



**MEMORANDUM**  
**HUMAN RESOURCES**  
County of Placer

TO: Board of Supervisors  
FROM: Kate Sampson, Director of Human Resources  
SUBJECT: Compensation Adjustments for Safety Management and Elected Safety Management

---

**ACTION REQUESTED**

1. Adopt an ordinance, introduced December 15, 2020, amending §3.12.040 of the Placer County Code, pertaining to the salary compensation of specified safety management employees.
2. Adopt an uncodified ordinance, introduced December 15, 2020, implementing salary compensation adjustments for safety management employees.
3. Adopt an ordinance, introduced December 15, 2020, amending § 3.12.020 and 3.12.030 of the Placer County Code pertaining to incentive pays for safety management employees and an elected safety management employee.

**SUMMARY OF REQUESTED ACTIONS**

In Placer County, the following unrepresented classifications are included in the Safety Management designation: Undersheriff, Assistant Sheriff, Sheriff's Captain, Sheriff's Lieutenant, Chief Probation Officer, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Probation Manager, District Attorney Chief Investigator and District Attorney Supervising Investigator. Presently, there are 32 individuals in these classifications. If the Board adopts the above requested actions, the safety management classifications will receive a salary increase of 4.0%, 4.25%, and 4.5% over the three-year period commencing upon adoption of the proposed codified and uncodified ordinances. In addition, certain special pays will be changed to a flat dollar amount instead of a percentage calculated on base salary. For the Undersheriff, Sheriff's Captain and Sheriff's Lieutenant classifications, the Board will amend §3.12.040 to delete these classifications from the salary calculation formula provided therein.

**BACKGROUND**

A. The Measure F Salary Formula Passed in 1976.

On November 2, 1976, the voters of Placer County passed a local initiative sponsored by the Placer County Deputy Sheriff's Association (PCDSA). The initiative, known as Measure F, provided a required method for annually determining and setting salaries for specified peace officer classifications. Measure F is now codified as Placer County Code §3.12.040. Presently included in the Measure F initiative are the following unrepresented safety management classifications: Undersheriff, Assistant Sheriff, Captain, and Lieutenant.

Placer County has implemented annual salary adjustments for the specified safety management classifications according to the method set forth by Measure F since its adoption. The Measure F formula requires the County to annually: (1) determine maximum salaries for comparable classes of positions in the three surrounding counties of El Dorado, Nevada and Sacramento; (2) calculate the average maximum salaries for those three agencies; and then, (3) set the salary of the Placer County comparable classifications at a level equal to that average.

Over the past 15 years, the average annual salary increase for the positions of Undersheriff, Captain, and Lieutenant has been approximately four percent. As a result, salaries for this group have escalated 26 percent above the Consumer Price Index [CPI] for the same time period. In contrast, the safety management classifications that were not included in Measure F adjustments have not experienced the same salary

escalation. In the past 15 years, the cost of living adjustments to salaries for these excluded classifications have been made commensurate with all general management classifications and are within one percent of CPI for the same time period.

Increases in individual years for the recipients of Measure F adjustments, however, have varied widely, ranging from less than one percent to more than 11.5 percent. This variation is driven solely by the policies approved by the boards of supervisors in three other counties, considering factors such as their own budgetary constraints, recruitment and retention interests, local laws, and total compensation packages offered. An example of these factors is El Dorado County's charter provision that sets minimum salaries for its peace officers at the average of salaries paid for comparable positions by the California Highway Patrol, Amador County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe. Additionally, Sacramento County's compensation for peace officers includes pension benefits provided by its own retirement system, rather than the California Public Employees' Retirement System, for which classic members contribute a significantly greater percentage of their salaries than the five percent contributed by Placer County's classic safety members.

In addition to salary, many elements comprise total compensation, including incentive pays, pensions, deferred compensation contributions, paid time off, and health benefits for active and retired employees. Each local agency offers a compensation package unique to its staffing needs, strategic community priorities, and fiscal abilities. The ministerial nature of Placer County Code §3.12.040 allows the Board of Supervisors (Board) no discretion to set salaries according to its own priorities for the safety managers specified in the code. While this practice has been used for many years, the lack of discretion afforded the Board is directly contradicted by the Placer County Charter.

#### B. The County Charter Passed in 1980.

The Board has the authority to establish compensation for safety management employees outside of Measure F. On November 4, 1980, the Placer County electorate passed Measure K, establishing a county charter. The provisions of the charter are the law of the State and have the force and effect of legislative enactments. In essence, the Charter is the constitution of the County and supersedes any law inconsistent therewith. [CA. Const. Art. XI, §3(a)]<sup>1</sup>

By approving Measure K, the voters provided the Board with the following authority, in relevant part (*emphasis added*):

Section 301. In General. The Board shall have all the jurisdiction and authority which now or which may hereafter be granted by the Constitution and the laws of the State of California or by this Charter.

Section 302. Duties. The Board shall:

(a) ...

(b) Provide, by ordinance, for the number of assistants, deputies, clerks and other person to be employed from time to time in the several offices and institutions of the County, **and for their compensation**.

Section 604. Continuation of Laws in Effect. All laws of the County in effect at the effective date of this shall continue in effect according to their terms unless contrary to the provisions of this Charter, or until repealed or modified pursuant to the authority of this Charter or the general law.

<sup>1</sup> CA. Const. Art XI, §3(a) provides, in relevant part: "County charters adopted pursuant to this section **shall supersede** any existing charter and all laws inconsistent therewith. The provisions of a charter are the law of the State and have the full force and effect of legislative enactments."

The Charter vests authority over the compensation of employees and existing local laws in the Board of Supervisors. Since the adoption of the Charter was subsequent to the 1976 election, Measure F and §3.12.040 were legally superseded by the actions of the 1980 electorate. At minimum, a salary formula that leaves no discretion to the Board in setting compensation for its employees is inconsistent with the Board's broad jurisdiction and authority granted by the Charter to establish compensation for county employees, particularly management employees.

C. The Contra-Arguments Against Board Authority.

Since the passage of the County Charter in 1980, the authority of the Board over employee compensation as established in the Charter has not been substantively amended or deleted. Therefore, the Board's legal authority exists despite arguments to the contrary. However, four arguments against the Board's authority to set compensation for the safety management classifications outside of Measure F deserve discussion:

**Argument One:** The Board does not have authority over Measure F because in 2002, the Placer County electorate did not pass Measure R, a Placer County Sheriff Deputy Salary Code Revision that stated the following question:

Shall Placer County Code, Chapter 3, Section 3.12.040 (also known as Measure F) be amended to remove that section in its entirety, thereby repealing that provision which requires Placer County Sheriff Deputy salaries be set by averaging the Sheriff Deputy salaries of Nevada County, Sacramento County and El Dorado County?

Discussion: The question before the voters in 2002 did not address the Board's authority under the Charter. It addressed only whether the electorate wanted to repeal Measure F. A county ordinance can be repealed by the electorate via the initiative process or by the Board via its Charter authority. The fact that the electorate chose not to exercise its authority to repeal Measure F in no way limits the Board's authority via the Charter. Therefore, as discussed above, the Board's authority under the Charter allows for the present action.

**Argument Two:** Even if the Board has the legal authority, the Board would be defying the will of the voters if it discontinued use of Measure F in setting salary for the safety management classifications of Undersheriff, Captain, and Lieutenant.

Discussion: The will of the voters in 1980 clearly intended to vest the Board with discretion over employee compensation. The 2002 election did not address the authority granted to the Board under the Charter. With each supervisorial election since 2002, the Placer County electorate has voted for their respective supervisor. In each election, the successful supervisorial candidate is vested by the "will of the voters" to exercise his or her authority, judgment, and discretion under the Charter. Thus, the will of the voters is reflected in each supervisorial election. It can be argued equally that the will of the voters is to grant each elected supervisor the authority to use their good judgment when making employee compensation decisions, especially in light of uncertain economic conditions.

**Argument Three:** The Board cannot amend Measure F as to the safety management classifications of Undersheriff, Captain, and Lieutenant because the Board has followed it for years.

Discussion: Under the Charter, the Board has the authority to make decisions regarding employee compensation. The fact that the Board has followed Measure F for the safety management classifications does not mean the Board *must* follow Measure F as to the safety management classifications. The authority of the Charter does not simply go away because it has not been used or because prior Boards have decided to follow Measure F. Further, a Board's prior discretionary decision on employee compensation does not compel the same decision in the future.

**Argument Four:** Why now? The Board has followed Measure F in setting salary for the safety management classifications of Undersheriff, Captain, and Lieutenant for so long that it would be unfair for the Board to exercise its Charter authority.

Discussion: The issue of “fairness” is subjective and depends largely on the perspective of the individual. The Board of Supervisors is elected to make decisions considering all the facts and circumstances facing the County. Prior legal analysis on Measure F did not focus on the Board’s charter authority passed in 1980. Current legal and economic circumstances required a fresh look at the legal underpinnings of Measure F and whether Measure F was, in fact, constitutional in light of the Charter election in 1980. Arguably, Measure F was not constitutional at the time of passage in 1976 because it divested all discretion and authority for employee compensation decisions from the elected Board of Supervisors to a mathematical formula informed by other elected bodies. The legal basis for the rote implementation of Measure F became even more tenuous when the Charter was passed by the electorate in 1980. It is clear that the Board has the legal authority to follow or not follow Measure F under the Charter in relation to the safety management classifications.

## **DISCUSSION**

As demonstrated in the County Charter, a foundational governing document for the organization’s operations, compensation of its employees is a critical duty of the Board. This essential function is rooted in the Board’s responsibility for the fiscal health of the County. The Public Safety Fund budget dedicates 71 percent of its resources to employee compensation, the single largest expenditure category. In its fiduciary duty to adopt budgetary and compensation policies that best provide for the safety and financial security of the taxpayers it represents, the Board’s necessity to exercise discretion over compensation cannot be understated. Indeed, over the past 40 years since Measure F’s adoption, rote salary increases for peace officer classifications without the Board adjusting for local conditions has resulted in total compensation substantially higher than that of the surrounding counties, whose policies drive the Measure F formula.

Currently, §3.12.040 provides for the method of adjusting salaries for several classifications of peace officers. Some of the classifications are represented by the PCDSA and their wages are subject to collective bargaining. The wages of unrepresented management classifications, including Undersheriff, Assistant Sheriff (not currently used), Captain, Inspector (not currently used), and Lieutenant, may be set by the Board at any time, as is its practice related to non-safety management classifications. For these reasons, the proposed ordinance amending §3.12.040 would remove reference to the management classifications from this section and restore the Board’s authority over their compensation.

In recognition that the Measure F formula for compensating affected safety managers has resulted in guaranteed annual increases of, on average, about four percent, staff recommends the Board approve general wage increases of 4.0 percent, 4.25 percent and 4.5 percent for the next three years. The proposed ordinance implementing these compensation adjustments affords the security of future increases following the same timing as Measure F, to which employees are accustomed. Additionally, planned, known salary increases will assist with fiscal forecasting for budgeting purposes, as opposed to only weeks of notice for the volatile increases associated with Measure F. Finally, wage increases scheduled in advance are an important tool for recruitment and retention efforts for key management positions overseeing public safety.

Consistent with the adopted schedule of classifications, the wage increases are proposed to apply to 32 employees in all Safety Management classifications: Undersheriff, Captain, Lieutenant, Investigator – Chief District Attorney, Investigator – Supervising District Attorney, Chief Probation Officer, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, and Probation Manager.

In addition, it is proposed that special incentive pays currently applicable to specified safety management and elected safety management employees be converted from percentages of salary to flat dollar amounts.

This action will allow the Board additional discretion over increases to special pays, rather than automatic adjustments inherent in percentages. The impacted incentive pays are currently set as follows:

**Current Special Incentive Pay Rates**

Undercover Assignment Pay	5%
POST Intermediate Certificate (hired before 2/26/13)	12%
POST Intermediate Certificate	5%
POST Advanced Certificate (hired before 2/26/13)	17%
POST Advanced Certificate	10%
Wellness Incentive Pay	2.5%

In order to ensure that affected employees do not experience a reduction in pay, the proposed conversion of the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certificate pay percentages to flat dollar amounts is calculated based on each classification’s top salary step. Wellness incentive pay is set equivalent to the current rate of the highest classification in each employee group (i.e., classified and unclassified). Undercover assignment pay, not currently in use, is set based on the average top salary step for eligible classifications. The proposed amounts are summarized in the table below:

**Proposed Monthly Special Incentive Pay Amounts**

Classification	Undercover Assignment	POST Intermediate (hired before 2/26/13)	POST Intermediate	POST Advanced (hired before 2/26/13)	POST Advanced	Wellness Incentive
Sheriff-Coroner-Marshall				\$ 3,015	\$ 1,775	\$ 445
Undersheriff				2,840	1,670	445
Assistant Sheriff				2,580	1,520	445
Sheriff’s Captain	\$ 595	\$ 1,595	\$ 665	2,260	1,330	335
Sheriff’s Lieutenant	595	1,400	585	1,985	1,170	335
District Attorney Chief Investigator				1,970	1,160	445
District Attorney Supervising Investigator	595	1,290	540	1,825	1,075	335
Chief Probation Officer						
Assistant Chief Probation Officer						
Probation Manager						

**FISCAL IMPACT**

Due to the unknown impact to salaries of the Measure F formula each year, the adopted Fiscal Year 2020/21 budget assumes a wage increase for safety managers of 3.5 percent. Any wage increases beyond the budgeted amount are expected to be absorbed within departments’ existing budgets. Adoption of the proposed ordinances will result in greater certainty and improved accuracy for budgetary planning in future years.

Although it is not known whether the proposed wage adjustments are above, below, or equivalent to the future increases that would be prescribed by the Measure F formula, their impact beyond the budgetary assumption of 3.5 percent can be estimated. The anticipated additional impact to total compensation costs (including salaries and affected benefits) of the proposed wage increases is approximately \$47,000, \$138,000, and \$283,000 over each of the next three fiscal years, respectively.

For the conversion of special incentive pays to flat dollar amounts, no employees will experience reductions in pay, although some will experience modest increases due to the establishment of a single rate for all individuals in a classification or group, regardless of current salary step. The estimated annual impact of the

conversion and its impact to related benefits is \$38,000. This expense will be offset in future years by the discontinuation of automatic increases in payment amounts that occur each year with the current percentage structure. The estimated savings resulting from the use of flat dollar amounts instead of percentages over the next three years of proposed wage increases is approximately \$136,000.

In total, the estimated impact of the proposed actions to the budget over three years is \$370,000.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Ordinance amending §3.12.040 of the Placer County Code

Attachment 2 – Ordinance implementing compensation adjustments for Safety Management employees

Attachment 3 – Ordinance amending §3.12.020 and 3.12.030 of the Placer County Code

Before the Board of Supervisors  
County of Placer, State of California

**In the matter of:** An ordinance amending §3.12.040 of the Placer County Code, pertaining to the compensation of specified safety managers.

Ordinance No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Introduced: December 15, 2020

The following Ordinance was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held \_\_\_\_\_, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Board of Supervisors

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of said Board

---

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

**Section 1.** County Code Chapter 3, Article 3.12, Section 3.12.040 regarding Salaries related to the Placer County Sheriff's Ordinance Initiative is amended as set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

**Section 2.** That this ordinance shall be effective upon adoption.

**Section 3.** That this ordinance amendment is adopted as a codified ordinance.

## Exhibit A

That the following section 3.12.040 of Chapter 3 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended to read as indicated (additions to ordinance shown in **bold and underline**, deletions shown in ~~strikethrough~~):

### **3.12.040 Salaries—Placer County sheriff's ordinance initiative.**

A. The board of supervisors shall, at least annually, determine the existing maximum salaries for the Nevada County sheriff's office, El Dorado County sheriff's office, and Sacramento County sheriff's office for each class of position employed by said agencies.

B. Effective January 1, 1977, and effective January 1st of each year thereafter the board of supervisors shall, during the month of January, determine the average salary for each class of position as set forth herein, and beginning the first period following January shall fix the average salary for each class of position in the Placer County sheriff's office at a level equal to the average of the salaries for the comparable positions in the Nevada County sheriff's office, El Dorado County sheriff's office and the Sacramento County sheriff's office.

C. As used herein the term "comparable class of position" shall mean a group of positions substantially similar with respect to qualifications or duties or responsibilities using the following positions as guidelines:

1. ~~Undersheriff, assistant sheriff\*, inspector, e~~**C**orporal, ~~captain,~~sergeant, deputy, lieutenant.

D. The provisions of this chapter shall prevail over any otherwise conflicting provisions which may relate to salaries of county employees or officers who are not elected by popular vote.

~~\*Assistant sheriff will be set at ten (10) percent below the undersheriff if no comparable class of position available.~~

# Before the Board of Supervisors County of Placer, State of California

**In the matter of:** An ordinance implementing compensation adjustments for Safety Management employees.

Ordinance No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Introduced: December 15, 2020

The following Ordinance was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held \_\_\_\_\_, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Board of Supervisors

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of said Board

---

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

**Section 1:** This ordinance implements compensation adjustments for Safety Management employees as set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

**Section 2:** This ordinance shall be effective upon adoption.

**Section 3:** This ordinance is adopted as an un-codified ordinance.

## **Exhibit A**

### **Compensation Adjustments for Safety Management Employees**

#### **Salary Adjustments**

1. Effective February 13, 2021, (pay date March 12, 2021) a four percent (4%) General Wage Increase will be implemented for Safety Management employees.
2. Effective February 12, 2022, (pay date March 11, 2022) a four and one-quarter percent (4.25%) General Wage Increase will be implemented Safety Management employees.
3. Effective February 11, 2023, (pay date March 10, 2023) a four and one-half percent (4.5%) General Wage Increase will be implemented for Safety Management employees.

# Before the Board of Supervisors County of Placer, State of California

**In the matter of:** An ordinance amending §3.12.020 and §3.12.030 of the Placer County Code, pertaining to the compensation of specified safety managers.

Ordinance No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Introduced: December 15, 2020

The following Ordinance was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held \_\_\_\_\_, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Board of Supervisors

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of said Board

---

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

**Section 1:** County Code Chapter 3, Article 3.12, Section 3.12.020 regarding classified service salary and benefits notations and 3.12.030 regarding unclassified service salary and benefits notations is amended as set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

**Section 2:** The Amendments identified on Exhibit A will start the first full pay period in February 2021, beginning February 13, 2021 (pay date March 12, 2021). This ordinance adopting the amendments identified on Exhibit A shall become effective pursuant to Government Code §25123.

**Section 3:** This ordinance is adopted as a codified ordinance.

## Exhibit A

Beginning on the first full pay period of February 2021, beginning February 13, 2021 (pay date March 12, 2021), the following sections of 3.12.020 and 3.12.030 of Chapter 3 of the Placer County Code are hereby amended to read as indicated (additions to ordinance shown in **bold and underline**, deletions shown in ~~strikethrough~~):

### 3.12.020 Classified service – Salary and benefits notations

1. Uniform Allowance—Sworn Peace Officers.

~~Assistant Sheriff~~

~~Deputy Sheriff I~~

~~Deputy Sheriff II~~

~~Sheriff's Captain~~

~~Sheriff's Lieutenant~~

~~Sheriff's Sergeant~~

~~Undersheriff~~

~~Sheriff-Coroner-Marshal~~

a. If required by the county to wear a uniform as a regular part of their duties, a uniform allowance shall be paid on a biweekly basis. This shall not affect reserve deputies, honorary deputies and other county officers and employees deputized for special purposes. New employees will be advanced the first year's uniform allowance in their first full paycheck and receive uniform allowance on a biweekly basis upon their first-year anniversary.

~~b. Effective July 23, 2004 at 5:01 p.m., the uniform allowance will increase by one hundred dollars (\$100.00) to nine hundred sixty five dollars (\$965.00) per year for Auburn area deputies and one thousand one hundred fifteen dollars (\$1,115.00) for Tahoe area deputies and resident deputies.~~

~~c. Effective pay period 18, February 4, 2005 at 5:01 p.m., the uniform allowance will increase by fifty dollars (\$50.00) to one thousand fifteen dollars (\$1,015.00) per year for Auburn area deputies and one thousand one hundred sixty five dollars (\$1,165.00) for Tahoe area deputies and resident deputies.~~

~~b. Effective pay period 18, February 3, 2006 at 5:01 p.m., t~~The uniform allowance ~~is~~**will** increase by fifty dollars (\$50.00) to one thousand sixty-five dollars (\$1,065.00) per year for Auburn area ~~deputies~~ and one thousand two hundred fifteen dollars (\$1,215.00) **per year** for Tahoe area ~~deputies and resident deputies~~.

~~c. Effective July 23, 2004 at 5:01 p.m., e~~Employees appointed or reassigned to Dutch Flat or Foresthill resident deputy or to any position east of Serene Lakes shall receive a one-time winter clothing stipend in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250.00).

d. The parties agree that if purchase of the campaign hat is mandatory, the sheriff's department will pay for the cost of the hat and will reimburse association members immediately upon provision of a receipt.

2. Career and Education Incentive. Full-time permanent employees in the following classes shall be eligible for the career and education incentive:

~~Assistant Sheriff~~

Deputy Sheriff I  
 Deputy Sheriff II  
~~Investigator—Chief District Attorney~~  
 Investigator—District Attorney  
 Investigator—Supervising District Attorney  
 Investigator—Welfare Fraud\*  
 Investigator—Welfare Fraud—Supervising\*  
 Sheriff  
 Sheriff's Captain  
 Sheriff's Lieutenant  
 Sheriff's Sergeant  
 Undersheriff

a. Basic POST.

i. ~~Employees hired or rehired on or after February 26, 2013 will not receive the Basic POST benefit.~~

ii. ~~Active employees already receiving Basic POST on February 26, 2013 will continue to receive Basic POST until they separate from Placer County employment at which point they lose all future rights to this benefit.~~

~~(A) Five percent of base salary for possession of a POST basic certificate.~~

~~(B) Effective the pay period beginning pay period 20, March 9, 2013, Basic POST will increase to seven percent of base pay.~~

iii. For employees represented by the Placer County Deputy Sheriff's Association, Basic POST pay shall be pursuant to the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between Placer County and the PCDSA.

b. Intermediate POST.

i. ~~Five percent of base salary for possession of a POST intermediate certificate.~~ **For Safety Management employees hired before February 26, 2013, compensation for POST intermediate certificate is as follows:**

<b><u>Investigator – Supervising District Attorney</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,290 per month</u></b>
<b><u>Sheriff's Lieutenant</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,400 per month</u></b>
<b><u>Sheriff's Captain</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,595 per month</u></b>

ii. **For Safety Management employees hired or rehired on or after February 26, 2013, compensation for POST intermediate certificate is as follows:**

<b><u>Investigator – Supervising District Attorney</u></b>	<b><u>\$540 per month</u></b>
<b><u>Sheriff's Lieutenant</u></b>	<b><u>\$585 per month</u></b>
<b><u>Sheriff's Captain</u></b>	<b><u>\$665 per month</u></b>

iii. For employees represented by the Placer County Deputy Sheriff's Association, Intermediate POST pay shall be pursuant to the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between Placer County and the PCDSA.

c. ~~Advanced POST. Five percent of base salary for possession of a POST advanced certificate.~~

i. **For Safety Management employees hired before February 26, 2013, compensation for POST advanced certificate is as follows:**

<b><u>Investigator – Supervising District Attorney</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,825 per month</u></b>
<b><u>Sheriff’s Lieutenant</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,985 per month</u></b>
<b><u>Sheriff’s Captain</u></b>	<b><u>\$2,260 per month</u></b>

ii. **For Safety Management employees hired or rehired on or after February 26, 2013, compensation for POST advanced certificate is as follows:**

<b><u>Investigator – Supervising District Attorney</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,075 per month</u></b>
<b><u>Sheriff’s Lieutenant</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,170 per month</u></b>
<b><u>Sheriff’s Captain</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,330 per month</u></b>

iii. For employees represented by the Placer County Deputy Sheriff’s Association, Advanced POST pay shall be pursuant to the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between Placer County and the PCDSA.

~~d. POST certificate incentive packages shall be cumulative but not compound.~~

~~i. For employees represented by the Placer County Deputy Sheriff’s Association, POST pay shall be pursuant to the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between Placer County and the PCDSA.~~

d. Full-time permanent employees in the above-listed classifications will be eligible for educational incentive pay of fifty dollars (\$50.00) per pay period for an associate degree (AA), seventy-five dollars (\$75.00) per pay period for a bachelor degree (BA) or one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per pay period for a masters degree (MA). To be eligible for educational incentive pay the degree must be from an accredited college, consistent with the human resources department practices in determining validity of the college and degree. Employees must present evidence of successful completion of a qualifying degree, consistent with this section to their department head, which shall determine and certify whether employees are eligible to receive educational incentive pay.

i. For employees represented by the Placer County Deputy Sheriff’s Association, the amount of the educational incentive for AA, BA or MA degrees shall be as set forth in the Memorandum of Understanding between Placer County and the PCDSA.

e. Employees may not receive educational incentive pay for more than one degree (associate, bachelor or masters). The payments are not cumulative and only one degree qualifies for payment. An employee may only receive educational incentive pay for one degree and not multiple degrees.

5. Special Teams Pay – **Sworn Peace Officers** ~~Deputy Sheriff’s Unit and Safety Management~~. Special pay will be as follows for those employees assigned by the sheriff to the following special teams without regard to call-out:

a. Explosive Ordinance Detail (EOD). An employee designated as EOD officer by the sheriff will receive an additional one hundred twenty-five dollars (\$125.00) per month in salary.

b. Undercover Assignment. ~~An employee designated by the sheriff to work an undercover assignment shall be entitled to receive five percent additional compensation.~~ **Safety Management employees designated to work an undercover assignment shall be entitled to receive \$595 per month.**

c. Certified Diver's pay shall increase from fifty dollars (\$50.00) per month to one hundred twenty-five dollars (\$125.00) per month.

d. Special Enforcement Team pay shall increase from fifty dollars (\$50.00) per month to one hundred twenty-five dollars (\$125.00) per month.

e. Hostage Negotiations Team members will receive pay of one hundred twenty-five dollars (\$125.00) per month.

f. The above-provisions do not apply to employees represented by the Placer County Deputy Sheriff's Association. Instead, Special Teams Pay and related special assignment pay shall be as set forth in the Memorandum of Understanding between the county and the PCDSA.

27. Wellness Incentive – ~~Deputy Sheriffs Unit~~ and Safety Management.

a. Employees in the following classifications, if otherwise qualified pursuant to this section, shall receive a wellness incentive allowance **of \$335 per month** ~~equal to two and one-half percent of their base pay:~~

~~Assistant Sheriff~~

~~Deputy Sheriff I~~

~~Deputy Sheriff II~~

~~Investigator—Chief District Attorney~~

~~Investigator—District Attorney~~

~~Investigator—Supervising District Attorney~~

~~Investigator—Welfare Fraud~~

~~Investigator—Welfare Fraud—Supervising~~

~~Sheriff~~

~~Sheriff's Captain~~

~~Sheriff's Lieutenant~~

~~Sheriff's Sergeant~~

~~Undersheriff~~

An employee must qualify to receive the wellness incentive. In order to qualify for and to continue receiving the wellness incentive, employees within the above-listed classifications shall:

i. Annually present to his or her department head, or designee, competent proof via a county-approved form, that he or she has had a physical exam consistent with the physical exam guidelines set forth by the United States Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S. Preventative Services Task Force by December 31st.

ii. If an employee fails to meet the annual required deadline of December 31st, he or she will not continue to receive the wellness incentive effective the first full pay period after



<u>Assistant Sheriff</u>	<u>\$1,520 per month</u>
<u>Undersheriff</u>	<u>\$1,670 per month</u>
<u>Sheriff-Coroner-Marshal</u>	<u>\$1,775 per month</u>

c. Full-time permanent employees in the above-listed classifications will be eligible for educational incentive pay of fifty dollars (\$50.00) per pay period for an associate degree (AA), seventy-five dollars (\$75.00) per pay period for a bachelor degree (BA) or one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per pay period for a masters degree (MA). To be eligible for educational incentive pay the degree must be from an accredited college, consistent with the human resources department practices in determining validity of the college and degree. Employees must present evidence of successful completion of a qualifying degree, consistent with this section to their department head, which shall determine and certify whether employees are eligible to receive educational incentive pay.

d. Employees may not receive educational incentive pay for more than one degree (associate, bachelor or masters). The payments are not cumulative and only one degree qualifies for payment. An employee may only receive educational incentive pay for one degree and not multiple degrees.

### 3. Wellness Incentive – Safety Management.

a. Employees in the following classifications, if otherwise qualified pursuant to this section, shall receive a wellness incentive of \$445 per month:

Investigator—Chief District Attorney

Assistant Sheriff

Undersheriff

Sheriff-Coroner-Marshal

b. An employee must qualify to receive the wellness incentive. In order to qualify for and to continue receiving the wellness incentive, employees within the above-listed classifications shall:

i. Annually present to his or her department head, or designee, competent proof via a county-approved form, that he or she has had a physical exam consistent with the physical exam guidelines set forth by the United States Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S. Preventative Services Task Force by December 31st.

ii. If an employee fails to meet the annual required deadline of December 31st, he or she will not continue to receive the wellness incentive effective the first full pay period after December 31st. However, if the employee subsequently provides the required documentation, he or she will qualify to receive the wellness incentive effective the first full pay period after the required documentation is received and approved.

c. For the purpose of this section, participation in an activity to maintain physical fitness shall be elective and is not mandated by the county of Placer or its employees.

E. All pays listed in this section must meet the CalPERS definition of special compensation to be considered reportable. The county will not be responsible for reporting any pays not

determined by CalPERS to be reportable. (Ord. 5991-B § 1, 2019; Ord. 5984-B § 1, 2019; Ord. 5903-B § 3, 2018; Ord. 5894-B § 5, 2017; Ord. 5732-B § 1, 2014; Ord. 5713-B § 1, 2013; Ord. 5617-B § 1, 2010; Ord. 5586-B 2010; Ord. 5531-B, 2008; Ord. 5478-B (Attach. A), 2007; Ord. 5449-B, 2007; Ord. 5443-B, 2007; Ord. 5441-B, 2007; Ord. 5435-B, 2007; Ord. 5428-B, 2006; Ord. 5425-B § 5, 2006; Ord. 5408-B, 2006; Ord. 5403-B, 2006; Ord. 5402-B, 2006; Ord. 5397-B, 2006; Ord. 5395-B, 2006; Ord. 5393-B, 2005; Ord. 5389-B, 2005; Ord. 5382-B, 2005; Ord. 5374-B, 2005; Ord. 5368-B, 2005; Ord. 5363-B, 2005; Ord. 5359-B, 2005; Ord. 5349-B, 2005; Ord. 5345-B, 2005; Ord. 5345-B, 2005; Ord. 5353-B, 2005; Ord. 5343-B, 2004; Ord. 5334-B, 2004; Ord. 5329-B, 2004; Ord. 5324-B, 2004; Ord. 5312-B, 2004; Ord. 5303-B, 2004; Ord. 5297-B, 2004; Ord. 5295-B, 2004; Ord. 5281-B, 2004; Ord. 5240-B, 2003; Ord. 5235-B, 2003; Ord. 5231-B, 2003; Ord. 5230-B, 2003; Ord. 5223-B, 2002; Ord. 5216-B, 2002; Ord. 5215-B, 2002; Ord. 5201-B, 2002; Ord. 5197-B, 2002; Ord. 5196-B, 2002; Ord. 5194-B, 2002; Ord. 5193-B, 2002; Ord. 5192-B, 2002; Ord. 5184-B, 2002; Ord. 5182-B, 2002; Ord. 5161-B, 2002; Ord. 5153-B, 2002; Ord. 5140-B, 2001; Ord. 5138-B, 2001; Ord. 5136-B, 2001; Ord. 5122-B, 2001; Ord. 5115-B, 2001; Ord. 5099-B, 2001; Ord. 5100-B, 2001; Ord. 5106-B, 2001; Ord. 5111-B, 2001; Ord. 5089-B, 2001; Ord. 5085-B, 2001; Ord. 5083-B, 2001; Ord. 5075-B, 2001; Ord. 5069-B, 2000; Ord. 5065-B, 2000; Ord. 5062-B, 2000; Ord. 5061-B (Attach. 1), 2000; Ord. 5058-B (Attach. 3, 4, 30), 2000; Ord. 5050-B, 2000; Ord. 5040-B, 2000; Ord. 5032-B, 2000; Ord. 5027-B, 2000; Ord. 5018-B, 2000; Ord. 5014-B, 2000; Ord. 4995-B, 1999; Ord. 4987-B, 1999; prior code § 14.3010)