

STAFF REPORT



MEETING DATE:	12/19/11
SUBJECT:	Minutes of the September 26, 2011, RTPA Special Meeting
AGENDA ITEM:	4-2
STAFF CONTACT:	Janie Coffman

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the board approve the minutes of the September 26, 2011, RTPA special meeting.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dan Little', written over a horizontal line.

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

Attachment: Minutes of the September 26, 2011, RTPA Special Meeting

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, September 26, 2011, 3:00 p.m.
City of Redding Council Chambers
777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, California

(Note: These minutes are not intended to serve as a transcript or verbatim record of the proceedings of the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency, but rather as a record of the meeting time, place and attendance; the order and general nature of discussion; board deliberations; and actions taken, if any.)

Board members Dickerson, Jones, Watkins, Comnick, Moty, Baugh and Hawes were present.

1. Call to Order

Chair Moty called the meeting to order at 3:21 p.m.

Public Comment Period

Board member Baugh: In June there was a payment of \$750,000 mistakenly issued to RABA. The board was not notified of this. My request is that this item be placed on a future agenda; to have the facts tracked down and get a correct timeline and scenario of events.

2. Consider Action to

- 1. Amend the RTPA bylaws giving the RTPA board authority over the executive director;**
- 2. Direct staff to prepare a detailed budget and transition plan for RTPA staffing independent from the County of Shasta for consideration at a future meeting; or**
- 3. Direct staff to prepare a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to provide a formal staffing arrangement between the RTPA and a host member agency (currently Shasta County) for consideration at a future meeting.**

Executive director Little: In August the Shasta County Board of Supervisors (BOS) took action to reorganize the plans and programs division of the department of public works. This created a dedicated RTPA staff within the division, but resulted in a loss to the RTPA of two planners. This left the RTPA with a staff level below the prior budgeted year, as well as below the amount approved by this RTPA board as part of this year's annual budget and overall work program. Questions as a result of the BOS action include:

- 1) Why did the county reduce RTPA staff?
- 2) Why didn't the county seek RTPA board or staff input prior to taking the action?
- 3) Does the county have the authority to reduce the RTPA staffing below budgeted levels without approval by the RTPA?
- 4) What were the impacts to the RTPA as a result of that action?

The RTPA now has one senior planner and one assistant planner instead of two of each. This reduction makes it difficult to meet the RTPA's core obligations.

The argument has been made that the staffing levels are consistent with three or four years ago when there were four senior planners within the division. What the RTPA did three or four years ago is not the same as what is being done today. One reason is because of the grant activity. When this board approved this years' budget, they approved seven full-time equivalent (FTE); four for grant activities and three for core activities.

Grants are needed to comply with new unfunded mandates, such as Senate Bill 375 (SB 375). SB 375 adds substantial new requirements to the regional transportation plan that are necessary to receive state and federal funds.

Total hours charged to the RTPA efforts in FY 09/10 was equivalent to 5.2 FTEs; 2.5 FTEs were planners. In FY 10/11 the workload increased due to grant funding in support of SB 375 compliance and capital projects. The level of effort and actual RTPA staff time went up to 6.6 FTEs, including four planners. In light of this, the RTPA board approved a budget for seven FTEs for FY 11/12.

At the request of the board, the RTPA's legal counsel provided a memo to county counsel suggesting changes to the bylaws so there is direct accountability between RTPA staff and the RTPA board. The existing bylaws state that, "The county director of public works or his/her designee is the RTPA director." The bylaws could be amended to say, "The RTPA board shall appoint its executive director."

Discussion:

Board member Baugh: In FY 10/11 how many staff were being trained to take pending retirement places? Were there overlaps in staffing?

Executive director Little: The two planners that were hired were experienced, so the training was minimal. What overlap there was, was also for the non-RTPA functions. If there was overlap in RTPA staffing, there would have also been an increase in the non-RTPA hours, which is not the case. Contrary to increases due to overlap, there was a reduction in the staffing levels as a result of a vacant senior planner position.

A side issue is overhead cost. The RTPA does not reimburse the county for overhead, which is about 30%. If there is an MOU, overhead reimbursement should be included in it.

There is also the option of an independent RTPA. An independent RTPA would be cleaner. In talking to peers and other agencies, there can still be conflicts with an MOU. It has been suggested that the cost associated with an independent agency should be determined by a third party.

Board member Dickerson: Thirty percent of what? Is that a standard for the county? Why not 25% or 50%? Where did this 30% evolve from?

Executive director Little: Thirty percent over salaries. The standard rate for engineering and professional level staff in public works is 30%.

Board member Jones: I, as an RTPA board member, did not know of the staff changes. Who on the RTPA board did know?

Executive director Little: The board members can speak for themselves. Obviously, the three board of supervisors members were aware of the reorganization. Although it may not have been known to the board of supervisors what impacts the reorganization would have on the RTPA as it was not included in the staff report to the board of supervisors.

Board member Moty: I met with Mr. Minturn (*Shasta County Director of Public Works (DPW)*) and talked about his proposal. In retrospect, it should have been brought before the RTPA board. My understanding was that we were not hurting the RTPA, and I'm still not convinced that we are. I'm not sure I agree with Mr. Little's report.

Board member Baugh: We (*the board of supervisors*) received this in a public forum at a county board of supervisors meeting. Yes, I was aware of it. Had I to do it over again, in retrospect, I think it should have been handled in a different way. It should have been brought to this board first and then to the county for approval. It seemed to make sense to me logically that responsibilities would be more effective if they weren't divided between county jobs and RTPA. I wouldn't handle it the same way again, but I might give the same answer.

Board member Hawes: I saw it as channeling these people to RTPA only a separation. In the long run I think it is going to help. That's why I didn't see it as a threat to the RTPA. I just took it as a management decision to make a separation and make a cleaner operation.

DPW director Minturn: I came before you last week to discuss the reorganization and to explain from the county's perspective that the move was neutral. I would like to give a presentation today demonstrating that it was neutral to the RTPA as well.

Last week I demonstrated FTEs charged to non-RTPA items and how it works out to two positions. A typical employee logs about 1,750 billable hours a year. We allocate one FTE over how many hours an employee works. It's been stable at about 8,000 hours a year until FY 09/10 when it went up a little because Jan Bulinski was hired and there was some overlap. Hours spiked in FY 10/11 because of the overlap from employees coming in and going out. Currently, we're back down to the same level as we had in FY 09/10.

Mr. Little may well have some grant needs. Three planners may not be enough anymore. There are some options that exist. One is overtime. There's also the option for contracting out. Another option is temporary employees and extra-help. There is a temporary position open that can be extended. The county has only limited needs for planners. The county has taken two positions to fulfill all the planning needs with the public works department.

RTPA time is bought by the hour. In FY 06/07 it was under \$400,000. It climbed steadily as government costs tend to do, and then it dropped suddenly this year. Costs are about the same as three years ago, but you're getting an extra 900 hours of staff time.

Board member Cornick: Mr. Minturn, you made the decision to take two planners away. Can you tell me how you made that decision?

DPW director Minturn: I was swayed by the meeting in June where conflicts were discussed. One day employees are working as a county representative and the next day as RTPA. I took a look at staffing and I took a look at who potentially could be moved out of that unit. There wasn't a lot of consultation about this move. When we added a new position for Jan Bulinski there was no consultation. I view this as a county staff issue. It was in the normal course of business that I brought it before my board.

Board member Cornick: I'm the one that asked for the independent figures because you, Mr. Minturn, are giving me figures. Mr. Little is giving me figures and they don't match. One of the things that Mr. Little has is the actual dollar amount for FY 10/11. He's showing \$610,158. You're showing the county figure at \$467, 274.

DPW director Minturn: Yes, and Mr. Little and I agree on those numbers. One number is inflated by an overlap of having nine employees in the office where we only had seven positions. It was also inflated because the 7% PERS payment hadn't been fully made and the top step employee hadn't retired yet.

Board member Cornick: You don't have any figures on the overhead. Are you agreeable on approximately 30%?

DPW director Minturn: It varies from 26% to 30%. We have to justify that to Caltrans. It would be a negotiable item; our incremental cost may not be exactly that.

Board member Cornick: I still feel that we would be far better off to have an independent person. It would make me feel more secure in saying this is probably the right figure. The reason I'm looking at this is because an independent RTPA is probably going to cost more money for staffing. Anything that costs the RTPA more money is going to come out of all four of our pockets (*cities and county*).

Board member Watkins: Mr. Minturn, you said that at the June RTPA meeting you took to heart that the RTPA board said there could be a potential for conflict. I don't remember the board saying the conflict was with individual employees, but at the higher level where grants and other money may be directed.

I believe that the executive director should be appointed by this board. I also would like to look for the economy of scale of continuing a working relationship with the county. I would see us going into some sort of an outline of points and an MOU that would tell us how we would proceed in working with a joint relationship. If not, then I would say the next step would be to have an independent RTPA.

Board member Hawes: I heard that some extra-help might be needed. I see one of the retirees sitting out there in the audience. Has there ever been any thought of bringing them back for a little extra time, if they are willing?

DPW director Minturn: Thomas Hays (the retiree) is signed on as an extra-help employee and I've seen him in the office in recent days. The decision rests with Mr. Little with his day-to-day management of staff.

Board member Dickerson: I recall at the June meeting that my expressed concern was with the current arrangements, whereby the director of public works has the ability to oversee the director of the RTPA. I believe that arrangement puts Mr. Minturn in a terrible position. Here's a man who works for the county. If he's doing his job correctly his loyalties lie with the county. When an issue comes up that has RTPA on one hand and the county on the other, Mr. Minturn cannot be faulted for taking the side of the county. That's an unnecessary dilemma that we have put him in because there are ways to correct that. I had no concern about the work that the line staff do. That was not the concern. At the risk of sounding redundant, this is the only RTPA in the state of California that operates under the model that we have here. All others are independent. I see no reason why we could not do that also. I believe that we should take action on this first item to at least make it the responsibility of the RTPA board to decide who the director is so that we maintain control over some of the issues that Mr. Minturn was describing here today. Another alternative is for the county to elevate the director of the RTPA to a department head. Perhaps then you wouldn't need the independent status. I believe that we need to go independent and all of these issues will take care of themselves.

Board member Jones: Mr. Minturn, if the RTPA was a stand-alone agency making their own staffing judgments as opposed to you doing that; do you see any problems associated with that?

DPW director Minturn: Management of staff is a tricky business. There is a lot of care and feeding that goes into employees. The county manages 1,700 employees. There are economies of scales of personnel, risk management and payroll departments. There is also a health plan that the county has 1,700 employees to spread costs over. I would see challenges in the establishment of that, in that you need to separate from the county umbrella.

Board member Baugh: I do believe we have three thoughts that have been presented to us. I do believe item number one is a simple answer. I believe this board should have authority over who it hires. I'm answering the question on what a county perspective is – this is a board, it is an independent board and it should have authority over who it hires. There's a suggestion that comes from our legal staff, Mr. Kenny, concerning an amendment being made to the bylaws. May I suggest that we make a recommendation today that we refer that to Mr. Kenny to consult with the county? While we still remain under the county umbrella, shouldn't the county also take a look at that and make sure that we don't create a legal conflict? I'm left with many questions about what the realities of the finances are. I think that it would be appropriate for us to have a clear understanding. I still remain opposed to creating additional overhead on behalf of the public. One of the big things that come to my mind is that if we completely separated this agency, would we even take the same model? Right now all the employees receive rather substantial benefits through PERS. Would it be to the financial benefit of this board, as an independent agency, even to continue that? Perhaps not. If we chose not to continue those types of benefits for the employees, would we get the great staff we have? I would support having some review and making sure we're going ahead in an appropriate manner. The first thought is that I believe we should have the authority to hire our executive director.

Board member Cornick: If the decision is to do an independent study who has to okay that? Does Mr. Minturn, or does Mr. Little, or do both of them have to okay an independent study of the position?

Executive director Little: Probably the clearest thing to do would be for this board to authorize it.

Board member Cornick: What I'm really looking for is the cost of an independent RTPA compared to what it's costing us at this point. That's the bottom line.

Public comment opened by Chair Moty:

Gracious Palmer, City of Shasta Lake citizen: I urge you to 1) amend the RTPA bylaws giving the RTPA board authority over the executive director, and 2) direct staff to prepare a detailed budget and transition plan for the RTPA staffing independent from Shasta County, for consideration at a future meeting.

Randy Carter, Shasta County resident: I have some concerns with having one entity carrying too much weight with the decision making process. The RTPA is structured so that all entities have fair and equal voice in our regional transportation. Shasta County is one of the only counties in the state where the RTPA is not fully autonomous from the county. Having any of the entities choosing their favorite appointment to executive director of the RTPA is simply not ethical. The public has entrusted the RTPA to be a fair and equitable voice, and the public expects the RTPA board to be the administrator here, not one entity. The RTPA board has full authority and should exercise that authority to appoint the executive director.

Rod Evans, Shasta County resident: I'd like to advise you of your stated goal – the RTPA is to provide a safe, balanced, coordinated and cost effective transportation system that serves the needs of the local metropolitan area and region. I think, in that vein, it becomes critically important that all municipalities are fairly represented and thus, in the end, all citizens are also fairly represented. I encourage the RTPA board to exercise its supervision and ability to choose the executive director and I would also urge the board to pursue the other two action items as well.

Sally Riley, the Construction Industry Force Account Council: I have questions about the urgency of this and why we're not taking a little more time. The first time the item came up for the board to appoint the executive director was a week ago, and now we have another meeting this week. I ask the county members how the county would handle an employee working in their building, under their payroll, that wasn't hired by them. I first want to go to the fact that I don't believe this board should change their bylaws to be able to appoint the executive director until those staffing needs and legalities are worked out. I ask that both the transition and the MOU be studied and looked at in a two to three month period. With the economy the way it is, saving money is extremely important for a government body. We need the money on the streets. We need to be able to get jobs out there. I ask that you not start now spending more money. A director independently appointed by this board could end up with a negotiating package that does not have the salary limits that are currently with the county or any of the cities.

Mary Machado, executive director for Shasta Voices: I want to remind you of some of the really good things that the staff has done, and that we as a community are not anxious to lose. They have aggressively, highly aggressively, applied for grants and have been very successful in bringing money to this community. The South Redding Six Lane Project, which is over \$22 million, the Dana to Downtown Project, the Cottonwood Truck Climbing Lanes; all these projects have created jobs that we desperately

need in this community. I don't want to lose those dollars and I don't want to lose the capable staff that we have that brings these multi-million dollar projects to our community. The county at this point seems to be focusing on the staffing needs rather than the benefits that the RTPA has provided to our community. I'd like to see the focus back where it belongs. I can't understand why you would not want board authority to select your own executive director. I don't think I understand why you would not want to be an independent agency. I'm very confident the staff that you have would be able to find the funds to operate autonomously – because they would be given a budget just like the county has a budget. I urge you to seriously make a decision today to amend the RTPA bylaws giving the board authority over the executive director, and to consider having a third party study whether or not the independent agency would be a good thing.

Gary Cadd, City of Redding resident: I'd like to thank Mr. Little for the job that you've done with the RTPA, and the job that you've done managing our transportation dollars. You've done a very good job. Your staff has done a very good job. I don't think that this would be the time to break any of that staff up. Changes were made by the county that is obvious the city members of this board weren't aware of. It does bring some urgency forward to make some changes now. I would recommend item number one, two and three. Move forward to look at an MOU and staffing issues. The main issue at this time is putting the executive director under your elected official's purview. It is very important and should be done now.

Board member Hawes: We could contract for these services and not have to pay any retirement or benefits of any sort. I'm of the belief that you don't fix what's not broken and I don't see this as being broken. Several people mentioned all the beautiful projects that have come to this city and the county. I don't know how we could have done much better of a job.

Board member Dickerson: Part of the reason we have difficulties today is because the only formalized working relationship between the RTPA and the county has been a single line in the bylaws that says the department of public works will appoint the director. No clarity, no explanation, no methodology as to how that will go forward. I believe that if we do number one, which we should do, it needs to be followed up by an MOU.

Board member Cornick: I think the county should have to agree with number one, too.

Board member Watkins: We had the opportunity to look at a whole independent board a month or two ago. We elected not to do that. The majority of the speakers indicated that this board should have the authority to appoint the executive director. I think we need to pass that today. I don't see any sense of going forward and having any additional studies on it. At the same time, I would like to put the ball in the court of the county and see what terms need to be worked out in an MOU so we can continue having cost sharing benefits. If we can't work out an MOU where we share some costs with the county, then our only alternative would be to have an independent agency. I'd like to see at least a couple attempts at saving money for the taxpayers. If we pass this and an MOU is looked at with the county, one of the options might be that the RTPA executive director should be a department head in the county. If that would solve some issues, then that would be part of the MOU that would come back to this board. I think we need to pass number one.

Board member Moty: The concerns I have here are with saying, "Let this board have the appointing authority in totality," and then say – "But county, you hire the employee, you're responsible for the employee, you take care of the employee, if he does something wrong, well that's tough, because we hired him and it's your responsibility." I have a hard time with that. The other question I have is what if this board decides that whoever they hire as the executive director, they don't want – they get rid of him. Who takes that employee? Does the county get him back? I have some concerns about that. One of the biggest things I have concerns about is asking the county to take on an employee who actually answers to a different boss. I think you create more problems than you have today. The other thing is the question, which is probably logically correct; if the county is not going to do it, then let's just go independent. Maybe we could do that. I think the answer is already in the staff report and in the comments – it's going to cost more money. I think Mr. Little's example here where he says Shasta County's RTPA is the one with the least amount of employees is because we're not independent, so we're not paying for all the other stuff. We're not paying for someone to do the timecards, payroll, insurance, retirement and building maintenance. Those are all other costs and that's probably why these places have more employees. So, it's going to be more money. It's going to come out of the repair of our roads and whatever stuff we do; plus \$140,000 in overhead on top of that. The county's been eating that for 40 years and I haven't heard the county screaming to get that \$140,000 back tomorrow. That's just more money that goes back into roads. If you want to spend it on administration and stuff like that, I guess we could do that as well.

Board member Jones: I'm going to make a motion that we amend the RTPA bylaws giving the RTPA board full authority over the executive director position.

Board member Watkins: I'll second it.

Board member Baugh: While I support the concept, it doesn't really do us any good based upon our current structure of being aligned with the county, to make an amendment to the bylaws that may in fact be opposed to county ordinance. My recommendation is that we don't need to be in a hurry to make this decision tonight. If we take the time to have Mr. Kenny sit down with county legal staff and find out any potential conflicts, that will probably answer that question. If you make it today, I vote no because you're not supplying answers to the potential conflict with county ordinance. We are dealing with the structure we have today, which I'll point out all of the wonderful things that have happened. The millions and multiple millions, hundreds of millions of dollars that continue to come into this county have been received and processed through this existing structure. This doesn't need to be decided today. If we go forward with the motion I will not support it.

Board member Dickerson: We spent a good deal of time last week, and a lot of time this week defining conflict of interest. Just by the conversation that's going on here it's clear to me that the staff of the county and the RTPA staff has clearly demonstrated that there is a conflict of interest under the present setup. We need to change that. The more growth that exists in Shasta County going forward, the more potential there is for this conflict to raise its head and cause significant problems. I think we need to solve it. I agree that we can't do it simply by changing the bylaws. That's why I would support the motion that the motion maker would also include the preparation of an MOU. That would require our counsel and county counsel to get together and discuss all these issues that were raised by folks here. They may come back to us with a good, solid recommendation on how to proceed with this. I

don't think I can support it if all we're doing is amending the bylaws. We end up in the same position we're in now for the long term.

Board member Jones: I'm prepared to amend my motion to direct staff, in addition, to prepare an MOU to provide a formal staffing arrangement between the RTPA and a host member agency, in this case Shasta County, for consideration at a future meeting.

Board member Watkins: I'll amend my second.

Board member Cornick: When does this take effect? Could you amend your motion to do it at the next meeting on the 25th of October?

Board member Jones: Is it wise, Mr. Little, to set it that quickly? What are your thoughts on that?

Executive director Little: We'd certainly start working on it right away. I think it needs to be addressed quickly. If nothing else we could certainly provide an update at the next meeting.

Board member Jones: I will amend my motion that the RTPA staff will report information back on the 25th, not necessarily that action will be taken on the 25th. We will have an information update and possible action on the 25th.

Board member Watkins: I will amend mine a second time.

Board member Cornick: We're amending the bylaws but we're not making an agreement with the county – is that true?

Board member Jones: I can read the entire motion – to amend the RTPA bylaws giving the RTPA board full authority over the executive director and direct staff to prepare an MOU to provide a formal staffing arrangement between the RTPA and the county for consideration at the October 25th meeting.

Board member Baugh: It would take action on item number one to begin with and to the point of an open MOU discussion. Shouldn't discussion include item number one, not exclude it? By making the motion today to enact item number one, now you have excluded any discussion and any questions that I asked you as to how it may refer to existing Shasta County ordinances. I think we're making a mistake and being hasty.

Board member Moty: I think what it does is it puts the county in a position of saying, "Okay, we're going to agree to an MOU, or we're not." Therefore, forcing the issue of going independent. If the county chooses to walk away, then what other choice do you have, unless Redding, or Shasta Lake or Anderson wants to take it over?

RTPA legal counsel Kenny: This board has the right to appoint its executive director. This board could appoint Mr. Minturn if they wanted to. They could appoint Mr. Little and leave him an employee of the county if the county agreed. They could appoint Mr. Little and contract with him separately.

Executive director Little: Mr. Chairman, if I'm directed to begin negotiations and the process for an MOU, it's very difficult to address that MOU without answering the fundamental question of what the staffing relationship is. The MOU can go in an entirely different direction based on that. It would be more productive and more valuable to have some guidance from the board to the executive director.

Board member Moty: I'd like to see us amend the bylaws to have more direct involvement in appointing the executive director, but actually telling some other entity that we're going to appoint your employee as our person and you have no control over that has inherent problems. Do you think your motion is clear or not Mr. Jones?

Board member Jones: I think there is one word possibly missing, and that is the word appoint. So, to amend the RTPA bylaws giving the RTPA board authority to *appoint* the executive director as opposed to the word *over* and direct staff to prepare an MOU to provide a formal staffing arrangement between the RTPA and the county, for consideration at the October 25 meeting.

Board member Watkins: Second.

RTPA legal counsel Kenny: Under that motion then, staff would come back on the 25th with an amendment to the bylaws and a status report or an MOU with the county.

Board member Watkins: I don't think there's a big concern over this board appointing the executive director. The ball is totally in the county's court. When we give them the authority to negotiate an MOU, they have to set conditions they would want if this is going to continue to be a cooperative agreement between the RTPA and the county.

Board member Baugh: I understand your intention with the motion, but I consider it to be vague. We're granting immediate authority over the appointment of the executive director, but we're not adopting a language that satisfies that. I simply think that we should be directing staff to bring back clarification, not making that motion today. If there was a legitimate way to have this work as described through an MOU I would be, as I stated earlier, interested in that.

Board member Moty: I support more board involvement or some other form of involvement in appointing the executive director; whether it is through the interview process where either board members, or someone from each of the cities, is involved or something like that. I don't know what this motion is saying and so I don't think I can support this at this point either. I'm just concerned this is going to force the whole issue into an independent thing where it's going to cost us more money in the end. We have a motion and a second (Jones/Watkins).

The motion failed with board members Jones, Watkins and Dickerson voting yes; board members Baugh, Hawes and Moty voting no; board member Cornick abstained.

Board member Cornick: I think what we're looking for is to prepare an MOU and provide a formal staffing arrangement between the RTPA and the host member agency, which is the county at this time, for consideration at a future meeting and at that time amend the bylaws if we so choose.

Board member Baugh: I'm hesitant to go that far. I think what I'm looking for is additional information. If we could simply direct staff to sit down with the county and explore alternatives I would be thrilled to have that discussion at a future board meeting.

Board member Hawes: I thought we were interested in the cost? I'd be interested in knowing the cost.

Board member Moty: What I'd be open to and what I would welcome are discussions. I'd like to see if there's an interest on the county's part to do that. Then bring that back and say, "Okay, here's where we think we can go or where we match up and where we don't". Then let us decide if we want to pursue it anymore or not.

Board member Cornnick: Mr. Little, does this RTPA have to have a host?

Executive director Little: No, that's the independent agency option. The steps would be, if you want, to try the MOU first and see if terms can be agreed upon. If those negotiations fail, the only other options are status quo, or going independent.

Board member Cornnick: If we vote on asking for the MOU then that's all we're going to get?

Executive director Little: Yes

Board member Cornnick: How about if we ask you at the same time for an independent study?

Executive director Little: You can certainly do that. As your executive director it would be good to have one direction going forward rather than trying to tackle independent versus MOU options at the same time. I'd prefer to go down one road or the other and have some general direction from this board

Board member Cornnick: I'm prepared to make a motion to ask you to do an independent study for us. What I'm looking for is the figures for what you're spending right now and the figures that it would cost for you to have a staff of eight as an independent RTPA.

Motion died for lack of a second.

Board member Watkins: I make a motion that we direct staff to prepare an MOU to provide the outline of a staffing arrangement between the RTPA and the county for consideration on October 25th, so we can better evaluate whether the board would be the appointing authority over the executive director in consultation with county concerns.

Board member Dickerson: Second

Board member Moty: Board member Watkins has deleted the change in the bylaws, and what I heard clearly is that it is just directing staff to meet with the county to discuss the possibility of an MOU to see if there's any common ground or agreement, including discussion about the authority over the executive director.

The motion passed with board members Jones, Watkins, Dickerson, Baugh, Cornick and Moty voting yes; board member Hawes voting no.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Moty adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director
/jac