



JUDICIAL ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

August 12, 2013

The Judicial Advisory Board of the City of Mesa met in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on August 12, 2013 at 7:51 a.m.

BOARD PRESENT

Peter Lesar
Kate Ali'varius
David Brooks
Robin Harris
Teresa Sanders*

BOARD ABSENT

Phillip Austin
Margaret Downie

STAFF PRESENT

Michael Claspell
Lindsey Lueptow
John Pombier
Debbie Spinner
Matt Tafoya
Christy Trevino

(*Boardmember Sanders participated in the meeting through the use of telephonic equipment.)

Chairman Lesar excused Boardmembers Austin and Downie from the entire meeting.

1. Approve the minutes from the April 29, 2013 Board meeting.

It was moved by Boardmember Ali'varius, seconded by Boardmember Brooks, that the minutes from the April 29, 2013 Board meeting be approved.

Chairman Lesar declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

2. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

3. Review, discuss and take action on items related to the reappointment process and application for Mesa's City Magistrates.

Chairman Lesar reported that at the April 29, 2013 Board meeting, the Boardmembers engaged in an extensive discussion with respect to the reappointment process and also possible revisions to the "Application for Reappointment, City Magistrate, Mesa Municipal Court." He stated that since that time, staff has incorporated the changes proposed by the Boardmembers into a draft document. **(See Attachment 1)**

Chairman Lesar briefly summarized the revised language contained in the document, as illustrated in red, including the following: No. 6 (See Page 1 of Attachment 1); No. 9c and No. 10 (See Page 2 of Attachment 1); and the Authorization for Background Checks. (See Page 5 of Attachment 1)

Boardmember Ali'varius noted that she was absent from the April 29th Board meeting and was interested in seeking input from her fellow Boardmembers with respect to No. 6. She stated that in her opinion, the question was onerous for the judges to respond to and inquired if it was necessary to include it in the application.

Boardmember Brooks clarified that when the Board reviewed the prior versions of the reappointment application, a similar question was included. He stated that if a judge remembered two or three unique cases, it would be helpful to him in learning about that person's judicial temperament, recollection of the case and how it was handled. He acknowledged that judges handle thousands of cases during a reappointment cycle, but suggested that for most lawyers and judges, there are certain cases that are memorable.

Boardmember Harris commented that the two Boardmembers who serve as judges also believed that it was a reasonable question to be included on the application.

Boardmember Sanders concurred with Boardmembers Brooks and Harris' comments and stated that in her opinion, it would be worthwhile to solicit that kind of information from the applicant.

Chairman Lesar further remarked that at the April 29th meeting, the Board referred to an older application, which requested that the applicant identify five unique cases. He said that the Boardmembers determined that it would be appropriate to limit the number of cases to three, with the understanding that they did not want the applicant to spend an excessive amount of time detailing such cases. He suggested that if this question is included in the application, that staff advise the applicants that their responses should be thoughtful, succinct and sincere.

Chairman Lesar, in addition, commented that having the applicant provide an explanation of his or her thought processes with respect to three unique cases would be very useful, especially since the Board's time with the applicant is limited to 30 minutes during the interview process.

Boardmember Harris inquired that if the Board approved the draft application, whether staff would communicate such changes to the judges at this time so that they are apprised of the modifications, as opposed to when they are up for reappointment.

Chairman Lesar responded that in speaking with Deputy City Clerk Michael Claspell, it was his understanding that the Board was meeting today with the intention of making a decision concerning the application so that it would be made available to the judges during the reappointment process.

Mr. Claspell confirmed Chairman Lesar's statement.

Boardmember Harris clarified his question as follows: Rather than have the judges view a revised application during the reappointment process, would it be more appropriate to apprise the judges of such modifications now. He stated that if the judges were aware, for example, of

the new question asking that they identify three unique cases, it might prompt them to keep that in mind when they submit their application for reappointment at a future date.

Senior Human Resources Analyst Christy Trevino explained that the Application for Reappointment is usually posted when the recruitment is open and the Human Resources (HR) Department is accepting the applications. She assured the Board that staff could apprise the judges of the revisions to the application through a simple e-mail process so that they are better prepared to complete the document when it is time for their reappointment.

Boardmember Brooks noted that at the April 29th meeting, the Board engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the Application for Reappointment. He stated that he was pleased with the revised document that staff has drafted and would be comfortable moving forward with it.

Chairman Lesar remarked that the Boardmembers have attempted to insert additional items into the application that will allow them “to dig a little more deeply into the thoughts, decision-making processes and the knowledge of the magistrates” when they appear before the Board for reappointment. He commented that he appreciated the more extensive description related to the Authorization of Background Checks and added that the Board wanted the opportunity to explore any resources that were available and ensure that “no stone has gone unturned.”

Boardmember Brooks advised that in conjunction with the broader authorization for background checks, the Board also discussed and agreed that certain types of information (i.e., personal or financial) would be reviewed and considered by the Board in Executive Session and then returned to staff so that they could maintain those records.

Chairman Lesar concurred with Boardmember Brooks’ comments and expressed appreciation for the Board being provided the flexibility to review the documents in such a manner.

It was moved by Boardmember Ali’varius, seconded by Boardmember Brooks, that the draft “Application for Reappointment, City Magistrate, Mesa Municipal Court,” which reflects the proposed changes as discussed by the Judicial Advisory Board, be approved.

Chairman Lesar declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

4. Review, discuss and take action on items related to the compensation review for Mesa’s City Magistrates.

Chairman Lesar reported that Mr. Claspell provided the Board an updated version of the Presiding Judge/City Judge Salary Review documents, which offer a comparative analysis of similar positions in a number of Valley municipalities. **(See Attachment 2)**

Boardmember Brooks commended staff for a broad-ranging survey and stated that in reviewing the data of the neighboring East Valley communities, as well as Phoenix, Glendale and Scottsdale, it illustrates that the current salaries of Mesa’s Presiding Judge and City Judges are below average. He stated that it was his understanding that the Board’s task, as directed by the City Council, was to explore the issue and make a recommendation with respect to compensation for those individuals. He questioned, however, whether the City had sufficient funds in its budget to consider such a recommendation.

Chairman Lesar clarified that in speaking with Mr. Claspell and also serving as the liaison between the City Council and the Board, it was his understanding that the Board has been provided this information in order to review, discuss and make a recommendation to the City Council with respect to a specific salary for Mesa's City Judges. He stated that if the City Council determined that such a recommendation was appropriate, they would take action on the matter.

City Attorney Debbie Spinner verified that the City Council has requested that the Board make a recommendation, based on their expertise and understanding of market salaries, where the salaries of Mesa's City Judges should fall within the ranges outlined in Attachment 2. She also advised that the City Council would take the Board's recommendation into consideration as part of the City's budget process.

Boardmember Harris remarked that in reviewing Attachment 2, he was impressed by the dramatic difference in salaries that Mesa's Presiding Judge and City Judges receive as compared to the surrounding communities. He noted that although Mesa has the second highest population, its judges receive the lowest salaries.

Boardmember Harris said that he would be interested in obtaining additional information regarding whether there was a difference in the scope of responsibility of Mesa's Presiding Judge as compared to similarly-employed individuals in other municipalities; whether the job description for a Presiding Judge is different in the various communities; and if the caseload of Mesa's City Judges is greater or less than that of City Judges in other municipalities. He suggested that the data might reveal that Mesa's City Judges do, in fact, have a greater caseload, which would demonstrate to the City Council why the Board might recommend a particular salary amount for those individuals.

Boardmember Ali'varius noted that pending the concurrence of her fellow Boardmembers, she would be comfortable with Presiding Judge Matt Tafoya responding to Boardmember Harris' questions.

Presiding Judge Tafoya addressed the Board and reported that in general, the scope of the job description for a Presiding Judge would be the same in all of the municipalities. He explained that Phoenix has the highest number of judges serving under the supervision of a Presiding Judge, while Scottsdale may have three or four judges. He also remarked that Glendale's Presiding Judge, who is new to the bench, is scheduled to receive a raise in March 2014. He added that the scope of work for the trial judges would be the same as well.

In response to a question from Boardmember Harris, Presiding Judge Tafoya clarified that the job descriptions are written on a city-by-city basis, as opposed to being a standardized document used by all municipalities.

Chairman Lesar stated the opinion that it would be somewhat challenging to compare caseloads between municipalities since they may have different mechanisms (i.e., electronic resources, the process by which they conduct business) in place in order to meet such caseloads.

Presiding Judge Tafoya confirmed Chairman Lesar's comments. He cited, by way of example, that Tempe might have the highest caseload, but said that most of the violations are parking tickets, which are handled through automation. He suggested that perhaps staff could obtain

comparisons of domestic violence cases and DUIs in other communities and added that all jurisdictions handle those cases in a similar manner.

Presiding Judge Tafoya further commented that all of the courts in Arizona are struggling with case volumes. He explained that the Arizona Supreme Court has established certain standards regarding the timely completion of cases, which all courts must comply with.

Boardmember Harris commented that the issue of the City's budget will "drive the need" for the Board to obtain as much data as possible to forward on to the City Council if it recommends salary increases for Mesa's City Judges. He said that it was possible that such data would demonstrate that Mesa's City Judges are working just as hard, if not harder, than the judges in other municipalities, and yet their salaries are at the bottom of the comparative scale.

Presiding Judge Tafoya recounted that several years ago during the economic downturn, City employees were asked to take a 2% pay cut. He explained that under rule of law, a judge's salary during his or her term cannot be lowered. He noted, however, that all of Mesa's City Judges volunteered to have their salaries reduced by the same percentage as the other City employees. He added that when the City reinstated the 2% to the employees' salaries, the judges received the same increase.

In response to a question from Boardmember Brooks, Presiding Judge Tafoya stated that to the best of his knowledge, the Arizona Supreme Court does not conduct surveys with respect to judges' salaries or compensation.

Extensive discussion ensued relative to Mesa Municipal Court's role as the lead court in the State with respect to technology and processing cases; that through the efforts of Mesa's judges and Court administrators, it is the only Arizona court that has gone paperless; that individuals from other courts throughout Arizona have visited the Mesa Municipal Court to learn about its technology innovations; that the Arizona Supreme Court awarded the City of Mesa \$2.3 million to develop the technology for a new Case Management System, which will be used by all of the limited jurisdiction courts in Arizona; that the Mesa Municipal Court has also developed the Bench Automation System, which is a unique project developed by the judges and technology staff; and that two of the City Judges teach classes for new judge orientation.

Chairman Lesar commented that in reviewing Attachment 2, there was no doubt that the difference between the actual salary of Mesa's City Judges and similar positions in the surrounding municipalities is anywhere between \$12,000 and \$20,000 less. He stated that the City of Mesa values its programs and people and works hard to be the frontrunner in attempting to "lead the great changes in the community and around the State." He added that he would like to think that Mesa could be more competitive in the market with respect to those salaries.

Chairman Lesar further remarked that Presiding Judge Tafoya indicated that there were certain elements of a caseload that are handled very quickly and the number of cases is really insignificant. He noted, on the other hand, that domestic violence or DUI cases take significantly more time to resolve than, for example, a traffic ticket. He added that perhaps the Board could consider some specific caseloads and the number of judges performing those functions in other municipalities.

Ms. Spinner suggested that staff could contact the Court Administrators in other communities to determine whether they could provide the number of DUI and domestic violence cases in their respective courts to compare with similar cases in the Mesa Municipal Court. She stated that it would be necessary to determine whether staff can provide the Board “apples to apples comparisons.”

Boardmember Harris recognized that staff might not be able to obtain true comparisons as outlined by Ms. Spinner. He reiterated, however, that if the Boardmembers obtained some data to forward on to the City Council, it would give more weight to their recommendation. He added that he would suspect that there are many City departments seeking raises for their staff and suggested that if assessments were conducted in all of those departments, Mesa’s salaries, as compared to other communities, might also be low for many of those positions.

Boardmember Brooks suggested that perhaps Presiding Judge Tafoya and the Mesa Municipal Court Administrator could provide the Board “hour-based kinds of information” with respect to the “extracurricular type of activities” (i.e., teaching, training) that Mesa’s City Judges are involved in that benefit Arizona’s entire court system.

Ms. Trevino responded that HR can assist with the quantitative analysis that compares the scope of responsibility, scope of supervision and qualifications. She suggested that HR and Court staff can take the items that the Boardmembers have addressed, possibly add a few more, and provide more analysis of the comparisons.

Responding to a series of questions from Boardmember Ali’varius, Mr. Claspell clarified that to the best of his understanding, this will be the first time that the Judicial Advisory Board has made a recommendation to the City Council regarding the salaries for Mesa’s City Judges; that in the past, the City Council reviewed and took action on staff’s recommendation in this regard; and that the Mayor and the City Council are expecting that the Board will make a recommendation.

Deputy City Manager John Pombier addressed the Board and further responded to Boardmember Ali’varius’ inquiries. He stated that although he does not have an exact date, the last time that Mesa’s City Judges received a salary increase, it was the result of a market-based evaluation. He explained that the ultimate goal of the City Council and the City Manager was for the Boardmembers to use their expertise and make a recommendation to them. He noted that the City Council may wish to examine all of the information that the Board is requesting from staff, but pointed out that they may not have the time or the background to review those materials like the Boardmembers can.

Responding to a question from Boardmember Brooks, Mr. Pombier clarified that in general, the philosophy at the City of Mesa has not been to determine salary simply based on population. He explained that staff conducts a comparison of salaries from the surrounding communities and attempts to “slot ourselves” somewhere in the upper half of the salary range, but not necessarily first or second.

Mr. Pombier reiterated that the City of Mesa wants to compensate its judges in a fair manner and said that staff reviews the market data in order to do so. He acknowledged that caseload or workload is a very difficult element to assess not only for the judges, but also for any City

employee. He added that the City relies very heavily on job descriptions, market data and scope of authority.

Ms. Trevino reiterated that Mesa's philosophy has generally been to be at or above the market average. She stated that for the last several years, Mesa's market has included Chandler, Glendale, Phoenix, Scottsdale and Tempe. She acknowledged that Gilbert has increased in terms of size and scope of services, so when Human Resources Analyst Lindsey Lueptow prepared the information for the Board, she provided comparisons that both included and excluded Gilbert. She added that in the future, there may be some discussion regarding whether Gilbert will be included in Mesa's compensation philosophy and if the composition of the City's local market will change.

Ms. Trevino, in addition, reported that to the best of her memory, the last time the City of Mesa conducted a benchmarking survey was in 2006. She noted, however, that she was unsure whether the Presiding Judge and City Judges were included in that process. She added that was the last time that all City classifications were reviewed either as benchmarks or as links to those benchmarks. She added that aside from that, salary surveys have been individual and by exception rather than by rule.

Boardmember Harris thanked Ms. Trevino for her informative comments. He suggested that in addition to the Boardmembers' recommendation to the City Council, perhaps they could also provide a one or two-page document that evaluates the criteria just outlined by Ms. Trevino. He pointed out that this was a big decision for the Board to make and noted that just to get Mesa's City Judges up to the market average would equate to a 15% increase, which is even more of a reason to include accompanying data to support such a recommendation.

Boardmember Ali'varius stated that she and Mr. Pombier worked together last year when she served on the Independent Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials. She inquired that with the political climate being what it is, how compelling a case did the Board need to make to see a salary increase for Mesa's City Judges, given that other City departments are also vying for a competitive increase.

Mr. Pombier responded that the City Council is very aware of the Mesa Municipal Court's efforts and hard work with respect to implementing new and innovative technology at the facility. He stated, in addition, that the City Council also relies very heavily on the Judicial Advisory Board's recommendations with respect to the reappointment process. He remarked that given that, as well as the significant disparity that the salary survey reveals, in his opinion, it is very clear that the issue must be addressed.

Mr. Pombier further acknowledged that the City's budget is always a concern to staff and the City Council, but reiterated that he would suspect that "something most likely will be done" with the Board's recommendation. He stated that he wished he could predict with absolute certainty that the City Council would follow through with the Board's wishes, but pointed out that compensation is "a tough political issue" at this time and noted that a 15% increase would represent a significant dollar amount. He indicated, on the other hand, that it is "kind of embarrassing" that the City of Mesa is that far behind the market averages.

In response to a question from Boardmember Ali'varius, Ms. Spinner clarified that the City Council can accept, reject or modify the Board's recommendation in any manner that they choose.

Boardmember Brooks inquired whether staff was aware if the other municipalities have had salary increases in the interim since Mesa's City Judges received a salary increase. He said if that were the case, it would explain, in part, the disparity that the Board is seeing in the salary survey.

Ms. Leuptow clarified that was one of the reasons for the updated salary survey data. She explained that Judge Tafoya provided her information regarding a recent salary increase for Tempe's Presiding Judge and City Judges, which she confirmed with Tempe's HR Department. She advised that Glendale's Presiding Judge also recently received a salary increase, which was confirmed with that municipality's HR Department as well. She further remarked that Judge Tafoya also advised that the salary review for Scottsdale's Presiding Judge will take place in March 2014.

Boardmember Brooks inquired whether it would be appropriate for the Board to consider, beyond salary issues, other compensation elements (i.e., 401(k) contributions, retirement benefits, City contributions to healthcare) that might be less expensive for the City, but also helpful for the judges.

Ms. Spinner responded that the Boardmembers can consider any items that they choose. She said that Attachment 2 includes the different components of the total compensation package that most other municipalities provide to their City Judges. She cited, for instance, that if the Boardmembers wanted to recommend that the Presiding Judge receive an increase in deferred compensation benefits, they could do so.

Ms. Trevino indicated that the Board can make recommendations and staff can gather information as directed by the Board. She explained that generally, when HR staff looks at compensation, they consider salary in terms of ranges or, with respect to the judges, a flat salary in a specific amount. She pointed out that staff determined that it was extremely difficult to compare total compensation since there are different plans and deductibles with respect to health insurance premiums. She also noted that what has been provided to the Board in the salary survey consists of the base salary, as well as additional benefits that are more "apples to apples comparisons," such as deferred compensation, phone allowance and vehicle allowance.

Chairman Lesar commented that he and his fellow Boardmembers recognize the importance of their recommendation, particularly in a climate where a 15% raise to simply meet market averages is significant for any City department. He also concurred that any recommendation that the Board makes to the City Council should include justification beyond what is contained in the salary survey.

Chairman Lesar remarked that it would be important for the Boardmembers to obtain additional information with respect to cases by category; reports to the Presiding Judge; the scope of responsibilities for City Judges; the number of judges that are within the City's judicial system; and the contributions that the judges make to the greater good of the community, other cities and the State. He stated that such information would provide the City Council the added

assurance that the Boardmembers were extremely thorough in their analysis and review of this matter.

Chairman Lesar added that the Board was not prepared to make a recommendation at this time and would like staff to provide additional information prior to its next meeting.

Boardmember Harris inquired if the Mayor and City Council were asking any other departments for similar kinds of recommendations, such as salary increases or evaluations.

Mr. Pombier responded that the Mayor and the City Council work closely with the City Manager concerning all types of compensation issues. He advised that generally, compensation matters are handled by the City's HR Department in the form of benchmarking. He reiterated that the City has not conducted a benchmarking since 2006, but noted that it is something that the City is considering. He pointed out, however, that conducting a Citywide benchmarking would come at a considerable cost and said that it was important to ensure that the funds are available before such an analysis is performed.

Mr. Pombier pointed out that the judges are a unique group of employees, in that they are appointed by the City Council, whereas most employees report to the City Manager.

Ms. Spinner further remarked that the City Manager, City Attorney, City Clerk, Presiding City Magistrate and City Auditor are all appointed by the City Council, who conducts annual reviews of those individuals. She noted that Mesa's City Judges have a somewhat different process in that the Judicial Advisory Board assists the City Council with their reappointment process.

(Chairman Lesar excused Boardmember Sanders from the remainder of the meeting at 8:52 a.m.)

Chairman Lesar thanked Presiding Judge Tafoya for his valuable input and feedback.

5. Scheduling of meetings and general information:

Discussion ensued relative to the scheduling of a future Judicial Advisory Board meeting, pending staff's receipt of the information requested by the Board; and that the City Council anticipates receiving the Board's recommendation by November of this year.

Chairman Lesar stated that the next meeting of the Judicial Advisory Board will tentatively be held on September 23, 2013 at 7:45 a.m., at which time the Boardmembers would continue to discuss the matter of compensation for Mesa's City Judges.

6. Adjournment.

It was moved by Boardmember Ali'varius, seconded by Boardmember Brooks, that the meeting of the Judicial Advisory Board be adjourned at 8:59 a.m.

Chairman Lesar declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Judicial Advisory Board meeting of the City of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 12th day of August 2013. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DEE ANN MICKELSEN, CITY CLERK

pag
(attachments – 2)



APPLICATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT CITY MAGISTRATE MESA MUNICIPAL COURT

This original application must be filed with the City of Mesa Human Resources Office, 20 E. Main Street, Suite 130, Mesa, AZ 85210, before 6:00 p.m. on **Thursday, (insert date)**. With the exception of certain personal identifying information (such as home address, home phone, social security number), note that the contents of the application are subject to disclosure under the Arizona Public Records Act. Note also that the Mesa Judicial Advisory Board and the City of Mesa may verify the information provided. For more information, contact Christy Trevino in Human Resources at (480) 644-4418.

A. PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Full name: _____
2. Have you continuously resided in Arizona during your term? _____
If not, please explain: _____
3. When were you first appointed to the Mesa Municipal Court? _____

B. EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

4. Since your previous appointment, what have you done to further your professional development and to prepare yourself for a subsequent term on the bench?

C. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

5. Since your previous appointment, have you represented clients before any courts or administrative agencies? _____ If so, please describe each circumstance, including dates and the nature of the representation.

6. Identify three unique cases that stand out to you, which you presided over or heard as a magistrate. State the date of the proceedings, the names and addresses of all counsel involved and a summary of the substance and significance of each case. Explain why each case is noteworthy and the skills used to achieve resolution. Attach not more than two written opinions, whether reported or not.

D. BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION

7. Other than the information disclosed during your initial appointment or subsequent reappointments, have you been engaged in any occupation, business or profession other than holding judicial office, or do you have any fiduciary responsibilities? _____ If so, please explain.

8. Since your previous appointment, have you paid all state, federal and local taxes when due? _____ If not, please explain.

9. Since your previous appointment, have you:

a. Ever violated a court order including, but not limited to, an order for payment of child or spousal support? _____ If so, please explain.

b. Had a sanction imposed upon you by any court? _____ If yes, please explain.

c. Been a party to litigation, excluding divorce? _____ If yes, please explain.

E. CONDUCT AND ETHICS

10. Have you received notice of a complaint, cautionary letter, private admonition or other sanction from the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct or any other judicial disciplinary body in any jurisdiction? _____ If so, in each case, describe in detail the circumstances and the outcome.

11. Since your previous appointment, have you unlawfully used controlled substances, narcotic drugs, or dangerous drugs as defined by Federal and State laws? _____ If yes, please explain in detail.

12. Since your previous appointment, have you been reprimanded, demoted, disciplined, placed on probation or suspended? _____ If so, please state the circumstances under which such action was taken; the name(s) of any persons who took such action; and the background and resolution of such action.

13. Since your previous appointment, have you been convicted of any criminal offense or have you had your driver's license suspended? _____ If so, please explain.

F. PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE

14. Are there any professional organizations or public service activities you have participated in that you would like to bring to the Board's attention?

G. REFERENCES

15. List the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of two references who are familiar with your professional activities.

16. List the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of two references who are neither lawyers nor judges, with whom you have had contact other than professionally.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

17. Provide any additional information relative to your application or qualifications, including any interests outside the law, that you would like to bring to the attention of the Board.

18. If you are recommended by this Board and reappointed by the City Council to serve, are you aware of any reason why you would be unable or unwilling to serve a full term? _____ If so, please explain.

The undersigned hereby authorizes all Bar Associations, references, employers, credit reporting agencies, business and professional associates, and all governmental agencies to release to the Mesa Judicial Advisory Board and the City of Mesa any information requested by the Board or the City in connection with the processing of my request for reappointment to the Mesa Municipal Court. Also, the undersigned acknowledges my understanding that the contents of this application are subject to disclosure under Arizona's Public Records Act. I affirm that the information provided above is accurate and complete. I understand that the Board and the City may verify the information provided.

Date: _____ (Signature)

Submission of this Application expresses my willingness to accept reappointment to the judicial position applied for in this application.

(Signature)

Please transmit the completed and signed original Application, as well as eight (8) double-sided copies, in an envelope marked "Judicial Reappointment Application" to:

City of Mesa Human Resources Office
20 E. Main Street, Suite 130
Mesa, AZ 85210

If you would like receipt of this Application acknowledged, please enclose a self-addressed and stamped envelope.

AUTHORIZATION FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS

By submission of this application, the applicant hereby authorizes the Mesa Judicial Advisory Board and the City of Mesa to conduct credit, criminal, driving (MVD) and disciplinary records checks (including records from the Commission on Judicial Conduct or employment records related to any disciplinary action that occurred) and to review the applicant's official City of Mesa personnel files, workstation files and all relevant employment and disciplinary records as part of the application process for judicial reappointment.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Work Phone: _____

Email Address: _____

Home Phone: _____

FAX Number: _____

Date of Birth: _____

Place of Birth: _____

Social Security Number: _____

State Bar Number: _____

Signed this _____ day of _____, _____

(Signature)

Presiding Judge

City	Population	Years in Position	Actual Base Salary	Salary Range	Deferred Comp	Vehicle Allowance (Yearly)	Communication Allowance (Yearly)	Total Compensation
Mesa*	463,162	9	\$150,000	flat salary, no range	\$750	\$3,600	\$0	\$154,350
Chandler	253,352	26	\$174,680	flat salary, no range	\$6,700	\$0	\$0	\$181,380
Glendale**	226,721	8.5	\$176,726	unknown range	\$16,500	\$4,800	\$1,200	\$199,226
Phoenix	1,469,471	less 1yr	\$177,199	flat salary, no range	\$18,458	\$5,220	\$1,200	\$202,078
Scottsdale	234,628	unknown	\$150,010	unknown range	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150,010
Tempe***	161,719	2yrs	\$157,724	\$120,611 - \$162,825	\$15,313	\$0	Cell phones may be offered at the discretion of the department	\$173,037
Gilbert	208,453	1yr/9mths	\$174,241	flat salary, no range	\$0	\$0	\$50	\$174,291

*Mesa Deferred comp is optional based on participation eligible for half of 1%

**Glendale Deferred comp is 10% of base salary, to max of \$16,500

***Tempe Deferred comp is 10% of base salary. Also Presiding Judge will receive a \$500 per month contribution into a 401k/457B defined contribution account in lieu of restoring car allowances

***Phoenix Deferred comp is 9.6% of base salary.

****Gilbert monthly cell phone stipend is available if they are on call. Eligible employees have the option of not receiving the stipend.

Summary:

Market Avgs based on Total Compensation and including Gilbert:

Mesa: \$180,003.67

Mesa: \$154,350.00

-25,653.67

Market Avgs based on Total Compensation excluding Gilbert:

Mesa: \$181,146.20

Mesa: \$154,350.00

-26,796.20

Market Avgs based on Actual Salary Including Gilbert:

Mesa: \$168,430.00

Mesa: \$150,000.00

-18,430.00

Market Avgs based on Actual Salary excluding Gilbert:

Mesa: \$167,267.80

Mesa: \$150,000.00

-17,267.80

City Judge

City	Population	Actual Base Salary	Salary Range	Deferred Comp	Vehicle Allowance (Yearly)	Communication Allowance (Yearly)	Total Compensation
Mesa*	463,162	\$130,000	flat salary, no range	\$650	\$0	\$0	\$130,650
Chandler**	253,352	\$142,661	flat salary, no range	\$750	\$0	\$0	\$143,411
Glendale***	226,721	\$150,217	flat salary, no range	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150,217
Phoenix****	1,469,471	\$144,999	flat salary, no range	\$15,104	\$3,360	\$1,200	\$164,663
Scottsdale	234,628	\$146,848	unknown range	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$146,848
Tempe	161,719	\$144,448	flat salary, no range	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$144,448
Gilbert*****	208,453	\$142,661	flat salary, no range	\$0	\$0	\$50	\$142,711

*Mesa Deferred comp is optional based on participation eligible for half of 1%

**Chandler Deferred comp is \$750.00 per year

***Glendale The City Judge salary is a percentage of what their Presiding City Judge gets

****Phoenix Receive 9.6% of base salary from the City, pre-tax, in a 401 deferred comp fund

*****Gilbert monthly cell phone stipend is available if they are on call. Eligible employees have the option of not receiving the stipend.

Summary:

Market Avgs based on Total Compensation and Including Gilbert:

\$148,716.33

Mesa:

\$130,650.00

-18,066.33

Market Avgs based on Total Compensation excluding Gilbert:

\$149,917.40

Mesa:

\$130,650.00

-19,267.40

Market Avgs based on Actual Salary Including Gilbert:

\$145,305.67

Mesa:

\$130,000.00

-15,305.67

Market Avgs based on Actual Salary excluding Gilbert:

\$145,834.60

Mesa:

\$130,000.00

-15,834.60