Statement at "Pay Increase" Bill Signing INTRO: FAOS (Jill/Paul) QUAD COMM: [Independent]

In 2015, the Quadrennial Commission analyzed the compensation o

New York City's elected officials by looking at the va characteristics of New York City, mandated duties and responsibilities for each office, the passage of time since the last raise (9 years), implicit ceilings on government pay, changes in median household income, how New Yorkers are faring economically, and many other factors.

The Commission recommended salary increases for all elected officials, and linked the proposed increases for City Council members to significant structural reforms. In January the Mayor endorsed the Commission's recommendations and submitted them to the Council.

The Council adopted local laws and Council rules to codify the Commission's proposed structural reforms and adopted all the recommended salary increases—except for the office of Council member—where the Council proposed increasing salaries by \$10,185 beyond the Commission's recommendations.

Overall, the proposed laws that are before the Mayor today are praiseworthy.

The laws adopt the Commission's central concept that raises for elected officials should, among other things, reflect the economic conditions of their constituents. The laws also adopt the Commission's structural recommendations that lulus be eliminated, and the job of Council member be classified as full-time. These two

foul Held

structural reforms have been talked about by reformers for at least three decades. However, never before have they been adopted.

In addition, the laws accept the Commission's recommendations that

- (1) changes be made that would facilitate future Commissions recommending that pay changes not take effect until after the next election, akin to the U.S. Constitution's 27th Amendment; and
 - (2) disclosure forms of elected officials should be placed on-line.

* * * *

While the Commission recommended a 15% raise for Council members, the proposed additional salary increase of \$10,185 would make their raise 24.1%.

The Council's reason was that the job of Council member will now be formally classified as full time.

The Commission did not make any allowance for that change. We explained our reasons for not doing so in testimony on February 3. Nonetheless, we recognize that some value could be assigned to removing the option.

Moreover, while we would not have made this particular change, we believe the proposed law is overall very progressive and in the interests of the City.

Think about what is wrong with Washington today! What is wrong is that if people don't get 100% of what they want, many just say no.

That is not the way a good government works.

Here, it would serve good government to sign the bills into law.