SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INDEX SHEET

Creation Date: 4/25/07
Source Code: PERSX
Agenda Date: 5/1/07
INVENUM: 59161

Resolution(s):

Ordinance(s):

Contract(s):

Continue Date(s): [1] 5/15/07

Index: --Letter of the Personnel Director
--Ordinance

Item: 44. CONSIDERED Ordinance amending Section 2.02.060 of the County Code Relating to Compensation of the Board of Supervisors;
(1) approved "in concept" ordinance amending subdivision **A** of Section 2.02.060 of the Santa Cruz County code relating to the compensation of the Board of Supervisors to return on May 15, 2007 for final adoption

COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT
701 OCEAN STREET, SUITE 310, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060-4073
(831) 454-2600 FAX: (831) 454-2411 TDD: (831) 454-2123
DANIA TORRES WONG, DIRECTOR

April 24,2007

APPROVED AND FILED
D OF SUPERVISORS
DATE: May 1, 2007
COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ
SUSAN A. MAURIELLO
EX-OFFICIO CLERK OF THE BOARD
BY Sharon Mitchell DEPUTY

Agenda: May 1, 2007

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
County of Santa Cruz
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Consideration of Ordinance Amending Section 2.02.060 of the County Code Relating to the Compensation of the Board of Supervisors

Dear Members of the Board:

As you are aware, Geoff Rothman of Renne, Sloan, Holtzman and Sakai is the consultant that is working with the Personnel Department to conduct the total compensation review for all of the bargaining units that have open contracts this year including the SEIU parity study. As a part of that overall effort, Mr. Rothman conducted an eight county compensation study of total compensation, which reveals that as of February 13, 2007, the Board's total compensation is 23% behind the eight county comparisons.

In 2001, your Board's total compensation was 26.22% behind the nine county comparisons (your Board later dropped Fresno County as a comparison). At that time, your Board approved equity adjustments to bring Board member's total compensation to within 95% of the market in 2001 over a four year period between 2001 – 2004 instead of to 100% of market over three years as was negotiated with other bargaining units including the General Representation Unit and the Middle Management Association.

For this reason, it is not surprising that the Board's total compensation continues to be substantially behind the eight county comparisons. In addition, due to fiscal constraints, adjustments to the compensation of unrepresented employees were deferred in subsequent years.

As you are aware, the County generally reviews the compensation of unrepresented employees beginning in December of each year. The review is now complete and in order to address the issues outlined above, staff is recommending that your Board authorize equity adjustments for Board members of 18% in order to set compensation at a level to reach 95% rather than 100%, of the amounts compensated to your counterparts in the eight comparison counties. It is proposed that the adjustments be effectuated in three equal installments effective July 15,2007, December 1,2007 and in December 13,2008.

There is no additional cost for the current fiscal year. Cost for the remaining fiscal years are approximately, $50,000 for 2007-2008, approximately $33,400 in 2008–2009, and approximately $16,700 in 2009–2010. These amounts will be reflected in future budget plans. Funding for the increases is the general fund.

It is therefore recommended that your Board approve the attached ordinance in concept and direct the ordinance return on your next Board agenda for final approval.

Very truly yours,

Dania Torres Wong
Personnel Director

Susan A. Mauriello
County Administrative Officer

Dtw/dtw

Cc: Auditor-Controller (2)
Personnel (2)

Attachments

CBD BOSMAIL

From: CBD **BOSMAIL**
Sent: **Monday, April 30,2007 3:49 PM**
To: CBD **BOSMAIL**
Subject: **Agenda Comments**

Meeting Date : 5/1/2007

Item Number : 44

Name : concerned citizen

Email : Not Supplied

Address : Not Supplied

Phone : Not Supplied

Comments :
It is a shame when the board of sups. are quick to give themselves raises. I sure hope they are just as quick when it comes to the employees that work for the county at contract time. 18% would be nice for the people who do most of the work.

Name of Caller: John Williams
240 Comstock Lane
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Comments: Opposed to raises for members of the Board of Supervisors. Feels it is unconscionable to consider raises at this time, especially in light of what's been happening the past few months.

44

CBD BOSMAIL

From: CBD BOSMAIL
Sent: Tuesday, May 01,2007 7:40 AM
To: CBD BOSMAIL
Subject: Agenda Comments

Meeting Date : 5/1/2007 **Item Number : 44**

Name : Andrea Sanchez **Email :** Not Supplied

Address : Not Supplied **Phone :** Not Supplied

Comments :
INCLUDE IN BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PACKET FOR TUESDAY, MAY 1,2007 AGENDA

SENTINEL FORUM

Is there a "union" for board members? Is there a "job market" for board members? Who cares what supervisors in other counties make? Are our Supes going to go on strike (please!), or move to other counties where they can enjoy higher salaries (good luck getting elected!)?

I think the Supervisors have infringed on personal liberty enough over the past several years, as to deserve a pay CUT. If they say they need more money because their responsibilities are so great and the burden is so heavy, I say give 'em less authority and power -- make their lives easier as we make their wallets lighter (and our own somewhat heavier). We don't need professional pols on a career track to Sacramento and DC. We need people who care about and are invested in this county, to tend to local concerns.

What have the Supervisors done to raise the median income in this County? Or make housing more affordable and available? I believe in pay for performance. Our government leaders should be making our lives BETTER, shouldn't they? On what stellar performance are they basing this self-approved raise?

Am I reading this right: almost $112K per annum, as of 2008?

Maybe instead of indexing the minimum wage to inflation, we should index Supervisor compensation to track (and certainly to not far exceed) the lowest median constituent income among the several disricts; or be inversely proportional to the highest median rent.

May I also suggest that we remove from office, at the first opportunity, anyone who votes in favor of this raise? If our County Supervisors can't get by and give us excellent service on a salary of less than 100K, we need to find some people who can. We require the people providing contract services to the County to bid in a competitive process; we generally take the low bid, or at least the one that gives us the lowest cost-benefit ratio. This should apply

44

across the Board -- starting with the Board of Supes, imho.

What chutzpah.

May 1, 2007

To: The Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors

From: Amy K. McKenna, a Santa Cruz County Resident

Re: Your consideration of voting for a raise in your pay as a Supervisor

Dear Supervisors:

It is my understanding that our financial condition in this county is not a healthy one. Many people have become jobless, losing their homes to foreclosure.

As I look upon you people before me, our Supervisors and your support staff, none of you appear to be in the homeless category, underfed, overworked or underpaid. Therefore, pay increases, which are unaffordable anyway, are unjustified at this time or in the near future.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Amy K. McKenna

Amy K. McKenna
P. O. Box 508
Capitola, Ca 95010-0508

Post Scrip: Please accept my apologies for all the typographical errors, but I can't afford a secretary!

#44