



County of Yolo

www.yolocounty.org

To: The Chair and Members of the Board of Supervisors

Regular-General Government 42.
County Administrator

Board of Supervisors

Meeting Date: 03/22/2022

Brief Title: Board of Supervisors Compensation Ordinance

From: Chad Rinde, Interim County Administrator, County Administrator's Office

Staff Contact: Chad Rinde, Interim County Administrator, County Administrator's Office, x8050

Subject

Review salary survey performed and introduce by title only, waive first reading, and receive public comment on "An Ordinance Amending the Yolo County Board of Supervisors Compensation Ordinance" and continue it to the April 12, 2022 meeting for a second reading and adoption. (General fund impact \$160,345) (Rinde)

Recommended Action

Review salary survey performed and introduce by title only, waive first reading, and receive public comment on "An Ordinance Amending the Yolo County Board of Supervisors Compensation Ordinance" and continue it to the April 12, 2022 meeting for a second reading and adoption.

Strategic Plan Goal(s)



In Support of All Goals (Internal Departments Only)

Reason for Recommended Action/Background

Background

The compensation for each member of the Board of Supervisors is set by Ordinance No. 919.8 (Attachment A) which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors at their January 24, 2017 meeting. The ordinance at that time adjusted the Board's compensation to 35% from the previous amount of 33% of the annual salary paid to a judge of the Yolo County Superior Court. The adjustment in 2017 was to maintain board member compensation which otherwise would have experienced changes due to changes in retirement contributions and did not involve a broader study of Board compensation levels. The most recent comprehensive survey was in 2002 when the 33% figure was established.

Ordinance No. 919.8 (the Board Salary Ordinance) addresses the process where on June 1st of each year, the County Administrator would perform a calculation of the current salary of the Board of Supervisors, the amount of increase or decrease to salaries to the Yolo Superior Court judges since the last calculation, and the annual salary level of each member of the Board of Supervisor to ensure it continues to be thirty-five percent (35%) of the salary of a judge of the Yolo Superior Court. The revised salary becomes applicable on July 1 and the County Administrator will file a written certificate with the Clerk of the Board.

Role of the Board of Supervisors

The role of the Board of Supervisors is complex and has legislative, executive, and in certain instances, quasi-judicial authorities. The Board performs executive actions when it sets priorities for the County such as approving budgets, supervising county officers, and controlling property to meet resident needs. The Board acts as a legislative body through the adoption of resolutions, board orders, and ordinances. The Board of Supervisors also has authority to adopt local revenues through taxes, assessments and fees so long as these are appropriately adopted to fund local services. The board

also serves in quasi-judicial roles where the board may settle claims, review land use, or make tax related decisions. In addition to these duties, County Supervisors serve in a variety of capacities on various other boards, commissions, or special districts.

The County has eight elected officials of which five (5) are members of the Board of Supervisors. The present compensation for elected officials is as follows:

Position	Salary
Board of Supervisor	\$74,841
Assessor/Clerk-Recorder/Registrar	\$192,226
District Attorney	\$234,681
Sheriff	\$228,162

Salary Survey

At the December 14, 2021 Board Governance Session, the Board asked for County staff to perform a salary survey of the Board's compensation compared to peer counties. As previously mentioned, the last salary study that established the salary formula for the Board of Supervisors occurred in 2002. Since that time, County operations have grown in both scale and complexity which was part of the rationale for requesting a study:

- The County population has grown significantly from 168,660 in 2000 to 216,403 in 2020, a 28% increase, resulting in increased constituent engagement with elected supervisors.
- The County budget was \$217,693,442 (FY2001/02 Recommended) compared to \$572,862,736 (FY2021/22 Recommended), an increase of 263% demonstrating the scale of additional financial oversight responsibility of supervisors.
- The County participates in and is represented on numerous additional local, state and regional bodies since 2002 including but not limited to the Regional Child Services Support Agency, Valley Clean Energy Alliance, Yolo County Habitat Conservancy, Woodland Davis Clean Water Authority, Yolo Groundwater Sustainability Agency, all of which add to Supervisor responsibilities and are uncompensated. A full list of Supervisor assignments is included in Attachment D.

As previously described, the current Board of Supervisor salary is a fixed percentage of Superior Court Judge salaries. Following a 58-county salary survey in 2002, the Board determined the percentage of Superior Court Judge method was appropriate that 33% would reflect a fair and reasonable salary for Supervisors at the time.

County staff performed a similar analysis reviewing current Board of Supervisors compensation across the 58 counties using data as of February 2022. Many different methods are used in determining Board compensation however it should be noted that the two most common are a (1) board approved salary wherein the compensation is determined and set by the board on a periodic basis using various underlying methods and (2) establishing a percentage of compensation of a Superior Court Judge. County staff found that 21 counties (including Yolo) maintain their compensation philosophy as a percentage of Superior Court Judge. These percentages range significantly with Alpine County (population 1,204) at 15% and Los Angeles County (population 10.01 million) at 100%. The Superior Court Judge salary is standardized across the state of California and in the analysis, the constant comparable across all counties is the size of population. Thus, County staff in Attachment B analyzed the trend of Supervisor salaries (as a percentage of a superior court judge) across all 21 counties that used this method. After compiling this information, staff determined that there was a positive correlation that as population grows, the percentage used of a superior court judge also grows.

In the analysis, County staff performed a trend analysis to determine whether Yolo County at 35% was relatively over, under, or fairly compensated based on its relative size. In the analysis this resulted in a conclusion that Yolo County was under compensating supervisors based on its relative size and that a reasonable compensation level would be as high as 50% of a Superior Court Judge salary. In considering the appropriate level of compensation, staff would like to remind the Board that since April 2001 the Board has maintained a compensation philosophy to compensate Yolo County employees

within 5 percent of a benchmark of compensation for similar positions within comparable public agencies (95% of market compensation philosophy). Thus, in alignment with that philosophy, the board should consider the maximum reasonable compensation to be 47.5% of a Superior Court Judge.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend that should the Board desire to adjust the level of compensation the salary study provides a basis for adjusting compensation to 47.5% of a Superior Court Judge. Accordingly, staff has prepared an ordinance for first reading and public hearing. However, the Board can amend the percentage, if desired, or adjust the timing for implementation of an adjustment..

County staff also updated the Compensation Ordinance to address issues of timing and retroactive treatment of salary adjustments to reflect that timing of salary adjustments would at the same time and manner as Superior Court Judges. This would eliminate the annual calculation process and salary adjustments would be done at the same time as changes to judge compensation and would follow the same method (meaning retroactive adjustments if performed for judges would apply to supervisors). These changes would be applied to prospective salary adjustments assuming the ordinance is adopted.

Collaborations (including Board advisory groups and external partner agencies)

The County Administrator's Office collaborated with the District 2 and District 5 Supervisors.

Competitive Bid Process/Vendor Performance

Not applicable.

Fiscal Information

Potential fiscal impact (see notes in explanation section below)

Fiscal Impact of this Expenditure

Total cost of recommended action	\$160,345
Amount budgeted for expenditure	\$0
Additional expenditure authority needed	\$160,345
On-going commitment (annual cost)	\$160,345

Source of Funds for this Expenditure

General Fund	\$160,345
--------------	-----------

Further explanation as needed

Budget adjustments will be performed with third quarter budget monitoring as needed to implement changes adopted to the Board Compensation Ordinance.

Attachments

- Att. A. Board Compensation Ordinance
- Att. B. Board Salary Study
- Att. C. Amended Compensation Ordinance (Redline)
- Att. D. Board Assignments

Form Review

Inbox	Reviewed By	Date
Chad Rinde (Originator)	Chad Rinde	02/01/2022 07:49 AM
Jill Perez	Jill Perez	02/02/2022 09:51 AM
Financial Services	Melissa Patterson	02/08/2022 08:11 AM
County Counsel	Hope Welton	02/08/2022 09:33 AM
Phil Pogledich	Lupita Ramirez	02/14/2022 08:28 AM
Chad Rinde (Originator)	Chad Rinde	02/16/2022 08:24 AM
Phil Pogledich	Julie Dachtler	03/15/2022 08:46 AM
Chad Rinde (Originator)	Chad Rinde	03/15/2022 09:39 PM

Phil Pogledich
Joanne Van Hoosear
Form Started By: Chad Rinde
Final Approval Date: 03/17/2022

Phil Pogledich
Joanne Van Hoosear

03/17/2022 07:24 AM
03/17/2022 08:26 AM
Started On: 01/25/2022 02:39 PM