

COMPENSATION BOARD FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS

Meeting Discussion Highlights – February 27, 2025

Members Present

Kevin Aguilar
Alisa Grandy
Aimee Smith

Guests Present

Catherine McMullen, County Clerk
Karen Brisbin, Justice of the Peace

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 2:03 p.m.
Welcome and Introduction of Members		All members present. Classification & Compensation staff present include Nina Smith, Erin Braman, and Danielle Misché.
Recognition of Guests		The County Clerk Catherine McMullen arrived at the beginning of the CB meeting. The Justice of the Peace Karen Brisbin arrived at 3:55 p.m.
County Clerk Presentation		<p>The Clerk's presentation is available upon request. This is Clerk McMullen's third year presenting to the Compensation Board. She began her presentation by reviewing the minimum qualifications for County Clerk, and her specific qualifications as the current County Clerk. Primary roles as Clackamas County Clerk include elections administration, organization and access to public records, recording all real property transactions, issuing marriage licenses, and officiating weddings. She is a department director responsible for three divisions: Recording, Elections, and Records Management, with approximately 20 regular staff and a budget of \$6.16M (of which 60% is self-funded). Clackamas County is the largest county with an elected Clerk.</p> <p>Records Management – retains and preserves county public records. Is also a passport acceptance facility for the U.S. State Department.</p> <p>Recording – Anytime you buy or sell property it gets recorded through the Clerk's Office, Recording Division. All marriages must have a license issued from the Clerk's Office. Some significant improvements include strengthened staffing (includes all positions reviewed by the C&C team), finished backlog of indexing from the pandemic, now an emerging leader in the state on best practices.</p> <p>Elections – Conducts all local, state and federal elections. Maintains voter registrations and filings, has 120 districts in Clackamas County which is the most in the State. Improvements include strengthened staffing (includes all positions reviewed by C&C team), opened 2nd location to establish east county voter center in Happy Valley, conducting facility remodels with focus on safety and security, incorporating new technology, and won award for communication around the November election.</p> <p>Nina asked about the requirements of the Clerk at other jurisdictions. Clerk McMullen stated that Multnomah and Washington counties are Home Rule</p>

		<p>meaning they have their own charter that they follow. Clackamas County is statutory (follows statutes) and is the largest County in the state to do so.</p> <p>The Clerk noted she is the lowest paid county Elected Official and is paid lower than all department Deputy Directors. She works an average of 50-60 hours per week, 6 days per week.</p> <p>The Clerk does not believe the matches are valid. Clackamas County is a Portland metro area Clerk and does more in her role than the matches. Example is that Deschutes, Lane and Marion clerks do not have a vote center, do not officiate weddings. Deschutes and Lane do not have ballot tracking.</p> <p>Aimee asked if there are other matches that the CB is not using. Clerk McMullen believes the others wouldn't include all the roles her department provides. Example provided is Multnomah County which has roles/functions spread across several departments.</p>
Discussion		<p>Alisa noted that the County Clerk's topics are similar to the County Assessor's concerns. She also noted that the number of staff does not feel like a reasonable measure of workload. Aimee mentioned that the number of distinct areas is more important.</p> <p>The CB went off the record at 2:31 p.m. to review the Meeting Discussion Highlights from the previous meeting.</p> <p>The CB went back on the record at 2:36 p.m.</p>
Review and Approve Meeting Discussion		Meeting discussion highlights (minutes) from February 19, 2025, were reviewed and approved without any changes.
Distribute and Discuss Updates	Action	<p>Philosophy of County Sheriff's Salary from Other Agencies: Erin noted none of the other jurisdictions have a set philosophy similar to ours except Marion County which ensures the Sheriff is paid at least one dollar more per year any other Sheriff's Office staff.</p> <p>The question about the budget last week: Nina stated there were no set budget exercises. Departments are expected to submit a balanced budget within the escalator amount (COLA, etc.).</p> <p>Scope of Tax Collection in Other Agencies: Danielle reviewed the tax revenue collection from the various jurisdictions. Clark and Deschutes have tax collection but not within the Assessor's Office. She noted an error on the Assessor's data sheet – it notes that Marion County's Assessor does not do tax collection, but it does.</p> <p>Clackamas County Department Director Salaries Compared to Elected Officials Salaries: Nina summarized the department director's salaries. Nina also noted that looking at the department director's salaries are not a new topic for the CB. Aimee asked if CC's comparable agencies are similar to the ones we use for elected officials. Nina stated it is not similar, we do not use Marion, Deschutes and Lane County. Kevin asked how our Elected Officials pay rates would compare as the directors have a salary range. Alisa requested to see actual salaries for director incumbents.</p>

		<p>Car Allowance: Nina noted the new Chair reached out about car allowance and that some other jurisdictions provide this while others do not. Nina noted the data sheets would include car allowance if applicable. Clark, Lane (\$700) and Washington Counties (\$355) provide a car allowance. This is built into the market average for each elected position. Back in 1995 the County stopped paying car allowances to management and Elected Officials. The Chair is not asking for anything but wanted the topic raised to the CB. Aimee asked if there are county vehicles they could use and Nina responded that there are cars available to them.</p> <p>CB went off the record at 3:02 p.m. so HR staff could update the department directors' salary document with actual salaries.</p> <p>CB went back on the record at 3:13 p.m.</p> <p>The new sheet provides the actual salaries of the department directors with the elected officials' salaries. The average director salary is \$16,265.79, the average EO salary is \$12,939.60, which is a 25.7% spread.</p> <p>Alisa noted back in 2021, the CB documented there were extraordinary circumstances. The CB could use this approach to address significant internal equity challenges which would allow the CB to close the internal equity gap between department directors now and would provide time in future for the CB to work on their plan. Alisa noted titles not comparables, so CB should work on their supporting statements. Aimee noted the CB had two EO's present and state on the record they are department directors. Aimee noted scope of authority and responsibility would constitute as a department director and that the minimum of grade NRP 38 is above all but three EO's current salary and the minimum of grade 40 is above all but two EO's current salary. Alisa noted they could add a fourth element (internal alignment with department directors) to their current order of process. Alisa asked if the Commissioners would be excluded and Aimee thought they should be excluded.</p> <p>Alisa asked if they were changing the order of process to: 1) COLA, 2) insert a new #2, aligning EO salaries in relation to department directors', 3) internal compression, and 4) market comparables. Aimee suggested working an example out on a flipchart to walk through using step 1 for COLA or department directors' grade.</p> <p>The CB agreed to use the salary grade NRP 40, minimum of grade. After working out the different scenarios (Clerk example), Kevin supported using step 2 for COLA because it keeps pace with the directors. Alisa would like to work through one of the EO's that is above grade 40 minimum (Sheriff example).</p>
	Action	
	Action	<p>The CB agreed the new order of process would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Match to minimum of grade NRP 40 2. COLA 3. Internal compression with the second in command 4. Market comparables

	Action	<p>The Commissioners are not department directors so this order of process would not apply to them.</p> <p>Nina suggested we start the meeting next week on March 6th a little bit later (at 3:30pm) when the Sheriff will begin her presentation. We will meet again on March 12th to finalize the final recommendation document and for signatures.</p> <p>The CB went on break and off the record at 3:49 p.m. The CB went back on the record at 3:55 p.m. and Judge Brisbin joined the meeting.</p>
Justice of the Peace Presentation		<p>Presentation available upon request. The Justice of the Peace hears all violations (criminal), and evictions and small claims (civil) in the County. Circuit Court has concurrent jurisdiction for crimes. Judge Brisbin provided a history of the County's Justice Court, noting that she has been the Justice since being appointed by the Governor in 2009 and court opening in 2010. She is an attorney and has duties similar of a department director. Judge Brisbin offered comparables to other attorneys within the County – the District Attorney's Office and County Counsel.</p> <p>Judge Brisbin is retiring at the end of 2025. This will be mid-term and the Governor will appoint an individual to complete the term. The requirements for the position – must have lived in Oregon for the last three years, and must currently live within the County for at least one year. As the recruitment will be to hire a local person, she would like the CB to position this position's salary for fairness, and excellence in recruiting.</p> <p>Judge Brisbin noted that she started with 10 FTE and due to efficiencies, she currently has four clerks and a manager.</p>
General Discussion	Action	<p>Aimee noted that the repetitive message from the EO's is that they are department directors and they are underpaid based on their comparables.</p> <p>The CB decided the meeting next week would start at 3:30pm. When the Sheriff will begin her presentation.</p> <p>Nina noted she has a meeting with the County Administrator next week and asked if the CB would like Nina to share with him their tentative recommendations. They agreed for her to do with Alisa noting they have not made solid recommendations yet so Nina should not share the formula but rather that a new element may be added to address that the CB is hearing again from EO's that they be favorably compared to other County department directors.</p> <p>Alisa noted this year's presentations were more about the EO's salary and comparables and not as much as about their roles in their position.</p>
Adjourn		Meeting adjourned at 4:19 p.m.

Action Items/Items for Follow-up		
<u>Deliverable</u>	<u>Responsible Party</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
n/a		

Upcoming meetings/events:

- Comp Board Meetings (all In-person):
 - **March 6, 2025 – 3:30-5pm**
 - **March 12, 2025 – 9am-12pm**
- Compensation Board Recommendations presented to Budget Committee: Tuesday, April 29, 2025 (in-person)

Comp Board Handouts:

- Agenda
- Meeting Discussion Highlights from February 19, 2025
- Philosophy of County Sheriff's Salary from Other Agencies
- Clackamas County Department Director Salaries Compared to Elected Officials Salaries (original and updated)
- Scope of Tax Collection in Other Agencies

Audio recording is available upon request.