



# Wake County

301 South McDowell Street  
Raleigh, NC

## Meeting Minutes Board of Commissioners

---

Tuesday, November 12, 2019

2:00 PM

Wake County Justice Center

---

### Work Session

#### Meeting Called to Order: Chair Jessica Holmes

Chair Holmes called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the meeting. She shared the agenda for today's meeting.

**Present:** 6 - Chair Jessica Holmes, Vice-Chair Greg Ford, Commissioner Matt Calabria, Commissioner Susan Evans, Commissioner Sig Hutchinson, and Commissioner James West

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Vickie Adamson

**Staff Present:** David Ellis, County Manager; Scott Warren, County Attorney; Denise Hogan, Clerk to the Board; Chris Dillon, Assistant County Manager; Denise Foreman, Assistant County Manager; Ben Canada, Assistant to the County Manager; Derwick Paige, Chief Community Vitality Officer; Angela Crawford, Human Services Director; Chris Clemmons, Senior Human Resources Consultant; Anza Harker, Human Resources Program Manager; Elaine Barnes, Human Resources Manager; Alicia Arnold, Human Services Division Director; Tim Maloney, Planning, Development, and Inspections Director; Frank Cope, Community Services Director; Terry Nolan, Planner III; Chris Whitenhill, Planner II; Tim Gardiner, Planner III; Sharon Peterson, Long Range Planning Administrator; Michael James, Senior Budget and Management Analyst; Dara Demi, Communications Director; Kelly Stratton, Communications Manager; Bill Greeves, Chief Information and Innovation Officer; Frank Cope, Community Services Director; Portia Johnson, Executive Assistant to the Board; and Michelle Cerett, Executive Assistant to the Board.

**Others Present:** Leigh Anne King, Principal, Clarion Associates; Sam Bridges, Attorney; Lindy Brown, Former County Commissioner; and Ana Pardo, North Carolina Justice Center.

[Agenda](#)

**Attachments:**    [Agenda BOC Work Session 11-12-19.pdf](#)

[PLANWake Comprehensive Plan](#)

**Attachments:**    [Comprehensive Plan BOC Nov 12.pdf](#)

Mr. Tim Maloney, Planning, Development, and Inspections Director, introduced Ms. Leigh Anne King, Principal, Clarion Associates, and said she will be making the presentation today on the PLANWake process. She said she will be sharing the findings of survey number two. She said she will also talk about the key components of the plan.

She shared the four phases of the project. She said phase two is complete and phase three is nearing completion.

She shared outreach numbers from survey's one and two.

She shared the community priorities identified in survey one.

- Significant change is needed to plan for growth
- Protect open space and natural areas
- Direct growth to towns
- Create walkable environments

She shared an overview of the findings in survey one and two.

Survey #1

- Most important to provide high quality schools and educational opportunities
- 3rd highest concern is growing cost of living, including housing

Survey #2

73% - Neighborhoods should be affordable for all

84% - County should focus on ensuring all have opportunities to prosper

88% - Need to focus on providing choices for moving around

94% - Ensure all modes of travel (walk, bike, drive, etc.) are safe

92% - County should consider health when making development choices

94% - Need to eliminate environmental concerns like water contamination

75% - Identify future locations for housing and commercial centers

74% - Keep some areas rural by limiting housing and commercial growth

71% - Don't accept the loss of special places and environments to growth

91% - Create a green space network linking cultural and natural features

93% - Plan for, protect, and preserve resource capacity (water, energy, sewer)

74% - Concerned that resources will be impacted by growth

She shared the key vision outcomes for PLANWake.

- Inclusive and Equitable
- Healthy and Active
- Sustainable and Vibrant

She shared steps necessary to meet the needs identified.

- There is agreement about the policy direction we need to be heading toward
- There are differing opinions about how to get there, and these will be tested further in Survey #3
- Comprehensive Plan will need to use a suite of goals/tools that balance policy tradeoffs
- Continued discussions are important for getting the balance “right”
- Opportunity to educate residents and stakeholders on benefits and tradeoffs of tools

Ms. King shared the objectives of survey number three, which is the next step. She said this step will be implemented later this month.

- Focus on Growth and Conservation
- Testing Growth Alternatives and Policy Directions

She shared the purpose of PLANWake.

PLANWake Will be Wake County’s Highest Policy and Action Guide for Decision-Makers.

- Growth Management
- Economic Development and Social Equity
- Transportation and Connectivity
- Built Environment
- Public Services and Facilities
- Resource Protection

She shared timeline for the plan.

PLANWake Will Consider the Long-Term and Focus on Achievable Actions for the Next 10 Years.

She shared the planning implementation cycle. List categories from map.

- Identify desired outcomes and policies

- Establish work priorities
- Allocate Resources
- Implement Priorities
- Evaluate and Measure

She shared the framework for establishing outcomes.

- Past Wake County Plans have been thoughtfully crafted but lacked measurable goals for tracking progress
- Result is a plan with strong policy direction that doesn't identify concrete action
- Successful plans are SMART plans

Ms. King shared the definition of SMART goals.

**S**pecific  
**M**easurable  
**A**chievable  
**R**ealistic  
**T**imely

She shared pitfalls that must be avoided in setting measurable goals.

- Too many measures
- Can't measure the metric
- Metrics too detailed
- Metrics don't reflect desired change

She shared the purpose of the performance goals.

- Performance Goals will be designed to:
- Provide a targeted # of metrics for evaluating performance
- Relevant across County Departments and Services
- Relevant across PLANWake Vision Outcomes (systems approach)
- Reflect multiple impacts on the community

She shared the topic categories.

Countywide

- Increase travel options and reduce car-dependence
- Decrease population experiencing severe housing problems
- Achieve goal of 30 percent protected open space

Development

- Increase population and job growth in places with access to transit
- Maintain and expand tree canopy as part of new development

Targeted population

- Reduce the % of households burdened by the cost of housing and transportation
- Expand access to services for vulnerable populations

She shared testing growth alternatives.

Growth in County Subdivisions is Not Achieving Four Priorities & Creates Challenges for Long Range Municipal Planning

Challenges to Maintaining and Promoting:

- Cohesive land use, design, and connectivity
- Providing municipal utilities around and among county areas
- Providing municipal services in areas with fragmented jurisdictions

Areas for testing a different growth management approach

- Focused testing - Plan to apply Countywide
- Models for other areas

She said the goal of the plan is to have one home per 30,000 square feet.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked how 30,000 square feet equates to an acre. Ms. King said the lots would be approximately .75 acres.

Commissioner West joined the meeting at 2:35

Ms. King shared maps of the dispersed growth and intentional growth opportunities.

She shared maps of growth alternate two for the PLANWake 540 South area, which include the rural edge, community reserve, community areas, and pedestrian oriented nodes. She said all the municipalities involved were included in the planning process. She said both growth alternatives meet the projections from the municipalities, but in a different way.

She shared the growth alternatives for the rural edge.

- Not needed to accommodate projected growth
- Prioritize Open Space / Ag Area Preservation through Partnerships
- Open Spaces "in use"
- Incentivize Set-Aside for Open Space (60%+)

- Unit yield equivalent may be lower than traditional subdivision

She shared the growth alternatives for the community reserve.

- Incentivize Set-Aside for Open Space (40%+)
- Unit yield equivalent to traditional subdivision
- Street design to match municipal standards
- Connectivity increased
- Limit approvals to projects meeting standards

She shared the growth alternatives for community areas.

- Municipal or “Municipal Ready” Development
- May Require More Time for Infrastructure Investments
- Connectivity Requirements
- Delay Approval for Annexation

She shared the growth alternatives for the pedestrian oriented nodes.

- Transit-Supportive Municipal Development
- May Require More Time for Infrastructure Investments
- Higher Standards for Connectivity and Density
- Delay Approval for Annexation
- US 401 & NC 540
- 3,640 acres
- 100-acre PODs
- 3.5X size of downtown Raleigh

She said the growth alternatives will be tested with the community. Once the aspects are confirmed, she will report back to the board.

Commissioner Hutchinson said this information is great. He asked that the interchanges around the I-540 corridor meet the goals around pedestrian and transit. Ms. King said that was considered and is part of the plan.

Vice-Chair Ford said this information closely relates to the board goals. He said looking at the current population, he estimates only .5 percent of the adult population participated in the surveys. He asked what challenges they faced as it relates to community outreach.

Ms. King said there was a strong effort to make the survey available to anyone who was willing to participate. She said it was presented in various places and in different languages.

Ms. King shared information on the participants in survey two.

- **4,117** total participants
- Respondents **represent all communities and demographics** across Wake County
- Most **owned their home** (68%) or **rented** (25%)
- Ages **0-25 under-represented** (11%) ages **(26-55) over-represented** (64%)

She shared comparisons of the respondents from survey #1 and survey #2.

- A statistically significant survey with a 99% confidence level and 3% margin of error for Wake County should have a sample size of 1,846.
- Survey #1 had a response capture of 4,682
- Survey #2 had a response capture of 4,117

*These surveys are not deemed statistically significant as respondents are self-selected and not randomly identified.*

Vice-Chair Ford asked Ms. King if she feels the statistics accurately represent the wishes of the population. Ms. King said the surveys are not statistically significant, but the participation was good.

Commissioner West asked about the alignment of land use. He asked if municipalities have flexibility in land use. Ms. King said each community has their own plans and the county will work with them to ensure their ordinances are aligned with the growth.

Ms. King shared examples of how PLANWake will reduce vehicle miles traveled.

- More walking (healthy and active)
- Less driving (inclusive and equitable)
- Fewer greenhouse gases (vibrant and sustainable)
- Less parking (vibrant and sustainable)

She shared examples of how PLANWake will reduce the percentage of households burdened by the cost of housing and transportation.

- More resources for healthcare (healthy and active)
- More resources for ending cycle of poverty (inclusive and equitable)
- More resources for local spending (vibrant and sustainable)

Commissioner Evans said she is pleased with the direction of PLANWake. She said most of Wake County will be developed within the next 20 years

so planning now is very important. She asked if the plan moves forward, would new zoning classifications be identified and if so, how would they be implemented.

Ms. King said the intent is to make these areas a preference. If that isn't possible, it would be completed once the infrastructure is done. She said the consistency is very important.

Mr. Maloney said when the plan is complete, it will have defined policies.

Vice-Chair Ford asked if the Wake County Planning Board has been involved in the process. Mr. Maloney said staff meets with the Planning Board on a monthly basis to receive their input and provide reports on the progress.

Chair Holmes thanked Mr. Maloney and Ms. King for all their work and said Wake County is headed in the right direction.

#### [Employee Classification and Compensation Structures](#)

**Attachments:**    [Board Presentation on Class and Comp Study2.pdf](#)

Ms. Angela Crawford, Human Resources Director, said she is excited to be presenting the classification and compensation study results. She thanked her staff for their work on the study and asked them to stand to be recognized.

She shared the background of the process. She said the process took 15 months to complete. She shared the challenges to completing the process.

- Current system more than 20 years old
- Current approach does not support a culture of high performance and accountability
- Attracting and retaining the talent we need.

She said employers are very competitive due to the low unemployment rate and it is important for the county to be competitive.

She shared the issues with the classification and compensation policy.

- Job and title inconsistency
- Uncertainty on current job roles and where they fit within the broader County structure
- Lack of transparency into career paths, promotional opportunities or advancement potential
- Inconsistent performance management and pay practices

Vice-Chair Ford commented on the online forums that employees can use to obtain and share salary information. He said that keeps salaries competitive.

Ms. Crawford shared the development process.

#### Data Points

- Salaries and Performance ratings
- Organizational charts and reporting relationships
- Current classification and compensation policies and procedures

#### Interviews

- County Manager's Office and Department Heads
- More than 200 employees participated in cross-functional and cross-departmental manager and employee focus groups

#### Market Research

- Study to establish salary market median values
- Human Resources and consultant slotted 740 proposed job titles based on market data or career level relationships

She said all department heads and several employees were involved in the process

Chair Holmes asked how the 200 employees were chosen. Ms. Crawford said Mercer provided recommendations on titles of employees to interview and the department heads identified the staff.

She shared the job family structure.

- Lays the foundation for clarity into roles, career paths, compensation, potential, and titling
- Provides the structural base to create consistency in compensation and performance management, robust employee development opportunities, and enhanced career pathing tools.

She shared the process of building the job architecture.

Taking jobs across the organization and creating organization specific job families, career paths, sub families and career levels

She shared job family structure. She said the department heads were involved in each phase of the process.

She said the number of job classifications changed from 329 before the

study to 740 after the study. She shared the benefits of the additional job classifications.

- fully captures the diverse roles within the County
- better describes the role, improving recruitment success
- accurately reflects the level and work
- provides defined opportunities for career development

She said the new job classifications will be more specific on the details of the job duties. She said in 2004, a consultant was used to condense job classifications. She said that resulted is 4,000 job classifications being reduced to 329, which was too far.

Vice-Chair Ford asked about the amount of work associated with re-writing the job descriptions.

Ms. Crawford said there is a new electronic job description tool that will be deployed in January. She said department heads will define the competencies as part of the job description.

Ms. Crawford shared compensation recommendations.

- Pay bands new term is "Market Ranges" to indicate pay is market based; All market ranges continue to be at or above Living Wage
- Establish new market range structures for CCBI, Information Technology and Medical in addition to the Legal, Sheriff and Detention existing special structures.
- Significant structure revision to EMS due to market conditions that hinder recruiting efforts.
- Department Heads actively involved in reviewing job families, sub families, classifications and respective market

She shared the new salary structure illustration for Information Technology. She said the IT department is struggling to be competitive with other employers.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if this will assist with recruiting highly skilled individuals. Ms. Crawford said it will not solve the problem, but it will help.

Vice-Chair Ford asked what is being done to retain staff.

Ms. Crawford said new process outlines a career path so employees can see where they have opportunities to advance.

Mr. David Ellis, County Manager, said it is important for the benefit package to be competitive. He said an assessment will be done in the near future that will allow all employees to provide feedback and identify challenge areas.

Ms. Crawford said the county has a very competitive benefits package. She said staff will begin receiving a benefit statement next year that will outline the monetary value of their benefit package.

Vice-Chair Ford said new salary structure is consistent with the private sector. He said private sector employers can be more flexible with their budgets. He asked about the process to be flexible and make counter offers when necessary to obtain talented employees. Ms. Crawford said department heads have the ability to go to the mid-point salary range without approval from the County Managers office, but they must manage their own budgets. Ms. Crawford said the labor market is constantly reviewed and changes are made accordingly.

Ms. Crawford shared a summary of changes to the market range.

Impacts to employees over max

Market range changes will reduce the number of employees over the maximum of the range by 80% from 82 to 14 employees

Employees to new minimum

Market range movement will require approximately 300 employee salaries be adjusted to the new minimum (7% of employees)

She said no employee will receive a decrease in pay. She said currently, employees at the max salary receive a bonus in lieu of a merit increase. She said pay policies have been changed as part of this process. She said premium pay was implemented in order to make the county more competitive.

She shared the dollar impact over all departments. She shared information on additional salary adjustments.

- Further calculations are needed to determine employee pay in relation to the new structure
- In January 2020, Human Resources will make recommendations for employee salary adjustments that are needed to maintain market positioning

Chair Holmes asked when employees will receive their increases. Ms.

Crawford said the new salaries will take effect on January 1, 2020.

Chair Holmes asked if the money was put in the budget to accomodate the salary increases. Mr. Ellis said \$2 million was added to the current year budget for this purpose.

Ms. Crawford said the largest increase was in Emergency Medical Services because there is a large need for paramedics.

Chair Holmes asked if there is a plan for compression. Ms. Crawford said the first step is to increase the salaries of those employees who are below the minimum. She said the remaining money will be used to make adjustments to other employee salaries. She said staff will present a compression plan in January.

Mr. Ben Canada, Assistant to the County Manager, said the action on November 18th will be to approve the new ranges discussed today.

Ms. Crawford shared the next steps.

- Amend Wake County Code Ordinance, Chapter 31, Section 31.05 to address change in classification approach
- Amend FY20 Personnel, Classification and Compensation Ordinance
- Upon approval, notify all employees of new job classification, market range and any individual salary impact of moves to the minimum
- Pay and classification changes to be effective January 1, 2020

Ms. Crawford said employees will be notified in mid-december if they are receiving an increase.

Chair Holmes said she is glad the change is taking place in January, not next fiscal year. She thanked staff for being proactive in preparing for the increases.

Chair Holmes said employees are deserving of this and the Human Resource staff has done a tremendous job.

Commissioner West said if employees are treated well, they will produce well.

Vice-Chair Ford thanked Ms. Crawford and her staff for all their work. He said the pension plan of the is attractive to employees.

Ms. Crawford said the county contributes to a county pension and a 401K

plan, which is unusual. She said according to Mercer, the county is very competitive in pension, except in retiree healthcare, which was lost in the recession.

Vice-Chair Ford asked how the restructuring is progressing in relation to the new salary structure. Mr. Ellis said the salary structure needed completed before the professional development piece. He said the restructuring of his office is nearly complete, but it is an ongoing process.

Mr. Ellis said Ms. Crawford has done a great job in moving the county forward.

### [Public Agency Funding Process](#)

**Attachments:**    [CommunityNonProfitFundingExemptionsWorksession.pdf](#)

Mr. Bill Greeves, Chief Innovation and Information Officer, shared an overview of the process. He shared the purpose of today's presentation.

- Staff is seeking Commissioner input on exempting FY20-funded public agencies from a new submission process.

He shared the staff recommendation for the Smart Start funding.

- Staff recommends moving Smart Start, and its associated funding (FY20 - \$1,688,028), to the Education budget, where it will undergo a review process similar to what we use for WCPSS and WakeTech requests.

He shared the definition and examples of "exemption."

- Exempted agency does not have to compete for funds in the newly-created submission process
- Agency is funded in the FY21 budget at its FY20 level
- If agency wishes to pursue an *increase* in funding, agency will follow the new submission process for the entirety of its request
- Funding for exempted agencies will be removed from the total "pot" allocated for public agencies (\$1,806,000)

Mr. Greeves shared a recap of the current year public agency funding. He asked if the board wanted to move any other agencies to exempt status.

Commissioner Hutchinson said he would like to exempt all the existing agencies. He said all these decisions are political. He said all current agencies should continue to be funded at the current level.

Vice-Chair Ford said the board has attempted to objectify funding for these agencies. He said all the agencies are valuable, but equity and access are important. He said there are several other agencies that do wonderful work as well and increase the quality of life. He said if all these were exempted, new funds would need added to the budget. He suggested adding a vetting process to open the opportunities to everyone.

Commissioner West said all the current agencies are very valuable, but it is important to drill down and evaluate how the public agency funding is used as it relates to the board goals.

Commissioner Calabria asked for clarification on what is being requested of the board today.

Mr. Greeves said staff needs direction on if any other agencies should be exempt from the competitive process.

Commissioner Hutchinson said there is no way to objectify the process because it is a political process. He said changes can be made to the process annually if necessary. He said he would support adding additional public agency funding to the budget, but the existing agencies should not be cut.

Vice-Chair Ford said the value and validity of the agencies is clear, but he feels the process needs to change. He said the decision was made last year to notify agencies that the process would be changing.

Mr. Greeves shared the next steps.

- Staff will issue an open call for qualified public agencies to submit funding requests for any funds remaining in the public agency funding allocation (Jan)
  - How/how broadly would you like us to advertise the submission process?
  - Would the board prefer we include a “do not contact” clause in the submission instructions?
- Staff will review funding requests against objective criteria and forward requests and summary sheets to Commissioners for consideration (Feb)
- Commissioners will use an affinity exercise to allocate remaining public agency funds (March)
- After completion of FY21 budget process, staff will collect feedback from Commissioners regarding the revised process

Chair Holmes said funding should relate to board priorities and goals.

Commissioner Evans said all these organizations provide a great service. She said she agrees that the process should be evaluated, and opportunities open to other agencies.

Commissioner Calabria asked for clarification on board support for adding additional funding to next year's budget.

Chair Holmes said she would support additional funds being added to the budget if it is justified. She said it is important for county funding to support programs that support board goals.

Commissioner West said it is important for the process to be reviewed in order to make a more informed decision.

Mr. Ellis said if the board wants additional agency funding in the next budget, he will need to know the new amount by March when the budget process begins.

Vice-Chair Ford said a standardized template should be created showing how funding relates to board goals. He said this will reduce the burden on staff.

Chair Holmes said the process must be transparent, fair, and inclusive of all organizations. She said all board members will have an opportunity to discuss the proposals.

Mr. Ellis said he expects several additional proposals and having a maximum amount for public agency funding would be helpful. He said staff will need to monitor the organizations to ensure the money is being spent properly

Chair Holmes suggested expanding the public agency funding to \$2 million for the next fiscal year.

Commissioner Evans said she supports the increase, but not an open process. She said opening the process will further burden staff and may be too much to handle with the current staff.

Commissioner Calabria agreed to the increase, but said it should not be a constraint. He said two problems he sees with an open process are the ability to resist good requests and understanding what the funding cut will mean for the agencies. He said decreasing funding could mean a decrease in staff for some agencies.

Chair Holmes said at this point, staff is only looking for direction on

exempting other agencies.

Commissioner Hutchinson noted for the minutes that he feels this is opening a pandoras box and it will require a lot of staff time.

Mr. Greeves asked if there should be a "no contact" clause added to the RFP.

Mr. Ellis said the "no contact" clause has been used in the past successfully for other projects.

Vice-Chair Ford said a "no contact" clause cannot be enforced.

Commissioner West said he doesn't agree with adding the "no contact" clause.

Commissioner Evans agreed there should not be a "no contact" clause.

Following further discussion, Mr. Greeves said staff has sufficient information to move forward.

Commissioner Hutchinson left the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

#### [Policy Workflow Items](#)

**Attachments:**    [Leave Data - Accruals and Usages.pdf](#)

Chair Holmes said she has received a request to change paid parental leave to paid family leave. She said the change would allow employees to use the leave to care for a sick family member. She shared a draft of the proposed change and said there is little fiscal impact for the change.

Chair Holmes said a very small population of staff would use it, but it is good to offer it.

Chair Holmes said she spoke with Ms. Crawford to get her opinion. Ms. Crawford said other employers are making the change.

Chair Holmes introduced Ms. Ana Pardo, NC Justice Center, and said she works with agencies on these types of issues.

Chair Holmes said this will help recruit staff.

Commissioner Evans said it is an excellent initiative. She said it would be beneficial for those who must care for children and parents. She shared how she struggled to care for her husband following surgery.

Ms. Pardo said research shows employers with these types of policies have less turnover. She said other local governments are considering the change.

Ms. Crawford said staff suggests adding this as additional leave instead of replacing the parental leave. She said Mecklenburg County has implemented the paid family leave and has not seen an increase in staff time off.

Vice-Chair Ford said staff needs direction to continue their research beyond the four hour rule.

Commissioner Calabria said he is supportive of the leave and would like staff to continue gathering information.

Chair Holmes said she was not aware that the other commissioners had not received a draft of the new policy. Therefore, she asked board members to provide feedback upon review of the draft.

Mr. Ellis said staff will send the draft to all board members tomorrow. If agreeable, it will be on the agenda for approval at December 2nd meeting. The new policy would then be effective January 1, 2020.

## **Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Cerett, Executive Assistant  
Wake County Board of Commissioners



## Legislation Details (With Text)

---

**File #:** 16-2500

**Type:** Regular Item      **Status:** Agenda Ready

**On agenda:** 11/12/2019      **In control:** Board of Commissioners

**Title:** Agenda      **Final action:**

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** [Agenda BOC Work Session 11-12-19.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

Agenda



## Legislation Details (With Text)

---

**File #:** 16-2501

**Type:** Regular Item      **Status:** Agenda Ready

**In control:** Board of Commissioners

**On agenda:** 11/12/2019      **Final action:**

**Title:** PLANWake Comprehensive Plan

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** [Comprehensive Plan BOC Nov 12.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

PLANWake Comprehensive Plan



## Legislation Details (With Text)

---

**File #:** 16-2502

**Type:** Regular Item      **Status:** Agenda Ready

**In control:** Board of Commissioners

**On agenda:** 11/12/2019      **Final action:**

**Title:** Employee Classification and Compensation Structures

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** [Board Presentation on Class and Comp Study2.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

Employee Classification and Compensation Structures



## Legislation Details (With Text)

---

**File #:** 16-2503

**Type:** Regular Item      **Status:** Agenda Ready

**In control:** Board of Commissioners

**On agenda:** 11/12/2019      **Final action:**

**Title:** Public Agency Funding Process

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** [CommunityNonProfitFundingExemptionsWorksession.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

Public Agency Funding Process



## Legislation Details (With Text)

---

**File #:** 16-2504

**Type:** Regular Item      **Status:** Agenda Ready

**On agenda:** 11/12/2019      **In control:** Board of Commissioners

**Title:** Policy Workflow Items      **Final action:**

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** [Leave Data - Accruals and Usages.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

Policy Workflow Items

## **Wake County Annual Leave Accruals**

| <b><i>Years of Current and Reinstated Service</i></b> | <b><i>Minutes Earned Each Year</i></b> | <b><i>Hours Earned Each Year</i></b> | <b><i>Days Earned Each Year</i></b> |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Less than 2 years</i>                              | <i>480</i>                             | <i>96</i>                            | <i>12</i>                           |
| <i>2 but less than 5 years</i>                        | <i>560</i>                             | <i>112</i>                           | <i>14</i>                           |
| <i>5 but less than 10 years</i>                       | <i>680</i>                             | <i>136</i>                           | <i>17</i>                           |
| <i>10 but less than 15 years</i>                      | <i>800</i>                             | <i>160</i>                           | <i>20</i>                           |
| <i>15 but less than 20 years</i>                      | <i>920</i>                             | <i>184</i>                           | <i>23</i>                           |
| <i>20 years or more</i>                               | <i>1,040</i>                           | <i>208</i>                           | <i>26</i>                           |

\*The chart above is used to illustrate the total annual leave hours and days for an employee who worked 12 months under the same annual work hours schedule. Review the policy for more information on accrual frequency and rate determinations.

## **Combined Annual and Sick Leave Accruals**

|   | <b><i>Less than 2 years</i></b> | <b><i>Years 2 to 5</i></b> | <b><i>Years 5 to 10</i></b> | <b><i>Years 10 to 15</i></b> | <b><i>Years 15 to 20</i></b> | <b><i>More than 20</i></b> |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b><i>Leave Earned in Weeks</i></b>       |                                 |                            |                             |                              |                              |                            |
| <b><i>Annual</i></b>                      | <i>2.4</i>                      | <i>2.8</i>                 | <i>3.4</i>                  | <i>4.00</i>                  | <i>4.6</i>                   | <i>5.2</i>                 |
| <b><i>Sick</i></b>                        | <i>2.4</i>                      | <i>2.4</i>                 | <i>2.4</i>                  | <i>2.4</i>                   | <i>2.4</i>                   | <i>2.4</i>                 |
| <b><i>Total Leave Earned in Weeks</i></b> | <i>4.8</i>                      | <i>5.2</i>                 | <i>5.8</i>                  | <i>6.4</i>                   | <i>7.0</i>                   | <i>7.6</i>                 |

## **Data Regarding Leave Usage for Care for a Parent, Child or Spouse with a Serious Health Condition**

| <b>Number of Instances of Employee Leave to Care for a Family Member with a Serious Health Condition</b> |             |              |              |
|--|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>For Care of</b>   | <b>2018</b> | <b>2019</b>  | <b>Total</b> |
| Child  | 16          | 21           | 37           |
| Parent   | 76          | 59           | 135          |
| Spouse   | 21          | 14           | 35           |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>113</b>  | <b>94</b>    | <b>207</b>   |
| <b>Average Weeks Used</b>  | <b>2.42</b> | <b>2.29</b>  | <b>2.36</b>  |
|  |             |              |              |
|  |             |              |              |
| <b>Number that used Leave Without Pay</b>  | <b>6</b>    | <b>11</b>    | <b>17</b>    |
| <b>Percent of total above</b>  | <b>5.3%</b> | <b>11.7%</b> | <b>8.2%</b>  |