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FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Thursday, October 25, 2012

4:00 PM

JWB, Conference Room 185

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Honorable Bernie McCabe, Mrs. Elise Minkoff

PHONE PARTICIPATION: Honorable Bob Dillinger

GUEST: Ray Neri

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Mrs. Maria Edmonds

JWB STAFF PRESENT: Gay Lancaster, Marcie Biddleman Lisa Sahulka, Lynn De La Torre, Sue Waltierick

MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY MR. MCCABE AT 4:08 PM.

I. Requested Approval of September 11, 2012 Finance Committee Notes

ACTION: Mrs. Minkoff moved approval to accept notes as written, seconded by Mr. Neri; no further discussion; motion carried.

II. Approval of Salary Adjustment for Employees

Mrs. Lancaster: Board members suggested a 3% adjustment at the time the Florida retirement system deductions were enacted in July 2011. We took it off the table because it seemed inappropriate at the time, in light of the millage increase. Staff have gone for quite some time, both shoudering the deductions and without increases in terms of merit or cost of living adjustments. We now have a proposal to provide those increases. The County approach is a one-time only increase, plus three days leave, however, the County has also provided merit increases more recently than JWB which was in 2008. The Board may recall we had scheduled pay adjustments in 2009/2010, but our health insurance rate increase used all the money that was set aside. After meeting with Alltrust, the good news is we are looking at no more than a 5% increase and perhaps less, although we budgeted for a higher percent.

Discussion then ensued among the members regarding dental and life insurance.
The savings request would cover a $1,500 across the board increase which we are requesting be added to the base salary, plus up to three annual leave days based upon the employee’s rating. This gives us combination of an across the board increase and the capacity to reward performance. The cost to the organization is in the budget.

Discussion took place. Mr. Dillinger called in at 4:22 PM and after being updated by Mr. McCabe of what had previously taken place he joined in on the discussion

Mrs. Lancaster: The 3% increase is the average amount the employee is paying annually to the FRS.

Mr. Dillinger asked if we can afford it.

Mrs. Lancaster said yes due to our health insurance costs coming in at such a modest increase; less than was budgeted.

Mr. McCabe inquired as to the impact of three days leave.

Mrs. Lancaster: It is recognition of performance and is an average of three days. Employees not performing will not receive any days. We would not expend more than the three days per person average total.

Mr. McCabe asked what the maximum payout upon separation is.

Ms. Sahulka: 30 days, 240 hours of annual leave; the maximum payout for someone who has been here ten years or more for sick leave would be 260 hours. Sick leave is paid out at a prescribed pro-rata portion 5%, up to 50%.

Mr. McCabe: Can they convert excess to sick time?

Dr. Duffy: No, but they can convert some of their vacation to cash twice a year.

Mr. McCabe: Do they have to use a certain amount of vacation every year?

Dr. Duffy: They can’t exceed 240 hours or they will lose it.

Mr. McCabe: So, they can sell their leave back to you.

Dr. Duffy: Yes, in effect they can.

Mr. Dillinger said he is for the 3%.

Mrs. Minkoff said there is a consensus to recover the 3% that was put into the FRS because we have been able to obtain lower insurance and it would still go to the salary base.

Mr. McCabe agreed with the 3% and also to use the vacation pool as a performance based non-bottom line reward.

ACTION: Mr. McCabe moved to accept the approval of a salary adjustment for employees; seconded by Mr. Dillinger; no further discussion; motion carried.

Mr. Dillinger left the conference call.
III. Approval of Salary Ranges

Dr. Duffy said the salary survey, which was finalized in August, looked at our salary ranges for each pay classification. It is good practice to bring people in at the first or second quartile, allowing people room to grow. According to the consultant, our salary ranges should be increased by 2 ½%. We are bringing people in at mid-point or above because these salary ranges are no longer competitive. It is recommended that we move the range, but it does not mean that anyone’s individual salary moves. Our current staff is in the 3rd and 4th quartile when they haven’t really been here long enough for that to be.

Mr. McCabe: Could you hire someone in at a similar position at a higher salary than someone that is already here occupying a similar position.

Dr. Duffy: Yes, that could happen now based on experience and so forth. We need to look at whether or not there is sufficient difference between the person that is currently here and the person we are hiring. We have not changed the salary ranges since 2008. In the meantime, the external market has moved up slowly from 2008 – 2012 and we are 2 ½% behind. So, with our current salaries people would be in a more appropriate quartile and when we are bringing people in could we bring them in at mid-point or above.

Mr. McCabe: You are moving the whole classification?

Mrs. Lancaster said yes, it gives us some budgetary room.

Mr. Neri asked if we are losing people.

Dr. Duffy: No, just one situation recently, but we are expecting some retirements in the next few years. It is about maintaining good HR practice and not getting too far behind.

Mrs. Lancaster: In the past, out of necessity, we had to hire some people that did not meet all the requirements for a position because they were working in jobs that were paying more and it is important to have a competitive salary.

Ms. Sahulka: We are in the process of hiring an Accountant and we received only two applications. We are competing with the business world.

ACTION: Mr. McCabe moved approval of the salary ranges; seconded by Mrs. Minkoff; no further discussion; motion carried.

Mr. McCabe moved to adjourn at 4:44 PM

Notes respectfully submitted by Joan Chamo, Executive Assistant