



**INDEPENDENT COMMISSION ON COMPENSATION FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS
AGENDA**

**City Council Chambers – Lower Level, 57 East 1st Street
Monday, October 29, 2012
5:30 P.M.**

Compensation Commission:

Kate Ali'varius (Chairperson)
Gary Levine (Vice-Chair)
Stacy Holmstedt

Tom Rhodes
Dan Wollam

Citizen Participation

All citizens are permitted and encouraged to speak on agenda items. If you wish to speak to the Board on any item on the agenda, please fill out a "Notice" slip with your name and the Item Number about which you wish to speak. Hand this to a staff person or take it to the front table. The Chairperson will call upon you in turn.

1. Approval of the minutes of the Independent Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials meeting held on October 16, 2012.
2. Conduct a public hearing regarding the compensation for Mayor and City Council.
3. Discuss and provide direction on the Commission's recommendation to the City Council regarding the compensation for Mayor and City Council.
4. Discuss and set dates for upcoming meetings.

The City of Mesa is committed to making its public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. For special accommodations, please contact the City Manager's Office at (480) 644-3333 or (480) 644-2778 (TDD) at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

Agenda Item 1

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION ON COMPENSATION FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS MINUTES

October 16, 2012

The Independent Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials met in Suite 170 of the Mesa City Plaza, 20 East Main Street, on October 16, 2012 at 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kate Ali'varius
Stacy Holmstedt
Gary Levine
Tom Rhodes
Dan Wollam

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

John Pombier
Debbie Spinner
Jill Kotsur
Linda White

1. Approval of the minutes of the Independent Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials meeting held on October 9, 2012.

It was moved by Commission Member Wollam, seconded by Commission Member Holmstedt, that the minutes of the Independent Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials held on October 9, 2012 be approved.

Carried unanimously.

2. Election of the Commission Vice Chairperson.

It was moved by Commission Member Rhodes, seconded by Commission Member Holmstedt, that Commission Member Levine be appointed Vice Chairperson of the Independent Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials.

Carried unanimously.

3. Select length of term for the Commission Chairperson and Vice Chairperson.

It was moved by Chairperson Ali'varius, seconded by Vice Chairperson Levine, that the length of the term for the Commission Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be for one year.

Carried unanimously.

4. Review and discuss Mayor and Council salary comparison information supplied by Commission Member Rhodes on October 9, 2012.

Commission Member Rhodes displayed a series of spreadsheets (**See Pages 1 and 2 of Attachment 1**) that illustrated the salaries of the Mayor and Councilmembers in 15 different cities. He pointed out that currently, the Mayor of Mesa receives \$.08708 per citizen which, in his opinion, is not a very competitive salary.

Commission Member Rhodes explained that based on the population, if the Mayor of Mesa were paid at the same rate as the Mayor of Long Beach, he would receive \$126,115.91 per year. He added that if the Mayor of Long Beach were paid at the same rate as the Mayor of Mesa, he or she would receive \$40,192.90 per year. He also noted that the Mesa City Charter does not indicate whether the Mayor's position is considered full-time or part-time.

Chairperson Ali'varius thanked Commission Member Rhodes for his comments and for the salary comparison spreadsheet that he prepared.

5. Review and discuss Mayor and Council salary comparison information supplied by Vice Chairperson Levine.

Vice Chairperson Levine utilized the spreadsheet submitted by Commission Member Rhodes to create some options that could be used to calculate compensation for the Mayor and Councilmembers. (**See Page 1 of Attachment 2**) He highlighted some of the possible variations as follows:

- Determine the average salary based on cities with a salary range higher than Mesa.
- Determine the average salary based on cities with a population that is within 10% of the population of Mesa.
- Determine the average compensation based on the salaries of all 15 cities listed on the spreadsheet.

City Attorney Debbie Spinner indicated that additional information was submitted to the Commission Members by Vice Chairperson Levine, at today's meeting and will be posted to the website.

6. Hear a presentation and discuss the Compensation Data Collected for Election Officials of Similarly Situated Municipalities.

Senior Human Resources Analyst Linda White displayed a document titled "History of Council Salary Adjustments 1967 through 2012" (**See Page 1 of Attachment 3**) and reported that the largest Council salary increases occurred in 1986 and 1998. She added that in 1986 an Ordinance was adopted which stated that in addition to salary adjustments, the Council would also be entitled to fringe benefits including, but not limited to, vacation pay, retirement benefits, health and accident benefits, insurance and other benefits available to City employees.

Ms. White also reported that in 1998, an Ordinance was adopted providing for both a salary adjustment, as well as cost-of-living adjustments given to other City employees. Ms. White noted that the City's population in 1998 was 382,479.

Commission Member Holmstedt commented that Mesa's population has increased by nearly 15% since 1998. She said that if the Mayor and Council's salaries were increased by 15% they would still be substantially lower than the salaries of other cities.

Chairperson Ali'varius requested that Ms. White review the data submitted by staff from the City of Peoria.

Ms. Spinner advised that the information received from the City of Peoria has not been provided to the entire Commission. She explained that the City of Peoria has a similar Compensation Commission and said that the minutes from their last meeting were provided to the Chairperson to serve as an example of how the Commission could proceed and present their recommendations. She stated that this information would be provided to all of the Commission Members and placed on the next meeting's agenda.

Ms. White pointed out that at the last meeting, the Commission requested that staff research and determine if other cities have an Ordinance that outlines whether or not the Mayor and/or Councilmembers are considered full-time or part-time employees. She displayed a document titled "Mayor and Councilmember Compensation Information" and reviewed the data she received from the various cities. (See Pages 2 and 3 of Attachment 3) She noted that in Arlington, Texas, the Mayor and Councilmembers are considered volunteer positions.

Responding to a question from Chairperson Ali'varius, Ms. White explained that the \$3,000 a year compensation that Arlington, Texas pays its volunteer Mayor and Councilmembers is intended to be a reimbursement for their mileage and other expenses.

Discussion ensued relative to Fresno, California, which considers its Mayor and Councilmembers to be temporary full-time employees and that temporary employees at the City of Mesa are considered to be "at will" employees.

Commission Member Rhodes commented that Mesa's Mayor and Councilmembers could not be considered "at will" employees since they are elected by the voters.

Ms. White briefly summarized the salary adjustment history of the Councilmembers in Phoenix, Tempe and Tucson. (See Page 2 of Attachment 3)

In response to a question from Commission Member Rhodes, Ms. White indicated that she would research and determine how many members currently serve on Phoenix's Compensation Commission, and also the manner in which those members are appointed.

Further discussion ensued relative to the number of Councilmembers who serve in larger cities.

Chairperson Ali'varius requested that Ms. White research and determine the number of Councilmembers in the respective cities included on the spreadsheet.

Ms. White provided a brief overview of her findings regarding the Mayor and Councilmembers in other cities who receive a cost-of-living increase at the same time as regular City employees. (See Page 2 of Attachment 3)

Ms. White clarified that the Commission requested that staff research and provide the following additional information:

- How many members serve on the Compensation Commission in Phoenix and how are they appointed.
- How many Councilmembers serve in other cities.
- How many constituents each Councilmember serves in other cities and whether the number of constituents changed as a result of redistricting.

Ms. White reviewed the benefit options currently available to the Mayor and Councilmembers, such as, car allowances and health insurance. **(See Page 1 of Attachment 4)**

Deputy City Manager John Pombier said that like all City employees, Councilmembers are eligible for the Tuition Reimbursement Program. He noted, however, that there has never been a Council budget for the program.

In response to a question from Chairperson Ali'varius, Ms. Spinner explained that each Councilmember has his/her own discretionary budget approved by the Council. She said that the manner in which the individual Councilmember chooses to use their budget is limited by the law in that it must be used to benefit the City of Mesa.

Responding to a question from Chairperson Ali'varius, Mr. Pombier explained that the Council budget is the same for all Councilmembers and is not based on the number of constituents they represent.

Ms. Spinner noted that the Council's staff are paid out of the City Manager's budget.

Chairperson Ali'varius suggested that each Commission Member share their thoughts regarding the information that has been presented.

Commission Member Holmstedt commented that she would like to have the data grouped into full-time and part-time categories to see how the cities compare.

Commission Member Rhodes stated that increasing the Mayor's salary from \$38,000 to \$99,000 may not be politically expedient, but if this is the salary that is deserved, then the Commission should move forward with such a recommendation.

Responding to comments made by Commission Member Rhodes, Chairperson Ali'varius said that the current Mayor would not benefit from the decisions made by the Commission.

Ms. Spinner clarified that if the Commission Members completed their duties in November and the Council acted on their recommendations in December, the salary adjustment would become effective with the seating of the new Council in January of 2013.

Chairperson Ali'varius suggested that the salary for the Mayor of Mesa be set somewhere in between the salaries of the Mayors of Phoenix and Tucson. She said that in her calculations, this would mean a salary somewhere in the range of \$60,000 to \$65,000 per year.

Commission Member Wollam remarked that the numbers that have been presented are helpful but do not tell the entire story. He explained that he still did not have a full understanding as to the amount of work and time expended by the Mayor and Councilmembers. He added that this information would be beneficial in determining a rate of pay.

Vice Chairperson Levine suggested that the information that has been presented be charted so that the total compensation and base salaries of other cities could be compared. He noted that there is no consistency between the other cities regarding the Mayor and Council being considered full or part-time employees.

Chairperson Ali'varius commented that the Commission will not be reviewing the individual performance of each of the Councilmembers. She inquired as to what factors the Commission Members believed were most important when considering a salary adjustment. She added that providing an appropriate salary would encourage accomplished individuals to run for the City Council.

Mr. Pombier remarked that the Commission may want to consider the effect that the cost-of-living in California would have on the salary calculations that have been provided. He also advised that staff would be unable to predict the number of meetings or the amount of time a specific Councilmember spends on his/her duties. He stated that Councilmembers are required to attend a certain number of meetings and added that their performance is judged by the votes of their constituents.

Discussion ensued relative to the cost-of-living difference in Arizona and California; alternative options that could be used to calculate compensation; and how a fair salary would attract candidates.

Commission Member Rhodes suggested that staff research and determine the population of each Council District in Mesa and Phoenix.

Responding to a question from Chairperson Ali'varius, Ms. Spinner explained that the number of hours spent on Council duties varies with each Councilmember. She advised that in addition to City Council meetings, Councilmembers serve on non-profit boards, attend meetings outside of the City and provide a tremendous amount of public outreach. She added that staff would only be able to report on how many City meetings the Mayor and Councilmembers attend in a month.

Further discussion ensued regarding the number of hours that the Mayor and Councilmembers spend on City business.

Commission Member Wollam remarked that if this Commission is not an evaluation committee, then the amount of hours spent on duties becomes more important. He said that there should be some understanding as to what the life of the Mayor and the Councilmembers consists of when considering compensation.

Mr. Pombier reported that the Redistricting Commission set a population goal of 73,174 for each Council District. He noted that some Districts grow at record rates, while some can actually shrink in size.

Discussion ensued relative to whether the \$150 car allowance and the \$80 phone allowance were enough to actually cover the expenses incurred.

Chairperson Ali'varius inquired as to whether or not the Commission Members had any concerns regarding the other benefits included in the compensation package, such as tuition reimbursement.

Commission Member Wollam pointed out that at the present time, Councilmembers are entitled to the same benefits as any other City employee. He said to take something away from the compensation package could indicate that the City is not willing to provide the same employee benefits to the Council.

Commission Member Rhodes remarked that many of the Councilmembers are already fully educated and would not have a need for tuition reimbursement.

Commission Member Holmstedt commented that tuition reimbursement could help attract the right candidates, particularly those who are early in their careers. She stated that with Mesa's emphasis on higher education, tuition reimbursement could be viewed as an important benefit.

Chairperson Ali'varius commented that obtaining a degree is not a simple task and that if a Councilmember were to attempt to pursue a degree, it could take time away from their constituents. She stated the opinion that some Councilmembers may be able to seek a degree, however, if the salary is not substantial, they would need to have other employment.

Ms. Spinner clarified that if the Commission decides that tuition reimbursement should be part of the compensation package, it would be necessary for the City Manager to determine how it would be budgeted. She added that there has never been a request for tuition reimbursement submitted by a Councilmember, although there have been questions raised.

Commission Member Wollam suggested that the Commission not attempt to make any decisions with regards to the issue of tuition reimbursement at this time and that the benefits package be reviewed at a later date. He said that he did not have any concerns regarding tuition reimbursement since there has never been a request for it and it is unlikely that a Councilmember would want to take advantage of the benefit.

Further discussion ensued relative to the amount of time that would need to be invested in order to pursue a degree while serving on the City Council.

Chairperson Ali'varius inquired as to whether any of the Commission Members believed that the Vice Mayor should be offered a higher salary due to the additional responsibilities of that role.

Discussion ensued regarding the additional duties of the Vice Mayor and whether offering a higher salary would "send a message" that the Vice Mayor is expected to do more than the other Councilmembers.

Vice Chairperson Levine stated the opinion that tuition reimbursement could be used to enhance the Council's abilities and should be left in place at this time.

Extensive discussion ensued regarding where, the City of Mesa ranks compared to other cities regarding compensation. It was noted that with regard to salary, Mesa is ranked number 12 out of the 15 cities surveyed.

Chairperson Ali'varius advised that based on her analysis of the total compensation package, the salary for the Mayor of Mesa should fall somewhere between that of Phoenix and Tucson. She reiterated that per her calculations, this would mean a salary in the range of \$60,000 to \$65,000 a year. She also offered the suggestion that the salary adjustment be implemented in two tiers, with an increase occurring this year and another increase the following year. She added that a tiered approach would allow time for the other cities to have an opportunity to catch up with respect to their own compensation for elected officials.

Commission Member Rhodes remarked that the Commission should not be constrained by Phoenix's salary.

Chairperson Ali'varius pointed out that Phoenix is the hub of Arizona and Mesa is the third largest city in the State. She said that to set a salary that exceeds that of Phoenix would be "politically hard to sell."

Commission Member Wollam commented that he would prefer to make a decision based on what is right for the position and not on what other cities have done.

Commission Member Holmstedt remarked that Mesa has an opportunity to be a leader and should not be constrained by what other cities are doing. She noted, however, that she was not opposed to exploring the salaries of other municipalities.

Chairperson Ali'varius inquired as to why the attempt to increase compensation in 2008 failed.

Commission Member Rhodes pointed out that there were some significant economic challenges in 2008 and that a salary increase for Councilmembers would probably not have been well received. He also said that in 2009, the Council's salary was reduced along with the salary of other City of Mesa employees.

Commission Member Wollam commented that some elected officials are self-conscious about the issue of raising their own compensation, and therefore, the use of Commissions such as this one have become more popular.

Ms. Spinner explained that the City Charter indicates that the Council votes to adopt a salary adjustment by Ordinance. She noted that in 2008, the Council voted not to proceed with a salary adjustment at that time.

The Commission Members discussed initiating a salary adjustment using a two-tiered approach and holding a public forum to allow citizens an opportunity to provide their input.

7. Discuss and set dates for upcoming meetings.

Discussion ensued among the Commission Members and staff relative to possible dates and locations for future meetings, including a public forum.

Ms. Spinner suggested that instead of holding a separate public hearing, that an item be included on the next meeting's agenda to allow comments from citizens present. She said that notice of the meeting will be posted, placed on the City's website and advertised in the newspaper.

Chairperson Ali'varius stated that it was the consensus of the Commission that the next meeting of the Independent Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials, which will include a public forum, will be held on Monday, October 29, 2012, at 5:30 p.m., in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street.

8. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present

9. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Independent Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials meeting adjourned at 7:19 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Independent Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials held on the 16th day of October, 2012. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

LINDA CROCKER, CITY CLERK

bdw
(attachments – 4)

Mayor

City	Amount	Pop	Am/Pop	Mesa @ A/P	Pop/Amt	Mesa A/P @ Pop
Long Beach, CA	\$ 132,585,71	461,564	\$ 0.28725	\$ 126,115.91	3.481249978	\$ 40,192.90
Fresno, CA	\$ 130,000.00	500,121	\$ 0.25994	\$ 114,123.04	3.847084615	\$ 43,550.43
Kansas City, MO	\$ 123,156.00	459,787	\$ 0.26785	\$ 117,599.09	3.733370684	\$ 40,038.16
Sacramento, CA	\$ 119,046.40	466,488	\$ 0.25520	\$ 112,042.00	3.918539326	\$ 40,621.68
San Jose, CA	\$ 105,350.00	967,487	\$ 0.10889	\$ 47,807.33	9.183550071	\$ 84,248.57
Tacoma, WA	\$ 89,158.00	204,000	\$ 0.43705	\$ 191,882.44	2.288072859	\$ 17,764.28
Phoenix, AZ	\$ 88,435.00	1,445,632	\$ 0.06117	\$ 26,857.87	16.34683101	\$ 125,885.34
Aurora, CO	\$ 60,079.62	332,354	\$ 0.18077	\$ 79,365.42	5.531892512	\$ 28,941.32
Tempe, AZ	\$ 55,496.00	161,719	\$ 0.34316	\$ 150,662.69	2.914065879	\$ 14,082.46
Glendale, AZ	\$ 48,000.00	226,721	\$ 0.21171	\$ 92,951.11	4.723354167	\$ 19,742.82
Tucson, AZ	\$ 42,000.00	520,116	\$ 0.08075	\$ 35,453.10	12.38371429	\$ 45,291.59
Mesa, AZ	\$ 38,231.60	439,041	\$ 0.08708	\$ -	11.48372027	
Peoria, AZ	\$ 30,802.80	158,000	\$ 0.19495	\$ 85,592.99	5.12940382	\$ 13,758.61
Virginia Beach, VA	\$ 30,000.00	437,994	\$ 0.06849	\$ 30,071.71	14.5998	\$ 38,140.43
Arlington, TX	\$ 3,075.00	364,000	\$ 0.00845	\$ 3,708.93	118.3739837	\$ 31,697.05
10/9/2012						

Mayor							
#	City	Amount	Pop	Amt/Pop	Mesa @ A/P	Pop/Amt	Mesa A/P @ Pop
1	Long Beach, CA	\$132,585.71	461,564	\$ 0.28725	\$126,115.91	3,481,249,978	\$ 40,192.90
2	Fresno, CA	\$130,000.00	500,121	\$ 0.25994	\$114,123.04	3,847,084,615	\$ 43,550.43
3	Kansas City, MO	\$123,156.00	459,787	\$ 0.26785	\$117,599.09	3,733,370,684	\$ 40,038.16
4	Sacramento, CA	\$119,046.40	466,488	\$ 0.25520	\$112,042.00	3,918,539,326	\$ 40,621.68
5	San Jose, CA	\$105,350.00	967,487	\$ 0.10889	\$ 47,807.33	9,183,550,071	\$ 84,248.57
6	Tacoma, WA	\$ 89,158.00	204,000	\$ 0.43705	\$191,882.44	2,288,072,859	\$ 17,764.28
7	Phoenix, AZ	\$ 88,435.00	1,445,632	\$ 0.06117	\$ 26,857.87	16,346,831,011	\$ 125,885.34
8	Aurora, CO	\$ 60,079.62	332,354	\$ 0.18077	\$ 79,365.42	5,531,892,512	\$ 28,941.32
9	Tempe, AZ	\$ 55,496.00	161,719	\$ 0.34316	\$150,662.69	2,914,065,879	\$ 14,082.46
10	Glendale, AZ	\$ 48,000.00	226,721	\$ 0.21171	\$ 92,951.11	4,723,354,167	\$ 19,742.82
11	Tucson, AZ	\$ 42,000.00	520,116	\$ 0.08075	\$ 35,453.10	12,383,714,291	\$ 45,291.59
12	Mesa, AZ	\$ 38,231.60	439,041	\$ 0.08708	\$ -	11,483,720,227	\$
13	Peoria, AZ	\$ 30,802.80	158,000	\$ 0.19495	\$ 85,592.99	5,129,403,821	\$ 13,758.61
14	Virginia Beach, VA	\$ 30,000.00	437,994	\$ 0.06849	\$ 30,071.71	14,599,814	\$ 38,140.43
15	Arlington, TX	\$ 3,075.00	364,000	\$ 0.00845	\$ 3,708.93	118,373,983,371	\$ 31,697.05
Examples of possible versions to determine compensation utilizing the data in the table above:							
Version 1 = All Cities above Mesa Pop. Average							
Sum of Line Amt/Pop #1 - #11.				\$2,493,375			
Average of above amt/pop				\$0,226,700			
Multiply above average amt/pop times Mesa pop = avg. compensation				\$99,532,730			
Version 2 = All Cities within 10% of Mesa Pop. Average							
Sum of Line Amt/Pop #1, #3, #4, #12, #14. All within 10% of Mesa pop				\$0,965,888			
Average of above amt/pop				\$0,193,180			
Multiply above average amt/pop times Mesa pop = avg. compensation				\$84,812,060			
Version 3 = All Cities Average							
Sum of Line Amt/Pop #1 - #15.				\$2,852,273			
Average of above amt/pop				\$0,190,180			
Multiply above average amt/pop times Mesa pop = avg. compensation				\$83,497,680			

**HISTORY OF COUNCIL
 SALARY ADJUSTMENTS
 1967 THROUGH 2012**

	MAYOR SALARY	COUNCIL SALARY	CAR ALLOWANCE	COMMUNICATION ALLOWANCE
1967 Original Charter	\$3,600	\$1,200		
1986* Ord. 2106	\$19,200	\$9,600		
1998** Ord. 3445	\$33,600	\$16,800		
2001 Ord. 3937			\$150/month	
2005 Ord. 4343				\$80/month

*Ordinance 2106 was adopted in 1986 and became effective 1988. In addition to the salary adjustment, the Council also became entitled to “fringe benefits not less than those received by other employees of the City, including, but not limited to vacation pay, retirement benefits, health and accident benefits and insurance, and such other fringe benefits as may from time to time be available to other city employees.”

**Ordinance 3445 was adopted in 1998 and became effective in 2000. In addition to the salary adjustment, the ordinance also states that, in the future, the Council’s salary would be adjusted by the cost-of-living adjustment given to other city employees.

Additional information requested by the Commission

The population in 1998 was 382,479 (source 1998 Planning Division Statistical Report)

MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBER COMPENSATION INFORMATION

Tuesday, October 16, 2012

City	Does your City Ordinance set out whether the Mayor and/or Councilmembers are considered full-time or part-time employees?	Has your Mayor and Council received salary adjustments since 2000, if so, when were the increases; what amount or percentage was the increase; and how was the increase determined (i.e., indexed to another position, independent commission, etc.)?	When you issue COLA's to employees are they also awarded to Mayor and Councilmembers at the same time?
Mesa, AZ	Not in ordinance	<p>See HISTORY OF COUNCIL SALARY ADJUSTMENTS chart</p> <p>Effective 1/3/06 Mayor went from 5,233/mo to 7,333/mo (\$87,997); \$4,291/mo to \$5,133/mo. (\$61,596). Mayor and Council salaries are set based on a citizen's commission that meets every 4 years for the purpose of recommending salary change language that will go on a ballot for voter approval. The last time they met they recommended no change so no ballot language was drafted. When they do change the salaries, the citizens commission normally looks at what pay increases employees received in the last 4 years; what the CPI has done in the last 4 years; what other mayors/councils in the local area and nationally are getting, etc.</p>	Yes
Phoenix, AZ	Not in ordinance. Law department considers them part-time		No
Tempe, AZ	Not in ordinance, considered part-time employees	<p>Mayor and Council salaries received an ECI adjustment of 3.5% in 2008. Raises are determined by the ECI (Employment Cost Index).</p>	<p>Yes, employees and Council generally receive adjustments at the beginning of the fiscal year.</p>
Tucson, AZ	Full Time status (<i>Carol is checking with the City Clerk's office regarding ordinance</i>)	No increases, Mayor and Council pay set by Ordinance.	<p>There have been no salary adjustments since 1995, and the increase would have been done by a Council vote on an Ordinance.</p>
Arlington, TX	Not in ordinance, more of a volunteer position (part-time).		

<p>Irora, CO</p>	<p>In ordinance Mayor is full time employee. Not in ordinance Councilmembers are part time</p>		
<p>esno, CA</p>	<p>Mayor and Councilmembers are considered temporary, full-time employees</p>		
<p>Glendale, AZ</p>	<p>City Ordinance does not state whether or not the Mayor and/or Councilmembers should be full-time or part-time. Considered part-time.</p>		
<p>Kansas City, MO</p>	<p>Not in ordinance; considers both full-time</p>		
<p>Long Beach, CA</p>	<p>Ordinance indicates Mayor is full-time. Per Mayor's office, Councilmembers are considered temporary full-time.</p>		
<p>Peoria, AZ</p>	<p>Nothing in ordinance, both considered part-time.</p>		
<p>Sacramento, CA</p>	<p>In ordinance, the mayor shall serve full-time. Nothing in ordinance about Councilmembers; however, they are all part-time.</p>		
<p>San Jose, CA</p>	<p>In ordinance, Mayor and Councilmembers are full-time.</p>		
<p>Tacoma, WA</p>	<p>Mayor is full-time, but specific language is not in the ordinance. There is also no ordinance language to denote whether councilmembers are full or part-time, but they are considered to be part-time.</p>		
<p>Virginia Beach, VA</p>	<p>Not in ordinance, considered part-time</p>		

MAYOR AND COUNCIL SALARY/BENEFITS INFORMATION
 Tuesday, October 09, 2012

Color Key:	Arizona cities		Out of State													
	Pop.	Annual Mayor Salary	Equival Mesa Salary***	Annual Vice Mayor Salary	Equival Mesa Salary***	Annual Councilmember Salary	Equival Mesa Salary***	Car allow per mos	Phone allow per mos	Exec Physical	Suppl. Life Insurance	If so, list benefits (medical, dental, vision)	Deferred Comp.	Retirement	Sick/Vac/Per s/holidays (list number of days)	Tuition
	Mesa, AZ	439,041	\$ 38,001.60	N/A	N/A	\$ 19,032.00	N/A	\$ 150.00	\$80	Yes-free	Supplemental Life: Yes, for employee, spouse and dependent upon election. Mayor/Council member paid. Life Insurance: City paid Life is in addition to the Supplemental Life for \$50,000	medical, dental, vision (paid by participant)	Yes, as a benefited employee they would be allowed to participate. I don't think they would qualify for the employer match.	PSPRS - elected official	Not eligible. They are paid a flat monthly rate, so no need for leave time.	
	Arlington, TX**	364,000	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 2,502.71	N/A	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 2,002.17	No	\$ 75.00	No	No	Medical, dental and vision paid by participant	No	PST	No	No
	Aurora, CO	332,354	\$ 54,999.12	\$ 44,142.85	\$ 14,583.00	\$ 12,752.04	\$ 10,234.92	\$ 760.50	Yes, tech allow. (\$2700 for Council and \$4,320)	No	Yes	Health, Dental, Life and LTD	Optional	Yes	No	No

Color Key:	Arizona cities		Out of State													
	Pop.	Annual Mayor Salary	Equivalent Mesa Salary***	Annual Vice Mayor Salary	Equivalent Mesa Salary***	Annual Councilmember Salary	Equivalent Mesa Salary***	Car allow per mos	Phone allow per mos	Exec Physical	Suppl. Life Insurance	If so, list benefits (medical, dental, vision)	Deferred Comp.	Retirement	Sick/Vac/Per (list number of days)	Tuition
Fresno, CA	500,121	\$ 130,000.00	\$ 128,677.96	\$ 70,169.50	\$ 69,455.91	\$ 65,000.00	\$ 64,338.98	No	No	No	No	Medical, dental and vision only (80% paid by City, 20% paid by participant)	No	No	No	No
Glendale, AZ	226,721	\$ 48,000.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 34,000.00	N/A	No	No	No	Yes	Medical, Dental, Vision	Yes	EORP	Holidays - 11/12	Yes, but program has been suspended not available to any employees
Kansas City, MO	459,787	\$ 123,156.00	\$ 128,426.72	N/A	N/A	\$ 61,569.00	\$ 64,203.98	No	City provides phone (no additional comp)	No	No	medical, dental, vision (paid by participant)	Optional	-	N/A elected	No
Long Beach, CA	461,564	\$ 132,105.71	\$ 90,899.38	N/A	N/A	\$ 33,026.43	\$ 22,724.85	\$ 450.00	\$ 30.00	Yes-free	No	No	No	No	No	Yes, Mayor Perm FT ee; No, Council Temp, PT ee; haven't had the budget to reimburse any employee at this time
Peoria, AZ	158,000	\$ 30,277.80	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 20,185.20	N/A	\$ 275.00	\$250 for Mayor & \$160 for Council	No	No	medical, dental, vision coverage at the same cost as employees	Voluntary	PSPRS - elected official	No	No

City	Color Key:		Arizona cities		Out of State														
	Pop.	Annual Mayor Salary	Equival Mesa Salary***	Annual Vice Mayor Salary	Equival Mesa Salary***	Annual Councilmember Salary	Equival Mesa Salary***	Car allow per mos	Phone allow per mos	Exec Physical	Suppl. Life Insurance	If so, list benefits (medical, dental, vision)	Deferred Comp.	Retirement	Sick/Vac/Per s/holidays (list number of days)	Tuition			
Phoenix, AZ**	1,445,632	\$88,000.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$61,600.00	N/A	\$435	No	No	Optional	Medical, Dental	457 & 401(a) optional	AZ Elected Officials	11.5 Holiday				
Sacramento, CA	466,488	\$116,646.40	\$ 83,066.92	N/A	N/A	\$ 60,815.99	\$ 43,308.64	\$ 400.00	Tech Allowance : Mayor \$2000 per year, Council \$1200 per year	No	\$100,000 Council; \$150,000 Mayor	Medical, dental, vision	Council Match up to \$2,423; Mayor match up to \$4,620	Yes	No	No			
San Jose, CA	967,487	\$105,000.00	\$ 42,917.89	N/A	N/A	\$ 81,000.00	\$ 33,108.09	\$ 350.00	No	No	No	medical, dental, vision	optional	choice of PERS or 457 plan	No	No			
Tacoma, WA	204,000	\$88,608.00	\$86,948.74	\$ 44,304.00	\$ 43,474.37	\$ 40,165.00	\$ 39,412.88	\$550 per month; mayor only	No	No	No	Medical, Dental, Vision for mayor; council may elect	No	TERS	18 for mayor only	No			
Tempe, AZ	161,719	\$ 55,496.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 27,747.00	N/A	No	Available if they choose	No	\$50,000	medical, dental, vision (pd by participant)	Optional	PSPRS - elected official	No	No			

Agenda Item 3

MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBER TOTAL COMPENSATION RANKING (Sorted by Full-time and Part-time)

(Includes Salary, Vehicle, and Phone/Technology Allowance, if offered)

Monday, October 29, 2012

MAYOR

Rank	FT/PT	City	Pop.	Total Compensation
1	FT	Long Beach, CA	461,564	\$ 132,585.71
2	FT	Fresno, CA	500,121	\$ 130,000.00
3	FT	Kansas City, MO	459,787	\$ 123,156.00
4	FT	Sacramento, CA	466,488	\$ 119,046.40
5	FT	San Jose, CA	967,487	\$ 105,350.00
6	FT	Tacoma, WA	204,000	\$ 89,158.00
7	FT	Aurora, CO	332,354	\$ 60,079.62
8	FT	Tucson, AZ	520,116	\$ 42,000.00
9	PT	Phoenix, AZ	1,445,632	\$ 88,435.00
10	PT	Tempe, AZ	161,719	\$ 55,496.00
11	PT	Glendale, AZ	226,721	\$ 48,000.00
12	PT	Mesa, AZ	439,041	\$ 38,231.60
13	PT	Peoria, AZ	158,000	\$ 30,802.80
14	PT	Virginia Beach, VA	437,994	\$ 30,000.00
15	PT	Arlington, TX**	364,000	\$ 3,075.00

**Arlington, TX - salaries are considerably lower, per Mayor's Office, these positions are more of a volunteer position.

Rank	FT/PT	City	Total Compensation Adjusted*
1	FT	Fresno, CA	\$ 128,677.96*
2	FT	Kansas City, MO	\$ 128,426.72*
3	FT	Long Beach, CA	\$ 91,379.38*
4	FT	Tacoma, WA	\$ 87,498.74*
5	FT	Sacramento, CA	\$ 85,466.92*
6	FT	Aurora, CO	\$ 49,223.35*
7	FT	San Jose, CA	\$ 43,267.89*
8	FT	Tucson, AZ	\$ 42,000.00
9	PT	Phoenix, AZ	\$ 88,435.00
10	PT	Tempe, AZ	\$ 55,496.00
11	PT	Glendale, AZ	\$ 48,000.00
12	PT	Mesa, AZ	\$ 38,231.60
13	PT	Virginia Beach, VA	\$ 32,368.05*
14	PT	Peoria, AZ	\$ 30,802.80
15	PT	Arlington, TX**	\$ 2,577.71*

*The salaries were adjusted using the cost of living calculator, City Rating.com (<http://www.cityrating.com/costofliving.asp>) which is mainly based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) (published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics)

MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBER TOTAL COMPENSATION RANKING (Sorted by Full-time and Part-time)

(Includes Salary, Vehicle, and Phone/Technology Allowance, if offered)

Monday, October 29, 2012

COUNCILMEMBERS

Rank	FT/PT	City	Pop.	Total Compensation
1	FT	San Jose, CA	967,487	\$ 81,350.00
2	FT	Fresno, CA	500,121	\$ 65,000.00
3	FT	Kansas City, MO	459,787	\$ 61,569.00
4	FT	Long Beach, CA	461,564	\$ 33,506.43
5	FT	Tucson, AZ	520,116	\$ 24,000.00
6	PT	Sacramento, CA	466,488	\$ 62,415.99
7	PT	Phoenix, AZ	1,445,632	\$ 62,035.00
8	PT	Tacoma, WA	204,000	\$ 40,165.00
9	PT	Glendale, AZ	226,721	\$ 34,000.00
10	PT	Virginia Beach, VA	437,994	\$ 28,000.00
11	PT	Tempe, AZ	161,719	\$ 27,747.00
12	PT	Peoria, AZ	158,000	\$ 20,620.20
13	PT	Mesa, AZ	439,041	\$ 19,262.00
14	PT	Aurora, CO	332,354	\$ 16,212.54
15	PT	Arlington, TX**	364,000	\$ 2,475.00

**Arlington, TX - salaries are considerably lower, per Mayor's Office, these positions are more of a volunteer position

Rank	FT/PT	City	Total Compensation Adjusted*
1	FT	Fresno, CA	\$ 64,338.98*
2	FT	Kansas City, MO	\$ 64,203.98*
3	FT	San Jose, CA	\$ 33,458.09*
4	FT	Long Beach, CA	\$ 23,204.85*
5	FT	Tucson, AZ	\$ 24,000.00
6	PT	Phoenix, AZ	\$ 62,035.00
7	PT	Sacramento, CA	\$ 44,908.64*
8	PT	Tacoma, WA	\$ 39,412.88*
9	PT	Glendale, AZ	\$ 34,000.00
10	PT	Virginia Beach, VA	\$ 30,210.18*
11	PT	Tempe, AZ	\$ 27,747.00
12	PT	Peoria, AZ	\$ 20,620.20
13	PT	Mesa, AZ	\$ 19,262.00
14	PT	Aurora, CO	\$ 13,695.42*
15	PT	Arlington, TX**	\$ 2,077.17*

*The salaries were adjusted using the cost of living calculator, City Rating.com (<http://www.cityrating.com/costofliving.asp>) which is mainly based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) (published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics)

MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBER District Information

Monday, October 29, 2012

City	Pop.	Council Districts	Approximate # of Constituents Per District	# of Councilmembers
Arlington, TX**	364,000	5 districts	District 1 (71,873); District 2(74,868); District 3 (76,688); District 4 (71,094); District 5 (70,915)	5 Councilmembers (including Mayor Pro Tem) are assigned to districts; 3 at-large and serve the entire City; and the Mayor
Aurora, CO	332,354	6 wards	In the process of redistricting final numbers available in November. Currently, districts are approximately 55,950 (+/- 5% deviation).	6 Councilmembers assigned to wards; 4 are elected at-large and serve the entire City; and Mayor
Fresno, CA	500,121	7 districts	District 1 (71,112); District 2 (71,475); District 3 (69,745); District 4 (70,514); District 5 (70,253); District 6 (70,373); District 7 (71,193)	7 Councilmembers and Mayor
Glendale, AZ	226,721	6 districts	Sahuaro (46,087); Barrel (42,723); Cactus (44,309); Cholla (53,562); Ocotillo (43,622); Yucca (51,351)	6 Councilmembers and Mayor
Kansas City, MO	459,787	6 districts	District 1 (74,345); District 2 (74,669); District 3 (78,677); District 4 (78,164); District 5 (78,595); District 6 (75,337)	12 Councilmembers (2 per district) in addition one serves as Mayor Pro Tem; and Mayor
Long Beach, CA	461,564	9 districts	District 1(49,117); District 2 (51,218); District 3 (52,320); District 4 (51,456); District 5 (49,852); District 6(49,444); District 7 (52,013); District 8 (53,009); District 9(53,828)	8 Councilmembers, Vice Mayor, and Mayor
Mesa, AZ	439,041	6 districts	District 1 (73,174); District 2 (64,638); District 3 (67,650); District 4 (63,303); District 5 (58,817); District 6 (78,566); District 7 (106,067)	6 Councilmembers (one is Vice Mayor) and Mayor
Peoria, AZ	158,000	6 districts	Acacia (17,868); Ironwood (22,114); Mesquite (51,463); Paloverde (19,743); Pine (22,176); Willow (20,701)	6 Councilmembers and Mayor
Phoenix, AZ	1,445,632	8 districts	District 1 (183,052); District 2 (203,063); District 3 (158,544); District 4 (153,306) District 5 (167,883); District 6 (164,285); District 7 (263,750); District 8 (164,305)	7 Councilmembers; Vice Mayor and Mayor
Sacramento, CA	466,488	8 districts	District 1 (106,729); District 2 (52,975); District 3 (50,645); District 4 (45,703); District 5(46,514); District 6 (49,879); District 7 (52,585); District 8 (61,458)	7 Councilmembers; Vice Mayor and Mayor

San Jose, CA	967,487	10 districts	District 1 (88,645); District 2 (92,314); District 3 (93,896); District 4 (102,999); District 5 (97,510); District 6 (100,236); District 7 (97,868); District 9 (101,108); District 9 (89,183); District 10 (89,183)	10 Councilmembers and Mayor
Tacoma, WA	204,000	5 Neighborhood districts	District 1 (37,406); District 2 (40,923); District 3 (40,007); District 4 (38,962); District 5 (41,099)	5 Councilmembers (including Deputy Mayor) assigned to districts; 3 Councilmembers at-large to serve the entire City; and Mayor
Tempe, AZ	161,719	No districts	N/A	5 Councilmembers, Vice Mayor and Mayor
Tucson, AZ	520,116	6 Wards (in the process of	Target population for each ward 86,719	6 Councilmembers and Mayor
Virginia Beach, VA	437,994	7 districts	Centerville (60,776); Kempsville (65,199); Rose Hall (63,770); Bayside (61,481); Lynnhaven (61,316); Beach (60,633); Princess Anne (64,819);	7 Councilmembers assigned to districts (one is Vice Mayor); 3 Councilmembers serve at-large (the entire City); and the Mayor