

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

**I. Call to Order & Opening Statement:**

The Compensation and Benefits Review Ad Hoc Committee (CBRAHC) convened in a Meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Rooms 3 & 4 of the Stephen P. Clark Government Center (SPCGC) at 9:20 a.m. County Commissioner Barbara J. Jordan, Chairwoman; and Commissioners Esteban Bovo, Jr., and Jose “Pepe” Diaz were present. Also present were Deputy Mayor Ed Marquez; Assistant County Attorney Lee Kraftchick; Internal Services Department Assistant Director Mary Lou Rizzo, and Division Director Arleene Cuellar; Commission Auditor Charles Anderson; and Deputy Clerk Alan Eisenberg.

The following Compensation and Benefits Review Committee (CBRC) members were in attendance: Mr. Enrique Falla and Mr. Kenneth Lipner.

Commissioner Diaz called the CBRAHC meeting to order and in the absence of a quorum, suggested that Ms. Mary Lou Rizzo begin her presentation.

**II. Presentation:**

Ms. Rizzo explained that the Internal Services Department was asked at the May 24, 2012 meeting to elaborate on the information presented by the CBRC, noting the focus of today’s (5/31) presentation was supplemental pay, longevity bonuses, and overtime. Ms. Rizzo said she would provide a brief overview of the issues involving off-duty pay. She recommended that specific departmental representatives responded to requests for additional information from Committee members.

Ms. Rizzo proceeded to present a Power Point presentation, entitled the “County’s Pay Components.

**a. Supplemental Pay**

Ms. Rizzo noted Adjusted Pay was the combination of Base Pay and Pay Supplements. She said Pay Supplements were granted either through the collective bargaining process for specific assignments, educational attainment, and working conditions; through the County’s Pay Plan for attainment of specific licenses or certifications; or for unusual working conditions. Ms. Rizzo noted the overall difference between Base Pay and Adjusted Pay was 7.5 percent average Countywide. She clarified, in response to Commissioner Diaz’ question, that Adjusted Pay did not include benefits.

Ms. Rizzo noted the County realized in excess of \$2 million in savings by changing the order in which Supplemental Pay was applied in the IAFF 1403 (Fire) employees contract on a recurring basis. She proceeded to explain that the \$50 bi-weekly Premium Pay for specific bargaining and non-bargaining unit employees and the \$80 per pay period Premium Pay for PBA non-sworn support employees were suspended through September 2014 pursuant to the Collective Bargaining Agreements.

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

Ms. Rizzo noted that the current Pay Plan and Collective Bargaining Agreements included 160 Pay Supplements pursuant to the Pay Plan, separate union agreements or the Florida State Statutes. She said the annual cost of Pay Supplements was \$137.5 million which was approximately seven-percent of the County's annual payroll expense. Ms. Rizzo noted that collective bargaining had resulted in the following Supplemental Pay changes: a reduction in the GSAF and PBA Night Differentials from 2 steps to 1 step; a reduction in AFSCME 199 On-Call pay from 2 steps to 1 step; a suspension of all supplemental pay for the Solid Waste Management workers through September 2014; and a suspension of supplemental pay for the GSAF Community Action Agency Teachers Certification.

Commissioner Diaz inquired whether Supplemental Pay was permanent or a lump-sum payment and whether the amount could be increased or decreased.

Ms. Rizzo responded that Supplemental Pay was a permanent pay component.

Ms. Cuellar also responded that Supplemental Pay could be provided for a temporary or specific assignment such as a night shift differential.

Ms. Rizzo added that all Supplemental Pay was subject to negotiation and that an employee would no longer receive that pay when moving from the night shift to the day shift. She said that Supplemental Pay for educational attainment was permanent.

Commissioner Diaz questioned whether an employee would continue receiving Supplemental Pay when changing positions or departments.

Ms. Rizzo noted the continuation of Supplemental Pay would depend on individual circumstances. For example, if an engineer with a professional certification was promoted to higher position, he would continue to receive the supplemental pay in addition to base pay, Ms Rizzo noted. In other instances, Supplemental Pay was attached to specific assignments rather than the individual and would remain with the position. Ms. Rizzo said a list was available that included details about Supplemental Pay included in base pay and temporary Supplemental Pay based upon assignment. Ms. Rizzo explained that the duration of Supplemental Pay was largely dependent on why it was granted.

Commissioner Diaz noted he was concerned that employee could continue to earn Supplemental Pay for a certification after that individual was no longer working in a position that required certification.

Ms. Rizzo responded that she would present an analysis at a future meeting depicting the relationship between permanent and transitory Supplemental Pay. She noted the CBRC discussed the feasibility of awarding a one-time bonus to employees for advanced degrees or certification rather than permanent Supplemental Pay, which would help sustain the Pay Plan. As an example, Ms. Rizzo noted that an accountant currently

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

received a permanent pay increase equal to one pay step after becoming a Certified Public Accountant (CPA) and individuals in this category could be awarded a one-time bonus rather than a permanent increase in pay.

Chairwoman Jordan noted the educational requirements for a CPA was significantly different from an accountant, and she did not believe that a one-time bonus would be an incentive for employees to pursue an additional education; that a one-time bonus would be more appropriate individuals in the Fire Department to provide specific services.

Commissioner Diaz said becoming a CPA was a tremendous amount of work and a pay step increase was warranted. He questioned whether attorneys received additional pay for advanced degrees or certifications.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick said he was unaware of any additional supplemental pay for attorneys receiving advanced degrees or certifications.

Commissioner Diaz noted that the difference between changes in category versus changes in supplemental pay needed to be addressed. He asked that additional information be included in Ms. Rizzo's analysis of Supplemental Pay by department; including the category and amount of supplemental pay received by employees; a rationale for limiting supplemental pay for some job classifications and not for others; and examples of lump sum payouts.

Ms. Rizzo reiterated that a list of Supplemental Pay categories and amounts were provided in the Collective Bargaining Unit information. She explained the basic eligibility criteria for supplemental pay was outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreements, while others were incentives necessary to recruit and recognize competent staff. Ms. Rizzo noted she would compile this information as requested by Commissioner Diaz.

Ms Rizzo noted the total cost of Supplemental Pay for FY 2010-11 were \$137.5 million as compared to \$136 million for FY 2009-10. She noted the increase was related to the one-year freeze on the \$50 bi-weekly Premium Pay for all employees during FY 2009-10. Ms. Rizzo noted significant savings were realized from concessions made by Collective Bargaining Units, and the average decrease in supplemental pay for FY 2011-12 (Quarters 1 and 2) was 21.5 percent.

Commissioner Bovo questioned why \$137.5 million was allocated for supplemental pay in FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11 when pay increases were frozen.

Ms. Rizzo responded that the one year freeze had different start/stop dates for each Collective Bargaining Unit which overlapped fiscal years thus making the analysis difficult to understand. She noted she would provide a more detailed analysis of the timing (start/stop dates) for each Collective Bargaining Unit, and noted the County lost an entire quarter on contractual concessions due to the timing of contract ratifications,

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

which meant that the savings were largely realized in the second quarter of the fiscal year.

Following further questioning from Commissioner Bovo, Ms Rizzo explained that the trend for the third quarter would be similar to the second quarter.

Ms. Cuellar added that savings from Premium Pay for the TWU Local 291 – Transit Unit were recently implemented and would be reflected in the concessions for the third quarter. She said she anticipated that the trend would continue resulting in additional savings.

Commissioner Bovo asked Ms. Rizzo to provide the Board with a five year trend analysis.

Chairwoman Jordan questioned the impact on freezes on supplemental pay as part of the collective bargaining process.

Using the \$50 bi-weekly supplemental pay for Premium Pay as an example, Ms. Rizzo noted employees did not receive this supplement in their pay checks for one year, beginning to the date this contract was ratified. The freeze resulted in a suspension of the payment, Ms. Rizzo noted. She noted a non-uniformed PBA Unit employee received supplemental pay of \$80 bi-weekly. However, the freeze would sunset on the expiration date of the existing contract pursuant to provisions set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and must be renegotiated in the upcoming contract.

Commissioner Bovo noted supplemental pay was often awarded to employees for advanced degrees or certification. He questioned the funding source used to pay for education and training. He also inquired whether an employee was required to remain employed by the County for a designated time period after being reimbursed for educational costs.

Ms. Rizzo responded that the County sometimes paid for training based upon contractual obligation or based on departmental practices. In some instances, employees pay for their own education and training; and the County also reimburses 50 percent of employees tuition costs, provided they were enrolled in the Tuition Refund Program (TRP), Ms. Rizzo explained. She said employees who benefit from the TRP must remain employed with the County for period of one year pursuant to County's Administrative Order.

Chairwoman Jordan questioned whether employee must remain employed with the County for one year or two years.

Ms. Rizzo explained that the initial requirement was two years; however, it was reduced to one year about five years ago.

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

Chairwoman Jordan expressed concern that one year was not sufficient considering the significant investment made by the County toward tuition reimbursement. She asked that this item be addressed in more detail later. She requested clarification as to whether the type of degree or certification obtained by an employee must be related to the work performed in order for an employee to received tuition reimbursement.

Ms. Rizzo explained that the governing Administrative Order was broad; that it granted compensation to employees aiming for advanced education and professional development including those aiming to prepare themselves for other career opportunities within the County.

Chairwoman Jordan noted the cost of tuition reimbursement for an employee obtaining a Master's, Doctorate or Juris Doctorate Degree at any educational institution could be as high a \$30,000.

Commissioner Diaz noted he agreed with Commissioner Jordan that one year was insufficient for the County to reap the benefit of its investment, particularly considering employees pursuing advanced education were positioning themselves for professional opportunities. He questioned the definition of a "percentage agreement" as listed in the Cost of Pay Supplements by Bargaining Unit.

Ms. Rizzo noted supplemental pay was negotiated as a part of the Collective Bargaining Agreements and awarded as a percentage of base pay, a flat payment amount, or a value pay step.

Following further discussion regarding supplemental pay and whether or not an employee would continue to receive the supplement if he/she was awarded other supplemental pay or was promoted to another position, Commissioner Diaz requested clarification regarding the process used to monitor supplemental pay if an employee's classification changed.

Ms. Rizzo responded that a Personnel Change Document (PCD) would be submitted to the Human Resources Department by the department requesting the supplement, and the PCD was subsequently forwarded to the Payroll Department for further processing and confirmation. Ms. Rizzo noted that the department would determine whether or not an employee was eligible for supplemental pay.

Commissioner Diaz questioned who supervised or audited this process to ensure supplements were properly administered. He also questioned whether the determination as to whether or not an employee would receive a step, percentage or flat supplement was only negotiated as a part of the Collective Bargaining Agreements.

Ms. Rizzo said step, percentage or flat supplemental pay was negotiated as a part of the Collective Bargaining Agreements. She explained that the percentages were negotiated between union representatives and the County Administration, e.g., the union may

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

request one pay step (4 to 5 percent) for a particular assignment, and the County Administration may offer one-percent. Ms. Rizzo noted a flat rate or a percentage supplement would be more beneficial to the County than a pay step supplement.

Commissioner Diaz inquired whether the County Commission was required to accept the complete Collective Bargaining Agreement or if it could consider separate components of that agreement.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick responded that contracts must be ratified, which means all components must be approved; and if rejected, the contract must be renegotiated. He explained that if any component of the negotiations result in an impasse, those items could be considered separately.

Commissioner Diaz noted the County had 101 supplemental pay categories: 24 percentage and 35 flat categories, each determined by negotiations between Administration and the unions. He questioned whether non-bargaining unit employees were eligible for supplemental pay and if so, who negotiated on their behalf.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick explained that a negotiation process for non-bargaining unit employees did not exist and that a few positions within this classification were eligible for pay supplements.

Ms. Rizzo further explained that the departmental representative would meet with individuals from the Human Resources Department to discuss supplemental pay for non-bargaining unit employees. She noted the Pay Plan granted the Mayor temporary authority to establish new job classifications and to authorize pay supplements during the fiscal year. In addition, Ms. Rizzo noted pay supplements were added to the Pay Plan and would remain in the Pay Plan permanently upon the adoption of the budget.

Commissioner Diaz questioned whether any information was available on supplements for non-bargaining unit employees.

Ms. Rizzo explained that this information was available in the Pay Plan Preface which was presented to the County Commission for approval during Budget Hearings.

Commissioner Diaz asked for a report listing all non-bargaining unit employees currently receiving pay supplements, including the categories and the reason for granting the supplement.

Ms. Rizzo reiterated that non-bargaining unit employee pay supplements were presented in the Pay Plan Preface.

Chairwoman Jordan noted Pay Supplements were implemented at the discretion of department directors. She questioned whether Human Resources could terminate a pay



CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

supplement if an employee was no longer eligible without the department director's support.

Ms. Rizzo explained that the application of business rules would enable Human Resources (HR) to identify when a supplement was requested for an employee who was ineligible based on the job classification. Conversely, she noted that Human Resources would be unaware of instances when an employees' assignment was changed within the department.

Chairwoman Jordan noted the decision to remove Pay Supplements should not be subjective and it should not be at the discretion of the department director to terminate supplements if granted consistent with the job classification.

Ms. Rizzo noted the HR Department would identify any classifications ineligible for supplements upon applying the business rules; however, they had no way of knowing when an employee's assignment was changed within the department.

Ms. Cuellar clarified that internal system procedures would determine mutual exclusiveness and eligibility for a particular occupational code, and the system would alert the HR Administration whether an employee was eligible for a supplement or whether that supplement was mutually exclusive with an existing supplement or position change. Ms. Cuellar said it was incumbent upon the department to notify HR when an employee's assignment changed.

Chairwoman Jordan noted a department may notify HR that an employee's assignment had changed, but this would not address the concern as to whether or not a supplement should be added or terminated as a result of the new assignment.

Ms. Rizzo said Commissioner Jordan was correct if the assignment was not in direct contradiction with established business rules, e.g., the business rule would cause HR to question an Automotive Service Excellence Certification pay supplement received by an Administrative Officer II after being promoted from an Automotive Body Repairer position.

In response to Chairwoman Jordan's question pertaining to situations that were in conflict with business rules, she noted HR would return the PCD to the department for resolution.

Commissioner Diaz inquired whether the County Commission could request that the Mayor negotiate in a specific manner and abide by the Commission's mandate.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick advised that the County Commission could establish specific parameters that would become part of the Mayor's negotiation strategy. He noted the Mayor was bound by the instructions of the County Commission, and cautioned that the outcome of the negotiations could be different from the original instructions.

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

Commissioner Diaz noted he previously assumed that a Strong Mayor had full capacity to negotiate in his/her sole discretion and that the County Commission could only deal with collective bargaining issues after the fact. He said it was beneficial for the Commission to become involved earlier in the process and to provide the Mayor with specific parameters within which to negotiate.

Ms. Rizzo responded to Commissioner Diaz that contracts covered a three year term; however, a mid-term re-opener clause was contained within contracts for particular items.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick clarified that the terms of the contract were subject to negotiation; however, the term could not exceed three years pursuant to State law and that all parties involved in these contractual negotiations supported longer terms. He noted that the County Commission could instruct members of the Administration to negotiate specific terms with unions and in the event they were unable to reach an agreement and resulted in an impasse, it would be presented to a special magistrate for recommendation and subsequently to the County Commission for final resolution.

Commissioner Diaz said he believed the County Commission should be involved in the collective bargaining agreements at the beginning of the negotiations process rather than at the end of the process, particularly since the final decision would be made by the County Commission.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick pointed out members of the County Commission could not participate in contractual negotiation on a daily basis; however, they provide the Administration with direction and they could either accept or reject any contract.

Chairwoman Jordan commented that the County Commission previously established parameters with the Mayor in Executive Session.

Commissioner Diaz said members of the County Commission were provided an update on the status of union negotiations in Executive Session by the Administration.

Commissioner Bovo noted that Administration should not be involved in negotiations with the County Commission and the unions, noting the County Commission was the legislative body and members of the Commission could ultimately establish parameters on what they believed were in the best interest of the public. He also noted the County Administration initiated the budget process by allowing Department Directors to present departmental goals and priorities. He said the Commission was prohibited from getting into the level of detail required for contract negotiations.

Commissioner Bovo questioned whether pay supplements were reported separately from salary on an employee's pay stub and whether the supplement was included when determining retirement benefits.



CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

Ms. Rizzo noted supplements were not itemized; however, they were reported as an aggregate amount showing the difference between base and adjusted pay. Ms. Rizzo noted that the master file system maintained records of every pay transaction in addition to employees' base pay, and most pay supplements were reported to the Florida Retirement System, and calculated in an employee's total retirement compensation.

Commissioner Diaz noted the interests of both employees and taxpayers needed to be recognized in a fair and equitable manner. He stressed the importance for the County Commission to establish the parameters for negotiations early in the process, and noted he concurred with Commissioner Bovo that the County Administration initiated the process; however, members of the County Commission were responsible for the final decision and should be well-informed of all issues before voting on them.

**b. Overtime**

Ms. Rizzo explained that the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) required the payment of overtime for time worked in excess of 40-hours per week, and a daily overtime provision was applicable to any time worked in excess of 8 hours per day; however, recent collective bargaining efforts with PBA, GSAF, SWM, W&S and CBA resulted in a change which calculates overtime on a weekly basis. Ms. Rizzo said that contractual provisions such as call back contributes to overtime costs and that overtime was reduced from 4 hours to 1 hour for PBA and AFSCME 1542 and to 3 hours for AFSCME 199. Ms. Rizzo also noted savings by reducing overtime payments for paid meal breaks (AFSCME and GSAF), holiday work (TWU), court time (PBA), and minimum staffing (IAFF). She said that non-contractual factors such as staff reductions and vacancies, seasonal workload shifts, emergencies/special events, and FLSA regulations also contributed to overtime costs. Ms. Rizzo noted that overtime was necessary for efficient operations, but it should be managed carefully and monitored.

Ms. Rizzo noted the total overtime costs was \$114.1 million in FY 2010-11; which was a reduction from \$118.2 million in FY 2009-10, and overtime pay varied across bargaining units.

Commissioner Bovo questioned whether HR was able to determine the overtime expense for PBA Rank and File employees for court appearances.

Ms. Cuellar noted this information was available and she would provide it to Committee members later. She explained that overtime expenses would be higher in the previous fiscal year before contractual changes were made as a result of the former four-hour minimum payment, which was reduced to two hours in the new agreements.

Commissioner Bovo asked whether HR communicated with the Courts Administration to ensure that police officers' were scheduled for court in ways that would reduce the amount of time spent in court.

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

Ms. Rizzo said she would follow-up with Commissioner Bovo regarding this question.

Ms. Rizzo noted members of the County Administration were hopeful that overtime costs could be controlled through collective bargaining concessions; and noted staff had reinforced the importance for department director's to manage budgets, staff allocations, and scheduling to achieve desired results.

Ms. Rizzo noted the savings realized from FY 2011-12 First Quarter to the Second Quarter after the Collective Bargaining Agreements were ratified was 27.4 percent. The Solid Waste union was an exception due to operational requirements and vacancies; and the GSAF Local 100 (Professionals) was another exception.

**c. Longevity Bonus Awards**

Ms. Rizzo noted employees with fifteen or more years of continuous service were eligible for an annual longevity bonus ranging from 1.5 to 3 percent of their salaries based on years of service. She said longevity bonuses were restored in current contracts and all bargaining unit employees were eligible for bonuses; however, the members of the Review Committee had raised concerns regarding this practice.

**III. Next Steps:**

Chairwoman Jordan noted that Supplemental Pay and Pay Ranges were linked to the Pay Plan. She questioned whether the Pay Plan was negotiated with the unions, noting that she believed the Pay Plan needed to be separated from the Supplemental Pay in order to make a decision since supplements were negotiated items.

Ms. Rizzo responded that contracts referenced the Pay Plan.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick responded that items included in the Pay Plan were incorporated in the collective bargaining agreements and any changes would require re-negotiation.

Chairwoman Jordan questioned the process for changing established pay ranges.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick noted a change could be made by negotiating the change(s) in the collective bargaining process and incorporating that change(s) in the Pay Plan with a Pay Plan amendment; changing the Pay Plan when the budget was adopted; or changing the Pay Plan pursuant to contractual negotiations.

Chairwoman Jordan noted a Pay Plan with an approximate 5 percent annual raise for employees plus a three to four-percent annual Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) as well as Pay Supplements tied to specific job classifications was not sustainable. She said she supported a flat rate between the Pay Plan and union negotiations that would not exceed five-percent; with steps or ranges that would not exceed 2.5 percent, based upon

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

evaluations, department director discretion, or policy; and the remainder would be negotiable by the unions. Chairwoman Jordan inquired whether her attempt to limit excessive expenditures with a five-percent cap could be tied to a Pay Plan and established pay range policy.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick responded that the unions would need to agree through the negotiation process to any change in steps as well as the concept of giving the department director the discretion to decide the level of a raise.

Chairwoman Jordan noted she questioned whether department director's should have the discretion to grant pay increases because this may be subjective; however, the concept was presented for discussion. She noted members of this Committee needed to find an alternative to the current automatic process of paying its employees, and noted she believed the pay range recommended by the Review Board was also subjective. The step increases in the Pay Plan should not exceed 3.0 percent. She noted in November 1991, the County experienced a pay crisis and ultimately adjusted the Pay Plan down from Step 5 to Step 1 for newly hired employees. Chairwoman Jordan said that new employees would be hired at a lower pay level by reducing the pay ranges and that this would not affect current County employees.

Chairwoman Jordan noted that more time needed to be spent on Pay Supplements in order to give the Mayor instructions on how to negotiate. She said that a policy would need to be upheld if the County Commission gave a mandate which was subsequently adopted as policy and union negotiations did not go well resulting in an impasse. Chairwoman Jordan noted a decision on what the CBRAHC was recommending was needed along with a review of supplements. She inquired whether the unions could be invited to the next CBRAHC meeting to explain the rationale for these supplements and their necessity.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick responded that it would be appropriate to invite union representatives.

Deputy Mayor Ed Marquez noted concern over evaluating supplements separately from the entire contract. He inquired whether this Committee would consider a meeting where members of the County Administration would provide an overview of the terms of each union contract individually, along with a discussion of supplements and how those supplements applied to the entire contract. Deputy Mayor Marquez said union representatives could then be invited to participate in a separate discussion with the Committee.

Commissioner Bovo concurred with Chairwoman Jordan that more information was needed on the impact of supplements upon each of the County unions and that it was not the intention for this body to get into the negotiation process.

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

Commissioner Diaz noted the County Commission was trying to understand the entire process by asking questions in an open dialogue. He said that an individual meeting with members of the Administration was not necessary unless more details were needed later.

Chairwoman Jordan commented that she did not believe Deputy Mayor Marquez was recommending one to one meetings with the Administration.

Deputy Mayor Marquez clarified that the goal was to review the County's Pay Plan because it was not sustainable. He noted he believed that the entire contract needed to be evaluated to determine how everything fits since Pay Supplements were included in the Pay Plan and were negotiable.

Chairwoman Jordan noted she did not want to tell the Mayor or anybody else participating in the negotiation process that they needed to cut Pay Supplements without understanding the purpose of those supplements and how they related to the overall process.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick advised that Deputy Mayor Marquez' request was appropriate because it would allow union representative to explain the basis for the supplements and he believed that the unions would be willing to discuss how the supplements came about and the importance of these supplements to union members. He explained that dialogue between members of the County Commission and unions representatives regarding specific supplements was prohibited because it could be interpreted as a direct negotiation and interferes with the Administration's role.

Commissioner Bovo said the general consensus to acquire a better understanding and to ask legitimate questions early in the process. He said the County Attorney's office should be available at that meeting to prevent any discussion that could be interpreted as negotiation.

Ms. Rizzo requested clarification whether the Committee members was requesting that Collective Bargaining representatives explain the validity of supplements, why they felt supplements were useful, and their rationale for advocating for particular supplements in the bargaining process.

Commissioner Bovo said union representatives did not need to justify supplements rather to explain them.

Commissioner Diaz noted it would be beneficial for County employees to provide suggestions for future improvements and cost savings.

Assistant County Attorney Kraftchick clarified that it would be appropriate to invite representatives to address items of importance to them.

CLERKS SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES  
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE  
MAY 31, 2012

Chairwoman Jordan noted it was important to understand Pay Supplements and asked Ms. Rizzo to invite all collective bargaining unit representatives to speak at the next meeting.

Commissioner Diaz asked that non-bargaining unit employees be invited to the next meeting; however, following further discussion, he withdrew this request.

Deputy Mayor Marquez requested clarification whether the next meeting should be extended to three hours.

Chairwoman Jordan suggested the time of the meeting remain two hours as scheduled and that it be carried-over if necessary. She noted the next meeting would be on June 14, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. at a venue to be announced.

**Adjournment:**

There being no further business, the Compensation & Benefits Review Ad Hoc Committee was adjourned at 11:08 a.m.