

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**  
**OF THE**  
**ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**2017 SALARY STANDARD COMMISSION**



**Presented to the County Council**

**December 4, 2017**

**ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**2017 SALARY STANDARD COMMISSION**

**Robin J. Clark, Esquire, Chair**

**O'Brien Atkinson, Vice Chair**

**JaCina Stanton, Esquire**

**Chris Steelman**

**Raymond "Rod" Devilbiss, Jr.**

**David Whitney**

**Bob Lee**

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE  
ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY COUNCIL  
2017 SALARY STANDARD COMMISSION**

Table of Contents

Introduction and Summary .....	1
Key Findings.....	2
Legal Authority for the Establishment of the Commission .....	3
Background.....	4
Findings.....	11
Commission Meetings .....	13
Recommendations.....	14
Conclusion .....	17
Appendices.....	18

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE  
ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY COUNCIL  
2017 SALARY STANDARD COMMISSION**

**Introduction and Summary**

The 2017 Salary Standard Commission is pleased to submit its report and recommendation for compensation and allowances to be paid to members of the County Council who are elected to office in the 2018 general election.

This Commission is an appointed body of County residents. We live across the county, each one of us from a different Council district. We include a pastor, an attorney, a retired plumbing contractor, a government researcher, a former firefighter, a police officer, and a PTA President. The experience of serving on the Commission was new to many of us. As members of the public, we had one primary interest – the quality and integrity of the County Council.

Throughout our research, discussion, and deliberations, Commissioners frequently recalled our role, and anchored our opinions in our perspectives as members of the constituency, not members of the government. We came in with different ideas about what we might recommend. At the start of the Commission, many of us were unsure of whether we would come to a consensus position. When we saw the facts, however, our perspectives quickly aligned.

As you will read in the following Report, the Commission reached a consensus opinion that the salaries of the County Council need to increase. The Commissioners also all agree that the Council must reinstate a vehicle allowance and add a technology allowance to adequately compensate Councilmembers for their work.

The Salary Standard Commission views these recommendations not as a raise for Councilmembers, but as a necessary remediation for the stagnation of Council wages since 2003. The Council's salaries must be increased in the coming term to reflect increased costs of living, expanded expectations for public service, and modern costs of technology needed to perform their essential job duties, including constituent services and outreach.

To reflect this need, the Commission considered tying the salaries of Councilmembers to a cost of living index, instead of setting an increase amount. The Commission ultimately decided against this approach, because tying Council salaries to an index could result in a salary decrease if the index decreases. At this point, the salaries of Councilmembers have fallen too far behind their peers and modern costs of living to risk a decrease, even if there is an economic downturn.

Summary of the recommendations:

Salary Adjustment (Increase)	2019	2020	2021	2022
Councilman	\$2760	\$775	\$791	\$807
Vice Chair	\$2780	\$796	\$812	\$828
Chairman	\$2850	\$867	\$884	\$902

Constituent Outreach Allowances	Cell Phone/ Internet	Automobile/ Transportation
Councilman	\$100/month	\$350/month
Vice Chair	\$100/month	\$350/month
Chairman	\$100/month	\$350/month

### Key Findings

According to the research of the Commission:

- If the Councilmembers' salaries were provided with the cost of living increases afforded to other non-represented County employees, Councilmember salaries would be **+27%, or \$9,720 in additional annual compensation.**
- If the Councilmembers' salaries were increased at the same rate of the increase in median household income in Anne Arundel County, Councilmember salaries would have increased by **+12.5% from 2003 to 2015, or \$4,500.**
- If Councilmembers' salaries were provided with the same increases as the County Executive's salary, Councilmember salaries would be **+39.2%, or \$14,118 in additional annual compensation.**
- If the Councilmembers' salaries were increased by the average increase received by Councilmembers in neighboring jurisdictions in the past ten years alone, they would be **+17.4%, or \$6,264 in additional annual compensation.**
- If Councilmembers' benefits and allowances had not been reduced since 2003, they may have had, roughly estimated, the equivalent of **+67%, or \$24,222 in additional annual compensation.**

According to the conclusions of the Commission:

- ❖ The salaries of Anne Arundel County Councilmembers, Vice Chair, and Chair need to be increased in the next term.
- ❖ A failure to increase compensation and benefits provided to Councilmembers undermines the ability of Councilmembers to adequately serve their constituents and provide the governance that Anne Arundel County residents expect and deserve.
- ❖ A failure to increase compensation and benefits provided to Councilmembers narrows the pool of residents who are able to afford serving on the Council, thereby threatening the ability of residents to elect a representative body to the Council.
- ❖ A failure to increase compensation and benefits will make future Councils vulnerable to persuasion by outside interests and would fail to support the maintenance of the Council's integrity.
- ❖ Over the past several years, there has been a hesitation of elected County Councilmembers to introduce and support increases to the salaries of future County Councilmembers. The repercussions of repeatedly freezing or cutting Councilmembers' compensation has lasting detrimental effects that far outweigh individual political advantages.

### **Legal Authority for the Establishment of the Commission**

MD Code, Local Government, §10-302, (a) states that “by ordinance, a county may establish a commission to recommend compensation and allowances for members of the county legislative body.” MD Code, Local Government, §10-302, (b)(2) provides that “the commission may recommend an increase or decrease in the compensation and allowances for members of the county legislative body.”

Pursuant to § 3-9-101 of the Anne Arundel County Code, “there is a Salary Standard Commission composed of seven members appointed by the County Council. The Commission shall report to the County Council in accordance with Local Government Article, § 10-302, of the State Code.” Additionally, by Bill No. 107-73, the Council created a seven-member Salary Standard Commission for Anne Arundel County. (Anne Arundel County Code, Article 2, § 201(a)). This provides that the Commission shall report to the County Council in accordance with the State Code.

The County Council pursuant to Resolution 41-17 adopted on September 5, 2017, established the 2017 Salary Standard Commission to set compensation and allowances to be paid to members of the County Council.

## **Background**

Over the course of the Commission's work, Commissioners studied the current salaries and benefits of Councilmembers, and changes to those salaries and benefits since 2003.

At the first meeting of the Commission, Amy Tate, Esq., Legislative Counsel to the County Council, provided an overview of information provided to Commissioners that contained past Commission reports, jurisdictional economic data, and data from other county councils in Maryland. Ms. Tate provided a legal summary of the Councilmembers' salary and allowance history.

Ms. Tate also reported that over the last 14 years that the Council had lost their car allowance, their mileage reimbursement, and their health insurance subsidy. By taking into account the Councilmembers' loss of various benefits, their compensation was actually reduced since 2003. This testimony, explored through subsequent conversations and additional research, provided a strong basis for the Commission's recommendation to increase salaries and allowances to future Councilmembers.

## Current Salaries

The County Council Salaries are defined in § 2-2-101 of the County Code as follows:

- (1) The Chair of the County Council is entitled to receive, while in that office, an annual salary of \$40,500 for the entire term beginning the first Monday in December, 2002.
- (2) The Vice Chair of the County Council is entitled to receive, while in that office, an annual salary of \$37,000 for the entire term beginning the first Monday in December, 2002.
- (3) Each other member of the County Council is entitled to receive, while in that office, an annual salary of \$36,000 for the entire term beginning the first Monday in December, 2002.

Two Salary Standard Commissions held since 2003 have recommended increases for the Council. None recommended reductions in the Council's other benefits and allowances.

- The Salary Standard Commission of 2005 recommended an increase on a graduated basis of 2% per year in each of the four years of the following term of office.
- In the midst of the recession, the Salary Standard Commission of 2009 recommended no increase in salary.
- The Salary Standard Commission of 2013 recommended a salary increase of 3% annually for the subsequent four years.

**Despite recommendations to do so, the Council has not raised salaries for future Councilmembers since 2003.**

### Current Benefits

The total compensation package of Councilmembers has worsened over the past few years, as salary levels have been held flat while benefits and allowances have been removed. Even in the midst of the recession, the Salary Standard Commission of 2009 recommended maintaining all of the Commission’s benefits and allowances. Instead, the Council reduced and eliminated benefits in 2010, and again in 2013.

**The County Council has stripped themselves of allowances and benefits that total an estimated \$24,222, equivalent to two-thirds of a current Councilmember’s salary.**

### *Healthcare Benefits*

Members of the County Council must currently pay 100% of the premium costs for the County healthcare plan—there is no County contribution toward health insurance costs for Councilmembers.

Councilmembers used to have full healthcare coverage, however, in 2010, the Council passed Bill No. 23-10, requiring Councilmembers to pay 100% of premium costs for health insurance.

Other County employees, even part-time employees, continue to receive some County contribution to health care. Full-time employees and part-time employees working 50% or more are eligible for medical, dental, visions, FSA, and life insurance. An employee enrolled in the HMO or EPO pays 15% of the cost and 25% for the Triple Option. Part-time employees pay more for health insurance based on their percentage of employment.

The Commission did not have a clear picture of the loss of compensation effected by the legislative change in 2010. However, the Commission did review the “Annual Cost of County Council Member,” from Exhibit D of the 2009 Salary Standard Commission Minutes of December 16, 2009, which stated the following:

Health, Dental, and Vision Costs	Monthly Cost
Cost of Highest Option Health Insurance – Family Coverage	\$1,301.73
Cost of Dental Insurance – Family Coverage	\$97.93
Cost of Vision Insurance – Family Coverage	\$8.47
Total Monthly Cost	<b>\$1,408.13</b>
Total Annual Cost	<b>\$16,897.56</b>

**The stripping of healthcare benefits could be estimated as a \$16,897 annual loss for Councilmembers compensation, based on data reviewed by the 2009 Salary Standard Commission.**

### *Pension Benefits*

Members of the County Council are currently eligible for a pension after 10 years of actual plan service plus transferred service from the State or a political subdivision of the State.

In 2014, the County Council passed Bill No. 97-13, which raised the vesting in the Employee Pension Plan for Councilmembers to 10 years. This change reduced Councilmembers' ability to earn pension benefits, by delaying vesting in the pension plan until 10 years of service, beyond the number of years of service a Councilmember may earn in two terms on the Council.

While it is possible that a Councilmember vests in the County's pension through additional service years in another qualifying government position, or through appointment, it is now much less likely that a Councilmember will vest in the County pension and receive a lifetime annuity.

It is very difficult to quantify the lost value of the change in vesting for the Councilmembers. The amounts depend on various factors, including whether or not a Councilmember would have served two terms or otherwise vested within eight years, the age of a Councilmember when he leaves office, mortality factors, and, of course, salaries.

Here is a rough illustration of the value of this lost benefit that the Commission received from an actuary contacted by the County Budget Office:

For a Councilmember who left at age 50 and had \$40,000 annual pensionable earnings throughout tenure:

- 8 years of service (without vesting): Refund of \$15,000
- If the Councilmember had 8 years of service, but the plan was changed to 8-year vesting for Councilmembers, then the estimated value of the lifetime annuity would be \$40,000

In an attempt to quantify the value of the change in vesting, the Commission considered that based on the information above, a Councilmember leaving office after two terms could receive a refund from the pension system of approximately \$15,000. This is actually a high estimate, since the Councilmember and Vice Chair salaries are currently less than \$40,000.

If a Councilmember vested in the system after two terms in office, as he or she would have under the old rule, the same Councilmember would be leaving office with a lifetime annuity estimated at \$40,000. This, according to the actuary, is based on the example of a Councilmember who leaves office at age 50, applying a certain mortality rate.

Considering the illustration above, the Commission is using an estimate of \$25,000 to express the loss of benefits as a result of the delay in pension vesting. This is equal to the \$40,000 annuity minus the \$15,000 refund. On an annual basis, over eight years, this could be viewed as a \$3,125 loss.

**The delayed vesting in the pension system from 8 years to 10 years could be broadly estimated as a \$3,125 annual loss in benefits for County Councilmembers.**

### Current Allowances

Members of the County Council are not currently provided with any allowances.

### *Mileage Allowance*

Members of the County Council are not entitled to a mileage allowance.

In 2010, the County Council removed their county mileage allowance. The County mileage allowance was a \$4,200 annual allowance, which equates to \$350 per month. Councilmembers must continue to travel for Council business and constituent outreach and services, but may not use a County vehicle nor receive reimbursement for use of their personal vehicles.

**The elimination of the mileage allowance was a \$4,200 annual loss to Councilmembers.**

### *Cell Phone & Technology*

Members of the County Council are not entitled to a phone allowance or reimbursement for cell phone use for county business. Members of the County Council could use a county cell phone, but none currently choose to avail themselves of that benefit.

Members of the County Council are not entitled to a technology allowance or reimbursement for home internet or computer use for county business. Members of the County Council could have a county laptop, but none currently choose to avail themselves of that benefit.

### Fiscal Outlook

The County's fiscal outlook has improved since the economic recession that occurred from 2008 to 2010. The Commission's recommendations acknowledge the fact, however, that Anne Arundel County is required to maintain a balanced budget, and other than capital projects, it may not operate at a deficit. The Commission also reviewed the approved allocation in the County Budget for FY 2018 for the County Council, which is \$1,984,200.

These recommendations consider the possibility of future economic downturns and, in the opinion of Commissioners, are prudent steps needed to support and maintain the Anne Arundel County's legislative branch of government.

Comparative Jurisdictions

In determining which counties were the strongest comparators for Anne Arundel County, the Commission considered structure of governance and demographic information. The Commissioners reviewed county salaries in various charter counties, considering where Anne Arundel’s salaries sit now among counties with similar populations, similar council size, and residents with similar median household incomes.

The Commission also asked which counties are used a comparators by the County’s human resources department. According to the County’s Personnel Officer, the salaries for Anne Arundel County employee positions are usually compared with Baltimore Metropolitan counties such as Howard County, Baltimore County, and Baltimore City.

In this report, the Commissioners decided to show comparisons with Baltimore County and Howard County. While there may be differences in the job duties and responsibilities of Councilmembers in these jurisdictions, the Commission finds them to be appropriate comparators.

**Salaries of Anne Arundel’s neighboring County Councilmembers have increased by an average of \$9,297 since fiscal year 2010. In the same timeframe, Anne Arundel County Councilmember salaries have not increased.**

According to information from the Maryland Association of Counties, Councilmembers and Council Presidents in Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Howard County, have higher salaries in fiscal year 2018 than they did in fiscal year 2010.

Comparative jurisdiction charts:

<b>County</b>	<b>Councilmember Salary FY2010</b>	<b>Councilmember Salary FY 2018</b>	<b>\$ Difference</b>	<b>% Difference</b>
<b>Anne Arundel County</b>	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$0	0%
<b>Baltimore County</b>	\$54,000	\$62,500	\$8,500	+15.7%
<b>Howard County</b>	\$52,892	\$62,985	\$10,093	+19.1%

<b>County</b>	<b>Council President Salary FY2010</b>	<b>Council President Salary FY2018</b>	<b>\$ Difference</b>	<b>% Difference</b>
<b>Anne Arundel County</b>	\$40,500	\$40,500	\$0	0%
<b>Baltimore County</b>	\$60,000	\$70,000	\$10,000	+16.7%
<b>Howard County</b>	\$53,892	\$66,485	\$12,593	+23.4%

Comparative jurisdiction charts (cont.):

<b>County</b>	<b>Populations 7/1/2016</b>	<b>Council Size</b>	<b>Median Household Income</b>
<b>Anne Arundel County</b>	568,346	7	\$89,860
<b>Baltimore County</b>	831,026	7	\$67,095
<b>Howard County</b>	317,233	5	\$110,238

Salaries of Other County Employees

The Commission considered the salary increases of employees of Anne Arundel County for context in determining the appropriate level of increase for County Councilmembers. The Commission considered both the salaries of employees represented by collective bargaining units (represented employees) and those not represented by collective bargaining units (non-represented employees).

Employees not represented by collective bargaining units tend to include upper level County staff with job duties more similar to County Councilmembers. However, both groups were considered for context, and the salary history for represented employees is included in the Appendix.

*Non-represented county employees' salaries*

The following information was provided to the Salary Standard Commission:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Across the Board (ATB) Increases for non-represented county employees</b>
<b>FY2005</b>	2%
<b>FY2006</b>	3%
<b>FY2007</b>	3%
<b>FY2008 Summer</b>	2%
<b>FY2008 Winter</b>	1%
<b>FY2009</b>	3%
<b>FY2014 Winter</b>	2%
<b>FY2014 Spring</b>	2%
<b>FY2015 Winter</b>	2%
<b>FY2015 Spring</b>	2%
<b>FY2016 Winter</b>	2%
<b>Cumulative Increase</b>	<b>27%</b>

**The County Council has provided a cumulative increase of 27% to non-represented County employees since 2003. In the same timeframe, Anne Arundel County Councilmember salaries have not increased.**

*County Executive salary*

Since 2003, the Anne Arundel County Executive has received salary raises through Bill 23-06 from \$102,000 to \$125,000 (2006) and from \$125,000 to \$130,000 (2009)

Bill 53-14 increased the County Executive’s salary from \$133,000 (2014) with raises each year until the County Executive’s present salary of \$142,000 (2017).

**The salary of the Anne Arundel County Executive has increased 39% since 2003 through legislation passed by the County Council. In the same timeframe, Anne Arundel County Councilmember salaries have not increased.**

Median Household Income of County Residents

The following information was provided by the Maryland Open Data Portal. Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index Urban-Research series, Less Food and Energy, seasonally adjusted.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Median Household Income</b>
2003	\$80,724
2004	\$81,424
2005	\$86,367
2006	\$92,247
2007	\$92,153
2008	\$92,866
2009	\$88,242
2010	\$88,577
2011	\$89,359
2012	\$91,821
2013	\$88,791
2014	\$88,248
2015	\$90,825
<b>\$ Increase from 2003-2015</b>	<b>\$10,101</b>
<b>% Increase from 2003-2015</b>	<b>+12.5%</b>

**The median household incomes of Anne Arundel County residents increased by 12.5% from 2003 to 2015. In the same timeframe, Anne Arundel County Councilmember salaries have not increased.**

## Conclusions on the Background Information

Since 2003, Anne Arundel County Councilmember salaries have not increased, but all other comparative salaries considered have increased. Those include the salaries of Councilmembers in other counties, the salaries of other Anne Arundel County employees, and the salaries of Anne Arundel County residents.

Taking into account the Councilmembers' loss of various benefits including their vehicle allowance, mileage reimbursement, health insurance, and pension benefit, the compensation package for Councilmembers has been reduced significantly since 2003. This background information, explored through subsequent conversations alongside the additional context described below, provided a strong basis for the Commission's recommendation to increase salaries and allowances for future Councilmembers.

## **Findings**

**The salary increase recommendations of this Report will adequately compensate County Councilmembers as those vested with the legislative powers of Anne Arundel County, one of Maryland's most populous, prosperous, and historic jurisdictions.**

Over 500,000 residents call Anne Arundel County home due to the area's superior quality of life on the Chesapeake Bay, a rich heritage, and an ideal proximity to Baltimore and Washington, D.C. The County boasts diverse communities, numerous attractions, educational and employment opportunities and several amenities.

Since 1964, Anne Arundel County, Maryland has had a charter form of government in accordance with State law. It is composed of a legislative branch known as the County Council and an executive branch that is headed by the County Executive. The County Council, as the legislative branch, adopts ordinances and resolutions, and has all of the County's legislative powers.

**The salary increase recommendations of this Report will preserve the Council's representative nature.**

The salary of Councilmembers must provide appropriate compensation for their job duties in order to maintain the Council as a body that represents County residents. Failure to adequately compensate Councilmembers for their service to the community may limit the range of residents who seek to serve on the Council. Council service must not become a privilege that few can afford. The Commission urges the Council to adopt the recommendations of this Report to prevent limiting Anne Arundel County constituents' candidate options.

**The technology allowance recommended in this Report will reflect the increased use of technology, and contemporary expectations of availability of Councilmembers on new modes of communication.**

The seven-member Anne Arundel County Council generally meets the first and third Mondays of each month, in addition to budget deliberations in May and occasional work sessions. The Salary Standard Commission acknowledges, however, that that duties and responsibilities of a Councilmember extend further than these base requirements.

In the past decade, the demands on local government leaders to be available to constituents via phone and email, have led to the expectation that Councilmembers will be responsive to requests, concerns, and complaints around the clock, seven days a week. Cell phones and email have become primary modes of communication, while social media platforms are emerging as powerhouses for outreach and input, even in the public sector.

As described above, Councilmembers are currently able to use a County cell phone. In the opinion of the Commission, however, the offer to use a County cell phone is an outdated response to the need for Councilmembers to be accessible and responsive to their electorate. The prolific use of cell phones means that it is highly unlikely that a Councilmember elected to office does not already have his or her own phone and a history of a certain phone number. Use of more than one cell phone is potentially cumbersome and complicated.

A better approach is a technology allowance of \$100/month that partially offsets a Councilmember's cell phone and internet service contracts. This approach supports Councilmember outreach and constituent communications while protecting Councilmembers incurring additional expenses in service of the public.

**Provision of a County laptop to Councilmembers supports their need to communicate with residents via email and other web-based platforms.**

A technology allowance of \$100 per month does not factor in any contribution to a personal computer. The Commission acknowledges the current offer for Councilmembers to use a laptop provided by the County for their Council business, and find this sufficient to meet their access needs.

**The vehicle allowance recommended in this Report shows consideration of Councilmembers' use of their personal vehicles to conduct Council business.**

The 2005 Salary Standard Commission found that a \$350 per month allowance for Councilmembers was reasonable. This finding was based on the lease and replacement rates for County vehicles and estimates of the amount of miles Councilmembers travel for Council business.

The 2005 Commission found through interviews that two Councilmembers from different areas of the County who reported spending vastly different amounts of time performing Council duties both estimated using their personal vehicles between 7,000 and 8,000 miles per year on Council business.

The Internal Revenues Service's reimbursement rates for 2017 are \$0.535/mile. For 8,000 miles per year, the federal reimbursement would be \$4,280 per year, or \$357 per month. This Commission, like the 2005 Commission, finds that this is an appropriate amount for the vehicle allowance.

Before deliberating on the topic of the automobile/transportation allowance, the Commission asked whether costs such as mileage on a personal vehicle were tax-deductible for Councilmembers. The response that the Commission received, from a tax attorney contacted by the Council staff, stated that Councilmembers can deduct employee business expenses if they itemize their deductions and if the employee business expenses exceed 2% of their adjusted gross income.

This Commission recommends an automobile/transportation allowance even in light of the fact that some travel expenses may be deductible currently. In coming to this decision, the 2017 Commission emphasize that encouraging and supporting Councilmembers to attend community meetings and perform constituent outreach throughout the County is in the public interest. Commissioners agree that an automobile/transportation allowance is a clear way to support this important duty.

### **Commission Meetings**

The Commission conducted four public meetings on September 27, 2017, October 18, 2017, October 25, 2017, and November 15, 2017 in the Arundel Center in Annapolis.

During the first meeting held on **September 27, 2017**, the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson were elected with Commissioner Clark appointed as Chairperson and Commissioner Atkinson appointed as Vice-Chairperson. The Commissioners heard presentations on background information provided and were directed to the County budget in response to inquiries about the County's fiscal outlook.

On **October 18, 2017**, the Commissioners discussed which counties were most similar to Anne Arundel County based on several factors, including: economics, population, size, and growth. The Commissioners discussed *inter alia* which counties should be used in the report to the Council. The Commissioners also reviewed the County employee cost of living adjustments provided for non-represented and represented County employees through across the board increases.

On **October 25, 2017**, the Commissioners agreed and voted that Councilmembers should not receive health benefits and pension benefits, conforming to current law. There was also further discussion of whether there should be an increase in the Councilmember's salaries and the mechanism(s) for possible increases.

On **November 15, 2017**, the Commission discussed and voted on its final recommendations after reviewing several proposals submitted by Commissioners. The Commissioners discussed whether there should be salary increases and/or COLAs and/or provisions to add allowances.

There were three proposals presented by Commissioners and each provided a different path to an increase in salary for the Councilmembers. After a detailed review of the proposals and a robust discussion about the method of increasing the salary, the Commissioners came to a consensus on its recommendation to the Council.

For more information regarding discussions of the Commission, see the minutes of the meetings enclosed in this Report.

### **Recommendations**

The Salary Standard Commission makes the following recommendations for compensation.

#### *Salary Recommendation*

The Salary Standard Commission recommends an immediate increase of \$2,000 to the salaries of the Councilmembers, Council Vice-Chair and Council Chair, and a 2% increase each of the next four years.

#### *Healthcare and Pension Benefits Recommendation*

The Commission considered the current status of pension and health care benefits. Council service is part-time and limited to two four-year terms. It is the understanding of the Commission that Councilmembers often have other employment in addition to their Council positions, and through this employment may receive health benefits and retirement planning. On this basis, the Commission recommends no change to the Council's current health care and pension benefits.

#### *Technology and Automobile Allowance Recommendation*

The Commission recognized that changes in technology require that Councilmembers be available to their constituents by text message, cellular telephone, email and social media. For Councilmembers to meet the changing needs of technology-driven society, Councilmembers' allowances should be updated. These allowances will enable Councilmembers to reach a diverse swath of their constituents on new media and platforms. The Commission recommends a \$100 per month technology allowance.

Councilmembers have always traveled to meet and speak with their constituents, to address constituent issues, and for Council meetings. The Commission recognizes that it is only fair and appropriate to compensate Councilmembers for the time spent traveling for Council business. The Commission recommends a \$350 per month automobile allowance.

*Base Salary in the County Charter Recommendation*

In addition to the recommendations above the Commission recommends that the County Council consider an amendment to County Charter Sec. 204 - Compensation. The base salary listed in Section 204 of the County Charter is set at a minimum of \$2,100 per year. This amount was determined when voters first adopted the County Charter in 1964, yet it still sets the minimum salary level for Councilmembers.

While it may be outside the purview of this report, the Commission discussed and supports the pursuit of a Charter Amendment that would update the language and current minimum salary of the County Council to \$36,000. The Commission recommends this change to protect against reductions to Councilmember salaries in the future.

The Commission understands that this change would have to be brought before the voters by way of a resolution passed by the County Council. If appropriate, the Commission recommends that the Council refer this topic for consideration as part of the ten-year Charter Review process.

*Total Compensation Package Recommendation*

The Commission reviewed the salary and benefits package as a total compensation package, and found that the modest salary increases, accompanied by reasonable allowances for vehicle use and computer and phone communications would result in a total compensation package was both reasonable and fiscally prudent.

**Charts of Commission Recommendations for County Council Compensation**

	2018 Salary	Increase	2019 Salary	Increase of	Constituent Outreach Allowances	
					Phone/Internet	Automobile/Transportation
<b>Councilman</b>	\$36,000	\$2000 + 2%	\$38,760	\$2760	\$100/month	\$350/month
<b>Vice Chair</b>	\$37,000	\$2000 + 2%	\$39,780	\$2780	\$100/month	\$350/month
<b>Chairman</b>	\$40,500	\$2000 + 2%	\$43,350	\$2850	\$100/month	\$350/month

**Charts of Commission Recommendations for County Council Compensation (cont.)**

	2019 Salary	Increase	2020 Salary	Increase of	Constituent Outreach Allowances	
					Phone/Internet	Automobile/Transportation
<b>Councilman</b>	\$38,760	2% of salary	\$39,535	\$775	\$100/month	\$350/month
<b>Vice Chair</b>	\$39,780	2% of salary	\$40,576	\$796	\$100/month	\$350/month
<b>Chairman</b>	\$43,350	2% of salary	\$44,217	\$867	\$100/month	\$350/month

	2020 Salary	Increase	2021 Salary	Increase of	Constituent Outreach Allowances	
					Phone/Internet	Automobile/Transportation
<b>Councilmen</b>	\$39,535	2% of salary	\$40,326	\$791	\$100/month	\$350/month
<b>Vice Chair</b>	\$40,576	2% of salary	\$41,388	\$812	\$100/month	\$350/month
<b>Chairman</b>	\$44,217	2% of salary	\$45,101	\$884	\$100/month	\$350/month

	2021 Salary	Increase	2022 Salary	Increase of	Constituent Outreach Allowances	
					Phone/Internet	Automobile/Transportation
<b>Councilmen</b>	\$40,326	2% of salary	\$41,133	\$807	\$100/month	\$350/month
<b>Vice Chair</b>	\$41,388	2% of salary	\$42,216	\$828	\$100/month	\$350/month
<b>Chairman</b>	\$45,101	2% of salary	\$46,003	\$902	\$100/month	\$350/month

## **Conclusion**

These recommendations, if enacted, will provide fair and reasonable compensation for members of the County Council who will be elected in November 2018. The Commission urges the Council to align the County Council's compensation with its contemporary duties and responsibilities through implementing these recommendations.

As described above, Councilmember salaries have stood still as every other group that we could think of considering for comparison, advanced. If the Councilmembers' salaries were provided with the increases afforded to other comparators, their salaries would be from 17% to 39.2% more (\$6,264 to \$14,118 more in dollars) than they are today.

Instead, their compensation has been decreased through cuts to benefits estimated by this Commission to be roughly equivalent to \$24,222 annually. There would be similar differences for the Council Vice-Chair, and Council Chair salaries, which have also been held back. Against this stark fact-pattern, each Commissioner arrived independently at the same conclusion – the County Council's salaries are in dire need of attention.

We may know more now than we thought we ever would about the Anne Arundel County Council's salaries, but that does not confer us with any ability to make a change. All we can do is submit this Report. You, our Councilmembers, are the only ones who can rectify this situation. The Commission firmly believes the time is now, and we urge you to act on these recommendations.

## EXHIBIT B

Chart of represented employees' across the board increases

<b>Across the board increases for represented employees</b>										
	July 2008	Jan 2009	July 2009	Jan 2014	April 2014	Jan 2015	July 2015	Jan 2016	July 2017	Dec 2017
AFSCME #582	2%	1%	0%	3%	-	3%		3%	2%	
AFSCME #582 FW Scale									3% Base-FW10 8% FW11-13	
AFSCME #2563	2%	1%	0%	3%	-	3%		3%	2%	
Correctional Program Spec	2%	1%	0%	3%	-	3%		2%	2%	
FODCOP Detention Officer	2%	1%	0%	2%	1%	3%	0.5%	3%	3%	
Detention Sergeants	2%	1%	0%	2%	1%	3%		3%	0%	
IAFF	3%	-	0%	3%	-	3%		3%	0%	
Deputy Sheriffs	3%	-	3% *	3%	-	3%		3%	0%	
Sheriff Sergeants	3%	-	0%	3%	-	3%		3%	0%	
FOP Lodge #70	3%	-	0%	3%	-	3%		3%	1%	2%
Police Sergeants Assoc.	3%	-	0%	3%	-	3%		3%	0%	Approx 2%
Police Lieutenants				3%	-	3%		3%	0%	Approx 2%
Battalion Chiefs				3%	-	3%		3%	0%	
Park Rangers				3%	-	3%		2%	2%	

Deputy Sheriff \* Won Arbitration Fixed all Sheriffs Dec 2013 to get 3% for 2010