



AGENDA
December 16, 2019

CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION

5:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

311 Vernon Street

Roseville, California

www.roseville.ca.us

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE WELCOMES YOUR PARTICIPATION

If an agenda item is open to public comment, such public comment shall be addressed to the chair of the meeting.

Public Comment - Speakers have three minutes under Public Comment to speak on issues that are not listed on the agenda and are within the City's jurisdiction. The Brown Act does not permit any action or discussion on items not listed on the agenda.

Consent Calendar - If applicable, the Consent Calendar consists of routine items that may be approved by one motion. Any person can remove an item from the Consent Calendar to be discussed separately.

Agenda Items - Speakers have five minutes to address items that are listed on the agenda.

Americans with Disabilities Act - Notify the City Clerk or Secretary at least 72 hours in advance if special assistance is required to participate in a meeting including the need of auxiliary aids or services.

Audio/Visual Presentations - If making a presentation regarding an agenda item, audio/visual materials must be submitted to the City Clerk or Secretary at least 72 hours in advance.

Roseville City Clerk 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 916-774-5200 TDD 916-774-5220

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ROLL CALL**
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
4. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
5. **MINUTES**

5.1. Minutes of Prior Meeting

Memo from Assistant City Clerk Audrey Byrnes and City Clerk Sonia Orozco

recommending the Charter Review Commission members approve the minutes of the November 18, 2019 Charter Review meeting.
CONTACT: Audrey Byrnes 916-774-5268 abyernes@roseville.ca.us

6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

6.1. Elective Officers - Article 2 - Section 2.02

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review Commission receive a presentation on proposed changes to Article 2 - Section 2.02 regarding elective officers.

CONTACT: Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325
msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

6.2. Number of Councilmember Seats - Article 2 - Section 2.02

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review Commission receive a presentation on projected population growth and the number of councilmember seats.

CONTACT: Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325
msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

6.3. Selection of Mayor and Vice Mayor - Article 2 - Section 2.03

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review Commission receive a presentation on proposed changes to Article 2 - Section 2.03 regarding selection of mayor and vice mayor.

CONTACT: Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325
msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

6.4. Eligibility for Office - Article 3 - Section 3.01

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review Commission receive a presentation on proposed changes to Article 3 - Section 3.01 regarding eligibility for office.

CONTACT: Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325
msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

6.5. Compensation of Councilmembers and Mayor - Article 3 - Section 3.05 and Employee Welfare Benefits Article 3 - Section 3.08

Memo from City Clerk Sonia Orozco and Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger recommending the Charter Review members receive a presentation on Article 3 - Section 3.05 compensation of councilmembers and mayor and Article 3 - regarding Section 3.08 employee welfare benefits.

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

7. ADJOURNMENT



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Minutes of Prior Meeting
Contact: Audrey Byrnes 916-774-5268 abyernes@roseville.ca.us
Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 12/16/2019
Item #: 5.1.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review Commission approve the November 18, 2019 Charter Review Commission minutes.

BACKGROUND

There is no background associated with this item. The request is to approve the minutes of the previous meeting. According to the Administrative Standards, the minutes may be approved by majority vote even if one or more of the voting members were not present at the meeting to which the minutes relate.

Respectfully Submitted,

Audrey Byrnes, Assistant City Clerk

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

November 18, 2019 Charter Review Commission Minutes



MINUTES

November 18, 2019

CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION

5:30 p.m.

Council Chambers
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California
www.roseville.ca.us

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Susan Rohan called the November 18, 2019 Charter Review Commission meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Brohman, Cannon, Constant, Dohner, Frank, Garrett, Rohan, Sanchez

Absent: Viele

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Paul Frank.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment received.

5. MINUTES

5.1. Minutes of Prior Meeting

Memo from Assistant City Clerk Audrey Byrnes and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review Commission members approve the minutes of the September 16, 2019 Charter Review meeting.

CONTACT: Audrey Byrnes 916-774-5268 abyrnes@roseville.ca.us

No public comment received.

Motion by Samuel Cannon, seconded by Kristine Dohner, to approve the

September 16, 2019 Charter Review Commission Minutes as presented. The Motion Passed.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Brohman, Cannon, Constant, Dohner, Frank, Garrett, Rohan, Sanchez

Absent: Viele

6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

6.1. Outstanding Issues - Article/Section Status Matrix

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco requesting the Charter Review Commission review the outstanding issues Article/Section Status Matrix and provide staff direction on listing of future agenda items or remove items from future consideration.

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

M. Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 sheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

City Clerk Sonia Orozco made the presentation to the Commission.

2.02 Elective Officers

Commission consensus to:

1. Input "district" as method of election and include language to mirror language in district based ordinance as follows: "City Councilmember Districts and District Elections. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 34886, all members of the city council of the City of Roseville shall be elected by-district as that term is defined in Government Code Section 34871, meaning that each of the five (5) councilmembers shall be elected one (1) from each district, by the voters of that district alone. All five (5) councilmembers shall be elected in the electoral districts established by this chapter and as subsequently reapportioned pursuant to state law".

2. Confirm five as the number of current councilmembers.

3. Limit three four year terms of office with a twelve year lifetime limit, and any appointment serving under two years is not applicable as a term and any appointment serving over two years is applicable as a term.

4. Request staff return with city ten year growth projections, examples of population breaks.

2.03 Assumption of office by meeting of council, and seating of mayor and vice mayor

Commission consensus to:

1. Strike all sentences in 2.03 referencing seating of Mayor and Vice Mayor. New language to be written for self selection process.

2. Consider self selection of Mayor with a strong written policy for rotation (City Council to emulate Placer County's method)

3. Include language clarifying that following the 2020 election, the current Vice Mayor will be seated as Mayor as the highest vote getter in the 2018 election per existing Charter language. Going forward, self selection policy will be in force.

2.04 Powers and duties of mayor

Commission consensus for no change to 2.04 and remove section from future consideration.

2.06 City attorney

Commission consensus for no change to 2.06 and remove section from future consideration.

2.07 City manager

Commission consensus for no change to 2.07 and remove from section from future consideration.

3.05 Compensation of council members and mayor

Commission consensus to:

1. Request staff return with tiered information and inflationary adjustment for Council pay.
2. Request staff return with Council pay history.

3.08 Employee welfare benefits

Commission consensus to:

1. Strike "non-" in 3.08 referencing non-elective officers and change language to signify that "employees only" are offered any group life, hospital, health or accident insurance designating that the city will offer PERS benefits to elected officials but not group life, hospital, health or accident insurance.

3.09 Councilmember vacancies

Commission consensus to:

1. Request staff return with Charter language regarding Council vacancies for 1) filling vacancies with next highest vote getter with certain percentage of vote, 2) filling vacancies with interim appointment until next election.
2. Fill vacancy within up to 60 days (not 30 as currently written) of vacancy.

4.04 Quorum

Commission consensus for no change to 4.04 and remove section from future consideration.

6.2. New Items for Consideration

Memo from City Clerk Sonia Orozco requesting Charter Review Commission members identify any new items not previously considered.

Commission consensus to:

1. Request topic on Local Districting Commission for future presentation.
2. Request topic on Resign following Election to an incompatible office for future presentation.
3. Hold campaign finance topics until after heard by City Council in January of 2020.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Rita Brohman, seconded by Robert Sanchez, to adjourn the meeting at 8:37 p.m. The Motion Passed.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Brohman, Cannon, Constant, Dohner, Frank, Garrett, Rohan, Sanchez

Absent: Viele



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Elective Officers - Article 2 - Section 2.02
Contact: M. Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us
Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 12/16/2019
Item #: 6.1.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review Commission receive a presentation on Article 2 - Section 2.02 regarding elective officers and direct staff to:

1. Return with additional information and/or further language suggestions for elective officers;
or
2. Approve revisions and place elective officers on the consensus list.

BACKGROUND

The Roseville City Council formally adopted a by-district election format at their December 4, 2019 City Council meeting and the proposed language regarding how elections are conducted conforms to the necessary requirements needed within the Charter by replacing the reference to "at large" elections with a reference to "by district" elections.

Current language of Section 2.02 is as follows:

Sec. 2.02. Elective officers

The electors of the City shall elect a council of five (5) members, at large, for a four (4) year term of office. The council shall constitute the legislative and governing body of the City and shall have authority, except as otherwise provided in this charter, to exercise all powers of the City, and to adopt such ordinances and resolutions as may be proper in the exercise thereof. Two (2) and three (3) councilmembers shall be elected alternately at the General Municipal Election each even-numbered year. No councilmember shall serve more than two (2) consecutive four (4) year terms, commencing as of a date subsequent to April 9, 1974. A partial term served due to appointment to a vacant council seat does not count as a term for purposes of this section.

Proposed changes to Section 2.02 are as follows:

The electors of the City shall elect a council of five (5) members each of whom shall be elected, at large, by district by the voters in that district for a four (4) year term of office. The council shall

constitute the legislative and governing body of the City and shall have authority, except as otherwise provided in this charter, to exercise all powers of the City, and to adopt such ordinances and resolutions as may be proper in the exercise thereof. Two (2) and three (3) councilmembers shall be elected alternately at the General Municipal Election each even-numbered year. No councilmember shall serve more than a maximum of ~~two~~ three (23) consecutive four (4) year terms, which may be served consecutively or nonconsecutively; ~~commencing as of a date subsequent to April 9, 1974. For purpose of the term limit, the counting of the terms shall commence and apply to councilmembers elected at and after the November 3, 2020 General Municipal Election.~~ A partial term due to appointment to a vacant council seat does not count as a term for purposes of this section.

In addition, regarding term limits, per the direction of the Commission, verbiage has been added to allow for three (3) four (4) year terms. The word "maximum" was inserted to prevent an interpretation that a councilmember could serve 12 years, sit out a term, and then be re-elected. Also, language was added making it explicit that the terms can be served either consecutively or nonconsecutively. Finally, since retroactive term limits are unlawful in California, staff is proposing language which clarifies that the new term limits commence after the November 3, 2020 election.

Following redline/strikeout the language will read as follows:

The electors of the City shall elect a council of five (5) members each of whom shall be elected by district by the voters in that district for a four (4) year term of office. The council shall constitute the legislative and governing body of the City and shall have authority, except as otherwise provided in this chapter, to exercise all powers of the City, and to adopt such ordinances and resolutions as may be proper in the exercise thereof. Two (2) and three (3) councilmembers shall be elected alternately at the General Municipal Election each even-numbered year. No councilmembers shall serve more than a maximum of three (3) four (4) year terms, which may be served consecutively or nonconsecutively. For the purpose of the term limit, the counting of the terms shall commence and apply to councilmembers elected at and after the November 3, 2020 General Municipal Election. A partial term due to appointment to a vacant council seat does not count as a term for purposes of the section.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Sheidenberger, Assistant City Attorney

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Number of Councilmember Seats - Article 2 - Section 2.02
Contact: M. Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us
Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 12/16/2019
Item #: 6.2.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review Commission receive a presentation on Article 2 - Section 2.02 regarding projected population growth and the number of councilmember seats and direct staff to:

1. Return with additional information and/or language suggestions regarding the number of councilmembers; or
2. Remove item from future consideration.

BACKGROUND

Section 2.02 of the Charter currently provides for five councilmember seats. In order to evaluate whether to recommend a revision to this section to allow for seven councilmember seats, the Commission asked staff to provide information regarding Roseville's projected population growth as well as a comparison to other cities.

Roseville's current population is 139,643. Roseville's population is estimated to grow to 161,881 by 2030 and to 182,814 by 2040.

Using the same jurisdictions used for the council compensation study, the following cities have five councilmember seats:

Elk Grove (167,965)
Corona (164,595)
Oceanside (175,948)
Antioch (112,968)
Carlsbad (112,930)
Concord (129,707)

The following cities have seven councilmember seats:

Hayward (158,985)

Modesto (211,903)
Richmond (110,378)
Vallejo (117,322)

The following cities have nine councilmember seats:

Berkeley (119,915)
Sacramento (509,000)

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Sheidenberger, Assistant City Attorney

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Selection of Mayor and Vice Mayor - Article 2 - Section 2.03
Contact: Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us
Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 12/16/2019
Item #: 6.3.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review Commission receive a presentation on Article 2 - Section 2.03 regarding selection of mayor and vice mayor and direct staff to:

1. Return with additional information and/or further language suggestions for selection of mayor and vice mayor;
2. Approve revisions and place elective officers on the consensus list; or
3. Remove item from future consideration.

BACKGROUND

The Roseville City Council formally adopted a by-district election format via ordinance at their December 4, 2019 City Council meeting. The ordinance adopted by Council requires the Council to self-select among its membership a mayor and vice mayor following every election. At the last Commission meeting, the majority of the Commissioners favored amending the Charter to mirror the ordinance to provide for self-selection, but asked staff to forward to Council a recommendation that they also adopt a policy specifying that self-selection shall be on a rotational basis, with each district serving as mayor at least every twelve years. The proposed revisions to Section 2.03 makes the necessary changes to the Charter by replacing language regarding the highest vote getter with self-selection language.

Current language of Section 2.03 is as follows:

Sec. 2.03. Assumption of office by, meeting of council, and seating of mayor and vice mayor.

The council shall be sworn in and assume office, subject to the qualifying provisions of this charter, upon receipt of a certified statement of the results of the election pursuant to California Elections Code 15372, as it may be hereafter amended. The council shall hold its first meeting at that time. The councilmember who received the highest number of votes in the latest election shall be seated as vice mayor. The vice mayor's term of office shall commence upon assumption of

office and continue until the election, qualification and assumption of office of their successor following the next General Municipal Election. Upon termination of a councilmember's term of office as vice mayor, the vice mayor shall be seated as mayor. The mayor's term of office shall commence upon assumption of office and continue until the assumption of their successor following the next General Municipal Election.

Proposed changes to Section 2.03 are as follows:

Sec. 2.03. Assumption of office by, meeting of council, and ~~seating~~ selection of mayor and vice mayor.

~~The council shall be sworn in and assume office, subject to the qualifying provisions of this charter, upon receipt of a certified statement of the results of the election pursuant to California Elections Code 15372, as it may be hereafter amended. The council shall hold its first meeting at that time. The councilmember who received the highest number of votes in the latest election shall be seated as vice mayor. The vice mayor's term of office shall commence upon assumption of office and continue until the election, qualification and assumption of office of their successor following the next General Municipal Election. Upon termination of a councilmember's term of office as vice mayor, the vice mayor shall be seated as mayor. Following the certification of the 2020 General Municipal Election, the councilmember who received the highest number of votes in the 2018 election shall be seated as mayor for a two (2) year term. Except as just provided, as soon as practicable following the certification of the results of every General Municipal Election, the council shall select a mayor and vice mayor from its membership. The mayor and vice mayor shall each serve a two (2) year term. The mayor's and vice mayor's term of office shall commence upon assumption of office and continue until the assumption of their successor following the next General Municipal Election. In the event of a vacancy of the mayor or vice mayor, the remaining councilmembers shall appoint from its membership a replacement for the remaining term.~~

Following redline/strikeout the language will read as follows:

Sec. 2.03. Assumption of office by, meeting of council, and selection of mayor and vice mayor.
The council shall be sworn in and assume office, subject to the qualifying provisions of this charter, upon receipt of a certified statement of the results of the election pursuant to California Elections Code 15372, as it may be hereafter amended. The council shall hold its first meeting at that time. Following the certification of the 2020 General Municipal Election, the councilmember who received the highest number of votes in the 2018 election shall be seated as mayor for a two (2) year term. Except as just provided, as soon as practicable following the certification of the results of every General Municipal Election, the council shall select a mayor and vice mayor from its membership. The mayor and vice mayor shall each serve a two (2) year term. The mayor's and vice mayor's term of office shall commence upon assumption of office and continue until the assumption of their successor following the next General Municipal Election. In the event of a vacancy of the mayor or vice mayor, the remaining councilmembers shall appoint from its membership a replacement for the remaining term.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Sheidenberger, Assistant City Attorney

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Eligibility for Office - Article 3 - Section 3.01
Contact: M. Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us
Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 12/16/2019
Item #: 6.4.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review Commission receive a presentation on Article 3 - Section 3.01 regarding eligibility of office and direct staff to:

1. Return with additional information and/or further language suggestions for eligibility of office;
or
2. Approve revisions and place eligibility of office on the consensus list.

BACKGROUND

The Roseville City Council formally adopted a by-district election format at their December 4, 2019 City Council meeting and the proposed language regarding eligibility for office conforms to the necessary requirements needed within the Charter by mirroring language contained within the new district-based elections ordinance.

Current language of Section 3.01 is as follows:

Sec. 3.01. Eligibility of office

Only United States citizens may be elected officers of the City. Only registered qualified electors who have been residents of the City or any territory legally annexed thereto at the time nomination papers are issued to the candidate pursuant to the general election law, shall be eligible to an elective City office.

Proposed changes to Section 3.01 are as follows:

Only United States citizens may be elected or appointed officers of the City. ~~Only registered qualified electors who have been residents of the City or any territory legally annexed thereto at the time nomination papers are issued to the candidate pursuant to the general election law, shall be eligible to an elective City office. (Amended by General Municipal Election on November 2, 2010; amended April 13, 1982; Res. No. 240.)~~ Furthermore, in order to be eligible for City office,

any councilmember elected or appointed to represent an electoral district must reside in that district and be a registered voter in that district, and any candidate for city council must reside in, and be a registered voter in, the district in which the candidate seeks election at the time nomination papers are issued.

Following redline/strikeout the language will read as follows:

Only United States citizens may be elected or appointed officers of the City. Furthermore, in order to be eligible for City office, any councilmember elected or appointed to represent an electoral district must reside in that district and be a registered voter in that district, and any candidate for city council must reside in, and be a registered voter in, the district in which the candidate seeks election at the time nomination papers are issued.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Sheidenberger, Assistant City Attorney

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title:	Compensation of Councilmembers and Mayor - Article 3 - Section 3.05 and Employee Welfare Benefits Article 3 - Section 3.08
Contact:	Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 12/16/2019
Item #: 6.5.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review Commission receive a presentation on Article 3 - Section 3.05 regarding compensation of councilmembers and mayor and Article 3 - Section 3.08 regarding employee welfare benefits and direct staff to:

1. Return with additional information and/or further language suggestions for councilmember and mayor compensation and/or employee welfare benefits;
2. Approve revisions and place councilmember and mayor compensation and/or employee welfare benefits on the consensus list; or
3. Remove items from future consideration.

BACKGROUND

The topic of compensation for elected officials has been brought before the Charter Review Commission in both the 2000 and 2010 reviews. The idea to increase compensation was suggested by former elected officials and members of the community.

Current Charter provision Article Section 3.05 regarding compensation of council members and mayor reads as follows:

- a. The council may enact an ordinance providing that each member of the council shall receive a salary, the amount of which shall be determined by the following schedule:
 1. If the City's population is between 50,000 and 75,000 persons, inclusive, the salary shall be five hundred dollars (\$500) per month for each councilmember, and the mayor shall receive an additional amount of fifty dollars (\$50) per month.
 2. If the City's population exceeds 75,000 persons, the salary shall be six hundred dollars (\$600) per month for each councilmember and the mayor shall receive an additional fifty dollars (\$50) per month.
- b. Councilmembers may, upon order of the council, be reimbursed for reasonable and necessary expenses actually incurred in the service of the City.

The salaries indicated above were established based on salaries enumerated in the California Government Code.

For comparison, General Law Cities follow Title 4 of the California Government Code Division 3. Part 1. General [36501-36525] as follows:

36516(a) (1) A city council may enact an ordinance providing that each member of the city council shall receive a salary based on the population of the city as set forth in paragraph (2). The salaries approved by ordinance under paragraph (1) shall be as follows:

(A) In cities up to and including 35,000 in population, up to and including three hundred dollars (\$300) per month.

(B) In cities over 35,000 up to and including 50,000 in population, up to and including four hundred dollars (\$400) per month.

(C) In cities over 50,000 up to and including 75,000 in population, up to and including five hundred dollars (\$500) per month.

(D) In cities over 75,000 up to and including 150,000 in population, up to and including six hundred dollars (\$600) per month.

(E) In cities over 150,000 up to and including 250,000 in population, up to and including eight hundred dollars (\$800) per month.

(F) In cities over 250,000 population, up to and including one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per month.

For the purposes of this subdivision, the population of a city shall be determined by the last preceding federal census, or a subsequent census, or estimate validated by the Department of Finance. As of January 1, 2019, the Department of Finance reported Roseville's population at 139,643.

Additionally, Title 4 of Government Code states the salary of a councilmember may be increased beyond the amount provided in the statute by an ordinance or by an amendment to an ordinance, however, amendment to Roseville's current councilmembers and mayor salaries would require a Charter amendment and a vote of the electorate.

If approved by the electorate, Government Code Section 36516.5 stipulates a change in compensation does not apply to a councilmember during his/her term of office; however, the prohibition expressed in the statute shall not prevent adjustment of all members of the council serving staggered terms whenever one or more members of such council becomes eligible for a salary increase by virtue of his/her beginning a new term of office. Stated differently, when one or more members begin a new term of office, the City may implement a change in compensation and benefits once a Charter amendment is approved.

In a number of Charter cities, voters set salary terms for elected officials over and above what is enumerated in the Government Code. Government Code 36516 also allows voters in general law cities to establish a different rate of compensation, which may only be increased or decreased by a vote of the people.

Members of the City Council are currently not eligible for health benefits, vision and dental

coverage, or life insurance.

The Eighth Edition Model City Charter, a publication of the National Civic League states "councilmembers are part-time officials and do not direct city departments. Council salary levels depend on a variety of factors specific to each community, including the part-time nature of the position and the emphasis on policy-making rather than administration." The publication goes on to reject the setting of the actual amount of compensation in the charter except for the salary of the first council after the charter goes into effect. The delay in the effective date of any salary increase provides some protection from criticism from the community. Additionally, the document explains that "the city should provide extra compensation for the mayor because, in addition to regular responsibilities, the mayor has significant inter-governmental and ceremonial responsibilities."

Determining if Roseville's elected officials are defined as "part-time" in the discharge of their duties is difficult. In addition to their regular responsibilities of representing Roseville citizens, the members also participate in 31 auxiliary boards, commissions, and committees throughout the Placer and Sacramento County region. Examples of the auxiliary bodies include the Northern California Power Agency, the Regional Water Authority and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and many other high priority organizations. Even though the positions are split up between the elected officials, each organization requires ample preparation and participation in representing Roseville.

Charter Review Commission members previously requested staff provide additional information on annual amounts of compensation, household medium income of jurisdictions, number of seats on the City Council, and annual budget information for other jurisdictions. A table indicating this information is attached for reference.

Proposed Edit to Section 3.05

A written request was submitted by Commission member Paul Frank to modify Section 3.05 in order to eliminate the 50,000 to 70,000 population provision as Roseville's population has exceeded this amount:

a. The council may enact an ordinance providing that each member of the council shall receive a salary, the amount of which shall be determined by the following schedule:

~~1. If the City's population is between 50,000 and 75,000 persons, inclusive, the salary shall be five hundred dollars (\$500) per month for each councilmember, and the mayor shall receive an additional amount of fifty dollars (\$50) per month.~~

~~2.~~ 1. If the City's population exceeds 75,000 persons, the salary shall be six hundred dollars (\$600) per month for each councilmember and the mayor shall receive an additional fifty dollars (\$50) per month.

b. Councilmembers may, upon order of the council, be reimbursed for reasonable and necessary expenses actually incurred in the service of the City. (Amended by General Municipal Election on November 2, 2010: amended by General Municipal Election on November 7, 2000: amended by General Municipal Election on November 5, 1985: Res. No. 240.)

Follow-up and action requested at the November 18, 2019 Charter Review Commission Meeting is denoted below for both sections 3.05 and 3.08:

3.05 Compensation of council members and mayor

Consensus of the Charter Review Commission to:

1. Request staff return with tiered information and inflationary adjustment for Council pay.

2. Request staff return with Council pay history.

Historic Roseville City Council and Mayor pay:

Charter Year	Amount Of Compensation	Additional Information
1934	Served with no compensation	None
1950	\$30.00 per month	None
1957	\$10.00 per council meeting attended	Compensation in any month shall not exceed \$30.00. Mayor to receive an additional \$30.00 per month due to ceremonial duties
1967	\$10.00 per council meeting attended	Compensation in any month shall not exceed \$60.00. Mayor to receive an additional \$30.00
1974	\$15.00 per meeting	Compensation in any month shall not exceed \$60.00. Monthly expense of allowance of the Mayor increased from \$30.00 to \$50.00
1985	\$150.00 per month	Mayor to receive an additional \$50.00 per month
1990	\$300.00 per month	Mayor to receive an additional \$50.00 per month
1995	\$500.00 per month	Using Title 4 of the California Government Code Division 3. Part 1 General [36501-36522] Mayor to receive an additional \$50.00 per month
2000	\$600.00 per month	Using Title 4 of the California Government Code Division 3 Part 1 General [36501-36525] Mayor to receive an additional \$50.00 per month

Using the tiering table and figures from Title 4 of the California Government Code Division 3. Part 1. General [36501-36525] the inflationary rates are as follows:

	2000 Value	2019 Value	Inflationary Rate Average Over Period
Rate of Pay for Cities over 75,000 up to and including 150,000 = \$600.00	\$600.00	\$895.66	2.13%
Rate of Pay for Cities over 150,000 up to and including 250,000 = \$800.00	\$800.00	\$1,194.22	2.13%
Rate of Pay for Cities over 250,000 = \$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,492.77	2.13%

Staff also confirmed that changing the word salary to stipend is acceptable per PERS regulations.

Staff requests the Charter Review Commission recommend if the compensation of the council and mayor should be increased, and if so, the dollar amount of the increase. As the City is moving to districts, consideration should be made in order to set appropriate amount.

3.08 Employee welfare benefits

1. Strike "non-" in 3.08 referencing non-elective officers and change language to signify that "employees only" are offered any group life, hospital, health or accident insurance designating that the city will offer only PERS benefits to elected officials but not group life, hospital, health or accident insurance.

The City Charter currently reads:

Section 3.08 Employee welfare benefits

The council may provide for the retirement of the City's non-elective officers and employees and make available to them any group life, hospital, health or accident insurance, either independently of, or as a supplement to, any retirement or other employee welfare benefits in effect at the time of approval of this charter by the legislature or otherwise provided by law.

Proposed Change to Section 3.08 ~~Employee W~~welfare benefits:

The council may provide for the retirement of the City's ~~non~~-elective officers and employees and make available to ~~them~~ employees only any group life, hospital, health or accident insurance, either independently of, or as a supplement to, any retirement or other employee welfare benefits in effect at the time of approval of this charter by the legislature or otherwise provided by law.

Following redline/strikeout the language will read as follows:

Section 3.08. Welfare benefits

The council may provide for the retirement of the City's elective officers and employees and make available to employees only any group life, hospital, health or accident insurance, either independently of, or as a supplement to, any retirement or other employee welfare benefits in effect at the time of approval of this charter by the legislature or otherwise provided by law.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk

Michelle Sheidenberger, Assistant City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Additional Information_Councilmember and Mayor Compensation_July 2019

Local Jurisdictions Comparisons – Demographics, Elected Officials Compensation/Benefits

						ANNUAL					
City	General Law (G) Charter (C)	Size Of City	Household Median Income	Full Service	# on Council	Base Pay Mayor (M) Council (C)	2018/2019 Budget Revenue (R) Expenditures (E)	CALPERS (Retirement) Percent & Annual Other	Medical Insurance (Family or Single)	Dental (D) Vision (V) Life Ins (L) Family or Single	Allowances: Car Cell Phone Internet Credit Other
Roseville	C	139,643	\$78,446	Yes	5	\$7,800 (M) \$7,200 (C)	\$526,274,762 (R) \$514,095,529 (E)	CALPERS Opt in 8% Contribution of \$468 out of Mayor/Council Pay	None	None	\$624 Internet \$420 Phone
Citrus Heights	G	86,291	\$80,100	No	5	\$6,300 (M & C)	\$59,570,912 (R) \$59,608,160 (E)	CALPERS 2.7%@55	Single \$7,200 if opt out \$7,200 goes into a deferred comp account	D - Family included in medical premium V - Family included in medical premium L - up to \$100,000	\$2,000 limit credit card to be used while on official travel or official business
Elk Grove	G	167,965	\$83,141	No	5	\$9,600 (M & C)	\$74,931,917 (R) \$74,558,567 (E)	CALPERS Classic 2%@55 Hired after 1/1/13 2%@62	Family - \$23,875 if opt out of medical \$7,800 deposited into deferred comp account	D - Family included in medical premium V - Family included in medical premium L - up to \$300,000	Deferred Comp- City will match 100% of officials contribution up to 3%
Folsom	C	77,246	\$102,692	No	5	\$8,760 (M) \$7,560 (C)	\$211,348,867 (R) \$206,129,066 (E)	PEPRA Classic 2.7%@55 New 2.0%@62	Family - up to \$18,072	D - Family \$1,922 V - Single \$264	None
Lincoln	G	47,339	\$78,647	No	5	\$7,680 (M & C)	\$80,154,107 (R) \$87,385,218 (E)	CALPERS Minimum Employer Contribution at \$1,380	Family - up to \$22,200	D - Family included in	None

										medical premium V- Family included in medical premium L - up to \$10,000	
Rocklin	G	60,351	\$84,121	No	5	\$8,220 (M & C)	\$80,402,900 (R) \$86,443,000 (E)	None	None	None	None

Comparable Jurisdictions in Population Comparisons – Demographics, Elected Officials Compensation/Benefits

ANNUAL											
City	General Law (G) Charter (C)	Size of City	Household Median Income	Full Service	# on Council	Base Pay Mayor (M) Council (C)	2018/2019 Budget Revenue (R) Expenditures (E)	CALPERS (Retirement) Percent & Annual Other	Monthly Medical Insurance (Family or Single)	Dental (D) Vision (V) Life Ins (L) Family or Single	Allowances: Car Cell Phone Internet Credit Other
Antioch	G	112,968	\$70,696	No	5	\$11,652 (M & C)	\$128,562,706 (R) \$136,135,158 (E)	City pays \$15,636 for PERS minimum employer contributions	Family - \$15,636 opt out any used funds split 50/50 between city and employee	Family D - \$2,196 V - \$408 L - \$12,000	Car: \$5,400 (M) \$4,200 (C) Cell Phone \$600
Berkeley	C	119,915	\$66,237	No	9	\$51,912 (M) \$35,038 (C)	\$418,702,033 (R) \$441,615,096 (E)	CALPERS - 2.7% @ 55 Classic New member must opt into CALPERS and pay employee contribution	Family - Full Kaiser Premium	D - Full Delta Dental V - none L - \$25,000	Mileage at Standard IRS rate - \$0.54.5 per mile

Carlsbad	C	112,930	\$113,217	No	5	\$25,826 (M) \$24,626 (C)	\$337,450,675 (R) \$342,334,296 (E)	CALPERS - 2.0% @ 62 formula with 3 years average earnings for final calculation	Family - choice of several medical plans up to Kaiser minimum opt out unused funds received as income	D - No V - No L - two times annual base salary	Car: Mayor \$5,400 Council \$4,200 Cell Phone \$549
Concord	G	129,707	\$76,335	No	5	\$15,600 (M&C)	\$100,301,000 (R) \$102,523,000 (E)	CALPERS - Tier I 2.5% @ 55 Official pays 8% Tier II 2.0% @ 55 Official pays 7% Reform 2% @ 62	Official Only - \$7,944	D - \$484 V - \$134 L - twice annual salary	Mileage at Standard IRS rate - \$0.54.5 per mile
Corona	G	164,595	\$85,669	No Elec only	5	\$9,600 (M&C)	\$351,320,531 (R) \$317,477,213 (E)	CALPERS - contribution is 8% of base salary paid by official	Family - \$18,208	L - coverage up to \$50,000	Mileage at Standard IRS rate - \$0.54.5 per mile
Hayward	C	158,985	\$68,138	No	7	\$39,959 (M) \$24,975 (C)	\$309,483,000 (R) \$315,264,000 (E)	CALPERS - 2.5 @ 55 Classic 2.0 @ 62 New Employer 26.388% Official 8%	Family - up to \$22,882 If opt out \$6,000 income in lieu of medical	D - \$1,546 V - \$697 L - 1x annual salary	Car: \$1,728 Mayor only
Modesto	C	211,903	\$56,493	No	7	\$43,200 (M) \$24,000 (C)	\$448,460,361 (R) \$498,733,876 (E)	PARS - Official contributes 3.75% and City contributes 3.75%	No Medical	D - No V - No L - No	None
Oceanside	C	175,948	\$60,487	No	5	\$21,528 (M) \$19,728 (C)	\$441,485,864 (R) \$397,822,375 (E)	PEPRA - Officials elected/appointed after 1/1/13 subject to PEPRA. Each members retirement varies based on time on Council	Family - Full Cost of Kaiser of United Healthcare	Family - D - Delta Dental V - Vision Service Plan L - 1 times annual base salary	Expense Allowance Mayor \$4,800 Council \$4,200

Richmond	C	110,378	\$67,102	No	7	\$46,500 (M) \$16,830 (C)	\$337,767,925 (R) \$351,673,571 (E)	CALPERS Official pays 8% and city pays 11.20% 2% @ 62	Family - Up to \$22,882	Family - D - Delta Dental \$1,470 V - Vision Service Plan \$220 L - \$25,000	Additional stipends for agency meetings
Vallejo	C	117,322	\$68,692	No	7	\$22,800 (M) \$14,700 (C)	\$226,857,860 (R) \$236,818,324 (E)	CALPERS - 2% @ 62 split between employer and official	Family - PEMCHA \$3,600 - City difference of 75% of Kaiser	Family - D - \$1,400 V - \$289 L - None	None