MEMORANDUM

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE COUNTY OF PLACER

TO: Honorable Board of Supervisors

FROM: Thomas M. Miller, Placer County Executive Officer

By: Michael E. Paddock, Senior Management Analyst

Brian Wirtz, Deputy County Counsel

Presented By: Wayne Nader, Chairman, Charter Review Committee

DATE: January 8, 2008

SUBJECT: Report of the 2007-08 Placer County Charter Review Committee

Action Requested:

Receive, review and consider the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the 2007-08 Placer County Charter Review Committee.

Background:

The Placer County Charter was adopted by the voters of the County in 1980. The County Charter is an important governing document that provides a level of flexibility in local decision making and contains provisions that guide the organizational structure, duties and responsibilities of elected and appointed officials. It also contains a provision for the periodic review and assessment of the charter document as a means to recommend any changes or additions to it. Specifically, Section 601 of the Charter requires the Board of Supervisors to convene a Charter Review Committee within five years of the last review and every five years thereafter. The purpose and function of the Charter Review Committee is to review the County Charter and after at least two public meetings prepare and present recommendations for any changes or additions to the County Charter. However, your Board is not compelled to accept or act upon any recommendation of the Committee. The Committee has completed its important work in reviewing the Charter and has completed a comprehensive report that includes specific recommendations for consideration and action by your Board. The Report of the Committee is attached to this memorandum and a summary of the recommended actions is outline below.

Summary of Recommendations:

County Counsel - appointment:

 Amend Section 507 so that the position of County Counsel shall be appointed by the Board of Supervisors and serve at its pleasure consistent with the terms of the Government Code section 27641. The Committee determined that this change will better ensure the ability of Counsel to provide objective advice insulated from political considerations.

County Superintendent of Schools – method of selection:

Retain and make no change in the current process for selection of the elected position
of County Superintendent of Schools. The Committee determined that the present
method (election) used to select the County Superintendent of Schools is appropriate
and valid based on the requirements and duties of that office. Also, there was no
compelling evidence or information presented to the Committee that would indicate a
greater benefit from changing to an appointed position.

Personnel Director - method of appointment:

Retain and make no change in the current process for selection of the appointed
position of Personnel Director. The Committee determined that although the present
method of appointment may not meet the standard business model of organizational
structure there are no inherent flaws or other problems with the operation and
leadership of the personnel department.

Other - Miscellaneous:

- Retain and make no change to Section 303 (d) of the County Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to inquire into the conduct of a county department that receives all of its funding from the State of California.
- Make direct and minor typographical corrections to the County Charter under the
 authority of Section 609 to clarify the authority of the Board of Supervisors under
 Section 303 (d) and in a footnote reference under Section 207 to correct a spelling error
 (from the word <u>count</u> to <u>court).</u>

Salary - Board of Supervisors:

- Remove the salary cap for the elected position of County Supervisor (Section 207) and replace it with an annual salary (including benefits) based on the computed average of comparable counties (eight county survey) with an annual cost-of-living-adjustment. The current computed average annual salary of comparable counties is approximately \$99,000.
- Amend Section 207 of the Charter by a provision or statement that would express the view, conclusion or fact that the office and position of County Supervisor requires the effort and time that is at least equivalent to a "full time position" or FTE.

Findings / Conclusions – Salary and Work Hours:

A recent survey of salaries and benefits conducted by Nevada County and reviewed by the Committee reveals that of the 58 counties in the State, Placer County ranks number 52 in terms of salary for its members to the Board of Supervisors. Within this ranking only six other Counties, Del Norte - \$28,080, Alpine - \$25,176,Trinity - \$25,008, Colusa - \$24,000, Modoc - \$15,859 and Tehama - \$12,540 rank lower than Placer. Also within this ranking the six Counties that rank immediately above Placer County and exceed the current salary includes Glen - \$30,285, Sierra \$31,000, Siskiyou, \$33,129, Sutter - \$34,471, Tuolumne - \$37,210 and Mariposa - \$37,290. It should be noted that some of these Counties also provide benefits in

addition to the salaries listed above; however, the Committee only used the actual salary when determining the salary recommendation. A copy of the complete survey is attached to and contained within the Report of the Committee to your Board (Attachment A).

Placer County also ranks at the bottom in salary paid to its county supervisors when compared to its eight comparable Counties that includes; Contra Costa - \$97,479, El Dorado - \$76,876, Sacramento - \$94,406, Santa Clara - \$137,318, Solano - \$90,973, Sonoma - \$111,862, Santa Cruz - \$99,424 and San Luis Obispo - \$79,014. The computed average salary of the comparable county survey is \$98,419 or \$68,419 more than Placer County (Placer County is 70% lower than the average). A copy of the complete survey is attached to and contained within the Report of the Committee to your Board (Attachment A).

The Committee has also reviewed the results of an analysis of work hours of each county supervisor and the result of this study reveal that each supervisor is working on an equivalent full time basis in order to meet the needs and demands of the office and to address constituent issues. The study indicates that in terms of documented meetings and cell phone usage each supervisor is working approximately 1300 hours. This documented time does not include other requirements such as responding to e-mails, reading the agenda package to absorb and respond to any issue or policy matter prior to the bi-monthly meeting schedule. Staff of the office has also made the observation that these documented and un-documented duties could be reasonably increased by a factor of 30% to 40% to reach a more realistic accounting of hours. By applying this factor to the documented hours and assuming a productive yearly hour total of 1780 hours suggests a full time work requirement for each member of the Board of Supervisors. A copy of the complete survey is attached to and contained within the Report of the Committee to your Board (Attachment A). A separate analysis of work hours was also conducted by the Chairman of the Committee and the results indicate that Board members may devote as much as 50 hours per week to meet the workload demands of the office. A copy of the analysis is attached to this memorandum (Attachment B).

Fiscal Impact:

There is no direct fiscal impact related to the receipt of the Report of the Committee to your Board. However, there may be an impact associated with the salary recommendation under Section 207.

Copies:

Charter Review Committee
Gayle-Garbolino-Mojica, County Superintendent of Schools
Anthony La Bouff, County Counsel
Rich Colwell, Chief Assistant County Executive Officer
Mike Boyle, Assistant County Executive Officer
Holly Heinzen, Assistant County Executive Officer
Nancy Nittler, Personnel Director
Brian Wirtz, Deputy County Counsel

ATTACHMENT A



Placer County Charter Review Committee 2007-2008

Aldo Pinesch: (Seat 1) Vice Chairman - Gregory H. Nau (Seat 2) Chairman - Wayne Nader (Seat 3) Ronald L. Feist, Ed.D (Seat 4) Rick Brown (Seat 5) Annabelle McCord (Seat 6) Todd Lindstrom (Seat 7)

Final Report – Placer County Charter Review Committee November 26, 2007

Presented to the Placer County Board of Supervisors: Wayne Nader, Chairman, Placer County Charter Review Committee

Prepared by:

Michael E. Paddock, Senior Management Analyst, County Executive Office Brian Wirtz, Deputy County Counsel, County Counsel's Office

I. INTRODUCTION

The Placer County Charter was adopted by the voters of the County in 1980. The County Charter is an important governing document that provides a level of flexibility in local decision making and contains provisions that guide the organizational structure, duties and responsibilities of elected and appointed officials. It also contains a provision for the periodic review and assessment of the Charter document as a means to recommend any changes or additions to it. Specifically, Section 601 of the Charter requires the Board of Supervisors to convene a Charter Review Committee within five years of the last review and every five years thereafter. The last review action occurred in late November 2001 and on February 20, 2007, the Board of Supervisors approved an action and authorized the process to convene a new Charter Review Committee.

A. Composition and Selection of Committee Members

1. Background:

On February 20, 2007, your Board approved the formation and membership structure of the 2007-08 Placer County Charter Review Committee. The purpose of the Committee is to review the County Charter, conduct at least two public hearings and then submit a report of recommendations, if any, to make changes or additions to the Charter. Your Board approved the staff recommendation for a seven member committee consisting of one appointee or candidate from each Supervisor and two at large members. Your Board also accepted the recommendation of staff to submit the names of all of the candidates to your Board for final approval. The names of the selected candidates including the two at-large members were approved by your Board on July 24, 2007. The names of the appointed members to the Committee are listed below:

2. Appointees:

- Seat 1 Mr. Aldo Pineschi
- Seat 2 Mr. Gregory H. Nau, Vice Chairman
- Seat 3 Mr. Wayne Nader, Chairman
- Seat 4 Dr. Ronald L. Feist, Ed.D
- Seat 5 Mr. Rick Brown
- Seat 6 At-Large Ms, Annabell McCord
- Seat 7 At-Large Mr, Todd Lindstrom

B. Meetings of the Committee - A Brief Summary

The Charter Review Committee conducted six public meetings beginning on August 27, 2007, including its final meeting on November 29, 2007. A copy of the approved Minutes from all of the meetings are attached to this Report. A summary of the major points of discussion or actions are summarized as follows:

1. August 27, 2007:

The Committee convened its first meeting and elected Mr. Wayne Nader as Chairman and Mr. Gregory Nau as its Vice-Chairman. A general background about the County Charter and the review process was provided to the Committee by County staff. The Committee discussed possible topics for review including the salary cap for County Supervisor, the nature and process for selecting the elected position of County Superintendent of Schools and the responsibilities of the appointed position of County Counsel and the status and relationship of this position with the Board of Supervisors. The Committee also asked that all County Departments be contacted to see if they had any recommendations relating to the Charter.

September 10, 2007:

The Committee received a presentation and documents of information from County Counsel, Mr. Anthony La Bouff, regarding the responsibilities of the office of County Counsel and how this position is appointed and its status under the County Charter and by the general law of the State. The Committee decided to consider this matter further with the possibility of amending the County Charter to match the provisions of general law. The Committee also discussed the position of Personnel Director and its reporting relationship with the Civil Service Commission. County staff also presented information to the Committee on the various methods and models used by other counties in the State to set the salary for the elected position of County Supervisors including indexing to another office or position (e.g. superior court judge), survey of comparable counties, average amount from a designated pool of counties or by other local method and option.

3. October 1, 2007:

The Committee received a presentation from Dr. Donald Brophy, President of the Placer County Board of Education, regarding the nature and method of selection of the elected position of County Superintendent of Schools. Dr. Brophy (who stated that he was appearing as a private individual, and not in his capacity with the Board of Education) presented his personal viewpoints and perspective on this elected position. and he advocated for amending the County Charter to make this position appointed instead of elected. The Committee also reviewed a request from the Director of Child Support Services to make some minor and grammatical changes to the County Charter under Section 303 (d) to clarify the authority of the County Board of Supervisors to review and investigate entities that receive funding from the County of Placer. The Committee also made a formal recommendation to amend Section 507 of the County Charter to change or formalize the method of selection and tenure of the position of County Counsel to make this process consistent with the general law under Section 27641 of the Government Code. The staff to the Committee also presented information from other counties that have conducted salary surveys for the position of County Supervisor. Information about previous elections related to the Personnel Director of Placer County and the Civil Service Commission was also presented by staff. The Committee requested this information to begin its review and deliberations on the matter of amending the County Charter to change the salary of the elected position of County Supervisor.

October 22, 2007:

The Committee began its business by discussing the perception of the "part-time" nature of the elected position of County Supervisor and how this perception is not supported by the actual hours and work demands upon each of the five County Supervisors. The Committee directed staff to conduct a study of the hours/work demands of the County Supervisors and report back to the Committee. The Committee also received a presentation and other information and documentation from the Placer County Superintendent of Education, Ms. Gayle Garbolino-Mojica, regarding her perspective and viewpoints on the nature, function and method of selection of this elected position. She advocated a position that would retain the current method of selection, i.e., elected position over other methods. She also presented a formal report on this matter entitled the <u>Janus Report</u>, to support her position and viewpoint.

5. November 13, 2007:

The Committee received a verbal summary from staff regarding the issue and 1996 election outcome related to changing the method of appointment of the Personnel Director from appointment by the Placer County Civil Service Commission to appointment by the County Executive Officer with confirmation from the Board of Supervisors. The Committee discussed this matter and, although there was general agreement that the current method of selection is not consistent with a "preferred business model," there are no defects in the current personnel operations, reporting and leadership of that office or department. On the basis of this conclusion, the Committee

made a formal declaration not to take action or other recommendation on this matter. The Committee also made a formal declaration not to take an action or make a recommendation related to the matter of selection of County Superintendent of Schools. Again, the Committee decided that there is no basis to make a change from the current method of selection for this elected position. The Committee also reviewed and made comment on the staff report of hours and work demands of each County Supervisor and how this report clearly demonstrates the equivalent full time nature of the position of County Supervisor. On the basis of this report and the salary survey information from other counties, the Committee made a formal declaration to recommend an amendment to the County Charter to change (increase) the current salary from \$30,000 per year to approximately \$99,000 (inclusive of salary and any benefits). The Committee also made a formal declaration to amend the Charter to declare the full time equivalent nature and work demands of this elected position.

II. <u>TOPICS OF REVIEW</u>

A. <u>Salary Cap - County Supervisor</u>

1. Issue/Problem:

Section 207 of the County Charter, paragraph 2, places a cap on the maximum level of annual compensation, \$30,000 for each member of the Board of Supervisors. This amount includes all compensation including salary and benefits, but also excludes employer paid expenses including social security, worker's compensation, unemployment insurance, CalPers retirement (if applied) and reimbursement for actual expenses. This section of the Charter was added by initiative action under Measure A submitted to the voters of the County on June 2, 1992. The members of the Placer County Charter Review Committee believe that the current salary as restricted by this provision of the Charter is inadequate given the complexity and the full time demands of the office of County Supervisor. The compensation is also inequitable as measured by and compared to all of the other counties in the State, including those counties that closely match the demographics and organizational structure of Placer County.

2. Findings:

a. Salary Survey

A recent survey of salaries and benefits conducted by Nevada County and reviewed by the Committee reveals that of the 58 counties in the State, Placer County ranks number 52 in terms of salary for its members to the Board of Supervisors. Within this ranking only six other Counties, Del Norte - \$28,080, Alpine - \$25,176, Trinity - \$25,008, Colusa - \$24,000, Modoc - \$15,859 and Tehama - \$12,540 rank lower than Placer. Also within this ranking the six Counties that rank immediately above Placer County and exceed the current salary include Glenn - \$30,285, Sierra \$31,000, Siskiyou, \$33,129, Sutter - \$34,471, Tuolumne - \$37,210 and Mariposa - \$37,290. It should be noted that some of these Counties also provide benefits in addition to the salaries listed

above; however, the Committee only used the actual salary when determining the salary recommendation. A copy of the complete survey is attached to this Report (Exhibit 1.)

Placer County also ranks at the bottom in salary paid to its County Supervisors when compared to its eight comparable counties that include Contra Costa - \$97,479, El Dorado - \$76,876, Sacramento - \$94,406, Santa Clara - \$137,318, Solano - \$90,973, Sonoma - \$111,862, Santa Cruz - \$99,424 and San Luis Obispo - \$79,014. The computed average salary of the comparable county survey is \$98,419 or \$68,419 more than Placer County (Placer County is 70% lower than the average). A copy of the Comparable County Survey and computed average is attached to this Report (Exhibit 2).

b. Work Hours - Placer County Supervisors

The Committee has also reviewed the results of an analysis of work hours of each County Supervisor, and the results of this study reveal that each Supervisor is working on an equivalent full time basis in order to meet the needs and demands of the office and to address constituent issues. The study indicates that in terms of documented meetings and cell phone usage each Supervisor is working approximately 1300 hours. This documented time does not include other requirements such as responding to c-mails, reading the agenda package to absorb and respond to any issue or policy matter prior to the bi-monthly meeting schedule. Staff of the office has also made the observation that these documented and un-documented duties could be reasonably increased by a factor of 30% to 40% to reach a more realistic accounting of hours. By applying this factor to the documented hours and assuming a productive yearly hour total of 1780 hours suggests a full time work requirement for each member of the Board of Supervisors. A copy of the Analysis of Work Hours study is attached to this Report (Exhibit 3)

Conclusion/Recommendation:

The Charter Review Committee has considered this provision of the Charter and has concluded that the current level of compensation of \$30,000 per year is inequitable and inadequate by any reasonable measure or survey. The Committee has also concluded that each County Supervisor is working on an equivalent full time basis to meet the demand of the office and to address the concerns of constituents. The Committee recommends the Board amend or replace Section 207 of the Charter to adjust the Board members' salary and provide for cost of living adjustments in future years.

B. County Counsel - Method of Appointment and Terms of Service

1. Issue / Problem:

Section 507 of the Charter sets forth the method of appointment of the County Counsel. This section reads, in relevant part, that the "County Counsel shall be appointed by the Board of Supervisors and serve at its pleasure." The Committee was concerned that having the County Counsel serve as an at-will employee of the Board could, at some point in the future, lend itself to the County Counsel being pressured for opinions that

were more reflective of political pressure than of sound, impartial legal grounds. The Committee was also quite clear that this concern was general in nature, and was in no way reflective of the actions of the current County Counsel or Board of Supervisors.

On August 27, 2007, the Committee directed the County Counsel's Office to compare Placer County's method of appointment with the method used in the State statutes. On September 10, 2007, this report was provided. The report pointed out that Government Code Section 27641 provides that a County Counsel shall serve for a four-year term (as opposed to the County Charter, which provides for service at the Board's pleasure).

In addition, the report pointed out that Government Code Section 27641 provides a specific process that must be undertaken in order for the Board to remove a County Counsel. The reasons for removal must be "due to neglect of duty, malfeasance or misconduct in office, or other good cause shown" and can only occur "upon written accusation to be filed with the board of supervisors, by a person not a member of the board, and heard by the board and sustained by a three-fifths vote of the board."

After receiving this report on September 10, 2007, the Committee directed the County Counsel's Office to provide draft language that would amend the Charter to be consistent with the Government Code. The suggested language was provided at the Committee's October 1, 2007 meeting.

2. Findings:

The Committee found that the State statutes relating to the method of appointment and removal of a County Counsel would better protect a County Counsel from being unduly pressured by political considerations. The Committee also pointed out its belief that this recommended amendment was intended to be proactive in nature, and was in no way reflective of the actions of the current County Counsel or Board of Supervisors.

3. Conclusion/Recommendation:

The Committee concluded that Section 507 of the County Charter be amended so that the position of County Counsel shall be appointed by the Board of Supervisors and serve at its pleasure consistent with the terms of Government Code section 27641 as currently enacted or hereafter amended including any successor statute enacted by the State Legislature to replace it.

C. County Superintendent of Schools - Method of Appointment

1. Issue/Problem:

The Committee was approached by members of the public who were interested in the current process of selection of the Placer County Superintendent of Schools. Section 401 of the County Charter provides requires the Superintendent of Schools to be an

elected position. The public members were interested in discussing the possibility of having the Superintendent of Schools appointed by the Board of Education, rather than having it remain as an elected position.

On October 1, 2007, the Committee received a presentation from Dr. Donald Brophy, President of the Placer County Board of Education, regarding the nature and method of selection of the elected position of County Superintendent of Schools. Dr. Brophy (appearing in his personal capacity and not in his capacity as President of the Board of Education) presented his personal viewpoints and perspective on this elected position. Dr. Brophy advocated for amending the County Charter to make this position appointed instead of elected. His primary concern was that there was a fundamental and growing inequity between the powers of the Superintendent of Schools relative to those of the Board of Education. Dr. Brophy provided the Committee with extensive documentation to support his viewpoint.

On October 22, 2007, the Committee also received a presentation and other information and documentation from the Placer County Superintendent of Education, Ms. Gayle Garbolino-Mojica, regarding her perspective and viewpoints on the nature, function and method of selection of this elected position. She advocated a position that would retain the current method of selection, i.e., elected position over other methods. She also presented a formal report on this matter, the <u>Janus Report</u>, to support her position and viewpoint.

2. Findings:

After hearing from members of the public and reading the materials provided, the Committee found that the bulk of the alleged inequity in authority between the Superintendent and the Board of Education was largely a result of historic legislative activity which has had the effect of shifting of mandated duties to the Superintendent. The Committee further found that there are only five appointed Superintendents statewide, and, based on the information provided, there was no measurable difference across the state, regardless on whether the Superintendent was appointed or elected. The Committee further found that several attempts have been made in other counties to change the Superintendent from an elected to an appointed position. All of these efforts failed by a large margin. Finally, the Committee found that the existing system in Placer County appeared to be working well, and found no reason to make any changes.

3. Conclusion/Recommendation:

The Committee unanimously made a formal declaration not to take an action or make a recommendation related to the matter of selection of County Superintendent of Schools. Again, the Committee decided that there is no basis to make a change from the current method of selection for this elected position.

D. <u>Personnel Director - Selection / Appointing Authority</u>

1. Issue/Problem:

On September 10, 2007, the Committee noted that the Director of Personnel was appointed by the Civil Service Commission (with concurrence of the Board of Supervisors). The Committee noted that the heads of other County Departments were appointed by the County Executive Officer (with Board of Supervisors concurrence), and requested County staff to provide additional information and history regarding this appointment process.

On November 13, 2007, the Committee discussed this issue. The voters of Placer County were presented with a measure at the November 5, 1996, election with regard to the appointment of the Personnel Director. This department head position, unlike all other non-elected department heads, is not selected by the County Executive Officer subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors, but rather serves in a "Classified" status and appointed by the Civil Service Commission. It was noted that the Civil Service Commission members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

The 1996 measure asked the voters to approve a change in the County Charter that would make the selection process of the position of Personnel Director similar to all other non-elected department heads. The measure failed with 44.6% in favor and 55.4% against.

2. Findings:

Some Committee members stated that, although the current selection and reporting process may not be a preferred business model and that other options exist, they saw no reason to amend a system that appears to be functioning. The Committee found that no issues or operations in the Personnel/Human Resources arena have come to their attention. Accordingly, the Committee found that no action on this issue was warranted.

3. Conclusion/Recommendation:

The Committee has concluded that there is no apparent need to make any recommendations to the Board to amend the appointment process of the Personnel Director and have decided to make no recommendation at this time to change the nature and method of selection of the Personnel Director.

E. Charter Section 303(d) - Clarification of Board's Review Authority

1. Issue/Problem:

The Committee reviewed a memorandum from the Director of Child Support Services regarding the possible need for minor changes to the County Charter under Section 303 (d) to clarify the authority of the County Board of Supervisors to review and investigate entities that receive funding from the County of Placer.

Section 303(d), in relevant part, allows the Board of Supervisors to "[r]equire periodic or special reports of expenditures and costs of operation; examine all records and accounts, and inquire into the conduct of any office, commission department or other entity to which the county contributes funds." The concern expressed by County staff was that the language in Section 303(d) might preclude the County from reviewing the conduct or books of those County departments that receive all of its funding from the State of California. The Committee subsequently directed staff from the County Counsel's Office to research this issue and report back with its findings. On November 13, 2007, the Committee discussed staff's findings that the Charter provided ample authority to allow the Board to require periodic or special reports of expenditures of any County department, regardless of its funding source.

2. Findings:

After considering the findings of the County Counsel's Office, the Committee found that the Board of Supervisors has the inherent authority to require periodic or special reports of expenditures, has the ability to examine records and accounts and inquire into the conduct of any part of the County under its inherent powers granted to it by State statutes and the County Charter. The Committee further found that the department's funding source was not a factor that affected this authority.

3. Conclusion/Recommendation:

The Committee has concluded that the Charter provides ample authority to allow the Board to require periodic or special reports of expenditures of any County department, regardless of its funding source, and further action on this issue is not required.

F. Minor Amendments Not Requiring a Public Vote

1. Issue/Problem:

During the various Committee meetings, two typographical errors in the Charter were noted. County Counsel explained to the Committee that Section 609 of the Charter allows the Board of Supervisors to "direct County Counsel to make spelling, punctuation or grammatical corrections in the County Charter or to change the sequence of specific Charter provisions as long as no change in the legal meaning or intent of the Charter results."

The first minor amendment mentioned is found in Section 303(d) of the Charter. This section, currently reads, in relevant part, to allow the Board to "... examine all records and accounts, and inquire into the conduct of any office, commission department or other entity to which the county contributes funds." The need for a comma between "commission" and "department" for clarity was noted.

The second minor amendment is found in footnote 1 of Section 207 of the Charter, which currently reads, in relevant part, "... in the case of Ferreira v. Williams,

Placer County Superior Court Case No. SCV-00553, the *count* ruled that ..." (emphasis added). Staff noted that the word "count" should be "court". Staff mentioned that the word "count" should be corrected to "court", so that this portion of the Charter reads, in relevant part, "... in the case of Ferreira v. Williams, Placer County Superior Court Case No. SCV-00553, the court ruled that ..."

The County Counsel's Office noted that making these minor amendments would not change the legal meaning or intent of the Charter, and as a result, the Board could direct County Counsel to make these changes to the Charter without a vote of the public.

2. Findings:

The Committee found that there was a need to make a minor correction to Section 303(d) by adding a comma between "commission" and "department", and that Section 207 should be amended by changing the word "count" to "court".

3. Conclusion/Recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the Board make two minor typographical corrections to the Charter: first, Section 303(d) needs a comma between the words "commission" and "department", and; in footnote 1 of Section 207 the word "count" should be changed "court".

III. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Following is a summary of the 2007 Charter Review Committee's recommendations:

A. Section 207 - Compensation of County Supervisor

(Recommendation of the Committee on 11-13-07)

The Charter Review Committee has considered this provision of the Charter and has concluded that the current level of compensation, \$30,000 per year is inequitable and inadequate by any reasonable measure or survey. The Committee has also concluded that each County Supervisor is working on an equivalent full time basis to meet the demand of the office and to address the concerns of constituents. Accordingly, the Committee recommends the following:

.1. Salary

The Committee recommends the Board consider an amendment to Section 207 of the County Charter to substitute or replace the existing salary cap to provide:

 The salary of the elected position of County Supervisor shall not exceed the average of the County survey of comparable counties (eight county survey)

currently in use by Placer County to evaluate the salaries of current employees and;

- The computed average amount of the survey shall include the total amount for both salary and for benefits (benefits that are available to County employees), and;
- Each Supervisor's salary, inclusive of any compensation necessary to purchase insurance or retirement benefits, shall be increased the first full pay period in January of each year in an amount equal to the average general wage percentage increase provided to all County employees in the non-safety retirement category during the prior calendar year. Those increases that are mandated for law enforcement (i.e., mandated by Measure F) shall not be included when computing this average.

2. Full Time Equivalent:

 Amend by adding an amendment to Section 207 of the Charter a provision or statement that would express the view, conclusion or fact that the office and position of County Supervisor requires the effort and time that is at least equivalent to a "full time position" or FTE.

B. County Counsel - Method of Appointment and Terms of Service (Recommendation of the Committee on October 11, 2007)

The Committee found that the State statutes better insulate a County Counsel from being unduly pressured by political considerations than does the County Charter. The Committee also pointed out its belief that this recommended amendment was intended to be proactive in nature, and was in no way reflective of the actions of the current County Counsel or Board of Supervisors.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends that Section 507 of the County Charter be amended so that the position of County Counsel "... shall be appointed by the Board of Supervisors and serve at its pleasure consistent with the terms of Government Code Section 27641 as currently enacted or hereafter amended including any successor statute enacted by the State Legislature to replace it."

C. County Superintendent of Schools

(Recommendation of the Committee on November 12, 2007)

After receiving substantial information from the public from both sides of this issue, the Committee made several findings, which are discussed in detail above.

Based on these findings, the Committee has decided to make no recommendation at this time to change the nature and process of selecting the elected position of County Superintendent of Schools.

D. Personnel Director - Selection/Appointing Authority

(Recommendation of the Committee on November 12, 2007)

The Committee found that, although the current method of selection of the Personnel Director is not consistent with their view of a "preferred business model," the Committee found no issues with the current personnel operations, reporting and leadership of that department.

Accordingly, the Committee found no need to make any recommendations to the Board to amend the appointment process of the Personnel Director.

E. Section 303(d) Issues

(Recommendation of the Committee on November 12, 2007)

The Committee examined the language of Section 303(d) to determine whether the Board of Supervisors has the inherent authority to inquire into the conduct of a County department that receives all of its funding from the State of California, and found that sufficient authority exists without any need for amending the Charter.

Accordingly, the Committee found no need to make any recommendations to the Board to amend this section relative to this issue.

F. Minor Typographical Corrections to Charter

(Recommendation of the Committee on November 12, 2007)

The Committee recommends that the Board make two minor typographical corrections to the Charter. Pursuant to Section 609 of the Charter, both amendments may by made by County Counsel upon direction from the Board without a vote of the public. The direction would be to:

- Correct and clarify Section 303(d) of the County Charter by adding a comma
 between the words "commission" and "department" so that this portion of the
 Charter reads, in relevant part, "... inquire into the conduct of any office,
 commission, department or other entity to which the county contributes
 funds."
- Correct a typographical error in footnote 1 of Section 207 of the Charter by changing the word "count" to "court", so that this portion of the Charter reads, in relevant part, "... in the case of Fierra v. Williams, Placer County Superior Court Case No. SCV-00553, the court ruled that ..."

The 2007-2008 Charter Review Committee hereby presents its report and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for consideration and possible action.

BOS Salary Study

1,526,148 1,261	137,318	Budget	Total FTE	Base Salary Methodology	Salary increase methodology
1 201	137,378	\$2,360,221,864	9081	Judges (80%)	As Judges
1,201	25,176	\$25,000,000	70	Ordinance	Only by Board vote
38,435	51,494	\$73,705,727	515	Percent of Superior Court Judge 25% July 1, 2006; 30% July 1, 07; 35% July 1, 08; 40% July 1, 09	As Judges
218,069	48,581	\$360,192,182	2300	Judges (66%)	Adjusted annually on July 1 according to safer judges and does not exceed 5%.
46,028		\$ 104,650,273		Ordinance	Only by Board vote
21,951	24,000			Ordinance	Only by Board vote
1,042,341	95,572	\$ 1,248,308,445	5,658	Ordinance	Only by Board vote
29,341	28,080	\$ 43,441,973	482	Ordinance	Only by Board vote
178,674	\$76,876	\$474,100,000	2,093	Ordinance set by Board members	Set by ordinance that the Board of Supervi salaries shall increase in the same proport increases in salary for elected department
917,515	\$102,989	\$1,652,065,199	8,018	Judges (60%) 3/22/94	Adjusted according to salary increases given Judges of the Superior Court of California
	46,028 21,951 1,042,341 29,341 178,674	46,028 21,951 24,000 1,042,341 95,572 29,341 28,080 178,674 \$76,876	46,028 \$ 104,650,273 21,951 24,000 \$ 60,898,778 1,042,341 95,572 \$ 1,248,308,445 29,341 28,080 \$ 43,441,973 178,674 \$76,876 \$474,100,000	46,028 \$ 104,650,273 21,951 24,000 \$ 60,898,778 1,042,341 95,572 \$ 1,248,308,445 5,658 29,341 28,080 \$ 43,441,973 482 178,674 \$76,876 \$474,100,000 2,093	30% July 1, 07; 35% Juiy 1, 08; 40% July 1, 09 218,069



	Population as of			tal County			
County	1/1/07	Salary		Budget	Total FTE	Base Salary Methodology	Salary increase methodology
Glenn	28,915	30,285		\$64,883,927	466	Ordinance set by Board members	On January 1 of each year or as soon their as the board may deem appropriate, the B Supervisors will establish by ordinance the compensation of the supervisors, or may eather County employees, to receive a salabased on the County pay schedule, which specify the range and step as appropriate,
							stated in Section 3.06.021, 3.06.022 and 3.06.023. The Chairman shall receive an additional \$100 per month more than othe members of the Board of Supervisors. In t event the supervisors do not enact an annordinance adjusting salaries, the supervisor continue to receive the compensation purs the last valid enacted ordinance.
	<u> </u>					-	
Humboldt	131,959			263,205,062		Ordinance	Only by Board vote
Imperial	172,672	\$51,070	,	\$293,806,694	2,105	Ordinance set by Board members	Determined according to adjustments con on employees.
Inyo	18,383	46,448	\$	76,068,479	534	Ordinance	Only by Board vote
Kern	801,648	83,070	\$	1,384,730,300		Ordinance -	Only by Board vote
Kings	151,381			\$193,646,679	1,287	Ordinance set by Board members	Ordinance set by Board members
						· :	
Lake	64,276	57,689	\$	181,000,000	976	Pursuant to ordinance, Supervisors salary is 60% of the average of the other Lake County elected officials (e.g sheriff, DA, assessor-recorder, clerk-auditor-controller; and treasurer tax collector.	Adjusted whenever the salaries of the other elected officials are increased.
Lassen	36,375	42,912	\$	87,333,997	472	Judges (25%)	As Judges, longevity increases after 5 year

		Current Annual	Total County		_	
County	1/1/07	Salary	Budget	Total FTE	Base Salary Methodology	Salary increase methodology
Los Angeles	10,331,939	171,648	\$ 21,241,000,000	102,058	Judges 100%	Increases as judges receive
Madera County	148,721	68,659	\$173,491,786	1,520	Ordinance set by Board members	Adjusted according to salary increases gra Superior Court Judges.
Marin	255,982	91,957	\$402.2 million	2,193	Ordinance set by Board members	Annually, in accordance with BLS CPI-U fo
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		5 1,521	·.	2,770		Francisco-San Jose-Oakland. However, the would be no CPI increase in years that the Jury is summoned to review and reset the
•	<u> </u>					based on a survey of comparator counties (occurs every 4 years).
Mariposa	18,254	37,290	\$82,538,294	403	Judges (25%) 7/1/90	Adjusted annually on July 1 according to just salary in effect on January 1.
Mendocino County	90,291	68,640	\$206,480,000	1,553.95	Judges (40%) 7/1/07	As of July 1, 2007 salaries 40% of Judges salary to be reviewed every two years to determine any increase.
Merced	251,510	69,360	\$416,308,606	2,312	Base salary is an average salary determined through a survey of Board member salaries of surrounding comparable counties	Adjusted annual according to a salary sur- surrounding comparable counties - not to a 5%
doc	9,721	13,200	\$ 32,228,015	229	Ordinance	Same Salary increase as other bargaining
Mono	13,985	40,064	\$ 45,453,966		Ordinance	Only by Board vote
Monterey	425,960			4,559	Judges (65%)	. :
Napa County	135,969	80,829	\$276,708,214		Judges (47.09%)	Adjusted annually according to judges sala increases
Nevada	99,766	39,447	\$180,121,519	986	Ordinance	Board vote
			\$ 5,904,027,069		Judges (80%)	

	Population as of	1	Total County			
County	1/1/07	Salary	Budget	Total FTE	Base Salary Methodology	Salary increase methodology
Placer	324,495	30,000	\$638,461,479	2,827	Salary set by voter initiative	Increases would be subject to voter initiative
Plumas	Plumas 21,128 38,040 \$ 81,340		\$ 81,340,419	435	Ordinance	Adjusted annually according to the CPI
Riverside	2,031,625	\$137,319	\$3,860,000,000	17,285	Judges (80%)	Adjusted according to judges salary increa
ramento	1,406,804	94,404	\$2,663,597,225	14,428	Ordinance adopted by the Board	The annual salary increase shall not excee
San Benito	57,803	46,150	\$112,000,000	450	Ordinance set by Board	None
San Bernardino	2,028,013	121,024	\$ 3,428,014,633	18,165	Avg of Riverside, Kern, San Diego, Orange, & Ventura	Increase every Jan 1st.
San Diego	3,098,269	137,318	\$4,193,000,000	16,844	Judges (80%)	Adjusted annually according to judges sala increases
San Francisco	808,844	92,901	\$ 6,065,992,294	27,990	Ordinance	
San Joaquin	679,687	7 3,27 8	\$1,129,000,000		same as increase methodology	Based on scheduled total compensation su salary set at median. (10 County survey - Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Kern, Sacramento, Santa Clara, Sonoma, Stanila Tulare & Ventura)
San Luis Obispo	264,900	79,014	\$474,898,770	2,538	Ordinance set by Board members	Annual raises are determined by taking the average percent raises from Kern, Merced Monterey, Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz a brought to the Board for approval
San Mateo	733,496	85,896	\$ 1,648,095,478	5,777	Set by Board Members	····
Santa Barbara	424,425	84,200	\$ 712,709,201	4,296	Ordinance - Survey other counties	As Board adopts, typically vote themselves same COLA as other elected county official Approve in Oct, takes effect in Dec.
Santa Clara	1,808,056	137,318	\$3,900,000,000	15,000	Executive Management Ordinance adopted by Board	The annual rate of 80% of the annual salar Superior Court Judge of the State of Califo County of Santa Clara

County	Population as of 1/1/07	Current Annual Salary	Total County Budget	Total FTE	Base Salary Methodology	Salary increase methodology
Santa Cruz	264,125				Base salary is an average salary determined through a survey of Board member salaries of surrounding comparable counties	Determined by Board Members.
Shasta	181,401	54,600	\$ 310,277,475	1,918	Ordinance set by Board	As Board Adopts - In line with Dept Heads Management (no adjustments since Dec 2
Sierra	3,485	31,000	\$ 18,146,264	119	Judges (18%)	As judges
Siskiyou	45,953				Ordinance	Annual COLA based on CPI
ano	424,823	90,972	\$ 990,526,546	3,092	Judges (53%)	As judges
Sonoma County	481,765	123,576	\$1,100,000,000	5,212	Judges (72%) 75% in first full pay period of 2008 Calendar year.	Their increases coincide with Superior Cou Judges and these can occur at any time du the year.
Stanistaus	521,497	68,073	\$ 272,920,531	4,582	Avg of Fresno, Kem, Monterey, Sac, Jan Joaguin, Solano, Sonoma & Ventura	Increase every Jan 1st.
Sutter	93,919	34,471	\$202,390,003 ·	962	Ordinance set by Board members	Annual COLA suggested by Personnel Dep brought to the Board for approval. (Board approve an increase for themselves in 200 last increase approved was 2% in 12/2004
Tehama County	61,774	12,540	\$120,247 _, 256	828	Salaries are set by a vote of the people.	Salary increases have to be voted on by a the people.
Trinity	14,171	25,008				
Tulare	429,006		\$614,798,095	4,919	Ordinance set by Board members	Annual raises are determined by using the average salary adjustments, other than me performance, of other county elected official during any calendar year.
	[1

County	Population as of 1/1/07	Salary	Total County Budget	Total FTE	Base Salary Methodology	Salary increase methodology
Tuolumne	57,223	37,210	\$122,652,221	940	Ordinance set by Board members	Increases occur intermittently when the BC it is appropriate.
Ventura	825,512	113,338	\$1,541,213,431	7,932	Judges (70%)	At same time as Superior Court Judge, wit cap each year.
Yolo	193,983	49,730	\$299,191,305	1,739	Judges (40%) Feb 07	Adjusted annually according to judges sala increases
Yuba	70,745	46,248	\$154,212,245		As of 12/02 Ordinance Chapter 2.30 tied future compensation increases to percentage increase in judicial salaries. In Oct. 06 Ordinance 1388 BOS elected to adjust salaries in accordance with county wide equity study	Annual raises are determined by the increagiven by the State of CA to judges.

BOS Salary Survey June 2007

•	Sort by Salary		Sc	ort by Populati	on		S	ort by Budge	t		Sort	by Sala
	Population as of	Current Asnual			Current Annual	·		Current Annual	Total County			Рори
County	1/1/07	Salary	County	1/1/07	Balary	County	ES of 1/1/07	Salary	Budget	Total FTE	County	se of
Los Angeles	10,331,939	171,648	Los Angeles	10,331,939	171,648	Los Angeles	10,331,939	171,318	21,241,000,000	102,058	El Doredo	7 7
Riverside	2,031,625	137,310	San Diego	3,098,269		San Franciaco	908,844		6,065,992,294	27,690	Mendocino	
Santa Clare	1,808,058	137,318	Orange	3,098,121		Oranga	3,096,121	137,318	5,904,027,009		Butte	2
San Diego	3,098,269	137,318	Riverside	2,031,62		San Diego	3,098,269		4,193,000,000		Nevede	1
Ainmeda	1,528,148	137.318	San Bemardino	2,028,013		Sente Clare	1,808,056	137,316	3,900,000,000		Sutter	
Orange	3,098,121	137,318	Senta Clara	1,808,058		Riverside	2,031,625		3,660,000,000	17,285	Placer	3
Sonoma County	481,785	123,576	Alemeda	1,528,146		San Bernardino	2,028,013		3,428,014,633	18,165		$\overline{}$
San Bemardino	2,028,013	121,024	Sacremento	1,406,804		Secremento	1,408,804	94,404	2,663,597,225	14,428		
Ventura	825,512	113,339	Contra Costa	1,042,341		Alamede	1,528,148		2,380,221,584			
Manterey	425,980	113,198	Freeno	917,516		Freano	917,515	102,988	1,652,085,199			Ţ <u>-</u>
Freanó	917,515	102,989	Ventura	825,512		San Mateo	733,498	65,696	1,649,095,476	5,777		j
Santa Cruz	284,125	99,424	San Francisco	808,844		Venture	825,512		1,541,213,431	7,932		
Contra Costa	1,042,341	95,572	Kém	801,646		Kern	801,648		1,384,730,300			
Secremento	1,408,804	94,404	San Maleo	733,496		Contra Costa	1,042,341	95,572	1,248,308,445	5,658		
n Francisco	608,644	62,901	San Josquin	679,687	73,278	San Joaquin	879,887		1,129,000,000	 		-
Jn.	255,982	91,957	Stanislaus	521,497		Sonoma	481,785		1,100,000,000	5,212		
Solano	424,823	90,972	Sonoma County	481,785	123,578	Salano	424,623		990,526,546			
San Mateo	733,496	85,890	Tulare	429,006	80,537	Montarey	425,960	113,198	879,800,000			
Santa Barbara	424,425	84,200	Monterey	425,980		Santa Berbara	424,425		712,709,201	4,298		
Kern	801,848	83,070	Solano	424,523	90,972	Placer	324,495	30,000	938,481,479			1
Napa County	135,989	80,829	Santa Barbara	424,425		Tulare	429,008		614,798,085	4,919	• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•
Tulare	429,008	80,537	Placer	324,495		San Luis Obispo	264,600	79,014	474,698,770	2,501		
San Luis Obispo	284,900	79,014	San Luis Obispo	284,900		El Dorado	178,674	78,876	474,100,000		 	
El Dorado	178,874	76,876	Santa Cruz	284,125		Merced	251,510		418,308,608			
Humboldt	131,959	73,920	Merin	255,982		Marin	255,982		402,200,000			
San Joaquin	679,687	73,278	Merced	251,510		Butte	218,069		380,192,182	2300		
Merced	251,510	69,380	Butte	218,069		Sente Cruz	264,125	99,424	317,390,792	2,455		1
Madera	148.721	68,650	Yolo	193,983		Shasta	181,401	54,800	310,277,475	1,918		
Mendocino	90,291	88,840	Sheete	181,401	54,800	Yolo	193,983	49,730	299,191,305			
Stanislaus	521,497	68,073	El Dorado	178,674		(mperia)	172,872	51,089	293,806,894			
Lake	84,278	57,689	Impedal	172,672	51,070	Napa County	135,989	80,829	278,708,214			
Kings	151,381	55,931	Kinge	151,361		Stanislaus	521,497		272,920,531			
Shaste	181,401	54,600	Madera	148,721		Humboldt	131,959		263,205,082			+
Amador	38,435	51,494		1	00,500;	- Individual					+	+
Imperial	172,872	51,070										1
Yolo	193,983	49,730	Nevede	95,784	39,447							
Butte	218,069	48,581	11274	99,192								+
Caleverns	48,028	48,110			· ·	Néveda	99.766	\$9,447	180,121,519	988		
· · GIRAGIES	18,383	48,448	_		_		94,1	445777	1441.8.1414	":		
_08	70,745	48,248	· ·									_
San Benito	57,803	48,150	Tehama County	81,774	12,540	Tuolumna	57,223	37,210	122,652,221	940		
Lassen	38,375	42,912	San Benito	57,803	46,150	Tehama	61,774	12,540	120,247,256	828	·· -	- †
Mono	13,985	41,064	Tuolumne	57,223		San Benito	57,803	48,150	112,000,000	450		-
Nevada	99,766	39,447	Caleveras	46,026		Siskiyou	45.953	33,129	111,188,924	744	 -	
Plumas	21,128	38,040	Staktyou	45,953	33,129	Calaveras	48.028	48,110	104,650,273			
	16,254	37,290	Amador	38,435	51,494	Lassen	38 375		87,333,988		 	+
Mariposa			Lassen	38,375	42,912	BeoghaM	18,254		92,538,294	403		+
Tuolumne	57,223 93,919	37,210 34,471	Dal Norte	29.341	28,080	Plumas	21,128	38,040	81,340,419	438		+
Statement	45,953	33,129		29,915		Inyo	18,383	48,448	78,088,478	534		+
Slektyou		31,000	Glenn	21,051	24,000	Amador	38,435	51,494	73,705,727	515	 	
Slena	3,485		Colusa			Glenn	28,915	30,285	64,883,927	466		;
3lenn	28,915	30,285	Plumes	21,128		Coluse	21,951	24,000				·+··· —
Placer	324,495	30,000	Inyo	18,383				41,064	60,698,778 45,453,966		. -	
Del Norte	29,341	28,080	Mariposa	18,254		Mono	13,885	28,080				+
Alpina	1,281	25,178	Trinity	14,171	25,008	Del Norte	29,341		43,441,973	462		+
Frinity	14,171	25,008	Mono	13,985		Modoc	9,721	15,858	32,228,015			+
Colusa	21,951	24,000	M≪doc	9,721		Alpine	1,261	25,178	25,000,000		-	+-
Modoc	9,721	15,859	Sierra	3,485		Sierra	3,485		18,148,264	119	· 	
Tehama County	61,774	12,540	Alpina	1,261	25,176	Trinity	14,171	25,008		1	!	1

	y increases Fled to ourt Judges Pay	Salaries Determ	alred by	Survey	of Benchmark Counties				Other
County	<u> </u> %	County	Auso	Soard Vote	Notes			County	Notes
Ajameda	90	Merced	X		Avg of Survey Adjusted snoughy, not exceed 5%	Alpine		Calavoras	50% of the average between the Au- Treasure-Yax Collector, Assessor, C Recorder and Sheriff.
Amador	25% July 1, 2008; 30% July 1, 07; 35% July 1, 08; 40% July 1, 08	Sen Bemadino	×		Avg of Survey Armumiy every Jan 1st	Colusa		El Donado	Raises are that of El Dorado County Elected Bargaining unit (ha) is brough the Board (or edoption
Suffie	68	Şan Joaquin	×		Median of Survey	Del Norte		Glenn	On January 1 the Board will establish ordinance, the compensation of the supervisors, or may elect to receive salary based on the County pay sche which shall specify the range and sta appropriate. In the event they do not their salaries, they will continue to rec the compensation pursuant to the last enacted ordinance.
Freeno	80	San Luis Oblapo		×	Avg of Survey Adjusted Annually	inyo		Lake	Supervisors salary is 65% of the ave the other Lake County elected official shorld, DA, assessor-recorder, clerk auditor-controller; and treasurer-tax cosociot.)
Laséen	25	Santa Berbaya		X		fmperial	Determined according to adjustments conferred on employees.	Madera	
os Angeles	100	Santa Cruz		Х :	Avg of Survey	Klings		Murin	Annually, IAW BLS CPI-U for San Francisco-Sen Jose-Oakland. No Ci Increase in years the Grand Jury reso the salary based on a survey of com-
Martposa	25	Stenielaus	х		Avg of Survey Every Jan 1st	Modec		Placer	counties (every 4 years). Voter initiative
Mendocino	40 Reviewed svery two years			Blank		Meno		San Maleo	Voter Initiative: Establish by ordinand resolution the compensation of officer employees and by ordinance the compensation of Supervisors, provide however that the compensation of a Supervisor shall not increase during the term of office for which the supervisor elected, nor within ninety (90) days preceding the election, above the percentage of increase in the posts of living, to be determined by the Control of November 1st of each year as shorthe Burseu of Labor Statistics Consumprice Index for the Sun Francisco-Ost Bay Area, not to exceed five percent in partyear; any amount of increase in the cost of thing in excess of five percent may be accumulated and applied to increases in estary in future years.
fonlerey lapa	50 47.09	Counties not rea	oording	endor	trito aot trest ible ordes	Neveda Plumas	Adjusted annually by the CPI	Tehama Yuba	Votes Inhative Adjusted annually by % Increase of Superior Court Judges
renge	80		Cor	rtra Cos	ta	Sacremento	Not to exceed 7%	<u></u>	
tiverside ian Diego	80 08		+	tumboli Kem		San Benilo Shasta	No adjustments since 02		11 to 1
anta Clare	80			Francis	co	Siaktyou	Adjusted annually by the CPI		
lerra	18			Trivity		Sutter			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
iolano 	53					Tulare	Determined by using the average salary adjustment of of other elected officials		•.
ionome fenture	72					Toolumne			
	70								

County	Şalary	Method	Retirement	Health	Insurance	Allowances	Expenditures
			n and the second			Automobile ellowance of \$600 month	
Contra Costa	\$97,479	Set by Ordinance - amt. effective 7-1-07	**************************************			plus mileege at IRS rate.	
El Dorado		Set by Ordinance	CO-COLUMN TO THE COLUMN TO THE	Health/Dental/Vision			
	26.78		Extra rest from the Victor of the Control of the Victor of				
Placer		Voter initiative - amendment to County Charter		Optional with payment for Health/Dentel/Vision			Control of the Contro
				Today Co. 1820 Taxas		Education	
				Medical - 80% of least		reimbursement \$1,200/FY, contribution to	
Sacramento	694,608	indexed - Judges 55%		expensive HMO, Dental \$95,34/mo		401K, 1% of gross pay	
Senta Clara	\$137,918	Indexed - Judges - 85%		Health/Dental/Vision		Vehicle allowance	
			Carteria pain relevant		Jo Countie	Vehicle allowence of \$10,400 per	
Solano	\$60,873	Indexed - Judges - 53%				year.	
		The second secon		Medical 84% of		Automobile, 6% contribution to deferred comp. and	
Sonoma	\$141,862	Indexed - Judges - 72% - 75% in 2008	Some Streets	indexed plan, Vision and Dental		professional development.	
Sante Cruz	\$64,424	Average of comparable Counties		Health/Dental/Vision	e Stormer Junga		
-						Contribution -	
San Luis Opisbo	\$75,014	Set by Ordinance	Codform County (co.	Health/Dental/Vision	Life Tracerioce	and education	

 Priorings:
 98419

 Placer County
 30000

 Ofference
 -88419

difference - percent -0.6951808



MEMORANDUM

From the office of the

Placer County Board of Supervisors

Mike Boyle, Assistant County Executive / mboyle@placer.ca.gov
Teri Sayad, Sr. Administrative Aide to the Board / tsayad@placer.ca.gov
Ann Holman, Clerk of the Board / aholman@placer.ca.gov

To:

Charter Review Committee Members

From:

Mike Boyle, Assistant County Executive

Date:

November 5, 2007

Subject:

Analysis of Hours / Supervisor Salaries

As requested by your Committee at the October 22, 2007 meeting to gain a general grasp of the time spent by Supervisors conducting county business, the following information has been developed.

The below represents a calendar, Board of Supervisors meeting agenda and phone record review over a one-year period from October 2006 to October 2007:

- Number of meeting hours listed on Supervisors' county calendars is 5,731 hours (or 1,146 hours per Supervisor).
- Number of hours listed on Supervisors' cell phones is 770 hours (or 154 hours per Supervisor).

The above summary provides important data. However, it has notable limitations insofar a number of county-related job elements are absent, including:

- Hours spent in meetings not listed on the county calendar.
- Hours spent reading, responding and writing emails.
- Hours spent preparing for 33 Board Hearings / reading 10,248 pages of agenda content.
- Hours spent preparing for / reading agenda content for attending various other committees and commissions.
- Hours spent on 2,474 phone calls made at the county office, (averaged at 495 calls per
 Supervisor).
- Hours spent on phone calls received at the county office.
- Hours spant on phone calls made or received at home.
- Number of phone calls made or received at home or office.
- Drive time to and from meetings.

Lastly, it is would be staff's best estimate that the above time spent on county business could be increased by a factor of 30% - 40% on activities not reflected in this general data.

ATTACHMENT B

Estimate of time commitment by each Of the Board of Supervisor members (based on a 40 hour week)

Task	Weeks
Hours for BOS meeting/5731 annually (1146)	28.7
Hours annually reviewing 10,248 pages of agenda documents (3 minutes per page equates to 512 hours)	12.8
Hours spent reading, responding and writing emails (2.4 hours a week)	3
Hours on cell phone (770 total/154 per Supervisor)	3.9
Hours on phone calls made from county office (2,474 calls/495 pre Supervisor/10 minutes a call)	2.1
Hours spent on phone calls received at the county office (2.4 hours a week	3
Hours spent on phone calls made or received at home (.8 hours a week)	1
Hours spent attending and preparing for other board and committee meetings (each Supervisor averages 5.4 monthly meetings/2.5 bi-monthly meetings/2 quarterly meetings/4.2 annual meetings)	5.8
Drive time to and from meetings (1.6 hours a week)	2
Hours spent in meeting not listed on county calendar (1.6 hours a week)	2
Total weeks	64.3
64.3 weeks X 40 hrs. = 2572 hrs. ÷ 50 weeks = <u>51.4 hours a week</u>	:
This does not include social or community events that the Supervisattend.	sors frequently