



**CITY OF MARTINEZ**

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
July 20, 2011**

**TO:** Mayor and City Council  
**FROM:** Phil Vince, City Manager  
**SUBJECT:** Grand Jury Report: Elected Officials Compensation  
**DATE:** July 13, 2011

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve and authorize the Mayor to sign the attached response to the Grand Jury report: “Elected Board Membership.”

**BACKGROUND:**

Early in California’s history, the California Constitution established grand juries in each county. The California Penal Code includes provisions on the formation of grand juries and their powers and duties. With respect to public agencies, grand juries are authorized to “investigate and report upon the operations, accounts, and records of the officers, departments, functions, and the method or systems of performing the duties of any such city or joint powers agency and make such recommendations as it may deem proper and fit.” (Cal. Penal Code section 925a) Within 90 days after the grand jury submits a report regarding the operations of any public agency, the “governing body of the public agency shall comment to the presiding judge of the superior court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the governing body...” (Cal. Penal Code section 933(c))

In April, Martinez (as well as other public agencies in the County) received the attached Grand Jury report: “Elected Board Membership”. The report was not just addressed to Martinez, but was of a county-wide nature with certain recommendations specific to certain jurisdictions.

Accordingly, the attached draft response is presented for the City Council’s consideration to transmit to the presiding judge.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Responding to the Grand Jury report took staff time.

**ACTION:**

Approve and authorize the Mayor to sign the attached response.

Attachments:

Grand Jury Report: "Elected Board Membership"

Martinez response to Grand Jury Report

**APPROVED BY:**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Philip Vance". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "P".

City Manager

April 26, 2011

City Manager  
City of Martinez  
525 Henrietta Street  
Martinez, CA 94553

Dear City Manager:

Attached is a copy of Grand Jury Report No. 1104, "Elected Board Membership" by the 2010-2011 Contra Costa Grand Jury.

In accordance with California Penal Code Section 933.05, this report is being provided to you at least two working days before it is released publicly.

Section 933.5(a) of the California Government Code requires that (the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions) in respect to each finding:

- (1) The respondent agrees with the finding.
- (2) The respondent disagrees with the finding.
- (3) The respondent partially disagrees with the finding.

In the cases of both (2) and (3) above, the respondent shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed, and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefor.

In addition, Section 933.05(b) requires that the respondent reply to each recommendation by stating one of the following actions:

1. The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary describing the implemented action.
2. The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.
3. The recommendation requires further analysis. This response should explain the scope and parameters of the analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion. This time frame shall not exceed six months from the date of the publication of the Grand Jury Report.

City of Martinez  
April 26, 2011  
Page 2

4. The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation thereof.

Please be reminded that Section 933.05 specifies that no officer, agency, department or governing body of a public agency shall disclose any contents of the report prior to its public release. Please insure that your response to the above noted Grand Jury report includes the mandated items. We will expect your response, using the form described by the quoted Government Code, no later than **July 25, 2011.**

It would be greatly appreciated if you could send this response in hard copy to the Grand Jury as well as by e-mail to [jcuev@contracosta.courts.ca.gov](mailto:jcuev@contracosta.courts.ca.gov) (Word document).

Sincerely,



LINDA L. CHEW, Foreperson  
2010-2011 Contra Costa County Civil Grand Jury

A REPORT BY  
THE 2010-2011 CONTRA COSTA COUNTY GRAND JURY

725 Court Street  
Martinez, California 94553

REPORT 1104

**Elected Board Membership**

APPROVED BY THE GRAND JURY:

Date: APRIL 6, 2011



LINDA L. CHEW  
GRAND JURY FOREPERSON

ACCEPTED FOR FILING:

Date: 4-21-11



JOHN LAETTNER  
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

**Contra Costa County Grand Jury Report #1104**

**ELECTED BOARD MEMBERSHIP**  
Public Service or Public Employment?

**TO: Cities and Towns in Contra Costa County** (see distribution list)  
**Independent Special Districts** (see distribution list)

**SUMMARY**

Given the difficult economic challenges facing local government, the Contra Costa County Grand Jury conducted a survey about compensation for elected Special District Boards (Board) and City Councils (Council). The Grand Jury looked at the use of funds and if the total amounts spent by these agencies for elected officials' compensation seemed reasonable.

The study revealed significant compensation disparities among elected Boards and Councils within Contra Costa County (County).

For example, while Martinez and Oakley both have similar populations of about 35,000 residents, the Martinez City Council total compensation is \$131,326, while Oakley's is only \$28,544.

San Ramon with 60,000 residents pays \$163,190 to its entire Council while Pittsburg, with slightly more residents, pays its Council \$40,035.

Richmond and Antioch, both with around 100,000 residents, pay their entire Councils \$267,139 and \$112, 591 respectively.

The Grand Jury recognizes those agencies that pay nothing or minimum compensation and thus demonstrate the spirit of public service.

At the same time, there are a large number of Boards and Councils that are being compensated amounts which may be viewed as exorbitant. Board and Council members are elected to serve their constituents. They set policy, oversee programs and services administered by professional employees and are accountable to the public for their actions.

The Grand Jury believes the public should be aware of the compensation paid to their elected officials, what benefits are provided and whether the compensation structure indicates that the spirit of public service has changed to an entitlement of public employment.

## BACKGROUND

County residents are living in very difficult economic times, in which both public agencies and individuals have had to cut spending.

The Grand Jury surveyed all 19 cities in the County as well as the 27 largest independent special districts that have their own publicly elected Boards of Directors. Population information for the analysis was obtained from Local Agency Formation Commission reports. The survey collected data for Fiscal Years (FY) 2008-09 and 2009-10.

Information was requested for the following categories pertaining to annual expenditures for elected officials: salary and/or meeting fees, health care insurance costs, pension or deferred compensation, life insurance premiums, car allowance or mileage, cell phone and/or internet access and travel & conference costs.

**The total amount spent county-wide in FY 2009-10 on compensation for the surveyed Boards and Councils was \$2,419,169.**

The following data is grouped by cities and special districts. Data reported are the total amounts for each Board or Council regardless of the number of elected members. All cities have five elected Council members with the exception of Richmond, which has seven. All special districts have five Board members except the Byron-Bethany Irrigation District, which has nine, with two vacancies.

### Cities

- The average annual amount spent for each Council was \$77,895.
- Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda had minimal expenses for their elected leaders.
- Eight cities compensate their elected leaders more than the average for all surveyed. These cities spent an average of \$136,145. Of that amount, 76.4% was paid for salary and/or meeting fees and health care benefits. See table below.
- Twelve cities pay for elected officials' pensions or other forms of retirement benefits.
- Twelve cities pay for elected officials' health care insurance costs.
- Eight cities pay life insurance premiums for elected officials.
- Six cities pay for elected officials' cell phone or internet access.

The following table summarizes the compensation data collected for the cities.

### Total Council Compensation Expense

Cities	Population	Cost	Salary and/or Meeting Fees	Health Care Insurance Costs	Pension & Deferred Comp	Other Costs
City of Lafayette	24,500	\$631	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$631
Town of Moraga	16,800	\$2,673	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,673
City of Orinda	17,600	\$2,801	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,801
City of Oakley	34,000	\$28,544	\$27,924	\$0	\$0	\$620
City of Clayton	10,784	\$29,590	\$23,400	\$0	\$4,640	\$1,550
City of El Cerrito	23,596	\$37,613	\$26,710	\$0	\$3,574	\$7,329
City of Pittsburg	63,004	\$40,035	\$33,240	\$5,220	\$0	\$1,575
Town of Danville	42,601	\$54,998	\$40,064	\$11,764	\$1,502	\$1,668
City of Pinole	19,193	\$59,965	\$17,862	\$41,396	\$0	\$707
City of Walnut Creek	66,000	\$61,798	\$35,100	\$0	\$16,086	\$10,612
City of Pleasant Hill	33,377	\$72,206	\$37,950	\$27,541	\$4,569	\$2,146
City of Brentwood	50,614	\$91,998	\$34,155	\$42,425	\$2,186	\$13,232
City of Hercules	23,000	\$93,691	\$51,960	\$34,141	\$5,059	\$2,531
City of San Pablo	30,950	\$100,961	\$45,210	\$37,906	\$6,555	\$11,290
City of Antioch	100,150	\$112,591	\$53,746	\$1,922	\$5,576	\$51,346
City of Concord	124,780	\$128,262	\$74,580	\$42,303	\$10,720	\$659
City of Martinez	36,179	\$131,326	\$46,200	\$71,416	\$9,697	\$4,012
City of San Ramon	59,002	\$163,190	\$47,935	\$59,768	\$12,457	\$43,030
City of Richmond	102,186	\$267,139	\$152,130	\$53,700	\$0	\$61,309
<b>Total of 19 Cities</b>		<b>\$1,480,012</b>	<b>\$748,166</b>	<b>\$429,502</b>	<b>\$82,622</b>	<b>\$219,721</b>
<b>Average of 19 Cities</b>		<b>\$77,895</b>	<b>\$39,377</b>	<b>\$22,605</b>	<b>\$4,349</b>	<b>\$11,564</b>

Note: Richmond has seven Council members; all other cities have five Council members

### Special Districts

- The average annual amount spent for each Board was \$34,784.
- Nine special districts paid their elected leaders from zero to less than \$100 in total. They are: Crockett Community Services District, Diablo Community Services District, Kensington Police Protection & Community Services District, Town of Knightsen Community Services District, Kensington Fire Protection District, Rodeo-Hercules Fire Protection District, Bethel Island Municipal Improvement District, Green Valley Recreation and Park District, and Moraga-Orinda Fire District.
- Eight special districts compensate their elected officials more than the average for all surveyed. These districts spent an average of \$99,089. Of that amount 87.7% was paid for salary and/or meeting fees and health care insurance costs. See the table below.
- Eight out of the nine most generous special districts are water or wastewater providers that pass on their costs to rate payers.
- Three special districts contribute to pension or other form of retirement benefits for one or more elected officials.

- Nine special districts pay for health care insurance costs for one or more elected officials.
- Four special districts pay life insurance premiums for one or more elected officials.

The following table summarizes the compensation data collected for the 27 special districts.

### Total Special District Board Compensation Expense

Special District	Popu- lation	Total Cost	Salary & Meeting Fees	Health Care Insurance Costs	Pension	Other Costs
Crockett Community Services District	3,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Diablo Community Services District	1,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Kensington Police Prot & Com. Serv. Dist.	5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Knightesen Town Community Serv. Dist	1,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Kensington Fire Protection District	4,936	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Rodeo-Hercules Fire Protection District	30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bethel Island Municipal Improve District	3,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Green Valley Recreation and Park District	473	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Moraga-Orinda Fire District	42,000	\$50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50
Byron Sanitary District	995	\$4,425	\$4,425	\$0	\$0	\$0
Diablo Water District	31,000	\$7,365	\$7,300	\$0	\$0	\$65
Ambrose Recreation and Park District	23,000	\$7,858	\$5,150	\$0	\$0	\$2,708
Rodeo Sanitary District	8,717	\$8,975	\$8,975	\$0	\$0	\$0
San Ramon Valley Fire Protection Dist	158,071	\$12,331	\$8,085	\$0	\$0	\$4,246
Pleasant Hill Recreation and Park District	40,003	\$15,226	\$12,500	\$0	\$0	\$2,726
West Contra Costa Healthcare District	201,196	\$16,385	\$8,200	\$4,188	\$0	\$3,997
Los Medanos Comm. Healthcare District	81,953	\$20,500	\$20,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
Discovery Bay Community Services Dist	15,000	\$22,661	\$22,500	\$0	\$0	\$161
Stege Sanitary District	40,000	\$30,670	\$22,540	\$0	\$0	\$8,130
Mt. View Sanitary District	18,253	\$41,283	\$19,307	\$12,593	\$0	\$9,383
Mt. Diablo Healthcare District	191,452	\$42,498	\$0	\$42,498	\$0	\$0
East Contra Costa Irrigation District	60,000	\$76,227	\$3,605	\$72,192	\$0	\$430
Ironhouse Sanitary District	35,350	\$94,070	\$28,220	\$62,780	\$2,051	\$1,020
Contra Costa Water District	550,000	\$99,826	\$36,700	\$41,177	\$0	\$21,949
Byron-Bethany Irrigation District	3,000	\$105,380	\$5,360	\$99,684	\$0	\$336
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District	451,900	\$158,174	\$52,156	\$90,435	\$0	\$15,583
West County Wastewater District	124,398	\$175,254	\$93,934	\$44,277	\$18,823	\$18,220
<b>Total of 27 Special Districts</b>		<b>\$939,158</b>	<b>\$359,457</b>	<b>\$469,823</b>	<b>\$20,873</b>	<b>\$89,005</b>
<b>Average of 27 Special Districts</b>		<b>\$34,784</b>	<b>\$13,313</b>	<b>\$17,401</b>	<b>\$773</b>	<b>\$3,296</b>

Note: Byron-Bethany Irrigation District has nine Board members, of which two are vacant; all other special districts have five Board members.

Contra Costa Water District reported no pensions paid but has a provision in their retirement plan to pay a pension for Board members at age 62 after 10 years of service.

Professional full-time managers are hired to run each agency. Historically, elected officials have looked upon their work as public service for the betterment of the community. Agencies have provided their elected leaders with benefits. These include health care insurance, employer paid retirement benefits, life insurance premiums, payments for cell phone/internet access, and mileage reimbursement or car allowance.

The total dollar amounts are small in relation to agency overall budgets. However, services to the public are being reduced in most agencies which usually means staff reductions. Although service reductions have been implemented, governing boards have continued to enjoy the same level of benefits. They should demonstrate their leadership by eliminating or reducing benefits.

## **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Each agency named needs to respond only for its own practices.**

**Finding # 1:** Sixteen cities and eighteen special districts provide benefits to their elected leaders in some fashion. These benefits may include salary, meeting fees, health care insurance costs, pension or deferred compensation, life insurance premiums, cell phone usage, and internet connections.

**Recommendation # 1:** All cities and special districts should conduct an annual public review of compensation provided to their respective elected Councils and Boards. This review should include such items as salary, meeting fees, health care insurance costs, pension/deferred compensation, life insurance premiums, cell phone usage, and internet connections. The public review should address whether or not changes in compensation are warranted.

**Finding # 2:** Eight cities spend more than the county-wide average (\$39,377) for salary and meeting fees. They are: Antioch, Concord, Danville, Hercules, Martinez, Richmond, San Pablo and San Ramon.

**Recommendation # 2:** These cities, as part of the annual review in Recommendation 1, should consider whether it would be appropriate to implement reductions of salary and meeting fee expenditures to bring them in line with other cities.

**Finding # 3:** Eight special districts spend more than the county-wide average (\$13,313) for salary and meeting fees. They are: Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, Contra Costa Water District, Discovery Bay Community Services District, Ironhouse Sanitary District, Los Medanos Community Healthcare District, Mt. View Sanitary District, Stege Sanitary District and West County Wastewater District.

**Recommendation # 3:** These special districts, as part of the annual review in Recommendation 1, should consider whether it would be appropriate to implement a

reduction of salary and meeting fee expenditures to bring them in line with other special districts.

**Finding # 4:** Health care benefits are provided to elected Board members by twelve cities and nine special districts.

**Recommendation # 4:** The policy of paying health care insurance costs for Council and Board members should be reviewed to determine whether this practice is appropriate. The agencies following this practice are:

Cities: Antioch, Brentwood, Concord, Danville, Hercules, Martinez, Pinole, Pittsburg, Pleasant Hill, Richmond, San Pablo and San Ramon.

Special Districts: Byron-Bethany Irrigation District, Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, Contra Costa Water District, East Contra Costa Irrigation District, Ironhouse Sanitary District, Mt. Diablo Healthcare District, Mt. View Sanitary District, West Contra Costa Healthcare District and West County Wastewater District.

**Finding # 5:** Pension benefits, with potential long-term financial implications for the agency, are provided to Council and Board members by twelve cities and three special districts.

**Recommendation # 5:** The policy of paying pension or deferred compensation for Council and Board members should be reviewed to determine whether this practice is appropriate. The agencies following this practice are:

Cities: Antioch, Brentwood, Clayton, Concord, Danville, El Cerrito, Hercules, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, San Pablo, San Ramon and Walnut Creek.

Special Districts: Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, Ironhouse Sanitary District and West County Wastewater District.

## REQUIRED RESPONSES

### Findings and Recommendations:

#### Cities and Towns

Antioch	1, 2, 4 and 5
Brentwood	1, 4 and 5
Clayton	1 and 5
Concord	1, 2, 4 and 5
Danville	1, 2, 4 and 5
El Cerrito	1 and 5
Hercules	1, 2, 4 and 5
Martinez	1, 2, 4 and 5
Oakley	1
Pinole	1 and 4
Pittsburg	1 and 4
Pleasant Hill	1, 4 and 5
Richmond	1, 2 and 4

San Pablo	1, 2, 4 and 5
San Ramon	1, 2, 4 and 5
Walnut Creek	1 and 5

Independent Special Districts:

Ambrose Recreation and Park District	1
Byron-Bethany Irrigation District	1 and 4
Byron Sanitary District	1
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District	1, 3, 4 and 5
Contra Costa Water District	1, 3 and 4
Diablo Water District	1
Discovery Bay Community Services District	1 and 3
East Contra Costa Irrigation District	1 and 4
Ironhouse Sanitary District	1, 3, 4 and 5
Los Medanos Community Healthcare District	1 and 3
Mt. Diablo Healthcare District	1 and 4
Mt. View Sanitary District	1, 3 and 4
Pleasant Hill Recreation and Park District	1
Rodeo Sanitary District	1
San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District	1
Stege Sanitary District	1 and 3
West Contra Costa County Healthcare District	1 and 4
West County Wastewater District	1, 3, 4 and 5

**Distribution List:**

Cities and Towns

Antioch, Brentwood, Clayton, Concord, Danville, El Cerrito, Hercules, Lafayette, Martinez, Moraga, Oakley, Orinda, Pinole, Pittsburg, Pleasant Hill, Richmond, San Pablo, San Ramon and Walnut Creek.

Independent Special Districts:

Crockett Community Services District, Diablo Community Services District, Discovery Bay Community Services District, Kensington Police Protection and Community Services District, Knightsen Community Services District, Kensington Fire Protection District, Moraga-Orinda Fire District, Rodeo-Hercules Fire Protection District, San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District, Los Medanos Community Healthcare District, Mt. Diablo Healthcare District, West Contra Costa County Healthcare District, Byron-Bethany Irrigation District, East Contra Costa Irrigation District, Bethel Island Municipal Improvement District, Ambrose Recreation and Park District, Green Valley Recreation and Park District, Pleasant Hill Recreation and Park District, Byron Sanitary District, Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, Ironhouse Sanitary District, Mt. View Sanitary District, Rodeo Sanitary District, Stege Sanitary District, West County Wastewater District, Contra Costa Water District and Diablo Water District.



## City of Martinez

525 Henrietta Street, Martinez, CA 94553-2394

(925) 372-3505  
FAX (925) 229-5012

July 21, 21011

The Honorable John Laettner  
Presiding Judge of the Contra Costa Superior Court  
A.F. Bray Court House, Department 25  
1020 Ward Street  
Martinez, CA 94553

**RE: Contra Costa County Grand Jury Report: “Elected Board Membership”  
(Report 1104)**

Dear Judge Laettner:

On behalf of the Martinez City Council, this letter responds to Contra Costa County Grand Jury Report: “Elected Board Membership” (Report 1104) regarding salaries and benefits provided to members of the Martinez City Council. The City Council authorized this response at its meeting on July 20, 2011.

Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933.05, the City will respond to each finding and to each recommendation individually.

**Grand Jury Findings:**

Finding #1: “Sixteen cities and eighteen special districts provide benefits to their elected leaders in some fashion. These benefits may include salary, meeting fees, health care insurance costs, pension or deferred compensation, life insurance premiums, cell phone usage, and internet connection.”

Agree. Although Martinez cannot speak to the policies in other jurisdictions, we do not have a reason to disagree that these benefits are provided in various jurisdictions including the City of Martinez.

Finding #2: “Eight cities spend more than the county-wide average (\$39,377) for salary and meeting fees. They are: Antioch, Concord, Danville, Hercules, Martinez, Richmond, San Pablo and San Ramon.”

Partially Agree. Before responding, we would like to provide clarification on the findings. The Grand Jury report states “The Martinez City Council total compensation is \$131,326.” In September of 2010, the City responded to the Grand Jury’s request for public records. The request asked for salary and benefits provided to elected officials for Fiscal Year 2008-2009 and Fiscal Year 2009-2010, not City Council members only. The City provided information on the

five Council members and the elected City Clerk and the elected City Treasurer. The information provided to the Grand Jury labeled the names and titles of each Council member, as well as the City Clerk and the City Treasurer. The total compensation of \$131,326 was derived from the seven elected officials. The total compensation for the five Council members was \$97,921.

We are only able to verify the information provided by Martinez and the mathematical calculations used for arriving at the total compensation for Martinez elected officials. All of the cities listed above are of differing sizes and budgets. Using population only as a basis for comparison between cities is somewhat limiting, because of varying budgets, council meeting schedules, and ancillary committee responsibilities. Population should be one of several factors used to compare cities when discussing appropriate levels of compensation.

Government Code Section 36516, which establishes salary caps for general law cities, has different caps depending on the population of the city. Increases to council compensation are limited to 5% per calendar year and must be specifically approved by the city council pursuant to an ordinance in open session, unless approved by the electorate at a municipal election.

Finding #3: This finding relates to special districts and Martinez is not required to respond.

Finding #4: “Health care benefits are provided to elected Board members by twelve cities and nine special districts.

Agree. Although Martinez cannot speak to the policies in other jurisdictions, we do not have a reason to disagree that health care benefits are provided in various jurisdictions including the City of Martinez.

Finding #5: “Pension benefits, with potential long-term financial implications for the agency, are provided to Council and Board members by twelve cities and three special districts.”

Agree. Although Martinez cannot speak to the policies in other jurisdictions, we do not have a reason to disagree that pension benefits are provided in various jurisdictions including the City of Martinez. Martinez also agrees that pension benefits have long-term financial implications, which is the reason why those benefits are included as part of the City’s overall pension liability reported annually in the City’s financial statements.

**Recommendations:**

Recommendation #1: “All cities and special districts should conduct an annual public review of compensation provided to their respective elected Councils and Boards. This review should include such items as salary, meeting fees, health care insurance costs, pension/deferred compensation, life insurance premiums, cell phone usage, and internet connections. The public review should address whether or not changes in compensation are warranted.”

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.

The overall budget process in Martinez is a transparent one, with several public meetings and documents available on the City's website. There is a specific page in the budget document that provides the total expenditures for the City Council. Those expenditures, along with all of the others in the budget, are part of the budget review and approval conducted at a public meeting. However, to increase transparency, the City will conduct a specific discussion on whether or not changes in Council compensation are warranted during the budget adoption process.

Recommendation #2: "These cities, as part of the annual review in Recommendation 1, should consider whether it would be appropriate to implement reductions of salary and meeting fee expenditures to bring them in line with other cities."

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.

Certainly, an annual review of council compensation and benefits discussed above would consider whether changes are appropriate and follow whatever statutory procedures may apply to such actions. The Council has already begun to have such a discussion, as evidenced during a recent public meeting to adopt the budget for FY 2011-12 and 2012-13. Changes in salary and benefits were not implemented, but the Council started the dialogue on the topic.

However, as stated earlier, bringing salary and meeting fee expenditures "in line with other cities" should not simply be based on a mathematical average that fails to take into account the responsibilities of council members for cities of varying sizes and services. Therefore, as to this part of the recommendation, we would suggest further analysis to determine what should be considered in looking at salary and meeting fee expenditures "in line with other cities" beyond simply an average of salaries provided in a wide variety of cities.

Recommendation #4: "The policy of paying health insurance costs for Council and Board members should be reviewed to determine whether this practice is appropriate."

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.

As mentioned above, a regular review of the compensation and benefits should include information about health insurance benefits provided to council members.

Recommendation #5: "The policy of paying pension or deferred compensation for Council and Board members should be reviewed to determine this practice is appropriate."

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.

As noted above, a regular review of the compensation and benefits should include information about pension or deferred compensation benefits provided to council members.

Honorable John Laettner  
Page 4  
July 21, 2011

We trust that the Grand Jury will find these responses helpful to its endeavor.

Sincerely,

Rob Schroder  
Mayor, City of Martinez

RS/AS:mc

c: Linda Chew, Contra Costa County Grand Jury Foreperson  
Phil Vince, City Manager  
Jeffrey Walters, City Attorney