

**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 count to court).

**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. Nae (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.

**2. 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.

**4. 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 Janus Report, 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. TOPICS OF REVIEW**

### **A. Salary Cap – County Supervisor**

#### **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 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 Analysis of Work Hours study is attached to this Report (Exhibit 3)

**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 Janus Report, 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. Personnel Director – Selection / Appointing Authority**

**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:

**I. 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 Council – 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 Council 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 Council or Board of Supervisors.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends that Section 507 of the County Charter be amended so that the position of County Council "... 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 be 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.

**EXHIBIT 1**

## BOS Salary Study

County	Population as of 1/1/07	Current Annual Salary	Total County Budget	Total FTE	Base Salary Methodology	Salary increase methodology
Alameda	1,526,148	137,318	\$2,360,221,864	9081	Judges (80%)	As Judges
Alpine	1,261	25,176	\$25,000,000	70	Ordinance	Only by Board vote
Amador	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
Butte	218,069	48,581	\$360,192,182	2300	Judges (66%)	Adjusted annually on July 1 according to se for judges and does not exceed 5%.
Calaveras	46,028		\$ 104,650,273		Ordinance	Only by Board vote
Colusa	21,951	24,000	\$ 60,898,778		Ordinance	Only by Board vote
Contra Costa	1,042,341	95,572	\$ 1,248,308,445	5,658	Ordinance	Only by Board vote
Del Norte	29,341	28,080	\$ 43,441,973	482	Ordinance	Only by Board vote
El Dorado	178,674	\$76,876	\$474,100,000	2,093	Ordinance set by Board members	Set by ordinance that the Board of Supervis salaries shall increase in the same proporti increases in salary for elected department I
Esno	917,515	\$102,989	\$1,652,055,199	8,018	Judges (60%) 3/22/94	Adjusted according to salary increases give Judges of the Superior Court of California

County	Population as of 1/1/07	Current Annual Salary	Total County 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 thereafter as the board may deem appropriate, the Board of Supervisors will establish by ordinance the compensation of the supervisors, or may elect other County employees, to receive a salary based on the County pay schedule, which shall 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 other members of the Board of Supervisors. In the event the supervisors do not enact an annual ordinance adjusting salaries, the supervisors shall continue to receive the compensation pursuant to the last valid enacted ordinance.
Humboldt	131,959	73,920	\$ 263,205,062	2,056	Ordinance	Only by Board vote
Imperial	172,672	\$51,070	\$293,806,694	2,105	Ordinance set by Board members	Determined according to adjustments confirmed 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	55,931	\$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, Supervisor's 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 years

34

County	Population as of 1/1/07	Current Annual Salary	Total County 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 granted to 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 for San Francisco-San Jose-Oakland. However, there would be no CPI increase in years that the Jury is summoned to review and reset the CPI 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 judge salary in effect on January 1.
Mendocino County	90,291	68,840	\$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 annually according to a salary survey of surrounding comparable counties - not to exceed 5%.
Modoc	9,721	13,200	\$ 32,228,015	229	Ordinance	Same Salary increase as other bargaining units.
Mono	13,985	40,064	\$ 45,453,966		Ordinance	Only by Board vote
Monterey	425,960	113,196	\$ 879,800,000	4,559	Judges (65%)	
Napa County	135,969	80,829	\$276,708,214	1,339	Judges (47.09%)	Adjusted annually according to judges salary increases
Nevada	99,766	39,447	\$180,121,519	986	Ordinance	Board vote
Orange	3,098,121	137,318	\$ 5,904,027,069	18,733	Judges (80%)	

35

County	Population as of 1/1/07	Current Annual Salary	Total County 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	21,128	38,040	\$ 81,340,419	438	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 increases
Sacramento	1,406,804	94,404	\$2,863,597,225	14,428	Ordinance adopted by the Board	The annual salary increase shall not exceed 3%
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 salary increases
San Francisco	808,844	92,901	\$ 6,065,992,294	27,990	Ordinance	
San Joaquin	679,687	73,278	\$1,129,000,000		same as increase methodology	Based on scheduled total compensation survey salary set at median. (10 County survey - Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Kern, Sacramento, Santa Clara, Sonoma, Stanislaus, 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 and 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 officials. Approve in Oct, takes effect in Dec.
Santa Clara	1,808,058	137,318	\$3,900,000,000	15,000	Executive Management Ordinance adopted by Board	The annual rate of 80% of the annual salary of Superior Court Judge of the State of California 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	99,424	\$317,390,792	2,455	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	33,129	\$ 111,188,924	744	Ordinance	Annual COLA based on CPI
Yuba	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 Court Judges and these can occur at any time during the year.
Stanislaus	521,497	68,073	\$ 272,920,531	4,582	Avg of Fresno, Kern, 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 Dept brought to the Board for approval. (Board does not approve an increase for themselves in 2004, 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 majority of the people.
Trinity	14,171	25,008				
Tulare	429,006	80,537	\$614,798,095	4,919	Ordinance set by Board members	Annual raises are determined by using the average salary adjustments, other than merit performance, of other county elected officials during any calendar year.

37

County	Population as of 1/1/07	Current Annual 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 BO is appropriate.
Ventura	825,512	113,338	\$1,541,213,431	7,932	Judges (70%)	At same time as Superior Court Judge, with cap each year.
Yolo	193,983	49,730	\$299,191,305	1,739	Judges (40%) Feb 07	Adjusted annually according to judges salary increases
Yuba	70,745	46,248	\$154,212,245	1,045	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 increases given by the State of CA to judges.

## BOS Salary Survey June 2007

Sort by Salary			Sort by Population			Sort by Budget					Sort by Sala	
County	Population as of 1/1/07	Current Annual Salary	County	Population as of 1/1/07	Current Annual Salary	County	Population as of 1/1/07	Current Annual Salary	Total County Budget	Total FTE	County	Populr as of 1
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 Dorado	17
Riverside	2,031,825	137,318	San Diego	3,088,299	137,318	San Francisco	808,844	82,901	6,085,992,294	27,690	Mendocino	8
Santa Clara	1,808,058	137,318	Orange	3,088,121	137,318	Orange	3,088,121	137,318	5,904,027,069	18,733	Butte	21
San Diego	3,088,299	137,318	Riverside	2,031,825	137,318	San Diego	3,088,299	137,318	4,193,000,000	18,844	Nevada	8
Alameda	1,528,148	137,318	San Bernardino	2,028,013	121,024	Santa Clara	1,808,058	137,318	3,900,000,000	15,000	Sutter	8
Orange	3,088,121	137,318	Santa Clara	1,808,058	137,318	Riverside	2,031,825	137,318	3,880,000,000	17,285	Placer	32
Sonoma County	481,785	123,578	Alameda	1,528,148	137,318	San Bernardino	2,028,013	121,024	3,428,014,833	18,168		
San Bernardino	2,028,013	121,024	Sacramento	1,408,804	94,404	Sacramento	1,408,804	94,404	2,893,597,225	14,428		
Ventura	825,512	113,338	Contra Costa	1,042,341	95,572	Alameda	1,528,148	137,318	2,380,221,884	8081		
Monterey	425,980	113,198	Fresno	917,515	102,988	Fresno	917,515	102,988	1,652,085,189	8,018		
Fresno	917,515	102,988	Ventura	825,512	113,338	San Mateo	733,486	85,896	1,648,095,478	5,777		
Santa Cruz	284,125	89,424	San Francisco	808,844	82,901	Ventura	825,512	113,338	1,541,219,431	7,932		
Contra Costa	1,042,341	95,572	Kern	801,848	83,070	Kern	801,848	83,070	1,384,730,300			
Sacramento	1,408,804	94,404	San Mateo	733,486	85,896	Contra Costa	1,042,341	95,572	1,248,308,445	5,858		
San Francisco	808,844	82,901	San Joaquin	879,887	73,278	San Joaquin	879,887	73,278	1,128,000,000			
San Joaquin	255,982	81,957	Stanislaus	521,497	68,073	Sonoma	481,785	123,578	1,100,000,000	5,212		
Solano	424,823	80,972	Sonoma County	481,785	123,578	Solano	424,823	80,972	990,528,548	3,092		
San Mateo	733,486	85,896	Tulare	428,008	80,537	Monterey	425,980	113,198	879,800,000	4,559		
Santa Barbara	424,425	84,200	Monterey	425,980	113,198	Santa Barbara	424,425	84,200	712,709,201	4,298		
Kern	801,848	83,070	Solano	424,823	80,972	Placer	324,495	30,000	838,481,479	2,827		
Napa County	135,989	80,829	Santa Barbara	424,425	84,200	Tulare	428,008	80,537	614,798,085	4,919		
Tulare	428,008	80,837	Placer	324,495	30,000	San Luis Obispo	284,900	79,014	474,898,770	2,501		
San Luis Obispo	284,900	79,014	San Luis Obispo	284,900	79,014	El Dorado	178,874	78,878	474,100,000	2,093		
El Dorado	178,874	78,878	Santa Cruz	284,125	89,424	Merced	251,510	89,380	418,308,806	2,312		
Humboldt	131,859	73,920	Marin	255,982	91,857	Marin	255,982	91,857	402,209,000	2,193		
San Joaquin	879,887	73,278	Merced	251,510	89,380	Butte	218,088	48,581	380,192,182	2,300		
Merced	251,510	89,380	Butte	218,088	48,581	Santa Cruz	284,125	89,424	317,390,792	2,455		
Madera	148,721	68,859	Yolo	193,983	49,730	Shasta	181,401	54,800	310,277,475	1,918		
Mendocino	90,291	88,848	Shasta	181,401	54,800	Yolo	193,983	49,730	288,191,305	1,739		
Stanislaus	521,497	68,073	El Dorado	178,874	78,878	Imperial	172,872	51,069	293,808,894	2,105		
Lake	84,278	57,889	Imperial	172,872	51,070	Napa County	135,989	80,829	278,708,214	1,339		
Kings	151,381	55,931	Kings	151,381	55,931	Stanislaus	521,497	68,073	272,920,531	4,582		
Shasta	181,401	54,800	Madera	148,721	68,859	Humboldt	131,859	73,920	283,205,082	2,056		
Amador	38,435	51,494										
Imperial	172,872	51,070										
Yolo	193,983	49,730										
Butte	218,088	48,581										
Calaveras	48,028	48,110										
Colusa	18,383	48,448										
Colusa	70,745	48,248										
San Benito	57,803	48,150	Tehama County	81,774	12,540	Tuolumne	57,223	37,210	122,852,221	940		
Lassen	38,375	42,912	San Benito	57,803	48,150	Tehama	81,774	12,540	120,247,258	828		
Mono	13,985	41,064	Tuolumne	57,223	37,210	San Benito	57,803	48,150	112,000,000	450		
Nevada	99,768	39,447	Calaveras	48,028	48,110	Siskiyou	45,953	33,129	111,188,824	744		
Plumas	21,128	38,040	Starkyou	45,953	33,129	Calaveras	48,028	48,110	104,650,273			
Mariposa	18,254	37,280	Amador	38,435	51,494	Lassen	38,375	42,912	87,333,980	472		
Tuolumne	57,223	37,210	Lassen	38,375	42,912	Mariposa	18,254	37,280	92,538,294	403		
Sutter	93,919	34,471	Del Norte	29,341	28,080	Plumas	21,128	38,040	81,340,419	438		
Siskiyou	45,953	33,129	Glenn	28,915	30,285	Inyo	18,383	48,448	78,088,478	534		
Sierra	3,485	31,000	Colusa	21,951	24,000	Amador	38,435	51,494	73,705,727	515		
Glenn	28,915	30,285	Plumas	21,128	38,040	Glenn	28,915	30,285	64,883,927	466		
Placer	324,495	30,000	Inyo	18,383	48,448	Colusa	21,951	24,000	80,898,778			
Del Norte	29,341	28,080	Mariposa	18,254	37,280	Mono	13,985	41,064	45,453,988			
Alpine	1,281	25,178	Trinity	14,171	25,008	Del Norte	29,341	28,080	43,441,973	482		
Trinity	14,171	25,008	Mono	13,985	41,064	Modoc	9,721	15,858	32,226,015	229		
Colusa	21,951	24,000	Modoc	9,721	15,858	Alpine	1,281	25,178	25,000,000	70		
Modoc	9,721	15,858	Sierra	3,485	31,000	Sierra	3,485	31,000	18,148,284	119		
Tehama County	81,774	12,540	Alpine	1,281	25,178	Trinity	14,171	25,008				

39

Salaries & Pay Increases Tied to Superior Court Judges Pay	
County	%
Alameda	80
Amador	25% July 1, 2008; 30% July 1, 07; 35% July 1, 06; 40% July 1, 05
Butte	66
Fresno	80
Lassen	25
Los Angeles	100
Mariposa	25
Mendocino	40 Reviewed every two years
Monterey	50
Napa	47.09
Orange	80
Riverside	80
San Diego	80
Santa Clara	80
Sierra	18
Solano	53
Sonoma	72
Ventura	70
Yolo	33

Salaries Determined by Survey of Benchmark Counties			
County	Auto	Board Vote	Notes
Merced	X		Avg of Survey Adjusted annually, not exceed 5%
San Bernardino	X		Avg of Survey Annually every Jan 1st
San Joaquin	X		Median of Survey
San Luis Obispo		X	Avg of Survey Adjusted Annually
Santa Barbara		X	
Santa Cruz		X	Avg of Survey
Stanislaus	X		Avg of Survey Every Jan 1st
Blank			
Counties not responding and/or info not available online:			
Contra Costa			
Humboldt			
Kern			
San Francisco			
Trinity			

Alpine	
Colusa	
Del Norte	
Inyo	
Imperial	Determined according to adjustments conferred on employees.
Kings	
Modoc	
Mono	
Nevada	
Plumas	Adjusted annually by the CPI
Sacramento	Not to exceed 7%
San Benito	
Shasta	No adjustments since 02
Siskiyou	Adjusted annually by the CPI
Sutter	
Tulare	Determined by using the average salary adjustment of other elected officials
Tuolumne	

Other	
County	Notes
Calaveras	50% of the average between the Auditor, Treasure-Tax Collector, Assessor, Clerk-Recorder and Sheriff.
El Dorado	Raises are that of El Dorado County's Elected Bargaining unit that is brought to the Board for adoption
Glenn	On January 1 the Board will establish, by ordinance, the compensation of the supervisors, or may elect to receive a salary based on the County pay schedule, which shall specify the range and step as appropriate. In the event they do not adjust their salaries, they will continue to receive the compensation pursuant to the last valid enacted ordinance
Lake	Supervisors salary is 65% of the average of the other Lake County elected officials (e.g. sheriff, DA, assessor-recorder, clerk-auditor-controller, and treasurer-tax collector.)
Madera	
Martin	Annually, IAW BLS CPI-U for San Francisco-San Jose-Oakland. No CPI increase in years the Grand Jury reviews the salary based on a survey of comparator counties (every 4 years).
Placer	Vote Initiative
San Mateo	Vote Initiative: Establish by ordinance or resolution the compensation of officers and employees and by ordinance the compensation of Supervisors, provided however that the compensation of a Supervisor shall not increase during the term of office for which the supervisor was elected, nor within ninety (90) days preceding the election, above the percentage of increase in the costs of living, to be determined by the Controller as of November 1st of each year as shown in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area, not to exceed five percent (5%) per year; any amount of increase in the cost of living in excess of five percent (5%) may be accumulated and applied to increases in salary in future years.
Tehama	Vote Initiative
Yuba	Adjusted annually by % increase of Superior Court Judges

40

**EXHIBIT 2**

**Charter Review Committee  
Comparative County Salary Survey Summary  
Salary Summary**

County	Salary	Method	Retirement	Health	Insurance	Allowances	Expenditures
Contra Costa	\$97,479	Set by Ordinance - amt. effective 7-1-07	No agreement - set \$12,000 annual contribution to each County's plan			Automobile allowance of \$600 month plus mileage at IRS rate.	Contribution to deferred comp.
El Dorado	\$78,876	Set by Ordinance	CalPERS - based on department's needs survey	Health/Dental/Vision	Life Insurance		Contribution to deferred comp.
Placer	\$90,000	Vote initiative - amendment to County Charter	CalPERS - based on department's needs survey	Optional with payment for Health/Dental/Vision	Life Insurance		Contribution to deferred comp.
Sacramento	\$94,400	Indexed - Judges 55%	County Plan - based on department's needs survey	Medical - 80% of least expensive HMO, Dental \$95.34/mo	Life Insurance	Education reimbursement \$1,200/FY, contribution to 401K, 1% of gross pay	Contribution to deferred comp.
Santa Clara	\$137,318	Indexed - Judges - 85%	CalPERS - based on department's needs survey	Health/Dental/Vision	Life Insurance	Vehicle allowance	Contribution to deferred comp.
Solano	\$90,873	Indexed - Judges - 53%	CalPERS plan, retirement provided		Life Insurance	Vehicle allowance of \$10,400 per year.	
Sonoma	\$141,862	Indexed - Judges - 72% - 75% in 2008	Same as county's plan	Medical 84% of indexed plan, Vision and Dental		Automobile, 6% contribution to deferred comp. and professional development.	
Santa Cruz	\$96,424	Average of comparable Counties	CalPERS - based on department's needs survey	Health/Dental/Vision	Life Insurance		
San Luis Obispo	\$78,014	Set by Ordinance	CalPERS - based on department's needs survey	Health/Dental/Vision	Life Insurance	Contribution - deferred comp. and education	

Average: 98419  
 Placer County: 30000  
 Difference: -68419  
 Difference - percent: -0.6951806

**EXHIBIT 3**



MEMORANDUM  
From the office of the  
Placer County Board of Supervisors

Mike Boyle, Assistant County Executive / [mboyle@placer.ca.gov](mailto:mboyle@placer.ca.gov)  
Teri Sayad, Sr. Administrative Aide to the Board / [tsayad@placer.ca.gov](mailto:tsayad@placer.ca.gov)  
Ann Holman, Clerk of the Board / [aholman@placer.ca.gov](mailto: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 spent 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 per 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 = 51.4 hours a week

This does not include social or community events that the Supervisors frequently attend.

