



Contra  
Costa  
County

To: Board of Supervisors  
From: David Twa, County Administrator  
Date: February 10, 2015

Subject: OPTIONS FOR SETTING BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEMBER SALARIES

---

**RECOMMENDATION(S):**

CONSIDER report on options for setting Board of Supervisors member salaries.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None. This is an informational report.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Board of Supervisors requested a report for the February 10, 2015 Board meeting on options to consider for setting their salaries, as well as possible amount. The last time the Board increased their salaries was July 1, 2007 when they received a 2% cost of living adjustment (COLA). The Supervisors also took wage reductions of 2.75% from July 1, 2009 through July 31, 2013 along with a majority of the County Employees.

**There are a variety of ways that the Counties of California set salaries for Supervisors:**

1. As a percentage of Superior Court Judges:

The Board has already seen information about what the Bay Area Counties and what large Urban Counties do, both as it relates to methods for setting salaries and as to

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEE

---

Action of Board On: **02/10/2015** ☐ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☒ OTHER

Clerks Notes: See Addendum - Multiple Motions

**VOTE OF SUPERVISORS**

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor  
Candace Andersen, District II Supervisor  
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor  
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 10, 2015

, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

NO: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: David Twa  
925-335-1080

cc:

current salary levels. Attached are the materials previously provided to the Board of Supervisors. A quick summary of those materials indicates that the Counties of Alameda, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma were used in the Salary Survey. Six of the eight Counties set their salaries as a percentage of that of the Superior Court Judges. Additionally, of the 12 Counties in California designated as “Urban Counties” based on population, 8

## BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

>

of those also set their Supervisors Salaries as a percentage of that of the Superior Court Judges. Among the 9 Bay Area Counties, Contra Costa County is the third most populous county.

Under state law, judicial salaries are linked to pay increases for other state workers. The law requires judicial salaries to increase by the average salary increase for state employees, negotiated through labor contracts. This is pursuant to provisions of California Government Code section 68203, subdivision (a). Yearly increases in judicial salaries are automatically linked to salary increases received by executive branch employees as negotiated through statewide collective bargaining agreements. After the agreements are executed, the California Department of Human Resources calculates the proposed increase amount and submits a formal Exempt Pay Letter to the Office of the State Controller.

2. Some California counties continue to set Supervisors salaries by an Ordinance process.
3. Some California counties use Ad Hoc Compensation Committees to recommend adjustments to Supervisors salaries. Santa Barbara County's Ad Hoc Committee has members selected by the CEO with input by the Board of Supervisors members. Their committee consists of representatives from the taxpayers' association, chambers of commerce, non-profits, and private sector businesses. San Luis Obispo has a similar Ad Hoc Committee.
4. San Francisco City and County (a charter county) uses their Civil Service Commission to set elected officials' salaries, including those of the Supervisors on a five-year cycle.
5. The state of California uses a California Citizens Compensation Commission to set the salaries of the elected state officers, including the Governor, and members of the Legislature.
6. Here is an example from another state:

"Gallatin County, MO: There is a county compensation board consisting of the county commissioners, three of the county officials described in subsection (1) appointed by the board of county commissioners, the county attorney, and two to four resident taxpayers appointed initially by the board of county commissioners to staggered terms of 3 years, with the initial appointments of one or two taxpayer members for a 2-year term and one or two taxpayer members for a 3-year term. The county compensation board shall hold hearings annually for the purpose of reviewing the compensation paid to county officers. The county compensation board may consider the compensation paid to comparable officials in other Montana counties, other states, state government, federal government, and private enterprise.

The county compensation board shall prepare a compensation schedule for the elected county officials, including the county attorney, for the succeeding fiscal year. The schedule must take into consideration county variations, including population, the number of residents living in unincorporated areas, assessed valuation, motor vehicle registrations, building permits, and other factors considered necessary to reflect the variations in the workloads and responsibilities of county officials as well as the tax resources of the county.

A recommended compensation schedule requires a majority vote of the county compensation board, and at least two county commissioners must be included in the majority. A recommended compensation schedule may not reduce the salary of a county officer that was in effect on May 1, 2001."

### **Consideration of Salary level**

As to what should be the salary level, there have been many suggestions from Supervisors, employee labor groups, and the general public. As to the process and an appropriate level, one of many options that the Board of Supervisors could consider would be a hybrid approach:

- Adopt an ordinance now increasing the salary by the amounts given to employees in July, 2014 (4%) plus the 3% employees will receive on July 1, 2015 (current salary of \$97,483 plus 7% compounded = \$104,424)
- With or without tying that amount to a % of the judge's salary (rounding to 57% of judges salary would be \$105,228)
- Appoint a 'citizens commission' to review and make recommendations for what would be an appropriate salary after that time (either by adjusting the percentage tied to the judges salaries or a new salary ordinance).
- Possible members of a citizens salary review commission could be representatives from some or all of the following:
  - Civil Grand Jury
  - Taxpayers' Association
  - East Bay Leadership Council (formerly the Contra Costa Council)
  - Non-profit organizations
  - Labor organizations
  - Registered voters
  - Mayors' Association

### **CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:**

None. This is an informational report.

### **CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:**

Not applicable.

### **CLERK'S ADDENDUM**

*Speakers: Margaret Hanlon-Gradie, Contra Costa AFL-CIO Labor Council; Mark Peterson, resident of Contra Costa; Eileen Bissen, resident of Contra Costa.*

*DIRECTED the County Counsel to prepare two ordinances for possible introduction on March 3, 2015: one authorizing a 7% (based on a 4% general COLA granted to employees in July 2014 plus a 3% COLA that employees will receive on July 1, 2015) increase to the Board of Supervisors member salaries to the level of \$104,307, and an alternate ordinance that additionally links the Board's salary level to that of Superior Court Judge's salary.* AYE: District I Supervisor John Gioia, District II Supervisor Candace Andersen, District IV Supervisor Karen Mitchoff, District V Supervisor Federal D. Glover NO: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho

*DIRECTED the County Administrator to convene an ad hoc committee to study the Board of Supervisors compensation; one person to be selected from each of the following organizations (organization will choose the representative):*

- a) Contra Costa County Civil Grand Jury b) Contra Costa County Taxpayers Association c) East Bay Leadership Council (formally the Contra Costa Council) d) Contra Costa County Central Labor Council e) Contra Costa County Human Service Alliance*

*The committee is requested to :*

- a) Review current compensation of Board of Supervisors b) Recommend any adjustment to current level of compensation c) Recommend methodology and process by which any future adjustments would occur d) Prepare recommendations for Board of Supervisors consideration no later than June 30, 2015.*

AYE: District I Supervisor John Gioia, District II Supervisor Candace Andersen, District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho, District IV Supervisor Karen Mitchoff, District V Supervisor Federal D. Glover

#### ATTACHMENTS

Board of Supervisors Salary Comparison\_October 2014