City of Mount Pleasant, Texas

2025-2026 Compensation Study

Final Report

July 21, 2026

Prepared by

J. Shane Howard, MBA

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 5

1. Study Design and Scope 7

1.1 Populations Covered 7

1.2 Peer Cohort Design 7

1.3 What Is In — And What Is Not — in the Base Benchmarks 8

1.4 Interim Reports and Documentation Record 8

2. Existing Conditions — The Diagnostic 9

2.1 Civilian — Compressed Structure with Limited Runway 9

2.2 Police — Below Market and Compressed at Command 9

2.3 Fire — Fragmented Firefighter Ladder and Narrow Promotional Differentials 9

3. Comprehensive Framework and Recommended Response 11

3.1 The Comprehensive Framework (Approach 1) 11

3.2 The Recommended Targeted Response (Approach 2) 11

4. Placement Philosophy and Methodology 13

4.1 Foundational Principles 13

4.2 The Placement Rule Hierarchy 13

4.3 Why Civilian Grades Do Not Receive Service Recognition 15

4.4 What Placement Does Not Do 15

5. Civilian and Telecom Recommendation 16

5.1 Position Reclassifications 16

5.2 The PS-1 / PS-2 Telecommunicator Scale 16

5.3 Utilities — Tier Framework 17

5.4 Public Works — Tier Framework 17

5.5 Held Positions and Managerial Flags 17

6. Sworn Recommendation — Police and Fire 19

6.1 Police — Proposed Grade Structure 19

6.2 Fire — Proposed Grade Structure 19

6.3 Rank-to-Rank Promotion Premium Resolution 19

6.4 Placement Options — Standard versus Service Recognition 20

6.5 Sworn Market Position After Placement 20

7. Directors — Placement Models 22
7.1 Current Position Against Peer Benchmark 22
7.2 Three Placement Models 22
7.3 Recommendation — Model A 23
8. Department Impact Summary 24
8.1 Departments With the Largest Impact 25
8.2 Departments With No Impact 25
8.3 Modest-Impact Departments 25
9. Combined Cost and Scenario Matrix 27
9.1 Component Summary 27
9.2 Scenario Matrix 27
10. Where Mount Pleasant Sits After Implementation 28
10.1 Priority Alignment 28
11. Implementation Considerations 29
11.1 COLA and Step Progression as Separate Actions 29
11.2 Minimum Salary Floor 29
11.3 Performance-Gated Step Advancement 29
11.4 Held Positions and Managerial Action 29
12. What the Recommendation Is — and Is Not 30
Appendix A: Grade Tables — Civilian, Telecommunicator, and Sworn 31
A.1 Civilian Letter Grades A–V 31
A.2 Public Safety Support Bands — Telecommunicators 31
A.3 Police Sworn Grade Structure 32
A.4 Fire Sworn Grade Structure 32
Appendix B: Master Grade-to-Position Reference 33
B.1 Civilian Positions by Grade 33
B.2 Telecommunicator Positions by Grade 34
B.3 Sworn Positions by Grade 34
Appendix C: Methodology Reference 36
C.1 Source Data 36
C.2 Civilian Market Matching 36
C.3 Sworn Placement Rules 36

C.4 Universal Placement Rules 36

Appendix D: Study Deliverables 38

Executive Summary

The City of Mount Pleasant commissioned this compensation study to assess the structural soundness, market competitiveness, and long-term sustainability of its pay system. The study covers all 172 City employees across three populations — civilian and telecommunicator staff, sworn public safety personnel, and executive and department directors — evaluated against the same analytical framework of internal structural review, external market benchmarking, and targeted structural response.

The study developed two structural approaches to the diagnostic findings. The first is a comprehensive structural framework: a seven-family, seventeen-tier classification system with uniform ten-step progression, designed to address every structural issue identified in the diagnostic review through a full pay-plan rebuild. That framework was presented in the May 2026 Council and Department Director workshop, with total-cost scenarios ranging from approximately $344,000 to $609,000 depending on options selected. The second is the recommended targeted response, informed by workshop input and by the City's fiscal and implementation priorities: it addresses the same identified structural issues while preserving the City's existing letter-grade architecture, applies targeted position-level reclassifications, incorporates a new PS-1 / PS-2 telecommunicator scale designed for the dispatch labor market, and applies revised sworn structures and director benchmarks. Both approaches are documented; the recommendation before Council is the targeted response.

The Recommendation in Brief

The recommended compensation package addresses documented structural conditions in each population using the analytical tool appropriate to that population. Civilian positions receive targeted reclassifications based on the existing letter-grade system, while telecommunicators are provided a new set of grades more reflective of the dispatch labor market. Sworn ranks are placed into a revised grade structure calibrated to the peer 50th percentile (peer median) that resolves the current-state command hierarchy inversion and thin promotion premiums. Directors are benchmarked individually against peers with comparable operational scope, with the recommended placement moving five below-market directors up to peer minimum.

Component	Employees	Change ($)	Change (%)	Approach
Civilian + Telecom	96	+$28,092	+0.54%	Targeted reclassifications; PS-1/PS-2 scale
Police Sworn	32	+$150,807	+6.43%	Peer-median structure + Service Recognition
Fire Sworn	33	+$188,043	+8.16%	Peer-median structure + Service Recognition
Directors (Model A)	11	+$45,589	+3.53%	Placement to peer minimum where below
Combined Recommendation	**172**	**+$412,531**	**+3.70% of $11.15M total base payroll**	

The combined increase equals 3.70% of the City's current $11.15 million base payroll. The recommendation is targeted rather than broad-based: it responds to specific structural conditions where the diagnostic review identified misalignment, and it holds harmless every position class where the current pay is already at or above the relevant peer benchmark. No employee's pay decreases under any scenario in this study.

1. Study Design and Scope

1.1 Populations Covered

The study covers all 172 City of Mount Pleasant employees, distributed across three populations that face materially different labor markets and require different analytical approaches. A single one-size-fits-all pay framework was explicitly identified in the diagnostic phase as a structural weakness of the current system; the study responds to that finding with different structural tools for different labor markets.

Population	Employees	Current Base Payroll	Analytical Approach
Directors	11	$1,293,057	Individual scope-based benchmarking against peers with comparable operational responsibility
Civilian	87	$4,742,081	Reviewed against MP letter grades A–V; targeted position reclassifications where scope no longer fit the grade
Telecom	9	$463,461	New PS-1 / PS-2 scale designed for the dispatch labor market
Police Sworn	32	$2,345,803	PD-1 through PD-4 revised structure calibrated to peer median
Fire Sworn	33	$2,304,992	FD-Cdt through FD-4 revised structure calibrated to peer median with consolidated firefighter ladder
TOTAL	**172**	**$11,149,395**	

1.2 Peer Cohort Design

Two cohorts were used throughout the study to reflect Mount Pleasant's actual competitive geography. The eleven-city full cohort served as the primary reference for most positions and includes:

- Bonham
- Corsicana
- Ennis
- Greenville
- Jacksonville
- Nacogdoches
- Palestine
- Paris
- Rockwall
- Sulphur Springs
- Waxahachie

A seven-city Texas Nonmetro sub-cohort — Bonham, Corsicana, Jacksonville, Nacogdoches, Palestine, Paris, and Sulphur Springs — was used where DFW-adjacent labor markets materially distort comparability, particularly for civilian roles that do not compete with the Metroplex.

Director positions were benchmarked individually against peers with comparable operational scope rather than against population-based averages. Mount Pleasant's directors carry consolidated operational responsibility that population-based comparisons systematically understate: for example, the Assistant City Manager also serves as the City Secretary along with the large portfolio she already manages, the Finance Director functions as a de facto Budget Director; the Public Works Director oversees streets, parks, fleet, facilities, and cemeteries with approximately 800 acres of parks; the Airport Manager operates an airport with approximately 137 based aircraft and full-service FBO operations at a scale typical of significantly larger communities. Where these consolidated scopes exist, the study identified peer cities with comparable operational responsibility (typically three to six peers per role) and pulled base salary at those peers' Range Minimum, Midpoint, and Maximum.

1.3 What Is In — And What Is Not — in the Base Benchmarks

The base benchmarks include base salary at Range Minimum, Midpoint, and Maximum for every peer position, using direct title matches where available and documented cluster matches where direct matches do not exist. The benchmarks do not include certification pay, education incentives, assignment pay, FTO pay, detective pay, corporal pay, K-9 pay, bilingual pay, health benefits, retirement contributions, or leave accruals. Total cash compensation is a distinct analysis. Where the study identified structural issues in base pay, those findings are independent of the incentive layer. Base pay competitiveness and incentive pay competitiveness are two separable questions.

1.4 Interim Reports and Documentation Record

The study drew on structured stakeholder engagement documented in three interim reports produced during the study process. Interim Report 1 synthesizes findings from nine department director interviews conducted across all City functions. Interim Report 2 synthesizes interviews with council members and identifies the political and governance considerations that shape implementation. The Interim Synthesis Report bridges the two, identifying areas of alignment, meaningful disconnects, and their implications for the study's recommendations. Together these reports established the operational and governance context from which the analytical framework and recommendations in this report proceed.

Unfortunately, some of the primary agreed upon goals of replacing the current grade and step system for a more sustainable system had to be abandoned due to budget and political realities as well as the risk posed by introducing sudden and complex structural changes in a very challenging operational environment. As a result, the final recommendation reflects an effort to initiate the process of transitioning to a more structurally coherent system and address the most urgent needs in addressing first responder pay, promotion equities across the organization, and key position market misalignments.

2. Existing Conditions — The Diagnostic

Before any comparative market analysis was conducted, each of the three populations was reviewed for internal structural soundness. The diagnostic findings summarized in this section are architectural findings about the current pay plan itself. They exist independent of any market comparison and would be true regardless of how Mount Pleasant's pay compares to peer cities. These conditions establish why a targeted structural response is needed and why the study responds differently to each population.

2.1 Civilian — Compressed Structure with Limited Runway

The civilian pay plan operates as a single legacy A–V letter-grade schedule supporting all 96 civilian and telecommunicator employees under one framework. Four architectural conditions define the current state. Adjacent grades overlap by approximately 79.6%, leaving very little true distance between grade levels. Thirty-nine of 96 employees (40.6%) sit within two steps of the top of their current grade. Average remaining progression across the civilian workforce is 2.9 steps, with several classes below 2.0. The internal-equity pattern is coherent in shape but the schedule does not consistently carry the organizational hierarchy in pay: role distinctions exist on paper without the compensation differentiation that would communicate them in practice.

The operational consequence is that structured progression, as it functions in the current plan, offers most civilian employees very little forward movement. Ceiling pressure builds with tenure, and certification distinctions between roles lose their compensation meaning.

2.2 Police — Below Market and Compressed at Command

The current Police pay schedule sits below the peer 50th percentile at every rank. Twenty-two of 32 sworn officers currently sit below what the peer market would identify as their rank's entry-level pay: thirteen officers and recruits, all six sergeants, and all three lieutenants. Ceiling pressure builds with tenure at the Sergeant and Lieutenant ranks, where operative ranges are short. A structural inversion exists at the command transition: the current Assistant Police Chief range begins below the top of the Lieutenant range, which is a command hierarchy not carried in pay. The Assistant Police Chief position was vacant at the time of the study, and current-state pay data at that rank reflects that vacancy.

Rank-to-rank promotion premiums are unusually thin under the current plan. The Officer-to-Sergeant transition carries a +10.0% premium at grade midpoint. The Sergeant-to-Lieutenant transition carries only +2.3%. The Lieutenant-to-Assistant Chief transition is functionally inverted at the range floor. These thin premiums reduce the financial incentive to accept supervisory responsibility, which is the mechanism through which career progression drives retention and knowledge continuity.

2.3 Fire — Fragmented Firefighter Ladder and Narrow Promotional Differentials

The current Fire pay plan splits the firefighter role across three sub-grades — Grade AA (Firefighter I / II), Grade BB (Firefighter III), and a historical Grade FF classification — with adjacent grade overlap of approximately 80% and promotional differentials of roughly $2,400 to $2,600 floor-to-floor. That differential

is too narrow to communicate certification distinctions meaningfully. The officer ranks compress similarly: Grade DD (Driver / Pump Operator) and Grade GG (Captain) sit close together, with only the DD-to-GG transition carrying a meaningful differential of approximately $8,882. The Deputy Fire Chief band (Grade JJ) trails the proposed structure across its entire range, with the largest gap at the top.

The pattern common to all three populations is not the absence of structure but the presence of hierarchy in name without corresponding differentiation in pay. Structural correction is a prerequisite to broad market repositioning: without meaningful separation between grades and ranks, external market alignment cannot be operationally translated into internal career progression.

3. Comprehensive Framework and Recommended Response

The study's structural design work produced two distinct approaches to the diagnostic findings. Both are documented here because the comprehensive framework represents legitimate analytical work that Council may reference in future policy cycles, and because presenting both makes clear that a full pay-plan rebuild was considered, designed, and costed rather than dismissed. The recommendation before Council is the targeted response; the comprehensive framework is preserved as a documented alternative.

3.1 The Comprehensive Framework (Approach 1)

The comprehensive framework was designed as a full structural rebuild responding to every diagnostic finding. On the civilian side, the framework proposed a seven-family, seventeen-tier classification system: Administrative (AD-1, AD-2), Program / Professional Operations (PP-1 through PP-3), Professional (PF-1 through PF-3), Service / Maintenance (SM-1, SM-2, SM-U), Skilled Craft (SC-1, SC-2), Technical (TN-1, TN-2), and Public Safety Support (PS-1, PS-2). Each tier carried a uniform ten-step progression under two alternative band-spread designs: a 3.75% Equity Plan producing approximately 39.3% band spread with adjacent overlap held to 30% or less, and a 3.05% Alternative Plan producing approximately 30.9% band spread with adjacent overlap held to 40% or less. Both alternatives shared the same Step 1 minimums, differing only in step growth and ceiling.

On the sworn side, the comprehensive framework established the four-rank grade structures for Police (PD-1 through PD-4) and Fire (FD-Cdt through FD-4) that carry forward into the recommendation. On the director side, the framework established the three placement models — to peer minimum, midway between peer minimum and peer median, and to peer median — also carried forward.

The comprehensive framework was presented to Council and Department Directors in the May 2026 workshop with total-cost scenarios ranging from +$343,755 (+3.1%) to +$609,253 (+5.5%), varying with the civilian band-spread selection, the presence or absence of a tenure overlay, and the sworn placement approach. Director placement models were layered on top, producing combined scenarios up to +$747,002 (+6.7%). The workshop's purpose was directional input on structure, placement, and cost path.

3.2 The Recommended Targeted Response (Approach 2)

The recommended response, informed by subsequent workshop input and by the City's fiscal and implementation priorities, retains the sworn grade structures and the director placement models but takes a different approach to the civilian population. Rather than converting the entire civilian workforce to a new family-and-tier framework, the recommendation preserves the existing Mount Pleasant A–V letter-grade structure and applies targeted reclassifications only to positions where the diagnostic identified specific misalignment between grade and current scope. The new PS-1 / PS-2 telecommunicator scale, originally designed as part of the comprehensive framework, is retained as a standalone structural response to the dispatch labor market.

The recommendation preserves the analytical work of the comprehensive framework without requiring wholesale conversion. Position classes below the peer 50th percentile receive targeted grade movement

where a documented scope-and-grade misalignment justifies it. Position classes at or above peer 50th are held. Should Council choose to pursue a broader structural conversion in a future budget cycle, the comprehensive framework remains documented as an available alternative.

The recommended combined package — civilian and telecom targeted reclassifications, sworn Service Recognition placement into the revised PD-1 through PD-4 and FD-Cdt through FD-4 grade structures, and Director Model A — produces a total increase of +$412,531, or 3.70% of the current $11.15 million total base payroll. Combined scenarios across sworn placement options and director models range from +$288,228 (+2.59%) under Standard sworn placement with Director Model A to +$612,491 (+5.49%) under Service Recognition placement with Director Model C. The recommendation sits at the lower-middle of that range and is detailed component-by-component in Section 9.

Why Both Are Presented

Both design approaches are documented in this report because the comprehensive framework represents legitimate analytical work that Council may reference in future policy cycles. Presenting both also makes clear that the recommendation is a considered choice among documented alternatives rather than the only response designed. The recommendation before Council is the targeted response.

4. Placement Philosophy and Methodology

Placement is the bridge between structure and payroll. A pay plan is a table of numbers until placement rules assign each employee to a specific step within that table. Two cities could adopt identical grade structures and produce very different cost outcomes based purely on their placement choices. This section documents the placement philosophy applied throughout the study, both because Council needs to see that placement was governed by documented rules rather than case-by-case judgment, and because the placement logic adopted here becomes a reference framework for future conversions, promotions, and reorganizations.

4.1 Foundational Principles

Four principles govern every placement decision in this study.

First, no employee's proposed pay is less than current pay under any scenario. This rule is universal across civilian, telecommunicator, sworn, and director placements. Where peer data or the new grade structure would suggest downward movement, current pay is protected without exception.

Second, the study delivers a targeted structural response — adjustments are made where the diagnostic identified specific misalignment, and positions already at or above market are held. The recommendation is not a broad-based increase.

Third, internal equity is preserved through a 7% promotion floor applied to genuine reclassifications, ensuring that a meaningful pay increase accompanies a genuine promotion.

Fourth, employees whose current pay exceeds what the new structure would justify are held at current pay and surfaced for managerial attention rather than mechanically adjusted — these are position-classification questions, not pay-plan mechanics.

4.2 The Placement Rule Hierarchy

Placement decisions apply a defined hierarchy of rules, each settled before the next is considered. The rules apply consistently across populations, with two population-specific variations noted below.

Rule 1 — No Pay Decrease

No employee receives a pay decrease under any placement scenario in this study. This is the foundational protection. It applies across all populations and supersedes every other rule in the hierarchy.

Rule 2 — Standard Placement (First Step ≥ Current Pay)

For any employee whose grade does not change, or whose grade changes without a promotion floor being applied, placement is at the lowest step in the target range that meets or exceeds current pay. A $5 rounding tolerance is applied for edge cases. This is a mechanical rule with no discretion. Standard Placement is the default treatment for civilian employees under this study.

Rule 3 — 7% Promotion Floor for Genuine Reclassifications

When a position is reclassified upward — not merely re-graded but genuinely promoted — the employee is placed at the lowest step meeting or exceeding current pay multiplied by 1.07. Under this recommendation, the 7% promotion floor applies to the Accountant II position being reclassified to Accounting Manager, the Building Inspector moving from Grade H to Grade J, the Code Compliance Officer II moving from Grade G to Grade H, and the Receptionist moving from Grade A to Grade B.

Rule 4 — Range Alignment Without Promotion Floor

Where a position moves grades but not as a genuine promotion — for example, structural realignment of utility Tier 2 to Grade F, or the Facility Maintenance Technician moving from D to F to reflect certification scope — no promotion floor is applied. Standard Placement alone controls. This rule distinguishes cases where the grade was adjusted from cases where the employee was promoted.

Rule 5 — Hold Treatment

Employees whose current pay exceeds what the new structure would justify (utility Tech I employees past the five-year certification expectation without licensure, Public Works Tech I employees past the five-year CDL / certification expectation, and the Building Official currently above peer maximum) are held at current pay with current grade and step preserved. These holds are surfaced in the workbook methodology for managerial action. Mechanical adjustment would obscure what are properly position-classification decisions.

Rule 6 — Probationary Treatment (Sworn Populations)

Probationary firefighters are placed at the FD-Cadet flat rate under Service Recognition placement, and at FD-1 Step 1 under Standard Placement. Probationary officers are placed at the PD-Cadet flat rate. The Cadet placements separate pre-certification status from the certified pay ladder, allowing new hires and probationary staff to occupy a distinct compensation position from certified personnel of the same nominal grade.

Rule 7 — Service Recognition Overlay (Sworn Populations Only)

On top of Standard Placement, Service Recognition applies tenure-based directed step adjustments: one additional step at 8 to 11.9 years of service, and two additional steps at 12 or more years. Placement is capped at the maximum step of the rank. Service Recognition is applied only to the sworn populations in this recommendation. It is a placement option, not a default, and Council may adopt Standard Placement instead. The distinction between the two options is not a different market position — both use the same peer-median range structure — but a different treatment of accumulated years in rank at conversion.

Rule 8 — Director Placement (Market Floor)

For directors, three placement models are documented, all applying the no-decrease rule. Model A places each director at peer minimum for their scope, or holds at current pay where already above peer minimum. Model B places at the midpoint between peer minimum and peer median. Model C places at peer median. The three models represent progressively stronger market positions rather than different structural frameworks.

4.3 Why Civilian Grades Do Not Receive Service Recognition

The May 2026 workshop deck included civilian tenure-overlay scenarios (V2 variants) that added one to two steps for tenured employees on top of Standard Placement. Those overlays were retained in the workshop material as design alternatives but are not included in the final recommendation. Two reasons stand behind that choice, and both are substantive rather than incidental.

First, structural. Sworn populations operate under a civil service framework in which step progression is a plan feature, tenure is a statutorily recognized career element, and Service Recognition placement rewards accumulated years in rank at conversion. The civilian population operates under an at-will framework in which progression is a management discretion, not a statutory expectation. Applying a tenure overlay to civilians would import a civil-service placement mechanic into an at-will structure — a category boundary the study elected not to cross.

Second, market position. The civilian population sits above peer 50th on 15 position classes and within ±2.5% on another 12. It sits below peer 50th on only 17 of the 44 civilian position classes analyzed. Broad-based tenure recognition would move already-above-market populations further above market. The diagnostic did not find tenure-driven attrition patterns on the civilian side that would justify that outcome.

4.4 What Placement Does Not Do

It is useful to state explicitly what these placement rules do not include. The recommendation does not embed an across-the-board cost-of-living adjustment; COLA remains a separate policy question for Council. The recommendation does not trigger automatic step advancement upon adoption; step movement remains a separate performance-and-time-in-grade question. The recommendation does not establish a minimum salary floor as a citywide policy; the diagnostic material discussed this as a design option but the recommendation does not include it. The recommendation does not equalize pay compression between existing civilian staff and market entry rates; compression relief was documented as a design consideration and not included in the final placement. Each of these remains available to Council as a policy tool for future cycles. The recommendation before Council is a targeted structural response, not a comprehensive pay-plan overhaul.

5. Civilian and Telecom Recommendation

The civilian and telecommunicator recommendation preserves the City's current Mount Pleasant letter grade structure (A–V) and applies targeted reclassifications where the diagnostic identified specific position-level misalignment. It also introduces a new Public Safety Support scale (PS-1 / PS-2) designed specifically for the dispatch labor market. Utility Tier 1 positions retain their current civilian grade placement, with a five-year certification expectation treated as a departmental management matter rather than a pay-plan structural feature. The total increase is +$28,092 across 96 employees, or +0.54% of the current $5,205,542 civilian and telecom base payroll.

5.1 Position Reclassifications

Nine position-level actions produce the civilian and telecom cost impact. Each is documented against a specific structural or scope condition identified during the diagnostic and department review process.

Position	Department	Movement	Rationale
Receptionist	Administration	A → B	7% promotion floor; scope aligns with Grade B
Building Inspector	Development Services	H → J	Licensing scope and inspection responsibility
Code Compliance Officer II	Development Services	G → H	Position scope no longer fit Grade G
Accounting Assistant → Accounting Manager	Finance	J → P	Genuine promotion; Sundi Jackson reclassification
Facility Maintenance Tech	Public Works	D → F	Certification scope alignment
Operator III	Utilities	H → I	Tier 3 licensed operator alignment
Foreman (Public Works)	Public Works	L → N	Superintendent-level responsibility recognition; placement-based
Telecommunicator	Police	E → PS-1	New dispatch labor market scale
Senior Telecommunicator	Police	F → PS-2	New dispatch labor market scale

5.2 The PS-1 / PS-2 Telecommunicator Scale

Telecommunicator positions have historically been placed on the general civilian schedule at Grade E (Telecommunicator) and Grade F (Senior Telecommunicator). The diagnostic and market review identified dispatch as a distinct labor market with its own certification profile, shift structure, and competitive pressure that the general civilian schedule does not represent well. The recommendation establishes a new Public Safety Support family with two grades — PS-1 (Telecommunicator) at $46,315 to $60,431 and PS-2 (Senior Telecommunicator) at $50,947 to $66,474 — each with ten steps and 3.0% per-step growth. The PS-2 minimum is set 10% above the PS-1 minimum, producing a clean promotional differential between the two grades that the current E-to-F transition does not deliver.

Senior Telecommunicator placement follows the Standard rule (first step ≥ current pay), which lands current incumbents at PS-2 Step 6 ($59,061). Telecommunicator placement follows the same rule against the PS-1 scale. A PD-Cadet grade at $59,921 flat rate is established for pre-certification police recruit compensation, parallel to the FD-Cadet treatment on the Fire side.

5.3 Utilities — Tier Framework

The Utilities Department framework, developed with the Director of Utilities during departmental review, applies a Tier 1 / Tier 2 / Tier 3 progression across Water, Wastewater, and Utility Maintenance operations. Tier 1 positions (Utility Tech I, Wastewater Tech I, Water Treatment Operator I) retain their current civilian grade placement, with a departmental expectation that unlicensed employees will obtain required certifications within five years of hire. This five-year expectation is a departmental management matter and does not create a distinct pay-plan structure; employees who exceed the five-year window without licensure are surfaced for managerial review rather than adjusted mechanically.

Tier 2 (Operator II / Tech II) is placed on Grade F.

Tier 3 (Operator III / Tech III) is placed on Grade I with the 7% promotion floor applied to genuine promotions.

Utility Foremen are placed on Grade N. Plant Foremen (Water and Wastewater) are benchmarked against the Chief Operator classification consistent with state licensing framework, using a Chief Operator peer cluster median of $76,591.

5.4 Public Works — Tier Framework

The Public Works framework, developed with the Director of Public Works during departmental review, applies a Tier 1 / Tier 2 / Tier 3 progression across Streets, Parks, Fleet, and Facilities operations. Tier 1 positions (Technician I across Streets, Parks, and Fleet operations) retain their current civilian grade placement, with a departmental expectation that employees will obtain required CDL endorsements and departmental certifications within five years of hire. This five-year expectation is a departmental management matter and does not create a distinct pay-plan structure; employees who exceed the five-year window without required credentials are surfaced for managerial review rather than adjusted mechanically.

Tier 2 (Technician II) is placed on Grade D.

Tier 3 (Technician III) is placed on Grade F. Facility Maintenance Technician moves from Grade D to Grade F to reflect certification scope.

Public Works Foremen move from Grade L to Grade N, aligning with the Utility Foreman placement and recognizing the superintendent-level responsibility documented in the diagnostic.

5.5 Held Positions and Managerial Flags

Several positions were identified during placement for hold treatment rather than mechanical adjustment. These holds preserve current pay while surfacing the underlying question for departmental action. Three

Utility Tech I employees who have passed the five-year certification expectation without obtaining required licensure are held at current pay pending direction from the Director of Utilities. Two Public Works Tech I employees in the same condition receive parallel treatment pending direction from the Director of Public Works. One Fleet Tech I employee is held at grade minimum. The Building Official is held at current pay ($111,299), which sits above peer market and does not warrant adjustment. The Welder position has no external peer data available and is held. Individual employee identifiers for these actions are documented in the study workbook methodology tabs.

6. Sworn Recommendation — Police and Fire

The sworn recommendation adopts revised grade structures calibrated to peer median for both Police and Fire, consolidates the fragmented firefighter ladder, and resolves the rank-to-rank compression identified in the diagnostic. Two placement options are documented: Standard Placement and Service Recognition. Both use the same grade structures; the difference is how accumulated years of service are recognized at conversion.

6.1 Police — Proposed Grade Structure

The proposed Police structure comprises four ranks plus a Cadet grade. PD-1 (Officer) carries ten steps. PD-2 (Sergeant), PD-3 (Lieutenant), and PD-4 (Assistant Chief) each carry five steps. PD-Cdt is a flat pre-certification rate. The proposed grade minimums and midpoints resolve the current-state structural inversion at the command transition: the PD-4 range now begins clearly above the PD-3 ceiling.

Grade	Title	Steps	Step 1 (Min)	Mid	Max	Spread
PD-Cdt	Police Recruit	flat	$59,921	—	—	—
PD-1	Police Officer	10	$67,864	$73,588	$79,313	16.9%
PD-2	Police Sergeant	5	$87,245	$93,560	$100,332	15.0%
PD-3	Police Lieutenant	5	$104,694	$109,452	$114,211	9.1%
PD-4	Assistant Chief	5	$125,632	$131,342	$137,053	9.1%

6.2 Fire — Proposed Grade Structure

The proposed Fire structure comprises four operational ranks plus a Cadet grade. FD-1 (Firefighter) consolidates the legacy AA / BB / FF firefighter ladder into a single ten-step grade. FD-2 (Driver / Pump Operator), FD-3 (Captain), and FD-4 (Deputy Chief) each carry five steps. FD-Cdt is a flat pre-certification rate for probationary personnel. Consolidation of the firefighter ladder is one of the most structurally significant changes in the recommendation — it eliminates the sub-grade fragmentation identified in the diagnostic and restores meaningful career progression within the firefighter role.

Grade	Title	Steps	Step 1 (Min)	Mid	Max	Spread
FD-Cdt	Fire Cadet	flat	$56,078	—	—	—
FD-1	Firefighter (consolidated)	10	$60,516	$68,008	$75,500	24.8%
FD-2	Driver / Pump Operator	5	$78,553	$84,107	$89,661	14.1%
FD-3	Captain	5	$84,173	$91,606	$99,039	17.7%
FD-4	Deputy Fire Chief	5	$94,905	$104,015	$113,125	19.2%

6.3 Rank-to-Rank Promotion Premium Resolution

The diagnostic identified specific promotion transitions where the current-plan premium was too thin to justify accepting supervisory or specialized responsibility. Every documented transition improves under the recommended plan, in most cases substantially. Premium figures below are calculated at grade midpoint — the raise a typical incumbent in the middle of a grade would receive on promotion to the next rank.

Transition	Current Plan Premium	Recommended Plan Premium
Officer → Sergeant	+10.0%	+27.1% ($19,972)
Sergeant → Lieutenant	+2.3%	+17.0% ($15,892)
Lieutenant → Assistant Chief	Inverted at floor	+20.0% ($21,890)
Firefighter → Driver / Operator	+0.9%	+23.7% ($16,099)
Driver / Operator → Captain	+2.9%	+8.9% ($7,499)
Captain → Deputy Chief	+2.9%	+13.5% ($12,409)

The tightest remaining transition — Driver / Operator to Captain — still delivers a nearly 9% raise at grade midpoint, three times the current plan. Every other transition delivers a promotion premium of at least 13.5%.

6.4 Placement Options — Standard versus Service Recognition

Two placement options are documented for sworn conversion. Both use the same proposed grade structures. The difference is exclusively in how accumulated years of service are recognized at the point of conversion.

Under Standard Placement, each employee is placed at the first step in the target range that meets or exceeds current pay. No tenure adjustments are applied. Probationary firefighters place at FD-1 Step 1. Standard Placement produces a sworn conversion cost of +$95,670 for Police (+4.08%) and +$118,877 for Fire (+5.16%), for a combined sworn Standard cost of +$214,547 (+4.61%).

Under Service Recognition, employees receive Standard Placement plus a tenure-based directed step overlay: one additional step at 8 to 11.9 years of service, and two additional steps at 12 or more years. Placement is capped at the maximum step of the rank. Probationary firefighters place at the FD-Cadet flat rate. Service Recognition produces a sworn conversion cost of +$150,807 for Police (+6.43%) and +$188,043 for Fire (+8.16%), for a combined sworn Service Recognition cost of +$338,850 (+7.29%).

The cost differential between the two options — approximately $124,300 for the two sworn populations combined — is entirely a placement decision. Neither option represents a different market position. Both place the sworn population into the same peer-median structure. The choice between them is a policy question about how the City recognizes accumulated years in rank at the moment of conversion. The recommendation is Service Recognition, which more fully honors the retention and knowledge continuity that the diagnostic identified as at risk in the sworn populations.

6.5 Sworn Market Position After Placement

Following implementation of the recommended sworn structure, Mount Pleasant's grade midpoints sit as follows against peer 50th at each rank. Positive percentages indicate the recommended Mount Pleasant midpoint sits above peer 50th; negative percentages indicate below.

Rank	Proposed Mid	Peer Median	vs. Peer Median
Police Officer (PD-1)	$73,588	$74,180	−0.8%
Police Sergeant (PD-2)	$93,560	$93,497	+0.1%
Police Lieutenant (PD-3)	$109,452	$108,446	+0.9%
Assistant Chief (PD-4)	$131,342	$116,055	+13.2%
Firefighter (FD-1)	$68,008	$66,573	+2.2%
Driver / Pump (FD-2)	$84,107	$90,190	−6.7%
Captain (FD-3)	$91,606	$94,247	−2.8%
Deputy Chief (FD-4)	$104,015	$114,297	−9.0%

Officer, Sergeant, Lieutenant, and Firefighter all land essentially at peer 50th, closing most of the current-state market gap. Assistant Chief is positioned above peer 50th to preserve meaningful separation above Lieutenant and to create competitive room for external recruiting into a vacant command position. Driver / Pump Operator, Captain, and Deputy Chief remain conservatively below peer 50th, reflecting the study's targeted-response posture rather than a mechanical point-for-point market match.

7. Directors — Placement Models

Director positions were benchmarked individually against peers with comparable operational scope, using the reasoning documented in the study's peer cohort design. Population-based comparison systematically understates the consolidated operational responsibility carried by Mount Pleasant's directors: Finance functions as de facto Budget Director; Public Works oversees streets, parks, fleet, facilities, and cemeteries with approximately 800 acres of parks; Airport operates 137 based aircraft and full-service FBO operations; Utilities carries scope across water, wastewater, and utility maintenance beyond typical municipal ranges. Individual scope-based benchmarking captures these consolidations; population-based benchmarking does not.

7.1 Current Position Against Peer Benchmark

The eleven director positions are shown below with their current pay and their individually-derived peer minimum, midpoint, and maximum benchmarks. The vs. Peer column shows the relationship of current pay to the peer benchmark and identifies the specific benchmark point that determines placement action under Model A.

Position	Current	Peer Min	Peer Median	Peer Max	vs. Peer
City Manager	$170,000	$169,318	$220,113	$247,786	Above Min
Asst. City Mgr / City Secretary	$130,949	$141,548	$160,638	$194,464	Below Min
Chief of Police	$144,750	$123,197	$137,686	$153,856	Above Mid
Fire Chief	$141,750	$111,997	$125,864	$140,822	Above Max
Director of Finance	$95,000	$105,133	$136,673	$168,213	Below Min
Director of Human Resources	$95,000	$105,626	$126,262	$146,897	Below Min
Director of Utilities	$101,188	$110,906	$136,673	$168,213	Below Min
Director of Public Works	$109,250	$110,906	$136,673	$168,213	Below Min
Director of Development Services	$125,000	$127,857	$151,454	$169,241	Below Min
Library Director	$80,000	$69,321	$83,449	$95,523	Below Mid
Airport Manager	$100,170	$65,801	$78,469	$94,952	Above Max

Five directors currently sit below their peer minimum: Assistant City Manager / City Secretary, Director of Finance, Director of Human Resources, Director of Utilities, and Director of Public Works. One additional director (Development Services) sits marginally below peer minimum. Two directors (Chief of Police, Fire Chief) sit at or above peer maximum. Two directors (Library, Airport) sit above peer minimum but below peer median. The City Manager sits marginally above peer minimum.

7.2 Three Placement Models

Three placement models were developed. All three apply the no-decrease rule universally — no director receives a pay reduction under any model. Model A places each director at peer minimum, or holds at current

pay where already above peer minimum. Model B places each director at the midpoint between peer minimum and peer median. Model C places each director at peer median.

Position	Current	Model A (Min)	Model B (Midway)	Model C (Mid)
City Manager	$170,000	$170,000	$194,715	$220,113
Asst. City Mgr / City Secretary	$130,949	$141,548	$151,093	$160,638
Chief of Police	$144,750	$144,750	$144,750	$144,750
Fire Chief	$141,750	$141,750	$141,750	$141,750
Director of Finance	$95,000	$105,133	$120,903	$136,673
Director of Human Resources	$95,000	$105,626	$115,944	$126,262
Director of Utilities	$101,188	$110,906	$123,789	$136,673
Director of Public Works	$109,250	$110,906	$123,789	$136,673
Director of Development Services	$125,000	$127,857	$139,656	$151,454
Library Director	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000	$83,449
Airport Manager	$100,170	$100,170	$100,170	$100,170
TOTAL	**$1,293,057**	**$1,338,646**	**$1,436,559**	**$1,538,605**
Change ($)		**+$45,589**	**+$143,502**	**+$245,548**
Change (%)		**+3.53%**	**+11.10%**	**+18.99%**
Positions Moved		**6 of 11**	**7 of 11**	**8 of 11**

7.3 Recommendation — Model A

Model A is the recommended placement. It corrects a below-market-minimum condition without moving any director to peer median or above. Under Model A, six of eleven directors see no change because they are already at or above the relevant peer benchmark: City Manager, Chief of Police, Fire Chief, Library Director, and Airport Manager sit at or above peer minimum for their scope. Five directors move up to peer minimum: Assistant City Manager / City Secretary (+$10,599), Director of Finance (+$10,133), Director of Human Resources (+$10,626), Director of Utilities (+$9,718), Director of Public Works (+$1,656), and Director of Development Services (+$2,857). Total Model A increase is +$45,589, or +3.53% of the $1,293,057 director base payroll.

Model B and Model C are documented as alternatives for completeness. Under Model B, seven directors move; total increase is +$143,502 (+11.10%). Under Model C, eight directors move; total increase is +$245,548 (+18.99%). Both alternatives include mechanical placement movement for the City Manager position; whether such movement would be adopted operationally is a contractual question separate from these placement mechanics. Model A does not require any City Manager placement movement.

Model A is the most conservative response consistent with the study's floor-correction framing for director placement. It responds to documented below-market conditions without repositioning the director population toward median. Alternatives are documented; the recommendation is Model A.

8. Department Impact Summary

The recommendation affects City departments differentially. Six of twelve civilian departments see no compensation change under the targeted civilian reclassification set. Four of the twelve see modest, position-driven changes. The largest departmental impacts fall on Police and Fire, which combine civilian, telecommunicator, and sworn populations, and on Administration, which houses the Assistant City Manager / City Secretary and Human Resources Director positions moved under Director Model A.

The table below presents each department's combined impact from all applicable components: civilian and telecommunicator reclassifications, sworn Service Recognition placement (Police and Fire departments only), and Director Model A placement. The column for civilian headcount reflects the number of civilian and telecom employees in the department; sworn employees and directors are counted separately at the citywide level and are not added into the civilian department headcount.

Department	Civ+Tel EEs	Civ+Tel Δ $	Sworn Δ $ (SR)	Director Δ $ (Model A)	Total Δ $	Driver of Change
Administration	1	+$327	—	+$21,225	+$21,552	Receptionist reclassification; Asst CM/City Secretary and HR Director floor moves
Airport	2	—	—	—	—	No change
Animal Control	4	—	—	—	—	No change
Civic Center	5	—	—	—	—	No change
Development Services	4	+$1,543	—	+$2,857	+$4,400	Building Inspector + Code Compliance II reclassifications; Director floor move
Finance	6	+$9,754	—	+$10,133	+$19,887	Accounting Manager reclassification; Director floor move
Fire	1	—	+$188,043	—	+$188,043	Sworn Service Recognition placement across 33 employees
Library	5	—	—	—	—	No change
Municipal Court	3	—	—	—	—	No change
Police	13	+$12,186	+$150,807	—	+$162,993	Telecom reclassifications to PS-1/PS-2; sworn Service Recognition across 32 sworn
Public Works	29	+$3,073	—	+$1,656	+$4,729	Facility Maintenance Tech + Foreman placements; Director floor move

Department	Civ+Tel EEs	Civ+Tel Δ $	Sworn Δ $ (SR)	Director Δ $ (Model A)	Total Δ $	Driver of Change
Utilities	23	+$1,210	—	+$9,718	+$10,928	Operator III reclassification; Director floor move
CITYWIDE TOTAL	**96**	**+$28,092**	**+$338,850**	**+$45,589**	**+$412,531**	

8.1 Departments With the Largest Impact

Fire carries the largest single-department impact at +$188,043, entirely from sworn Service Recognition placement across the 33 sworn firefighters. The impact reflects both the closing of the current-state market gap (identified across every Fire rank in the diagnostic) and the tenure recognition that Service Recognition delivers at conversion. Fire's civilian complement is a single Administrative Assistant position, which is unchanged.

Police carries the second-largest departmental impact at +$162,993 combined. The sworn Service Recognition placement across 32 sworn employees accounts for $150,807 of that total. Additional impact of $12,186 comes from the nine telecommunicator positions moving from the general civilian grades E and F to the new PS-1 and PS-2 scale designed for the dispatch labor market. Together these two components represent the majority of the study's cost, consistent with the broad consensus that public safety competitiveness is the strongest market-driven condition identified across the study.

Administration reflects a combined $21,552 impact concentrated in two director-floor movements: Assistant City Manager / City Secretary (+$10,599 to reach peer minimum) and Director of Human Resources (+$10,626 to reach peer minimum). Both positions were documented as below peer minimum for their scope. A modest $327 Receptionist reclassification (Grade A to Grade B) rounds out the department's impact.

8.2 Departments With No Impact

Six departments — Airport, Animal Control, Civic Center, Library, Municipal Court, and Fire (civilian side only) — see no compensation change under the recommendation. Positions in these departments were reviewed against the same diagnostic framework as all other positions; the review found that current grade placements were appropriate to scope and that current pay was within acceptable market bands. No structural condition was identified requiring correction in these departments under the targeted response.

8.3 Modest-Impact Departments

Development Services, Finance, Public Works, and Utilities carry moderate combined impacts ranging from $4,400 to $19,887, each driven by a small number of specific position-level actions plus a director floor movement. Development Services reflects the Building Inspector reclassification (Grade H to J) and Code Compliance Officer II reclassification (G to H) together with the Development Services Director floor move. Finance reflects the reclassification of an existing Accountant II position to Accounting Manager (Sundi Jackson, Grade J to P) together with the Finance Director floor move. Public Works reflects Facility

Maintenance Technician movement (D to F), Public Works Foreman placements (L to N; placement-based, not midpoint-based), and the Public Works Director floor move. Utilities reflects the Operator III movement (H to I) and the Director of Utilities floor move.

9. Combined Cost and Scenario Matrix

The recommended combined package is Civilian and Telecom targeted reclassifications, Sworn Service Recognition placement into the revised peer-median structure, and Director Model A. Together these components produce a total increase of +$412,531, or 3.70% of the current $11.15 million total base payroll. The matrix below shows the full range of combined outcomes across sworn placement options and director models, so Council can see how each component decision compounds into the total.

9.1 Component Summary

Component	Change ($)	Change (%)	Base Population
Civilian + Telecom	+$28,092	+0.54%	$5,205,542 (96 ee)
Police Sworn — Service Recognition	+$150,807	+6.43%	$2,345,803 (32 ee)
Fire Sworn — Service Recognition	+$188,043	+8.16%	$2,304,992 (33 ee)
Directors — Model A	+$45,589	+3.53%	$1,293,057 (11 pos)
COMBINED RECOMMENDATION	**+$412,531**	**+3.70%**	**$11,149,395 (172 ee)**

9.2 Scenario Matrix

The matrix below combines sworn placement approach (rows) with director model (columns). Each cell is a total dollar change from the current $11.15M base payroll, followed by that change as a percentage of the base.

Sworn Approach	Director Model A	Director Model B	Director Model C
Sworn Standard Placement	+$288,228 (2.59%)	+$386,141 (3.46%)	+$488,187 (4.38%)
Sworn Service Recognition (Recommended)	**+$412,531 (3.70%)**	**+$510,445 (4.58%)**	**+$612,491 (5.49%)**

Combined outcomes range from +$288,228 (+2.59%) under the most conservative combination — Sworn Standard Placement with Director Model A — to +$612,491 (+5.49%) under the most aggressive combination — Sworn Service Recognition with Director Model C. The recommended combination sits at +$412,531 (+3.70%) and reflects the study's judgment that Service Recognition placement is warranted for sworn populations to honor accumulated years in rank, and that Model A is appropriate for director placement to correct floor conditions without repositioning toward median.

10. Where Mount Pleasant Sits After Implementation

Following implementation of the recommended package, Mount Pleasant's pay position against peer 50th sits as summarized below. The table aggregates position-class outcomes into three market-position categories — below peer 50th by more than 2.5%, within ±2.5% of peer 50th, and above peer 50th by more than 2.5% — by employee group. Aggregate market position is calculated as an average gap across position classes within the group.

Group	Positions Analyzed	Below Peer 50th (< −2.5%)	At / Near (±2.5%)	Above Peer 50th (> +2.5%)	Avg Gap
Civilian	42	14	12	16	+2.7%
Telecom	2	1	0	1	−2.4%
Police	4	0	2	2	+4.7%
Fire	6	3	3	0	−3.7%

The recommendation places Mount Pleasant at or near peer 50th on the great majority of position classes. Civilian finishes slightly above peer 50th on average, reflecting the preservation of positions already at or above market. Telecom finishes slightly below on average, reflecting the conservative placement into the new PS scale. Police Officer and Sergeant land essentially at peer 50th; Lieutenant and Assistant Chief are placed above peer 50th to preserve meaningful separation between ranks after the corrected promotion premiums are applied. Fire finishes slightly below peer 50th on average, reflecting a conservative placement approach at Driver / Pump, Captain, and Deputy Chief.

10.1 Priority Alignment

The recommendation maps to four Council-articulated priorities documented throughout the study process. On retention, sworn Service Recognition placement rewards accumulated years in rank, and the Sergeant-to-Lieutenant and Firefighter-to-Driver compression is resolved. On competitiveness, sworn placement into a revised grade structure calibrated to peer 50th positions the City to compete effectively for both retention and lateral hiring; the director floor correction moves five below-market directors up to peer minimum. On internal equity, the 7% promotion floor on reclassifications ensures meaningful pay increases accompany genuine promotions, and no pay decreases occur in any scenario. On sustainability, the 3.70% total increase is targeted where structural conditions justified it, preserving capacity for future adjustments.

11. Implementation Considerations

The recommendation before Council is the analytical basis for structural decisions to be made in the budget and policy process. Several implementation considerations warrant Council attention as separate policy questions beyond the structural recommendation itself.

11.1 COLA and Step Progression as Separate Actions

The recommendation adjusts pay-plan structure and applies placement rules at the point of conversion. It does not embed a cost-of-living adjustment, and it does not trigger automatic step advancement upon adoption. COLA and step progression are distinct policy questions that Council may address separately from structural adoption. Separating these two categories — COLA as market alignment, step as career progression — gives Council a cleaner set of policy levers than a combined mechanism would provide, and reduces the "stacking" appearance that the diagnostic identified as an optics concern.

11.2 Minimum Salary Floor

A citywide minimum salary floor is available as a policy tool but is not embedded in this recommendation. The diagnostic identified minimum floor establishment as a low-cost signal of fairness that counters the narrative that compensation attention focuses only on upper management. Council may consider a minimum floor as a separate action; the recommendation does not depend on it.

11.3 Performance-Gated Step Advancement

Step advancement within any grade structure remains a management action. The recommendation does not specify the conditions under which step movement occurs. Council may direct that step advancement be governed by documented performance thresholds, longer intervals between step increases, or explicit management-level approval gates. These are policy choices layered on top of the structural framework and do not require modification of the recommended grade tables.

11.4 Held Positions and Managerial Action

Several positions surfaced during placement carry managerial action items rather than pay-plan mechanics: cap-violator holds in Utilities and Public Works (Tier 1 employees past the five-year certification expectation), the Fleet Foreman superintendent-title question, the Development Coordinator reclassification pending under Development Services, the Water Plant classification question in Utilities, and the Building Official above-peer-maximum condition. Each is documented in the study workbook under managerial action flags. Resolution of these items may occur outside the compensation study cycle.

12. What the Recommendation Is — and Is Not

This report and the recommendation it contains are a structural and market analysis of the City of Mount Pleasant's compensation system, a set of recommendations for a targeted, proportional response to specific structural and market conditions identified, a menu of alternatives on director placement and sworn placement approach, and documentation of what the study did, how it did it, and what it found.

The report is not a broad-based cost-of-living adjustment or automatic raise, a recommendation to increase every employee's pay, a specific budget proposal or line item, or a commitment to any implementation timeline. Council approval requested is: approve receipt and acceptance of this report as the analytical basis for structural decisions to be made in the budget and policy process. Subsequent implementation decisions — including funding, phasing, and any adjustments to specific components — remain fully with Council.

Appendix A: Grade Tables — Civilian, Telecommunicator, and Sworn

A.1 Civilian Letter Grades A–V

The Mount Pleasant letter grade schedule (A–V) is preserved under the recommendation. Grade minimums, midpoints, and maximums are shown below. All grades carry ten steps except Grade A (starts at Step 3) and Grade B (starts at Step 2). Full step tables are available in the study workbook.

Grade	Step 1 (Min)	Mid	Step 10 (Max)	Spread	Notes
A	$36,887	$41,126	$45,366	23.0%	Starts at Step 3
B	$36,508	$42,071	$47,634	30.5%	Starts at Step 2
C	$38,333	$44,175	$50,016	30.5%	
D	$40,250	$46,383	$52,517	30.5%	
E	$42,262	$48,702	$55,143	30.5%	
F	$44,375	$51,138	$57,900	30.5%	
G	$46,594	$53,694	$60,795	30.5%	
H	$48,924	$56,379	$63,834	30.5%	
I	$51,370	$59,198	$67,026	30.5%	
J	$53,938	$62,158	$70,378	30.5%	
K	$56,635	$65,266	$73,896	30.5%	
L	$59,467	$68,529	$77,591	30.5%	
M	$62,441	$71,955	$81,469	30.5%	
N	$65,563	$75,553	$85,544	30.5%	
O	$68,841	$79,331	$89,821	30.5%	
P	$72,283	$83,298	$94,313	30.5%	
Q	$75,897	$87,463	$99,029	30.5%	
R	$79,692	$91,836	$103,980	30.5%	
S	$83,676	$96,428	$109,180	30.5%	
T	$87,860	$101,249	$114,638	30.5%	
U	$92,253	$106,312	$120,370	30.5%	
V	$96,866	$111,627	$126,389	30.5%	

A.2 Public Safety Support Bands — Telecommunicators

Grade	Title	Step 1 (Min)	Mid	Step 10 (Max)
PS-1	Telecommunicator	$46,315	$53,373	$60,431
PS-2	Senior Telecommunicator	$50,947	$58,710	$66,474

A.3 Police Sworn Grade Structure

The proposed Police grade structure comprises four ranks (PD-1 through PD-4) plus a PD-Cadet pre-certification flat rate. PD-1 (Officer) carries ten steps; PD-2 (Sergeant), PD-3 (Lieutenant), and PD-4 (Assistant Chief) each carry five steps. Grade minimums, midpoints, and maximums are shown below. Full step tables are available in the study workbook.

Grade	Title	Steps	Step 1 (Min)	Mid	Max	Spread
PD-Cdt	Police Recruit	flat	$59,921	—	—	—
PD-1	Police Officer	10	$67,864	$73,588	$79,313	16.9%
PD-2	Police Sergeant	5	$87,245	$93,560	$100,332	15.0%
PD-3	Police Lieutenant	5	$104,694	$109,452	$114,211	9.1%
PD-4	Assistant Chief	5	$125,632	$131,342	$137,053	9.1%

A.4 Fire Sworn Grade Structure

The proposed Fire grade structure comprises four operational ranks (FD-1 through FD-4) plus an FD-Cadet pre-certification flat rate. FD-1 (Firefighter) consolidates the legacy AA / BB / FF firefighter ladder into a single ten-step grade; FD-2 (Driver / Pump Operator), FD-3 (Captain), and FD-4 (Deputy Fire Chief) each carry five steps. Grade minimums, midpoints, and maximums are shown below. Full step tables are available in the study workbook.

Grade	Title	Steps	Step 1 (Min)	Mid	Max	Spread
FD-Cdt	Fire Cadet	flat	$56,078	—	—	—
FD-1	Firefighter (consolidated)	10	$60,516	$68,008	$75,500	24.8%
FD-2	Driver / Pump Operator	5	$78,553	$84,107	$89,661	14.1%
FD-3	Captain	5	$84,173	$91,606	$99,039	17.7%
FD-4	Deputy Fire Chief	5	$94,905	$104,015	$113,125	19.2%

Appendix B: Master Grade-to-Position Reference

This appendix maps every position class in the recommendation to its proposed grade. The reference is organized by grade in ascending order, and includes civilian, telecommunicator, and sworn positions. Directors do not appear on this table because director positions are benchmarked individually against peers with comparable operational scope rather than assigned to letter grades.

B.1 Civilian Positions by Grade

Grade	Position Class	Department	Notes
B	Receptionist	Administration	Reclassified from Grade A
B	Event Services I	Civic Center	
B	Customer Service Rep I	Animal Control	
B	Building Maintenance I	Public Works	
B	Technician I	Public Works	PW Tier 1 framework
C	Animal Control Officer	Animal Control	
C	Event Services II	Civic Center	
D	Airport Maintenance I	Airport	
D	Customer Service Rep I	Finance	
D	Municipal Court Clerk	Municipal Court	
D	Technician II	Public Works	
D	Technician I	Utilities	Utilities Tier 1
E	Animal Shelter Coordinator	Animal Control	
E	Operator I	Utilities	Utilities Tier 1
F	Administrative Assistant	Development Services	
F	Administrative Assistant	Fire	
F	Administrative Assistant	Utilities	
F	Facility Maintenance Tech	Public Works	Reclassified from Grade D
F	Fleet Tech I	Public Works	
F	Technician III	Public Works	
F	Operator II	Utilities	Utilities Tier 2
F	Technician II	Utilities	Utilities Tier 2
F	Welder	Utilities	No external peer data
H	Accountant I	Finance	
H	Crime Victim Liaison	Police	
H	Evidence Manager	Police	

Grade	Position Class	Department	Notes
H	Executive Assistant	Police	
H	Records Clerk / Property Manager	Police	
H	Fleet Tech II	Public Works	
H	Electrician	Utilities	
H	Technician III	Utilities	
I	Electrician II	Public Works	
I	Operator III	Utilities	Reclassified from Grade H (Utilities Tier 3)
J	Accountant II	Finance	
J	Building Inspector	Development Services	Reclassified from Grade H
L	Civic Center Manager	Civic Center	
L	Utility Office Manager	Finance	
L	Municipal Court Administrator	Municipal Court	
N	Foreman	Public Works	Reclassified from Grade L
N	Foreman	Utilities	
P	Accounting Manager	Finance	Reclassified from Accountant II (Grade J)
T	Building Official	Development Services	Held (above peer market)

B.2 Telecommunicator Positions by Grade

Grade	Position Class	Department	Employees	Notes
PS-1	Telecommunicator	Police	6	Moved from Grade E to new PS-1 dispatch scale
PS-2	Senior Telecommunicator	Police	3	Moved from Grade F to new PS-2 dispatch scale

B.3 Sworn Positions by Grade

Grade	Rank / Title	Department	Notes
PD-Cdt	Police Recruit / Pre-Certification	Police	Flat rate; separates pre-cert from certified pay ladder
PD-1	Police Officer	Police	
PD-2	Police Sergeant	Police	
PD-3	Police Lieutenant	Police	

Grade	Rank / Title	Department	Notes
PD-4	Assistant Police Chief	Police	Position vacant at time of study
FD-Cdt	Fire Cadet / Probationary	Fire	Flat rate; used for probationary placement under Service Recognition
FD-1	Firefighter (consolidated)	Fire	Consolidates legacy AA / BB / FF ladder
FD-2	Driver / Pump Operator	Fire	
FD-3	Captain	Fire	
FD-4	Deputy Fire Chief	Fire	

The Chief of Police, Fire Chief, and City Manager are executive positions and are addressed under Section 7 (Directors). All director-level positions are benchmarked individually against peers with comparable operational scope rather than assigned to a letter grade or sworn rank structure.

Appendix C: Methodology Reference

C.1 Source Data

The study drew on several authoritative source datasets. Civilian roster and current pay data came from the City's payroll master and departmental verification. Market reference data came from a peer city compensation dataset containing 1,171 raw peer position records across the eleven-city cohort. Step plan data came from the Mount Pleasant FY 2026 Final Pay Plan (Modified) for the current Mount Pleasant structure. Sworn roster data came from Fire and Police master files with civil service classification and step assignments. Utilities licensure data came from City records of Class A / B / C water and wastewater license holders. The utilities and public works framework guidance came from Director interviews conducted as part of the study process.

C.2 Civilian Market Matching

Each civilian position was matched to a peer benchmark drawn from the raw peer city data. Direct title matches were preferred; cluster matches were used where direct matches did not exist. Notable cluster matches include: Civic Center Manager benchmarked to Jacksonville's exact title as a single-peer reference; Records Clerk / Property Manager benchmarked to Ennis' Police Records Manager as chain-of-custody scope; Utility Office Manager benchmarked to a Utility Billing Manager cluster median; Evidence Manager benchmarked to Ennis' Property and Evidence Manager; Plant Foremen benchmarked to a Chief Operator cluster consistent with state licensing framework; Airport Maintenance benchmarked to Airport Service Technician (Paris single-peer); Building Maintenance benchmarked to Maintenance Worker I cluster; Event Services II benchmarked to Event Setup Lead (Waxahachie single-peer). Five positions relied on single-peer benchmarks where broader peer data was unavailable, and their placement decisions weight the underlying Mount Pleasant scope and departmental context alongside the single peer reference.

C.3 Sworn Placement Rules

Standard Placement: each sworn employee placed at the first step in the target range that meets or exceeds current pay; no pay decreases.

Service Recognition Placement: Standard base plus one step for 8 to 11.9 years of service; plus two steps for 12 or more years of service; capped at maximum step of rank.

Probationary employees under Service Recognition placed at the FD-Cdt or PD-Cdt flat rate. Anomalous FD-1 employees flagged with an asterisk in the workbook receive standard placement pending managerial review.

C.4 Universal Placement Rules

No employee receives a pay decrease under any placement scenario.

Standard placement rule (first step at target grade ≥ current pay, with a $5 rounding tolerance) applies where no promotion floor governs. The 7% promotion floor (current pay × 1.07) applies to genuine reclassifications. Hold treatment preserves current grade, step, and pay for cap-violator positions and above-market incumbents, with managerial-action flags noted in the workbook methodology tabs.

Appendix D: Study Deliverables

The following deliverables accompany this final report and constitute the full analytical record of the study:

The Combined Study Workbook is the authoritative source for all roster-level placement outcomes, per-position peer benchmarks, and grade tables. It contains a Cover with topline summary, a Department Summary aggregating cost impact by department and scenario, complete Grade Tables for civilian, telecom, and sworn structures, a Position Summary aggregating position-class outcomes, per-employee roster tabs for civilian and telecom, per-officer and per-firefighter placement rosters under both Standard and Service Recognition scenarios, individual director current pay and peer benchmark data, the three director placement models, and detailed methodology tabs documenting decision rules, source data, market match logic, and managerial-action flags.

Three interim reports produced during the study process documented the operational and governance context that shaped the recommendation.

Peer benchmark data underlying the study includes per-city peer detail tables showing Mount Pleasant's current midpoint against each peer city's midpoint for every position class, and sworn peer benchmark data supporting the PD-1 through PD-4 and FD-Cdt through FD-4 range design.