

| Merit | Boston | New York | Philadelphia | Richmond | Cleveland | Atlanta | Chicago |
|---------------|--|--|---|---|-----------|--|---------|
| 2001 | 4.30 | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.30 | 4.10 | 4.50 | |
| 2002 | 4.30 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.30 | 4.30 | 4.50 | |
| 2003 | 4.30 | 3.90 | 3.50 | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.50 | |
| 2004 | 3.50 | 3.54 | 3.00 | 3.40 | 3.00 | 2.80 | |
| 2005 | 3.70 | 3.65 | 3.50 | 3.60 | 3.50 | 3.20 | 3.00 |
| 2006 | 3.90 | 4.25 | 3.50 | 3.40 | 3.60 | 3.50 | 3.70 |
| 2007 | 3.90 | 4.25 | 3.80 | 3.80 | 3.80 | 3.90 | 3.90 |
| 2008 Proposed | | | | | | | |
| Structure | Boston | New York | Philadelphia | Richmond | Cleveland | Atlanta | Chicago |
| 2001 | 4.25 | 4.60 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 5.00 | |
| 2002 | 3.20 | 4.25 | 3.40 | 3.30 | 3.30 | 3.50 | |
| 2003 | 2.55 | 3.40 | 3.00 | 4.40 | 2.20 | 3.40 | |
| 2004 | 2.10 | 3.00 | 2.40 | 2.70 | 2.80 | | |
| 2005 | 2.50 | 4.10 | 2.70 | 2.70 | 2.90 | 2.70 | |
| 2006 | | 3.00 | 2.80 | 0.00 | 3.20 | 2.20 | 2.10 |
| 2007 | | 3.00 | | | 3.00 | | |
| 2008 Proposed | | | | | | | |
| | *2001 & 2004 targeted high perfms & low compa ratios | *2005 NY structure was adjusted to 18 months to reflect lead/lag | Although the overall 2006 Bankwide merit increase was 3.5%, we made the following distinctions for these departments: Protection 4.0% Research 4.0%; Retail Payments 3.0%; Supervision, Regulation & Credit 4.0% | *Richmond went to lead/lag in 2003. Structure did not change in 2006. | | *2004- moved to new structure so no compare; 2005 is incumbent -weighted average | |

| St. Louis | Minneapolis | Kansas City | Dallas | San Francisco | FRIT | Board |
|---|-------------|---|--------|---------------|--|-------|
| 4.50 | 4.20 | 4.50 | | | 4.30 | 4.75 |
| 4.50 | 4.20 | 3.70 | | | 4.40 | 4.60 |
| 3.80 | 3.60 | 3.70 | | | 3.00 | 4.00 |
| 3.50 | 3.00 | 3.20 | | | 3.00 | 4.10 |
| 3.50 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.90 | 3.60 | 3.80 |
| 3.75 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 3.80 | | 3.80 | 3.80 |
| 4.00 | 3.50 | 3.90 | 3.80 | 4.25 | 4.00 | 3.80 |
| | | | | | | |
| St. Louis | Minneapolis | Kansas City | Dallas | San Francisco | FRIT | Board |
| 2.96 | 2.40 | 3.40 | | | 2.70 | 3.80 |
| 3.28 | 2.80 | 3.20 | | | 3.50 | 3.50 |
| 2.89 | 2.60 | 3.00 | | | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| 2.52 | 2.80 | 0.10 | | | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| 3.00 | 2.80 | 0.00 | | | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| 2.60 | 2.90 | 2.80 | | | 2.90 | 3.00 |
| | | | | 2.90 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| | | | | | | |
| 2006: St. Louis - 2% merit budget for General Schedule emps.; 3.75 for all others. 2.6% wtg. avg. structure adj. varied widely by pay schedule. | | *KC was above-market in many grades and held structure for market to catch up. In 2004 only top 3 grades moved; 2005 no changes at all to structures. | | | *With lead structure in 2001, was 5.17 | |

| System Merit Average | Banks' Merit Average |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 4.43 | 4.40 |
| 4.36 | 4.34 |
| 3.63 | 3.59 |
| 3.28 | 3.19 |
| 3.43 | 3.40 |
| 3.65 | 3.64 |
| 3.90 | 3.91 |
| | |
| System Structure Average | Bank's Structure Average |
| 3.52 | 3.49 |
| 3.38 | 3.37 |
| 3.04 | 3.04 |
| 2.44 | 2.38 |
| 2.67 | 2.64 |
| 2.50 | 2.45 |
| | |
| | |
| | |