



CUPERTINO

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

CITY HALL

10300 TORRE AVENUE • CUPERTINO, CA 95014-3202

(408) 777-3212 • FAX (408) 777-3366

August 24, 2010

The Honorable Jamie Jacobs-May
Presiding Judge
Santa Clara County Superior Court
191 North First Street
San Jose, CA 95113

FILED

AUG 30 2010

DAVID H. YAMASAKI
Chief Executive Officer/Clerk,
Superior Court of CA County of Santa Clara
BY D. ALDYCKI

RE: Grand Jury: Cities Must Rein In Unsustainable Employee Costs

Dear Honorable Judge Jacobs-May:

The City of Cupertino received the above Grand Jury report dated May 26, 2010 and has set forth our responses in Attachment A. We agree with all its applicable findings and have responded to all applicable recommendations. We also agree that all governmental agencies need to operate under a sustainable salary and benefit plan for its employees and appreciate the Grand Jury's efforts in this regard.

In conjunction with your efforts to address this issue for our entire county, we ask that the Grand Jury:

- Encourage CalPERS to offer additional plans that extend retirement age options out to 60, 62 and 65, and
- Recommend that CalPERS investment guidelines be re-visited to prevent or limit high risk investments that have contributed to wide rate-of-return fluctuations.

Finally, please correct an error in the report (page 4) which states that the City of Cupertino's median total compensation cost per full-time equivalent for regular (non-safety) employees is \$132,982. This number should be \$103,080 (see Attachment B).

Thank you for our consideration of the above and restatement of our information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kris Wang".
Kris Wang
Mayor

ATTACHMENT A

Finding 1:

The cost of total compensation for employees has grown substantially in the past decade and now threatens the cities' fiscal stability.

Response 1:

The City of Cupertino (CITY) agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 1:

All of the cities in the County need to implement measures that will control employee costs. As a starting point, each city should determine the percentage of savings required from the total compensation package to reach budget stability, and provide choices of wages and benefits in collective bargaining sessions for the unions to choose to achieve that percentage goal.

Response 1:

The recommendation has been implemented. CITY historically and currently has a balanced budget and a strategic plan to control employee compensation to avoid budget instability. Over the past ten years, CITY has maintained services without layoffs.

Finding 2:

Salary and wage increases do not reflect changes in economic conditions; e.g. even with minimal inflation, yearly COLAs are granted with little bearing on the actual increase in cost of living or market conditions.

Response 2:

CITY agrees with the finding. Cupertino analyzes market conditions and budget constraints, and negotiates with employees on pay increases if these are warranted. In FY2010—2011, a minimal increase of .5% was negotiated although the yearly COLA was over 2%.

Recommendation 2:

Cities should not increase salaries and wages that are not supported by planned revenue increases. Cities should tie COLA increases to clear indicators and retain the ability to adjust or withhold based on current economic data.

Response 2:

The recommendation has been implemented. CITY has assessed expenses and revenues, and offers salary increases commensurate with strategic budget planning and economic indicators.

Finding 3:

Step increases are arbitrary and do not adequately represent an employee's added value to a city. Combined with COLAs, new employees' wages increase quickly and are not necessarily reflective of improved knowledge and skills.

Response 3:

CITY agrees with the finding. CITY's step increases are performance based and tied to evaluations. Employee needs to progress in knowledge and skills.

Recommendation 3:

Cities should negotiate step progressions from the current three and half years to seven years. Employees should not receive COLA increases while in step progression.

Response 3:

The recommendation is not current industry practice, but will be taken under advisement. The subject of pay increases are considered during the collective bargaining process. The feasibility of these combined recommendations will be considered in future negotiations.

Finding 4:

Medical insurance costs for active employees are growing year after year at rates that exceed most cities' revenue growth, while the employee contribution to medical care is minimal.

Response 4:

CITY agrees with the finding. Cupertino has a set dollar amount for the employer's contribution to health benefits and employees pay the annual increases each year. In some cases, this dollar amount has not been adjusted since 2002.

Recommendation 4:

Cities should negotiate that employees assume some of these increased costs for their medical benefits. To contain medical costs cities should consider the following:

- A. Split monthly premiums between the city and the employee and increase the employee's share, if already cost splitting, and remove any employee caps.

Response 4A:

The recommendation has been implemented. CITY cost is fixed. Employee pays annual increases.

- B. Establish reasonable co-pays for doctors' visits, prescription drugs, and in-patient and out-patient hospital care.

Response 4B:

The recommendation has been implemented. CITY purchases medical plan coverage from CalPERS, and CalPERS regulates through its purchasing agreements the co-pays and related costs for medical services. The CITY investigated alternative medical benefit providers through a regional joint powers agreement with a medical benefit broker and found that cost for coverage was more expensive and provided less medical benefits for the employees.

- C. Prohibit an employee from being covered by both city-provided medical benefits and as a dependent of another city employee.

Response 4C:

CITY agrees with the finding. Employee may not have dual coverage with another CalPERS agency, and CalPERS retirement law paragraph 22843 sets forth how family members are covered.

- D. Reduce cash-in-lieu payments.

Response 4D:

The recommendation was implemented in 2005 for all groups.

- E. Introduce a new lower premium, high-deductible medical plan.

Response 4E:

The recommendation has been implemented. CITY purchases medical plan coverage from CalPERS, and CalPERS regulates through its purchasing agreements the co-pays and related costs for medical services. The CITY investigated alternative medical benefit providers through a regional joint powers agreement with a medical benefit broker and found that cost for coverage was more expensive and provided less medical benefits for the employees.

Finding 5:

Pension formula changes instituted in the past decade, stock market losses, the aging “baby boomer” work force, and the growing unfunded pension and OPEB liability all contribute to making retiree pension and health care costs the most problematic and unsustainable expenses the cities are facing. The city contribution to pension plans and OPEBs far exceeds the employee contribution.

Response 5:

CITY agrees with finding.

Recommendation 5a:

Cities should:

- 1) Renegotiate and make provisions for increasing the employee's contribution for current pension plans.
- 2) Renegotiate to stop paying the employees' contribution amount to pension plans.
- 3) Renegotiate to implement a contribution amount for employees to OPEB; this contribution should provide for a reasonable split of costs between a city and the employee for retiree medical and dental benefits.

Response 5a:

The recommendation has been implemented. Recent negotiations resulted in increases for employee's contribution to the current pension plan and reduction of the employer's contribution. Consideration will be given to the feasibility of negotiating the OPEB costs in future negotiations.

Recommendation 5b:

Cities should thoroughly investigate reverting to prior pension formulas that were less costly.

Response 5b:

The recommendation was discussed this year during negotiations and will be addressed in 2012 negotiations.

Recommendation 5c:

To provide a meaningful, long-term solution, the cities should negotiate agreements to:

- 1) Institute a two-tier system for pension and retiree health care for new hires.
- 2) Increase the retirement age from 50 or 55 to 60 or 65.
- 3) Calculate current post-employment health care plans with health savings plan.
- 4) Replace current post-employment health care plans with health savings plans.

Response 5c:

The recommendation will be addressed in 2012 negotiations, especially a tier system with increased retirement age. Consideration will be given to the feasibility of negotiating the health savings plans in the future. In addition, we strongly recommend that the Grand Jury encourage CalPERS to offer more retirement options using age 60, 62 or 65.

Finding 6:

Public sector employees are granted a generous number of holidays, personal days, vacation days and sick leave annually. Rules and limits on accrual vary by city and union, but vacation days and sick leave can be accumulated and converted to cash or calculated into the pension benefit within those limits.

Response 6:

CITY agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 6a:

Cities should renegotiate with the bargaining units to:

- 1) Reduce vacation time.
- 2) Reduce the number of holidays and/or personal days.
- 3) Cap sick leave and eliminate the practice of converting accumulated sick leave to cash or adding into their years of service for inclusion in their retirement benefit.

Response 6a:

Recommendation has not been implemented. CITY will consider the feasibility of this recommendation for future negotiations. All contracts are currently settled.

Recommendation 6b:

Cities should negotiate to substitute paid days off for unpaid days instead of imposing furloughs. For example, reduce paid holidays to major holidays only, consistent with private industry; and convert minor holidays to unpaid. Therefore, the public is not impacted by fewer services caused by furloughs, and the city saves the employee cost.

Response 6b:

Recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. CITY has no furloughs. Public has not lost services.

Finding 7:

Cities traditionally determine their compensation packages by surveying the wages and benefits of other public sector employees in the same geographic area. There is major resistance to comparing themselves or mirroring trends with the private sector. This has allowed wages and benefits to become artificially high and out of sync with market trends.

Response 7:

CITY agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 7a:

Cities should research competitive hiring practices and alter the approach to determine fair wages and benefits for each city by using public and private sector data.

Recommendation 7b:

Cities should renegotiate salaries and wages using valid market comparisons and not only the current wage index. Cities should utilize more market-oriented compensation practices so that salaries can adjust as competition for labor changes. Cities should reduce entry-level compensation for positions for which there are many qualified applicants.

Responses to 7a and 7b:

Recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be considered in preparation for future bargaining sessions. All contracts are currently settled.

Finding 8:

All cities perform certain core functions to run smoothly and provide services to their residents. To reduce employee costs and streamline operations, the cities are in various stages of contracting services to private industry or partnering with other cities, special districts or the County to deliver services.

Response 8:

CITY agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 8a:

Cities should explore outsourcing some functions and services to private industry. Cities should discuss the prospect with cities that are successfully doing this to determine best practices and areas for success. Cities should develop contract with measurable objectives, performance goals, and timelines.

Response 8a:

Recommendation has been implemented. Cupertino is a contract city in the areas of library, Sheriff Services and refuse. Fire and sewer services are performed by a special district and we have leased our water utility to a private company.

Recommendation 8b:

Cities should create partnerships with other cities, special districts and/or the County for services, such as payroll, human resources, animal control, police and fire. Cities should investigate sharing the cost of new information technology systems.

Response 8b:

Recommendation has been implemented. Cupertino is a contract city in the areas of library, Sheriff Services and refuse. Fire and sewer services are performed by a special district and we have leased our water utility to a private company. In addition, we partner with other cities for animal control, disaster preparedness and training.

Finding 9:

Cities can gain operation efficiencies and effectiveness with lower employee costs by making sure they are staffed with the correct numbers of people in the appropriate job classification in all departments and work groups.

Response 9:

CITY agrees with finding.

Recommendation 9:

Cities should analyze the functions performed by all job classifications and make adjustments in the work force. Consolidate functions within the same group or a similar group. Reassign appropriate work to lower paid job classifications. Eliminate unnecessary functions.

Response 9:

Recommendation has been implemented. CITY's on-going practice is to analyze and consolidate positions as they become vacant. CITY also analyzes the cost of labor from outsourcing and from shared services with other agencies, thereby reducing payroll costs.

Finding 10: (Applies to San Jose)**Finding 11:**

In many cities, the contract negotiations process is completed by placing the negotiated collective bargaining agreements on the consent calendar for approval, which is acted on quickly at the start of council meetings by a single motion and vote of the council.

Response 11:

City agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 11:

Cities should consider holding well-publicized public hearings about the cities' goals of negotiations before negotiations begin, and again at the end of negotiations to report to citizens clearly what changes have been made in contracts.

Response 11:

Recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be considered in the future if so determined after further consideration by Council.

Finding 12:

Current contracts were negotiated in good faith by representatives of the cities and the bargaining units; they were approved by the city councils. Promises made to employees were made by elected officials, past and present. Responsibility for formulating and approving solutions to restore the cities' financial stability resides squarely with our elected officials. The economic downturn has placed additional pressure on the situation.

Response 12:

City agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 12a:

City council members and mayors should become better informed about the fiscal realities of their cities, long-term costs and commitments, and be cognizant of potential issues in labor agreements.

Response 12a:

Recommendation has been implemented. City Council is well aware of the fiscal realities and long-term costs and commitments and understands the implications of labor agreements.

Recommendation 12b:

City councils and mayors should direct city administrators to (re) negotiate collective bargaining agreements that reverse the escalation of employer costs through concessions, cost sharing, and a second tier for new employees.

Response 12b:

Recommendation has been implemented.

Recommendation 12c:

City councils and mayors should meet with the bargaining units to clearly outline the cities' financial health and show how employee costs are impacting the budget.

Response 12c:

Recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. Management representatives meet and conferred with Council prior to negotiations and stay within Council directives. The negotiation team clearly outlines the City's financial health at the beginning of negotiations to the Council and all bargaining groups.

Recommendation 12d:

City councils and mayors should inform citizens of their plans for controlling unsustainable employee costs and remove politics from the equation.

Response 12d:

Recommendation has been implemented. This result has occurred during budget study sessions and Council meeting discussions.

Finding 12: (Applies to San Jose)

ATTACHMENT B

CITY OF CUPERTINO

THE FOLLOWING EXCEL SPREADSHEET PROVIDES 2009 GROSS SALARY FOR THE CITY OF CUPERTINO FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS FOR REGULAR NON-SAFETY EMPLOYEES.

THE MEDIUN (MIDDLE) TOTAL COMPENSATION COST IS CALCULATED ON PAGE 5 OF THIS SCHEDULE. IN SUMMARY,

Median Gross Salary = employee #79, Susan Winslow.	\$71,089.44
Fully loaded benefit multiplier	<u>x 1.45%</u>
Median Salary and Benefits - 2009, City of Cupertino	<u><u>\$103,080.00</u></u>

LAST, FIRST NAME	CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT	BASE PAY	OVERTIME	OTHER PAY	2009 GROSS
MILLER, ATHENA G	SR. OFFICE ASSISTANT	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 9,084.06	\$ -	\$ 1,976.50	\$ 11,060.56
HETLAND, JOHN B	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 18,047.00	\$ 46.59	\$ 447.02	\$ 18,540.61
HUNG MARTIN, MIRANDA	ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 31,179.00	\$ -	\$ 560.93	\$ 31,739.93
RECORDS, JOHN E	MAINTENANCE WORKER III	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 31,808.96	\$ -	\$ 769.90	\$ 32,578.86
SPITSEN, PAUL	RECREATION ASSISTANT	SENIOR CENTER	\$ 17,458.74	\$ -	\$ 17,064.43	\$ 34,523.17
FLORES, SUSAN	RECREATION ASSISTANT	SPORTS AND FITNESS	\$ 34,917.48	\$ -	\$ 2,864.44	\$ 37,781.92
LEWIS, SUSAN	RECREATION COORDINATOR	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 37,954.02	\$ -	\$ 212.45	\$ 38,166.47
GROSS, LESLIE	ASSISTANT PLANNER	PLANNING	\$ 38,876.38	\$ -	\$ 974.84	\$ 39,851.22
HEJZA, JULIE	SR OFFICE ASSISTANT	CITY CLERK	\$ 40,989.09	\$ 139.90	\$ 695.91	\$ 41,824.90
LEE, LAURA DOMONDON	COMMUNITY RELATIONS COORD	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 41,678.78	\$ 29.54	\$ 2,814.32	\$ 44,522.64
CARDENAS, TIFFANY	OFFICE ASSISTANT	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 47,569.74	\$ -	\$ 72.00	\$ 47,641.74
BULLOCK, RONALD	FACILITY ATTENDANT	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 46,024.02	\$ 3,210.24	\$ 558.48	\$ 49,792.74
VILLALOBOS, RAFAEL	FACILITY ATTENDANT	SENIOR CENTER	\$ 48,719.84	\$ -	\$ 1,073.03	\$ 49,792.87
VILLA, FRANCISCO	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 50,839.51	\$ -	\$ 623.66	\$ 51,463.17
LAITILA, MICHAEL	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 50,904.29	\$ -	\$ 1,482.73	\$ 52,387.02
ORTEGA, VINCENT	FACILITY ATTENDANT	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 48,719.84	\$ 3,562.47	\$ 120.00	\$ 52,402.31
GARCIA, PATRICIA	SR OFFICE ASSISTANT	PLANNING	\$ 52,353.11	\$ -	\$ 516.00	\$ 52,869.11
RAMOS, JOHN J	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 50,394.66	\$ 596.10	\$ 1,938.25	\$ 52,929.01
WILLIAMS, JONATHAN	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 51,513.87	\$ 555.51	\$ 1,160.55	\$ 53,229.93
SCHMITT, ANDREW	MAINTENANCE WORKER I	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 51,556.25	\$ 1,245.12	\$ 554.48	\$ 53,355.85
REDWINE, MARY	SR OFFICE ASSISTANT	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 52,805.67	\$ 372.03	\$ 180.00	\$ 53,357.70
SANTOS, DOMINGO	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	FACILITIES DIVISION	\$ 51,462.05	\$ 1,743.15	\$ 760.00	\$ 53,965.20
BADAL, ANDY	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 52,693.92	\$ 111.05	\$ 1,612.96	\$ 54,417.93
ALEGRIA, ALFREDO	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 53,912.40	\$ -	\$ 952.00	\$ 54,864.40
KINST, JULIA	OFFICE ASSISTANT	SENIOR CENTER	\$ 55,098.60	\$ -	\$ 180.00	\$ 55,278.60
PARSLEY YELAVICH, LINDA	RECREATION COORDINATOR	SENIOR CENTER	\$ 49,758.67	\$ -	\$ 5,605.98	\$ 55,364.65
FAUTH, JASON	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 51,849.49	\$ 1,983.21	\$ 1,737.27	\$ 55,569.97
PHILLIPS, LAUREN	RECREATION COORDINATOR	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 55,414.99	\$ 964.21	\$ 72.00	\$ 56,451.20
STEED, JAMES	MAINTENANCE WORKER I	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 56,499.83	\$ -	\$ 905.38	\$ 57,405.21
MENDEZ, SYLVIA	SR. OFFICE ASSISTANT	BUILDING	\$ 52,206.92	\$ 5,101.36	\$ 108.00	\$ 57,416.28
VILLALOVOS, ADRIAN	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 54,700.32	\$ -	\$ 2,933.82	\$ 57,634.14
ORDWAY, JEFFREY	RECREATION COORDINATOR	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 59,061.17	\$ -	\$ 72.00	\$ 59,133.17
TEFFT, THEODORE	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 57,229.30	\$ -	\$ 2,484.87	\$ 59,714.17

MABUTAS, CLIFF	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 58,664.88	\$ 1,804.54	\$ 1,317.37	\$ 61,786.79
ABE, ASAKO	HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR	HUMAN RESOURCES	\$ 29,446.68	\$ -	\$ 32,459.62	\$ 61,906.30
JAUCH, HEATHER	SR OFFICE ASSISTANT	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 60,187.27	\$ 42.66	\$ 1,949.06	\$ 62,178.99
ALEXANDER, BRADFORD	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 59,314.24	\$ 1,507.90	\$ 1,893.19	\$ 62,715.33
SHAFFER, REBECCA	SR OFFICE ASSISTANT	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 60,187.27	\$ -	\$ 2,958.36	\$ 63,145.63
FERRANTE, JONATHAN	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 57,020.88	\$ 844.89	\$ 5,375.89	\$ 63,241.66
JAMES, MOLLY	RECREATION COORDINATOR	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 58,942.01	\$ 4,370.17	\$ 72.00	\$ 63,384.18
COLES, TIMOTHY	RECREATION COORDINATOR	BLACKBERRY ADMIN	\$ 60,600.63	\$ -	\$ 2,908.36	\$ 63,508.99
BANFIELD, BARBARA J	RECREATION COORDINATOR	BLACKBERRY ADMIN	\$ 62,897.80	\$ 649.78	\$ 645.00	\$ 64,192.58
WONG, RICHARD	ACCOUNT CLERK	FINANCE	\$ 64,013.69	\$ 45.37	\$ 144.00	\$ 64,203.06
SANDER, RACHELLE	RECREATION COORDINATOR	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 63,989.05	\$ 1,093.01	\$ 419.10	\$ 65,501.16
HOOK, ROBERT	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 63,044.70	\$ -	\$ 2,484.87	\$ 65,529.57
RUMALEAN, YULIA	ACCOUNT CLERK	FINANCE	\$ 60,696.45	\$ 689.29	\$ 4,365.88	\$ 65,751.62
TERADA, PETER	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ -	\$ 2,360.72	\$ 65,878.20
ARNST, PETER	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 93.18	\$ 2,320.25	\$ 65,930.91
SACKS, LAWRENCE	I.T. ASSISTANT	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	\$ 65,970.84	\$ -	\$ 270.00	\$ 66,240.84
BARRAS, DORIE	EXEC ASSIST TO THE CITY ATTY	CITY ATTORNEY	\$ 50,579.36	\$ -	\$ 15,828.73	\$ 66,408.09
CARIAGA, ABRAHAM	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 1,951.54	\$ 979.01	\$ 66,448.03
MORENO, JESUS O	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ -	\$ 3,084.89	\$ 66,602.37
MAO, TINA	ACCOUNT CLERK	FINANCE	\$ 64,013.69	\$ -	\$ 2,738.44	\$ 66,752.13
TOGNETTI, PAUL	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 1,080.44	\$ 2,368.63	\$ 66,966.55
HAYES, KELSEY	RECREATION COORDINATOR	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 62,571.44	\$ 4,390.02	\$ 99.00	\$ 67,060.46
ALVAREZ, NICHOLAS	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 465.94	\$ 3,178.96	\$ 67,162.38
TABARES, ALBERT	EQUIPMENT MECHANIC	GENERAL SERVICES	\$ 6,321.09	\$ 426.14	\$ 61,101.44	\$ 67,848.67
OSBORNE, CHYLENE	ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK	FACILITIES DIVISION	\$ 67,680.84	\$ -	\$ 180.00	\$ 67,860.84
PRONI, ANTHONY	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ -	\$ 4,462.41	\$ 67,979.89
MO, TERESA	RECREATION COORDINATOR	SENIOR CENTER	\$ 66,344.98	\$ -	\$ 1,659.41	\$ 68,004.39
EBBEN, BETHANY	ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK	PLANNING	\$ 67,847.00	\$ -	\$ 180.00	\$ 68,027.00
HEMBREE, TODD D	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ -	\$ 4,686.47	\$ 68,203.95
HOFFMAN, MABEL	OFFICE ASSISTANT	SENIOR CENTER	\$ 48,004.40	\$ 605.11	\$ 19,931.42	\$ 68,540.93
OLSEN, KARL	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ -	\$ 5,033.21	\$ 68,550.69
LEVY, KAREN	RECREATION COORDINATOR	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 66,344.98	\$ 316.34	\$ 2,021.06	\$ 68,682.38
FERRIS, COLLEEN	RECREATION COORDINATOR	SPORTS AND FITNESS	\$ 66,344.98	\$ -	\$ 2,367.33	\$ 68,712.31
LA BRIE, MARC	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 4,236.20	\$ 1,332.24	\$ 69,085.92

NAITO, PAMELA	HUMAN RESOURCES TECH	HUMAN RESOURCES	\$ 68,976.77	\$ -	\$ 270.00	\$ 69,246.77
BODENE, WILLIAM	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	FACILITIES DIVISION	\$ 62,193.63	\$ 4,049.23	\$ 3,352.96	\$ 69,595.82
NEMETZ, SCOTT	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	BLACKBERRY ADMIN	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 4,089.43	\$ 2,214.59	\$ 69,821.50
DUNN, DONALD	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GENERAL SERVICES	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 135.85	\$ 6,391.86	\$ 70,045.19
BARRAGAN, MANUEL	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 1,274.08	\$ 5,407.98	\$ 70,199.54
LOPEZ, ANGEL	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 62,960.42	\$ 5,567.15	\$ 1,712.28	\$ 70,239.85
FREY, KIMBERLY	RECREATION COORDINATOR	SENIOR CENTER	\$ 66,344.98	\$ 1,331.78	\$ 2,679.24	\$ 70,356.00
LOMAS III, RUTILIO	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	FACILITIES DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 2,510.53	\$ 4,370.48	\$ 70,398.49
MARTINEZ, DEBORAH C	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	FACILITIES DIVISION	\$ 65,448.61	\$ -	\$ 5,053.95	\$ 70,502.56
POLITO, RUSSELL	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 1,889.52	\$ 5,378.56	\$ 70,785.56
WINSLOW, SUSAN J	ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK	BUILDING	\$ 67,847.00	\$ -	\$ 3,242.44	\$ 71,089.44
SAKHRANI, GULU	CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER	CODE ENFORCEMENT	\$ 70,868.80	\$ -	\$ 270.00	\$ 71,138.80
IRWIN, MELANIE	SR OFFICE ASSISTANT	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 60,187.27	\$ 6,133.57	\$ 5,339.15	\$ 71,659.99
HENRIQUES, DONNA	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 70,819.55	\$ -	\$ 1,188.00	\$ 72,007.55
BERNARD, KAREN A	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 71,952.54	\$ -	\$ 162.00	\$ 72,114.54
BRIDGE, WILLIAM	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 4,531.27	\$ 4,237.61	\$ 72,286.36
MERTENS, CHRISTOPHER	MAINTENANCE WORKER III	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 70,050.50	\$ -	\$ 2,324.67	\$ 72,375.17
CATON, TRACI	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	PLANNING	\$ 72,235.15	\$ -	\$ 162.00	\$ 72,397.15
KIM, ROBERT	MEDIA COORDINATOR	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 72,895.68	\$ 103.33	\$ 270.00	\$ 73,269.01
GOSS, LIAN (KAREN)	CASE MANAGER	SENIOR CENTER	\$ 69,264.03	\$ 1,048.26	\$ 4,299.53	\$ 74,611.82
WOLFE, KANE	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 3,411.69	\$ 7,784.77	\$ 74,713.94
ROSALES, GILBERT	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GENERAL SERVICES	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 720.28	\$ 10,648.69	\$ 74,886.45
STEENFOTT, DOROTHY A	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	ADMIN SERVICES	\$ 72,235.15	\$ -	\$ 3,048.32	\$ 75,283.47
RODRIGUEZ, JESUS	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 60,321.76	\$ 2,864.49	\$ 12,131.56	\$ 75,317.81
DRAKE, MICHAEL	MAINTENANCE WORKER III	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 70,050.50	\$ 3,554.60	\$ 3,378.47	\$ 76,983.57
DELGADO, REINALDO G	MEDIA COORDINATOR	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 72,895.68	\$ 1,394.95	\$ 3,031.90	\$ 77,322.53
COGLIANESE, PETER	MEDIA COORDINATOR	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 72,895.68	\$ -	\$ 4,866.52	\$ 77,762.20
JOHNSON, JO ANNE	ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 78,381.67	\$ -	\$ 171.00	\$ 78,552.67
SCHMIDT, GRACE	DEPUTY CITY CLERK	CITY CLERK	\$ 72,235.15	\$ 3,556.25	\$ 2,901.17	\$ 78,692.57
TOGNETTI, SHAWN	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	GENERAL SERVICES	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 5,892.80	\$ 9,803.37	\$ 79,213.65
WINSLOW JR, ROGER	MAINTENANCE WORKER III	FACILITIES DIVISION	\$ 67,930.55	\$ 5,642.67	\$ 5,764.17	\$ 79,337.39
BLOOMQUIST, TY	MAINTENANCE WORKER I/II	FACILITIES DIVISION	\$ 63,517.48	\$ 6,952.38	\$ 9,208.93	\$ 79,678.79
GATHERS, BRIAN	MAINTENANCE WORKER III	GROUNDS DIVISION	\$ 70,050.50	\$ 801.33	\$ 9,017.28	\$ 79,869.11
LOOMIS, MIKE V	EQUIPMENT MECHANIC	GENERAL SERVICES	\$ 64,427.48	\$ 7,585.56	\$ 7,961.64	\$ 79,974.68

TRYBUS, JEFFREY	CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER	CODE ENFORCEMENT	\$ 80,176.98	\$ 56.83	\$ 464.82	\$ 80,698.63
BLOOMQUIST, CURTIS P	STREET LIGHT WORKER	GENERAL SERVICES	\$ 71,016.68	\$ 7,176.19	\$ 5,222.16	\$ 83,415.03
GERHARDT, TERI	GIS COORDINATOR	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	\$ 83,346.25	\$ -	\$ 216.00	\$ 83,562.25
LAGERGREN, LINDA	EXEC ASST TO THE CITYMNGR	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 79,021.80	\$ 202.88	\$ 4,871.34	\$ 84,096.02
JIMENEZ, MARIA	HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST	HUMAN RESOURCES	\$ 80,453.88	\$ -	\$ 4,312.20	\$ 84,766.08
KORNAHRENS, GARY	SR CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFCR	CODE ENFORCEMENT	\$ 81,588.54	\$ 735.18	\$ 2,547.65	\$ 84,871.37
LOMAN, HERMAN	TRAFFIC SIGNAL TECHNICIAN	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 79,451.30	\$ 789.58	\$ 4,882.44	\$ 85,123.32
WYKOFF, ALEXANDER	SR CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFCR	CODE ENFORCEMENT	\$ 81,588.54	\$ 1,060.13	\$ 3,178.75	\$ 85,827.42
SILVA, RONALD J	PUBLIC WORKS SUPERVISOR	GENERAL SERVICES	\$ 69,524.45	\$ -	\$ 16,733.47	\$ 86,257.92
HOM, ARNOLD	PLAN CHECK ENGINEER	BUILDING	\$ 86,161.70	\$ -	\$ 216.00	\$ 86,377.70
GHOSH, PIU	ASSOCIATE PLANNER	PLANNING	\$ 83,784.01	\$ -	\$ 2,970.36	\$ 86,754.37
STREAM, GARY	BUILDING INSPECTOR	BUILDING	\$ 87,270.16	\$ -	\$ 1,032.00	\$ 88,302.16
MIYAKAWA, LAURA	HUMAN RESOURCES TECH	HUMAN RESOURCES	\$ 86,703.63	\$ -	\$ 1,889.28	\$ 88,592.91
WINTER, RICHARD	BUILDING INSPECTOR	BUILDING	\$ 88,782.50	\$ -	\$ 1,032.00	\$ 89,814.50
MATHUR, NIDHI	WEB SPECIALIST	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 83,346.25	\$ -	\$ 6,501.60	\$ 89,847.85
ADAMS, QUINTON R	NETWORK SPECIALIST	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	\$ 83,357.56	\$ 4,511.24	\$ 2,534.40	\$ 90,403.20
ORR, CHRIS	PUBLIC WORKS SUPERVISOR	FACILITIES DIVISION	\$ 85,238.32	\$ -	\$ 5,292.25	\$ 90,530.57
GREEF, JEFFREY	BUILDING INSPECTOR	BUILDING	\$ 92,501.94	\$ -	\$ 552.00	\$ 93,053.94
CHANG, JENNIFER Y	ACCOUNTANT	FINANCE	\$ 86,703.63	\$ -	\$ 6,748.51	\$ 93,452.14
DONNELLY, CHERYL	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS MGR	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 92,747.25	\$ -	\$ 1,032.00	\$ 93,779.25
SAKAI, EDWIN T	EQUIPMENT MECHANIC	GENERAL SERVICES	\$ 75,157.03	\$ 10,060.16	\$ 8,594.77	\$ 93,811.96
COOKE, ERIN	ENVIRONMTAL AFFAIRS COORD	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 93,771.80	\$ -	\$ 144.00	\$ 93,915.80
CHOW, HANNAH	ASSOCIATE CIVIL ENGINEER	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 96,773.43	\$ -	\$ 216.00	\$ 96,989.43
GREGORY, ROBERT	BUILDING INSPECTOR	BUILDING	\$ 96,899.65	\$ -	\$ 1,032.00	\$ 97,931.65
HONDA SNEILING, AKI	SENIOR PLANNER	PLANNING	\$ 98,333.10	\$ -	\$ 826.97	\$ 99,160.07
HANEL, CHRISTINE	RECREATION SUPERVISOR	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 96,809.96	\$ -	\$ 2,767.26	\$ 99,577.22
VANDEVEER, MICHAEL	TRAFFIC SIGNAL TECHNICIAN	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 91,658.84	\$ 1,646.81	\$ 6,617.97	\$ 99,923.62
SABICH, ROBERT	BUILDING INSPECTOR-CNTR SPEC	BUILDING	\$ 99,070.79	\$ -	\$ 1,189.40	\$ 100,260.19
GIL, VERA J	SENIOR PLANNER	PLANNING	\$ 100,227.38	\$ -	\$ 240.00	\$ 100,467.38
BISELY, JOHN	PUBLIC WORKS SUPERVISOR	GROUPS DIVISION	\$ 99,070.79	\$ -	\$ 2,209.80	\$ 101,280.59
RIEDEN, KEVIN	PUBLIC WORKS INSPECTOR	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 99,070.79	\$ -	\$ 2,708.44	\$ 101,779.23
JUNG, COLIN C	SENIOR PLANNER	PLANNING	\$ 100,227.40	\$ -	\$ 2,393.06	\$ 102,620.46
WALTERS, THOMAS	RECREATION SUPERVISOR	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 96,809.96	\$ -	\$ 7,530.96	\$ 104,340.92
MCCARTHY, DON	RECREATION SUPERVISOR	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 96,809.96	\$ -	\$ 8,526.48	\$ 105,336.44

LAMY, JULIA	SENIOR RECREATION SUPERVISOR	SENIOR CENTER	\$ 101,650.77	\$ -	\$ 5,394.38	\$ 107,045.15
MAHAN, DIANE	PUBLIC WORKS SUPERVISOR	STREETS DIVISION	\$ 99,070.79	\$ -	\$ 8,261.72	\$ 107,332.51
CHAO, GARY	CITY PLANNER	PLANNING	\$ 107,964.74	\$ -	\$ 192.00	\$ 108,156.74
SQUARCIA, LARRY	SR. BUILDING INSPECTOR	BUILDING	\$ 105,857.18	\$ 155.30	\$ 4,052.44	\$ 110,064.92
LYNAUGH, CARMEN	PUBLIC WORKS PROJ MANAGER	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 110,095.44	\$ -	\$ 2,684.40	\$ 112,779.84
SMITH, KIM M	CITY CLERK	CITY CLERK	\$ 110,647.44	\$ -	\$ 5,324.28	\$ 115,971.72
KITSON, JR, RICHARD G	PUBLIC & ENV AFFAIRS DIR	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 122,290.69	\$ -	\$ 3,551.88	\$ 125,842.57
SHRIVASTAVA, AARTI	DIRECTOR OF COMM DEVELOP	PLANNING	\$ 123,057.63	\$ -	\$ 3,039.20	\$ 126,096.83
SERRATOS, MARIYAH	INFO TECHNOLOGY MANAGER	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	\$ 125,061.12	\$ -	\$ 2,540.40	\$ 127,601.52
KILIAN, CHARLES T	CITY ATTORNEY	CITY ATTORNEY	\$ 3,822.89	\$ -	\$ 125,742.37	\$ 129,565.26
SEEDS, GAIL	STEVENS CREEK CORR PREV MNR	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 129,835.29	\$ -	\$ 552.00	\$ 130,387.29
WOO, DAVID	FINANCE DIRECTOR	FINANCE	\$ 129,835.29	\$ -	\$ 1,068.47	\$ 130,903.76
KLINE, KELLY	REDEV/ECON DEVELOP MNGR	PLANNING	\$ 129,835.29	\$ -	\$ 1,422.53	\$ 131,257.82
STILLMAN, DAVID	SR. CIVIL ENGINEER	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 132,835.17	\$ -	\$ 216.00	\$ 133,051.17
GREENE, TERRY	CITY ARCHITECT	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 129,835.29	\$ -	\$ 4,583.88	\$ 134,419.17
CASTEEL, GREGORY J	BUILDING OFFICIAL	BUILDING	\$ 129,835.29	\$ -	\$ 5,459.78	\$ 135,295.07
LEE, ROGER	ASSIST DIRECTOR OF PW MTC	FACILITIES DIVISION	\$ 135,750.81	\$ -	\$ 240.00	\$ 135,990.81
GOEFFERT, GLENN	ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PW	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 142,214.41	\$ -	\$ 4,031.88	\$ 146,246.29
QUALLS, JR, RALPH	DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS	PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN/ENG	\$ 160,990.57	\$ -	\$ 8,345.24	\$ 169,335.81
LINDER, MARK	DIRECTOR OF PARKS REC	PARKS AND REC ADMIN	\$ 164,793.20	\$ -	\$ 5,183.96	\$ 169,977.16
ATWOOD, CAROL A	DIRECTOR OF ADMIN SERVICE	ADMIN SERVICES	\$ 175,310.98	\$ -	\$ 11,010.66	\$ 186,321.64
KNAPP, DAVID W.	CITY MANAGER	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 220,632.75	\$ -	\$ 13,973.20	\$ 234,605.95
			\$ 11,612,809.05	\$ 145,708.30	\$ 729,402.62	\$ 12,487,919.97
						\$ 79,540.89

Median Gross Salary = employee #79, Susan Winslow.

\$71,089.44

Fully loaded benefit multiplier

x 1.45%

Median Salary and Benefits - 2009, City of Cupertino

\$103,080.00