2009

ELECTED OFFICIALS' SALARIES. PREVENTS PAY INCREASES DURING BUDGET DEFICIT YEARS.

QUICK-REFERENCE GUIDE

PROP 1E MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FUNDING. TEMPORARY REALLOCATION. HELPS BALANCE STATE BUDGET.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by the Legislature

Helps balance state budget by amending the Mental Health Services Act (Proposition 63 of 2004) to transfer funds, for two years, to pay for mental health services provided through the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment Program for children and young adults. Fiscal Impact: State General Fund savings of about $230 million annually for two years (2009–10 and 2010–11). Corresponding reduction in funding available for Mental Health Services Act programs.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: A portion of funds previously approved by the voters under Proposition 63 to support the expansion of community mental health programs will be redirected over the next two years to achieve state General Fund savings.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: All Proposition 63 funds would continue to be used to support the expansion of community mental health programs. Other budget reductions or revenue increases would be needed to address the state's fiscal problems.

ARGUMENTS

PRO This is a one-time redirection of funds to help close an unprecedented $42 billion budget shortfall. Voting yes on Prop. 1E will ensure that we can continue to provide critical services to our most vulnerable Californians. It's the right thing to do for those who need us most.

CON The Mental Health Services Act's successful programs save the state and local governments money by reducing incarceration, homelessness, hospitalization, out-of-home placements, and school failure. During these difficult times, let's keep programs that work and respect the will of the people. Vote no on Proposition 1E.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

No contact information was provided.

AGAINST

Rusty Selix
No on Prop. 1E
1127 11th Street, #925
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 557-1166
www.NoProp1E.com

PROP 1F ELECTED OFFICIALS' SALARIES. PREVENTS PAY INCREASES DURING BUDGET DEFICIT YEARS.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by the Legislature

Encourages balanced state budgets by preventing elected Members of the Legislature and statewide constitutional officers, including the Governor, from receiving pay raises in years when the state is running a deficit. Directs the Director of Finance to determine whether a given year is a deficit year. Prevents the Citizens Compensation Commission from increasing elected officials' salaries in years when the state Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties is in the negative by an amount equal to or greater than one percent of the General Fund. Fiscal Impact: Minor state savings related to elected state officials' salaries in some cases when the state is expected to end the year with a budget deficit.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Members of the Legislature, the Governor, and other elected state officials could not receive salary increases in certain cases when the state General Fund is expected to end the year with a deficit.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: A commission established by voters in 1990 could continue to give salary increases to Members of the Legislature, the Governor, and other elected state officials in any year, including cases when the state General Fund is expected to end the year with a deficit.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Yes on 1F: NO PAY RAISES FOR POLITICIANS WHEN CALIFORNIA IS RUNNING A DEFICIT. Prop. 1F prohibits legislators, the governor and other state politicians from getting pay raises whenever the state is running a deficit.

CON Proposition 1F *won't work.* Legislators won't change their voting behavior just because of a threatened salary freeze. This petty, vindictive attempt to punish the Legislature will give us *no relief* from budget stalemates, while unfairly penalizing innocent bystanders such as the Secretary of State and Board of Equalization.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Peter Newman
484 B Washington Street, Suite 130
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 626-3563
info@reformforchange.com
www.reformforchange.com

AGAINST

Pete Stahl
Pete Rates the Propositions
NoOn1F@PeteRates.com
www.PeteRates.com

PROPOSITION

1F ELECTED OFFICIALS' SALARIES. PREVENTS PAY INCREASES DURING BUDGET DEFICIT YEARS.

OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY

ELECTED OFFICIALS' SALARIES. PREVENTS PAY INCREASES DURING BUDGET DEFICIT YEARS.

- Encourages balanced state budgets by preventing elected Members of the Legislature and statewide constitutional officers, including the Governor, from receiving pay raises in years when the state is running a deficit.
- Directs the Director of Finance to determine whether a given year is a deficit year.
- Prevents the Citizens Compensation Commission from increasing elected officials' salaries in years when the state Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties is in the negative by an amount equal to or greater than one percent of the General Fund.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact:

- Minor state savings related to elected state officials' salaries in some cases when the state is expected to end the year with a budget deficit.

FINAL VOTES CAST BY THE LEGISLATURE ON SCA 8 (PROPOSITION 1F)

Senate:	Ayes 39	Noes 0
Assembly:	Ayes 80	Noes 0

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

BACKGROUND

Voter-Created Commission Sets State Official Pay and Benefits. Proposition 112—approved by voters in June 1990—amended the State Constitution to create the California Citizens Compensation Commission. The commission includes seven members appointed by the Governor, none of whom can be a current or former state officer or state employee. The commission establishes the annual salary, as well as medical insurance and other benefits, for the following elected state officials:

- The Legislature (120 Members).
- The Governor.
- The Lieutenant Governor.
- The Attorney General.
- The Controller.
- The Insurance Commissioner.
- The Secretary of State.
- The Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- The Treasurer.
- The Board of Equalization (4 Members).

While the commission has control over most pay and benefits received by these state officials, there are certain exceptions. For example, Members of the Legislature are eligible to receive per diem payments to cover lodging, meals, and other expenses for each day of attendance at legislative sessions. The level of per diem payments is set by another state board and not by the commission. In addition, under Proposition 140 (approved by voters in November 1990), Members of the Legislature have been prohibited from earning state retirement benefits since November 1990. Accordingly, the commission has no control over these retirement benefits.

Factors the Commission Considers When Setting State Officials' Pay and Benefits. Proposition 112 requires the commission to consider the following factors when it adjusts the annual salary and benefits of state officials:

- How much time is required to perform official duties, functions, and services.
- The annual salary and benefits for other elected and appointed officials in California with similar responsibilities, including judicial and private-sector officials.

- The responsibility and scope of authority of the state official.

Currently, the Constitution does not list the financial condition of the state as a factor the commission must consider when setting the pay and benefits of these officials. In addition, Proposition 6—approved by voters in November 1972—prohibits the reduction of elected state officials' salaries during their terms of office.

Current Salaries of Elected State Officials. Based on past commission decisions, elected state officials are currently eligible to receive annual salaries ranging from $116,000 (for legislators) to $212,000 (for the Governor).

PROPOSAL

This proposition amends the Constitution to prevent the commission from approving increases in the annual salary of elected state officials in certain cases when the state General Fund is expected to end the year with a deficit.

Official Certification of a Deficit Would Be Required. On or before June 1 of each year, the state Director of Finance (who is appointed by the Governor) would be required to notify the commission in certain cases when the state's finances have weakened. Specifically, the Director would notify the commission if the Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties (SFEU) is expected to have a negative balance equal to or greater than 1 percent of the annual revenues of the state General Fund on June 30 (the last day of the state's fiscal year). As described in the analysis of Proposition 1A (also on this ballot), the SFEU is the state's traditional rainy day reserve fund. Currently, 1 percent of General Fund revenues is almost $1 billion.

Certification of the Deficit Would Prevent Raises for Elected State Officials. In years when the commission chooses to adjust state officers' pay and benefits, it already is required to pass a resolution to do this before June 30. These pay and benefit adjustments take effect beginning in December. Under this measure, if the Director of Finance certifies that the SFEU will end the month of June with a deficit of 1 percent or more of General Fund revenues, state officials will not be eligible to receive a salary increase to take effect in December of that year.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Cost Savings From State Officials' Salaries During Certain Deficit Years. This measure would prevent the commission from approving pay increases for state officials in certain cases when the state General Fund is expected to end the year with a deficit. Under current practice, the commission might have otherwise approved pay increases in those years. The commission does not grant pay increases every year, and the level of pay increases granted by the commission is not always the same. Since January 2000, the commission has raised the pay of elected officials four times. Over this period, the total pay increases for each official have been equal to or less than the rate of inflation. Currently, a 1 percent raise for the elected state officials costs the state about $160,000 per year. If, for example, the commission were inclined to grant the officials a 3 percent raise but were prevented from doing so under this measure, the state would save less than $500,000 that year. Consequently, savings in any year would be minor.

May Contribute to Different Budget Decisions by the Legislature and Governor. The Constitution already requires the Legislature and the Governor to adopt a balanced budget each year. When the budget falls substantially out of balance during the course of a fiscal year, the Constitution allows the Governor to declare a fiscal emergency and call the Legislature into a special session to address the emergency. The Constitution, however, does not require the budget to *end* the year in balance. This measure may have the effect of influencing the Legislature and the Governor to make different budgetary decisions—decisions, for example, that reduce a projected state deficit or make it less likely a deficit emerges in the first place. These impacts, however, are not possible to estimate.

For text of Proposition 1F, see page 56.

★ ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1F ★

YES ON 1F: NO PAY INCREASES FOR LEGISLATORS DURING TIMES OF STATE BUDGET DEFICITS.

Proposition 1F is straightforward and makes sense: During times when our state budget is running a deficit, legislators and the Governor should not receive pay increases.

A vote for Proposition 1F is a vote to prohibit legislators, the Governor and other state politicians from getting pay raises whenever our state is running a budget deficit.

BY STOPPING LEGISLATIVE PAY RAISES DURING STATE BUDGET DEFICITS, WE CAN SAVE OUR STATE MILLIONS OF DOLLARS WHEN THEY'RE NEEDED MOST AND BRING ACCOUNTABILITY TO THE LEGISLATURE.

In times of deficit, critical services like schools, public safety and healthcare get cut. But legislators and the Governor still get pay raises.

Since 2005, legislators have had their pay increased three separate times. In four years their pay has increased nearly $17,000. Every year legislators have received a pay raise the state has been in a deficit.

California's legislators are the highest paid in the nation, some earning more than $130,000 a year in salary plus tens of thousands more annually in perks and benefits. From taxpayer-funded cars and gas, to tax-free money for living expenses, legislators are living high off the hog while the state's deficit continues to grow.

YES ON 1F: PART OF A RESPONSIBLE PACKAGE OF REFORMS TO FIX A DYSFUNCTIONAL LEGISLATURE AND BRING ACCOUNTABILITY TO A BROKEN SYSTEM.

We're all frustrated by California's broken budget system. We're all tired of legislators who are immune to the problems they create. Year after year, politicians deliver late budgets that harm our schools, healthcare system, police and fire services and more. The perpetual budget problems also hurt taxpayers as we see our taxes raised or services cut because of the Legislature's failure to budget responsibly.

VOTE YES ON 1F: NO PAY RAISES FOR THE POLITICIANS WHEN OUR STATE IS IN A DEFICIT.

STATE SENATOR ABEL MALDONADO
LEWIS K. UHLER, President
National Tax Limitation Committee
JOEL FOX, President
Small Business Action Committee

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1F ★

"Oh boy! Here's a brick we can throw at the Legislature! That will make us feel better!"

Voters, please come to your senses. Proposition 1F will have absolutely no practical effect. Withholding pay raises from legislators will not suddenly propel them into agreement over how to balance the state budget. The problems run far deeper than that.

What Proposition 1F *will* do is give you the *illusion* of having made a difference. You'll walk away from your polling place thinking, "There, I've really stuck it to those louts in Sacramento." But come the next budget cycle, it will be exactly the same. Hard-line legislators in both parties will obstinately refuse to make the necessary concessions, resulting in yet another long, painful stalemate. Yes, you will have withheld their pay raises. So what?

The real reform was passed last November, when Californians wisely adopted the redistricting reforms in Proposition 11. Starting in 2012, many legislative districts will be less polarized, so more legislators will be answerable to constituents of *both* parties. This will result in more civility, cooperation and compromise, and budgets that work for all Californians.

But Proposition 1F won't help. It's on your ballot just to make you *think* you're doing something. Don't be fooled now and disappointed later. Vote no.

PETE STAHL, Author
Pete Rates the Propositions

★ ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1F ★

Proposition 1F won't work. Worse, it's petty, vindictive and childish.

Proposition 1F naively hopes to prevent budget deficits by withholding raises for legislators and elected state officers if the state budget does not balance.

This is just plain silly. Everyone wants our state government to be fiscally healthy. But this measure will never do the trick. For Proposition 1F to work, our legislators would have to be so selfish and immature that the possibility of a modest salary increase could induce them to betray their core values.

Of course they're not that selfish. Regardless of party, members of the Legislature are deeply caring, diligent, patriotic people who truly love the communities they represent and serve. Our state's structural deficit, if anything, has been caused by their overeagerness to serve too many constituencies, rather than the kind of selfish greed that would make Proposition 1F effective.

Freezing salaries will not loosen politicians' commitment to their ideologies. You cannot get conservative legislators to support tax increases just by threatening to cancel their raises. Similarly, liberal legislators will never agree to cuts in social programs just to increase their pay.

It's ludicrous to think that the mere threat of a salary freeze will somehow cause our polarized elected officials to rush into each others' arms and magically overcome their political differences. Proposition 1F will never do what it promises.

You may be thinking, "Okay, maybe Proposition 1F won't do any good. But it will make me feel better, and it can't do any harm!"

Not so. Proposition 1F freezes the salaries of not just the Legislature and Governor, who are responsible for passing and signing the budget, but also innocent bystanders such as the Insurance Commissioner and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This collateral damage will hurt some fine public servants and help no one.

And how good will you feel about freezing legislators' salaries when you know that their votes wouldn't change whether their salaries were frozen, reduced, or entirely eliminated? After all, they're clearly not in this for the money.

The current salary for nearly all legislators is $116,208. In most of California, this is solidly middle-class compensation. Many small business owners, doctors, lawyers, engineers, and managers make far more. You may earn more or you may earn less, but you've got to admit that our elected leaders aren't getting rich on their salaries.

Now consider that we ask these officials to run an enterprise with annual revenues exceeding $100 billion. That's roughly the income level of large corporations such as AT&T, Ford, and Hewlett-Packard, whose executives are paid millions of dollars. When you think about it in those terms, paying salaries such as $169,743 for a Treasurer and $133,639 for a Speaker of the Assembly is a terrific bargain.

Let's not make that discrepancy even worse just for an empty, childish, feel-good moment. Vote no on Proposition 1F.

PETE STAHL, Author
Pete Rates the Propositions

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1F ★

YES ON 1F: NO PAY INCREASES FOR LEGISLATORS DURING TIMES OF STATE BUDGET DEFICITS.

Proposition 1F is straightforward and fair: When our state budget is running a deficit, legislators and the Governor should not receive pay increases.

When the economy suffers, most working Californians don't get pay increases. Neither should the Legislature.

Since 2005, legislators have had their pay increased three separate times. In four years their pay has increased nearly $17,000. Legislators get pay raises even when we're facing huge deficits. That's not right!

California's legislators are the highest paid in the nation, some earning more than $130,000 a year in salary plus tens of thousands more annually in perks and benefits.

PROP. 1F MAKES SENSE AND IS FAIR.

In times of state budget deficits—when taxes are often raised and schools, police and fire, healthcare and other services all get cut—legislators should not get pay raises.

YES ON IF: PART OF A RESPONSIBLE PACKAGE OF REFORMS TO FIX A DYSFUNCTIONAL LEGISLATURE AND BRING ACCOUNTABILITY TO A BROKEN SYSTEM.

We're all frustrated by California's broken budget system. We're all tired of legislators who are immune to the problems they create. Propositions 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 1E & 1F are a package of reforms to clean up budget dysfunction in Sacramento.

VOTE YES ON 1F: NO PAY RAISES FOR THE POLITICIANS WHEN OUR STATE IS IN A DEFICIT.

www.reformforchange.com

STATE SENATOR ABEL MALDONADO
JAMES N. EARP, Executive Director
California Alliance for Jobs
JOEL FOX, President
Small Business Action Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

(5) The balance of funds shall be distributed to county mental health programs for services to persons with severe mental illnesses pursuant to Part 4 (commencing with Section 5850), for the children's system of care and Part 3 (commencing with Section 5800), for the adult and older adult system of care.

(6) Five percent of the total funding for each county mental health program for Part 3 (commencing with Section 5800), Part 3.6 (commencing with Section 5840), and Part 4 (commencing with Section 5850) of this division, shall be utilized for innovative programs pursuant to an approved plan required by Section 5830 and such funds may be distributed by the department only after such programs have been approved by the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission established pursuant to Section 5845.

(7) Prior to the distribution of funds under paragraphs (1) to (5), inclusive, effective July 1, 2009, the sum of two hundred twenty-six million seven hundred thousand dollars ($226,700,000) shall be redirected to support the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) Program as administered by the State Department of Mental Health for the 2009–10 fiscal year. For the 2010–11 fiscal year prior to the distribution of funds under paragraphs (1) to (5), inclusive, effective July 1, 2010, the sum of two hundred twenty-six million seven hundred thousand dollars ($226,700,000) shall be redirected to support the EPSDT program, except that this amount may be adjusted to fund caseload as appropriate in the EPSDT program, but the total amount redirected for the 2010–11 fiscal year shall not exceed the sum of two hundred thirty-four million dollars ($234,000,000). This paragraph shall become inoperative on July 1, 2011.

(b) In any year after 2007–08, programs for services pursuant to Part 3 (commencing with Section 5800), and Part 4 (commencing with Section 5850) of this division may include funds for technological needs and capital facilities, human resource needs, and a prudent reserve to ensure services do not have to be significantly reduced in years in which revenues are below the average of previous years. The total allocation for purposes authorized by this subdivision shall not exceed 20 percent of the average amount of funds allocated to that county for the previous five years pursuant to this section.

(c) The allocations pursuant to subdivisions (a) and (b) shall include funding for annual planning costs pursuant to Section 5848. The total of such costs shall not exceed 5 percent of the total of annual revenues received for the fund. The planning costs shall include funds for county mental health programs to pay for the costs of consumers, family members and other stakeholders to participate in the planning process and for the planning and implementation required for private provider contracts to be significantly expanded to provide additional services pursuant to Part 3 (commencing with Section 5800), and Part 4 (commencing with Section 5850) of this division.

(d) Prior to making the allocations pursuant to subdivisions (a), (b) and (c), the department shall also provide funds for the costs for itself, the California Mental Health Planning Council and the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission to implement all duties pursuant to the programs set forth in this section. Such costs shall not exceed 5 percent of the total of annual revenues received for the fund. The administrative costs shall include funds to assist consumers and family members to ensure the appropriate state and county agencies give full consideration to concerns about quality, structure of service delivery or access to services. The amounts allocated for administration shall include amounts sufficient to ensure adequate research and evaluation regarding the effectiveness of services being provided and achievement of the outcome measures set forth in Part 3 (commencing with Section 5800), Part 3.6 (commencing with Section 5840), and Part 4 (commencing with Section 5850) of this division.

(e) In 2004–05 funds shall be allocated as follows:

(1) 45 percent for education and training pursuant to Part 3.1 (commencing with Section 5820) of this division.

(2) 45 percent for capital facilities and technology needs in the manner specified by paragraph (2) of subdivision (a).

(3) 5 percent for local planning in the manner specified in subdivision (c) and

(4) 5 percent for state implementation in the manner specified in subdivision (d).

(f) Each county shall place all funds received from the State Mental Health Services Fund in a local Mental Health Services Fund. The Local Mental Health Services Fund balance shall be invested consistent with other county funds and the interest earned on such investments shall be transferred into the fund. The earnings on investment of these funds shall be available for distribution from the fund in future years.

(g) All expenditures for county mental health programs shall be consistent with a currently approved plan or update pursuant to Section 5847.

(h) Other than funds placed in a reserve in accordance with an approved plan, any funds allocated to a county which have not been spent for their authorized purpose within three years shall revert to the state to be deposited into the fund and available for other counties in future years, provided however, that funds for capital facilities, technological needs or education and training may be retained for up to 10 years before reverting to the fund.

(i) If there are still additional revenues available in the fund after the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission has determined there are prudent reserves and no unmet needs for any of the programs funded pursuant to this section, including all purposes of the Prevention and Early Intervention Program, the commission shall develop a plan for expenditures of such revenues to further the purposes of this act and the Legislature may appropriate such funds for any purpose consistent with the commission's adopted plan which furthers the purposes of this act.

PROPOSITION 1F

This amendment proposed by Senate Constitutional Amendment 8 of the 2009–2010 Regular Session (Resolution Chapter 3, Statutes of 2009) expressly amends the California Constitution by amending a section thereof; therefore, existing provisions proposed to be deleted are printed in ~~strikeout type~~ and new provisions proposed to be added are printed in *italic type* to indicate that they are new.

PROPOSED LAW

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 8 OF ARTICLE III

SEC. 8. (a) The California Citizens Compensation Commission is hereby created and shall consist of seven members appointed by the Governor. The commission shall establish the annual salary and the medical, dental, insurance, and other similar benefits of state officers.

(b) The commission shall consist of the following persons:

(1) Three public members, one of whom has expertise in the area of compensation, such as an economist, market researcher, or personnel manager; one of whom is a member of a nonprofit public interest organization; and one of whom is representative of the general population and may include, among others, a retiree, homemaker, or person of median income. No person appointed pursuant to this paragraph may, during the 12 months prior to his or her appointment, have held public office, either elective or appointive, have been a candidate for elective public office, or have been a lobbyist, as defined by the Political Reform Act of 1974.

(2) Two members who have experience in the business community, one of whom is an executive of a corporation incorporated in this State which ranks among the largest private sector employers in the State based on the number of employees employed by the corporation in this State and one of whom is an owner of a small business in this State.

(3) Two members, each of whom is an officer or member of a labor organization.

(c) The Governor shall strive insofar as practicable to provide a balanced representation of the geographic, gender, racial, and ethnic diversity of the State in appointing commission members.

(d) The Governor shall appoint commission members and designate a chairperson for the commission not later than 30 days after the effective date of this section. The terms of two of the initial appointees shall expire on December 31, 1992, two on December 31, 1994, and three on December 31, 1996, as determined by the Governor. Thereafter, the term of each member shall be six years. Within 15 days of any vacancy, the Governor shall appoint a person to serve the unexpired portion of the term.

(e) No current or former officer or employee of this State is eligible for appointment to the commission.

(f) Public notice shall be given of all meetings of the commission, and the meetings shall be open to the public.

(g) On or before December 3, 1990, the commission shall, by a single resolution adopted by a majority of the membership of the commission, establish the annual salary and the medical, dental, insurance, and other similar benefits of state officers. The annual salary and benefits specified in that resolution shall be effective on and after December 3, 1990.

Thereafter, at or before the end of each fiscal year, the commission shall, by a ~~single~~ resolution adopted by a majority of the membership of the commission, adjust ~~the annual salary and~~ the medical, dental, insurance, and other similar benefits of state officers. The ~~annual salary and~~ benefits specified in the resolution shall be effective on and after the first Monday of the next December.

Thereafter, at or before the end of each fiscal year, the commission shall adjust the annual salary of state officers by a resolution adopted by a majority of the membership of the commission. The annual salary specified in the resolution shall be effective on and after the first Monday of the next December, except that a resolution shall not be adopted or take effect in any year that increases the annual salary of any state officer if, on or before the immediately preceding June 1, the Director of Finance certifies to the commission, based on estimates for the current fiscal year, that there will be a negative balance on June 30 of the current fiscal year in the Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties in an amount equal to, or greater than, 1 percent of estimated General Fund revenues.

(h) In establishing or adjusting the annual salary and the medical, dental, insurance, and other similar benefits, the commission shall consider all of the following:

(1) The amount of time directly or indirectly related to the performance of the duties, functions, and services of a state officer.

(2) The amount of the annual salary and the medical, dental, insurance, and other similar benefits for other elected and appointed officers and officials in this State with comparable responsibilities, the judiciary, and, to the extent practicable, the private sector, recognizing, however, that state officers do not receive, and do not expect to receive, compensation at the same levels as individuals in the private sector with comparable experience and responsibilities.

(3) The responsibility and scope of authority of the entity in which the state officer serves.

(4) Whether the Director of Finance estimates that there will be a negative balance in the Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties in an amount equal to or greater than 1 percent of estimated General Fund revenues in the current fiscal year.

(i) Until a resolution establishing or adjusting the annual salary and the medical, dental, insurance, and other similar benefits for state officers takes effect, each state officer shall continue to receive the same annual salary and the medical, dental, insurance, and other similar benefits received previously.

(j) All commission members shall receive their actual and necessary expenses, including travel expenses, incurred in the performance of their duties. Each member shall be compensated at the same rate as members, other than the chairperson, of the Fair Political Practices Commission, or its successor, for each day engaged in official duties, not to exceed 45 days per year.

(k) It is the intent of the Legislature that the creation of the commission should not generate new state costs for staff and services. The Department of Personnel Administration, the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System, or other appropriate agencies, or their successors, shall furnish, from existing resources, staff and services to the commission as needed for the performance of its duties.

(*l*) "State officer," as used in this section, means the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Insurance Commissioner, Secretary of State, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Treasurer, member of the State Board of Equalization, and Member of the Legislature.