



MEETING NOTICE

**Lancaster County Elected Officials
Salary Review Committee
Monday, October 16, 2017 at 10:00 a.m.
County-City Building
555 South 10th Street
Third Floor, Human Resources Room 302**

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Selection of Committee Chair
3. Meeting Schedule
4. Review of Salary Information
5. Open Discussion

Public parking is available in the lot north of the County-City Building. Entrance for the public is on 10th Street. You will receive a parking pass at the meeting for exiting the lot.

Please contact Kerry or Minette at 441-7449 if you have any questions.

MINUTES
LANCASTER COUNTY ELECTED OFFICIALS SALARY REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNTY-CITY BUILDING, ROOM 302
MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2017 AT 10:00 A.M.

Members Present: Kathy Campbell, Former County Commissioner and Nebraska State Senator; Steve Eicher, Former Pfizer Human Resources Director; Jim Gordon, Attorney at Law; Judy Halstead, Former Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department Director (via conference call); Pat Kahm, Professional Resources Management, Inc.; Pat Kant, Former Lincoln-Lancaster Human Resources Personnel Coordinator

Members Absent: Sam Seever, Former MDS Pharma Services Vice President of Legal Services

Others Present: Kerry Eagan, County Chief Administrative Officer; Doug McDaniel, City-County Human Resources Director; Nicole Gross, City-County Human Resources Compensation Manager; Kelly Lundgren, County Clerk's Office

The following documents were distributed before the meeting:

1. Elected Officials Salary Review Committee 2017 (Exhibit A)
2. Elected Officials Salary Survey 2017 (Exhibit B)
3. 2019-2022 Salary Recommendations for County Officials from the Nebraska Association of County Officials (NACO) (Exhibit C)
4. Final Report and Recommendations of the Elected Officials Salary Review Committee from December 19, 2013 (Exhibit D)
5. Elected Official Salary Spreadsheet (Exhibit E)
6. Appointed Salary Information (Exhibit F)
7. County Resolution R-14-0004 in the matter of setting salaries for elected County officials for the 2015-2018 term (Exhibit G)

A copy of the Nebraska Open Meetings Act was available and the meeting was called to order at 10:07 a.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Introductions were made by all present.

2. SELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIR

Steve Eicher moved and Kathy Campbell seconded to nominate Jim Gordon as Committee Chair. Motion carried unanimously.

3. MEETING SCHEDULE

Kerry Eagan said the deadline for setting salaries is January 15, 2018.

The consensus was to schedule meetings on November 13, November 20, November 27 and December 11, 2017. The meetings will begin at 10:00 a.m.

4. REVIEW OF SALARY INFORMATION

Eagan reviewed the materials that were provided to the committee members (Exhibits A-G).

Doug McDaniel referred to the Elected Officials Salary Survey (Exhibit B) and stated that the numbers have been updated to reflect the projected increase for January based on the current consumer price index (CPI).

Pat Kahm questioned if the commissioners in the comparable counties were part-time or full-time. McDaniel said they are still trying to confirm that information.

Judy Halstead inquired if any of the counties offered cash compensation in lieu of health insurance. McDaniel stated Lancaster County does not and he was not aware if any other counties offer that option. He added it is not standard practice in the public sector.

McDaniel offered the following observations: (1) it is difficult to find a market salary for Clerk of the District Court as in most counties it is a state position; (2) the Lancaster County Assessor and Register of Deeds is a combined position; and (3) the Lancaster County Attorney and Public Defender prefer to keep their salaries equal.

Kathy Campbell referenced the elected official's salary spreadsheet (Exhibit E) which showed the salaries from 2011 to 2017. She noted that from 2011 to 2014 there was a 2% increase across the board and in 2015 to 2017 the percentages of increase varied. Eicher said at that time the Committee based the increase on a formula tied to the cost of living. Eagan noted that a market adjustment was also incorporated which raised those salaries that were substantially behind and the Committee elected to split it between 2015 and 2017.

5. OPEN DISCUSSION


Eagan suggested allowing elected officials the opportunity to meet with the Committee as they have in the past. Halstead asked what information would be presented. Eagan said traditionally the discussions included new statutory duties, job description changes over the past four years, workload increases and general office information. Kahm added that some may also offer their opinion on whether their position merits a raise or special consideration.

Campbell asked Eagan to explain the "anticipated salary" information contained in the Nebraska Association of County Officials (NACO) report (Exhibit C). Eagan stated NACO researches how counties set their salaries and then provides an estimate. County Boards will set the salaries based on the formula and the cost of living index in December. Eagan said he visited with Tim Genuchi, Accounting Operations Manager, County Clerk's Office, and the cost of living index through September was 1.5%.

McDaniel said he will continue to gather information regarding Kahm's inquiry regarding if the commissioners included in the market salary group are considered full or part-time status. Eagan stated a memo will be sent scheduling elected officials to attend the November 13 and November 20 meetings. The memo will also request that a written overview of job duties and changes to workloads be prepared. Halstead suggested that the memo emphasize the Committee is interested in job responsibilities and not individual accomplishments. Eagan said he will forward the elected officials' responses to the Committee prior to the meetings.

Gordon moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:06 a.m. Kahm seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Submitted by Kelly Lundgren, County Clerk's Office



Elected Officials Salary Review Committee - 2017

Name	Occupation	Mailing Address	Phone #	Email
Kerry Eagan	County Chief Administrative Officer	555 S. 10 th Street Room 110 Lincoln, NE 68508	(402)441-7447	keagan@lancaster.ne.gov
Kathy Campbell	Former Lancaster County Commissioner and Nebraska State Senator		(402)432-7979	kccampbellne@gmail.com
Judy Halstead	Former Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Director	Lincoln, NE 68502	(402)429-9641	JudyHalstead@hotmail.com
Steve Eicher	Former Human Resources Director - Pfizer	8601 Echo Ct. Lincoln NE 68520	(402)484-6240 (402)304-2566(C)	eichersteve@gmail.com
Jim Gordon	Attorney at Law		(402)450-0983	jgordon71108@gmail.com
Pat Kahm	Professional Resources Management, Inc.	6711 Park Crest Ct. Lincoln NE 68506	(402)484-0404	pkahm@aol.com
Sam Seever	Former VP of Legal Services MDS Pharma Services	6425 Lone Tree Drive Lincoln NE 68512	(402)304-0322(C)	sam.seever@yahoo.com
Pat Kant	Former Lincoln/Lancaster County Personnel Coordinator		(402)540-7855	pakant@neb.rr.com

ELECTED OFFICIALS SALARY SURVEY 2017

	BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS Market Salary	CLERK OF THE DISTRICT COURT Market Salary	COUNTY ASSESSOR Market Salary	REGISTER OF DEEDS Market Salary	COUNTY ATTORNEY Market Salary
DOUGLAS (Omaha, NE) 554,995	\$45,594	\$108,123	\$124,848	\$124,848	\$179,698
LINN (Cedar Rapids, IA) 221,661	\$77,917	-	\$105,622	\$103,889	\$166,026
POLK (Des Moines, IA) 474,045	\$86,579	-	\$135,437	\$115,438	\$195,391
SEDGWICK (Wichita, KS) 511,995	\$70,175	\$63,968	-	\$88,193	\$137,668
SHAWNEE (Topeka, KS) 178,146	\$39,000	-	\$87,537	\$62,408	\$139,050
SCOTT (Davenport, IA) 172,474	\$31,875	-	\$98,134	\$86,300	\$147,800
MEAN	\$58,523	\$86,046	\$110,316	\$96,846	\$160,939
MEDIAN	\$57,885	\$86,046	\$105,622	\$96,041	\$156,913
MIDPOINT LANCASTER 2017 (Population 309,637)	\$58,204	\$86,046	\$107,969	\$96,444	\$158,926
	\$44,894	\$98,651	\$123,678	\$123,678	\$154,757
\$ +/-	\$13,310	-\$12,606	-\$15,709	-\$27,234	\$4,169
% +/-	29.65%	-12.78%	-12.70%	-22.02%	2.69%
MIDPOINT LANCASTER 2018**	\$58,204	\$86,046	\$107,969	\$96,444	\$158,926
	\$45,792	\$100,624	\$126,152	\$126,152	\$157,852
\$ +/-	\$12,412	-\$14,579	-\$18,183	-\$29,708	\$1,074
% +/-	27.11%	-14.49%	-14.41%	-23.55%	0.68%

*annual amounts set to 30hrs
per week for comparison.

*Sedgwick County is
a state position

*Lancaster County Assessor and
Register of Deeds are combined.

** Salaries have been increased 2% based on R-14-0004 which states "Annual increases effective January 1st based on the following formula. If the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all Urban Consumers Midwest Region, as published for the November immediately preceeding each January for 2016 through 2018 is: (a) Not less than 1.5% and not greater than 2.5%, each elected official should receive a 2% salary increase; (b) Less than 1.5%, the salary increase should be 2%, minus 50% of the amount by which the CPI is less than 1.5%, but with the 2% base not being lowered beyond 0%; and (c) More than 2.5%, the salary increase should be 2%, plus 50% of the amount by which the CPI exceeds 2.5%.

ELECTED OFFICIALS SALARY SURVEY 2017

	COUNTY CLERK Market Salary	COUNTY ENGINEER Market Salary	COUNTY SHERIFF Market Salary	COUNTY TREASURER Market Salary	PUBLIC DEFENDER Market Salary
DOUGLAS (Omaha, NE) 554,995	\$110,000	\$129,803	\$130,187	\$121,512	\$179,698
LINN (Cedar Rapids, IA) 221,661		\$102,205	\$143,411	\$103,889	
POLK (Des Moines, IA) 474,045	\$115,975	\$126,339	\$162,587	\$115,975	\$104,177
SEDGWICK (Wichita, KS) 511,995	\$88,193	\$124,971	\$135,220	\$88,193	\$150,785
SHAWNEE (Topeka, KS) 178,146	\$73,319	\$131,970	\$97,812	\$79,546	
SCOTT (Davenport, IA) 172,474		\$132,163	\$113,600	\$86,300	
MEAN	\$96,872	\$124,575	\$130,470	\$99,236	\$144,887
MEDIAN	\$99,097	\$128,071	\$132,704	\$96,041	\$150,785
MIDPOINT	\$97,984	\$126,323	\$131,587	\$97,638	\$147,836
LANCASTER 2017 (Population 309,637)	\$93,100	\$120,301	\$120,439	\$92,496	\$154,757
\$ +/-	\$4,884	\$6,022	\$11,148	\$5,142	-\$6,921
% +/-	5.25%	5.01%	9.26%	5.56%	-4.47%
MIDPOINT	\$97,984	\$126,323	\$131,587	\$97,638	\$147,836
LANCASTER 2018**	\$94,962	\$122,707	\$122,848	\$94,346	\$157,852
\$ +/-	\$3,022	\$3,616	\$8,739	\$3,293	-\$10,016
% +/-	3.18%	2.95%	7.11%	3.49%	-6.35%

**Shawnee County Treasurer receives an additional \$15,000 of income from the State that we added to the wage.*

*** Salaries have been increased 2% based on R-14-0004 which states "Annual increases effective January 1st based on the following formula. If the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all Urban Consumers Midwest Region, as published for the November immediately preceding each January for 2016 through 2018 is: (a) Not less than 1.5% and not greater than 2.5%, each elected official should receive a 2% salary increase; (b) Less than 1.5%, the salary increase should be 2%, minus 50% of the amount by which the CPI is less than 1.5%, but with the 2% base not being lowered beyond 0%; and (c) More than 2.5%, the salary increase should be 2%, plus 50% of the amount by which the CPI exceeds 2.5%.*



2019-2022 SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COUNTY OFFICIALS



OCTOBER 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	1
COMMITTEE MAKE-UP.....	2
INTRODUCTION.....	2
NEBRASKA CONSTITUTION AND STATUTES	3
Elected Officials.....	3
Deputy Officials.....	4
County Officers - Clerks and Assistants.....	4
Federal Minimum Wage.....	4
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	4
CURRENT ISSUES	5
State and Local Workers	5
Retention of Staff.....	5
SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS.....	6
METHOD USED TO ARRIVE AT THE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	7
MINIMUM BASE SALARY WITHIN A RANGE DEFINED.....	8
TRENDS FOR MINIMUM BASE SALARY.....	9
SALARY RANGES BY COUNTY.....	9
FUNDING FOR MINIMUM SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS.....	12
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS	13
Multiple Officeholders as Defined by State Statute.....	13
Shifting Duties and Responsibilities Between County Officials	13
Nonstatutory Responsibilities	13
County Board Members - Commissioners and Supervisors.....	13
County Attorneys.....	14
Public Defenders.....	14
Sheriffs.....	14
Engineers, Surveyors	15
Budget Preparation.....	15
Mandatory Education.....	15
Caseloads.....	16
HEALTH AND MEDICAL BENEFITS.....	16



Affordable Care Act (ACA) and Health Insurance.....	16
"Cash In Lieu" of Health Insurance.....	17
Prohibition of Financial Incentives Not to Enroll in a Group Health or a Large Group Health Plan.....	18
Cost-of-Living Increases.....	18
Potential Conflicts of Interest/Financial Gain/Compensation as Provided by Law.....	19
LOCAL FACTORS TO CONSIDER.....	20
Growth In and Declining Population Factors.....	20
SAMPLE RESOLUTIONS.....	23
SALARY, COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT, BENEFITS.....	23
Sample 1: (Percentage Rate).....	23
Sample 2: (Flat Dollar Amount).....	23
Sample 3: (Consumer Price Index).....	23
Sample 4: (Consumer Price Index with fixed ceiling).....	23
Sample 5: (A Percentage of the Consumer Price Index).....	23
BUDGET PREPARATION.....	24
Sample 1:.....	24
Sample 2:.....	24
HEALTH AND MEDICAL PLAN.....	24
Sample 1:.....	24
"CASH IN LIEU OF" HEALTH INSURANCE.....	24
Sample 1:.....	24
Appendix A -- County Populations, Valuations by Alphabetical Listing	
Appendix B -- County Populations, Valuations by Population	
Appendix C -- County Populations, Valuations by Valuation	
Appendix D - Summary of Cases, Attorney General's and Accountability and Disclosure Opinions	
Appendix E -- Table 1. Nebraska Counties Categorized by Similar Characteristics for County Population Projections	
Appendix F -- Comparison Population of Growth Rates 2000-16	
Appendix G - Additional Resources for Employment and Benefit Information	



ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The following report is the result of the cooperative effort of 13 county officials representing seven elected offices. The committee was appointed during the summer of 2017 by Nebraska Association of County Officials' (NACO), President William Tielke, Holt County Supervisor. Committee members were selected in such a manner to ensure equal representation of the five NACO districts and the elected offices of the county assessor, attorney, clerk, clerk of the district court, sheriff and treasurer. President Tielke served as an *ex officio*, non-voting member and appointed the commissioners and supervisors. The presidents of the aforementioned affiliate associations submitted names to be appointed by President Tielke. Committee members who participated in the project are:

William Tielke, *NACO President (ex officio, non-voting member) Holt County Supervisor*

Wendy Dethlefs
Hamilton County Clerk of the District Court

Amy Nelson
Fillmore County Clerk

Shawn Eatherton
Buffalo County Attorney

Edward Rastovski,
Saunders County Supervisor

Marvin Kohout
Saline County Commissioner

Becky Richter
Hamilton County Commissioner

William Lewis
Furnas County Commissioner

Mike Robinson
Washington County Sheriff

Mike McGinnis
Box Butte County Commissioner

Barb Swanson
Polk County Treasurer

Judy Mutzenberger
Cuming County Supervisor

Amy Watchorn
Dixon County Assessor



COMMITTEE MAKE-UP

The Nebraska Association of County Officials Board of Directors wishes to thank the 2017 Salary Committee for its interest in this important project and the volunteer hours that committee members contributed toward the project's goal of establishing salary recommendations that are fair and equitable for Nebraska's county officials. The contribution of the committee is significant to other counties as they establish salaries for county officials during the upcoming term of office.

The committee also wishes to thank the 93 county clerks who responded to NACO's request to complete comprehensive salary and benefit surveys for elected officials, deputies, appointed officials and so that its members would have access to current salary data. We recognize that completing these surveys would have taken a significant amount of time. Without this information, the committee would have had no means of completing its comparative study. Please be assured that your input is greatly appreciated.

INTRODUCTION

As stated by the Nebraska Department of Economic Development on the "About Nebraska" page of its website:

Nebraska is a great place to live, work, play and grow a business. We have a great work ethic, one of the best quality of life rankings in America, an overall cost of living that ranks below the national average, a fine educational system, some of the nation's shortest commuting times, a strong and healthy economy, and a business-friendly atmosphere.

Nebraska is a great place to work, play and stay. That's what Nebraskans — both long-time and new residents — increasingly say. And that's what quality of life rankings of states increasingly show.

Nebraska has an overall cost of living that ranks below the national average in all major categories, including food, housing, utilities, transportation, and health care. When adjusted for these cost of living advantages, Nebraska's wages and salaries compare very favorably with those in other states.

Nebraska has a fine educational system, where the ratio of teachers to pupils is one of the nation's highest, and the rate of high school graduation is one of the best in the United States.

Nebraska has a safe environment. The overall crime rate in Nebraska is 40 percent lower than the U.S. average.

Nebraska ranks...

- **2nd** Top 10 Payroll to Population, *Gallup.com*, 2015;
- **3rd** The Top 10 Best States for High Tech, *ChiefExecutive.net*, 2016; and
- **3rd** Best States for Business, *Forbes*, 2016. Source: <https://opportunity.nebraska.gov/>



Additionally, “Nebraska’s low cost of living, low unemployment rate, and top-five ranking for work environment make it close to one of *MoneyRates.com*’s “10 Best States for 2017” (No. 11 to be specific). <http://www.money-rates.com/research-center/best-states-to-make-a-living/>

With such ideals in mind, the 2017 Salary Recommendations Committee created the following report.

NEBRASKA CONSTITUTION AND STATUTES

The Nebraska Constitution provides that the compensation of any public officer may not be increased or diminished during his or her term of office except that, when there are members elected or appointed to the Legislature or officers elected or appointed to a court, board, or commission having more than one member and the terms of one or more members commence and end at different times, the compensation of all members of the Legislature or of such court, board, or commission may be increased or diminished at the beginning of the full term of any member. Nothing in this section shall prevent local governing bodies from reviewing and adjusting vested pension benefits periodically as prescribed by ordinance. Neb. Const. art. III, § 19. The courts and the Attorney General’s office have interpreted this to mean that any change in compensation during the term of office must be based on a formula stated in the board resolution setting the salary for the term of office. For example, the board can grant a cost of living increase by stating that the salary shall be adjusted annually in accordance with the change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). See Appendix D (Case and AGO summaries).

Elected Officials

The salaries of all elected county officers ***must be fixed by the county board prior to January 15*** of the year in which a general election will be held for the respective offices. The salaries of all deputies in the offices of the elected officers and appointive veterans service officers of the county must be fixed by the County Board at such times as necessity may require. Section 23-1114.¹ Recognizing that 2018 is such an election year and that County Board members must set the salaries for the 2019-2022 term prior to January 15, 2018, the Nebraska Association of County Officials (NACO) once again renewed its continued effort to promote that fair and equitable salaries and benefits be provided to all elected and appointed county officials.

With limited exceptions, a filing fee shall be paid to the election commissioner or county clerk by county officers equal to one percent of the annual salary as of November 30, 2017, the year preceding the election. Section 32-608.

¹ The salaries of all elected officers of the county shall be fixed by the County Board prior to January 15 of the year in which a general election will be held for the respective offices. The salaries of all deputies in the offices of the elected officers and appointive veterans service officers of the county shall be fixed by the County Board at such times as necessity may require. Section 23-1114(1).



Although there are minimum statutory salaries for various county officials, those statutory provisions have not been modified since the late 1960's. These statutes **are to be** interpreted for the purpose to provide, *in the public interest, adequate compensation to the county officials and County Board members.* Sections 23-1114.14, 23-1114.15.

Deputy Officials

The County Board must fix the salaries of all deputies in the offices of the elected officers at such times as necessity may require. Section 23-1114. The salary of one full-time deputy of the various county offices *shall not be less than 65 percent of the officer's salary.* Section 23-1114.09.

County Boards are encouraged to consider the caseloads, workloads, and number of assistants when setting the salaries of deputies.

County Officers – Clerks and Assistants

Portions of section 23-1111 were amended by LB 62 (2011) that was introduced to address issues associated with *Wetovick v. County of Nance*, 279 Neb. 773, 782 N.W.2d 298 (2010)). In the *Wetovick* case, the court addressed a budgetary dispute between a county board and county official. LB 62 (2011) modified 23-1111(1) by redefining the budgetary approval that is to be received by the county board and 23-1111(2) was added.²

Federal Minimum Wage

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and section 48-1203, covered nonexempt workers are entitled to a minimum wage of not less than \$9.00 per hour that was effective January 1, 2016. Based on a forty hour work week, the minimum annual salary for a covered nonexempt worker is \$18,720.00.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

As you read the following report, it is important to keep in mind the historical background behind NACO's efforts in making salary recommendations for elected county officials. In the late 1970's, several members of the Nebraska Legislature expressed concerns that the salaries of county officials did not appear to keep pace with other salaries in the state. They then advocated that the state set salaries for county officials. NACO has long opposed the idea of the Legislature setting salaries for elected county officials. Recognizing that local officials would best know the salary requirements of their respective offices, NACO appointed a committee in 1981 to study county salaries and publish a report recommending minimum base salaries for elected officeholders for the 1983-1986 term. The efforts of the 1981 committee resulted in a noticeable improvement in county salaries and benefits. The committee's efforts also proved to the Legislature that local control was best.

² (1) The county officers in all counties shall have the necessary clerks and assistants for such periods and at such salaries as the county officers may determine, subject to budgetary approval by the county board. (2) In carrying out its budget-making duties, a county board shall not eliminate an office or unduly hinder a county officer in the conduct of his or her statutory duties. If a county officer challenges the county board's decision in court, the county officer shall have the burden to prove such elimination or hindrance by clear and convincing evidence. Section 23-1111.



Similar committees were appointed in 1985 and every four years since, including 2017, to study county officials' salaries and make salary recommendations prior to the January 15 general election setting deadline established in NEB. REV. STAT. § 23-1114. In these cases, further improvements were made in providing fair and equitable salaries and benefits for county officials.

CURRENT ISSUES

During the last several years, there has been an increased emphasis on reducing property taxes and increasing the efficiency of county government. Additionally, current economic times have been trying and uncertain and in some cases counties have had to implement salary freezes and/or layoff staff. As a result, all county officials have dealt with budget and levy lids and consolidation issues, as well as shifting and increasing responsibilities within the various county offices. These diverse issues continue to be considered as counties and county officials look for ways to fulfill the duties of their offices and at the same time minimize the costs to Nebraska's taxpayers during fiscally challenging times. As County Boards determine the salaries for county officials during the 2019-2022 terms, they must balance their statutory obligations to stay within budget and levy limits with their interests of attracting and retaining qualified and skilled county officials.

To continue its efforts in this important area, NACO, in accordance with the wishes of President Bill Tielke, organized a committee again this year to examine current salaries and benefits offered to elected and appointed officials in each of the 93 Nebraska counties, and to then to make recommendations for salaries and benefits of elected officials for the 2019-2022 term.

State and Local Workers

Compensation costs for state and local government workers increased 2.6 percent for the 12-month period ending in June 2017. In June 2016, the increase was 2.3 percent. Wages and salaries increased 2.1 percent for the 12-month period ending in June 2017, higher than the June 2016 increase of 1.7 percent. Benefit costs increased 3.2 percent for the 12-month period ending in June 2017. The prior year's increase was 3.4 percent. Source: "Employment Cost Index", Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor (7/28/2017).

The Employment Cost Index (ECI) measures the change in the cost of labor, free from the influence of employment shifts among occupations and industries. Detailed information on survey concepts, coverage, methods, nonresponse adjustment, and imputation can be found in the BLS Handbook of Methods, Chapter 8, "National Compensation Measures," at: www.bls.gov/opub/hom/pdf/homch8.pdf. *Id.*

The September 2017 "Employment Cost Index" is scheduled for release 10/31/2017. *Id.*

Retention of Staff

A key issue that faces counties and will continue to be an issue that county boards and county officials must address is the retention of employees. "It is more efficient to retain a quality employee than to recruit, train and orient a replacement employee of the same quality." *Managing for Employee Retention* (2017).

The biggest priority, and concern, for business leaders in 2017 will be retaining employees in a competitive talent marketplace....



The one consistent truth across every type of worker, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, or geography, is that compensation is king for both recruiting and retention. If you don't pay employees fairly, they will leave—and no perk will change their mind. A new poll by 60 Minutes and *Vanity Fair* found that the best way to keep an employee motivated is money, and 35% of respondents said it was the most important thing they look for in a new job. Employees can review websites such as PayScale.com and Salary.com to see the average pay for different professions in various industries. They can also speak to their peers or current employees to compare and contrast their pay, and leverage it in a negotiation with their employer....

Companies that want to win the war for talent next year will have to boost employee pay, expand their employee benefits, and offer additional training opportunities. Employees that are disengaged, don't have their needs met, and aren't incentivized properly end up costing companies even more money than it does to replace them. *What Employers Will Worry About in 2017*, Dan Schawbel (2016).

SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS

While each of Nebraska's 93 counties operates within the same statutory framework, each is an individual political subdivision whose organizational structure varies depending in part upon its population. *Just as populations vary, so do the elements which affect county finances.*

In arriving at acceptable salary range recommendations for the 2019-2022 term, committee members took into account a variety of factors, such as:

1. County population and valuation by alphabetical listing (See Appendix A –2016 - Estimated Populations – Source is the Nebraska Department of Economic Development and Valuations and Levies – Source is the 2016 Total Value - Nebraska Dept. of Revenue Property Assessment Division);
2. County population (See Appendix B –2016 Estimated Population – Source is the US Census Bureau);
3. County valuations and levies (See Appendix C –Source is the 2016 Total Value - Nebraska Dept. of Revenue Property Assessment Division);
4. 2017 and estimated 2018 salaries of elected and appointed officials (Source is Survey to 93 County Clerks);
5. Current benefits offered by counties;
6. Cost-of-living adjustment factors counties now use;
7. Consumer Price Index (CPI – Urban and Midwest) increases 2011-2013;
8. Salary increases received by state employees;
9. County Levies.
10. Center for Public Affairs and Research - <https://www.unomaha.edu/college-of-public-affairs-and-community-service/center-for-public-affairs-research/programs/population-estimates.php>.
11. "Employment Cost Index", Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor (7/28/2017).

Members of the committee are well aware that the positions of elected and appointed county officials are unique, making it particularly difficult to compare their positions with those of other positions within a



community. However, the committee does stress that in spite of a lack of comparisons, consideration must be given to local salary levels and economic conditions when salaries are established.

The committee appreciated that since 1981, many County Boards have made a recognizable effort to eliminate the disparity once found in county salaries and benefits but more work remains to be done. It is the desire of the committee that County Boards continue to exercise good judgment when establishing salaries and benefits for elected and appointed officials.

The committee *strongly urges* county board members to thoroughly review this report and give consideration to the recommendations it contains before adopting a final salary resolution prior to January 15, 2018. It is understood that all counties face statutory levy and budget limits. It is further understood that the recurring uncertainty regarding property tax revenues, consolidation issues and economic uncertainty are of eminent concern to counties. However, the rate of inflation the state has experienced since 2015 and the current costs of goods and services should be taken into consideration, as well as the growth and decline of populations in certain areas of the State. In order that qualified individuals will continue to be attracted to seek and retain county offices, salaries and benefits should be afforded which reflect the current standard of living in Nebraska and are acceptable in today's competitive job market.

METHOD USED TO ARRIVE AT THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Arriving at the specific amount for salaries is not simple. Rather, it is a process that reflects not only upon market conditions, but other factors such as societal values and political realities. Additionally, the training and skill necessary for holding office, and retaining and attracting qualified individuals to the office are factors that are important considerations when setting a fair and equitable salary for county officials.

The 2017 Salary Committee reviewed a great deal of information and considered a variety of methods that could be used to arrive at a salary range, including annual inflation rates. The committee began with the \$38,000 minimum base established for base of Category 1 counties by the 2013 Salary Committee. Additionally, the same calculation for adjusting the high of the recommended salary range (\$48,000) for the base of Category 1 was utilized. Based upon population, valuation and weighting figures described later in the report that the Committee reviewed, it compared the groupings of the counties established in the 2015 recommendations. The committee then adjusted some of the counties' groupings and established 6 categories for salary ranges.

The salary ranges for Categories 1-6 are as follows:

Category	Minimum Recommended Salary 2019	High of Recommended Salary Range 2019
1	\$ 42,900	\$ 54,200
2	\$ 48,600	\$ 67,700
3	\$ 54,300	\$ 72,500
4	\$ 59,800	\$ 79,000
5	\$ 64,500	\$ 82,000
6	\$101,600	\$135,500



The committee increased the recommended salaries to account for cost of living increases as reflected by current inflation rates, the Consumer Price Index percentage of change and other factors. More specifically, the Committee determined that the adjusted minimum salary within each county should reflect approximately a 1.575 percent/% (calculated as follows -- $0 + 1.8 + 2.25 + 2.25 = 6.3/4$) adjustment to the actual salary for 2018 to determine the minimum salary for the term of office for 2019-2022. The 0 and 1.8 percent are actual U.S. Department of Labor – Bureau of Labor Statistics for Midwest CPI-U figures for December-December 2015 and 2016 respectively. The 2.25 % for the next two years are estimates utilized by the Committee. The ranges for the categories of counties were determined by evaluating a weighted analysis of population and valuation where population was weighted by seventy percent population (70 %) and valuation by thirty percent (30 %). The basis for such weighting was because the Committee determined that the population of the county would serve as a major indicator of the volume of work that a county official would be required to perform.

The committee evaluated the differences and similarities of the various counties and groupings thoroughly with respect to valuation, population, growth and decline in populations and other factors influencing counties' and county officials' responsibilities. The committee elected to add a category of counties established by the 2013 Salary Committee. The basis for doing so was because the differences in the counties and salaries, populations and valuations were seemingly more distinguishable than previously recognized.

After establishing a range of salary levels for each county, the committee approved the following recommendations for the 2019-2022 term of office:

1. In view of the current economic conditions and the forecast for 2019-2022 every effort should be made to provide a livable income which will attract and retain competent candidates. Therefore, a minimum base salary for any full-time elected official entrusted with the performance of county affairs should be no less than \$42,900 per annum prior to deductions in any county.
2. At a minimum, paid health insurance coverage equivalent to single person coverage should be provided.
3. After establishing a base salary of at least \$42,900, County Boards are strongly urged to include in their salary resolutions provisions for cost-of-living increases for calendar years 2020, 2021 and 2022. The salary resolution a County Board adopts prior to January 15, 2018 may not be altered to increase or decrease a county official's salary during the 2019-2022 term of office.

MINIMUM BASE SALARY WITHIN A SALARY RANGE DEFINED

The committee wishes to emphasize that the lowest salary in a "salary range" and as used in this report should be understood to mean the *least amount* acceptable to provide a livable income for the person maintaining the duties of the office. Additionally, while a salary range is established for each county, a county must establish a base salary for each office pursuant to the Nebraska Constitution and state statute.

Such recommendations *are not intended* to suggest that county officials' salaries should be frozen or reduced where the salary of a county official is higher than the amount contained in the salary range established by the Committee.



TRENDS FOR MINIMUM BASE SALARIES

Although a number of counties pay their county officials at or above the 2011 Salary Committee's recommended level, there are a number that do not. Based on the 2013 Salary Survey, 50 of 93 counties were paying county officials at or above the minimum salary recommendation for 2011. This is a noteworthy decrease from the 2011 report in which 76 of 93 counties were paying the minimum level commended.

These observations played a significant factor in the Salary Committee determining that a salary range was appropriate for the 2019 Salary Recommendations report.

An earlier report shows that in 2007, 67 of the 93 counties were at or above the minimum salary recommendation.

In 2017, 78 of 93 counties were paying at or above the minimum recommended salary. Based on the 2017 salaries of the county clerks, 15 counties do not meet the 2015 minimum recommended salary for the minimum salary within their counties established range of salaries. This is a slight decrease from the 2015-2018 term of office.

The salaries of clerks in 2017 range from around \$20 - \$20,000 above the minimum salary recommendation with the counties' range.

SALARY RANGES BY COUNTY

Included within the information reviewed by the Committee was a chart showing the differences between the actual salaries for 2017 and the minimum salary recommendations for the term of office beginning in 2015. From this chart, it was determined there were counties that did not meet the 2015 recommended minimum salary by as much as \$8,400. At the same time, there were counties that exceeded the recommended minimum salary by over \$15,700 and one county that exceeded the maximum within the range by \$700. These differences in salaries prompted the Committee to adopt philosophies of past Salary Committees by recognizing the value of "local control" and at the same time provide a basis for establishing salaries to county officials that provide a livable wage. With those principles in mind, the Committee established a range of salaries for the respective categories of counties to strive to attain.

The following represents the committee's minimum base salary recommendations within a range of salaries for each county for the office term commencing January 3, 2019.³

³ Unless otherwise provided by the Nebraska Constitution or by law, the terms of all elected officers begin on the first Thursday after the first Tuesday in January next succeeding their election. NEB. CONST. ART. XVII, sec. 5.



2019-2022		County	Weighted	2016 Est.	2016	2016
70% Pop./30%Val. Range			70 % Pop, 30 % Val	Population	Taxable Value	Tax Rate
0-175,000,000	1	ARTHUR	65,133,293	469	217,109,881	0.2319
0-175,000,000	1	MCPHERSON	76,301,706	493	254,337,869	0.2516
0-175,000,000	1	GRANT	79,427,193	641	264,755,815	0.2930
0-175,000,000	1	HOOKER	80,859,911	708	269,531,384	0.2925
0-175,000,000	1	THOMAS	81,116,121	716	270,385,398	0.2782
0-175,000,000	1	BANNER	83,692,145	798	278,971,953	0.3705
0-175,000,000	1	BLAINE	96,392,370	484	321,306,771	0.2410
0-175,000,000	1	LOGAN	99,159,188	772	330,528,824	0.2278
0-175,000,000	1	LOUP	101,549,827	591	338,498,045	0.1762
0-175,000,000	1	DEUEL	130,904,529	1,873	436,344,061	0.4587
0-175,000,000	1	GARFIELD	136,904,507	2,011	456,343,664	0.2667
0-175,000,000	1	KEYA PAHA	138,436,978	791	461,454,748	0.2087
0-175,000,000	1	WHEELER	169,873,467	776	566,243,079	0.2178
0-175,000,000	1	HAYES	170,788,019	897	569,291,305	0.1621
0-175,000,000	1	BOYD	173,957,907	1,982	579,855,066	0.2639
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	SIoux	190,213,776	1,242	634,043,022	0.1435
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	ROCK	199,344,242	1,390	664,477,562	0.3169
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	KIMBALL	206,178,655	3,679	687,253,598	0.4630
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	GARDEN	212,458,699	1,930	708,191,159	0.3544
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	PAWNEE	219,031,892	2,652	730,100,118	0.2834
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	HITCHCOCK	232,060,828	2,825	773,529,503	0.2300
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	BROWN	247,413,826	2,960	824,705,848	0.3082
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	DAWES	264,466,059	8,979	881,532,578	0.3607
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	JOHNSON	267,172,551	5,171	890,563,105	0.2700
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	DUNDY	268,701,407	1,831	895,667,085	0.2183
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	GOSPER	271,552,484	1,971	905,170,346	0.2044
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	GREELEY	288,932,928	2,399	963,104,162	0.1644
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	SHERMAN	289,392,351	3,054	964,634,045	0.2261
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	FRONTIER	290,270,705	2,621	967,562,901	0.2171
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	SHERIDAN	307,345,264	5,234	1,024,471,999	0.3448
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	HARLAN	308,960,539	3,473	1,029,860,358	0.1675
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	VALLEY	312,500,411	4,184	1,041,658,275	0.2324
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	THURSTON	315,007,993	7,127	1,050,010,013	0.3116
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	MORRILL	320,520,221	4,787	1,068,389,568	0.3384
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	FRANKLIN	320,961,752	3,014	1,069,865,474	0.2290
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	WEBSTER	321,877,124	3,603	1,072,915,341	0.3155
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	FURNAS	328,036,116	4,787	1,093,442,549	0.2150
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	NEMAHA	344,743,140	6,971	1,149,127,534	0.2942
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	NANCE	347,315,474	3,576	1,157,709,904	0.2144
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	RED WILLOW	377,899,765	10,722	1,259,640,865	0.2965
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	HOWARD	397,890,091	6,429	1,326,285,301	0.1745



1919-2022		County	Weighted	2016 Est.	2016	2016
70% Pop./30% Val. Range			70% Pop., 30% Val.	Population	Taxable Value	Tax Rate
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	PERKINS	408,474,358	2,898	1,361,574,432	0.2189
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	BOX BUTTE	423,876,877	11,194	1,412,896,804	0.3013
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	NUCKOLLS	432,698,496	4,265	1,442,318,369	0.1869
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	RICHARDSON	443,329,202	8,060	1,477,745,200	0.3441
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	DIXON	457,906,810	5,762	1,526,342,589	0.2262
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	CHEYENNE	466,697,539	10,051	1,555,635,012	0.4297
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	CHASE	468,521,772	3,937	1,561,730,053	0.1828
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	STANTON	472,969,939	5,944	1,576,552,594	0.2066
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	KEITH	506,588,849	8,018	1,688,610,789	0.2429
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	DAKOTA	511,316,996	20,465	1,704,342,234	0.3250
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	MERRICK	545,615,080	7,828	1,818,698,667	0.2363
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	COLFAX	553,528,767	10,414	1,845,071,591	0.2992
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	WAYNE	571,499,359	9,365	1,904,976,012	0.2503
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	CHERRY	580,473,643	5,832	1,934,898,535	0.2122
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	POLK	580,887,645	5,203	1,936,280,009	0.1389
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	JEFFERSON	582,018,422	7,177	1,940,044,660	0.2828
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	BURT	593,927,498	6,546	1,979,743,051	0.2433
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	PIERCE	617,601,706	7,159	2,058,655,649	0.2162
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	THAYER	619,961,888	5,101	2,066,527,723	0.1346
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	KNOX	628,206,059	8,571	2,094,000,198	0.1544
175,000,001-650,000,000	2	KEARNEY	642,310,175	6,552	2,141,018,627	0.1827
650,000,001-825,000,000	3	SALINE	687,067,897	14,331	2,290,192,884	0.3042
650,000,001-825,000,000	3	CLAY	687,429,046	6,163	2,291,415,774	0.2235
650,000,001-825,000,000	3	OTOE	698,553,703	16,081	2,328,474,821	0.2902
650,000,001-825,000,000	3	PHELPS	716,707,033	9,266	2,389,001,821	0.2052
650,000,001-825,000,000	3	BOONE	722,464,604	5,332	2,408,202,906	0.1510
650,000,001-825,000,000	3	BUTLER	731,124,408	8,052	2,437,062,572	0.1446
650,000,001-825,000,000	3	FILLMORE	763,864,415	5,720	2,546,201,370	0.1652
650,000,001-825,000,000	3	CUMING	782,104,638	9,016	2,606,994,423	0.0997
650,000,001-825,000,000	3	ANTELOPE	786,939,176	6,329	2,623,115,820	0.1947
650,000,001-825,000,000	3	CEDAR	807,344,747	8,671	2,691,128,924	0.1845
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	SCOTTS BLUFF	833,992,649	36,422	2,779,890,512	0.4140
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	WASHINGTON	901,758,408	20,603	3,005,813,287	0.3238
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	SEWARD	918,719,254	17,284	3,062,357,183	0.2744
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	HAMILTON	961,326,825	9,186	3,204,401,315	0.1304
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	GAGE	968,496,660	21,799	3,228,271,337	0.2881
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	HOLT	982,292,732	10,250	3,274,285,189	0.2179
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	DAWSON	996,315,874	23,640	3,320,997,753	0.3064
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	YORK	1,022,344,115	13,794	3,407,781,532	0.1936
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	CASS	1,038,192,070	25,767	3,460,580,111	0.3710
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	CUSTER	1,067,197,047	10,807	3,557,298,273	0.1760



2019-2022		County	Weighted 70 % Pop., 30% Val.	2016 Est. Population	2016 Taxable Value	2016 Tax Rate
825,000,001-1,100,000,000	4	SAUNDERS	1,096,554,857	21,038	3,655,133,768	0.2460
1,100,000,001-3,000,000,000	5	ADAMS	1,121,989,092	31,684	3,739,889,712	0.2711
1,100,000,001-3,000,000,000	5	MADISON	1,148,979,463	35,015	3,829,849,842	0.3218
1,100,000,001-3,000,000,000	5	DODGE	1,181,863,518	36,757	3,939,459,295	0.2218
1,100,000,001-3,000,000,000	5	LINCOLN	1,422,119,015	35,550	4,740,313,768	0.2689
1,100,000,001-3,000,000,000	5	PLATTE	1,592,726,941	32,861	5,309,013,126	0.1985
1,100,000,001-3,000,000,000	5	HALL	1,644,000,517	61,705	5,479,857,745	0.3906
1,100,000,001-3,000,000,000	5	BUFFALO	1,757,757,560	49,383	5,859,076,639	0.2896
3,000,000,001-15,000,000,000	6	SARPY	4,069,413,850	179,023	13,564,295,114	0.2969
3,000,000,001-15,000,000,000	6	LANCASTER	7,025,694,023	309,637	23,418,257,589	0.2753
3,000,000,001-15,000,000,000	6	DOUGLAS	12,120,153,627	554,995	40,399,217,100	0.2806

FUNDING FOR MINIMUM SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS

In counties where additional revenue would be required to meet the minimum salary recommendations, the following examples reflect the additional levy that a county would need to assess to fund such recommendations:

- **Example A** has a \$200,000,000 valuation. County A has 4 county officials, excluding county board members, whose salaries need adjusted by approximately an additional \$3,200/official. Thus, the budget would increase by \$12,800/year which equals approximately an additional \$.0064 levy.
- **Example B** has a \$500,000,000 valuation. County B has 4 county officials, excluding county board members, whose salaries need adjusted by approximately an additional \$4,000/official. Thus, the budget would increase by \$16,000/year which equals approximately an additional \$.0032 levy.
- **Example C** has a \$700,000,000 valuation. County C has 6 county officials, excluding county board members, whose salaries need adjusted by approximately an additional \$4,500/official. Thus, the budget would increase by \$27,000/year which equals approximately an additional \$.00386 levy.
- **Example D** has a \$780,000,000 valuation. County D has 6 county officials, excluding county board members, whose salaries need adjusted by approximately an additional \$3,500/official. Thus, the budget would increase by \$21,000/year which equals approximately an additional \$.0027 levy.
- **Example E** has a \$1,000,000,000 valuation. County E has 7 county officials, excluding county board members, whose salaries need adjusted by approximately an additional \$3,600/official.



Thus, the budget would increase by \$25,200/year which equals approximately an additional \$.0025 levy.

- **Example F** has a \$2,000,000,000 valuation. County F has 7 county officials, excluding county board members, whose salaries need adjusted by approximately an additional \$3,800/official. Thus, the budget would increase by \$26,600/year which equals approximately an additional \$.00133 levy.

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

A number of special considerations were discussed by the committee and its members offer the following additional recommendations:

Multiple Officeholders as Defined by State Statute

Since many county clerks hold from two to five statutory offices, the committee encourages County Boards to consider the additional workload involved and provide a sufficient number of staff members to help alleviate the problem a multiple officeholder faces. The committee further recommends that while this may ease the workload somewhat, additional compensation should be considered for the elected official since the ultimate responsibility for the offices rests on his or her shoulders.

Shifting Duties and Responsibilities Between County Officials

In some counties, duties have been transferred to another county official and additional employees are now under another officials' supervision (e.g. Treasurers - mandatory 1-stop services). The committee recommends that as County Boards set salaries for such officials, they recognize factors such as increased workloads and additional supervision of employees, and compensate the county officials accordingly.

Nonstatutory Responsibilities

Responsibilities other than statutory duties should also be taken into consideration for compensation of all county officials.

County Board Members - Commissioners and Supervisors

It has been found that County Board members sometimes fail to adjust their own salaries. The committee *strongly encourages* County Board members to give serious consideration to adjusting their own salaries upward and that the salary agreed upon, for both the commissioner and supervisor forms of government, be at least 50 percent of the minimum base recommended in this report. Additionally, the committee recommends that the County Boards adjust their salaries to reflect cost of living changes for themselves as well as the other county officials.

Further, the committee understands that the chairperson of the County Board sometimes acquires additional responsibilities. Therefore, County Boards may wish to compensate the chairperson accordingly. The committee recommends that the amount of any additional compensation be left at the discretion of the County Board but established in the salary resolution.



County Attorneys

State statutes mandate that the office of county attorney requires specialized training and continuing legal education. The county attorney is on call 24 hours per day and has an immense number of responsibilities. The role of the county attorney varies greatly from year-to-year, as well as from county-to-county. In order to attract attorneys, the position in most counties is part-time; that is, allowing for an outside private practice. Compensation should be made on a county-by-county basis, with consideration given to keeping qualified individuals in office.

In some cases, the office of county attorney is a full-time position, curtailing the opportunity for private practice.⁴ The Committee recommended a “minimum” base salary of 160 percent of elected county officials’ salary **for full-time county attorneys**. This recommendation is intended to be a *minimum base recommendation*, or what the committee established to mean the *least* amount acceptable to provide a livable income for a full-time county attorney. Such minimum recommendation *is not intended* to suggest that a county attorney’s salary should be frozen or reduced where his or her salary is higher than the minimum base recommendation. The committee further recommended that salary increases for county attorneys be commensurate with the percentage salary increases afforded other elected officials within the county.

Public Defenders

The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees to all persons accused of a crime the right to counsel in their defense. The United States Supreme Court has clarified that the Sixth Amendment requires the Government to make counsel available for persons accused of crime who cannot afford to hire an attorney. *State, County and Local Expenditures for Indigent Defense Services Fiscal Year 2008*, American Bar Association Standing Committee on Legal Aid and Indigent Defendants Bar Information Program (November 2010).

Nebraska’s indigent defense is organized within each of its 93 counties. Counties are able to select their method of delivery from public defenders, assigned counsel, or contract counsel. Counties with populations over 100,000 and those with approval from the county board have public defender offices. Douglas, and Lancaster Counties have public defender offices. In addition, where public defenders are established with a population over 100,000, the chief public defender in those counties is publicly elected.

Sheriffs

Historically, Salary Committees have recommended that the salary of the county sheriff should be set at 115 percent of the recommended minimum base salary. This year the Committee elected to recommend an increase in the percentage provided to sheriffs who operate a jail. The recommended amount is 125%-140% percent of the minimum recommended salary if the sheriff is also in charge of operating the county jail. Counties are encouraged to consider an increased salary for a sheriff who operates a jail, including the size of the jail, staffing of personnel, workload and any other factors relevant to operating jail duties. Additionally, County Boards have been encouraged to consider any housing allowances or other benefits that may currently be provided to the sheriff.

⁴ See Neb. Rev. Stat. § 23-1206.01 for the provisions related to full-time employment for county attorneys.



Engineers, Surveyors

Another office that past Salary Committees have felt deserve special consideration is that of the engineer or surveyor. It too varies from county-to-county as determined by state statutes. Whatever the classification - full-time, part-time or contractual - specialized training and certification are required. When establishing the salary for this office, County Boards have been encouraged to consider not only the training and certification, but also the size of the county's road program, including but not limited to the number of paved and unpaved road miles.

If a county having a population of less than 150,000 has an elected county surveyor in office on January 1, 2020, the county board may, prior to February 1, 2020, following a public hearing, adopt a resolution to continue to elect the county surveyor for the county and not to submit the question pursuant to subsection (2) of this section. Section 32-525(3).

Beginning in 2021, in each county having a population of less than 150,000 inhabitants, the county board must submit the question of electing a county surveyor in the county to the registered voters of the county at the next statewide general election if (i) the county board, by majority vote of all the members of the county board, adopts a resolution on or before September 1 prior to the next statewide general election to submit the question to the voters or (ii) a petition conforming to section 32-628 asking for the submission of the question to the voters is presented to the election commissioner or county clerk on or before September 1 prior to the next statewide general election signed by at least ten percent of the registered voters of the county. The election commissioner or county clerk shall verify the signatures pursuant to section 32-631 and place the question on the ballot if he or she determines that at least ten percent of the registered voters of the county have signed the petition. Section 32-525(4)(a).

Budget Preparation

While some county officials can be paid an additional amount for preparing the budget, if there is no reference in the salary resolution established prior to the election, the resolution should include some reference to paying the county clerk or other elected county officials for performing such duties. During the 2002 legislative session, LB 1018 passed so that county clerks are provided the same eligibility to receive payment for preparing the county budget as other county officials. (See sample resolutions for budget preparation.)

Mandatory Education

Various county officials are required to receive specialized training before and/or after election. Other county officials attend optional training courses designed to improve upon their skills and knowledge in the county office. Following are some examples:

State statutes and rules and regulations mandate that to be eligible to run for the office of county assessor, a person must hold an Assessor Certificate issued by the Property Tax Administrator. Additionally, individuals must obtain continuing education for re-certification.

State statute requires individuals that wish to seek nomination or appointment to the office of County Attorney be admitted to the practice of law in this state. Those in counties of Class 4, 5, 6 or 7 must have actively practiced law in this state by the time such person would



take office.⁵ Section 23-1114.01 applies for purposes of designating the classification of counties. Every county attorney and deputy county attorney in this state is required to annually undertake and complete the required hours of continuing legal education established by the Nebraska County Attorney Standards Advisory Council. Section 23-1217.

Public Defenders are required to be admitted to the practice of law. Section 23-3401. Nebraska Supreme Court Rules mandate ten hours of continuing education for all active attorneys.

Judicial branch employees are required to attend judicial branch education programs as directed by the Supreme Court or the Nebraska Judicial Branch Advisory Education Committee. For the purposes of the Supreme Court rules, judicial branch employees include Clerks of the District Court and ex officios.

In conjunction with the submission of a candidate filing form, a candidate for Sheriff who does not have a law enforcement certificate or diploma issued by the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice must submit a standardized letter certifying that he or she has passed a background check and received a minimum combined score on the reading comprehension and English language portions of an adult education examination designated by the Nebraska Law Enforcement Training Center. Each sheriff is required to attend the Nebraska Law Enforcement Training Center and receive a certificate attesting to satisfactory completion of the Sheriff's Certification Course within eight months of taking office unless such sheriff has already been awarded a certificate or unless such sheriff can demonstrate his or her previous training and education is such that he or she will professionally discharge the duties of the office. There is an exception for any sheriff in office prior to July 19, 1980. Additionally, each sheriff must attend twenty hours of continuing education in criminal justice and law enforcement courses approved by the council each year following the first year of such sheriff's term of office. Section 23-1701.01.

Caseloads

Cases and workloads of county offices, including attorneys, public defenders and clerks of the district court, should be given consideration when establishing salaries.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL BENEFITS

The committee recommends that counties continue to make every effort to provide the most complete health and medical coverage possible. At a minimum, single coverage should be provided. However, consideration should be given to upgrading the coverage if at all possible subject to federal mandates.

Affordable Care Act (ACA) and Health Insurance

In March 2010, President Obama signed comprehensive health reform, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), into law. Many provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care

⁵ Population of 14,000 to 19,999 inhabitants, Class 4; Population of 20,000 to 59,999 inhabitants, Class 5; Population of 60,000 to 199,999 inhabitants, Class 6; Population of 200,000 inhabitants or more Class 7. Section 23-1114.01.



Act (Affordable Care Act) that become effective beginning in 2014 are designed to expand access to affordable health coverage. Since that timeframe, the merits both for and against the Affordable Health Care Act continue to be debated at the Federal and State level by Executive, Legislative and the Judiciary in court decisions. At the time of the Salary Committee's discussions, the US Senate was debating its version of a health care bill. Earlier this year, the House had passed its version of a health care related bill. As of September 20, 2017, the Senate has not passed its version of either a repeal or modification to the Affordable Care Act.

A March 2001 Attorney General's Opinion concluded that health and dental insurance coverages and premiums paid for those benefits are not "compensation" subject to the strictures of art. III, § 19 of the Nebraska Constitution so they may be changed from time to time. County Boards may consider such benefits at the same time they consider salary related issues for elected officials. Given the changing environment of the health care currently, boards are encouraged to adopt resolutions that provide for flexibility to consider different variables related to health and benefit plans occasionally. Additionally, boards are *strongly discouraged* from adopting resolutions which are worded in such a manner to prevent consideration of changes in plans during the county officials term of office. (See Appendix D for a summary of an Attorney General's Opinion discussing health insurance)

Counties are encouraged to keep apprised of current requirements and benefits associated with health insurance.

"Cash In Lieu" of Health Insurance

While some counties look for ways to manage insurance costs, (See sample resolutions "cash in lieu of insurance"), opt-out or "cash in lieu" of options are considered. The Treasury Department issued a proposed rule on Premium Tax Credits that includes clarifications on how cash in lieu of insurance arrangements in a cafeteria plan (aka opt-out arrangements) are treated for purposes of the affordability calculation under the ACA Employer Shared Responsibility Rules. The final rule was expected in 2016 following a comment period, and would be effective January 1, 2017. However, several comments on the proposed rule were received and the Treasury Department and the IRS continue to examine the issues raised by opt-out arrangements and expect to finalize regulations on the effect of opt-out arrangements on an employee's required contribution at a later time.

Although not the Eighth Circuit court that establishes the law in Nebraska, a recent court held that under the Fair Labor Standards Act, employers must pay employees overtime based on their "regular rate." *Flores v. City of Gabriel*, 824 F3d 890 (2016). The court concluded that an employer that paid cash in lieu of unused benefits should have added those payments into the regular rate for overtime pay under some circumstances. The court held that one of the key issues was whether "the character of the payment was compensation for work." The City petitioned the Supreme Court for review and it is pending.

This court decision, continued climate of the various branches of government and the continued analysis of the IRS Department illustrate reasons for which counties would want to consider incorporating language within their salary resolutions to address "cash in lieu" of provisions so as to not possibly conflict with the prohibitions of Art. III, §19 to "shall not be increased or diminished during his or her term of office, ..."



Counties who are considering an opt-out or “cash in lieu” option should consult with your county attorney and competent benefits counsel to ensure the option is offered in compliance with caselaw, statutes and constitutional provisions.

Prohibition of Financial Incentives Not to Enroll in a Group Health Plan or a Large Group Health Plan

The Medicare Secondary Payer (MSP) is the term used by Medicare when Medicare is not responsible for paying first. (The private insurance industry generally talks about “Coordination of Benefits” when assigning responsibility for first and second payment). These Federal requirements are found in Section 1862(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. § 1395y(b)(5)). Section 70.2 of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Medicare Secondary Payer Manual states:

Section 1862(b)(1)(A)(i)(II) of the Act provides that GHPs of employers of 20 or more employees must provide to any employee of spouse age 65 or older the same benefits under the same conditions that they provide to employees and spouses under 65 if those 65 or older are covered under the plan on the basis of the individual’s current employment status or the current employment status of a spouse of any age. The requirement applies regardless of the whether the individual or spouse 65. <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Manuals/downloads/msp105c01.pdf>

It is unlawful for an employer or other entity to offer any financial or other incentive for an individual entitled to benefits under this subchapter not to enroll (or to terminate enrollment) under a group health plan or a large group health plan which would (in the case of such enrollment) be a primary plan (as defined in paragraph (2)(A)). Any entity that violates the previous sentence is subject to a civil money penalty of not to exceed \$5,000 for each such violation. The provisions of section 1320a–7a of this title (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under the previous sentence in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1320a–7a(a) of this title. See section 42 U.S.C. § 1395 y (b)(3)(c).

Applicable regulations are found at 42 CFR Part 411.

Cost-of-Living Increases

Based on the results of the survey conducted for the committee, 33 counties did not include any type of a cost-of-living provision for elected officials in the resolutions for salaries beginning in 2015. This is an increase in the counties that did not provide cost of living provisions for elected officials based on the 2011 study.

As was the case with the previous committees, this committee strongly believes that a provision for a cost-of-living increase is an integral part of the salary resolution. Such increases are particularly important since salaries are set for a four-year term and may not be altered during that time period. County Boards are encouraged to include a provision for a cost-of-living increase when preparing their respective resolutions. It is important that salaries of county officials, including County Board members’ salaries, continue to keep pace with the cost of living.



Many methods are available for providing cost-of-living increases. Likewise, there are many variations to these methods which counties may wish to consider. During the course of this study, the following methods were found to be most widely used by County Boards:

1. Grant a specific dollar amount increase each year;
2. Grant a specific percentage rate increase effective each year;
3. Grant an annual salary adjustment which is tied to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor;
4. Grant an adjustment based on the Consumer Price Index but limit it to a maximum dollar amount; or
5. Grant an annual salary adjustment which is tied to a percentage of the Consumer Price Index issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The preceding cost-of-living adjustment methods are listed solely for example purposes. No recommendation on which method to use was expressed by the committee. County Board members are encouraged to implement a method that best suits their county.

IMPORTANT NOTE: County Board members are *strongly discouraged* from adopting salary resolutions which are worded in such a manner to prevent cost-of-living adjustments. Oftentimes resolutions contain clauses which permit adjustments only if, for example, the Consumer Price Index is greater than 5 percent. In cases such as this, county officials would receive no adjustment if the CPI was under that percentage. Wording such as this could essentially freeze the salary for the four-year term and make it even more difficult to meet minimum salary recommendations in the future.

Potential Conflicts of Interest/Financial Gain/Compensation Provided by Law

An Accountability and Disclosure Opinion, adopted by the Commission June 2017, addresses the following questions:

1. *May a county board member vote for him or herself for county board chair without violating the conflict of interest provisions within Neb. Rev. Stat. §49-1499.03?*

Yes, a county board member may vote for himself or herself for county board chair without violating the provisions of Neb. Rev. Stat. §49-1499.03. The referenced section defines a potential conflict of interest as one in which, if an official takes official action, it will likely result in financial benefit or detriment to that official. If so, there may be a potential conflict of interest. The question simply asks whether a board member, in the absence of any potential financial gain or detriment, may vote for himself or herself. *NADC Advisory Opinion #202.*

2. *If the answer to (1) is yes, is the answer different if the county board chair would receive additional compensation for serving as county board chair as provided for in a county's salary resolution?*

No, the answer is not different if the county board chair receives additional compensation for being county board chair. The term "financial gain", as it is used in §49-1499.03 of the NPADA does not include government compensation provided by law. Therefore, it is not a conflict of interest, as defined by the NPADA, for a county



board member to vote for himself or herself for the position of chairman of the county board even where that position has a greater compensation. *NADC Advisory Opinion #202.*

3. *If an individual is allowed to vote for him or herself, would he or she be required to notify the Accountability and Disclosure Commission of such action pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §49-1499.03(1)(c)?*

No, an individual need not file a Potential Conflict of Interest Statement with the Nebraska Accountability and Disclosure Commission ("NADC") or otherwise notify the NADC, about voting for himself or herself for county board chair. *NADC Advisory Opinion #202.*

LOCAL FACTORS TO CONSIDER

While county government employment differs from private sector and non-profit employment, as well as State and Federal Government employment, the Committee recommends that the county consider salaries and benefits paid to their employees for the purpose of comparison, if appropriate. See Appendix E for additional resources to obtain relevant information.

Growth in and Declining Population Factors

David Drozd and Jerry Deichert at the University of Nebraska at Omaha Center for Public Affairs Research in December 2015 prepared a report entitled "Nebraska County Population Projections: 2010 to 2050." Portions of this report are supported by the Nebraska Legislative Planning Committee. Within the introduction of the report, it states:

There are many potential uses of understanding how the population might change into the future. Population projections help us to plan and prepare for likely demographic changes. Using the current population structure and applying birth, death, and net migration rates and how they change for various ages provides a glimpse of the changes and shifts that are likely to occur as well as the timing of such changes....

The report following the description of data and methods states:

County Classification Groups

Many Nebraska counties have relatively small populations. Thus, the number of birth, death, and migration events in these counties are relatively small and can vary widely from year to year.

Therefore, to provide more stability and less fluctuation to the data, counties with similar characteristics and migration patterns were grouped, and the rates for the group as a whole were calculated and then applied to the individual counties in that group. This reduced the effect of small numbers and the choppy or erratic nature of working with information from relatively sparsely populated areas in which few life events occur in a given year.

Douglas County containing the city of Omaha and **Lancaster County** containing the city of Lincoln have a large enough population to provide individual projections without any county grouping. Nebraska's 3rd largest county, Sarpy, has a substantially larger population than the next



largest county (Hall), and is unique among Nebraska's counties in that its location near Omaha has led to strong population and housing growth in recent decades. **Sarpy County** had by far the highest level of net immigration during the 2000s, and it occurred for nearly all age groups, a distinct pattern compared to other counties. Thus, it was deemed essential to use Sarpy County's data specifically, and not group it with any other counties.

Certain other Nebraska counties follow Sarpy County's example of relatively strong migration given their proximity to Omaha and Lincoln and commuters who work in these larger cities but reside in the nearby counties. **Cass, Dodge, Gage, Otoe, Saunders, and Washington Counties** border either Douglas or Lancaster County and were found to have similar migration patterns during the 2000s, namely that they had a net outmigration of those at college age (15-29) but had an immigration for those of working age as well as children under 15 (families of the workers moving into these areas). Washington County did have net immigration of those aged 15-19 in the 2000s, but given the closure of Dana College in Blair the migration is likely to soften going forward. **Cheyenne County**, containing Sidney and Cabela's as a major employer, also had this migration pattern during the 2000s and was thus placed into this group of counties that were impacted by jobs or commuting, which will be referred to as "commuter counties".

Other types of counties with unique migration patterns included those with a "major college". **Buffalo, Dawes, and Wayne Counties** were included in this category as each had extremely high migration rates for the 5-year age groups of 15-19 and 20-24, followed by high levels of outmigration for ages 25 to 39. These counties contain the University of Nebraska at Kearney, Chadron State College and Wayne State College respectively.

Similarly, counties with a "small college" were grouped together. **Adams, Nemaha, Saline, and Seward Counties** home to Hastings College, Peru State College, Doane College, and Concordia University were included in this category. They were distinct from the "major colleges" and the "commuter counties" in that they only had a large immigration for the 15-19 five-year age group. Outmigration occurred for the 20-24 age group, and the outmigration was especially high for those who migrated during the 2000s who were aged 25-29 in 2010 (all migration by age values refer to the age of the person at the end of the 2000s period in 2010 – they could have migrated at any point during the 2000s but the movement is summarized for the ending age in 2010).

Nebraska has several counties that contain a city of at least 10,000 persons and serve as regional centers for shopping and services. Two of these counties are defined by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) as being metropolitan (Hall and Dakota) while the others are classified as being "micropolitan". Counties with a city of 10,000 that were not already classified into another category (e.g. Dodge and Gage as "commuter counties" and Buffalo as a "major college") fell into this category. **Dawson, Lincoln, Madison, Platte, and Scotts Bluff Counties** along with **Hall and Dakota Counties** comprised the "regional centers" category.

The remaining Nebraska counties were primarily rural in nature. In analyzing population changes during the 2000s, it has been noted that counties containing a city of 5,000 residents performed better from a population change standpoint than those that did not have a city of this size. This stems from both a higher level of natural change (births – deaths) as well as better net migration levels. For example, during the 2000s the "city of 5,000" counties of **Box**



Butte, Colfax, Phelps, Red Willow, and York had a net outmigration rate of about 50% for 20-24 year olds. In comparison, the outmigration rate was about 80% for counties rural in nature not containing a city of 5,000 people.

This left 64 Nebraska counties without a larger city or college yet to be classified. Two groups of 32 counties were formed based upon their net migration rates during the 2000s. The level of net migration was found using the difference in the 2000 and 2010 Census counts, accounting for the births and deaths that occurred within the county between the ten calendar years from 2000 to 2009. The migration rate was calculated as the net migration divided by the total population of the county at the start of the period in 2000. The migration rates were ranked and the 32 best counties were placed into a “high migration” group with the other 32 counties falling into a “low migration” group of counties. The cutline between the groups turned out to be a decade migration rate of -6.5% during the 2000s. Overall, the “high migration” rural counties as a group had an outmigration rate of -3.3% versus a -9.3% rate in the “low migration” rural counties. See **Table 1** for a listing of counties and the category into which they were grouped.

Note: Table 1 is Appendix E. See also, Appendix F.

Other factors influencing population increases and decreases within a county are births and fertility rates, deaths and survival rates and net migration rates. Each of these are factors worthy of consideration as a county establishes salaries for the next term of office of elected officials.

For a copy of “Nebraska County Population Projections: 2010 to 2050” Prepared by David Drozd, Jerry Deichert, Center for Public Affairs Research, University of Nebraska at Omaha go to:

<https://www.unomaha.edu/college-of-public-affairs-and-community-service/center-for-public-affairs-research/documents/nebraska-county-population-projections-2010-to-2050.pdf>

Although the initial reaction to a population loss would be a reduction in services required to county residents and others, the committee recognized and acknowledged that despite the decline or potential decline in the population in counties, duties and responsibilities of some of the county’s elected officials would remain the same. For example, the same quantity in the miles of roads would exist to maintain, the same number of parcels of land would exist to value and assess and other similar items.



SAMPLE RESOLUTIONS

The following are merely intended as samples of resolutions. They are not to be interpreted as legal documents. Before preparing the resolution for your county, consult your county attorney.

SALARY, COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT, BENEFITS

Sample 1: (Percentage Rate)

The annual salary for the office of _____ be established at \$_____ for the calendar year 2019. That for each year thereafter a _____ percent cost-of-living increase shall be added to the previous year's salary so the total amount paid for the calendar year 2020 shall be \$_____, for the calendar year 2021 shall be \$_____, and for the calendar year 2022 shall be \$_____.

Sample 2: (Flat Dollar Amount)

The annual salary for the office of _____ be established at \$_____ for the calendar year 2019. That for each year thereafter a \$_____ cost-of-living increase shall be added to the previous year's salary so the total amount paid for the calendar year 2020 shall be \$_____, for the calendar year 2021 shall be \$_____, and for the calendar year 2022 shall be \$_____.

Sample 3: (Consumer Price Index)

The annual salary for the office of _____ be established at \$_____ for the calendar year 2019, plus an annual increase during the term of office (2020, 2021, 2022) based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. When the CPI is 0 % or less than 0 %, the county official's annual salary shall remain the same as the prior year.

Sample 4: (Consumer Price Index with fixed ceiling)

The annual salary for the office of _____ be established at \$_____ for the calendar year 2019, plus an annual increase during the term of office (2020, 2021, 2022) based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, but that such increase shall not exceed the amount of \$_____ in any one year. When the CPI exceeds _____%, the increase in the annual salary for the office shall be _____% for the next year. When the CPI is 0% or less than 0 %, the county official's annual salary shall remain the same as the prior year.

Sample 5: (A Percentage of the Consumer Price Index)

The annual salary for the office of _____ be established at \$_____ for the calendar year 2019, plus an annual increase during the term of office (2020, 2021, 2022) based on _____% of the Consumer Price Index (CPI), as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. When the CPI exceeds 5%, the increase in the annual salary for the office shall be 5% for the next year. When the CPI is 0 % or less than 0 %, the county official's annual salary shall remain the same as the prior year.



BUDGET PREPARATION

Sample 1:

If the County Board designates any elected county official who is qualified to serve as the budget-making authority, he or she shall receive \$_____ for the calendar year 2019 and \$ ____ for 2020, \$ _____ for 2021 and \$ _____ for 2022.

Sample 2:

Be it further resolved, the county reserves the right to enter into any agreement with an elected official or officials who is qualified to serve as the budget-making authority as may be approved by the board. It is the intent of the _____ County Board that such agreement shall not constitute an increase in the herein adopted salary but shall be and is part of such salary as adopted and approved by this resolution.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL PLAN

Sample 1:

Be it further resolved that in addition to the above stated salary the elected official shall receive during his or her term of office at county expense the employee's portion of the county's health and medical plan, the same as offered to all county employees.

“CASH IN LIEU OF” HEALTH INSURANCE

Sample 1:

Be it further resolved that in addition to the above stated salary, the elected official shall receive during his or her term of office at county expense opt-out provisions (aka “cash in lieu of” provisions) if an employee opts out of the health and medical plan, the same as offered to all county employees. This option will be available as permitted by Federal and State statutes and rules and regulations of agencies, including those promulgated and adopted by the U.S. Department of Treasury, the U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Pursuant to the “cash in lieu of” program adopted by the county board and as allowed by State and Federal law and rules and regulations, an elected county official shall receive “cash in lieu” of health insurance the same as offered to all county employees.



Appendix A -- County Populations, Valuations by Alphabetical Listing

County	2016 Estimated Population	2016 Taxable Value	2016 Tax Rate	County	2016 Estimated Population	2016 Taxable Value	2016 Tax Rate
ADAMS	31,684	3,739,889,712	0.2711	JEFFERSON	7,177	1,940,044,660	0.2828
ANTELOPE	6,329	2,623,115,820	0.1947	JOHNSON	5,171	890,563,105	0.2700
ARTHUR	469	217,109,881	0.2319	KEARNEY	6,552	2,141,018,627	0.1827
BANNER	798	278,971,953	0.3705	KEITH	8,018	1,688,610,789	0.2429
BLAINE	484	321,306,771	0.2410	KEYA PAHA	791	461,454,748	0.2087
BOONE	5,332	2,408,202,906	0.1510	KIMBALL	3,679	687,253,598	0.4630
BOX BUTTE	11,194	1,412,896,804	0.3013	KNOX	8,571	2,094,000,198	0.1544
BOYD	1,982	579,855,066	0.2639	LANCASTER	309,637	23,418,257,589	0.2753
BROWN	2,960	824,705,848	0.3082	LINCOLN	35,550	4,740,313,768	0.2689
BUFFALO	49,383	5,859,076,639	0.2896	LOGAN	772	330,528,824	0.2278
BURT	6,546	1,979,743,051	0.2433	LOUP	591	338,498,045	0.1762
BUTLER	8,052	2,437,062,572	0.1446	MADISON	35,015	3,829,849,842	0.3218
CASS	25,767	3,460,580,111	0.3710	MCPHERSON	493	254,337,869	0.2516
CEDAR	8,671	2,691,128,924	0.1845	MERRICK	7,828	1,818,698,667	0.2363
CHASE	3,937	1,561,730,953	0.1828	MORRILL	4,787	1,068,389,568	0.3384
CHERRY	5,832	1,934,898,535	0.2122	NANCE	3,576	1,157,709,904	0.2144
CHEYENNE	10,051	1,555,635,012	0.4297	NEMAHA	6,971	1,149,127,534	0.2942
CLAY	6,163	2,291,415,774	0.2235	NUCKOLLS	4,265	1,442,318,369	0.1869
COLFAX	10,414	1,845,071,591	0.2992	OTOE	16,081	2,328,474,821	0.2902
CUMING	9,016	2,606,994,423	0.0997	PAWNEE	2,652	730,100,118	0.2834
CUSTER	10,807	3,557,298,273	0.1760	PERKINS	2,898	1,361,574,432	0.2189
DAKOTA	20,465	1,704,342,234	0.3250	PHELPS	9,266	2,389,001,821	0.2052
DAWES	8,979	881,532,578	0.3607	PIERCE	7,159	2,058,655,649	0.2162
DAWSON	23,640	3,320,997,753	0.3064	PLATTE	32,861	5,309,013,126	0.1985
DEUEL	1,873	436,344,061	0.4587	POLK	5,203	1,936,280,009	0.1389
DIXON	5,762	1,526,342,589	0.2262	RED WILLOW	10,722	1,259,640,865	0.2965
DODGE	36,757	3,939,459,295	0.2218	RICHARDSON	8,060	1,477,745,200	0.3441
DOUGLAS	554,995	40,399,217,100	0.2806	ROCK	1,390	664,477,562	0.3169
DUNDY	1,831	895,667,085	0.2183	SALINE	14,331	2,290,192,884	0.3042
FILLMORE	5,720	2,546,201,370	0.1652	SARPY	179,023	13,564,295,114	0.2969
FRANKLIN	3,014	1,069,865,474	0.2290	SAUNDERS	21,038	3,655,133,768	0.2460
FRONTIER	2,621	967,562,901	0.2171	SCOTTS BLUFF	36,422	2,779,890,512	0.4140
FURNAS	4,787	1,093,442,549	0.2150	SEWARD	17,284	3,062,357,183	0.2744
GAGE	21,799	3,228,271,337	0.2881	SHERIDAN	5,234	1,024,471,999	0.3448
GARDEN	1,930	708,191,159	0.3544	SHERMAN	3,054	964,634,045	0.2261
GARFIELD	2,011	456,343,664	0.2667	SIOUX	1,242	634,043,022	0.1435
GOSPER	1,971	905,170,346	0.2044	STANTON	5,944	1,576,552,594	0.2066
GRANT	641	264,755,815	0.2930	THAYER	5,101	2,066,527,723	0.1346
GREELEY	2,399	963,104,162	0.1644	THOMAS	716	270,385,398	0.2782
HALL	61,705	5,479,857,745	0.3906	THURSTON	7,127	1,050,010,013	0.3116
HAMILTON	9,186	3,204,401,315	0.1304	VALLEY	4,184	1,041,658,275	0.2324
HARLAN	3,473	1,029,860,358	0.1675	WASHINGTON	20,603	3,005,813,287	0.3238
HAYES	897	569,291,305	0.1621	WAYNE	9,365	1,904,976,012	0.2503
HITCHCOCK	2,825	773,529,503	0.2300	WEBSTER	3,603	1,072,915,341	0.3155
HOLT	10,250	3,274,285,189	0.2179	WHEELER	776	566,243,079	0.2178
HOOKER	708	269,531,384	0.2925	YORK	13,794	3,407,781,532	0.1936
HOWARD	6,429	1,326,285,301	0.1745				

Appendix B -- County Populations, Valuations by Population

County	2016 Estimated Population	2016 Taxable Value	2016 Tax Rate	County	2016 Estimated Population	2016 Taxable Value	2016 Tax Rate
ARTHUR	469	217,109,881	0.2319	ANTELOPE	6,329	2,623,115,820	0.1947
BLAINE	484	321,306,771	0.2410	HOWARD	6,429	1,326,285,301	0.1745
MCPHERSON	493	254,337,869	0.2516	BURT	6,546	1,979,743,051	0.2433
LOUP	591	338,498,045	0.1762	KEARNEY	6,552	2,141,018,627	0.1827
GRANT	641	264,755,815	0.2930	NEMAHA	6,971	1,149,127,534	0.2942
HOOKER	708	269,531,384	0.2925	THURSTON	7,127	1,050,010,013	0.3116
THOMAS	716	270,385,398	0.2782	PIERCE	7,159	2,058,655,649	0.2162
LOGAN	772	330,528,824	0.2278	JEFFERSON	7,177	1,940,044,660	0.2828
WHEELER	776	566,243,079	0.2178	MERRICK	7,828	1,818,698,667	0.2363
KEYA PAHA	791	461,454,748	0.2087	KEITH	8,018	1,688,610,789	0.2429
BANNER	798	278,971,953	0.3705	BUTLER	8,052	2,437,062,572	0.1446
HAYES	897	569,291,305	0.1621	RICHARDSON	8,060	1,477,745,200	0.3441
SIOUX	1,242	634,043,022	0.1435	KNOX	8,571	2,094,000,198	0.1544
ROCK	1,390	664,477,562	0.3169	CEDAR	8,671	2,691,128,924	0.1845
DUNDY	1,831	895,667,085	0.2183	DAWES	8,979	881,532,578	0.3607
DEUEL	1,873	436,344,061	0.4587	CUMING	9,016	2,606,994,423	0.0997
GARDEN	1,930	708,191,159	0.3544	HAMILTON	9,186	3,204,401,315	0.1304
GOSPER	1,971	905,170,346	0.2044	PHELPS	9,266	2,389,001,821	0.2052
BOYD	1,982	579,855,066	0.2639	WAYNE	9,365	1,904,976,012	0.2503
GARFIELD	2,011	456,343,664	0.2667	CHEYENNE	10,051	1,555,635,012	0.4297
GREELEY	2,399	963,104,162	0.1644	HOLT	10,250	3,274,285,189	0.2179
FRONTIER	2,621	967,562,901	0.2171	COLFAX	10,414	1,845,071,591	0.2992
PAWNEE	2,652	730,100,118	0.2834	RED WILLOW	10,722	1,259,640,865	0.2965
HITCHCOCK	2,825	773,529,503	0.2300	CUSTER	10,807	3,557,298,273	0.1760
PERKINS	2,898	1,361,574,432	0.2189	BOX BUTTE	11,194	1,412,896,804	0.3013
BROWN	2,960	824,705,848	0.3082	YORK	13,794	3,407,781,532	0.1936
FRANKLIN	3,014	1,069,865,474	0.2290	SALINE	14,331	2,290,192,884	0.3042
SHERMAN	3,054	964,634,045	0.2261	OTOE	16,081	2,328,474,821	0.2902
HARLAN	3,473	1,029,860,358	0.1675	SEWARD	17,284	3,062,357,183	0.2744
NANCE	3,576	1,157,709,904	0.2144	DAKOTA	20,465	1,704,342,234	0.3250
WEBSTER	3,603	1,072,915,341	0.3155	WASHINGTON	20,603	3,005,813,287	0.3238
KIMBALL	3,679	687,253,598	0.4630	SAUNDERS	21,038	3,655,133,768	0.2460
CHASE	3,937	1,561,730,053	0.1828	GAGE	21,799	3,228,271,337	0.2881
VALLEY	4,184	1,041,658,275	0.2324	DAWSON	23,640	3,320,997,753	0.3064
NUCKOLLS	4,265	1,442,318,369	0.1869	CASS	25,767	3,460,580,111	0.3710
FURNAS	4,787	1,093,442,549	0.2150	ADAMS	31,684	3,739,889,712	0.2711
MORRILL	4,787	1,068,389,568	0.3384	PLATTE	32,861	5,309,013,126	0.1985
THAYER	5,101	2,066,527,723	0.1346	MADISON	35,015	3,829,849,842	0.3218
JOHNSON	5,171	890,563,105	0.2700	LINCOLN	35,550	4,740,313,768	0.2689
POLK	5,203	1,936,280,009	0.1389	SCOTTS BLUFF	36,422	2,779,890,512	0.4140
SHERIDAN	5,234	1,024,471,999	0.3448	DODGE	36,757	3,939,459,295	0.2218
BOONE	5,332	2,408,202,906	0.1510	BUFFALO	49,383	5,859,076,639	0.2896
FILLMORE	5,720	2,546,201,370	0.1652	HALL	61,705	5,479,857,745	0.3906
DIXON	5,762	1,526,342,589	0.2262	SARPY	179,023	13,564,295,114	0.2969
CHERRY	5,832	1,934,898,535	0.2122	LANCASTER	309,637	23,418,257,589	0.2753
STANTON	5,944	1,576,552,594	0.2066	DOUGLAS	554,995	40,399,217,100	0.2806
CLAY	6,163	2,291,415,774	0.2235				

Appendix C -- County Populations, Valuations by Valuation

County	2016 Estimated Population	2016 Taxable Value	2016 Tax Rate	County	2016 Estimated Population	2016 Taxable Value	2016 Tax Rate
ARTHUR	469	217,109,881	0.2319	CHASE	3,937	1,561,730,053	0.1828
MCPHERSON	493	254,337,869	0.2516	STANTON	5,944	1,576,552,594	0.2066
GRANT	641	264,755,815	0.2930	KEITH	8,018	1,688,610,789	0.2429
HOOKER	708	269,531,384	0.2925	DAKOTA	20,465	1,704,342,234	0.3250
THOMAS	716	270,385,398	0.2782	MERRICK	7,828	1,818,698,667	0.2363
BANNER	798	278,971,953	0.3705	COLFAX	10,414	1,845,071,591	0.2992
BLAINE	484	321,306,771	0.2410	WAYNE	9,365	1,904,976,012	0.2503
LOGAN	772	330,528,824	0.2278	CHERRY	5,832	1,934,898,535	0.2122
LOUP	591	338,498,045	0.1762	POLK	5,203	1,936,280,009	0.1389
DEUEL	1,873	436,344,061	0.4587	JEFFERSON	7,177	1,940,044,660	0.2828
GARFIELD	2,011	456,343,664	0.2667	BURT	6,546	1,979,743,051	0.2433
KEYA PAHA	791	461,454,748	0.2087	PIERCE	7,159	2,058,655,649	0.2162
WHEELER	776	566,243,079	0.2178	THAYER	5,101	2,066,527,723	0.1346
HAYES	897	569,291,305	0.1621	KNOX	8,571	2,094,000,198	0.1544
BOYD	1,982	579,855,066	0.2639	KEARNEY	6,552	2,141,018,627	0.1827
SIoux	1,242	634,043,022	0.1435	SALINE	14,331	2,290,192,884	0.3042
ROCK	1,390	664,477,562	0.3169	CLAY	6,163	2,291,415,774	0.2235
KIMBALL	3,679	687,253,598	0.4630	OTOE	16,081	2,328,474,821	0.2902
GARDEN	1,930	708,191,159	0.3544	PHELPS	9,266	2,389,001,821	0.2052
PAWNEE	2,652	730,100,118	0.2834	BOONE	5,332	2,408,202,906	0.1510
HITCHCOCK	2,825	773,529,503	0.2300	BUTLER	8,052	2,437,062,572	0.1446
BROWN	2,960	824,705,848	0.3082	FILLMORE	5,720	2,546,201,370	0.1652
DAWES	8,979	881,532,578	0.3607	CUMING	9,016	2,606,994,423	0.0997
JOHNSON	5,171	890,563,105	0.2700	ANTELOPE	6,329	2,623,115,820	0.1947
DUNDY	1,831	895,667,085	0.2183	CEDAR	8,671	2,691,128,924	0.1845
GOSPER	1,971	905,170,346	0.2044	SCOTTS BLUFF	36,422	2,779,890,512	0.4140
GREELEY	2,399	963,104,162	0.1644	WASHINGTON	20,603	3,005,813,287	0.3238
SHERMAN	3,054	964,634,045	0.2261	SEWARD	17,284	3,062,357,183	0.2744
FRONTIER	2,621	967,562,901	0.2171	HAMILTON	9,186	3,204,401,315	0.1304
SHERIDAN	5,234	1,024,471,999	0.3448	GAGE	21,799	3,228,271,337	0.2881
HARLAN	3,473	1,029,860,358	0.1675	HOLT	10,250	3,274,285,189	0.2179
VALLEY	4,184	1,041,658,275	0.2324	DAWSON	23,640	3,320,997,753	0.3064
THURSTON	7,127	1,050,010,013	0.3116	YORK	13,794	3,407,781,532	0.1936
MORRILL	4,787	1,068,389,568	0.3384	CASS	25,767	3,460,580,111	0.3710
FRANKLIN	3,014	1,069,865,474	0.2290	CUSTER	10,807	3,557,298,273	0.1760
WEBSTER	3,603	1,072,915,341	0.3155	SAUNDERS	21,038	3,655,133,768	0.2460
FURNAS	4,787	1,093,442,549	0.2150	ADAMS	31,684	3,739,889,712	0.2711
NEMAHA	6,971	1,149,127,534	0.2942	MADISON	35,015	3,829,849,842	0.3218
NANCE	3,576	1,157,709,904	0.2144	DODGE	36,757	3,939,459,295	0.2218
RED WILLOW	10,722	1,259,640,865	0.2965	LINCOLN	35,550	4,740,313,768	0.2689
HOWARD	6,429	1,326,285,301	0.1745	PLATTE	32,861	5,309,013,126	0.1985
PERKINS	2,898	1,361,574,432	0.2189	HALL	61,705	5,479,857,745	0.3906
BOX BUTTE	11,194	1,412,896,804	0.3013	BUFFALO	49,383	5,859,076,639	0.2896
NUCKOLLS	4,265	1,442,318,369	0.1869	SARPY	179,023	13,564,295,114	0.2969
RICHARDSON	8,060	1,477,745,200	0.3441	LANCASTER	309,637	23,418,257,589	0.2753
DIXON	5,762	1,526,342,589	0.2262	DOUGLAS	554,995	40,399,217,100	0.2806
CHEYENNE	10,051	1,555,635,012	0.4297				

Appendix D -- Summary of Cases, Attorney General's and Accountability and Disclosure Opinions

Related to Art. III, § 19 and Compensation for County Officials

In *Shepoka v. Knopik*, 201 Neb. 780, 272 N.W.2d 364 (1978), a resolution of a county board fixing the salaries of elected county officers at an amount plus an annual adjustment for changes in the cost of living as determined by an independent federal agency, does not violate this Article and section of the Nebraska Constitution.

The court found in *Hamilton v. Foster*, 155 Neb. 89, 50 N.W.2d 542 (1951) an increase or decrease in compensation resulting from a change in population was not prohibited by this section. The Court held the change in population is a factual and not a legislative change.

It was determined by the court in *Ramsey v. County of Gage*, 153 Neb. 24, 43 N.W.2d 593 (1950) that an increase in salaries of county commissioners during their term of office was prohibited by this section.

In 2001 *Att'y Gen. Op. No. 8* the Attorney General considered whether health insurance coverages and premiums are "compensation" within the restrictions of Art. III, § 19 of the Nebraska Constitution. After evaluating various sources, the Attorney General's Office concluded that health and dental insurance coverages and premiums paid for those benefits are not "compensation" subject to the strictures of art. III, §§ 19 of the Nebraska Constitution. This conclusion was reached after (1) finding that the term "compensation" is not defined in the Nebraska Constitution, (2) finding no Nebraska cases which define that term directly in the context of art. III, § 19, (3) reviewing authority from other jurisdictions where cases indicate both that health insurance is and health insurance is not "compensation" for purposes of state constitutional provisions which prohibit increasing or decreasing an officer's compensation during his or her term of office, and (4) considering the intent of the framers of the constitutional provision at issue. The opinion points out that such a conclusion regarding the nature of "compensation" under art. III, § 19 might be somewhat different if changes in health insurance benefits or premium changes were directed against or to one particular officer or group of officers for obvious retaliatory reasons or to increase the salaries of those individuals alone. Additionally, potential problems could exist if there are changes for salaries of individuals during their terms of office in order to cover the costs of health insurance premiums, whether the health insurance premiums are deducted from those salaries or paid separately. For example, if \$2,000 were added to all salaries to cover the cost of health insurance in one year and \$2,500 added the next, then there would be an increase in the salaries for those individuals during their term and an increase in their compensation, whether deductions were made for that health insurance or not. In this opinion, former 1976 *Att'y Gen. Op. No. 246* was rescinded. The referenced opinion concluded that a County Board could not change the health insurance provided to an elected county official during his term of office from family coverage to single coverage based upon art. III, § 19. 1975-76 Rep. Att'y Gen. 353 (Opinion No. 246, dated August 2, 1976). As pointed out by the Attorney General's Office, that opinion did not discuss the Constitutional Convention of 1919-1920 or any other relevant authorities pertaining to art. III, §§ 19.

Nebraska Accountability and Disclosure Commission (NADC) Advisory Opinion #202, adopted by the Commission June 2017, addresses a series of questions related to conflicts of interest, financial gain and compensation. See summary of the opinion in the body of this report.

Appendix E – (Table 1. Nebraska Counties Categorized by Similar Characteristics for County Population Projections)

Prepared by: Center for Public Affairs Research, UNO (December 2015)

Note: the purposed of these classifications is to group similar counties so that more accurate aggregated birth, death, and net migration rates can be applied consistently to the age structures of the specific counties.

Counties that are relatively densely populated and are not grouped/have their own specific rates (3):

Douglas	Lancaster	Sarpy					
---------	-----------	-------	--	--	--	--	--

Counties with high levels of commuting/local jobs – “commuter” counties (7)

Cass	Cheyenne	Dodge	Gage	Otoe	Saunders	Washington	
------	----------	-------	------	------	----------	------------	--

Counties that have a city of 10,000 residents and are a “regional center” (7)

Dakota	Dawson	Hall	Lincoln	Madison	Platte	Scotts Bluff	
--------	--------	------	---------	---------	--------	--------------	--

Counties that have a “major college” (3):

Buffalo	Dawes	Wayne					
---------	-------	-------	--	--	--	--	--

Counties that have a “small college” (4):

Adams	Nemaha	Saline	Seward				
-------	--------	--------	--------	--	--	--	--

Counties that have a “city of at least 5,000 residents” (5):

Box Butte	Colfax	Phelps	Red Willow	York			
-----------	--------	--------	------------	------	--	--	--

Counties without a city of 5,000 that had a “relatively high” level of migration in the 2000s (32):


Arthur	Butler	Chase	Custer	Deuel	Franklin	Furnas	Garden
Garfield	Gosper	Greeley	Hamilton	Harlan	Hitchcock	Hooker	Howard
Jefferson	Johnson	Keith	Kimball	Knox	Logan	McPherson	Merrick
Nance	Nuckolls	Pawnee	Perkins	Polk	Sherman	Valley	Webster

Counties without a city of 5,000 that had a “relatively low” level of migration in the 2000s (32):

Antelope	Banner	Blaine	Boone	Boyd	Brown	Burt	Cedar
Cherry	Clay	Cuming	Dixon	Dundy	Fillmore	Frontier	Grant
Hayes	Holt	Kearney	Keya Paha	Loup	Morrill	Pierce	Richardson
Rock	Sheridan	Sioux	Stanton	Thayer	Thomas	Thurston	Wheeler

Source: <https://www.unomaha.edu/college-of-public-affairs-and-community-service/center-for-public-affairs-research/documents/nebraska-county-population-projections-2010-to-2050.pdf>, page 8.

Comparison of Population Growth Rates: 2000-06 versus 2010-16



Sources: Post 2010 Census Population Estimates, 2016 Vintage Population Estimates, U.S. Census Bureau

Prepared by: David Drozd, Center for Public Affairs Research, University of Nebraska at Omaha - March 21, 2017

Note: The closure of Dana College is not fully reflected for Washington County, as the Census Bureau is still including students in dorms in the estimates.

Appendix G – Additional Resources for Employment and Benefit Information

- Nebraska Association of County Officials (NACO) www.nacone.org
(includes contact information for the NACO office which facilitated the writing and dissemination of this report)
- U.S. Census Bureau www.census.gov
(Population)
- U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics www.bls.gov/cpi
(Consumer Price Index (CPI) – Urban and Midwest)
- U.S. Department of State www.state.gov/m/fsi/tc/79700.htm
(Salaries, Costs of Living and Relocation)
- Nebraska Department of Administrative Services <http://das.nebraska.gov/emprel/>
(State employee pay plans and benefit information)
- Nebraska Department of Economic Development www.neded.org
- Nebraska Department of Labor www.dol.nebraska.gov
- Nebraska Department of Revenue – Property Assessment Division www.revenue.ne.gov/PAD/
(Reports, valuations and a great deal of county by county information)
- “Nebraska County Population Projections: 2010 to 2050,” prepared by: David Drozd, Jerry Deichert, Center for Public Affairs Research – University of Nebraska at Omaha (December 2015)
<https://www.unomaha.edu/college-of-public-affairs-and-community-service/center-for-public-affairs-research/documents/nebraska-county-population-projections-2010-to-2050.pdf>

2017 and 2018 Anticipated Elected County Officials' Salaries

County Name	Board Chair	Board Chair	County Board	County Board	Assr	Assr	Assr	Attorney	Attorney	Attorney	Attorney	Combined Offices	Combined Offices	Combined Offices	Combined Offices	Clerk	Clerk
	2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	Part-time/Full-time		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018		2017 Salary	2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018
Adams	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$60,500	\$62,950		\$84,767	\$87,310	Full Time					\$60,500	\$60,500	\$62,950
Antelope	\$16,150	\$16,756	\$15,142	\$15,748	\$51,878	\$53,953		\$52,779	\$54,890	PT		\$51,878	\$51,878				
Arthur	\$4,800	\$4,800	\$4,800	\$4,800			Ex Officio	\$6,300		Part-Time	Appt	\$29,600	\$30,000				
Banner	\$8,000	\$8,160	\$8,000	\$8,160	\$38,827	\$39,052		\$13,213	\$13,477	Full Time		\$38,827	\$39,052	Clerk, ROD, CDC			
Blaine	\$10,086	\$10,338	\$10,086	\$10,338	na			\$23,114	\$23,692	Full-time					\$41,373	\$41,373	\$42,345
Boone	\$22,914	\$23,831	\$22,914	\$23,831	\$50,544	\$52,416		\$50,544	\$52,416	PT		\$50,544	\$52,416	Clerk, Elec, Reg Deeds, Dist Court			
Box Butte	\$24,225	\$24,588	\$24,225	\$24,588	\$48,450	\$49,177					Contract					\$48,450	\$49,177
Boyd	\$9,600	\$9,600	\$9,600	\$9,600	\$41,616	\$42,448		\$41,616	\$42,448	part time		\$41,616	\$42,448	ex officio - clerk, reg of deeds, distr court			
Brown	\$22,500	\$23,000	\$20,350	\$20,850	\$45,000	\$46,000		\$45,000	\$46,000	Full-time					\$45,000	\$45,000	\$46,000
Buffalo	\$26,400	\$27,400	\$24,000	\$25,000	\$68,959	\$71,027		\$106,196	\$109,382	Full-time					\$68,959	\$68,959	\$71,027
Burt			\$13,688		\$48,348			\$48,348		FT		\$48,348		Clerk, ROD, EC			
Butler	\$25,720	\$26,760	\$25,720	\$26,760	\$52,020	\$53,060		\$62,424	\$63,672	PT					\$52,020	\$52,020	\$53,060
Cass	\$26,523	\$27,318	\$26,523	\$27,318	\$62,191	\$64,056		\$96,738	\$99,671	Full-time					\$62,191	\$62,191	\$64,056
Cedar	\$36,000	\$37,500	\$36,000	\$37,500	\$58,900	\$60,400		\$58,900	\$60,400	FT	NA				\$60,900	\$60,900	\$62,400
Chase	\$25,500	\$26,500	\$25,500	\$26,500	\$51,000	\$53,500		\$51,000	\$53,500	PT		\$51,000	\$53,500	Ex Officio (Clerk, ROD, EC, CDC)			
Cherry	\$23,550	\$24,150	\$23,550	\$24,150	\$47,100	\$48,300		\$55,000	\$55,000	Full-time					\$47,100	\$47,100	\$48,300
Cheyenne	\$25,700	\$26,435	\$24,500	\$25,235	\$58,350	\$60,100		\$87,525	\$90,150	Full time					\$58,350	\$58,350	\$60,100
Clay	\$17,700	\$17,700	\$15,900	\$15,900	\$49,000	\$50,500		\$49,000	\$50,500	full time					\$49,000	\$49,000	\$50,500
Colfax	\$24,730	+500	\$24,730	+500	\$50,375	+1000		\$83,079	+1650	Full-time					\$50,375	\$50,375	+1000
Cuming	\$16,458	\$16,869	\$13,958	\$14,307	\$55,082	\$56,459		\$59,361	\$60,845	P					\$55,082	\$55,082	\$56,459
Custer	\$25,302	\$26,062	\$25,302	\$26,062	\$53,346	\$54,947		\$78,507	\$80,862	FT					\$53,346	\$53,346	\$54,947
Dakota	\$24,076	\$24,534	\$22,876	\$23,334	\$56,877	\$58,015		\$88,808	\$90,584	Full-time					\$56,877	\$56,877	\$58,015
Dawes	\$21,933	CPI	\$21,933	CPI	\$43,871	CPI		\$64,845	CPI	FT					\$46,320	\$46,320	CPI
Dawson	\$19,040	\$19,310	\$18,040	\$18,310	\$57,940	\$59,680		\$92,410	\$95,185	Full-time					\$63,940	\$63,940	\$65,680
Deuel	\$14,750	\$15,000	\$14,750	\$15,000	\$42,000	\$43,000		\$42,000	\$43,000	Full					\$42,000	\$42,000	\$43,000
Dixon	\$16,320	\$16,646	\$16,320	\$16,646	\$49,980	\$50,980		\$51,729	\$52,764	P		\$49,980	\$50,980	Clerk, Ex officio Reg of Deeds & Election Comm			
Dodge	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$17,500	\$17,500	\$60,152	\$61,355	Ex Officio	\$87,763	\$89,518	F					\$74,003	\$74,003	\$75,483
Douglas	\$43,594	\$49,884	\$43,594	\$49,884				\$179,698	\$186,886	Full-time		\$124,848	\$127,345		\$110,000	\$110,000	\$111,635
Dundy	\$16,810	\$17,230	\$16,810	\$17,230	\$47,278	\$48,460		\$44,126	\$45,229						\$47,278	\$47,278	\$48,460
Fillmore	\$18,651	\$19,181	\$17,651	\$18,181	\$49,652	\$51,141		\$55,586	\$57,253	part-time					\$49,652	\$49,652	\$51,141
Franklin	\$12,600	\$12,600	\$8,925	\$8,925	\$43,821	\$45,135		\$47,473	\$48,897	P					\$43,821	\$43,821	\$45,135
Frontier	\$23,256	\$23,256	\$23,256	\$23,256	\$43,021	\$44,311		\$43,021	\$44,311	FT					\$43,021	\$43,021	\$44,311
Furnas	\$21,515	\$22,375	\$21,515	\$22,375	\$43,030	\$44,750		\$43,030	\$44,750	f					\$43,030	\$43,030	\$44,750
Gage	\$23,171	\$23,635	\$23,171	\$23,635	\$57,783	\$58,939		\$86,670	\$88,403	Full					\$57,783	\$57,783	\$58,939
Garden	\$18,500	\$18,500	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$43,864	\$44,303		\$43,864	\$44,303						\$43,864	\$43,864	\$44,303
Garfield	\$13,100	\$13,100	\$13,100	\$13,100	\$43,000	\$43,000		\$43,000	\$43,000	FT		\$43,000	\$43,000	Ex Officio, Clerk, ROD, EC, Dist Court			
Gosper	\$17,336	\$17,856	\$17,336	\$17,856	\$45,685	\$47,241		\$45,685	\$47,241						\$45,685	\$45,685	\$47,241
Grant	\$9,200	\$9,500	\$9,200	\$9,500			Ex Officio	\$18,000	\$18,500	n/a	Appt.	\$46,800	\$47,800	Ex Officio			
Greeley	\$19,097	\$19,670	\$19,097	\$19,670	\$42,436	\$43,710		\$42,436	\$43,710	FT					\$42,436	\$42,436	\$43,710
Hall	\$24,882	\$25,882	\$24,882	\$25,882				\$97,920	\$99,878	full time		\$71,808	\$73,244	Assr/ROD	\$65,280	\$65,280	\$66,586
Hamilton	\$25,962		\$24,762		\$55,440			\$55,440		FT					\$4,666	\$5,440	
Harlan	\$14,231	\$14,613	\$12,731	\$13,113	\$41,665	\$42,915		\$47,064	\$48,476	full-time		\$41,665	\$42,915	Ex Officio	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hayes	\$19,143	\$19,526					ex-officio	\$35,166	\$35,869			\$46,974	\$47,914	clerk, ROD, Election, Dist Crt, Assr			
Hitchcock	\$20,600	\$21,012	\$20,600	\$21,012	\$47,234	\$48,179		\$47,234	\$48,179	FT					*47,234	*47,234	\$48,179
Holt	\$14,700		\$14,700		\$57,400	\$58,600		\$102,400	\$103,600						\$57,400	\$57,400	\$58,600
Hooker	\$13,300	\$13,700	\$13,300	\$13,700				\$25,500	\$26,250	Part-time	Contract	\$44,550	\$45,825	Appt-Clerk/Assr/Election Comm/ROD/CDC			
Howard	\$19,700	\$20,200	\$18,500	\$19,000	\$44,700	\$45,550		\$61,500	\$61,750	full time		Clerk	ROD	EC	\$46,700	\$46,700	\$47,550
Jefferson			\$25,197	\$25,954	\$50,395	\$51,907		\$60,473	\$62,287	fulltime		\$50,395	\$51,907	clk, rod, el comm supt of sch			

2017 and 2018 Anticipated Elected County Officials' Salaries

County Name	Board Chair	Board Chair	County Board	County Board	Assr	Assr	Assr	Attorney	Attorney	Attorney	Attorney	Combined Offices	Combined Offices	Combined Offices	Combined Offices	Clerk	Clerk	
	2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	Part-time/Full-time		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018		2017 Salary	2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	
Johnson	\$15,704	\$16,172	\$15,704	\$16,172	\$41,418	\$42,666		\$46,800	\$48,204	Part-time		Clerk,CDC/Reg Deeds			\$41,418	\$41,418	\$42,666	
Kearney	\$12,103	\$12,406	\$11,347	\$11,631	\$51,500	\$53,000		\$78,000	\$79,500	Full-time		\$55,500	\$57,000	Clk,ROD,Elec				
Keith	\$26,654	\$27,054	\$26,654	\$27,054	\$53,308	\$54,107		\$79,962	\$79,962	part-time						\$53,308	\$54,107	
Keya Paha	\$7,440	\$7,590	\$7,440	\$7,590			ex officio	\$15,000	\$15,000	part		\$36,000	\$36,720	ex officio				
Kimball	\$19,127	\$19,796	\$18,216	\$18,854	\$47,507	\$49,169		\$53,841	\$55,725	Part-time		n/a	n/a		\$47,507	\$47,507	\$49,169	
Knox	\$24,314	\$24,892	\$23,114	\$23,692	\$57,784	\$59,229		\$57,784	\$59,229	Full-time		\$57,784	\$59,229	Clerk, EC & Ex-Officio ROD				
Lancaster	\$44,894	\$45,725	\$44,894	\$45,725				\$154,757	\$157,620	Full-time		Assr/ ROD 1	\$125,966		\$93,100	\$93,100	\$94,822	
Lincoln	\$26,260	+ COLA	\$26,260	+ COLA	\$64,034	+COLA		\$94,940	+ COLA	Full					\$70,902	\$70,902	+COLA	
Logan	\$7,420	\$7,470	\$7,420	\$7,470				\$19,200	\$19,200					Contract		\$39,923	\$39,923	\$40,921
Loup	\$11,684	\$11,918	\$11,684	\$11,918	\$5,931	\$6,050	Ex Officio	\$29,282	\$29,868	Full					\$39,535	\$39,535	\$40,326	
Madison	\$45,450	\$46,450	\$43,650	\$44,650	\$72,500	\$74,000		\$85,000	\$86,500	FT		NA	NA		\$72,500	\$72,500	\$74,000	
McPherson	\$6,974	\$7,113	\$6,974	\$7,113	\$43,697	\$44,571	Ex-officio	\$6,000	\$6,000	Full		\$43,697	\$44,571	Ex-Officio	\$43,697	\$43,697	\$44,571	
Merrick	\$13,804	\$14,068	\$13,204	\$13,468	\$48,014	\$48,974		\$72,022	\$73,462	Full-time					\$48,014	\$48,014	\$48,974	
Morrill	\$17,500	\$17,500	\$16,500	\$16,500	\$48,213	\$50,142		\$72,533	\$75,435	P/T					\$50,613	\$50,613	\$52,542	
Nance	\$13,805	\$14,147	\$11,405	\$11,747	\$45,619	\$46,987		\$52,462	\$54,035	ft		\$45,619	\$46,987	Clerk, District Court, Election Comm., Reg. of Deeds				
Nemaha	\$21,013	\$21,538	\$21,013	\$21,538	\$47,278	\$48,460		\$57,784	\$59,229	F		Clk/Elec/Reg of Deeds			\$47,278	\$47,278	\$48,460	
Nuckolls	\$21,054	\$21,554	\$20,554	\$21,054	\$41,108	\$42,108		\$41,108	\$42,108			\$41,108	\$42,108		\$41,108	\$41,108	\$42,108	
Otoe	\$26,000	\$28,000	\$26,000	\$28,000	\$58,000	\$60,000		\$79,000	\$81,000	PT		\$5,000	\$5,000		\$58,000	\$58,000	\$60,000	
Pawnee	\$19,500	\$20,000	\$19,500	\$20,000	\$39,000	\$40,000		\$39,000	\$40,000	Full-time					\$39,000	\$39,000	\$40,000	
Perkins	\$23,400	\$24,102	\$23,400	\$24,102	\$46,800	\$48,204		\$46,800	\$48,204	F/FT		\$46,800	\$48,204	Clerk Ex-Officio				
Phelps	\$18,814	\$19,378	\$17,744	\$18,216	\$57,351	\$59,645		\$85,896	\$88,473	FT		CLERK	ROD		\$57,351	\$57,351	\$59,645	
Pierce	\$31,080		\$31,080		\$51,800			\$57,000		fulltime					\$51,800	\$51,800		
Platte	\$16,000	\$16,500	\$16,000	\$16,500	\$58,500	\$59,500		\$84,000	\$84,500	Full Time		-----	-----		\$58,500	\$58,500	\$59,500	
Polk	20,075/yr	20,700/yr	20,075/yr	20,700/yr	47,850/yr	49,200/yr		47,850/yr	49,200/yr	Part time					47,850/yr	47,850/yr	49,200/yr	
Red Willow	\$21,643	\$22,184	\$21,013	\$21,538	\$48,329	\$49,537		\$52,531	\$53,845	p		\$48,329	\$49,537	clerk,ROD,election comm				
Richardson	\$22,260	\$23,010	\$22,260	\$23,010	\$51	\$52,250		\$64,364	\$67,582	NA					\$50,750	\$50,750	\$52,250	
Rock	\$16,550		\$16,550		\$38,080	\$42,080		\$38,080	\$42,080			\$38,080	\$42,080	Ex Officio				
Saline	\$28,800	\$29,300	\$27,800	\$28,300	\$55,600	\$56,600	Ex-Officio	\$87,216	\$88,216	P					\$55,600	\$55,600	\$56,600	
Sarpy	\$27,095	\$27,095	\$26,094	\$26,094	\$97,419	cola		\$152,250	cola	Fulli					\$95,889	\$95,889	cola	
Saunders	\$24,525	\$24,893	\$24,525	\$24,893	\$60,670	\$61,580		\$89,472	\$90,814	Full-time					\$65,732	\$65,732	\$66,642	
Scotts Bluff	\$19,367	\$19,755	\$17,607	\$17,959	\$59,897	\$61,095		\$88,360	\$90,127	ft					\$59,897	\$59,897	\$61,095	
Seward	\$26,445	\$27,305	\$26,445	\$27,305	\$61,500	\$63,500	Elected	\$92,250	\$95,250	FT	Elected				\$61,500	\$61,500	\$63,500	
Sheridan	\$20,730	\$21,530	\$20,730	\$21,530	\$41,460	\$43,060		\$41,460	\$43,060	PT					\$41,460	\$41,460	\$43,060	
Sherman	\$16,429	\$17,038	\$15,229	\$15,838	\$44,717	\$46,506		\$44,717	\$46,506	PT					\$44,717	\$44,717	\$46,506	
Sioux	\$11,045	\$11,376	\$11,045	\$11,376				\$35,821	\$36,896	p		\$52,927	\$54,515					
Stanton	\$24,500	\$25,000	\$23,500	\$24,000	\$47,600	\$48,800		\$48,600	\$49,800	ft					\$47,600	\$47,600	\$48,800	
Thayer	\$19,287	\$19,848	\$18,687	\$19,248	\$49,177	\$50,652		\$59,012	\$60,783	ft					\$49,177	\$49,177	\$50,652	
Thomas	\$10,614	\$10,933	\$9,809	\$10,103				\$26,875	\$27,681	PT		\$42,568	\$43,845	Ex officio	ex officio	ex officio	ex officio	
Thurston	\$12,500	\$12,500	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$45,618	\$46,987		\$48,242	\$49,689	Full Time					\$45,618	\$45,618	\$46,987	
Valley	\$7,800		\$6,000		\$42,500			\$48,000							\$42,500	\$42,500		
Washington	\$19,687	Midwest CPI	\$19,087	CPI	\$51,663	CPI		\$81,895	CPI	Full-time		NA			\$51,663	\$51,663	CPI	
Wayne	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$56,000	\$57,500		\$56,000	\$57,500	FT		\$56,000	\$57,500	CLK/ROD/ELECT				
Webster	\$17,486	\$17,908	\$16,886	\$17,308	\$42,214	\$43,169		\$42,214	\$43,269						\$42,214	\$42,214	\$43,169	
Wheeler	\$9,915	\$9,915	\$9,915	\$9,915	\$0	\$0	ex officio	\$34,000	\$34,000	full		\$42,000	\$42,000	ex officio	\$0	\$0	\$0	
York	\$22,887	unknown	\$22,387	unknown	\$56,759	unknown		\$76,702	unknown	full-time					\$56,759	\$56,759	unknown	

2017 and 2018 Anticipated Elected County Officials' Salaries

County Name	Clerk	CDC	CDC	CDC	Pub Def	Pub Def	Pub Def	Pub Def	ROD	ROD	ROD	Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff	Surv/Eng	Surv/Eng	Surv/Eng	Surv/Eng
		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	Part-time/Full-time		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	Part-time/Full-time	
Adams		\$60,500	\$62,950		\$63,575	\$65,575	Part Time		\$60,500	\$62,950		\$71,000	\$72,500		\$4,500	\$4,500	Part Time	
Antelope		\$51,878	\$53,953									\$55,247	\$57,457					
Arthur	Ex-Officio			Ex-Officio								\$28,100	\$28,500					
Banner												\$40,472	\$41,281	\$1,040	\$1,061	Part Time		
Blaine	ex-officio			ex-officio			n/a				ex-officio	\$45,177	\$46,306				Part-time	
Boone												\$57,024	\$59,136					
Box Butte	ROD, EC	\$48,450	\$49,177		\$49,725	\$40,471	PT					\$58,140	\$59,012					
Boyd												\$41,616	\$42,448					
Brown	Ex Officio			Clerk	\$32,760	\$32,760		Contract				\$45,000	\$46,000	\$48,027	\$49,468	Full-time	Hi-Way Sup	
Buffalo		\$68,959	\$71,027		\$53,098	\$54,691	Part-time		\$68,959	\$71,027		\$84,129	\$86,653	\$29,213	\$30,213	Part-time		
Burt		\$48,348										\$55,638		\$15,250		Part Time		
Butler		\$52,020	\$53,060									\$62,424	\$63,672	\$15,606	\$15,918	PT		
Cass		\$62,313	\$64,183		\$49,737	\$51,229	Full-time		\$62,313	\$64,056		\$75,160	\$77,415	\$55,323	\$56,982	Par-time		
Cedar		\$58,900	\$60,400		\$42,000	\$42,000	PT	Contract	NA			\$60,900	\$62,400	NA				
Chase												\$61,200	\$64,200				contract	
Cherry		\$47,100	\$48,300		\$33,000	\$33,000	Full-time		\$0	\$0	Ex-Officio	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$47,100	\$48,300	Full-time		
Cheyenne		\$58,350	\$60,100		\$124,800			Contract			Ex Officio	\$70,019	\$72,120	\$200	\$200	Part time		
Clay		\$49,000	\$50,500		\$28,800	\$28,800		contract				\$52,400	\$53,900				appt	
Colfax	ROD/EC	\$50,375	+1000		\$60,000	\$0	Part-time	contract			Ex Officio with	\$59,415	+1200	\$16,505	+330	Part-time		
Cuming	ROD, EC	\$55,082	\$56,459									\$63,261	\$64,745	& Dep. EM	\$12,300	\$12,608	P	
Custer		\$53,346	\$54,947						\$53,346	\$54,947		\$65,245	\$67,203					
Dakota		\$56,877	\$58,015		\$69,835	\$71,232	Full-time					\$62,046	\$63,287				appt.	
Dawes		\$43,871	CPI		\$50,093	CPI	3/4 TIME			CPI	EX OFF	\$43,871	CPI		\$18,000		PT	CONTRACT
Dawson		\$57,940	\$59,680		\$86,463	\$89,057	Full-time	Contract	\$57,940	\$59,680		\$78,126	\$80,470	\$59,122	\$60,900	Full-time		
Deuel				Ex Officio							Ex Officio	\$48,000	\$49,000	\$200	\$200	part-time		
Dixon		\$49,980	\$50,980									\$49,980	\$50,980					
Dodge	Ex Officio	\$55,331	\$56,438	Ex Officio	NA				\$54,072	\$55,153	Ex Officio	\$67,372	\$68,719	Ex Officio	\$16,831	\$17,168	PT	Ex Officio
Douglas		\$108,123	\$110,286		\$179,698	\$186,886	Full-time					\$130,187	\$134,093	\$129,804	\$132,400	Full-time		
Dundy	Ex Officio							Contract				\$54,759	\$56,128				Contract	
Fillmore	ROD & EC	\$49,077	\$51,141									\$61,157	\$62,991					
Franklin		\$3,600	\$3,600	Ex-Officio	None	None					Ex-Officio	\$49,595	\$51,083				As Needed	
Frontier	Ex Officio Clerk ROD, CDC, EC			ex officio								\$53,925	\$55,473				Contract	
Furnas		\$24,675	\$25,660								ex off w/ cl	\$49,350	\$51,325				p	
Gage		\$57,783	\$58,939					Contract	\$57,783	\$58,939		\$71,740	\$73,175	\$23,171	\$23,635	Part		
Garden		combined/clerk		appt.	None				combined/clerk			\$52,637	\$53,164				appt.	
Garfield												\$49,450	\$49,450					
Gosper				Ex Officio							Ex Officio	\$45,865	\$47,241				Appointed	
Grant	Ex Officio			Ex Officio			n/a				Ex Officio	\$46,000	\$47,000	Appt	\$9,000	\$9,000	n/a	Appt
Greeley	Ex-Off 4 Offices											\$43,710	\$45,022				contract	
Hall		\$65,280	\$66,586		\$97,920	\$99,878	full time					\$75,072	\$76,573	\$75,072	\$76,573	full time		
Hamilton		\$55,440							\$555,440			\$68,726		\$9,100				
Harlan	Ex Officio	\$0	\$0	Ex Officio					\$0	\$0	Ex Officio	\$49,999	\$51,498	\$25,668	\$26,448	full-time		
Hayes	ex-officio			ex-officio							ex-officio	\$46,974	\$47,914					
Hitchcock	Ex Officio	*			\$24,000	\$24,000	PT	Contract	*			\$55,144	\$56,244				PT	Appt.
Holt		\$57,400	\$58,600		\$52,400	\$53,600	PT				EX Officio	\$61,400	\$62,600	\$11,480	\$11,720	PT		
Hooker												\$48,550	\$49,825	Appt				
Howard	Ex Officio				\$50,000	\$50,000	part time	contract				\$51,000	\$52,000	\$21,000	\$21,500	part time		
Jefferson		\$50,395	\$51,907		\$57,000	\$57,000	parttime	contract				\$60,473	\$62,287	\$8,000	\$8,000	parttime		

2017 and 2018 Anticipated Elected County Officials' Salaries


County Name	Clerk	CDC	CDC	CDC	Pub Def	Pub Def	Pub Def	Pub Def	ROD	ROD	ROD	Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff	Surv/Eng	Surv/Eng	Surv/Eng	Surv/Eng	
		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	Part-time/Full-time		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018		2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018	Part-time/Full-time		
Johnson				Ex Officio	\$38,000	\$38,500	part-time	contract				Ex Officio	\$51,740	\$54,288		\$4,004	\$4,004	Part-time	
Kearney		\$49,000	\$50,500		\$27,000	\$27,750	Part-time					\$66,000	\$67,500	Sheriff,Jail, Commun					Contract
Keith	ex officio	\$53,308	\$54,107		\$75,000	\$75,000			clerk			\$63,969	\$64,929		\$13,327	\$13,527	Part-time	Ex Officio	
Keya Paha	ex officio			ex officio								ex officio	\$34,320	\$35,010					contract
Kimball		\$47,507	\$49,169					Contract				Ex Officio	\$53,313	\$55,179					Contract
Knox	See Combined Offices	\$57,784	\$59,229		\$25,000	\$25,000	Full-time	Contracted & shared with Holt County	See Combined			\$64,984	\$66,429		\$1,000	\$1,000	Full-time	Elected	
Lancaster		\$98,651	\$100,476		\$154,757	\$157,620	Full-time					\$120,438	\$122,666		\$120,301	\$122,527	Full-time		
Lincoln		\$60,600	+ COLA		\$60,600	+ COLA	Full		\$60,600	+ COLA		\$74,336	+ COLA		\$13,200	+ COLA	Part		
Logan	Ex Officio											\$39,923	\$40,921						
Loup				Ex Officio								Ex Officio	\$39,535	\$40,326		\$3,500	\$3,500	Part Time	Appt.
Madison		\$59,500	\$61,000		\$75,000	\$76,500	FT		\$59,000	\$60,500		\$75,500	\$77,000		\$11,000	\$11,000	PT		
McPherson	Ex-Officio	\$43,697	\$44,571	Ex-Officio					\$43,697	\$44,571	Ex-Officio	\$41,616	\$42,448						
Merrick		\$48,014	\$48,974						ExOfficio	ExOfficio	ExOfficio	\$57,618	\$58,770		\$16,805	\$17,141	Part-time	ExOfficio	
Morrill		\$48,213	\$50,142									\$75,423	\$77,720						
Nance					\$30,000	\$30,000	pt	contract				\$52,462	\$54,035						
Nemaha		\$47,278	\$48,460					Contract	ex/clerk			\$57,784	\$57,784					Contract	
Nuckolls		\$41,108	\$42,108					2,500				\$45,084	\$46,084					500	
Otoe		\$58,000	\$60,000		\$58,000	\$60,000	PT		\$58,000	\$60,000		\$69,600	\$72,000		\$34,800	\$36,000	PT		
Pawnee				Ex-Officio								Ex-Officio	\$42,200	\$43,200					
Perkins												\$53,820	\$55,435						
Phelps		\$57,351	\$59,645		\$36,043	\$37,125	PT					\$67,631	\$70,336		\$19,781	\$20,374	PT		
Pierce	Ex-Officio	\$51,800			\$25,000			appointed				Ex-Officio	\$62,200					appointed	
Platte		\$58,500	\$59,500		\$59,800	\$60,300	Full Time		\$58,500	\$59,500		\$71,000	\$72,000		\$17,000	\$17,000	Full Time		
Polk	Ex Officio ROD & EC	N/A	N/A	Contract with State	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	Ex officio	57,360/yr	58,960/yr		\$12,200	\$12,200	Part time		
Red Willow		\$48,329	\$49,537		\$60,000	\$60,000	f					\$52,531	\$53,845		\$6,829	\$7,000	p		
Richardson	Reg of Deeds & EC	\$50,750	\$52,250									\$58,950	\$60,450		\$11,300	\$11,600	NA		
Rock												\$46,212	\$50,212		\$9,000				
Saline	Ex-Officio	\$55,600	\$56,600	Ex-Officio	\$65,532	\$65,532	P	Contract				\$73,416	\$74,416	Ex-Officio	\$29,050	\$29,550	P	Appt	
Sarpy		\$93,339	cola		\$139,500	cola	Full		\$84,668	cola		\$127,512	cola		\$116,291	cola	Full		
Saunders		\$60,670	\$61,580		\$60,670	\$61,580	Part-time		\$60,670	\$61,580		\$71,930	\$73,009		\$60,670	\$61,580	Full-time		
Scotts Bluff		\$59,897	\$61,095		\$76,601	\$78,133	ft		\$59,897	\$61,095		\$71,389	\$72,817		\$2,427	\$2,476	pt		
Seward	Elected	\$61,500	\$63,500	Elected	\$70,420	\$72,533	FT	Elected	-	-	Ex officio	\$73,800	\$76,200	Elected	\$6,500	\$6,500	FT	Elected	
Sheridan		\$41,460	\$43,060		\$41,460	\$43,060	PT					Ex Off	\$41,460	\$43,060	NA				
Sherman	Clerk,ROD,EC,CD,C,Jury Comm			EO	\$30,000	\$30,000		Contract			EO	\$44,717	\$46,506				PT	Contract/\$	
Sioux												\$44,180	\$45,505						
Stanton	ex officio											\$53,100	\$54,300						
Thayer		\$49,177	\$50,652					Contract				\$59,012	\$60,783					contract	
Thomas	ex officio	ex officio		n/a	n/a				ex officio	ex officio		\$42,999	\$44,289		\$9,000	\$9,000	PT	appolntment	
Thurston		\$45,618	\$46,987						Ex Officio			\$54,742	\$56,384					Contract	
Valley				Ex Officio	\$32,500			contract				Ex Officio	\$43,000		\$12,000			contract	
Washington		\$51,663	CPI		NA				\$51,663	CPI		\$64,306	CPI		\$36,160	CPI	Part-time		
Wayne		\$56,000	\$57,500									\$56,000	\$57,500		\$600	\$600	PT		
Webster	Ex Officio	\$0	\$0	Ex Officio					\$0	\$0	Ex Officio	\$47,014	\$48,069		\$1,200	\$1,200		Appointed	
Wheeler	ex-officio	\$0	\$0	ex-officio	na	na	na	na	\$0	\$0	ex-officio	\$44,000	\$44,000	ex-officio	\$0	\$0	na	contract	
York	ROD, EC	\$56,759	unknown		\$56,759	unknown	full-tlme					\$67,842	unknown		\$10,000	unknown	part-time	appointed	

2017 and 2018 Anticipated Elected County Officials' Salaries

County Name	Treasurer 2017 Salary	Treasurer Anticipated 2018
Adams	\$60,500	\$60,650
Antelope	\$51,878	\$53,953
Arthur	\$29,600	\$30,000
Banner	\$38,827	\$39,052
Blaine	\$36,772	\$37,691
Boone	\$50,544	\$52,416
Box Butte	\$48,450	\$49,177
Boyd	\$41,616	\$42,448
Brown	\$45,000	\$46,000
Buffalo	\$68,959	\$71,027
Burt	\$48,348	
Butler	\$52,020	\$53,060
Cass	\$66,691	\$68,692
Cedar	\$58,900	\$60,400
Chase	\$51,000	\$53,500
Cherry	\$47,100	\$48,300
Cheyenne	\$58,350	\$60,100
Clay	\$49,000	\$50,500
Colfax	\$50,375	+1000
Cuming	\$55,082	\$56,459
Custer	\$53,346	\$54,947
Dakota	\$56,877	\$58,015
Dawes	\$43,871	CPI
Dawson	\$57,940	\$59,680
Deuel	\$42,000	\$43,000
Dixon	\$49,980	\$50,980
Dodge	\$67,372	\$68,719
Douglas	\$121,512	\$125,157
Dundy	\$47,278	\$48,460
Fillmore	\$49,652	\$51,141
Franklin	\$43,821	\$45,135
Frontier	\$43,021	\$44,311
Furnas	\$43,030	\$44,750
Gage	\$57,783	\$58,939
Garden	\$43,864	\$44,303
Garfield	\$43,000	\$43,000
Gosper	\$45,685	\$47,241
Grant	\$41,700	\$42,700
Greeley	\$42,436	\$43,710
Hall	\$65,280	\$66,586
Hamilton	\$55,440	
Harlan	\$41,665	\$42,915
Hayes	\$46,974	\$47,914
Hitchcock	\$47,234	\$48,179
Holt	\$57,400	\$58,600
Hooker	\$44,550	\$45,825
Howard	\$44,700	\$45,550
Jefferson	\$50,395	\$51,907

2017 and 2018 Anticipated Elected County Officials' Salaries

County Name	Treasurer	Treasurer
	2017 Salary	Anticipated 2018
Johnson	\$41,418	\$42,666
Kearney	\$51,500	\$53,000
Keith	\$53,308	\$54,107
Keya Paha	\$34,320	\$35,010
Kimball	\$47,507	\$49,169
Knox	\$57,784	\$59,229
Lancaster	\$92,496	\$94,207
Lincoln	\$64,034	+ COLA
Logan	\$39,923	\$40,921
Loup	\$39,535	\$40,326
Madison	\$67,500	\$69,000
McPherson	\$41,616	\$42,448
Merrick	\$48,014	\$48,974
Morrill	\$48,213	\$50,142
Nance	\$45,619	\$46,987
Nemaha	\$47,278	\$48,460
Nuckolls	\$41,108	\$42,108
Otoe	\$58,000	\$60,000
Pawnee	\$39,000	\$40,000
Perkins	\$46,800	\$48,204
Phelps	\$57,351	\$59,645
Pierce	\$51,800	
Platte	\$58,500	\$59,500
Polk	\$47,850	\$49,200
Red Willow	\$48,329	\$49,537
Richardson	\$50,750	\$52,250
Rock	\$38,080	\$42,080
Saline	\$55,600	\$56,600
Sarpy	\$96,399	cola
Saunders	\$60,670	\$61,580
Scotts Bluff	\$59,897	\$61,095
Seward	\$61,500	\$63,500
Sheridan	\$41,460	\$43,060
Sherman	\$44,717	\$46,506
Sioux	\$51,970	\$53,529
Stanton	\$47,600	\$48,800
Thayer	\$49,177	\$50,652
Thomas	\$40,446	\$41,659
Thurston	\$45,618	\$46,987
Valley	\$42,500	
Washington	\$51,663	CPI
Wayne	\$56,000	\$57,500
Webster	\$42,214	\$43,169
Wheeler	\$38,000	\$38,000
York	\$56,759	unknown



**FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
ELECTED OFFICIALS SALARY REVIEW COMMITTEE
December 19, 2013**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- Pat Kahm, Professional Resource Management, Inc.
- Joe Edwards, former Lancaster County Commissioner
- Gerry Dimon, former Vice President of Human Resources for Ameritas
- Jim Gordon, Attorney, DeMars Gordon Law Firm, Member of the Lancaster County Budget Monitoring Committee, and Chair of this Elected Officials Salary Review Committee.
- Steve Eicher, former Pfizer Human Resource Department Director
- Sam Seever, former Vice President of Legal Services for MDS Pharma Services
- Peggy Chantry, Bryan East Compensation Coordinator

SUPPORT STAFF

Facilitator - Kerry P. Eagan, Chief Administrative Officer
Professional Consultant - Doug McDaniel, Lincoln-Lancaster County Human Resources Director
Administrative Support - Angela Zocholl, County Records Specialist

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to NEB. REV. STAT. §23-1114 (Reissue 2012), the Lancaster County Board of Commissioners is required to set salaries for all County elected officials prior to January 15, 2014, a year in which a general election is held. Salaries shall be effective January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2018. The Elected Officials Salary Review Committee was established by the County Board to provide recommendations regarding appropriate salaries for County elected officials. The Committee is comprised of citizens with expertise in governmental, business, legal and personnel matters.

PROCESS

The Committee met a total of four times. All incumbent elected officials were asked to submit to the Committee written information containing a summary of their duties, how their duties have changed during the last four years, and what they believe is a fair salary for their position. Each elected official met with the Committee to discuss this information. Doug McDaniel, the Lincoln-Lancaster County Human Resources Director, provided information and consultation to the Committee.

The Committee also reviewed the following materials and reports in formulating its recommendations:

1. 2015-2018 Minimum Salary Recommendations for County Officials, Nebraska Association of County Officials (October 2013)
2. Final Report and Recommendations from the Elected Officials Salary Review Committee, dated December 17, 2009
3. Lancaster County Board Resolution No. R-09-0107, Setting Salaries for County Elected Officials for 2011-2014 Term
4. Elected Officials Salary and Benefit Survey, Lincoln/Lancaster County Personnel Department for 2013
5. Lancaster County Elected Officials Salaries for 1999 through 2013
6. Budget and Employee Information for County Elected Officials
7. Reports from County Elected Officials regarding duties, changes in duties, and salary recommendations
8. Lancaster County Director Salary Information for 2012-2013
9. Lancaster County Board Committee Assignments for 2013
10. Lancaster County Organizational Chart
11. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index (CPI)- All Urban Consumers, Mid-West Region, January through August 2013.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

After meeting with the elected officials and reviewing the materials presented to the Committee, an extensive discussion was conducted to determine salary recommendations for Lancaster County elected officials. The following factors and principles were considered by the Committee in formulating its recommendations: comparability, consistency with past elected official salary increases, whether there were any major changes in duties, consistency with salary increases for County employees, and what is in the best interests of County taxpayers.

First, the question of comparability was addressed. The Committee acknowledged the importance of paying Lancaster County elected officials comparably to similarly situated elected officials in other counties. At the same time, the Committee was reluctant to place too much emphasis on a comparison to statistical averages. While comparability can give an indication of what a fair salary would be, the Committee noted that the higher salaries in larger counties in the array [See Item 4

in the list of documents presented to the Committee], are not necessarily reflective of what would be a fair salary in Lancaster County. Accordingly, comparability served as a general guide to the Committee, but was not the determinative factor in the formulation of the Committee's recommendations.

The Committee also examined how salaries for County elected officials have been set in the past. In this regard, the Committee placed importance on making recommendations which are not only consistent with past recommendations from the Salary Review Committee, but also consistent with how the Lancaster County Board has set salaries in the past.

Another factor used by the Committee was whether there have been any major changes to the duties performed by elected officials. After meeting with each elected official and examining the written materials presented in conjunction with those meetings, the Committee found no major changes to the duties of any County elected official.

Next, the Committee looked at salary increases for other Lancaster County employees. It was noted that over the past several years the average salary increase for County employees has been approximately two percent.

Finally, the interests of the taxpayers who pay the salaries of County elected officials were considered. The Committee sought a balance in matching comparable salaries in other jurisdictions, the need to establish salaries which attract qualified candidates, adequate compensation for the work performed, and the goal of keeping property taxes as low as possible. The Committee also took into consideration that qualified candidates often seek elected positions more out of a sense of public service and duty, rather than for economic remuneration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the foregoing analysis, the Elected Officials Salary Review Committee hereby makes the following salary recommendations to the Lancaster County Board of Commissioners for the 2015 - 2018 term:

For 2015, each Lancaster County Elected Official should receive a two percent increase. For 2016-2018, each elected official should receive an annual salary increase based on the following formula. If the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all Urban Consumers Midwest Region, as published for the November immediately preceding each January for 2016 through 2018 is:

- (A) Not less than 1.5% and not greater than 2.5% – then each elected official should receive a 2% salary increase;
- (B) Less than 1.5% – then the salary increase should be 2%, minus 50% of the amount by which the CPI is less than 1.5%; and
- (C) More than 2.5% – then the salary increase should be 2%, plus 50% of the amount by which the CPI exceeds 2.5%.

RECOMMENDED SALARIES

OFFICIAL	2015	2016 - 2018
County Attorney	\$143,268	Annual increases effective January 1, based on the following formula. If the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all Urban Consumers Midwest Region, as published for the November immediately preceding each January for 2016 through 2018 is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) Not less than 1.5% and not greater than 2.5%, each elected official should receive a 2% salary increase; (B) Less than 1.5%, the salary increase should be 2%, minus 50% of the amount by which the CPI is less than 1.5%; and (C) More than 2.5%, the salary increase should be 2%, plus 50% of the amount by which the CPI exceeds 2.5%.
Public Defender	\$143,268	
Assessor/Reg of Deeds	\$120,051	
Engineer	\$113,382	
Sheriff	\$116,056	
County Treasurer	\$84,659	
County Clerk	\$80,751	
District Court Clerk	\$84,653	
Commissioners	\$40,376	

Respectfully submitted this 19th day of December, 2013, on behalf of the Lancaster County Elected Officials Salary Review Committee.

James E. Gordon

James E. Gordon, Chair

LANCASTER COUNTY
ELECTED OFFICIALS SALARY

OFFICIAL	2011 SALARY	2012 SALARY		2013 SALARY		2014 SALARY		2015 SALARY		2016 SALARY		2017 SALARY	
COUNTY ATTORNEY	132,358.00	135,005.16	2.00%	137,705.26	2.00%	140,459.37	2.00%	\$146,795.00	4.51%	\$148,483.14	1.15%	154,757.08	4.23%
PUBLIC DEFENDER	132,358.00	135,005.16	2.00%	137,705.26	2.00%	140,459.37	2.00%	\$146,795.00	4.51%	\$148,483.14	1.15%	154,757.08	4.23%
COUNTY ENGINEER	104,747.00	106,841.94	2.00%	108,978.78	2.00%	111,158.36	2.00%	\$115,103.00	3.55%	\$116,426.68	1.15%	120,300.57	3.33%
COUNTY SHERIFF	107,217.00	109,361.34	2.00%	111,548.57	2.00%	113,779.54	2.00%	\$116,488.00	2.38%	\$117,827.61	1.15%	120,438.42	2.22%
COUNTY ASSESSOR/ROD	110,908.00	113,126.16	2.00%	115,388.68	2.00%	117,696.45	2.00%	\$120,051.00	2.00%	\$121,431.59	1.15%	123,678.07	1.85%
COUNTY TREASURER	78,212.00	79,776.24	2.00%	81,371.76	2.00%	82,999.20	2.00%	\$87,260.00	5.13%	\$88,263.49	1.15%	92,496.36	4.80%
COUNTY CLERK	74,602.00	76,094.04	2.00%	77,615.92	2.00%	79,168.24	2.00%	\$85,632.00	8.16%	\$86,616.77	1.15%	93,100.18	7.49%
CLERK OF DIST. CT.	78,206.00	79,770.12	2.00%	81,365.52	2.00%	82,992.83	2.00%	\$90,288.00	8.79%	\$91,328.31	1.15%	98,650.85	8.02%
COUNTY COMMISSIONER	37,301.00	38,047.02	2.00%	38,807.96	2.00%	39,584.12	2.00%	\$42,001.00	6.11%	\$42,484.01	1.15%	44,893.96	5.67%



Appointed Salary Information 2017

Name	Department	Class title	Current salary	2.5% Increase
ETHERTON, KIM G.	COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS	COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS DIRECTOR	\$95,085	\$97,462
MEYER, DENNIS M.	BUDGET AND FISCAL	BUDGET & FISCAL OFFICER	\$102,598	\$105,163
ECKLEY, LINDA S	RISK MANAGEMENT	RISK MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR	\$84,490	\$86,602
HOYLE, SARA L.	HUMAN SERVICES	HUMAN SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR	\$82,002	\$84,052
RINGLEIN, RICHARD J.	VETERANS SERVICES	COUNTY VETERANS SERVICE OFFICER	\$69,772	\$71,516
EAGAN, KERRY P.	ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER	\$142,844	\$146,415
VACANT	ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	DEPUTY CHIEF ADMIN OFFICER		
DAVIDSAVER, JAMES	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR	\$71,444	\$73,230
HOSKING, MARK DAVID	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DEP DIRECTOR	\$57,787	\$59,231
ETHERTON, SCOTT	MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS CENTER	MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS CENTER DIRECTOR	\$86,805	\$88,975
ROY, SANAT K.	COMM. MENTAL HEALTH CENTER	CLINICAL DIRECTOR	\$163,886	\$167,983
MEYER, BRENT DOUGLAS	WEED CONTROL AUTHORITY	WEED CONTROL SUPERINTENDENT	\$68,453	\$70,164
KILLEEN, DONALD F.	CNTY/CITY PROPERTY MANAGEMENT	FACILITES AND PROPERTIES DIRECTOR	\$119,596	\$122,586
SCHINDLER, MICHELLE L.	YOUTH SERVICES CENTER	YOUTH SERVICES CENTER DIRECTOR	\$102,195	\$104,749
THOMPSON, ANNETTE B.	YOUTH SERVICES CENTER	JUV DETENTION CENTER DEP DIRECTOR	\$78,557	\$80,521
JOHNSON, BRADLEY*	CORRECTIONS	CORRECTIONS DIRECTOR	\$106,001	\$106,001

*Brad Johnson is scheduled for an increase to \$110,000 in 3 months.


Attachment A

Salary Information 2017

Name	Department	Class title	Current salary	2.5% increase
BALTA, PAULINE	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF I	\$36,919	\$37,842
HOUGH, SHARON MARIE	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
FOLSOM, KIM R.	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
LAMPE, SHERI A.	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
PETERSEN, MARIAN G.	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
RHYNALDS, CHRISTINE L.	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
SCHMIDT, BERNADETTE L.	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
DRAPER, KRISTIN	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
ROTHE, AMBER	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
CEBALLOS, KRISTIN	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
HUSSEY, ELIZABETH	DISTRICT COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
NEUBERGER, ANGELA R.	JUVENILE COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
POFAHL, ANGELA M.	JUVENILE COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
PAUL, DIANNE E.	JUVENILE COURT	BAILIFF II*	\$60,491	\$62,003
BORGERDING KULWICKI, JENNIFER	DISTRICT COURT	CHILD SUPPORT REFEREE	\$105,346	\$107,979
FULTON, JOEL	DISTRICT COURT	DISTRICT COURT JUDGES LAW CLERK	\$44,344	\$45,452
CHOI, KATIE**	DISTRICT COURT	DISTRICT COURT JUDGES LAW CLERK	\$44,344	\$45,452

* The Board has stated they would like to equalize the Bailiff II to the Paralegal II. The Paralegal II is currently paid \$61,999 at the maximum.

** Katie Choi, Law Clerk, will start January 9, 2017.



RECEIVED

JAN 09 2014

LANCASTER COUNTY CLERK

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, NEBRASKA

IN THE MATTER OF SETTING SALARIES FOR ELECTED COUNTY OFFICIALS FOR THE 2015-2018 TERM))))

RESOLUTION NO. R-14-0004

WHEREAS, NEB.REV.STAT. §23-1114 provides that the salaries of all elected officers of the county shall be fixed by the county board prior to January 15 of the year in which a general election will be held for the respective offices; and

WHEREAS, 2014 is a year in which a general election will be held for the respective offices; and

WHEREAS, the Lancaster County Board of Commissioners, with the assistance of a review committee comprised of citizens with expertise in governmental, business, legal, and personnel matters, has determined the appropriate salaries for the elected officers of Lancaster County for the 2015-2018 term.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the County Board of Lancaster County, Nebraska, as follows

- 1. That the annual salaries for the elected officers of Lancaster County for the 2015-2018 term of office are hereby established as stated in "Exhibit A", attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference.
2. That in no instance shall the salary of any elected office be decreased from the previous year's salary.
3. That it is the intent of the County Board that in the event any provision contained herein be found contrary to law, the remainder of this Resolution shall remain in full force and effect.

BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS of Lancaster County, Nebraska, in
regular session on this 14th day of January, 2014, in the County-City Building, Lincoln,
Lancaster County, Nebraska.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF LANCASTER COUNTY, NEBRASKA






Raybould voted nay

Amundson Absent

Approved as to form this
14th day of January, 2014.



Joe Kelly
Lancaster County Attorney

EXHIBIT A

RECOMMENDED SALARIES

OFFICIAL	2015	2016 - 2018
County Attorney	\$146,795	Annual increases effective January 1 st based on the following formula. If the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all Urban Consumers Midwest Region, as published for the November immediately preceding each January for 2016 through 2018 is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Not less than 1.5% and not greater than 2.5%, each elected official should receive a 2% salary increase; (b) Less than 1.5%, the salary increase should be 2%, minus 50% of the amount by which the CPI is less than 1.5%, but with the 2% base not being lowered beyond 0%; and (c) More than 2.5%, the salary increase should be 2%, plus 50% of the amount by which the CPI exceeds 2.5%.
Public Defender	\$146,795	
Assessor/Reg of Deeds	\$120,051	
Engineer	\$115,103	
Sheriff	\$116,488	
County Treasurer	\$87,260	
County Clerk	\$85,632	
District Court Clerk	\$90,288	
Commissioners	\$42,001	

After the annual increase based on the CPI has been determined for 2017, the

following market adjustments shall be added to the following elected official salaries for 2017:

County Attorney	\$3,527
Public Defender	\$3,527
Engineer	\$1,720
Sheriff	\$431
County Treasurer	\$2,600
County Clerk	\$4,881
District Court Clerk	\$5,635
Commissioners	\$1,624