



**Contra  
Costa  
County**

To: Board of Supervisors  
From: Dianne Dinsmore, Human Resources Director  
Date: July 18, 2017

Subject: Establish the new classification of Economic Development Manager-Exempt (5AH6); allocate on the salary schedule and add one position

**RECOMMENDATION(S):**

Consider adopting Personnel Resolution No. 22113 to establish the classification of Economic Development Manager - Exempt (5AH6) (unrepresented) at salary plan and grade B85 1954 (\$8,256 - \$11,064); and add one (1) position in the Department of Conservation and Development.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Upon approval, this action will result in an annual cost of approximately \$173,291 of which \$27,936 represents annual pension costs. The cost of this position is funded in the Department of Conservation and Development's FY 17-18 approved budget.

**BACKGROUND:**

At its annual retreat on January 31, 2017, the Board received a presentation from John Kopchik, DCD Director, on the "Need for Expanded Investment in Economic Development in Contra Costa County." The presentation described what is meant by economic development (including purpose and benefits), provided an overview of common approaches in California, described the County's history in this area, identified an

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **07/18/2017** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

**VOTE OF SUPERVISORS**

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor  
Candace Andersen, District II Supervisor  
Diane Burgis, District III Supervisor  
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor  
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: July 18, 2017

David Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Contact: Dianne Dinsmore,  
(925) 335-1766

By: June McHuen, Deputy

opportunity and need to expand our activities and described the cost and next steps with pursuing an expansion of the County's economic development work. The presentation raised the concept of identifying initial funding for dedicated economic development staff (an Economic Development Coordinator and Planner II or III or equivalent), providing support (part-time clerical, GIS and accounting) and a modest expense budget and charging this team with pursuing a range of economic development tasks, including developing an Economic Development Strategy to guide the future work plan.

The Board discussed the matter in some detail, generally supported the concept and an initial allocation and asked that the funding be addressed through the Budget process and that details such as where in the County organizational structure the economic development function should be housed be discussed with the Northern Waterfront Ad Hoc Committee and brought back to the Board. The Board approved the FY 2017/18 Budget on May 9, 2017.

On June 9, 2017, the Northern Waterfront Ad Hoc Committee approved the creation and recommended salary placement of the Economic Development Manager, but deferred to the full Board the decision regarding where the function should be housed.

A classification specification for Economic Development Manager – Exempt (Attachment

1) is provided for informational purposes only. The recommended salary range is the 7-step salary plan and grade (B85/1954), \$8,256.60 - \$11,064.64 per month, equivalent to an annual pay range of \$99,079.25 to \$132,775.68.

With regard to location of the function, , for the purposes of this report, the position is being added to Department of Conservation and Development since that is where the FY 2017/18 budget is approved. However, below for your Board's consideration and direction is a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of housing the economic development function within three different areas of the County organization

## BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

### Department of Conservation and Development (DCD)

#### **Advantages:**

- Built in niche for economic development work since Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative has been managed out of DCD.
- Well connected to other staff working on related issues, including staff involved with various aspects of planning and land entitlement (e.g. current planning, advance planning, transportation planning, CEQA and other regulatory compliance, successor agency) and close proximity to Geographic Information Systems staff who will be critical to accessing and analyzing data on potential economic development sites.
- Well placed to assist with permit streamlining efforts. Effective permit streamlining will require very close and frequent coordination so that accurate information is conveyed to prospective applicants. Ability to identify and pursue permit streamlining opportunities will require the staff to get into the weeds of permitting from time to time.
- DCD management is committed to the concept and will work hard to help economic development efforts succeed.

#### **Disadvantages:**

- Less connected to staff in the County Administrator's Office (CAO) working on County finance issues and annexations.
- Less connected to Work Force Development Board
- Not as well placed as CAO for access to multiple departments.
- Not as high profile as CAO.

### **b. County Administrator's Office (CAO)**

#### **Advantages:**

- Placement in the CAO rather than in a department may suggest that the County is placing a higher priority on the economic development work, and this perception may be helpful as the staff person reaches out to businesses and other jurisdictions.
- Best facilitates coordination with County Administrator's Office on matters of County finances and on annexations.
- Well placed for access to multiple departments.
- Raises the profile of the work.

#### **Disadvantages:**

- May be more cumbersome and expensive to assist with support staff and office space may be constrained.
- Less connected to other staff working on related issues, including staff involved with various aspects of planning and land entitlement (e.g. current planning, advance

planning, transportation planning, CEQA and other regulatory compliance, successor agency), with Geographic Information Systems and to Workforce Development Board.

- More challenging to assist with permit streamlining efforts as close coordination with planning, building and other functions will be key.
- CAO's preference has been to delegate program work to departments so that CAO may focus on running the County.
- Insufficient personnel to supervise this function, particularly in its initial stages.

#### **c. Department of Employment and Human Services (EHSD)**

##### **Advantages:**

- Workforce Development Board is housed in EHSD and their work is a significant component of economic development
- Could help strengthen coordination between economic development and workforce development

##### **Disadvantages:**

- Less connected to other staff working on related issues, including staff involved with various aspects of planning and land entitlement (e.g. current planning, advance planning, transportation planning, CEQA and other regulatory compliance, successor agency) and with Geographic Information Systems
- More challenging to assist with permit streamlining efforts as close coordination with planning, building and other functions will be key.
- Not as high profile as CAO and not as well placed as CAO for access to multiple departments.
- Not as well connected to staff working on related issues as DCD.

#### **CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:**

If this item is not approved, the County will not have the required classification to lead the County-wide Economic Development Strategic Plan and Programs.

#### **CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:**

#### **CLERK'S ADDENDUM**

***Speakers: Willie Mims, ECNAACP.***

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

Personnel Resolution No. 22113