

Amy Harvey

From: Roger Stancil
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 3:24 PM
To: Allen Buansi; Donna Bell; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Town Council; Michael Parker; Nancy Oates; Pam Hemminger; Rachel Schaevitz; Roger Stancil; Ross Tompkins
Cc: Ken Pennoyer; Amy Oland; Matthew Brinkley; Cliff Turner; CHRIS BLUE; Loryn Clark; Susan Brown; Scott Clark; Amy Harvey; Beth Vazquez; Carolyn Worsley; Catherine Lazorko; Christina Strauch; Dwight Bassett; Flo Miller; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Rae Buckley; Ralph Karpinos; Ran Northam; Roger Stancil; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: FW: Medical Renewal Negotiation

I asked our healthcare consultant, HCW, to provide a summary of our negotiations with Blue Cross Blue Shield. Ellen Tucker is our primary contact and does an excellent job representing the Town interests. Please note that the Employee Healthcare Task Force work and support of the introduction of a \$250 deductible yielded a savings to the Town of \$542,442.

From: Ellen Tucker [mailto:etucker@hewbenefits.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 12:37 AM
To: Roger Stancil <rstancil@townofchapelhill.org>
Cc: Cliff Turner <cturner@townofchapelhill.org>; Ken Pennoyer <kpennoyer@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Medical Renewal Negotiation

Roger:

Per your request, here is a summary of the medical renewal negotiations:

	Total Premium	Percentage Change vs Current Premium	Savings by Line
Original Renewal requested by BCBSNC	\$12,216,127	10.3%	
Negotiated Renewal prior to plan changes	\$11,613,075	4.9%	\$603,052
\$250 Deductible	\$11,070,633	0.0%	\$542,442
\$250 Deductible with package pricing	\$10,906,107	-1.5%	\$164,526
Total			\$1,310,020

BCBSNC's underwriter developed a 16.6% renewal increase, but requested a 10.3% increase. The net medical loss ratio was 92.3% for the current underwriting period and 97.6% for the prior underwriting period, so most of the premium paid by the Town was used to pay claims. BCBSNC would like for the net medical loss ratio to be 83.2%. We are trying to hold BCBSNC to a higher loss ratio, to ensure a favorable premium cost for the Town. Additionally, there were 16 claimants over \$75k in the current underwriting period for a total of \$1,848,707, and 16 claimants over \$75k for the prior underwriting period for a total of \$2,071,638. I negotiated based on almost all components of the renewal, including: claims projection, claims experience adjustment, administrative charge, pooling charge (protection from large claimants) and the health insurance tax (which should be prorated). Also, claims experience after the end of the underwriting period was more favorable, so we continued to review our projection and negotiate based on updated monthly claims data.

Regards,

Ellen

Ellen Tucker, CMCE
Area Vice President
Health & Welfare Consulting

Hill, Chesson & Woody, a division of Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc.
4819 Emperor Boulevard, Suite 200 | Durham, NC 27703
P: 919.403.1986 | 910.202.4296
www.hcwbenefits.com | www.linkedin.com/in/ellenmtucker
Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc.

Confidentiality Note: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential material and/or material protected by law. Any retransmission or use of this information may be a violation of that law. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

Amy Harvey

From: Roger Stancil
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 8:03 PM
To: Allen Buansi; Donna Bell; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Town Council; Michael Parker; Nancy Oates; Pam Hemminger; Rachel Schaevitz; Roger Stancil; Ross Tompkins
Cc: Loryn Clark; Ben Hitchings; Ken Pennoyer; Amy Oland; Matthew Brinkley; Amy Harvey; Beth Vazquez; Carolyn Worsley; Catherine Lazorko; Christina Strauch; Dwight Bassett; Flo Miller; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Rae Buckley; Ralph Karpinos; Ran Northam; Roger Stancil; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: Council Question: an urban designer on staff

Council Question: What considerations should be given to the suggestion to employ an urban designer on staff?

Staff Response: *The Town's traditional approach has been to engage urban designers on a case by case basis and generally require an applicant to pay the cost. This approach has been taken to recognize the varying urban design considerations for different projects, to assign the cost of an urban designer to the applicants rather than the community as a whole and to mitigate the effect of changing community interests and standards on a particular employee. The Town approach has been to facilitate community conversation and decision on urban design.*

The ability of an employee or Board in a design oversight role to influence the built outcomes in the community is directly connected to the Town's adopted design requirements. A Town employee or consultant who reviews plans as they move through today's development process could advise on design, but their authority to require changes would be limited to the legal parameters in place now.

For a Town employee or consultant to have different authority, the Council could consider adopting different design guidelines or review processes in the LUMO, within the authority granted to the Town by the State.

Under General Statutory authority, the Council can appoint an appearance commission, which it has done with the creation of the CDC. This commission can seek "voluntary adherence" to standards and policies. In reality, most of what the CDC does involves review and negotiation with developers on plans.

Under General Statutory authority, the Council can appoint a historic district commission, which it has done. The HDC can approve or deny certificates of appropriateness based on standards related to congruity of structures.

The Town also has special authority through its Charter to create special appearance districts, in which the CDC would have a level of authority over design more in line with the HDC's role in historic districts. The Blue Hill District has been established and designated as a special appearance district under the authority granted by the Charter. This allows the Town to apply more detailed design standards in this area than elsewhere in Town. Other areas of the Town could be established as special appearance districts. Some areas that could be considered include any of our neighborhood conservation districts and our downtown.

Hiring design staff without enacting ordinances to exercise this additional authority might not give them the ability to support the Council's interests.

Questions to consider:

- *Would the Town be assuming a role over planning private projects that should be reserved to the private sector and paid for by the applicants rather than the taxpayers?*
- *Would this lead to more conflict or an expectation that we had more authority than we actually do?*

- *If the Town created more special appearance districts, would we increase our application fees to cover these costs?*
- *What would the design community think?*

Options:

- *The Council could provide some limited funding to hire a design consultant to research and offer guidance aimed at achieving the Council's desired design outcomes. A consultant could provide options and cost-ranges for the Council to consider when adopting next year's budget.*
- *In order to provide the necessary guidance for an urban designer, whether a consultant or employee, another approach would be to ask the consultant for the FLUM effort to do detailed character/place-type studies for all of the focus areas. If adopted as part of the Future Land Use Map, these studies could be used to develop design standards for those districts in the LUMO re-write.*
- *Based on other research and outreach activities in recent years, this effort could range from \$50,000 - \$100,000. A request for proposals would be the route to identify an actual consultant or project cost.*

Additional information:

For Urban Designers surveyed by the American Planning Association (2,284 responding) the Annual Base Salary was:

<i>25th Percentile</i>	<i>50th Percentile (median)</i>	<i>75th Percentile</i>
<i>\$64,500</i>	<i>\$82,500</i>	<i>\$106,000</i>

Amy Harvey

From: Roger Stancil
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 7:10 PM
To: Allen Buansi; Donna Bell; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Town Council; Michael Parker; Nancy Oates; Pam Hemminger; Rachel Schaevitz; Roger Stancil; Ross Tompkins
Cc: Ken Pennoyer; Amy Oland; Matthew Brinkley; JABE HUNTER; CHRIS BLUE; Loryn Clark; Scott Clark; Susan Brown; Amy Harvey; Beth Vazquez; Carolyn Worsley; Catherine Lazorko; Christina Strauch; Dwight Bassett; Flo Miller; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Rae Buckley; Ralph Karpinos; Ran Northam; Roger Stancil; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: An alternative approach to the debt management fund tax increase
Attachments: MSC Budget questions
Importance: High

Options for the Debt Management Fund tax increase:

When we developed the Recommended Budget, we included .8 cent tax rate increase for the debt management fund as a fiscally prudent approach to future financial sustainability. I know tax increases are painful to discuss and difficult for a community with a high total tax rate when considering County and Schools taxes as well as the Town. The information below, developed by Business Management Director Ken Pennoyer, points to two alternatives to a tax increase for this fund this year.

- One option is no tax increase this year and, if all stays the same, consider a slightly larger tax increase next year of .95 cents to avoid negative cash flow.
- Another option is to consider modifying the proposed building, which is a major contributor to our debt, and adjust any increase on that new information.

If you consider this approach as one part of a reduction of the recommended tax rate increase, I recommend you eliminate this increase this year. That will also give you time with your new Manager and an opportunity to continue your strategic planning process and consider how this building aligns with your goals.

The Debt Management Fund cash flow projection includes the following assumptions regarding projects that will be financed from the fund over the next 5 years (FY19-FY24).

Project	Financing Cost	Financing Date	Debt Service	Interest Rate
MSC	\$ 34,100,000	5/01/19	\$ 2,430,000	4.0%
Wallace Deck	2,400,000	5/01/19	171,000	4.0%
Affordable Housing	5,000,000	5/01/19	360,000	4.0%
Blue Hill Phase II	2,600,000	5/01/19	184,600	4.0%
Affordable Housing	5,000,000	7/01/20	372,000	4.5%
Streets & Sidewalks	7,700,000	7/01/21	592,844	5.0%

Affordable Housing (AH) Bonds

It is assumed that the Debt Fund tax rate will be increased in the year that the affordable housing bonds are issued in an amount sufficient to cover the additional debt service cost. Based on the assumptions above the rate increase needed would total one penny, applied as follows:

FY20 – 0.5 cents

FY21 – 0.5 cents

Debt Fund Cash Flow (not including AH Bonds)

In order to keep the Debt Fund from experiencing negative cash flow one of two things needs to happen. Either the capital financing plan described above needs to be delayed or reduced significantly or the dedicated property tax needs to be increased. The amount of property tax increase needed depends on the year the tax is applied. The low-point for cash flow is FY2024-25, therefore the tax rate increase does not have to be instituted immediately however it does get more expensive with each year of delay.

Tax rate increase needed *(not including AH bonds)*

FY2018-19 - 0.80 cents

FY2019-20 – 0.95 cents

FY2020-21 – 1.15 cents

FY2021-22 – 1.35 cents

FY2022-23 – 2.0 cents

Delaying or Reducing Projects

The MSC represents the bulk of the Town’s planned borrowing for the next 5 years, therefore any change to projects to delay or avoid a tax increase in the debt fund would impact that project. In order to avoid a tax increase in the debt fund altogether, the cost of the MSC would need to be reduced by \$9-10 million. Alternatively the project could be delayed approximately three years. This would solve the cash flow problem in FY2024-25, but the building cost is expected to escalate by 6% per year, adding about \$5 million to the project.

Building Information and Options:

To determine the options for reducing the costs of the MSC building, we asked our architect, Eric Schoenagel, AIA, LEED® AP, for his perspective. I have attached his email as shown below.

Following up on our conversations, I wanted to share some points for consideration in evaluating the projected construction costs and potential cost savings strategies for you to discuss with the Town Council. First, it’s important to understand that when we create preliminary construction budgets we utilize a cost per square foot model to develop the budget. As such, there are only 2 ways to effectively lower the costs. The first is to lower the anticipated costs per square foot (how much we pay) and the second is to reduce the amount of building area (how much we build). I’ll further outline my thoughts on both approaches below. I’ve also double checked with contacts in the construction market place and the currently budgeted amount of \$350/SF does align with similar projects constructed in the Triangle. If the final goal is to create savings of between \$9M and \$10M, I believe drastic measures will be required to achieve that kind of savings.

Cost Savings #1 – reduced construction costs (per sf)

- We believe that with careful consideration of the design of the building, and alignment of needs for the project with the budget, we can target a reduced cost of \$300/sf potentially saving **\$3.6M**. Some enhancements, for example solar panels or full building emergency power, could not be included. However, the building program and anticipated functionality would be preserved. The whole team would have to challenge ourselves to stay focused on the needs rather than the wants and everyone involved in the project, including Boards and Commissions, would need to buy into this approach to help achieve this savings.
- By targeting a reduced cost/sf, we will need to lower the cost of the finishes used within the building. To do this we may have to target specific areas to look at using more cost-effective materials for example linoleum tile in lieu of porcelain tile in the lobby.
- Due to the front-loaded costs with how the site is initially being developed, some savings could be achieved by reducing the amount of site infrastructure initially installed and/or by relocating the building to a flatter area of

the site. Further savings could be achieved by reducing the amount utilities and of storm water measures installed initially.

- It might be possible to further Value Engineer the building, but past a certain threshold (level noted above) the cuts become drastic and generally affect the maintenance and operations of the facility. Typically, the results from this approach are increased operating (energy consumption) and maintenance costs.
- It might not be possible to save the anticipated \$9M to \$10M without drastic value engineering or further reductions to the site development or building area.

Cost Savings #2 – reduced building program area

- Reducing the building to 45,000 sf (cut 40%) a savings of \$9M could be achieved. Careful consideration of the building program would be required to achieve such a drastic cut.
- The Town would need to determine which program areas would be cut. Assuming the police program is not reduced, to achieve a 27,000-sf reduction at least 4 departments would have to be removed from the building in addition to a significant reduction in the shared/collaboration/meeting spaces.
- The reduction in area would reduce the site development area required by reducing parking. The police function might still require the dual entrances and connecting roadways.
- At times, smaller buildings can be less cost effective to build.

As you probably know, the current construction market is very volatile and experiencing a 4% yearly escalation rate. The costs/sf noted in option #1 are expected to work through our bidding in 2019.

If bidding were to be postponed past 2019 the 4% escalation should be included in any budgeting. For the \$25M construction budget (hard costs), this would equate to a \$1.1M in escalated costs. According to my contacts in construction market place, they do not see a reduction in escalation for the next 2-3 years.

Amy Harvey

From: Mary Jane Nirdlinger
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 4:14 PM
To: Roger Stancil; Ken Pennoyer
Cc: JABE HUNTER; Matthew Brinkley
Subject: MSC Budget questions

From: Eric Schoenagel [mailto:ESchoena@littleonline.com]
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 3:31 PM
To: Mary Jane Nirdlinger <mnirdlinger@townofchapelhill.org>
Cc: 'maryallisonbeck@gmail.com' <maryallisonbeck@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: MSC.....

Mary Jane

Following up on our conversations, I wanted to share some points for consideration in evaluating the projected construction costs and potential cost savings strategies for you to discuss with the Town Council. First, it's important to understand that when we create preliminary construction budgets we utilize a cost per square foot model to develop the budget. As such, there are only 2 ways to effectively lower the costs. The first is to lower the anticipated costs per square foot (how much we pay) and the second is to reduce the amount of building area (how much we build). I'll further outline my thoughts on both approaches below. I've also double checked with contacts in the construction market place and the currently budgeted amount of \$350/SF does align with similar projects constructed in the Triangle. If the final goal is to create savings of between \$9M and \$10M, I believe drastic measures will be required to achieve that kind of savings.

Cost Savings #1 – reduced construction costs (per sf)

- We believe that with careful consideration of the design of the building, and alignment of needs for the project with the budget, we can target a reduced cost of \$300/sf potentially saving **\$3.6M**. Some enhancements, for example solar panels or full building emergency power, could not be included. However, the building program and anticipated functionality would be preserved. The whole team would have to challenge ourselves to stay focused on the needs rather than the wants and everyone involved in the project, including Boards and Commissions, would need to buy into this approach to help achieve this savings.
- By targeting a reduced cost/sf, we will need to lower the cost of the finishes used within the building. To do this we may have to target specific areas to look at using more cost-effective materials for example linoleum tile in lieu of porcelain tile in the lobby.
- Due to the front-loaded costs with how the site is initially being developed, some savings could be achieved by reducing the amount of site infrastructure initially installed and/or by relocating the building to a flatter area of the site. Further savings could be achieved by reducing the amount utilities and of storm water measures installed initially.
- It might be possible to further Value Engineer the building, but past a certain threshold (level noted above) the cuts become drastic and generally affect the maintenance and operations of the facility. Typically, the results from this approach are increased operating (energy consumption) and maintenance costs.
- **It might not be possible to save the anticipated \$9M to \$10M without drastic value engineering or further reductions to the site development or building area.**

Cost Savings #2 – reduced building program area

- Reducing the building to 45,000 sf (cut 40%) a savings of \$9M could be achieved. Careful consideration of the building program would be required to achieve such a drastic cut.

- The Town would need to determine which program areas would be cut. Assuming the police program is not reduced, to achieve a 27,000-sf reduction **at least 4 departments would have to be removed from the building in addition to a significant reduction in the shared/collaboration/meeting spaces.**
- The reduction in area would reduce the site development area required by reducing parking. The police function might still require the dual entrances and connecting roadways.
- At times, smaller buildings can be less cost effective to build.

As you probably know, the current construction market is very volatile and experiencing a 4% yearly escalation rate. The costs/sf noted in option #1 are expected to work through our bidding in 2019.

If bidding were to be postponed past 2019 the 4% escalation should be included in any budgeting. For the \$25M construction budget (hard costs), this would equate to a \$1.1M in escalated costs. According to my contacts in construction market place, they do not see a reduction in escalation for the next 2-3 years.

If I can be of any further assistance please don't hesitate to contact me.

Thanks
Eric

Eric Schoenagel, AIA, LEED® AP

Little

919.474.2500 (o) 919.474.2543 (d) 919.474.2502 (f)

Littleonline.com | Littlespeakeasy.com | [Facebook](https://www.facebook.com/eric.schoenagel) | [Twitter](https://twitter.com/eric.schoenagel)

 Please consider the environment before printing this page or its attachments

)



Mary Jane Nirdlinger, Assistant Town Manager

405 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd. | Chapel Hill NC 27514

Town of Chapel Hill | www.townofchapelhill.org
c: 919-619-4956 | mnirdlinger@townofchapelhill.org
w: 919-968-2739

Amy Harvey

From: Roger Stancil
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 6:16 PM
To: Allen Buansi; Donna Bell; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Town Council; Michael Parker; Nancy Oates; Pam Hemminger; Rachel Schaevitz; Roger Stancil; Ross Tompkins
Cc: Ken Pennoyer; Cliff Turner; Amy Oland; Matthew Brinkley; Amy Harvey; Beth Vazquez; Carolyn Worsley; Catherine Lazorko; Christina Strauch; Dwight Bassett; Flo Miller; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Rae Buckley; Ralph Karpinos; Ran Northam; Roger Stancil; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: Town of Chapel Hill Pay Plan
Attachments: 2017-18 Pay Plan.pdf

I have received some questions about the Town's Pay Plan. Attached is the classification and pay plan for the Town. Under the Town personnel ordinance, the Town Council adopts the Pay Plan and the Town Manager administers it. We conduct a market survey regularly to see how our classifications and pay compare with our competitor cities in North Carolina. We make changes based on those surveys and report them to Council in the next budget. Our goal is to conduct a comprehensive pay and classification study every five years. Our last comprehensive study was conducted about four years ago. If you have additional questions, please let me know.



TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL
Human Resource Development

405 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-5705

phone (919) 968-2700 fax (919) 968-2839
www.townofchapelhill.org

MEMORANDUM

To: Roger Stancil, Town Manager
From: Cliff Turner, Director-HRD, Ken Pennoyer, Director-BMD
Date: November 20, 2017
Subject: Request to approve Pay Plan

Roger,

Ken and I have reviewed the 2018 Pay Plan. We have worked in MUNIS to create this version so that is more accurate than what we had been using. This will also align with Position Control and the Dashboard reports you receive.

I am attaching the version based on what Council approved for the FY 17/18 Budget. We have another version that is updated as we approve Position changes that occur during the year. The other version HRD will maintain and provide to BMD as we finalize the Budget to assure the new pay plan will be accurate.

Cliff Turner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cliff Turner", written below the name.

Ken Pennoyer

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Ken Pennoyer", written below the name.



Town of Chapel Hill, NC

Effective Date: July 1, 2017
 Revised Date: November 17, 2017

Approved By:
 Roger L. Stancil, Town Manager

Senior Management Structure

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Market</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Title</u>
I	\$ 67,814	\$ 88,837	\$ 109,859	ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF ASST DIR-HOUSING & COMMUNITY FIRE MARSHAL OPERATIONS MANAGER-HOUSING PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
II	\$ 72,561	\$ 95,055	\$ 117,549	ASST DIR P&R-REC OPS ASST DIR-HRD ASST DIR-LIB/HEAD PUBLIC SERV OPERATIONS MANAGER-PW PLANNING OPERATIONS MANAGER POLICE LEGAL ADVISOR
III	\$ 77,641	\$ 101,709	\$ 125,778	ASST DIR-BUSINESS MANAGEMENT ASST DIR-TRANSPORTATION EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COORD FIRE CHIEF-DEPUTY OPERATIONS MANAGER OF ENGINEERING INFRASTR OMBUDS-SR. POLICE CHIEF-ASSISTANT
IV	\$ 85,405	\$ 111,880	\$ 138,355	DIR-COMMUNICATIONS-PUBLIC DIR-HOUSING DIR-HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT DIR-PARKS AND REC DIR-PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SVC DIR-TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS EXE. DIR-COMM ARTS & CULTURE LEGAL ADVISOR-SR
V	\$ 99,069	\$ 129,781	\$ 160,492	ASST TOWN MANAGER DIR-BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIR-PUBLIC WORKS DIR-TRANSPORTATION EXE. DIR.-HOUSING & COMMUNITY EXE. DIR.-PLANNING & SUST. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR-TECH SOL FIRE CHIEF POLICE CHIEF\EXE DIR COMM SAFE
VI	\$ 116,902	\$ 153,141	\$ 189,381	TOWN MANAGER-DEPUTY

Exempt Structure

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Market</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Title</u>
108	\$ 37,403	\$ 49,352	\$ 60,593	HOUSING OFFICER II

109 \$ 40,395 \$ 53,300 \$ 65,440

ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
ASST PARKING SERVICES SUPT
PLANNER
RECREATION SUPERVISOR
TR ADVERTISING SALES MANAGER

110 \$ 43,627 \$ 57,564 \$ 70,675

ADAPTAVE RECREATION COORD
CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER-SR
CULTURAL ARTS COORDINATOR
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST
ENGINEERING INSPECTOR-SR
HR CONSULTANT
LIBRARY ACCOUNTS COORDINATOR
MECHANIC SUPERVISOR-BUS
PLANNER II
POLICE ANALYST
STORMWATER ANALYST
TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT MGR
TRANSIT PLANNING COORDINATOR

111 \$ 47,117 \$ 62,170 \$ 76,329

ACCOUNTANT-HOUSING
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE SUPERVISOR
ADMIN ANALYST
ASSISTANT MAINTENANCE MANAGER
ASST MANAGER-TRANSIT
BUDGET ANALYST
CHILD. & FAM OUTREACH COORD
COMM. DEVEL. PROGRAM MANAGER
COMMUNITY OUTREACH MANAGER
CRISIS COUNSELOR
DEPUTY TOWN CLERK
DRAINAGE MAINT SUPERVISOR
ENGINEER I
GRANTS COMPLIANCE MANAGER
HUMAN SERVICES COORD
INSPECTOR SUPERVISOR
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
LIFELONG LEARNING COORDINATOR
OCC HEALTH & SAFETY OFFICER
PAYROLL COORDINATOR
PROJECT MANAGER
READER SERVICE COORDINATOR
REFERENCE LIBRARIAN
SENIOR PLANNER
STREETS SUPERVISOR
SURVEY/PROJECT COORD
TEEN ENGAGEMENT COORDINATOR

112 \$ 50,886 \$ 67,143 \$ 82,436

ACCOUNTANT-TREASURY
ACQUISITIONS & COLL. MANAGER
AFFORDABLE HOUSING OFFICER
ASSISTANT TO TOWN ATTORNEY
CHIEF BUILDING INSPECTOR
DEMAND RESPONSE MANAGER
ENGINEER II
FACILITIES SUPERVISOR
FLEET MANAGER
GIS ANALYST II
LIBRARY EXPERIENCE MANAGER
LIBRARY SYSTEMS MANAGER
MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS MGR

NETWORK ADMINISTRATOR
 PLANNER-PRINCIPAL
 PURCHASING & CONTRACTS MANAGER
 SUPERINTENDENT-PARKING SERVICE
 SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR
 WEB ADMINISTRATOR
 YOUTH & FAMILY EXP. MANAGER

113 \$ 55,466 \$ 73,186 \$ 89,855

ACCOUNT SUPV-TREASURY
 ACCOUNTANT-PAYROLL & PAYABLES
 ACCOUNTANT-REVENUE
 ADMINISTRATIVE SVCS MANAGER
 BUSINESS ANALYST
 CRISIS UNIT SUPERVISOR
 CULTURAL ARTS ADMINISTRATOR
 ENGINEERING COORDINATOR-SR
 FINANCIAL SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR
 LEARNING & DEVELOPMENT MGR
 MANAGEMENT ANALYST
 RECREATION MANAGER-P&R
 SENIOR-HRD CONSULTANT
 SR. COMMERCIAL PLANS REVIEWER
 TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEM ENGINEER

114 \$ 60,458 \$ 79,773 \$ 97,942

AFFORDABLE HOUSING MANAGER
 ASSISTANT TO THE MANAGER
 COMMUNICATIONS MANAGER
 ENGINEER III
 FACILITIES MANAGER
 MAINTENANCE MANAGER
 OMBUDS
 PARK MAINTENANCE SUPT
 PLANNING MANAGER
 PROJECT MANAGER-PARKS & REC
 RISK MANAGER
 SENIOR ANALYST
 SOLID WASTE SERVICES MANAGER
 SUPT-ST & CONT SVCS
 SYSTEMS & SUPPORT MANAGER
 TECHNICAL SERVICES MANAGER
 URBAN FORESTER/SPCL PROJ

115 \$ 65,899 \$ 86,952 \$ 106,756

BUDGET MANAGER
 BUILDING INSPECTOR MANAGER
 CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER
 ECONOMIC DEVLMT COORDINATOR
 SENIOR ENGINEER
 TRAFFIC ENGINEERING MANAGER

116 \$ 71,830 \$ 94,778 \$ 116,365

ASST DIR TR-ADMIN SVCS
 MANAGER-TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Non-Exempt Structure

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Market</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Title</u>
204	\$ 24,979	\$ 32,959	\$ 40,465	SERVICE ATTENDANT
205	\$ 25,728	\$ 33,948	\$ 41,679	AQUATICS SPECIALIST
206	\$ 26,757	\$ 35,305	\$ 43,347	

				CONSTRUCTION WORKER I MAINTENANCE ASST MAINTENANCE REPAIR WORKER PARK MAINTENANCE SPLST PARKING ATTENDANT
207	\$ 27,827	\$ 36,718	\$ 45,080	
				MAINT. MECHANIC I-HOUSING MECHANIC HELPER OFFICE ASSISTANT OFFICE ASSISTANT-PT PARTS CLERK SOLID WASTE COLLECTOR TRANSIT OP FIXED ROUTE-PT TRANSIT OPERATOR-DEM RES PT TRANSIT OPERATOR-FIXED ROUTE
208	\$ 29,219	\$ 38,554	\$ 47,334	
				ADMIN ASST PT BUS SERVICE TECHNICIAN CONSTRUCTION WORKER II CUSTOMER SERVICE TECH LIBRARY EXPERIENCE ASSISTANT LIBRARY EXPERIENCE ASST.-PT MAINT. MECHANIC II-HOUSING RECREATION ASSISTANT SIGN & MARKING TECH I SOLID WASTE EQUIP OP I TRANSIT OPERATOR-DEMAND RESPON
209	\$ 30,680	\$ 40,481	\$ 49,701	
				ACCOUNTING TECH I ADMIN ASSISTANT BLDG MAINT MECH I MAINT. MECH III-HOUSING MECHANIC I MECHANIC I-BUS PARK MAINTENANCE SPLST-CERT PARKING ATTENDANT-SR PARKING ENFORCEMENT OFFICER PERMIT TECHNICIAN PLANNING TECHNICIAN RECORDS TECH RECORDS TECH-PT SCHEDULING & RUN CUT COORD
210	\$ 32,214	\$ 42,505	\$ 52,186	
				ASSISTANT HOUSING OFFICER ASST ARBORIST CONSTRUCTION WORKER III CUSTOMER SERVICE COORDINATOR PERMITTING SYSTEMS TECH PROCESSING TECHNICIAN RESIDENT SERVICES COORD SENIOR HEAVY EQUIPMENT OPER SOLID WASTE EQUIP OP II STREET SWEEPER EQUIP OP TRAFFIC SIGNAL TECH I
211	\$ 33,824	\$ 44,631	\$ 54,796	
				BLDG MAINT MECH II CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER CONSTRUCTION WORKER IV FESTIVAL & EVENTS TECHNICIAN HUMAN RESOURCES TECHNICIAN LIBRARY EXPERIENCE SPECIALIST

				LIBRARY EXPERIENCE SPLST-PT MECHANIC II MECHANIC II-BUS RECORDS SUPERVISOR RECREATION SPECIALIST RECREATION SPECIALIST I-PT SIGN & MARKING TECH II SOLID WASTE EQUIP OP III SR. STREET SWEEPER EQUIP OP
212	\$ 35,516	\$ 46,862	\$ 57,535	ACCOUNTING TECH II ASST PARKING SVCS SUPV ASST RECREATION SUPV GIS TECHNICIAN HOUSING OFFICER I INSPECTOR LANDSCAPE CREW LEADER LEAD CONSTRUCTION WORKER MUNICIPAL ARBORIST PAYROLL TECHNICIAN PURCHASING SPECIALIST REVENUE COLLECTOR SIGN & MARKING TECH II TRAFFIC SIGNAL TECH II
213	\$ 37,291	\$ 49,205	\$ 60,412	ASSISTANT HR CONSULTANT BLDG MAINT MECH III CONSTRUCTION CREW SUPERVISOR DRAINAGE CREW SUPERVISOR ENGINEERING INSPECTOR ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN GRAPHIC ARTIST LEAD SIGN & MARKING TECH LIBRARY EXP SPLST-TECH MECHANIC III MECHANIC III-BUS PARTS MANAGER SOLID WASTE INSPECTOR SOLID WASTE SVCS CREW SUPV STORMWATER SPECIALIST STREET CREW SUPERVISOR STREET INSPECTOR SUPERVISOR-PARKING SERVICES SUPERVISOR-TRANSIT
214	\$ 39,156	\$ 51,666	\$ 63,433	GIS TECHNICIAN-SR SENIOR ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN SPECIAL OLYMPICS COORDINATOR TRAFFIC SIGNAL TECH III TRAINING COORDINATOR
215	\$ 41,114	\$ 54,249	\$ 66,604	ASSISTANT TOWN CLERK COMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST COMMUNITY EDUCATION COORD FACILITIES SYSTEMS TECHNICIAN GRANTS COORD LEAD TRAFFIC SIGNAL TECH MARKETING & SPONSORSHIP COORD PARK MAINTENANCE SUPV PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST RISK CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR TRANS DEM. MGMT COM MGR

216 \$ 43,581 \$ 57,504 \$ 70,601

FORENSIC & EVIDENCE SPECIALIST
 INFORMATION TECH ANALYST
 MAINTENANCE MECHANIC SUPERVISOR
 MECHANIC SUPERVISOR
 SOLID WASTE SERV SUPERVISOR

217 \$ 46,195 \$ 60,954 \$ 74,837

INSPECTOR-SR
 PLANS REVIEWER
 TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEMS ANALYST

218 \$ 48,966 \$ 64,611 \$ 79,327

FIRE PROTECTION SPECIALIST
 INFORMATION TECH ANALYST-SR

Fire Structure

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Market</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Title</u>
F1	\$ 35,436	\$ 44,941	\$ 54,080	FIREFIGHTER LEVEL I
F2	\$ 37,952	\$ 48,132	\$ 57,919	FIREFIGHTER-MASTER
F3	\$ 42,887	\$ 54,391	\$ 64,040	FIRE EQUIPMENT OPERATOR
F4	\$ 49,647	\$ 61,730	\$ 72,729	FIRE INSPECTOR FIRE LIEUTENANT
F5	\$ 53,027	\$ 67,251	\$ 79,553	FIRE INSPECTOR II
F6	\$ 55,679	\$ 70,614	\$ 83,530	FIRE CAPTAIN FIRE COMMUNICATIONS TECH OFFIC FIRE MARSHAL-ASSISTANT
F7	\$ 57,473	\$ 71,460	\$ 83,707	FIRE MARSHAL-DEPUTY
F8	\$ 62,042	\$ 80,258	\$ 96,065	BATTALION CHIEF

Police Structure

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Market</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Title</u>
P1	\$ 37,048	\$ 48,884	\$ 60,123	POLICE OFFICER I
P2	\$ 38,900	\$ 51,328	\$ 62,286	POLICE OFFICER II
P3	\$ 40,845	\$ 52,837	\$ 64,124	POLICE OFFICER III
P4	\$ 46,942	\$ 58,367	\$ 68,066	POLICE OFFICER IV
P5	\$ 41,940	\$ 65,872	\$ 79,396	POLICE SERGEANT

P6 \$ 60,735 \$ 77,027 \$ 91,326

POLICE LIEUTENANT

P7 \$ 63,943 \$ 84,371 \$ 101,731

POLICE CAPTAIN

Amy Harvey

From: Roger Stancil
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 2:17 PM
To: Allen Buansi; Donna Bell; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Town Council; Michael Parker; Nancy Oates; Pam Hemminger; Rachel Schaevitz; Roger Stancil; Ross Tompkins
Cc: Susan Brown; Amy Harvey; Beth Vazquez; Carolyn Worsley; Catherine Lazorko; Christina Strauch; Dwight Bassett; Flo Miller; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Rae Buckley; Ralph Karpinos; Ran Northam; Roger Stancil; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: artist grants

Council Question: Does the Public and Cultural Arts disburse any grants? If so, what kinds of grants are disbursed?

Staff Response: *The Town does not provide grants in the traditional sense for anything. We generally treat everything as a performance agreement so we are getting specific results for specific payments to human services agencies, artists, etc. In the arts arena, for a number of years, the Town, via the Public Art Office (now Community Arts & Culture), has commissioned both works of public art and public arts experiences via two main programs - [Artists-in-Schools](#) and the [Community Art Project](#). Some might consider these grants, but the Town's Public Arts staff considers them commissions of art. Generally, they put out a Call for Artists that outlines the goals of each program and any stipulations or restrictions for that given year. Based on the proposals they receive and criteria, a committee makes a selection. An award is made for each program annually, and then staff work closely with the artist to execute the proposed project. The Community Arts and Culture staff is currently working with a variety of stakeholders to review these programs and see how we might assess and evaluate and perhaps approach them differently.*

Council Question: Do these commissions come out of money budgeted for the Office of Community Arts & Culture?

Staff Response: *Yes, these commissions come out of the funds budgeted for Community Arts & Culture.*

Council Question: Can you share the list of artists with whom commissions have been made during this past year?

Staff Response: *All of the previous commissions under the Artists in Schools and Community Art Project are listed [here](#) and [here](#). For 2017-18, we commissioned the following via these annual programs:*

- *Artists in Residence - Anita Woodley/Phoenix Academy: In February and March of 2018 teaching artist Anita Woodley worked with 32 Phoenix Academy students to promote self-esteem, conflict resolution and other personal affirmation through writing, drumming and theatrical improvisation.*
- *Community Art Project - "Tunnel Vision," Students from Boomerang and Volunteers for Youth programs used a tunnel on the Bolin Creek Trail as their canvas for artistic expression, under the guidance of local artist Daniel LeClair.*

In addition, this year, as part of the community-wide effort to celebrate the bicentennial of the birth of Frederick Douglass, we commissioned Tarish Pipkins, aka Jeghetto, to create a Frederick Douglass puppet and multi-media performance that was done at two public venues and at two CHCCS schools.

We also provided some funding to Carter Hubbard and her Florafitti project, via an semi-regular program called "Creative Projects."