

ACTION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR BOARD MEETING
OF THE
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY
HELD OCTOBER 28, 2002

Commissioners met at the Central Office. The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Lyn Ann Rosen at 6 p.m. Present: Vice Chair Lyn Ann Rosen, and Commissioners: York Gin, Mike Nichols, Josh Stewart, Tim Escamilla (arrived 6:20 p.m.), and Carol Schneider. Absent: Chair Alan Styles. Also Present: Mary Jo Zenk, Deputy Executive Director/Chief Financial Officer; Rosie Anderson, Director of Housing Assistance Programs; and Starla Warren, Director of Housing Development. Recorder: Sandy Tebbs

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Minutes--Approval of Minutes of the Annual Board Meeting held September 23, 2002
- B. Minutes--Approval of Minutes of the Special Board Meeting held October 12, 2002
- C. New Position – Portola Vista Resident Manager
- D. Resolution 2147 – Commendation for Ulysses Pollard
- E. Conflict of Interest Code
- F. Resolution 2148 – Contract Renewal with the County of Monterey to provide case management services to the residents of Pueblo Del Mar
- G. Review of Section 8 Schedule of Allowances for Tenant Purchased Utilities and Other Services
- H. Amendment to Memorandum of Understanding – Plaza Grande, LP/Silverie Properties, LLC and Housing Authority – County of Monterey
- I. Resolution 2149 – Support of Proposition 46, The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act

Upon motion by Commissioner Nichols, seconded by Commissioner Gin, the Board approved the Consent Agenda. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Rosen, Gin, Nichols, Stewart, Schneider
NOES: None
ABSENT: Styles, Escamilla

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Finance/Development Committee
Personnel Committee
Monterey County Housing, Inc.
Affordable Acquisitions
Rippling River Focus Group

Ms. Zenk reported that Kim Stemler had been hired under contract as the new MCHI Executive Director. Ms. Warren reported that the Rippling River Focus Group was not able to attend tonight's meeting. To Board's query, Ms. Warren stated from her perception the Focus Group is making some progress but wants to focus on doing rehabilitation. It should not be the Housing Authority's responsibility to take care of all the identified deficiencies that many professionals have identified. In the next three or four meetings the Focus Group should be able to either agree to disagree or come back with a recommendation to the Board.

REPORT OF SECRETARY

A. Executive Report

Ms. Zenk reported she had heard from Mr. Nakashima at the NAHRO Conference and NAHRO is concerned about Congress restructuring the Section 8 Program, which for HACM would mean a substantial reduction of approximately \$300K in admin fees and the possible loss of 348 vouchers. During a lengthy discussion, the Board decided that a letter should be submitted publicly about this issue and in particular before the elections take place on November 5, 2002.

Upon motion by Commissioner Stewart, seconded by Commissioner Nichols, the Board decided that a letter should be written and made public as soon as possible, before the election, on the substantial loss of funds that the Housing Authority would be facing if the Section 8 Program is cut by Congress to pay for homeland security and the possible war. The Board further decided that the letter should be signed on behalf of the Board of Commissioners by the Vice Chair Lyn Ann Rosen in the absence of the Chair. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Rosen, Gin, Nichols, Stewart, Schneider
NOES: None
ABSENT: Styles, Escamilla

OLD BUSINESS

A. Classification and Compensation Study Update

Acting Chair Rosen noted that this item was for information only. David Werlin, Deputy Director of SEIU Union Local 817 commented that since the Board's work session a couple of Saturday's ago, he provided the Board with some additional information that he hoped that all of the members of the board have received and had an opportunity to go over. He stated the Union covered a couple of issues. One was the discussion of the study itself and the discussion on that Saturday regarding the benefits and how benefits should weigh in. While the Union does agree that the benefits should be considered in all the costs, the Union spent some time actually looking at the benefit study and came up with some problems with the benefit study itself. One of the problems was that while HACM comes near the bottom in paid time off for workers, that wasn't included in the study so the Union went ahead and included the value of that in the benefits compensation.

Mr. Werlin continued, as far as medical benefits, the numbers were wrong and he thought what the Consultant did was took the numbers from a couple of years ago, which may have been the active numbers during the time of the management study or may have been the accurate numbers for the management study, but they weren't the accurate numbers for their members so the Union changed those. Their members pay from—for the worker in the example that was used in the study--would pay either \$244.76 or \$283.56 per month for their family medical benefits.

Mr. Werlin further commented in the other area that it was important for them to look at was Retirement. He stated he took a shot at sort of equalizing the values in the Retirement but there were two different kinds of Retirement Plans. So what they (Union) knew was the way it was presented wasn't really accurate; the value given to what County's do in a PERS Plan really wasn't presented very accurately. They tried to come up with something, but ultimately the deal was—and from a worker's perspective they were not bargaining over changing anything--but it was just not accurate to say that the Retirement that HACM provides here—it's not a bad plan—but it's not stable—it's not a pension plan and it's not accurate to say that it is of more value to a worker than a public pension plan like that provided in the County of Monterey or any of the surrounding Counties. The Union did try to correct some of those and stated the Union provided a replacement sheet for comparable benefits. Mr. Werlin commented he was not saying that these are the exact numbers, but this was what the Union tried to estimate. What it winds up saying is that HACM is actually not in front of other folks in benefits, if anything HACM is slightly behind. When that is tied in with the wages, HACM is for the most part far behind. It doesn't put HACM equal to other organizations in what workers make.

Mr. Werlin continued, so they (Union) would ask you (the Board)—there was actually the secondary issue and he addressed that—there was some question regarding information the Union provided to their

members regarding the management study and the implementation of the management study. He stated he tried to show HACM exactly where that came from--management has determined that it will not provide the Union any specific information regarding the management salaries so the Union took the wage tables at the time of the study and the wage tables currently and matched them. What the Union came up with was—they don't know what any individual manager makes (because) that information hasn't been provided to them, but he stated what the Union does know is that in every instance the management wage tables are now above the mean that was provided for in the study. So what they are asking the Board to do in this process is direct HACM management staff to return to meet with the Union but with an attempt at getting full parity. When management says they want to go to fifty percent of parity, that consistently puts them (Union) below average. There's no reason HACM can't strive to be better than average—that's what they (Union) would ask, but at a minimum that HACM FULLY attempt to reach the mean. That's what is fair to these workers and not the minimum that's fair to these workers.

Mr. Werlin continued just as an aside from the previous issue with the federal government, the Union is politically active and they (Union) would like very much to be supportive of the Authority. This Union is one of the largest Unions in the Country and they are very politically active and would like to be helpful in this process if HACM has any ideas—obviously HACM would take the leadership role on this but please feel free to contact the Union.

Commissioner Escamilla arrived at 6:20 p.m.

Commissioner Stewart noted that under the MOU, Mr. Werlin would have to get together with HACM management. Mr. Werlin stated the Union would be happy to meet further. Vice Chair Rosen reiterated that this item was for information only. Commissioner Schneider asked how the total hours of 149.33 were figured.

The Board thanked Mr. Werlin.

The Board decided to move the Closed Session forward to accommodate staff. The board convened to Closed Session at 6:24 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

The Board of Commissioners met in Closed Session for the following purpose and reason:

- A. With respect to every item to be discussed in Closed Session pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8: Real Property Negotiations
ACTION: No action taken.

The Board reconvened to regular session at 6:55 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS

- A. Section 8 Fair Market Rents/Payment Standard

Upon motion by Commissioner Nichols, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, the Board approved the recommended Section 8 Fair Market Rents/Payment Standard at 100 percent. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Rosen, Gin, Nichols, Stewart, Escamilla, Schneider
NOES: None
ABSENT: Styles

- B. Vintner Study and Workforce Housing Follow-up
Resolution No. 2150 New Development Directions

Upon motion by Commissioner Stewart, seconded by Commissioner Gin, the Board tabled this agenda item to November 23, 2002 Board Retreat Strategic Planning Session. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Gin, Nichols, Stewart
NOES: Escamilla, Schneider
ABSENT: Styles
ABSTAIN: Rosen

INFORMATION

- A. Administrative Report and Summary of Actions for September/October 2002
- B. Status Report: August 2002 Financial Statements and September 2002 Disbursements
- C. Status Reports: Monthly Development Report
- D. Housing Management Report
- E. Eligibility/Section 8 Reports

There was no discussion on the information items.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Rosen stated the copy of the bills is not reflecting the name portion; Ms. Tebbs apologized about the copying and noted she would make sure the bills reflected that portion for the future bills.

Commissioner Escamilla stated he wished he had showed up for agenda item 7A and asked if Mr. Phillips was going to provide the total lump sum of staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Schneider requested an example of what the percentage would be if an individual made \$12,500 a year.

Commissioner Nichols commented that the spreadsheet on what the figures were and where they came from was also not provided by the Union.

Commissioner Rosen commented the Resolution for Mr. Pollard has passed and the Clerk needs the Commissioners' signatures on that resolution.

The Board congratulated Commissioner Escamilla on his new baby; Commissioner Escamilla thanked the Board for the baby cup.

CLOSED SESSION: This item was previously discussed above.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:24 p.m.