



**Local Agency
Formation Commission
of Santa Clara County**

777 North First Street
Suite 410
San Jose, CA 95112

SantaClaraLAFCO.org

Commissioners

Rich Constantine
Susan Ellenberg
Sequoia Hall
Sergio Jimenez
Linda J. LeZotte
Mike Wasserman
Susan Vicklund Wilson

Alternate Commissioners

Cindy Chavez
Maya Esparza
Yoriko Kishimoto
Russ Melton
Terry Trumbull
Executive Officer
Neelima Palacherla

**FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA
SPECIAL MEETING**

June 25, 2020 • 1:30 PM

Finance Committee Members: Sequoia Hall • Linda J. LeZotte • Russ Melton

***** BY VIRTUAL TELECONFERENCE ONLY *****

Pursuant to the provisions of California Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20, issued on March 17, 2020, this meeting will be held by teleconference only. No physical location will be available for this meeting. However, members of the public will be able to access and participate in the meeting.

PUBLIC ACCESS AND PUBLIC COMMENT INSTRUCTIONS

PUBLIC ACCESS

Members of the public may access and watch a live stream of the meeting on Zoom at <https://sccgov-org.zoom.us/j/97126974008>. Alternately, the public may listen in to the meeting by dialing **(408) 638-0968** and entering **Meeting ID 97126974008#** when prompted.

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS may be submitted by email to LAFCO@ceo.sccgov.org. Written comments will be distributed to the Commission as quickly as possible. Please note that documents may take up to 24 hours to be posted to the agenda on the LAFCO website.

SPOKEN PUBLIC COMMENTS will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Commission, click on the link <https://sccgov-org.zoom.us/j/97126974008> to access the Zoom-based meeting.

1. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
2. When the Chairperson calls for the item on which you wish to speak, click on “raise hand” icon. The Clerk will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.
3. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted (3 minutes).

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

1. Pursuant to Government Code §84308, no LAFCO commissioner shall accept, solicit, or direct a contribution of more than \$250 from any party, or his/her agent; or any participant or his /or her agent, while a LAFCO proceeding is pending, and for three months following the date a final decision is rendered by LAFCO. Prior to rendering a decision on a LAFCO proceeding, any LAFCO commissioner who received a contribution of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months from a party or participant shall disclose that fact on the record of the proceeding. If a commissioner receives a contribution which would otherwise require disqualification returns the contribution within 30 days of knowing about the contribution and the proceeding, the commissioner shall be permitted to participate in the proceeding. A party to a LAFCO proceeding shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contribution of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months by the party, or his or her agent, to a LAFCO commissioner. For forms, visit the LAFCO website at www.santaclaralafco.org. No party, or his or her agent and no participant, or his or her agent, shall make a contribution of more than \$250 to any LAFCO commissioner during the proceeding or for 3 months following the date a final decision is rendered by LAFCO.
2. Pursuant to Government Code Sections 56100.1, 56300, 56700.1, 57009 and 81000 et seq., any person or combination of persons who directly or indirectly contribute(s) a total of \$1,000 or more or expend(s) a total of \$1,000 or more in support of or in opposition to specified LAFCO proposals or proceedings, which generally include proposed reorganizations or changes of organization, may be required to comply with the disclosure requirements of the Political Reform Act (See also, Section 84250 et seq.). These requirements contain provisions for making disclosures of contributions and expenditures at specified intervals. More information on the scope of the required disclosures is available at the web site of the FPPC: www.fppc.ca.gov. Questions regarding FPPC material, including FPPC forms, should be directed to the FPPC's advice line at 1-866-ASK-FPPC (1-866-275-3772).
3. Pursuant to Government Code §56300(c), LAFCO adopted lobbying disclosure requirements which require that any person or entity lobbying the Commission or Executive Officer in regard to an application before LAFCO must file a declaration prior to the hearing on the LAFCO application or at the time of the hearing if that is the initial contact. In addition to submitting a declaration, any lobbyist speaking at the LAFCO hearing must so identify themselves as lobbyists and identify on the record the name of the person or entity making payment to them. Additionally, every applicant shall file a declaration under penalty of perjury listing all lobbyists that they have hired to influence the action taken by LAFCO on their application. For forms, visit the LAFCO website at www.santaclaralafco.org.
4. Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on the agenda and distributed to all or a majority of the Commissioners less than 72 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at the LAFCO Office, 777 North First Street, Suite 410, San Jose, California, during normal business hours. (Government Code §54957.5.)
5. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, those requiring accommodation for this meeting should notify the LAFCO Clerk 24 hours prior to the meeting at (408) 993-4705.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Committee on any matter not on this agenda. Speakers are limited to THREE minutes. All statements that require a response will be referred to staff for reply in writing.

2. DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT STUDY REPORT

Recommended Action: Consider report and provide direction, as necessary, and forward a recommendation to the full Commission.

3. ADJOURN

Recommended Action: Set date and time for the next Finance Committee meeting, as necessary.



June 8, 2020

Comprehensive Organizational Review and Assessment Study

Final Report

**Local Agency Formation Commission
of Santa Clara County**

KOFF & ASSOCIATES

KATIE KANEKO

President

2835 Seventh Street
Berkeley, CA 94710
www.KoffAssociates.com

Kkaneko@koffassociates.com

Tel: 510.658.5633

Fax: 510.652.5633



June 8, 2020

Ms. Neelima Palacherla
Executive Officer
LAFCO of Santa Clara County
777 North First Street, Suite 410
San Jose, CA 95112

Dear Ms. Palacherla:

Koff & Associates is pleased to present the Final Comprehensive Organizational Review and Assessment Study for the Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County (LAFCO). This report documents the study methodology and provides classification, compensation, organizational and operational recommendations for the Commission.

We would like to thank you for your assistance and cooperation without which this study could not have been brought to its successful completion.

We will be glad to answer any questions or clarify any points as you are implementing the findings and recommendations. It was a pleasure working with LAFCO and we look forward to future opportunities to provide you with professional assistance.

Very truly yours,

Katie Kaneko
President



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Study Scope	1
Recommendations	1
SCLAFCO INFORMATION	3
Organization Functional Structure.....	3
METHODOLOGY	4
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	6
STAFFING LEVELS.....	6
Functional Area Staffing Levels	8
Management	8
Analysis/Project Delivery	10
Administration.....	11
CLASSIFICATION	13
Classification Descriptions.....	13
Classification Recommendations.....	14
Title Change	14
New Classifications	14
Reclassification.....	15
The Relationship Between Classification And Compensation	15
COMPENSATION.....	15
Study Process - Benchmark Classifications	15
Cost Of Labor Differential.....	16
Salary And Benefits Data.....	17
Market Compensation Findings	20
OPERATIONAL PRACTICES AND TRENDS.....	23
CONCLUSION	27



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. SCLAFCO Full-Time Equivalent Employees (FTE)	3
Table 2. Number of Employees Per Thousand People Served.....	7
Table 3. Average FTE and FTE per capita for LAFCOs with 5-year MSR update cycle.....	8
Table 4. Staffing Analysis by Functional Area (Agencies with 5-yr MSR cycle).....	8
Table 5. Staffing Analysis – Management.....	9
Table 6. Staffing Analysis – Analysis/Project Delivery.....	10
Table 7. Staffing Analysis – Administration.....	12
Table 8. Summary of Proposed Staffing by Functional Area.....	13
Table 9. Title Change Recommendations.....	14
Table 10. Proposed New Classifications.....	15
Table 11. Reclassification Recommendations.....	15
Table 12. Benchmark Classifications.....	16
Table 13. Cost of Labor Differential.....	17
Table 14. Market Compensation Results Summary.....	21
Table 15. Salary Placement Recommendations.....	23

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. SCLAFCO Organization Chart.....	3
Figure 2. Analysis/Project Delivery Organization Chart.....	10
Figure 3. Administrative Function Organization Chart.....	11

APPENDICES

- Appendix I: Market Results and Salary Placement Recommendations
- Appendix II: Summary of Recommendations
- Appendix III: Market Staffing Analysis
- Appendix IV: Classification Concepts



Organizational Review and Assessment Study – Final Report

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County

Appendix V: Classification Descriptions

Appendix VI: Recommended Position Allocations

Appendix VII: ERI Geographic Assessor Methodology

Appendix VIII: Orange County LAFCO Bylaws, Policies and Procedures Section 3.6: Performance Management



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In October 2019, Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (SCLAFCO) contracted with Koff & Associates (K&A) to conduct a comprehensive organizational review and assessment study focusing on staffing levels, job specifications, compensation, organizational and operational structure relative to an industry focused comparator group and best management practices. The content of this report focuses on opportunities for organizational improvement by providing information for the SCLAFCO to consider in making future classification, compensation, and staffing decisions to best support the SCLAFCO's strategic planning priorities. At any point in time, within any organization, there will be opportunities for improvement, and it is our overall assessment that the SCLAFCO is poised to effectively address these issues going forward.

Study Scope

This staffing study process was precipitated by the SCLAFCO's interest in:

- Ensuring the organization is properly staffed, numerically and organizationally, to carry out current and future functions in the most efficient manner possible.
- Ensuring that employees should be recognized for the level and scope of work performed and that they are paid on a fair and competitive basis that allows the SCLAFCO to recruit and retain a high-quality staff.
- Ensuring that class descriptions reflect current programs, responsibilities, and technology.
- Identifying best management practices related to organizational and operational structure of the SCLAFCO.

Recommendations

Through the data collection process, K&A identified the following areas of opportunity that should be considered in future decision making to facilitate operational efficiency and effectiveness, as well as enhance the service provision to SCLAFCO constituents.

Organizational Structure and Staffing: K&A performed an assessment of the current organizational structure and staffing, including classification structure. The assessment and recommendations are based on K&A's understanding of the SCLAFCO's operations, as well as a survey of similar LAFCO agencies to review the organizational structure, staffing, and trends in the market. The following recommendations for staffing and classification changes are intended to support SCLAFCO's proactive operational mandates and address succession planning by providing clear career pathways for staff:

- Creation of a LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer classification and reclassification of one LAFCO Analyst to the new classification.
- Revision of the class description and retitling of the LAFCO Office Specialist to LAFCO Commission Clerk/Office Manager.
- Creation of a three level LAFCO Analyst series (LAFCO Associate Analyst, LAFCO Analyst I, and LAFCO Analyst II).
- Reclassification of 1 LAFCO Analyst to the Analyst II level in the series.
- Increase total FTEs from 4 to 5 with the addition of 1.0 LAFCO Associate Analyst position and reclassification of the LAFCO Office Specialist to the new position.



Compensation: The results of the total compensation study showed:

- The Executive Officer classification was significantly below the market median by 26.5% in base salary and by 30.5% in total compensation (salary plus benefits).
- The LAFCO Analyst classification was above the market median by 4.6% in base salary and by 3.7% in total compensation.
- The LAFCO Office Specialist classification was below the market median by 12.8% in base salary and was above the market median by 2.0% in total compensation.
- **Because the three benchmark classifications were in different bargaining units, there is a significant difference in the impact of benefit to total compensation.** Accordingly, K&A recommends that salary decisions be based on base salary versus total compensation market results.
- K&A considers a classification falling within 5% of the median to be competitive.

Specific salary placement recommendations are found in Appendix I. Each benchmark class recommendation was based on the market median and all other classifications were internally aligned based on common market practices.

Operational Best Practices and Trends: K&A performed an assessment of market practices in a variety of operational areas that were indicated to be of interest based on staff interviews, such as strategic planning practices, public inquiry tracking, staffing/operational models, as well as issues contributing to controversy and growth pressures. Overall, K&A found that the SCLAFCO's policies and practices are generally consistent with the comparator group but that there are dimensions of SCLAFCO operations which are more demanding than other LAFCOs, specifically the commitment to a proactive Municipal Service Review and implementation program on an on-going five-year cycle and ongoing strategic planning which includes a directive for community outreach and communications. This finding helped shape the recommendations for staffing and classification structure.

K&A also found that the dependent vs. independent staffing relationship of the comparator LAFCOs to their respective counties has impact in a number of operational areas, including staff development, performance evaluation and position management. While there is not necessarily a clear advantage to one model over the other, K&A recommends that SCLAFCO explore revision of the current MOU with the County to ensure that SCLAFCO has the flexibility to make staffing changes determined by the Commission to be necessary to implement the SCLAFCO's strategic goals and initiatives.

SCLAFCO expressed specific interest in addressing professional development and succession planning. There is a direct link between training and development and organizational outcomes, such as financial performance, productivity, quality of service, customer satisfaction, and employee job satisfaction. Continuing to invest in employee development and training enhances recruitment and retention of qualified staff. Overall, K&A found that the resources the SCLAFCO uses for training and development are consistent with the market. However, in the area of performance evaluation, K&A did find a significant difference in practice for the Executive Officer and recommends that the current evaluation process be revised to review the degree of involvement of the County.

The recommendations contained in this report are meant to be used as a guide for the SCLAFCO to use in future decision-making and strategic planning. The SCLAFCO should assess the feasibility and potential consequences of implementing and not implementing each recommendation prior to acting. Each




recommendation is explored in detail within the Analysis and Recommendations section. The summary of recommendations is also presented in Appendix II.

SCLAFCO INFORMATION

The California State Legislature authorizes a LAFCO in each county as an independent regulatory agency to determine the boundaries of the cities and special districts in that county. The SCLAFCO’s mission is to promote sustainable growth and good governance in Santa Clara County by preserving agricultural and open space lands, preventing urban sprawl, encouraging efficient delivery of services, promoting accountability and transparency of local agencies, and exploring and facilitating regional opportunities for fiscal sustainability.

Organization Functional Structure

Figure 1: SCLAFCO Functional Organization Chart



SCLAFCO has a staff currently composed of four employees. The current team includes an Executive Officer, two Analysts and an Office Specialist. SCLAFCO contracts with the County of Santa Clara for staffing and services. SCLAFCO staff are County employees and are represented by County bargaining units - County Employees’ Management Association (CEMA) and Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 521.

Table 1. SCLAFCO Full-Time Equivalent Employees (FTE)

Functional Area	Santa Clara LAFCO
1. Management: LAFCO Executive Officer	1
2. Administration: LAFCO Office Specialist	1
3. Analysis/Project Delivery: LAFCO Analyst	2
TOTALS	4



METHODOLOGY

K&A utilized various methods of data collection including document review, individual interviews, questionnaires, and external surveys. These methods produced in-depth data from SCLAFCO employees and data from comparable LAFCOs. The staffing analysis compares the LAFCO to the comparator group based on the FY19-20 budget for each agency.

Document Review

Documentation from SCLAFCO was collected. The documentation included current organization charts, classification descriptions, salary information, operational and capital improvement program budgets, documentation on current operational practices, reports, policies and procedures, and other relevant documentation.

Position Description Questionnaires

Position Assessment Questionnaires (PAQ) were developed to identify employees' current roles, duties, and responsibilities. Prior to distribution of the questionnaires to employees, K&A facilitated orientation meetings with employees. In addition to distributing the questionnaires, employees were presented with an explanation of the study process, expectations, and elements not part of the study.

Individual Interviews

All staff participated in an individual interview process. The purpose of the interviews was to follow-up on the information provided in the employee completed PAQ forms and surveys, as well as to get staff perspective on what is working, not working, and opportunities for improvement related to staffing. Additionally, the interview with the Executive Officer gathered information on key areas such as organizational efficiency, staffing, succession planning, and organizational strategy.

External Survey of Comparable Agencies

Finally, K&A collected data from comparable agencies. The goals of the industry/market survey were to obtain information on organizational scope and structure, classification structure, compensation, and staffing levels. The factors that were reviewed in selection of the comparator districts included:

- **Organizational type and structure:** K&A generally recommends that agencies of a similar size and structure providing similar services to that of SCLAFCO be used as comparators. Accordingly, we limited our evaluation to other LAFCOs throughout the state. Based on SCLAFCOs demographics, K&A focused on LAFCOs in the greater Bay Area and the CALAFCO Coastal region, as well as LAFCOs in urban counties elsewhere in the state. This focus created an initial list of 21 LAFCOs to evaluate with the goal of selecting 12, the sufficient number of comparator agencies to study for trends and operational considerations.
- **Staff, Commission membership, operational budgets, and population:** Staff and operational budget size determine the amount of resources available for the agencies to provide services, and population size accounts for the ratio of resources to constituents served. We specifically evaluated data related to population of the county served by each LAFCO, whether there is Special District representation on the Commission, number of full-time equivalent staff at each LAFCO, and LAFCO expenditures for FY 19-20.
- **Cost of Living:** Cost of living is the amount of money needed to sustain a standard of living and is a measurement of how expensive it is to live in one area versus another. This factor is important to consider for evaluating compensation competitiveness and regional similarity.



- **Comparable Services / Attributes:** Organizations providing similar services are ideal for comparison; given the specialized nature of SC LAFCO’s services, we compared the following services and attributes, based on responses to the 2019 CALAFCO Biennial Survey for each LAFCO:
- Use of staffing models – employees of LAFCO or employees of county;
 - Number of commission meetings per year;
 - Number of proposals processed in the last year;
 - Number of Sphere of Influence/Municipal Service Reviews conducted in the last five years;
 - History of involvement in lawsuits; and
 - Number of times LAFCO featured in a local news story in the last two years.

There were 21 agencies evaluated in this analysis through an Absolute Value ranking method. These above criteria were considered in selecting the group of comparator agencies. K&A then developed a list of the top ranked comparator agencies based on these criteria.

LAFCO Approval of Comparator Agencies

In December 2019, K&A presented the methodology and comparator agency list to LAFCO’s Finance Committee for their review and approval of the more limited list of twelve comparator LAFCOs. In February 2020, K&A met with LAFCO’s Finance Committee to further explain the factors considered and process used to develop the list and to review K&A’s draft memo to SC LAFCO for overall clarity to a general audience. In April 2020, SC LAFCO approved K&A’s recommended list of twelve (12) comparator LAFCOs and directed K&A to use the following comparators for the purposes of this study:

- Alameda LAFCO
- Contra Costa LAFCO
- Marin LAFCO
- Monterey LAFCO
- Orange LAFCO
- Riverside LAFCO
- Sacramento LAFCO
- San Bernardino LAFCO
- San Diego LAFCO
- San Mateo LAFCO
- Sonoma LAFCO
- Ventura LAFCO

LAFCO Survey of Comparator Agencies

The data collection involved review of public documents available on the agency’s websites for classification and compensation data, the 2019 CALAFCO Biennial Survey responses, and the development of a survey questionnaire to elicit information on organizational practices and trends. K&A sought interviews with each agency. Five of the comparators agreed to interviews; the remaining agencies were not able to take the time but provided written responses. While these responses were somewhat less detailed than the interview responses, in general K&A found the information to be sufficiently complete and followed up for clarification as needed.



ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There are numerous operational challenges faced by the SCLAFCO today. Recent State legislature has created additional responsibilities for oversight and tracking of local agency operations. There is increased scrutiny from affected agencies, stakeholders, and the general public of LAFCO's policies and decisions, which necessitates more research and analysis of historical records to identify trends or set the record straight. At the same time, the SCLAFCO has formulated initiatives to increase visibility and public awareness of SCLAFCO activities in Santa Clara County. To meet these expectations, the SCLAFCO will need to continually assess its operations to gain efficiencies.

The SCLAFCO also anticipates internal challenges, specifically in potential turnover in personnel due to retirements or lack of advancement opportunities. The current classification structure does not provide development through a career path to address succession planning and preservation of institutional knowledge.

During our research and analysis of staffing and organizational practice, we identified recurring themes and market observations which directed us to recommendations for the SCLAFCO to focus on and address. The SCLAFCO has a dedicated staff ready to move forward to make meaningful and sustainable changes to ensure that the SCLAFCO meets the ongoing needs of the Santa Clara County community. Addressing these recommendations will help to ensure continual organizational improvement. The recommendations are described in detail within this section of the report.

STAFFING LEVELS

LAFCO staffing levels have overall remained steady for the last twenty years but did increase by one Analyst position in the last two years. SCLAFCO began leasing private office space in the last three years, bringing an end to frequent relocations within County facilities and providing a space customized to LAFCO operations. However, the move necessitated on-going coordination of functions such as facility maintenance, office equipment maintenance, and information technology services, adding to staff workload. Other examples of higher-than-normal workload expectations include SCLAFCO's proactive operational mandates, such as the strategic and implementation plans for outreach and communications; review and comment on CEQA documents and other projects (General Plan updates, ordinance amendments and development projects) that could have an impact on LAFCO's work; and a high level of involvement in CALAFCO activities. The current staff struggles to meet this workload, often in ways that are not sustainable long-term (e.g. accumulating months of unused vacation time, working extra hours, and deferring necessary office organization activities such as file management, digitizing LAFCO records, maintaining mailing lists, developing a database of active contracts, etc). Often deadlines are pushed out. Additionally, as most of the current SCLAFCO staff have served for nearly 20 years, staffing changes are anticipated in the near-term and beyond.

We began our staffing analysis by reviewing staffing per capita within the comparator group. This analysis shows the SCLAFCO's authorized staffing per capita is approximately .2 FTE below the comparator agencies based on 2019 Population. The average of the comparator agencies is 0.4 FTE per capita whereas the SCLAFCO is 0.2 FTE per capita. The Employees per Thousand Served provides a general overview of how the SCLAFCO compares in terms of staffing levels to the population served. The SCLAFCO appears to have fewer staff in relation to population served in this analysis.



Table 2 displays the number of employees per thousand people served for each of the comparator agencies.

Table 2. Number of Employees Per Thousand People Served

LAFCO	2019 Population Served	Authorized FTE	FTE per 1000 Served
Santa Clara County LAFCO	1,954,286	4	.20
Alameda County LAFCO	1,669,301	3	.18
Contra Costa County LAFCO	1,155,879	2	.17
Marin County LAFCO	262,879	2.85	1.08
Monterey County LAFCO	445,414	4.5	1.01
Orange County LAFCO	3,222,498	5	.16
Riverside County LAFCO	2,440,124	6	.25
Sacramento County LAFCO	1,546,174	2	.13
San Bernardino County LAFCO	2,192,203	5	.23
San Diego County LAFCO	3,351,786	8	.24
San Mateo County LAFCO	774,485	2.5	.32
Sonoma County LAFCO	500,675	3.2	.65
Ventura County LAFCO	856,598	3	.35
Average:			0.40

Population data for each county served is from the State of California Demographic Research Unit’s 2019 Population report.

While this is one measure, we did observe significant variations in operational mandates of each agency that were indicated to have a significant impact on staff workload. For example, California State law governing LAFCOs directs that Sphere of Influence (SOI) reviews/updates and supporting Municipal Service Reviews (MSR) be conducted every five years, as necessary, with “as necessary” being determined by local policy and work plan priorities. SCLAFCO committed to the five-year cycle approach for MSR updates and is currently embarking on its third round of reviews. Six agencies - Marin, Monterey, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego reported a similar operational goal. Other agencies reported conducting reviews only in response to applications for SOI changes or as issues surface.

Table 3 displays a subset of FTE data for those comparator agencies with a 5-year MSR update cycle similar to SCLAFCO. This subset indicates that those agencies with a 5-year MSR update cycle have a greater FTE per 1000 served which seems to substantiate the greater workload reported as a result. Comparing FTE per capita of the MSR agencies, SCLAFCO appears to be roughly 1.22 FTE understaffed supported by a lower FTE per capita percentage than this comparator groups’ average.



Table 3. Average FTE and FTE per capita for LAFCOs with 5-year MSR update cycle

LAFCO	2019 Population Served	Authorized FTE	FTE per 1000 Served
Santa Clara County LAFCO	1,954,286	4	.20
Marin County LAFCO	262,879	2.85	1.08
Monterey County LAFCO	445,414	4.5	1.01
Orange County LAFCO	3,222,498	5	.16
Riverside County LAFCO	2,440,124	6	.25
San Bernardino LAFCO	2,192,203	5	.23
San Diego County LAFCO	3,351,786	8	.24
Average:		5.22	.61

Population data for each county served is from the State of California Demographic Research Unit’s 2019 Population report.

Due to the significant variation in the operational mandates required of each agency, we should continue to look at other trends in staffing with a continued focus on those agencies that have similar operational mandates as SCLAFCO. Further analysis of staffing by functional area is presented below which will identify areas in which the SCLAFCO may be understaffed or overstaffed.

Functional Area Staffing Levels

Table 4 highlights SCLAFCO’s staffing by functional area as a percentage of overall workforce compared to the market average for comparator agencies with a 5-year MSR update cycle similar to SCLAFCO. We observed that the work performed by LAFCOS could be separated into three distinct functions: Management, Project Delivery and Analysis, and Administration. Further breakdown of the work performed in these areas are discussed below. Details of staffing levels in each of these functional areas for each comparator can be found in Appendix III.

Table 4. Staffing Analysis by Functional Area (Agencies with 5-yr MSR cycle)

Functional Area	SCLAFCO Staffing (% of Total SCLAFCO Staff)	Market Average Staffing (% of Total Agency Staff)
Management	25%	26%
Project Delivery/Analysis	50%	41%
Administration	25%	33%

The percentages reported are rounded up; the cumulative total is 100%.

Management

Role and Responsibilities of the Management Functional Area

The LAFCO Executive Officer is responsible for overseeing, directing, and participating in all activities of the SCLAFCO program, including short- and long-term planning as well as development and administration



of LAFCO policies, procedures, and services, and is the liaison between the SCLAFCO Commission and the general public, and other governmental agencies including the County, special districts, cities and other regional and state agencies. We observed that other LAFCOs included higher level staff in this functional area to assist in planning and external liaison roles. For the purposes of this analysis based on market findings, the Assistant Executive Officer classification was allocated as .5 to the Management functional area and .5 to the Analysis/Project Management functional area and Senior Analyst level staffing .25 to the Management functional area and .75 to the Analysis/Project Management functional area to recognize that positions at this levels are designed to contribute in both functional areas.

Staffing

Table 5 shows a staffing analysis of this area by budgeted FTE and percentage compared to the market.

Table 5. Staffing Analysis – Management

	SCLAFCO FTE	SCLAFCO Staffing (% of Total SCLAFCO Staff)	Market Average FTE	Market Average Staffing (% of Total Agency Staff)
Management Totals	1	25%	1.4	26%
Executive Officer	1	25%	1.0	19%
Assistant Executive Officer	0	0%	.3	5%
Senior Analyst	0	0%	.1	2%

Observations Regarding Organizational Structure and Common Market Practices

Overall, the budgeted staffing of the management functional area for SCLAFCO is slightly below market for comparable services. Five of the twelve comparator agencies have an Assistant Executive Officer classification; three of these are agencies with a five-year cycle operational goal for MSRs similar to SCLAFCO. The Assistant Executive Officer level is responsible for day-to-day operations, direct supervision of staff, management of the more complex projects, and involvement in executive decisions including in the Executive Officer’s absence. This organizational structure allows the Executive Officer to focus more on strategic planning and developing and enhancing relationships with local agencies. It also provides a career ladder for professional staff to develop management and supervisory skills, which addresses succession planning needs.

Two of the comparator agencies have a Senior Analyst level, which is an advanced-journey level responsible for the more complex projects and for providing functional direction (training and work review) but not full supervision to lower level staff. This level may also act in the Executive Officer’s absence. K&A recommends the addition of an Assistant Executive Officer classification as it is more common among those LAFCOs with a proactive operational direction. The Assistant Executive Officer level’s responsibility for direct supervision of staff provides more management support for the Executive Director, as well as more opportunity for management skills development to support succession plans.

The proposed Assistant Executive Officer classification is provided in Appendix V. It should be noted that the more senior of the LAFCO’s two Analysts is currently performing many of the duties described for this classification. K&A recommends that one of the Analysts be reclassified to this level as this is the work the position is performing.



Impact to Classification System

Modifications to the classification system as a result of this staffing analysis include:

- Recommendation for the addition of a LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer classification.
- Reclassification of one LAFCO Analyst to the new LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer classification.

Analysis/Project Delivery

Figure 2: Analysis/Project Delivery Organization Chart



Role and Responsibilities of the Analysis/Project Delivery functional area

The Analysis/Project Delivery functional area is responsible for professional work on a variety of projects involving research, data collection, analysis, and other related tasks in support of the LAFCO goals and strategic initiatives.

Staffing

Table 6 shows a staffing analysis of this area by budgeted FTE and percentage compared to the market.

Table 6. Staffing Analysis – Analysis/Project Delivery

	SCLAFCO FTE	SCLAFCO Staffing (% of Total SCLAFCO Staff)	Market Average FTE	Market Average Staffing (% of Total Agency Staff)
Analysis/Project Delivery Totals	2	50%	2.1	41%
Assistant Executive Officer	0	0%	.2	5%
Senior Analyst	0	0%	.4	7%
Analyst	2	50%	1.5	29%

Organizational Structure Observations and Common Market Practices

Overall, based on the services provided, the staffing of this functional area is very close to market average. However, the study found that seven comparators have Analyst classification series; five agencies have series that include entry level, journey level, and advanced journey level classifications and two agencies have entry and journey level classifications. These agencies do not have positions allocated at all classification levels within their series, but the existence of the series creates a potential career



development progression which supports retention and succession planning efforts. Modeled on similar series structure within the current County classification system, K&A recommends the creation of a LAFCO Analyst classification series consisting of Associate Analyst (paraprofessional), Analyst I (entry-level) and Analyst II (journey-level). Together with the proposed LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer class, this provides SCLAFCO with paraprofessional, entry, journey, and advanced journey level classifications. The proposed LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer class will support both the Analysis/Project Delivery and the Management functional areas, providing a potential path for development of management skill sets. The proposed LAFCO Analyst Associate class provides a para-professional bridge to the Analysis/Project Delivery function, while the Analyst I and Analyst II levels provide an opportunity for progression from entry to journey level as incumbents become more familiar with SCLAFCO systems, operations, practices, and procedures.

As noted above, the existence of a classification series does not require that positions be allocated at all levels. At this time, K&A recommends the addition of 1.0 LAFCO Associate Analyst and reclassification of the LAFCO Office Specialist to the new position. The additional position offsets the loss of .5 FTE to the Analysis/Project Delivery functional area from the reclassification of one Analyst to Assistant Executive Officer and picks up the technical and project delivery support component currently provided by the Administrative functional area, discussed below. The additional position results in staffing for Analysis/Project Delivery slightly above market and staffing for Administration slightly below market, but this is justified by SCLAFCO’s proactive operational mandates, such as the five-year MSR update cycle and the strategic and implementation plans for outreach and communications.

Impact to Classification System

Modifications to the classification system as a result of this staffing analysis include:

- Creation of a three level LAFCO Analyst series (LAFCO Associate Analyst, LAFCO Analyst I, and LAFCO Analyst II).
- Addition of a LAFCO Associate Analyst position.
- Reclassify the existing LAFCO Office Specialist to the LAFCO Associate Analyst classification.
- Reclassification of 1 LAFCO Analyst to the LAFCO Analyst II level.

Administration

Figure 3: Administrative Function Organization Chart



Role and responsibilities of the Administrative function

The Administrative functional area is responsible for the Commission support, including agenda preparation and distribution, minutes, and coordination of economic interest statements, election processes, and Public Records Request responses. This area is also responsible for the coordination of payroll, accounts payable and billing/receivable, budget monitoring and control, contract administration,



purchasing services, and coordination of information technology services and facility maintenance. Finally, this area provides technical support to the Analysis/Project Management functional area including application tracking and initial review, data gathering, and development of maps, graphics, and related presentation materials. Commission and administrative support currently occupy 60% of the Office Specialist’s time, while technical support accounts for 40% of time. SCLAFCO began leasing private office space in the last three years, bringing an end to frequent relocations within County facilities and providing a space customized to LAFCO operations. However, the move necessitated on-going coordination of functions such as facility maintenance, office equipment maintenance, and information technology services, adding approximately 10% to staff workload. It is our understanding that the needs of the organization exceed a single position. Examples of administrative tasks that are not able to be fully supported include digitization of SCLAFCO records and enhancements to the website such as a meeting calendar and updated content on service providers.

Staffing

Table 7 shows a staffing analysis of this area by budgeted FTE and percentage compared to the market.

Table 7. Staffing Analysis – Administration

	SCLAFCO FTE	SCLAFCO Staffing (% of Total SCLAFCO Staff)	Market Average FTE	Market Average Staffing (% of Total Agency Staff)
Administration Totals	1	25%	1.7	33%
Commission Clerk /Office Manager	1	25%	1	19%
Administrative Assistant	0	0%	.7	14%

Organizational Structure Observations and Common Market Practices

Overall, based on the services provided, SCLAFCO staffing of the administrative functional area is below the staffing levels in the comparable agencies. Additionally, as described below in the classification analysis, the current LAFCO Office Specialist position has a very broad scope, including project technical support as well as Commission and general office management/administrative support, which presents a challenge in the event of turnover.

None of the comparator agencies include a technical support component in their administrative function. Three of the comparators have additional full-time administrative positions and one comparator has an additional part-time administrative position; these positions provide some assistance with application intake functions as well as general administrative support, but do not provide data gathering, application review, or graphics support. As discussed above in the review of the Analysis/Project Delivery functional area, seven comparators have an Analyst classification series, where the entry-level performs these lower-level technical support duties as they are learning LAFCO systems and operations. Separating out these more technical, project related duties better allocates the work into roles aligned with best practices. The administrative support role currently provided by the Office Specialist will then focus on commission support and office management, which is a full-time role alone. Accordingly, K&A recommends retitling the LAFCO Office Specialist classification to Commission Clerk/Office Manager, which is more descriptive of the scope of work, as well as more consistent with the market.



Impact to Classification System

Modifications to the classification system as a result of this staffing analysis include:

- Revision of the class description and retitling of the LAFCO Office Specialist to LAFCO Commission Clerk/Office Manager.

Table 8. Summary of Proposed Staffing by Functional Area

Functional Area	Proposed SCLAFCO Staffing FTE	Proposed SCLAFCO Staffing (% of Total LAFCO Staff)	Market Average FTE	Market Average Staffing (% of Total Staff)
Management	1.5	30%	1.4	26%
➤ LAFCO Executive Officer	1			
➤ LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer	.5			
Analysis/Project Delivery	2.5	50%	2.1	41%
➤ LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer	.5			
➤ LAFCO Analyst Associate/I/II	2.0			
Administration	1	20%	1.7	33%
➤ Commission Clerk/Office Manager	1			
Total FTE	5		5.2	

The percentages reported are rounded up; the cumulative total is 100%.

CLASSIFICATION

Classification Descriptions

New and revised classification descriptions were developed for all positions, to ensure that the body of work performed by each SCLAFCO position was appropriately reflected and supported the operational needs of SCLAFCO. The basic concepts outlined in Appendix IV were utilized. The recommended class descriptions are included in Appendix V of this report.

As mentioned earlier, the class descriptions are based upon the information from the written PDQs completed by each employee, the individual job audit interviews (if required), and from information provided by employees and managers during the review processes. These descriptions provide:

- A written summary documenting the work performed and/or proposed by the incumbents of these classifications;
- Distinctions among the classes; and
- Documentation of requirements and qualifications to assist in the recruitment and selection process.



Classification Recommendations

All class descriptions were updated in order to ensure that the format is consistent, and that the duties and responsibilities are current and properly reflect the required knowledge, abilities, and skills. Revised and proposed new classification descriptions can be found in Appendix V.

When evaluating the allocation of positions, the focus is on assigned job duties and the job-related requirements for successful performance, not on individual employee capabilities or amount of work performed. Positions are evaluated and classified on the basis of such factors as knowledge and skill required to perform the work, the complexity of the work, the authority delegated to make decisions and take action, the responsibility for the work of others and/or for budget expenditures, contacts with others (both inside and outside of the organization), the impact of the position on the organization, and working conditions.

Title Change

Proposed changes to the classification plan include a title change for two existing classifications. As discussed above, it is recommended that the existing LAFCO Office Specialist position be retitled Commission Clerk/Office Manager which is more descriptive of the work performed, as well as more consistent with the market. Additionally, as a result of the proposed LAFCO Analyst series, the current LAFCO Analyst will need to be allocated to the appropriate level within the series, which will result in a title change from LAFCO Analyst to LAFCO Analyst II.

Table 9. Title Change Recommendations

Current Classification Title	Proposed Classification Title
LAFCO Office Specialist	LAFCO Commission Clerk/Office Manager
LAFCO Analyst	LAFCO Analyst II

New Classifications

The study resulted in the proposal of three new classifications: LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer, LAFCO Associate Analyst, and LAFCO Analyst I. A LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer classification is recommended to be responsible for day-to-day operations, direct supervision of staff, management of the more complex projects, and making executive decisions in the Executive Officer’s absence. This will allow the Executive Officer to focus more on strategic planning and developing and enhancing relationships with local agencies, as well as addressing succession planning by providing a potential career ladder.

The LAFCO Office Specialist position description has been revised and retitled to focus on the office management and Commission support functions and a new classification and the technical, project support components of the position have been removed. The LAFCO Associate Analyst, the paraprofessional level in the series, is recommended to be responsible for technical and project delivery support including application processing, data gathering and the development of maps, charts, displays, presentations, graphics, brochures, and drawings.

Finally, a LAFCO Analyst I classification is recommended as an entry level professional class to perform research and analytical studies while learning LAFCO systems, operations, practices, and procedures. Together with the retitled LAFCO Analyst II and the proposed LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer, these additional classes provide SCLAFCO with a potential career development progression from



paraprofessional through advanced level professional which supports retention and succession planning efforts. We observed this classification structure in seven of the comparator agencies.

Table 10. Proposed New Classifications

Proposed New Classifications
LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer
LAFCO Analyst I
LAFCO Associate Analyst

Reclassification

Reclassification recommendations are made for positions that are working out of class due to level and scope of work and/or job functions that have been added or removed from/to those positions over time.

The study resulted in two incumbents, allocated to two classifications, to be reclassified, as noted in the table below. These recommendations are based on the individual positions interviewed. Not every incumbent in the current classification are recommended for a reclassification. All recommended position allocations are found in Appendix VI.

Table 11. Reclassification Recommendations

Current Classification Title	Proposed Classification Title
LAFCO Analyst	LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer
LAFCO Office Specialist	LAFCO Associate Analyst

The Relationship Between Classification and Compensation

Classification and the description of the work and the requirements to perform the work are separate and distinct from determining the worth of that work in the labor market and to the organization. While recommending the appropriate compensation for the work of a class depends upon an understanding of what that work is and what it requires (as noted above), compensation levels are often influenced by two factors:

- The external labor market; and
- Internal relationships within the organization.

COMPENSATION

Study Process - Benchmark Classifications

Classifications that we would expect to provide a sufficient sample for analysis were selected as “benchmarks” to use as the basis to build the compensation plan. Benchmark classifications are those classifications that are compared to the market, and these classifications are used as a means of anchoring SCLAFCO’s overall compensation plan to the market. Proposed new classifications not surveyed will be



included in the compensation plan and aligned to the benchmark classifications using internal equity principles detailed below starting on page 23.

The benchmark classifications are listed in Table 12.

Table 12. Benchmark Classifications

Classification Title
1. LAFCO Executive Officer
2. LAFCO Analyst
3. LAFCO Office Specialist

Cost of Labor Differential

Use of a broader geographic survey group, as was done in this study by the inclusion of agencies throughout the state of California, generally raises questions on the impact of the cost of living differences and while that is a factor for survey agency selection, it is not the most appropriate method to measure regional differences in wages. Cost of Living focuses on the difference in the cost of consumer goods including housing and therefore can fluctuate more dramatically between locations. Cost of Labor measures regional differences in wage trends and is a more effective measure in drawing a comparison between salaries.

K&A lists the Cost of Labor differentials to be utilized by SCLAFCO to provide more accurate wage comparisons. To accomplish this, we used databases from the Economic Research Institute (ERI), a nationally recognized provider of data with respect to differences in the costs of living and cost of labor in cities with a population of over 10,000. The Cost of Labor percentages reflect regional differences in wages and are relevant to making compensation decisions because the focus is on what other employers are paying within the region rather than the differences in the cost of consumer goods. For more detailed information on the ERI’s Geographic Assessor methodology, please refer to Appendix VII.

The cost of labor percentages are as follows:



Table 13. Cost of Labor Differential

Agency	Cost of Labor Differential
Alameda County LAFCO	5.2%
Contra Costa County LAFCO	5.2%
Marin County LAFCO	1.7%
Monterey County LAFCO	10.6%
Orange County LAFCO	12.6%
Riverside County LAFCO	16.0%
Sacramento County LAFCO	14.9%
San Bernardino County LAFCO	16.1%
San Diego County LAFCO	14.8%
San Mateo County LAFCO	0.4%
Sonoma County LAFCO	11.9%
Ventura County LAFCO	13.7%

The differentials indicate that the surveyed agencies pay, on average, 10.3% less than the SCLAFCO. For those agencies having a lower cost of labor, salaries were adjusted up by the differential percentages in order to ensure parity with SCLAFCO.

Salary and Benefits Data

The following salary and benefits data was collected for each benchmark classification (the cost of these benefits to each agency was converted into dollar amounts and can be found in Appendix II [Benefit Detail] of this report; these amounts were added to base salaries for total compensation purposes). Please note that compensation systems are continually changing; therefore, this data represents a snapshot in time and reflects the comparator salaries and benefits as of February 2020.

1. Monthly Base Salary

The top of the salary range and/or control point. All figures are presented on a monthly basis.

2. Employee Retirement

The retirement reflects the benefits offered to the majority of the employees:

- **PERS Formula:** The service retirement formula for each agency’s Classic plan. For agencies with retirement systems established under the County Employees Retirement Law of 1937 (“37 Act”), retirement formulas were converted to the equivalent PERS formula for purposes of comparison.
- **Enhanced Formula Cost:** The baseline PERS formula is 2%@62 for miscellaneous employees. There is typically a cost to the employer for offering a formula with a higher benefit than the baseline formula. For each enhanced formula, the cost to the employer is based on a percentage range calculated by PERS. K&A took the midpoint of the range and multiplied the



percentage by the top monthly salary to calculate the cost of the enhanced formula. The percentage value for each enhanced formula is:

- 2%@60: midpoint of range = 1.5%
- 2%@55: midpoint of range = 2.7%
- 2.5%@55: midpoint of range = 4.9%
- 2.7%@55: midpoint of range = 6.4%
- 3%@60: midpoint of range = 7.4%

- **Employer Paid Member Contribution:** The amount of the employee’s contribution to PERS that is paid by the employer (Employer Paid Member Contribution).
- **Single Highest Year:** The period for determining the average monthly pay rate when calculating retirement benefits. The base period is 36 highest paid consecutive months. When final compensation is based on a shorter period of time, such as 12 months’ highest paid consecutive months, there is a cost to the employer. Similar to the enhanced formula, the cost to the employer is based on a percentage range calculated by PERS. K&A took the midpoint of the range and multiplied the percentage by the top monthly salary to calculate the cost of the final compensation.
- **Social Security:** If an employer participates in Social Security, then the employer contribution of 6.2% of the base salary up to the federally-determined maximum contribution of \$696.45 per month was reported. Note that the maximum contribution rate is that of 2017 in order to be consistent with the timeframe during which data was collected.
- **Other:** Any other retirement contributions made by the employer.

3. Deferred Compensation

Deferred compensation contributions provided to all employees of a classification with or without requiring the employee to make a contribution is reported.

4. Insurances

The employer paid premiums for an employee with family coverage was reported. The employer paid insurances included:

- Cafeteria/Flexible Benefit Plan
- Medical
- Dental
- Vision

5. Leaves

Other than sick leave, which is usage-based, the number of hours off for which the employer is obligated. All hours have been translated into direct salary costs.

- **Vacation:** The number of paid time-off (or vacation) hours available to all employees who have completed five years of employment.
- **Holidays:** The number of holiday hours (including floating hours) available to employees.
- **Administrative:** Administrative (or management) leave is normally the number of paid leave hours available to Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) Exempt and/or management to reward



for extraordinary effort (in lieu of overtime). This leave category may also include personal leave which may be available to augment vacation or other time off.

6. Auto Allowance

This category includes either the provision of an auto allowance or the provision of an auto for personal use only. If a vehicle is provided to any classification for commuting and other personal use, the average monthly rate is estimated at \$450. Mileage reimbursement is not included.

All of the benefit elements are negotiated benefits provided to all employees in the classification. As such, they represent an ongoing cost for which an agency must budget. Other benefit costs, such as sick leave, tuition reimbursement, and reimbursable mileage are usage-based and cannot be quantified on an individual employee basis.

Data Collection

Data was collected during the month of February 2020, through comparator agency websites, conversations with human resources, accounting, and/or finance personnel, and careful review of agency documentation such as classification descriptions, memoranda of understanding, organization charts, and other documents.

Matching Methodology

K&A believes that the comparator data collection step is the most critical for maintaining the overall credibility of any study and relied on SCLAFCO's classification descriptions as the foundation for comparison.

When K&A researches and collects data from the comparator agencies to identify possible matches for each of the benchmark classifications, there is an assumption that comparable matches may not be made that are 100% equivalent to the classifications at SCLAFCO. Therefore, K&A does not match based upon job titles, which can often be misleading, but rather analyzes class descriptions before a comparable match is determined.

K&A's methodology is to analyze each class description and the whole position by evaluating factors such as:

- Definition and typical job functions;
- Distinguishing characteristics;
- Level within a class series (i.e., entry, experienced, journey, specialist, lead, etc.);
- Reporting relationship structure (for example, manages through lower-level staff);
- Education and experience requirements;
- Knowledge, abilities, and skills required to perform the work;
- The scope and complexity of the work;
- Independence of action/responsibility;
- The authority delegated to make decisions and take action;
- The responsibility for the work of others, program administration, and for budget dollars;
- Problem solving/ingenuity;
- Contacts with others (both inside and outside of the organization);
- Consequences of action and decisions; and
- Working conditions.

In order for a match to be included, K&A requires that a classification's "likeness" be at approximately 70% of the matched classification.



When an appropriate match is not identified for one classification, K&A often uses “hybrids” which can be functional or represent a span in scope of responsibility. A functional hybrid means that the job of one classification at SCLAFCO is performed by two or more classifications at a comparator agency. A “hybrid” representing a span in scope means that the comparator agency has one class that is “bigger” in scope and responsibility and one class that is “smaller,” where SCLAFCO’s class falls in the middle.

If an appropriate match could not be found, then no match was reported as a non-comparable (N/C).

Data Spreadsheets

For each benchmark classification, there are three information pages:

- Top Monthly Base Salary Data
- Benefit Detail (Monthly Equivalent Values)
- Total Compensation Data

The average (mean) and median (midpoint) of the comparator agencies are reported on the top monthly salary and total compensation data spreadsheets. The % above or below that the LAFCO is compared to the average and median is also reported.

The mean is the sum of the comparator agencies’ salaries/total compensation divided by the number of matches. The median is the midpoint of all data with 50% of data points below and 50% of data points above.

In order to calculate the mean and median, K&A requires that there be a minimum of four (4) comparator agencies with matching classifications to the benchmark classification. The reason for requiring a minimum of four matches is so that no one classification has undue influence on the calculations. Sufficient data was collected from the comparator agencies for all of the benchmark classifications.

When using survey data to make salary range recommendations and adjustments, K&A recommends using the median, rather than the mean, because the median is not skewed by extremely high or low salary values.

Market Compensation Findings

The following table represents a summary of the market top monthly (base) salary and total compensation (base salary plus benefits [retirement, insurance, leaves, and allowances]) findings. For each benchmark classification, the number of matches (agencies with a comparable position) and percent above or below the top monthly salary market median and total compensation market median is listed. The table is sorted by top monthly salary in descending order from the most positive percentile (above market) to the most negative (below market).



Table 14. Market Compensation Results Summary

Classification Title	# of Matches	Top Monthly Salary% Above or Below Market Median	Total Compensation % Above or Below Market Median
LAFCO Analyst	10	4.6%	3.7%
LAFCO Office Specialist	12	-12.8%	2.0%
LAFCO Executive Officer	12	-26.5%	-30.5%

Generally, a classification falling within 5% of the median is considered competitive in the labor market for salary survey purposes because of the differences in compensation policy, actual scope of work, and position requirements. However, SCLAFCO can adopt a different standard.

Overall, the differences between market base salaries and total compensation indicate that the LAFCO’s benefits package puts SCLAFCO at a more competitive advantage, except for the Executive Officer classification. Further analysis indicates that, on average, classifications are 11.6% below the market median for base salaries, while that figure changes to 8.3% below the market median for total compensation, which is a 3.3% difference (i.e., SCLAFCO “gains” a competitive advantage when taking benefits into consideration). While SCLAFCO’s total compensation mean indicates relative overall competitiveness, there is significant variation between the three benchmark classifications for differences between base salary and total compensation:

- **LAFCO Office Specialist.** The 14.8% difference between median base salary and median total compensation for this benchmark is primarily due to employer paid member contribution to retirement. This benefit applies only to this classification for SCLAFCO because it is represented by a different bargaining unit. Only two of the twelve comparator agencies provide this benefit.
- **LAFCO Executive Officer.** SCLAFCO’s benefit package is not as competitive as the comparator group. Primarily this is because deferred compensation and annual leave are calculated as a percentage of base pay and with SCLAFCO’s Executive Officer base salary significantly below market, competitiveness is further exacerbated by benefits that are determined as a percentage of pay.
- **LAFCO Analyst.** The difference between median base salary and median total compensation for this classification is .9%, which is not statistically significant.

As a result of this significant difference in the impact of benefits packages between the three benchmark classifications, K&A recommends that salary decisions be based on base salary versus total compensation market results.

Internal Salary Relationships

Building from the salary levels established for identified benchmark classes, internal salary relationships were developed and consistently applied in order to develop specific salary recommendations for all non-benchmarked classifications.

In the future, SCLAFCO may need to utilize internal alignment practices if the number of staff grows and additional classifications are added or classifications change. While analyzing internal relationships, the same factors analyzed when comparing SCLAFCO’s classifications to the labor market are used when making internal salary alignment recommendations.



In addition, the following are standard human resources practices that are commonly applied when making salary recommendations based upon internal relationships:

- A salary within 5% of the market average or median is considered to be competitive in the labor market for salary survey purposes because of the differences in compensation policy and actual scope of the position and its requirements. However, the LAFCO can adopt a closer standard.
- Certain internal percentages are often applied. Those that are the most common are:
 - The differential between a trainee and experienced (or journey) class in a series (I/II or Trainee/Experienced) is generally 10% to 15%.
 - A lead or advanced journey-level (III or Senior-level) class is generally placed 10% to 15% above the journey-level.
 - A full supervisory class is normally placed at least 10% to 25% above the highest level supervised, depending upon the breadth and scope of supervision.
- When a market or internal equity adjustment is granted to one class in a series, the other classes in the series are also adjusted accordingly to maintain internal equity.

Internal equity between certain levels of classifications is a fundamental factor to be considered when making salary decisions. When conducting a market compensation survey, results can often show that certain classifications that are aligned with each other are not the same in the outside labor market. However, as an organization, careful consideration should be given to these alignments because they represent internal value of classifications within job families, as well as across the organization.

For the purposes of this study, K&A utilized market data to develop the salary recommendations for all of the benchmarked classifications and used internal equity principles to make the salary recommendations for two (2) proposed new classifications that were not benchmarked. For the non-benchmarked classifications, internal alignments with other classifications will need to be considered, either in the same class series or those classifications that have similar scope of work, level of responsibility, and “worth” to SCLAFCO. Where it is difficult to ascertain internal relationships due to unique qualifications and responsibilities, reliance can be placed on past internal relationships. It is important for SCLAFCO management to carefully review these internal relationships and determine if they are still appropriate given the current market data.

It is also important to analyze market data and internal relationships within class series as well as across the organization, and make adjustments to salary range placements, as necessary, based on the needs of the organization. At the time the LAFCO Analyst classification was created, the salary was aligned sufficiently above the County Planner III and Senior Management Analyst classifications to encourage movement into the new class as a potential career development opportunity.

SCLAFCO may want to make internal equity adjustments or alignments, as it implements the compensation strategy. This market survey is only a tool to be used by the LAFCO to determine market indexing and salary determination.

Proposed Salary Range Placements

Table 15 illustrates the proposed salary placement for each classification based on the market data as well as the internal relationship analysis. This information is also included in Appendix I.



Table 15. Salary Placement Recommendations

Class Title	Current Maximum Monthly Salary	% from Top Monthly Median	Market Placement	Proposed Maximum Monthly Salary	Rationale
LAFCO Executive Officer	\$12,101	-26.5%	\$15,309	\$15,309	Market placement
LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer	Proposed			\$12,272	Internal alignment: 20% above LAFCO Analyst II
LAFCO Analyst II	\$10,715	4.6%	\$10,227	\$10,227	Market placement; y-rate
LAFCO Analyst I	Proposed			\$9,297	Internal alignment: 10% below LAFCO Analyst II
LAFCO Analyst Associate	Proposed			\$8,084	Internal alignment: 15% below LAFCO Analyst I
LAFCO Commission Clerk/ Office Manager	\$6,277	-12.8%	\$7,079	\$7,079	Market placement

These recommendations are based on base salary market results. The following calculation was used:

1. Multiplied SCLAFCO’s current top monthly salary by the percentage difference between SCLAFCO’s base salary and the base salary market median to calculate the Market Placement Salary.

Recommendations for proposed classifications are based on internal alignment in accordance with the common practices discussed above. Salaries within 5% of the market are considered to be competitive.

For all classifications, this primary implementation procedure must be completed only at the initial time of implementation. In the future, if SCLAFCO decides to implement annual across-the-board cost of living adjustment increases, only the salary schedule that was developed and included herein needs to be increased by the appropriate percentage, and each individual salary range will move up with this adjustment. This will ensure that the internal salary relationships are preserved and the salary schedule remains structured and easily administered.

Using the Market Data as a Tool

K&A would like to reiterate that this report and the findings are meant to be a tool for SCLAFCO to create and implement an equitable compensation plan. Compensation strategies are designed to attract and retain excellent staff; however, financial realities and SCLAFCO’s expectations may also come into play when determining appropriate compensation philosophies and strategies. The collected data presented herein represents a market survey that will give SCLAFCO an instrument to make future compensation decisions.

OPERATIONAL PRACTICES AND TRENDS

K&A collected information on operational practices and trends in the following areas that were indicated to be of interest based on staff interviews:

- Operational staffing structure and degree of independence from County
- Tracking of public inquiries



- Approaches to Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs)
- Strategic planning
- Growth trends and controversial issues

Operational Staffing Structure and Degree of Independence from County

K&A found that the staffing relationship of the comparator LAFCOs to their respective Counties has impact in a number of operational areas, including staff development and performance evaluation, position management, and outsourcing of administrative services. In general, there are two staffing models used by comparator LAFCOs: staff as employees of the County (dependent model) and staff as employees of the LAFCO (independent model). Four comparators – Alameda, San Mateo, Sonoma, and Ventura – use the dependent (County staffing) model as does SCLAFCO, where agency staff are employees of their County and the County provides a majority of HR, fiscal, information technology and other administrative support services. In the alternative model, followed by eight comparators, agency staff are not county employees, although five of these comparators (Orange, Marin, Riverside, San Diego, and Sonoma) contract with their counties for benefits and payroll services. The agencies serving the largest populations have the highest FTE count and do not use County staffing (Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego LAFCOs).

The operational area in which the dependent vs independent model has the biggest impact is staff development, including performance evaluation. SCLAFCO conducts annual performance evaluations for staff in accordance with County practices. The Executive Officer is responsible for staff evaluations. K&A found that all the comparator agencies conducted annual staff evaluations which were the responsibility of the Executive Officer. The three comparators whose employees are County employees followed their County's evaluation process for staff; the other comparators did not follow any formal evaluation process.

SCLAFCO's Memorandum of Agreement with the County specifies that the County Executive's Office shall consider input from SCLAFCO in the formal performance evaluation for the LAFCO Executive Officer. The process followed begins with a self-evaluation by the Executive Officer provided to the Deputy County Executive, which is sent with a cover memo by the Deputy to the Commission. The Commission meets in closed session to discuss; the Commission's feedback is summarized verbally by the Commission Chair and SCLAFCO Counsel to the Executive Officer. A written summary is developed by SCLAFCO Counsel and sent to the Deputy. The Deputy discusses the written summary with the Executive Officer and writes a performance evaluation which is sent back to the Commission along with the written summary for final review/consideration in closed session.

No comparators followed an evaluation process similar to SCLAFCO for their Executive Officers. For Alameda and Ventura LAFCOs, whose Executive Officers are County employees, performance evaluation input from the Commission is summarized and presented to the Executive Officer by the County Administrator (Alameda) or Human Resources (Ventura) to provide anonymity, but the Counties provide no additional input. All other Executive Officers (including San Mateo and Sonoma's Executive Officers who are also County employees) received performance evaluations directly from their respective Commissions. Orange County develops the Executive Officer performance evaluation in conjunction with their annual strategic planning session which is facilitated by an outside consultant; the process is outlined in Section 3.6 D of OC LAFCO's Bylaws, Policy and Procedures Manual (Appendix VIII).

For those LAFCOs using the independent model, the Executive Officer evaluation process is also the opportunity for the LAFCO Commission to review compensation. For those agencies where LAFCO classifications were part of the County system, compensation was determined by the counties. And while



the surveyed LAFCOs did not provide specifics as to the process for setting compensation, both Ventura and Sonoma indicated that their Commission had the ability to recommend compensation increases. The lack of opportunity to review Executive Officer compensation under the dependent model may have contributed to the significant market salary discrepancy. K&A recommends that SCLAFCO revise the current evaluation process for the Executive Officer to review the need for involvement of the County in light of these findings. Orange County's process provides one potential model which starts with a self-evaluation by the Executive Officer. Since the Commission is not involved in day-to-day operations, the organization could benefit from inclusion of 360-degree input or some other methodology to take the pulse of the organization.

SCLAFCO's primary resource for staff training is the California Association of Local Agency Formation Commissions, the American Planning Association, and the California Special Districts Association, as well as the County's training programs. None of the comparators reported any type of management training other than required training on human resource issues such as sexual harassment (usually provided by the respective County HR departments). However, some of the independent model LAFCOs made use of additional training resources such as local community colleges. Orange County LAFCO has a particularly robust staff training program. All staff including the Executive Officer are expected to develop an annual performance development plan outlining specific training goals such as classes, workshops, or conferences. These performance development plans are then used to allocate Orange County LAFCO's budgeted funds for professional development (including educational reimbursement).

K&A found that LAFCOs following the dependent model experienced less autonomy in the management of their job classifications. SCLAFCO reported experiencing challenges in dealing with the County Employment Services Agency on requests for reclassification as job duties have evolved based on goals and initiatives established by the Commission. Alameda County LAFCO reported experiencing challenges with County involvement in their recruitments and recently updated their Memorandum of Agreement with the County to provide greater independence in hiring decisions. Sonoma County LAFCO reported that their County's job descriptions for LAFCO staff do not align to LAFCO duties which has had impact on recruitment, although the County has been responsive to classification change requests approved by the Commission. San Mateo County LAFCO also reported issues with recruitment using general county job descriptions that do not align to LAFCO duties.

As stated earlier, some agencies using the independent model contract with their respective Counties for benefits and/or payroll services. This has a positive fiscal impact by providing economy of scale but less control over fiscal impact from collective bargaining. However, there is more autonomy in creating positions to meet specific needs; for example, Riverside LAFCO specifically reported finding their County's maps to be unreliable and determined it more efficient to create their own system and supporting GIS Analyst position.

In summary, while the staffing relationship of the comparator LAFCOs to their respective Counties had impact in several operational areas, there is not necessarily a clear advantage to one model over the other. However, as will be further discussed below, there are dimensions of SCLAFCO operations which are more demanding than other LAFCOs. K&A recommends that SCLAFCO explore revision of the current MOU with the County to ensure that the SCLAFCO has the flexibility to make staffing changes determined by the Board to be necessary to implement the SCLAFCO's strategic goals and initiatives.



Tracking Public Inquiries

SCLAFCO is experiencing an increase in inquiries from the general public and local agencies, both in response to specific controversial or politicized projects as well as resulting from the Commission initiatives to increase visibility and public awareness, and expressed interest in operational practices and tools to track this workload. However, K&A found that while all of the comparators tracked applications and the inquiries related to them, no agencies used a tracking system specifically for documenting inquiries separately from applications. Orange County LAFCO did report use of project management software (Mavenlink) as their fee schedule is cost recovery, based on hourly rates rather than acreage, which allows them to track pre-application inquiries. However, the system does not support reporting on overall call volume.

Approaches to Municipal Service Reviews

Santa Clara LAFCO began conducting municipal services reviews (MSRs) in 2005; two rounds have been completed on five-year cycles and a third round is in progress, taking into consideration strategic opportunities and needs. SCLAFCO's approach to conducting MSRs includes a special focus on implementation of MSR recommendations and on working with affected agencies to ensure implementation. The MSR function is one of the expectations of the State legislation governing LAFCOs, however each LAFCO has varying approaches to MSRs in terms of frequency, scope, and implementation of recommendations. Six of the comparators – Marin, Monterey, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego – reported to K&A that they conduct MSRs on a five-year cycle. Marin LAFCO reported that their five-year cycle had lapsed, and they recently added an Analyst position to address; Riverside LAFCO also reported delays in maintaining the cycle which they are developing a strategic plan to address. Six comparators - Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Mateo, and Sonoma – reported that they perform one MSR per year based on need/priority. SCLAFCO's five-year cycle for MSRs is consistent with organizational practice for half of the comparator agencies and also has an impact on staffing. As noted in Table 3, the six LAFCOs that follow the five-year cycle approach have 5.22 FTE on average and an average of .61 FTE per population served. Higher staffing levels in those LAFCOs with a similarly proactive operational mandate to SCLAFCO and SCLAFCO's proactive approach to MSRs supports K&A recommendations for staffing level adjustments as previously described. In light of the previous discussion regarding the impact of the staffing relationship model, it should be noted that those LAFCOs with higher staffing levels as a consequence of their commitment to conducting five-year MSR reviews also use the independent model.

Strategic Planning

The SCLAFCO develops an annual workplan to implement the Commission's strategic initiatives; currently approximately 10-15% of time is spent on strategic planning and workplan development by the Executive Officer with support from the Analysts. Five of the comparator agencies (Alameda, Marin, Monterey, Orange, and Sacramento) reported a similar process. Orange County LAFCO currently creates strategic planning goals for an 18-month period with staff developing specific implementation projects on an annual basis. Riverside and Sonoma reported strategic planning as a goal in process. The remaining agencies did not report any specific strategic planning process. The LAFCOs that reported having a strategic planning process in place included the majority of LAFCOs that have a proactive commitment to conducting MSRs regularly and that have higher staffing levels. None of the LAFCOs in the study have created a strategic and implementation plan for outreach and communications on the level of SCLAFCO.



Growth Trends and Controversial Issues

Each LAFCO was expected to have specific perspectives in this area based on local issues in their respective counties. K&A found three types of issues reported by comparators as likely to generate controversy or politicization in their counties. Seven comparators (Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, Orange, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo and Sonoma) indicated that special district reorganizations or dissolutions were most likely to generate controversy. Three agencies (Alameda, Contra Costa, and Monterey) reported that large annexations and island annexations as a source of controversy in their counties. Two agencies (Sonoma and Ventura) also reported unfamiliarity or disagreement with the LAFCO process as a source of controversy. Marin, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Diego, and Sonoma LAFCOs also saw potential future workload impact and controversy as a result of the new and pending State housing-related legislation. Santa Clara LAFCO has reported similar and additional issues such as agricultural land protection and recent legislation limiting new water systems outside of cities as potential issues of controversy in the county. Santa Clara LAFCO can expect to continue to face such challenges and should consider this trend as it looks at its operational and staffing needs. No agencies reported any specific operational or staffing changes in response to these trends as yet, but these are factors for SCLAFCO to consider in future decision making. In general, SC LAFCO can expect to continue to need to defend its growth management framework and policies and educate the public and other agencies about LAFCO.

CONCLUSION

Collectively, K&A found that there are dimensions of SCLAFCO operations which are more demanding than other LAFCOs, specifically the commitment to conduct MSR updates on an on-going five-year cycle and to regular strategic planning including strategies for outreach and communications. This comprehensive organizational review and assessment provides specific recommendations for staffing, classification, compensation, and training and development in light of these findings, as well as providing general information on operational practices and trends for SCLAFCO to consider in making future decisions to best support SCLAFCO's strategic planning priorities. A summary of all recommendations can be found in Appendix II.

It has been a pleasure working with SCLAFCO on this critical project. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide any additional information or clarification regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted by,

Koff & Associates

Katie Kaneko
President



Appendix I

Market Results and Salary Placement Recommendations

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix I: Results Summary - Top Monthly
January 2020

Classification	Top Monthly Salary Data					Total Monthly Compensation Data					# of Matches
	Top Monthly Salary	Average of Comparators	% above or below	Median of Comparators	% above or below	Total Monthly Comp	Average of Comparators	% above or below	Median of Comparators	% above or below	
LAFCO Analyst	\$ 10,715	\$ 10,098	5.8%	\$ 10,227	4.6%	\$ 14,638	\$ 14,150	3.3%	\$ 14,093	3.7%	10
LAFCO Executive Officer	\$ 12,101	\$ 15,915	-31.5%	\$ 15,309	-26.5%	\$ 16,219	\$ 21,743	-34.1%	\$ 21,169	-30.5%	12
LAFCO Office Specialist	\$ 6,277	\$ 7,120	-13.4%	\$ 7,079	-12.8%	\$ 10,212	\$ 10,334	-1.2%	\$ 10,006	2.0%	12
		AVERAGE:	-13.1%	AVERAGE:	-11.6%		AVERAGE:	-10.6%	AVERAGE:	-8.3%	

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix I: Market Compensation Data (sorted by Top Monthly Salary)
January 2020

LAFCO Analyst										
Rank	Comparator Agency	Classification Title	Top Step Salary	Cost of Wages	Adjusted Top Step	Benefits Package	Total Monthly Comp	Salary Effective Date	Next Salary Increase	Next Percentage Increase
1	Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County	Local Agency Formation Commission Analyst	\$ 11,629	5.2%	\$ 12,234	\$ 4,136	\$ 16,370	7/1/2019	7/1/2020	3.00%
2	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Diego	Local Government Analyst III	\$ 10,343	14.8%	\$ 11,874	\$ 3,661	\$ 15,535	6/19/2019	unknown	unknown
3	Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County	LAFCO Analyst	\$ 10,715		\$ 10,715	\$ 3,923	\$ 14,638	10/11/2019	unknown	unknown
4	Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County	Senior Analyst	\$ 9,568	10.6%	\$ 10,582	\$ 5,071	\$ 15,653	6/24/2019	unknown	unknown
5	Local Agency Formation Commission of Ventura County	LAFCO Analyst	\$ 9,178	13.7%	\$ 10,435	\$ 3,442	\$ 13,877	12/29/2019	unknown	unknown
6	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Bernardino	Senior Analyst	\$ 8,898	16.1%	\$ 10,331	\$ 3,978	\$ 14,308	7/20/2019	7/18/2020	3.00%
7	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo ¹	[Management Analyst/ Planner III]	\$ 10,083	0.4%	\$ 10,123	\$ 4,305	\$ 14,428	12/15/2019	12/13/2020	3-4%
8	Local Agency Formation Commission of Orange County	Policy Analyst II	\$ 8,248	12.6%	\$ 9,287	\$ 3,093	\$ 12,379	7/1/2019	unknown	unknown
9	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County ²	[Administrative Analyst I/Planner III]	\$ 8,115	11.9%	\$ 9,081	\$ 4,783	\$ 13,864	7/2/2019	6/2/2020	3.00%
10	Local Agency Formation Commission of Contra Costa County	Analyst II	\$ 8,219	5.2%	\$ 8,646	\$ 4,376	\$ 13,022	4/17/2019	unknown	unknown
11	Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County	Local Government Analyst III	\$ 7,231	16.0%	\$ 8,388	\$ 3,673	\$ 12,061	1/1/2020	unknown	unknown
12	Local Agency Formation Commission of Marin County	N/C								
13	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sacramento County	N/C								

Summary Results	Top Step Salary	Adjusted Top Step	Total Monthly
Average of Comparators	\$ 9,151	\$ 10,098	\$ 14,150
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	14.6%	5.8%	3.3%
Median of Comparators	\$ 9,038	\$ 10,227	\$ 14,093
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	15.7%	4.6%	3.7%
Number of Matches	10	10	10

N/C - Non Comparator

1 - Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo: Functional Match: This hybrid match represents that the duties of the class are performed by more than one class at the comparator agency. The salary displayed is the higher of the matches.

2 - Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County: Functional Match: This hybrid match represents that the duties of the class are performed by more than one class at the comparator agency. The salary displayed is the higher of the matches.

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix I: Benefit Detail
January 2020

Agency		Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Contra Costa County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Marin County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Orange County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sacramento County	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Bernardino	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Diego	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Ventura County
Benchmark/ Comparator Agency Match		LAFCO Analyst	Local Agency Formation Commission Analyst	Analyst II	N/C	Senior Analyst	Policy Analyst II	Local Government Analyst III	N/C	Senior Analyst	Local Government Analyst III	[Management Analyst/ Planner III]	[Administrative Analyst I/Planner III]	LAFCO Analyst
	Top Step	\$ 10,715	\$ 12,234	\$ 8,646		\$ 10,582	\$ 9,287	\$ 8,388		\$ 10,331	\$ 11,874	\$ 10,123	\$ 9,081	\$ 10,435
Retirement	Classic	2.5%@55	1.18%@50 to 2.43%@65	2%@55		2%@55	1.62% @ 65	3%@60		2%@55	2.7%@55	2%@61.25	3%@60	1.18%@50
	Enhanced Formula Cost	\$ 579		\$ 277		\$ 339		\$ 679		\$ 331	\$ 190	\$ 162	\$ 736	\$ 167
	EE Cost Sharing	\$ -858											\$ -275	\$ -274
	ER Paid Member Contrib			\$ 432										
	Calc Classic EPMC as Spec Comp													
	Single Highest Year	\$ 64		\$ 43				\$ 59					\$ 64	
	Social Security	\$ 664	\$ 711	\$ 536				\$ 520			\$ 711	\$ 628	\$ 563	\$ 647
Deferred Compensation			\$ 85			\$ 810	\$ 186			\$ 103		\$ 272	\$ 313	
Other Ret.								\$ 108		\$ 826				
Insurance	Cafeteria							\$ 823			\$ 1,527			\$ 1,185
	Health	\$ 1,986	\$ 1,347	\$ 1,677		\$ 2,239	\$ 1,561			\$ 1,148		\$ 1,650	\$ 1,980	
	Dental	\$ 118	\$ 62	\$ 103		\$ 232	\$ 90			\$ 20		\$ 131	\$ 118	
	Vision	\$ 10				\$ 28						\$ 17	\$ 16	
	Other Ins. ¹		\$ 275				\$ 292							
Leaves	Vacation	\$ 659	\$ 706	\$ 499			\$ 536	\$ 1,097		\$ 596	\$ 685	\$ 618	\$ 856	\$ 1,003
	Holidays	\$ 536	\$ 706	\$ 432		\$ 488	\$ 429	\$ 387		\$ 556	\$ 548	\$ 467	\$ 454	\$ 401
	Admin Leave	\$ 165	\$ 329	\$ 291		\$ 936				\$ 397		\$ 633		
Allow	Auto													
Benefit Package Total		\$ 3,923	\$ 4,136	\$ 4,376	\$ 0	\$ 5,071	\$ 3,093	\$ 3,673	\$ 0	\$ 3,978	\$ 3,661	\$ 4,305	\$ 4,783	\$ 3,442

N/C - Non Comparator
1 - Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County: County allowance paid to employees for cafeteria benefit plans.

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix I: Market Compensation Data (sorted by Total Compensation)
January 2020

LAFCO Analyst										
Rank	Comparator Agency	Classification Title	Top Step Salary	Cost of Wages	Adjusted Top Step	Benefits Package	Total Monthly Comp	Salary Effective Date	Next Salary Increase	Next Percentage Increase
1	Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County	Local Agency Formation Commission Analyst	\$ 11,629	5.2%	\$ 12,234	\$ 4,136	\$ 16,370	7/1/2019	7/1/2020	3.00%
2	Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County	Senior Analyst	\$ 9,568	10.6%	\$ 10,582	\$ 5,071	\$ 15,653	6/24/2019	unknown	unknown
3	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Diego	Local Government Analyst III	\$ 10,343	14.8%	\$ 11,874	\$ 3,661	\$ 15,535	6/19/2019	unknown	unknown
4	Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County	LAFCO Analyst	\$ 10,715		\$ 10,715	\$ 3,923	\$ 14,638	10/11/2019	unknown	unknown
5	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo ¹	[Management Analyst/ Planner III]	\$ 10,083	0.4%	\$ 10,123	\$ 4,305	\$ 14,428	12/15/2019	12/13/2020	3-4%
6	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Bernardino	Senior Analyst	\$ 8,898	16.1%	\$ 10,331	\$ 3,978	\$ 14,308	7/20/2019	7/18/2020	3.00%
7	Local Agency Formation Commission of Ventura County	LAFCO Analyst	\$ 9,178	13.7%	\$ 10,435	\$ 3,442	\$ 13,877	12/29/2019	unknown	unknown
8	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County ²	[Administrative Analyst I/Planner III]	\$ 8,115	11.9%	\$ 9,081	\$ 4,783	\$ 13,864	7/2/2019	6/2/2020	3.00%
9	Local Agency Formation Commission of Contra Costa County	Analyst II	\$ 8,219	5.2%	\$ 8,646	\$ 4,376	\$ 13,022	4/17/2019	unknown	unknown
10	Local Agency Formation Commission of Orange County	Policy Analyst II	\$ 8,248	12.6%	\$ 9,287	\$ 3,093	\$ 12,379	7/1/2019	unknown	unknown
11	Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County	Local Government Analyst III	\$ 7,231	16.0%	\$ 8,388	\$ 3,673	\$ 12,061	1/1/2020	unknown	unknown
12	Local Agency Formation Commission of Marin County	N/C								
13	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sacramento County	N/C								

Summary Results	Top Step Salary	Adjusted Top Step	Total Monthly
Average of Comparators	\$ 9,151	\$ 10,098	\$ 14,150
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	14.6%	5.8%	3.3%
Median of Comparators	\$ 9,038	\$ 10,227	\$ 14,093
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	15.7%	4.6%	3.7%
Number of Matches	10	10	10

N/C - Non Comparator

1 - Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo: Functional Match: This hybrid match represents that the duties of the class are performed by more than one class at the comparator agency. The salary displayed is the higher of the matches.

2 - Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County: Functional Match: This hybrid match represents that the duties of the class are performed by more than one class at the comparator agency. The salary displayed is the higher of the matches.

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix I: Market Compensation Data (sorted by Top Monthly Salary)
January 2020

LAFCO Executive Officer										
Rank	Comparator Agency	Classification Title	Top Step Salary	Cost of Wages	Adjusted Top Step	Benefits Package	Total Monthly Comp	Salary Effective Date	Next Salary Increase	Next Percentage Increase
1	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Diego	Executive Officer LAFCO	\$ 19,464	14.8%	\$ 22,344	\$ 6,715	\$ 29,059	6/19/2019	unknown	unknown
2	Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County	Executive Officer of LAFCO	\$ 15,417	16.0%	\$ 17,883	\$ 6,930	\$ 24,813	1/1/2020	unknown	unknown
3	Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County	Executive Officer	\$ 15,679	10.6%	\$ 17,341	\$ 7,381	\$ 24,722	7/1/2019	unknown	unknown
4	Local Agency Formation Commission of Ventura County	LAFCO Executive Officer	\$ 15,091	13.7%	\$ 17,158	\$ 5,119	\$ 22,277	12/29/2019	unknown	unknown
5	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Bernardino	Executive Officer	\$ 14,554	16.1%	\$ 16,897	\$ 6,414	\$ 23,311	7/20/2019	7/18/2020	3.00%
6	Local Agency Formation Commission of Orange County	Executive Officer	\$ 13,646	12.6%	\$ 15,365	\$ 4,990	\$ 20,355	1/1/2019	unknown	unknown
7	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sacramento County	New Growth Manager	\$ 13,275	14.9%	\$ 15,253	\$ 5,712	\$ 20,965	6/22/2019	unknown	unknown
8	Local Agency Formation Commission of Contra Costa County	Executive Officer	\$ 14,082	5.2%	\$ 14,814	\$ 6,559	\$ 21,374	4/17/2019	unknown	unknown
9	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo	Principal Management Analyst	\$ 14,189	0.4%	\$ 14,246	\$ 5,155	\$ 19,401	12/15/2019	12/13/2020	3-4%
10	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County	LAFCO Executive Officer	\$ 12,067	11.9%	\$ 13,503	\$ 6,813	\$ 20,316	7/2/2019	6/2/2020	3.00%
11	Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County	Local Agency Formation Commission Executive Officer	\$ 12,792	5.2%	\$ 13,457	\$ 4,310	\$ 17,767	7/1/2019	7/1/2020	3.00%
12	Local Agency Formation Commission of Marin County	Executive Officer	\$ 12,500	1.7%	\$ 12,713	\$ 3,847	\$ 16,560	1/1/2019	unknown	unknown
13	Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County	LAFCO Executive Officer	\$ 12,101		\$ 12,101	\$ 4,118	\$ 16,219	10/11/2019	unknown	unknown

Summary Results	Top Step Salary	Adjusted Top Step	Total Monthly
Average of Comparators	\$ 14,396	\$ 15,915	\$ 21,743
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	-19.0%	-31.5%	-34.1%
Median of Comparators	\$ 14,136	\$ 15,309	\$ 21,169
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	-16.8%	-26.5%	-30.5%
Number of Matches	12	12	12

N/C - Non Comparator

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix I: Benefit Detail
January 2020

Agency		Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Contra Costa County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Marin County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Orange County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sacramento County	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Bernardino	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Diego	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Ventura County
Benchmark/ Comparator Agency Match		LAFCO Executive Officer	Local Agency Formation Commission Executive Officer	Executive Officer	Executive Officer	Executive Officer	Executive Officer	Executive Officer of LAFCO	New Growth Manager	Executive Officer	Executive Officer LAFCO	Principal Management Analyst	LAFCO Executive Officer	LAFCO Executive Officer
	Top Step	\$ 12,101	\$ 13,457	\$ 14,814	\$ 12,713	\$ 17,341	\$ 15,365	\$ 17,883	\$ 15,253	\$ 16,897	\$ 22,344	\$ 14,246	\$ 13,503	\$ 17,158
Retirement	Classic	2.5%@55	1.18%@50 to 2.43%@65	2%@55	2%@55	2%@55	1.62% @ 65	3%@60	2%@55	2%@55	2.7%@55	2%@61.25	3%@60	1.18%@50
	Enhanced Formula Cost	\$ 653		\$ 474	\$ 407	\$ 555		\$ 1,449	\$ 488	\$ 541	\$ 358	\$ 228	\$ 1,094	\$ 275
	EE Cost Sharing	\$ -969							\$ -153				\$ -409	\$ -451
	ER Paid Member Contrib			\$ 741										
	Calc Classic EPMC as Spec Comp													
	Single Highest Year	\$ 73		\$ 74				\$ 125	\$ 76				\$ 95	
	Social Security	\$ 711	\$ 711	\$ 711				\$ 711	\$ 711		\$ 711	\$ 711	\$ 711	\$ 711
	Deferred Compensation			\$ 85		\$ 1,327	\$ 768		\$ 610	\$ 169			\$ 405	\$ 515
Other Ret.							\$ 108		\$ 1,352					
Insurance	Cafeteria				\$ 1,875			\$ 823	\$ 1,587		\$ 1,608			\$ 1,185
	Health	\$ 1,986	\$ 1,347	\$ 1,677		\$ 2,239	\$ 1,561			\$ 1,148		\$ 1,650	\$ 1,980	
	Dental	\$ 118	\$ 62	\$ 103		\$ 232	\$ 90			\$ 20		\$ 131	\$ 118	
	Vision	\$ 10				\$ 28						\$ 17	\$ 16	
	Other Ins. ¹		\$ 275				\$ 375							
Leaves	Vacation	\$ 745	\$ 776	\$ 855	\$ 733	\$ 886	\$ 2,339	\$ 880	\$ 975	\$ 1,289	\$ 870	\$ 1,272	\$ 1,650	
	Holidays	\$ 605	\$ 776	\$ 741	\$ 587	\$ 800	\$ 709	\$ 825	\$ 821	\$ 910	\$ 1,031	\$ 658	\$ 675	\$ 660
	Admin Leave	\$ 186	\$ 362	\$ 499	\$ 244	\$ 1,801			\$ 440	\$ 650	\$ 1,117	\$ 890	\$ 390	
Allow	Auto			\$ 600		\$ 400	\$ 600	\$ 550	\$ 250	\$ 650	\$ 600		\$ 466	\$ 575
Benefit Package Total		\$ 4,118	\$ 4,310	\$ 6,559	\$ 3,847	\$ 7,381	\$ 4,990	\$ 6,930	\$ 5,712	\$ 6,414	\$ 6,715	\$ 5,155	\$ 6,813	\$ 5,119

N/C - Non Comparator

1 - Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County: County allowance paid to employees for cafeteria benefit plans.

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix I: Market Compensation Data (sorted by Total Compensation)
January 2020

LAFCO Executive Officer										
Rank	Comparator Agency	Classification Title	Top Step Salary	Cost of Wages	Adjusted Top Step	Benefits Package	Total Monthly Comp	Salary Effective Date	Next Salary Increase	Next Percentage Increase
1	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Diego	Executive Officer LAFCO	\$ 19,464	14.8%	\$ 22,344	\$ 6,715	\$ 29,059	6/19/2019	unknown	unknown
2	Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County	Executive Officer of LAFCO	\$ 15,417	16.0%	\$ 17,883	\$ 6,930	\$ 24,813	1/1/2020	unknown	unknown
3	Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County	Executive Officer	\$ 15,679	10.6%	\$ 17,341	\$ 7,381	\$ 24,722	7/1/2019	unknown	unknown
4	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Bernardino	Executive Officer	\$ 14,554	16.1%	\$ 16,897	\$ 6,414	\$ 23,311	7/20/2019	7/18/2020	3.00%
5	Local Agency Formation Commission of Ventura County	LAFCO Executive Officer	\$ 15,091	13.7%	\$ 17,158	\$ 5,119	\$ 22,277	12/29/2019	unknown	unknown
6	Local Agency Formation Commission of Contra Costa County	Executive Officer	\$ 14,082	5.2%	\$ 14,814	\$ 6,559	\$ 21,374	4/17/2019	unknown	unknown
7	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sacramento County	New Growth Manager	\$ 13,275	14.9%	\$ 15,253	\$ 5,712	\$ 20,965	6/22/2019	unknown	unknown
8	Local Agency Formation Commission of Orange County	Executive Officer	\$ 13,646	12.6%	\$ 15,365	\$ 4,990	\$ 20,355	1/1/2019	unknown	unknown
9	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County	LAFCO Executive Officer	\$ 12,067	11.9%	\$ 13,503	\$ 6,813	\$ 20,316	7/2/2019	6/2/2020	3.00%
10	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo	Principal Management Analyst	\$ 14,189	0.4%	\$ 14,246	\$ 5,155	\$ 19,401	12/15/2019	12/13/2020	3-4%
11	Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County	Local Agency Formation Commission Executive Officer	\$ 12,792	5.2%	\$ 13,457	\$ 4,310	\$ 17,767	7/1/2019	7/1/2020	3.00%
12	Local Agency Formation Commission of Marin County	Executive Officer	\$ 12,500	1.7%	\$ 12,713	\$ 3,847	\$ 16,560	1/1/2019	unknown	unknown
13	Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County	LAFCO Executive Officer	\$ 12,101		\$ 12,101	\$ 4,118	\$ 16,219	10/11/2019	unknown	unknown

Summary Results	Top Step Salary	Adjusted Top Step	Total Monthly
Average of Comparators	\$ 14,396	\$ 15,915	\$ 21,743
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	-19.0%	-31.5%	-34.1%
Median of Comparators	\$ 14,136	\$ 15,309	\$ 21,169
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	-16.8%	-26.5%	-30.5%
Number of Matches	12	12	12

N/C - Non Comparator

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix I: Market Compensation Data (sorted by Top Monthly Salary)
January 2020

LAFCO Office Specialist (Commission Clerk/Office Manager)										
Rank	Comparator Agency	Classification Title	Top Step Salary	Cost of Wages	Adjusted Top Step	Benefits Package	Total Monthly Comp	Salary Effective Date	Next Salary Increase	Next Percentage Increase
1	Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County	Clerk to the Commission	\$ 7,895	10.6%	\$ 8,732	\$ 4,420	\$ 13,152	6/24/2019	unknown	unknown
2	Local Agency Formation Commission of Ventura County	LAFCO Office Manager/Clerk of the Commission	\$ 7,679	13.7%	\$ 8,731	\$ 3,074	\$ 11,805	12/29/2019	unknown	unknown
3	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sacramento County	Administrative Services Officer I	\$ 6,551	14.9%	\$ 7,527	\$ 3,094	\$ 10,621	6/23/2019	6/21/2019	2-4%
4	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Diego	Administrative Assistant, Executive	\$ 6,321	14.8%	\$ 7,257	\$ 2,847	\$ 10,104	6/19/2019	unknown	unknown
5	Local Agency Formation Commission of Orange County	Office Manager/Commission Clerk	\$ 6,371	12.6%	\$ 7,174	\$ 2,831	\$ 10,005	7/1/2019	unknown	unknown
6	Local Agency Formation Commission of Marin County	LAFCO Administrative Secretary	\$ 7,029	1.7%	\$ 7,148	\$ 2,846	\$ 9,994	7/2/2017	unknown	unknown
7	Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County	Local Agency Formation Commission Clerk	\$ 6,663	5.2%	\$ 7,009	\$ 3,116	\$ 10,125	7/1/2019	7/1/2020	3.00%
8	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Bernardino	Clerk to the Commission/Office Manager	\$ 5,985	16.1%	\$ 6,949	\$ 3,058	\$ 10,007	7/20/2019	7/18/2020	3.00%
9	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo	Administrative Secretary II	\$ 6,325	0.4%	\$ 6,350	\$ 2,974	\$ 9,324	10/6/2019	10/4/2020	2-3%
10	Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County	LAFCO Office Specialist	\$ 6,277		\$ 6,277	\$ 3,936	\$ 10,212	6/18/2018	unknown	unknown
11	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County	Administrative Aide	\$ 5,562	11.9%	\$ 6,224	\$ 3,696	\$ 9,920	7/2/2019	6/2/2020	3.00%
12	Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County	Commission Coordinator	\$ 5,323	16.0%	\$ 6,174	\$ 2,950	\$ 9,124	1/1/2020	unknown	unknown
13	Local Agency Formation Commission of Contra Costa County	Clerk/Executive Assistant	\$ 5,865	5.2%	\$ 6,170	\$ 3,657	\$ 9,827	4/17/2019	unknown	unknown

Summary Results	Top Step Salary	Adjusted Top Step	Total Monthly
Average of Comparators	\$ 6,464	\$ 7,120	\$ 10,334
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	-3.0%	-13.4%	-1.2%
Median of Comparators	\$ 6,348	\$ 7,079	\$ 10,006
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	-1.1%	-12.8%	2.0%
Number of Matches	12	12	12

N/C - Non Comparator

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix I: Benefit Detail
January 2020

Agency		Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Contra Costa County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Marin County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Orange County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sacramento County	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Bernardino	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Diego	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County	Local Agency Formation Commission of Ventura County
Benchmark/ Comparator Agency Match		LAFCO Office Specialist	Local Agency Formation Commission Clerk	Clerk/ Executive Assistant	LAFCO Administrative Secretary	Clerk to the Commission	Office Manager/ Commission Clerk	Commission Coordinator	Administrative Services Officer I	Clerk to the Commission/ Office Manager	Administrative Assistant, Executive	Administrative Secretary II	Administrative Aide	LAFCO Office Manager/ Clerk of the Commission
	Top Step	\$ 6,277	\$ 7,009	\$ 6,170	\$ 7,148	\$ 8,732	\$ 7,174	\$ 6,174	\$ 7,527	\$ 6,949	\$ 7,257	\$ 6,350	\$ 6,224	\$ 8,731
Retirement	Classic	2.5%@55	1.18%@50 to 2.43%@65	2%@55	2%@55	2%@55	1.62% @ 65	3%@60	1.92% @ 60	2%@55	2.7%@55	2%@61.25	3%@60	1.18%@50
	Enhanced Formula Cost	\$ 339		\$ 197	\$ 229	\$ 279		\$ 500	\$ 120	\$ 222	\$ 116	\$ 102	\$ 504	\$ 140
	EE Cost Sharing	\$ -247							\$ -391				\$ -189	\$ -230
	ER Paid Member Contrib	\$ 470		\$ 309					\$ 387					
	Calc Classic EPMC as Spec Comp	\$ 35												
	Single Highest Year	\$ 38		\$ 31				\$ 43					\$ 44	
	Social Security	\$ 389	\$ 435	\$ 383		\$ 668	\$ 143	\$ 383	\$ 467		\$ 450	\$ 394	\$ 386	\$ 541
	Deferred Compensation			\$ 85						\$ 69			\$ 118	\$ 262
Other Ret.							\$ 108		\$ 556					
Insurance	Cafeteria				\$ 1,875			\$ 823			\$ 1,527			\$ 1,185
	Health	\$ 1,986	\$ 1,347	\$ 1,677		\$ 2,239	\$ 1,561		\$ 1,569	\$ 1,148		\$ 1,650	\$ 1,980	
	Dental	\$ 118	\$ 62	\$ 103		\$ 232	\$ 90		\$ 119	\$ 20		\$ 131	\$ 118	
	Vision	\$ 10				\$ 28						\$ 17	\$ 16	
Leaves	Other Ins. ¹		\$ 275				\$ 292							
	Vacation	\$ 386	\$ 404	\$ 356	\$ 412	\$ 571	\$ 414	\$ 807	\$ 433	\$ 401	\$ 419	\$ 388	\$ 407	\$ 840
	Holidays	\$ 314	\$ 404	\$ 309	\$ 330	\$ 403	\$ 331	\$ 285	\$ 391	\$ 374	\$ 335	\$ 293	\$ 311	\$ 336
	Admin Leave	\$ 97	\$ 189	\$ 208						\$ 267				
Allow	Auto													
Benefit Package Total		\$ 3,936	\$ 3,116	\$ 3,657	\$ 2,846	\$ 4,420	\$ 2,831	\$ 2,950	\$ 3,094	\$ 3,058	\$ 2,847	\$ 2,974	\$ 3,696	\$ 3,074

N/C - Non Comparator

1 - Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County: County allowance paid to employees for cafeteria benefit plans.

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix I: Market Compensation Data (sorted by Total Compensation)
January 2020

LAFCO Office Specialist										
Rank	Comparator Agency	Classification Title	Top Step Salary	Cost of Wages	Adjusted Top Step	Benefits Package	Total Monthly Comp	Salary Effective Date	Next Salary Increase	Next Percentage Increase
1	Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County	Clerk to the Commission	\$ 7,895	10.6%	\$ 8,732	\$ 4,420	\$ 13,152	6/24/2019	unknown	unknown
2	Local Agency Formation Commission of Ventura County	LAFCO Office Manager/Clerk of the Commission	\$ 7,679	13.7%	\$ 8,731	\$ 3,074	\$ 11,805	12/29/2019	unknown	unknown
3	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sacramento County	Administrative Services Officer I	\$ 6,551	14.9%	\$ 7,527	\$ 3,094	\$ 10,621	6/23/2019	6/21/2019	2-4%
4	Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County	LAFCO Office Specialist	\$ 6,277		\$ 6,277	\$ 3,936	\$ 10,212	6/18/2018	unknown	unknown
5	Local Agency Formation Commission of Alameda County	Local Agency Formation Commission Clerk	\$ 6,663	5.2%	\$ 7,009	\$ 3,116	\$ 10,125	7/1/2019	7/1/2020	3.00%
6	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Diego	Administrative Assistant, Executive	\$ 6,321	14.8%	\$ 7,257	\$ 2,847	\$ 10,104	6/19/2019	unknown	unknown
7	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Bernardino	Clerk to the Commission/Office Manager	\$ 5,985	16.1%	\$ 6,949	\$ 3,058	\$ 10,007	7/20/2019	7/18/2020	3.00%
8	Local Agency Formation Commission of Orange County	Office Manager/Commission Clerk	\$ 6,371	12.6%	\$ 7,174	\$ 2,831	\$ 10,005	7/1/2019	unknown	unknown
9	Local Agency Formation Commission of Marin County	LAFCO Administrative Secretary	\$ 7,029	1.7%	\$ 7,148	\$ 2,846	\$ 9,994	7/2/2017	unknown	unknown
10	Local Agency Formation Commission of Sonoma County	Administrative Aide	\$ 5,562	11.9%	\$ 6,224	\$ 3,696	\$ 9,920	7/2/2019	6/2/2020	3.00%
11	Local Agency Formation Commission of Contra Costa County	Clerk/Executive Assistant	\$ 5,865	5.2%	\$ 6,170	\$ 3,657	\$ 9,827	4/17/2019	unknown	unknown
12	Local Agency Formation Commission of San Mateo	Administrative Secretary II	\$ 6,325	0.4%	\$ 6,350	\$ 2,974	\$ 9,324	10/6/2019	10/4/2020	2-3%
13	Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County	Commission Coordinator	\$ 5,323	16.0%	\$ 6,174	\$ 2,950	\$ 9,124	1/1/2020	unknown	unknown

Summary Results	Top Step Salary	Adjusted Top Step	Total Monthly
Average of Comparators	\$ 6,464	\$ 7,120	\$ 10,334
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	-3.0%	-13.4%	-1.2%
Median of Comparators	\$ 6,348	\$ 7,079	\$ 10,006
% Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County Above/Below	-1.1%	-12.8%	2.0%
Number of Matches	12	12	12

N/C - Non Comparator



Appendix II

Summary of Recommendations

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix II: Summary of Recommendations

Priority: High (H)
Medium (M)
Low (L)

Target Completion Date: To be determined by SCLAFCO

	Priority	Date	Recommendation
1	H		Creation of a LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer classification and reclassification of one LAFCO Analyst to the new classification.
2	H		Revision of the class description and retitling of the LAFCO Office Specialist to LAFCO Commission Clerk/Office Manager.
3	H		Creation of a LAFCO Analyst Associate/I/II classification series.
4	H		Addition of 1.0 LAFCO Analyst Associate position, increasing headcount from 4 to 5 FTEs, and reclassification of the LAFCO Office Specialist to the new position which will require the filling the vacancy of the LAFCO Commission Clerk/Office Manager.
5	H		Implementation of salary ranges for new classifications and market salary adjustments for current classification salary ranges, with highest priority for adjustment of the LAFCO Executive Officer salary range.
6	M		Review/revision of current County MOU to ensure flexibility to make staffing and compensation changes determined by the Commission to be necessary to implement strategic goals and initiatives.
7	H		Revision of the current evaluation process for the LAFCO Executive Officer to increase involvement of the Commission, including compensation recommendations.



Appendix III

Market Staffing Analysis

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix III: Market Staffing Analysis - 5yr MSR Agencies
February 2020

	Santa Clara Co LAFCO	% of Total Staffing	Marin Co LAFCO	% of Total Staffing	Monterey Co LAFCO ³	% of Total Staffing	Orange Co LAFCO ⁴	% of Total Staffing	Riverside Co LAFCO ⁵	% of Total Staffing	San Bernardino Co LAFCO ⁶	% of Total Staffing	San Diego Co LAFCO ⁷	% of Total Staffing	Average FTE	Average % of TS
Management	1.0	25.0%	1.0	35.1%	1.0	25.0%	1.5	30.0%	1.5	25.0%	1.0	21.1%	1.5	18.8%	1.38	26.3%
Executive Officer	1	25.0%	1	35.1%	1	25.0%	1	20.0%	1	16.7%	1	21.1%	1	12.5%	1.00	19.14%
Assistant Executive Officer ¹	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5	10.0%	0.5	8.3%	0	0.0%	0.5	6.3%	0.25	4.78%
Senior Analyst ²	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.25	5.3%	0	0.0%	0.13	2.39%
Professional	2	50.0%	1	35.1%	1.5	37.5%	2.5	50.0%	2.5	41.7%	1.75	36.8%	3.5	43.8%	2.13	40.67%
Assistant Executive Officer ¹	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5	10.0%	0.5	8.3%	0	0.0%	0.5	6.3%	0.25	4.78%
Senior Analyst ²	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.5	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.75	15.8%	0	0.0%	0.38	7.18%
Analyst	2	50.0%	1	35.1%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	2	33.3%	1	21.1%	3	37.5%	1.50	28.71%
Administrative	1	25.0%	0.85	29.8%	1.5	37.5%	1	20.0%	2	33.3%	2	42.1%	3	37.5%	1.73	33.01%
Office Manager/Clerk of the Commission	1	25.0%	0.85	29.8%	1	25.0%	1	20.0%	1	16.7%	1	21.1%	1	12.5%	0.98	18.66%
Administrative Assistant	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5	12.5%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	1	21.1%	2	25.0%	0.75	14.35%
Total Staff	4	100.0%	2.9	100.0%	4.0	100.0%	5	100.0%	6	100.0%	4.75	100.0%	8	100.0%	5.23	100.0%

Notes

- 1 - Assistant Executive Officer level assigned .5 to Management functional area and .5 to Analysis/Project Management functional area
- 2 - Senior Analyst level assigned .25 to Management functional area and .75 to Analysis/Project Management functional area
- 3 - Monterey: Flexibly-staffed Senior/Principal Analyst, Assistant/Associate Analyst
- 4 - Orange: Flexibly staffed Policy Analyst I/II
- 5 - Riverside: Assistant EO new for 2020 subject to approval at Jan Commission meeting; flexibly staffed Local Gov Analyst I/II/III
- 6 - San Bernardino: Senior Analyst, Analyst-GIS/Database Management
- 7 - San Diego: Assistant EO budgeted, but not filled since 2010; Local Gov Analyst I/II/III and GIS Analyst

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix III: Market Staffing Analysis - All Agencies
February 2020

	Santa Clara Co LAFCO	% of Total Staffing	Alameda Co LAFCO	% of Total Staffing	Contra Costa Co LAFCO ¹	% of Total Staffing	Marin Co LAFCO	% of Total Staffing	Monterey Co LAFCO ²	% of Total Staffing	Orange Co LAFCO ³	% of Total Staffing
Management	1.0	25.0%	1.0	33.3%	1.0	33.3%	1.0	35.1%	1.0	22.2%	1.5	30.0%
Executive Officer	1	25.0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	35.1%	1	22.2%	1	20.0%
Assistant/ Deputy Executive Officer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5	10.0%
Professional	2	50.0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	35.1%	2	44.4%	2.5	50.0%
Assistant/Deputy Executive Officer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5	10.0%
Senior Analyst	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	44.4%	0	0.0%
Analyst	2	50.0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	35.1%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%
Administrative	1	25.0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0.85	29.8%	1.5	33.3%	1	20.0%
Office Manager/Clerk of the Commission	1	25.0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0.85	29.8%	1	22.2%	1	20.0%
Administrative Assistant	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5	11.1%	0	0.0%
Total Staff	4	100.0%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	2.9	100.0%	4.5	100.0%	5	100.0%

Notes

- 1 - Contra Costa: Flexibly-staffed Analyst I/II
- 2 - Monterey: Flexibly-staffed Senior/Principal Analyst, Assistant/Associate Analyst
- 3 - Orange: Flexibly staffed Policy Analyst I/II
- 4 - Riverside: Assistant EO new for 2020 subject to approval at Jan Commission meeting; flexibly staffed Local Gov Analyst I/II/III
- 5 - San Bernardino: Senior Analyst, Analyst-GIS/Database Management
- 6 - San Diego: Assistant EO budgeted, but not filled since 2010; Local Gov Analyst I/II/III and GIS Analyst
- 7 - Sonoma: Flexibly-staffed Administrative Analyst I/II/III

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
Appendix III: Market Staffing Analysis - All Agencies
February 2020

Riverside Co LAFCO ⁴	% of Total Staffing	Sacramento Co LAFCO	% of Total Staffing	San Bernardino Co LAFCO ⁵	% of Total Staffing	San Diego Co LAFCO ⁶	% of Total Staffing	San Mateo Co LAFCO	% of Total Staffing	Sonoma Co LAFCO ⁷	% of Total Staffing	Ventura Co LAFCO	% of Total Staffing	Average FTE	Market Average Staffing (% of Total Agency Staffing)
1.5	25.0%	1.0	50.0%	1.0	20.0%	1.5	18.8%	1.0	40.0%	1.4	43.8%	1.5	37.5%	1.2	25.0%
1	16.7%	1	50.0%	1	20.0%	1	12.5%	1	40.0%	1	31.3%	1	25.0%	1.0	20.8%
0.5	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5	6.3%	0	0.0%	0.4	12.5%	0.5	12.5%	0.2	4.2%
2.5	41.7%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	3.5	43.8%	1	40.0%	1.3	40.6%	1.5	37.5%	2.4	50.08%
0.5	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5	6.3%	0	0.0%	0.4	12.5%	0.5	12.5%	0.2	4.80%
0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.1	22.64%
2	33.3%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	3	37.5%	1	40.0%	0.9	28.1%	1	25.0%	1.1	22.64%
2	33.3%	1	50.0%	2	40.0%	3	37.5%	0.5	20.0%	0.5	15.6%	1	25.0%	1.2	24.96%
1	16.7%	1	50.0%	1	20.0%	1	12.5%	0.5	20.0%	0.5	15.6%	1	25.0%	0.9	17.76%
1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.3	7.20%
6	100.0%	2	100.0%	5	100.0%	8	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	3.2	100.0%	4	100.0%	4.81	100.00%



Appendix IV

Classification Concepts



CLASSIFICATION

Classification Concepts: Positions vs. Classifications

“Position” and “Classification” are two terms that are often used interchangeably, but have very different meanings. As used in this report:

- A position is an assigned group of duties and responsibilities performed by one person. A position can be full-time, part-time, regular or temporary, filled or vacant. Often the word “job” is used in place of the word “position.”
- A classification or class may contain only one position or may consist of a number of positions. When you have several positions assigned to one class, it means that the same title is appropriate for each position; that the scope, level, duties, and responsibilities of each position assigned to the class are sufficiently similar (but not identical) that the same core knowledge, skills, abilities, and other requirements are appropriate for all positions, and that the same salary range is equitable for all positions in the class.

The description of a position often appears as a working desk manual, going into detail regarding work process steps, while a class description emphasizes the general scope and level of responsibilities, plus the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other requirements for successful performance.

When positions are classified, the focus is on assigned job duties and the job-related requirements for successful performance, not on individual employee capabilities or amount of work performed. Positions are thus evaluated and classified on the basis of such factors as knowledge, skills, and abilities required to perform the work, the complexity of the work, the authority delegated to make decisions and take action, the responsibility for the work of others and/or for budget expenditures, contacts with others (both inside and outside of the organization), and the impact of the position on the organization and working conditions.

Just as there is a difference between a position and a class, there is also a difference between a position description and a class description. A position description, often known as a “desk manual”, generally lists each duty an employee performs and may also have information about how to perform that duty. A class description normally reflects several positions and is a summary document that does not list each duty performed by every employee. The class description, which is intended to be broader, more general and informational, is intended to indicate the general scope and level of responsibility and requirements of the class, not detail-specific position responsibilities.

The Relationship Between Classification and Compensation

Classification and the description of the work and the requirements to perform the work are separate and distinct from determining the worth of that work in the labor market and to the organization. While recommending the appropriate compensation for the work of a class depends upon an understanding of what that work is and what it requires (as noted above), compensation levels are often influenced by two factors:



- The external labor market; and
- Internal relationships within the organization.

The Purpose of Having a Classification Plan

A position classification plan provides an appropriate basis for making a variety of human resources decisions such as the:

- Development of job-related recruitment and selection procedures;
- Clear and objective appraisal of employee performance;
- Development of training plans and succession planning;
- Design of an equitable and competitive salary structure;
- Organizational development and the management of change; and
- Provision of an equitable basis for discipline and other employee actions.

In addition to providing this basis for various human resources management and process decisions, a position classification plan can also effectively support systems of administrative and fiscal control. Grouping of positions into an orderly classification system supports planning, budget analysis and preparation, and various other administrative functions.

Within a position classification plan, job classifications can either be broad (containing a number of positions) or narrow (emphasizing individual job characteristics). Broad job classifications are indicated when:

- Employees can be hired with a broad spectrum of knowledge, skill, and/or academic preparation and can readily learn the details of SCLAFCO, the department, and the position on-the-job; or
- There is a need for flexibility of the assignment within a department or an organization due to changing programs, technologies, or workload.

Individualized job classifications are indicated when:

- There is an immediate need to recruit for specialty knowledge and skills;
- There is a minimum of time or capability for on-the-job training; or
- There is an organizational need to provide for specific job recognition and to highlight the differences between jobs.

Most classification plans are a combination of these two sets of factors and we have chosen the middle ground in this study as being most practicable in SCLAFCO's changing environment and service delivery expectations, as well as being in line with SCLAFCO's strategic plan.



Classification Descriptions

Class descriptions are based upon the information from the written PDQs completed by each employee, the individual job audit interviews (if required), and from information provided by employees and managers during the review processes. These descriptions provide:

- A written summary documenting the work performed and/or proposed by the incumbents of these classifications;
- Distinctions among the classes; and
- Documentation of requirements and qualifications to assist in the recruitment and selection process.

Just as there is a difference between a position and a class, there is also a difference between a position description and a class description. A position description, often known as a “desk manual”, generally lists each duty an employee performs and may also have information about how to perform that duty. A class description normally reflects several positions and is a summary document that does not list each duty performed by every employee. The class description, which is intended to be broader, more general and informational, is intended to indicate the general scope and level of responsibility and requirements of the class, not detail-specific position responsibilities.

The sections of each class description are as follows:

Title: This should be brief and descriptive of the class and consistent with other titles in the classification plan and the occupational area.

- The title of a classification is normally used for organization, classification, and compensation purposes within SCLAFCO. Often working titles are used within a department to differentiate an individual. All positions have a similar level of scope and responsibility; however, the working titles may give assurance to a member of the public that they are dealing with an appropriate individual. Working titles should be authorized by Human Resources to ensure consistency within SCLAFCO and across departmental lines.

Definition: This provides a capsule description of the job and should give an indication of the type of supervision received, the scope and level of the work and any unusual or unique factors. The phrase “performs related work as required” is not meant to unfairly expand the scope of the work performed, but to acknowledge that jobs change and that not all duties are included in the class specification.

Supervision Received and Exercised: This section specifies which class or classes provide supervision to the class being described and the type and level of work direction or supervision provided to this class. The section also specifies what type and level of work direction or



supervision the class provides to other classes. This assists the reader in defining where the class “fits” in the organization and alludes to possible career advancement opportunities.

Class Characteristics: This can be considered the “editorial” section of the specification, slightly expanding the Definition, clarifying the most important aspects of the class and distinguishing this class from the next higher-level in a class series or from a similar class in a different occupational series.

Examples of Typical Job Functions: This section provides a list of the major and typical duties, intended to define the scope and level of the class and to support the Qualifications, including Knowledge and Skills. This list is meant to be illustrative only. It should be emphasized that the description is a summary document, and that duties change depending upon program requirements, technology, and organizational needs.

Qualifications: This element of the description has several sections:

- A listing of the job-related knowledge and skills required to successfully perform the work. They must be related to the duties and responsibilities of the work and capable of being validated under the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s Uniform Guidelines on Selection Procedures. Knowledge (intellectual comprehension) and Abilities (acquired proficiency) should be sufficiently detailed to provide the basis for selection of qualified employees.
- A listing of educational and experience requirements that outline minimum and alternative ways of gaining the knowledge and abilities required for entrance into the selection process. These elements are used as the basic screening technique for job applicants.
- Licenses and/or certifications identify those specifically required in order to perform the work. These certifications are often required by an agency higher than SCLAFCO (i.e., the State), and can therefore be appropriately included as requirements.

Physical Demands: This section identifies the basic physical abilities required for performance of the work. These are not presented in great detail (although they are more specifically covered for documentation purposes in the PDQs) but are designed to indicate the type of pre-employment physical examination (lifting requirements and other unusual characteristics are included, such as “finger dexterity needed to access, enter, and retrieve data using a computer keyboard”) and to provide an initial basis for determining reasonable accommodation for ADA purposes.

Working Conditions: These can describe certain outside influences and circumstances under which a job is performed; they give employees or job applicants an idea of certain risks involved in the job and what type of protective gear may be necessary to perform the job. Examples are loud noise levels, cold and/or hot temperatures, vibration, confining workspace, chemicals, mechanical and/or electrical hazards, and other job conditions.



Fair Labor Standards Act

One of the major components of the job analysis and classification review is the determination of each classification's appropriate Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) status, i.e., exempt vs. non-exempt from the FLSA overtime rules and regulations.

As we review position description questionnaires and notes from the interviews, we analyze each classification's essential functions to determine FLSA status. There are three levels for the determination of the appropriate FLSA status that are utilized and on which we base our recommendations. Below are the steps used for the determination of Exempt FLSA status.

Salary Basis Test: The incumbents in a classification are paid at least \$684 per week (\$35,568 per year), not subject to reduction due to variations in quantity/quality of work performed. Note: computer professionals' salary minimum is defined in hourly terms as \$46.55 per hour.

Exemption Applicability: The incumbents in a classification perform any of the following types of jobs:

- **Executive:** Employee whose primary duty is to manage the business or a recognized department/entity and who customarily directs the work of two or more employees. This also includes individuals who hire, fire, or make recommendations that carry particular weight regarding employment status. Examples: executive, director, owner, manager, supervisor.
- **Administrative:** Employee whose primary activities are performing office work or non-manual work on matters of significance relating to the management or business operations of the firm or its customers and which require the exercise of discretion and independent judgment. Examples: coordinator, administrator, analyst, accountant.
- **Professional:** Employee who primarily performs work requiring advanced knowledge/education and which includes consistent exercise of discretion and independent judgment. The advanced knowledge must be in a field of science or learning acquired in a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction. Examples: attorney, physician, statistician, architect, biologist, pharmacist, engineer, teacher.
- **Computer professional:** Employee who primarily performs work as a computer systems analyst, programmer, software engineer or similarly skilled work in the computer field performing a) application of systems analysis techniques and procedures, including consulting with users to determine hardware, software, or system functional specifications; b) design, development, documentation, analysis, creation, testing, or modification of computer systems or programs, including prototypes, based on and related to user or system design specification; or c) design, documentation, testing, creation or modification of computer programs based on and related to user or system design specifications; or a combination of the duties described above, the performance



of which requires the same level of skills. Examples: system analyst, database analyst, network architect, software engineer, programmer.

Job Analysis: A thorough job analysis of the job duties must be performed to determine exempt status. An exempt position must pass both the salary basis and duties tests. The job analysis should include:

- Review of the minimum qualifications established for the job;
- Review of prior class descriptions, questionnaires, and related documentation;
- Confirmation of duty accuracy with management; and
- Review and analysis of workflow, organizational relationships, policies, and other available organizational data.

Non-exempt classifications work within detailed and well-defined sets of rules and regulations, policies, procedures, and practices that must be followed when making decisions. Although the knowledge base required to perform the work may be significant, the framework within which incumbents work is fairly restrictive and finite. (Please note that FLSA does not allow for the consideration of workload and scheduling when it comes to exemption status).

Finally, often times a classification performs both non-exempt and exempt duties, so we analyze time spent on each type of duties. If a classification performs mostly non-exempt duties (i.e. more than 50% of his or her time), then the classification would be considered non-exempt.

Classification Structure and Allocation Factors

The proposed classification plan provides SCLAFCO with a systematic classification structure based on the interrelationship between duties performed, the nature and level of responsibilities, and other work-related requirements of the jobs.

A classification plan is not a stable, unchanging entity. Classification plans may be updated and revised by conducting classification studies that are organizational wide (review of the all classifications and positions) or position-specific. The methodology used for both types of studies is the same, as outlined above.

For either type of study, when identifying appropriate placement of new and/or realigned positions within the classification structure, there are general allocation factors to consider. By analyzing these factors, SCLAFCO will be able to change and grow the organization while maintaining the classification plan.

1. Type and Level of Knowledge and Skill Required

This factor defines the level of job knowledge and skill, including those attained by formal education, technical training, on-the job experience, and required certification or professional registration. The varying levels are as follows:



A. The entry-level into any occupational field

This entry-level knowledge may be attained by obtaining a high school diploma, completing specific technical course work, or obtaining a four-year or advanced college or university degree. Little to no experience is required.

B. The experienced or journey-level (fully competent-level) in any occupational field

This knowledge and skill level recognizes a class that is expected to perform the day-to-day functions of the work independently, but with guidelines (written or oral) and supervisory assistance available. This level of knowledge is sufficient to provide on-the-job instruction to a fellow employee or an assistant when functioning in a lead capacity. Certifications may be required for demonstrating possession of the required knowledge and skills.

C. The advanced level in any occupational field

This knowledge and skill level is applied in situations where an employee is required to perform or deal with virtually any job situation that may be encountered. Guidelines may be limited and creative problem solving may be involved. Supervisory knowledge and skills are considered in a separate factor and should not influence any assessment of this factor.

2. Supervisory/Management Responsibility

This factor defines the staff and/or program management responsibility, including short and long-range planning, budget development and administration, resource allocation, policy and procedure development, and supervision and direction of staff.

A. No ongoing direction of staff

The employee is responsible for the performance of his or her own work and may provide side-by-side instruction to a co-worker.

B. Lead direction of staff or program coordination

The employee plans, assigns, directs, and reviews the work of staff performing similar work to that performed by the employee on a day-to-day basis. Training in work procedures is normally involved. If staff direction is not involved, the employee must have responsibility for independently coordinating one or more programs or projects on a regular basis.

C. Full first-line supervisor

The employee performs the supervisory duties listed above, and, in addition, makes effective recommendation and/or carries out selection, performance evaluation, and disciplinary procedures. If staff supervision is not involved, the employee must have



programmatic responsibility, including development and implementing goals, objectives, policies and procedures, and budget development and administration.

D. Manager

The employee is considered management, often supervising through subordinate levels of supervision. In addition to the responsibilities outlined above, responsibilities include allocating staff and budget resources among competing demands and performing significant program and service delivery planning and evaluation. This level normally reports to the Executive Officer.

E. Executive Management

The employee has total administrative responsibility for SCLAFCO and reports to the Commission.

3. Supervision Received

A. Direct Supervision

Direct supervision is usually received by entry-level employees and trainees, i.e., employees who are new to the organization and/or position they are filling. Initially under close supervision, incumbents learn to apply concepts and work procedures and methods in assigned area of responsibility to resolve problems of moderate scope and complexity. Work is usually supervised while in progress and fits an established structure or pattern. Exceptions or changes in procedures are explained in detail as they arise. As experience is gained, assignments become more varied and are performed with greater independence.

B. General Supervision

General supervision is usually received by the experienced and journey-level employees, i.e., employees who have been in a position for a period of time and have had the opportunity to be trained and learn most, if not all, duties and responsibilities of the assigned classification. Incumbents are cross-trained to perform the full range of technical work in all of the areas of assignment.

At the experienced-level, positions exercise some independent discretion and judgment in selecting and applying work procedures and methods. Assignments and objectives are set for the employee and established work methods are followed. Incumbents have some flexibility in the selection of steps and timing of work processes.

Journey-level positions receive only occasional instruction or assistance as new or unusual situations arise and are fully aware of the operating procedures and policies of assigned projects, programs, and team(s). Assignments are given with general guidelines and incumbents are responsible for establishing objectives, timelines, and methods to deliver work products. Work is typically reviewed upon completion for soundness,



appropriateness, and conformity to policy and requirements, and the methodology used in arriving at the end results are not reviewed in detail.

C. General Direction

General direction is usually received by senior level or management positions. Work assignments are typically given as broad, conceptual ideas and directives and incumbents are accountable for overall results and responsible for developing guidelines, action plans, and methods to produce deliverables on time and within budget.

D. Administrative and Policy Direction

Administrative direction is usually received by executive management classifications. The incumbent is accountable for accomplishing SCLAFCO -wide planning and operational goals and objectives within legal and general policy and regulatory guidelines. The incumbent is responsible for the efficient and economical performance of the organization's operations.

4. Problem Solving

This factor involves analyzing, evaluating, reasoning, and creative thinking requirements. In a work environment, not only the breadth and variety of problems are considered, but also guidelines, such as supervision, policies, procedures, laws, regulations, and standards available to the employee.

A. Structured problem solving

Employees learn to apply concepts and work procedures and methods in assigned area of responsibility and to resolve problems and issues that are specific, less complex, and/or repetitive. Exceptions or changes in procedures are explained in detail as they arise.

B. Independent, guided problem solving

Work situations require making independent decisions among a variety of alternatives; however, policies, procedures, standards, and regulations and/or management are available to guide the employee towards problem resolution.

C. Application of discriminating choices

Work situations require independent judgment and decision-making authority when identifying, evaluating, adapting, and applying appropriate concepts, guidelines, references, laws, regulations, policies, and procedures to resolve diverse and complex problems and issues.

D. Creative, evaluative, or critical thinking

The work involves a high-level of problem-solving requiring analysis of unique issues or increasingly complex problems without precedent and/or structure and formulating, presenting, and implementing strategies and recommendations for resolution.



5. Authority for Making Decisions and Taking Action

This factor describes the degree to which employees have the freedom to take action within their job. The variety and frequency of action and decisions, the availability of policies, procedures, laws, and supervisory or managerial guidance, and the consequence or impact of such decisions are considered within this factor.

A. Direct, limited work responsibility

The employee is responsible for the successful performance of his or her own work with little latitude for discretion or decision-making. Work is usually supervised while in progress and fits an established structure or pattern. Direct supervision is readily available.

B. Decision-making within guidelines

The employee is responsible for the successful performance of their own work, but able to prioritize and determine methods of work performance within general guidelines. Supervision is available, although the employee is expected to perform independently on a day-to-day basis. Emergency or unusual situations may occur, but are handled within procedures and rules. Impact of decisions is normally limited to the work unit, project, or program to which assigned.

C. Independent action with focus on work achieved

The employee receives assignments in terms of long-term objectives, rather than day-to-day or weekly timeframes. Broad policies and procedures are provided, but the employee has latitude for choosing techniques and deploying staff and material resources. Impact of decisions may have significant program or SCLAFCO -wide service delivery and/or budgetary impact.

D. Decisions made within general policy or elected official guidance

The employee is subject only to the policy guidance of elected officials and/or broad regulatory or legal constraints. The ultimate authority for achieving the goals and objectives of the SCLAFCO are with this employee.

6. Interaction with Others

This factor includes the nature and purpose of contacts with others, from simple exchanges of factual information to the negotiation of difficult issues. It also considers with whom the contacts are made, from co-workers and the public to elected or appointed public officials.

A. Exchange of factual information

The employee is expected to use ordinary business courtesy to exchange factual information with co-workers and the public. Strained situations may occasionally occur, but the responsibilities are normally not confrontational.



B. Interpretation and explanation of policies and procedures

The employee is required to interpret policies and procedures, apply and explain them, and influence the public or others to abide by them. Problems may need to be defined and clarified and individuals contacted may be upset or unreasonable. Contacts may also be made with individuals at all levels throughout SCLAFCO.

C. Influencing individuals or groups

The employee is required to interpret laws, policies, and procedures to individuals who may be confrontational or to deal with members of professional, business, community, or other groups or regulatory agencies as a representative of SCLAFCO.

D. Negotiation with organizations from a position of authority

The employee often deals with the Commission, elected officials, government agencies, and other outside agencies, and the public to advance and represent the priorities and interests of SCLAFCO, provide policy direction, and/or negotiate solutions to difficult problems.

7. Working Conditions/Physical Demands

This factor includes specific physical, situational, and other factors that influence the employee's working situation.

A. Normal office or similar setting

The work is performed in a normal office or similar setting during regular office hours (occasional overtime may be required, but compensated for). Responsibilities include meeting standard deadlines, using office and related equipment, lifting materials weighing up to 25 pounds, and communicating with others in a generally non-stressful manner.

B. Varied working conditions with some physical or emotional demands

The work is normally performed indoors, but may have some exposure to noise, heat, weather, or other uncomfortable conditions. Stand-by, call back, or regular overtime may be required. The employee may have to meet frequent deadlines, work extended hours, and maintain attention to detail at a computer or other machinery, deal with difficult people, or regularly perform moderate physical activity.

C. Difficult working conditions and/or physical demands

The work has distinct and regular difficult demands. Shift work (24-7 or rotating) may be required; there may be exposure to hazardous materials or conditions; the employee may be subject to regular emergency callback and extended shifts; and/or the work may require extraordinary physical demands.



Organizational Review and Assessment Study – Final Report

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County

Based on the above factors, in the maintenance of the classification plan when an employee is assigned an additional duty or responsibility and requests a change in classification, it is reasonable to ask:

- What additional knowledge and skills are required to perform the duty?
- How does one gain this additional knowledge and skills – through extended training, through a short-term seminar, through on-the-job experience?
- Does this duty or responsibility require new or additional supervisory responsibilities?
- Is there a greater variety of or are there more complex problems that need to be solved as a result of the new duty?
- Does the employee have to make a greater variety of or more difficult decisions as a result of this new duty?
- Are the impacts of decisions greater because of this new duty (effects on staff, budget, SCLAFCO -wide activities, and/or relations with other agencies)?
- Are guidelines, policies, and/or procedures provided to the employee for the performance of this new duty?
- Is the employee interacting with internal and external stakeholders others more frequently or for a different purpose as a result of this new assignment?
- Have the working or physical conditions of the job changed as a result of this new assignment?

The analysis of the factors outlined above, as well as the answers to these questions, were used to determine recommended classifications for all SCLAFCO employees. The factors above will also help to guide the placement of specific positions to the existing classification structure and/or revision of entire classification structure in the future.



Appendix V

Classification Descriptions

LAFCO ANALYST SERIES

DEFINITION

The LAFCO Analyst series describes levels of positions that under general supervision (LAFCO Associate Analyst/Analyst I) or direction (LAFCO Analyst II), performs professional work on a variety of projects involving research, data collection, analysis, and other related tasks in support of the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of Santa Clara County; responsible for a variety of specialized studies, report preparation and public contact; and performs related work as required.

DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS

The LAFCO Analyst series is flexibly staffed and positions may be budgeted to be filled by advancement from a lower level after gaining the knowledge, skill, and experience which meet the qualifications for and after demonstrating the ability to perform the work of the higher-level class.

The LAFCO Analyst series is distinguished from the LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer in that the latter class routinely provides technical guidance and supervision to analytical and support staff and performs the most complex and highly sensitive body of analytical work with a high degree of independence.

Definition of Levels

The allocation of positions to a level of the LAFCO Analyst series depends on the responsibilities and complexities of the assignment and the nature of the program activities measured by such factors as: breadth of responsibility, independent judgment, information system knowledge, supervision or project management exercised, impact on the organization, interaction with others and job knowledge.

LAFCO Associate Analyst

This is the first and pre-professional level within the series. Incumbents receive delegated assignments with defined scope, pre-determined methodology and well-established procedures. Work assignments are typically subject to detailed and frequent review.

LAFCO Analyst I

This is the first working professional level within the series. Initially under close supervision, incumbents learn LAFCO systems, operations, practices, and procedures. Incumbents are initially assigned projects or responsibilities that are routine in nature and narrow in scope. As experience is gained, assignments become more varied and are performed with greater independence. Positions at this level usually perform most of the duties required of the positions at the II level but are not expected to function at the same skill level and usually exercise less independent discretion and judgement in matter related to work procedures and methods.

LAFCO Analyst II

This is the full journey/professional level class within the series. Positions at this level are distinguished by the performance of the full range of duties as assigned, working independently, and exercising judgment

and initiative. Positions at this level receive only occasional instruction or assistance as new or unusual situations arise and are fully aware of the operating procedures and policies of the work unit. Work is normally reviewed upon completion and for overall results.

TYPICAL TASKS

The following tasks are typical of those performed by incumbents in this class series, other related duties may be performed. Not all duties listed are necessarily performed by each individual at each level.

Associate Analyst:

- Develops, maintains, and implements LAFCO's administrative procedures; develops and maintains LAFCO application processing procedures and process flow charts; maintains records of implementations and recommends improvements to procedures, as necessary; and provides training to staff on the procedures.
- Processes LAFCO applications; reviews applications for completeness and consistency with filing requirements; facilitates application review meetings and coordinates reports from various County departments; and assists with evaluating application consistency with LAFCO application filing requirements, policies and state law.
- Gathers data, analyzes information, and prepares reports outlining methodology, analysis and recommendations related to LAFCO specific areas; conducts or participates in statewide surveys on LAFCO operations, procedures and policies; and assists with staff reports and performs studies by collecting, tabulating and analyzing data using appropriate statistical methods to identify trends.
- Determines the location of cities and special districts boundaries, urban service areas and sphere of influence boundaries in response to inquiries by public/private agencies; reviews and verifies changes made to cities and special district layers in GIS; conducts research and generates vicinity maps of boundaries for cities and special districts upon request.
- Creates and maintains a database for tracking application and project activities and retrieves information; performs research and prepares reports using the database.
- Provides graphical support for LAFCO programs including the development of maps, charts, displays, presentations, graphics, brochures, and drawings; prepares materials for grant applications.
- May serve as Commission Clerk, as needed.

Analyst I/II:

- Conducts analysis relating to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and on a variety of special projects involving research, data collection and other tasks supporting the operations of Santa Clara County LAFCO; performs a variety of responsible and specialized technical services involving administrative, planning, financial, legislative, and data analysis.
- Conducts special studies involving inter-jurisdictional or inter-agency coordination, most of which is of a complex, controversial, and politically sensitive nature.
- Reviews and analyzes proposals filed with LAFCO, conducts field investigations, makes recommendations, and prepares and presents staff reports to Commission or LAFCO Executive Officer in written or oral form.
- Researches, analyzes, and interprets information and data necessary to meet State law requirements and LAFCO policies and objectives.
- Oversees contracts and consultants related to special studies.
- Makes verbal presentations and manages public participation/outreach processes relating to pending LAFCO proposals, studies, policies, and procedures; develops a variety of graphic presentation materials for community meetings and public hearings.
- Interprets and explains governmental regulations, policies and procedures to the public, governmental agencies, staff, and consultants.

- Advises management on the impact of new and proposed state and local legislation that pertains to LAFCO.
- Responds to inquiries from the general public, other governmental agencies, and organizations.
- Participates in LAFCO related organizations and professional associations.
- Participates and represents LAFCO on various committees and organizations as required.
- Performs other related duties as required.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS

Any combination of training and experience that would provide the required knowledge, skills, and abilities is qualifying. A typical way to obtain the required qualifications would be:

LAFCO Associate Analyst:

Equivalent to a bachelor's degree in public administration, city and regional planning or closely related field.

Knowledge of:

- General principles and practices of public administration.
- Basic statistical research techniques and procedures.
- Data collection techniques.
- Communication techniques required for gathering, evaluating, and transmitting information.
- Design techniques and tools to produce maps and graphics.
- Computer applications related to the work, including word processing, database, spreadsheet, publishing, and presentation applications, and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) software.

Ability to:

- Collect, assemble, and analyze simple technical data.
- Prepare a variety of graphic materials such as maps, charts, and displays.
- Prepare boundary maps and illustrative graphics using GIS and other software.
- Speak effectively and participate in group meetings and individual interviews with members of the public and agency staff.

LAFCO Analyst I:

Equivalent to a bachelor's degree in public administration, city and regional planning or closely related field AND two (2) years of professional land use planning or administering a public program or related experience. A master's degree in public administration or city and regional planning may be substituted for two (2) years of the required experience. A master's degree in a closely related field may be substituted for one (1) year of the required experience.

Knowledge of:

- Principles and practices of public administration and urban and regional land planning.
- Research, analysis, and statistical methods applicable to management analysis.
- State and local laws and guidelines relating to environmental protection.
- Methods and techniques of effective technical report preparation and presentation.
- Design techniques and tools to produce maps and graphics.
- Computer applications related to the work, including word processing, database, spreadsheet, publishing, and presentation applications, and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) software.

Ability to:

- Collect, interpret, and evaluate data of a complex and specialized nature.

- Communicate and present concise, logical oral and written reports.
- Understand, interpret, and apply laws, policies, and procedures.
- Gain and maintain the confidence and cooperation of those contacted during the course of work.

LAFCO Analyst II:

Equivalent to bachelor's degree in public administration, city and regional planning or closely related field AND four (4) years of professional land use planning or administering a public program or related experience, including two (2) years working in a professional capacity on interagency planning projects with a LAFCO, city or county planning department, or related public agency. A master's degree in public administration or city and regional planning may be substituted for two (2) years of the required experience. A master's degree in a closely related field may be substituted for one (1) year of the required experience.

Knowledge of:

- Applicable local, state, and federal law guidelines and standards including those related to environmental protection.
- Statutory purposes of LAFCO and state and local regulations relating to LAFCO.
- Research, analysis, and statistical methods applicable to land use and environmental analysis.

Ability to:

- Reason logically and creatively and utilize a variety of analytical techniques to resolve complex and specialized problems.
- Understand, interpret, and apply laws, policies, and procedures.
- Plan, organize, and conduct work assignments under minimum direction or independently and meet deadlines.
- Manage and coordinate large projects and studies.
- Gain and maintain the confidence and cooperation of those contacted during the course of work especially in sensitive relationships with representatives of departmental and other outside groups.
- Represent LAFCO and or act as LAFCO spokesperson.

Possession of a valid California Driver's License prior to appointment and the ability to qualify for a County Driver's Permit.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS

- Mobility to work in a standard office setting and use standard office equipment, including a computer; to operate a motor vehicle and visit various County sites; primarily a sedentary office classification although standing in work areas and walking between work areas may be required.
- Vision to read printed materials and a computer screen.
- Hearing and speech to communicate in person and over the telephone.
- Finger dexterity is needed to access, enter, and retrieve data using a computer keyboard or calculator and to operate standard office equipment.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

- Office environment with moderate noise levels, controlled temperature conditions, and no direct exposure to hazardous physical substances.
- Employees may interact with upset staff and/or public and private representatives in interpreting and administering departmental policies and procedures,

LAFCO ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER

DEFINITION

Under general direction, assists the LAFCO Executive Officer in carrying out the policies and directives of the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of Santa Clara County; administers and supervises day-to-day activities, duties, and responsibilities of LAFCO programs; and performs other related duties as assigned.

DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS

This is a single-position management classification responsible for assisting the Executive Officer in carrying out the policies and directives of LAFCO. Responsibilities include developing and implementing policies and procedures for assigned programs, budget administration and reporting, and program evaluation. Incumbents serve as a professional-level resource for organizational, managerial, and operational analyses and studies. Performance of the work requires the use of considerable independence, initiative, and discretion within established guidelines. The LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer differs from the LAFCO Executive Officer as the LAFCO Executive Officer has overall responsibility for all functions and activities of the LAFCO program under policy direction from the Commission.

TYPICAL TASKS

- Serves as assistant to the LAFCO Executive Officer and acts in place of the LAFCO Executive Officer in his or her absence.
- Directly supervises other LAFCO staff on projects identified by the LAFCO Executive Officer.
- Performs major proposal analysis, gathers, and analyzes information related to LAFCO applications; prepares background reports and preliminary recommendations; and reports orally and in writing to the Commission on proposals.
- Ensures compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), reviews proposals for adequacy of environmental review documents; reviews and prepares comments on initial studies, negative declarations, and EIRs prepared by other agencies; and conducts initial studies, prepares and supervises the preparation of negative declarations and other environmental documents where LAFCO is the Lead Agency.
- Assists the LAFCO Executive Officer in preparing and administers LAFCO's annual budget.
- Plans, organizes, and directs the activities of staff in the receiving, processing, and analyzing of applications and petitions for LAFCO action including the creation of staff reports and holding of public hearings.
- Reviews and researches legislative topics, and performs other special assignments.
- Represents LAFCO matters before various public and private policy making boards and agencies and makes presentations to LAFCO or other local governments at public hearings.
- Conducts studies, prepares reports and makes recommendations on proposals submitted to LAFCO involving jurisdictional/boundary changes for cities or special districts.
- Manages and conducts special studies such as Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence studies involving inter-jurisdictional or inter-agency coordination.
- Selects and hires staff and ensures the orientation, training, and development of program staff; directs and evaluates the work of subordinate staff and consultants.

- Acts as liaison between the Commission, the general public, and other governmental agencies; develops public participation and outreach processes and explains LAFCO laws, policies and procedures to the public, community organizations, government agencies and the media.
- Keeps abreast of new trends and developments related to LAFCO's activities, rules, and regulations.
- Performs related duties as required.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS

Any combination of training and experience that would provide the required knowledge, skills, and abilities is qualifying. A typical way to obtain the required qualifications would be:

Equivalent to a bachelor's degree in public administration, city and regional planning or closely related field AND five (5) years of professional land use planning or administering a public program or related experience, including supervisory, management or administrative experience that demonstrates the ability to perform the typical tasks. A master's degree in public administration or city and regional planning may be substituted for two (2) years of the required experience. A master's degree in a closely related field may be substituted for one (1) year of the required experience. LAFCO work experience or working in a professional capacity in city or county planning or public administration is highly desirable.

Possession of a valid California Driver's License prior to appointment and the ability to qualify for a County Driver's Permit.

Knowledge of:

- LAFCO laws, practices, and procedures, and federal, state, and local laws and guidelines related to environmental protection.
- Public administration and financing and functions of counties, cities, and special districts.
- Urban and regional planning principles, practices, and techniques.
- Principles of organization and administrative, fiscal and program management.
- Principles and practices of employee supervision, including work planning, assignment review and evaluation, discipline, and the training of staff in work procedures.
- Communication techniques required for gathering, evaluating, and transmitting information.
- Principles and practices of budget development and administration.
- Public outreach methods and procedures.
- Computer applications related to the work, including word processing and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) software.

Ability to:

- Plan, organize, supervise, direct, and implement administrative and analytical support activities, including large and/or controversial projects, for LAFCO.
- Select and supervise staff, provide training and development opportunities, ensure work is performed effectively, and evaluate performance in an objective and positive manner.
- Organize public hearings and speak effectively in public.
- Work independently and meet deadlines.
- Analyze and interpret data and formulate recommendations.
- Develop and effectively utilize available resources.
- Establish and maintain effective working relationships with elected officials, the public, and staff of other agencies.

- Effectively represent LAFCO in meetings with governmental agencies, community groups, various business, professional, and regulatory organizations, and in meetings with individuals.
- Communicate clearly and concisely, both orally and in writing.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS

- Mobility to work in a standard office setting and use standard office equipment, including a computer; to operate a motor vehicle and visit various County sites; primarily a sedentary office classification although standing in work areas and walking between work areas may be required.
- Vision to read printed materials and a computer screen.
- Hearing and speech to communicate in person and over the telephone.
- Finger dexterity is needed to access, enter, and retrieve data using a computer keyboard or calculator and to operate standard office equipment.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

- Office environment with moderate noise levels, controlled temperature conditions, and no direct exposure to hazardous physical substances.
- Employees may interact with upset staff and/or public and private representatives in interpreting and administering departmental policies and procedures.

LAFCO COMMISSION CLERK/OFFICE MANAGER

DEFINITION

Under general supervision, provides skilled clerical and administrative support and serves as Clerk to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), and performs related work as required.

DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS

This is a journey-level classification responsible for providing skilled administrative support to the LAFCO program requiring comprehensive knowledge of subject matter and organizational activities. Positions at this level perform the full range of duties as assigned, working independently, and exercising judgment and initiative; receive only occasional instruction or assistance as new or unusual situations arise; and are fully aware of the operating procedures and policies of the work unit.

TYPICAL TASKS

Commission Support

- Prepares, organizes, prints and distributes the agenda for LAFCO meetings, including preparation of the preliminary agenda; assembles and copies agenda material and supporting documents; posts agenda on-line and arranges for the distribution of agenda materials to Commissioners, staff and others.
- Attends and clerks Commission meetings and prepares meeting minutes and summary of proceedings to create the official record; indexes, retrieves, and provides for the retention of documents related to LAFCO proceedings.
- Prepares, publishes, posts and sends out a variety of notices along with materials related to agenda items to the public, news media and other interested parties based on State law; designs newsletters, flyers and reports for publication online as well as in hard copy format.
- Receives, processes, and monitors economic interest statements and tracks and records Commissioner and staff compliance with required training.
- Provides LAFCO's response to Public Records Requests in compliance with the State Public Records Act.

Administrative Support

- Oversees the daily administration of LAFCO fiscal affairs in accordance with LAFCO and County of Santa Clara policies, including accounts receivable, accounts payable, payroll, and purchasing.
- Coordinates routine office maintenance issues and special maintenance projects and acts as liaison to the property management and maintenance team for the LAFCO office.
- Acts as primary contact and coordinates with various vendors and service providers for services such as acquisition, installation, and maintenance of network and desktop hardware and software, printers, phones, and office security system.
- Administers service agreements with vendors for records management system, website maintenance and hosting, digitization and printing services, and other support services as needed.
- Maintains electronic document management system, office files and records.
- Establishes controls on correspondence with deadlines and expiration dates.

- Develops and implements office methods, procedures, and forms; assists in creating operating and policy manuals; and recommends changes as necessary.
- Creates mailing lists and labels using a variety of information sources and software programs such as word processing, databases, spreadsheets, and Geographic Information Systems (GIS).
- Sets up audio/visual equipment in meeting rooms and performs minor troubleshooting as necessary.
- Makes travel arrangements for staff and commissioners and coordinates travel reimbursement process.
- Interacts with LAFCO staff, County departments, other agencies and public entities, and other county LAFCOs; participates in LAFCO-related organizations and professional associations.
- Screens office visitors and phone calls, meets the public, makes appointments, and arranges conferences and events.
- Independently composes correspondence requiring application of specialized knowledge from notes or oral directions.
- Performs other related duties as required.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS:

Any combination of training and experience that would provide the required knowledge, skills, and abilities is qualifying. A typical way to obtain the required qualifications would be:

Equivalent to graduation from the twelfth (12th) grade AND four (4) years of increasingly responsible office administrative and/or secretarial experience, including the taking and transcribing of meeting minutes. College or business school training in a field related to the work is desirable and may be substituted for the experience on a year-for-year basis to a maximum of two (2) years. Experience in dealing with government and community contacts is desirable.

Knowledge of:

- Basic parliamentary procedures and local/State laws and policies relating to conducting and/or adjourning official meetings.
- Practices of public agency meeting organization, coordination and record keeping.
- Functions and basic office operations of an administrative office.
- Records management and retention principles and practices, including legal requirements for recording, retention, storage, and disclosure.
- Modern office administrative practices and procedures, including filing systems, financial record keeping, reference sources and preparation of correspondence and reports.
- Business letter writing and the standard format for reports and correspondence.
- Techniques for providing a high level of customer service by effectively dealing with the public, vendors, contractors, and LAFCO staff.
- Computer applications related to the work, including word processing, website content management, database, and spreadsheet applications.
- Business mathematics and basic statistical techniques.

Ability to:

- Comprehend and take appropriate notes at LAFCO meetings and public hearings for which the content is varied and complex.
- Maintain impartiality and objectivity in recording conflicting and controversial viewpoints in discussions of sensitive public issues.
- Interpret, evaluate, select, organize, and condense a variety of discussions in order to prepare the official minutes of LAFCO meetings and public hearings.
- Provide administrative and secretarial assistance to management.
- Organize work, set priorities, meet critical deadlines and follow-up on assignments.

- Use initiative and independent judgement within established guidelines.
- Communicate effectively in providing information and assisting elected officials, staff, public, and media.
- Establish and maintain effective working relationships.
- Prepare a variety of financial and database reports, resolutions, correspondence, and other written materials.
- Write proficiently in various established styles and formats using proper English and correct spelling, punctuation, and grammar.
- Organize, maintain, and update office database and records systems.
- Make mathematical calculations with speed and accuracy.
- Operate and maintain modern office equipment, including computer equipment and specialized software applications programs.
- Interpret and apply LAFCO-specific laws and ordinances, office policies and procedures.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS

- Mobility to work in a standard office setting and use standard office equipment, including a computer; to operate a motor vehicle and visit various County sites; primarily a sedentary office classification although standing in work areas and walking between work areas may be required.
- Vision to read printed materials and a computer screen.
- Hearing and speech to communicate in person and over the telephone.
- Finger dexterity is needed to access, enter, and retrieve data using a computer keyboard or calculator and to operate standard office equipment.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

- Office environment with moderate noise levels, controlled temperature conditions, and no direct exposure to hazardous physical substances.
- Employees may interact with upset staff and/or public and private representatives in interpreting and administering departmental policies and procedures.

LAFCO EXECUTIVE OFFICER

DEFINITION

Under policy direction of the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of Santa Clara County, plans, organizes, directs, and coordinates the activities of the LAFCO program; provides leadership, policy guidance, strategic direction and day-to-day management of LAFCO; fosters cooperative working relationships with the Commission, the County of Santa Clara, cities and special districts, the public and other entities; and performs other related duties as assigned.

DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS

This is a single position executive classification that is appointed by the Commission. The LAFCO Executive Officer reports directly to the Commission and performs all duties necessary for the proper and efficient management of LAFCO as determined by the Commission and State law. The incumbent has full management responsibility for the Santa Clara County LAFCO program and is the liaison between the LAFCO Commission and the general public, and other governmental agencies including the County, special districts, cities and other regional and state agencies.

The LAFCO Executive Officer differs from the LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer in that the LAFCO Executive Officer is responsible for all functions and activities of the LAFCO program. The LAFCO Executive Officer takes policy direction from the Commission and reports to the County Executive's Office on personnel and administrative matters.

TYPICAL TASKS

- Plans, organizes, and administers, either directly or through management staff, the receiving, processing, and analyzing of applications and petitions for LAFCO action.
- Directs and coordinates the development and implementation goals, policies, and work programs subject to LAFCO review and approval implements policies and procedures for carrying out functions of the program and evaluates programs and procedures for overall effectiveness.
- Monitors changes in laws, regulations, and technology that may affect LAFCO operations; implements policy and procedural changes as required.
- Represents LAFCO in meetings with governmental agencies, community groups, and various business, regulatory and legislative organizations; establishes and cultivates relationships with LAFCO stakeholders; acts as the LAFCO liaison with the media.
- Directs studies, reviews staff reports and makes recommendations on proposals submitted to LAFCO involving jurisdictional/boundary changes for cities or special districts.
- Directs special studies such as Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence studies involving inter-jurisdictional or inter-agency coordination.
- Defines personnel resource needs and allocates them as required to reach program objectives; oversees the selection, training, professional development, and performance evaluation of staff; and directs and evaluates the work of subordinate staff and consultants.

- Creates contracts to hire consultants; responsible for effective management of contracts to ensure that products are delivered.
- Oversees the preparation of the annual budget for LAFCO; authorizes directly or through staff, expenditures, and purchases; provides information regarding the financial condition and needs to the Commission.
- Ensures that the Commission is kept informed of LAFCO functions, activities, and financial status, and of legal, social and economic issues affecting LAFCO activities.
- Keeps abreast of new trends and developments related to LAFCO's activities, rules and regulations and actively participates in LAFCO-related organizations and professional associations.
- Performs related duties as required.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS

Any combination of training and experience that would provide the required knowledge, skills, and abilities is qualifying. A typical way to obtain the required qualifications would be:

Equivalent to a bachelor's degree in public administration, city and regional planning or closely related field AND seven (7) years of professional land use planning or administering a public program or related experience, including supervisory, management or administrative experience that demonstrates the ability to perform the typical tasks. A master's degree in public administration or city and regional planning may be substituted for two (2) years of the required experience. A master's degree in a closely related field may be substituted for one (1) year of the required experience.

LAFCO work experience or working in a professional capacity in city or county planning or public administration is highly desirable.

Possession of a valid California Driver's License prior to appointment and the ability to qualify for a County Driver's Permit.

Knowledge of:

- LAFCO laws, practices, and procedures, and federal, state, and local laws and guidelines related to environmental protection.
- Public administration and financing and functions of counties, cities, and special districts.
- Principles of organization and administrative, fiscal and program management.
- Urban and regional planning principles, practices, and techniques.
- Administrative principles, practices, and methods including goal setting, program development, implementation and evaluation, policy and procedure development, quality control, and work standards.
- Principles and practices of employee supervision, including work planning, assignment review and evaluation, discipline, and the training of staff in work procedures.
- Principles and practices of budget development and administration.
- Principles and practices of contract administration and evaluation.
- Principles and techniques for working with groups and fostering effective team interaction to ensure teamwork is conducted smoothly.
- Techniques for providing a high level of customer service and for effectively dealing with the public, local agency staff, and other entities.
- Computer applications relevant to the work performed and communication tools used for business functions and program, project, and task coordination.
- Communication techniques required for gathering, evaluating and transmitting information.
- Public outreach methods and procedures.

Ability to:

- Develop and implement goals, objectives, practices, policies, procedures, and work standards.
- Provide administrative, management, and professional leadership for the LAFCO.
- Understand, interpret, and apply all pertinent laws, codes, regulations, policies and procedures, and standards relevant to work performed.
- Develop creative and practical solutions to complex problems.
- Select and supervise staff, provide training and development opportunities, ensure work is performed effectively, and evaluate performance in an objective and positive manner.
- Effectively represent the agency in meetings with governmental agencies; community groups; various business, professional, and regulatory organizations; and in meetings with individuals.
- Use tact, initiative, prudence, and independent judgment within general legal, policy, and procedural guidelines.
- Organize public hearings and speak effectively in public.
- Establish, maintain, and foster positive and effective working relationships with those contacted in the course of work.
- Communicate clearly and concisely, both orally and in writing.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS

- Mobility to work in a standard office setting and use standard office equipment, including a computer; to operate a motor vehicle and visit various County sites; primarily a sedentary office classification although standing in work areas and walking between work areas may be required.
- Vision to read printed materials and a computer screen.
- Hearing and speech to communicate in person and over the telephone.
- Finger dexterity is needed to access, enter, and retrieve data using a computer keyboard or calculator and to operate standard office equipment.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

- Office environment with moderate noise levels, controlled temperature conditions, and no direct exposure to hazardous physical substances.
- Employees may interact with upset staff and/or public and private representatives in interpreting and administering departmental policies and procedures.



Appendix VI

Recommended Position Allocations

Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
 Recommended Allocations
 February, 2020

Last Name	First Name	Current Title	Recommended Title	Action
Abello	Emmanuel	LAFCO Office Specialist	LAFCO Associate Analyst	Reclassification
Noel	Dunia	LAFCO Analyst	LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer	Reclassification
Palacherla	Neelima	LAFCO Executive Officer	LAFCO Executive Officer	No Change
Rajagopalan	Lakshmi	LAFCO Analyst	LAFCO Analyst II	Title Change

No Change
Title Change
Reclassification



Appendix VII

ERI Geographic Assessor Methodology

Methodology

The Geographic Assessor® & Pay Survey

ERI Economic Research Institute was founded over 25 years ago to provide compensation applications for private and public organizations. ERI's applications are available to management, analysts and consultants and are now widely used by client organizations. Subscribers include corporate compensation, relocation, human resources, and other professionals, as well as independent consultants and counselors, and US and Canadian public sector administrators (including military, law enforcement, city/county, state/provincial, and federal government pay administrators).

ERI compiles the most robust salary, cost-of-living, and executive compensation survey data available, with current market data for more than 1,000 industry sectors. The majority of the Fortune 500 and thousands of other small and medium sized organizations rely on ERI data and analytics for compensation and salary planning, relocations, disability determinations, board presentations, and setting branch office salary structures in the United States, Canada, and worldwide.

ERI is a leader in the collection, and analysis of compensation, occupation, and cost-of-living data. All data are employer-provided and come from a variety of sources. Survey data are collected through internally conducted salary surveys and the purchase of third party salary surveys. Additional data are gathered through the digitization of Proxy and 10-K data and Freedom of Information Requests in the US. Compensation data are compiled in terms of mean and median salaries for jobs of similar duties, responsibilities, skills, and functions through an extensive job matching process. **ERI** produces surveys and application analyses by which managers, advisors, and Boards of Directors may make recommendations and/or decisions. **ERI** does not provide fee-for-service consulting; our sole focus is providing valid and reliable information to our subscribers.

Overview

The **Geographic Assessor & Pay Survey** application and databases present in-depth time series regression analyses of base salary and wage differences among and between different cities and areas. ERI researchers have utilized these regression techniques for decades, the difference from the original publication being the extent and quality of survey data that are available today. Geographic cost of labor regressions represent analyses of the demand and supply of labor (as opposed to cost-of-living's reflection of the demand and supply of goods and services). ERI has been collecting and analyzing salary surveys since its founding; over 20 million position incumbents' data are now included in ERI's survey databases. For those interested, we refer the reader to ERI's founder's original published article on this subject:

Thomsen, D. J. (1974). Geographic Differentials in Salaries Within The United States, *Personnel Journal*, 53, 9, 670-4.

Salary/Wage Differentials

The **Geographic Assessor & Pay Survey** application is an easy-to-use program that aids with the assessment of branch location wage and salary competitiveness and the setting of salary structures. ERI's **Geographic Assessor & Pay Survey** application calculates wage and salary differentials between any of over 7,300 North American cities and almost 1,300 European cities.

Cost-of-Living Analyses

The **Geographic Assessor & Pay Survey** application and databases presents cursory cost-of-living information. This information is limited to renters' spending patterns and is intended to provide only a first look at the relative buying power of wages/salaries in different areas. ERI recommends using salary differentials for salary structure adjustments; however, the Geographic Assessor does report summary cost-of-living differentials to develop a more comprehensive picture of a location (or potentially for use in conjunction with the salary differentials).

Statistical Methodology

The **Geographic Assessor & Pay Survey** application consists of linear regression analyses programs. Eight trend lines are created for any area. Local area salary data are compared to the corresponding national salary by job or job family to create a series of differentials per area. A sample of these differentials by job or job family is displayed on the Graphs tab. To create a single differential across jobs (one that can vary by salary level), the average, conditional on salary level, is computed via a simple linear regression (the regression line is also displayed on the Graphs tab). Since these differentials vary both by salary and salary structure, a separate regression is performed for each salary structure. The user only needs to input the salary level for the base location; the program automatically assigns the structure based on the ranges below and returns the corresponding differential.

Structures

These regression equations are expressed in terms of “structures,” as follows:

Wage Earner Structure	Min - 24,000
Low Salary Structure	24,000 -36,000
Mid Salary Structure	36,000 - 48,000
High Salary Structure	48,000 - 72,000
Management Salary Structure	72,000 - 108,000
Executive-1 Structure	108,000 - 144,000
Executive-2 Structure	144,000 - 192,000
Executive-3 Structure	192,000+

The Wage/Salary area structures are the formulae resulting from ERI's regression analyses of all available data for the area. The program will automatically assign the correct structures by city on the Two City Comparison table, the Comparison List table, and the Graphs table.

Sources

Data used in the cost-of-labor calculations come from salary survey sources. **ERI** collects available salary survey data for jobs and areas; evaluates survey data for validity and reliability; and compiles mean and median salaries for positions with similar duties, responsibilities, skills, and functions. Because ERI has decades of experience collecting and evaluating salary data, we have refined methods for validating both the source data and results.

Selected FAQs

Who uses the Geographic Assessor application and databases? How do they use it and how should I?

Companies setting salary structures, who pay different rates in different locations, use it. Branch pay differentials allow you to take advantage of the differing labor markets to minimize operating costs while maintaining the ability to attract, retain, and motivate employees in each area. Most often, companies use the labor cost differentials reported by the **Geographic Assessor** to make data-based decisions and manage complexity by adjusting existing structures based on local labor cost differentials or, when the differentials are sufficiently large, to develop new structures. Companies also use the labor cost differentials to research general overall labor cost differences associated with opening new branch offices. In addition to using the **Geographic Assessor** with salary structures, there are other uses of labor cost differentials, such as to adjust salary survey results directly, say from state or region to the national equivalent (or the inverse) when data at the desired geographic level or area is not directly available.

While these are all valid uses of labor cost differentials per se, each planning situation is different. So it is important to keep in mind the current planning context such as consistency with prior methods, compensation philosophy, and organizational culture, and so on when deciding how to best leverage the differentials reported. We at ERI are happy to answer questions on the data and general uses, but we do not do consulting.

In terms of specific users, a number of voluntary subscriber disclosures about reliance on ERI data are cited in customer testimonials (see <http://www.erieri.com/testimonials>) and corporate proxies (<http://www.erieri.com/ExecutiveCompensationProxyData>) and periodically appear in other authorized releases or public declarations. While ERI does not release listings of the names of its subscribers ERI has thousands of subscribers, including the majority of the Fortune 500 and several large government agencies. Subscribers include corporate compensation, relocation, and human resources specialists, plus other professionals, as well as independent consultants and counselors, and US and Canadian public sector administrators (including military, law enforcement, city/county, state/provincial, and federal government pay administrators).

A quick search of professional compensation forums will often return examples of uses of the **Geographic Assessor** in practice, like this anonymous posting:

“In the last 3 organizations where I have worked, we used data from national surveys and applied geographical differentials to the survey data to create our salary ranges. We considered the national survey data to be 100%. We would then use the geographical differentials ([+] or -) from ERI and applied that to the survey data for each of the cities where we had offices.”

Where do the numbers for salaries and wages come from?

Since its founding, ERI's methodology has been designed so as to be a premier provider of quality information and survey data. All salary surveys sources for jobs have been carefully evaluated for validity, reliability, and use. Unreliable data sources and questionable data are identified and excluded from ERI's analysis. Many of ERI's **Assessor Series** applications (including the **Geographic Assessor**) look at trends over time and multiple sources, allowing for a more thorough validation process than could be established using a single source or at a single point in time.

ERI methodology has evolved over the decades in our pursuit of the highest quality standards in our expanded offering of products. During this time, ERI has won the patent for online interactive salary surveys and managed that patented survey for over a decade, built trusting relationships where we exchange data and products with other survey firms, and contracted for leased proprietary datasets. ERI has also developed its series of traditional salary surveys to become a leader in both online data collection and traditional salary survey methodologies.

Where do the numbers for cost of living come from?

ERI collects, compiles, and analyzes data relating to cost of living from available sources and researches areas which are not commonly surveyed individually. ERI compiles actual housing sales data from commercially available sources. Gasoline, consumables, medical care premium costs, and effective income tax rates are also just as accurately collected from authoritative online databases, and ERI research staff audit these sources with additional detailed study.

Why does the Geographic Assessor's Two City Comparison profile 'renter only' analyses?

Too many variables affect a home ownership analysis for ERI to make an appropriate set of assumptions for a cost-of-living comparison based solely on inputted earnings levels. However, the **Relocation Assessor** application and databases are designed to allow you to input the many additional variables (down payment and interest rate information, for example) that affect a home ownership comparison.

Why do the differentials change at different base salary values?

The **Geographic Assessor** analyses illustrate that salary differentials are not constant for an area. That is, a single number is not sufficient to describe the relationship between geography and pay across all salary levels. To account for this variation, the **Geographic Assessor** uses regression analyses to report the most accurate differential as salary level changes.

What is the difference between cost-of-living and geographic pay differentials?

A more complete differentiation can be found in Help under Assessor Series FAQ #3, but this question arises often enough that an abbreviated response should be included here. Put simply, wage and salary differentials reflect the local demand for and supply of labor, whereas cost of living is dictated by the local demand for and supply of goods and services. Because different factors affect the supply and demand of labor than affect the market basket of goods (the basis of cost of living), these two differentials will not, in most cases, be the same. Research has shown they often do move in the same direction, but not always. Take the case where there is a net increase in workers due to migration. The increase in labor supply could put downward pressure on the labor differential while putting upward pressure on housing costs, thereby increasing cost of living. Even when the differentials are in the same direction, the magnitudes can be very different. In urban centers, for example, both types of differentials are often higher; but, since workers can commute from areas with less expensive housing, the COL differentials tend to be much higher than the labor differentials in these cases.

Besides the underlying difference in the supply and demand, another reason why users focus on cost of labor differentials is that cost-of-labor differentials often more closely correspond to the labor market scope of the salary structure. In other words, COL can vary greatly from neighborhood to neighborhood within the same city, but companies would not restrict the recruitment labor market to a single neighborhood.

While employees may find it more desirable for their pay to be adjusted for local cost-of-living variances, this is an extremely unusual practice, and in many cases will not be cost effective for the employer. That is, in many cases, the employer would be competing against organizations with relatively lower compensation costs and, thus, be at a competitive disadvantage. Most compensation professionals agree that, when a company is hiring from the local work force (that is, when no transfer or relocation occurs), wages and salaries are set according to market pricing of wages and salaries only. In a recent informal polling of webinar attendees, most used salary differentials when adjusting salary structures, while a much smaller subset used both types in conjunction (perhaps where required). None used cost of living exclusively. While the cost-of-labor differentials are best utilized when adjusting pay structures (as the underlying data are congruent), in practice, there may be other contextual factors such as compensation philosophy or contractual requirements that need to be considered.

The program allows me to easily compute cross-country comparisons, but are such comparisons valid?

The cross-country comparisons are statistically valid; however, it is not advisable to take a pay system from, say, the United States and try to adjust it for a Canadian branch office using the general geographic differentials because U.S. and Canadian economies value jobs quite differently (as do most international economies). It is important to review pay by job and job description, rather than by general salary level. Cross-country comparisons, however, can give some general insight into labor cost differences where such information may be difficult to obtain otherwise.

Reliability Statistics - A Note for Expert Witnesses

In 1975, the US Congress passed Federal Rule of Evidence 702 so that a threshold standard for the admission of expert witness testimony might exist in federal courts. Based on the concept that experts should use methodologies that are “generally accepted” by a discipline's practitioners, the rule states: “If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, may testify thereto in the form of an opinion or otherwise.” Following this, the Supreme Court issued an opinion in *Daubert v. Merrill-Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 509 U.S. 579, 113 S. Ct. 2786, 125 L.Ed.2d 469 (1993) that has become the standard for the admission of “general acceptance”. In this Case (which standard is now adopted by federal and most state courts), the admittance of expert witness testimony and evidence required a two-step analysis: A) Evidence must be relevant, and B) Evidence must be reliable. The “relevance” is a subjective judgment, but simple logic may be applied (salary survey data for use in labor cost differentials, proxy compensation data for use in maximum reasonable compensation cases, etc.) For the latter, “reliability”, the Supreme Court established four separate, non-exclusive tests: 1) it can be illustrated that the theory or technique can be tested, 2) the data has

been subjected to peer review and publication, 3) there is a known or potential rate of error, and (4) there a level of general acceptance in that particular discipline's community.

ERI Statement as to the Relevance and Reliability of Data

Relevance is totally determinable by the circumstances and situation presented. **ERI** provides outsourced analyses and presentations of salary, executive compensation, benefit, and cost-of-living survey data. Reliability is described in a four part, non-exclusive summary to match the Daubert challenge:

Testable

To illustrate how the technique can be tested is straightforward. The technique and data sources are described in this methodology, and replicating the results is a matter of performing similar regressions through similar salary data. Using smaller data samples will likely give similar, albeit less robust and comprehensive, results.

Subject to Publication and Peer Review

Assessor Series application databases are published on a quarterly basis. Unique monthly Internet visits now exceed 500,000 to <http://www.erieri.com> and related sites, with approximately five million unique visitors each year. **ERI's** peers are its competitors, those firms that also provide data analyses to their clients. Unlike **ERI**, that solicits an annual subscription, most compensation and benefits consulting firms charge an hourly rate for their research services. Suffice it to say, all the major consulting firms have purchased subscriptions so that their consultants could utilize **ERI** analyses. **ERI** data are used by these firms when consulting with their clients.. **ERI** data and analyzes are under constant review and critique by its competitors. **ERI**, unlike these firms, provides no fee-for-service/time consulting.

Known or Potential Rate of Error

Each **Assessor Series** application database illustrates, via a "Reliability Statistics" link, the beginning of a statistical overview of ERI data. Statistics are reported as derived from just one survey source for all salary and compensation presentations (so that copyright restrictions are not violated). **ERI** accumulates many survey sources to compile its analyses. Hence the data illustrated may be, in ERI's estimate, considered to be the highest possible standard error that might exist with each analysis. **Assessor Series** application database results are, by logic, more robust than the standard error displayed and reported.

General Level of Acceptance within the Discipline's Community

ERI has thousands of subscribers, including the majority of the Fortune 500 and several large government agencies. Many of these organizations are entering their third decade of being subscribers. **ERI** exhibits at major tradeshows. ERI data are used as source data by major publications and job boards. WorldatWork, NASBA, and HRCI accept ERI Distance Learning Center courses for professional maintenance and recertification continuing education credit. Major US employers rely upon ERI data as cited in corporate proxy filings (see <http://www.erieri.com/ExecutiveCompensationProxyData>).

ERI Economic Research Institute is a licensed user of postal code and latitude and longitude data from the United States Postal Service (USPS). Canadian Postal Codes are adapted from Statistics Canada Postal Code^{OM} Conversion (2013) which is based on data licensed from Canada Post Corporation. Contains data adapted from Statistics Canada, National Household Survey, 2011. This does not constitute an endorsement by Statistics Canada of this product. Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2017. Contains Royal Mail data © Royal Mail copyright and database right 2017. Contains National Statistics data © Crown copyright and database right 2017.

ERI Economic Research Institute

111 Academy Drive, Suite 270, Irvine, CA, 92617 USA

Telephone (800) 627-3697

Email info.eri@erieri.com

<http://www.erieri.com>

Assessor Series application and database access by license agreement only.

**Copyright © 1989-2017 ERI Economic Research Institute, Inc.
Patent Nos. 6,862,596 and 7,647,322**



Appendix VIII

Orange County LAFCO Bylaws, Policies and Procedures
Section 3.6 Performance Management



Bylaws, Policies and
Procedures

2019

3.6 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

A. Overview

The intent of the performance review process is to create a supportive, safe, professional performance review process and environment that optimizes the employee's ability to receive and actualize constructive performance feedback and that motivates the employee to authentically and actively pursue personal and professional growth/excellence.

B. Performance Review Policy – General Employees

A review and discussion of each employee's performance is conducted to:

- Ensure assigned projects/tasks are completed at an acceptable level of quality to effectively serve the mission, vision, and values of the agency.
- Plan for maximizing employee performance to serve the agency's needs.
- Motivate and assist employees in achieving their personal growth and career objectives.

C. Performance Review Procedure – General Employees

The discussion of job performance and goals on an informal, weekly basis is strongly encouraged. The formal employee performance review process will include:

- Assessment of Employee Job Performance - At the beginning of the fiscal year, both the employee and supervisor will complete an assessment of his/her job performance. The assessment will include a summary of projects/tasks completed and a well-organized, clear and in-depth self-analysis of job performance as related to projects/tasks.
- Assessment of Employee Professional Strengths and Weaknesses - Both employee and supervisor will prepare an individual written statement of employee's professional and personal strengths and weaknesses as they relate to the work environment.
- Discussion of Employee Assessments
Following preparation of the assessments (job performance and professional strengths and weaknesses), a meeting will be convened with the employee/supervisor to compare, contrast and discuss assessments/statements and identify areas for goal setting.
- Development of Discussion of Goals
Based upon discussion with supervisor, employee prepares draft annual goals for discussion and review with the Assistant Executive Officer and/or Executive Officer. Goals should be specific, concise, measurable and represent commitment to professional growth.

- Finalization of Goals and Performance Review

Following goal development, a meeting will be convened involving employee/Assistant Executive Officer/Executive Officer to jointly discuss and finalize employee goals. The employee will be responsible for preparing the final, agreed to written goals and submitting them to supervisor.

Performance reviews will be completed for all General Employees by no later than the end of the first quarter of each fiscal year.

While merit-based pay adjustments are awarded by LAFCO in an effort to recognize truly superior employee performance, positive performance evaluations do not always guarantee increases in salary or promotions. Salary increases, and promotions are solely within the discretion of LAFCO and depend on many factors in addition to performance. Pay increases or bonuses will be tied to the accomplishment of specific established employee goals.

After receiving their review, an employee will be required to sign the evaluation report acknowledging that it has been presented and discussed between the employee and the Assistant Executive Officer or the Executive Officer. LAFCO's provision of performance evaluations does not alter the at will employment relationship.

D. Policy for Executive Officer Performance Evaluation Process (Adopted May 11, 2016)

1. As part of the Strategic Planning process, each year

- a. The Executive Officer will submit a report summarizing the agency's performance against the previous period's past annual work plan.
- b. The Executive Officer will also provide a recommended strategic plan and draft annual work plan for the upcoming period.
- c. The Strategic direction and projects will be prioritized for the upcoming annual work plan at the Annual Strategic Planning workshop.
- d. The Annual work plan will be adopted by the Commission at a Regular meeting.

2. The Executive Officer will complete a self-evaluation indicating his/her performance against the previous period's annual work plan and Agency goals in accordance with the next period's annual work plan. The Executive Officer will also include a professional development plan for the upcoming period. This can be continuous skills training and exposure to new ideas and concepts obtained through seminars, professional association programs, conferences or other educational programs.

3. The Chair will provide each Commissioner the Executive Officer's self-

evaluation and a blank evaluation form for that Commissioner's completion prior to the full Commission closed session performance discussion.

4. The Chair will lead the Commission's closed session discussion on the Executive Officer's performance and professional development goals and the agency goals, soliciting feedback and input from all Commissioners.
5. The Chair will be given financial parameters for negotiating compensation with the Executive Officer and delegated authority to represent the Commission in compensation discussions with the Executive Officer.
6. The Chair will meet with the Executive Officer to provide the Commission's feedback, sentiments of the discussion and to negotiate compensation.
7. The Chair will report back to the Board to close out the Executive Officer Evaluation Process and to prepare any necessary agenda items and public action required to complete the process.
8. The Executive Committee will meet with the Executive Officer quarterly to check on progress to annual work plan, make any necessary adjustments, and bring the annual work plan back to the Commission for consideration.

3.7 PERSONNEL RECORDS

A. Overview

The intent of this policy is to clarify the guidelines for treatment of employee personnel records and information.

B. Policy

Employees have the right to inspect certain documents in their personnel file, as provided by law, in the presence of a LAFCO representative at a mutually convenient time. Employees may add written versions of any disputed item to their file.

LAFCO will attempt to restrict disclosure of an employee's personnel file to authorized individuals within the organization. Any request for information from the file must be made to the Executive Officer or specific designee. Only the Executive Officer or specific designee is authorized to release information regarding current or former employees. Disclosure of personnel information to outside sources will be limited to the extent allowed by law. However, LAFCO will cooperate with requests from authorized law enforcement or local, state or federal agencies conducting official investigations, with validly issued subpoenas and as otherwise required by law or legal proceeding to be released.

AMENDED AND RESTATED MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY
AND THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

This Amended and Restated Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is between the Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County (LAFCO) and the County of Santa Clara (County). The purpose of this agreement is to set forth the terms and conditions upon which the County will provide staffing, facilities and support services to LAFCO.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, since the inception of LAFCO from approximately 1963 to 2001, the County fully funded LAFCO including furnishing the Commission with the necessary quarters, equipment, supplies and staffing from the Offices of the County Executive, County Counsel, County Clerk, County Surveyor, and the County Planning Department; and

WHEREAS, new legislation has been passed effective January 1, 2001, which requires LAFCOs to be independent bodies and to contract for personnel and facilities (Government Code sections 56380 and 56384); and

WHEREAS, on February 6, 2001, the LAFCO and the County entered into an interim MOU to allow for the continuation for the current staffing levels and office arrangement through June 30, 2001 to assist LAFCO during the transition to independent operation; and

WHEREAS, on June 5, 2001, the LAFCO and the County executed a formal Memorandum of Understanding outlining the terms and provisions for the continuation of the services by the County to LAFCO, that became effective on July 1, 2001, and

WHEREAS, County is willing and able to provide and LAFCO with its own budget is willing and able to retain personnel and services to fulfill LAFCO's goal of independent staffing and autonomy under the terms and conditions set forth herein; and

WHEREAS, both County and LAFCO recognize and acknowledge that although the County shall pursuant to this MOU provide staffing, space and services to LAFCO, LAFCO is an independent agency and the County shall have no ability to control or influence any LAFCO action or staff recommendation; and

WHEREAS, LAFCO will reimburse the cost for services provided by the County, and

WHEREAS, several changes over the years necessitate an amendment of the MOU.

Approved: 11/05/2013

The parties therefore agree as follows.

1. EFFECTIVE DATE

The effective date of this MOU shall be November 5, 2013 ("Effective Date"). It shall expire when terminated pursuant to Section 5 ("TERM AND TERMINATION") below. On the Effective Date of this MOU, the earlier Memorandum of Understanding effective October 21, 2010 shall be terminated.

2. STAFFING

2.1 LAFCO EXECUTIVE OFFICER SERVICES

The County Executive's Office shall designate a full-time unique classified code entitled LAFCO Executive Officer to the position. The position shall be subject to all normal labor contract provisions, Merit System Rules, County ordinances and County policies as applicable. The County shall recruit the LAFCO Executive Officer through the County's standard process, however, candidates may be interviewed by LAFCO and final selection shall be subject to LAFCO approval. The LAFCO Executive Officer shall perform the duties as specified in the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act and shall do and perform all functions necessary or advisable to manage and conduct the business of LAFCO. The LAFCO Executive Officer shall work at the direction of LAFCO and shall report directly to LAFCO on all Commission matters. The LAFCO Executive Officer shall report to the County Executive's Office on all personnel and administrative matters. Should a conflict arise between the LAFCO Executive Officer's duties as a County employee and duties as the LAFCO Executive Officer, the LAFCO Executive Officer shall promptly advise the County Executive's Office and LAFCO of the issue so that it may be resolved by the two entities. The County Executive's Office shall notify LAFCO at least ninety (90) days prior to the termination of the LAFCO Executive Officer's bargaining unit contract to allow LAFCO to timely submit requests for review of compensation and classification. During this period, LAFCO may request that the County Executive's Office review the LAFCO Executive Officer's compensation and classification to determine that they are appropriate for the position. Should the County undertake a classification study for the LAFCO Executive Officer's position, the County's Employee Service Agency ("ESA") will consult with the LAFCO Finance Committee. In conjunction with a representative of the County, the LAFCO Chair and the LAFCO Finance Committee shall establish annual performance objectives for the LAFCO Executive Officer. The LAFCO Chair and the LAFCO Finance Committee shall annually evaluate the performance of the LAFCO Executive Officer against the performance objectives established. The County Executive's Office shall consider input from LAFCO in the formal County performance evaluation of the LAFCO Executive Officer.

2.2 LAFCO ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER SERVICES

The County Executive's Office shall designate a full-time unique classified code entitled LAFCO Analyst, serving as LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer. The position shall be subject to all normal labor contract provisions, Merit System Rules, County Ordinances and County policies as applicable. The LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer shall be recruited through the County's standard process, but final candidates shall be interviewed with approval for hiring by the LAFCO Executive Officer. The LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer shall take work assignments and direction from the LAFCO Executive Officer and may serve as the LAFCO Executive Officer in his/her absence. The LAFCO Executive Officer shall have full supervisory responsibility over the LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer.

The County Executive's Office shall notify LAFCO at least ninety (90) days prior to the termination of the LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer's bargaining unit contract to allow LAFCO to timely submit requests for review of compensation and classification. During this period, LAFCO may request that the County Executive's Office review the LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer's compensation and classification to determine that they are appropriate for the position. Should the County undertake a classification study for the LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer position, ESA will consult with the LAFCO Finance Committee.

2.3. LAFCO CLERK SERVICES

The County Executive's Office shall designate a full-time unique classified code entitled LAFCO Office Specialist as the LAFCO Clerk. The position shall be subject to all normal labor contract provisions, Merit System Rules, County Ordinances and County policies as applicable. The LAFCO Clerk shall be recruited through the County's standard process, but final candidates shall be interviewed with approval for hiring by the LAFCO Executive Officer. The LAFCO Clerk shall take all workload direction from the LAFCO Executive Officer and the LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer.

The County Executive's Office shall notify LAFCO at least ninety (90) days prior to the termination of the LAFCO Clerk's bargaining unit contract to allow LAFCO to timely submit requests for review of compensation and classification. During this period, LAFCO may request that the County Executive's Office review the LAFCO Clerk's compensation and classification to determine that they are appropriate for the position. Should the County undertake a classification study for the LAFCO Clerk's position, ESA will consult with the LAFCO Finance Committee.

2.4 LAFCO SURVEYOR SERVICES

The County Surveyor shall provide services to LAFCO on an as needed basis to check maps and legal descriptions, to maintain jurisdictional boundaries, and to staff LAFCO meetings. Services shall be invoiced at the surveyor's intra-county hourly rate updated annually and billed directly to LAFCO on a quarterly basis via intra county payment voucher.

3. SERVICES

County shall provide the following services to LAFCO. LAFCO will be subject to the normal County administrative fees / costs charged in consideration for these services either directly or through the County's then-current Cost Allocation Plan.

3.1 ACCOUNTING AND BANKING SERVICES

The County Controller-Treasurer Department shall provide all banking and accounting services for LAFCO. Interest earned on LAFCO funds, shall be based on LAFCO's average daily cash balance in the Treasury and on the Treasury's pooled earnings rate net of administrative costs. Such interest earnings shall be calculated and paid quarterly into the LAFCO account. The Controller shall provide accounting and reporting on both budget and actual transactions. Additionally, the Controller shall use the final budget as provided by LAFCO to determine the cities' and the County's share of costs. The Controller shall bill and collect payments from the cities and the County, depositing these payments to LAFCO's account in the County Treasury.

3.2 OFFICE SPACE, EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

The County shall provide space suitable for LAFCO offices. The County shall allow the use of the County Board Chambers and other meeting rooms for Commission / staff meetings, subject to availability. County shall provide purchasing services for LAFCO, including solicitation and evaluation of proposals for goods and services, issuance of purchase orders and/or development of purchase agreements, and processing of payment upon receipt of the purchased goods/services.

3.3 PERSONNEL SERVICES

The County shall provide personnel services including recruitment, advertising, screening of applications, and development of hiring lists. The County shall provide payroll, benefits coordination and administration services and Labor Relations services.

3.4 GENERAL COMPUTER MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES

The County shall provide technical assistance in setting up computers, networking, and Internet access services, including but not limited to, continued connection to the County computer network. These services shall be charged on an hourly basis at the Information Services Department's intra-county hourly rate established annually. These charges shall be invoiced and billed directly to LAFCO via the intra-county payment voucher on a quarterly basis.

3.5 PHONE SYSTEMS

The County shall provide connection to the County phone system and voice mail.

3.6 GIS SERVICES

The County shall provide access to the County Planning Office's GIS server and the data layers maintained by the Planning Office.

3.7 SUPPORT FUNCTIONS

All other support / administrative functions of a type currently provided to LAFCO or required to be provided by law.

4. TERM AND TERMINATION

This MOU may be terminated without cause at the end of each fiscal year by provision of written notice by the terminating party to the other party no later than five months before the end of the fiscal year.

In addition, this MOU may be terminated for cause upon 10 days written notice by the terminating party to the other party.

In the event that this MOU is terminated pursuant to the provisions of this Section, LAFCO shall pay the County the pro rata amount for services provided up to the date of the termination of this Agreement.

5. GENERAL PROVISIONS

5.1 SIGNATURES

LAFCO hereby authorizes the Executive Officer or, his/her designee, to execute any documents to implement this MOU. The Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes the County Executive or his/her designee to execute any documents to implement this MOU.

5.2 ASSIGNMENT

Neither party may assign this MOU, nor any interest therein, without the other party's written consent.

5.3 NOTICES

All notices, demands and correspondence required or provided for under this MOU shall be in writing and delivered in person or dispatched by certified mail,

postage prepaid, to the address below. Notice of any change of address shall be provided in the manner set forth above and delivered to the other party.

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA:

County Executive
County of Santa Clara
70 W. Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95110

LAFCO:

LAFCO Executive Officer
LAFCO of Santa Clara County
70 W. Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95110

5.4 SEVERABILITY

The parties hereto agree that the provisions are severable. If any provision of this MOU is held invalid, the remainder of this MOU shall be effective and shall remain in full force and effect unless amended or modified by mutual written consent of the parties.

5.5 ENTIRE AGREEMENT, WAIVERS AND AMENDMENTS

This MOU constitutes the entire understanding and agreement of the parties. This MOU integrates all of the terms and conditions mentioned herein or incidental hereto, and supersedes all negotiation or previous agreements between the parties with respect to all or any part of the subject matter hereof. All waivers of or amendments to the provisions of this MOU must be in writing and signed by the appropriate authorities of LAFCO or of the County.


5.6 MUTUAL INDEMNIFICATION

In lieu of and notwithstanding the pro rata risk allocation which might otherwise be imposed between the Parties pursuant to Government Code Section 895.6, the Parties agree that all losses or liabilities incurred by a party shall not be shared pro rata but instead the County and LAFCO agree that pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, each party hereto ("indemnifying party") shall fully indemnify and hold the other party, their officers, board/commission members, employees and agents, harmless from any claim, expense or cost, damage or liability imposed for injury (as defined by Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of the negligent acts or omissions or willful misconduct of the indemnifying party, its officers, employees or agents, under or in connection with or arising out of any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to such party under this MOU. No party, nor any officer, board/commission member, employee or agent thereof shall be responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of the negligent acts or omissions or willful misconduct of the other party hereto, its officers, board members, employees or

agents, under or in connection with or arising out of any work authority or jurisdiction delegated to such other party under this MOU.


IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Memorandum of Understanding effective as of November 5, 2013.

LAFCO of Santa Clara County




MIKE WASSERMAN
Chairperson, LAFCO
Date: 10/2/2013

ATTEST:




Emmanuel Abello, Clerk
Local Agency Formation Commission

Approved as to Form:



Mala Subramanian, LAFCO Counsel


COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA



KEN YEAGER
President, Board of Supervisors
Date: NOV 05 2013

Signed and Certified that a copy of this document has been delivered by electronic or other means to the President, Board of Supervisors.

Attest:



Lynn Regadan, Clerk
Board of Supervisors

Approved as to Form and Legality:



Nancy Clark, Deputy County Counsel

