

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOHNSON COUNTY COMPENSATION
BOARD:
JANUARY 28, 2009**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Discussion/Action: Electing a Chair | 1 |
| Discussion/Action: Previous Minutes (January 30, 2008) | 1 |
| Discussion: Salary Information Packets Received by Compensation Board | 2 |
| Discussion: Salaries of Elected Officials | 3 |
| County Attorney Janet Lyness | 3 |
| County Auditor Tom Slockett | 4 |
| County Recorder Kim Painter | 5 |
| County Treasurer Tom Kriz | 6 |
| Sheriff's Major Steve Dolezal | 10 |
| Discussion/Action: Salary Recommendations | 12 |
| Setting Date and Time of Next Meeting | 16 |
| Attachment A: Board of Supervisors' Letter to Compensation Board | 17 |
| Attachment B: Sheriff's Letter to Compensation Board | 19 |

Chairperson Hughes called the Johnson County Compensation Board to order in the Johnson County Administration Building at 6:04 p.m. Members present were: Laura Hahn, Patrick Hughes, Bill Kapp, Hyman Joseph, Joe Moreland, Janelle Rettig, and David Steen.

Elected Officials, Department Heads, and Staff present were: County Attorney Janet Lyness, County Auditor Tom Slockett, County Recorder Kim Painter, County Treasurer Tom Kriz, Human Resources Coordinator Vanessa Wierman, Human Resources Administrator Lora Shramek, Sheriff's Major Steve Dolezal, and Deputy Auditor Casie Kadlec.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: ELECTING A CHAIR

Hughes: I'm going to call this to order. Good evening everyone. My name is Patrick Hughes and by virtue of the fact that I was the Chair last year, I get to open up this year's Compensation Board meeting. I appreciate everybody that came tonight. I would ask that anybody that has cell phones, that you turn them off or silence them at this point. Our first matter of business is electing a Chair. So I will accept nominations for a Chair tonight.

Hahn: I nominate Patrick Hughes.

Kapp: Second.

Hughes: Patrick Hughes has been nominated for Chair. Are there any other nominations for Chair? Are there any other nominations for Chair? Are there any other nominations for Chair? Hearing none Patrick Hughes will serve as the Chair tonight.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: PREVIOUS MINUTES (JANUARY 30, 2008)

Hughes: Our next matter of business is we all received minutes from last year's meeting in the mail and this would be a point in time that we either approve the minutes as distributed or correct them and then have a motion to approve.

Joseph: May I correct the minutes?

Hughes: Yes, you can.

Joseph: Page 13 from the bottom up where it says first "Joseph:" should be "when the State Legislature", instead of "when they State Legislature said"; "that means they get a 5% raise" instead of "give a 5% raise".

Hughes: Okay, so a typo. Any other corrections?

Hahn: I have one on page nine, right after where Mr. Kriz started speaking. In his fourth line, he is talking about Kim Painter pushing through some legislation and it says "while she would probably like to take credit for all of that". I think what he probably said was "while she would probably not like to take credit for all of that".

County Treasurer Tom Kriz: Thank you.

Hughes: It was just pointed out to me that Statute says we have to have a Vice-Chair, which in my memory is something we've never done. Do I have any nominations for Vice-Chair?

Steen: I nominate Joe Moreland then.

Hughes: Joe Moreland has been nominated for Vice-Chair. Are there any other nominations for Vice-Chair? Any other nominations for Vice-Chair? Any other nominations for Vice-Chair? Hearing none Joe Moreland will stand as Vice-Chair. We've had two corrections to the minutes. Are there any other corrections to the minutes? Hearing none I would entertain a motion we accept the minutes as corrected.

Joseph: I so move.

Hughes: A motion has been made.

Kapp: Second

Hughes: Does everyone understand the motion? Is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none all in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed nay.

Motion by Joseph, second by Kapp, to accept the minutes of the Compensation Board meeting of January 30, 2008, as corrected.

Hahn: Aye.

Kapp: Aye.

Steen: Aye.

Moreland: Aye.

Rettig: Aye.

Joseph: Aye.

Hughes: Opposed nay. Minutes are carried.

DISCUSSION: SALARY INFORMATION PACKETS RECEIVED BY COMPENSATION BOARD

Hughes: Okay, that leads us into discussion on the information packets we have received. Once again I thank Casie for putting those together and getting those to us. There's lots of information in those. I appreciate that, and we do actually, at least I, do look at this, go through it, and I appreciate that the Supervisors did spend some time in their informal meetings this year talking about whether they are full-time or part-time. It doesn't seem like they really resolved it, but at least they talked about it a lot. Based on their discussions, actually, I'll bring this up later, but it kind of gave me a different twist on

maybe what we might do tonight. Usually at this point we let any elected officials who care to take a few moments address the Compensation Board, and we'll do that again this year. I see four officials here. Pat was here. Did he have to leave?

County Auditor Tom Slockett: The Supervisors had a City Assessor's meeting at 6:30 tonight.

DISCUSSION: SALARIES OF ELECTED OFFICIALS
County Attorney Janet Lyness

Hughes: Oh, okay. Janet, do you have anything that you would like to say to the Board?

County Attorney Janet Lyness: Good evening. I think that the Board of Supervisors actually gave you a letter today where they are requesting a 3% increase. I believe that is based on what all the bargaining units approximately are getting or a little bit less. That would be my request as well. I think that all of the elected officials met earlier this year and we were going to request just the same amount or at a 3% level, so that we would be consistent with the bargaining units or a little bit under what some of the bargaining units are getting. But because of economic times we're not going to request anything more than that. However we would like to make sure that the levels of the elected officials and the deputies are consistent with the raises going to the bargaining unit people. It's been quite a year in Johnson County, as you know, starting with snow and ice storms and going to floods. In law enforcement, it's been quite a year, where we have had more murders, as I was saying to someone earlier this year, than we have ever had in Johnson County in a year. We've had quite a few interesting incidents that have occurred during the past year and so it has been a busy year. We're a little worried about what it's going to look like in the future with law enforcement and from the County Attorney's perspective with economic times being worse, about what that's going to mean for crime and what we are seeing in the community. Getting back to compensation levels, I think that our salaries for the elected officials, we felt that it was appropriate to just keep them at or just under what most of the bargaining units are getting for the next year. As far as other things to mention, I think that looking at what other counties are doing, and I've been looking... I'm on a list serve so I get a lot of what other counties are doing and they've been responding about what they're seeing for non-bargaining officials in other counties and I have been seeing anywhere from 3% to 3.5% for a lot of non-bargaining positions. Some are up as much as 5% in other counties, but 3% seems about the low from different counties that I've seen in terms of what they've been doing with non-bargaining and elected officials. Just to try to keep people consistent, but recognizing that we don't want to ask for that much more, but we'd like to continue at the level that we are with the bargaining unit. That would be my request. Any questions?

Hughes: Any questions?

Hahn: Janet, last year I think or perhaps it was in some of these materials there was discussion about structuring the pay scale in the County Attorney's Office so that there were three levels rather than five. Is that something that happened or is underway?

Lyness: Yes. And that's one of the things I know I talked a couple years ago about having deputies. Actually this past year I was looking at doing that, too. But what we were able to do was change from having five different levels for Assistant County Attorneys to basically just taking the top three and dropping out the bottom two levels. I can tell you from having hired somebody in the last six months, the candidate pool that I had for starting at a much higher level was very different than what I had at starting at a lower level for the introductory. The bottom level position in our office is an Assistant

County Attorney One. Having that Assistant County Attorney One start higher, it was just a much, much better applicant pool that I had. So I'm in the process of trying to adjust. Where I had five levels before and now I have three, and trying to move people up is something that I've been working on doing. I've moved several people up and that's kind of in the plan for the next year.

Moreland: What is that amount at the lowest level now Janet?

Lyness: \$50,000 is where I started our most recent new hire at. Previously it was \$40,000, which I started up higher than what had previously been done, but that difference was just really so obvious.

Moreland: Are we getting more lateral applications with the higher salary? Is that the difference?

Lyness: Right, and just the experience of the attorneys who are applying. I eventually hired somebody who had been working in the Cook County State's Attorney's Office for seven years. While I have to admit she did have to take a pay cut to come work with me even at the level, I am not sure I could have gotten somebody with that much experience starting at \$40,000. Just the quality of the applicants that I had was excellent, just really excellent. We had some exceptional candidates and it was very hard to select just one, because there were so many excellent candidates this time. It was just a noticeable difference. Not that I haven't hired good people before; just the number of good candidates who applied was just an obvious difference. So that's something that's been very exciting in our office. The other thing that's going on currently is the non-bargaining employees are part of a salary survey that's going on with the County now. We're just in the beginning process of that. An outside firm has been hired to look at all of the positions and to figure out where they should be. Are people in the non-bargaining positions in the County getting paid what they should be, comparing them with other counties, comparing them with the market, etcetera, and looking at what their duties are? So that's going on at the same time and that's going to take several more weeks to do that. We'll see what that comes out at, too. So there may be some recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about changing the pay grades for some of our non-bargaining employees, too.

Hughes: Any other questions? Thank you.

Lyness: Thanks.

County Auditor Tom Slockett

Hughes: Tom, anything to say?

Slockett: I don't really have a lot to add to that. I'd like to take the opportunity to compliment my staff for the job that they've been doing. The flood also affected the Auditor's Office. Being on the bottom floor we had to move everything onto desks and shelves and it was very close to having to evacuate the building. Since Payroll and Accounts Payable are critical services to the County, those areas of the staff were relocated to Secondary Roads and we issued over \$1 million each in payroll and accounts payable during the flood, which I think was a good service to the community and the vendors. Of course we had the General Election and that impacts the entire staff who help out with satellite voting and early voting. We have the highest percentage of voting before Election Day in the state. About 55% of the people who voted, voted before Election Day, which takes a much greater toll on the office than in the counties where mostly people vote on Election Day. Our performance in Elections has been stellar, as well as in the Accounting Division. This is a little visual aid to show Johnson County was third in the State in terms of turnout this year. The top two counties were Dickenson County with a population of 17,000, and Kossuth County with a population of

16,000. This is Story County, another Regent's institution, at 15, and this broad line is Blackhawk, another Regent's institution, 53rd. These other yellow areas are other counties over 100,000 in population. Linn County, 13th, Scott County at 28th, Polk County at 45th, Blackhawk County at 53rd, and Woodberry at 96th. The reason that the size of the counties is significant is the smaller rural counties that don't have much turnover in population, everybody knows where to vote, where the precinct is located and they traditionally have higher turnouts. So it's really a tremendous compliment to the voters of Johnson County and to my staff for making voting convenient and accessible and I'm very, very proud of that. I do think it's important to at some point pay Johnson County department heads at the same level that other tax paid governments and municipalities are paid. This certainly is not a year for catch up. I'm not recommending that, but also I do think it's important to set the pay commensurate with the complexity of the job and in some sort of equilibrium with what the same positions are paid elsewhere. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Hughes: Questions?

Rettig: Tom, I've had good personal experience with your staff this year.

Slockett: We've had a good one with you, too.

Rettig: I've spent a lot of time here. Can you remind us of how many deputies you have and how you do their pay grades?

Slockett: I have five deputies and by State law the top two have a maximum pay of 85%, and so my Elections Deputy is 85% and one person in the accounting division is at 85%. The rest can be paid up to 80% and currently the other deputies are at that level or they are eligible to be paid at that level.

Rettig: And have you had to hire a deputy in this past year.

Slockett: No, I haven't had to.

Rettig: I was just curious how, like Janet's experience of interviewing.

Slockett: I would like to address the notion of turnover, because I have had two political opponents in the last year and there was a lot of misinformation that was put out about turnover. The fact is that turnover in the Auditor's Office is lower than some of the other offices in the Administration Building and we are average for turnover in the offices located in this building. I have been unfortunate enough to have a couple of Elections employees, and I'm being slightly facetious in saying that, hired by the Secretary of State's Office. My previous Elections Deputy is now the State Director of Elections. She took the place of the previous State Director of Elections, Sandy Steinbach, who was also a former Johnson County Elections Deputy. Also another Elections employee in my office was hired by the Secretary of State's Office. So I think that's a recognition of the great job we do and the level of complexity of voter registration and conducting elections in a university community with as large a percent of the population as we have here in Johnson County.

Hughes: Any other questions? Thank you, Tom. Kim?

County Recorder Kim Painter

County Recorder Kim Painter: Good evening. Thanks everybody for being here and all the work you did before you got here tonight. I'm sure that took quite a bit of time to sift through. I don't have a lot really to add to what anybody has said before. It's certainly been an interesting year in the arena of real estate in general. We are looking at the first six months of the year being about \$43,000 below last year in terms of revenues, but we are seeing a little bit of a pick up right about now and it is always hard for us to guess how that is going to project out for the last six months of the year, usually among our busiest months. So I'm still hopeful that we could see revenues pretty much

on target this year. The one thing I did want to say that I'm extremely pleased to finally be able to say is that I've gotten an opportunity to do something that I've wanted to do for sometime which is to see how the office would function with one less person on my staff. We had someone retire in June and I have not filled that position, in part because of the somewhat decreased level of real estate related recordings, but also because we've been very successful in leveraging technology and making some good advancements in how people do their work. We are able to provide good service at this point. I'm pretty happy with that. I look to keep that position open for the foreseeable future and to make that permanent, if possible. I would just say that if real estate returns to what normal was in 2003 and just goes through the roof, it might be harder to do that on a permanent basis, but I was pleased to be able to try that. The staff is doing a great job and I couldn't be happier with that. So, we'll be able to give a chunk of money back from our personnel services budget this year and I'm happy about that. And I'll answer any questions that you might have.

Hahn: Kim you said revenue is down about \$43,000 for the first six months. Is that July through December?

Painter: Yes

Hahn: How does that compare? I mean what's \$43,000 down from what? Roughly.

Painter: A percent?

Hahn: A percent or what was the revenue previous for the same period.

Painter: Well, I of course do not have my total. I've got it month to month, so it's quite variable. For example, in December of last year we were \$2,026 less than we were this year. November we were \$14,000 plus dollars more. So every month was slightly different and it varied. I think the largest decrease in revenues we saw was in August where we were down \$16,000. So our total revenues for the year should be projected about \$1.02 million as I recall and we are off target by that \$43,000 amount. I'm sorry I don't have the precise total for the six months.

Hahn: I'm just trying to get some sense of scale.

Painter: Sure.

Rettig: Kim, we were mailed this chart and it said you had nine employees in a budget of \$611,819. So you're down to eight employees?

Painter: Correct.

Rettig: And is that pay raise or pay classification of the person who retired approximately what pay grade was it?

Painter: Approximately a \$36,000 salary and then the benefits, which I don't have right now.

Rettig: Sure, that's fine. I think that's great. I mean I don't necessarily... I mean using technology to reduce County employees or government employees without laying someone off, when there's actually a retirement.

Painter: It's been very successful in some of the larger offices and I just hadn't had an opportunity to see what might happen. It presented itself this year, so I'm happy about that.

Hughes: Other questions? Thank you. Tom.

County Treasurer Tom Kriz

Kriz: Thank you everybody. I'll be fairly brief tonight. Just to kind of recap where we've been, as Janelle mentioned, you have a sheet there that shows employees in the office. That does show 16 for our office. We currently have 13 employees with three open positions that we've kept open through people leaving and moving. We've been able to

mesh that. Since 1999 we have reduced our staff from 21 full-time and three part-time to those 13 people. So you can see that over the ten year period. Technology has helped immensely. And yet we do more business with the people we have. We have some tremendous County employees. I'd put ours up against anybody anyplace that really believe in the system we do. We were fortunate this year to cut our operating budget for the tenth year in a row, which is pretty unheard of in government. The savings to the taxpayers have been right just a little over \$3 million in the last ten years through the reduction of staff and benefits and things like that. We think we're doing our job the best we can with what we have. The community continues to grow. We have over 122,000 vehicles, trailers, and trucks registered in Johnson County now. Unlike what you heard from Kim, it's a little strange, but tax collections are actually ahead of schedule this year. That's really odd. But I think in some cases people have found they can't earn any money to speak of, and I look at David on that, because banks don't pay anything on savings, but with savings rates down, people have just decided to often just pay their March payment early or pay their whole payment in September, which is a little unique. So we are actually ahead on our tax collections this year. We've seen a little dip in Motor Vehicle, but what we've seen in the Motor Vehicle side is that late model used cars are selling well. For the car dealerships, new model cars are not selling well, unless they are the very expensive cars, and those are selling well. Those are the ones that don't have liens. Those are the \$80,000, \$90,000, \$100,000 cars, with no liens. We are still seeing movement and things happening in that option. As you remembered the deputies' salaries changed as Tom alluded to. In our office I have two First Deputies at 85%, I have one Second Deputy at the 80%, and we just promoted a person into a Second Deputy position in the Motor Vehicle Department at 60%, which is an entry level deputy. We've had no turnover in people. In fact we have a fairly sizable waiting list of people that if a job would open up in our office, they're very interested in that job. One factor I did give to Joe Moreland, who is our representative, is each year we've talked about there was a small discrepancy between the Auditor, Treasurer and Recorder and how we would ever solve that. After last years meeting, I sat down and figured it out to about five units as to how you could make that come out right to the penny and it's a very small amount. But we do have that figure. There was never an easy way to do that, but Joe does have that figure now and that would be possible to bring those to where the three are the same by using the formula I gave him. In talking to my deputies, they would be ecstatic in the 3% to 3.5% range, which is where you heard most of the unions are. It was very interesting as we talked to our employees, many of those in the bargaining unit, as we talked, were happy if it was zero, as long as everybody's was zero. And I think that shows a little bit about the type of employees you have, but they want it to be fair across the board. Those that have been there, I would concur with what everybody has said, in that 3% to 3.5% would be very fair and would keep them in line with that. The deputies do receive longevity now for the first time ever and that's something that the non-bargaining didn't, so we've made great strides in that in the last few years.

Hughes: Any questions?

Hahn: Tom, is that longevity being spread throughout the offices, the Recorder and...?

Kriz: Yes, all deputies would receive it.

Hahn: One of the things you talked about in previous years was the ability to overnight invest County funds and to get good return on that. Can we assume, because the Federal interest rate has been trashed recently, that's not doing so well.

Kriz: That's right. It has held the same today and working with the Auditor's Office and Dana Aschenbrenner in Tom's office, we've actually reduced what we project for the next year's budget by just under \$800,000 that was received on interest earnings. And

we still earn, along with Polk County, for our money invested, the top earnings from the Treasurers that report in at State. But when you've seen Fed fund rates down to 1%, for the first time ever we've seen financial institutions that said it's okay if you don't have any money on deposit with us, because we negotiate using higher rates than they can get in the open market sometimes. So that's a little unique. It depends on the size of the bank and everything, but yes, you can assume our investment, in total dollars, will be considerably down until things turn around a little bit. We still invest as quickly as it is, as before. Many times funds that come in are invested the very same day they come in. But it is hard to make up a change of 3.5% to 4% down to 1% or 1.5% and we're fortunate we did negotiate some early on that are still up around 3%, but that'll be dropping off here in the next three or four months. So that's a county-wide issue, but its less dollars they'll have to spread out.

Rettig: Can you give us a comparison what, for example, was the interest income in the last year?

Kriz: About \$1.2 million.

Hahn: \$1.2 million and we're going to have a...

Kriz: We're looking at more at \$400,000.

Hahn: Wow.

Kriz: That's barring the Fed doesn't do anything with interest rates or they go up and I think where the economy is, it's unlikely. We'll air on the conservative side a little bit there, but the Fed could change tomorrow and go to a half. So you've got to go up fairly long with investments to receive much of a return and we normally have not done that at the County because we try to return to the taxpayer the excess we have, so there's not much of a reserve there.

Hughes: Other questions?

Hahn: Well, I'll ask this of Tom because he's the Treasurer, but if anybody else can offer any comments, and I'm asking because there's no one here from the Supervisor's Office. I'm trying to get some kind of a picture of what the overall Johnson County budget is looking like in the face of being in a major recession and what are the implications of that for tax collections and other kinds of income or expenditures. Can anybody offer something on that?

Kriz: Yes I can speak to that and everybody else can, certainly. We have a Finance Committee now that meets, in which Auditor Slockett is involved with the Assessors and others. For the first time ever the County is starting to look at budgeting out two or three years rather than just year to year. It appears this next year will be pretty good in the fact that a lot of your revenue that comes in are generated by property tax dollars, and because you're basing that on an assessment that was a year before, those dollars will still be there. Also keeping in mind that when taxes go out there, if people do not pay those taxes, those taxes are sold at tax sale, so somebody pays those taxes. So there's not a glut of unpaid property tax money. So that's almost a given that will come in, tax-wise. It appears that yes, this current budget, the County should be in pretty good shape because of the assessment values, because of what's there. The following years, we are talking at this time next year as we look out, we'll have a better idea. The Assessors have said that they look at flat valuations. The assessment year is coming up that there's maybe not the growth in assessment at 4% or 6%. So you know, two years down the road or three years, it could be a tighter situation with not a lot of growth. There is less growth, the Assessors have told us, in many areas, such as new construction. And what new commercial construction is being done, often has been in TIF districts, to where it doesn't provide many dollars to the County, it goes to the cities that it's TIF'd in. But next year's budget, certainly while Johnson County is not recession-proof, we are still in a very good position compared to many other counties.

So, a lot of that is based on documents and items that come from our Assessors, and they're the ones that really generate those dollars based on the assessments of properties.

Moreland: Tom does the County depend on an investment income and is that down as far as interest rates?

Kriz: Well yes, that's what we were talking about a little bit. Part of the budget is investment income.

Moreland: As opposed to property taxes.

Kriz: That's where we scaled that back from \$1.2 to \$400,000. Yes, that's all an integral part of the total budgeting.

Joseph: Tom, how do you deal with the flooded properties that have already been assessed and obviously the rates are there. Do they get reassessed at a lower rate or how does that work?

Kriz: Well, that's an Assessors' question actually; fortunately I don't have to deal with that. But when we send the tax bills out, because their tax bills are based on assessment, and the assessment is January 1st of each year, a flooded property that flooded last year will still have the full value on it. Now the Assessors will go out and reassess that, but many of those properties were fixed up past the flood. When you look at January 1st of this year, they may even assess at a higher value because they've been fixed up. Now some will undoubtedly be lower and the impact will be a little more like in the City of Coralville and in the City of Iowa City, the Assessors tell me. But because you're always behind in your assessment year that's tough for the homeowner that's not in the home and yet the tax bill will come out and it will be for the same amount or more, while the house has maybe been destroyed. It will catch up down the road, but in the short term, it doesn't, because you are always collecting in arrears on that type of thing. Just like properties when we had the tornado that came through, some of those were destroyed and gone. The next year property tax billings went out and they said, well, I don't even have a building and it's still \$12,000. But where that will catch up is when it's re-built, when it's reassessed down, but then when it's re-built, it'll be reassessed for a year or so just on the value of land and not that new building that's sitting there. So, it's hard to catch up. There was a number of people I know approached the Board of Supervisors this year on that and there was just no good way to lower mid-year once they're set.

Joseph: Thank you.

Rettig: Anybody can answer. In preparing departmental budgets across the County, you were asked to do certain things and can you remind us what those were. Like the status quo and fuel.

Kriz: I'll speak for myself on my budget. We were asked by the Board and as part of what came to the Finance Committee to try to come in as close to status quo as possible with no increase in line items, with the exception of things, probably perhaps items like postage and things that we know have to change. In the SEATS area the cost of fuel or something like that that can change. But everything was asked to come in as close to no increase as possible.

Rettig: And then the built-in pay raises that were already built-in, there's been no talk of reducing those?

Kriz: No, not that I have heard. Anybody else could comment on that, but not that I have heard.

Slockett: One thing to keep in mind is most of the County departments are almost entirely, well 80% to 90% salaries, so you can hold the line, yet still the collective bargaining unit basically determines the lion's share of the increased costs to the departments.

Kriz: My particular budget I can speak to is 92% salary and benefits.

Hahn: There was some discussion about not filling positions, which you have not filled a position Kim and you have some open positions Tom. Is there anything being looked at in that regard in other departments or with bargaining unit or non-collective bargaining unit employees?

Kriz: I can't answer that question.

Painter: I'm trying to remember if there was anything said about... I believe the Board mentioned that they were going to encourage department heads to look very carefully as positions came open, in line with just keeping an eye down the road towards possible tougher times.

Moreland: I'll just make a comment Tom because David asked me about this infamous \$232 difference between the Recorder, Treasurer, and the Auditor. If a 3% increase is recommended across-the-board, if a 3.34857% increase for the Recorder and Treasurer is recommended and accepted by the Board of Supervisors, then that would get the Auditor, Recorder, and Treasurer all at the same pay level. So I thought I'd just share those figures with everybody.

Hahn: You've done the high math.

Moreland: Tom's done the high math.

Hughes: Any other questions?

Moreland: We've got a letter from the Board of Supervisors, the Sheriff also sent a letter.

Hahn: The Sheriff Representative is standing up.

Sheriff's Major Steve Dolezal

Sheriff's Major Steve Dolezal: I'm sorry Mr. Hughes. I didn't have a agenda, so I don't know if it was elected officials or whether I, as Lonny's representative, can speak now.

Hughes: I think that's fine. Go ahead.

Dolezal: I could tell you, you all have a tough job and I appreciate what you do. Lonny unfortunately had an Emergency Management meeting tonight that conflicted with this, so I was his representative sent to talk to you. I can recap like many of the other electeds did about the year that we had. Obviously for law enforcement, it's always a challenge for us. We're a 24/7 365 operation. We were impacted by the flood immensely. Our staff was forced to work 12 hour shifts and give up vacations during that time period to deal with the situation at hand. They did a wonderful job. You couldn't ask more from them. Having said that, I'd be happy to recap anything else that you have concerning law enforcement questions, obviously. Our calls for service continue to go up. Demand for us continues. The area towns that contract services for us, that demand also continues to go up, and we try to fill that role the best that we can. When I was asked to come one of the things that Lonny had passed to me was what the statutory requirements of your commission was to do, which was to rate our rate of pay based on what our peers are making. I know that there was a sheet put together by Human Resources. Lora Shramek put it together and if you see that the Sheriff, based on his peers just as Sheriffs go, his ranking falls behind what our County rank is. It has continued to do that and I would hope that you would take that and keep that in mind when you give the consideration to put him back within his rank. And I found it interesting that it says, I believe, and I could be wrong, but it's by peers and I don't know if that statutorily meant just sheriffs in the State or whether you are going to look at other law enforcement officials in the county. And as that goes when you put him against the University of Iowa Public Safety Director Chuck Green, Chief Hargadine from Iowa City, and Chief Bedford from Coralville, Lonny falls fourth in that rank. So he has that, and

the responsibilities that come at the Sheriff's Office are as you know challenging, especially as we deal with jail overcrowding also as an issue, trying to keep that in mind on a case by case basis. I struggle to come to you and talk, and I know that we've talked about the bargaining units getting around the 3% wage. I happen to be the Sheriff's Office Representative that negotiates on the County side for that and I have always made it a point that my employees deserve more. Unfortunately I don't get that choice. That direction is given to us by the Board of Supervisors of what we are allowed to pay our employees and that makes a tough position for me, because I think that compared to their peers in this county, they are underpaid. So I throw that out. I know that's always been an issue that if the bargaining unit gets this, the elected gets this, but really that's not my call. I can't make those monetary decisions. The direction simply comes from the Board of Supervisors. So I want to throw that out. I think they deserve more. I wish I could give them more. They're hard working. They give up a lot. Law enforcement is a very strenuous job. It's hard on the family. Hours of work are hard for a lot of folks, especially when you start out. It is late nights, it's evenings, you're giving up a lot of things. We all make those sacrifices. That's the job we choose, and unfortunately it gets in our blood and we love it. I'm open to any questions should anybody have any.

Hughes: Any questions?

Hahn: I'm perpetually curious about the Jail. I know that there was some change in approach that the Sheriff had initiated to try to not move so many people out of Johnson County, just move those people who are more long-term prisoners, if you will, and keep shorter term people closer. I'm wondering if that is still working. In addition I assume, although I don't know for sure, that a lot Johnson County inmates may have previously gone to Linn County and so how has that affected what's going on in the Sheriff's Department?

Dolezal: Sure, I'll answer your first question first. Logistics is clearly a challenge for us. I'll tie in your Linn County question. Linn County Jail did close and actually during the flooding we became, ironically with us housing there, we became potential housing for them. Then when 380 got closed off because of the water going over that, that shut that down. But we did have 28E agreements, which are reciprocating agreements with other counties, that for a short term we took part of Cedar County's inmates when they would get arrested in the West Branch area because they couldn't cross from Cedar to Tipton to take theirs. Washington County couldn't cross it in the Riverside area because of the flooding, so we mutually agreed to help each other out during that situation. We equally had the same challenge north of Johnson County to try to get people places. With that happening, we expanded our ability to house prisoners. We currently house them in up to seven counties. We house a lot of inmates currently in Washington County, who has a new facility. Iowa County has a new facility. We've gone as far as Benton, and Marshall County has been a good recipient of some of our folks. Having said what you said is the short-termers here, long-termers there, we've tried to do that. Logistically its hard. When we start out our day, we have someone spend their time and figure that out. We have people in five jails, who needs to be back here and at what time? So we send somebody on the road or multiple people on the road to go get people to bring them here. The short-termers obviously hope they're going to get out. Long-termers that tend to stay and are known as pre-trial detainees waiting for their trial are long-term out, so that's logistically how we did that. The Sheriff also was a big advocate of in-home detention and work release programs using the leg bracelet and monitors to try to bring that jail inmate population down. A lot of those things are out of the control of the Sheriff. Obviously a judge sees the person and makes that ultimate decision whether you shall be remanded to the custody of the Sheriff. This is like jail overcrowding

unfortunately, the price of that continues to go up as we deal with that. We are probably going to fall somewhere between the \$800,000 and \$1 million mark this year to pay to house inmates out of our county.

Hughes: Any other questions? If not, thank you.

Dolezal: Thank you.

Hughes: Now is there anybody here from the County Supervisors that I failed to recognize?

DISCUSSION/ACTION: SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Hughes: Okay. I think that takes us to a discussion on five and six, which is discussion on the salaries and recommendations. I guess with that I would just make a comment that I alluded to earlier. Last year when we decided to go with an across the board raise, it was brought up in discussion that across the board raises systemically penalize the Supervisors, who get a smaller raise dollar-wise, because they make less. One thing in the informal minutes of the Supervisors did strike me, and that is I did say they can't decide whether they're three-quarter time or full-time. But they did point out that currently, regardless of what they are, they're only making 71% of what the Auditor, Treasurer, and Recorder make. I acknowledge that this \$232 between the Auditor, Recorder, and Treasurer is kind of crazy and we can address that. But right now, I guess after reading that, I decided, well, if they can't decide whether they are three-quarter time or full-time, then maybe the Compensation Board should have a different strategy. That would be to try to at least get that they're three-quarter time, to at least get them to three-quarters of what the other three are making, because I do put the Sheriff and the County Attorney in a different classification. Right now, if we did a 3% across the board to everybody but the Supervisors, to get the Supervisors to 75% would require 11%. That's how far off we are. So by going across the board we are getting them further away from three-quarters. To give a 1% raise across the board would still require an 8.6% raise for the Supervisors. And if we went with a 0% raise, it would still require a 7.4% raise for the Supervisors to get them up to three-quarters. Now I acknowledge that the Supervisors don't manage as many people in their office as the Auditor, Treasurer, and Recorder do, but I do think that a long-term goal of the Compensation Board ought to be to try to push them up to that three-quarters. In going with across the board, we're moving in the opposite direction. That would be my only comment. Maybe this year isn't the year to try to close that gap, but I do think that going with an across the board raise pushes them further, so instead of maybe 71%, they'll end up with 70% or 60%. But across the board doesn't work in its long term strategy of getting them up to 75% of what the wages of our full-time Auditor, Recorder, and Treasurer are. And with that I open up to comments and discussion from anybody else on the Board.

Hahn: Well, I guess I would agree with Patrick about a couple of things. I think that historically we have probably spent too much time spinning on this issue of whether the Supervisors are three-quarter time or full-time and it's perhaps a little bit beside the point. To say somebody's full-time or part-time kind of suggests that they punch a clock at the beginning of the day and punch out at the end, and that's not really what the job of the Board of Supervisors is. They have meetings. They have to be flexible. They have to take phone calls at odd hours. Simply they have a job, and they have to do it. So I think that, Patrick's notion, kind of parsing through all the things that the Supervisors said in some of those informal meeting minutes and trying to focus on maybe a 75% goal for the Supervisors makes some sense. I also agree, sounding like a broken record, but I have over the past number of years come to the view that doing across the

board percentage raises is not necessarily the best thing to do, because it just continues to exacerbate the spread. I would generally be in favor of those two things, trying at some juncture to get the Supervisors up to 75% and also trying to do an approach with these salaries that is dollar amounts rather than percentages. That might even be a simpler way to deal with this \$232 discrepancy that we have in some of the offices.

Steen: I agree. I also believe the Board needs to consider at least bumping the Sheriff's into the top five for the counties. That is the scope of what this Board is supposed to do and I think you can make a case that possibly comparing it to the University of Iowa Chief of Police, who may be a little overpaid.

Hughes: This is being recorded.

Steen: I know, I was kidding. I think a logical step is to get the Sheriff into the top five.

Rettig: I have a comment about the Sheriff's situation. The Sheriff's salary is not in the top five when you compare it to population, but if you compare it to full-time employees the Sheriff's rank actually is higher. The pay is actually comparable. How do I word this? If you go through the charts on page, I don't know where it is, full-time employees, Polk County has 382, Scott County has 169, Linn County has 166, Pottawattamie County has 159, Black Hawk County has 131, Woodbury County has 114; we are actually seventh at 96 full-time employees in the Sheriff's Department. However in pay, the Sheriff ranked sixth, so it is true the Sheriff is not in rank when you go by rank as far as population. But that is not true that the Sheriff is not in rank when you go by full-time equivalent. I am inclined to look at the overall budget and the request the Supervisors made on every other employee in the County, and that is status quo budget, 3% increases, with certain budget lines going up that they have no choice about. I would point to the letter that we received today. At the bottom of paragraph one it says we would request a salary increase of 3% for Fiscal Year 2010. In addition we do not request any changes in our part-time status as has been discussed in the past. I would be inclined to accept their recommendations. I entertained earlier this week that not knowing exactly what was happening with the County budget, that 3% might be high, if we were looking at layoffs like the State, some cities, and other counties surrounding us. I have done some research over the last 48 hours and found out for this coming fiscal year we look to be alright, and so I am comfortable with this recommendation of 3% across the board for all elected officials.

Hahn: Do you read the Supervisors' letter, Janelle, to suggest 3% across the board for everybody or just 3% for the Supervisors? I read it as asking for 3% for the Supervisors.

Hughes: Yes, I agree.

Rettig: Yes, we have had three County elected of the five say they are comfortable with 3% and think that would be good, three or four. So yes, we do not have an official letter from the other five, but we've had verbal presentations.

Hahn: I guess also to Janelle's comment about perhaps 3% being high, I have been going through all these materials and thinking about this. I must say I am kind of astonished by the size of some of the raises in some of these counties in the face of this economy. I think that there is really some obligation on the part of this Board and everyone in the County to think about the long-term and the financial pressures we are under in general right now in our community, our state, and our country. I am not sure that it is wise to do even a 3% raise, just because we think we are going to have enough money to do it for this year, because we do not know what is coming down the road. It troubles me a bit, because of what is going on in other parts of the economy and with other employers.

Moreland: I think we need to remember that we are setting a ceiling here on raises, that it is ultimately the Board of Supervisors' determination as to what they are going to approve, but they cannot do anything more than what we recommend. That certainly

gives a little bit of comfort. A couple of observations, in going back to where the discussion started and this issue of part-time versus full-time status, I don't think that is a decision that the Compensation Board should be even discussing at all. I mean that is a decision the Board of Supervisors needs to make as far as whether that's a part-time position, three-quarters time, or a full-time position. Now I do think there is some merit in looking at where the Supervisors are compensated in connection with the other elected officials. If we are saying it is a three-quarter time position, I'm just not sure this is the year to do it with the recession and status of budgetary concerns with the County. I also think it makes some sense at some point for this Compensation Board to stop the percentage increment raises and look at dollar amount raises, so we aren't widening gaps. If we try to bring the Supervisors up to be more 75%, but then do a percentage for the three electeds that are basically the same salary, then they get skewed from the Sheriff and County Attorney. I think it will have to be all or nothing if we choose to go that direction. I do also put some merit in the fact that the Board of Supervisors has requested a 3% raise for them, rather than making a specific request of something more than that, that would get them actually at a 75% or three-fourth time to the Auditor, Recorder, and Treasurer. Those are my observations.

Hahn: The Supervisors are probably just now acknowledging the financial realities, which people are all faced with right now. It is just not an appropriate time to be requesting a huge salary increase no matter how appropriate that might be at some other juncture. And again I do tend to favor just doing some dollar raises. I think I totaled the salary for the five elected officials plus the five Supervisors is \$669,994 and 3% of that is \$20,099.82. If you divide \$20,000 ten ways and gave everyone a \$2,000, raise that is one way to spend \$3,000 more on salaries for elected officials, but to do it in a way that doesn't spread the gap.

Moreland: But then we go in the other direction. Then we just gave the County Attorney what percentage raise?

Hahn: A lesser percentage raise. Yes, I understand that.

Moreland: A lot less than the union folks gave, which is also a concern for me.

Hughes: Bill or Hy, do you have anything you want to share?

Joseph: Yes, I have just a few comments. First of all, with regard to the small discrepancy between the three offices of the Auditor, the Recorder, and the Treasurer, I have been looking over the spreadsheet about the other counties and I did not go through all of them, but I got through the first ten and three of the first ten there are discrepancies. I am sure there are discrepancies all over and each of them has their own story and sometimes one gets more and sometimes the other gets more over time. I don't know if it is worth our effort to try to eliminate a small discrepancy and just call attention to it this year. In general I think I agree with what several people said. I agree with what Janelle said, that 3% across the board is probably the way I would want to go, because that seems to be what the Supervisors requested. Most of the elected officials seemed to say that, and it is fairly consistent with what the negotiations are for union employees. That is where I would like to go.

Kapp: My only thought right now or two; one is the one that has been bandied around about the economy and how the Board will be required to react. The other is that last year we made a recommendation of 6% that was reduced to 3.5%, due to some vocal complaints about that and the Supervisors did not feel like presenting to the public the case they presented to us that there was a budget in good shape to do that this time. I can understand that. I am not criticizing for it, but I am just saying to us, I don't think this is a good time. Given that last year was not a good time, this year certainly is not a good time to be trying to create conflicting compensation for which the vocal critics will be talking primarily about the higher end changes and not the lower end changes.

Hughes: So I have heard at least two people say that they thought 3% across-the-board was acceptable to them. I guess if somebody wanted to make a motion to that affect, this would be an appropriate time to do that and then if there are amendments or discussion we can move on to that.

Moreland: I would make that motion, a 3% across-the-board recommendation for all elected officials.

Hughes: Is there a second to that motion?

Joseph: Second.

Hughes: Motion has been made and seconded that we recommend a 3% across-the-board raise to all the elected officials. Does everybody understand the motion? Is there any discussion on the motion? If someone wanted to make an amendment, this would be the time to do that. Hearing no discussion, all in favor indicate by saying aye.

Motion by Moreland, second by Joseph, that the Compensation Board recommend a 3% across the board increase for the Board of Supervisors, County Attorney, County Auditor, County Recorder, County Sheriff, and County Treasurer. Hughes declared the motion passed.

Kapp: Aye.

Moreland: Aye.

Joseph: Aye.

Rettig: Aye.

Hughes: Opposed nay.

Hahn: Nay.

Steen: Nay.

Deputy Auditor Casie Kadlec: Can we do a roll call?

Hughes: Just do a show of hands. All in favor show of hands, four; opposed, two. Four to two. That's our recommendation. Thanks again to everyone for coming tonight. Oh, I guess we have a little more agenda. We are under other and then we go to business from the public.

Rettig: I wanted to say that this has been a challenging year for all public employees in Iowa. In our region in particular, ice storms and snow storms started us, and the flood, and record turnout in the election, and so every department has been affected in some way. It looks like it could be not necessarily a much better year so far, other than we probably won't have a record turnout election. I appreciate the work of public employees in this county in particular, because it has been a tough year on us. I would encourage the County to give a new fringe benefit. I do not have the capacity on this Board to make that recommendation, other than the microphone and that is there is a new bike commuter fringe benefit, and the rules have gone through administrative rules and it is ready. I think the County should offer that to all employees, including the ten elected officials and I heard from one who would use that bike commuter compensation. That's what I have to say.

Hughes: Is there any other?

Moreland: May I suggest that the letter we receive from the Board of Supervisors and as well as the correspondence received from the Sheriff be referred to in the minutes and maybe as attachments, so they are part of the record.

Hughes: Sure.

Moreland: I don't have the Sheriff's correspondence. I can get it to Casie.

Kadlec: You want to email it to me?

Hughes: Any other other? Any business from the public?

SETTING DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Hughes: We are supposed to set the date and time for the next meeting, but for the past couple of years, we have kind of postponed that until December, because it has never worked to do it the other way. Is that acceptable with everybody that is returning?

Rettig: I think that is acceptable, but I did have one comment about it. We sent in the forms early, but in the end we got two weeks notice or something and I had to reschedule it. After I had sent in the form, because I filled out a lot of days, I put something on the agenda for today. So I don't know how that works. Maybe we all didn't get our forms back in time and so maybe it is our fault and we should be prompter, but I just wanted to point that out. In the end I had to put something on top of this, because I had given 23 dates.

Hughes: Casie, in your original posting to us did you give us a deadline? I don't remember.

Kadlec: I didn't give you a deadline, but I certainly could do that.

Hughes: Give us a deadline next time. That would help. I would note that we have got four members of this Board whose terms expire this year and I don't know if any of them will be reappointed, but if not, I would thank them very much for their service on this Board. As everyone knows, we do not get paid for doing this. We do it for the love of the job. So I thank them for their service. With that, unless anyone else has anything to say, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Hahn: So moved.

Hughes: Motion has been made.

Rettig: Second.

Hughes: And second to adjourn. All in favor indicate by saying aye.

Motion by Hahn, second by Rettig, that the meeting adjourn.

Hahn: Aye.

Kapp: Aye.

Steen: Aye.

Moreland: Aye.

Rettig: Aye.

Joseph: Aye.

Hughes: Opposed nay. Thank you.

Adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

Attest: Tom Slockett, Auditor

By:

On the _____ day of _____, 2009

By Casie Kadlec, Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT A: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' LETTER TO COMPENSATION BOARD



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Terrence Neuzil, Chairperson
Pat Harney
Larry Meyers
Sally Stutsman
Rod Sullivan

January 28, 2008 ^{2009 CP}

Dear Compensation Board Members:

Thank you for your commitment to serve on the Compensation Board. Your task of determining salaries for both elected officials and subsequently the administrative deputies of elected officials is not easy, particularly during times of economic uncertainty. The Board of Supervisors has determined that given the state of the economy combined with an exceptional amount of work and demand of our job, we would request a salary increase of 3% for Fiscal Year 2010. In addition, we do not request any changes in our part-time status as has been discussed in the past.

This past year, we responded well to major flooding that inundated our community and we dealt with one of the worst winters on record. With strong strategic planning principles, our county has invested dollars in major building and technological infrastructure projects to meet our needs for the next several decades. 2009 will be full of triumphs as we open our new Health and Human Services Building, SEATS/Secondary Roads Office and Maintenance Facility, the Joint Emergency Communications and Dispatch Center, the Conservation Operations Center and make renovations to the County Administration Building. Demolition of both the Armory and the Fisher Building, next to the Ambulance Building, are also expected as we follow through on the County Campus Plan. And planning for a new Justice Center will continue. In addition, our time will be taken with further work on flood recovery and strategically focusing our efforts on downsizing our budget. We will also be going through the process of hiring a new Executive Assistant to the Board.

The times have been good, but they are changing. The prospect of declining property values, housing foreclosures, higher interest rates and inflation, and revenue shortfalls, combined with residents who have lost their pensions or jobs, and the general increase in the cost of living will all mean an attitude adjustment in how much we tax and how we manage our government. It will also provide all of us an opportunity to take a closer look at what are our priorities are, to implement budget cuts and downsize in areas that we no longer can afford.

Page 2

Our request of 3% is the same as what we have asked of our employees for FY '10. Given the fact that members of the Board of Supervisors cannot receive additional overtime, bonus pay, merit pay or longevity, if our request is approved, it will mean our Board will receive less of an increase than any Johnson County employee; a message that we would like to send given these times of economic uncertainty.

Sincerely,



Terrence Neuzil, Chairperson
Johnson County Board of Supervisors

ATTACHMENT B: SHERIFF'S LETTER TO COMPENSATION BOARD

I would call your attention to page 107 of the compensation package. Johnson County is currently ranked as the 5th most populous county in the state of Iowa. It is believed that if the census were held today Johnson County would likely rank #4.

The Sheriff is the only one out of 10 county elected officials that does not have a salary that ranks #5 or lower, 8 out of the 10 county elected officials have a salary rank of #4 or lower.

Salaries of local law enforcement administrators and Iowa State Patrol are as follows.

- The University of Iowa Chief of Police has 34 sworn officers and a salary of \$154,870.00
- The Iowa City Police Chief has 75 sworn officers and a salary of \$106,018.00 an Iowa City Police Captain has a salary of \$93,662.00.
- The Coralville Police Chief has 32 sworn officers and a salary of \$92,796.00
- The Johnson County Sheriff has 62 sworn officers plus approximately 25 reserve deputies and manages the only jail in the county. Salary for the Sheriff is \$91,644.00.
- According to the Gazette online salaries Lt. Darin Fratzke of the Iowa State Patrol has a salary of \$125,925.57 and Lt. Neil Wellner of the Iowa State Patrol has a salary of \$93,293.53.

Even if the Compensation Board voted to do an adjustment to the Sheriff of 10% this year that would put his salary at \$100,808.40. This would still have the Sheriff's salary well behind the Iowa City Police Chief and University of Iowa Police Chief even if they had their salaries frozen this year.

I believe this is the time to develop a strategy to boost the Sheriff's Salary over the next few years so that he is compensated more closely to the salaries paid to the local law enforcement administrators in this area and the State of Iowa.