



Municipal Reference and
Research Center
RECEIVED

OCT 23 1995

31 CHAMBERS STREET
NEW YORK CITY

C 2

REPORT OF THE

N.Y. City, M... Quadrennial Advisory Commission For The Review Of Compensation Levels Of Elected Officials.

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Richard L. Gelb, Chairman
Stanley Brezenoff
Robert M. Kaufman

OCTOBER, 1995

145.66
MCS56
1995
C.2

REPORT OF THE 1995 QUADRENNIAL
ADVISORY COMMISSION FOR THE REVIEW OF
COMPENSATION LEVELS OF ELECTED OFFICIALS

I. Introduction

The Administrative Code of the City of New York, Section 3-601, calls for the appointment of an advisory commission once every four years to review compensation levels of elected officials in the City of New York and, if warranted, recommend changes. The Quadrennial Advisory Commission For The Review Of Compensation Levels Of Elected Officials ("Commission") is required to study the compensation levels of the Mayor, Public Advocate, Comptroller, the Borough Presidents, the City Council Members and the District Attorneys of the five counties within the City of New York.

At the conclusion of the study and review, the Commission is required to issue to the Mayor a report containing its recommendations for changes in compensation levels for any and/or all of the elected positions or its recommendation that no changes are warranted. The Mayor then is required to submit the Commission's report with his recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission's mandate is to determine what appropriate salaries should be for elected officials for the period beginning on July 1, 1995 and ending June 30, 1999. To

perform this study and review we have considered the criteria set forth in the Administrative Code, the report of the 1991 Quadrennial Advisory Commission For The Review Of Compensation Levels Of Elected Officials ("1991 Shinn Commission") and reports of prior Commissions, and changes in various key economic and competitive factors since 1987, the last compensation increase for most elected officials.¹ The Commission also considered the impact of compensation adjustments on all other City employees.

In addition to the above factors, we also considered the fiscal condition of the City. We would be remiss not to weigh the budgetary constraints and less than favorable economic forecasts that have plagued the City's fiscal landscape, with limited exceptions, since the fiscal crisis of the 1970s.

The 1991 Shinn Commission was confronted with budgetary constraints and projected budget deficits. That caused it to make specific proposals of where salary levels should be for each position, but not to recommend implementation of those higher salaries for most officials.

This Commission is faced with the fact that salary levels of all elected City officials, except District Attorneys, have not been increased since 1987. Further, the City's

¹ The compensation level for the elected offices in the City of New York, except the office of the District Attorneys of the five counties, has not been increased since 1987. The 1991 Shinn Commission recommended and the Mayor and City Council approved an eighteen thousand dollar (\$18,000) increase for the office of the District Attorney and that recommendation was implemented.

budgetary constraints and economic realities, while improving, remain severe. However, the balance of factors reviewed by this Commission support our proposal to increase the compensation levels of the elected officials of the City of New York.

In conducting our work, we studied the statistical and operational issues set out as relevant criteria in the law. We also wrote and asked for the views of the Mayor, Public Advocate, Comptroller, Borough Presidents, District Attorneys and the Speaker of the City Council with respect to City Council Members. We received written responses from many of them, setting out their views on compensation issues. We also received a letter from the New York Public Interest Research Group ("NYPIRG"), a non-profit organization. We were available for other public comments at a public hearing on September 19, 1995.

In conducting this study and review we chose not to undertake a detailed study regarding the still evolving effects of the 1990 amendments to the New York City Charter. These changes include the abolition of the Board of Estimate, the creation of the position of Public Advocate² and changes in the duties and responsibilities of the Mayor, the City Council and

² For compensation history prior to the creation of the Public Advocate position, the Commission has used the compensation level of the former position of the President of the Council. The Local Laws of the City of New York and the Session Laws of the State of New York confirm that, except with respect to the functions associated with the Board of Estimate, the duties, responsibilities and limitations of the Public Advocate are identical to those of the former President of the Council.

the Borough Presidents. Our study and review does address the results of these changes by adopting the findings of the 1991 Shinn Commission as to changes in the duties of certain offices, and its acknowledgment that, at some point in the future, "job descriptions will have to be rewritten to reflect the reallocation of certain responsibilities and accountabilities." We further concur with the 1991 Shinn Commission that the effects of these amendments should be evaluated further in the future.

We note that the prior Commissions commented on whether Council Members should be full time or part time, and on whether there should be restrictions on their outside income. NYPIRG recommended that we also consider those issues. We have concluded that these are important issues that should be explored, but that they are outside the scope of the responsibility assigned to this Commission by the language of Section 3-601 of the Administrative Code. Thus, we do not believe they are an appropriate area of recommendation by this Commission. We suggest that a separate commission, consisting of representatives or appointees of both the Executive and Legislative branches of City Government, as well as private sector members, would be a more appropriate body to study those questions.

As discussed more fully herein, the Commission recommends that the compensation level of the offices of the various elected officials of the City of New York be increased at

an appropriate rate. Our recommendation accepts and builds upon the evaluations of the 1991 Shinn Commission.

II. Origin of the Commission

Local Law 77 (Section 3-601 of the Administrative Code) directs the Mayor to appoint, every four years, an advisory commission comprised of private citizens to review the compensation levels of the offices of elected officials. The Administrative Code provides, in part, that:

The commission shall study the compensation levels for the mayor, the public advocate, the comptroller, the borough presidents, the council members and the district attorneys of the five counties within the city and shall recommend changes in those compensation levels, if warranted. In making its recommendations the commission shall take into consideration the duties and responsibilities of each position, the current salary of the position and the length of time since the last change, any change in the cost of living, compression of salary levels for other officers and employees of the city, and salaries and salary trends for positions with analogous duties and responsibilities both within government and in the private sector.

The Administrative Code also provides that:

the members of the commission shall be private citizens generally recognized for their knowledge and experience in management and compensation matters.

The following Commission members were appointed for the 1995 Commission by Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani:

Chairman:

Richard L. Gelb
Chairman Emeritus
Bristol-Myers Squibb Company

Members:

Stanley Brezenoff
President
Maimonides Medical Center

Robert M. Kaufman
Partner
Proskauer Rose Goetz & Mendelsohn LLP

The Commission staff consisted of Gregg L. Bienstock, Esq., Labor and Employment Group, Proskauer Rose Goetz & Mendelsohn LLP, and Charles G. Tharp, Ph.D., Senior Vice President, Human Resources, Bristol-Myers Squibb Company.

III. Economic Factors Affecting Salary Levels

The Administrative Code requires the Commission to consider changes in economic factors and the length of time since the last salary increase for elected positions. In this section of our report we set forth a table that illustrates these facts and figures.

The key economic factors considered by the Commission are changes in the cost of living and the effect of these changes on the salaries of elected officials. Because the salaries of most elected officials have not been increased since 1987 it is appropriate to consider cost of living changes since 1987. The following table displays the 1987 salary level, the 1991 Shinn Commission's proposed 1991 salary levels and the effect of changes in the cost of living, relative to the salary level of elected officials, since 1987.

EFFECTS OF CHANGES IN THE COST OF LIVING ON EXISTING SALARIES

<u>Elected Official</u>	<u>1987 Salaries³</u>	<u>1991 Proposed Salaries⁴</u>	<u>1987 Salaries Aged at NYCCPI⁵</u>	<u>1987 Salaries Deflated at NYCCPI⁶</u>
Mayor	130,000	153,000	183,700	92,000
Public Advocate	105,000	115,000	148,400	74,300
Comptroller	105,000	122,500	148,400	74,300
Borough President	95,000	105,000	134,200	67,200
Council Member	55,000	65,000	77,700	38,900
District Attorneys	97,000	115,000	137,100 ⁷	68,600 ⁷

³ Base salaries for elected officials adopted on July 1, 1987 and salaries presently in effect except for the salary of the District Attorneys.

⁴ Base salaries proposed, but not adopted, for elected officials in 1991. Pursuant to the 1991 Commission's recommendation, the base salary for the District Attorneys was increased effective January 1, 1992.

⁵ 1987 base salaries aged at the annual rate of the New York City Consumer Price Index, i.e., what the salaries would have to be today to have kept pace with changes in the cost of living. See Appendix 1.

⁶ 1987 base salaries deflated at the annual rate of the New York City Consumer Price Index. See Appendix 1.

⁷ If the 1992 salaries for the District Attorneys were aged and deflated at NYCCPI, the respective numbers would be \$124,000 and \$106,000.

As the chart above establishes, the salaries of elected officials would have to be increased by approximately 40% merely to keep pace with changes in the cost of living since 1987. If such an increase were to be granted, it would be based in great part on the fact that the salaries of elected officials have not been adjusted in eight years.

IV. Compression of Salary Levels

The inevitable result of the study, review and possible increase of the salaries of elected officials once every four years, even if fully justified increases are given, is the compression of salaries at all levels of City government. Compression is further exacerbated when increases do not even occur every four years. Compression results not only from the fact that increases are usually given to senior officials at a lesser percentage than those of lower level employees but, in addition, from the timing of such increases. While elected officials receive salary increase at four year intervals, at best, almost all other City employees receive salary increases at twelve to eighteen month intervals. As a result of these factors, the basic principles of compensation structure -- that differences in responsibility and accountabilities be reflected by clear distinctions in compensation -- are upset and salaries at all levels are artificially compressed.

The problem of compression exists at all levels of City Government, and results from the artificially low salary of the Mayor. The Mayor's salary serves as a specific cap on the compensation of the other elected City-wide officials, on the Deputy Mayors, and on the Commissioners of the Mayoral agencies, all of which have not been increased since 1988. This in turn restricts the ability of the City to compensate adequately the

Deputy and Assistant Commissioners and other management level employees.⁸

Corresponding salary compression problems exist in the offices of other elected officials and throughout the ranks of the City workforce. Plainly, differences in responsibilities and accountabilities are not reflected by clear distinctions in salary levels in the City of New York.

The compression issue is further exacerbated by the fact that the majority of employees of the City have received eight wage rate increases totaling 26.5% since July 1, 1987 while elected officials, except District Attorneys, have received none.⁹ The result of these collectively bargained increases is that the salary level of employees of the City are approaching

⁸ For example, in the New York Police Department, there are twenty-seven ranking officers who make more than the Commissioner and First Deputy Commissioner; in the Fire Department, there are twenty-four ranking officers who make more than the Commissioner and First Deputy Commissioner.

⁹ These collectively bargained increases are applicable to all represented employees and generally are applicable to City employees in the Management Pay Plan. However, the increases have not uniformly been applied to the salary level of titles and/or persons in titles earning more than \$70,000 and/or not represented by a bargaining agent. In 1990, employees in the Management Pay Plan earning more than \$70,000 were required to take a pay cut while employees in the Management Pay Plan with salaries below \$70,000 were subject to a wage freeze. However, in December 1991, salaries that were cut in 1990 were reinstated to their 1989 level. In 1992, employees in the Management Pay Plan with a performance rating of at least "good" received increases equivalent to the collectively bargained increases for 1990 and 1991 (4.5%). Deputy Mayors and Agency Heads did not and have not received these increases resulting in further compression on the Deputy Mayor and Agency Head titles from positions below.

and, in some cases, exceeding the salary level of their supervisors and agency heads. The collectively bargained increases for civilian employees and the application of these increases to the salary levels of elected officials is set forth in Appendix 2.

Another of the effects of salary compression is the impact on the City's ability to attract and retain productive and qualified employees at all levels. As salary levels within the City are compressed, the City is unable to pay salaries that are comparable to other public agencies or the private sector. The result is that, at a time when increased productivity and competence are of vital importance to the City's fiscal recovery, the City's ability to compete in the marketplace for the best and the brightest employees is severely diminished.

The issue of compression was addressed in a limited manner in 1991. To help alleviate the severe salary compression between District Attorneys and their subordinates, and resulting recruitment and retention problems, the 1991 Shinn Commission recommended that the salary level of the District Attorneys be increased while freezing the salary levels of all other elected officials. This recommendation was implemented by the City Council and the Mayor in recognition of the then existing compression and recruitment and retention problem.

This Commission recognizes there will always be some compression in government. However, with salary levels of

subordinates approaching and, in some cases, exceeding managers and the need to reduce recruitment and retention problems at these levels, the time has come to address the compression issue.

V. Benchmark Considerations

New York City is like no other City in the world and its governance is unlike that of any other City. Indeed, many argue there are no jurisdictions comparable to New York City. In fact, New York City's revenue base is almost eight times that of the second largest city (Los Angeles) and its population base is more than twice that of Los Angeles. See Appendix 3. Additionally, the number and variety of services that New York City provides -- police protection, education, fire, sanitation, and health and welfare services, to name a few -- and the demands for these and other services are greater than in any other City. The enormity of the City's population and the extent of services provided by the City cause every decision of the Mayor and other elected officials to be subject to extensive analysis and criticism.

Despite the enormity of the task associated with governing the largest city, the elected officials of the City of New York are not compensated accordingly. It is true that elected officials chose public service and were aware that their compensation levels would not be comparable to those in the private sector. Nevertheless, this should not preclude officials in America's largest city from being paid salaries commensurate with their level of responsibility. Further, they should be entitled to a rate of growth similar to the salary level movement in government and private industry.

Despite the size and budget of New York City, many of its elected officials rank between fourth and sixth in salary when compared to others of the largest cities in the United States. (See charts in Appendix 4.) New York's Mayor at \$130,000 is paid substantially less than the Mayor of Chicago who receives \$170,000 per year, less than the Mayors of San Francisco (\$138,699) and Houston (\$133,005) and the same amount as the Mayor of Detroit. Similar aberrations exist with respect to other City officials: Comptrollers of San Francisco (\$130,082), Los Angeles (\$107,877) and Atlanta (\$105,941) are paid more than the Comptroller of New York City who receives \$105,000; District Attorneys of Dallas (\$130,450), San Francisco (\$129,508), Houston (\$121,420), Los Angeles (\$121,000) and Washington, D.C. (\$115,700) are paid more than those in New York City who are paid \$115,000.¹⁰

¹⁰ Council Members in Los Angeles earn \$98,070; Chicago, \$75,000; Washington, D.C., \$75,885; Philadelphia, \$65,000; Detroit, \$60,000. All are paid more than the \$55,000 salary of those in New York City, but it is not clear whether those positions are in fact or by law full time.

Additionally, the salary levels of the Mayor and other elected officials of the City of New York pale in comparison to the salaries of individuals heading agencies, authorities and labor unions in the region.

<u>Entity</u>	<u>Incumbent</u>	<u>Salary</u>
Port Authority of NY and NJ	George Marlin	\$170,000
New York Power Authority	S. David Freeman	\$197,000
New York City Board of Education	Rudolph F. Crew	\$195,000
NYS Health Dep't.	Barbara DeBuono, MD	\$152,382
District Council 37	Stanley Hill	\$245,000
Clerical Workers' Union	Al Diop	\$167,465
United Federation of Teachers	Sandra Feldman	\$156,963

Moreover, positions in the private sector classified as "executive" and "exempt salaried" -- classifications that certainly encompass the offices of the elected officials in the City of New York -- demand substantially higher salaries and have been subject to annual increases of at least 4% since 1991. According to studies of three compensation experts, salary levels of executives and exempt salaried employees have increased at a steady rate since 1991.

FOUR YEAR ANNUAL SALARY MOVEMENT FOR
EXECUTIVES AND EXEMPT SALARIED EMPLOYEES¹¹

Employee Type	Source	1994	1993	1992	1991
Executive	ACA	4.1%	4.4%	4.8%	5.1%
	Mercer	4.4%	4.8%	5.3%	5.6%
	Towers Perrin	<u>4.1%</u>	<u>4.4%</u>	<u>4.7%</u>	<u>5.2%</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>4.2%</u>	<u>4.5%</u>	<u>4.9%</u>	<u>5.3%</u>
	<u>Compounded 4-Year Increase</u>	<u>20.3%</u>			
Exempt Salaried	ACA	4.0%	4.3%	4.7%	5.0%
	Mercer	4.2%	4.5%	4.9%	5.2%
	Towers Perrin	<u>4.0%</u>	<u>4.4%</u>	<u>4.7%</u>	<u>5.2%</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>4.1%</u>	<u>4.4%</u>	<u>4.8%</u>	<u>5.1%</u>
	<u>Compounded 4-Year Increase</u>	<u>19.7%</u>			

¹¹ The data contained in the chart is from studies by three separate compensation experts -- American Compensation Association Report on the Salary Budget Survey ("ACA"); The 1994/1995 Compensation Planning Survey, The National Survey Group, William M. Mercer, Inc. ("Mercer"); The Salary Management Newsletter, Towers Perrin.

VI. City Charter Revisions and The Effect on Elected Officials

As a result of the 1990 amendments to the New York City Charter, several far reaching changes to the structure of City government have been implemented. Those major changes included the elimination of the Board of Estimate and the corresponding changes in the duties and responsibilities of the Mayor, the Public Advocate, the City Council and the Borough Presidents. These changes have brought about increased duties and responsibilities for the City Council Members and a decrease in the statutorily-mandated activities of the five Borough Presidents.¹² The decreased duties and responsibilities of the newly created position of the Public Advocate were also recognized by the 1991 Shinn Commission in evaluating the increase designated for the Public Advocate.¹³

The 1991 Shinn Commission recognized these changes and took them into account in its proposed salary schedule for affected officials. We accept that evaluation and implement it. We also agree with the 1991 Shinn Commission that the salary relationship of the elected officials should be revisited and

¹² The Commission has not been presented with evidence that would, at this time, cause it to disregard the conclusion of the 1991 Shinn Commission that the amendments to the Charter resulted in a decrease in the statutorily-mandated duties of the Borough Presidents.

¹³ The Local Laws of the City of New York and the Session Laws of the State of New York confirm that the duties, responsibilities and limitations of the Public Advocate are substantially identical to those of the former President of the Council, except with respect to the Board of Estimate duties.

reevaluated periodically. We have done so and have concluded that the full impact of these amendments has not yet been seen.

VII. Recommendations Regarding the Compensation Level
of Elected Officials in the City of New York

Based on our study and review of the facts and our presentation of the same, the Commission recommends that the compensation level of the offices of the various elected officials of the City of New York be increased further from the levels recommended by the 1991 Shinn Commission by an amount equal to two percent for each year beginning on July 1, 1992, 1993, 1994 and 1995. The Commission's recommendation adopts the salary levels proposed by the 1991 Shinn Commission and applies our recommendation to those figures. Additionally, our recommendation is retroactive to July 1, 1995. The following chart sets forth the 1987 base salary, 1991 proposed salary levels, the Commission's recommended increase in dollars and the new salary levels for the offices of the elected officials of the City effective July 1, 1995.

<u>Elected Official</u>	<u>1987 Base</u>	<u>1991 Base</u>	<u>Further Increase</u>	<u>New Salary¹⁴</u>
Mayor	\$130,000	\$153,000	\$12,000	\$165,000
Public Advocate	\$105,000	\$115,000	\$10,000	\$125,000
Comptroller	\$105,000	\$122,500	\$10,500	\$133,000
Borough President	\$ 95,000	\$105,000	\$ 9,000	\$114,000
Council Member	\$ 55,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 5,500	\$ 70,500
District Attorneys	\$ 97,000	\$115,000	\$10,000	\$125,000

¹⁴ The recommended salaries for the offices of elected officials have been rounded to the nearest \$500.

The Commission is certainly mindful of the precarious nature of the City's fiscal situation and offers this fiscally responsible recommendation with full appreciation of the economic and budgetary constraints facing the City. Importantly, our recommendation does not make the salary level of elected officials the highest in the nation, it does not equal the change in the New York City Consumer Price Index since 1987 or 1991, nor can it be compared to the wage increases received by City employees in collectively bargained titles because those increases were actually paid out. The Commission's recommendations are meant to bring the compensation level of the elected officials to a level that begins to alleviate compression in salaries, to a level that adequately compensates our elected officials for their responsibilities and accountabilities, and to a level that addresses the reality that salaries have not been increased since 1987.

The Commission recommends that the salary levels of elected officials in the City of New York be increased to the levels set forth above. We have arrived at these salary levels by adopting the 1991 Shinn Commission's proposed salary levels which carefully considered the basic guidelines for the Commission, and by increasing those salary levels by two percent for each year through July 1, 1995. Our recommendation is effective at the beginning of the 1995 fiscal year, July 1, 1995.

VIII. Conclusion

The statutory mandate of this Commission was to study the compensation levels of the elected officials of the City of New York and recommend changes in the compensation levels, if warranted. The Commission concludes that, despite the fiscal climate of the City, the facts plainly support the salary increases set forth below:

<u>Elected Official</u>	<u>New Salary</u>
Mayor	\$165,000
Public Advocate	\$125,000
Comptroller	\$133,000
Borough President	\$114,000
Council Member	\$ 70,500
District Attorneys	\$125,000

Although increases in the level of compensation for elected officials are never popular, the magnitude of the duties, responsibilities and accountabilities associated with positions responsible for governing the largest City in the United States must be recognized. We believe that this recommendation is necessary, important and fair and should be approved. If this recommendation is not adopted, salary levels for elected officials would likely remain at the same level until at least 1999 -- a full twelve years since the last increase -- resulting in further salary compression and greater erosion of salaries of

elected officials as a result of subsequent changes in the cost of living.

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission strongly recommends approval and implementation, as of July 1, 1995, of the proposed salary increases set forth herein.

Appendix 1.

Consumer Price Index: 1987-1995

<u>Year</u>	<u>New York City CPI</u>
1987	5.1%
1988	4.8%
1989	5.6%
1990	6.0%
1991	4.5%
1992	3.6%
1993	3.0%
1994	2.4%
May 1995	2.9%

Total inflation 7/1/87 to 6/1/95 41.5%

ppendix 2.

Increase Elected Official Pay At The Historical Rate of Union Increases: Beginning July 1, 1988

	<u>Union Increase</u>	<u>Mayor</u>	<u>Public Advocate</u>	<u>Comptroller</u>	<u>Boro President</u>	<u>Council Member</u>	<u>District Attorneys</u>
July 1, 1987		\$130,000	\$105,000	\$105,000	\$95,000	\$55,000	\$97,000
July 1, 1988	5.0%	\$136,500	\$110,250	\$110,250	\$99,750	\$57,750	\$101,850
July 1, 1989	5.0%	\$143,325	\$115,762	\$115,762	\$104,737	\$60,637	\$106,942
July 1, 1990	3.5%	\$148,341	\$119,814	\$119,814	\$108,403	\$62,760	\$110,685
July 1, 1991	1.0%	\$149,825	\$121,012	\$121,012	\$109,487	\$63,387	\$111,792
July 1, 1993	2.0%	\$152,821	\$123,433	\$123,433	\$111,677	\$64,655	\$114,028
July 1, 1994	2.0%	\$155,878	\$125,901	\$125,901	\$113,911	\$65,948	\$116,309
December 1, 1994	3.0%	\$160,554	\$129,678	\$129,678	\$117,328	\$67,927	\$119,798
July 1, 1995	0.0%	\$160,554	\$129,678	\$129,678	\$117,328	\$67,927	\$119,798

Appendix 3

Revenue and Population of Major US Cities		
City	Revenue	Population
Chicago, IL	\$3.6 billion	2,700,000
San Francisco, CA	1.4 billion	729,000
Houston, TX	2.4 billion	1,600,000
Detroit, MI	2.2 billion	1,000,000
New York, NY	31.6 billion	7,330,683
Los Angeles, CA	4.0 billion	3,600,000
Newark, NJ	415 million	275,000
Boston, MA	1.4 billion	574,283
Philadelphia, PA	2.6 billion	1,600,000
Atlanta, GA	2.0 billion	394,000
Cleveland, OH	359.9 million	505,616
New Orleans, LA	415.6 million	495,000
Washington, D.C.	3.3 billion	570,000
St. Louis, MO	327.5 million	396,000
Minneapolis, MN	975.2 million	350,000

Appendix 4

COMPENSATION REVIEW OF ELECTED OFFICIALS

Earnings for Mayor of Major US Cities	
City	Salary
Chicago, IL	\$170,000
San Francisco, CA	138,699
Houston, TX	133,005
Detroit, MI	130,000
New York, NY	130,000
Los Angeles, CA	127,491
Newark, NJ	115,000
Boston, MA	110,000
Philadelphia, PA	110,000
Atlanta, GA	100,000
Cleveland, OH	93,600
New Orleans, LA	92,482
Washington, D.C.	90,705
St. Louis, MO	90,246
Minneapolis, MN	71,604
Average	\$112,345
Median	110,000
75th %tile	130,751

NOTE: Summary statistics exclude New York City.

Earnings for City Council President of Major US Cities	
City	Salary
New York, NY	105,000
Los Angeles, CA	98,070
Washington, D.C.	81,855
Philadelphia, PA	80,000
Chicago, IL	75,000
Detroit, MI	63,000
Newark, NJ	55,611
Boston, MA	54,500
Minneapolis, MN	53,170
Cleveland, OH	52,008
St. Louis, MO	50,310
New Orleans, LA	42,484
Atlanta, GA	25,000
San Francisco, CA	
Houston, TX	
Average	\$60,920
Median	55,056
75th %tile	78,750
*Known as the President of the Board of Aldermen	

NOTE: Summary statistics exclude New York City.

COMPENSATION REVIEW OF ELECTED OFFICIALS

Earnings for Comptroller of Major US Cities	
City	Salary
San Francisco, CA	\$130,082
Los Angeles, CA	107,877
Atlanta, GA**	105,941
New York, NY	105,000
Chicago, IL	102,792
Houston, TX	92,575
Boston, MA	90,580
Washington, D.C.	78,610
Cleveland, OH	72,800
St. Louis, MO	72,514
Newark, NJ	70,236
Philadelphia, PA	70,000
Minneapolis, MN	68,198
New Orleans, LA	40,884
Detroit, MI*	
Average	\$84,853
Median	78,610
75th %tile	104,367
<p>* Finance or Budget Director - salary ranges from \$76,300-\$100,900. 2% increase budgeted for 7/1/95.</p> <p>** Salary range = \$69,961 - \$110,355 (was told to back 4% out of the max to get current salary.)</p>	

NOTE: Summary statistics exclude New York City.

COMPENSATION REVIEW OF ELECTED OFFICIALS

Earnings for District Attorneys of Major US Cities	
City	Salary
Dallas, TX	\$130,450
San Francisco, CA	129,508
Houston, TX	121,420
Los Angeles, CA	121,000
Washington, D.C.*	115,700
New York, NY	115,000
Chicago, IL	112,124
Detroit, MI	101,710
Newark, NJ	100,000
Philadelphia, PA	94,111
Minneapolis, MN	89,154
Cleveland, OH	85,130
New Orleans, LA	84,600
Boston, MA	72,500
St. Louis, MO	69,900
Atlanta, GA	108,594
Average	\$102,393
Median	101,710
75th %tile	121,000
*US Attorney	

NOTE: Summary statistics exclude New York City.

Earnings for Council Members of Major US Cities

City	Salary
Los Angeles, CA	\$98,070
Chicago, IL	75,000
Washington, D.C.	71,885
Philadelphia, PA	65,000
Detroit, MI	60,000
New York, NY	55,000
Boston, MA	54,500
Minneapolis, MN	53,170
Newark, NJ	50,462
New Orleans, LA	42,484
Cleveland, OH	40,093
Houston, TX	37,030
St. Louis, MO*	26,075
San Francisco, CA	23,928
Atlanta, GA	22,000
Average	\$51,407
Median	51,816
75th %tile	66,714

* Council Member = Alderman in Charge of District Ward.

NOTE: Summary statistics exclude New York City.