



PUBLIC MEETING: Special Commission Meeting

DATE: Friday **September 23, 2022, 6 PM**

LOCATION: Cascade Locks City Hall 140 Wa Na Pa St, Cascade Locks, OR 97014 <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85806615790>

AGENDA

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Meeting called to Order at 6:00 pm
 - a. Roll Call
 - i. President Groves
 - ii. Vice President Lorang
 - iii. Commissioner Caldwell
 - iv. Commissioner Stipan
 - v. Commissioner Bump
3. Modifications, Changes, and Additions to the Agenda
4. Action Items
 - a. Adopt Process and Criteria for General Manager Evaluation
 - i. Mark Knudson is here from SDAO to help districts facilitate manager evaluations. He is going to talk about how he suggests approaching the evaluation criteria for the GM and how to use it. The overall approach has to do with some issues that have been brought to him involving job descriptions, but he doesn't want anyone to be concerned because he is here to show everyone how to conduct these. To him, there are 2 fundamental reasons for evaluations. One is to hold the employee accountable who is being evaluated, and the other reason is due to overlook. Asking what you want the employee to do and what it would look like. Mark compared his job description templates to the GM description, and states he has yet to see mind reading on them. He brings up a chart that shows SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats), goals and priorities, implementing them, as well as tracking and reporting. This is to help guide the GM as well as the board in the evaluation. He suggests that it is about looking forward in terms of expectations for what to do in the future, and feedback from the last year. In this situation, we have an issue of the description being "weak". In the agreement, it identifies the Commission's duties, and in the second page shows more specific items such as coordinating with agencies and community involvement. He asks if there have been any initial updates of the description since 2019; there has been none. Mark continues saying that we can't expect the GM to

read their mind and go beyond. He offers a 3-year plan to propose to the Commission. Beginning, a review in the last 9 months based off of the current job description. Mark says that as part of what he is doing, he wants to be able to provide an updated job description and work together that has more specifications and better duties that better define the GM duties, becoming the basis of the evaluation. Phase 2, to have another review and look back at the last couple months to then help create an annual evaluation schedule. Period 3, to potentially have a more refined description, more goals, and criteria, giving a chance to provide goals for the following time until the next evaluation. Mark asks the Commission if this makes sense to have this timeline for the evaluation, members agree. P Groves adds that once you do your sidebar analysis, what would be the process if you have to change stuff, Mark says that things happen and do change and uses his own example saying that you can set the goal and staff will work towards achieving it, but stuff happens. The healthy part of the process is to sit down and see what's next. He continues that if you don't have goals, they won't be achieved. Mark wanted to make sure more time is spent on this due to it being a solid foundation. His suggested approach is that this evening, the Commission would reach an agreement for the criteria and form that is used based on the current job description. He will work on getting everything updated over the next couple days. The GM will then start a self-evaluation telling how she thinks she has done such as important accomplishments. Thereafter, the Commission will then do their own self-evaluation, individually fill out the form and send it to Mark by Oct 13. If he gets everyone's forms, he will compile it anonymously and come back to the Oct 20th meeting and ask if the summary makes sense, then invite the GM in and have the Commission deliver the news based on summary after the passed 9 months. Mark continues that it helps to look at this as a forward moving tool rather than going backwards. It is a compressed schedule and will make it a priority to complete this. Mark takes a moment to ask members present if anyone has questions or comments. C Stipan brings up that he has an evaluation at work and how it keeps being postponed and is making him nervous. His own description is 20 pages saying what they want him to do and says he is going to enjoy doing this to help him prepare for his own evaluation. He continues that if another Commissioner comes

along, they will be able to work with the GM with some duties that may not be on the description. He asks the question about being able to give a proper evaluation due to it potentially being life-threatening as his own job evaluation has been postponed. Mark continues that this is just a tool to provide feedback for the GM and how the Commission needs to be clear about what needs to be done. VP Lorang says that he is concerned about the objectivity from some Commissioners but is hopeful that this structure will be fair. Mark agrees that he is committed to the extent of fairness to this such as people doing the evaluation and compiling it to bring back. He continues that if there are conflicting views, the board ultimately decides, as one voice, in terms of the feedback and score to be provided. P Groves adds he likes that C Stipan says and that he will be honest about his views and bases it off facts. He adds that the current description is pretty vague but there is enough to work from. He brings up a sheet from the Commission packet and based on the bullet points of the duties and agreement, there are 6 areas of evaluation. Under the first item, he provides what he thinks would be the best criteria to base the GM off of. Maintaining effective communication with the Commission and elected officials. Being able to provide information in timely basis, as well as timely and accurate reports, and providing staff support for the Commission. Providing effective leadership goals and giving the responsibility of discipline when needed. Meeting good organization. Mark says that the Commission was more specific in this area for what they want. Providing effective fiscal management. It specifically talks about financial records for the Port, following more information on refining this. Financial obligations and if things are being completed. Vital role of this position is to help with accounting. Provides effective supervision of maintenance and utilities of the Port, planning and maintaining equipment for properties and disposal of surplus properties. Providing effective customer and community service. He says that this helps maintain effective working relationships with the Port to form relationships. Influencing improvements, is what Mark would add to this as well. He has tried to provide additional terms to help this be better understood. At this point, he would like to hear feedback from the Commission on changes they would like to make. VP Lorang says he seems to be spot on for the expectations of the GM. P Groves says that he agrees this evaluation looks very good as well taking

account of the community too. GM agrees it is more elaborate than the description and that the pandemic has put her in a lot of different functions but agrees it is more elaborate. Mark asks if there is something that doesn't belong on here, GM replies no that she thinks they can all be expectations, just more elaborate. Mark replies that he doesn't want this to add more, but more as a tool to help and knows that sometimes it can get confusing with conflicting thoughts about how it can be understood. GM says that the bullet points are the only information she has gotten and believes everyone is in the same boat of not knowing for sure what everything means. Mark agrees and says that this is for taking this current description and past ones, to help use as a perspective tool. C Stipan asks about the things that would be best during evaluations, he doesn't think it's about looking at the negative sides of the job. Mark agrees and says that this is for the GM to help show all the variables that aren't as weighed in as much but should be. Mark points out that this is a good idea looking back at the past 9 months, and that looking back to '19 and '20, there is a lot of noise to sift through, and instead offers the 9 month timeline. Mark offers if there is support, if the Commission could formally approve this criteria.

C STIPAN MOTIONS TO APPROVE THE EVALUATION CRITERIA AS WRITTEN; VP LORANG SECONDS; UNANIMOUS 5-0

- ii. VP Lorang brings back an issue that was brought up about the Port needing to hire someone to look over the books and give a financial plan to get off of bridge revenues. Mark says that is only half of it and the other half that he understood was to have additional support from the auditor so wrap up the fiscal year of 2021. VP Lorang asks if we should wait for the results of the audit before making decisions of the auditor having any reason for a deeper look. Mark agrees that would be best. P Groves says that the Commission approved the document and doesn't recall a forensic audit. He said that GM said we are behind in our books and that he knows we are struggling to find an accountant, to no fault of the GM. Mark says that as a board member, being able to make those decisions is crucial. P Groves says that the audit is only a snapshot in time and that would help to look into some things and have everything in order. Mark wants to make sure the Commission is okay with the form and is content with a consensus using the form

he offered. VP Lorang agrees it is good and likes the grades. Mark replies that he likes the old school grading and being able to easily define the performance. Mark offers to send this out in an email. He continues with another sheet titling 'Accomplishments in the Past Year". He says that it would be great for the Commission to know the big accomplishments. Each Commissioner will fill this out individually and as a board, decide priorities and is willing to provide focus. P Groves recalls previous evaluation basing it off of a paper passed to each member, choosing a grade, and giving a raise dependent on said evaluation. Mark ends saying he is optimistic about this.

5. Adjournment at 7:09 pm

Port of Cascade Locks

Port Commission President

Jess Groves

Port Commission Secretary/Treasurer

Joeinne Caldwell

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired, or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities, should be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting by contacting the Port of Cascade Locks office at 541-374-8619.