AGENDA
Friday, August 2, 2019

12:00 p.m.

☐ Call to Order (Chairperson Stocks)
☐ Pledge of Allegiance
☐ Approval of Minutes (Secretary Till)
   A. July 26, 2019 (Study Committee Regular Meeting)

☐ General Reports
   B. Report on analysis in response to “Other” public surveys received in the courthouse by the July 5th deadline (County Council Administrator Dillon)

☐ Community Outreach and Possible Action
   C. Suggestions for additional public service announcement(s) (Committee Member Till)
   D. Suggestions for next newspaper editorial regarding the public engagement process (Chairperson Stocks)

☐ Citizens to Be Heard

☐ Presentations
   E. Presentation and discussion on draft districting plans (William Cooper, consultant on election districts)

☐ General Business- Action Items- Discussion and Consideration of: (none)
☐ Consent Agenda- Action Items (none)
☐ Discussion Items (none)
☐ Discussion and Possible Action on Study Strategy
   F. Discussion and possible action on recommending either part-time or full-time status of the future governing body (Chairperson Stocks)
   G. Continued discussion and possible action on elements to include in the Optional Plan for Grand County government (Attorney Gavin Anderson)

☐ Public Hearings- Possible Action Items (none)

☐ Future Considerations

☐ Closed Session(s) (if necessary)

☐ Adjournment

NOTICE OF SPECIAL ACCOMMODATION DURING PUBLIC MEETINGS. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals with special needs requests wishing to attend Change of Form of Government Study Committee meetings are encouraged to contact the County two (2) business days in advance of these events. Specific accommodations necessary to allow participation of disabled persons will be provided to the maximum extent possible. T.D.D. (Telecommunication Device for the Deaf) calls can be answered at: (435) 259-1346. Individuals with speech and/or hearing impairments may also call the Relay Utah by dialing 711. Spanish Relay Utah: 1 (888) 346-3162.

It is hereby the policy of Grand County that elected and appointed representatives, staff and members of Grand County Council may participate in meetings through electronic means. Any form of telecommunication may be used, as long as it allows for real time interaction in the way of discussions, questions and answers, and voting.

At the Change of Form of Government Study Committee meetings/hearings any citizen, property owner, or public official may be heard on any agenda subject. The number of persons heard and the time allowed for each individual may be limited at the sole discretion of the Chair. On matters set for public hearings there is a three-minute time limit per person to allow maximum public participation. Upon being recognized by the Chair, please advance to the microphone, state your full name and address, whom you represent, and the subject matter. No person shall interrupt legislative proceedings.

Requests for inclusion on an agenda and supporting documentation must be received forty-eight (48) hours prior to a regular or special Change of Form of Government Study Committee Meeting, subject to the Chair’s authorization. Information relative to these meetings/hearings may be obtained at the Grand County Council’s Office, 125 East Center Street, Moab, Utah and at www.grandcountyutah.net; (435) 259-1346.
Call to Order
The Grand County Change in Form of Government Study Committee met in Regular Session on the above date in the County Council Chambers. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Stocks at 12:03 p.m. In attendance were Study Committee Members Judy Carmichael, Walt Dabney, Bob Greenberg, and Marcy Till; Cricket Green and Jeramy Day arrived late. Also in attendance was Bryony Hill (Council Office Coordinator) to take minutes.

Pledge of Allegiance
The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Marcy Till.

Approval of Minutes
A. July 19, 2019 (Study Committee Regular Meeting)

MOTION: Motion made by Bob Greenberg to approve the July 19, 2019 minutes with the suggested changes. Motion seconded by Judy Carmichael. Motion carried 6-0-1 with Jeramy Day abstaining.

General Reports
B. Report on response received from the Lieutenant Governor's Office regarding whether the municipal election year of 2021 is possible for election of candidates into a new form of government (Chris Baird, County Clerk/Auditor)
   • Chris Baird, County Clerk/Auditor reported that he spoke with the Lieutenant Governor's Office about whether we could have the election of officers run in a municipal general election (2019 or 2021), and the answer to that was no. Lt. Governor's office indicated the Transition Plan must comply with state code and the election of officers must happen during the regular general election (2020 or 2022).

C. Report on breakdown by event location of number of surveys received (County Council Administrator Dillon)
   • No discussion, but the following breakdown was included in packet:
     39- Grand Center
     40- Spanish Valley
     27- Castle Valley
     37- 4th of July
     106- Other
     Total- 249
Community Outreach and Possible Action

D. Suggestions for additional public service announcement(s) (Committee Member Till)
   • Marcy did not have anything to report at this time.

E. Suggestions for next newspaper editorial regarding the public engagement process (Chairperson Stocks)
   • Stephen did not have anything to report at this time.

Citizens to Be Heard

   • Mark Thomas- who lives on palisade avenue, asked, “has a decision definitely been made will
     the form be on the ballot or not?” Stephen Stocks stated that there is no definitive date. Mark
     Thomas stated he recommends a “5 person council executive official be appointed by the
     council rather than be elected as a mayor”.

Presentations: None

General Business- Action Items- Discussion and Consideration of: None

Consent Agenda- Action Items

F. Ratifying the Chair’s signature on a thank you letter to attorneys who provided proposals for
   legal services
   • Bob Greenberg stated that since the body was unanimous in its expression of intent that such a
     letter be sent, he thinks it is unnecessary at this time. Stephen Stocks agreed and said that it
     can be resolved without having to do anything else. Therefore, no motion was made.

Discussion Items

G. Elements to include in an optional plan for county government (Attorney Gavin Anderson, by
   phone)
   • Discussion was had on the Initial Outline of the Grand County Option Plan of Government.
     Gavin Anderson would be able to attend by phone at the next meeting and update the
     document with the recommendations made on later agenda items in today’s meeting.

MOTION: Motion made by Bob Greenberg for a short recess. Motion seconded by Walt Dabney.
Carried 7-0.

Back from recess at 1:29 pm.

Discussion and Possible Action on Study Strategy

H. Recommending voting by district or at-large or a combination of both, postponed from July 19,
   2019 (Chairperson Stocks)
   • Bob Greenberg suggested having a discussion with the County Planner on what ideas he might
     have and look at HD Overlay, parcel size, primary vs. 2nd homes, age of housing stock,
     transportation corridors, property values. He suggest doing a one time workgroup with County
     Planner, City Planner and Mr. Cooper (consultant on election districts) and have them come up with
     a recommendation or possible ideas.
MOTION: Motion made by Bob Greenberg to have a one time workshop with County Planner, City Planner and Mr. Cooper to provide recommendations on what other variables other than purely numbers and recommend districts to the Study Committee. Motion died for lack of second.

- Discussion was had on voting by District, At-Large, or a combination of both. Which would yield the best candidates?
  - Districts- Citizens would get to vote for the candidate that would be able to represent them best.
  - At-Large- Citizens would get to vote for all candidates.
  - Combination of both- There would be somewhat of a compromise and Citizens can vote for the candidates in their District as well as those that are At-Large. By doing a combination, Citizens would be able to vote for the majority of the Candidates.

- Discussion continued about having 2 (two) Districts, a City District and Rural District, and the benefits of having one of each represent City and Rural Districts.

Motion was made by Jeramy Day to have 3 At-Large and 2 Districts, with one district being primarily within City limits and the second being rural, outside the city limits, and with the caveat that Mr. Cooper use only population data. Seconded by Cricket Green.

- Continued discussion after motion was on the table with Gavin Anderson weighing in stating that no County has more At-Large than by District. Right now, Grand County has 5 Districts and 2 At-Large.
- A general consensus was that Grand County is unique, doesn’t necessarily do things how everyone else does them, and we shouldn’t worry about past elections.

MOTION: Motion was made by Jeramy Day to have 3 At-Large and 2 Districts, with one district being primarily within City limits and the second being rural, outside the city limits, and with the caveat that Mr. Cooper use only population data. Seconded by Cricket Green. Motion carried 6-1 with Bob Greenberg in opposition.

I. Discussion and possible action on recommending one of the four forms of county government, postponed from July 19, 2019 (Committee Member Till)

- Discussion was had on the four forms of government. Committee Members saw the concerns the citizens have about the current form.
- Having Commissioners, they are shown a little bit more “respect”. They are involved in the workings of the Government and they understand what is going on day-to-day. Gavin Anderson agrees with this and this is what he has observed.
- Commission has executive and legislative powers. Council has legislative powers and delegate executive duties.

MOTION: Motion was made by Bob Greenberg to recommend an appointed Council-Manager form of Government. Seconded by Marcy Till.

- Continued discussion regarding finding a Council Manager and how it could be difficult to find one. However, if you pay what the position should be paid, “they will come”.
- Remember what the consensus was when they interviewed department heads, council members (past and present). They don’t want chaos, they want a smooth transition.

MOTION: Motion was made by Bob Greenberg to recommend an appointed Council-Manager form of Government. Seconded by Marcy Till. Motion carried 4-3 with Stephen Stocks, Cricket Green and Jeramy Day opposed.
Public Hearings- Possible Action Items (none)

Future Considerations
  - To offer compensation for snacks.
  - Gavin to come down and address as a possible action item. Gavin will redraft document with updated information.

Closed Session(s) (if necessary): None

Adjournment
Moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:15pm.

______________________________
Stephen Stocks
Chairperson

______________________________
Marcy Till
Secretary
From: Tara Collins  
Sent: Monday, July 29, 2019 4:45 PM  
To: Ruth Dillon  
Subject: RE: Number of Surveys by Location- request for "Other" analysis by 8/1  
Importance: High

Other Surveys:

Council with appointed Manager received twice as much support as the next popular form, the Expanded Commission.
Commission form voted the worst form had dramatically more votes than all the other 3 forms.

7 members had 1.4 times more support than 5 members, which was second in line. There was little support for 3 or 9 members.

Part time was 6.2 times more popular than full time. A mixture came in second place, with less than half the support for part time.

Combination of voting by districts and at-large, and All at-large, virtually tied in support (one tickmark difference). They both had nearly 4 times more support than voting all by district.

- Please clarify whether the Cumulative/synopsis analysis below is for the Grand Totals, or for the 4 locations but not the "Other" surveys.

Tara

From: Ruth Dillon  
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2019 12:53 PM  
To: Tara Collins  
Subject: FW: Number of Surveys by Location- request for "Other" analysis by 8/1  
Importance: High

Tara,

Please do an analysis of the SC surveys from the 100+ "Other" category and write it up similar to Walt’s format / similar language as described in the following minutes from last week’s SC meeting. What he wrote is not confidential nor would your writing be so long as you use his style of language. There were so many surveys in the “Other” category that I believe this analysis is needed. Due Thursday 8/1 when I get back. Note that these analyses are by location and they follow the order of the 4 survey questions. My plan is to simply email your writeup to the Study Committee when I return. Have fun with it!

Note: If perchance you have it all done [without stress] before this Friday’s noontime SC meeting, I will be on a flight at 11AM that day so you have my permission to forward it on to each study committee member even without me seeing it -- because I trust your analysis abilities and your writing abilities. Committee Member email addresses follow the format
of firstinitiallastname@grandcountyutah.net (not a real email address), such as wdabney@grandcountyutah.net for Walt Dabney. But next week is fine.

Grand Center Open House:
Council with appointed Manager recommended form of government had 3 times more interest than the nearest other form of government, the Expanded Commission.

5 or 7 members was virtually a tie with little or no support for 3 or 9 members.

Full time versus part-time status, part time was 3.5 times more of interest than full time.

Combination of voting by districts and at-large was 1.7 times more of interest than all at-large which came in second. Voting by all districts had virtually no support.

Spanish Valley Open House:
Council with appointed Manager was 3 times more of interest than the next, Expanded Commission.

5 members was twice as popular as 7; 3 and 9 members had virtually no support.

Part time was 5 times more popular than full time.

Combination of voting by districts and at-large was about 1.5 times over the next, all at-large.

Castle Valley Open House:
Council with appointed Manager was 6 times more of interest than the next.

5 & 7 members virtually tied.

Part time was 9 times more of interest than full time.

Combination of voting by districts and at-large was 3 for every 2 over at-large. Walt reported that Castle Valley participants appeared very interested in being their own district, but stated that the population is only 300.

Fourth of July booth event:
Council with appointed Manager was first, Expanded Commission was seconded, and Council with Elected Executive, which he reported had some interest, was third.
5 members was twice as popular as the next, which was 7, with little interest in 3 or 9.

Part time was twice as popular as full time.

Voting all at-large was slightly more popular than a combination of voting by districts and at-large, an anomaly from among the other events.

Cumulative/synopsis (County Council Administrator Dillon reported that approximately 250 surveys were received on time):

Form of government: Council with appointed Manager came in first.

Number of representatives in the form of government: Either 5 or 7 with major support, 5 had the most support, 7 with some less. Three or 9 had very little support accumulatively.

Part-time versus full-time status: Part time had significantly more support than full time.

Voting at-large versus voting by district or a combination of both: All elected at large or a combination of at-large and districts, with little support for electing by all districts.

From: Tara Collins  
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2019 10:52 AM  
To: Ruth Dillon  
Subject: Number of Surveys by Location

Here are the total number of study committee surveys by location:

39  Grand Center
40  Spanish Valley
27  Castle Valley
37  4th of July
106  Other

Total: 249

In addition, there were 10 surveys turned in after the deadline, which were not tallied.

Tara
Hi everyone,

I am attaching a zip file with three draft plans.

Plan A (District 1 -- 79.8% Moab) is the draft we drew at the online meeting. Plan B (District 1 -- 86.5% Moab) and Plan C (District 1 -- 97.8% Moab) are new.

Plan C is a little bit outside of the +/- 5% range, but not enough to matter given that we are so far away from 2010. It is also probably closer to what you had in mind in terms of urban/rural districts.

The zip file has maps and stats for all three plans, along with a table showing precinct assignments by district under the three plans. All three plans follow current precinct boundaries. Of course, other options are possible if precincts are split to follow census blocks.

The maps in the zip file include a county-wide view, a zoom on south Grand County, and a third map zooming on Moab, with some streets identified.

Let me know if you need further clarification or closer zooms on the maps.

Bill

From: Bob Greenberg <bgreenberg@grandcountyutah.net>
To: Bill Cooper <bcooper@msn.com>
Cc: Grand County Study Committee <studycommittee@grandcountyutah.net>; Ruth Dillon <rdillon@grandcountyutah.net>; Matt Ceniceros <mceniceros@grandcountyutah.net>; Stephen Stocks <sstocks@grandcountyutah.net>
Subject: Grand County

Hi Bill,

Thank you for your excellent presentation. The idea of two districts, one primarily rural and one primarily town has caught the Committee’s imagination and was adopted at the end of Friday’s meeting. Would you please put together a
couple of two-district scenarios? I think that the best way to send them would be PDFs to the Study Committee’s email box cc’ed above (studycommittee@grabdcountyutah.net). I think it would be useful for you to walk us through them at our next meeting (8/2 at noon), or the one after that (8/9 at noon) whichever agenda allows adequate time, assuming that you are available for both. Please let Ruth know if your schedule allows your participation on those dates. Ruth will then get back to you as to which meeting works best for the Committee as soon as the agendas have been put together. Matt will handle the IT end.

Again, thank you for your work on this. It has allowed the Committee to make a more informed decision on districting.

Bob
Precinct Assignments by July 30, 2019 Draft Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Pop</th>
<th>Moab Pop</th>
<th>18+ Pop</th>
<th>Voters</th>
<th>DRAFT PLAN A</th>
<th>DRAFT PLAN B</th>
<th>DRAFT PLAN C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Population data based on 2010 Census, with estimates to account for census blocks split by precinct boundaries.
Population Summary Report  
Grand County, UT – Draft Plan A -- July 30. 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Deviation from ideal district size</th>
<th>% Deviation from ideal district size</th>
<th>Moab Pop.</th>
<th>% Moab Pop</th>
<th>18+ Pop</th>
<th>2018 Registered Voters</th>
<th>% 2018 Registered Voters of 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4858</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>3876</td>
<td>79.79%</td>
<td>3638</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>64.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4367</td>
<td>-245</td>
<td>-5.32%</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>26.70%</td>
<td>3469</td>
<td>2847</td>
<td>82.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5042</td>
<td>54.66%</td>
<td>7107</td>
<td>1.4697</td>
<td>77.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideal District size = 4,612

Total Deviation: 10.65%

Note: Population data based on 2010 Census, with estimates to account for census blocks split by precinct boundaries.
### Population Summary Report

Grand County, UT — Draft Plan B -- July 30, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Deviation from ideal district size</th>
<th>% Deviation from ideal district size</th>
<th>MoabPop.</th>
<th>% Moab Pop</th>
<th>18+ Pop</th>
<th>2018 Registered Voters</th>
<th>% 2018 Registered Voters of 2010 18+ Pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4757</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>4114</td>
<td>86.48%</td>
<td>3641</td>
<td>2390</td>
<td>65.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4467</td>
<td>-145</td>
<td>-3.14%</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>20.77%</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>2818</td>
<td>81.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9225</strong></td>
<td><strong>-145</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3.14%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5042</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.66%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7107</strong></td>
<td><strong>2608</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.31%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideal District size = 4,612

Total Deviation 6.29%

Note: Population data based on 2010 Census, with estimates to account for census blocks split by precinct boundaries.
### Population Summary Report
Grand County, UT – Draft Plan C – July 30, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Deviation from ideal district size</th>
<th>% Deviation from ideal district size</th>
<th>Moab Pop.</th>
<th>% Moab Pop.</th>
<th>18+ Pop.</th>
<th>% 2018 Registered Voters</th>
<th>% 2018 Registered Voters of 2010 18+ Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4893</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
<td>4788</td>
<td>97.85%</td>
<td>3731</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>64.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4331</td>
<td>-281</td>
<td>-6.08%</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
<td>3376</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>83.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9225</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5042</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.66%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7107</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.04%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4753</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideal District size = 4,612

Total Deviation 12.18%

Note: Population data based on 2010 Census, with estimates to account for census blocks split by precinct boundaries.
GRAND COUNTY OPTIONAL PLAN OF GOVERNMENT

I. Purpose and Preamble

A. Authorized by legislative enactment, in the Changing Forms of County Government Act, 2018 – Grand County is required to change its form of county government.

B. Overview of government structure:

1. This Plan adopts the County Council/Appointed County Manager form of county government.

2. No change in county powers and no effect on municipalities, districts, schools and so forth.

3. The County Council/Appointed County Manager form of county government creates a separation-of-powers government with legislative powers vested in a County Council and executive powers vested in a County Managers who is appointed by the Council.

C. Definitions: office, department, executive or executive branch, legislative, other.
II. General powers

A. Powers and status of Grand County — body corporate and politic, political subdivision of the State of Utah, general purpose government.

1. Express and implied authority.
2. Statutory and common law.
3. General grants of statutory authority.
4. Specific grants of statutory authority.
5. Further authority as set out in this Plan.

B. Provision of public services:

1. Both within and outside municipalities as per state statute.
2. Creation of districts, areas, or interlocal entities to provide services as provided by law.
3. Levels of service as provided by law and county governing body.

C. Broad and liberal interpretation of authority, powers, responsibilities and scope as provided in statute and other law.
III. Legislative powers and responsibilities.

A. The legislative body shall be a Council of five members, three elected at-large and two elected by geographic district.

B. Quorum requirement – 3 members

C. Elect Chair and Vice-Chair. Duties.

D. Partisan elections and filling vacancies as provided by state statute.

E. Council Members Elected At-Large
   1. Residents of county, qualifications by statute.
   2. Initial terms staggered; terms start on first Monday in January in year ______.

F. Council members elected by district.
   1. Residents of county and district, qualifications by statute.
   2. Initial terms staggered; terms start on first Monday in January in year ______.
   3. Council districts of equal populations as set out in attached Exhibit (one primarily rural and one primarily City of Moab).
   4. Reapportioned after census.
G. Removal from office as provided by statute. Vacancies and resignations.


I. Council staff or manager, as needed.

J. Council meetings - the voting procedures and recording votes, abstention, declaration of conflict of interest, recusal, circumstances requiring a super-majority.

K. Council meetings, regularly scheduled and special meetings, Open Meetings Act and Robert’s Rules.

L. Preparation of agendas. Who may request an agenda item.

M. General legislative powers and duties of Council: laundry list of legislative activities and actions as provided by statute, such as enact ordinances, budget process, investigations, quasi-judicial hearings, advise and consent, creation of districts, omnibus legislative acts and powers.

N. Council prohibitions:

1. No other elective office and no other employment with Grand Co.
2. (OPTION: prohibit direct interference with executive branch activities and employees except in open meetings and as provided by law)
IV. Executive branch powers and responsibilities

A. The chief executive of the county is a council-appointed manager.

1. Appointed by majority vote of a quorum of the county council.

2. Qualifications

3. Removal from office as determined by majority vote of the council.

4. No elective office, no other employment with Grand Co.

5. Compensation and benefits, as set by council.

B. Duties of executive.

1. No duties or supervision over independent elected officials.

2. Laundry list of executive activities and actions as provided by statute, such as manage and direct work and activities, oversee departments, carry out council directives and ordinances, appoint and remove board members subject to advise and consent, control assets and conduct investigations, prepare a budget, contracts.

C. Appointment of executive office staff.
V. Administrative Organization – offices, departments and agencies.

A. General provisions

1. Executive Branch activities and organization under the Executive’s direction, as set out in plan.

2. Structure of departments set by county ordinance (OPTION: should department organization be only by ordinance? Should smaller subparts of departments, like divisions or other agencies, be created at the executive’s discretion or also by ordinance?)

3. Departments and divisions are led by qualified directors (OPTION: who are merit-covered and who are merit-exempt? At what level are directors subject to advice and consent?)

4. Offices (sheriff, clerk, auditor, etc) duties are set by state law and not under the supervision of the executive or council.

5. (OPTION: who or what county office or department does: HR, purchasing and purchasing agent, records and archives?)

6. References in this Plan, ordinance or law to a particular department or office include all the subordinates and employees of those departments or offices.
B. County Offices

1. Duties by statute

2. Election by statute

3. *(OPTION: elected offices may be consolidated in this Plan)*

C. Personnel System

1. Council or commission to adopt ordinances and regulations regarding the personnel system *(OPTION: merit system? At-will? Adopt the County Personnel Management Act? Separate merit system for law enforcement?)*

2. Council or commission to adopt process for approving hires *(OPTION: approve each individual as hired, approve personnel allocations per office and department, or approve the personnel budget for each office or department?)*

3. No political activities or campaigning in county workplace or among county employees. No use of county resources for political purposes.
VI. Transition Plan

A. Transition preparations

1. The (current) county council may enact ordinances and adopt resolutions to provide for the orderly transition to new form. Include any transfer of powers and provisions to manage and transfer: records and files, property, assets, funds, or personnel. All in accordance with Plan, statute and ordinance.

2. The office of current county council member is dissolved or restructured to new council form. *(OPTION: What happens with existing council members whose terms are cut short? Paid for remaining salary which would have accrued during remainder of the term, or other separation pay, or nothing? What if such a council member is elected under the new form of government?)*

B. Adoption of the Optional Plan when approved by voters at election to be held on ________

2. Contingency provision regarding election of officers and the potential to amend current election time-table and effective date. Provide that if the Legislature changes the dates for electing new officials, the current county council is empowered to adopt a resolution which would change the election and the effective date set out in this Plan.

C. Continuity of activities, authority, responsibilities and liabilities.
   1. Continue all rights and powers without interruption.
   2. Continue all administrative, legislative, judicial and quasi-judicial proceedings.
   3. Continue all contract obligations, bonds and franchises.

D. Cooperation of all county officers and employees.

E. The Plan may be amended in accordance with state law.

F. Separability provision – if any provision of the Plan is held invalid, it doesn’t affect the other parts of the Plan.