

## MINUTES

Walla Walla Joint Community Development Agency Board (WWJCDAB) meeting

March 7, 2011 - Walla Walla Joint Community Development offices, 55 East Moore Street

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  
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  
Brent Baldwin, Code Compliance Officer, Walla Walla Joint Community Development Agency  
Shelley Clarke, Permit Technician, Walla Walla Joint Community Development Agency  
Imedia Osorio, Administrative Assistant, Walla Walla Joint Community Development Agency  
Nabiel Shawa, City Manager, City of Walla Walla  
Andy Porter, Union-Bulletin

Nina Hill, County Code Compliance Officer, and Imedia Osorio, Administrative Assistant, new joint agency employees, were introduced.

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

There was no public comment.

Mr. Tompkins moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting; Mr. Barrow seconded; motion was approved with Mr. Clemens abstaining, as he was not present for the February meeting.

### Old Business

#### Employees:

Mr. Glover advised that two new employees - Nina Hill and Imelda Osorio - had been hired, and they were introduced prior to the meeting opening. There is an advertisement out to fill the final building inspector position, which he hopes to have completed by April.

#### City Code Compliance Officer:

There was a review of the matter to date and Chief Fulton's position on having this CCO located at the city in the WWPD. A memo from Mr. Glover dated March 7, 2011 was presented for discussion. As related in the memo, he will accept and implement any decision reached, and has no serious concerns regarding available options. Mr. Clemens asked Mr. Shawa for any input. Mr. Shawa was appreciative of the time Mr. Glover took to review the situation. He can see the merit of Chief Fulton's position. In speaking with some members of the city council, there was a concern expressed that the joint agency is just getting started, and that any changes or modifications probably should be held until those possible changes, and the operations of the joint agency in general, can be reviewed subsequent to the agency being operational for a certain period of time. The new police station facility will be completed later in the year; possibly this topic can be revisited then. He pledged that the city will work with Mr. Glover to make things work. Mr. Tompkins asked who would make the final decision on this point. Mr. Donaldson advised that it would be the county commissioners and city council, pursuant to the intergovernmental agreement that formed the agency, would have to agree to amendments thereto. Mr. Tompkins didn't

feel that the county had a position; rather it was more the city's realm in this instance, but did feel that Mr. Glover as director of the joint agency must have oversight responsibility and not the city by bypassing the director. Mr. Barrow felt that Mr. Glover was indeed in charge of the agency employees, but had a question for Mr. Glover and Mr. Shawa, wondering if there was any reason for the same previous cooperative relationship might not continue to exist between the agency employees and the WWPD. He felt that if it was a matter of access to police records or assistance, he would expect the same level of cooperation. Additionally, he had heard the same thing Mr. Shawa had from some council members, that being that they would like to see the joint agency work as anticipated in the agreement. Mr. Glover felt it can work and would be easy to make work. If the CCO stays in the agency there would need to be some discussion to ensure the position would be as effective as before and anticipated to be now. There was some talk regarding a graffiti task force and other resources being developed. He would be glad to visit with Chief Fulton or any designated member of the WWPD. Access to police records - can that be done remotely? He didn't think so, but wasn't sure. Mr. Barrow doesn't see the CCO's main job as graffiti clean-up; that person's main job is to work with landowners and issue citations as necessary, and asked Mr. Glover if he saw a problem with the agency continuing to supervise the city CCO. Mr. Glover said no, and provided the additional background information that the Blue Mountain Mall issues and graffiti there has caused an increase in the visibility of this aspect of duties. He complimented Mr. Baldwin on his actions in this area, and said Mr. Baldwin was empathetic to the issues and has really tried hard, but the landowner(s) has shown a lack of responsibility. The city has different needs, Mr. Tompkins felt, and if the position in question has to go back to the city that's fine, but need autonomy to have Mr. Glover run the agency. Mr. Clemens expressed the position that the agency had just been put together, and he would hate to see it start separating. He would be interested in hearing the position of the city council members, but feel that whatever needs to be done to make it work should be done. In that the city's process is different from that of the county's, he asked if there was a way to align the processes of the two entities. Mr. Glover thought that could be done. There are different needs, and the CCO would have different roles. He said he would hate to do a huge rewrite of everything now, but rather would like to have everyone work together and in six months look at where things are and see what code rewrites are needed. There would be changes in code to match what is being done. So - yes, it can be done, but he would like to wait and see what is working and what needs to be changed. Mr. Barrow asked if there were any impediments foreseen if the agency continues to manage the CCO position. Mr. Shawa said no. Citizens still can and do complain to city hall, and if it comes to his desk, he forwards it to Mr. Glover. The Blue Mountain Mall or private problems are transmitted to Mr. Glover. Maybe there is some direct communication between staff as part of a cooperative working relationship, but otherwise, it goes to the director. Mr. Glover said that works well, just so long as he continues to be kept in the loop. It was generally acknowledged that the Blue Mountain Mall is an exceptional case. Mr. Shawa added that if the CCO need assistance and Mr. Glover concurs, it should happen; it does not need to get his approval as city manager. The CCO could go by the WWPD to catch up after checking in at the agency, he mentioned, and Mr. Glover felt that was an excellent idea. Although he had initially been supportive of the chief's proposal, Mr. Barrow said he now believes that it is in the best interest of the joint endeavor to keep the agency doing the job. If there is a problem, take that opportunity to review the situation, but he is in favor of keeping the CCO at the agency. Mr. Tompkins concurred, with Mr. Glover in charge. Mr. Clemens asked that the board be keep posted.

Consensus of board, with no motion made to formalize, is to keep the position at the agency and under Mr. Glover's supervision and responsibility.

Mr. Glover further reported that Mr. Baldwin has been training the new code compliance officer, Nina Hill, which has been a real plus and it has been nice to have that additional assistance and expertise.

The city and county do have different needs, Mr. Tompkins said, but when there are similar or the same codes or interpretation of codes, he felt it was fair to give Mr. Glover the direction to advise the city and county as the work to review both codes begins. There are different forms of government involved, and in some cases although there are codes established in both jurisdictions, they may be enforced in only one. We all abide by the same building code, but can end up with different interpretations, and there can be different philosophies involved. Mr. Barrow felt there can and will be differences; however, all involved can try to ensure even more responsibility jointly to city and county citizens. Mr. Tompkins emphasized that he had no complaints regarding the agency, he just felt that there would be some differences crop up, and care needs to be taken to figure out how to get closer.

Development of policies internal controls, bill payment and credit cards:

Mr. Glover advised he was aiming for mid-year on this, in compliance with Mr. Donaldson's suggestion. For payment of bills, checks require two signatures. He has found that as the agency has no credit history, a delay in obtaining such as occurred, but the accountant can help with this.

Mr. Clemens asked if a log of all changes proposed/needed is being kept; Mr. Glover said yes. Mr. Tompkins suggested maybe also keeping track of all the issues and situations that arose while putting together the joint agency might be beneficial, now and in the future, for the entities involved and the citizens. Others in the state are aware of and watching this joint agency that has come together, and such information could be helpful in a lot of ways.

New Business

Approval of bills and claims:

The first month there were very few bills. This item will be on the April agenda. The accountant did provide a report (copy provided and information briefly reviewed), and someone from the firm will be present for the April board meeting, Mr. Glover reported. Mr. Tompkins asked if the accountant's information could be provided electronically for sharing among the partners and other interested persons. Mr. Glover will request this. A copy of the revised budget was also provided, with current updates on salaries and benefits, etc. It was clarified that no action to approve bills was needed, and that the accountant can provide a list of expenditures if/as needed.

Other/unfinished business

Mr. Tompkins brought up for review the possibility of the board membership being increased from three to five, for quorum purposes, etc., with the make-up being two members appointed by the county (one commissioner and one other), two members appointed by the city, and one at-large member. Currently if two members have to be done there isn't a quorum, or if two members talk, it is a quorum. There would be no fiscal impact. Mr. Barrow said that he would bring this up at the council meeting Wednesday night and discuss this with Mr. Shawa; it makes sense to him. It would be a revision to the agreement. Mr. Donaldson thought he and Mr. Nolte could work something out if the council is amenable.

Mr. Glover advised that he met with the county commissioners regarding items staff had identified in the Comprehensive Plan that need amending, minor, technical corrections. A list has been compiled. He asked how to process these in the annual cycle - the county will prepare a letter to go to Mr. Glover, and then to the city. Mr. Donaldson thought it was not the city's expectation to veto; city's permission is not needed. Mr. Nolte indicated that these are not county-sponsored items, but rather technical changes (to maps and to correct typos); however, in looking at 8.3 of the intergovernmental agreement it would appear that the county would have to get permission. Mr. Donaldson suggested the county send a letter to Mr. Shawa for a quick turnaround; he didn't think that was the intent of the agreement language, but it will be worked on to make clear. Consensus to proceed; no intent to hold up.

Mr. Glover had another point, that being the agency processing of public works and fire permits. There may be a need to sit down with attorneys; concern is that in the past, Development Services staff has processed these permits. Now with the new organization and new staff, there's a question on how to handle, and this is not covered in the agreement. Mr. Tompkins asked what the fire permits covered; Ms. Clarke answered that it was for fire sprinkling, fire alarms, etc. Mr. Glover said so far processing is taking place as it did in the past, but will mean a change to the way business is being done or a change to the agreement and the city would have to fill in that gap. In the county for public works permits those are obtained from the Public Works Department. Mr. Tompkins asked how fireworks are handled, and Mr. Glover said those would be done at the agency, under the burn control officer. Mr. Barrow agreed there was a need to discuss, but felt there was still the goal of "one-stop shopping". Staff brought this up, Mr. Glover said, and he didn't feel people should be going all over the department. There would need to be a person paid for this, or have someone at the front desk to handle. In one day the revenue that came in totaled \$27,000; \$24,000 of that was public works-related. In February, \$324,000 came in, with \$100,000 of that building and land use permits, so that means over \$200,000 in work not related to the agreement. Mr. McCarty had information that in years 2008, 2009, and 2010, 52-54% of revenue came in from public works activities. That was part of the city's cost and part of the consideration for sharing. There were three permit techs then, though, and now there's one, Mr. Glover mentioned. More discussion and review is needed. The board asked that a recommendation be brought back for further consideration.

No unfinished business.

#### Director's Update

A written update was provided in advance of the meeting, and copies were also passed around. Mr. Glover is looking ahead to reporting needs. There will be one prepared related to the joint agency, and his idea at this time is to share that with the city and county jointly, then if either entity requests more detail, that can be provided. Forms are being adjusted to reflect joint agency ownership, and Mr. Glover noted there is one "How Did We Do" to use in case of any issues.

#### Next meeting

The next regular meeting will be April 4, 2011.

As there was no other business, Mr. Tompkins moved to adjourn and Mr. Barrow seconded; motion approved. Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

APPROVED April 4, 2011

---

Bill Clemens, Chair