

#26



LATE DISTRIBUTION EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
DATE 12/9/14 BOS 12/9/14

Comment on 12-9-14 BOS Agenda Item #14-1649, Longevity and CPA bonuses

1 message

Monique Wilber <monique.w@comcast.net>

Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 8:56 PM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I cannot attend the December 9, 2014, meeting as I work full time. Please enter this email comment into the record.

There is no reason that tax dollars should be spent to provide bonuses to anyone. I find it absolutely offensive that this possibility is even a consideration, especially for electeds, who were elected to safeguard our tax dollars and represent their constituency. I am a government worker, and my pay has been flat, and actually has declined, since 2006.

I request that you reject and do not approve Resolutions 235-2014 and 236-2014. Residents depend on you to spend our tax dollars wisely. Do not approve this frivolous spending. The citizens of this County are watching you and expecting you to do the right thing by us.

Sincerely,
Monique Wilber
Shingle Springs



LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 12-9-14 ITEM 26

Jim Mitrisin <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>

Item #26 public comment

2 messages

Ross Branch <ross.branch82@gmail.com>

Tue, Dec 9, 2014 at 11:13 AM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Cc: jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us, kim.dawson@edcgov.us

Dear COB:

Could you please make sure the attached document is included in the finalized public record for item #26 on today's agenda. Thank you.

Ross Branch



item 26 opposition.doc

45K

December 9, 2014

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
300 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

RE: Reinstatement of Incentive Pay for Elected Officials – Opposition

Dear Chairwoman Santiago and Supervisors Mikulaco, Frentzen, Veerkamp, & Briggs:

I write to express my opposition to agenda item #26 of today's agenda which reinstates incentive pay for elected officials. As a taxpayer in the County, I am disappointed that this Board would consider reinstating pay bonuses for elected officials that just 13 months ago were scrapped. The intent of the original measure, in November 2013, stemmed from the Board's desire to provide "transparency" related to the salaries of elected officials. Should the Board move forward with this action today, all hopes of transparency are lost. Instead of providing the public with a single and discernable figure of compensation, the practice of ambiguous special duty and incentive pay, on top of a base salary, is perpetuated.

Astonishingly, this is happening at a time when the County faces budget shortfalls in the coming years. We are told, the County faces "structural deficits" meaning there is an underlying imbalance between revenues and expenditures. Such deficits can only be addressed through government action of reduced spending or increased taxation. By adding expenditures today, you are taxing the residents of tomorrow.

There is also the question of the appropriateness of elected officials receiving special bonuses. While I support the notion of recruiting "the best" and doing what it necessary to retain them; and, I support the need to pay our elected officials; I oppose the idea that elected officials receive special bonuses. Serving in elective office is ultimately about public service, not publicly-funded spoils. Longevity pay, in particular, is especially offensive. Paying an elected official for longevity is essentially rewarding that individual for winning re-election. That is not what our system is about. Additionally, the resolution before you today defines longevity as "total service with El Dorado County and prior related professional service with *any city or county*." How does "any city or county" fit in the definition of longevity?

The resolution contains another concern. The last "Whereas" states that incentive pay for elected department heads will be in effect until "a comprehensive, Classification and Compensation study is conducted and implemented." This gives the impression that a study will be conducted soon and the pay situation will be rectified. This belies the facts. As was discussed in great detail last November, the law requires that changes to pay can only be made every four years. Even if a study was conducted and implemented in the next six months, those changes would not take place until 2020. Since changes to pay approved in November do not take effect until 2015, passing this resolution means the status quo remains in effect.

For these reasons, I am opposed to the action recommended in Item #26. As a taxpayer and a voter, I ask for a "no" vote. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ross Branch", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ross Branch