

## FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

### Minutes

August 26, 2020

#### 1. ROLL CALL

Committee: City Councilors David Low, Chas Jones and Matt Lehman.

Staff: City Manager Chris Workman, Finance Director Joan Swanson, and City Recorder Ruth Post.

#### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**2.1 July 22, 2020 Minutes** - Councilor Low moved, Councilor Jones second, to approve the July 22, 2020 minutes as presented. Motion APPROVED 3-0.

#### 3. NEW BUSINESS

**3.1 CARES Act Small Business & Social Service Agency Grant Programs** – Chair Low summarized the motions that were approved by the City Council for the Committee to discuss.

Utility Bill Assistance: Ms. Swanson provided updated information regarding utility customers who are behind per the aging report, noting that the total of the potential list is approximately \$22,000; and discussed a potential process for utilizing Vina Moses to provide assistance in paying the bills. There was discussion about the process the utility billing staff uses with customers who are behind on their bills. Ms. Swanson recommended a process for notifying customers they are eligible to have Vina Moses pay their bill and shared a draft letter to customers (Supplemental Agenda Item #3.1). There was discussion about disparity in the amounts that customers are behind. There was discussion about the apportionment of the CARES Act funds that have been allocated to cities and a possible second apportionment in the future.

There was discussion about using only Vina Moses or splitting funds between them and We Care. There was discussion about whether to provide funding for 100% of customers' bills or to limit it to 90%. There was discussion about the Council motion having included relief for other COVID-related expenses and the current amount of the overdue bills exceeding the \$20,000 that was approved by the Council.

There was discussion about the types of outstanding bills, including those that have disconnected service and moved away. There was discussion about the City's reimbursement process from the State.

The Committee consensus was for staff to proceed as discussed.

Small Business Assistance Grant: Mr. Workman reviewed the draft application presented in the application packet. Ms. Post noted the majority of the application text was derived from applications being used by other cities. There was discussion about the maximum number of full-time equivalent employees listed in the application and the number of employees different businesses in Philomath have. There was discussion about possible scenarios and whether to change the language from first come, first served, to a specific date deadline for review of applications. There was discussion about City-related liens and whether to include that reference or amend it to delinquent City-related liens.

There was discussion about the minimum and maximum assistance amounts and discussion that the expenses being submitted for reimbursement must be COVID related. There was discussion about asking whether previous PPE CARES Act funds had been received and the amount of the actual funding being requested.

There was discussion about whether businesses are, or have been, delinquent on property taxes and whether the information should be requested. There was further discussion about providing assistance to businesses that may, or may not, survive the pandemic. There was discussion about business physical locations being in Philomath.

Mr. Workman reviewed next steps for the process including finishing the form and setting an application deadline six weeks out. The Committee agreed by consensus to proceed as outlined.

Social Service Agency Assistance Grant: There was discussion about the review process for both programs. There was discussion about establishing a minimum and maximum grant amount and identifying the benefits the service agencies provide to Philomath residents. There was discussion about how to allocate funds, either equally or at varying levels based on merit. There was discussion about different types of services and the benefits they provide, comparing those that provide survival benefits to those that provide less tangible services. There was discussion about leaving the criteria open-ended with the requirement that the agencies must justify their request.

The number of City of Philomath residents that are benefited by the agency was added to the application. There was discussion about setting the maximum funding amount at \$5,000.

There was discussion about whether staff or the Committee would review the applications. Consensus was for the Committee to convene after the deadline for both grants to review the applications and make funding decisions. There was discussion about pushing the grant information out via social media and personal contacts.

There was discussion about whether home occupation businesses should qualify. There was discussion about whether to exclude any particular types of businesses. There was discussion about other funding opportunities for different types of businesses.

There was consensus to proceed with the Small Business Grant as discussed.

Chair Low called a break at 5:32 p.m. The Committee reconvened at 5:38 p.m.

#### **4. OLD BUSINESS**

##### **4.1 Evaluation Processes for City Manager, Attorney and Municipal Judge –**

City Manager Evaluation: Mr. Workman outlined options for either maintaining the current type of evaluation format for the City Manager or a process that ties the performance to the Strategic Plan. Chair Low supported the use of the Strategic Plan and more frequent review of progress on the plan. Councilor Lehman supported getting feedback from staff, not necessarily every year. Councilor Jones supported both of those points with establishment of metrics that aren't necessarily picked up in the Strategic Plan. Mr. Workman offered to draft a hybrid model for the Committee to review.

There was discussion about completing a 360 review in the coming year. There was discussion about the timing of the City Manager's evaluation.

Municipal Judge: Mr. Workman reviewed methods of evaluating the Judge's performance and the past practice to have the Judge provide the Council with an annual presentation. There was discussion about the sample evaluation form provided. There was discussion about the value of specific staff, particularly the court clerk, providing feedback. Consensus was to have the Judge appear before the Council and to have staff provide feedback. There was discussion about timing for the Judge to appear before the Council and consensus was for February.

City Attorney: There was discussion about the last evaluation of the Attorney being in 2014. There was discussion about the most recent evaluation form and the timing of an evaluation. There was discussion about other attorneys that work with the Planning Commission and Court.

**4.2 Transient Lodging Tax discussion: Council Objective 2.3.4** – Mr. Workman recommended tabling the discussion until the City is closer to having an RV park to collect revenue from and for the Department of Revenue to establish a mechanism to assist in collections. There was discussion about keeping the RV park developer apprised of the TLT status. There was discussion about the DOR being in contact with the League of Oregon Cities regarding the status of their collection program. There was discussion about collecting the revenue from Air BnB's, VRBO and other types of rental entities.

Mr. Workman brought forward a proposal to engage the Philomath Chamber to provide support in outreach working with the local businesses in applying for grant funds. There was discussion about using the Chamber to make personal contacts with businesses. Consensus was given for the use of the Chamber of Commerce.

## **5. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned 6:18 p.m.

Meeting recorded by Ruth Post, MMC, City Recorder