



Human Resources

P.O. Box 788 • Heppner OR 97836
(541) 676-5620

Karen Wolff
Human Resources Director
kwolff@co.morrow.or.us

TO: Morrow County Board of Commissioners

FROM: Karen Wolff, Human Resources Director

DATE: March 21, 2018

RE: Morrow County Compensation Board Recommendations

The Morrow County Compensation Board met on February 21, 2018. Unfortunately, one member of the Board was not able to attend the meeting due to a family emergency. I want to thank all of the Board members for their time and effort in this process. All members of the Board had reviewed the notebooks that were provided to them prior to the meeting and arrived at the meeting ready to begin discussions.

The meeting format allowed for public comment at the beginning and the end of the meeting. During deliberations, the Board would ask questions of those in attendance and the information provided was helpful.

There was discussion regarding the compensation of the Commissioners. Please refer to the minutes of the meeting for more details. The Board made their recommendation for compensation of the Commissioners based on the compensation paid to Commissioners in other counties that also have a paid Administrator. The decision was not based on whether the position was a part-time or full-time equivalent.

I updated the Board on the discussions surrounding the method of compensation for the Surveyor. I was careful to stress that the discussion of method had no reflection on the ability of the current Surveyor or on the quality of work of the current Surveyor. I advised the Board that based on opinions from our legal representatives we have decided to treat the Surveyor as a W2 employee, the same as other Elected Officials. The Board did not render a decision regarding whether the Surveyor should/could also receive pass-through fees as I advised the Board that is a decision for our legal team. As a W2 employee, the Surveyor is now eligible for benefits. Based on adding benefits to the equation, it was recommended that no COLA be applied to the Surveyor compensation this year.

There was also significant discussion about the compensation of the Sheriff. The Board would like to have the Sheriff's compensation reviewed at the time that the position is eligible for filing. The Board would like to review the compensation before someone files for the position, to see if an adjustment is in order to bring the compensation in line with other counties.

There is a similar compensation review suggested for the Justice of the Peace position. Judge Spicer stated in the Board meeting that she does not anticipate finishing out her current term. The Board would like to have the compensation for this position reviewed prior to someone filing for the position to see if we are in line with other counties.

Please refer to the minutes for more detail of the deliberations and decisions of the Compensation Board.

The Compensation Board recommends the following compensation for Elected Officials for Fiscal Year 2018-2019:

- **Commissioners at \$51,000 with no COLA.**
- **Justice of the Peace at \$75,000 with no COLA.**
- **Clerk, Treasurer, Assessor and Sheriff will receive a 3% COLA.**
- **District Attorney at \$8,000 with no COLA.**
- **Surveyor at \$36,000 with no COLA because of additional benefits.**
- **These are all gross wage numbers.**
- **At the time that either the Justice of the Peace position or the Sheriff position are eligible for filing to run for the position, the compensation of each position will be reevaluated.**

I appreciate the time and effort of the Board members and thank them for taking this evaluation very seriously. I also appreciate their employers for allowing them the time to participate in this meeting.

Morrow County Compensation Board Meeting Minutes
February 21, 2017
Bartholomew Building Upper Conference Room
Heppner, Oregon

Present

Lisanne Currin, Chair
Andy Fletcher
Eileen Hendricks
Jill Martin
Karen Wolff, Human Resources Director

Excused:

Kevin Ince

Call to Order: 1:17 p.m.

Introductions around the table.

Eileen Hendricks, Board Member
Andy Fletcher, Board Member
Lisanne Currin, Board Chair
Jill Martin, Board Member
Karen Wolff, Human Resources Director
Darrell Green, County Administrator
Kate Knop, Finance Director

Justin Nelson, District Attorney on iPad

Audience:

Commissioner Melissa Lindsay
Former Commissioner Leann Rea
Judge Ann Spicer
Sherron Woodside

Ms. Wolff explained that Mr. Ince is not able to attend today due to a family emergency.

*Mr. Fletcher moved to appoint Lisanne Currin as Chair of the Compensation Board.
Unanimous consent.*

Minutes

The Board reviewed the Minutes from last year.

Ms. Martin moved to approve the minutes of the 2017 Compensation Board meeting as presented. Mr. Fletcher seconded. Unanimous approval.

Public Comment

Chair Currin asked for any general public comment. None.

District Attorney

Mr. Nelson asked the Compensation Board to not consider any increase in compensation for him this year. He appreciates the increase in compensation last year. Compensation/stipend was \$8,000 last year. No questions for Mr. Nelson.

Wage Matrix

Chair Currin asked Ms. Wolff to provide background information on the wage matrix information that was included in the Compensation Board notebook this year. Ms. Wolff said that in an attempt to make it very clear that we are comparing the compensation of elected officials to the compensation of managers, she was asked to put the elected positions through the JobMeas™ wage matrix. This wage matrix is used to establish a wage. It is based on a formulary and each characteristic has a weight and it comes up with a number value, which then falls onto the wage scale for a particular pay range. A couple of years ago the managers were all put through the formula and placed on the wage scale, similar to the represented employees. Some of the heaviest weighted characteristics are Education and Experience. A matrix for each elected position is included. Ms. Wolff reviewed an example, County Clerk. The formula evaluates the **minimum** requirement for the position. The minimum requirement to file for the position of Clerk is to be an Elector in the county and to have lived in the county for at least one year. If this were an appointed position, Ms. Wolff believes there would be more minimum Education & Experience requirements. That difference makes a comparison with managers a little ‘thorny’. Ms. Wolff reviewed other factors, and explained that these are global factors, not just Morrow County factors. Ms. Wolff asked the Board if they wanted to have her go into further detail.

Ms. Martin said she has experience with evaluating jobs and this made sense to her. It is similar to a system that she has used before. She agrees that it is a little thorny for comparison.

Ms. Wolff explained that she is not asking the Board to use this to establish a wage for elected officials. This is a tool to use in comparing with managers.

Ms. Wolff explained that included in the notebook were comparisons of the current elected official wage with manager wages. One spreadsheet is a step one comparison and the other is a midpoint comparison.

Ms. Martin asked about Home Rule. She said that last year it was stated that Home Rule had been explored several years back and the committee said they did not want to pursue Home Rule because they did not want to change the Juvenile Judge position. Now that the Juvenile Judge position is technically gone, is there interest from the county to consider Home Rule? Is that a question for the Commissioners? Ms. Martin said she is curious about the whole process.

Ms. Currin advised Ms. Martin that there had been several meetings over the last year exploring Home Rule. Ms. Currin asked former Commissioner Leann Rea to speak to the Board about this as she was serving as the facilitator for these meetings.

Ms. Rea advised that each of the three Commissioners, in their own way, had asked Ms. Rea about Home Rule. A committee was formed, which included two members of the Compensation Board. Two members from each community, and a few extras, for a total of 12-13. Ms. Rea said there were four or five meetings. Retired Commissioner Doherty from Umatilla County spoke to them, current Administrator at that time Jerry Sorte spoke, retired Assessor Greg Sweek spoke, current Assessor Mike Gorman spoke, and Becky Kindle from the Bank of Eastern Oregon spoke. When it was all done, the committee decided it would be a good way to go, but none of them were willing to put themselves out there to make it happen, so they would not ask someone else to do it.

Ms. Currin agreed that the committee did not know that there was enough overwhelming support for making a change.

Ms. Rea said that when the law changed in 1972 and counties no longer had to go to the Legislature to get their ordinances and such approved, the benefits to Home Rule diminished.

Ms. Martin said that the compensation would be easier because there would be job descriptions and the wage could be identified. That is why she was asking. Ms. Rea agreed.

COLA

Mr. Fletcher confirmed that there was a 3% COLA for all employees last year. Ms. Wolff said that for Fiscal Year 2017/2018 the two AFSCME Collective Bargaining Agreements had 3% COLAs, we settled with Teamsters and they had 3% COLAs, Elected Officials received 3% and Nonrepresented received 3%. We found that the Gazette-Times reported recently that the Commissioners approved a 3% COLA for Fiscal Year 2018/2019 for Nonrepresented and Elected Officials. The decision was only for Nonrepresented employees. This Board makes the recommendation for the COLA for Elected Officials.

Ms. Currin asked if we applied to COLA to the stipend for the District Attorney. The Board agreed that the stipend was just a flat amount and no COLA.

The Board agreed that they would like to work through each position and make final decisions at the end of the process.

District Attorney – cont.

Mr. Nelson was still in attendance by video.

Ms. Wolff advised Mr. Nelson that if there are questions from the Board we will give him a call or text. Mr. Nelson said that would work well for him and he would go back to his class.

County Comparators

Ms. Currin asked how the Commissioners decided on the counties to use for comparison. Are they the same as last year?

Ms. Wolff explained that Hood River county was deleted from the comparators. It is a very unique county structure and difficult to compare to them. The comparators were selected based on: who do we compete with for employees; other counties that are not natural resource based economies; and geographically close/regional.

Commissioners

Ms. Currin said that last year there was a lot of discussion about whether Commissioners are part-time or full-time or what was their true status?

Ms. Wolff reviewed the Budget Committee rough draft minutes from last year. Previously, the Juvenile Judge was compensated as a full-time employee and each of the Commissioners received 50% of that. The Compensation Board recommendation last year was to pay each of the three Commissioners the same. That would result in one position being paid at 50% of their previous compensation. The Commissioner compensation would be increased by that 50% amount, divided equally between all three Commissioners. This is what was forwarded to the Budget Committee. There was a great deal of discussion about this recommendation. Ms. Wolff read from the draft Budget Committee minutes regarding Commissioner compensation. The final result was no increase in compensation for Commissioners, but apply the 3% COLA.

Ms. Currin asked Commissioner Lindsay if she would like to address the Board. Commissioner Lindsay advised the Board that prior to the Compensation Board meeting last year a quorum of the Commissioners voted to no longer label Commissioners as part-time, but rather full-time, and County Counsel clarified that there really is no part-time label for Commissioners. Ms. Currin pointed out that in the surveys of counties that was provided in the notebook, many of the counties identify their Commissioners as part-time. Maybe that is just past history.

Ms. Currin prepared a spreadsheet with many of the factors for Commissioners. There were two counties in the comparator counties that did not have paid County Administrators and there seemed to be a direct reflection on the rate of pay of the Commissioners. When comparing only counties with paid Administrators, the average wage was \$48,000. The Compensation Board recommendation last year was \$51,000. This does not factor in part-time or full-time.

Ms. Martin said she did not prepare a spreadsheet, but as she was eye-balling it, she was in the \$45,000 range, so she is in the same ballpark as Ms. Currin.

Mr. Fletcher said he is still good with the way that the compensation was calculated last year because it was budget neutral.

Ms. Hendricks liked Ms. Currin's approach.

Ms. Rea commented that at the time that the decision was made to eliminate the Juvenile Judge position and go with three Commissioners, the Commissioners thought they were budget neutral with reducing one of the Commissioners from 1.0 FTE to 0.5 FTE and the other 0.5 FTE would be used to pay for the Administrator. The other dollars that paid for the Administrator was the funding that the county saved in hiring attorneys for the Juvenile Hearings.

Clerk

Ms. Wolff pointed out the letter submitted by the current County Clerk. Ms. Wolff also reviewed other documents in the Clerk tab in the notebook. The information request from last year, using 2016 information, has been included with all positions. A great deal of effort went in to creating this comparison. The information not be exact, but it is still relative.

Ms. Hendricks said she asked Ms. Wolff about the effect of the Pay Equity Act on Elected Officials. The answer that everyone has to this question throughout various industries is 'I don't know.' There is no clarity yet on how this is to be applied. A plan has to be in effect by January 2019.

Ms. Currin said she believes that the best comparison for this position is other Clerks in other counties. Some have slightly different duties, but they all are hopefully doing the statutory requirements for the position. We are right there in the average for this position, if not slightly above. Ms. Martin said she thought our comparison was good.

Sheriff

Ms. Hendricks confirmed that there was an adjustment to this wage a few years ago, to make sure that the Sheriff was paid more than the Undersheriff. Ms. Wolff confirmed that did occur three or four years ago. We now have a different Undersheriff, with a wage that is not as close to the Sheriff's wage. Ms. Currin commented that this wage is significantly above the average wage for other counties. Ms. Wolff confirmed that it was increased in order to comply with Oregon State Statute and the end result was that the Sheriff was paid \$100 per month more than the Undersheriff.

Mr. Fletcher asked if this wage will be addressed in the future as retirements and other personnel changes occur. Ms. Wolff said she is sure the Commissioners would be very pleased to entertain a suggestion from the Compensation Board that that would be a consideration. That way, when someone files for the position, they will know exactly what they are filing for. They might or might not be paid the same as the current Sheriff.

Mr. Fletcher moved to recommend that the Sheriff wage be evaluated at the next election, to make sure we are in line with the other counties. Ms. Martin seconded. Unanimous approval.

Treasurer

Ms. Wolff pointed out the letter provided by the current Treasurer as well as additional information.

Ms. Hendricks asked about the ORS requirement that the budget administered be included in the evaluation of compensation, as mentioned in the letter from the Treasurer. Ms. Hendricks asked if the position of the Treasurer is that they are administering the entire budget? Ms. Currin referred to the document in the front of the notebook that listed Budgets Administered. The Treasurer's budget is listed and they have responsibility for that budget. Ms. Hendricks asked who coded invoices? Is that an Accounting function?

Mr. Green responded that most of the coding is done by the Department Heads and spread out throughout the departments. Ms. Wolff replied that the Finance Director has the final

responsibility for managing the APs and is it within budget? Purchase Preauthorizations are signed by the Finance Director. The Treasurer is responsible for receipting the \$38M that comes in. The Finance Director is responsible for how the money is spent. Ms. Currin asked Ms. Wolff if the Department Heads are responsible for their own budgets. Ms. Wolff said yes.

Ms. Hendricks asked for clarification of the term ‘receipting’ of funds. Ms. Currin directed this question to Ms. Kate Knop, Finance Director. She replied that the Treasurer is responsible for depositing funds and posts the funds to the account that each department directs. Ms. Wolff added that the Assessor’s Office is responsible for tax collection. They receive the taxes and apply them to the tax payer account, and then create a deposit to take to the Treasurer, the Assessor and Treasurer counterbalance to each other, the Treasurer then deposits it to the bank.

Ms. Hendricks asked if this is similar to the Road Department. Road funds go through the Road Department. Ms. Knop said yes. Ms. Martin clarified that the intent is to clarify what budget is the responsibility of the Treasurer and then read a portion of the letter provided by the current Treasurer, citing statute that size of budget administered shall be considered. Ms. Knop confirmed that the Treasurer budget is about \$100,000 and the Treasurer is a liaison with other departments.

Ms. Wolff reviewed the ORS that was referenced in the Treasurer’s letter, which was included in the Compensation Board notebook, ORS 204.112(3).

Ms. Currin said that the number of employees supervised was provided in the notebook.

Surveyor

Ms. Wolff provided some background on the Surveyor position. Last year, after the Compensation Board met, Ms. Wolff was provided with a copy of IRS Publication 5138 Quick Reference Guide for Public Employers. This was provided on a completely different subject. But as Ms. Wolff read through the publication, which has a lot of very good information, she got to the definition of a Fee Based Official. A Fee Based Official receives fees for the work that they do, as opposed to receiving a wage. All other Elected Officials may not receive fees from the public. We approved changing the compensation of the Surveyor to \$36,000, which is significantly more than the fees that the Surveyor receives. The litmus test is that Fee Based Officials may receive additional compensation from the county, in addition to fees, as long as it does not exceed the amount of fees. In reviewing the history of fees, which vary greatly, the fees were never close to \$36,000. We asked for an opinion from our auditors. They said they believe the position is no longer a Fee Based Official. Then we reached out to Labor Counsel and they said the same thing. Ms. Wolff stressed that this is not about the work that is being done by our current Surveyor, who is doing a phenomenal job. This has nothing to do with the quality of their work. It is about how we compensate this position. In the past they received a 1099 from us. This is now a W2 employee and they need to be compensated the same as all other Elected Officials.

Ms. Wolff said we even asked the IRS for an opinion, and we received an answer, very quickly. Ms. Wolff read from the email from the IRS to Ms. Knop, which said “We are returning the form without a determination. They recommend consulting the State regarding Section 218 agreement

with the Social Security Administration.” Ms. Hendricks said Section 218 simply addresses whether a person is subject to Social Security withholding. Ms. Wolff agreed.

Ms. Wolff said she believes we made the correct decision. The Surveyor disagrees with our opinion.

Ms. Hendricks asked if the Surveyor has his own staff that helps him. Ms. Wolff said she does not believe that he has any staff, other than his family, that help him. The Surveyor makes his own decisions, just as our other Elected Officials make their own decisions about what work they are going to do and when they are going to do it. We do rely on their use of their own equipment, and we may need to work that out with them.

Ms. Currin asked if he would be entitled to benefits. Ms. Wolff said yes, he will be entitled to benefits, such as retirement. We will be withholding taxes from the Surveyor, just as we do for all other Elected Officials. Ms. Hendricks said that she believes that if they were in any other position and they were not elected, that the Surveyor would be correct. She does not disagree with the evaluation based on being an Elected Official. Based on her other employment, they have been through a desk review, where they come in to visit the business, and because of that review she agrees with our determination. Also based on this experience, all they do is say, ‘oh, you must not have realized’ and as long as we say ‘We will do better’, there is no exposure.

Ms. Wolff said we are trying to correct the situation. Our county is evolving and how we do business is evolving. As we make changes, then the dominos start to fall in place. Ms. Currin said making someone an employee is the ‘safer’ route. You will not be penalized for withholding taxes.

Ms. Wolff asked the Board to clarify their intent with any compensation. Is it net compensation or gross compensation? All other Elected Officials are identified as gross compensation. Ms. Wolff wants to make this very clear.

Ms. Hendricks said if the Surveyor is identified as part-time, they make not make the threshold for benefits. Ms. Wolff advised that all Elected Officials receive full benefits, as an example Commissioners, whether they are full-time or part-time.

Ms. Martin asked if the Compensation Board needs to make a decision about the fees. Ms. Wolff said she did not believe that was a decision the Board needs to make. We are looking at that question and will need to come up with an answer and will be circling around with our legal experts on that matter. Ms. Martin clarified that if we do not allow fees to be paid to the Surveyor, there will actually be a loss of compensation. Ms. Wolff responded yes.

The Board confirmed that the compensation for all Elected Officials is gross compensation.

Ms. Wolff explained that as part of this investigation of the Surveyor position, it came to light that the Surveyor no longer has to be elected. For any number reasons, the position probably should not have gone to the ballot, but it did go to the ballot. Therefore, the current Surveyor is duly elected and as such is an Elected Official. Ms. Wolff believes that when the term of this

position comes to an end, she believes the Commissioners are going to say this will no longer be an elected position. That is a decision the Commissioners may make. This decision would be made prior to the position opening for filing.

Commissioner Lindsay clarified that the Compensation Board is not including fees in their decision. The Board confirmed, that is correct. Commissioner Lindsay clarified that the State of Oregon decided that the Surveyor position is not an elected position, unless the Commissioners decide to keep it as an elected position. According to the County Clerk, she went to a County Court meeting and asked if the Surveyor position should be elected or appointed. A decision was not made. Thereby, the Clerk followed past practice and put it on the ballot. Today, the State is saying the Surveyor should not be on the ballot unless the Commissioners decide to keep it on the ballot. If the Commissioners decide to have the Surveyor be an appointed position, they are not taking it away from the citizens, but rather, following the State.

Assessor

Ms. Wolff pointed out a letter from the current Assessor as well as other documents.

Ms. Currin said that when she looks at the other counties, we are in the ballpark. Ms. Martin said we are actually ahead of the ballpark. Ms. Hendricks said that not all of the comparators are Tax Collectors, so she thinks we are in line.

When asked about Ms. Hendricks questions, she referenced the Treasurer's letter which asked to be brought in line with the Assessor. Ms. Hendricks said she did not see a comparable amount of responsibility. Ms. Martin agreed, as did Ms. Currin. Also considering budgets administered and employees supervised.

Justice of the Peace

Ms. Currin asked Judge Spicer to address the Board.

Judge Spicer said she wanted to address the Board because the Justice Court system in Oregon is so "schizophrenic". Morrow County is considered a 'full service' Justice Court. That means they handle traffic tickets, small claims, civil cases less than \$10,000, misdemeanors, and evictions. Many counties do just traffic. Many other don't do anything criminal. Some counties do evictions in Justice Court, some do them in Circuit Court. Over the last three years, we have almost doubled the work in Justice Court in Morrow County. When Judge Spicer took office we were bringing in approximately \$250,000 per year. Doing mostly traffic then. The biggest increase in cases has been in Truancy, which takes a lot of time.

Judge Spicer pointed out that in order to be a Justice Court Judge you have to either have a law degree or have to attend classes at the Judicial College. That is a statutory change. Judge Spicer expects this to continue to change. Right now, approximately 1/3 of the Justices are not attorneys.

Ms. Currin asked if Judge Spicer uses her law degree in her capacity as Judge. Judge Spicer said "Every day."

Ms. Wolff pointed out the wage matrix is completed based on a law degree not being required. Ms. Currin said that was part of her questioning, to determine what is really required to do the job.

Judge Spicer said that Gilliam County is one of the other 'full service' Justice Courts. The other counties in the comparison don't do all of the categories that Gilliam and Morrow County do. Ms. Wolff said that due to the variety of Justice of the Peace positions, she provided nine comparators for the position, rather than just the five comparators.

Judge Spicer reviewed each of the counties in the comparison.

- Baker County is a part-time position.
- Clackamas County not sure.
- Columbia County is a part-time/full-time position. They have three different courts. This reflects one of the courts.
- Deschutes County does primarily traffic.
- Harney County does primarily traffic.
- Klamath County not sure.
- Marion County more full service.
- Malheur County more full service.
- Gilliam County is full service.
- Sherman County does primarily traffic.
- Union County does mostly traffic.
- Wheeler County does everything but they have a lot less cases.

Ms. Wolff explained that she called Gilliam County and asked them how they handle compensation for the Justice Court Judge. They explained that their Elected Officials are on a matrixed system, similar to what the nonrepresented employees have. As you are in office longer, you move up the matrix. This matrix is based off of the Sherman County example. Sherman County sets their Judge position as 100% and the other elected positions are a percentage of that amount. This is a type of longevity system. 15 of the 36 counties have longevity systems for elected positions. The current Justice of the Peace is being paid \$75,432 for this Fiscal Year.

Ms. Currin said the current wage for this position is \$70,529, confirmed by Ms. Martin.

Ms. Currin asked Judge Spicer to confirm her budget for this year. \$300,000? Judge Spicer said it is closer to \$500,000 this year. Ms. Currin found that it is actually \$727,000.

Ms. Currin asked if the three positions in the department have been this way for a couple of years. Judge Spicer said no, just over a year that the County Court increased the FTE to 3.0.

Ms. Currin clarified that she was referring to the compensation for Treasurer, Clerk and Justice of the Peace. Ms. Wolff confirmed that was changed in 2013 and all made the same compensation.

Ms. Currin believes that a law degree for a position is important. Judge Spicer clarified that if you do not have a law degree that you have one year to complete specific classes at the Judicial College in Reno, NV. It is about a month worth of classes.

Ms. Hendricks said that if we consider the items that the statute says we should consider, the budget is very equivalent to the Assessor's Office, the education is higher, the employees supervised is less. Ms. Currin said that looking at the comparables is hard. Ms. Currin said she thinks Gilliam County is the best comparable. Judge Spicer agreed. The Gilliam County Judge does not have a law degree, but the number of cases going through her court are similar, until this year and we are doing more.

Ms. Hendricks asked if they could make a recommendation with a difference if a new Judge does not have a law degree? Ms. Wolff said that the same stipulation be placed on this position as has been put on the Sheriff's position. At the time of retirement or reelection, the compensation be reviewed. Judge Spicer said she does not expect to complete the current term. At the time that someone files for the position, does the Compensation Board want to consider their education as they evaluate compensation?

Mr. Fletcher moved to recommend that the Justice of the Peace wage be reevaluated prior to the position opening up for filing, in anticipation of Judge Spicer's retirement. Ms. Hendricks seconded. Unanimous approval.

Ms. Currin asked the Board if they were interested in a modification to the compensation at this time. Ms. Hendricks said she could be convinced to modify the wage closer to the Assessor. Ms. Currin said she calculated the 3% which would take it to +\$72,000. Ms. Martin likes the sound of \$75,000. It is closer to Gilliam County and gets it closer to the Assessor position. It recognizes the law degree, which it sounds like is very beneficial to this position. For our county, it is a benefit to have someone in that position with a law degree. Ms. Currin agreed. Ms. Currin recommends we consider that in our final motion. All agreed.

District Attorney

Nothing to add.

COLA

Ms. Wolff explained that after she wrote the memo regarding COLA, the Commissioners did decide on a 3% COLA for Nonrepresented employees. Teamsters will receive 3% next Fiscal Year. We are currently bargaining with AFSCME, both General Employees and Road, so we do not know the COLA for those employees.

Ms. Wolff said she met with the Commissioners on January 23, 2018 regarding COLA. She asked them if they had any guidance that they would like to provide to the Compensation Board. Ms. Wolff provided a COLA history as well as CPI information as she believed this was important information to consider as part of a COLA discussion. Ms. Wolff reviewed CPI, depending on which category, ranged from 2.1% to 4.2%. Ms. Wolff reviewed COLA history.

Ms. Hendricks stated that in the past the CPI was substantially lower than the 3% COLAs that were approved. She would not recommend increasing the COLA. It would fit with the Collective Bargaining Agreements. Ms. Martin said it fits with private industry, at least the Financial Services industry, which has been 3-4%. Salary increases for private industry might get closer to 4%. She would not go lower than 3%. Ms. Hendricks said that on the other hand, Morrow County has skyrocketed. Ms. Wolff added that the Unemployment Rate for Morrow County is 4.2% and Umatilla County is 4.8%. 4.0% is considered the baseline, unemployable rate. Ms. Martin asked if Morrow County is the third highest wage county in the state. Ms. Wolff confirmed. Ms. Martin said based on this she would not go lower than 3%. Ms. Currin said she is comfortable with that.

Ms. Wolff explained the two spreadsheets comparing Elected Officials wages with the Nonrepresented wage matrix. One spreadsheet is a Step 1 comparison and one is a midpoint comparison. This is a tool for the Board to use when evaluating the Elected Official wages. Ms. Currin commented that with the exception of the Commissioners, all of the elected positions fell on the wage matrix above where the JobMeas™ system placed them. Ms. Wolff confirmed.

Ms. Hendricks said that next year for this Board may be very interesting. How do we marry the Compensation Board laws and the Pay Equity law? Ms. Wolff agreed.

Ms. Currin summed up the discussions:

- An adjustment to the Commissioners and the Justice of the Peace. Justice of the Peace to \$75,000. Commissioners to \$51,000, same as last year. No COLA.

Mr. Fletcher moved to increase the compensation for each of the three Commissioners to \$51,000, with no COLA to be applied, and \$75,000 for the Justice of the Peace, with no COLA. The Assessor, Treasurer, Clerk, and Sheriff to receive a 3% COLA. Ms. Hendricks seconded. Unanimous approval.

Mr. Fletcher moved to have the District Attorney compensation remain at \$8,000 with no COLA. Ms. Martin recused herself from this decision as she is related to the current District Attorney. Ms. Hendricks seconded. Unanimous with one recusal.

Mr. Fletcher asked Ms. Wolff if the Surveyor had any concerns with the amount of the current compensation. Ms. Wolff said it was her understanding that we disagree about the method of compensation, but there is no concern about the amount of compensation. Mr. Fletcher said the Board reviewed the amount of compensation a couple of years ago and that is how we came to the current \$36,000. Mr. Fletcher said that in light of adding benefits, he is pretty comfortable leaving the compensation where it is. Ms. Hendricks agrees. The value of the pension and health insurance is significant.

Mr. Fletcher moved to leave the Surveyor compensation at \$36,000 as a W2 employee. No COLA. Ms. Hendricks seconded.

Ms. Martin asked why no COLA. Mr. Fletcher said because of adding the pension and the health insurance. Discussion.

Ms. Knop asked about the pass through fees. Ms. Wolff replied that it was decided that was a legal counsel decision.

Unanimous decision.

Ms. Wolff recapped the recommendation. She will prepare a written memo that she will forward to the Board for review prior to taking it to the Commissioners.

- Commissioners at \$51,000 with no COLA.
- Justice of the Peace at \$75,000 with no COLA.
- Clerk, Treasurer, Assessor and Sheriff will receive a 3% COLA.
- District Attorney at \$8,000 with no COLA.
- Surveyor at \$36,000 with no COLA because of additional benefits.
- These are all gross wage numbers.
- At the time that either the Justice of the Peace position or the Sheriff position are eligible for filing to run for the position, the compensation of each position will be reevaluated.

Commissioner Lindsay asked for clarification of a decision for the benefit of the Budget Committee. Is the Justice of the Peace recommendation based on comparison to another county or because of the law degree? Ms. Currin said because of both. Ms. Martin said it is a combination of those two factors. Ms. Hendricks said it is because of the budget that is administered, education level, and comparison with other counties.

Mr. Currin asked for any other comments for the good of the order.

Ms. Wolff stated that she will send the memo to the Compensation Board for review. Ms. Wolff will let the Board know when she will be presenting this information to the Commissioners and any of the Board members are welcome to attend that meeting.

Ms. Wolff thanked each of the Board members for their time and efforts in this process. She knows that the Board members put a lot of effort into evaluating the information in the notebooks and she truly appreciates it.

Adjourn 3:07 p.m.

**AFFIDAVIT FOR THE VOLUNTARY CANCELLATION
OF A PORTION OF A WATER RIGHT CERTIFICATE (ORS 540.621)**

State of Oregon)
) ss
County of **Morrow**)

I/We (or authorized agent), **Morrow County**, residing at **100 S. Court St., Heppner, OR**, telephone number **541-676-5620**, being first duly sworn depose and say:

1. I/We are the legal and deeded owner(s) of the property described as tax lot number **(Roadway: Gravel Pit Lane and ROW as recorded on Partition Plat 2006-11)**, within the **SW NW ¼¼**, Section **26**, Township **5N** (N/S), Range **26E** (E/W), of the Willamette Meridian, in **Irrigon, Morrow County**, Oregon, as shown on the attached map and described in the attached deed and legal description and made part of this affidavit.
2. I/We wish to cancel the following portion(s) of the water right certificate number **79963** issued to **Robert V. Gillett** with a date of priority of **8/10/1977**.

A place of use, or use.

- For the use of (specify irrigation, domestic, etc.) **Irrigation**

FOR IRRIGATION OR NURSERY USE:

- Total number of acres to be cancelled **2.02**
- Location of acres to be cancelled must be clearly identified on a copy of the final proof map.
- In the amount of **1/80** cubic foot per second
- From the water source (s) **A well in the Columbia River Basin**

AND/OR (less common)

One or more of the authorized points of diversion (surface water) or points of appropriation (groundwater) authorized under the certificate.

- For the use of (specify irrigation, domestic, etc.) _____
 - From the water source (s) _____
 - Located within the _____ ¼¼, Section _____, Township _____ (N/S), Range _____ (E/W)
- Location Description (if given on the certificate) _____

3. The appurtenant water right^(s) is not located within the boundaries of an irrigation, drainage, water improvement, or water control district, or federal reclamation project (if the right is located within a district or reclamation project, name it here: **West Extension Irrigation District**)

4. The portion of the water right being cancelled is served by an irrigation district. The signature of the district manager on the line below indicates the concurrence of the district to the cancellation of the portion of the water right served by the district.

Signature of district manager Printed Name Date

5. If the water right is issued in the name of an irrigation district then the affiant must have the concurrence of the district to the cancellation of the portion of the water right. (Signature of district manager on the line below documents consent of the district.)

Signature of district manager Printed Name Date

6. I/We have abandoned any and all interest in the portion of the water right described in Item 2, above, and request that portion of the right be canceled.

Signature of legal owner as listed on deed, or authorized agent Date

Signature of legal co-owner as listed on deed Date
(If applicable)

Subscribed and Sworn to Before Me this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Notary Public for Oregon

My Commission Expires _____

PLEASE ATTACH A LEGIBLE COPY OF:

- 1) **A deed which lists landowners and includes a legal description of affected lands, and**
- 2) **A copy of a water right final proof map, or a tax lot map, or an adjudication map with the abandoned portion of the right clearly drawn and identified.**
- 3) **IF ACTING AS AN AUTHORIZED AGENT, include a copy of Power of Attorney or other documents granting authority to act on behalf of the legal owner(s).**

**Affidavit for the Voluntary Cancellation
Of a Portion of a Water Right Certificate**

Morrow County

Right of Way Legal Description

Gravel Pit Lane and Rights of Way as recorded on Partition Plat 2006-11.

WATER RIGHT PARTIAL CANCELLATION
 TOWNSHIP 5 NORTH, RANGE 26 EAST, WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN
 Morrow County

Date: Jan 19, 2018

