

The Finance and Judiciary Committee for the City of Junction City met at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, January 8, 2015 in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City, Oregon.

PRESENT WERE: Chairman Herb Christensen, Councilor Karen Leach, Councilor Steven Hitchcock, City Administrator Melissa Bowers, and Finance Director Mike Crocker.

I. Changes to the Agenda

City Administrator Bowers stated that she would like to discuss the AFSCME labor contract under other business.

II. Approval of Minutes for December 4, 2014

Minutes were approved as presented.

III. Legal Services

City Administrator Bowers discussed Legal Services with the Committee. The packet distributed to the Committee was the same packet the City Council received on December 9, 2014. The agenda item was referred to the Finance and Judiciary Committee. She stated the last time legal services were reviewed was in 1988 and the minutes at that time, only reflected the hiring of Speer Hoyt. Only the firm was noted and no specific attorney was mentioned. Examples from other cities were provided and include requests for proposals and requests for qualifications. Ms. Bowers stated that attachment B from Hood River may be the closest example for an RFQ that may work for Junction City. An RFQ may work best for Junction City, since it would give the City the opportunity to look at a firm's qualifications. She stated that we may want to use different firms that specialize in specific areas. She believed that all of the examples use different firms for different specialized areas. An RFQ will require firms to list out their specialties. Councilor Hitchcock asked how an RFP works compared to an RFQ. Ms Bowers responded that one difference is that candidates can be interviewed and questioned with an RFQ. With an RFQ, firms are giving the city a run-down of their skills and specialties. An RFP is more structured and an RFQ can be used to structure a future RFP. Multiple RFP's could be used for specialized areas.

Councilor Karen Leach asked if in-house counsel for certain or general services might make sense and use other firms for other specialized requirements. Ms Bowers responded that it may not make sense for Junction City based on historical costs. Junction City's relationship is on a case by case basis, hourly only and non-contractual.

Other samples in the packet were from the City of Sisters, City of Reedsport and the City of Cascade Locks.

Ms Bowers suggested using a different firm to review an RFQ, rather than the City's current legal firm, since Speer Hoyt would likely respond to the RFQ. She discussed using the firm we use for the City Prosecutor.

Councilor Christensen asked what the next step would be for this process. Ms Bowers responded that giving staff direction to identify options for a firm to help prepare an RFQ and bring those options back to Committee and then forwarding to Council the Committee's recommendation for an RFQ and the firm to help prepare it. The Committee agreed with City Administrator's Bowers' recommendation.

IV. City Records Retention

City Administrator Bowers presented materials that were presented to Council on December 9, 2014. The city's current policy is to default to the State's records retention policy. The Committee did a site visit to the City's records archives as part of its December meeting. Previously there was discussion by Council that the City may want to have a more restrictive retention policy than what the state requires. She stated that there are two parts to this discussion, the records storage location and what records the City needs to keep.

Currently there is a City moratorium on records destruction. She stated that the current facility needs maintenance to continue using it, or the identification of a new location. The Qhut has been considered in the past, but is not an option at this time. Issues with the current site include ventilation, mold, access and security.

The contents are not completely known, some items do not need to be kept, and other items have just been left there. A records project is needed to address the records storage needs of the City and records to be kept defined.

Councilor Hitchcock inquired about how much there may be that needs to be scanned and how much does not need to be kept at all.

Ms Bowers stated that the first step is to categorize the records in storage. The State rules breaks down in detail what needs to be kept. The City can work on what items the City would like to keep longer than the state's requirements.

The Committee discussed the benefits of having records scanned and having less paper to deal with. Councilor Hitchcock suggested that the City and staff have a lot of projects to work on. Ms Bowers suggested that a record project be included in the budget to fund the project which may include inventorying the records and other

expenses. Councilor Karen Leach discussed the possibility of fixing up the current location.

Finance Director Crocker brought up the Court retention requirements and the Court records project previously completed. Court would like to continue to follow the state's requirements and not have records accumulate when a lot of effort and cost was expended to complete the Court records project. Also, he stated that Finance generates records each month that will accumulate.

City Administrator Bowers suggested that there are categories that could be excluded from the City's moratorium. Examples would be Court and Police records. A list of excluded items could be brought back to Committee and then forwarded to Council.

The recommendation of the Committee is to direct staff to budget for the records project and for staff to develop categories of moratorium items and categories of items to exclude from the records destruction moratorium.

The budget is to include the costs of staffing and storage needs for the project.

V. Precise Budgeting

Director Crocker reviewed draft language for fiscal policies to address a "Quarterly Financial Report Review" and "Mid-Year Budget Adjustments". He noted a few words presented in track changes. The Committee discussed the monthly general fund presentation and any effect these fiscal policy changes may have. The Committee discussed when budget adjustment items would be brought to Council and bringing them in a reasonable time. Language will be added to address bringing budget changes to Council in a reasonable time.

Director Crocker will make updates and bring them back to the next Committee meeting.

VI. Other Business

City Administrator Bowers discussed the labor contracts with the Committee. She stated that both the AFSCME and Police Association contracts will expire on June 30, 2015. AFSCME has stated that they are willing to renew the existing contract with one exception. The Police Association has indicated that they want to open negotiations. In the past these contracts have been presented directly to Council. Ms Bowers stated that this Committee oversees human resources and contracts and Council would likely send it back to the Finance and Judiciary Committee. She reviewed the item to be changed as requested by AFSCME. She pointed out the item on page 35, section 1c which addresses the amount of insurance paid by the City for part time staff. The language is not clear in the application of this provision from month to month. The

request by AFSCME is for the City to pay the full insurance cost for staff at 30 hours or more. She stated the cost would be \$6,000 in insurance costs.

The Committee was in favor of an amendment for the AFSCME contract and the change requested, and directed staff to forward it to Council.

VII. UPDATES

None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:42 pm.

ATTEST:

Mike Crocker, Finance Director