

STATE OF TEXAS

COMMISSIONERS' COURT
MEETING MINUTES
JULY 10, 2017

COUNTY OF COLLIN

On Monday, July 10, 2017, the Commissioners' Court of Collin County, Texas, met in Regular Session in the Commissioners' Courtroom, Jack Hatchell Collin County Administration Building, 4th Floor, 2300 Bloomdale Road, City of McKinney, Texas, with the following members present, and participating, to wit:

Judge Keith Self

Commissioner Susan Fletcher, Precinct 1

Commissioner Cheryl Williams, Precinct 2

Commissioner Chris Hill, Precinct 3

Commissioner Duncan Webb, Precinct 4

Judge Self led the Invocation.

Commissioner Williams led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Commissioner Hill led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Texas Flag.

1. Judge Self called to order the meeting of the Collin County Commissioners' Court at 1:30 p.m. and recessed the meeting at 3:24 p.m. The meeting was reconvened and immediately recessed into Executive Session at 3:25 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 3:40 p.m. and adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

President Self called to order the meeting of the Collin County Health Care Foundation at 3:25 p.m. and adjourned the meeting at 3:25 p.m.

President Self called to order the meeting of the Collin County Toll Road Authority at 3:25 p.m. and adjourned the meeting at 3:25 p.m.

DECISIONS MANDATED BY LEGAL ENTITIES OUTSIDE OF COMMISSIONERS COURT AUTHORITY:

1. AI-43353 Advertise for Services, CSCD: Evaluation and Counseling for Felony/Misdemeanor Offenders (SCORE) (RFP No. 2017-243), Adult Probation.

2. AI-43390 Personnel Appointments, Human Resources.

3. AI-43391 Personnel Changes, Human Resources.

FYI NOTIFICATION

1. AI-34688 Outstanding Agenda Items, Commissioners Court.

2. **AI-43300** P-Card Disbursements, Auditor.
3. **AI-43308** County overtime for the pay period ended July 2, 2017, Human Resources.
4. **AI-43367** Voluntary Terminations, Human Resources.

2. Public Comments.

3. Presentation/Recognition:

- a. **AI-43389** Designation of Collin County as a Purple Heart County, County Judge.

Judge Self invited Gus Wittschack, Commander, and Jon Lunkwicz, Adjutant & Finance Officer, from the DFW Mid-Cities Chapter #1513, Military Order of the Purple Heart, to come forward. Judge Self presented the men with a proclamation proclaiming Collin County as a Purple Heart County in recognition of those wounded and dead who have been recipients of the Purple Heart.

Commander Wittschack, on behalf of the DFW Mid-Cities Chapter #1513, presented the Court with a Military Order of the Purple Heart Special Recognition Award plaque for Collin County's dedication and support honoring America's combat wounded Veterans by becoming a Purple Heart County. (Time: 1:33 p.m.)

4. Consent agenda to approve: Judge Self deleted items 4e1 and 4f1 and asked for comments on the remainder of the consent agenda. Commissioner Williams pulled item 4d2. Hearing no further comments, a motion was made to approve the remainder of the consent agenda. (Time: 1:34 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams
Second by: Commissioner Susan Fletcher
Vote: 5 – 0 Passed

- a. **AI-43358** Disbursements for the period ending July 3, 2017, Auditor.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-465-07-10

- b. **AI-43359** Indigent Defense Disbursements, Auditor.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-466-07-10

- c. **AI-43362** Tax refunds totaling \$354,595.34, Tax Assessor/Collector.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-467-07-10

d. Advertisement(s):

1. **AI-43352** Construction, Demand Response Load Transfer, Collin County Central Plant (IFB No. 2017-242), Construction & Projects.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-468-07-10

2. **AI-43349** Transportation of Election Equipment (IFB No. 2017-237), Elections.

Because there has been public concern with the security of election equipment transportation Commissioner Williams asked Bill Bilyeu, County Administrator, to clarify how the equipment is transported. Mr. Bilyeu said there are multiple checks in the process. Each machine is sealed before being loaded into a carrying device which is also sealed and logged before transport which is all completed by election staff. Once the machines reach their destination they are accepted by the receiving judge who inspects the seals and performs a logic and accuracy test before being used. Clerks and judges from both parties are present to check seals and perform the testing. The machines are again sealed, loaded into carrying devices and logged by election staff before being returned. The seals used on the machines and carrying devices are picked up by the judge separately from the equipment delivery process. With no further discussion, a motion was made to approve the item. (Time: 1:37 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams
Second by: Commissioner Susan Fletcher
Vote: 5 – 0 Passed

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-469-07-10

3. **AI-43357** Services: Pest Control (IFB No. 2017-217), Facilities.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-470-07-10

4. **AI-43336** Insurance, Third Party Administration (RFP No. 2017-254), Human Resources.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-471-07-10

5. **AI-43368** Insurance, Workers' Compensation Excess Liability (RFP No. 2017-270), Human Resources.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-472-07-10

6. **AI-43377** Equipment, Lease: Road Construction and Right of Way Maintenance Equipment (IFB No. 2017-244), Public Works.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-473-07-10

7. **AI-43350** Polygraph Testing (RFP No. 2017-168), Sheriff.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-474-07-10

e. Award(s):

1. **AI-43375** Tax Statement Preparation and Mailing Service (RFP No. 2017-202) to VariVerge, Tax Assessor/Collector.

HELD

f. Amendment(s):

1. **AI-43354** No. 2 to the Personal Services Agreement with Jennifer Smith for a Program Manager to oversee and administer the Veterans Court Program to include various changes to the scope of services, increase the annual contract amount to \$73,000, extend the contract through and including June 30, 2018 and further authorize the Purchasing Agent to finalize and execute same, 296th District Court.

HELD

2. **AI-43269** No. 3 to the Inter-Governmental Cooperative Reimbursement Agreement for the Low Income Vehicle Repair Assistance, Retrofit and Accelerated Vehicle Retirement Program (LIRAP) (Contract No. 582-12-20275) with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) to extend the expiration date from August 31, 2017 to June 28, 2019, Special Projects.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-475-07-10

3. **AI-43344** No. 7 to Physician Services (AGR No. 07335-10) with Dr. James Shupe to extend the contract for one (1) year through and including September 30, 2018 and further authorize the Purchasing Agent to finalize and execute same, County Clerk.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-476-07-10

g. Change Order(s):

1. **AI-43373** No. 1 to Construction, Health Care Services Pavement Replacement (IFB No. 2016-306) with IronHorse Unlimited, Inc. for additional concrete and asphalt removal and further authorize the Purchasing Agent to finalize and execute same, Construction & Projects.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-477-07-10

h. Contract Renewal(s):

1. **AI-43330** Services, Detention Slider Door Repairs (IFB No. 2017-161) with ISI Detention Contracting Group Inc. dba Argyle Security Group to extend the contract for one (1) year through and including September 30, 2018, Facilities.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-478-07-10

i. Budget adjustment(s)/amendment(s):

1. **AI-43339** \$3,000 to transfer funds to Education and Conference, 417th District Court.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-479-07-10

2. **AI-43404** \$3,000 to cover negative balance and education and conference expenses, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 3-1.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-480-07-10

j. Receive and File, Auditor:

1. **AI-43345** Monthly Financial Reports for May 2017.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-481-07-10

k. Filing of the Minute(s), County Clerk:

1. **AI-43341** June 12, 2017.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-482-07-10

2. **AI-43364** June 19, 2017.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-483-07-10

l. Miscellaneous

1. **AI-43135** Acknowledgment of continuing education credits for Commissioner, Precinct
2, Administrative Services.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-484-07-10

2. **AI-43318** Broker/Dealer List for 2017, Auditor.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-485-07-10

3. **AI-43392** Personnel Appointments, Human Resources.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-486-07-10

4. **AI-43393** Personnel Changes, Human Resources.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-487-07-10

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Caren Skipworth, CIO, came forward to discuss General Discussion items 5 – 10. The five items for discussion are projects which have been submitted to the Budget Department for the FY18 budget. If they are approved, they will be removed from the upcoming budget. IT has worked diligently with the Purchasing Department to bring in savings on some of the FY17 projects. In doing so IT would like to use the savings on some FY18 projects.

The first budget amendment was for the email archive replacement for an estimated cost of \$71,000 - \$80,000. The savings available to be used on this project is \$80,000 from the image network storage solution. In October 2016 a decision was made for 101 employees in the County to keep four years of archived email which is approximately four million per year. Normally only six months of production email is kept. IT would like to buy a product to manage this better. This will allow the Public Information Officer increased capabilities for providing open records requests and will allow increased capabilities for Human Resources to access archived emails for their jobs.

The second budget amendment was for a Websense upgrade with an estimated cost of \$80,000. The savings available to be used on this project is \$80,000 from the courtroom audio equipment upgrade. The current Websense system which is a web filtering tool is dated, from a capability prospective, and is not able to drill down into encrypted websites and block malware. The upgrade will increase security at the employee level when accessing the network to use the internet and will increase capabilities of the County's IT security of the network.

The third budget amendment was for Open DNS (Domain Name System) for an estimated cost of \$130,000. The savings available to be used on this project is \$130,000 from the EOL (End-of-Life) switch/router replacement. The upgraded DNS will increase protection from external threats such as website links in emails. Currently IT does not have a tool to catch these threats, but with the new DNS they will.

The fourth budget amendment was to upgrade Nagios with an estimated cost of \$8,000. The savings available to be used on this project is \$9,000 from the EOL switch/router replacement. The current version of Nagios is an open source free version which was originally to monitor the County's voice system for outages. IT would like to expand and upgrade this product to monitor the other environments such as the website and disk capacity. If there is an outage or disk capacity shortage the system will notify IT of the issue to be resolved quickly. There will be round the clock monitoring and maintenance included.

The fifth budget amendment was for the FootPrints Service Catalog Module for an estimated cost of \$17,500. The savings available to be used on this project is \$17,500 from the managed print services. This will add an additional module to IT's FootPrints Help Desk system. Users will be able to select a service required and provide IT with proper information which will reduce the recurring calls from IT for additional information. There will be a form on the internal website employees can fill out which will automate and route to the proper tech.

Commissioner Williams asked where these projects fall on IT's priority list for FY2018. Ms. Skipworth said they are all in the 2-3 category.

The final budget amendment was for the print server replacement project with an estimated cost of \$17,000. The savings available to be used on this project is \$17,000 from the IBM System x3650 project. The servers are old and at EOL and have no maintenance support. These servers will be dedicated to the areas where print is still necessary. Now that all of the printers are networked, IT is able to use print servers to manage print jobs and direct them to the correct printer. This project is a 3-4 priority, but will need to happen.

Commissioner Hill went through each project cost and asked Ms. Skipworth if each project is on the FY18 budget request. Ms. Skipworth confirmed the projects are all on the FY18 budget request.

Judge Self asked if these projects are the most important projects to use the funds on. Ms. Skipworth said the projects dealing with security are definitely needed as well as the print server. The FootPrints service catalog would be nice to automate IT more, but it is not something that is critical to have today. The email archive is critical because of the capacity of growth email. The Nagios is also critical to be proactive in monitoring outages to the systems.

Commissioner Hill appreciated IT trying to offload some of the FY18 expenses with FY17 savings and wants to reward that, but does not want to take all the low priorities from the FY18 budget to squeeze them into this year if they would not stand alone in the FY18 budget. The Commissioner said he would love to see more of this in terms of saving taxpayers money by getting projects sped up, but he would like to see the departments FY18 budget requests which correspond to the amendments. Monika Arris, Budget, said the projects were submitted for the FY18 budget. They have been researched and were to be recommended in the FY18 budget which was reflected in the memos attached to the agenda items.

With no further discussion a motion was made to approve General Discussion items 5-10 as presented. (Time: 2:00 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Susan Fletcher
Second by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams
Vote: 4 – 0 Passed

Commissioner Webb was not present for the vote.

5. AI-43159 Utilization of savings from the completed Image Network Storage Solution Project to cover funding for the Email Archive Replacement Project and budget amendment in the amount of \$80,000 for same, Information Technology.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-488-07-10

6. AI-43160 Utilization of savings from the completed Courtroom Audio Equipment Project to cover funding for the Websense Upgrade Project and budget amendment in the amount of \$80,000 for same, Information Technology.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-489-07-10

7. AI-43161 Utilization of savings from the completed EOL Switch/Router Replacement Project to cover funding for an Open DNS Project and budget amendment in the amount of \$130,000 for same, Information Technology.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-490-07-10

8. AI-43162 Utilization of savings from the completed EOL Switch/Router Replacement Project to cover funding for the Upgrade Nagios Project and budget amendment in the amount of \$9,000 for same, Information Technology.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-491-07-10

9. AI-43163 Utilization of savings from the completed IBM System x3650 Project to cover funding for the Print Server Replacement Project and budget amendment in the amount of \$17,000 for same, Information Technology.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-492-07-10

10. AI-43173 Utilization of savings from the completed Lexmark Managed Print Services Project to cover funding for the Footprints Service Catalog Module Project and budget amendment in the amount of \$17,500 for same, Information Technology.

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-493-07-10

11. AI-43378 Compensation presentation, Human Resources.

Cynthia Jacobson, Human Resources, gave a compensation presentation which was a follow up from the discussion with a consultant during the budget presentation last year. Compensation is one of the five key components in a successful Total Rewards program. Compensation programs must be periodically evaluated to maintain a favorable Total Rewards value proposition which will: 1) attract the right talent at the right time; 2) motivate/engage employees to perform at high levels of effort and commitment; and 3) retain employees who are valuable contributors to Collin County's success. A general evaluation of the County's compensation program was conducted by Korn Ferry Hay Group last summer. Several changes have already been implemented as a result of their recommendations: 1) increased spot bonus – GEM (Going the Extra Mile) Awards – from \$50 to \$250 after tax; 2) expanded data collection for annual survey and targeting market median instead of the average when possible – HR is in the process of gathering data for 2017 analysis; 3) using the hot jobs process as outlined by the consultant on an as needed basis; and 4) increased PFP (Pay for Performance) maximum to two times the average increase.

The consultant also recommended some areas for consideration. This included: 1) coming up with a formalized compensation philosophy; 2) policy changes; 3) options for calculating annual increases; 4) establishing a consistent data-based method of determining changes to compensation; and 5) options for distributing pay changes.

HR wrote a compensation philosophy the Court could modify if they chose to do so. The following components were presented as possibilities to include in a guiding compensation philosophy: 1) utilize a data-based, market driven compensation philosophy; 2) attract, retain and motivate talented employees who can provide the best services possible; 3) balance the use of taxpayer funds with what employees are paid; and 4) tie performance and rewards to ensure top performers are rewarded for their efforts.

As for policy changes, the consultant suggested a change to the promotion policy. The current promotion policy is to increase employee's salary by 5% or the amount needed to bring them to pay grade minimum, whichever is greater.

The suggested change would be calculated by increasing the employees' current salary by 5% for each pay grade they move up with a maximum increase of 15% or pay grade minimum, whichever is greater. HR conducted a survey and found no clear philosophy on which option is better. The policy change would cost approximately \$100,000 of additional compensation.

If the promotion policy is changed, a change to the demotion policy should be considered in the same manner. The current demotion policy is calculated by decreasing the employee's current salary by 5% or to maximum of pay range, whichever decrease percentage is greater or to decrease to previous salary if returning to previous pay grade within one year, accounting for any pay increases which have occurred. There are two options for a policy change: 1) calculated by decreasing the employee's current salary by 5% or to maximum of pay range, whichever decrease percentage is greater or decrease to previous salary if returning to previous pay grade within two years, accounting for any pay increases which have occurred; or 2) calculated by decreasing the employee's current salary by 5% for each pay grade they move down – with a decreasing limit of 15% – or to the maximum of new pay range, whichever decrease percentage is greater, or decrease to previous salary if returning to previous pay grade within two years, accounting for any pay increases which have occurred.

Annual performance pay change calculation options for consideration include: 1) a merit matrix method; 2) continue with the current pay calculation; or 3) modifications to pay calculation. The consultant suggested using a merit matrix. A merit matrix is supposed to work towards getting to the midpoint. HR spent a lot of time trying to make the suggestion work for the County, but had difficulties with it. They went back to the consultant for assistance and contacts of entities implementing a merit matrix. The consultant could not provide anyone who is using this method. HR does not recommend using the merit matrix because they could not match the compensation philosophy with what was recommended. Because it is unusual to not implement a consultant's recommendation, Ms. Jacobson provided information supporting the reason to not use a merit matrix. While a merit matrix offers a link to position-in-range, the tradeoff is a decreased link between employee performance and individual reward. A merit matrix is significantly more complex than the current program. Under the current program the PFP score correlates to the employee's performance ranking which translates to the annual increase percentage. Under the matrix program the PFP score gets an employee assigned to a rating group and then assigned to a position-in-range based on their relationship to the midpoint. Those who are above pay grade midpoint would receive significantly lower increases even with superior performance. Increased complexity will result in decreased employee understanding.

The second option for performance calculation is to continue to use the current pay calculation. This is an established process and is understood by employees. It would also require no additional training or new communications. Points for consideration with the current process include: 1) the significant pushback from employees at all levels with the utilization of the self-appraisal in the PFP score – the need to justify their ratings and comments has resulted in a feeling of employees being unable to represent their performance as they see it; and 2) the manner in which the funds are distributed – what happens if all employees are lumped together in one set of numbers.

The third option for performance calculation is to modify the pay calculation. This would include: 1) remove the self-appraisal from the score and pay calculation, but continue using it between managers and employees as a communication tool with very little HR intervention; and/or 2) distribute all available funds amongst the entire employee population by ranking employees based on the entire employee population rather than by department – by merging all departments together it provides additional funding for high performers, but increases complexity and may result in reduced employee understanding.

The next topic discussed was establishing a consistent, data-based method of determining changes to compensation. Ms. Jacobson explained six historical methodologies. The first methodology was projected salary increase budgets. Salary increase budget projections are useful in ensuring the County's performance increase decisions are aligned with general market conditions. It provides a general idea of what most organizations will budget for increases. HR compares both public and private sector data.

The second methodology was market range movement which provides a general idea of what most organizations will budget for the change in their pay ranges. Collin County has a successful and efficient method of maintaining pay scales by applying market range increases. HR asked comparable public entities if they applied market adjustments to employee salaries in addition to pay ranges. Six out of seven respondents perform annual market pay adjustments in addition to their annual step, performance, merit or across-the-board increase. The industry survey for the private sector showed 76% of respondents indicated their company had utilized both as well. The number one reason this method is used is to avoid wage compression. Preventing compression is important because of the changing job market – unemployment is nearly half the rate it was in 2010, there is greater competition for talent and there is a reduced number of applications per position in some areas. Also millennials have surpassed the baby boomers in the workforce. By 2040 they will be 75% of the workforce.

Ms. Jacobson explained what happens when there are changes to the market movement at the same time as giving wage increases. HR looked at the time it would take for a new hire for the County to get to the midpoint and the maximum of their pay grade. For example, if there is a 3% PFP increase and a range movement of 2% it will take the employee 18 years to get to the midpoint of the pay grade and 39 years to get to the maximum of the pay grade. Typically it would take 12-15 years to reach the end of a pay grade.

The third methodology was using available funds which were budgeted, but not used in the previous year. This would reinvest unused funds into employee pay increases. Generally the nominal amount is less than 1%.

The fourth methodology was sum of the midpoints to sum of the actuals which was recommended by the consultant. This is looking at where the employee's pay is versus where the sum of the midpoint is. Over the years several different methods have been used. Ms. Jacobson shared a chart which showed the percentage of employees over and under the midpoint from 2008 to 2017. Last year, following the consultant, the County tried the sum of the midpoints with a little extra money; however, market movement was not used which resulted in not moving any farther along to correct compression. In looking at the chart, which showed 66% of employees were under the midpoint and 34% of employees were over the midpoint in 2017, Commissioner Hill asked what is the ideal situation. Ms. Jacobson said when calculating HR would gear toward 50%-50%. Discussion continued on the past years during the recession where there was no market movement. Commissioner Hill asked if there are other factors such as two-thirds of the employees are brand-new or in the first few years of employment and therefore should be under the midpoint or are there other factors that lend to that number. Ms. Jacobson was confident in saying two-thirds of the employees are not new to the point that would cause this set of calculations. Those factors do impact the sum of the midpoint; however, the turnover rate is low on a year-end year out basis. Other factors which cause an impact are wage compression, changes to employee demographics and reclassifications. The County is a little over \$4 million behind in addition to increases and market movement. Ms. Jacobson believes the market is going to move more than the 2% seen on average.

The fifth methodology was individual compa-ratios which compares midpoint to actual salary on a case by case basis. This was utilized in FY14, FY15 and FY16; however, 2013 data was used over those years.

The sixth methodology was CPI (Consumer Price Index) which reflects changes in the prices paid by consumers for goods and services. This method was used between 2009 – 2016 as a data point in salary budget discussions. The consultant did not recommend this method because it is the leading cause of wage compression.

The next topic discussed was the method of distributing funds. Ms. Jacobson presented two distribution options: 1) distribute both performance and market adjustment funds through the PFP calculation – all merit based distribution; or 2) distribution performance funds through the PFP calculation and market adjustment funds based on a flat percent – a blend of merit based and universal distribution. There were two timing options presented for the distribution of funds. The first would be to apply performance and market adjustments to employee salary at a single point in the year, i.e. October.

The second option would be to apply funds at separate times of the year, i.e. PFP in October and market adjustments in January. Commissioner Williams asked how the sum of the midpoints would be affected if funds were distributed through the PFP process. Ms. Jacobson said PFP will not affect the sum of the midpoints because the correct amount to distribute will be put in. It may affect individuals which it should do – the high and low performers. Judge Self said there seems to be a relationship in grouping all the employees together and these two ideas and asked Ms. Jacobson to explain. Ms. Jacobson said if the employees are all lumped together it gives access to appropriated performance funds that cannot be utilized when grouped by department. The con of this would be that a department head or elected official would not be able to control the distribution, but would still control the employee ratings. There was a lengthy discussion on the benefit of grouping employees together to alleviate the issue of some department heads/elected officials not using the PFP process the way it is intended. If the Court decides to make the change to consolidate all employees into one group, it will not be implemented in this year, but could be implemented next year.

Commissioner Williams asked how this would impact the ones who rate low, high or exactly the same. Ms. Jacobson said it would not really impact them because the data is normalized so that the harsh raters are normalized to the same as the easy raters. The ones that rate everyone the same will still rate the employees the same and the average increase will still be given.

Commissioner Fletcher asked if the goal is to get to the sum of the midpoints, how do we continue to motivate those who are at midpoint or above because their raises will be less. Ms. Jacobson said that is why HR does not recommend merit matrix. Under PFP they would go all the way to the end of the pay grade and still get the lump sum recognitions that other public sector entities do not give.

Commissioner Williams revisited the time it takes for an employee to get to the midpoint and maximum of a pay grade. She said the 39 years to the maximum is unacceptable. If there is a stagnated market and PFP is used, then law enforcement will feel as if they are falling behind. Judge Self said using performance increase and market movement together could fix this because the County has only been using one method. He said the sum of the midpoint is a good tool for the County to use. Ms. Jacobson agreed the sum of the midpoint concept was the best thing to come out of having the consultant. Commissioner Hill also agreed with the sum of the midpoint tool and said in speaking with department heads and elected officials who feel PFP is broken, it always comes down to the fact PFP has not been sufficiently funded to make it work.

The following options were selected for the HR department to use to prepare for the budget workshop. Commissioner Webb was not present to vote.

Define compensation philosophy – a motion was made to include the following statements in the compensation philosophy: 1) Collin County utilizes a data-based, market driven compensation philosophy; 2) we will strive to meet the needs of our County's residents by attracting, retaining and motivating talented employees who can provide the best services possible; 3) compensation policies, pay structure and total rewards decisions will reflect the need to balance our goal of retaining top talent with the responsible use of taxpayer funds; and 4) it is our objective to establish a strong tie between performance and rewards, and ensure top performers are rewarded for their efforts. (Time: 2:58 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Chris Hill
Second by: Commissioner Susan Fletcher
Vote: 4 – 0 Passed

Promotion and demotion policies – There was concern with the fairness of this policy when comparing new hires versus promoting from within which comes down to experience in the position. Judge Self asked how many people are promoted more than one pay grade in a year. Julie Rutherford, HR, said more employees are promoted multiple grades than promoted a single grade. Commissioner Williams preferred the modified policy and said she feels strongly the demotion policy should also be a 5% decrease per pay grade matching the promotion policy. The Court decided to move forward to modify the promotion policy to a 5% per pay grade increase with a maximum increase of 15% or the amount needed to reach pay grade minimum and a modified demotion policy with a decrease in pay by 5% per pay grade with a maximum decrease of 15% or if occurring within two years of a promotion, the employee returns to their previous rate – adjusted for PFP and market increases. (Time: 3:07 p.m.)

Increase funding data – Ms. Jacobson explained the regression analysis performed every year to ensure a hot market movement for one particular department does not affect the data for the rest of the population. Those are considered outliers and pulled for reclassification consideration. Once all of the compensation practices are aligned and there is, for example, an employee whose PFP scores are dragging, this means that there is a personal PFP issue, not a systemic issue. A motion was made to select the following data points: Data Point 1) projected average salary increase budgets in market; Data Point 2) projected market wage movement; and Data Point 4) aggregate midpoint versus actual pay ratio. (Time: 3:13 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams
Second by: Commissioner Chris Hill
Vote: 4 – 0 Passed

Distribution of increase funds – There was discussion on the transparency of distributing performance increases, market movement increases and the \$4 million correction to catch up to the market through the PFP tool. The Court would like those all to be distributed through PFP, but be clearly defined in the budget. A motion was made to distribute both performance and market adjustment funds through the PFP calculation. (Time: 3:17 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams
Second by: Commissioner Chris Hill
Vote: 4 – 0 Passed

Timing to distribute funds – The Court decided to hold off on determining the timing to distribute funds until a later date.

Increase calculation – There was discussion on the logistics of distributing funds among the entire county rather than by department. Ms. Jacobson said this piece could not be implemented this year, but with IT support it would be ready for FY19. Monika Arris, Budget, said the timeline for PFP completion would have to be moved up to at least early August in order for this to be included in the adopted budget. A motion was made to approve utilizing the modified PFP calculation with both of the following: eliminate self-appraisal in calculation, but continue for documentation purposes only; and to distribute funds among the entire county rather than by department. (Time: 3:24 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Chris Hill
Second by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams
Vote: 4 – 0 Passed

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-494-07-10

12. Possible future agenda items by Commissioners Court without discussion.

Judge Self would like an update on the RTR (Regional Toll Revenues) lay down from Engineering. (Time: 3:24 p.m.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Judge Self recessed Commissioners' Court into Executive Session at 3:25 p.m. in accordance with Paragraph 551.072, Real Estate to discuss the authorization to initiate condemnation proceedings to acquire the right-of-way needed for a portion of the Collin County Outer Loop between SH289/Preston Road and the DNT (Dallas North Tollway).

Judge Self reconvened the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

Real Estate (551.072)

AI-43376 Authorization to initiate condemnation proceedings to acquire the right-of-way needed for a portion of the Collin County Outer Loop between State Highway 289 (Preston Road) and the Dallas North Tollway (DNT), Special Projects.

A motion was made to approve the drafted court order. (Time: 3:41 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Chris Hill
Second by: Commissioner Susan Fletcher
Vote: 4 – 0 Passed

COURT ORDER NO. 2017-495-07-10

Commissioner Webb was not present for the vote.

There being no further business of the Court, Judge Self adjourned the meeting at 3:41 p.m.



Keith Self, County Judge

Susan Fletcher, Commissioner, Pct. 1

Cheryl Williams, Commissioner, Pct. 2

Chris Hill, Commissioner, Pct. 3

Duncan Webb, Commissioner, Pct. 4

ATTEST:

Stacey Kemp, Ex-Officio Clerk
Commissioners Court
Collin County, TEXAS