

COMPENSATION BOARD FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS

Meeting Discussion Highlights – March 12, 2025

Members Present

Kevin Aguilar
Alisa Grandy, Chair
Aimee Smith

Members Absent

None

Guests Present

None

Staff Present

Nina M. Smith
Erin Braman
Danielle Misché

Call to Order		Nina M. Smith, Classification & Compensation Manager, called the Compensation Board for Elected Officials (CB) meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.
Welcome and Introduction of Members		Members present are Kevin Aguilar, Alisa Grandy, and Aimee Smith. Classification & Compensation staff present include Nina Smith, Erin Braman, and Danielle Misché.
Discussion		The CB went off the record at 9:06 a.m. to review the Meeting Discussion Highlights from the previous meeting. The CB went back on the record at 9:07 a.m.
Review and Approve Meeting Discussion		Meeting discussion highlights (minutes) from March 6, 2025, were reviewed and approved without any changes.
General Discussion	Decision	<p>Alisa asked Aimee if she is in agreement with the tiered approach for recommendations that Alisa and Kevin discussed last week. Aimee agrees to the approach the CB discussed at the last meeting.</p> <p>Nina noted County Administrator Schmidt was unable to attend today as the Commissioners are at their retreat. Mr. Schmidt wanted to let the CB know he doesn't agree with the elected officials being equivalent to department directors and their salaries nor the compression review to reflect a minimum 10% salary spread. Nina stated the facts we know about the differences: the EO's are accountable to the voters unlike appointed department directors who report to the County Administrator; the EO's do not attend the monthly Executive Management Team (EMT) management meetings where common county issues are addressed; due to their elected status, EO's could choose to "pull out" from the "One County" goal/strategy of the County Administrator, whereas department directors must adhere.</p> <p>Alisa noted these differences look more structural than job duties/responsibilities because some of the EO's are heads of departments. This is similar structure to the CB's review of comparables as not all are exact matches. Nina noted that Multnomah, Deschutes, and Lane counties also look at department director's salaries to align their EO's salaries.</p> <p>Nina explained the three FY Impact handouts (alignment to minimum of NRP 40, alignment to minimum NRP 38, and a traditional implementation that does not include a salary grade alignment). All monthly rates include county paid deferred compensation.</p>

		<p>Alisa pointed out that if the CB decides to use the minimum of salary grade NRP 40, it appears to be a high ask, impacting three EO's. If the CB uses the minimum of salary grade NRP 38 this is only around \$16,000 above the traditional implementation cost, impacting two EO's. Kevin indicated that using NRP 38 versus traditional approach moves the Justice of the Peace pay rate more which helps for the upcoming recruitment.</p> <p>Aimee asked if they should run through an exercise that might meet the concerns of the County Administrator. Kevin noted that perhaps the 10% compression is too large.</p> <p>Aimee asked about the CA's concern regarding the 10% compression review. Nina noted that Sheriff is impacted by the compression review, and only for a 2% adjustment. Aimee said we could document that this compression review is not a large deviation from existing county compensation practices. Nina noted that other jurisdictions consider compression and Deschutes County uses a 5% spread. Kevin noted that we could change our standard to a 5% spread; it would only affect the Sheriff. Alisa wants to make sure the CB doesn't change their approach too often. Nina asked for clarification if looking at the department directors' salary grade is a new prong to the process or just a consideration this year. The CB agreed this is a new prong.</p> <p>Nina went off the record at 9:30 a.m. to get the flip charts that the CB worked on two meetings ago.</p> <p>The CB went back on the record at 9:32 a.m.</p> <p>The CB reviewed the examples they drew out using COLA first and then using minimum of the NRP grade first, noting the difference was very small.</p>
	Decision	<p>Kevin suggested instead of adding a new step, they add the adjustment for department directors' salary grade into #3's order of process (market comparators). This broadens the consideration for comparators to include market and a consideration utilizing NRP 38. Alisa agreed presenting them together may be more palatable.</p> <p>To summarize clarified three-pronged formula:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) COLA – applied every year 2) Compression – will evaluate each year 3) Market/Department Directors' salary grade NRP 38 (internal/external) comparators – will evaluate each year
	Decision	<p>The CB discussed they will move forward using the salary grade NRP 38.</p> <p>Nina pulled up the worksheet to use as a visual for the CB members to decide which order of process they would like to use. Nina noted that the narrative we have heard for the EOs is for post-COLA alignment and CB is currently matching to the minimum of NRP 38 pre-COLA. Aimee suggested re-titling the column to 'Minimum of FY 25/26' for grade NRP 38 which will include the COLA.</p> <p>Nina noted moving from the minimum of NRP 40 to NRP 38 may address Gary's concern. Alisa noted using the minimum of a department directors' salary grade addresses the EOs' concerns who act as department heads.</p>

	Decision	<p>Formal Recommendations – All recommendations are applied to Elected Officials’ “adjusted” pay rates which includes deferred compensation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ COLA: 2.8% ○ Compression: Not a factor ○ Market Comparators (external/internal): heard from the Assessor; CB confirmed market comparators; 5.7% above market average pre-COLA and above minimum of NRP 38. ○ Recommendation for Assessor: 2.8% COLA • Clerk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ COLA: 2.8% ○ Compression: Not a factor ○ Market Comparators (external/internal): heard from the Clerk; 7.8% below average pre-COLA, 4.9% below post-COLA; below market comparators. ○ Recommendation for Clerk: 2.8% COLA; Minimum of Salary Grade NRP 38 July 1-FY 25/26. • County Commissioners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ COLA: 2.8% ○ Compression: n/a ○ Market: 2.9% below average pre-COLA but with COLA no adjustment recommended. Do not act as department head. ○ Recommendation for County Commissioners: 2.8% COLA <p>County Commissioner, Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommendation for Board Chair: An additional 1% to the current 2% add-to-pay for a total recommendation of 3% add-to-pay. • District Attorney (County paid supplemental salary): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ COLA: 2.8% ○ Compression: Not a factor ○ Market Comparators (external/internal): 14.3% above average pre-COLA and above minimum of NRP 38 ○ Recommendation for District Attorney: 2.8% COLA • Justice of the Peace: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ COLA: 2.8% ○ Compression: Not a factor ○ Market Comparators (external/internal): heard from the Justice of the Peace; 4.5% below average pre-COLA, 1.7% below post-COLA. Below minimum of NRP 38. ○ Recommendation for Justice of the Peace: 2.8% COLA; 1.7% increase to address below market and increase to Minimum of Salary Grade NRP 38 July 1-FY 25/26 • Sheriff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ COLA: 2.8% ○ Compression: 2% increase for CB’s philosophy to maintain 10% spread with highest paid Undersheriff.
--	----------	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Market Comparators (external/internal): heard from the Sheriff; 12.6% above average pre-COLA and above minimum of NRP 38. ○ Recommendation for Sheriff: 2.8% COLA; 2.0% adjustment due to compression <p>• Treasurer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ COLA: 2.8% ○ Compression: Not a factor ○ Market Comparators (external/internal): 0.2% above average pre-COLA and above minimum of NRP 38. ○ Recommendation for Treasurer: 2.8% COLA <p>CB went off the record at 10:04 a.m. for staff to prepare final recommendation documents for members to review and sign forms based on today's discussion and decisions.</p> <p>Decision</p> <p>The CB went back on the record at 11: 36 a.m.</p> <p>Nina asked the CB if they are in agreement with the wording and content of the recommendation documents: CB Cover Memo to Budget Committee; CB Recommendations Summary. Alisa moved to adopt the recommendations documents and Aimee seconded the motion.</p> <p>Nina mentioned that she and Alisa can meet at a later time to prepare the power point presentation for the CB recommendations to the Budget Committee. The power point presentation will reflect the wording and content of the CB approved recommendation documents. The CB presentation is scheduled for April 29. Nina and Alisa intend to meet on April 9.</p> <p>Nina recognized and thanked Alisa for eight years of service to the Compensation Board of Elected Officials. Thank you Alisa! This will also be Kevin's last year on the Compensation Board as he moves into the Clackamas County Recruitment Manager role later this month. Thank you Kevin for your time as a CB member!</p>
Next Year Suggestions		<p>The CB will start their meetings next year in January.</p> <p>Need to prepare tentative CB meeting schedule in October. Perhaps 5 meetings will be needed.</p> <p>We will invite the CA to the first meeting.</p> <p>Next year's review will include the big every three year's in-depth match analysis.</p> <p>We will have two new members to orient to CB processes. Alisa suggested a review of the CB onboarding process to make it more effective in getting new CB members up to speed quickly.</p> <p>Nina noted the two openings and to spread the word. Recruiting will occur early in the Fall.</p>

		<p>Alisa suggested to possibly increase the CB a four member board, due to turnover in recent years.</p> <p>Kevin suggested scheduling presenters for the first meeting so it is easier for CB to move forward with decisions and recommendations. Aimee noted for next year with the CA attending the first meeting it may make more sense for other presenters to attend the second meeting.</p> <p>Aimee suggested thinking about potential inclement weather in January and the option to do meetings virtually.</p>
Recommendations		All members signed the cover sheet for the recommendations.
Adjourn		Meeting adjourned at 11:44 a.m.

Upcoming meetings/events:

- Compensation Board Recommendations presented to Budget Committee: Tuesday, April 29, 2025 (in-person)

Comp Board Handouts:

- Agenda
- Meeting Discussion Highlights from March 6, 2025
- FY Cost documents
- Salary Recommendations Cover Sheet
- Compensation Board Recommendations

Audio recording is available upon request.