

Salary Commission

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

Date: May 25, 2010

To: Multnomah County Board of County Commissioners

From: 2010 Salary Commission

Nancy Drury, Employee Services Director, Clackamas County

Sue Fischer, HR and Compensation Consultant, Cascade Employers Association

Jan Lambert, Senior Compensation Analyst, Pacificorp

Chair David Rhys, Classification/Compensation Manager, City of Portland

Mary Rowe, Human Resources Director, METRO

Re: Report and Recommendation Regarding the Sheriff's Salary

Under the authority of Section 4.30 of the Multnomah County Home Rule Charter as amended November 2004, the 2010 Multnomah County Salary Commission (Commission) was appointed by the County Auditor to set salaries for the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC). In 1991 a County Counsel's opinion stated that the Salary Commission may also make recommendations regarding the salaries of the Sheriff and District Attorney, if requested. Through Resolution No. 97-160, the Board of County Commissioners requested the Auditor to include the Sheriff's Salary in the Salary Commission study, beginning in October 2007.

Enclosed is our report and recommendation for the salary for the Sheriff for fiscal years 2010/11 and 2011/12. We will be happy to answer questions or provide additional information upon request.

2010 Salary Commission Page 1 6/2/2010

Executive Summary

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 recommends that the salary of the Sheriff for 2010/11 should be equal to the midpoint of the Multnomah County Department Director II 2010/11 salary range and should be adjusted for 2011/12 to match the midpoint of the Department Director II 2011/12 range.

Respectfully submitted this 25th day of May, 2010

By the Multnomah County Salary Commission:

Nancy Drury, Sue Fischer, Jan Lambert, David Rhys, and Mary Rowe.

2010 Salary Commission Page 2 6/2/2010

SALARY COMMISSION BACKGROUND

In November 1984 the Home Rule Charter was amended to establish a five-member salary commission. The first Commission was appointed in 1986 and a new Commission has been appointed in each even year up to the current 2008 Commission.

In November 2004 the Home Rule Charter was amended 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 1991 a County Counsel's opinion stated that the Salary Commission may also make recommendations regarding the salaries of the Sheriff and District Attorney, if requested. Through Resolution No. 97-160, the Board of County Commissioners requested the Auditor to include the Sheriff's Salary in the Salary Commission study, beginning in October 2007.

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.

Start Date	Annual Salary	% increase
7/1/2009	135,000	0.0%
7/1/2008	135,000	16%
7/1/2007	116,453	2.7%
7/1/2005	113,391	2.7%
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 the Commission to determine if there are differences in Sheriff duties in OR and WA counties that would be important for the Commission to know. The 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 much broader 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 Winter, 2010

County	Actual Salary	Geographic adjustment*	Equivalent Portland Salary	
Clackamas, OR	120,276	None—Ptld Metro area	120,276	
Lane County, OR	115,835	4.0%	120,500	
Marion County, OR	114,046	7.4%	122,538	
Washington County, OR	131,784	None—Ptld Metro area	131,784	
Clark County, WA	98,220	None—Ptld Metro area	98,220	
Pierce County, WA	140,770	-2.1%	137,790	
Snohomish County, WA	121,061	-6.8%	112,772	
Thurston County, WA	118,008	-0.2%	121,308	
Average			120,241	
Multnomah County			135,000	
Differential			112.3%	

^{*}Geographic adjustment via Economic Research Institute data through Multnomah County Human Resources Office.

Salary Data Source: Multnomah County Auditor's Office Salary Survey 2010

2010 Salary Commission Page 4 6/2/2010

The survey data shows the Sheriff's salary to be 112.3% 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.

Exhibit B: Department Directors' Salaries:

Department	Classification	2009/10 Salary	Pay Scale Minimum	Pay Scale Midpoint	Pay Scale Maximum
Community Justice	Department Director I	\$138,988	\$ 93,199	\$118,609	\$144,020
Community Services	Department Director I	\$144,020	\$ 93,199	\$118,609	\$144,020
Library	Department Director II	\$135,000	\$107,932	\$137,263	\$166,593
County Management	Department Director II	\$152,082	\$107,932	\$137,263	\$166,593
Human Services	Department Director II	\$154,035	\$107,932	\$137,263	\$166,593
Health Services	Department Director II	\$154,035	\$107,932	\$137,263	\$166,593
District Attorney		\$155,180			
Sheriff		\$135,000			

The midpoint of the Department Director II salary range is \$137,263 and five of the six positions are paid above the Department Director II midpoint. In fact all but one 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.

4. Comparability with the Portland Police Chief:

The city does not have responsibility for jails; however it has law enforcement duties that are more encompassing than Multnomah County. As a result, the jobs are substantially different. 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 second highest level position in the office is Chief Deputy although it appears there is also a position called Undersheriff. Because this Commission is unaware of the

2010 Salary Commission Page 5 6/2/2010

long-term viability of the Undersheriff position, our data will reflect only the comparability between the Sheriff and Chief Deputy. There are two incumbents serving as Chief Deputy making approximately \$117,700 each in a range with a minimum of \$88,861 and maximum of \$124,403. There is a salary differential between the actual salaries of the Sheriff and Chief Deputies of approximately 15%. Compensation theory suggests the spread between the supervisor and subordinate should be 10% to 25%. The current separation between Sheriff and Chief Deputies is reasonably adequate, but should be reviewed by future Salary Commissions.

This Commission takes note that the Multnomah County Home Rule Charter specifies that the County Sheriff's salary shall be fixed by the BOCC in an amount that is not less than any member of the Sheriff's Office. ORS 204.112 (4) has a similar provision, requiring 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. 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 \$135,000 is 112.3% 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. All but one of the department directors are paid above the midpoint of the Department Director II range. Therefore, the Salary Commission finds it reasonable to recommend that the Sheriff be placed at the midpoint of the Department Director II range.

The two Chief Deputies to the Sheriff are paid a salary lower than the Sheriff's salary. Increasing the Sheriff's salary to the midpoint of the Department Director II salary range will not have a significant effect on the differential between the Sheriff and his immediate subordinates.

The recommended salary for the Sheriff is the same as the Chair's salary which is being set by this Commission at the midpoint of Department Director II. Both are elected officials of the County. However, based on the unique responsibilities of each position, a different set of factors was considered to determine the salaries. We note that the Sheriff's position requires professional certification that the Chair's position does not. In the end however, we believe the data supports having both positions appropriately at the same pay rate.

2010/2011 and 2011/2012 SALARY

The Commission recommends that the salary of the Sheriff for 2010/11 should be equal to the midpoint of the Multnomah County Department Director II salary range for 2010/11.

The Commission recommends that the salary of the Sheriff for 2011/12 be equal to the midpoint of the Department Director II salary range for 2011/12.

2009/ENHANCING SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC

The Commission recommends that the BOCC accept the recommendations in total for the following reasons:

- 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.

LAST BUT CERTAINLY NOT LEAST

The Commission wishes to thank Sheriff Daniel Staton for agreeing to meet with us and providing information about the responsibilities of the Sheriff's position. We also thank Jennifer Ott in the Sheriff's Office for collecting and sharing valuable internal and external data with us.

The Commission wishes to thank Joi Doi and Travis Graves of the County Human Resources Office for collecting and sharing valuable information regarding management salaries and the County's compensation structure.

The Commission wishes to thank Agnes Sowle, County Attorney, for discussing legal issues with us.

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.

Cc: Daniel Staton, Sheriff