

[Speaker 10] (0:00 - 0:01)

There we go.

[Speaker 1] (0:03 - 0:32)

Thank you. Stephanie. Welcome everyone to the.

This is really sort of like the October slash November budget audit committee meeting of Thursday, November 7. And I don't think we have to call the role visual role call. We're here.

And thank you all for being here as well. Is there any public comment on non agenda items today? Go ahead.

[Speaker 8] (0:33 - 0:34)

I'm going to try.

[Speaker 10] (0:34 - 0:34)

Yeah.

[Speaker 8] (0:35 - 1:49)

In the state of California, many cities and counties continually violate the Americans with Disabilities Act, making it impossible to access public services. Public safety in Clayton has become a joke as ignoring maintenance of sidewalks and streets makes it increasingly dangerous for mobility challenges. Challenge residents like me to exercise basic civil rights.

I have been battling Clayton's illegal governance for the last 20 years. ADA case, DOT 2020-0141. Instead of complying with DOT requests for resolution, Clayton chooses to support those who create a hostile living environment through harassment, isolation and bullying at 1553 Haviland Place.

Intimidation tactics like recent de facto voter suppression don't work on me, just stiffen my resolve. Thank you.

[Speaker 1] (1:51 - 2:04)

Anybody else? Public comment on non agenda items? No?

Thank you. Okay, we'll move on to item number three. Of course.

[Speaker 2] (2:04 - 2:17)

So nothing related to your comment, but going forward, special meetings don't require public comment on non agenda items. So we should strike that from all special meetings, for all agendas, for all special meetings.

[Speaker 4] (2:19 - 2:20)

Okay, we'll talk later.

[Speaker 1] (2:22 - 2:30)

Okay, item number three, discussion of RFPs in the public purchase portal. Assistant City Manager Regina Rubier, please.

[Speaker 3] (2:30 - 3:25)

So we had four RFPs recently out. One was for investment management and advisory services. One was for the on-call community development and code enforcement services.

One was for the finance and human resources services. And one was an invitation for bid for the utility transport and search and rescue vehicle. So the investment management services RFP received no bids.

So we will continue to follow the city's purchasing policy and work with UBS on what we discussed at the September 10th meeting, Budget and Audit Committee meeting. James Dillon and I met yesterday, and we went over both of your questions that you had at that meeting. And James is preparing a presentation for a future meeting, hopefully in December.

[Speaker 1] (3:25 - 3:34)

Okay, so a question around that. So to continue as is, or to transition to managed services?

[Speaker 3] (3:34 - 3:41)

To transition to the management services that we talked about at the September 10th meeting.

[Speaker 1] (3:41 - 3:45)

Okay, and he'll do the presentation at which meeting?

[Speaker 3] (3:46 - 3:52)

We're hoping the December 19th meeting. December 19th. Second meeting.

[Speaker 1] (3:52 - 3:54)

The second meeting, yes. Whichever date that is.

[Speaker 4] (3:56 - 3:58)

The 17th.

[Speaker 1] (3:58 - 4:02)

17th, right. Beth, anything?

[Speaker 2] (4:02 - 4:21)

So can we clarify for for the original proposal at 20 basis points that are calculated volume or magnitude? I think that works out to like 24,000. So at that rate, an RFP isn't required, correct?

[Speaker 4] (4:22 - 4:23)

Correct.

[Speaker 2] (4:23 - 4:24)

Official RFP.

[Speaker 4] (4:24 - 4:25)

Bids, yes.

[Speaker 2] (4:26 - 5:04)

Okay, so given that we've done that, even though I think it is underneath the threshold, I do still think it's important as a council to hear the presentation. So I agree that's a good course of action. But I want to be really clear that the questions that we had were not complex and we weren't like seeking other proposals.

We were really looking for clarity and that actual presentation. So hopefully Mr. Hill is able to do that.

[Speaker 4] (5:04 - 5:15)

Yes, and what we've done is referenced with him the questions and concerns from that original meeting so that he can address those when he comes back in December. Okay, sounds good.

[Speaker 1] (5:15 - 5:19)

Okay, and then the next one.

[Speaker 6] (5:19 - 5:26)

I have a question. This is the first that I've heard of a transport search and rescue vehicle. What budget was that in?

[Speaker 7] (5:27 - 5:28)

Well, we're not there yet.

[Speaker 1] (5:29 - 5:31)

We're not there yet. Yeah, we're still doing UBS.

[Speaker 3] (5:38 - 6:12)

So item 3b is the on-call community development and co-enforcement services. We received three bids on that. One was from Urban 37, one was from CSG, and the third one was from Four Leaf.

The city manager and I are evaluating those proposals and depending on how we move forward, if we do a staff augmentation or if we look into staffing the staff, the community

development staff through contractual work. So we're working through that.

[Speaker 1] (6:12 - 6:19)

And just one thing on that is that community development and co-enforcement, it could be or.

[Speaker 3] (6:19 - 6:34)

It is definitely or. And we wrote the RFP so that firm one could do the community development and firm two could do the co-enforcement. Or if we like one firm for both, they could do both.

Got it.

[Speaker 1] (6:35 - 6:36)

Were you ready to say something?

[Speaker 3] (6:37 - 7:16)

No. Okay. Item 3c is the finance and human resources services.

As we know, when Adam was here, he brought on much more than consulting to come and do this type of work as the bridge to get staff on board. We've exceeded that term of the \$30,000. So we went out for an RFP for the service and there was only one response and that was much more.

And at this point, based on what happens this afternoon, I think it might be our recommendation to put that RFP on hold at this point.

[Speaker 1] (7:16 - 7:18)

And LC's last day was October 31st.

[Speaker 3] (7:19 - 7:19)

Correct.

[Speaker 1] (7:20 - 7:24)

Who was our much more than consulting employee. Yes.

[Speaker 3] (7:24 - 8:27)

Item 3d, the utility transport and search rescue vehicle with related accessories is part of the SSHGAP grant, the state homeland security grant. That is actually a FEMA grant that's been transferred over to Cal OES, which has been transferred over to Contra Costa Sheriff's Office. And we have to work very, very closely with the Sheriff's Office on the bid, on the whole procurement process.

And the Sheriff's Office just this morning gave us the okay to move forward that we have satisfied the bid requirements. We have satisfied all the procurement rules. The vendor that we

have selected is in the SAM government portal.

You have to be registered federal vendor. And so we are ready to go and move forward with that. There's zero dollars out of city of Clayton's pocket for this utility vehicle that will help our police department if they have to go and make a rescue on the trails.

Excellent.

[Speaker 1] (8:27 - 8:31)

And this was like around 65,000. Okay.

[Speaker 3] (8:31 - 8:31)

Great.

[Speaker 2] (8:32 - 8:37)

This is 100%.

[Speaker 3] (8:37 - 8:47)

This was already approved by council quite a while ago. And this is just an update on that. We are able to move forward.

[Speaker 2] (8:54 - 8:58)

Can you give a one sentence description of this vehicle?

[Speaker 3] (8:59 - 9:01)

A side-by-side off-road vehicle.

[Speaker 2] (9:02 - 9:12)

Okay. Where's it going to be kept? So the purchase of the vehicle is covered by the grant, but the ongoing maintenance, what's the projection of that?

[Speaker 3] (9:13 - 9:25)

That I don't think has been discussed. I believe that a trailer is coming with this vehicle. So you can drive it around.

Okay. Okay.

[Speaker 2] (9:26 - 9:27)

Is that the only updates you have?

[Speaker 3] (9:27 - 9:30)

The only updates on the RFPs.

[Speaker 6] (9:32 - 9:35)

So it's not a pickup truck. It's a side-by-side?

[Speaker 3] (9:35 - 9:38)

It is a side-by-side. It's an off-road vehicle.

[Speaker 6] (9:39 - 9:42)

Kind of like an ATV. Okay.

[Speaker 3] (9:42 - 9:43)

It's a big ATV.

[Speaker 6] (9:43 - 9:49)

So they're going to put, it's 100% paid for. Right. So they're not going to put the lights on top?

[Speaker 3] (9:49 - 10:04)

That's all part of the grant. Yes. They're going to put a radio in it?

I don't know about the radio. MDT? I don't know that it's going to require the MDT.

Probably not the computer, but communications, yes.

[Speaker 6] (10:04 - 10:11)

All right. I just never heard of one 100% funded. Usually the city has to put it in there.

Yeah. That's great.

[Speaker 3] (10:12 - 10:13)

This is state homeland security grant.

[Speaker 1] (10:16 - 10:42)

Okay. Excellent. All righty.

Item number four, adopt a resolution authorizing revisions to the full-time administrative assisting classification, addition of full-time classifications for senior management, analyst, senior planner, recreation coordinator, part-time classification of rec leader, and related specs. I don't have to read the whole thing.

[Speaker 2] (10:43 - 11:02)

So I would just, before we start, I would say, I think that you phrased this in a way that it would be lifted onto the actual city council agenda, but we shouldn't do that because we, as a subcommittee, are not, we are not charged with or empowered. I understand that's the same thing.

[Speaker 1] (11:02 - 11:02)

Yeah.

[Speaker 2] (11:03 - 11:07)

So there should be like, yeah, that first one. Yeah. You're right.

[Speaker 1] (11:07 - 11:13)

And even the rest of the document is as if you were addressing the council rather than the committee.

[Speaker 2] (11:13 - 11:19)

So I don't want to give the impression that we are taking action on behalf of the council. Right. Got it.

[Speaker 1] (11:19 - 11:20)

Okay.

[Speaker 2] (11:20 - 11:29)

So if we could actually update the agenda so that if future people are pulling down the agenda, when they look at it, they can, I don't know if it's, we're allowed to update the agenda.

[Speaker 3] (11:29 - 11:30)

I will double check.

[Speaker 2] (11:31 - 11:36)

I don't want that to give that impression in the future. If you look at this a year from now.

[Speaker 4] (11:36 - 11:42)

If we're not, if we're not able to do that, we will reflect it in the minutes though, that request and to make that distinction.

[Speaker 1] (11:44 - 12:38)

No, I thought the same thing. So are you going to pull something up on the screen that we, any of the attachments, like the staff recommendation and go through these position by position? Because I think we do have, or I do have a number of questions.

And maybe even, can you give us, it would be nice to give us a little background, like what's precipitated this and why we're doing this and why we're adding these positions and what's budgeted, what's not budgeted, your recommendation for salary levels, kind of go walk us through the analysis that you did because that's where most of my questions are.

[Speaker 2] (12:38 - 12:59)

Can I interrupt? I would not read through the whole thing because you and I have both read it. So I would summarize very briefly on what the purpose is, because again, it's phrased in a way that it's seeking approval, but I don't think that's what you're doing.

[Speaker 1] (13:02 - 13:15)

I asked her to bring it up and then to give us a summary, like what precipitated this and why are they recommending this? Yeah. Not to read, but I do think for a reference point, if we're able to, I don't know if you're able to share screen.

[Speaker 3] (13:15 - 13:23)

The only thing that I have, Council Member Trippiano, is the staff report. Okay.

[Speaker 1] (13:26 - 13:58)

Be a good starting point, right? Reference point. But give us some of the background.

What precipitated this? Why are you recommending these positions? Some are budgeted, some are not, and how the map all works out as it impacts our budget this year and next.

And if you're not able to share screen. I'm trying to figure this out. I don't know if we need to.

[Speaker 10] (13:58 - 14:00)

Well, no, that's not right.

[Speaker 3] (14:11 - 14:25)

So what we are asking for are four full-time positions, one part-time position, one is for the administrative assistant position, which was budgeted in this current fiscal year.

[Speaker 1] (14:26 - 14:27)

And we currently have a temp.

[Speaker 3] (14:27 - 16:10)

And this is currently supported with a temporary person. We are looking at the possibility of bringing on a full-time recreation coordinator to help with all of the special events. We are looking at bringing on a management analyst.

That was discussed in the budgeting process, but it was in the org chart, but we did not fund it in the budget. Placeholder. Yeah, it was a placeholder there for Chris to come on board, determine what type of staffing is needed for this city.

So it was a placeholder there and it was not budgeted. And then we are looking at bringing on a senior planner. We have two positions currently budgeted for the community development department.

As Chris and I have gotten our feet about us throughout the city in the last few months, we are determining that we don't necessarily need a two full-time people in the planning department that we're just needing the one person in the planning department. And then we have a part-time recreation leader. It's currently in this budget and this position will go and help open and close event halls, whether it's Endeavor Hall, Weyer Hall, they'll help facilitate park rentals, those types of things.

Mm-hmm. We've done a class and comp study on all five of these positions. We've used the same agencies that the Police Officers Association used.

[Speaker 1] (16:10 - 16:11)
Who's that?

[Speaker 3] (16:14 - 16:15)
Let me.

[Speaker 1] (16:16 - 16:17)
If you have time.

[Speaker 4] (16:17 - 16:22)
It's the city of Dublin, East Bay Regional Park. Oh, the cities.

[Speaker 1] (16:22 - 16:25)
I thought you said an agency that the POA uses. Got it.

[Speaker 3] (16:26 - 16:56)
The same agencies that the Police Officers Association uses. We took the high and the low. We came up with an average and we went with the median salaries.

We have a 5% salary adjustment in between the five steps that the city offers. And that's how we came up with the recommendations for these salary positions.

[Speaker 10] (16:57 - 16:57)
Okay.

[Speaker 4] (16:58 - 17:16)
A little bit of background. I'll talk about this. The senior planner that we are proposing, as you know, we have been using a contract planning services company.

I have been here for two months. I'm on my third director.

[Speaker 1] (17:16 - 17:20)
Not contract planning, community development, right?

[Speaker 4] (17:20 - 18:10)

Yes, they're doing both jobs. They're doing both jobs. It is not working well.

We are struggling. We are falling behind on some significant projects. We have had some difficulties with typical planning duties like plan reviews.

There are some definite challenges. There is no guarantee that even moving companies, we get stability in that position, which is just going to further hinder what we're trying to accomplish, both for our community members and our developers. One of the things that we looked at is we understand that there's no need for a director and a planner.

There's not enough work to support that.

[Speaker 10] (18:10 - 18:10)

Right.

[Speaker 4] (18:11 - 20:06)

Kind of combining both of those into a senior position, a senior planner, one step below a director or a manager for the work that we need to accomplish, we can do that. And then if there's ever a time that there's a need to augment because of a large project, because of general plan update and review, we can always look at augmenting with a contractor to help with those services if needed. But we'll address those one off as they come about.

But this provides us stability for the full-time person, whereas with our contract person, they're here 16 hours a week versus 40 hours a week. So those are some of the complications that we've seen over the last couple of months. And this is not a shock to either of you.

We've had these discussions of what our challenges have been with that position specifically. The recreation coordinator position, as mentioned, to help with the events, the concerts, our shows, all of those things. And if there's a desire to expand to have that person available to do that.

But also being that central person for all of our park and facility rentals. Right now, it's kind of a catch as catch can. Stephanie's doing that as an ancillary duty.

We have spoken on the weekend that is not going well. Things are slipping. And so having dedicated staff and having that part-time staff to go out and actually facilitate those rentals.

Because right now what we're doing is we're burdening our maintenance staff. We're paying them overtime to come back on a Saturday to open the building when we can just have part-time staff, which is typical practice of other agencies. It's having part-time staff to take care of those rentals and be available on days when we have events and activities that they can

assist.

[Speaker 1] (20:08 - 20:19)

And we did have somebody doing that for years, if I understand right. But that person is no longer in our employment, correct?

[Speaker 3] (20:19 - 20:21)

She only will handle Endeavor Hall.

[Speaker 1] (20:22 - 20:23)

Only Endeavor Hall.

[Speaker 3] (20:23 - 20:28)

And for the longest time, she wasn't even available to help with that. Right.

[Speaker 4] (20:29 - 20:29)

So.

[Speaker 1] (20:29 - 20:30)

Okay.

[Speaker 4] (20:30 - 21:31)

I'm trying to streamline and kind of make it a little more efficient. And make sure that, you know. One of my big priorities is when people come and they, when they're threatening Endeavor Hall, that they get what they want.

They get what they pay for. They get what they expected. And that's not happening at this level because, again, they're ancillary duties at the maintenance level and at the coordination level.

And we have to fine-tune how we're going to operate that so that we are efficient and effective. And then the management analyst is, you know, as roles changed when the interim city manager was here, you know, talking about having that management analyst person. I always refer to that as the Swiss Army knife.

That can back up Regina, back up Stephanie. We have nobody to look at grant opportunities. And if we were to achieve and be successful in a grant application and award, there's not staff to do the reporting, the financials, all of the things that need to be done.

[Speaker 1] (21:31 - 21:34)

Which is often more important than applying for the grant.

[Speaker 4] (21:35 - 21:48)

And so having somebody that can, as part of their regular duties, do that. But also take on the

role of our HR piece. We don't have a designated HR staff person what we're talking about.

[Speaker 1] (21:48 - 21:51)

And I thought that was Regina. It is.

[Speaker 3] (21:51 - 22:02)

From a management perspective, from the high level stuff. But if the new employee that needs to fill out their insurance information. Be right.

Yeah.

[Speaker 4] (22:02 - 22:38)

And that person, again, you know, other agencies have an analyst in HR that just does HR. This is somebody, again, just like most of our employees that are going to have one, two, three assignments to help and cover in different and various areas. I mean, we just don't have, we don't have the finances.

And we don't have the need to have full-time people in singular job categories. So that's why we have this, I call it the umbrella effect, right? You've got to kind of cover everything with a smaller staff.

[Speaker 1] (22:39 - 23:59)

Okay. I have a number of questions, but do you want to start? Okay.

And sorry that, you know, normally I might try to send these to you ahead of time. It just was one of those days where it wasn't happening. So the administrative assistant classifications, and I'm, this is a reference piece from our June 4th budget meeting when we approved the budget.

We had, it was called office assistant. And the range on that at that time was, and I've got it here in my notes, 55 to 66,000 a year. And so I think one thing I want to just say generally, I understand the cities that you use as a comparative analysis.

But I think we really have to look at workload. And so, you know, to put like a Dublin in there versus a Clayton, you know, we're more like an Orinda or a Moraga or a smaller city. And so now the range is 70,000 to 85 something.

[Speaker 3] (23:59 - 24:00)

87.

[Speaker 1] (24:00 - 24:01)

87.

[Speaker 3] (24:01 - 24:02)

What was it before?

[Speaker 1] (24:02 - 24:03)

It was 55.

[Speaker 3] (24:03 - 24:07)

The office assistant, it was, is different than the administrative assistant.

[Speaker 1] (24:07 - 24:11)

Well, that's what I wanted to ask. Who has the job description in that position?

[Speaker 3] (24:11 - 24:12)

55 to what?

[Speaker 1] (24:12 - 24:27)

66. And cities like Moraga are at 62 when you use the analysis. Lafayette at 60, Moraga at 62, Orinda at 62.

So I just thought, why are we going in so much higher?

[Speaker 3] (24:28 - 24:40)

We, well, we had two positions in the budget and one was the office assistant and one was the administrative assistant. And where we came in with this is the administrative assistant.

[Speaker 1] (24:40 - 24:46)

I just pulled this one June 4th. Because I don't see the rec leader either in there.

[Speaker 3] (24:46 - 24:52)

Yeah, this is not. That was part of our budget. This is, this is not correct.

[Speaker 1] (24:52 - 24:52)

Okay.

[Speaker 2] (24:53 - 24:56)

That's what was, that's the table that we approved. Okay.

[Speaker 1] (24:56 - 24:58)

In the June 4th budget.

[Speaker 2] (24:58 - 24:58)

Okay.

[Speaker 1] (25:00 - 25:03)

So maybe we need an updated table.

[Speaker 2] (25:03 - 25:26)

Well, no, I mean, we can't update the table. The tables all have to be approved. Well, that's what we're asking for here is to update this.

But what I'm saying is when you're saying that it's not correct, that there's no rec leader, I would disagree because it is because that's what we approved. So there is no rec leader. So with the status quo, it doesn't exist.

If we want to add it, we can do that.

[Speaker 3] (25:28 - 25:41)

But so that baseline, that's, that's what we're adding here are the administrative assistant and the recreation leader. We did not add it here, but we did put the money in the budget to cover it.

[Speaker 1] (25:41 - 25:44)

Okay. And that I couldn't find.

[Speaker 3] (25:44 - 25:44)

Okay.

[Speaker 1] (25:44 - 26:19)

So, yeah, that's, I looked and I looked and then I was like, well, maybe it should be on this table. And then it's not on this table. So, and the salaries, when I looked at the budget, it, it's like kind of one number.

And so I, you know, I see it in your analysis, but I didn't see it in that budget. And so is the, is the job description for administrative assistant different than this office assistant? Yes, because they were 2 different kind of like 70 to 87.

[Speaker 3] (26:19 - 26:45)

Yeah, there's 2 different positions. There's the administrative assistant, which is a high level. It's to help backup.

Stephanie, the office assistant is a very entry level. Part time receptionist position. The office assistant is what.

I'm sorry, because I wasn't here. It was the part time position that I believe Gonzalo was doing.

[Speaker 2] (26:45 - 26:46)

So are we killing that position?

[Speaker 3] (26:47 - 26:48)

Yes.

[Speaker 2] (26:48 - 26:49)

Okay.

[Speaker 9] (26:49 - 26:53)

He also was the code enforcement person. He did 2 jobs.

[Speaker 10] (26:53 - 26:53)

Yeah.

[Speaker 2] (26:53 - 27:13)

I mean, that represents a 28% increase. That's, that's fairly significant, I would say. Um, so I, I don't know if it's, uh, I'm not commenting on whether or not that's like a good number.

I just, it strikes me as it's a significant increase. So I don't, I don't know.

[Speaker 1] (27:14 - 27:25)

And also when the Lafayette is 16 or August 62 or into 62, you use those as a comparison. Why would we be even much higher than that?

[Speaker 4] (27:26 - 28:11)

Because it's an average of the comparable. One of the issues when you get into looking at job descriptions and salary ratings is what cities you're comping jobs to. So last year when he did the POA and did the contract, these were the cities that were the comparables.

You can't just pick and choose depending on the job. Cities typically will adopt. These are our cities for specific reasons like you're talking about and you're right on track.

The size, budget, staff number, all of those kinds of things that kind of fit in. But we've established kind of this last year, we just did it this way. So that's why it was done this way.

[Speaker 2] (28:12 - 28:53)

Yeah, I would say that when we looked at the POA, it wasn't necessarily to say that we are pegging ourselves to those cities. It was a data point that gave us like a reference point. And then we independently made the decision to say that we felt that we were too low.

And so we wanted to move up. We didn't really know how much we wanted to move up. So we use those references as a data point.

But it wasn't a pegging. And then I would also say pegging to the POA, even if that were the case, I wouldn't take the same approach for the non-POA staff.

[Speaker 8] (28:53 - 28:54)

It's workload.

[Speaker 2] (28:54 - 28:56)

I think the pegging are different.

[Speaker 6] (28:58 - 29:03)

Workload, yeah. Okay, I'll ask you a question because you're talking about something that is wrong.

[Speaker 2] (29:04 - 29:27)

So that being said, I know that these are just ranges. But I can't really point to a lot of evidence, but they feel high. So I don't know what there is to do about that at this point.

But they do seem like non-applicable.

[Speaker 1] (29:28 - 29:44)

Well, in workload, that's what I was thinking. It should be more based on workload, not on averages. And so I'm thinking our workload is probably similar to an Orinda or a Moraga or a Lafayette based on.

[Speaker 4] (29:44 - 29:58)

I don't think that's a fair analysis to say workload because none of us at this table know what their workload is. Now, if you want to hinge it to population, size of community, budget, yes.

[Speaker 2] (29:58 - 29:59)

Those are objective criteria.

[Speaker 4] (29:59 - 30:05)

Absolutely, absolutely. But to say workload, I don't know what the analytics are for that.

[Speaker 1] (30:05 - 30:14)

Based on population, based on, that's what I'm saying. And I think some of the others are, I don't know. It's an unfair comparison, I think.

[Speaker 3] (30:14 - 30:49)

When these are done, what we do is we look at the job description. And we have to make sure that at least 80% of that job description compares to what our job description is. And that's how they are considered comparable agencies.

If you look at some of the other positions that we have here, you will see that not all agencies are listed because they don't have comparable positions. OK.

[Speaker 1] (30:49 - 30:53)

It just feels very high to me. I'm not going to. So that was.

[Speaker 2] (30:54 - 31:49)

Yeah, I guess as another reference, I think from the highest to the lowest on the upper end on these comparables, there's like a 24% delta. So clearly there's opportunity to kind of stake your own land on where you think it should fall. And I think we need to base it on something.

I don't know what it is, but it makes sense to base it on something objective. But it's not controlling. It's really a data point.

Like we could say we want to base it on, we want to do our comparables based on, let's say, population. But whatever that happens to yield, it doesn't mean that's what we have to pick. We can pick something else, you know, if we so choose.

But then it's a balance between can you acquire talent at that rate, right? So.

[Speaker 1] (31:49 - 32:04)

And then your recommendation for this position is what? What is the salary? Are we talking about the range today?

Are we talking about because you've obviously budgeted an amount, correct?

[Speaker 3] (32:04 - 32:33)

And the amount that we budgeted for the administrative assistant position falls in within this range, which is. And we budgeted approximately \$77,000 for this budget, for this position, and the range is in step A is \$70,560 with a high of \$87,305.

[Speaker 1] (32:33 - 32:37)

But so you're recommending \$77,000.

[Speaker 3] (32:37 - 32:39)

So that's what we have budgeted for.

[Speaker 1] (32:42 - 32:47)

Oh, that's what you're saying. It's already in the budget. Budgeted for.

It's already in the budget.

[Speaker 3] (32:47 - 32:47)

Yes.

[Speaker 1] (32:48 - 33:00)

And that's why I, all right, I looked, I couldn't find it anywhere yesterday. So I might have to go back and look again at the budget because, again, I brought up this table.

[Speaker 3] (33:01 - 33:19)

Yeah, right. Those were the positions that were available at the time the budget was put into place. But there were dollars in the budget that we also included for exactly what we're doing right now.

[Speaker 1] (33:19 - 33:23)

So I could find \$77,000 somewhere in that budget that we approved?

[Speaker 3] (33:23 - 33:34)

You won't find it there. It's in the spreadsheets that I was using behind the scenes to create that spreadsheet that we were working from.

[Speaker 4] (33:34 - 33:48)

And the recommendation for me moving forward with the budget process is delineating the positions and the accounting associated with positions as part of the budget.

[Speaker 2] (33:48 - 33:51)

Well, I mean, you have that already. It's just the supporting schedules, right?

[Speaker 4] (33:51 - 34:03)

Right. But that's what I'm talking about. Yes.

But to make that part of the public process. Yeah. And so that document is searchable, let's put it that way.

OK.

[Speaker 1] (34:04 - 34:25)

OK. And then for the senior management analyst position, I just wanted to understand what that person, and I looked at the job description, how it would be different than what you're doing as our assistant city manager. Is it supportive to your position?

[Speaker 3] (34:26 - 35:32)

It's very supportive to my position. It would be, it's going to do several things. It's not only going to support me, it will support Chris, it will support Jennifer when she's on vacation.

This person will have that skill set to help with the accounting, with payroll. Since I've been here, Jennifer has done payroll twice while she's on vacation. And that's not fair to an employee.

Right. It will help Stephanie if she needs some clerking, some high-level clerking abilities. This person will be able to do all of those things.

They will be responsible for contract management. They will be a very supportive role in the HR realm. I will still handle the majority of HR, but the more simple, the more daily task type things, just pushing workers' comp paperwork through.

Do you really want to be paying me my wages to be doing that?

[Speaker 1] (35:32 - 35:32)
No.

[Speaker 3] (35:34 - 35:36)
So that's what this position will be.

[Speaker 1] (35:37 - 35:43)
Okay. And do you have any questions about that position?

[Speaker 2] (35:46 - 35:49)
No, I was still on the administrative assistant.

[Speaker 1] (35:49 - 35:51)
Oh, okay. Go ahead.

[Speaker 2] (35:51 - 36:08)
I mean, again, the reason why I think it's high, I guess, because on the requirements, it's a high school degree and one year of work experience. And they're topping out at \$87,000. That seems pretty high.

That's why, I mean, I don't have anything to base it on. So I have no objective criteria.

[Speaker 4] (36:10 - 36:22)
And frankly, that's why we're here, is to have that discussion. And if you guys are, I think, then we can talk about what you feel a range is appropriate.

[Speaker 2] (36:22 - 36:28)
And yeah, I think, okay. So I have some comments at the end, like general stuff, but you have other specific.

[Speaker 1] (36:28 - 37:38)
Yeah, I'm on several of the other positions. So do you want to, we'll go through the positions. Okay.

So, and we'll circle back on that. So the recreation coordinator, which sounds like, when I look at the duties, should really, is almost like a special, I think we were calling it a special event manager at one point. And now it's not a manager, it's a coordinator, but the hourly position is the leader.

I think that's a little bit confusing to call the coordinator. Anyway, that's my, just one of my takes. But so I didn't see.

So, and I don't want to get into the org chart yet, because I do have some questions. But let me ask you this, would the leader, which is the hourly position, is not reporting to the coordinator? Yes, it is.

It's not on the org chart. Okay. Yeah, yeah.

Okay. Or I think in somewhere in your description, you said that the leader is going to report to the clerk.

[Speaker 3] (37:38 - 37:44)

I thought that yesterday evening. Okay. There's missing a comma.

That's where I got confused. Yeah.

[Speaker 1] (37:44 - 37:54)

So the coordinator, which is kind of like, I'm going to just say the special event manager, is reporting to.

[Speaker 3] (37:55 - 38:00)

Probably the management analyst is who that person would report to.

[Speaker 1] (38:00 - 38:05)

So the management analyst who does contracts, aid children, and workers comp.

[Speaker 3] (38:05 - 38:41)

Yeah. And accounting. Because there's going to be a lot of contracts with that events coordinator.

With the management of the concerts in the Grove, with the management of the different facilities. With the collection of funds from the facilities. There's a lot of finance, financial pieces, insurance requirements.

There's a lot of financial pieces involved with that.

[Speaker 1] (38:42 - 39:10)

And is there any reason we're calling that a coordinator? Because again, the salary range is \$75,000 to \$91,000. And your recommendation on this position.

Oh, and just going back to senior management analyst. Your recommendation on salary was, can you just give that to me directly? Do you have that by position?

I know the range is 123 to 150.

[Speaker 4] (39:13 - 39:15)
120 to 158.

[Speaker 1] (39:16 - 39:22)
128. And your recommendation for that?

[Speaker 3] (39:22 - 39:27)
That is the recommendation. That's the range and then there's 5 steps.

[Speaker 1] (39:30 - 39:31)
Go ahead.

[Speaker 4] (39:31 - 39:34)
I was going to say what you're talking about analysts.

[Speaker 1] (39:34 - 39:37)
Just going back to management. I just want to make sure.

[Speaker 3] (39:38 - 39:46)
So there's the 5 steps. Step A is 128,691. Step B is 136.

[Speaker 1] (39:46 - 39:51)
But in your analysis, you must have a figure in mind, right? You don't have a range.

[Speaker 3] (39:52 - 39:56)
Yes, mid-range. We're looking at mid-range.

[Speaker 1] (39:59 - 40:05)
Okay, and then same with recreation coordinator. What range is that?

[Speaker 4] (40:05 - 40:06)
75 to 91.

[Speaker 1] (40:07 - 40:11)
No, no, no, what you're recommending. Mid-range. Mid-range, see.

[Speaker 4] (40:11 - 40:12)

All of them are mid-range.

[Speaker 1] (40:13 - 40:23)

Oh, they're all mid-range. They're all budgeted. That helps, thank you.

And then, of course, those that are not budgeted.

[Speaker 2] (40:23 - 40:53)

So the rec coordinator is 75 to 91 on the range. So that's like 5 over 7, like 8%, 7% higher than the administrative assistant. On the ranges, both ends.

But that one requires a 4-year degree plus like 2 to 3 years work experience. You see how like there's not very much of a gap between them. That's why I think I'm still on the administrative.

I get it. I understand. So anyways, that's just commentary.

[Speaker 1] (40:56 - 41:26)

Okay, and then you're saying that we budgeted moving on to recreation leader, which I think we used to call facilities attendance, right? As the hourly position. And you're saying it was budgeted already?

It was budgeted. At an hourly rate or? At an hourly rate, yes.

Okay, which was, do we know offhand? It was roughly 40,000 that we budgeted. Okay, and again, this person will report to the coordinator.

[Speaker 4] (41:26 - 41:27)

Yes.

[Speaker 1] (41:27 - 41:29)

And not to city clerk.

[Speaker 4] (41:29 - 41:48)

Okay, that was the other question. It's important to remember with the part-time rec leader position. Those costs will be passed on to the user.

So that'll be part of the master fee update to pay for staff to open and close. Do all of those things. Okay, so it's not just a full hit to the GF.

[Speaker 1] (41:49 - 41:51)

And are we updating master fees again?

[Speaker 4] (41:52 - 41:52)

We will, yes.

[Speaker 1] (41:53 - 41:53)

Yeah, we will.

[Speaker 4] (41:53 - 42:01)

Okay, my recommendation is to do it all during the budget process. So that annually during the budget, we're doing master fee. We're doing every day at one time.

[Speaker 1] (42:02 - 42:10)

Because the master fees now are in effect for one year. So we're not going to do it again until next year?

[Speaker 3] (42:10 - 42:12)

Until fiscal year 25.

[Speaker 2] (42:12 - 42:18)

I think Chris is suggesting that we do it in the June 2025 time frame to be effective. Correct.

[Speaker 1] (42:18 - 42:19)

I said next year.

[Speaker 2] (42:19 - 42:23)

Yeah, to be effective by whatever month. It takes like three months.

[Speaker 1] (42:23 - 43:08)

And then recreation leader, I think that was my only other question. And then maybe you can walk us through. We're reallocating community development director and assistant planner, which we also budgeted for.

Oh, I know that I did have one other question too. Before we, Jeff may have some questions. And then I know I have some questions on the org chart.

The 150,000 that you had budgeted for consultants. Does that include much more or temporary services? Say for Lauren, who Shane, I think is doing some HR and four lead.

That seemed low.

[Speaker 3] (43:09 - 43:12)

Actually, just for Lauren.

[Speaker 1] (43:13 - 43:58)

And not much. Okay, but much more. We have spent money since yeah.

Approximately 150 be higher. That's that was my. Because you have that in your table.

And I don't know if Shane in there. Also, you said it included for leaf. Yes, and I'm sorry, I don't even know the company that Lauren works through.

Roth staffing. Okay, that's wrong. Okay, Jeff, do you have.

[Speaker 2] (43:58 - 46:36)

Yeah, for as we go forward. Because this is we're targeting within the 2nd meeting in November, correct. So, what would really help, I think is.

If in as part of the presentation. You do like a before after view of a few things. 1 is.

At the approved budget, the number of and the overturn. Before, so that's the current status quo. With a proposal that is consistent with what you're what you're suggesting here.

So you can see the before after because I think there are. Several moving parts and then there's some puts and takes both ways. And it becomes a little bit easier to follow for discussion.

I think that'd be better. I would also recommend we don't have this yet. But I would also recommend a before after on your chart.

That's a functional return. So, have you, have you seen these before? So, like, it's something like, what are the key duties here?

And you laid them out because really the block of duties that we're talking about. Aren't really changing. We still have to do all the same stuff.

So it's a question of, like, where is it now? And where is it going to be? There could be new duties added, right?

That's possible. And there could be something in a way. But the functional work chart, I think, will really help.

Show the movement. So that'd be my recommendation on that. And then, so all of this would be for after these, right?

I would also recommend. Protecting the cost. Associated with that same thing.

So you have, like, you have FTEs, org, functional org, and cost. Beforehand, after. So that, like,

if you're looking at it, you could just see, like, here's what we have.

And here's what it's like. I think that'll present a much more clearer picture of what it is. I, on the table, on the agenda, which is page 11 of the 37-page document.

I think there's a formula error on the bottom half somewhere. Not really comparing correctly. So it's just an administrative thing.

And then, yeah. And a lot of the functional stuff. I mean, it's not, like, super detailed.

But you could pull a lot of it from the job descriptions, I think.

[Speaker 4] (46:37 - 46:41)

That's the hard part, too, is job descriptions are very vanilla and generic.

[Speaker 2] (46:41 - 46:41)

Yeah.

[Speaker 4] (46:42 - 46:44)

Versus what someone's actually doing.

[Speaker 2] (46:44 - 47:08)

That's more important. Yeah. I have the same concerns over the comparables and, like, how we're getting that.

I think it bears, like, a second look to see, like, and the titling also. Like, a rec leader seems really cool. I mean, it is cool.

But we're not really, it's not a leadership position.

[Speaker 10] (47:09 - 47:09)

At all.

[Speaker 2] (47:09 - 47:18)

Right. So I don't want to give the wrong impression. I know.

And the coordinator.

[Speaker 10] (47:18 - 47:18)

Yeah.

[Speaker 4] (47:19 - 47:31)

These are very standard titles in every agency. And, I mean, this is kind of my bread and butter.

This is me.

This is your wheelhouse. It is. And coordinator is the appropriate title.

[Speaker 2] (47:31 - 47:50)

I was a rec coordinator when, as a part-time job over the summer, I coached kids, roller hockey teams and summer camps. So I was a summer camp leader and a rec coordinator. I got paid a very low amount.

Not very much.

[Speaker 4] (47:50 - 47:51)

Yes.

[Speaker 2] (47:51 - 47:52)

A very low amount. It was in the summer.

[Speaker 1] (47:53 - 47:58)

Well, but the coordinator is the salaried position and the leader is the hourly.

[Speaker 4] (47:58 - 48:07)

Yeah. Rec leader is, in every agency, it's either a rec leader or a rec specialist or is the part-time position.

[Speaker 1] (48:07 - 48:12)

I've seen it. We don't want to have a facilities attendant. I didn't say facilities.

[Speaker 4] (48:13 - 48:21)

Your entry lowest level full-time is a recreation coordinator. Right. It's a supervisor, recreation manager, director.

[Speaker 2] (48:22 - 48:34)

So that is what I'm familiar with as well. So whatever. It's not typically like a very, I'm just not going to say anything like that.

[Speaker 1] (48:36 - 49:08)

So the other thing I just want to discuss before we get into the org chart too is basically at these salary levels, adding these new positions, some of which have money budgeted, some of which don't. We're taking out the community development director and the assistant planner. You're saying, I know you've got to maybe do some updating on the consulting costs, but that it's a hit of about \$59,000 to this year's budget.

[Speaker 2] (49:08 - 49:09)

That's favorable.

[Speaker 1] (49:10 - 49:10)

Right.

[Speaker 2] (49:11 - 49:38)

So I'm reading it right? Yes. So you need to have the, sorry, on the tables, it's always better to present, it's always better to present like your legend is credits favorable or unfavorable?

Because when you view it, negatives usually look bad. So if you're going to say negatives are good, that's fine. But just put like favorable in parentheses.

[Speaker 1] (49:38 - 49:51)

Okay. Okay. It does say savings.

It says total net salary savings. But then next year, we're looking at \$127,000. Correct.

Because this is a partial.

[Speaker 2] (49:53 - 49:54)

But that sign is different.

[Speaker 1] (49:55 - 49:55)

Yeah.

[Speaker 2] (49:56 - 49:58)

I think there's different signs.

[Speaker 1] (49:59 - 49:59)

Yeah.

[Speaker 2] (50:00 - 50:04)

And it actually should be zero. So to say.

[Speaker 1] (50:04 - 50:18)

Well, and the \$59,000 isn't really the savings though, right? No. That is, it's not savings.

We're not saving \$59,000. We're adding \$59,000, right? After all is said and done.

[Speaker 3] (50:18 - 50:19)

No, it won't.

[Speaker 1] (50:19 - 50:21)

We're saving \$59,000.

[Speaker 2] (50:21 - 50:23)

It just needs to be clear.

[Speaker 1] (50:23 - 50:26)

Leaving, adding all these positions and taking these two away.

[Speaker 4] (50:26 - 50:37)

Because you're only paying for, we're adding lower paid and getting a little higher paid. Yes. A few months.

Months. Right. This is assuming we hired somebody January 1.

[Speaker 1] (50:37 - 50:46)

And the other thing I was going to say. This is based on an effective start date of what? January 1st?

[Speaker 2] (50:46 - 50:47)

January 1st.

[Speaker 1] (50:47 - 50:47)

Okay.

[Speaker 2] (50:48 - 50:56)

So yeah, so like having the assumption and then the legend will be helpful for people. I would say that blankedly for all tables.

[Speaker 1] (50:58 - 51:49)

And then the last thing I just wanted to talk about was the org chart. And I'm going to put my glasses on. Obviously not.

The print is small. So Regina, your title is actually Assistant City Manager, Administrative Services Director, right? That's what we approved in June.

So I would just recommend updating that. We've already talked about the rec coordinator and leader. So one question I did have is Code Enforcement Officer, who is right now a temp, may still be a temp, is going to report to a potential permanent employee.

There's no conflict there, right? No.

[Speaker 4] (51:51 - 51:53)

You get conflict the other way around.

[Speaker 1] (51:53 - 51:54)

The other way, right.

[Speaker 2] (51:55 - 51:57)

You have someone reporting to a temp?

[Speaker 4] (51:58 - 52:28)

Yeah, if you have a contract employee supervising your staff on a permanent basis, that can be complex. And there's nuances too. So Larry, who's not here, who's not in the building ever, never sees maintenance, supervising maintenance and doing an evaluation on Jim would not work.

Right. That would be a huge difficulty because he's not on site.

[Speaker 2] (52:28 - 52:41)

Is it the fact that he's a contractor or the fact that he's not on site? Both. But you could have a contractor.

You can, but. For example, let me case a point. An interim city manager.

[Speaker 4] (52:42 - 52:42)

Yes.

[Speaker 2] (52:42 - 52:44)

Is supervising. Correct.

[Speaker 4] (52:46 - 52:59)

So you would get an argument that there could be some PERS implications of a non-permanent. I'm saying on a permanent basis, not an interim. But that's not a supervisory conflict.

[Speaker 2] (52:59 - 53:00)

That's a PERS conflict.

[Speaker 4] (53:00 - 53:01)

Yeah. So that's a different conflict.

[Speaker 2] (53:02 - 53:03)

Yes. Right.

[Speaker 3] (53:04 - 53:12)

Okay. Because now you're implying that that contractual employee isn't really contractual

employee. It's a city employee.

[Speaker 2] (53:12 - 53:16)

Yeah. I mean, I understand the PERS position, which.

[Speaker 3] (53:16 - 53:17)

So it's kind of a multi.

[Speaker 2] (53:17 - 53:26)

But that's not what I thought. That's not what you were talking about. I thought you were talking about, you can't have full-time employees reporting to contract positions.

[Speaker 4] (53:27 - 53:37)

I think legally you might be able to. That's what I'm talking about. But for me, operationally, I see numerous issues.

[Speaker 2] (53:37 - 53:38)

It could be undesirable.

[Speaker 4] (53:39 - 53:40)

There you go.

[Speaker 2] (53:41 - 53:44)

But allowable. Okay.

[Speaker 1] (53:46 - 53:48)

And then the last thing. Yeah.

[Speaker 2] (53:49 - 53:51)

There's no best practice that's made up.

[Speaker 1] (53:53 - 54:07)

So just again, so the org chart is correct. The description is wrong about rec leader and rec coordinator going, reporting to the senior management analyst. And you know what I can't.

[Speaker 2] (54:07 - 54:08)

Where are they going to report?

[Speaker 1] (54:09 - 54:44)

Well, in the description, it said the rec leader would report to the city clerk. But quick question. I don't remember this and I'd have to go back.

In the senior management analyst, that is a supervisory position as well then, right? They would

know that they're supervising two people. Is that in the job description?

I didn't remember that. And that they would be doing performance reviews and right. So that we might want to just think about that, right?

Because now they're going to have two people reporting to them.

[Speaker 5] (54:46 - 54:46)

One.

[Speaker 1] (54:48 - 54:53)

No rec coordinator. Rec coordinator and leader.

[Speaker 4] (54:53 - 54:55)

The rec leader reports to the coordinator.

[Speaker 1] (54:55 - 55:09)

Okay. And I don't know if we need, we have in the rec coordinator that they will have a direct one directory for it also, right?

[Speaker 9] (55:09 - 55:10)

So.

[Speaker 2] (55:12 - 55:13)

Okay.

[Speaker 1] (55:14 - 55:16)

And then I just have one more.

[Speaker 2] (55:16 - 55:58)

It's really odd to have such a narrow span of control where you essentially have one leader person in a management position supervising one person. I don't think that's a good idea, generally. One, it's more expensive.

And you typically, in a leadership position, you'd have at least a few direct reports. You just have one to one to one. You've created like this vertical that I think is just less overall efficient.

So I don't know if that's how we're actually trying to structure it. Because like you said, it seems awkward. Yeah.

I think one of the positions was said to go to the administrative assistant, I'm sorry, to the city clerk. Right.

[Speaker 1] (56:00 - 56:01)

And it was the leader.

[Speaker 2] (56:01 - 56:07)

Yeah. I don't know if you want that hierarchical rather than having it more.

[Speaker 1] (56:07 - 56:12)

That's the same with our city clerk has an administrative assistant reporting directly.

[Speaker 2] (56:14 - 57:14)

So for your position, Regina, you have the accountancy and managing analyst, and then the analyst would have one person and that person would have one person. I would say it should be flat and you have four people. And then those people don't need to be leadership positions and you can pay them less.

Like our idea when we conceived of some of these roles, the council as a whole, I mean, yes, us, us, of course. But when we discussed this, one of the goals was to have a flatter org so that you could pay higher at the top level, you guys, and then pay less at the staff level who are actually just doing a lot of work. So we rely heavily on the leadership positions, pay closer to market, get stronger candidates, and then have them supervise multiple people so that you're really using them as arms and legs.

That was the intent of what we're trying to do. If that doesn't work, that's fine. But one to one to one to me is...

[Speaker 10] (57:15 - 57:16)

It seems awkward.

[Speaker 2] (57:16 - 57:32)

It's just less efficient. I've been in organizations that do that and all over the place. It's just weird to have one to one to one.

I mean, a few of you managed that. I mean, why wouldn't I just manage one to one? You know, so that'd be mine.

[Speaker 4] (57:33 - 57:37)

And it's something that is a challenge here because it is so small.

[Speaker 2] (57:37 - 58:18)

It is, but it's so small. But then you have all these managers. The fact that it is so small makes it more efficient to have less layers, less management layers, right?

Because then each person has to kind of, not rigidly, but they will observe the chain of

command. And then you'll have all these ops and all this stuff. Versus if you flatten your...

Then you are the one that has the vision for everyone. And then you're directing traffic versus you direct them to direct them. That becomes less than direct.

I think it's more efficient. So I don't know. I would just consider that if you're thinking about this.

[Speaker 1] (58:18 - 58:53)

Well, when you said the senior management analyst is kind of like the Swiss army knife and like a floater kind of. I don't see that person as a manager in my mind. So yeah, I think that's a doer.

The other question I had on the org chart, just so I understand in the police department, administrative clerk reports to police office coordinator. So is that Gabby reporting to Sandy? She does?

She doesn't report. They don't both report to the chief. Okay.

[Speaker 10] (58:55 - 58:56)

Yeah.

[Speaker 1] (58:57 - 59:30)

Because to me, they seem supportive of the police chief. But my next question is they both report to the admin sergeant. Who is that, Shaw?

Okay. So then Gabby reports to Sandy and Sandy reports to Shaw. Yes.

Okay. I always thought Sandy and Gabby reported to the chief. Directly.

Not to a sergeant.

[Speaker 2] (59:34 - 59:36)

I like flatter orgs.

[Speaker 4] (59:36 - 59:57)

Again, I will say that's typical. And correct me if I'm wrong. In a police agency where the, unless it's the executive assistant to the chief, reports to the chief, other administrative, whether it's evidence, whether it's text up front, report to the admin sergeant, commander, lieutenant, captain, pick your title.

Okay.

[Speaker 2] (59:58 - 1:00:03)

I think that that's fine. Although Gabby to Sandy is weird. Yeah.

[Speaker 6] (1:00:03 - 1:00:06)

So administrative sergeant is there. Yeah, it was one.

[Speaker 2] (1:00:06 - 1:00:08)

So I mean, that's fine.

[Speaker 6] (1:00:08 - 1:00:10)

They report to the chief. It's so small.

[Speaker 2] (1:00:10 - 1:00:23)

And then like, is this accurate to say that one police officer reports to a day sergeant, one police officer reports to the night sergeant? Is that person the one who does their evals?

[Speaker 10] (1:00:24 - 1:00:24)

Yep.

[Speaker 2] (1:00:24 - 1:00:29)

I would assume so. It's like a one-to-one relationship. Like a Jedi padawan kind of thing.

[Speaker 9] (1:00:33 - 1:00:33)

Okay.

[Speaker 1] (1:00:36 - 1:00:38)

Kind of the first time I've seen it this way. Okay.

[Speaker 9] (1:00:38 - 1:00:41)

Yeah, it's never been presented this way, by the way. Okay.

[Speaker 1] (1:00:42 - 1:00:53)

Okay. I think I don't have any other questions on this. I just have a few questions before we wrap up.

Do you have any other questions?

[Speaker 2] (1:00:54 - 1:01:20)

And I think I would. So I would say I would like to get a look prior to our November 19th meeting after you incorporate some of the things that we've talked about. I want to see it again for the first time at our November 19th meeting.

Like, I don't know how you feel about that. I agree. We have two weeks, I guess.

So it's not that much time. But if possible, that's not a directive, but it's just a request.

[Speaker 4] (1:01:21 - 1:01:23)

Would you like to have another special meeting?

[Speaker 2] (1:01:23 - 1:01:31)

I can just look at it. Okay. That works, too.

Yeah. And then, so questions from the audience?

[Speaker 6] (1:01:31 - 1:01:39)

Yes. First of all, POA did not pick those cities. Brett picked them.

[Speaker 4] (1:01:39 - 1:01:43)

No, I didn't say the POA did. I said when the POA. The city picked the cities.

[Speaker 6] (1:01:43 - 1:03:10)

So what happens, Brett, as the city manager, picked the cities to promote Jim Warburton to superintendent. He picked those cities. And the POA has been trying for 20 years that I know of to pick other cities like this.

And it was almost refused. And then for, let's see what else. So he picked those cities.

Recreation. I have a problem with that word because in campaigning, people want the city to run efficiently. If you use the word recreation, it means you're having volleyball games and basketball games.

And that's not included. I don't know what other word could be used. But I do agree about the, to make sure that the doors are open, the parks are clean because I've been hearing the same thing from one pride parade.

Now when they rented that park, it was, all the trash cans were full. We should have a form that makes sure it checks that off that those things are empty when we're renting them. We're renting them to people that have to pay money.

It should be clean. And if it's a two-day event, it should be clean both days. So that's another thing on that.

I don't, maybe there's a better word for that. You know, you talked about the city engineer and doesn't oversee the superintendent. Don't we pay him \$3,000 a month to do that?

[Speaker 3] (1:03:11 - 1:03:19)

It's for, it's also for the climate tech work that he's doing as well. All right. And it's more for the climate tech.

Yeah, right.

[Speaker 1] (1:03:20 - 1:03:24)

Anymore. But if he's not doing that anymore, that should, yeah.

[Speaker 6] (1:03:25 - 1:03:31)

So the budget that you worked on when you first came, you were using the previous budget.

[Speaker 3] (1:03:31 - 1:03:35)

Yes, we use that as somewhat of a starting point.

[Speaker 6] (1:03:36 - 1:03:51)

Some of that budget I'll say was not approved by the city council. They just put money in there. And one example I'll give you is \$20,000 for a lieutenant's position that was not approved by the city council.

It was not approved.

[Speaker 3] (1:03:51 - 1:03:59)

We did not use that lieutenant position in this budget. I know you did, but you took it out? Yes.

Okay.

[Speaker 6] (1:03:59 - 1:04:54)

Okay, that's fine that you took it out. Because there's a lot of distrust with the city manager and Amy's position, the assistant, because they lied. They lied that they had no more money than they did.

So that's going to be a contention next time for being trusted when we do negotiations. The other thing is, I heard you say for the November meeting, I would ask the committee, then I'll ask the council, the committee to postpone that until the new council was seated. Because it's not fair to the new council to be saddled on something they might not agree on.

And I would like time, if I can use council members, to go all through this again. That's just me. What's the rush?

I can't wait till two weeks after that. That's what I'm saying. That's my comments.

[Speaker 8] (1:04:55 - 1:05:48)

I have another comment. Go ahead. My chief problem with the city of Clayton is access.

Who in the personnel in Clayton manages access? Access to parks, access to sidewalks,

access to streets, access to buildings. We want to have access for all, as is legally mandated at the federal level.

There's no excuse for Clayton to keep... I can't get into Westwood Park, because the curves are too tall. The people who try to get into the...

[Speaker 1] (1:05:51 - 1:06:09)

It's a non-agenda item. And so we passed that point in the agenda already. Okay, okay.

We talked to... We gave an opportunity earlier, but be sure to come to our next council meeting. We haven't seen you in a while.

Come to the meeting.

[Speaker 8] (1:06:09 - 1:06:13)

It's because I've been so sick. I'm sorry to hear that, Mark.

[Speaker 1] (1:06:13 - 1:06:14)

And Frank?

[Speaker 7] (1:06:15 - 1:08:50)

So a lot of points that were brought up here on the presentation of stuff. And I think this came up when we had our meeting. The climate is very...

The political climate is very heated in the city. There are folks who will take things. And you said, what's the hit we're going to take to the budget?

And right away I'm thinking, there's somebody out there that's going to take that. And then as Council Member Wong pointed out, that make sure it's clear that we are saving money. Because if that's somebody out there right now saying that the budget now is...

The deficit, the quote deficit, which we discussed last time is three, four, five times. As I brought up last time, the idea that the city is broke when we have 14, 15 million, right? So not to add more burden to you guys, but presentation is everything.

And that it's clear what we're trying to do. And I think that's what Council Member Wong was... And then to add to what hopefully the candidate and Council Member Elect, the distrust factor.

I wouldn't go as far as that and start using language about who lied and that. But there was something that took place earlier this year. I don't see that now, by the way.

Where, yeah, it created distrust from a lot of people's point of view. And presentation has all to do with it. You guys have limited staff, but how you present everything is...

How it's interpreted by the public is a huge factor. And more information is always better, but that it's clear what that information is. I went through this thing and I saw it.

I'm a finance guy. And I saw, okay, I see a savings here. Gonna want a little more clarification, but Vice Mayor Cipriano says, you see the parentheses, perfect example.

I have clients that they get their statements. I see minus, minus, minus. Yes, you took \$50,000 out of your account.

That's a minus. Your account should go down by \$50,000. I have clients with a lot of money.

Tell them my account goes down when I take out money. Yes, it does. Okay, so presentation is everything.

We wanna dial down what's going on in the city right now. So more of a burden for you guys, but definitely what Council Member Juan is asking for, keep that in mind. Yeah, so that we can...

Because there's a lot of work to do.

[Speaker 1] (1:08:52 - 1:08:53)

Thank you. Dan?

[Speaker 5] (1:08:53 - 1:08:54)

May I?

[Speaker 1] (1:08:54 - 1:08:54)

Yes.

[Speaker 5] (1:08:54 - 1:13:03)

Thank you all for the opportunity to come and listen today. For you, I'm Dan Richardson, currently on the Planning Commission, a retired Park and Public Works Director for the City of Walnut Creek. I've spent a career doing this.

A couple of comments. Very good comments you made. The ones about the cities and stuff, and we would do cities, and it was always a challenge picking what are the cities.

Once you got past the cities, where we really went, the agencies I worked for, and I think you worked for a citizen city, and I worked there for a while too, is that usually we found ourselves either the... You decide where you want it to be. Top of the bottom third, bottom of the second third, very seldom ever in the top third.

So depending upon the agencies, you would pick ones that have like work, like things that do.

Not someone like Dublin, clearly, because that's apples and oranges between us. But a city like this size, typically would find itself at the top of the bottom third.

So whatever those cities are, you're working towards. And that was something that staff knew, and that most people knew. And there are exceptions to that occasionally.

The second thing I would say is that, as I listen here, you're creating a bureaucracy. That's what you've done. You come in here, you've both been here a short and reasonable amount of time, and you're creating abrupt bureaucracy to support you at the top.

Got to have this, got to have that, got to have recreation people, got to have things like that. That's difficult, I think, going forward with a lot of different places, because you're taking your pyramid and you're turning it upside down. Put it back on the other side, and it's the worker bees that are out there doing stuff.

And those are the people that make a difference. You have a landscape assessment district coming up in 2027 that's going to expire. I am an advocate of renewing it, clearly, because it does fund a lot of things.

I chaired the last two efforts to renew it. We have a role for you. Thank you.

So I've worked on that, and I've worked on a lot of different things like that. And people need something out there right now to see that it's getting done. I see a little bit of improvements here or there.

I think when they created, any good, bad, or indifferent, there was a battle in the maintenance constantly this maintenance worker two position was held over the staff, like a carrot. Beat on them and hold it. You got to do this.

Well, when Amy came in here and made them all maintenance worker twos, it made a difference. Productivity picked up. You got better work out of the troops, different things like that.

Now, granted, those troops are working 410s, and I have a whole soapbox I can give you on 410s, and the percentage of productivity over 40 hours and four days doesn't work. My opinion. And so I think those are important.

I think it's key to do those things. I think it's key to not lose sight of the fact that it's the people driving up and down. We talk about, we need a code enforcement officer.

We need more consultants. Our definition of a consultant was someone that lived more than 100 miles away from me and wanted a lot of money to drive and visit you. That's what a consultant is.

That's what we've done. Very lack of ownership. Some of you may have been standing out, holding up signs on the corner of Mitchell Canyon, North Mitchell Canyon, Clayton Road, where the traffic is going by 150 miles an hour.

I drive my grandson every day. I walk my grandson up this corner every day, and I walk him back home. There's a bus stop there.

There's the old, that was a fire station on the corner. If it's one of the new folks, that was a fire station currently owned by CINO, I believe. It's a little brother with one of them.

And the trees have grown.

[Speaker 1] (1:13:05 - 1:13:07)

We're trying to keep it to budget, not it.

[Speaker 5] (1:13:08 - 1:13:12)

Yeah, I know, but you're talking about budget. And all these kinds of things. Three minutes.

[Speaker 1] (1:13:13 - 1:13:14)

Yeah, and three minutes.

[Speaker 5] (1:13:15 - 1:13:26)

I'll wrap it up. I urge you not to lose sight of creating bureaucracy and lose sight of where the work really gets done. Thank you.

[Speaker 2] (1:13:26 - 1:13:41)

Yeah, the triangle is a good analogy, I would say. I like the regular triangle. So that's why I'm talking about like flatter, the flatter or is similar.

But you've heard me say that already.

[Speaker 9] (1:13:42 - 1:13:50)

I just, you know, as a member of the community, I just want to say, you know, the guys who are there, the meetings. Welcome.

[Speaker 1] (1:13:50 - 1:14:34)

Thank you. Okay, so I think with all that said, we're done with item number four. I do have some things for item number five, which I'll just go through quickly.

So, and I think these are all related to our budget and audit committee. So correct me if I'm wrong. One thing is, we've talked here several times about our pending FEMA request.

And I know that's maybe a little bit off topic, but can we get an update on what?

[Speaker 4] (1:14:34 - 1:14:38)

Yeah, update your weekly. It's going out today, tomorrow. Great, there we go.

[Speaker 1] (1:14:39 - 1:14:50)

And HDL, I believe is coming back with an update on business license software. Are we also adding facilities rental software as well?

[Speaker 4] (1:14:50 - 1:14:52)

We are exploring right now.

[Speaker 1] (1:14:52 - 1:15:13)

Okay, great. And I just want to, again, I've got other things, but I want to keep it to this. Hold on a sec.

Library refresh. We have an update. I know we've talked about it here.

[Speaker 3] (1:15:15 - 1:15:17)

We're scheduling the working group.

[Speaker 2] (1:15:17 - 1:15:22)

The next working group, okay. Rather than going, I would just go through the list and then like we can.

[Speaker 1] (1:15:22 - 1:15:30)

I think that's my last one. Yeah, that was my last one. I have some others that are related to budget and audit, which I can talk to Kristen and Gina about.

[Speaker 4] (1:15:30 - 1:15:34)

I believe Stephanie has an update for the library refresh in the weekly as well.

[Speaker 2] (1:15:34 - 1:16:20)

So I guess what I would request is that in the weekly, if you could create like either a table or something that identifies all the significant open items that are working. And then so we can see what status or updates from the prior was done. That way it will help because there's so many.

It'll be easier to track if you just have like a standing list. And then you can kill them as they are complete. But like things like biotech and HDL and sound or noise events and surplus plan.

All the stuff that is working that when you came in, there's like all the lights are spinning.

[Speaker 4] (1:16:21 - 1:16:22)

Yep, they're still spinning.

[Speaker 2] (1:16:22 - 1:17:17)

Hard to keep track, right? And so I think it would be helpful for me at least, I don't know if anyone else, but it would be helpful for me if we had just a regular thing so that each week you can just see here's what's happened. Right, when I do report out project work, if they said like, I only report out in two weeks.

It's like what's been done over the prior two weeks and what is going to happen to the next two, every time. So then at the time I get the next meeting, I look and I say, what did I plan to do versus what I actually did every, and then I can see it. So like if you say, what is upcoming in the next interval and then you look when you get to that next interval, you can see what actually happened.

I think that's a great, for me at least, that's a great way to track information in my recommendation. But you can think about how you want to operationalize.

[Speaker 1] (1:17:21 - 1:17:37)

Okay, anything else for future topics? That's enough said. I think we're going to adjourn at 5.17. Thank you. And I'll send you my list because I'm not sure if it's all budget and audit and some of it has come through here. It hasn't, but.

[Speaker 6] (1:17:41 - 1:17:47)

Okay. Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Dan. Good to see you. We have a person sitting I talked to you about.