## CLEAN ENERGY FINANCE AND INVESTMENT AUTHORITY

## AGENDA

Budget and Operations Committee of the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority

845 Brook Street
Rocky Hill, CT 06067
Friday, May 16, 2014
2:00-3:30 p.m.

Staff Invited: Mackey Dykes, Brian Farnen, Bryan Garcia, George Bellas

1. Call to order
2. Public Comments -5 minutes
3. Approve meeting minutes for April 17, 2013 meeting* - 5 minutes
4. Revised Salary Ranges** - 25 minutes
5. Comprehensive Plan Outline and Discussion - 25 minutes
6. Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Outline and Discussion - 20 minutes
7. Other Business - 10 minutes
8. Adjourn
*Denotes item requiring Committee action
** Denotes item requiring Committee action and recommendation to the Board for approval
Online Meeting Access
https://www4.gotomeeting.com/join/369297295
Dial-In
Dial +1 (630) 869-1013
Access Code: 369-297-295

## Next Regular Meeting

Monday, June 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2014$
Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority, 845 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, CT

## CLEAN ENERGY FINANCE AND INVESTMENT AUTHORITY

## RESOLUTIONS

Budget and Operations Committee of the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority

845 Brook Street
Rocky Hill, CT 06067
Friday, May 16, 2014
2:00-3:30 p.m.

Staff Invited: Mackey Dykes, Brian Farnen, Bryan Garcia, George Bellas

1. Call to order
2. Public Comments -5 minutes
3. Approve meeting minutes for April 17, 2013 meeting* - 5 minutes

## Resolution \#1

Motion to approve the minutes of the Budget and Operations Committee meeting for April 17, 2014. Second. Discussion. Vote.
4. Revised Salary Ranges** -25 minutes

## Resolution \#2

RESOLVED, the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority's Budget and Operations Committee recommends that the CEFIA Board of Directors approve the salary ranges for Director I level positions and above outlined in Attachment A.
5. Comprehensive Plan Outline and Discussion - 25 minutes
6. Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Outline and Discussion - 20 minutes
7. Other Business
8. Adjourn
*Denotes item requiring Committee action
** Denotes item requiring Committee action and recommendation to the Board for approval

Dial-In
Dial +1 (630) 869-1013
Access Code: 369-297-295
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## Compensation Study Background

- In the Fall of 2012, CI and CEFIA commissioned a study from Buck Associates to compare CEFIA salaries to private and nonprofit/government entities salaries
- The study evaluated CEFIA's market position including base salary, bonus and benefits


## Compensation Study Results

- With a few exceptions, weighted base salaries are within an acceptable range of the market median
- Several senior positions fell short of an acceptable range when compared to the market median for total compensation (base salary + bonus)


## Compensation Study Recommendation

|  | Corporate <br> Division | Program <br> Division | Investment <br> Division |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grades $1-4$ |  |  |  |
| Grades 5-6 | 0 |  |  |
| Grades 7- EX |  |  |  |

- Administrative Assistant
- Assistant
- Executive Assistant
- Associate
- Senior Associate
- Assistant Manager
- Associate Manager
- Manager
- Senior Manager
- Assistant Director
- Associate Director
- Director I
- Director II
- Managing Director
- Officer


## Corporate Positions

CLEAN ENERGY
FINANCE AND INVESTMENT AUTHORITY

| Job Title | CURRENT RANGES |  | SURVEY INFORMATION |  | PROPOSED RANGES |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Min | Max | Base <br> Midpoint | TCC* <br> Midpoint | Min | Mid | Max |
| Director I | \$ 102,307 | \$ 144,490 | \$ 108,000 | \$ 122,000 | \$ 91,526 | \$ 114,408 | \$ 137,289 |
| Director II | \$ 118,867 | \$ 167,880 |  |  | \$ 109,832 | \$ 126,994 | \$ 144,155 |
| Managing Director | New |  |  |  | \$ 137,290 | \$ 151,019 | \$ 164,748 |
| Chief Legal Officer | \$ 131,635 | \$ 184,716 | \$ 178,000 | \$ 217,000 | \$ 130,200 | \$ 162,750 | \$ 195,300 |
| Vice President | New |  | \$ 169,000 | \$ 190,000 | \$116,250 | \$150,000 | \$183,750 |
| President | \$ 131,635 | \$ 184,716 | \$ 273,000 | \$ 345,000 | \$ 172,000 | \$ 207,500 | \$ 243,000 |

*Total cash compensation (base salary + annual bonus)

## Program Positions

CLEAN ENERGY
FINANCE AND INVESTMENT AUTHORITY

| Job Title | CURRENT RANGES |  | SURVEY INFORMATION |  | PROPOSED RANGES |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Min | Max | Base Midpoint | TCC <br> Midpoint | Min | Mid | Max |
| Director I | \$ 102,307 | \$ 144,490 | \$ 125,000 | \$ 135,000 | \$ 99,962 | \$ 124,697 | \$ 149,431 |
| Director II | \$ 118,867 | \$ 167,880 | \$ 125,000 | \$ 135,000 | \$ 120,000 | \$ 138,750 | \$ 157,500 |
| Managing Director |  |  |  |  | \$ 150,000 | \$ 165,000 | \$ 180,000 |
| Vice President | New |  | \$ 169,000 | \$ 190,000 | \$116,250 | \$150,000 | \$183,750 |
| Officer |  |  | \$ 130,200 |  | \$ 162,750 | \$ 195,300 |

## Investment Positions

CLEAN ENERGY
FINANCE AND INVESTMENT AUTHORITY

| Job Title | CURRENT RANGES | SURVEY INFORMATION |  | PROPOSED RANGES |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Min Max | Base Midpoint | TCC Midpoint | Min | Mid | Max |
| Director I | \$ 102,307 \$ 144,490 |  |  | \$ 106,104 | \$ 132,630 | \$ 159,156 |
| Director II | \$ 118,867 \$ 167,880 |  |  | \$ 132,632 | \$ 153,356 | \$ 174,080 |
| Managing Director | New |  |  | \$ 165,790 | \$ 182,369 | \$ 198,948 |
| Vice President/Chief |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investment Officer | \$ 131,666 \$ 184,716 | \$ 186,000 | \$ 288,000 | \$ 145,824 | \$ 182,187 | \$ 218,550 |
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## Budget and Operations Committee of the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority

Agenda Item \#5
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## Comp Plan and FY15 Budget Process

|  | May B\&O | June B\&O | June Board |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Comprehensive Plan | Outline | Draft | Final |
| FY15 Budget | Pre-draft | Draft | Final |
| FY14 Results |  |  | Draft |

# Comprehensive Plan 

, Organization Overview
, Public Policy
, Stakeholders

- Financing
- Marketing


## Comprehensive Plan

## Sectors

- Targets

| Program | Projects | Capital Deployed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{cc}Clean Energy <br>

Deployed (MW)\end{array} $$
\begin{array}{c}\text { Clean Energy } \\
\text { Saved } \\
\text { (MMBtu) }\end{array}
$$\right]\)

- CES and IRP Context
, C\&LM Context
, Product Overview
- Objective Function
, Product Development


## CLEAN ENERGY <br> FINANCE AND INVESTMENT AUTHORITY
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## FY15 Budget

, Built around each sector

- Budget for each product to feed into objective function
- Product development budgets for new products envisioned in comprehensive plan


## FY15 Budget

Organization Changes

- Bring "Treasury"/accounting function in-house

, Net . 15 FTE
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## CLEAN ENERGY FINANCE AND INVESTMENT AUTHORITY

Visit us online ctcleanenergy.com

845 Brook Street<br>Rocky Hill, CT (860) 563-0015

# BUDGET AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE CLEAN ENERGY FINANCE AND INVESTMENT AUTHORITY <br> Draft Minutes - Special Meeting <br> Thursday, April 17, 2014 

A special meeting of the Budget and Operations Committee ("Budget Committee") of the Board of Directors of the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority (the "CEFIA") was held on April 17, 2014, at the office of the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority, 845 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, CT 06067.

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at $3: 03$ p.m. Budget Committee members participating: Mun Choi (by phone) and Commissioner Rob Klee (by phone).

Member Absent: Norma Glover.
Staff Attending: George Bellas, Mackey Dykes, Brian Farnen (by phone), Bryan Garcia, Cheryl Samuels, Madeline Priest, and Kerry O'Neill (by phone)

Others Attending: Alex Kragie (by phone)

## 2. Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

## 3. Approval of Meeting Minutes:

The Budget Committee members were asked to consider the minutes from the December 11, 2013 meeting.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Klee, seconded by Mr. Choi, the Budget Committee members voted unanimously in favor of adopting the minutes from the December 11, 2013 meeting as presented.

## 4. Marketing Director:

Mr. Dykes explained that the organization has set aggressive deployment goals and needs to restructure marketing support to help sectors meet them. The new marketing director will integrate all marketing type functions (i.e. marketing, PR, Community outreach) and provide a coordinated, multi-pronged strategy across the organization. Mr. Choi commented that this was timely and he was in favor of the new position. Mr. Klee also agreed and asked if the New York Green Bank had a marketing director that was doing the same for their organization. Bryan Garcia explained that the New York Green Bank is not targeting the marketing front at this time and that they will focus on big banks and big projects for deploying capital as well as utilizing NYSERDA to build
demand. Mr. Dykes added that CEFIA is working on a smaller, more consumer-oriented scale. Kerry O'Neill spoke to the need of having a marketing director with a consumer goods background since CEFIA's target is the consumer more so than lenders. Mr. Dykes asked the committee for a motion for recommendation for approval of the Marketing Director Position description and amended staffing plan to the full board.

> Upon a motion made by Mr. Choi, seconded by Mr. Klee, the Budget Committee members voted unanimously in favor of adopting the following resolution regarding the Marketing Director position.

RESOLVED, the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority's Budget and Operations Committee recommends that the CEFIA Board of Directors approve the Marketing Director position description and amendment to the staffing plan to reflect the new position.

## 5. EnergizeCT Launch Budget:

Mr. Dykes stated that Energize Connecticut is CEFIA's partnership with UI, CL\&P, the Energy Efficiency Fund and DEEP. The partners developed a marketing plan to increase consumer awareness of the EnergizeCT brand. The CEEF asked CEFIA to contribute to the plan. CEFIA's contribution to the plan would be $1 / 4$ of the cost. The plan covers several different aspects (i.e. Media Sponsorship, Public Appearances, Social Media, Transit ads, Paid Search, Digital ads and Direct Mail). Mr. Choi mentioned that he saw an EnergizeCT ad in the Hartford Business Journal. Mr. Klee mentioned he also saw an EnergizeCT ad on television the previous night. Mr. Dykes explained the breakdown of the $\$ 274,250.00$ and how the money would be used to cover various media sponsorship, (i.e. Facebook Paid Ads, Yahoo Paid Ads, Digital Production, etc.) and would like the committee to approve this additional funding. Mr. Dykes stated that the Facebook "likes" have increased because of the ads and the goal is to increase brand awareness. Mr. Dykes reviewed a schedule of television media sponsorship ads airing from April $14^{\text {th }}$ to June $8^{\text {th }}$ on NBC as well as online sponsorship and events.

> Upon a motion made by Mr. Choi, seconded by Mr. Klee the Budget and Operations Committee members voted unanimously in favor of adopting the following resolution regarding the EnergizeCT Launch Budget:

RESOLVED, that the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority's ("CEFIA") Budget and Operations Committee (the "Committee") recommends that the CEFIA Board of Directors approve an increase up to $\$ 274250$ in the marketing budget for fiscal year 2014 budget to support the Energize Connecticut brand launch; and

RESOLVED, the Committee recommends that the CEFIA Board of Directors direct staff to enter into any necessary agreements with the Energize Connecticut partners to execute the Energize Connecticut brand launch and Energize Connecticut marketing activities.

## 6. MatchDrive Contract Amendment:

Mr. Dykes explained that MatchDrive is a marketing firm that was brought on to help meet CEFIA's deployment goals. CEFIA would like to increase the contract with MatchDrive with a proposed increase of $\$ 390,000$ for a new PSA total of $\$ 1,443,550.00$. The funds come from existing marketing budget and are not an increase in overall budget. Mr. Dykes expressed that CEFIA is happy with the work MatchDrive does and Kerry O'Neill feels that it's award winning. The money would go towards producing case studies featuring customers telling their stories and utilizing various mediums to get the information out to the public. The Commercial and Industrial side is asking for $\$ 100,000$ increase to develop a new website, produce additional case studies and conduct online advertising. The Residential side is asking for an increase of $\$ 150,000$ to fund with Facebook promotions and advertising, Spring case studies, and an online banner ad media buy and production. $\$ 140,000$ is requested for general needs, including work on CEFIA's rebranding and producing a financing calculator for EnergizeCT.com. A question was asked of the timing of MatchDrive and the new Marketing Director Position and how that would relate to the new MatchDrive contract. Mr. Dykes explained that CEFIA is hoping to finish out this year with MatchDrive and the New Marketing Director would take over for the next fiscal year. CEFIA would like MatchDrive to stay on for another year to support the New Marketing Director and then let the marketing director make a decision on what they want to do in terms of a future contract.

> Upon a motion made by Mr. Choi, seconded by Mr. Klee the Budget and Operations Committee members voted unanimously in favor of adopting the following resolution regarding the MatchDrive Contract Amendment:

RESOLVED, that the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority's ("CEFIA") Budget and Operations Committee (the "Committee") recommends that the CEFIA Board of Directors approve an increase to PSA 1859 with MatchDrive of $\$ 390,000$.

## 7. Residential Data Administrator:

Mr. Dykes explained that all four residential products were collecting an incredible amount of data from numerous institutions and growing. He explained that the types of data being collected is financial data both origination and payment data, project level data(i.e. contractor, measures installed, etc.) and in the future will be collecting projected and actual energy savings and generated data. Kerry O'Neill explained the need to have the data for a product in an IT platform to provide an opportunity for significant operational efficiencies, especially as programs scales. Putting an outside resource in place would provide nimble and responsive data analytics to both support reporting and drive marketing decision-making strategies. A robust data platform will enable CEFIA to make a much more compelling case to external investors about the risk and rewards of our product offering, in support of our efforts to secure low-cost
capital. Customer's sensitive personal information would also be protected. Mr. Dykes mentioned that an RFP went out in December and only two companies responded; METIS and kWh Analytics. When comparing the two platforms, the METIS platform was found to meet all of CEFIA's needs and more. Mr. Dykes stated that CEFIA would like to enter into a PSA with METIS not to exceed \$180,000 for one year with an option to extend for an additional \$180,000 for year two. Mr. Dykes mentioned that the PSA was currently in front of Commissioner Smith at this point due to the size of the PSA and said CEFIA was bringing this to the Budget and Operations Committee to brief themdue to the operational nature of the contract.

## 8. Comprehensive Plan and FY 15 Budget Process

Mr. Dykes explained the last comprehensive plan is about to expire and would like to bring an outline of the plan to the May Budget and Operations Committee meeting to get feedback as CEFIA looks to develop the next plan. He would bring an outline of the plan and structure for the FY15 budget for feedback from the Budget and Operations Committee. A final draft of both would be presented to the Budget and Operations Committee in June to bring to the June $20^{\text {th }}$ board meeting for a final vote.
Adjournment: Upon a motion made by Mr. Choi, seconded by Mr. Klee, the Budget Committee members voted unanimously in favor of adjourning the April 17, 2014 meeting at 3:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Klee, Chairperson of Budget Committee

## Memo

To: Budget and Operations Committee<br>From: Mackey Dykes, Chief of Staff<br>Date: May 10, 2014<br>Re: Revised Salary Ranges

The Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority's (CEFIA) success can be attributed largely in part to its ability to attract and retain a high-caliber staff. This ability is a result of several things, including an exciting mission, a national identity as a leader in the green bank movement, and the progressive energy policy of Connecticut. Also important in this mix is a flexible and competitive salary structure. While CEFIA cannot expect to compete with private financial institutions, it is useful to understand the market and benchmark against what both private and similar public institutions offer. CEFIA undertook a study and is proposing new Director I level and above salary ranges (highlighted in Attachment A) for board approval. There is no cost as no actual salaries will immediately change as a result of this recommendation but this action will put in place a structure that continues CEFIA's ability to attract and retain top talent.

## Background

In late 2012, Connecticut Innovations (CI) and CEFIA contracted with Buck Consultants to conduct a market compensation study (Attachment B). Buck Consultants developed the methodology of the project in consultation with CEFIA and CI staff and two joint board members, Commissioner Smith and John Olsen.

Benchmark CEFIA positions were chosen from the 3 business units: Corporate, Program and Finance/Investment. Buck Consultants obtained comparable compensation data from both private and nonprofit government entities. The study evaluated CEFIA's market position including base salary, bonus and benefits and the results were weighted to reflect CEFIA's position as a quasi-state organization that could not pay private-level salaries but could offer other incentives such as better than average benefits.

## Results and Recommendation

The results of the study are documented in Attachment B. Broadly, Buck Consultants found that, with a few exceptions, the weighted CEFIA base salaries are within an acceptable range (defined by Buck

Consultants to be plus or minus ten percent) of the market median. However, when compared to total cash compensation (base salary plus bonus), several senior positions fell short of this range.

We are recommending a new salary structure (Attachment A) based on the study. The new structure will allow CEFIA to offer attractive salaries and, when appropriate, increase existing salaries for retention. In addition, it will provide parity across the organization as well as offer a smooth progression for career paths. Positions have been organized into eight grades for each business segment plus an Executive level.

Per CEFIA's operating procedures, salary ranges below the Director level have been approved by the President. Approval is requested for ranges at the Director I level and above (highlighted in attachment A)

## Resolution

RESOLVED, the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority's Budget and Operations Committee recommends that the CEFIA Board of Directors approve the salary ranges for Director I level positions and above outlined in Attachment A.

Submitted by: Mackey Dykes, Chief of Staff

## CEFIA Schedule of Positions

| Grade | Corporate Division Positions | Program Division Positions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Administrative Assistant | Administrative Assistant | Investment Division Positions |
| 2 | Assistant / Executive Assistant | Project Assistant / Executive Assistant | Administrative Assistant |
| 3 | Associate | Associate | Assistant / Executive Assistant |
| 4 | Paralegal / Senior Associate / Assistant Manager / <br> Associate Manager | Senior Associate / Assistant Manager / Associate <br> Manager | Senior Associate / Assistant Manager / Associate |
| Manager |  |  |  |

## CEFIA Corporate Positions


*Total Cash Compensation (TCC) is equal to the sum of base salary plus annual bonus

## CEFIA Program Positions


*Total Cash Compensation (TCC) is equal to the sum of base salary plus annual bonus

*Total Cash Compensation (TCC) is equal to the sum of base salary plus annual bonus

## CEFIA

Compensation Market Assessment Report October 31, 2012


A Xerox Company
buckconsultants
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## Background

- Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority ("CEFIA") - this report provides the CEFIA analysis for 19 positions covered in the overall CI/CEFIA compensation study
- The study evaluated CEFIA's market position for Base Salary and Total Cash Compensation ("TCC" which is equal to the sum of Base Salary and Annual Bonus) for the benchmark jobs
- For this analysis, we have calculated CEFIA's benefits were worth on average, an additional seven percent (7\%) of salary over the external market, which we have included as part of CEFIA's Base Salary and TCC
- During our initial analysis period we held a call with three CI Board members, two of whom are CEFIA Board members, to gain their perspectives and we met individually with a number of senior management people to better understand the organizations and the compensation issues
- This report presents our findings as well as general observations and recommendations for the future.


## Executive Summary

- With only a few exceptions, CEFIA's base salary levels are at (+/-10\%) or above the market median
- For this comparison, base salary also includes the benefit levels provided at CEFIA, which are higher (by an amount, on average, that we have estimated equals $7 \%$ of salary) than in the overall competitive markets for talent
- The lack of an annual incentive plan at CEFIA, common in the For-Profit segment of the competitive markets for talent, results in below median Total Cash Compensation ("TCC") for four of CEFIA's senior positions
- Since incentive plan opportunities for manager and below positions are not typically significant, the overall competitive position remains at market medians for other employees
- The total costs for CEFIA to increase base salaries and TCC to, or close to, median levels are:

UNCAPPED COSTS

| CI | Base <br> Salary <br> (000s) | TCC <br> (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost to <br> Median | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 220$ |
| Cost to $90 \%$ <br> of Median | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 110$ |
| Cost to $80 \%$ <br> of Median | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 40$ |

- The large majority of the $\$ 220,000$ cost is concentrated in three senior people - two corporate executive positions and the CIO - This is principally due to lack of annual incentive plan
- We do initially recommend that a "modest" annual incentive plan be considered for select, senior CEFIA positions


## Executive Summary, continued

- It is important to note, that it is reasonable for CEFIA to consider the following factors in establishing where it wants to position its compensation versus the "competitive markets for talent" - thus, potentially targeting something less than full market median levels, for instance, $90 \%$ or $80 \%$ of market median. Reasons that support the lower target include:
- The organization's Mission to the State of Connecticut; willingness to give back to the community in an attempt to promote business growth and development
- CEFIA's position in the market naturally allows for lower job risk due to the operating environment
- Investment team - limited risk for funding; receives State backing
- Program positions - State backing
- Considering these reasons, we suggest a "haircut" aka, placing a "value" in lower compensation that one would be willing to accept when taking a position at CEFIA; meaning that depending on the level of the position, their personal situation, or their stage in their career there is a reason for accepting the opportunity presented at CEFIA. We believe it is appropriate to look at this value as a range - from $10 \%$ to $25 \%$ of base salary


## Methodology

- Process
- Benchmark positions to be evaluated were identified and reviewed with CEFIA
- CEFIA provided organization charts and job documentation for the positions in the study where available
- Buck met with CEFIA management to ensure our accurate understanding of the organization, roles, responsibilities and education and experience requirements
- A matching matrix was prepared identifying how the CI / CEFIA job would be matched in each survey and was reviewed with CI / CEFIA
- Buck researched the market for Base Salary and Total Cash Compensation for each of the positions in the study using multiple survey sources listed on the next slide
- Where responsibilities at CEFIA differed from the typical market position definition, Buck adjusted the market data with a premium or discount, typically ranging from $10 \%-20 \%$ to account for the difference


## Methodology, continued

- The following weightings were utilized, based on conversations with CI/CEFIA and Buck's judgment, when conducting the market competitive assessment:

| Job Category | Not for Profit/Government | For Profit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Corporate Executives | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Investment | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Corporate Positions | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Program | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Corporate Positions-Admin | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |

## Methodology, continued

- Survey sources used in the analysis and the corresponding industry:

| Published Survey Title | Not-For- <br> Profit/Gov | For-Profit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| American Bankers Association ("ABA") |  | X |
| Connecticut Bankers Association |  | X |
| Holt Private Equity, Venture Capital Survey Report ("Holt") |  | X |
| Towers Watson Survey Reports (using multiple industry cuts): | X | X |
| Top Management Compensation Survey |  | X |
| Supervisory and Middle Management Compensation Survey |  | X |
| Accounting and Finance Survey |  | X |
| Administrative Professional Compensation Survey |  | X |
| Mercer Survey Reports: (using multiple industry cuts) | X |  |
| Mercer Top Management Survey | X | X |
| Mercer Finance Accounting and Legal Survey | X | X |
| Mercer Metropolitan Benchmark Survey | X |  |
| CBIA Survey | X |  |
| Kenexa Compensation Database (using multiple industry cuts) | X |  |
| Economic Research Institute ("ERl") Database (using multiple industry cuts) |  | X |
| Quatt Compensation Survey Report - associations |  |  |
| Total Compensation Solutions ("TCS") Compensation Report - not for profits |  |  |
| PRM Management Compensation Report - not for profits |  |  |
| Washington Technical Professional Forum ("WTFP") Survey - for select program roles |  |  |

## Methodology, continued

- CEFIA positions were matched to similar roles and responsibilities found in surveys based on the following scope:
- Operating budgets - ranging from \$20-60 million depending on the survey
- Assets: \$100-\$299 million
- Number of Full-time Employees - ranging from 25-50EEs
- Industries: we used multiple industry cuts appropriate for the position, including:
- Other Business Services;
- Government Support Services / Public Administration
- Financial Services
- Technical Industry
- Data were aged to October 1, 2012 at an annualized rate of $2 \%$ based on the salary structure projected median for 2012 from WorldatWork Survey across private and public industries
- Benefits value calculated by Buck at 7\% of salary (on average, across CEFIA positions) more valuable than in the various competitive market places. Note: this figure is an average as it would actually differ by person given date of hire, their age, etc. The principal components:
- Pensions: 3-5\%
- Active Employee Health Care: 1-2\%
- Post Retirement Health Care: 1-2\%
- PTO: 1-2\%


## Methodology, continued

- Buck typically uses the following guidelines when interpreting differences between pay practices and market findings:
- Variances within +/- 10\% of a market percentile are generally considered to be within the market norm. They represent statistical differences but probably have limited practical significance
- Positions that have variances greater than or less than $10 \%$ of the market median will have their variance percent highlighted in red
- Pay variances between $10 \%$ to $20 \%$ of a market percentile are within a reasonable range of that market norm. This is analogous to paying an individual low or high, but within a salary range
- Further review should be conducted of positions with a greater than $20 \%$ differential as these are considered to be meaningful differences


## Findings - Summary Information

- The following tables summarize CEFIA's base salary and total cash compensation ("TCC") competitiveness relative to the market - for all 19 positions, and then also presented by department and by level
- A large majority of the positions, $80 \%$, have a base salary at market median (within +/- 10\%)
- Only one position, manager level, is more than $10 \%$ below median level
- The lack of an annual incentive plan at CEFIA worsens the competitive market position for three senior people and one manager position to put them more than $10 \%$ below median levels for TCC


| CEFIA | Executive |  | Investment |  | Program |  | Corporate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Base <br> Salary | TCC | Base <br> Salary | TCC | Base <br> Salary | TCC | Base <br> Salary | TCC |
| Below $-10 \%$ of <br> Median | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Within $\pm 10 \%$ of <br> Median | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| Above $10 \%$ of <br> Median | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |


| CEFIA <br> By Level | Directors and Above |  | Managers and Below |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Base <br> Salary | TCC | Base <br> Salary | TCC |
| Below -10\% of Median | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Within $\pm 10 \%$ of Median | 4 | 4 | 9 | 10 |
| Above 10\% of Median | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |

Note: For this analysis, Base Salary and TCC take into account the average cost of benefits for the positions at CEFIA as calculated by Buck to be worth, on average, $7 \%$ of salary more than in the competitive markets for talent

## Findings - Summary Information, continued

- The following Costing Charts present the cost to CEFIA to either fully increase compensation to median levels, or to get within $10 \%$ or $20 \%$ of market medians:
- A large majority of the TCC cost shown below is for three senior employees - CIO, GC and Chief of Staff - since the lack of an incentive plan creates a meaningful shortfall for this level employee
- Additional potential costs to CEFIA materially decrease if the organization were to decide to either:
- Determine to be at $90 \%$ or $80 \%$ of market medians
- Cap a compensation increase to no more than $15 \%$ for any employee

UNCAPPED COSTS

| Cl | Base <br> Salary <br> (000s) | TCC <br> (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost to <br> Median | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 220$ |
| Cost to $90 \%$ <br> of Median | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 110$ |
| Cost to $80 \%$ <br> of Median | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 40$ |

## "Uncapped" Costs:

Cost to make up the total difference between current employee pay and market median, $90 \%$ of the median, and $80 \%$ of the median; regardless of the variance between them

CAPPED AT 15\% INCREASE

| Cl | Base <br> Salary <br> (000s) | TCC <br> (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost to <br> Median | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 70$ |
| Cost to $90 \%$ <br> of Median | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 30$ |
| Cost to $80 \%$ <br> of Median | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |

## "Capped" Costs:

Cost to make up only the first $15 \%$ difference between current employee pay and market median, $90 \%$ of the median, $80 \%$ of the median

## Findings - CEFIA, Executive Positions

- For Base Salary, both positions fall at market median level, given our +/- $10 \%$ tolerance
* Competitive Variance is calculated using the Salary $+7 \%$ and TCC figure against the competitive market

| CEFIA |  |  |  | Competitive Base Salary <br> Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* <br> Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position Title | Incumbent | Current Salary | $\begin{gathered} \text { Salary + } \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Executive Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Counsel | Farnen, Brian | \$155 | \$166 | \$144 | \$178 | \$223 | 15\% | (7\%) | (26\%) |
| Chief of Staff | Dykes, Mackey | \$125 | \$134 | \$100 | \$146 | \$175 | 33\% | (9\%) | (23\%) |
| Aggregate Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23\% | (8\%) | (25\%) |

- For Total Cash, the positions approximate the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile of the competitive market median



## Findings - CEFIA, Investment Positions

- For Base Salary, the Investment positions are at the market competitive $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile
* Competitive Variance is calculated using the Salary $+7 \%$ and TCC figure against the competitive market

| CEFIA |  |  |  | Competitive Base Salary <br> Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* <br> Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position Title | Incumbent | Current <br> Salary | $\begin{gathered} \text { Salary + } \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Investment Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Investment Officer | Hunter, Roberto | \$181 | \$194 | \$127 | \$186 | \$254 | 52\% | 4\% | (24\%) |
| Senior Manager, Clean Energy Finance | Healey, Benjamin | \$103 | \$110 | \$91 | \$106 | \$125 | 20\% | 3\% | (13\%) |
| Manager, Clean Energy Finance | Lieberman, Alexandra | \$80 | \$86 | \$83 | \$96 | \$113 | 3\% | (11\%) | (25\%) |
| Aggregate Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29\% | 0\% | (21\%) |

- For Total Cash, two of the three investment positions fall well below median levels

| CEFIA |  |  |  | Competitive Total Cash <br> Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* <br> Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position Title | Incumbent | Current Salary | TCC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Investment Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Investment Officer | Hunter, Roberto | \$181 | \$194 | \$180 | \$288 | \$384 | 8\% | (33\%) | (50\%) |
| Senior Manager, Clean Energy Finance | Healey, Benjamin | \$103 | \$110 | \$97 | \$115 | \$147 | 13\% | (5\%) | (25\%) |
| Manager, Clean Energy Finance | Lieberman, Alexandra | \$80 | \$86 | \$88 | \$105 | \$123 | (3\%) | (18\%) | (30\%) |
| Aggregate Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7\% | (23\%) | (40\%) |

## Findings - CEFIA, Program Positions

- For Base Salary, the Program positions are very close to market $50^{\text {th }}$ percentiles
* Competitive Variance is calculated using the Salary $+7 \%$ and TCC figure against the competitive market

| CEFIA |  |  |  | Competitive Base Salary <br> Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* <br> Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position Title | Incumbent | Current Salary | $\begin{gathered} \text { Salary + } \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Program Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program Director | Multiple Incumbent | \$132 | \$141 | \$107 | \$125 | \$140 | 32\% | 13\% | 1\% |
| Sr Program Manger, Clean Energy Dev. | Ross, Rick | \$109 | \$117 | \$90 | \$104 | \$125 | 30\% | 12\% | (6\%) |
| Project Manager Clean Energy Deploy. | Kragie, Alex | \$78 | \$83 | \$74 | \$85 | \$99 | 13\% | (1\%) | (16\%) |
| Program Manager | Charpentier, Lucy | \$76 | \$82 | \$74 | \$85 | \$99 | 11\% | (4\%) | (18\%) |
| Program Associate | McCarthy, Neil | \$61 | \$66 | \$61 | \$70 | \$79 | 7\% | (6\%) | (17\%) |
| Program Analyst |  |  |  | \$51 | \$59 | \$69 |  |  |  |
| Project Assistant | Multiple Incumbent | \$47 | \$50 | \$40 | \$45 | \$49 | 26\% | 13\% | 2\% |
| Aggregate Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21\% | 5\% | (9\%) |

- For Total Cash, the Program positions continue to approximate the market $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile

| CEFIA |  |  |  | Competitive Total Cash <br> Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* <br> Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position Title | Incumbent | Current Salary | TCC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Program Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program Director | Multiple Incumbent | \$132 | \$141 | \$113 | \$135 | \$155 | 25\% | 5\% | (9\%) |
| Sr Program Manger, Clean Energy Dev. | Ross, Rick | \$109 | \$117 | \$94 | \$113 | \$144 | 25\% | 4\% | (19\%) |
| Project Manager Clean Energy Deploy. | Kragie, Alex | \$78 | \$83 | \$75 | \$90 | \$103 | 11\% | (7\%) | (19\%) |
| Program Manager | Charpentier, Lucy | \$76 | \$82 | \$75 | \$90 | \$103 | 8\% | (9\%) | (21\%) |
| Program Associate | McCarthy, Neil | \$61 | \$66 | \$62 | \$71 | \$81 | 6\% | (7\%) | (19\%) |
| Program Analyst |  |  |  | \$52 | \$60 | \$71 |  |  |  |
| Project Assistant | Multiple Incumbent | \$47 | \$50 | \$41 | \$46 | \$51 | 23\% | 10\% | (2\%) |
|  |  |  |  |  | Aggregate Variance |  | 17\% | (1\%) | (15\%) |

Note: For this analysis, Base Salary and TCC take into account the average cost of benefits for the positions at CEFIA as calculated by Buck to be worth, on average, $7 \%$ of salary more than in the competitive markets for talent

## Findings - CEFIA, Corporate Positions

- For Base Salary, the Corporate positions are at the median of the competitive market
* Competitive Variance is calculated using the Salary $+7 \%$ and TCC figure against the competitive market

| CEFIA |  |  |  | Competitive Base Salary <br> Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* <br> Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position Title | Incumbent | Current Salary | $\begin{gathered} \text { Salary + } \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Corporate Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director, Marketing and Outreach | Wall, Bob | \$113 | \$121 | \$99 | \$114 | \$125 | 22\% | 6\% | (3\%) |
| Director, Gov. and External Affairs | Goldberg, David | \$115 | \$123 | \$93 | \$102 | \$130 | 33\% | 21\% | (5\%) |
| Sr. Marketing Manager (event) | Rivera, Gladys | \$86 | \$92 | \$70 | \$73 | \$85 | 31\% | 26\% | 8\% |
| Sr. Marketing Manager (website) | Murphy, John | \$79 | \$85 | \$71 | \$81 | \$95 | 20\% | 4\% | (11\%) |
| Associate Marketing and Outreach | Schmitt, Robert | \$51 | \$55 | \$57 | \$53 | \$61 | (3\%) | 5\% | (10\%) |
| Administrative Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Executive Assistant |  |  |  | \$56 | \$64 | \$75 |  |  |  |
| Paralegal | French,Loyola | \$57 | \$61 | \$54 | \$60 | \$69 | 13\% | 2\% | (12\%) |
| Administrative Assistant, Sr. | Samuels, Cheryl | \$47 | \$50 | \$40 | \$46 | \$52 | 24\% | 9\% | (5\%) |
| Administrative Assistant | Mancini, Andrea | \$42 | \$45 | \$37 | \$42 | \$47 | 21\% | 6\% | (5\%) |
| Receptionist |  |  |  | \$26 | \$29 | \$33 |  |  |  |
| ( Aggregate Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21\% | 11\% | (5\%) |

- For Total Cash, the Corporate positions generally remain at the median of the competitive market

| CEFIA |  |  |  | Competitive Total Cash <br> Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* <br> Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position Title | Incumbent | Current Salary | TCC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Corporate Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director, Marketing and Outreach | Wall, Bob | \$113 | \$121 | \$108 | \$120 | \$136 | 12\% | 1\% | (11\%) |
| Director, Gov. and External Affairs | Goldberg, David | \$115 | \$123 | \$100 | \$114 | \$152 | 24\% | 8\% | (19\%) |
| Sr. Marketing Manager (event) | Rivera, Gladys | \$86 | \$92 | \$71 | \$75 | \$91 | 30\% | 23\% | 1\% |
| Sr. Marketing Manager (website) | Murphy, John | \$79 | \$85 | \$74 | \$85 | \$101 | 14\% | (0\%) | (16\%) |
| Associate Marketing and Outreach | Schmitt, Robert | \$51 | \$55 | \$47 | \$54 | \$62 | 16\% | 2\% | (12\%) |
| Administrative Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Executive Assistant |  |  |  | \$54 | \$63 | \$73 |  |  |  |
| Paralegal | French,Loyola | \$57 | \$61 | \$55 | \$61 | \$71 | 12\% | 1\% | (14\%) |
| Administrative Assistant, Sr. | Samuels, Cheryl | \$47 | \$50 | \$41 | \$47 | \$53 | 23\% | 6\% | (6\%) |
| Administrative Assistant | Mancini, Andrea | \$42 | \$45 | \$38 | \$43 | \$48 | 20\% | 5\% | (7\%) |
| Receptionist |  |  |  | \$26 | \$29 | \$33 |  |  |  |

## Findings - CEFIA Overall Detail

Base Salary

* Competitive Variance is calculated using the Salary $+7 \%$ figure against the competitive market

| CEFIA |  |  |  | Competitive Base Salary <br> Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* <br> Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position Title | Incumbent | Current <br> Salary | $\begin{gathered} \text { Salary + } \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Executive Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Counsel | Farnen, Brian | \$155 | \$166 | \$144 | \$178 | \$223 | 15\% | (7\%) | (26\%) |
| Chief of Staff | Dykes, Mackey | \$125 | \$134 | \$100 | \$146 | \$175 | 33\% | (9\%) | (23\%) |
| Investment Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Investment Officer | Hunter, Roberto | \$181 | \$194 | \$127 | \$186 | \$254 | 52\% | 4\% | (24\%) |
| Senior Manager, Clean Energy Finance | Healey, Benjamin | \$103 | \$110 | \$91 | \$106 | \$125 | 20\% | 3\% | (13\%) |
| Manager, Clean Energy Finance | Lieberman, Alexandra | \$80 | \$86 | \$83 | \$96 | \$113 | 3\% | (11\%) | (25\%) |
| Program Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program Director | Multiple Incumbent | \$132 | \$141 | \$107 | \$125 | \$140 | 32\% | 13\% | 1\% |
| Sr Program Manger, Clean Energy Dev. | Ross, Rick | \$109 | \$117 | \$90 | \$104 | \$125 | 30\% | 12\% | (6\%) |
| Project Manager Clean Energy Deploy. | Kragie, Alex | \$78 | \$83 | \$74 | \$85 | \$99 | 13\% | (1\%) | (16\%) |
| Program Manager | Charpentier, Lucy | \$76 | \$82 | \$74 | \$85 | \$99 | 11\% | (4\%) | (18\%) |
| Program Associate | McCarthy, Neil | \$61 | \$66 | \$61 | \$70 | \$79 | 7\% | (6\%) | (17\%) |
| Project Assistant | Multiple Incumbent | \$47 | \$50 | \$40 | \$45 | \$49 | 26\% | 13\% | 2\% |
| Corporate Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director, Marketing and Outreach | Wall, Bob | \$113 | \$121 | \$99 | \$114 | \$125 | 22\% | 6\% | (3\%) |
| Director, Gov. and External Affairs | Goldberg, David | \$115 | \$123 | \$93 | \$102 | \$130 | 33\% | 21\% | (5\%) |
| Sr. Marketing Manager (event) | Rivera, Gladys | \$86 | \$92 | \$70 | \$73 | \$85 | 31\% | 26\% | 8\% |
| Sr. Marketing Manager (website) | Murphy, John | \$79 | \$85 | \$71 | \$81 | \$95 | 20\% | 4\% | (11\%) |
| Associate Marketing and Outreach | Schmitt, Robert | \$51 | \$55 | \$57 | \$53 | \$61 | (3\%) | 5\% | (10\%) |
| Administrative Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paralegal | French,Loyola | \$57 | \$61 | \$54 | \$60 | \$69 | 13\% | 2\% | (12\%) |
| Administrative Assistant, Sr. | Samuels, Cheryl | \$47 | \$50 | \$40 | \$46 | \$52 | 24\% | 9\% | (5\%) |
| Administrative Assistant | Mancini, Andrea | \$42 | \$45 | \$37 | \$42 | \$47 | 21\% | 6\% | (5\%) |
| Aggregate Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23\% | 3\% | (13\%) |

Note: For this analysis, Base Salary and TCC take into account the average cost of benefits for the positions at CEFIA as calculated by Buck to be worth, on average, $7 \%$ of salary more than in the competitive markets for talent

## Findings - CEFIA Overall Detail

## Total Cash Compensation

* Competitive Variance is calculated using the TCC figure against the competitive market

| CEFIA |  |  |  | Competitive Total Cash <br> Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* <br> Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position Title | Incumbent | Current <br> Salary | TCC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Executive Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Counsel | Farnen, Brian | \$155 | \$166 | \$166 | \$217 | \$290 | 0\% | (23\%) | (43\%) |
| Chief of Staff | Dykes, Mackey | \$125 | \$134 | \$106 | \$156 | \$187 | 26\% | (14\%) | (28\%) |
| Investment Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Investment Officer | Hunter, Roberto | \$181 | \$194 | \$180 | \$288 | \$384 | 8\% | (33\%) | (50\%) |
| Senior Manager, Clean Energy Finance | Healey, Benjamin | \$103 | \$110 | \$97 | \$115 | \$147 | 13\% | (5\%) | (25\%) |
| Manager, Clean Energy Finance | Lieberman, Alexandra | \$80 | \$86 | \$88 | \$105 | \$123 | (3\%) | (18\%) | (30\%) |
| Program Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program Director | Multiple Incumbent | \$132 | \$141 | \$113 | \$135 | \$155 | 25\% | 5\% | (9\%) |
| Sr Program Manger, Clean Energy Dev. | Ross, Rick | \$109 | \$117 | \$94 | \$113 | \$144 | 25\% | 4\% | (19\%) |
| Project Manager Clean Energy Deploy. | Kragie, Alex | \$78 | \$83 | \$75 | \$90 | \$103 | 11\% | (7\%) | (19\%) |
| Program Manager | Charpentier, Lucy | \$76 | \$82 | \$75 | \$90 | \$103 | 8\% | (9\%) | (21\%) |
| Program Associate | McCarthy, Neil | \$61 | \$66 | \$62 | \$71 | \$81 | 6\% | (7\%) | (19\%) |
| Project Assistant | Multiple Incumbent | \$47 | \$50 | \$41 | \$46 | \$51 | 23\% | 10\% | (2\%) |
| Corporate Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director, Marketing and Outreach | Wall, Bob | \$113 | \$121 | \$108 | \$120 | \$136 | 12\% | 1\% | (11\%) |
| Director, Gov. and External Affairs | Goldberg, David | \$115 | \$123 | \$100 | \$114 | \$152 | 24\% | 8\% | (19\%) |
| Sr. Marketing Manager (event) | Rivera, Gladys | \$86 | \$92 | \$71 | \$75 | \$91 | 30\% | 23\% | 1\% |
| Sr. Marketing Manager (website) | Murphy, John | \$79 | \$85 | \$74 | \$85 | \$101 | 14\% | (0\%) | (16\%) |
| Associate Marketing and Outreach | Schmitt, Robert | \$51 | \$55 | \$47 | \$54 | \$62 | 16\% | 2\% | (12\%) |
| Administrative Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paralegal | French,Loyola | \$57 | \$61 | \$55 | \$61 | \$71 | 12\% | 1\% | (14\%) |
| Administrative Assistant, Sr. | Samuels, Cheryl | \$47 | \$50 | \$41 | \$47 | \$53 | 23\% | 6\% | (6\%) |
| Administrative Assistant | Mancini, Andrea | \$42 | \$45 | \$38 | \$43 | \$48 | 20\% | 5\% | (7\%) |
| Aggregate Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14\% | (8\%) | (25\%) |

Note: For this analysis, Base Salary and TCC take into account the average cost of benefits for the positions at CEFIA as calculated by Buck to be worth, on average, $7 \%$ of salary more than in the competitive markets for talent

## Incentive Plan Commentary

- During our initial discussions with the Board and management, the establishment of annual and long term incentives for CEFIA and Cl have been discussed and are to be considered; within the constraints of:
- Affordability
- Understandability and appreciation by the potential participants
- Fairness
- State influence
- "Successful" incentive plans - well communicated, easy to understand, achievable, appreciated, payouts close to target levels - in an organization without recent history is a major challenge
- We strongly suggest "starting modestly", regarding:
- "Who" - who participates, and who does not
- Only a small number of senior level employees should participate, given:
- There are not compensation shortfalls for mid and lower level employees
- Most jobs at lower levels would not participate in incentive plans in the for profit, not-for-profit and government sectors
- Setting goals for incentive plan payout purposes for positions that do not have material impact on organization performance is challenging and does not provide strong "line of sight" between goals / performance / payouts


## Incentive Plan Commentary

- "What"
- An Annual Plan only
- "How Much"
- We suggest a very modest target level (see chart on following page), differing by job type and level in first year, with increasing opportunity over time
- Awarding an annual incentive at the target percent would roughly cost $\$ 50 \mathrm{~K}$
- "Why" - the metrics
- Use no more than 2 metrics to keep it simple
- Use team goal and CEFIA goal
- Focus on financial results


## Annual Incentive Plan Framework

- The table below highlights our preliminary recommendations regarding the size of awards, as a percentage of salary

| Position Level | Yr. 1 Target | Yr. 2 Target | Yr. 3 Target |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CEO | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| Corp Execs and <br> CIO | $10 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Directors* | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Managers | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Below | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

- Maximum opportunity is 1.33 times target percentage
- Threshold opportunity is 0.5 times target percentage
-     * A $5 \%$ of salary, growing to $10 \%$, could be considered


## Appendix

## Appendix - Market Pricing Detail, All

| Survey Name | Position Title | Survey <br> Scope | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { Cos. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { EEs } \end{gathered}$ | Weighted |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Competitive Weighted Base Percentile |  |  | Competitive Weighted TTC Percentile |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| General Counsel |  |  |  |  | \$144 | \$178 | \$223 | \$166 | \$217 | \$290 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$139 | \$164 | \$197 | \$153 | \$185 | \$232 |
| PRM | Top Legal Executive/General Counsel | Organization Budget: $\$ 30.0 \mathrm{~mm}-\$ 59.9 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 13 | 13 | \$159 | \$182 | \$226 | \$167 | \$191 | \$237 |
| Kenexa | General Counsel | Edu., Govt. \& Nonprofit / Size: 50-100 / State: All | 750 | 750 | \$124 | \$155 | \$192 | \$153 | \$205 | \$280 |
| ERI | Top Legal Officer | Government Support Services; Budget \$25M | na | na | \$110 | \$128 | \$152 | \$126 | \$148 | \$178 |
| TW Top | Top Legal Executive | Public Administration/Government - FTEs 60 | 12 | 12 | \$164 | \$189 | \$219 | \$166 | \$196 | \$231 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$148 | \$193 | \$249 | \$179 | \$248 | \$348 |
| TW Top | Top Legal Executive | FP - Other Fin Svcs Orgs; Assets \$200M | 9 | 9 | \$173 | \$230 | \$306 | \$204 | \$291 | \$415 |
| Kenexa | Top Legal Executive | Business Svcs / Size: 50-100 / State: All | 750 | 750 | \$124 | \$155 | \$192 | \$153 | \$206 | \$281 |
| Chief of Staff |  |  |  |  | \$100 | \$146 | \$175 | \$106 | \$156 | \$187 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$100 | \$146 | \$175 | \$106 | \$156 | \$187 |
| PRM | Chief of Staff | Organization Budget: $\$ 30.0 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{-} \$ 59.9 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 5 | 5 | \$108 | \$175 | \$208 | \$115 | \$186 | \$220 |
| Kenexa | Chief of Staff | Edu., Govt. \& Nonprofit / Size: $25-50$ / State: All | 5 | 5 | \$93 | \$117 | \$141 | \$97 | \$126 | \$153 |
| Chief Investment Officer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$127 | \$186 | \$254 | \$180 | \$288 | \$384 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$127 | \$186 | \$254 | \$180 | \$288 | \$384 |
| Kenexa | Top Investment Executive | Financial Services / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 0 | 0 | \$115 | \$154 | \$212 | \$133 | \$197 | \$327 |
| Holt | Managing Director | Firm Classification: Venture Capital (Small) | 8 | NA | \$107 | \$196 | \$304 | \$111 | \$235 | \$385 |
| Holt | Partner / Managing Director / Porttolio Manager | Firm Classification: LBO/Growth Equity (Small) | 7 | na | \$160 | \$209 | \$246 | \$294 | \$431 | \$440 |
| Holt | Managing General Partner | Firm Classification: Venture Capital (Small) | 16 | NA | \$211 | \$322 | \$496 | \$266 | \$425 | \$672 |

## Appendix - Market Pricing Detail, continued



## Appendix - Market Pricing Detail, continued

| Survey Name |  | Su | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ \text { Cos. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { EEs } \end{gathered}$ | Weighted |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Competitive Weighted Base Percentile |  |  | Competitive Weighted TTC$\qquad$ |  |  |
|  | Position Title |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Sr Program Manger, Clean Energy Dev. |  |  |  |  | \$90 | \$104 | \$125 | \$94 | \$113 | \$144 |
| Not For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$84 | \$100 | \$116 | \$89 | \$107 | \$129 |
| Kenexa | Project Management Manager | Edu., Gov't. \& Nonprofit / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 150 | 1900 | \$84 | \$100 | \$116 | \$89 | \$107 | \$129 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$95 | \$109 | \$133 | \$99 | \$118 | \$160 |
| TW Middle | Project/Program Management | Ind: Elect. \& Semiconductor / Profit Status: FP / Career Band: M3 | 6 | 22 | \$101 | \$107 | \$135 | \$106 | \$117 | \$179 |
| Mercer Metro | Project Management Manager | All Orgs | 64 | 315 | \$90 | \$111 | \$132 | \$92 | \$120 | \$142 |
| Project Manager Clean Energy Deploy. |  |  |  |  | \$74 | \$85 | \$99 | \$75 | \$90 | \$103 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$68 | \$78 | \$91 | \$70 | \$81 | \$95 |
| PRM | Program Manager | Organization Budget: \$30.0 mm - \$59.9 mm | 16 | 60 | \$60 | \$75 | \$94 | \$60 | \$75 | \$95 |
| Kenexa | Program Manager | Edu., Gov't. \& Nonprofit / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 225 | 4300 | \$84 | \$98 | \$112 | \$87 | \$102 | \$119 |
| ERI | Program Manager | Government Support Services; YOE 4 | na | na | \$60 | \$63 | \$68 | \$62 | \$66 | \$71 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$79 | \$91 | \$107 | \$81 | \$98 | \$112 |
| TW Middle | Project/Program Management | Ind: Elect. \& Semi / Profit Status: FP / Career Band: M2 | 7 | 21 | \$82 | \$93 | \$109 | \$82 | \$107 | \$115 |
| Mercer Metro | Project Manager (Non-technical) - Sr. | All Orgs | 307 | 4598 | \$78 | \$91 | \$105 | \$84 | \$98 | \$113 |
| WTPF | Project Manager I/ Level: P3 | Govt Chartered / Defense | 9 | 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Senior Manager, Clean Energy Finance |  |  |  |  | \$91 | \$106 | \$125 | \$97 | \$115 | \$147 |
| Not For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$86 | \$99 | \$113 | \$92 | \$107 | \$125 |
| Kenexa | Financial Analysis Manager | Edu., Gov't. \& Nonprofit / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 500 | 3700 | \$88 | \$98 | \$109 | \$94 | \$107 | \$121 |
| Kenexa | Project Management Manager | Edu., Gov't. \& Nonprofit / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 150 | 1900 | \$84 | \$100 | \$116 | \$89 | \$107 | \$129 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$91 | \$106 | \$125 | \$97 | \$115 | \$147 |
| TW Middle | Financial Analysis | Industry: BSS / Profit Status: FP / Career Band: M3 | 8 | 40 | \$94 | \$107 | \$133 | \$102 | \$117 | \$175 |
| Mercer Metro | Project Management Manager | All Orgs | 64 | 315 | \$90 | \$111 | \$132 | \$92 | \$120 | \$142 |
| Kenexa | Financial Analysis Manager | Financial Services; Assets < \$1B | 500 | 3700 | \$90 | \$100 | \$111 | \$96 | \$109 | \$124 |
| Manager, Clean Energy Finance |  |  |  |  | \$83 | \$96 | \$113 | \$88 | \$105 | \$123 |
| Not For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$76 | \$85 | \$95 | \$82 | \$93 | \$105 |
| Kenexa | Financial Analysis Manager | Edu., Gov't. \& Nonprofit / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 500 | 3700 | \$76 | \$85 | \$95 | \$82 | \$93 | \$105 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$83 | \$96 | \$113 | \$88 | \$105 | \$123 |
| Mercer Metro | Project Manager (Non-technical) - Sr. | All Orgs | 307 | 4598 | \$78 | \$91 | \$105 | \$84 | \$98 | \$113 |
| TW Middle | Financial Analysis | Industry: BSS / Profit Status: FP / Career Band: M2 | 16 | 40 | \$88 | \$102 | \$122 | \$92 | \$111 | \$133 |

## Appendix - Market Pricing Detail, continued

| Survey Name | Position Title | Survey <br> Scope | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ \text { Cos. } \end{gathered}$ | \# <br> EEs | Competitive Weighted Base Percentile |  |  | Competitive Weighted TTC Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Program Manager |  |  |  |  | \$74 | \$85 | \$99 | \$75 | \$90 | \$103 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$68 | \$78 | \$91 | \$70 | \$81 | \$95 |
| PRM | Program Manager | Organization Budget: $\$ 30.0 \mathrm{~mm}-\$ 59.9 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 16 | 60 | \$60 | \$75 | \$94 | \$60 | \$75 | \$95 |
| Kenexa | Program Manager | Edu., Gov't. \& Nonprofit / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 225 | 4300 | \$84 | \$98 | \$112 | \$87 | \$102 | \$119 |
| ERI | Program Manager | Government Support Services; YOE 4 | na | na | \$60 | \$63 | \$68 | \$62 | \$66 | \$71 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$79 | \$91 | \$107 | \$81 | \$98 | \$112 |
| TW Middle | Project/Program Management | Ind: Elect. \& Semiconductor / Profit Status: FP / Career Band: M2 | 7 | 21 | \$82 | \$93 | \$109 | \$82 | \$107 | \$115 |
| Mercer Metro | Project Manager (Non-technical) - Sr. | All Orgs | 307 | 4598 | \$78 | \$91 | \$105 | \$84 | \$98 | \$113 |
| WTPF | Project Manager I/Level: P3 | Govt Chartered / Defense | 9 | 90 | \$78 | \$88 | \$107 | \$78 | \$90 | \$107 |
| Program Associate |  |  |  |  | \$61 | \$70 | \$79 | \$62 | \$71 | \$81 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$52 | \$59 | \$71 | \$54 | \$59 | \$72 |
| PRM | Program Staff Position | Organization Budget: \$30.0 mm - \$59.9 mm | 10 | 59 | \$56 | \$63 | \$70 | \$56 | \$63 | \$70 |
| Quatt | Program Staff Position | All Orgs | 10 | NA | \$49 | \$55 | \$71 | \$52 | \$56 | \$75 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$70 | \$81 | \$88 | \$70 | \$82 | \$90 |
| TW Admin | Project/Program Management | Industry: BSS / Profit Status: FP / Career Band: P3 | 12 | 159 | \$81 | \$93 | \$99 | \$81 | \$94 | \$101 |
| WTPF | Program/Project Administrator / Level: P2 | Govt Chartered / Defense | 9 | 41 | \$59 | \$70 | \$77 | \$59 | \$70 | \$79 |
| Program Analyst |  |  |  |  | \$51 | \$59 | \$69 | \$52 | \$60 | \$71 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$50 | \$56 | \$67 | \$51 | \$56 | \$69 |
| PRM | Program Staff Position | Organization Budget: $\$ 30.0 \mathrm{~mm}$ - $\$ 59.9 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 10 | 59 | \$50 | \$57 | \$63 | \$51 | \$57 | \$63 |
| Quatt | Program Staff Position | All Orgs | 10 | NA | \$49 | \$55 | \$71 | \$52 | \$56 | \$75 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$52 | \$62 | \$71 | \$52 | \$64 | \$73 |
| TW Admin | Project/Program Management | Industry: Services / Profit Status: FP / Career Band: P2 | 20 | 131 | \$51 | \$60 | \$72 | \$51 | \$64 | \$76 |
| WTPF | Program/Project Administrator / Level: P2 | Govt Chartered / Defense | 9 | 41 | \$53 | \$63 | \$70 | \$53 | \$63 | \$71 |
| Project Assistant |  |  |  |  | \$40 | \$45 | \$49 | \$41 | \$46 | \$51 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$38 | \$42 | \$47 | \$39 | \$43 | \$48 |
| PRM | Program Assistant | Organization Budget: \$30.0 mm - \$59.9 mm | 12 | 46 | \$38 | \$42 | \$48 | \$38 | \$42 | \$48 |
| ERI | Administrative Assistant | Government Support Services; YOE 7 | na | na | \$38 | \$41 | \$45 | \$39 | \$42 | \$46 |
| Kenexa | Project Administrator I | Edu., Gov't. \& Nonprofit / Size: 25-50 / State: All | na | na | \$39 | \$44 | \$49 | \$41 | \$47 | \$51 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$41 | \$47 | \$52 | \$43 | \$48 | \$54 |
| TW Admin | Administrative Services | Industry: BSS / Profit Status: FP / Career Band: P2 | 13 | 77 | \$41 | \$47 | \$51 | \$41 | \$47 | \$53 |
| Kenexa | Project Administrator I | Business Svcs / Size: 25-50 / State: All | na | na | \$42 | \$48 | \$52 | \$44 | \$50 | \$55 |

# Appendix - Market Pricing Detail, continued 



## Appendix - Market Pricing Detail, continued

Weighted

| Survey Name | Position Title | Survey <br> Scope | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ \text { Cos. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { EEs } \end{gathered}$ | Competitive Weighted Base Percentile |  |  | Competitive Weighted TTC Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Executive Assistant |  |  |  |  | \$56 | \$64 | \$75 | \$54 | \$63 | \$73 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$55 | \$61 | \$70 | \$49 | \$55 | \$61 |
| Quatt | Executive Assistant | All Orgs | 21 | NA | \$54 | \$59 | \$70 | \$56 | \$62 | \$71 |
| PRM | Executive Assistant | Organization Budget: $\$ 30.0 \mathrm{~mm}$ - $\$ 59.9 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 39 | 55 | \$59 | \$70 | \$77 | \$60 | \$71 | \$79 |
| Kenexa | Secretary to CEO | Edu., Govt. \& Nonprofit / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 750 | 9,800 | \$49 | \$56 | \$65 | \$24 | \$26 | \$30 |
| ERI | Secretary to CEO | Government Support Services; YOE 7 | na | na | \$56 | \$59 | \$66 | \$57 | \$60 | \$66 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$58 | \$67 | \$81 | \$59 | \$71 | \$86 |
| CT Banking | Assistant to the President | All Orgs | 11 | 12 | \$59 | \$63 | \$76 | \$59 | \$67 | \$80 |
| Holt | Executive Assistant | Firm Classification: Venture Capital (Small) | 10 | NA | \$54 | \$69 | \$88 | \$56 | \$76 | \$101 |
| CBIA | Secretary - Executive | Central CT (CC) | 6 | 30 | \$68 | \$77 | \$91 | \$68 | \$77 | \$91 |
| Kenexa | Secretary to CEO | Business Svcs / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 750 | 9,800 | \$52 | \$60 | \$69 | \$54 | \$61 | \$71 |
| Administrative Assistant, Sr. |  |  |  |  | \$40 | \$46 | \$52 | \$41 | \$47 | \$53 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$36 | \$41 | \$45 | \$37 | \$41 | \$46 |
| TCS | Administrative Assistant | Operating Budget: \$20 to \$50 Million | 9 | 27 | \$34 | \$40 | \$44 | \$34 | \$40 | \$44 |
| ERI | Administrative Assistant | Government Support Services; YOE 6 | na | na | \$37 | \$40 | \$44 | \$38 | \$41 | \$45 |
| Kenexa | Administrative Assistant III | Edu., Govt. \& Nonprofit / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 275 | 3500 | \$38 | \$42 | \$48 | \$39 | \$43 | \$49 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$44 | \$51 | \$59 | \$44 | \$52 | \$60 |
| CT Banking | Administrative Assistant | All Orgs | 17 | 59 | \$39 | \$43 | \$49 | \$39 | \$44 | \$50 |
| TW Admin | Administrative Services | Industry: BSS / Profit Status: FP / Career Band: P3 | 12 | 92 | \$49 | \$57 | \$71 | \$49 | \$61 | \$71 |
| CBIA | Administrative Assistant | Central CT (CC) | 16 | 106 | \$47 | \$58 | \$67 | \$47 | \$58 | \$67 |
| Kenexa | Administrative Assistant III | Business Svcs / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 999 | 9999 | \$40 | \$45 | \$51 | \$41 | \$46 | \$52 |
| Administrative Assistant |  |  |  |  | \$37 | \$42 | \$47 | \$38 | \$43 | \$48 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$34 | \$38 | \$42 | \$34 | \$39 | \$43 |
| TCS | Administrative Assistant | Operating Budget: \$20 to \$50 Million | 9 | 27 | \$34 | \$40 | \$44 | \$34 | \$40 | \$44 |
| ERI | Administrative Assistant | Government Support Services; YOE 4 | na | na | \$35 | \$37 | \$41 | \$35 | \$38 | \$42 |
| Kenexa | Administrative Assistant II | Edu., Govt. \& Nonprofit/ Size: 25-50 / State: All | 999 | 9999 | \$33 | \$37 | \$41 | \$34 | \$38 | \$42 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$40 | \$47 | \$53 | \$41 | \$47 | \$54 |
| CT Banking | Administrative Assistant | All Orgs | 17 | 59 | \$39 | \$43 | \$49 | \$39 | \$44 | \$50 |
| TW Admin | Administrative Services | Industry: BSS / Profit Status: FP / Career Band: P2 | 13 | 77 | \$41 | \$47 | \$51 | \$41 | \$47 | \$53 |
| CBIA | Administrative Assistant | Central CT (CC) | 16 | 106 | \$47 | \$58 | \$67 | \$47 | \$58 | \$67 |
| Kenexa | Administrative Assistant II | Business Svcs / Size: 25-50 / State: All | 999 | 9999 | \$35 | \$39 | \$44 | \$36 | \$40 | \$45 |
| Receptionist |  |  |  |  | \$26 | \$29 | \$33 | \$26 | \$29 | \$33 |
| Not for Profit |  |  |  |  | \$24 | \$26 | \$29 | \$24 | \$27 | \$29 |
| Kenexa | Receptionist | Edu., Govt. \& Nonprofit/ Size: 25-50 / State: All | 30 | 50 | \$23 | \$26 | \$29 | \$24 | \$26 | \$30 |
| ERI | Receptionist | Government Support Services; YOE 2 | na | na | \$25 | \$27 | \$29 | \$25 | \$27 | \$29 |
| For Profit |  |  |  |  | \$28 | \$31 | \$37 | \$28 | \$32 | \$38 |
| CT Banking | Receptionist / Switchboard Operator | All Orgs | 21 | 34 | \$29 | \$32 | \$41 | \$29 | \$33 | \$41 |
| CBIA | Receptionist/Telephone Operator | Central CT (CC) | 14 | 28 | \$31 | \$35 | \$40 | \$31 | \$35 | \$40 |
| Kenexa | Receptionist | Business Svcs / Size:25-50 / State: All | 90 | 90 | \$25 | \$27 | \$31 | \$25 | \$28 | \$31 |

## Appendix - Multiple Incumbents

* Competitive Variance is calculated using the Salary + 7\% and TCC figure against the competitive market

| Connecticut Innovations |  |  |  | Competitive Base Salary Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position | Incumbent | Current Salary | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Salary + } \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Program Director |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bailey, Jessica | Director, CPace | \$142 | \$152 | \$107 | \$125 | \$140 | 42\% | 21\% | 8\% |
| Hedman, Dale | Director, Renewable Energy Deployment | \$122 | \$131 | \$107 | \$125 | \$140 | 23\% | 5\% | (6\%) |
| Project Assistant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kranich, Edward | Project Assistant | \$40 | \$43 | \$40 | \$44 | \$49 | 8\% | (3\%) | (13\%) |
| Lewis, Lynne | Project Assistant | \$51 | \$54 | \$40 | \$44 | \$49 | 37\% | 23\% | 11\% |
| Vigil, MaryCruz | Project Assistant | \$51 | \$54 | \$40 | \$44 | \$49 | 37\% | 23\% | 11\% |


| Connecticut Innovations |  |  |  | Competitive Total Cash Percentile |  |  | Competitive Variance* Percentile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position | Incumbent | Current Salary | TCC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 25th | 50th | 75th | 25th | 50th | 75th |
| Program Director |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bailey, Jessica | Director, CPace | \$142 | \$152 | \$113 | \$135 | \$155 | 34\% | 12\% | (2\%) |
| Hedman, Dale | Director, Renewable Energy Deployment | \$122 | \$131 | \$113 | \$135 | \$155 | 16\% | (3\%) | (16\%) |
| Project Assistant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kranich, Edward | Project Assistant | \$40 | \$43 | \$41 | \$45 | \$51 | 5\% | (6\%) | (16\%) |
| Lewis, Lynne | Project Assistant | \$51 | \$54 | \$41 | \$45 | \$51 | 34\% | 20\% | 7\% |
| Vigil, MaryCruz | Project Assistant | \$51 | \$54 | \$41 | \$45 | \$51 | 34\% | 20\% | 7\% |

Note: For this analysis, Base Salary and TCC take into account the average cost of benefits for the positions at CEFIA as calculated by Buck to be worth, on average, $7 \%$ of salary more than in the competitive markets for talent
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