



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board Administrative Subcommittee**

### **Meeting Summary**

**August 11, 1997 4 p.m.**

**Aiken, S.C.**

The SRS Citizens Advisory Board Administrative Subcommittee met on Monday, August 11, 1997, at 4 p.m. at the Aiken Federal Building in Aiken, S.C. Subcommittee Chair Beaurine Wilkins resided over the meeting. Board members Lane Parker and Karen Patterson also attended. Board Facilitator Walt Joseph and Board Administrator Dawn Haygood were present as well. Gerri Flemming and Gary Little of the Department of Energy also attended. Mike French and Jim Farmer participated from the general public.

The meeting began with a discussion of ways to improve the membership selection process to ensure candidates will make the necessary commitment to participate in Board activities. Beaurine Wilkins suggested the Administrative subcommittee call all potential candidates during the two-day selection process and conduct phone interviews. Walt Joseph suggested the Subcommittee select four candidates per position as opposed to three to provide an alternate and that phone interviews could be conducted following candidate selection. Mike French stated he had worked with large technical societies and that a questionnaire with eight-ten questions could be used to standardize the interview process. The Subcommittee agreed to select four candidates per position and send letters to the top three with a specific date and window of time in which a member would call to interview the candidates. Board members will all use the same questionnaire.

Walt Joseph discussed a recent Board self evaluation and stated improvement of the membership selection process was high on the list of concerns. This includes screening candidates, adopting a replacement plan for mid term expirations and pre-approving replacement candidates. Board members next discussed a replacement plan for unforeseen board vacancies. One suggestion was that the runner up during the annual election could be voted in by acclamation of a majority vote of the Board. Board members could vote for a first, second and third candidate during the annual election. If the second runner up is not voted in as a replacement candidate by a majority of the Board then the full selection process would be required to fill the position.

Board members next discussed potential bylaws amendments to provide in a proposal to the full Board for consideration in September. The first proposed change is to change "All" in Section 3.5 (f). to "General." Walt Joseph offered the following addition to Section 3.5 of the Bylaws: "If a member leaves the Board prior to the end of his/her term, the runner-up candidate in the general election may be elected by acclamation of a majority of the Board members to fill the unexpired term." It was agreed that this language replace Section 3.5 (g) and that (g) be moved to a newly added Section 3.5 (h). Board members also proposed the addition of the following to Section 3.5:

(i) In the event that the Board is faced with two or more concurrent vacancies, a special election may be held if the above stated procedure in Section 3.5 (g) is not applicable.

Board members stated this would probably not be very likely, however the current four vacancies were not expected either. Karen Patterson suggested three concurrent vacancies might require a special election, but acquiesced to Mr. Parker and Ms. Wilkins.

Karen Patterson suggested proposed amendments to Section 3.3 Qualifications for Membership. She noted there had been so much resistance to changing the demographic criteria that it might be better to loosen the requirements within the stakeholder categories to provide flexibility in the membership selection process. Dawn Haygood gave a brief overview of the number of candidates available in each stakeholder category during the 1996 selection process. Mike French encouraged the Board to minimize the limitations it places on itself to allow for more flexibility. Board members agreed to propose the following modifications in Section 3.3 (f):

- a. At least two but no more than three public officials
- b. At least two but no more than three business representatives
- c. At least two but no more than three academic representatives
- d. At least six but no more than ten general public representatives...
- e. At least one but no more than two labor representatives
- f. At least one but no more than two minority issues representatives...
- g. At least four but no more than five environmental activist representatives

This modification will allow more flexibility during the selection process by ensuring that all stakeholder category criteria are met to allow for more stakeholder category options within a given slate of candidates (i.e. two business candidates could be paired with a public official as long as the other demographic requirements are maintained).

The following proposed amendments were also agreed to by the subcommittee:

- 1) Delete the last sentence in Section 9.1 Authority since it deals with the history of the Board.
- 2) Change the 30-day notification requirement in Section 9.2 Procedure to Amend to a 10-day requirement which is more consistent with the Board's administrative procedures.

Dawn Haygood announced that a full solicitation campaign would begin in the fall to solicit membership applications, a bi-annual requirement of the Board. She discussed the low rate of return of applications compared to those requested during previous advertising campaigns. She noted that the application request for three letters of recommendation might be the reason for the low return rate. Several suggestions were made to correct this situation.

Mike French suggested the Board ask for three references just as an employment application would. Beaurine Wilkins stated that the letters were very important in choosing candidates and she thought the requirement was necessary. Karen Patterson suggested the Board request a minimum of three references preferably with letters of support. Beaurine Wilkins stated she would like to require at least two letters of recommendations accompany the candidate's

application. Dawn Haygood offered that Board staff could call any references and make notes for the subcommittee's review. Board members decided to require two letters of recommendation with membership applications.

The meeting adjourned at 6 p.m.