

MINUTES

Walla Walla Joint Community Development Agency Board (WWJCDAB) special meeting

January 18, 2011 - 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
Jesse Nolte, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Walla Walla County
Preston Fredrickson, Assistant City Attorney, City of Walla Walla
Tim McCarty, Support Services Director, City of Walla Walla
Andy Porter, Union-Bulletin
Dan Tompkins, Tompkins & Associates
Gordon Heimbigner, County Treasurer
Debbie Neal, Chief Deputy, County Treasurer's office

The special meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Clemens. Roll call was held with Board members Barrow, Tompkins and Clemens present. Quorum established.

The agenda for the special meeting was to discuss and possibly make decisions regarding: 1) accounting services for the agency; 2) a resolution to extend the provisions of RCW 41.48.030, providing Social Security coverage to eligible employees of the agency; and 3) any unfinished business.

Accounting Services:

Mr. Glover provided background on who/what agency handles various financial matters for the agency. The County Treasurer and Auditor were unable to provide all the services needed, and a RFQ went out for fiscal services. Subsequently the selection of Tompkins & Associates was made and a contract was executed. Due to the wording of the Intergovernmental Agreement in place, information regarding the provision of accounting services for the new agency by the county (treasurer and auditor) is not clear. The County Treasurer is not clear regarding his role and how revenue is tracked and disbursed to each entity, the city and county, for accounting purposes. Mr. McCarty concurred that clarity is needed. The joint agency makes the deposit, identifies revenue source/recipient, and Treasurer receives that monthly and reports, with either the Treasurer's office or joint agency providing the breakdown (city, county, joint agency). Mr. Heimbigner stated that the governing intergovernmental agreement provides that the city and county quarterly will deposit into an account "with the agency's treasurer" a sum to cover that entity's proportionate share..... 6.3 says the Treasurer shall remit back all fees and monies to the city and county for the share specified from within the incorporated and the unincorporated areas.... He asked about interest that accumulates. 6.4 appoints the county as treasurer, and he is the County Treasurer. Accounts have been set up for the joint agency under the auspices of the County Treasurer. He can provide the accounting needed so there is no question of where the funds are disbursed, but he's confused about his role now.

Mr. Tompkins said that the intergovernmental agreement was drawn up that way initially, but there is a fiscal agent now. He wasn't sure what the understanding was on the part of the county auditor and treasurer now, after the RFQ was drawn up and that public process completed. Mr. Heimbigner said if the intergovernmental agreement was rewritten to take the reference to the county treasurer out, that would be fine. The county treasurer's bond would cover the financial transactions now, and he was concerned about that bond. Mr. Barrow said his understanding was that the revenue comes in from the county and city and money collected goes into an account and is remitted back to the respective entities, so only one revenue stream, plus expenses. Various comments/discussions ensued.

Mr. Dan Tompkins provided his input that the accounting will be provided by Tompkins & Associates as the fiscal agency, including checks written, fees and taxes paid, etc. If the Treasurer's office provides the service, there will be fees. If Tompkins & Associates, the firm will set up payables and there will be a balance sheet of what is owed. There has to be a way to track everything. He needed to know if the Treasurer was his boss, or did he report to the board? Is the intergovernmental agreement to be rewritten?

Mr. Nolte said the intergovernmental agreement needs to be rewritten, consistent with the RFQ, as the agreement says the county provides treasurer services and that is not the way it is to happen. Mr. Dan Tompkins mentioned that for purposes of auditing by the State Auditor's office, his firm can provide as much transparency as needed, but if the Treasurer's office keeps a part and his firm keeps a part of the services, this won't be in one place. Mr. Heimbigner said he would suggest taking the county out as the treasurer, appoint Tompkins & Associates/Dan Tompkins as treasurer, and then his elected official bond as county treasurer isn't at risk. He made it clear that he has complete faith in Tompkins & Associates and Dan Tompkins; however, if he can't answer 100% because he is not providing 100% of the services, he has a concern. His office could cover the revenue reporting, but felt it would be easier if Tompkins & Associates does it all. He wasn't sure what the other partner, the city, would want.

Mr. Greg Tompkins responded that this is a joint agency board decision, not the city's or county's, and per the RFQ, the accounting firm selected was to provide accounting and payroll services. Mr. Barrow agreed with Mr. Greg Tompkins and felt the accounting firm should provide all services and would have the responsibility for same, and agreed with Mr. Nolte that the intergovernmental agreement should be reworked.

Mr. Heimbigner requested that the minutes reflect that he/county treasurer is no longer to provide the services as of this date, to cover him/his office until the intergovernmental agreement can be rewritten. Mr. Clemens asked if that would change anything; Mr. Dan Tompkins said no, he thought that Tompkins & Associates was to be doing 100% of the described work already.

Mr. McCarty felt that with the intergovernmental agreement between the city and county be rewritten, those two entities would be involved in the decision, and felt that there should be a review of information to be certain the parties are satisfied. Cash flow issues need to be looked at; have to give consideration to how that works.

Mr. Barrow said that there was a meeting between the city and county that brought closure to this issue, wherein the county commissioners and city councilmembers were in agreement. Mr. Tompkins concurred, that there was a formal meeting of the two entities and there was a vote then for moving ahead, so he felt the approval of the two entities had been obtained. Other discussion ensued.

Mr. Barrow moved that the revenue from fees be segregated for city and county billed services and the expenses paid out of that, and all treasurer services required by the intergovernmental agreement would be provided by the accountant, in accordance with the RFQ. Mr. Greg Tompkins seconded. Discussion ensued. Subsequent to the discussion, Mr. Barrow withdrew his motion and Mr. Tompkins withdrew his second.

Then Mr. Barrow moved that the treasurer's services be provided by Tompkins and Associates. Mr. Greg Tompkins seconded. Discussion. Motion approved.

Social Security

Mr. Glover requested action on a resolution to sign employees up for Social Security services. Language for the resolution draft came from Social Security information. Some discussion on if there was a choice to offer - yes, there is.

Mr. Tompkins moved to approve a resolution to extend the provisions of RCW 41.48.030, providing Social Security coverage to eligible employees of the agency. Mr. Barrow seconded. Motion approved.

Other/unfinished business

Mr. Glover's I-9 forms approved.

Mr. Dan Tompkins asked how the bill approval process works - with Watershed Planning, the board approves; how will this be handled? Mr. Clemens responded that Mr. Glover will approve, as the board meets monthly; Mr. Fredrickson clarified that the board ratified consistent with the bylaws. Mr. Glover mentioned that the personnel manual will also need to be updated regarding when employees are paid.

Mr. Glover provided a brief update on the status of the last two job openings.

As there was no other business, Mr. Barrow moved to adjourn and Mr. Tompkins seconded; motion approved. Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m. The next regular meeting will be February 7, 2011.

A tour of the facilities housing the joint agency was then conducted for those interested.

APPROVED February 7, 2011



Bill Clemens, Chair