

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

*SPECIAL MEETING*

TUESDAY

9:00 A.M.

MARCH 14, 2000

PRESENT:

Ted F. Short, Chairman

Jim Shaw, Vice-Chairman

Joanne Bond, Commissioner

Pete Sferrazza, Commissioner

Jim Galloway, Commissioner

Amy Harvey, County Clerk

Katy Singlaub, County Manager

Madelyn Shipman, Legal Counsel

The Board met in special session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 E. Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and conducted the following business:

**00-165 AGENDA**

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Short ordered that the agenda for the March 14, 2000, special meeting be approved.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**00-166 DISCUSSION - HAYGROUP COMPENSATION PHILOSOPHY**

Joanne Ray, Human Resources Director, stated that the purpose of the meeting today is for discussion and direction regarding the compensation philosophy for Washoe County. She then introduced the Steering and Job Evaluation Committee members who were present.

Neville Kenning, HayGroup Consultant, used the overhead projector to review the Project Update and Development of Compensation Philosophy handout and asked for comments and direction from the Board on the following items:

1) Plan Design

\*Uniformity vs. consistency

\* One size fits all vs. multiple pay plans

Commissioner Galloway commented that this should be consistent with relative ranking within the pay plan and if necessary, to meet market demands; and that the County could have multiple pay plans within a bargaining unit.

## 2) Basis of Establishing Rate of Pay

\*Internal equity vs. external competitiveness

\*Jobs vs. persons

Commissioner Bond commented that she would like to reflect both internal and external, realistically as much as possible.

Commissioner Shaw stated that he agrees with Commissioner Bond as he feels it would be very difficult to separate them, and they should make the consistency available, while keeping a happy medium.

Katy Singlaub, County Manager, stated that the County has had difficulty recruiting for positions, and believes that what the commissioners are saying is that, if the County cannot measure a job because there is no internal benchmark, or they are having trouble attracting qualified individuals, they then may ratchet up the external competitiveness in that balancing.

## 3) Definition of Compensation

\*Base pay

\*Variable pay

\*Benefits

\*Mix of fixed vs. variable

Commissioner Shaw inquired about some employees who are not getting the same health benefits as other employees and this is a concern of his and requested that this be addressed in the study.

Steve Watson, Labor Relations Manager, stated that in Nevada, virtually all subject matters being discussed today are mandatory subjects of bargaining and will be negotiated with employee organizations; that they can define negotiating strategies that would be consistent with the strategies adopted for compensation and benefits to balance the negotiations process; and that they do not have a unilateral right to do any of these systems without negotiating these with the employee groups.

Commissioner Sferrazza stated that the problem is, if the study is to be put in place, the County is going to have to take a bargaining position as

to whether there will be equity or not, and this study should establish what the County will be bargaining for.

Mr. Kenning stated that what the job evaluation process is doing is providing the relative ranking positions based on content.

#### 4) Definition of Market and Level of Competitiveness

\*Set based on base pay or total cash compensation

\*Definition of market and consistency of market

Commissioner Galloway stated that at a previous caucus meeting, he spoke in favor of not only using comparable governments, but also considering the private sector; that they do not want to be so low that they don't attract good people from the private sector and they don't want to be so high that they are paying double what the private sector is paying; and that the market competitive rate needs to be determined.

Mr. Kenning stated that questions to be considered is who do you recruit from and where do they come from.

Chairman Short stated that a couple of things the Committee should know is the number of applications for a job and the difficulty in filling that position. He further stated that other markets used for comparison should be locations that have comparable costs of living and housing, etc.

#### 5) Statement of Pay Delivery Philosophy

\*Pay for service/tenure

\*Pay for job content

\*Pay for performance

\*Pay for skill/education

\*Pay for competency

\*Pay for individual/team/organization results

Commissioner Galloway stated that he believes pay for skills and education should be relevant to the employee's job.

Commissioner Shaw stated that he believes pay for job content, pay for performance, and pay for competency are important and should be included in their philosophy, as there are a lot of similarities between the three.

Commissioner Bond stated that she agrees with Commissioner Shaw's suggestion and believes they are the most important; and that she is also

concerned about the pay for skills and education, because she has seen people taking classes that are not relevant to their job.

Commissioner Sferrazza stated that he would like to see some pay for skill and education, because if, for example, a police officer has already been certified by post, that would save the County money to hire that person; and that criminal justice is relevant to an officer's position, because they would be less likely to make false arrests or do something that would cost the County money.

#### 6) Statement of Affordability and Return on Human Resources Investment

\*Fiscal responsibility

\*Interests of "stakeholders"

Commissioner Galloway stated that in the fiscal responsibility maybe it should say that no compensation program will cause the government to live beyond its means.

All Commissioners agreed to change the word "stakeholders" and replace it by "the public, including employees."

#### 7) Statement of Accountability of Compensation Plan Management

\*Board vs. County Manager vs. Line Manager vs. Human Resources

Mrs. Singlaub stated that the Board would always have a role in things like bargaining parameters; and that they would always have a role in making fiscal commitments that are translated in the application of the compensation philosophy. She further stated that with the adoption of this program, things like the determination of where a job fits in the ranking would be made by the Job Evaluation Committee, the Board again, by its own policies, would affirm those decisions or reject them.

Commissioner Galloway commented that the Court employees are not under the control of the County Manager; that he does not have a suggestion as to how to handle that issue; and that the Court is only answerable to the County Manager in the sense that when they come with their budget to the County Commission, they have to approve it, and the County Manager's recommendations are valuable, but she does not have the ability to administer it on a detailed level. She continued that there are elected officials who have certain unclassified positions they can fill and those positions will be outside the system. Mrs. Singlaub clarified that there are unclassified positions that are not just restricted to elected officials, but is something that is consistent throughout the system.

Commissioner Sferrazza inquired about the right to appeal by an employee if they are not satisfied with the classification. Mrs. Singlaub responded that the County currently has a grievance procedure that permits that to take place, which is a part of the philosophy and policies and procedures of the Board.

Ms. Ray stated that the tentative agreement, for at least this stage of the study is that, if an employee disagrees with the classification, the employee may appeal to the Job Evaluation Committee, and then if they still disagree there is an agreement with the associations that the HayGroup would be the final arbitrator of the appeal. Mrs. Singlaub clarified that that procedure is for the term of the study and the Board is

looking for the broader policy that would govern future appeals.

Commissioner Bond inquired about the process for the employees who are not represented by an association. Ms. Ray responded that they are following the same process for the non-represented employee.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Commissioner Sferrazza left the meeting at 11:15 a.m.**

\* \* \* \* \*

8) Other Statements

Chairman Short inquired when the final results would be completed. Mr. Kenning responded approximately July.

**COMMISSIONERS'/MANAGER'S COMMENTS**

Mrs. Singlaub thanked all parties, involved with this project, for their hard work. She further stated that the target date to come back with the recommended philosophy statement and comparable comparative market is the March 28, 2000, meeting as an action item.

\* \* \* \* \*

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

TED F. SHORT, Chairman  
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST: AMY HARVEY, County Clerk