REPORT OF THE

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COMPENSATION

Larry Hendel, Central Labor Council of Contra Costa County, AFL-CIO
Terri Montgomery, East Bay Leadership Council
Angie Coffee, East Bay Leadership Council
Tom Hansen, Building Trades Council
Clifford Bowen, Public at large

March 19, 2019

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) The salary of Board of Supervisors' members should be adjusted to the average of the 9 Bay Area Counties and tied to the Superior Court Judges to be consistent with the 9 Bay Area Counties methodology for any future adjustments.
- 2) Adjust the Board of Supervisors' base salary, starting with July 1, 2019, to tie future salary adjustments to 60% of the Superior Court Judges' salaries.
- 3) Adjust the Board of Supervisors' base salary, starting with January 1, 2020, to tie future salary adjustments to 63% of the Superior Court Judges' salaries.
- 4) Adjust the Board of Supervisors' base salary, starting with January 1, 2021 and future years, to tie future salary adjustments to 65% of the Superior Court Judges' salaries.

FISCAL IMPACT

100% County General Fund. The first year recommended increase to base salary would result in a total increased payroll cost of approximately \$75,020 of which \$16,476 is the County contribution to retirement cost.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COMPENSATION

At the December 18, 2018 meeting of the Board of Supervisors, the County Administrator was directed to appoint a 5-member Ad Hoc Committee on Board of Supervisors Compensation composed of impartial citizens representing business, labor, and the general public.

The Board requested that the following organizations nominate members to the Ad Hoc Committee:

- East Bay Leadership Council (EBLC) selected two individuals, Terri Montgomery, and Angie Coffee;
- the Central Labor Council of Contra Costa County, AFL-CIO selected Larry Hendel; and
- the Building Trades Council selected Tom Hansen.

As directed by the Board of Supervisors, the County Administrator conducted an application process to appoint a member at large from applications received via a public solicitation process. Five members of the public submitted applications, from which the County Administrator selected Clifford Bowen, a former member of the Contra Costa County Civil Grand Jury, to be the at large member.

The Charge of the Committee was to:

- (a) review the compensation of the Board of Supervisors;
- (b) recommend any adjustment to the compensation;
- (c) recommend a methodology and process by which any future increases would occur; and
- (d) prepare recommendations in time for consideration by the Board of Supervisors at its April 9, 2019 meeting.

At the first meeting of the Committee, the members elected Tom Hansen as the Chair, and Clifford Bowen as the Vice Chair. The Committee met on February 5, 12, 20, and 28, and on March 11 and 19.

The Committee discussed the following factors that would be important in setting compensation for the Board of Supervisors:

1) While salary is not the guiding factor for Supervisorial candidates, it should be fair and equitable, not be so low as to be a barrier to public service and should be high enough to attract good candidates.

- 2) The Board's salary should be based on the duties and responsibilities of the position rather than on the performance of the official (the performance to be decided by the electorate).
- 3) A process should be designed to de-politicize the practice of setting a salary for Board members.
- 4) Any major adjustment to salary should be phased in over time.

Determination of the Board of Supervisors' compensation has always been complicated by issues of whether or not to use base salary, other pay items, pension contributions, pension benefits, health care contributions and numerous other factors. Additional consideration is given to which Counties should be use for comparison purposes. In order to simplify the process, the Committee decided to use the 9 Counties most commonly used in salary studies for Department Heads and other major employee classifications. Those Counties are all Bay Area Counties except for Sacramento. For ease of reference we refer to these 9 Counties as "Bay Area Counties" even though it includes Sacramento. The City/County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors was not considered due to its unique make up of both City and County elected officials.

The Committee's analysis has taken into consideration that of the 9 Bay Area Counties used as comparable, 7 tie their salaries to a percentage of the Superior Court Judges salaries. The Committee also noted, of the 9 Bay Area Counties, some provide more generous benefits and some provide less generous benefits than Contra Costa County. Because of this, the Committee has worked to quantify and compare total annual compensation as opposed to limiting its review to just base salary data. The Committee met 6 times and reviewed a number of materials relating to compensation.

The Committee also had available for their review over 500 pages of documentation, including agendas, Record of Action notes, and background materials from the previous Ad Hoc Committee on Board of Supervisors Compensation from 2015. All of this material is available publicly at:

http://64.166.146.245/agenda_publish.cfm?get_month=3&get_year=2019&mt=BOSCOMP&countDownload=&downloadFile=&id=

Attached to this report are some of the materials reviewed by the Committee.

Attachment "A" shows the comparable compensation elements for the 9 Bay Area Counties. Attachment "B" shows the history of Judicial Pay increases for the past nine years. Attachment "C" shows the salary history for the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors dating back to 1995. Attachment "D" shows the listing of comparable counties that tie Supervisor salaries to a percentage of Superior Court Judge. Attachment "E" illustrates the implementation of the proposed salary in three annual increments and the percentage of Superior Court Judge pay. The Committee recommends that each adjustment to base salary take place on July 1 of 2019, January 1 of 2020, and January 1 of 2021.

The Committee considered 11 different compensation factors for review, including County Population and Annual Budgets for each of the 9 Counties. (see appendix A – Comparison of Compensation to peer counties). These compensation factors were separated into three categories, (1) which benefits were directly related to monetary comparisons, (2) which benefits would be viewed as standard items to each comparison County, and (3) which benefits would be viewed as "special" to individual Counties.

Based on the Committee's review they determined that items such as pension contributions, pension benefits, and health care contributions were standard items to each comparison County. After further refinement, the Committee settled on Annual Salary, Other Pay, Auto Allowance and Deferred Compensation as the primary factors for comparison purposes.

Even with narrowing of these categories, the Committee found it difficult to make accurate determinations of compensation comparisons for the 9 Bay Area Counties. Transparent CA's website provides excellent materials, but tends to lag behind actual numbers. Staff was able to update some of the information through individual contacts in each of the Counties, but even then it was unclear as to whether or not some of the data was accurate, or double counted, by virtue of how it was reported by each of the Counties. Auto Allowance and Deferred Compensation items were often included in whole or in part with the Other Pay numbers reported by Transparent CA.

Recognizing the many policy decisions that the Board of Supervisors makes, it was clear that the position of County Supervisor is a complex and challenging full time job. For compensation purposes, a Board member is a County employee, (i.e. granted a salary with benefits). This places the Board member into a potential conflict of interest in setting their own salary since the Board would be giving themselves salary and benefits for which they have also bargained with other employee labor groups.

This has led 7 of the 9 Bay Area Counties to tie their salary increases to that of the Superior Court Judges. (See Attachment D). Annual increases in judicial salaries are linked to those received by executive branch employees as negotiated through statewide collective bargaining agreements. After bargaining agreements are reached, CalHR calculates the proposed increased amount and submits a formal Exempt Pay Letter to the State Controller. The methodology CalHR uses to calculate judicial salary increases pursuant to § 68203 is based on salary costs related to *all* state employees within the executive branch. This methodology calculates an average general salary increase relative to the state's entire executive branch workforce, which includes 21 bargaining units as well as the remaining excluded employees. The methodology takes into account the size of the bargaining unit and the total costs of general salary increases across the entire executive branch. (See attached memoranda from the Judicial Council of California – Appendix B). Over the past 10 years the annual increases in judicial salaries has been approximately the same as that given to Contra Costa County employees.

At its February 28, 2019 meeting the Committee agreed that the Auto Allowance should be viewed as an expense reimbursement and it was eliminated from the Salary and Other Pay categories for comparison purposes. A comparison of Salary only showed the 9 Bay Area Counties used for comparison purposes to average \$134,372 and for Salary and other pay items to average \$150,569. Using the same data, Contra Costa County Salary only was currently at \$116,841, and for Salary and other comparable pay items was \$129,861. Contra Costa County was therefore between \$17,531 and \$20,708 lower than the 9 Bay Area Counties used for comparison purposes. The Committee recognized that because of the significant difference it would be appropriate to phase any increase in over multiple years.

Based on this the Committee, at its March 19 meeting, gave direction to staff to prepare a schedule for the salary increase to start at 60% of the Superior Court Judges salary upon Ordinance with an effective date of July 1, 2019 and to increase to 63% of the Superior Court Judges salary on January 1, 2020 and increase to 65% of the Superior Court Judges salary on January 1, 2021.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) The salary of Board of Supervisors' members should be adjusted to the average of the 9 Bay Area Counties and tied to the Superior Court Judges to be consistent with the 9 Bay Area Counties methodology for any future adjustments.
- 2) Adjust the Board of Supervisors' base salary starting with July 1, 2019 to tie future salary adjustments to 60% of the Superior Court Judges' salaries.
- 3) Adjust the Board of Supervisors' base salary starting with January 1, 2020 to tie future salary adjustments to 63% of the Superior Court Judges' salaries.
- 4) Adjust the Board of Supervisors' base salary starting with January 1, 2021 and future years to tie future salary adjustments to 65% of the Superior Court Judges' salaries.

	А	В	C	D I	=	F	G	Н	I	J	K	L N	М	N C		Р (R	S	T	U	V
1	TOTAL COMPENSATION								Ī													
2	22-Feb-19								1													-
3									1													-
		202111.47.01		0.UD 0.T ¹	1	ANNUAL		OTHER		AUTO		FERRED		TOTAL	01 D	ANNUAL SALARY, THER PAY, EFERRED		PENSION	P	ANNUAL ENSION		AISER A
5		POPULATION	-	BUDGET		SALARY		PAY	+	ALLOWANCE	- '	СОМР	Al	LL COLUMNS		COMP	CON	TRIBUTION	+ '	BENEFIT	C	OVERAGE
6									+												-	
7	ALAMEDA	1,660,202	\$	3,996.8	ć	165,939	\$	7,903	+				\$	173,842	Ś	173,842	\$	14,171	\$	19,806	Ś	21,205
	MARIN	263,886	\$	766.6	\$	124,454	\$	13,428	+	\$ 9,600			\$	147,482	\$	137,882	\$	12,869	\$	19,913	Ś	20,410
	NAPA	141,294	\$	494.4	Ś	97,676	\$	9,380	-	\$ 5,280	\$	1,000	\$	113,336	\$	108,056	\$	7,912	\$	19,535	\$	21,169
_	SACRAMENTO	1,529,501	\$		Ś	114,083	\$	10,434		ÿ 3,200	\$	1,141	\$	125,658	Ś	125,658	\$	12,389	Ś	17,770	Ś	17,439
_	SAN MATEO	774.155	\$	2,667.4	\$	146,908	\$	13,235		\$ 13,338	Ť	-/	\$	173,481	Ś	160.143	Ś	11,978	\$	21,932	\$	18,824
	SANTA CLARA	1,956,598	\$	8,868.1	Ś	165,939	Ś	4,800	T	+ 10,000	\$	18,500	\$	189,239	\$	189,239	\$	6,523	\$	33,188	\$	15,033
13	SANTA CRUZ	276,864	\$	821.6	\$	128,846	\$	4,210				-,	\$	133,056	\$	133,056	\$	8,820	\$	20,160	\$	24,048
14	SOLANO	439,793	\$	1,093.8	\$	109,935	\$	34,256		\$ 10,400	\$	1,319	\$	155,910	\$	145,510	\$	7,695	\$	23,746	\$	18,577
15	SONOMA	503,332	\$	1,679.6	\$	155,568	\$	24,608			\$	1,556	\$	181,732	\$	181,732	\$	18,559	\$	31,114	\$	18,704
16																						
17	9 County Average	838,403	\$	2,743.0	\$	134,372	\$	13,584		\$ 9,655	\$	4,703	\$	154,860	\$	150,569	\$	11,213	\$	23,018	\$	19,490
18	Median (50 percentile)	503,332	\$	1,679.6	\$	128,846	\$	10,434					\$	155,910	\$	145,510	\$	11,978	\$	20,160	\$	18,824
19																						
20	CONTRA COSTA	1,149,363	\$	4,098.0	\$	116,841	\$	7,200		\$ 7,200	\$	13,020	\$	144,261	\$	137,061	\$	14,278	\$	18,695	\$	18,539
21																						
22	Amount Below Average	(310,960)	\$	(1,355)	\$	17,531	\$	6,384		\$ 2,455	\$	(8,317)	\$	10,599	\$	13,508	\$	(3,065)	\$	4,323	\$	951
23	Percent below Average	-37.1%		-49.4%		13.0%		47.0%		25.4%		-176.8%		6.8%		9.0%		-27.3%		18.8%		4.9%
24																						
25	Amount Below Median	(646,031)	\$	(2,418)	\$	12,005	\$	3,234					\$	11,649	\$	8,449	\$	(2,300)	\$	1,465	\$	285
_	Percent Below Median	-128.4%		-144.0%		9.3%		31.0%						7.5%		5.8%		-19.2%		7.3%		1.5%
27																						
28	¹ in millions																					

Superior Court Judge, Salary History

2010-11	0	\$178,789
2011-12	0	\$178,789
2012-13	0	\$178,789
2013-14	1.40%	\$181,292
2014-15	1.83%	\$184,610
2015-16	2.40%	\$189,041
2016-17	1.52%	\$191,914
2017-18	4.23%	\$200,042
2018-19	3.69%	\$207,424

Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

Board Action	Board Date	<u>Explanation</u>	Effective	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Increase</u>
			1/1/95	\$50,328	
Ordinance No 98-15	3/24/1998	Salary Plan Adjustment	6/1/98	\$51,348	2.03%
Ordinance No 98-15	3/24/1998	Salary Plan Adjustment	10/1/98	\$53,172	3.55%
Ordinance No 99-57	12/14/1999	Cost of Living Adjustment	2/15/00	\$57,480	8.10%
Ordinance No 99-57	12/14/1999	Cost of Living Adjustment	10/1/00	\$57,540	0.10%
Ordinance No 99-57	12/14/1999	Cost of Living Adjustment	10/1/01	\$59,892	4.09%
This was a technical level change		Salary Reallocation	9/30/03	\$59,924	0.05%
Ordinance No 2006-70	12/12/2006	Salary Reallocation	2/17/07	\$95,572	59.57%
Ordinance No 2006-70	12/12/2006	Cost of Living Adjustment	7/1/07	\$97,483	2.00%
Waiver of Supervisors's Salary (all)	7/21/2009	Waiver - 2 fiscal years	FY 09-11		-2.31%
Waiver of Supervisors's Salary (all)		Waiver - fiscal year	FY 11-12		-2.75%
Waiver of Supervisors's Salary (all)		Waiver - fiscal year	FY 12-13		-2.75%
Waiver of Supervisors's Salary (C. Anderson)		Waiver 1/4/15 - 6/30/15		(\$2,321)	
Waiver of Supervisors's Salary (C. Anderson)		Waiver 7/1/15 - 1/3/16		(\$2,067)	
Ordinance No 2014-10	1/20/2015	Repealed			
Ordinance No 2015-15	3/10/2015	Salary Plan Adjustment	6/1/15	\$104,307	7.00%
Ordinance No 2015-19	8/25/2015	Salary Plan Adjustment	1/1/16	\$108,328	3.86%
Ordinance No 2015-19	8/25/2015	Salary Plan Adjustment	1/1/17	\$112,504	3.85%
Ordinance No 2015-19	8/25/2015	Salary Plan Adjustment	1/1/18	\$116,841	3.86%

Board of Supervisors Salaries Comparable Counties

COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEMBER									
Counties using percentage of Judges' salaries for Supervisors ¹									
Counties	Calculation								
ALAMEDA	80% of Superior Court Judge's Salary								
SANTA CLARA	80% of Superior Court Judge's Salary								
SONOMA	75% of Judicial salaries								
MARIN	60% of Superior Court Judge's Salary + CPI COLA								
SACRAMENTO	55% of Superior Court Judge's Salary								
SOLANO	53% of Superior Court Judge's Salary								
NAPA	47.09% of Superior Court Judget's Salary								
Results of 2017 CSAC Survey									

Phase In Salary Methodology

	SALARY ONLY		SALARY & OTHER PAY
9 COUNTY AVERAGE	\$	134,372.00	\$ 150,569.00
Contra Costa	\$	116,841.00	\$ 116,841.00
Deferred Comp	\$	-	\$ 13,020.00
Auto	\$	-	\$ -
TOTAL	\$	116,841.00	\$ 129,861.00
DIFFERENCE	\$	17,531.00	\$ 20,708.00
			•
JUDGES SALARY	\$	207,424.00	
60)% \$	124,454.40	
63	3% \$	130,677.12	
65	5% \$	134,825.60	

County Administrator

County Administration Building 651 Pine Street, 10th Floor Martinez, California 94553-1229 (925) 335-1080 (925) 335-1098 FAX

David J. Twa County Administrator

February 15, 2019

Appendix A Contra Costa County



Board of Supervisors

John M. Gioia 1st District

Candace Andersen 2nd District

Diane Burgis 3rd District

Karen Mitchoff 4th District

Federal D. Glover

5th District

Ad Hoc Committee on Board of Supervisors Compensation

RE: Compensation Comparison – Discussion Document

Pursuant to the Committee's request, we have prepared the attached compensation comparison. We used public data sources to compile the data and have reached out to our peer counties to confirm the accuracy of the information. Not all counties have responded; therefore, the chart should be used for discussion purposes only. The following assumptions/comments are provided:

- Annual Salary current annual base salary
- Other Pay (Transparent California) total Other Pay category from Transparent California website (transparentcalifornia.com/salaries/2017), averaged for Board members reported. Details of pay are not provided by the service. Although CCC Board members do not receive longevity, several counties provide the benefit to Board members. Other Pay is included here for comparison purposes. These figures may be included in Auto Allowance and Deferred Compensation below.
- Auto Allowance for those counties that report category, the pay is listed separately. This pay may also be included in the Other Pay category from Transparent California.
- Deferred Compensation for those counties that report category, the pay is listed separately. This pay may also be included in the Other Pay category from Transparent California.
- Average Employee FY 2018-19 Contribution Rates presented as a percentage of retirement compensable pay. There is not an "apples-to-apples" comparison for pension contribution rates. The rates provided are based on Age of Entry of 40 for those systems using Age of Entry as opposed to Entry Age Normal. Note also that most systems have multiple pension plan/tiers and that all have at least two. The particular plan/tier is determined by the date at which an individual joins a system, reciprocity provisions that also vary by plan, and policy. Employees/Elected Officials hired/elected after December 31, 2012, fall under the Public Employees' Pension Reform Act (PEPRA) of 2013. Contributions for the PEPRA plan differ by system as well.
- Employee Pension Contribution based on salary only, this is the calculated amount an employee/elected official would pay towards their pension each year based on the average employee contribution rate and annual salary.
- County Health Contribution based on the 2018 subsidy to the annual cost of Kaiser HMO Family premium. Note that this particular benefit can vary widely within a particular Board let alone between counties. Plan premiums and plan coverage is not consistent from one Kaiser plan to another. Additionally, not all employees choose to be covered by a county provided health plan, and the coverage can be single, single +1, or single +2 or more (or even single +3 or more for California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERs) PEMHCA plans).

Ad Hoc Committee on Board of Supervisors Compensation Page Two (2)

- <u>Annual Pension Benefit</u> based on annual salary and eight (8) years of service with no reciprocal service. This is the calculated benefit that an employee may receive if they are in the tier identified in the chart, have no reciprocal service, and are eligible to retire. Retirement eligibility varies by system.
- Pension Formula and Vesting note that four (4) of the survey counties are members of the CalPERS retirement system (identified with an asterisk). Pension formulas and vesting varies by retirement system, etc. Even with similar formula, the annual COLA and final accumulation period can vary as well.
- <u>Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013</u> the PEPRA benefit is the same for all public agencies, 2% at age 62 for new non-safety members with an early retirement age of 52 and a maximum benefit factor of 2.5% at age 67. However, the contribution to the plan by the employee and the employer will vary from system to system based on system funding and policy.
- Retirement System Assumed Rate of Return the current rate of return is noted as well as any adopted changes to future rates.
- County Pension Rate FY 2018-19 for those counties whose information was available it is noted. As with the employee contribution rate, "apples-to-apples" comparisons cannot be made. Although a comparison of cost can be made, a comparison of compensation cannot be made using this measure. Annual pension contribution rates are dependent upon economics, funding, and policy and are rarely influenced by the Board of Supervisors. Additionally, entities can issue pension obligation bonds, which may or may not be included in the reported pension rate.
- Retiree Health many counties have made changes to eliminate or modify contributions to health care subsidies for retirees; however, as can be seen in the chart, this benefit varies significantly between counties.

Compensation comparisons can be very complicated and still not generate a "fair" comparison. The clearest comparison is that of base salary and other pays (auto, deferred compensation).

If there are any questions regarding the material being submitted, please do not hesitate to contact me at 925-335-1023.

Sincerely,

Il Musicoll

Lisa Driscoll

County Finance Director

Enclosures

UPDATED 2-15-19 COMPARISON OF COMPENSATION TO PEER COUNTIES

		Alameda	Contra Costa		Marin	Napa*	1	Sacramento	l	San Mateo	San	a Clara*		Santa Cruz*		Solano*		Sonoma
Annual Salary	Ś	165,939		1 (•	٠ ,		\$		\$	165,939	۲.		\$		5 \$	155,568
,	7		, ,,,		· ,	·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						126,000		109,93		,
Other Pay (Transparent CA)	\$	7,903	\$ 7,200		\$ 13,428 \$ 9,600	,	_	\$ 10,434	\$	13,235	\$	4,800	\$	4,210	\$	34,25	_	24,608
Auto Allowance/Mileage		not available	\$ 7,200		3,000	\$ 5,280	<u>ر</u>		>	13,338		available		not available	\$	10,40	00	not available
Deferred Compensation		not available	\$ 13,020	0	None	not available		not available		not available	not	available		not available		not available		not available
Average Employee FY 2018-19 Contribution Rates (Entry Age 40 for non-PERS plans)		8.54%	12.22	:%	10.34%	8.10	%	10.86%		8.52%		3.93%	5	7.00%		7.00	%	11.93%
Employee Pension Contribution (based on Salary only)	\$	14,171	\$ 14,278	8 5	\$ 12,869	\$ 7,912	2 5	\$ 12,389	\$	11,978	\$	6,523	\$	8,820	\$	7,69	5 \$	18,559
County Health Contribution - Kaiser Family Coverage (2018)	\$	21,205	\$ 18,539	9 5	\$ 20,410	\$ 21,169	9 9	\$ 17,439	\$	18,824	\$	15,033	\$	24,048	\$	18,57	7 \$	18,704
Annual Pension Benefit: Based on 8 years service and age 55	\$	19,806	\$ 18,695	5 5	\$ 19,913	\$ 19,535	5 5	\$ 17,770	\$	21,932	\$	33,188	\$	20,160	\$	23,74	6 \$	31,114
Pension Formula & Vesting	55; T	_	Tier 1 & 3 Enhanced 2% @ 55, up to 3% COLA, 1 year FAC period	3. C	General Classic Tier A 2% @ 55, up to 2% OLA, 3 year FAC eriod	CalPERS Tier 1 2.5% @ 55, and Tier 2 2% @ 60.	u	Fier 3 - 1.947% @55; up to 2% COLA, years to vest	8/7 up t	n 4 hired before /11 - 2% @ 55.5, to 2% COLA, 3 year C period	CalPERS @ 55	Classic - 2.5%	55, 1	2 2% @ 60, 3year	to 1/1 60; H	ERS Hired 5/4/1 1/2013 - 2% @ lired prior to 12 - 2.7% @ 55		A 2.5% @ 55; ar FAC period
Public Employees Pension Reform Act of 2013					2% at age 62 fo	r new non-safety mer	nbe	rs with an early retire	men	t age of 52 and a m	aximum b	enefit factor	of 2.5	% at age 67				
Retirement System Assumed Rate of Return		7.25%	7.00)%	7.00%	7.25% for FY 2018-19 rate, lowered to 7.00% in FY 19-20	9	7.00%	rate	for FY 2018-19 es, lowered to 6.75 FY 2019-20	rate, low	FY 2018-19 ered to FY 19-20	rate	% for FY 2018-19 lowered to % in FY 19-20	rate,	% for FY 2018-19 lowered to % in FY 19-20)	7.25%
County Pension Rate		not available	29.63	3%	21.69%	20.99	%	18.54%		32.71%	not	available		not available		22.94	%	18.95%
Retiree Health	none ACEF parti		Capped - Kaiser rate is \$1,115.84 per month for Family. No subsidy if hired after 12/31/08.	h so so P fo so \$	Capped, based on ire date and years of ervice. Hired on or fter 1/1/08 using lan 4 - Max subsidy ormula - years of ervice (up to 20) x 150 (max subsidy of 250 per month).	Subsidy to monthly health premium by converting accumulated, unused sick leave to credit for the retiree's portion the monthly premiur (Eight hours of unused, accumulated sick leave = one month of retiree health insurance premium.)	a d or of n.	\$650/annually while n active employee	get reti Ban be' hea hou	k leave does not added to rement base. ked sick leave can 'spent" on retiree lth premiums. 8 ırs buys one month etiree health.	County p	ays for single under the iree-only	PEM		PEMH (curre mont unuse accru accou only b	HCA minimum ently \$136 per in.). Accumulate ed sick leave ials paid into RH unt. Account mete used for h care-related	HRA active post cont IS Boa ay elect 2000 cont HRA serv per cont that	ted as of Jan. 1, Preceive \$2400 ribution to an after 2 years of ice. Then, \$110 month ribution after , as long as they ain in active

^{*}CalPERS Members - classic member FY 2018/19 contribution rates.



Personnel Management Division

Exempt Program1515 S Street, North Building, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 324-9381 Fax (916) 327-1886

Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Secretary, Government Operations Agency Marybel Batjer
Acting Director Adria Jenkins-Jones

November 5, 2018

State Controller's Office 300 Capitol Mall Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Exempt Pay Letter

Per Government Code section 68203, this is to notify you that the Department of Human Resources (CalHR) has adjusted the following statutory judicial salaries, effective July 1, 2018.

After CalHR calculated the 2018 Judicial Salary Increase of 2.89%, two bargaining units (5 and 9) received a general salary increase retroactive to July 1, 2018. With the inclusion of the Bargaining Unit 5 and 9 general salary increases, the 2018 calculation yields a 3.69% average percentage salary increase. To account for the difference between the previously provided 2.89% and the newly calculated 3.69%, CalHR has adjusted the judicial salaries by 0.7774% to 0.7779% as reflected in the chart below:

Class Code	Class Title	Monthly Salaries	Annual Salary	New Monthly Salary	New Annual Salary
L5987	Chief Justice	\$21,954.91	\$263,459.00	\$22,125.66	\$265,508.00
L5988	Associate Justice	\$20,936.33	\$251,236.00	\$21,099.08	\$253,189.00
L5991	Justice, Court of Appeal	\$19,627.83	\$235,534.00	\$19,780.41	\$237,365.00
L9999 Judge, Superior Court		\$17,151.91	\$205,823.00	\$17,285.33	\$207,424.00

Please note that the monthly rate may be rounded down so that the total for the twelve months does not exceed the annual amount. If you have any questions, please contact Angelina Snarr at (916) 324-9406 or Angelina.Snarr@calhr.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Manpreet Singh

Exempt Program Manager

Angelina S

(916) 323-4023

State Controller's Office Page 2

cc: Evelyn Ramos, Human Resources Supervisor Aurora Rezapour, Director, Human Resources Office Martin Hoshino, Administrative Director Millicent A. Tidwell, Chief Deputy Director John Wordlaw, Chief Administrative Officer



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Exempt Pay Letter

DATE: August 28, 2018

TO:

State Controller's Office

300 Capitol Mall

Sacramento, CA 95814

FROM:

California Department of Human Resources

Exempt Program

SUBJ:

Exempt Pay Letter

Per Government Code section 68203, this is to notify you that the Department of Human Resources (CalHR) has adjusted the following statutory judicial salaries, effective July 1, 2018. This represents a salary increase of 2.89% percent based on the figures of the average increase provided to state employees in FY 2018.

Class Code	Class Title	Monthly Salaries	Annual Salary	New Monthly Salary	New Annual Salary
L5987	Chief Justice	\$21,338.25	\$256,059.00	\$21,954.91	\$263,459.00
L5988	Associate Justice	\$20,348.25	\$244,179.00	\$20,936.33	\$251,236.00
L5991	Justice, Court of Appeal	\$19,076.50	\$228,918.00	\$19,627.83	\$235,534.00
L9999	Judge, Superior Court	\$16,670.16	\$200,042.00	\$17,151.91	\$205,823.00

Please note that the monthly rate may be rounded down so that the total for the twelve months does not exceed the annual amount. If you have any questions, please contact Angelina Snarr at (916) 324-9406 or Angelina.Snarr@calhr.ca.gov.

Manpreet Singh

Exempt Program Manager

(916) 323-4023

Manpreet.Singh@calhr.ca.gov

CC:

Evelyn Ramos, Human Resources Supervisor

Aurora Rezapour, Director, Human Resources Office

Martin Hoshino, Administrative Director Millicent A. Tidwell, Chief Deputy Director John Wordlaw, Chief Administrative Officer