

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE OPEN MEETINGS ACT TO MAKE IT WORKABLE FOR ADVISORY BOARDS
AND COMMISSIONS WHILE PRESERVING THE INTENT AND PURPOSE OF THE ACT**

The proposed legislation attempts to solve two typical problems encountered by volunteer advisory boards and commissions when attempting to comply with the Open Meetings Act. The proposed changes make the law more workable while maintaining the intent and purposes of the Act.

1. The first issue arises because some municipal volunteer boards and commissions perform managerial and administrative functions. Examples include both fire and road service area commissioners who are responsible, once the assembly approves the service area budget, to supervise and manage the affairs of the service area. These include decisions concerning when to plow the streets, whether a pothole needs to be fixed, etc. In implementing these duties commissioners are really fulfilling the role of municipal employees.

Current state law exempts most administrative and managerial activities by exempting staff meetings and gatherings. This exemption recognizes that it would be impossible to apply the Act to the everyday transactions of governmental employees confronting day-to-day issues and problems. This exemption, however, does not currently extend to members of governmental bodies that also have administrative and managerial responsibilities. Thus, volunteer boards and commissions that try to supervise and manage the affairs of a governmental entity, like a service area, often find that they must choose between complying with the Act or providing delayed and unresponsive services.

Exempting these boards and commissions only when they meet only to fulfill their administrative and managerial functions allows them to effectively conduct business without harming any of the purposes or intent of the Open Meetings Act. These advisory bodies are still required to comply with the Act whenever they meet to make or discuss legislative or policy decisions, including recommending their annual budget and tax levy, adopting strategic plans, or discussing any other legislative policies.

2. The second issue arises due to an anomaly in state law. Although state law prescribes a minimum number of members necessary to constitute a meeting for policy-making bodies, this exception does not exist for advisory-only bodies. All that is required for a meeting of an advisory body is that the meeting be prearranged. Accordingly, a meeting exists under the Act if only two of a 12 member advisory body decide to meet to discuss to consider the business of the body. In this circumstance the rule for advisory bodies is **more** stringent than the rule governing actual policy-making bodies. The proposed change removes this anomaly by allowing two members of an advisory board to have a prearranged meeting as long as it does not result in a violation of the "three or a majority" rule applicable to policy-making bodies.