

**Minutes Meeting  
Citizens' Compensation Advisory Committee  
November 9, 2015**

**Members Present:** Connie Spyropoulos-Linardakis  
John Mathews  
Cori Petersen  
Dale Cox  
Frances Hume

**Members Excused:** Kerma Jones  
Jennifer Seelig

**Staff Present:** David Salazar, City Compensation Administrator  
Jodi Langford, City Benefits Administrator  
Nancy Torres, Committee Support/Coordinator  
Jonathan Pappasideris, Senior City Attorney

**Guests:** Jeffrey Vaughn (SLC Association of Firefighters); Lisa Demmons (SLC Association of Firefighters); Michael Millard (SLC Police Association).

A recording of these proceedings is on file and available by request from the SLC- HR Department.

**Meeting Open & Welcome:** Committee Chair Connie Linardakis opened the meeting and established that a quorum of Committee members was present.

**Adoption of October 26, 2015 Meeting Minutes:** A motion to approve minutes presented from the 10/26/2015 meeting was made by Cori Petersen; the motion was seconded by John Mathews. The vote to approve the minutes was unanimous.

**Utah Open Meetings Act annual training for Committee members:** Jonathan Pappasideris provided training, as mandated by state statute, on requirements of the Utah Open Meetings Act to the Committee members present. Highlights of this presentation included—

- Definition of a meeting: The convening of at least a quorum of a public body for purpose of discussing, receiving public comments or acting upon a matter over which the body has jurisdiction or advisory power;
- Convening a meeting and proper notice requirements: At least 24 hours public notice required for each meeting, including an agenda, date, time, and place;
- Agendas: Must provide reasonable specificity to notify the public as to the topics to be considered at the meeting. Topics raised, but not reflected on the agenda may be discussed, but no final action may be taken during that meeting;
- Requirements for closing a meeting: the Committee may only close a meeting for limited and specific reasons, as stated in statute, with two-thirds of members voting to close the meeting;
- Records of open meetings: written minutes and a recording must be kept, however, the approved written minutes (not the recording) are the official record of the meeting;
- Approval of minutes: pending minutes (i.e. draft minutes) are required to be available within a reasonable time after the date of the meeting. Public access to written minutes must be made available within three business days after they are approved by the Committee;
- Records of closed meetings: except for limited reasons, a recording of any closed meeting MUST be kept, and detailed written minutes that disclose the content of the closed meeting MAY be kept. Both are classified as "protected" records under GRAMA;
- Member e-mails & text messages — the Act restricts members from transmitting electronic messages to each other during an open meeting, including emails, instant messages and text messages. However, no restriction exists when members are not convened in an open meeting. Jonathan noted that although the Act is silent on whether electronic messages can be transmitted to non-Committee members during an open meeting, he advises best practice is for members to know that any electronic messages, such as emails or text messages, may be deemed public records under GRAMA.

- Violations of the Act: Penalties for violations of the Act may be considered a misdemeanor or could result in the voiding of any actions taken during an open meeting.

Connie requested that a copy of Jonathan's PowerPoint presentation be sent to all members after the meeting, including those members who were absent from the meeting.

**2015-16 Wage & Salary Survey Planning:** Prior to discussing the survey process and presenting input received from Fire & Police union representatives, David Salazar provided the Committee with information received from FirstWest in response to questions raised during the presentation given in the last meeting. David informed the Committee that the source for the data used in FirstWest's analysis of wage differences based on cost of living differences came from the "the Council for Community & Economic Research." The second question about what expenses were included in the "miscellaneous" category of the cost of living factor referred to in the executive summary included: food away from home; personal care; apparel; household operations; reading/entertainment; and, alcoholic beverages.

In response to Cori Petersen's question during the last meeting about which data were collected during last year's Mountain States City Police & Fire wage survey, David distributed a copy of the survey instrument used which showed data elements included—demographic data, job titles, number of incumbents, salary range, etc. David responded to additional questions about the availability of data on variable pay offered by other public safety agencies, such as shift differential, and other survey factors.

David reported that he had met with representatives of the Fire & Police unions to receive their input about cities to be included in the sample for the special survey to be conducted by FirstWest. He distributed a copy of an email notification from Police Association President, Michael Millard, received immediately before the meeting. Frances Hume clarified that the union's email appeared to include a summary of the City Council's criteria for comparable U.S. cities, not notes from David's meeting with union representatives. David noted the section, Recommended Cities, which included a suggested short list of cities by name and population size (100,000 to 600,000) shown at the end of the email.

John Mathews inquired about whether any retention problems exist indicating the loss of Fire & Police personnel to cities with populations of less than 100,000. Fire and Police union representatives responded from the audience with specific anecdotal accounts and examples of losses of personnel to other local and out-of-state agencies. Dale Cox suggested that union representatives should first define what standards and criteria distinguish Salt Lake City's public safety agencies, to be followed by identifying a list of like cities based on the same criteria. The Committee took comment from union representatives about various criteria they wished to have considered, including consideration of specific cities mentioned in their email—Denver, Las Vegas, Phoenix, Boise & Reno. By way of information, Connie Linardakis shared the list of cities considered by the City & County of San Francisco for purposes of wage comparison, taken from their current police union contract; she noted cities including Berkeley, Concord, Oakland, San Jose, and others are all cities from the geographic area surrounding San Francisco.

In an effort to advance the consideration and wage analysis suggested by City Council, Connie restated her recommendation that a third-party wage survey be conducted to compare Fire & Police wages with their counterparts in similar U.S. cities. Dale Cox reiterated the need for union representatives to provide input about like cities. Connie recommended the best approach is for union representative to work through selection criteria directly with the third-party company.

David recommended FirstWest as a qualified and objective service provider who would be able to conduct the survey, including a comparison of base wages. He explained that no RFP (request for proposal) would be required given the City's current contract agreement with FirstWest to provide HR consulting services. The Committee discussed options

A motion to appoint a third-party to gather input from union representatives on criteria and cities to be considered by the Committee for a special wage survey was made by Frances Hume; the motion was seconded by John Mathews. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. David noted his prior discussion with HR Director, Deb Alexander, about the Committee's proposal to initiate a third-party survey and suggested FirstWest as the

company who could complete this project; he also suggested that funding for the survey would likely come from the HR department's existing budget or a subsequent HR budget amendment. The Committee concurred and agreed to hold a subsequent meeting to consider and approve the list of cities proposed by the third-party survey company.

This meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:37 PM.

**Next Meeting Date:** The next meeting date was left open, subject to the conclusion of planning meetings held between union representatives and FirstWest HR Solutions.

**These minutes were approved in a Committee meeting held on 12/16/2015.**