BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SALARY METHODOLOGY

SUMMARY
During the current fiscal year, the Board has presented two ordinances for increase in Board salaries without notifying the public that these increases were subject to referendum.

Prior to the passage of State of California Proposition 12 in 1970, the State Legislature set the salary of the Board of Supervisors. The ballot language of Proposition 12 amended Article XI, §1, subdivision (b) of the California Constitution. Proposition 12 reads as follows: “COMPENSATION OF COUNTY SUPERVISORS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Provides that county governing body, rather than Legislature, shall prescribe compensation of its members by an ordinance that is subject to referendum.” (Emphasis added.)

Proposition 12 was approved by the voters. Orange County methodology for meeting the requirements of Proposition 12 is to present an ordinance providing for an increase in salary for the Board of Supervisors in the Agenda for the meeting of the Board. The ordinance is held for at least 5 days for a required second reading. During 1998–99, the first ordinance increased salaries to be received and the second ordinance recommended deferred salary benefit. The first reading of the second increase, deferred salary, occurred on December 15, 1998 as Item 79. The second reading when the ordinance was “APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED” occurred on January 12, 1999.

The Grand Jury questions the current methodology for increasing Board of Supervisors salaries.

FINDING:
Under California Penal Code Sections 933 and 933.05, responses are required to all findings. The 1998–99 Orange County Grand Jury has arrived at one major finding. The Board of Supervisors is required to respond to the finding.

1. The system in current use does not give taxpayers a realistic opportunity to voice their opinions about salary policy. Voters do not receive Board of Supervisors Meeting Agenda. Even if the average citizen became aware of the ordinance proposing a salary increase for supervisors, appearance before the Board to voice objection
provides no timely or affordable method to ensure that the ordinance would then be decided by referendum. Therefore, the present method of granting salary increases nullifies the intent of Proposition 12, which is to give voters veto power over proposed salary increases for members of the Board of Supervisors.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

In accordance with *California Penal Code* Sections 933 and 933.05, each recommendation must be responded to by the government entity to which it is addressed. These responses are submitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court. **The Board of Supervisors** is required to respond to the recommendation. Based on the finding, the 1998–99 Orange County Grand Jury recommends that:

1. The Orange County Board of Supervisors should place the matter of all future Board salary increases on the ballot of the next regularly scheduled Orange County election after adoption of the ordinance by the Board.
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