

**FINAL Meeting Minutes  
Rivanna River Basin Commission  
Executive Committee**

May 28, 2009

2 pm – 4 pm

Albemarle County Office Building - 5th Street (COB-5th)  
(corner of Old Lynchburg Road and 5th Street at 1600 5<sup>th</sup> Street)

---

**Attendance**

***Rivanna River Basin Commission Members:***

\*Mr. John E. Easter II, Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District Board of Directors

\*Ms. Holly Edwards, Charlottesville City Council

Mr. John Martin, Albemarle County Citizen (not a member of the Executive Committee)

\*Mr. Marvin F. Moss, Fluvanna County Board of Supervisors

\*Ms. Roberta Savage, Greene County Citizen

\*Ms. Sally Thomas, Albemarle County Board of Supervisors

\* Rivanna River Basin Commission Executive Committee Member

***Others present:***

Ms. Leslie Middleton, RRBC Executive Director

Mr. Richard Lloyd, community member

Ms. Dede Smith, community member

Ms. Rose Brown, RRBC volunteer

**1. Call to order**

Ms. Thomas called the meeting to order at 1:59 pm.

**2. Roll call**

Attendance was taken.

**3. Determination of quorum**

It was determined a quorum was present.

**4. Approval of the agenda**

The agenda was approved, with no changes.

**5. Approval of the minutes of the preceding EC meeting**

There were no previous minutes to approve.

**6. Report of the Chair**

Ms. Thomas recently attended the Chesapeake Bay Program meetings. Ms. Thomas serves on the Chesapeake Bay Program's Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAG), which focuses on the needs and perspectives of local government. The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), which represents non-governmental organizations, has urged the Chesapeake Bay Program to seek outside evaluation. The chair of the Science and Technology Advisory Committee (STAC) has recently reported: (1) scientists have overestimated the effect of best management practices; (2) scientists have underestimated the impact of population growth and development; (3) STAC is trying not to make same mistake with regards to the effects of climate change on the health of the Chesapeake Bay. There is evidence that droughts will become drier, and storms will be more severe. More dirt will thus erode and continue to fill the Bay with sediment. Finally,(4) the Virginia Secretary of Natural Resources surmises that there is a "positive tipping point," which means that the Chesapeake Bay Program may not have to reach every goal for cleaning the Bay, but at some point the goals reached may be enough, and nature will take over.

Ms. Thomas noted that during the CBP Executive Council's meeting (May 11, 2009) promises were made about 2011 goals, especially Virginia's commitment to tighter stormwater controls and regulations. Mr. Moss asked if there were high expectations of the President's Executive Order. Ms. Thomas replied that there are, but that the Governors' meeting was before the Executive Order was issued. Ms. Thomas went on to say that Governor Kaine mentioned the Executive Order yesterday at the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority tertiary treatment upgrade to Moore Creek plant groundbreaking event. Ms. Middleton noted that the Chesapeake Bay program is being lifted to the executive level, and Mr. Moss noted that having an independent evaluator is essential.

## **7. Report of Executive Director**

Ms. Middleton passed out a handout titled "Executive Director's Report" (filename: ED report to Exec Ctte 090528) and gave an update on the following topics:

- Summary of May 19 RRBC TAC meeting

Ms. Middleton and the TAC members spent most of the May 19 TAC meeting allocating National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) grant resources to localities. A detailed breakdown of these allocations is listed on the handout. Ms. Middleton explained the history of the grant process and allocations. Original allocations were made by Mr. Ridge Schuyler and Ms. Diane Frisbee during the original grant proposal. At that time, Fluvanna High school components were clear, but Greene County had not yet scoped their best management projects. The original proposal was for \$1 million, but the RRBC has been awarded \$725,000. Ms. Middleton made executive decisions, which were not formulaic, but rather based on locality need, the amount of match that a locality can provide, and political urgency. \$480,000 has been allocated to counties to pay for best management practices (BMPs) and some extra costs for counties (for example, Fluvanna and Greene counties will be getting inventories for stormwater retrofit opportunities). All localities will receive consistent signage at the funded BMPs as part of the funding. Some retrofit of designs will be necessary to accommodate monitoring.

Ms. Thomas attended the May 19 TAC meeting, and described that the TAC members tried various formulas and eventually used professional judgment and a process of compromise to finalize the allocations. Mr. Moss commented that the criteria listed seem fair. Ms. Middleton reiterated that she does not have numbers to show that there was a uniform process to determine allocation. She offered to provide more specific wording and explanation, for Commissioners to take back to localities. Mr. Moss stated that this would probably not be necessary. Mr. Moss asked where the rest of the funds would be used. Ms. Middleton replied that the majority of the remaining funds would go to monitoring of the BMPs (with StreamWatch under contract to coordinate) and workshops and symposia.

Stormwater monitoring has proven to be a complicated topic because there is little precedent. Some strategies are being outlined for working with locality staff, engineers and planners to build local expertise and excitement about new stormwater regulations. There will be a watershed-wide symposium in the future, which the RRBC may coordinate with Rivanna Conservation Society and the annual teacher summit.

While referring to the handout, Mr. Easter asked how the \$480,000 was determined. Ms. Middleton explained that originally, when the grant proposal was for \$998,000, approximately \$500-\$600,000 was allocated for localities. This had to be reduced to \$480,000 when the grant proposal was reduced to \$750,000 and then the eventual grant award to \$725,000. Ms. Middleton gave some examples of how some numbers were cut/changed and offered to send Mr. Easter the spreadsheet that was used for the process. Mr. Easter said that that would not be necessary.

Ms. Thomas commented that each project and its match money have been approved by National Fish and Wildlife Fund (NFWF); and that there is a \$2.8 million match required with the grant. Mr. Easter asked if that amount would come from the localities? Ms. Middleton explained that in most cases, the match money is the additional costs of putting in place the BMPs. Mr. Moss clarified that these are already appropriated funds. Ms. Savage pointed out that in-kind donation can be used as match, not just cash. Ms. Middleton stressed that there will be no match requirement beyond what counties have already committed.

Ms. Middleton explained that Ms. Carol Wise, Assistant Director of Philanthropy at The Nature Conservancy, joined the TAC meeting and discussed how the RRBC "seed" money was raised through a lead donor in our community. Mr. Moss asked if the lead donor has expressed approval of the RRBC and the projects on which they have been working. Ms. Middleton replied that the donor is pleased at the progress and that obtaining the NFWF grant is seen as a significant success in working with the localities, which are each bringing their own match funds to the project. Ms. Thomas explained that Ms. Wise has been keeping donors informed of the progress of the RRBC. Mr. Easter asked if the lead donor is anonymous, and Ms. Middleton replied said yes.

During the TAC meeting, members discussed changing the format of the meetings to take more advantage of technical expertise. Ms. Middleton explained that the make-up of the TAC includes locality staff, most of whom have professional environmental training and experience, plus additional, highly trained technical experts. There is a growing tension about how technical

the TAC should be. This will be discussed in more detail on July 14 during the next TAC meeting. Ms. Thomas pointed out that professors at the university don't want to discuss budget details, and that staff people are not able to participate when the group discussion is over their heads. Mr. Easter asked if it is a tension that is best resolved by the TAC, or if it is the role of the RRBC. Ms. Savage stated that it is an issue for the TAC itself because it benefits the group to have a certain amount of tension; it is part of having a diverse group. Mr. Moss pointed out that this is why planners are so important in the TAC: they know what will be feasible in communities. Ms. Middleton referred to the Charter, which states that the TAC is directed to carry out tasks designated by the RRBC. Ms. Middleton said that there is a role for the RRBC, to help guide the TAC through the tension, but that they may want to wait. Mr. Easter asked Ms. Middleton to inform the RRBC when she believes that the TAC needs oversight. Ms. Middleton stated that some RRBC members sit in on TAC meetings, and they will know when the healthy tension becomes something else. Mr. Moss reiterated that the Fluvanna County planners have been benefiting from the TAC meetings and have been coming back to the County with good feedback.

Ms. Middleton reminded the RRBC that there would be a press event in Richmond on June 1 at 1 p.m. at the State Capitol to announce the NFWF grant recipients. Ms. Middleton will prepare a press release to area media outlets for distribution on Monday, June 1, that will showcase the RRBC and locality cooperation on this grant project. Ms. Savage asked if all grantees would be attending, and Ms. Middleton clarified that it would be just Virginia grantees. Mr. Moss recommended that the press release should include quotes from Ms. Thomas and himself. Mr. Moss pointed out that this is the first grant from any group for the Fluvanna High School project.

- Discussion of StreamWatch – RRBC relationship

Ms. Middleton pointed out the diagram and chart on page 5 and 6 of the handout. The diagram and chart were created by Mr. John Murphy from StreamWatch, to clarify the StreamWatch – RRBC relationship. Ms. Middleton explained that when Mr. Schuyler and Ms. Frisbee left their former positions, there was a lost link between RRBC and StreamWatch. Ms. Frisbee was on the TAC for StreamWatch, and Mr. Schuyler was on the StreamWatch Steering Committee. Mr. Murphy asked Ms. Middleton to invite the RRBC to join the StreamWatch Steering Committee. Ms. Middleton believes that the RRBC should accept the invitation. Ms. Thomas clarified that StreamWatch will be contracting with the RRBC for the Healthy Waters grant. Ms. Thomas posed that perhaps the RRBC should be more independent of StreamWatch because of the possibility of working with other contractors. Mr. Moss pointed out that the RRBC has a good relationship with StreamWatch and asked what the benefits there would be in making a new relationship. Ms. Middleton reiterated that because there is no longer a link to the StreamWatch committees, there might be a break of communication. The RRBC could sit on the committee as an ex-officio member. Ms. Thomas pointed out that this would be more work for Ms. Middleton. Ms. Middleton stated that she will simply be in the loop of communication, receiving meeting minutes, and that it should not be much more work. Ms. Savage commented that Mr. Murphy sits on the RRBC TAC and provides data as a contractor. Ms. Brown takes minutes during the RRBC meetings. Perhaps that is enough interplay.

Ms. Thomas asked if action could be taken before consulting the entire RRBC. Members agreed that it would be fine for Ms. Middleton to just receive StreamWatch minutes and stay in the communication loop, but Ms. Middleton was not sure if Mr. Murphy would feel comfortable with just sending minutes to her; he may wish for more participation than that. Mr. Easter pointed out that there was a suggested action on the handout; to vote whether to accept the StreamWatch invitation. Ms. Middleton explained that the group should not assume that everyone on the RRBC understands how StreamWatch operates. If nothing else, there is an opportunity for StreamWatch to help the RRBC to understand this more clearly. Mr. Moss motioned to accept the StreamWatch invitation to become a non-voting member of the StreamWatch steering committee. Mr. Easter seconded the motion. All members were in favor, and the motion passed.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that the RRBC could revisit the issue later if needed. Ms. Savage clarified that on the StreamWatch chart (on the handout), Rivanna Conservation Society (RCS) is just a fiscal agent for StreamWatch. When StreamWatch was formed, Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District (TJSWCD) and RCS both became fiscal agents for StreamWatch. It was decided at that time that government funding would go through TJSWCD and grant and private funds would be administered through RCS.

- Land Cover Map & Greene County

Ms. Middleton handed out a draft organization/relationship chart that shows the numerous relationships between localities, non-profits, and the RRBC on various projects, including the Land Cover Map project. Ms. Middleton noted that the RRBC had committed \$25,500 toward the costs of the Rivanna watershed portion of the Land Cover map. Albemarle and Fluvanna counties contributed additional funds so that each of those entire counties could be mapped, not just the portions of the county within the Rivanna watershed. Greene County chose not to contribute funds to map the rest of Greene County. However, Greene County is updating its Comprehensive Plan, and the RRBC is involved, with the TJPDC, through the Healthy Waters Initiative. Ms. Middleton is working to find \$4.4K to flesh out the rest of the Greene County land cover map. Mr. Moss commented that this is a good gesture because it helps to cement the relationship between the RRBC and the localities. Ms. Savage commented that Greene County would not be able to afford the map otherwise, so this is for the betterment of the larger watershed.

Ms. Thomas expressed the opinion that Ms. Middleton should not take funds from the RRBC budget to help Greene county, but that if others in the RRBC think that that would be appropriate, then the RRBC should discuss the matter. Ms. Middleton said that she believes that she'll be able to secure the funding. She said that even if she can find the funds, she might not have them in hand, in time for the map contract. She asked if the RRBC could front the money to cover the contract modification, and then the money would be returned when Ms. Middleton secured the funds. Mr. Moss said that this would be fine, as long as the funding is guaranteed before the RRBC fronts the money. Ms. Thomas proposed that a motion should be made for the RRBC should advance the money, and be repaid when other funds are available. Ms. Savage made the motion, and Mr. Easter seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion passed.

Ms. Edwards asked if the funding would be from a grant. Ms. Middleton replied that it would probably be leftover grant money from an agency such as the Department of Forestry, Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), or Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission. Ms. Middleton is researching a few possibilities, which all involve excess funds from grants that have already been given. DCR often has an end of year mini-grant program. Ms. Middleton asked if anyone wanted to discuss the possibility of RRBC funding the full \$4.4K. There was no interest at this time.

- Status of grant funding and grant match documentation

The grant from the National Fish and Wildlife Fund (NFWF) will be finalized by the end of June. NFWF is administering the grant through an online process, which will allow grantees to request and receive money quickly. Ms. Middleton noted that the NFWF grant monies will be separate from the money transferred from The Nature Conservancy (fundraising specifically for the RRBC).

Ms. Middleton gave an overview of the grant funding for the Healthy Waters Initiative at the present time: \$35K of the \$55K will go to Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU). \$16K will go to StreamWatch to conduct local bio-monitoring. \$4K will be left for the RRBC. Ms. Thomas said that she was delighted and encouraged about this grant money, and thanked Ms. Middleton for working so hard on the grant proposal. Ms. Middleton noted that Rick Hill, the grant sponsor, said that the next step is to bring a representatives from the Environmental Protection Agency to the Rivanna watershed, possibly Laura Gabanski (EPA Headquarters Healthy Watersheds coordinator) and Jon Capacasa (Region III Water Protection Division Director).

- Preparation of Fiscal 2010 budget

This topic was postponed.

- Renewal of TJSWCD as fiscal agent

Ms. Middleton had looked back through previous minutes and could not find a resolution to designate the Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District as the RRBC fiscal agent. Mr. Moss motioned to renew the TJSWCD fiscal arrangement. Mr. Easter seconded. All were in favor, and the motion passed.

- Planning for July 23, 2009 RRBC meeting in Fluvanna County

Mr. Moss said that Fluvanna County has found creative ways to use nonprofits to help forward government projects. He noted that there have been good environmental preservation efforts, and that some of those efforts would be showcased during the next RRBC meeting in Fluvanna County. Ms. Middleton asked if the RRBC could visit the site of new high school as a field trip? Mr. Moss said that the RRBC would be at Pleasant Grove anyway, so a trip to the high school can be added. Mr. Martin will arrange for a meeting place for the RRBC.

- Update on City appointee process

Ms. Thomas said that the TJPDC has reviewed the candidates for the City of Charlottesville appointee. She reviewed that the RRBC Charter lists the requirements for applicants, and that there were four applicants. Keith Lancaster, an engineer who works for Southern Development Corporation, was chosen as the TJPDC recommendation to the City. The City will appoint applicants to all its Commissions at the June 15<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting.

- Commissioner bios

Ms. Middleton is missing a few bios. Mr. Easter pledged to send his. Ms. Edwards asked if her information could just be taken from the website. Ms. Middleton agreed to start with that and added that she may need additional information. Mr. Moss stressed the importance of having a good packet of information for new Commissioners. He said that it is hard to participate in a group that does not provide good information. Ms. Middleton asked for specific recommendations of content for the packet. Various suggestions were the Charter, legislation, meeting minutes, summary of achievements, bios, and press releases. Ms. Thomas stated that if Ms. Middleton had any trouble getting information from any of the commissioners, Ms. Thomas could help.

- Website update

Ms. Middleton referenced the website ‘wire frame’ on page 4 of the handout. Ms. Middleton requested feedback. None was given at this time, but Commissioners agreed to look at the wire frame and submit comments later. The next step is a minor redesign of the RRBC logo to add colors, so that a color palette can be chosen for the website. Ms. Middleton distributed handouts of color palette options. The commissioners preferred the green circle with black font. The logo designs came from Fran Smith (DEZA, Ltd), a local graphic designer and are covered under the web-site line item. Mr. Easter asked if they should consider the different costs between a two color and a three color logo. Ms. Middleton replied that state-of-the-art printing that accommodates two, three and four color designs is widely available without significant cost differentials of the past.

- Center for Non-profit Excellence

Ms. Middleton proposed that the RRBC join the Center for Non-profit Excellence at the \$100 level. Ms. Savage moved to accept, Mr. Moss seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion passed. Ms. Savage noted that the Center has a meeting, which the RRBC could use.

## **8. Policies and procedures: Agenda Item 8**

Update on legal, fiscal and staffing options for RRBC

- Reappointment of Chair and Vice-Chair of RRBC

Ms. Middleton pointed out that the Charter requires the RRBC Chair and Vice-Chair to be appointed every two years by the Commission. Since these appointments were made in April 2007, the RRBC is overdue in appointing these positions. A number of options for rectifying this oversight and the issue of nominating and electing these positions were then explored, including creating a Nominating Committee to nominate for these positions; calling a special meeting of the RRBC; amending the Charter (which requires majority vote of full RRBC) to have elections of Chair and Vice Chair elected at the end of the calendar year following local elections; conducting a meeting via conference call (not allowed by FOIA regulations);

Ms. Edwards noted that the charter was amended in 2007 to add this clause. Ms. Middleton explained that the first RRBC meeting was in April 2007 and that during 2007 the RRBC meetings monthly. Ms. Middleton added that certain portions of the Charter (those that are in addition to the Statute) may be changed without an act of General Assembly. Ms. Thomas asked if Mr. Easter would make recommendations for changes to the Charter, and he agreed. Ms. Thomas explored how to amend the charter, on page 7, and determined that a majority vote is required. Mr. Easter asked if each person would look through the charter and contact him with any other changes that should be made. Ms. Middleton and Ms. Edwards agreed to work with Mr. Easter on the recommended changes. Ms. Middleton will coordinate a meeting to review the charter in June or early July.

Mr. Easter called attention to the Charter clause about filling vacant officer positions. He noted that the chair and vice chair terms actually expired on April 30<sup>th</sup> and have technically vacant since then. According to the charter, it is acceptable to fill the vacancies during the July meeting. Ms. Middleton confirmed that Ms. Thomas was elected in May 2007; therefore her term expired on April 30, 2009. Ms. Thomas has been the "acting temporary chair" since then. Mr. Martin clarified that although the terms expired, the people holding the positions will continue with their tasks until replaced. Ms. Thomas suggested a motion that officers whose terms expired should continue in office until they are replaced in July. Ms. Savage asked for a clarification about the timeline, and Mr. Easter confirmed that as of April 20<sup>th</sup>, the Chair and Vice Chair terms ended. Mr. Easter moved that the Chair and Vice Chair continue in their positions until replaced. Mr. Moss seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion passed.

The Executive Committee determined that, under the circumstances, the appropriate way to nominate and elect the new Chair and Vice-Chair will be as follows at the July 23 meeting: early in the meeting, the Acting Chair will ask for volunteers to sit on the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee will then be elected and will retire for a short time to confer and then return to propose a slate of candidates for Chair and Vice-Chair. The full Commission will then vote on the slate. The newly-elected Chair will assume responsibility for following the July 23, 2009 meeting.

Ms. Thomas noted that the RRBC went through the month of May without noticing the problem or taking action and that they have now taken the best action that can be taken. Mr. Moss stated that the Executive Committee should communicate this issue to all RRBC members as soon as possible. All agreed to be more diligent in the future. Ms. Savage suggested a small chart of responsibilities or calendar so future dates and milestones are not missed. Ms. Middleton agreed to create the chart.

- Other RRC officers: Secretary and Treasurer

Ms. Savage asked if the RRBC should have a secretary. Ms. Middleton said that there are notes in minutes reflecting that, but that the RRBC Charter does say that other officers can be elected. Mr. Moss asked why the RRBC would need a treasurer when it already has a fiscal agent. Ms. Middleton replied that the fiscal agency might not remain at the Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District. It would be good to have a Commissioner assume the responsibility of watching the fiscal accounts. Mr. Moss asked if it must be a member of the RRBC. Ms. Savage noted that there are new IRS rules that require all nonprofits to have an auditing committee that includes a person who is not a member of the board. Even though the RRBC isn't a nonprofit, it will probably need to go in this direction. A separate party, such as a financial oversight committee, should be auditing the bank statements. Mr. Moss suggested finding a citizen to act as a *pro bono* treasurer. Ms. Savage suggested posting a request to The Nature Conservancy's volunteer group listserv. She also suggested contacting audit firms and asking for recommendations. Ms. Middleton pointed out that this would be separate from hiring an auditor, which will probably have to be done in the future also.

- Options for obtaining legal advice:

Ms. Middleton said that she had a conversation with Phyllis Katz, a local government attorney from Anderson, Sands, and Marks in Richmond. According to Ms. Katz, the RRBC does not have to do anything in particular to become an entity. To hire staff and generate W2s, the RRBC just needs a tax ID number. However, as an "independent local entity", the RRBC does have the immunities of a public body. Ms. Katz recommended that the RRBC obtain directors and officers insurance and public liability insurance. The RRBC is bound by Virginia's Freedom of Information Act, Conflicts of Interest Act, and the Public Procurement Act. Ms. Katz also recommended obtaining legal council for the next steps. Ms. Middleton suggested contracting with an accounting firm to get procedures right from start and to prepare in advance for future audits. Ms. Middleton has not yet researched costs for contracting with an accounting firm. One consideration could be for additional personnel to handle administrative tasks.

Ms. Middleton distributed a handout with staffing options previously distributed via email to the RRBC. The four options are: (1) hire Executive Director (ED) as a contractor (1099); (2) request TJSWCD to hire ED as one of its employees "on loan" to RRBC; (3) RRBC becomes a non-stock, not-for-profit entity and hires under its own Tax ID; (4) RRBC creates a non-profit, 501(c)3 to become the hiring entity. The third option could be done immediately. Mr. Moss asked if that option would preclude the existing arrangement with the TJSWCD. Ms. Middleton stated that it would not preclude their being the fiscal agent for the RRBC. She added that the TJSWCD might be starting to feel the administrative impact of being fiscal agent for RRBC. Mr. Easter, who sits on the TJSWCD board, reported that he has not heard this from TJSWCD staff. Ms. Middleton recommends the third option for hiring staff though she acknowledged that it is impossible for her to be objective in this matter. Other options are problematic for a variety of reasons. Mr. Moss asked for clarification about what motion was passed during the last RRBC meeting. Ms. Middleton stated that, at the last RRBC meeting, the

decision was made to retain her as the executive director under an extension to the existing contract with the intent for the Commission to make a formal offer once the hiring process had been decided.

Mr. Moss suggested that a future Executive Committee meeting should be held for this subject solely; perhaps with a facilitator involved during the meeting. During the meeting, the Executive Committee could go through the options and fiscal implications and then make a recommendation to the full Commission at its July 23 meeting. Ms. Thomas proposed holding this meeting in June. Ms. Edwards said that the Charter should be the guiding principles for that conversation. Ms. Edwards asked if there are other commissions in similar positions as this one. Ms. Thomas stated that the Rappahannock River Basin Commission is organized quite differently. Ms. Middleton does not know of another model that is equivalent. The RRBC is unique in its identity as a local entity without political subdivision status. Ms. Savage said that there were river basin commissions outside of Virginia that were chartered by the Clean Water Act and that they may be examples for the RRBC. Ms. Thomas stated that the fiscal, staffing and legal status conversation could be furthered and clarified at the June Executive Committee meeting.

Mr. Martin suggested retaining legal council immediately and having legal counsel present during the June meeting. Ms. Savage recommended having a tax accountant and legal counsel or someone who can do both. Mr. Martin clarified that the RRBC may need short-term legal counsel now to help Commissioners understand their long-term legal needs. Mr. Moss recommended Sharon Spandak, county attorney in Orange, VA, as well as a firm in Stafford County. He also recommended Phyllis Katz. Ms. Thomas recommended Gail Marshall. Mr. Moss stated that the person would have to read into options in advance of the meeting, in order to provide sound advice. Ms. Middleton asked who would need to make the decision about who to hire. Mr. Martin suggested that the Chair, Vice Chair and Executive Director should pick an attorney. Mr. Moss confirmed that the whole group was comfortable with that and everyone agreed. Ms. Savage noted that when the NFWF grant is awarded, the RRBC would probably have to do Requests for Proposals for this kind of contract. Ms. Middleton said that she has looked at guidelines, and that for now they do not have to do an RFP. Mr. Martin clarified that this step is to hire an attorney to assess the needs of the RRBC, and to give advice, not to hire a long-term attorney.

Due to lack of time, the Executive Committee agreed to postpone the rest of this discussion. Mr. Moss proposed that the next Executive Committee meeting should be devoted fully to a detailed discussion of policies and procedures.

#### **9. Schedule next Executive Committee Meeting**

The next Executive Committee meeting was set for June 25, 2009, from 2-4 pm. Ms. Middleton will contact commissioners with location details. [Note: Time was changed to 4 to 6 p.m.]

#### **10. Other business**

There was no other business.

#### **11. Adjourn**

Ms. Thomas adjourned the meeting at 4:01pm.

**Attachments:**

RRBC\_EC\_Agenda\_09May28

RRBC\_Agenda\_Item\_8\_09May28

RRBC\_EC\_ED\_report\_09May28