

PAVE COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – June 1, 2017 at 9:04 am
Courtyard Conference Room

Member Attendance:

Roy Lindsay (Chair)
Dennis Roler
Rick Riker
John Raul
Joseph Scheinberg
Valerie Lovelace
Vacant positions (2)

Staff/Liaison/Other:

Aaron Cubic (City Manager)
Jay Meredith (Finance Director)
Lora Glover – Parks & Community Development Director
Jason Canady – Public Works Director

I. – Continue review of draft project report for Operations Plan – Community Development Programs and conference call with project manager.

- Chair Lindsay asked Jay to make the phone call to John.
- Jay asked if there were any questions from John.
- John stated they took the list of ten items from last meeting and used that to revise the plan.
- Chair Lindsay suggested John explain each item as they go through the list.
- John explained the first change, on page six. This was regarding the long-term key recommendations and when these will be phased in. We added looking at a standalone Parks Department if we received funding.
- Chair Lindsay commented that he was grateful the information came forward to be included in the budget. Some of those new positions are because of this study.
- Councilor Lovelace asked about the Public Works Director if a background as a City Engineer is what we were looking for.
- Jason stated we would evaluate that. We are not sure we will be able to hire a City Engineer/Assistant Director.
- John explained number two, pages 29 and 30, the one stop counter. The courtyard would be a good location for this.
- Councilor Riker asked if each department still has their own station, but it is all in one building.
- John stated you could do this however you wanted. His suggestion is to have each station at one long counter. The idea is to have the customer come to one counter to get all the services he or she needs.
- City Manager Cubic stated the roadblock is the space we have right now. In the courtyard, there are a number of doors each leading to a different department. It seems every week he is directing someone to the proper department. That is not good customer service.
- Member Scheinberg asked how we would educate the public. What if the person at the counter does not know everything that is required and the customer has to come back again?
- City Manager Cubic stated the person at the counter could steer you in the right direction. If that person at the counter is not to one who can provide the service, we can get the staff person who can. If you need an appointment, then we make an

appointment. The key is to make sure we listen and understand what they need. Then we can figure out the process to help them.

- John discussed number three, on page 46. This was a simple change. We took out monetary incentives and put in non-monetary incentives.
- Councilor Riker asked while we are on that page, there is a chart showing a percentage on time for building permit applications. He asked how this compare with other cities.
- John stated we are doing very well on turnaround time.
- Lora said John had recommended that we publish this information on our website so we can track it.
- Chair Lindsay stated we should promote ourselves and let people know our successes.
- Jay saw the change in terminology from compensation to incentive. Our basic comment is we do not want to imply monetary compensation for this particular item. He is suggesting we take out that term incentive because in our environment incentive is monetary, particularly in working with our various bargaining units.
- John said he could just drop the word incentive.
- Councilor Riker stated that recognition in some way seems like you are in the spot light but incentives are nice gestures. He likes the word incentive, but does not think it needs to be monetary. It could be something like an afternoon off.
- City Manager Cubic stated we do those things but we do not call them incentives because incentives are more counterproductive to the HPO culture we are trying to develop. Incentives may provide the wrong idea as to what you might get; it is counterproductive to the HPO thought process. The competitive salary is not the driving force of good work product, behavior and organizational culture. The organizational culture is what drives the good work performance. If we are all paid competitively an extra incentive will get you less from a productivity standpoint than a good system that rewards leadership and positive behavior. We are trying to move away from incentives and move toward recognition. Incentivize means you are requiring something to get that performance. We want to provide the culture that develops that performance and then you recognize that.
- Chair Lindsay said the committee agrees with Jay's comment.
- John said he would drop the word incentive.
- John talked about number four, page 52. This is clarifying the funding source was from insurance.
- Councilor Riker asked for a refresher.
- Jason stated this is in reference to the Solid Waste Funds that the City manages for the landfill operations. We spread those duties out among several people within Public Works. The thought was we are at a point where we probably should dedicate one person to do some of that work. This is to clarify that there is no dedicated funding stream for that work, but it could be reimbursable from the insurance. This may be part time or part of somebody else's duties. Jason stated that this is very involved with more than environmental testing; there is also a fire mitigation plan that we have to manage.
- John talked about number five. The concept was to go citywide off facility management but we clarified that and put in phasing being Public Works and Parks first with possible future steps including Public Safety and other functions. This is discussed on page 53.
- Councilor Roler asked who handles that now.
- John said this is spread out into a couple of places.
- Jason said that currently multiple departments handle this. David Reeves has Property Management. They handle City Hall and other City properties and remote facilities. In Public Works, all of the Treatment Plants are handled at the Treatment Plant level. Parks handles all of their facilities. Public Safety handles a lot of their facility

maintenance at their level so it is compartmentalized. This will take a while to implement.

- Councilor Riker asked if recommendation 3.5 is on page 55.
- John stated this was discussed a little bit on the top of page 53 as well. The main thing is the recommendation with is 3.5.
- Councilor Roler asked what the duties of a Facilities Manager are.
- John stated it is a broad range of things all the way from maintenance to asset management.
- Jason stated that Mike Byrne handles all of the facilities as well as 60 people's individual needs. He also does remote facilities like the Downtown Growers Market, flower baskets, landscaping, pruning trees, park reserve properties, as well as managing contractors as needed.
- Councilor Lovelace asked about the chart explaining the recommended Public Works Department organizational structure. Is the Distribution and Collection going to be split into two?
- Jason stated that was correct.
- Jay stated maybe we should show that chart to have Distribution and Collection separate.
- John said he would do that.
- Councilor Roler asked about the engineering. Some of it is staying with Parks and Community Development and some of it going to Public Works. He is wondering what the split is.
- John said the basic idea is that there is an engineering function working with the development customer and the other is looking at engineering aspects of projects that are designing infrastructure that the Public Works Department will ultimately take.
- Councilor Roler asked who does this work now.
- Lora stated the Contract City Engineer is currently under the PCD, so between the Contract Engineer and Fred Saunders we handle that in conjunction with Jason's Department.
- Councilor Lovelace asked if the new Development Engineering would stay with PCD and the rest would go to Public Works.
- John stated section 3.4 explains that concept. You will continue to have consultants, but you will have the other two we just discussed.
- Member Scheinberg asked if we are talking about City projects or customers coming with projects. And is PCD going to be transferred to Public Works
- John stated PCD's orientation will be having engineering staff person who works with customers and Public Works will be the technical back up to that function, and they will be doing their own engineering related to their projects and capital projects.
- Jay stated right now our engineering staff does both.
- There was more discussion on this. John explained these two positions and referred to page 53, figure 14.
- City Manager Cubic asked what John's prospective was on the Assistant Public Works Director/Engineer. He is struggling with this concept. He sees this as more than just one FTE. It would be difficult to find this skillset as well.
- John stated the reason they recommended this is they will have the certification to look over someone else's work and put their stamp on it. The strongest part of our recommendation is you need a City Civil Engineer.
- There was discussion on this.

- John explained number 6; provide more advantages of pulling together the Parks Functions and putting them in one spot. We did that on page 63. We agreed with having the flexibility of moving it back if necessary.
- Councilor Roler stated he did not see the benefit of hiring a staff person for recreation instead of contracting out for this. The cost of PERS and insurance did not seem to make financial sense.
- John stated they feel we will get a much better service for our customer by bringing it in-house.
- Chair Lindsay asked if John felt the company we are using now is not state of the art.
- John said they feel putting maintenance together when you get Public Works up to speed would make more sense.
- Councilor Lovelace asked if that ties in with keeping track of the cost as well and monitoring the costs of those services.
- John said there is a whole packet of recommendations that an in-house supervisor of that function could do a better job.
- Lora stated we can look at increasing our park services fees to enhance that funding, but it is the philosophy of the Council to provide those services back to the community. The Park Supervisor oversees Recreation NW program. We are getting the services of 2 ½ people with this contract price. I do not have the staffing level to hire one person and still provide some of those services. This will have to be a Council decision. We have a small community and the relationship Molly and Alison bring to all the other recreational services and groups is very valuable to us. Lora does not recommend that we change this at this point.
- Chair Lindsay stated this is all a recommendation and it has value but it does not fit our situation now.
- There was discussion on our county needs at this time while planning for growth in the future.
- John stated that this is in recommendation 8, which is strategically the most fruitful way to go. With a Parks District, you would have a lot more certainty and you could do a lot more things.
- Councilor Roler asked if it was possible to approve recreation by bringing in more technology to make it more efficient without getting into the recreation business ourselves.
- John stated there are many combinations of ways we could put this together. Our recommendation is that you get someone who is a practitioner in the field, but you do not have to do it that way.
- Councilor Riker asked if we could have our current management reach out to that type of person to come in and help them provide that expertise.
- John said we got expert detail with them. The person that did our parks department report ran parks departments in our state. This report is the recommendation from her and she is suggesting we have someone on an ongoing basis to stay abreast of the things that are changing in the field.
- Lora stated they have the certification that several of our parks municipal worker are working towards right now.
- John said they recommended a number of those trainings for our staff.
- John explained number 7, the Urban Forester. They put in a lot more information about that including alternatives to hiring a full time position. One of those suggestions is more training and certification for existing staff. We could also extend our contracted services.
- Lora said she has two people working on those trainings this week.

- Jason stated the reason this position came up was because of calls from folks that have need somebody to come out and see if this is a City tree problem, is it in the right-of-way or leaning over somebody's property line and they just want somebody to come out and give them a quick snapshot of what that is. That is what the intent of what the Urban Forester would do. Often times we have to hire an arborist to go out and look to make sure it is not a City issue.
- Lora stated there was also an Urban Forestry plan that has been adopted but not implemented.
- Jason stated there are a lot more than parks trees that the position would be taking care of.
- There was more discussion on this and the possibility of adding these duties to existing positions.
- John stated on page 68, after recommendation no. 5.20, we added a paragraph about the district and that you all should consider that recommendation.
- Chair Lindsay said creating a district is a long-term process.
- John talked about number 9. We had a short discussion that although GIS is separate funding wise it is not managed and located that way. There is a medium-term strategy of moving that out when your current GIS Program Manager retires. He complimented our GIS manager and program.
- John discussed number 10. There are a number of miscellaneous changes. He pointed out the pages of these changes. Changes were on pages 21 - 23 Parks and Recreation recommendations, they removed the table but recommendations stayed the same. Page 26, we updated the Stakeholder figure. Page 35, Jason asked that we change Facility Plans to Facility Master Plans. Page 50 we added an explanation of the Internship Program, which is what we talked about last meeting. Page 52 we updated that the Distribution and Collection Superintendent is retiring this year. Page 53 we removed taxpayers from Infrastructure Operation and Maintenance funding at Jason's request. We clarified the part-time status of the Landfills position; we talked about that under number 4. On appendix D, continuous improvement, Lora caught another cities name in there; also, we did spend a little time talking about continuous improvement. I gave her a manual from the regional planning agency I work for now. Those are all the changes we made. I have two more, plan to replace on incentives and change in the work chart for Distribution and Collection to be two separate people.
- Councilor Roler asked for the rationale behind the 5.1 and 5.2 on page 21. He is not sure what committee he is talking about.
- John said we discussed both of those on page 61. Julie was the parks and recreation team member and met with some of those people. They felt the three committees could do a better job of communicating.
- Councilor Lovelace is on several committees and shares input on what the other committees are doing. There are certain projects they can help each other with if they knew what each committee was doing.
- Chair Lindsay stated better communication is a good thing. There needs to be discussion on how to achieve that.
- Councilor Roler asked about what kind of revisions are you looking at for the Parks and Advisory Board.
- John stated that he suspects it was about implementing the plan.
- Councilor Lovelace said there was some frustration of the Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Master Plan feeling as if they were in a holding pattern.
- John said you had a good plan and the project kept going but not everything else.
- Lora talked about the jail funding and having a funding freeze. Lottery funds from the state will help with Riverside projects.

- Jay asked John to discuss recommendations things to consider with the Charter with the Parks Advisory Board.
- John said he would clarify that.
- Chair Lindsay thanked John for his time.
- Member Scheinberg asked Lora and Jason if this would benefit their departments.
- Lora stated that it is different for Parks to be with CD. When they went through the last round of interviews for Principal Planners, two of these planners thought this was very unique and the beginning of something that should work very well. They had been in locations where Parks was with Public Works and it had failed. She is excited and would advocate keeping Parks the way it is now. In the future, we may need a Parks District.
- Member Lovelace said a Parks District would be good if we collaborated with the County.
- Lora said with the engineering aspects, are we just going to divide the existing staff we have or does that mean two or three new FTS's. She is cautious about doing that divide. She does think it is important for her to keep the new development part of it with customer services. Under GIS, Lora has seen programs where GIS failed. It failed in the County once they took it away from Planning. She would advocate that it stays in the Planning Departments. She is concerned about how much we are shoving Jason's way.
- There was discussion on can this all be done and is this best for Grants Pass.
- Jason stated that should be centered around the people. He said they need engineering support. The bulk of the work getting done in the field are our projects that are being run, we need to have a say, we need to have a little more control. We are a small city but we are at a point where we are starting to outgrow that. We want to maintain that small city feel but we are getting a little too big for that. We need to start thinking about how we deliver those services. Parks can fit in several places. He would not advocate moving that, but that is just his opinion. Property Management is what we do in Public Works so right now it fits pretty well where it is. If you look at bringing in Public Safety, he thinks the way we currently do it would have to change.
- Chair Lindsay said timing is an important part of this. Succession planning is important and you want to develop people for these positions.
- There was discussion on trying to fill higher levels positions in this area.
- Councilor Riker stated that he appreciated hearing about this committee's opinions on Recreation NW.
- Lora stated that Molly and Alison are worth their weight in gold.
- Member Scheinberg stated he understood that Jason and Lora would recommend keeping things the way they were.
- Jason said we need to evaluate how we deal with engineering.
- Lora stated they could split the team. She stated if they did split, she would still rely heavily on a contract engineer.
- Jason agreed and said he would need to have a contract engineer as well.
- There was discussion on using a contract engineer versus hiring an engineer.

II. New Business –

- Member Roler asked Jay how many new positions we have added to the fiscal year 2018 budget because of Citygate's recommendation.
- Jay stated there were five new positions added to the fiscal year 2018 budget. There was discussion on the recommended positions that were not added in yet. Jay

stated there is a chart in the second draft that suggests when we should consider taking action on these positions.

- Member Riker asked about the other chart that explained the phasing transition over three to five years. He asked if this was for the Parks Department.
- Jay stated that this is two years out when we consider the recommendation of the Recreation Superintendent position.
- Member Roler asked what the Municipal Services was.
- Jay stated that was the Parks position.
- Member Lovelace asked when Jeff Nelson was retiring.
- Lora stated it was about two plus years out.
- Chair Lindsay stated this is a time for the entire organization to be facing succession planning. The police department has quite a few top positions that will be retiring in the next two plus years.
- Jason stated this was happening across all departments.
- Member Lovelace asked if we have had any luck in hiring a Planner.
- Lora stated the Associate Planner, Ryan Nolan, is coming on board on Monday. He was the City Recorder in Cave Junction. We are in background for a Principal Planner out of San Benito County. Lora talked about Aaron Anderson, her temporary Assistant Planner. She stated when the budget is finalized she will post that position.

III. Approve Minutes: April 20, 2017

- Committee Member Roler noted an error on page 4, it stated 'Committee Roler asked about how much billing we have done with our contract engineers based on hiring an Engineer. There was discussion about the in-house Engineer versus the group they are using now.' Committee Member Riker was the person who made this statement.
- Corrections were made to member titles.

MOTION/VOTE

Committee Member Roler moved and Member Lovelace seconded motion to approve the minutes from the meetings of April 20, 2017.

The vote resulted as follows: "Ayes": Members, Lindsay, Roler, Riker, Scheinberg, Lovelace and Raul. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. Motion passed.

V. Set next meeting date and agenda - The next meeting will be on June 21, 2017 at 9:00 AM. The Committee is invited to the full presentation of this at the City Council Workshop on July 17, 2017 at 11:45 in the Council Chambers.

Meeting adjourned at 11:04 am

These minutes were prepared by Dianne Phelan, City of Grants Pass Administration.