

Dave,

Your blog has a link to a document titled "Some of Coeur d'Alene's Highest Paid Employees\*". The City did not prepare this report although it appears to be a compilation of data that the City has provided in the past.

Attached to this email and titled 2009-2010 Actual Pay is a document that was sent to the Idaho Freedom Foundation on May 12, 2011. It includes pay for the period 10/1/2009 through 9/30/2010. The data in this document appears to be shown in the document on your blog under column 4 titled "2010 Salary".

Attached to this email and titled 2011-12 Budgeted Pay is a document that was provided to Sharon Culbreth on Sept. 13, 2011. It is a list of projected pay for the upcoming fiscal year beginning Oct. 1, 2011 and ending Sept. 30, 2012. It includes a 3% cost of living increase and any eligible service time/performance increases. This data appears to be shown in the document on your blog under column 3 titled "2011 Salary".

I have several concerns regarding the document currently posted on your blog. They are outlined below.

First, Tony Berns IS NOT a city employee. The information provided is titled "Some of Coeur d'Alene's Highest Paid Employees\*" and lists Tony Berns. It is inaccurate.

Second, the information provided appears to make an inaccurate comparison year over year, from 2010 to 2011. There is a year in between that is not shown. It should be clearly shown that the information provided is over a three year period. Under the heading "2010 Salary", these numbers are actual pay for the fiscal year 2009-10 (Oct. 1, 2009 to Sept. 30, 2010). The information provided under the heading "2011 Salary" should be clearly shown as projected pay for fiscal year 2011-12 (Oct. 1, 2011 to Sept. 30, 2012). These columns are also incorrectly titled because not all employees are paid a "salary". Some employees are paid "wages".

Third, the last column which shows an increase or decrease in pay over the years was not generated by the City, and I haven't confirmed the accuracy of these percentages. However, I am concerned that without clarification, the further dissemination of this document will generate confusion. For example, W Util. Worker II shows an increase in the three year period of 43.89%. Without knowing the background, this would appear absurd. This employee took advantage of a retirement incentive which was offered during these difficult economic times in order to reduce city personnel costs. The reason for the large increase was due to the incentive he received, not an increase in base wages. Another example is shown with a Deputy City Attorney as an almost 40% reduction in pay. What isn't shown is that she voluntarily reduced the number of hours worked.

If after you review this information, you have questions, please feel free to give me a jingle at 769-2367. In the meantime, I would request that the current document be pulled from your blog based upon the inaccuracies it contains and the potential for confusion regarding the time period presented. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,  
Wendy