

**From:** [Kendrick, Jonathan A. - VP & Chief Human Resources Officer](#)  
**To:** [Dykes, Melissa H. - President/COO](#); [Maillis, Patricia L. - Director, Employee Services](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Alternate Performance Structures  
**Date:** Friday, August 16, 2019 1:17:46 PM  
**Attachments:** [VI. A. 1. a. FY2016 Pay for Performance Agenda Item final \(2\).pdf](#)  
[FY 15 Pay for Performance Payout Results v2.1 Final.xlsx](#)

---

Attached are two files Pat sent me that show five boxes for payment. I've also attached a simple (very simple) table as to what a five-box plan might look like as a basis for determining PUP. If we handled P4P that way we'd need to assign percentages. Let me know your thoughts. Thanks!

---

**From:** Maillis, Patricia L. - Director, Employee Services  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 15, 2019 1:58 PM  
**To:** Kendrick, Jonathan A. - VP & Chief Human Resources Officer  
**Subject:** Alternate Performance Structures

Examples of 4 and 5 buckets of performance used in the recent past.

I'll explain the changes that are shown in the 2<sup>nd</sup> document – it was a stellar year, we were going to have higher than normal payouts and Paul M got push back from the media and the Board that our goals were too easy so he changed the metrics at the end (not good, but happened) to soften the optics.

**Pat Maillis**

Director, Employee Services

Direct: (904-665-4132)

Cell : (904-703-3453)



# FY 2016 Performance Program Summary



## Summary of Corporate Performance Factors

### Safety

#### OSHA Recordable Incident Rate (RIR)

FY12 Results: 1.48 RIR

FY13 Results: 1.78 RIR

FY14 Results: 2.4 RIR

FY15 Results: 1.56 RIR

**FY16 Goal: 1.2 ≥ RIR**

**FY 16 Results: 1.82 RIR**

RIR		Incentive Opportunity					
		Non-Appointed	Appointed / Managerial				
		All CBU	Grade E-G	Grade H	Grade I	Grade J	Grade K
RIR > 1.2	Below	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1.2 ≥ RIR > 1.1	Meets	\$300	\$600	\$850	\$1,000	\$1,375	\$1,625
1.1 ≥ RIR > 1.0	Exceeds	\$400	\$800	\$1,130	\$1,325	\$1,830	\$2,165
.99 ≥ RIR	Exemplary	\$500	\$1,000	\$1,410	\$1,700	\$2,290	\$2,705

### Customer Satisfaction

#### JD Power Residential Electric Industry Customer Satisfaction Survey: Total Industry

FY12 Results: No Metric for Customer Satisfaction

FY13 Results: Top of the Third Quartile

FY14 Results: Top 25% of the Third Quartile

FY15 Results: Bottom 25% of First Quartile

**FY16 Goal: Bottom 25% of First Quartile**

**FY16 Results: Top 25% of the Second Quartile**

SURVEY RANKING		Incentive Opportunity					
		Non-Appointed	Appointed / Managerial				
		All CBU	Grade E-G	Grade H	Grade I	Grade J	Grade K
Top 25% of second quartile	Below	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bottom 25% of first quartile > 2015	Meets	\$300	\$600	\$850	\$1,000	\$1,375	\$1,625
Bottom 26% - 49% of first quartile	Exceeds	\$400	\$800	\$1,130	\$1,325	\$1,830	\$2,165
Top 26% - 50% of first quartile	Exemplary	\$500	\$1,000	\$1,410	\$1,700	\$2,290	\$2,705

### Cost Control: Electric Mwh

#### Cost per Mwh

FY12 Baseline: \$54.73

FY13 Results: \$53.92

FY14 Results: \$49.81

FY15 Results: \$49.44

**FY16 Goal: \$49.44**

**FY16 Results: \$48.35**

COST/Mwh		Incentive Opportunity					
		Non-Appointed	Appointed / Managerial				
		All CBU	Grade E-G	Grade H	Grade I	Grade J	Grade K
cost > \$49.44	Below	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$49.44 ≥ cost ≥ \$48.94	Meets	\$300	\$600	\$850	\$1,000	\$1,375	\$1,625
\$48.94 > cost ≥ \$48.44	Exceeds	\$400	\$800	\$1,130	\$1,325	\$1,830	\$2,165
\$48.43 > cost	Exemplary	\$500	\$1,000	\$1,410	\$1,700	\$2,290	\$2,705

**Cost Control: Water Kgal**

**Cost per Kgal**

FY12 Baseline: \$4.47

FY13 Results: \$4.49

FY14 Results: \$4.07

FY15 Results: \$3.98

**FY16 Goal: \$3.98**

**FY16 Results: \$4.08**

COST/KGL		Incentive Opportunity					
		Non-Appointed	Appointed / Managerial				
		All CBU	Grade E-G	Grade H	Grade I	Grade J	Grade K
cost > \$3.98	Below	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$3.98 ≥ cost ≥ \$3.91	Meets	\$150	\$300	\$425	\$500	\$690	\$815
\$3.91 > cost ≥ \$3.84	Exceeds	\$200	\$400	\$565	\$665	\$920	\$1,085
\$3.84 > cost	Exemplary	\$250	\$500	\$705	\$835	\$1,150	\$1,355

**Cost Control: Wastewater Kgal**

**Cost per Kgal**

FY12 Baseline: \$7.96

FY13 Results: \$7.53

FY14 Results: \$7.34

FY15 Results: \$7.26

**FY16 Goal: \$7.26**

**FY16 Results: \$7.12**

COST/KGL		Incentive Opportunity					
		Non-Appointed	Appointed / Managerial				
		All CBU	Grade E-G	Grade H	Grade I	Grade J	Grade K
cost > \$7.26	Below	\$0					
\$7.26 ≥ cost ≥ \$7.16	Meets	\$150	\$300	\$425	\$500	\$690	\$815
\$7.16 > cost ≥ \$7.06	Exceeds	\$200	\$400	\$565	\$665	\$920	\$1,085
\$7.06 > cost	Exemplary	\$250	\$500	\$705	\$835	\$1,150	\$1,355

## Example Overall Payout Opportunity at Meets

### Example of FY 16 Payout: Company Performance<sup>1</sup>

JEA Actual Payout	All CBU	Grade E-G	Grade H	Grade I	Grade J	Grade K
Safety	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Customer Satisfaction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Cost Control: Electric	\$500	\$1,000	\$1,410	\$1,700	\$2,290	\$2,705
Cost Control: Water	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Cost Control: Wasterwater	\$200	\$400	\$565	\$665	\$920	\$1,085
<b>Total Estimated Payout for Corporate Results</b>	<b>\$700</b>	<b>\$1,400</b>	<b>\$1,975</b>	<b>\$2,365</b>	<b>\$3,210</b>	<b>\$3,790</b>

<sup>1</sup>Corporate Results for Managerial / Appointed employees comprises 50% of overall incentive opportunity

### Appointed / Managerial:

### Example of FY 16 Appointed / Managerial Individual Performance Opportunity<sup>2</sup>

Employee Performance	Grade E	Grade F	Grade G	Grade H	Grade I	Grade J	Grade K
Below	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Meets	\$1,100	\$1,600	\$2,200	\$3,400	\$4,000	\$5,500	\$6,500
Exceeds	\$1,155	\$1,680	\$2,310	\$3,570	\$4,200	\$5,775	\$6,825
Exemplary	\$1,210	\$1,760	\$2,420	\$3,740	\$4,400	\$6,050	\$7,150

<sup>2</sup>Individual Performance Results for Appointed / Managerial employees comprises 50% of overall incentive opportunity

## Total Estimated Cost for FY 2016 Pay for Performance Program

### Corporate Results:

SLT:	No. Emp.	8	\$34,205
Appointed:	No. Emp.	364	\$741,331
Non appointed:	No. Emp.	1577	\$1,072,204
<b>Total:</b>		<b>1949</b>	<b>\$1,847,740</b>

### Individual Performance Results:

SLT:	No. Emp.	8	\$91,214
Appointed:	No. Emp.	364	\$1,176,533
<b>Total:</b>	No. Emp.	<b>372</b>	<b>\$1,267,747</b>

### Total FY16 Pay for Performance Payout:

SLT:	No. Emp.	8	\$125,419	The total amount represents 2.2% of salaries
Appointed:	No. Emp.	364	\$1,917,864	
Non appointed:	No. Emp.	1577	\$1,072,204	
<b>Total:</b>	No. Emp.	<b>1949</b>	<b>\$3,115,487</b>	

## Total Actual Cost for FY2015 Pay for Performance:

SLT:	No. Emp.	7	\$159,442	The total amount represented 3% of salaries
Appointed:	No. Emp.	373	\$2,250,223	
Non appointed:	No. Emp.	1584	\$1,789,985	
<b>Total:</b>	No. Emp.	<b>1964</b>	<b>\$4,199,650</b>	