



## **Salary Commission**

501 SE Hawthorne, Room 601  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone (503) 988-3320

Date: April 26, 2012

To: Multnomah County Board of County Commissioners

From: 2012 Salary Commission  
Nancy Drury, Employee Services Director, Clackamas County  
Jan Lambert, Senior Compensation Analyst, PacifiCorp  
Chair David Rhys, Classification/Compensation Manager, City of Portland  
Mary Rowe, Human Resources Director, METRO  
Catrinus Wallet, Compensation Manager, Knowledge Universe US

Re: Multnomah County Salary Commission Report

Under the authority of Section 4.30 of the Multnomah County Home Rule Charter as amended November 2010, the 2012 Multnomah County Salary Commission (Commission) was appointed by the County Auditor to set salaries for the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC), the Sheriff, and the supplemental salary of the District Attorney.

Enclosed is our report which sets the salaries for these positions and documents the basis for our decisions. We will be happy to answer questions or provide additional information upon request.

## **Executive Summary**

### Board of County Commissioners Positions

The 2010 Salary Commission set the 2010/11 and 2011/12 salaries for the Commissioners at the current approved rate of \$90,640. The 2010 Salary Commission set the 2010/11 salary for the Chair at the midpoint of the 2010/11 Department Director II salary, and the 2011/12 salary at the midpoint of the Department Director II 2011/12 range.

The 2012 Salary Commission reviewed the methodology for setting salaries and agreed the methodology remained appropriate for the Commissioners' salary. External market factors were analyzed for comparability and appropriateness and the average of the external market salaries was considered a valid benchmark. However, there has been no significant change in the market salaries while County salaries have been adjusted by a cost of living factor. Accordingly, this Salary Commission believes that some cost of living adjustment is warranted despite the apparent lack of change in market comparator salaries. The 2012 Salary Commission sets the 2012/13 salary for Commissioners' salaries at the current approved rate of \$90,640 increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2012/13. Additionally, for 2013/14, that salary rate shall be increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2013/14.

The 2012 Salary Commission reviewed the methodology for setting the salary for the Chair and agreed with the approach used by the 2010 Salary Commission. A search of the external market did not yield comparable positions: therefore, internal equity continues to be given greater weight. The Chair supervises the Department Directors and those salaries have the most bearing on the salary of the Chair. Since the prior Salary Commission's review, a new classification of Chief Operations Officer has been added and is under the general supervision of the County Chair. Setting the salary at the midpoint of the Department Director II range continues to be a reasonable approach. The Chair's salary for 2012/13 salary effective July 1, 2012 shall be adjusted to match the midpoint of the Department Director II 2011/12 of \$136,672 increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2012/13. Additionally, for 2013/14, that salary rate shall be increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2013/14.

### Sheriff

The Commission considered three primary factors in recommending a salary adjustment for the Sheriff:

1. salaries of Sheriffs in comparable jurisdictions;
2. salaries of Multnomah County department directors; and
3. salaries of direct reports to the Multnomah County Sheriff.

The Commission gave more weight to internal equity (salaries of department directors and the Sheriff's subordinates) but considered external market comparators (salaries of other jurisdictions).

The Commission has determined that the \$140,008 salary of the Sheriff for 2012/13 should be increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees. Additionally, for 2013/14, that salary rate shall be increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2013/14.

### The County Paid Supplemental Salary of the District Attorney

The Commission analyzed the methodology used in 2006, 2008 and 2010 for making a recommendation for the County paid supplemental salary of the District Attorney. The methodology essentially gives more weight to internal equity (salaries of department directors and the District Attorney's subordinates) than to external market considerations (salaries of other OR and WA District Attorneys). The 2006 and 2008 Commissions recommended, and the BOCC approved, that the salary for the District Attorney be placed at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the Department Director II salary range. The prior Commission believed that it was more accurate to use the following description: 75% of the Department Director II salary range.

While the District Attorney's current \$155,180 salary is slightly above 75% of the Department Director II range, the 2012 Commission has determined it is still appropriate that the salary of the District Attorney shall be increased for 2012/13 by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2012/13. Additionally, for 2013/14, that salary rate shall be increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2013/14.

Should the State increase or decrease its level of contribution, the County will then subsequently adjust its level of contribution to return it to the total salary described in the paragraph above.

Respectfully submitted this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of April, 2012.

### **By the Multnomah County Salary Commission:**

Nancy Drury, Jan Lambert, David Rhys, Mary Rowe, and Catrinus Wallet.

## **SALARY COMMISSION HISTORY**

In November 1984 the Home Rule Charter was amended as follows:

"The auditor shall appoint a five-member salary commission, composed of qualified people with personnel experience by January 1, 1986, and by January 1 in each even year thereafter....(to make) salary adjustment recommendations, if any..."

The first Commission was appointed in 1986 and a new Commission has been appointed in each even year up to the current 2012 Commission.

In 1990, the voters approved a ballot measure submitted by the Multnomah County Charter Review Commission that allowed the BOCC to approve their own salary increases rather than salary increase recommendations being referred to the voters. The measure also specified they were not allowed to set salaries higher than the recommendation from the Commission.

In 1991, a County Counsel's opinion stated that the Commission may also make recommendations regarding the salaries of the Sheriff and District Attorney, if requested.

In 2004, the voters approved a ballot measure submitted by the Multnomah County Charter Review Commission that modified the language of the County Charter, Section 4.30 to read as follows:

"The auditor shall appoint a five-member salary commission, composed of qualified human resource professionals with compensation experience, by January 1 of each even year. The salary commission shall *set the salaries* for the chair of the board of county commissioners and the county commissioners, documenting the basis of its decisions."

In October 2005, the Commission was given the authority, under BOCC Resolution No. 05-169, to recommend salary adjustments to the District Attorney's salary in future years. Included in the BOCC Resolution No. 05-169 was a provision that the District Attorney receive the annual cost of living increases, base on the total salary granted to other management staff in the County.

Beginning in October 2007, the Board of County Commissioners requested the Auditor to include the Sheriff's Salary in the Salary Commission study, through Resolution No. 97-160.

Ballot measure 26-76, adopted by the people November 2, 2010, amended the Home Rule Charter, giving authority to the Salary Commission to set the salary of the Sheriff and the County paid supplemental salary of the District Attorney.

## **CONTENTS OF THIS REPORT**

This report contains sections on the following:

- Board of County Commission positions (Chair and Commissioner)
- Sheriff
- County paid supplemental salary of the District Attorney

### **I. BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSION POSITIONS**

#### **SALARY HISTORY**

From FY 1983-84 through FY 1990-91, the Chair and Commissioners did not receive an increase in salary. From FY 1991-92 through FY 1995-96, cost of living increases were added to Chair and Commissioners' salaries, but their salaries remained far below comparable jurisdictions and the relative worth of the jobs.

In 1996 the BOCC approved the Commission recommendation that a Commissioner's salary be indexed to 75% of a judge's salary and that the Chair's salary be indexed to the mid-point of the salary range for the Chair's direct reports, Multnomah County department directors.

The 1998 Commission reaffirmed this methodology for indexing of salaries and further recommended that an appropriate ratio between the Commissioners' salaries and the Chair's salary be no more than 80%. The 1998 BOCC did not act on the recommendation, but did in fact increase the Chair's and the Commissioners' salaries in accordance with the phased-in approach approved by the 1996 BOCC.

In 2000, the BOCC approved the Commission recommendation that the Commissioners' salary remain 75% of a circuit court judge's salary July 1, 2000 and 2001. The BOCC further approved the recommendation that the Chair's salary be increased to the midpoint of the department directors' salary range effective July 1, 2000 and 2001.

In 2002 the BOCC approved the Commission's recommendation for no change to the methodology for Commissioners' salaries. In regard to the Chair's salary, the Commission determined that County department directors' salaries were below market according to the County Human Resources staff. Therefore, indexing the Chair's salary to the department directors' salaries would not be appropriate. Consequently, the BOCC approved the Commission's recommendation of indexing the Chair's salary to 125% of a judge's salary and suggested the Board may want to consider a phased in approach.

The 2004 Commission recommended, and the BOCC approved, no change in methodology for Commissioners and increased the Chair's salary in accordance with the previously approved phased-in approach.

The 2004 charter language changed the authority for setting salaries for the BOCC from the BOCC themselves to the Commission.

The 2006 Commission given this new charge believed that indexing to a judge's salary, a salary over which the BOCC had no control, was no longer relevant. Instead the 2006 Commission assessed both the external market and internal equity in order to set the salaries with an emphasis on internal equity for the Chair's position and the external market for the Commissioner's position.

The 2010 Commission continued the approach of the 2006 and 2008 Commissions, assessing both the external market and internal equity, adjusting the internal equity comparison for the Chair's position and maintaining an emphasis on the external market for the Commissioner's position.

Current salaries are as follows: all four Commissioners are paid the approved salary of \$90,640 and the Chair is paid at the approved salary of \$136,200.

## **METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

Compensation theory suggests that evaluating both external market data and internal equity is the most widely accepted methodology for setting salary rates. This is the revised approach taken by the 2006, 2008, and 2010 Commissions and is being re-affirmed by the 2012 Commission.

The Commission collected and reviewed data from a number of sources. The data is summarized below.

### **1. Survey information for Commissioner from the County HR Office:**

The County Human Resource office previously identified several comparable counties for purposes of comparing Commissioner salaries. The current Salary Commission continues to believe that there are sufficient Northwest comparators and, as a result, national comparators are not necessary for an appropriate market comparison. (A prior Commission had included Hennepin County, MN, Denver County, CO, and Hamilton, OH.) The current Commission also continues to limit the geographic adjustment to a single index used by the County HR Office, from the Economic Research Institute, rather than the average of multiple indexes used by a prior Commission.

**Exhibit A: Comparison of Commissioner salaries in comparable counties**

<b>County</b>	<b>Actual Salary</b>	<b>Geographic adjustment*</b>	<b>Equivalent Portland Salary</b>
Clackamas County, OR	80,866	None—Ptld Metro area	80,866
Lane County, OR	74,298	5.8%	78,599
Marion County, OR	76,606	8.0%	82,733
Pierce County, WA	104,468	-3.5%	100,772
Snohomish County, WA	102,779	-7.9%	94,709
Thurston County, WA	105,276	-0.6%	104,662
Average			90,390
		<b>Multnomah Co</b>	<b>90,640</b>
		Differential	100.30%

*\*Geographic adjustment via Economic Research Institute data through Multnomah County Human Resources Office.*

*Salary Data Source: Multnomah County Auditor's Office Survey, December 2011*

*Note: The Washington County rate was considered but not used by this and prior Commissions in that their salary rate is set at 40% of their Chair's salary which is 80% of the District Court Judge salary.*

*NOTE: Not adjusted for any employer paid pickup contribution to retirement system.*

Because the data was collected in December 2011, it is possible these jurisdictions will increase salaries at some point in 2012. However, we are using data that is accurate as of the time of this report. Consequently, using this data for setting 2012/13 salaries creates what is called a "lag" effect in compensation terms, but it is still the best data to compare with at this point in time.

## **2. Survey information for Chair from other counties:**

For many years, salary commissions have struggled with matching the Chair's position to like positions in other counties. We have concluded, as did the prior Commission, that we are unable to match the position to another county with any degree of confidence. There are counties in the northwest and across the country that match the demographics of Multnomah County closely enough to be considered a contender. However, their organizational structures vary widely, some with split responsibilities between the legislative body and a county executive who manages operations. In Multnomah County, those responsibilities are held by only one position, Chair of the BOCC, although there is a position responsible to the Chair, of Chief Operating Officer, who supervises Department Directors under the authority of the County Chair. This year, we found no equivalent job matches. We encourage future Commissions to continue monitoring this element to determine if any good matches can be found.

### 3. Regional councils and local boards:

A review of these jurisdictions showed limited comparability. Metro is a governmental agency in the Portland area with elected officials whose salaries should be noted. However, Metro is much smaller than Multnomah County, both in terms of staff and budget. The current data from Metro is detailed in Exhibit B below.

**Exhibit B: Comparison with Metro 2011 salaries**

<b>Metro Position</b>	<b>2011 Salary</b>
Council President (salary of a judge)	\$114,468
Councilor (one-third of a judge salary)	\$38,156

### 4. City of Portland:

Although past Commissions did not use data from the City of Portland, the County's Human Resources office does use city data for comparison with both elected official salaries and management salaries. However, it should be noted that City Commissioners have operational responsibility for city bureaus, thus are not a good job match. Additionally, both the staff and budget for the City are considerably larger than Multnomah County. Approved salaries for the City of Portland Mayor and Commissioners as of July 1, 2011 are detailed in Exhibit C below.

**Exhibit C: Comparison with City of Portland approved 2007 salaries**

<b>City of Portland Position</b>	<b>2011 Salary</b>
Mayor	\$122,907
Commissioner	\$ 103,522

City of Portland salaries may or may not increase at some point in 2012 but it is the best data at this point in time.

### 5. Comparability between the Chair and County department directors:

The Chair has county-wide operational and fiscal responsibilities, which the Commissioners do not. Six (6) department directors in two pay levels are under the ultimate authority of the Chair. Currently, all of the direct report department directors have salaries above the midpoint of their range. Since the prior Salary Commission's review, a new classification of Chief Operations Officer has been added and the position reports to the County Chair. Salaries for all positions are detailed in Exhibit D below.



**Exhibit D: Department directors' and elected officials' 2011 salaries:**

Department	Classification	2011/12 Salary	Pay Scale Minimum	Pay Scale Midpoint	Pay Scale Maximum
Community Justice	Department Director I	\$141,768	\$ 95,575	\$124,248	\$152,920
Community Services	Department Director I	\$146,900	\$ 95,575	\$124,248	\$152,920
Library	Department Director I	\$137,700	\$95,575	\$124,248	\$152,920
County Assets	Chief Info Officer	\$153,000	\$105,132	\$136,672	\$168,593
Human Services	Department Director II	\$160,000	\$105,132	\$136,672	\$168,593
Health Services	Department Director II	\$157,116	\$105,132	\$136,672	\$168,593
COO/County Mgmt	COO/Prin Dept Director	\$157,116	\$115,645	\$150,339	\$185,033
District Attorney		\$155,180			
Sheriff		\$140,008			
BOCC Chair		\$136,200			

Compensation theory suggests the spread between the supervisor and subordinate should be 10% to 25%. However, the Chair's actual salary compared with these positions under his authority shows that the Chair is paid less than all of them and slightly less than the midpoint of the higher level salary range of the Department Director II. This Salary Commission acknowledges that some elected positions are regularly paid less than non-elected positions of their direct reports. Because of this fact, normal compensation theory does not directly apply.

**6. Tenure in the job:**

Generally speaking, salary will increase based in part on tenure in the position. These are elected positions and presumably, a newly elected BOCC member would receive the salary of the outgoing BOCC member. Consequently, tenure in the position should not be a factor in considering an appropriate salary.

**7. Assumption of full-time:**

Although there is no mandated requirement that the BOCC be full-time positions, this Commission is making the assumption that they are and all salaries shown are full-time equivalent salaries.

**8. Benefits considerations:**

According to the County HR staff, elected officials receive the same benefits as any other County employee with the exception of disability. Level of benefits for these classifications is not within the scope of the Salary Commission authorized review.

**9. Consumer Price Index (CPI) considerations:**

CPI data is an integral part of the information base in the data presented. It has influenced the market data from both outside sources such as other counties and from within the county in determining appropriate salary ranges for department directors.

**10. Pay for performance:**

BOCC salaries relate to the office and not to persons; in other words, the salaries are based on what the *job* is worth and because it does not include a "pay for performance" model it is not a measure of the worth of the *individual* who occupies the position.

**11. Compensation philosophy:**

Typically an organization will consider three factors when designing compensation programs. These are the ability for an organization to 1) attract, 2) retain and 3) motivate employees. Attracting talent for the BOCC is limited to the local area so salary comparability with other jurisdictions to a certain extent is not relevant. Nevertheless, although it cannot be proven, this Commission believes that an equitable and competitive salary will attract a larger number of highly qualified individuals to run for, and be willing to serve in, this and other elected offices.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

Although Commissioners' salaries have maintained a close parity with the external market data, this Salary Commission notes that their authorized salaries have not increased since 2009. The fact that comparator salaries have not increased leads this Salary Commission to find that other jurisdictions appear not to have adjusted salaries related to the cost of living. As a result, Commissioners' salaries for 2012/13 shall be set at the current approved rate of \$90,640 adjusted by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2012/13. Additionally, for 2013/14, that salary rate shall be adjusted by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2013/14.

This Salary Commission acknowledges that some may have concerns that adjustments related to increases for non-represented County employees that the Board of County Commissioners may ultimately approve. This Salary Commission's salary adjustments for Board positions are limited to a period of two years. Subsequent Salary Commissions are not tied to this determination for future years.

As a result of the salary determination by the 2008 and 2010 Salary Commissions, the Chair's authorized salary is more closely aligned with other County positions that are under the ultimate authority of the Chair. In this case, the most significant and heavily weighted data is internal equity. Greater weight is being given to internal equity considerations than to the external market for the following reasons:

- a. internal equity (data regarding department directors) is a professionally acceptable method for assigning a salary;
- b. external market data has not provided acceptable job matches although the search should continue by future Salary Commission as external comparators are also an important consideration.

The Chair's approved salary for 2010/11 is \$136,204. The approved salary is less than the salaries of all of the Department Directors under its ultimate authority. The current midpoint of the Department Director II salary range is \$136,672.

This Salary Commission believes that the Chair's 2012/13 salary should be adjusted effective July 1, 2012 to match the midpoint of the Department Director II 2011/12 of \$136,672 increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2012/13. Additionally, for 2013/14, that salary rate shall be increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2013/14.

## **2012/13 AND 2013/14 SALARIES**

The 2012 Salary Commission sets the 2012/13 salary for Commissioners' salaries at the current approved rate of \$90,640 increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2012/13. Additionally, for 2013/14, that salary rate shall be increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2013/14.

The 2012 Salary Commission sets the 2012/13 salary for the Chair effective July 1, 2012 to match the midpoint of the Department Director II 2011/12 of \$136,672 increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2012/13. Additionally, for 2013/14, that salary rate shall be increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2013/14.

## **II. SHERIFF**

### **SALARY HISTORY**

A brief salary history shows the Sheriff's salary for the past few years as well as the slight inconsistency in the date of the granting of salary increases for this position.

<b>Start Date</b>	<b>Annual Salary</b>	<b>% increase</b>
7/1/2011	140,008	0.0%
7/1/2010	140,008	3.7%
7/1/2009	135,000	0.0%
7/1/2008	135,000	15.9%
7/1/2007	116,453	2.7%
7/1/2006	113,391	0.0%
7/1/2005	113,391	2.7%
7/1/2004	110,410	0.0%
1/1/2003	110,410	5.5%
12/1/2002	104,697	

### **METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

The Commission collected and reviewed current data from a number of sources. The data is summarized below.

#### **1. Sheriff's salaries in counties in Oregon and Washington:**

Several counties in Oregon and Washington, as follows, were considered for external market data comparisons.

Oregon: Clackamas, Lane, Marion and Washington  
Washington: Clark, Pierce, Snohomish and Thurston

The Multnomah County Sheriff's Office was contacted by a prior Commission to determine if there were differences in Sheriff duties in OR and WA counties that would be important for the Commission to know. The prior Commission was advised that other counties do have jail responsibilities; however, the Multnomah County Sheriff is responsible for a larger and significantly more complex jail operation. Thus the span of responsibility is different in significant ways for the Multnomah County Sheriff in comparison to most other counties in Oregon and Washington. The

Commission notes that some Oregon counties have larger enforcement responsibilities than Multnomah County.

Salary data was collected from these jurisdictions and is shown in Exhibit A. The current Commission revised the geographic adjustment to a single index used by the County Human Resources office, from the Economic Research Institute, rather than the average of multiple indexes used by the prior Commission.

## 2. Sheriff's salaries in other jurisdictions:

The Sheriff's Office previously identified four counties in California and three counties in other states for purposes of comparing Sheriff salaries. The current Salary Commission determined that there were sufficient Northwest comparators, and as a result, national comparators are not necessary for an appropriate market comparison.

### Exhibit A: Sheriff Salaries adjusted for Geographical Differences November 2011

County	Actual Salary	Geographic adjustment*	Equivalent Portland Salary
Clackamas, OR	129,831	None—Ptld Metro area	129,831
Lane County, OR	123,490	3.5%	127,764
Marion County, OR	114,046	7.2%	122,210
Washington County, OR	137,016	None—Ptld Metro area	137,016
Clark County, WA	102,228	None—Ptld Metro area	102,228
Pierce County, WA	140,766	-3.6%	135,670
Snohomish County, WA	121,061	-8.28%	111,174
Thurston County, WA	118,008	-0.9%	116,901
Average			120,849
<b>Multnomah County</b>			<b>140,008</b>
Differential			+14.0%

*\*Geographic adjustment via Economic Research Institute data through Multnomah County Human Resources Office.*

*Salary Data Source: Multnomah County Auditor's Office Salary Survey November 2012.*

*NOTE: Not adjusted for any employer paid pickup contribution to retirement system.*

The survey data shows the Sheriff's salary to be 114.0% of the average of other jurisdictions. It supports an argument that the Sheriff's salary is at a sufficient level in comparison to other Northwest comparators, given the larger jail responsibilities.

### 3. Comparability between the Sheriff and Multnomah County department directors:

There are six (6) department directors in the County in two pay scales and a new classification of Chief Operating Officer.

#### Exhibit B: Department Directors' Salaries:

Department	Classification	2011/12 Salary	Pay Scale Minimum	Pay Scale Midpoint	Pay Scale Maximum
Community Justice	Department Director I	\$141,768	\$ 95,575	\$124,248	\$152,920
Community Services	Department Director I	\$146,900	\$ 95,575	\$124,248	\$152,920
Library	Department Director I	\$137,700	\$95,575	\$124,248	\$152,920
County Assets	Chief Info Officer	\$153,000	\$105,132	\$136,672	\$168,593
Human Services	Department Director II	\$160,000	\$105,132	\$136,672	\$168,593
Health Services	Department Director II	\$157,116	\$105,132	\$136,672	\$168,593
COO/County Mgmt	COO/Prin Dept Director	\$157,116	\$115,645	\$150,339	\$185,033
District Attorney		\$155,180			
Sheriff		\$140,008			

The midpoint of the Department Director II salary range is \$136,672. All of the department director positions are paid above the midpoint of their ranges.

The Sheriff's position is not included in the Department Director classifications, but given the level of authority and responsibility of the position, an argument could be made that it is equivalent to Department Director II. Thus, in order to maintain internal equity, the Sheriff should also be paid at or above the midpoint of Department Director II. The Sheriff is currently paid above the midpoint of the Department Director II at a salary of \$140,008.

### 4. Comparability with the Portland Police Chief:

The city does not have responsibility for jails; however it has law enforcement duties that are substantially different than Multnomah County. As a result, the jobs are not directly comparable. For these reasons, information on compensation for the Portland Police Chief was reviewed but not considered for this study.

### 5. Comparability between the Sheriff and his direct reports:

The highest level positions below the Sheriff within the Sheriff's Office are the Undersheriff and the Chief Deputy. There is one incumbent serving as Chief Deputy making \$122,400 in a range with a minimum of \$88,495 and maximum of \$141,592.

There is a salary differential between the actual salary of the Sheriff and Chief Deputy of 14%. There is one incumbent serving as Undersheriff making \$127,400 in a range with a minimum of \$95,063 and maximum of \$133,083. There is a salary differential between the actual salary of the Sheriff and Chief Deputy of 9.9%. Compensation theory suggests the spread between the supervisor and subordinate should be 10% to 25%. The current separation between Sheriff and direct reports is reasonably adequate, but should be reviewed by future Salary Commissions.

The commission notes that ORS 204.112 (4) requires that a County Sheriff be paid at a higher rate than members of the Sheriff's Office.

**6. Tenure in the job:**

Generally speaking, salary will increase based in part on tenure in the position. This is an elected position and presumably, should a new Sheriff be elected, he/she would receive the salary of the outgoing Sheriff. Consequently, tenure in the position should not be a factor in considering an appropriate salary.

**7. Benefits considerations:**

Of the data available to this Commission, there are differences in benefits packages provided to Oregon Sheriffs. However, the level of benefits is not within the scope of the Salary Commission authorized review.

**8. Internal equity versus external market considerations:**

Consideration is being given to internal equity considerations as well as to the external market:

- a. internal equity (data regarding department directors and subordinates) is a professionally acceptable method for assigning a salary;
- b. concerning external market data (data regarding other county Sheriff salaries), while not exactly matching the operations of the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office, in the opinion of this Salary Commission, the comparison to other Northwest Sheriff positions is still relevant and forms the basis of an additional source of information for purposes of recommending salary for the Multnomah County Sheriff's position.

**9. Consumer Price Index (CPI) considerations:**

CPI data is an integral part of the information base in the data presented. It has influenced the market data from both outside sources such as other counties and from within the county in determining an appropriate salary range for department directors.

**10. Compensation philosophy:**

Typically an organization will consider three factors when designing compensation programs. These are the ability for an organization to 1) attract, 2) retain and 3) motivate employees. Attracting talent for the Sheriff's position is limited to the local area, and to those with the required certifications, so salary comparability with other

jurisdictions to a certain extent is not relevant. Nevertheless, although it cannot be proven, this Commission believes that an equitable and competitive salary will attract a larger number of highly qualified individuals to run for, and be willing to serve in, this and other elected offices.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

The salaries of Sheriffs in Oregon and Washington jurisdictions are reasonably aligned to this position. The position's current salary of \$140,008 is 14% above Northwest comparators. This differential does not support an increase for the position on the basis of market comparison.

However, the Multnomah County Department Director positions are paid incrementally more than the Multnomah County Sheriff even though the Sheriff position is arguably equivalent to Department Director II. Therefore, the Salary Commission finds it reasonable to recommend that the Sheriff be placed at least at the midpoint of the Department Director II range. The Sheriff's salary is currently above the midpoint now.

The Undersheriff and the Chief Deputy to the Sheriff are paid a salary lower than the Sheriff's salary. Maintaining the Sheriff's salary at or above the midpoint of the Department Director II salary range does not have a significant effect on the differential between the Sheriff and his immediate subordinates.

## **2012/2013 and 2013/2014 SALARY**

The Commission determines that the salary of the Sheriff for 2012/13 be increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2012/13. Additionally, for 2013/14, that salary rate shall be increased by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2013/14.

We note that State law requires the salary of any Sheriff to be higher than that of the Sheriff's staff. Accordingly, if an increase to any Sheriff's staff member is above the salary rate paid to the Sheriff, the Sheriff's salary shall be adjusted to be \$12.00 more annually, until the next review by the next Salary Commission.

The Commission notes that the following principles were considered in this salary determination:

1. the recommendations come from professionals in the field of compensation and are based on (to the best of our knowledge) accurate, relevant and appropriate data and methodologies;
2. the salary recommendations relate to the office and not to the person; in other words, the salary is based on what the *job* is worth and because it does not



- include a "pay for performance" model it is not a measure of the worth of the *individual* who occupies the position;
3. being paid for what the job is objectively worth is extremely vital to maintaining high quality leadership for the Sheriff and his/her successor; thus the public will be better served.

### **III. DISTRICT ATTORNEY**

#### **SALARY HISTORY**

Oregon district attorneys receive a salary from the State of Oregon. Some district attorneys in the State, including Multnomah County, also receive a supplemental salary from the County jurisdiction.

For ten years, 1994-2004, the Multnomah County District Attorney did not receive a cost of living increase from either the State or County. The resulting inequity was addressed by the 2006 Commission.

The State currently contributes \$104,832 annually to the District Attorney's salary. In 2011, the County supplement was \$50,348, thus the combined annual salary currently is \$155,180, which is currently above 75% of the Department Director II salary range.

The 2006 and 2008 Commissions recommended, and the BOCC approved, that the salary for the District Attorney be placed at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the Department Director II salary range.

The 2010 Commission believed that it was more accurate to use the following description: 75% of the Department Director II salary range.

#### **METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

The Commission collected and reviewed current data from a number of sources. The data is summarized below.

##### **1. District Attorney's salaries in counties in Oregon and Washington:**

The larger counties in Oregon and Washington, as follows, were considered for external market data comparisons.

Oregon:	Clackamas, Lane, Marion, and Washington
Washington:	Clark, Pierce, Snohomish, and Thurston

Salary data was collected from these jurisdictions and is shown in Exhibit A. The current Commission employed the geographic adjustment of a single index.

A prior Commission acknowledged that there are differences in district attorney duties in OR and WA counties. Most counties are only responsible for prosecuting crimes that have occurred within their jurisdictional boundaries, however the Multnomah County District Attorney's Office also provides Termination of Parental Rights services to the State, works with the US Attorney's Office to prosecute some federal cases, and prosecutes all city code crimes in the City of Portland

**Exhibit A: District Attorney Salaries adjusted for Geographical Differences  
December 2011**

County	Actual Salary	Geographic adjustment*	Equivalent Portland Salary
Clackamas, OR	\$141,175	None—Ptld Metro area	\$141,175
Lane County, OR	\$138,507	3.2%	\$142,901
Marion County, OR	\$130,478	6.9%	\$139,502
Washington County, OR	\$137,016	None—Ptld Metro area	\$137,016
Clark County, WA	\$148,836	None—Ptld Metro area	\$148,836
Pierce County, WA	\$148,832	-3.6%	\$143,473
Snohomish County, WA	\$148,832	-7.9%	\$137,081
Thurston County, WA	\$148,836	-1.4%	\$146,826
Average:			\$142,100
Multnomah Co.			\$155,180
Differential:			9.2%

*\*Geographic adjustment via Economic Research Institute data through Multnomah County Human Resources Office.*

*Salary Data Source: Multnomah County Auditor's Office Salary Survey December 2011*

*NOTE: Not adjusted for any employer paid pickup contribution to retirement system.*

**2. Comparability between the District Attorney and Multnomah County department directors:**

There are six (6) department directors in the County in two pay scales and a new classification of Chief Operating Officer. In 2005 the Multnomah County Human

Resources office concluded that the position of District Attorney is comparable in classification to Department Director II.

**Exhibit B: Department Directors' Salaries:**

Department	Classification	2011/12 Salary	Pay Scale Minimum	Pay Scale Midpoint	Pay Scale Maximum
Community Justice	Department Director I	\$141,768	\$ 95,575	\$124,248	\$152,920
Community Services	Department Director I	\$146,900	\$ 95,575	\$124,248	\$152,920
Library	Department Director I	\$137,700	\$95,575	\$124,248	\$152,920
County Assets	Chief Info Officer	\$153,000	\$105,132	\$136,672	\$168,593
Human Services	Department Director II	\$160,000	\$105,132	\$136,672	\$168,593
Health Services	Department Director II	\$157,116	\$105,132	\$136,672	\$168,593
COO/County Mgmt	COO/Prin Dept Director	\$157,116	\$115,645	\$150,339	\$185,033
District Attorney		\$155,180			

The midpoint of the Department Director II salary range is \$136,672 and all of the director positions are paid above their midpoints. In order to maintain internal equity, based on the comparison to the other Department Directors, the District Attorney should be paid at least 75% of the range of the Department Director II.

**3. Comparability between the District Attorney and his direct reports:**

The second highest level position in the office is the Chief Deputy District Attorney. One incumbent is currently paid \$155,618 which is 3.7% higher than the salary of the District Attorney.

Compensation theory suggests the spread between the supervisor and subordinate should be 10% to 25%. However, since the District Attorney position is comparable to Department Director II and already above 75% of that range, the decision to link it to the Chief Deputy salary should be made with a great deal of caution. This Commission has determined that the relationship of this post to the Department Director II classification takes priority over comparing it to the Chief Deputy salary.

**4. Tenure in the job:**

Generally speaking, salary will increase based in part on tenure in the position. This is an elected position and presumably, should a new District Attorney be elected, he/she would receive the salary of the outgoing District Attorney. Consequently, tenure in the position should not be a factor in considering an appropriate salary.

**5. Benefits considerations:**

Of the data available to this Commission, there are differences in benefits packages provided to Oregon district attorneys. However, the level of benefits is not within the scope of the Salary Commission's authorized review.

**6. Internal equity versus external market considerations:**

Greater weight is being given to internal equity considerations than to the external market for a couple of reasons:

- a. internal equity (data regarding department directors and subordinates) is a professionally acceptable method for assigning a salary;
- b. external market data (data regarding Oregon and Washington county district attorney salaries) is not directly comparable to Multnomah County.

**7. Consumer Price Index (CPI) considerations:**

CPI data is an integral part of the information base in the data presented. It has influenced the market data from both outside sources such as other counties and from within the county in determining an appropriate salary range for department directors.

**8. Compensation philosophy:**

Typically an organization will consider three factors when designing compensation programs. These are the ability for an organization to 1) attract, 2) retain and 3) motivate employees. Attracting talent for the DA's position is limited to the local area, and to those with the required certifications, so salary comparability with other jurisdictions to a certain extent is not relevant. Nevertheless, although it cannot be proven, this Commission believes that an equitable and competitive salary will attract a larger number of highly qualified individuals to run for, and be willing to serve in, this and other elected offices.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

The salaries of district attorneys in Oregon and Washington jurisdictions are closely aligned to this position when in fact, this position has greater responsibility than most, if not all, of the counties listed. Accordingly it should be paid more.

The Chief Deputy to the District Attorney is paid a salary slightly above that of the District Attorney, creating a salary compression issue. This Commission is aware this compression issue has existed for a number of years. It, too, needs to be carefully watched and reviewed when the Salary Commission is next convened.

In comparison with the elected Chair of the BOCC, the salary for the District Attorney is greater than the Chair's salary at the midpoint of the Department Director II salary range. Both are elected officials of the County. However, the District Attorney is required to

have professional credentials, including a law degree, not required of other County elected positions and that justifies the higher salary. The responsibilities of this District Attorney are comparable to leading a large law firm.

## **2012/13 and 2013/14 SALARY**

As the District Attorney's current salary is slightly above 75% of the Department Director II range, the Commission has determined that the current salary of the District Attorney shall be increased for 2012/13 by the cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2012/13. Additionally, for 2013/14, that salary rate shall be increased any cost of living increase given to Multnomah County non-represented employees for 2013/14.

Additionally the Commission recommends that the salary be considered the combined total salary including both the County's and State's contributions. Should the State increase or decrease its level of contribution, the County will then subsequently adjust its level of contribution to return it to the total salary described in the paragraph above.

## **ENHANCING SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC**

The Commission notes that the following principles were considered in this salary determination:

1. the recommendations come from professionals in the field of compensation and are based on (to the best of our knowledge) accurate, relevant and appropriate data and methodologies;
2. the salary recommendations relate to the office and not to the person; in other words, the salary is based on what the *job* is worth and because it does not include a "pay for performance" model it is not a measure of the worth of the *individual* who occupies the position;
3. being paid for what the job is objectively worth is extremely vital to maintaining high quality leadership for the District Attorney and his/her successor; thus the public will be better served.

## **LAST BUT CERTAINLY NOT LEAST**

The Commission wishes to thank Joi Doi, Steve Herron, and John Kaneski of the County Human Resources office for providing background and information on County compensation and geographic comparison factors.

The Commission wishes to thank Jenny Morf, County Attorney, for discussing with us legal issues.

The Commission also wishes to extend its appreciation to the Multnomah County Auditor and his staff. We could not have completed our work without their research and data collection.