



MEETING NOTICE

**Lancaster County Elected Officials
Salary Review Committee
Tuesday, December 10, 2013 at 8:00 a.m.
County-City Building
555 South 10th Street - Suite 302
(Personnel Conference Room)**

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes for Meeting on November 13, 2013
2. Discussion - Elected Official Salary Recommendations

Public parking is available in the lot north of the County-City Building. Entrance for the public is on 10th Street. You will receive a parking pass at the meeting for exiting the lot.

Please contact Kerry or Minette at 441-7447 if you have any questions.

MINUTES
LANCASTER COUNTY ELECTED OFFICIALS SALARY REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNTY-CITY BUILDING, ROOM 302
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2013, AT 8:00 A.M.

Members Present: Steve Eicher, Former Pfizer Human Resources Director; Jim Gordon, Attorney at Law; Pat Kahm, Professional Resources Management, Inc.; Peggy Chantry, Bryan Health Compensation Coordinator; Sam Seever, Former MDS Pharma Services Vice President of Legal Services

Members Absent: Gerry Dimon, Former Ameritas Vice President of Human Resources; Joe Edwards, Former County Commissioner

Others Present: Kerry Eagan, County Chief Administrative Officer; Doug McDaniel, City-County Personnel Director; Angela Zocholl, County Clerk's Office

The meeting was called to order at 8:14 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE NOVEMBER 13, 2013 MEETING

MOTION: Eicher moved and Kahm seconded approval of the minutes. Eicher, Kahm, Chantry, Seever and Gordon voted aye. Dimon and Edwards were absent. Motion carried 5-0.

2. DISCUSSION – ELECTED OFFICIAL SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Gordon commended County officials on their ability to control expenses.

Seever felt County officials should know the salary and responsibilities when running for office, but it was important to maintain a competitive salary to attract good candidates.

Kahm noted there is no salary cap and cautioned letting salaries become unreasonable. A 2% raise every year could result in extraordinarily high salaries. She did not feel that was the case with anyone at this time, but it could be an issue in the future. Gordon noted that raises were withheld when the economy was down, so that factor could help control this.

Chantry questioned what the goal should be in setting salaries and if they should match the market midpoint. Gordon felt fairness was the ultimate goal. He would consider the individual person, the job being done and the time spent doing the job. Eicher said the job should be considered versus the individual person.

Doug McDaniel entered the meeting at 8:27 a.m.

Eicher asked McDaniel and Eagan if they felt any salaries were out of line. McDaniel said he did not find anything alarming. He noted the County Assessor/Register of Deeds takes on two areas, making it harder to compare. The County Treasurer is somewhat new in his position, but there is a question on internal inequity. McDaniel said he looks more at the internal market. He did not think there was any compression with positions right below elected officials. Eagan said last time there was concern

over the economy trumping other considerations. This time other factors, such as comparability, salary compression and cost of living, should be considered.

Kahm asked what number to use for cost of living. Eagan and McDaniel felt 2% was a good number.

Eicher suggested setting a formula relative to the consumer price index (CPI) for a baseline. Any outliers could be addressed separately, such as the Treasurer's salary.

Gordon asked if the Committee would want to handle each office separately or all in the same manner. Kahm said there could be a 2% or 2.5% baseline with exceptions based on individual positions. Gordon questioned how the baseline number should be determined and if the intent was to make up for deficiencies in the past. McDaniel said he has previously used a 5% range as a standard for comparing salaries. He suggested using a baseline and anyone outside the 5% range could be considered for an additional adjustment.

Eicher felt a 2.5% increase was too high considering the private sector has been flat with raises in the past few years. He suggested starting with the rate of 2% and adjusting the raise based on change in the CPI.

Eagan noted the County Board would take action on salaries for unclassified employees at today's Board meeting. A 2% raise is being proposed with the exception of a few positions at 3%.

The Committee discussed using 2% as a base rate annually when the CPI is between 1.5 and 2.5. Each CPI change above or below the 1.5 – 2.5 bracket changes the 2% rate up or down by 50% of the difference. For a CPI less than 1.5, the salary increase would be 2% minus 50% of the amount by which the CPI is less than 1.5. For a CPI more than 2.5, the salary increase would be 2% plus 50% of the amount by which the CPI exceeds 2.5.

The meeting was recessed at 9:14 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 9:23 a.m.

County Board of Commissioners

The Committee discussed the array of salaries for the Board of Commissioners on the Salary Survey (Exhibit A).

The consensus was to follow the 2% formula without extra adjustment, resulting in a salary of \$40,376 for 2015.

Clerk of the District Court

Eicher questioned if the salary was low. McDaniel pointed out that only Douglas County is listed on the Salary Survey (Exhibit A) and many other places appoint the Clerk of the District Court, which may not allow for a good comparison. Gordon noted that litigation against the State is filed in Lancaster County District Court, increasing the workload. The committee discussed the Clerk of the District Court's duties and compared the workload to Douglas County.

The consensus was to follow the 2% formula without extra adjustment, resulting in a salary of \$84,653 for 2015.

County Assessor/Register of Deeds

The Committee noted the salary was already above the midpoint listed on the Salary Survey (Exhibit A). Eagan explained that the position is for two combined offices, which accounts for the salary being larger.

The consensus was to follow the 2% formula without extra adjustment, resulting in a salary of \$120,051 for 2015.

County Attorney

Gordon said the main concern was keeping the salary comparable to the Public Defender.

The consensus was to follow the 2% formula without extra adjustment, resulting in a salary of \$143,268 for 2015.

County Clerk

The Committee discussed the array of County Clerk salaries on the Salary Survey (Exhibit A) and considered a 3% adjustment for 2015.

The consensus was to follow the 2% formula without extra adjustment, resulting in a salary of \$80,751 for 2015.

County Engineer

The consensus was to follow the 2% formula without extra adjustment, resulting in a salary of \$113,382 for 2015.

County Sheriff

The consensus was to follow the 2% formula without extra adjustment, resulting in a salary of \$116,056 for 2015.

County Treasurer

The Committee did not feel there was justification to treat the County Treasurer's salary differently based on population comparison. They acknowledged the great strides made in that office, but stated they could not increase salary based on merit.

The consensus was to follow the 2% formula without extra adjustment, resulting in a salary of \$84,659 for 2015.

Public Defender

The consensus was to follow the 2% formula without extra adjustment, resulting in a salary of \$143,268 for 2015.

Summary

Eagan reviewed the factors considered by the Committee in making their decision: comparability to other counties of a similar size, consistency with past years, no major changes in duties of elected officials, consistency with other County employees' raises and balanced interest of the taxpayers. He said the report would be presented at the December 19 staff meeting and distributed to the Committee prior to that date.

Kahm distributed the Elected Officials Summary Review of Last Four Years (Exhibit B) for use in future reviews.

Eagan restated the recommendation. For 2015, a 2% increase will be given for all elected officials. For 2016-2018, a 2% baseline will be used for a CPI of 1.5 – 2.5. For a CPI less than 1.5, the salary increase would be 2% minus 50% of the amount by which the CPI is less than 1.5. For a CPI more than 2.5, the salary increase would be 2% plus 50% of the amount by which the CPI exceeds 2.5.

MOTION: Eicher moved and Seever seconded to proceed with the salary formula as outlined. Eicher, Gordon, Kahm, Chantry and Seever voted aye. Dimon and Edwards were absent. Motion carried 5-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:06 a.m.

Submitted by Angela Zocholl, County Clerk's Office



ELECTED OFFICIALS SALARY SURVEY 2013

	BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS Market Salary	CLERK OF THE DISTRICT COURT Market Salary	COUNTY ASSESSOR Market Salary	REGISTER OF DEEDS Market Salary	COUNTY ATTORNEY Market Salary
DOUGLAS (Omaha, NE) 517,110	\$36,217	\$94,263	\$109,204	\$98,481	\$156,619
LINN (Cedar Rapids, IA) 211,226	\$47,406			\$94,813	\$150,790
POLK (Des Moines, IA) 430,640	\$50,834			\$101,668	\$175,373
SEDGWICK (Wichita, KS) 498,365	\$41,859			\$78,480	\$139,313
SHAWNEE (Topeka, KS) 177,934	\$43,000			\$59,225	\$139,050
SCOTT (Davenport, IA) 168,799	\$40,100			\$80,100	\$138,700
MEAN	\$43,236	\$94,263	\$109,204	\$85,461	\$149,974
MEDIAN	\$42,430	\$94,263	\$109,204	\$87,456	\$145,051
MIDPOINT	\$42,833	\$94,263	\$109,204	\$86,459	\$147,513
LANCASTER 2013	\$38,808	\$81,366	\$115,389	\$115,389	\$137,705
\$ +/-	\$4,025	\$12,897	-\$6,185	-\$28,930	\$9,808
% +/-	10.37%	15.85%	-5.36%	-25.07%	7.12%
MIDPOINT	\$42,833	\$94,263	\$109,204	\$86,459	\$147,513
LANCASTER 2014**	\$39,584	\$82,993	\$117,697	\$117,697	\$140,459
\$ +/-	\$3,249	\$11,270	-\$8,493	-\$31,238	\$7,054
% +/-	8.21%	13.58%	-7.22%	-26.54%	5.02%

**annual amounts set to 20hrs per week for comparison.*

**Lancaster County Assessor and Register of Deeds are combined.*

*** Salaries have been increased 2% based on R-09-0107 which states "Annual increase - the higher of 2% OR the increase in the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics CPI for all Urban Consumers Mid-West Region as published for November immediately preceding each January 1st, but with a maximum increase not to exceed 4%."*

ELECTED OFFICIALS SALARY SURVEY 2013

	COUNTY CLERK Market Salary	COUNTY ENGINEER Market Salary	COUNTY SHERIFF Market Salary	COUNTY TREASURER Market Salary	PUBLIC DEFENDER Market Salary
DOUGLAS (Omaha, NE) 517,110	\$107,710	\$119,919	\$110,275	\$109,552	\$153,548
LINN (Cedar Rapids, IA) 211,226		\$97,517	\$124,233	\$94,813	
POLK (Des Moines, IA) 430,640	\$102,163	\$119,768	\$145,132	\$102,163	
SEDGWICK (Wichita, KS) 498,365	\$78,480	\$111,453	\$118,036	\$78,480	\$139,313
SHAWNEE (Topeka, KS) 177,934	\$61,800	\$127,500	\$89,610	\$53,560	
SCOTT (Davenport, IA) 168,799		\$105,369	\$103,500	\$80,100	
MEAN	\$87,538	\$113,588	\$115,131	\$86,445	\$146,431
MEDIAN	\$90,322	\$115,611	\$114,156	\$87,456	\$146,431
MIDPOINT	\$88,930	\$114,599	\$114,643	\$86,951	\$146,431
LANCASTER 2013	\$77,616	\$108,979	\$111,549	\$81,372	\$137,705
\$ +/-	\$11,314	\$5,620	\$3,094	\$5,579	\$8,726
% +/-	14.58%	5.16%	2.77%	6.86%	6.34%
MIDPOINT	\$88,930	\$114,599	\$114,643	\$86,951	\$146,431
LANCASTER 2014**	\$79,168	\$111,159	\$113,780	\$82,999	\$140,459
\$ +/-	\$9,762	\$3,441	\$863	\$3,951	\$5,971
% +/-	12.33%	3.10%	0.76%	4.76%	4.25%

*** Salaries have been increased 2% based on R-09-0107 which states "Annual increase - the higher of 2% OR the increase in the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics CPI for all Urban Consumers Mid-West Region as published for November immediately preceding each January 1st, but with a maximum increase not to exceed*

Elected Officials Summary Review of Last Four Years



Position Title:

Name:

Date:

To enable the convened Salary Committee to evaluate the nature of your position and its impact, please provide information that helps the group understand your role, changes to the scope of your role and anything else that would be helpful in recommending the compensation for this elected position for the next four years.

In a brief paragraph, or even by bullet points, explain what you are responsible for within your position/department.

Please review the following functions managed by you. Review the last four years explaining any significant changes, reason for such changes and the impact the changes have had on your position/department.

- Fiscal Management/Budget
 - Please evaluate how well you believe you have managed your budget/bottom line these last four years?
- Technology
- Legislative/Compliance
- Human resources utilization/personnel count/other personnel issues/management
- Service to the public
- Scope of service provided, etc.?
- Other

From your point of view, how should the taxpayer evaluate performance of the person in this role?

What do you consider to be the most important/largest challenges that your department will face in the next several years? Please explain.

Provide any additional information you would like the committee to consider.

What salary recommendation would you make for the upcoming four year term?

- Comments associated with this recommendation?

Please attach a copy of: _____