



Process Improvement Steering Committee

March 27, 2013 3:00 p.m.

Building 1, Conference Room 350

Purpose of Meeting

The committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to City Council. The function of the committee will be to work in harmony with City Council and City management to identify problems and barriers that may have negative impact on City operations, efficiency and effectiveness and facilitate solutions.

Attendees

<i>Name</i>		<i>Name</i>	
Tuck Bowie - Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Councilman Bob Dyer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
David Browning		Bob Scott	
Tanya Arney	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brad Martin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tom Etter - Guest	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wanda Cooper	
Doug McLiverty		Dan Brockwell	
Bill Brunke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mary Hancock - Staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Josh Clark – Guest (TBA)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Catheryn Whitesell - Staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sandi Thompson (Recorder)	

Meeting Notes, Decisions, Issues

1. Welcome and Call to Order
2. Next Meeting: April 24, 2013
3. Old Business: Meeting notes from February 27, 2013 were approved.
4. New Business/Discussion Items
 - **Arrears** – Dave Hansen
 - Dave Hansen and Patti Phillips to meet with Councilman Dyer, other Council members, and key city staff to discuss converting City payroll to arrears
 - Councilman Dyer offered to meet with David Browning and union folks
 - Why is the city responsible for this gap pay – temporary pain
 - City’s current pay practice results in a lot of payroll adjustments (80,000 Total -- 60,000 are related to arrears).
 - Had to re-program the Oracle system to allow for our current pay system
 - Goals:
 - Transition to arrears with minimal pain
 - Trying to move to arrears at minimal costs at one time
 - Provide a 2.4% bonus/conversion check to cover the arrears move.
 - Arrears is the industry standard
 - Tuck Bowie – He and Mr. Brunke were comfortable with the finance plan.
 - Is there a position paper that the committee could endorse? If there is, send to Catheryn Whitesell and she will send to the committee.



Process Improvement Steering Committee

March 27, 2013 3:00 p.m.

Building 1, Conference Room 350

- The employees will never agree that they should take a pay cut to change the archaic pay system to the industry standard.
- Just improving processes like this will help us avoid things like furloughs.
- Will the city also move to bi-weekly payroll as well?
 - We will re-evaluate that after arrears---May be okay with where arrears gets us on reducing adjustments.
- Efficiency gained gives a payback in 7 – 10 years.
- 60,000 adjustments @ 10 minutes = 5 folk's time – what happens to them? Cut?

- **Development Review and Building Permit Process**

Need DSC to be actively involved in these steps

- Bob Scott discussed his thoughts (*see attached*)
 - Clearly define what the problems are
 - If we agree the process is broken, what would a fixed system look like
 - What are our options to get to our improved system
- Too many folks involved; too complex a process with no one authorized to make final decision
- There are things that can be improved in DSC; there are things the developer's can do to improve as well.
- Get Nancy McIntire involved in these conversations as soon as possible.
 - Brad and Dan need to meet with her to start the conversation as soon as reasonably possible.
- Is there a way to sample permits and what was the time it really took?
- Diversity of submittals in quality as well as type, but should be able to.
- Needs to change the culture of the DSC so that if someone is on vacation you can still get your plan reviewed.
- Can we get what DSC tracks now on Plan Revisions?

5. Future Business/Discussions Items

- **Chair/Vice-Chair** - Decision for next meeting when Bill Brunke will be back.
- **Tablets & Arrears** – Councilman Dyer to meet with individual Councilmembers to discuss
- **Article on Committee** – Councilman Dyer was contacted by Inside Business to do an article on the Committee
 - Committee needs to look at BPOL process as a barrier to business and what are others do

THOUGHTS ON PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS

Brad, I have had a chance to review the white paper you put together on the above, and I have had a chance to think about both the paper and the problem. I would like to follow up on our good conversation of last week by putting down some of the thoughts we discussed. I think the paper gives us a great start and a great foundation to work from. I've put together a few thoughts on the substance of the issue as well as the structure of how we might approach it. I'm glad we had a chance to discuss it because I think that strengthens it.

We all agree that the development review process has some problems associated with it and, despite many of the strengths of the process and the people in it, as you cite in the paper, there is still plenty of room for improvement.

- I. So, given that there are problems, what are they, specifically? Can we break down the general topic of "problems" into some specific categories? The white paper gives us a good start on this. In reading it, I can glean the following characteristics of the process that have been considered problematic:
 - a.) Review times are long. Nancy McIntyre said in our meeting the other day that she did not think they could be improved upon. I think it should be kept on the list for now.
 - b.) Direction given by the staff is unpredictable, arbitrary and capricious, and unreliable.
 - c.) The DSC must take the numerous comments from various reviewing departments and turn them into a cogent review letter to the developer's representative, even if there are conflicts among the reviewing departments. This system is cumbersome.
 - d.) The developer must go through multiple reviews by the DSC before gaining approval. This problem is not mentioned in the white paper, but came up in our last meeting.

I'm not sure this is a perfect list, but I think we should agree on some list with appropriate adjustments. And I think we should invite Nancy to participate in putting it together. Any solution, in order to work, must be shared in by the DSC. Any solution imposed on the DSC without its input is doomed to failure. And I think the DSC has a lot of good input to offer. Ideally, these issues will be supported with facts and figures and not just general perceptions. General perceptions, as on target as they may be, will not be sufficient to establish credibility with those who review our product.

- II. If we could fix these problems, what would the fixed process then look like? What characteristics would it have? Can we put numbers and facts to it? Anyone building a subdivision needs to work from a set of plans describing the finished product, and I think we do too. We need to start with the end in mind.

- III. What options are available for addressing each area we wish improvement in? What actions, adjustments, corrections, additions, etc., are available for our consideration? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each?
- IV. After evaluation of the alternatives and choice of the best, how would they be implemented and how will future conditions be monitored for further possible adjustment?

There are not any new or deep thoughts here. I'm just trying to organize ideas that have already been discussed and put some kind of structure to our work. I hope this helps.