

Olympia Tumwater RFA Planning Committee

June 27, 2022

Committee Schedule Update

Agenda for June 27:

- Updated work plan
- Discussion of input from Councils on Governance
- Follow up on Financial Model

Agenda for July 11

- Fire Benefit Charge –1st of 2 sessions
- RFA Organizational Chart
- Asset Transfers Proposal
 - List of assets—vehicles, real property
 - Proposed disposition

Agenda for July 25

- 2nd FBC session
- Process to confirm RFA name
- Governance: staggering of terms
- Prep for Council Finance Presentation
 - Go – No-go recommendation

August 8: **Additional Committee Meeting**

- Follow up from Council finance presentations
- Prep for Public Outreach
- Close-out of Additional items needed for drafting RFA plan

August 9: Council Update on Finance Issues

August X: 2nd Round Public Engagement – to be scheduled

Governance – Councils Input, Cont'd discussion

- What did we hear from each Council?
- Ideas on refining proposals?

Governance Options, Initial Council Input

Olympia Council Feedback	Tumwater Council Feedback
<i>Option 4: 5</i> <i>Option 5: 3</i>	<i>Option 4: 5</i> <i>Option 5: 2</i>
<i>Option 3: 3</i> <i>Option 6: 0</i>	<i>Option 3: 2</i> <i>Option 6: 0</i>
Option counts above include all options that Councilmembers mentioned or described as something they could support.	

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
# Of seats	5	6	7	7	7	7
Appointed by Olympia	1	3	2	1	1	2
Appointed by Tumwater	1	3	2	1	1	2
Directly elected – At- large			3	5		
Directly elected – by District	3				5	3

RFA Planning Committee Recommendations

- **The RFA Planning Committee recommends that the governance structure transition over time, i.e., the RFA Plan should include both**
 - An **Initial Board** of all City elected officials as required, **and**
 - A **different structure** for the ongoing Governance Board after 2025.
- **Rationale:**
 - Allow for some directly-elected representation that can be solely dedicated to the RFA – rather than serving on both a City Council and the RFA Board.
 - Retain a connection to the member Cities.
 - Consider approaches that enable all RFA voters to vote for most of the RFA board members—not just those in the City in which they live.

Recommended Initial Board Structure (2023-2025)

- **Recommendation: 6 City Councilmembers, 3 appointed from each City.**
- **Options Considered:**
 - 4 members, 2 from each City
 - 5 members, 3 from Olympia, 2 from Tumwater
 - 6 members, 3 from each City
- **Rationale:**
 - Mirrors current RFA Planning Committee structure which is working well
 - Maximizes equity in start-up of the new RFA agency as a true partnership
 - Maximizes input from each City without involving a quorum of each City Council

Question for Council:
Any concerns with this approach?

RFA Planning Committee recommends a 7-member board; Seeks Council input on other details

Rationale for 7-members: functional size, large enough to support subcommittees, odd number to avoid tie votes

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
# Of seats	5	6	7	7	7	7
Appointed by Olympia	1	3	2	1	1	2
Appointed by Tumwater	1	3	2	1	1	2
Directly elected – At- large			3	5		
Directly elected – by District	3				5	3
Voting	Each Board member has 1 vote					
Other	Staggering of terms/initial term for each Board member under discussion – want to minimize turnover required at each election.					

Questions for Council:

- Any concerns with 7-member board size?
- Preferences on Districts *versus* At-Large seats (or having both)?
- Thoughts about ongoing Council representation on Board?
- Other?