendix A contains a list of the specific third-party surveys used.

Not all survey publications or their participants utilize the same effective date for collection of data. In order for all survey data to have a common effective date (i.e., July 1), the Division projects (ages) pay rates and benefit premiums by applying relevant trend factors.

- To project all reported salary rates to July 1, 2010, the Division used the 2009 first quarter figures from the annual Employment Cost Index (ECI) – Wages and Salary for all

Civilian Workers. The annual change of 2.23% was used to project the data. Due to limited survey sources available at this time, a survey update will be completed in December to include additional third-party surveys and reflect a more recent ECI.

- To project medical and dental benefit premiums to July 1, 2010, the Division used the 2009 Segal *Health Plan Cost Trend Survey* supplemented by the 2009 MSEC *Health and Welfare Plans Survey*. Cost increase trend factors of 10% for medical and 6% for dental plans were used to project premium rates. This is also a consistent trend from last year's survey findings.

Six published surveys were used for the collection of salary data from public and private sector employers in Colorado and state governments across the central and northwest regions (listed in Appendix A). The Division participates in the development and review of benchmark jobs included in the published surveys, in conjunction with other survey organizations.

- The Division's Compensation Unit reviews the survey benchmark descriptions to determine whether the State has jobs that are comparable, verifying job duties through class descriptions, position description questionnaires (PDQ), job announcements, and confirmation from Human Resources professionals and subject matter experts in departments where positions are assigned.
- The Compensation Unit conducts a second review of benchmark matches once all survey data are collected and compiled for analysis to ensure the validity of matches and verify the accuracy of data collected. This follows and is in addition to the validation of data performed by the third-party organizations conducting the surveys.

Three published surveys were used for the collection and comparison of data on group benefit plans including public and private sector employers in Colorado. Data from these surveys were used to analyze plan premiums, cost sharing, and plan features. Tables outlining the detailed findings are provided in Appendix D, with overall findings summarized in the Group Benefit Plan section of this report.

### **SALARY BUDGET PLANNING – MARKET TRENDS**

The Division used salary budget projections collected from the MSEC 2009 *Colorado Compensation Briefing*, WorldatWork 2009-2010 *Salary Budget Planning Survey*, and Hewitt Associates 2009-2010 *U.S. Salary Increase Survey* to determine the prevailing market practice for planned pay structure and total actual salary increases for 2010. Total salary increases are defined as all increases market employers plan for the upcoming year through various compensation programs, such as merit, performance, longevity, across-the-board, cost of living, market, and other base and non-base increases to actual salaries.

- Findings from the salary budget planning surveys indicate projections for 2010 pay structure increases to be approximately 1.8%. This finding is consistent for the Colorado labor market and national market for public and private sector employers across all industries.
- Salary budget planning surveys indicate projections for 2010 total actual salary increases to be approximately 2.8%. This finding is consistent for the Colorado labor market and national market for public and private sector employers across all industries.

It is the State's policy to compensate its employees competitive with the prevailing market and to recognize employee performance and contributions. The State's policy of performance pay is consistent with prevailing practices in the market, which is to include performance, market, and other base and non-base increases. Funding this statutory policy continues to be a critical component of the competitive total compensation package for the workforce.

### **SUMMARY OF BENCHMARK COMPARISONS**

The Division collected and reviewed data on numerous survey benchmarks based on its responses to third-party surveys. Following reviews of the benchmark matches and data collected, the final analysis and summary included benchmark comparisons to 214 (42%) of 516 of the State's classes representing approximately 24,486 (73%) of 33,673 employees in the state personnel system.

Data reported in published surveys are in various formats, thus have been adjusted to reflect common and consistent figures to draw valid comparisons.

- Data reported in annual and hourly rates were adjusted to monthly figures based on full-time hours for direct comparison to state salaries; and,
- All data were projected (aged) based on the effective dates of data collection reported by each survey to reflect the common effective date of July 1, 2010.

Because geographic markets are different across the nation, geographic differential factors were collected by referencing the Economic Research Institute's (ERI) 2009 *Geographic Assessor Report*. Data from other state governments (the only survey market employers outside Colorado) were adjusted to Colorado income levels using the ERI assessor. The geographic figures reflecting wage and salary differentials by the average of each state are provided in Appendix B.

## SALARY SURVEY FINDINGS

Published survey data are reported in various labor market groups including industry, geographic region, and by individual organization in public sector surveys.

- Where data was reported by individual organizations, the Division summarized data into an aggregate format by calculating the median (50<sup>th</sup> percentile) of actual salaries reported and average of salary range minimums, midpoints and maximums reported.
- In all surveys where midpoints were not reported, the Division calculated the midpoints using the reported minimums and maximums.
- Where applicable, State data were excluded.

The Division applied technically and professionally sound compensation industry guidelines, including those recommended by the U.S. Department of Labor, WorldatWork, and the Sherman Antitrust Act, to ensure integrity of all data. With the exception of methodology specifically directed by C.R.S. 24-50-104 (1)(III)(A) for conducting the survey of Trooper classes, benchmarks and salary data with fewer than five data points reported for both salary and salary range figures were excluded from the comparisons, because fewer than five data points is considered an insufficient sample for drawing comparisons.

Following a review and validation of summary results of each published survey, the Division combined final market results to conduct individual comparisons of the State's classes to survey benchmarks. A summary of findings are provided on the following pages that reflect the comparisons of state salaries and salary ranges in relationship to the total market salaries and salary ranges.

- In each comparison, the percentage difference has been calculated between the State's salary figure and the market salary figure. The percent difference is a tool for comparing two data figures and this approach provides a means for the State to determine what percentage it would need to adjust its salaries or salary ranges, either upward or downward, to align with the market. For example, in comparing the salary range midpoints a positive percentage figure indicates the amount the State would have to increase its midpoint to align with the market midpoint and a negative figure indicates the percentage the State would need to decrease its midpoint to align with the market. This percentage difference is shown for each benchmark job.
- The results provide comparisons of the State's average actual salaries to the median (50<sup>th</sup> percentile) of market actual salaries. Also provided are comparisons of the State's salary range midpoints to the market salary range midpoints. The overall percentages calculated by occupational group and for all benchmarks are not simply an average of all of the individual averages, but rather, reflect the sum of all state salary rates minus the sum of all market salary rates, divided by the sum of all state salary rates.

## SALARY SURVEY FINDINGS

A summary of benchmark comparisons by each occupational group and the overall difference found across all benchmark comparisons are provided in the following table. Comparisons of Trooper classes to market benchmarks are provided in a separate table.

<b>Comparison of State Actual Salaries and Midpoints to the Market Median Salary and Range Midpoints</b>	<b>Median (50<sup>th</sup> Percentile)</b>	<b>Range Midpoints</b>
Enforcement & Protective Services*	-9.3%	-6.5%
Health Care Services	4.5%	-1.7%
Labor, Trades & Crafts	2.9%	2.8%
Administrative Support & Related	7.5%	3.0%
Professional Services	-3.1%	-3.3%
Physical Science & Engineering	-8.8%	-7.3%
<b>Overall Difference</b>	<b>-1.3%</b>	<b>-2.5%</b>

*\*Does not include Trooper classes.*

Overall findings by individual occupational group and for all benchmarks suggest that the State's salary range midpoints are within a competitive position in relationship to the market, which is defined by the State as plus/minus 7.5% and by common compensation industry standards as competitive if the figures are within 5% to 10% of the market. However, the percentage differences in state actual salaries for the Physical Science and Engineering and Enforcement and Protective Services occupational groups are slightly above the market by 8.8% to 9.3% respectively, while those for the Administrative Support and Related occupational group are slightly below market by 7.5%.

More critical, are the findings by individual benchmarks that indicate the State's actual salaries and salary range midpoints vary above and below the market by significant percentages.

- While the majority of the State's actual salaries were found to be within a competitive position in relationship to the median market salaries, the findings also indicated variations ranging from 40.2% above market at the highest extreme, to 40% below market at the lowest extreme.
- Comparisons of salary range midpoints by individual benchmarks reveal a similar pattern. The State's range midpoints vary in the extreme from approximately 33% above to 34% below market.

The Division also compared the State's distribution of employee salaries within their respective salary ranges (range placement) in relationship to the market range placement. Range placement measures the relative placement of the employee's actual salary or average salary within the range of pay established for the job class. Pay that is at the range midpoint would have a range penetration of 50%.

## SALARY SURVEY FINDINGS

Comparisons of the range placement by occupational groups and the overall findings are provided in the following table. Comparisons of the Trooper range placement are provided in a separate table.

Comparison of Salary Range Placement	Range Placement (State)	Range Placement (Market)
Enforcement & Protective Services*	59%	51%
Health Care Services	42%	58%
Labor, Trades & Crafts	50%	50%
Administrative Support & Related	36%	49%
Professional Services	49%	49%
Physical Science & Engineering	56%	50%
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>51%</b>

\*Does not include Trooper classes.

The Division must use similar methodologies to conduct state to market comparisons of actual salaries and salary ranges as well as comparisons of salary range widths and range placement. However, C.R.S. 24-50-104(1)(III)(A) outlines two provisions for determining the prevailing market and adjusting salaries for Trooper classes that differ from other classes.

- Statute defines the labor market for Trooper classes to include the three highest-paid, large (more than 100 commissioned officers) law enforcement jurisdictions within Colorado, which were identified in this year's survey as the cities of Aurora, Fort Collins, and Denver's Career Service Authority.
- Second, salary adjustments for the Trooper classes are to be at least 99% of the average actual salary for its defined market, reduced by the FY 2003-2004 survey adjustment of 3.5% pursuant to C.R.S. 24-50-104(4)(d)(IV).

In addition to conducting a comparison of the Trooper classes to the market defined by statute, the Division also conducted comparisons of market data collected in the MSEC *Public Employer* and CSCA compensation surveys to include all Colorado law enforcement jurisdictions and other state governments. The additional market analyses allowed the Division to compare levels within the Trooper class series, where there is otherwise insufficient data reported by the statutorily defined market. Individual benchmark comparisons of salaries and salary ranges for the Trooper classes are detailed in Chart 2, of Appendix B.

Benchmark comparisons for the Trooper classes are provided in the tables on the following page. The percent difference reflects the adjustment needed to reach 99% of the market average salaries reduced by the FY 2003-2004 survey adjustment of 3.5% pursuant to statute. Insufficient data were reported for by the defined market for State Patrol Intern and State Patrol Trooper III.



**SALARY SURVEY FINDINGS**

<b>Comparison of Trooper Actual Salaries and Range Midpoints to the Market Average Salaries and Midpoints</b>	<b>% Difference at 99% of Market</b>	<b>Range Midpoints</b>
State Patrol Intern	<i>Insufficient Data</i>	-9.0%
State Patrol Trooper	10.3%	-6.5%
State Patrol Trooper III	<i>Insufficient Data</i>	-7.3%
State Patrol Supervisor	-2.5%	-1.7%
State Patrol Admin I	-0.8%	8.6%
State Patrol Admin II	-1.2%	6.5%
<b>Overall Difference</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	

Overall findings in the comparisons of the Trooper sub-group indicate that the State’s actual salaries are very competitive in relationship to the statutorily defined market, with the exception of those for the fully-operational, State Patrol Trooper. An increase of about 10.3% would be required to bring salaries in just the Trooper class to 99% of the market.

The comparison of the State’s salary range midpoints for the Trooper classes were made to the overall market, as only two of the three statutorily defined market employers reported range data. Two levels within the Trooper class series are outside the State’s threshold (plus/minus 7.5%) level of competitiveness with the market, the State Patrol Intern at 9.0% above market and Patrol Administrator I at 8.6% below market.

A comparison of the distribution of Trooper salaries (range placement) in relationship to the overall market are provided in the following table. Similar to the comparison made of salary range midpoints, the market defined for Trooper classes lacks sufficient data to draw comparisons, thus, the broader market was used for this comparison.

<b>Comparison of Salary Range Placement State Trooper classes to Overall Market</b>	<b>Range Placement (State)</b>	<b>Range Placement (Market)</b>
State Patrol Intern	0%	36%
State Patrol Trooper	46%	47%
State Patrol Trooper III	99%	64%
State Patrol Supervisor	98%	57%
State Patrol Admin I	99%	91%
State Patrol Admin II	100%	85%

**Cash Incentive/Bonus Pay**

This year’s survey also included the collection and analysis of cash incentive/bonus pay reported by market employers as part of the total annual compensation package provided to employees. This analysis was implemented in response to recommendations made in audits of the annual survey process. Data on annual incentive pay is reported in the MSEC *Colorado Compensation and Information Technology* surveys. MSEC defines its annual incentive data collected as:

## SALARY SURVEY FINDINGS

“...the number of incumbents eligible for additional compensation (bonuses / incentives) as a percentage of base salary or lump-sum payment. Participants provided the annual cash incentive for last fiscal / calendar year.” This would be the equivalent of the State’s performance-based variable pay recognized as an annual, lump-sum award.

The Division compiled the average annual cash incentives/bonuses paid, weighted by the number of employees reported as eligible for or receiving the incentives, and calculated the amount as a percentage of total base compensation reported for each survey benchmark. While cash incentive/bonus pay data were reported in 91 of the 214 benchmarks included in this year’s survey, representing jobs across all occupational groups, relative to the total number of employees for which base salaries were reported, this information is not considered significant to draw conclusions in terms of total compensation. Overall, the cash incentive/bonus pay reported amounts to approximately 7.7% of base compensation reported for the same benchmarks.

The CSCA survey reports general information on bonus programs of which 12 out of 28 states reported having programs. Programs reported are primarily linked to performance with some programs linked to cost-savings initiatives or recruitment and retention practices. Insufficient data was reported on the actual number or percentage of employees receiving the cash incentives/bonuses or the actual amounts paid out.

### **Summary of Findings**

Although overall findings indicate that the percentage differences in the the State’s actual salaries and salary range midpoints are not significantly above or below market salaries and salary range midpoints, the Division did find discrepancies in the comparisons by individual classes. As a result of including other state governments in the State’s labor market comparison, the Division now has market data to compare jobs that are unique to state government functions. However, the State must also consider the internal relationships of jobs in addition to the external market values to align jobs based on its own organizational structure and functions. The new survey source along with the major shift in methodology for this year’s report, has resulted in some comparisons that are considerably out of line with the market. Another methodology change in this year’s survey included consolidating the Division’s “outlier” analysis process to review and recommend adjustments to individual classes that have gradually fallen outside the State’s threshold as defined as its competitive position with the prevailing market (plus/minus 7.5%).

Through implementing these new methodologies of conducting direct state to market salary data comparisons and introducing other state government data, the Division has found broader system issues in terms of the internal and external alignment of job classes that require further review and examination before making recommendations in the short-term for individual class adjustments or across-the-board adjustments by individual occupational groups.

### **OTHER SYSTEM COSTS**

One system maintenance study is included in this report: the Driver’s License Examiner class series. A more detailed summary of the study findings is included in Appendix C of this document. The expected cost of these changes is estimated to be \$36,234. PERA, AED, and Medicare costs are included in the calculations.

## **GROUP BENEFIT PLANS**

The Division used the *2009 Health and Welfare Plans Survey* published by MSEC and the *2009 Health and Dental Benefits Premium Reports* by CML to measure market practices in medical, dental, and life insurance benefits. In addition to measuring the employer and employee contribution levels, the Division also examined basic benefit plan design and cost-related features, including the types of plans offered by market employers; member co-pays for prescriptions, office and emergency care visits; and the members' costs for deductibles, out-of-pocket maximums, and co-insurance. Medical insurance cost increase trend information was also collected from publications by The Segal Company. Appendix A lists all third-party survey reports used. Detailed comparisons are provided in Tables 1 through 3, in appendix D.

Data collected on premium costs and contributions represent approximately 1,030 medical plans and 766 dental plans reported by approximately 830 Colorado private and public sector employers. (Employers frequently provide multiple plans for their employees.)

### **Medical – Summary of Findings**

For the plan design comparisons, the Division used the most prevalent plans chosen by state employees, the self-funded Preferred Provider Organization (PPO) OA-1500 plan and Kaiser Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) plan. As defined by MSEC, a PPO plan is “a benefit design wherein covered persons obtain a higher level of reimbursement if non-emergency services are obtained from participating providers” and an HMO is “a pre-paid medical group practice plan that provides a comprehensive predetermined medical care benefit package.” Based on data collected in the MSEC survey, the State is comparable with market employers by offering the most common medical plans (PPO and HMO) to its employees. Also comparable with the market is the State's use of a third-party administrator (TPA) to process the medical claims, including the use of stop-loss insurance to protect the State's self-funded medical liability. Like the majority of employers, the State does not allow employees to receive cash in lieu of medical coverage.

The State's contribution to group benefit plans in this report reflects both premium and internal operating overhead. While it is common market practice for employers to pay the overhead costs as well, the costs are not reported as part of their contribution to premiums. In terms of eligibility for medical care coverage, comparable to the most common practices in market, state employees become eligible for enrollment on the first day of the month following their employment with the State. A close second is the market practice of employees become eligible the first day of the month following 30 days of employment. Overall, the State's medical plans provide typical and prevailing coverage that includes inpatient care, office visits, psychiatric care, substance abuse programs, prescription drugs, outpatient surgery, home health care and hospice, well baby care, annual physical, nurse line, maternity management, chiropractic, first-dollar preventive care, chronic disease management, and pre-tax flexible benefits.

Overall, the State's medical plans are comparable to the market in terms of basic cost-sharing features such as co-pays and co-insurance responsibility; however, the employees' cost of deductibles and out-of-pocket maximums for the State's most popular plan, the OA-1500, are higher than the market average for PPO plans.

## GROUP BENEFIT SURVEY FINDINGS

The following table summarizes basic benefit comparisons between the State and the average market for all plans. Detailed comparisons are provided in Appendix D.

<b>Comparison of State Medical Benefit Plan Features to the Market Average</b>	<b>State OA-1500</b>	<b>State Kaiser HMO</b>
Prescription Co-Pay, Generic and Formulary Brand	Same	Slightly Lower
Prescription Co-Pay, Non-Formulary Brand	Slightly Higher	N/A
Office Visit Co-Pay (does not include specialists)	N/A	Slightly Lower
Emergency Care	N/A	Slightly Lower
In-Network		
Deductibles, Tiers 1 (Employee) and 4 (Family)	Higher	N/A
Out-of-Pocket Maximum, Tiers 1 and 4	Slightly Higher	N/A
Out-of-Network		
Deductibles, Tiers 1 (Employee) and 4 (Family)	Higher	N/A
Out-of-Pocket Maximum, Tiers 1 and 4	Higher	N/A
Co-Insurance (most common %)	Same	N/A

As part of the Five-Year Total Compensation Strategic Direction, the Division set the goal of achieving prevailing employer contribution to premiums on July 1, 2009 (end of the 5<sup>th</sup> year) so attention could turn to requesting funds to improve plan designs and cost-related features that also lag the market. As a result of budget shortfalls, the State allocated funding to maintain contributions at 90% of the market employer contributions projected for FY 2009-2010. Current comparisons of the State's share of contributions in relationship to the market average employer contributions to premiums (adjusted by market trends to July 2009), indicate that the State's contribution will be *close* to 100% of market for the first half of this fiscal year. This is due in part to the projected cost increase trend factor of 11% applied in last year's survey to project market costs to the current fiscal year, which was slightly higher than the actual premium cost increases incurred by the local Colorado market.

Medical cost trend is influenced by a number of complex factors including, but not limited to, medical cost inflation and cost-shifting. Cost increase trends projected for 2010 have decreased slightly from last year to an average of 10%, which has been applied to project current market premiums to FY 2010-2011. Overall, these projections are intended to be conservative in terms of ensuring the State keeps up with cost increases. Because the actual market premiums resulted in lower than projected costs, the State cost to match the projected market for FY 2010-2011 is lower.

Employee demographics, enrollment patterns, and utilization are key factors in premium cost increases and medical cost trends. Health care costs continue to outpace wage increases, especially in light of salary budget freezes experienced by the State and other market employers. The State's demographics such as the average employee age of 46, geography (i.e., all counties), and utilization drive higher overall medical cost compared to employers with which the State competes. Consequently, even though the State will achieve the prevailing market employer contribution level for the first half of next year in the face of relatively higher costs for our risk

## GROUP BENEFIT SURVEY FINDINGS

pool, further increased funds will be needed to bring plan designs and cost-related features (e.g., deductibles and out-of-pocket maximums) into line with the market.

Finally, effective with the FY 2009-2010 plan year, the State has redistributed total employer contributions to encourage enrollment of eligible children. This change is reflected in the total cost of employer contributions. The following table compares employer medical plan contributions between the projected FY 2010-2011 market and the State's current employer medical contribution dollars by tier.

	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4
State FY 09-10 Contribution	\$350.66	\$592.54	\$627.10	\$868.98
Projected Market for FY 10-11	\$398.37	\$702.46	\$632.02	\$942.95

### **Dental – Summary of Findings**

In the MSEC survey, three basic plan types were reported: Dental HMO, Dental PPO (the most common plan type reported in market), and Group Indemnity. The State currently provides two PPO's, the Basic Plan and Basic Plus Plan (the State's most prevalent plan), and a Dental Reimbursement plan. Similar to the medical benefits analysis, employers' contributions to premiums for all plan types were analyzed.

For the plan design comparison, the Division used both the State's PPO plans. Like the State, 96% of the 663 organizations responding to the MSEC survey, reported offering dental plans to its employees. Similar to eligibility requirements for medical coverage, the State is comparable to the most common practice in market that employees are eligible for enrollment on the first day of the month following their employment with the State. Also similar to medical plan coverage, the second most common market practice is employees become eligible the first day of the month following 30 days of employment. The State's dental plans provide typical and prevailing coverage that includes diagnostic and preventive services; basic services such as restorations, periodontal treatment, root canal therapy, and extractions; and, major services such as crowns, bridges, and dentures.

Overall findings indicate that the dental plan features for the current Basic Plus plan, in which the majority of state employees are enrolled, are comparable to the most common practices in the market. Similar to the State's plans, the maximum dental benefit reported in the market is between \$1,000 and \$1,500; orthodontia is provided for children by about 73% of market employers and 23% for adults (a benefit provided under the State's Plus plan); and, the maximum orthodontic benefit (per person) is \$1,500 in the State's Basic Plus Plan compared to the market average \$1,395. Detailed comparisons are provided in Appendix D.

In order to project the premium cost increases for FY 2010-2011, the Division used the cost increase trend reported by Segal of 6%. Dental benefits in terms of deductibles, maximum benefits, and co-insurances tend to be stable over the years. Cost containment through plan design in dental plans is not as prevalent as medical plans. Combining the benefit features of the State's Basic and Plus plans, the State's dental benefits are comparable to the market.

## GROUP BENEFIT SURVEY FINDINGS

Last year, funding was approved to maintain the State's contribution to dental premiums at 85% of the prevailing contribution made by market employers. For the FY 2009-2010 dental plans, the State experienced a slight decrease in overall premium costs. A comparison of the State's current contributions to dental premiums, effective July 2009, in relationship to the market average contributions to premiums adjusted by market trends to July 2009, indicate that the State's contribution is close to 95% of market. This comparison is calculated based on the total of state contribution costs and total market contribution costs relative to the State's enrollment for all tiers, effective June 30, 2009.

Also as in the State's medical plans, a redistribution of the total employer premium contribution was implemented to encourage enrollment in plans covering children. The following table compares employer dental plan contributions between the projected FY 2010-2011 market and the State's current employer dental contribution dollars by tier.

	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4
State FY 09-10 Contribution	\$20.72	\$33.86	\$35.72	\$48.86
Projected Market for FY 10-11	\$20.49	\$35.90	\$40.11	\$52.63

### **Life Insurance And Accidental Death & Dismemberment (AD&D) – Summary of Findings**

The Division collected data from the MSEC survey to compare the basic life and AD&D insurance benefits provided by market employers, including the portion paid by the employer, and value of the benefit. Detailed comparisons are provided in Appendix D.

Overall, benefits in life and AD&D insurances remain stable as reported by MSEC. The most common practice (97% of employers) is for employers to fully pay for the plans. The State provides 100% state-paid basic life insurance to all employees. The most common amount of insurance is a multiplier of one to two times the annual salary (60% of reporting companies); the weighted average multiplier is 1.4 times the annual salary. Beginning July 2009, the State increased its life benefit to \$50,000 for all employees. This brings the State into a more competitive position with market.

### **Total New Cost Of Contributions To Group Benefit Plans**

To meet **100%** of the 2010 prevailing level of employer contributions to total group benefits plans (medical, dental, life & AD&D), the total cost is estimated to be **\$21,937,985**.

**APPENDIX A – THIRD-PARTY SURVEYS**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Publication</b>	<b>Component(s)</b>
<b>Economic Research Institute (ERI)</b>	<b>2009 Geographic Assessor Survey</b>	<b>Salary</b>
<b>Mountain States Employers Council (MSEC)</b>	<b>2009 Colorado Compensation Survey</b>	<b>Salary</b>
<b>Mountain States Employers Council (MSEC)</b>	<b>2009 Public Employers Survey</b>	<b>Salary</b>
<b>Mountain States Employers Council (MSEC)</b>	<b>2009 Information Technology Survey</b>	<b>Salary</b>
<b>Central States Compensation Association (CSCA)</b>	<b>2008 Central States Salary Survey</b>	<b>Salary</b>
<b>Mountain States Employers Council (MSEC)</b>	<b>2008 Health Care Compensation, Summer</b>	<b>Salary</b>
<b>Colorado Municipal League (CML)</b>	<b>June 2009 Health &amp; Dental Benefits Premium Reports (Technology Net, Inc.)</b>	<b>Benefits</b>
<b>The Segal Company</b>	<b>2009 Health Plan Cost Trend Survey</b>	<b>Benefits</b>
<b>Mountain States Employers Council (MSEC)</b>	<b>2009 Health &amp; Welfare Plans</b>	<b>Benefits</b>
<b>Mountain States Employers Council (MSEC)</b>	<b>2009 Colorado Compensation Briefing</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Budgeting</b>
<b>Institute of Management and Administration (IOMA)</b>	<b>July 2009 preliminary Report on Salary Surveys</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Budgeting</b>
<b>Hewitt Associates</b>	<b>2009-2010 U.S. Salary Increase Survey</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Budgeting</b>
<b>WorldatWork (WAW)</b>	<b>Salary Budget Survey 2009-2010</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Budgeting</b>

## APPENDIX B – SALARY SURVEY REFERENCES

### **Geographic Differentials**

Because geographic markets are different across the nation, geographic differential factors were collected by referencing the Economic Research Institute’s (ERI) *2009 Geographic Assessor Report*, effective April 2009.

The geographic figures reflecting the average of each state reporting salary data in the CSCA survey were collected, as well as for the State of Colorado. For the Division’s comparisons, Colorado is considered to be the base state and all other states are compared to the base. For instance, if a state was +3.5% above, that state’s data were decreased by 3.5% to be comparable to Colorado’s geographic market; if a state was -4.3% below, that state’s data were increased by 4.3%. A differential of “1” means that it is equal to the State of Colorado’s geographic area.

State	Differential
Alaska – Statewide	16.6%
Arizona – Statewide	-4.3%
Arkansas – Statewide	-11.6%
Idaho – Statewide	-8.7%
Illinois – Statewide	3.5%
Indiana – Statewide	-4.5%
Iowa – Statewide	-6.8%
Kansas – Statewide	-7.4%
Louisiana – Statewide	-7.9%
Michigan – Statewide	4.5%
Minnesota – Statewide	1.9%
Missouri – Statewide	-3.4%
Montana – Statewide	-11.4%
Nebraska – Statewide	-9.3%
Nevada – Statewide	3.3%
New Mexico – Statewide	-9.9%
North Dakota – Statewide	-10.5%
Oklahoma – Statewide	-11.4%
Oregon – Statewide	1.0%
South Dakota – Statewide	-12.5%
Texas – Statewide	-5.5%
Utah – Statewide	-5.6%
Washington – Statewide	7.2%
Wisconsin – Statewide	-1.2%
Wyoming - Statewide	-10.0%
State of Colorado	1.0



## APPENDIX B – SALARY SURVEY REFERENCES

### Comparison Charts

**Chart 1** – provides a comparison of the State’s distribution of employee salaries within their assigned range of pay (range placement) relative to the market.

**Chart 2** – provides an overall comparison of the Trooper classes in relationship to market, including actual salaries, salary ranges, and range placement.

### Survey Terms and Definitions

**Class Title** – reflects the titles of the State’s job classes used for comparison to market jobs.

**#EEs** – refers to the number of state employees represented in the job class and the number of employees for which the market organizations reported actual salary data.

**Market #Orgs** – reflects the total number of participant organizations reporting actual and/or salary range data for all survey benchmark jobs matched to the State’s job. (The State is excluded from this data.)

**Wgt Avg Salary** – Represents the average of salary rates weighted by the number of employees for which salaries were reported for a given benchmark. Also referred to as the mean.

**Median (50<sup>th</sup> Percentile)** – Represents the middle figure in a range of rates reported; 50% of the salary rates are below, and 50% of the salary rates are above the median rate.

**% Diff** – Percent difference is a tool used to compare an organization’s internal salary data to the external market salary data. Formula:  $(\text{Market Salary} - \text{State Salary}) / \text{State Salary}$

**Range Placm’t** – reflects the salary placement or distribution of the employee’s actual or average salary within the salary range, calculated relative to the minimum and maximum. Formula:  $(\text{Salary} - \text{Minimum}) / (\text{Maximum} - \text{Minimum})$

**APPENDIX B – SALARY SURVEY REFERENCES**

**CHART 1 – COMPARISON OF PAY DISTRIBUTION**

**Enforcement & Protective Services (without Troopers)**

Class Code	Class Title	State Avg Salary 7/1/09	State Salary Ranges			Market Median 7/1/10	Market Salary Ranges		
			Minimum 7/1/09	Maximum 7/1/09	Range Placm't		Minimum 7/1/10	Maximum 7/1/10	Range Placm't
A1A1	CORRECTIONS CASE MGR I	\$5,181	\$3,977	\$5,653	72%	\$3,888	\$3,253	\$5,031	36%
A1D2	CORR/YTH/CLIN SEC OFF I	\$3,489	\$3,273	\$4,651	16%	\$3,473	\$3,054	\$4,475	29%
A1D5	CORR/YTH/CLN SEC SUPV III	\$5,124	\$3,977	\$5,653	68%	\$4,152	\$3,138	\$4,931	57%
A1D7	CORR OR YTH SEC OFF V	\$6,758	\$5,075	\$7,215	79%	\$4,681	\$3,730	\$5,966	43%
A2A2	CRIMINAL INVESTIGATOR I	\$5,290	\$4,605	\$6,545	35%	\$5,026	\$3,932	\$5,854	57%
A3C1	COMMUNITY PAROLE OFF	\$4,514	\$3,360	\$6,100	42%	\$3,678	\$3,196	\$4,782	30%
A3C3	COMM PAROLE SUPV	\$6,933	\$4,965	\$7,060	94%	\$4,674	\$3,852	\$6,231	35%
A4B1	POLICE OFFICER INTERN	\$3,604	\$3,360	\$4,782	17%	\$3,787	\$3,356	\$4,567	36%
A4B2	POLICE OFFICER I	\$4,186	\$3,707	\$5,270	31%	\$4,767	\$3,970	\$5,507	52%
A4B3	POLICE OFFICER II	\$5,052	\$4,175	\$5,936	50%	\$5,097	\$4,261	\$5,569	64%
A4B4	POLICE OFFICER III	\$6,174	\$4,965	\$7,060	58%	\$6,221	\$5,171	\$6,900	61%
A4B5	POLICE ADMINISTRATOR I	\$7,378	\$5,747	\$8,172	67%	\$8,149	\$6,370	\$8,318	91%
A4B6	POLICE ADMINISTRATOR II	\$8,603	\$6,338	\$9,010	85%	\$8,790	\$6,960	\$9,173	83%
A4C3	SAFETY SECURITY OFF III	\$6,196	\$4,605	\$6,545	82%	\$4,806	\$4,130	\$6,412	30%
<b>Overall Averages - Salary Placement within the Range, EPS</b>					<b>59%</b>				<b>51%</b>

## APPENDIX B – SALARY SURVEY REFERENCES

### Health Care Services

Class Code	Class Title	State Avg Salary 7/1/09	State Salary Ranges			Market Median 7/1/10	Market Salary Ranges			
			Minimum 7/1/09	Maximum 7/1/09	Range Placm't		Minimum 7/1/10	Maximum 7/1/10	Range Placm't	
C1H1	DENTIST I	\$10,464	\$8,692	\$12,696	44%	\$9,872	\$6,963	\$11,280	67%	
C1J1	PHYSICIAN I	\$11,330	\$11,330	\$13,379	0%	\$14,274	\$9,985	\$17,115	60%	
C4J2	CLIN BEHAV SPEC II	\$4,718	\$3,946	\$5,707	44%	\$4,315	\$3,450	\$5,384	45%	
C4L2	SOCIAL WORK/COUNSELOR II	\$4,262	\$3,757	\$5,436	30%	\$4,112	\$3,272	\$5,029	48%	
C4L3	SOCIAL WORK/COUNSELOR III	\$4,914	\$4,141	\$5,991	42%	\$4,679	\$3,519	\$5,545	57%	
C4L4	SOCIAL WORK/COUNSELOR IV	\$5,391	\$4,351	\$6,291	54%	\$4,434	\$3,678	\$5,932	34%	
C4M2	PSYCHOLOGIST I	\$6,569	\$5,431	\$7,853	47%	\$6,240	\$4,533	\$7,051	68%	
C5J2	CLINICAL THERAPIST II	\$3,664	\$3,177	\$4,594	34%	\$3,544	\$2,985	\$4,568	35%	
C5K2	THERAPIST II	\$4,987	\$4,053	\$5,863	52%	\$5,580	\$4,070	\$6,287	68%	
C5L2	THERAPY ASSISTANT II	\$3,541	\$2,804	\$4,055	59%	\$3,604	\$2,802	\$4,209	57%	
C6P2	CLIENT CARE AIDE II	\$2,359	\$2,096	\$3,027	28%	\$2,409	\$2,097	\$3,166	29%	
C6Q4	DENTAL CARE IV	\$4,823	\$4,053	\$5,863	43%	\$4,540	\$3,170	\$4,832	82%	
C6R1	HEALTH CARE TECH I	\$2,871	\$2,543	\$3,678	29%	\$2,917	\$2,416	\$3,663	40%	
C6R2	HEALTH CARE TECH II	\$3,282	\$2,672	\$3,864	51%	\$3,609	\$2,750	\$4,157	61%	
C6S1	NURSE I	\$5,019	\$4,141	\$5,991	47%	\$5,753	\$4,137	\$6,329	74%	
C6S2	NURSE II	\$5,606	\$4,692	\$6,785	44%	\$6,643	\$4,612	\$7,270	76%	
C6S3	NURSE III	\$6,070	\$4,926	\$7,124	52%	\$6,641	\$4,866	\$7,541	66%	
C6S4	MID-LEVEL PROVIDER	\$6,698	\$5,431	\$7,853	52%	\$7,185	\$5,340	\$8,088	67%	
C6S5	NURSE V	\$7,584	\$6,117	\$8,850	54%	\$7,726	\$6,042	\$9,361	51%	
C6S6	NURSE VI	\$8,661	\$7,364	\$9,922	51%	\$8,430	\$6,410	\$10,415	50%	
C7C2	HEALTH PROFESSIONAL II	\$4,133	\$3,757	\$5,436	22%	\$4,027	\$3,389	\$5,207	35%	
C7C3	HEALTH PROFESSIONAL III	\$4,996	\$4,351	\$6,291	33%	\$4,475	\$3,573	\$5,530	46%	
C7C6	HEALTH PROFESSIONAL VI	\$6,890	\$5,828	\$8,430	41%	\$9,644	\$6,826	\$10,375	79%	
C7E1	NURSE CONSULTANT	\$7,194	\$5,828	\$8,430	52%	\$4,305	\$3,747	\$5,944	25%	
C8A2	DIAG PROCED TECHNOL II	\$3,781	\$3,501	\$5,063	18%	\$4,078	\$3,213	\$4,821	54%	
C8A3	DIAG PROCED TECHNOL III	\$4,361	\$3,946	\$5,707	24%	\$5,847	\$4,441	\$6,589	65%	
C8A4	DIAG PROCED TECHNOL IV	\$5,293	\$4,926	\$7,124	17%	\$6,462	\$5,226	\$7,789	48%	
C8B2	DIETITIAN II	\$4,452	\$3,757	\$5,436	41%	\$4,392	\$3,429	\$5,109	57%	
C8C1	LABORATORY SUPPORT I	\$2,318	\$1,950	\$2,820	42%	\$2,570	\$2,002	\$3,014	56%	
C8D1	LABORATORY TECHNOLOGY I	\$3,591	\$3,177	\$4,594	29%	\$3,560	\$2,792	\$4,192	55%	
C8D2	LABORATORY TECHNOLOGY II	\$4,064	\$3,501	\$5,063	36%	\$3,772	\$3,018	\$4,664	46%	
C8D3	LABORATORY TECHNOLOGY III	\$4,829	\$4,053	\$5,863	43%	\$5,542	\$4,066	\$6,165	70%	
C8D4	LABORATORY TECHNOLOGY IV	\$5,780	\$4,469	\$6,464	66%	\$6,399	\$4,652	\$7,043	73%	
C8E1	PHARMACY I	\$7,949	\$6,425	\$9,291	53%	\$8,695	\$6,504	\$9,718	68%	
C8E3	PHARMACY III	\$8,930	\$7,567	\$9,922	58%	\$11,041	\$8,260	\$13,196	56%	
C8F1	PHARMACY TECHNICIAN I	\$2,323	\$2,305	\$3,337	2%	\$2,901	\$2,253	\$3,332	60%	
C8F2	PHARMACY TECHNICIAN II	\$2,860	\$2,543	\$3,678	28%	\$2,937	\$2,424	\$3,601	44%	
C9A1	ANIMAL CARE I	\$2,487	\$2,305	\$3,337	18%	\$2,508	\$2,247	\$3,132	30%	
C9B1	VETERINARIAN I	\$7,481	\$6,289	\$9,093	43%	\$6,086	\$4,552	\$7,257	57%	
<b>Overall Averages - Salary Placement within the Range, HCS</b>					<b>41%</b>					<b>58%</b>

## APPENDIX B – SALARY SURVEY REFERENCES

### Labor, Trades & Crafts

Class Code	Class Title	State	State Salary Ranges			Market	Market Salary Ranges			
		Avg Salary 7/1/09	Minimum 7/1/09	Maximum 7/1/09	Range Placm't	Median 7/1/10	Minimum 7/1/10	Maximum 7/1/10	Range Placm't	
D6A1	ELECTRICAL TRADES I	\$3,847	\$3,178	\$4,476	52%	\$4,125	\$3,191	\$4,551	69%	
D6A2	ELECTRICAL TRADES II	\$4,281	\$3,585	\$5,042	48%	\$4,372	\$3,400	\$4,984	61%	
D6B2	MACHINING TRADES II	\$4,317	\$3,337	\$4,698	72%	\$3,784	\$3,086	\$4,525	49%	
D6C2	PIPE/MECH TRADES II	\$4,367	\$3,585	\$5,042	54%	\$4,136	\$3,267	\$4,751	59%	
D6D1	STRUCTURAL TRADES I	\$2,872	\$2,491	\$3,510	37%	\$3,443	\$2,827	\$3,959	54%	
D6D2	STRUCTURAL TRADES II	\$3,449	\$2,883	\$4,059	48%	\$3,653	\$2,879	\$4,276	55%	
D6E1	UTILITY PLANT OPER I	\$4,290	\$3,412	\$4,802	63%	\$4,149	\$3,194	\$4,788	60%	
D6E2	UTILITY PLANT OPER II	\$5,274	\$4,146	\$5,837	67%	\$6,145	\$4,400	\$6,799	73%	
D7A2	EQUIPMENT MECHANIC II	\$3,757	\$3,096	\$4,356	52%	\$3,611	\$2,891	\$4,155	57%	
D7A3	EQUIPMENT MECHANIC III	\$4,400	\$3,680	\$5,179	48%	\$4,314	\$3,461	\$4,807	63%	
D7A4	EQUIPMENT MECHANIC IV	\$5,003	\$3,948	\$5,558	66%	\$4,950	\$3,892	\$5,704	58%	
D7B1	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I	\$2,316	\$2,097	\$2,948	26%	\$2,533	\$2,060	\$2,922	55%	
D7B2	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR II	\$2,708	\$2,547	\$3,585	15%	\$2,886	\$2,501	\$3,406	43%	
D7B3	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III	\$3,492	\$2,808	\$3,950	60%	\$3,659	\$3,031	\$4,105	58%	
D7B4	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR IV	\$3,962	\$2,947	\$4,150	84%	\$3,763	\$3,202	\$4,377	48%	
D7C2	PRODUCTION II	\$2,325	\$2,097	\$2,948	27%	\$2,994	\$2,500	\$3,677	42%	
D7C3	PRODUCTION III	\$2,891	\$2,311	\$3,252	62%	\$2,861	\$2,504	\$3,739	29%	
D7D1	TRANSPORTATION MTC I	\$3,381	\$2,808	\$3,950	50%	\$3,083	\$2,623	\$3,754	41%	
D7D2	TRANSPORTATION MTC II	\$4,116	\$3,096	\$4,356	81%	\$4,175	\$3,413	\$4,635	62%	
D7D3	TRANSPORTATION MTC III	\$4,972	\$3,865	\$5,440	70%	\$4,579	\$3,565	\$5,187	62%	
D8B1	CUSTODIAN I	\$1,952	\$1,723	\$2,427	33%	\$2,058	\$1,790	\$2,618	32%	
D8B3	CUSTODIAN III	\$2,984	\$2,547	\$3,585	42%	\$3,394	\$2,909	\$4,237	36%	
D8C2	DINING SERVICES II	\$1,931	\$1,686	\$2,376	36%	\$1,914	\$1,659	\$2,392	35%	
D8C3	DINING SERVICES III	\$2,186	\$1,951	\$2,747	30%	\$2,285	\$2,005	\$2,929	30%	
D8C5	DINING SERVICES V	\$2,987	\$2,618	\$3,681	35%	\$3,549	\$2,825	\$4,027	60%	
D8D1	GENERAL LABOR I	\$2,444	\$2,200	\$3,096	27%	\$2,673	\$2,478	\$3,641	17%	
D8E1	GROUNDS & NURSERY I	\$2,673	\$2,547	\$3,585	12%	\$3,418	\$2,936	\$3,996	45%	
D8E2	GROUNDS & NURSERY II	\$2,992	\$2,748	\$3,867	22%	\$3,794	\$3,253	\$4,439	46%	
D8E3	GROUNDS & NURSERY III	\$3,557	\$3,178	\$4,476	29%	\$4,475	\$3,774	\$5,204	49%	
D8G1	MATERIALS HANDLER I	\$2,491	\$2,152	\$3,031	39%	\$2,675	\$2,187	\$3,241	46%	
D8G2	MATERIALS HANDLER II	\$3,059	\$2,618	\$3,681	41%	\$2,920	\$2,500	\$3,698	35%	
D8G3	MATERIALS HANDLER III	\$3,812	\$3,178	\$4,476	49%	\$3,338	\$2,688	\$4,114	46%	
D8G4	MATERIALS SUPERVISOR	\$4,497	\$3,865	\$5,440	40%	\$4,280	\$3,639	\$5,414	36%	
D8H1	SECURITY I	\$2,479	\$2,261	\$3,181	24%	\$2,431	\$2,191	\$3,242	23%	
D8H3	SECURITY III	\$3,432	\$2,947	\$4,150	40%	\$3,010	\$2,566	\$4,114	29%	
D9A1	CORRECTL INDUS SUPV I	\$3,836	\$3,412	\$4,802	31%	\$4,023	\$3,189	\$5,116	43%	
D9B3	ENGR/PHYS SCI ASST III	\$3,333	\$2,748	\$3,867	52%	\$3,703	\$3,019	\$4,330	52%	
D9C1	INSPECTOR I	\$4,042	\$3,412	\$4,802	45%	\$4,493	\$3,429	\$5,485	52%	
D9C2	INSPECTOR II	\$4,528	\$3,948	\$5,558	36%	\$4,767	\$3,877	\$5,428	57%	
D9D1	LTC OPERATIONS I	\$5,571	\$4,259	\$5,998	75%	\$5,477	\$4,253	\$6,157	64%	
D9D2	LTC OPERATIONS II	\$6,276	\$4,696	\$6,607	83%	\$6,091	\$4,847	\$7,094	55%	
D9E1	PROJECT PLANNER I	\$4,891	\$4,146	\$5,837	44%	\$4,686	\$4,038	\$5,921	34%	
<b>Overall Averages - Salary Placement within the Range, LTC</b>					<b>49%</b>					<b>50%</b>

## APPENDIX B – SALARY SURVEY REFERENCES

### Administrative Support & Related

Class Code	Class Title	State	State Salary Ranges			Market	Market Salary Ranges		
		Avg Salary 7/1/09	Minimum 7/1/09	Maximum 7/1/09	Range Placm't	Median 7/1/10	Minimum 7/1/10	Maximum 7/1/10	Range Placm't
G1A2	POLICE COMMUNICATION TECH	\$3,612	\$3,042	\$4,269	46%	\$3,371	\$2,886	\$4,150	38%
G1A3	POLICE COMMUNICATION SUPV	\$4,745	\$3,990	\$5,594	47%	\$5,167	\$4,093	\$5,591	72%
G1B2	SERVICE DISPATCHER	\$2,994	\$2,389	\$3,343	63%	\$3,299	\$2,693	\$3,859	52%
G1C2	TELEPHONE OPERATOR I	\$2,188	\$1,829	\$2,566	49%	\$2,414	\$1,952	\$2,856	51%
G2A2	COMPUTER OPERATOR I	\$3,063	\$2,573	\$3,609	47%	\$3,444	\$2,706	\$4,128	52%
G2A3	COMPUTER OPERATOR II	\$3,755	\$3,128	\$4,383	50%	\$4,092	\$3,105	\$4,792	59%
G2C2	CUST SUPPORT COORD I	\$3,789	\$3,356	\$4,706	32%	\$3,537	\$2,948	\$4,385	41%
G2C4	CUST SUPPORT COORD III	\$5,619	\$4,619	\$6,477	54%	\$7,162	\$5,032	\$7,755	78%
G2D2	DATA ENTRY OPERATOR I	\$2,344	\$2,163	\$3,033	21%	\$2,570	\$2,098	\$3,004	52%
G2D4	DATA SPECIALIST	\$3,101	\$2,836	\$3,977	23%	\$3,599	\$3,026	\$4,383	42%
G3A1	ADMIN ASSISTANT INT	\$1,976	\$1,920	\$2,692	7%	\$2,214	\$1,966	\$2,876	27%
G3A2	ADMIN ASSISTANT I	\$2,287	\$2,117	\$2,968	20%	\$2,526	\$2,109	\$3,075	43%
G3A3	ADMIN ASSISTANT II	\$2,804	\$2,573	\$3,609	22%	\$3,015	\$2,468	\$3,649	46%
G3A4	ADMIN ASSISTANT III	\$3,344	\$2,897	\$4,065	38%	\$3,564	\$2,944	\$4,312	45%
G3A5	OFFICE MANAGER I	\$4,222	\$3,448	\$4,834	56%	\$4,328	\$3,526	\$5,161	49%
G3C3	LIBRARY TECHNICIAN II	\$3,110	\$2,836	\$3,977	24%	\$2,811	\$2,289	\$3,562	41%
G3D1	MEDICAL RECORDS TECH I	\$3,183	\$2,760	\$3,870	38%	\$2,723	\$2,301	\$3,549	34%
G3D2	MEDICAL RECORDS TECH II	\$3,897	\$3,197	\$4,481	55%	\$4,058	\$3,194	\$4,684	58%
G3H2	UNEMP INSURANCE TECH	\$3,329	\$2,897	\$4,065	37%	\$3,424	\$2,793	\$4,355	40%
G4A2	COLLECTIONS REP II	\$2,601	\$2,334	\$3,274	28%	\$3,011	\$2,585	\$3,953	31%
G4A3	COLLECTIONS REP III	\$3,497	\$3,448	\$4,834	4%	\$4,233	\$3,498	\$5,224	43%
G4B2	DRIVER'S LIC EXAM I	\$2,586	\$2,503	\$3,511	8%	\$2,870	\$2,469	\$3,694	33%
<b>Overall Averages - Salary Placement within the Range, ASR</b>					<b>36%</b>				<b>49%</b>

## APPENDIX B – SALARY SURVEY REFERENCES

### *Professional Services (includes Financial Services consolidated July 1, 2009)*

Class Code	Class Title	State	State Salary Ranges			Market	Market Salary Ranges		
		Avg Salary 7/1/09	Minimum 7/1/09	Maximum 7/1/09	Range Placm't	Median 7/1/10	Minimum 7/1/10	Maximum 7/1/10	Range Placm't
H2A2	APP PROGRAMMER I	\$3,926	\$3,549	\$5,120	24%	\$4,844	\$4,240	\$6,263	30%
H2A3	APP PROGRAMMER II	\$5,106	\$3,915	\$5,645	69%	\$6,515	\$4,785	\$7,213	71%
H2A4	APP PROGRAMMER III	\$5,634	\$4,315	\$6,223	69%	\$7,432	\$5,596	\$8,540	62%
H211	IT TECHNICIAN I	\$3,598	\$3,379	\$4,878	15%	\$3,544	\$3,076	\$4,510	33%
H212	IT TECHNICIAN II	\$4,217	\$3,728	\$5,379	30%	\$4,531	\$3,681	\$5,577	45%
H214	IT PROFESSIONAL II	\$5,397	\$4,530	\$6,535	43%	\$5,899	\$4,607	\$7,074	52%
H215	IT PROFESSIONAL III	\$6,466	\$4,994	\$7,203	67%	\$6,957	\$5,240	\$8,065	61%
H216	IT PROFESSIONAL IV	\$7,546	\$5,784	\$8,341	69%	\$7,886	\$6,012	\$9,238	58%
H218	IT PROFESSIONAL VI	\$9,339	\$7,181	\$9,922	79%	\$9,316	\$6,756	\$10,638	66%
H314	MEDIA SPECIALIST III	\$3,960	\$3,289	\$4,749	46%	\$4,050	\$3,179	\$4,541	64%
H315	MEDIA SPECIALIST IV	\$4,326	\$3,628	\$5,233	43%	\$4,671	\$3,923	\$5,866	39%
H3U4	ARTS PROFESSIONAL II	\$3,982	\$3,204	\$4,620	55%	\$4,010	\$3,133	\$4,794	53%
H4M3	TECHNICIAN III	\$3,609	\$3,052	\$4,404	41%	\$3,493	\$2,841	\$4,503	39%
H4O1	AIRCRAFT PILOT	\$4,960	\$4,087	\$5,898	48%	\$5,229	\$4,001	\$6,349	52%
H4P2	FINGERPRINT EXAMINER I	\$4,183	\$3,455	\$4,985	48%	\$3,666	\$2,849	\$4,570	47%
H4Q2	PORT OF ENTRY I	\$3,653	\$3,138	\$4,522	37%	\$3,673	\$2,886	\$4,411	52%
H4R1	PROGRAM ASSISTANT I	\$3,770	\$2,985	\$4,307	59%	\$3,814	\$2,977	\$4,942	43%
H5E1	LEGAL ASSISTANT I	\$3,935	\$3,534	\$5,097	26%	\$4,503	\$3,676	\$5,437	47%
H5E2	LEGAL ASSISTANT II	\$4,919	\$4,087	\$5,898	46%	\$5,615	\$4,306	\$6,322	65%
H5F2	HEARINGS OFFICER II	\$5,631	\$4,733	\$6,828	43%	\$5,271	\$4,277	\$6,814	39%
H6G3	GENERAL PROFESSIONAL III	\$4,803	\$3,895	\$5,617	53%	\$4,306	\$3,517	\$5,415	42%
H6G4	GENERAL PROFESSIONAL IV	\$5,826	\$4,733	\$6,828	52%	\$5,343	\$4,368	\$6,533	45%
H6G5	GENERAL PROFESSIONAL V	\$6,858	\$5,481	\$7,903	57%	\$7,084	\$5,509	\$8,233	58%
H6G6	GENERAL PROFESSIONAL VI	\$7,852	\$6,041	\$8,713	68%	\$8,051	\$6,195	\$9,565	55%
H6G8	MANAGEMENT	\$9,322	\$6,662	\$9,922	82%	\$8,590	\$6,816	\$10,734	45%
H6G8S	MANAGEMENT-SES	\$11,006	\$6,662	\$12,402	76%	\$9,756	\$6,754	\$10,970	71%
H6H2	ARCHIVIST II	\$4,595	\$3,366	\$4,851	83%	\$3,793	\$2,992	\$4,975	40%
H6I1	CHAPLAIN I	\$4,829	\$4,294	\$6,193	28%	\$3,982	\$3,401	\$5,177	33%
H6J3	COMP INSURANCE SPEC II	\$4,862	\$3,895	\$5,617	56%	\$4,906	\$4,008	\$5,883	48%
H6J5	COMP INSURANCE SPEC IV	\$6,847	\$5,481	\$7,903	56%	\$7,424	\$5,746	\$8,590	59%
H6M1	FOOD SERV MGR I	\$3,911	\$3,366	\$4,851	37%	\$4,891	\$3,844	\$5,805	53%
H6N2	LABOR/EMPLOYMENT SPEC I	\$3,690	\$3,366	\$4,851	22%	\$3,187	\$2,651	\$4,100	37%
H6N3	LABOR/EMPLOYMENT SPEC II	\$4,694	\$3,895	\$5,617	46%	\$3,490	\$3,066	\$4,631	27%
H6N5	LABOR/EMPLOYMENT SPEC IV	\$6,219	\$5,481	\$7,903	30%	\$4,681	\$3,867	\$5,893	40%
H6N6	LABOR/EMPLOYMENT SPEC V	\$7,488	\$6,041	\$8,713	54%	\$6,687	\$5,240	\$7,593	62%
H6O2	LOTTERY SALES REP II	\$4,299	\$3,366	\$4,851	63%	\$3,543	\$3,073	\$4,936	25%
H6P2	PARK MANAGER II	\$3,564	\$3,366	\$4,851	13%	\$3,435	\$3,041	\$4,794	23%
H6Q1	RECORDS ADMINISTRATOR I	\$5,051	\$4,202	\$6,059	46%	\$5,245	\$4,218	\$6,559	44%
H6Q2	RECORDS ADMINISTRATOR II	\$6,221	\$4,861	\$7,012	63%	\$7,770	\$5,852	\$9,198	57%
H6R2	REHABILITATION COUNS I	\$4,354	\$3,895	\$5,617	27%	\$3,916	\$3,202	\$4,979	40%
H6U3	WILDLIFE MANAGER III	\$4,831	\$4,087	\$5,898	41%	\$4,411	\$3,486	\$5,509	46%
H6U5	WILDLIFE MANAGER V	\$7,110	\$5,754	\$8,297	53%	\$5,389	\$3,929	\$6,207	64%
H6V1	YOUTH SERV COUNSELOR I	\$4,627	\$3,895	\$5,617	42%	\$3,322	\$2,804	\$4,333	34%
H6V2	YOUTH SERV COUNSELOR II	\$5,228	\$4,294	\$6,193	49%	\$3,597	\$3,137	\$5,018	24%
H7A1	STATE TEACHER I	\$4,759	\$4,409	\$6,362	18%	\$4,155	\$3,175	\$5,002	54%

## APPENDIX B – SALARY SURVEY REFERENCES

H7B1	STATE TEACHER AIDE	\$2,624	\$2,278	\$3,286	34%	\$2,949	\$2,216	\$3,292	68%
H7C1	CHILD CARE AIDE	\$2,032	\$1,785	\$2,579	31%	\$1,644	\$1,503	\$2,117	23%
H7C2	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUC I	\$2,068	\$1,970	\$2,846	11%	\$2,350	\$2,181	\$2,917	23%
H8A1	ACCOUNTANT I	\$4,171	\$3,534	\$5,097	41%	\$3,777	\$3,199	\$4,903	34%
H8A2	ACCOUNTANT II	\$4,794	\$3,895	\$5,617	52%	\$4,377	\$3,595	\$5,295	46%
H8A3	ACCOUNTANT III	\$5,936	\$4,861	\$7,012	50%	\$6,502	\$5,127	\$7,751	52%
H8A4	ACCOUNTANT IV	\$7,464	\$6,041	\$8,713	53%	\$7,466	\$5,893	\$8,830	54%
H8B1	ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN I	\$2,629	\$2,391	\$3,449	23%	\$2,534	\$2,195	\$3,341	30%
H8B2	ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN II	\$2,911	\$2,636	\$3,801	24%	\$3,329	\$2,703	\$3,974	49%
H8B3	ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN III	\$3,536	\$3,052	\$4,404	36%	\$3,972	\$3,217	\$4,660	52%
H8B4	ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN IV	\$4,182	\$3,711	\$5,349	29%	\$5,218	\$4,424	\$6,665	35%
H8C1	CONTROLLER I	\$6,984	\$5,628	\$8,118	54%	\$6,484	\$5,063	\$8,004	48%
H8C3	CONTROLLER III	\$9,209	\$7,167	\$9,922	74%	\$8,079	\$6,251	\$9,505	56%
H8D3	AUDITOR II	\$4,731	\$4,001	\$5,771	41%	\$4,503	\$3,560	\$5,590	46%
H8D4	AUDITOR III	\$5,834	\$4,733	\$6,828	53%	\$5,487	\$4,392	\$6,880	44%
H8D5	AUDITOR IV	\$7,073	\$5,754	\$8,297	52%	\$8,387	\$6,177	\$9,604	64%
H8E2	BUDGET ANALYST II	\$5,611	\$4,409	\$6,362	62%	\$4,833	\$3,959	\$6,344	37%
H8F3	FIN/CREDIT EXAMINER II	\$5,474	\$4,861	\$7,012	28%	\$5,323	\$3,914	\$6,621	52%
H8F6	FIN/CREDIT EXAMINER V	\$8,713	\$6,516	\$9,399	76%	\$7,162	\$5,253	\$8,973	51%
H8G3	RATE/FINANCIAL ANALYST II	\$5,246	\$4,733	\$6,828	24%	\$4,725	\$3,658	\$5,855	49%
H8G5	RATE/FINANCIAL ANALYST IV	\$7,600	\$6,345	\$9,147	45%	\$5,877	\$4,724	\$7,308	45%
H8J3	PROPERTY TAX SPEC II	\$5,037	\$4,409	\$6,362	32%	\$4,649	\$3,443	\$5,460	60%
H8K3	REVENUE AGENT II	\$4,658	\$4,508	\$6,505	7%	\$4,365	\$3,627	\$5,377	42%
H8K5	REVENUE AGENT IV	\$7,984	\$6,206	\$8,953	65%	\$6,065	\$5,001	\$7,109	50%
H8N1	TAX EXAMINER I	\$3,494	\$3,204	\$4,620	20%	\$3,458	\$2,835	\$4,457	38%
<b>Overall Averages - Salary Placement within the Range, PS</b>					<b>49%</b>				<b>49%</b>

## APPENDIX B – SALARY SURVEY REFERENCES

### Physical Science & Engineering

Class Code	Class Title	State Avg Salary 7/1/09	State Salary Ranges			Market Median 7/1/10	Market Salary Ranges			
			Minimum 7/1/09	Maximum 7/1/09	Range Placm't		Minimum 7/1/10	Maximum 7/1/10	Range Placm't	
I1B2	STATISTICAL ANALYST II	\$5,353	\$4,593	\$6,590	38%	\$3,741	\$3,129	\$4,856	35%	
I2A3	ARCHITECT I	\$6,445	\$5,062	\$7,266	63%	\$5,210	\$4,019	\$6,324	52%	
I2B3	ELECTRONIC ENGINEER III	\$8,608	\$6,785	\$9,742	62%	\$7,685	\$5,834	\$8,793	63%	
I2C1	ENGINEER-IN-TRAINING I	\$4,608	\$4,077	\$5,850	30%	\$4,909	\$4,115	\$6,193	38%	
I2C2	ENGINEER-IN-TRAINING II	\$5,351	\$4,593	\$6,590	38%	\$6,098	\$5,000	\$7,428	45%	
I2C4	PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER I	\$7,142	\$5,459	\$7,838	71%	\$6,272	\$4,967	\$7,582	50%	
I2C5	PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER II	\$8,556	\$6,462	\$9,273	74%	\$7,831	\$5,850	\$8,896	65%	
I2C6	PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER III	\$9,395	\$8,068	\$9,922	72%	\$10,197	\$7,814	\$11,757	60%	
I2D2	LANDSCAPE SPECIALIST	\$4,377	\$4,280	\$6,140	5%	\$4,488	\$3,329	\$5,090	66%	
I2D3	LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT I	\$6,515	\$4,822	\$6,922	81%	\$5,847	\$4,746	\$6,723	56%	
I3A2	ENVIRON PROTECT SPEC I	\$4,878	\$4,280	\$6,140	32%	\$4,722	\$4,063	\$5,899	36%	
I3A3	ENVIRON PROTECT SPEC II	\$6,221	\$4,954	\$7,109	59%	\$4,641	\$3,651	\$5,823	46%	
I3A6	ENVIRON PROTECT SPEC V	\$9,360	\$7,126	\$9,922	80%	\$8,757	\$6,807	\$10,644	51%	
I3B2	PHY SCI RES/SCIENTIST I	\$5,040	\$4,280	\$6,140	41%	\$5,138	\$4,200	\$6,031	51%	
I3B3	PHY SCI RES/SCIENTIST II	\$6,107	\$4,954	\$7,109	53%	\$4,998	\$3,963	\$6,116	48%	
I3B4	PHY SCI RES/SCIENTIST III	\$7,373	\$5,733	\$8,229	66%	\$5,899	\$4,444	\$6,717	64%	
I5C1	CIVIL ENG PROJ MANAGER I	\$6,161	\$4,822	\$6,922	64%	\$4,965	\$3,712	\$5,921	57%	
I5C2	CIVIL ENG PROJ MANAGER II	\$6,675	\$5,317	\$7,631	59%	\$5,404	\$4,130	\$6,772	48%	
I5D1	ENGR/PHYS SCI TECH I	\$4,048	\$3,520	\$5,055	34%	\$3,997	\$3,414	\$4,831	41%	
I5D2	ENGR/PHYS SCI TECH II	\$4,733	\$3,779	\$5,423	58%	\$4,652	\$3,689	\$5,295	60%	
I5D3	ENGR/PHYS SCI TECH III	\$5,542	\$4,165	\$5,979	76%	\$4,595	\$3,614	\$5,466	53%	
I5E2	ELECTRONICS SPEC I	\$3,759	\$3,264	\$4,686	35%	\$3,860	\$3,142	\$4,808	43%	
I5E3	ELECTRONICS SPEC II	\$4,596	\$3,779	\$5,423	50%	\$4,506	\$3,673	\$5,574	44%	
I9B2	LAND SURVEY INTERN II	\$4,451	\$3,698	\$5,305	47%	\$3,925	\$3,413	\$4,856	35%	
I9B3	PROF LAND SURVEYOR I	\$5,702	\$4,822	\$6,922	42%	\$5,231	\$4,012	\$5,891	65%	
I9B4	PROF LAND SURVEYOR II	\$6,902	\$5,317	\$7,631	68%	\$6,469	\$5,405	\$7,762	45%	
<b>Overall Averages - Salary Placement within the Range, PSE</b>					<b>56%</b>					<b>52%</b>

**Overall Averages - Salary Placement, All Occupational Groups**

**48%**

**51%**



## APPENDIX B – SALARY SURVEY REFERENCES

### CHART 2 – COMPARISON OF TROOPER CLASSES TO MARKET

Class Code	Class Title	#Orgs	#EEs	#Rngs	Actual Salary		Salary Range			Range Placm't
					Wgt Avg	Median	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	
A4A1	<b>STATE PATROL INTERN</b>		<b>28</b>		<b>\$3,600</b>		<b>\$3,598</b>	<b>\$4,356</b>	<b>\$5,114</b>	<b>0%</b>
	Overall Market Average	13	108	9	\$3,880	\$3,787	\$3,356	\$3,962	\$4,567	36%
	% Difference				7.8%	5.2%	-6.7%	-9.0%	-10.7%	
	Statutory Market	3	0	0	No Data Reported					
A4A3	<b>STATE PATROL TROOPER</b>		<b>508</b>		<b>\$4,965</b>		<b>\$4,167</b>	<b>\$5,044</b>	<b>\$5,920</b>	<b>46%</b>
	Overall Market Average	95	13,423	86	\$5,047	\$4,692	\$3,849	\$4,713	\$5,627	47%
	% Difference				1.7%	-5.5%	-7.6%	-6.5%	-4.9%	
	Statutory Market	3	1,190	3	\$5,705	\$5,741	\$4,333	\$5,181	\$6,029	83%
	% Difference				14.9%	15.6%	4.0%	2.7%	1.8%	
	Statutory Market at 99%				\$5,648			\$5,129		
	<b>% Adjustment to Match Statutory Market*</b>				<b>10.3%</b>					
A4A4	<b>STATE PATROL TROOPER III</b>		<b>88</b>		<b>\$6,206</b>		<b>\$4,380</b>	<b>\$5,303</b>	<b>\$6,225</b>	<b>99%</b>
	Overall Market Average	10	70	10	\$5,892	\$5,097	\$4,261	\$4,915	\$5,569	64%
	% Difference				-5.1%	-17.9%	-2.7%	-7.3%	-10.5%	
	Statutory Market	3	0	0	No Data Reported					
A4A5	<b>STATE PATROL SUPERVISOR</b>		<b>95</b>		<b>\$6,961</b>		<b>\$4,930</b>	<b>\$5,969</b>	<b>\$7,008</b>	<b>98%</b>
	Overall Market Average	93	3,622	85	\$6,184	\$6,050	\$4,876	\$5,868	\$6,922	57%
	% Difference				-11.2%	-13.1%	-1.1%	-1.7%	-1.2%	
	Statutory Market	3	295	2	\$7,105	\$7,066	Insufficient Data			N/A
	% Difference				2.1%	1.5%				
	Statutory Market at 99%				\$7,034					
	<b>% Adjustment to Match Statutory Market*</b>				<b>-2.5%</b>					
A4A6	<b>STATE PATROL ADMIN I</b>		<b>32</b>		<b>\$7,915</b>		<b>\$5,582</b>	<b>\$6,760</b>	<b>\$7,937</b>	<b>99%</b>
	Overall Market Average	43	350	37	\$7,925	\$8,149	\$6,370	\$7,344	\$8,318	91%
	% Difference				0.1%	3.0%	14.1%	8.6%	4.8%	
	Statutory Market	3	100	2	\$8,214	\$8,172	Insufficient Data			N/A
	% Difference				3.8%	3.2%				
	Statutory Market at 99%				\$8,131					
	<b>% Adjustment to Match Statutory Market*</b>				<b>-0.8%</b>					
A4A7	<b>STATE PATROL ADMIN II</b>		<b>9</b>		<b>\$8,888</b>		<b>\$6,253</b>	<b>\$7,571</b>	<b>\$8,888</b>	<b>100%</b>
	Overall Market Average	35	122	31	\$8,681	\$8,845	\$6,954	\$8,060	\$9,166	85%
	% Difference				-2.3%	-0.5%	11.2%	6.5%	3.1%	
	Statutory Market	3	18	2	\$9,187	\$9,206	Insufficient Data			N/A
	% Difference				3.4%	3.6%				
	Statutory Market at 99%				\$9,095					
	<b>% Adjustment to Match Statutory Market*</b>				<b>-1.2%</b>					
<b>Overall Average Percentage Difference</b>					<b>7.7%</b>					

\*The percent adjustment is calculated on the Statutory Market at 99% of the weighted average salary, reduced by the FY 2003-2004 survey adjustment of 3.5% pursuant to C.R.S. 24-50-104(4)(d)(IV).

**APPENDIX C – SYSTEM MAINTENANCE STUDY**

**SYSTEM MAINTENANCE STUDY**

C.R.S. 24-50-104(4)(c) and (6)(a) require that any study involving increased costs must be included in the annual compensation report for an effective date on the ensuing July 1. The study completed this year for inclusion in the report is the Driver’s License Examiner class series.

The final findings of the Driver’s License Examiner study are contained in JEL 10-01, published July 31, 2009. The Department of Revenue is the only department using this class series. Sixteen employees (all Driver’s License Examiner Interns) out of a total 198 positions in five classes, will have their salaries adjusted to higher grade minimums, with a cost of approximately \$36,234. The following information depicts the assumptions made in the calculation of increased costs for the Driver’s License Examiner study.

- Data was taken from CPPS as of May 31, 2009, and is assumed to be accurate as of that date.
- Only permanent, full-time positions are reported. Vacant, temporary, part-time and substitute positions are excluded.
- The implementation date of July 1, 2010, coincides with the presumed implementation of any annual compensation adjustments. In accordance with the Director's Rules regarding the order of multiple actions on the same effective date, system maintenance studies are implemented first. For this reason, these calculations use the final FY 2009-2010 compensation plan values and do not include any potential FY 2010-2011 annual compensation survey adjustments.
- In accordance with the Director's Rules, system maintenance studies are implemented on a "dollar-for-dollar" basis where an employee's current salary remains unchanged when a class is moved to a new grade. An exception is when a class moves upward and individual employee salaries that are below the new grade minimum are adjusted upward to the new grade minimum. Such adjustments to base salary represent increased cost.
- The estimated total first-year cost to implement this study is approximately \$36,234. PERA, AED, and Medicare costs are included in the calculations.

The pay grades recommended for each class are shown in the following table.

<b>Current Class</b>	<b>Current Grade</b>	<b>New Class</b>	<b>New Grade</b>
G4B1IX Driver’s License Examiner Intern	G27	G4B1XX Driver’s License Examiner I	G29
G4B2TX Driver’s License Examiner I	G33	G4B2XX Driver’s License Examiner II	G34
G4B3XX Driver’s License Examiner II	G41	G4B3XX Driver’s License Examiner III	G41
G4B4XX Driver’s License Examiner III	G47	G4B4XX Driver’s License Examiner IV	G47
G4B5XX Driver’s License Examiner IV	G53	G4B5XX Driver’s License Examiner V	G53

## APPENDIX D – GROUP BENEFIT PLAN COMPARISONS

### **Group Benefit Plan Comparisons**

Summarized in the following tables are comparisons of medical and dental benefit and basic life insurance plan features, cost-sharing, and plan values. Comparisons were made based on the State's most popular medical and dental plans. Plan features, cost-sharing, and medical and dental premium data were collected from the MSEC 2009 *Health and Welfare Survey* and CML *Benefits Survey Reports*. Benefits data from the CSCA survey were not included as the data were not reported in a common format for measurement.

**Table 1** – Provides information regarding the types of medical plans offered by market employers; average member co-pays for prescriptions, office and emergency care visits across plans; and, the average deductibles, out-of-pocket maximums, and percentage co-insurance paid by the plan members in PPO plans. A total of 659 organizations reported data on medical plan features and cost-sharing; approximately 792 employers reported data on medical plan premiums.

**Table 2** – Provides information regarding the types of dental plans offered by market employers and a summary of the most common benefits provided. A total of 637 organizations reported data on dental plan features, including 508 (80%) providing the most common, PPO plans; approximately 742 employers reported data on dental plan premiums.

**Table 3** – Summarizes the most common practices reported in the market related to basic life insurance plans.

Types of plans provided and benefits offered are reported as a percentage of the total number of organizations reporting data. Because employers may offer multiple plans, the percentages of plans provided will not add up to 100.

**APPENDIX D – GROUP BENEFIT PLAN COMPARISONS**

**TABLE 1 – MEDICAL PLAN COMPARISONS**

<b>Medical Benefits</b>	<b>Market</b>	<b>State</b>	
<b>Types of Medical Plans Offered</b>	<b>% Providing Plan</b>	<b>Plan Offered?</b>	
Health Maintenance Organization (HMO)	31%	Yes	
Preferred Provider Organization (PPO)	70%	Yes	
Point of Service (POS)	15%	No	
Consumer Driven Health Plan (HSA/HRA)	27%	HSA qualified (HDHP)	
Self-insured/Self-funded	44%	Yes	
<b>Flexible Spending Accounts (Section 125)</b>	91%	Yes	
Health Care	85%	Yes	
Dependent Care	68%	Yes	
<b>Employer Contribution to Premiums*</b>	<b>Market Average (All Plans)</b>	<b>State Contribution (All Plans)</b>	
Employee-Only Coverage	\$398.37	\$350.66	
Employee + Spouse	\$702.46	\$592.54	
Employee + Child(ren)	\$632.02	\$627.10	
Employee + Spouse + Child(ren)	\$942.95	\$868.98	
<b>Employee Share of Premiums**</b>		<b>OA 1500</b>	<b>Kaiser HMO</b>
Employee-Only Coverage	\$84.10	\$39.50	\$71.00
Employee + Spouse	\$287.11	\$265.20	\$328.98
Employee + Child(ren)	\$251.35	\$74.78	\$127.80
Employee + Spouse + Child(ren)	\$437.08	\$300.50	\$385.78
<b>Prescriptions (three tier most common )</b>	<b>Average Co-Pay</b>	<b>OA 1500</b>	<b>Kaiser HMO</b>
Generic	\$24	\$25	\$20
Formulary Brand	\$64	\$63	\$60
Non-Formulary Brand	\$106	\$125	N/A
<b>Office Visit (Primary Care Providers)</b>	<b>Average Co-Pay</b>	<b>EE Share (after deductible)</b>	<b>Co-Pay</b>
HMO	\$42	N/A	\$30
PPO	\$37	20%	N/A
<b>Emergency Care</b>			
HMO	\$111	N/A	\$100
PPO	\$118	20%	N/A
<b>In-Network</b>	<b>Average EE Share (PPO Plans)</b>	<b>EE Share</b>	<b>EE Share</b>
Deductible (Tier 1-Employee)	\$794	\$1,500	N/A
Deductible (Tier 4-Family)	\$1,956	\$3,000	N/A
Out-of-Pocket Maximum (Tier 1)	\$2,631	\$3,000	\$1,000 + co-pays
Out-of-Pocket Maximum (Tier 4)	\$5,744	\$6,000	\$3,000 + co-pays
Coinsurance (most common %)	20%	20%	N/A
<b>Out-of-Network</b>			
Deductible (Tier 1-Employee)	\$1,600	\$3,000	No Benefit
Deductible (Tier 4-Family)	\$4,098	\$6,000	No Benefit
Out-of-Pocket Maximum (Tier 1)	\$5,393	\$6,000	No Benefit
Out-of-Pocket Maximum (Tier 4)	\$11,829	\$12,000	No Benefit
Coinsurance (most common %)	40%	40%	N/A

\*Market premium rates adjusted to July 2010 using cost increase trend factor of 10%; state data is effective July 2009.

## APPENDIX D – GROUP BENEFIT PLAN COMPARISONS

\*\*State employee share of premium costs based on the most common state plans.

**TABLE 2 –DENTAL PLAN COMPARISONS**

Dental Benefits	Market (Common Practices)	State Benefit (Most Common Plans)	
<b>Types of Plans Offered</b>	<b>% Providing Plan</b>	<b>Plan Offered?</b>	
Dental PPO	80%	Passive PPO	
Dental HMO	18%	No	
Group Indemnity	19%	No	
Self-insured/Self-funded	39%	Yes	
<b>Employer Contribution to Premiums*</b>	<b>Market Average (All Plans)</b>	<b>State Contribution (All Plans)</b>	
Employee-Only Coverage	\$20.49	\$20.72	
Employee + Spouse	\$35.90	\$33.86	
Employee + Child(ren)	\$40.11	\$35.72	
Employee + Spouse + Child(ren)	\$52.63	\$48.86	
<b>Employee Share of Premiums**</b>		<b>Basic Plan</b>	<b>Basic Plus</b>
Employee-Only Coverage	\$14.41	\$1.46	\$8.80
Employee + Spouse	\$31.13	\$14.74	\$30.88
Employee + Child(ren)	\$34.73	\$4.08	\$17.28
Employee + Spouse + Child(ren)	\$55.36	\$17.36	\$39.38
<b>Maximum Benefit (per person per year)</b>	<b>PPO Plans % Providing Benefit</b>	<b>Basic Plan</b>	<b>Basic Plus</b>
\$1,000	27%	\$1,000	
\$1,500	45%		\$1,500
<b>Plan Features (most common)</b>			
Deductible applies to basic & major coverage, but not preventive	70%	Yes	Yes
Orthodontics covered for children	73%	No	Yes
Orthodontics covered for adults	23%	No	Yes
<b>Deductible</b>	Not Reported	\$50 per member / \$150 per family	
<b>Maximum Orthodontic Benefit (per person)</b>	\$1,395	N/A	\$1,500

\*Market premium rates adjusted to July 2010 using cost increase trend factor of 6%; state data is effective July 2009.

\*\*State employee share of premium costs based on the most common state plans.

**APPENDIX D – GROUP BENEFIT PLAN COMPARISONS**

**TABLE 3 –LIFE INSURANCE PLAN COMPARISONS**

Life Insurance Benefits	Market (Common Practices)		State Benefit	
	% Providing Benefit	Annual \$ Value of Benefit	Offered?	Annual \$ Value of Benefit (Per Employee)
<b>Life Insurance Provided as a Benefit</b>	96%		Yes	
<b>100% Employer Paid Premiums</b>				
Basic Life Insurance	97%	Not Reported	Yes	\$101
Basic Accidental Death & Dismemberment (AD&D)	86%	Not Reported	Yes	\$12
<b>Value of Basic Life Insurance</b>				
Provide a specific dollar (\$) amount	32%	\$30,890	Yes	\$50,000
Provide as a multiple of annual base salary			No	<i>(Value based on average state salary)</i>
1x base salary	32%	Not Reported	No	\$49,932
1.5x base salary	10%	Not Reported	No	\$74,898
2x base salary	18%	Not Reported	No	\$99,864