

MINUTES

Walla Walla Joint Community Development Agency Board (WWJCDAB) meeting

December 13, 2010 - Walla Walla County Public Health and Legislative Building

Board members present: Jim Barrow, Greg Tompkins, and Bill Clemens.

Others present in the audience:

Tom Glover, Director, Walla Walla Joint Community Development Agency
Barbara Clark, Mayor, City of Walla Walla
Jesse Nolte, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Walla Walla County
Nabiel Shawa, City Manager, City of Walla Walla
Tim Donaldson, City Attorney, City of Walla Walla
Preston Fredrickson, Assistant City Attorney, City of Walla Walla
Tim McCarty, Support Services Director, City of Walla Walla
Dominick Elia, City Councilmember, City of Walla Walla
Jennifer Seekamp, Human Resource Manager, City of Walla Walla
Shelley Clarke, City of Walla Walla Development Services
Matt Perkins, City of Walla Walla Development Services
Dave Collette, City of Walla Walla Development Services
Andy Porter, Union-Bulletin
Alpha O'Laughlin, Union representative, Local 1191-WC

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Chair Clemens. Roll call was held with Board members Barrow, Tompkins and Clemens present. Quorum established.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Barrow moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting; Mr. Tompkins seconded; motion approved.

Old Business:

Employee benefits. Mr. Glover reported that this item is still being worked on.

Agency Budget:

The draft budget, as last provided, has not changed, Mr. Glover reported. He provided the board with a copy of that document again. There were some issues brought up at the last meeting that could impact the budget. There was only one response to the RFP for financial services, an expenditure that is part of the budget to be adopted. That response was from Tompkins & Associates at a cost of \$1600/month, or \$19,800/year, plus a one-time set up fee of \$1,000. Mr. Tompkins announced that he would not vote on that item, as he has a conflict (Dan Tompkins of Tompkins & Associates is his brother).

In looking at the information provided by the city regarding workload and considering the approximately 500 unresolved city code compliance cases pending, Mr. Glover had reassessed needs and suggested adding a position to the agency budget as proposed. The city and the county both have these responsibilities; however the county has one person with this responsibility currently and a much smaller caseload remaining open than does the city, which has two employees working on compliance issues. The cost put into the budget was the cost of sharing. Also, the county may want to retain a principal planner position.

Mr. Barrow pointed out that this would add \$100,000 to the budget, and he wondered if since there wasn't a certainty regarding the amount of work needed in permits and code enforcement to close on the city side, maybe not budget for the two positions now and keep to the original budget instead, then revisit this

in six months to see if additions or adjustments are needed. Mr. Tompkins was not in favor of this approach, as it would be going against the director's recommendation on needs as he has assessed them, and the budget if adopted on that position would not be a true and accurate reflection of costs and not fiscally prudent. Mr. Barrow appreciated his points. He asked Mr. Glover if he would be comfortable with a conservative budget, putting in positions recommended but not hiring to fill until the workload was fully known after the agency has been in operation for a period of time, as he was hesitant to hire people and then there not be the need anticipated. Mr. Glover responded that having a savings later was better; interviews are ongoing to hire just one person; but if the budget had funds for the second person, that person could be added later if needed. The county has handled approximately 350 cases with one compliance officer. Discussion here re positions and budget. Mr. Tompkins mentioned he had learned that an incentive pay/gain-sharing plan may be put forth as something possibly for the future for the agency employees, which was a concern to him as an unknown budget expense if undertaken. Mr. Barrow felt that consideration was not an option at this time, as the agency hasn't opened its doors yet.

On another budget item, there is an expense budgeted in the amount of \$4,000 for credit card fees. Mr. Glover has found that this is not necessary. Currently apparently the city picks up the merchant fee as a part of doing business. An alternative is to use the Official Payments program utilized by several counties; the fees are paid by the credit card user then, not the counties. Mr. Nolte says that in this situation the county can absorb the fees or pass them on. Board consensus was to use the Official Payments program to save this expense/the fees.

Employee pay ranges are still being reviewed, but work is nearly complete. May be a need to amend the budget once more once this review is complete.

Mr. Tompkins advised that the county commissioners would be discussing the joint agency and its status in a workshop meeting tomorrow (December 14) at 9 a.m., to possibly make determinations on start date or possibly not moving forward. It was his understanding that city needed a decision from the county by tomorrow, and that will be the purpose of the commissioners' meeting.

Action to adopt budget was postponed.

Finances, financial oversight, and responsibilities:

Mr. Glover advised this information was covered above. He was unsure about proceeding with entering into an agreement with regard to financial services to be provided to the agency; Mr. Barrow concurred this might be premature.

Draft internal policies:

Mr. Glover advised these would be ready for next Monday's meeting.

Director's update:

Written update provided by Mr. Glover and then reviewed in brief. An employer ID number has been obtained. There remains a question about the need for attorney services, as some conflicting information has been received. This is in the budget as an estimated cost of \$10,000. Mr. Barrow understood the services needed would be provided by WCIA and that no outside counsel would be needed. Mr. Clemens was hesitant to subtract all the funds, as it wasn't clear if all advice could be provided.

The next meeting will be December 13, 2010. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:30 p.m.

APPROVED December 20, 2010

Bill Clemens, Chair