

Date: June 6, 2010

To: Board of Supervisors

RE: Board of Supervisors Budget

From the differences shown for each Supervisorial District, it appears that we have emphasized the problems that departments have in creating fairness in the work place. The absurd differences between district budgets is caused by all of the various options for salary and for benefits.

In the 1980s payment for Board members was the same for all districts! In or about 1988 the assistants position was established as at will position to serve the same term as the appointing Supervisor. All assistants were on the same salary schedule. Now, as with so many other positions in the county, the combined salaries and benefits for assistants and for Board members range widely as follows:

District 1	Member 91,442	Assistant 102,941	Total 194,383	Total Budget 196,883
2	112,127	94,133	206,261	207,721
3	88,287	91,413	179,700	180,900
4	107,038	76,440	183,478	185,978
5 (For a furth	111,087 ner itemization of thi	103,910 s information see the a	214,997 attached chart.)	217,497

My very strong opinion is that each district should have the same total budget! Each district's functions are equally as important to their constituents as any other district. When the law says that a supervisors salary is to be set by ordinance that is what the public thinks we are being paid; NOT what we accumulate by creating add-ons through bargaining agreements for other units. I believe that this should be the same for the assistants; all should be equal.

The way to resolve this matter is to create an ordinance that specifies how Supervisors and their assistants salaries and benefits are established. It should allow that all salaries and benefits and all travel and vehicle expenses and office rental shall be within the amounts allowed by the budget amount for each district and that the total budget amount should be the same for all districts.

In that fashion, the Board member would need to manage their budget just as we tell department heads they must manage. If a member wanted to pay more for an employee they could as long as they were within their budget. If they wanted to travel they would need to have less salaries.

I believe such an ordinance should be in place this fall. Let us be the example makers.