

CONTINUED DISCUSSION: COUNCIL COMPENSATION

Charter Review Committee Meeting
January 5, 2022

Sue Gallagher, City Attorney
Rob Jackson, Assistant City Attorney

Current Council Compensation

- Charter Section 4 provides that Council compensation will be determined in accordance with state law, provided that the Mayor shall receive 150% of Council member salary.
- State law sets forth a schedule of Council compensation based on city population.
- For cities of comparable size --- cities with populations between 150K and 250K – state law provides for a Council member salary of \$800 per month.

Current Council Compensation

- State law allows the \$800 per month salary to be increased up to 5% per calendar year.
- The allowable 5% increase is a flat rate, not compounded. The maximum increase is thus \$40 per month.
- The \$40 per month increase may accumulate if not immediately applied. (Increase to be calculated “from the operative date of the last adjustment of the salary.”)
- The increase must be adopted by Council ordinance.

Current Council Compensation

- Santa Rosa Council compensation has not been adjusted for about a decade.
- Under current law, the Council may thus adjust its monthly salary by \$40 for each of the last 10 years
- This would result in a total one-time increase in monthly salary of \$400. With existing salary at \$800 per month, the new monthly salary would be \$1,200.
- This would result in a new annual salary of \$14,400.

Current Council Compensation

- Under state law, adjustments can be made to Council compensation only when at least one council member begins a new term.
- Since Council elections occur every other year, an adjustment can be made every other year.
- Adjustments cannot be approved in advance. The Council cannot provide for automatic future increases.

Alternatives Are Available

- The Charter's provision tying the SR City Council's compensation to state law is optional.
- The compensation of Council members is a matter of municipal affairs and fully within the discretion of the City's voters.
- The voters can set whatever Council compensation they deem appropriate.

What Are We Trying to Solve?

- Increase opportunities for greater diversity
- Continued recruitment of strong candidates
- Fairness to Council members

Key Decision Points

- Method of calculation
- Dollar amount
- Process

Method of Calculation

- Flat dollar amount, without provision for increase
 - Cities vary significantly in their flat rate. For example, \$5 per meeting in Petaluma, \$2248 per month in Fremont
- Flat dollar amount, with provision for increase
 - Commonly includes reference to state law's 5% increase, but some tie to CPI or set other cap

Method of Calculation

- Tie to other public official's salary
 - Percentage of Superior Court Judge salary
 - Percentage of Department Head salaries
 - Other City employee salary

- Tie to median income
 - Median income for three person household
 - Percentage of median income

Dollar Amount

- What is the result of the calculation method?
- How does it compare to level allowed by state law?
- Does it reasonably reflect Council member work load?
- Is it acceptable to the voters?

Process

- Salary set forth in Charter
- Salary calculation set forth in Charter
- Commission appointed for review and recommendation of salary adjustments
- Other procedure

Comparable Cities

Compensation - Comparable Cities								
City	Population	Mayor Annual	Councilmembers Annual	Charter City	Elected Mayor	Calculation		
Fremont	230,504	\$47,916	\$26,975	No	Yes	Tied to CPI		
Hayward	162,954	\$39,960	\$24,975	Yes	Yes	Ordinance		
Vallejo	126,090	\$22,800	\$14,700	Yes	Yes	Ordinance		
Concord	125,410	\$16,224	\$16,224	No	No	Ordinance		
Berkeley	124,321	\$107,300	\$67,599	Yes	Yes	Tied to Median Income		
Fairfield	119,881	\$7,200	\$6,000	No	Yes	Increases approved (\$1,300/\$1560)		
Richmond	116,448	\$46,500	\$16,830	Yes	Yes	Charter		
San Mateo	105,661		\$7,200	Yes	No	Ordinance		
Daly City	104,901		\$18,382	No	No	Tied to State Law		
Vacaville	102,386		\$9,948	No	Yes	Tied to State Law		
Livermore	90,761	\$17,880	\$12,840	No	Yes	Tied to State Law with limits		
County of Sonoma	488,863		\$160,958			Tied to Judicial salaries		
Santa Rosa	178,127	\$14,400	\$9,600			Tied to State Law		

North Bay Cities

Council Compensation -- North Bay						
		City	Population 2020		Mayor Annual	Councilmembers Annual
		Napa	97,246		\$34,440	\$17,220
		San Rafael	61,271			\$13,200
		Petaluma	59,776		\$10/meeting	\$5/meeting
		Novato	53,225			\$4,800
		Rohnert Park	42,521			\$5,809
		Windsor	26,344			\$5,316
		Healdsburg	11,340			\$1,800
		Sonoma	10,618			\$3,600
		Cloverdale	8,280			\$6,660
		Cotati	7,584			\$3,600
		Sebastopol	7,521			\$3,600
		County of Sonoma	488,863			\$160,958
		Santa Rosa	178,127		\$14,400	\$9,600

What was proposed previously?

- Measure M was presented to the voters in 2002.
- It would have increased Council salaries to \$1,500 per month, with the Mayor to receive \$2,250 per month.
- It would have provided for an annual increase equal to that given to City executive staff, but not to exceed CPI.
- It failed on a vote of about 60% opposed and 40% in favor.

Other California Cities?

City	Population	Mayor Annual	Councilmembers Annual
Fresno	537,100	\$85,000	\$80,000
Sacramento	525,398	\$145,440	\$96,257
Oakland	440,980	\$212,422	\$85,382
Stockton	314,835	\$90,480	\$29,363
Modesto	216,810	\$43,200	\$24,000
Santa Rosa	176,759	\$14,400	\$9,600
Hayward	158,089	\$39,161	\$24,476
Vallejo	121,722	\$22,800	\$14,700
Berkeley	120,763	\$107,300	\$67,599
Livermore	90,761	\$16,800	\$11,600
Pleasanton	80,617	\$13,740	\$12,540
Napa	76,498	\$34,440	\$17,220
San Rafael	57,912		\$13,200
Petaluma	57,908		\$11,049
Novato	55,268		\$4,700
Rohnert Park	42,521		\$5,809
Windsor	27,447		6550
Eureka	26,194	\$7,500	\$6,000
Healdsburg	11,383		\$1,800
Sonoma	10,618		\$3,600
Sebastopol	7,356		\$3,600

Questions?