

CCMPO/CCRPC Joint Board Meeting 11/03/10

Breakout Group Topic: Bylaws

Issues heard: (from outreach feedback, Board, and staff)

Staffed by: Julie & Dave

Membership

- CCTA would like to be a voting member – would giving CCTA a vote technically increase the voting power of CCTA member towns? Should other regional organizations then also be allowed voting membership?
- Buel's Gore would like to be a voting member.
- What if the MPO needs to incorporate adjacent communities such as the St. Albans area?
- What happens to the Local Emergency Planning Committee?
- Role of special interest groups – at large members – should other regional entities be considered such as the Chittenden County Solid Waste District, the Champlain Water District, the Intervale?
- Should Federal Highway be a voting member?
- Will GBIC become a voting member?

Representation

- Have one representative from each organization form the new Board.
- Reduced number of reps could reduce local control, loss of broader base, more power in the hands of fewer people, keep two representatives per town?
- Concern about the representation of rural towns by some rural towns – finding enough volunteers to fill the positions.
- If there is going to be one board member (reducing from 1 MPO & 1 RPC) for each town, the member most recently appointed should be the rep to maintain institutional memory.
- Should the board member be an elected official – if they are, is there the risk of lack of continuity due to the potential for changes when local elections are held? **No Staff Reps?**
- Role of the Alternates – should they be eliminated, should their role be expanded to include work on committees to prepare them for regular membership; should there be a few “super” meetings each year including both regular members and alternates; should there be more than one alternate?
- If one Board member is selected from the 2 current MPO/RPC town reps – that person should be balanced with regards to issues of transportation, land use, the environment.

Voting

- Maintain current voting rules – weighted voting for MPO issues, municipal representatives voting on municipal plan adoption (similar to liquor control board rules during Selectboard meetings).
- Consider new voting rules.
- Consider leaving all current voting in place as is – MPO reps vote on MPO matters, RPC reps vote on RPC matters.
- If you have two voting schemes, what is the purpose of merger?
- Should regional organizations which receive funding from the MPO (or RPC) be voting members? Towns have a vote and receive funding, however, they are also dues-paying members.
- Do not consider changing existing voting rules with regards to weighted voting until the Census figures are released and the merged Board has had a chance to operate for a period of time.
- Could there still be two representatives with only one vote between them?
- The MPO has always been a voting member of the RPC Board but not vice versa.

Other Considerations

- Federal and State requirements.
- Duties of the Board.
- Committee structure - could more of the Board level work be moved to Committees.
- Merge the MTP and the Regional Plan Update Committees for work on both activities.
- Have the bylaws dictate the Committee structure and function.
- Would the number of meetings per month increase to two?
- Have the meeting activities split with MPO activities the first half of the meeting and RPC activities the second half.
- Not all parts of the bylaws need to be changed immediately.