

JLP




County Administrator's Office

Craig L. Pedro
County Administrator

Tuolumne County Administration Center
2 South Green Street
Sonora, CA 95370
Phone (209) 533-5511
Fax (209) 533-5510
www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov

August 23, 2017



AUG 25 2017

Superior Court of California
County of Tuolumne
By: [Signature] Clerk

Judge of Superior Court
Honorable Kate Powell Segerstrom
Tuolumne County Superior Court
60 North Washington Street
Sonora, CA 95370

Re: Response to Grand Jury Report – **Board of Supervisors**

Dear Judge Powell-Segerstrom:

The following is offered in response to the 2016-2017 Grand Jury Report as it pertains to the Board of Supervisors Overview.

Grand Jury Findings

F1. With various committee responsibilities (commonly 10 to 15 per supervisor), bi-monthly board meetings, committee meetings, and representing the county in regional, state and national interests, the job of a Tuolumne County Supervisor often entails 40 to 60 hours per week which is more than a part-time position.

Response: Agree

F2. State and federal representation is a key role for the Board due to Tuolumne County's higher than normal ratio of public non-taxable lands to private taxable land.

Response: Agree

F3. State and federal representation is also needed to solicit and procure more grant monies to cope with the recent states of emergency with fire, drought, tree mortality and flood-caused road damage emergencies confronting the County.

Response: Agree

F4. All Supervisors are performing daily tasks (e.g., calendaring, email, communications, and tracking program status) which consume time they might spend on more strategic planning and oversight. These tasks might be handled by assistants, representatives in committee meetings, or through updated processes and procedures.

Response: Disagree given that: 1) the finding is somewhat relative to each supervisor and their particular work habits and preferences; 2) there are limitations to what a representative can actually do in place of a Supervisor in certain committee settings; and 3) the updated processes and procedures suggested have not been identified to allow proper evaluation of the statement.

F6. The status of the County of Tuolumne 5-Year Program and Major Projects Plan is tracked within a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The individual managing this activity states that it is cumbersome and difficult to update.

Response: Agree that the CAO has reported manipulating a spreadsheet for this task can be cumbersome. Disagree given that the CAO has reported that it is not difficult to update.

F7. Each of the two most common methods for granting supervisorial pay in California - an average based upon raises granted to various civil bargaining groups and raises equal to those received by California State Superior Court Judges - brings with them negatives that need to be considered when approving a raise method. However, using the average raises granted (in Tuolumne County's case) to the county employee bargaining groups is the most straightforward and logical way to determine a raise.

Response: Disagree to the extent both methods can be considered to be straightforward and logical.

F8. Raises granted without a vote because of an ordinance agreed to in the past, can cause significant issues with transparency and absolve supervisors of their elected responsibilities.

Response: Disagree to the extent tying Board salaries to a percentage of that paid Superior Court Judges through adoption of an ordinance is: 1) legally permissible; 2) voted upon in open session (publically); 3) a long time practice of several counties without significant complaints regarding a lack of transparency; and 4) transparent in that Board salaries can be viewed at any time on either the County of Tuolumne's or State Controller's websites.

F9. While supervisors have a right to accept or reject a pay raise, rejection of a fiscally responsible pay raise can cause significant problems in achieving the County Supervisors' stated goal of growing the pool of potential county supervisors.

Response: Agree

Grand Jury Recommendations

R2. The CAO and BOS should seek tools to help facilitate the update of the status of programs and projects in real-time across agencies, committees, and commissions. This will ensure that all stakeholders have access to the most current information in one place and that programs and projects status is highly visible to the Board, County agencies, and the public. (F3, F4, F6)

Response: The recommendation requires further analysis. Some programs, projects and goals (e.g. capital projects, IT systems, etc.) can be addressed using project management software (e.g. Microsoft Projects) while others (e.g. response to emergencies, monitoring and response to State and Federal legislation and regulations, pursuit of making housing affordable, etc.) do not lend to such software. It should also be noted that outside of Board Policy Advisory Committees, few committees and organizations that Board members participate in have specific annual objectives that the Board has control over. This review will be completed prior development of the Board's 2018 Goals in February or March.

R3. Tuolumne County Supervisors should receive a pay raise equal to the increases negotiated with all county bargaining groups thus establishing fiscally responsible, consistent, and stable pay practices for the position of current Supervisors and all future Supervisors. (F1, F2, F7, F8, F9)

Response: This recommendation has not yet been implemented. The Board intends to take action on an ordinance to implement Board salary increases before the end of December.

R4. In the interest of transparency, the 2016-2017 Grand Jury does not favor automatic increases in pay and recommends that Board of Supervisors vote on every compensation issue. (F7, F8, F9)


Response: This recommendation has not yet been implemented, but action will be taken on an ordinance to implement Board salary increases before the end of December. See the Board's response to Recommendation #3 above. The Board understands that such an action would be consistent with the Grand Jury's intent of approving specific salary increases through ordinance versus simply setting Board salaries at a percentage of ever changing Superior Court Judge salaries.

R5. The Supervisors should vote to accept fiscally responsible pay raises, thus working toward the goal of making the BOS job more financially attractive to potential supervisors. Supervisors not desiring a raise have the option to return all or part to the county. (F9)

Response: This recommendation has not yet been implemented, but action will be taken on an ordinance to implement Board salary increases before the end of December. See the Board's response to Recommendation #3 above.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the above findings and recommendations.
Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions regarding same.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Craig L. Pedro". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Craig" and last name "Pedro" clearly distinguishable.

CRAIG L. PEDRO
County Administrator