STAFF REPORT

To: Board of Directors

From: Paul Helliker, General Manager

Date: September 13, 2017

Subject: Selection of New Board Member

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Determine Process for Selecting New Board Member

BACKGROUND

During the August 9, 2017 Board meeting, the Board decided to appoint a new Board member and authorized staff to distribute the notice concerning the vacancy on the Board of Directors that was created by the passing of Director Walters on August 5. The deadline for candidates to submit letters of interest and resumes was set as September 8. The Board has until October 4 to select a new Board member, after which time the decision will become the responsibility of the Board of Supervisors of Sacramento County.

As of September 7, sixteen candidates have applied for the position. All have been determined to be eligible to serve as a Board member. Should the Board decide to interview all of these candidates, staff recommends that the interviews be conducted during two separate Board meetings, to avoid having either meeting continue for more than 4 hours. The September 27 regular Board meeting could be one of these meetings dedicated to interviews.

The Board may want to consider the format to use for the interviews. Two options would be either sequential individual interviews, or conducting the interviews simultaneously, in a “panel” format (in which each question would be asked of each candidate, prior to moving to the next question, which could then be posed to the candidates in a different order.) The interviews and the deliberations are required to be conducted during a Board meeting accessible to the public (i.e., not in closed session), so any member of the public, including any of the Board candidates, can attend all of the proceedings.

The Board may want to consider a ranking and selection process. As has been the process for selection of a General Manager, the Board may want to use a set selection of questions during the interviews, which could be shared with the candidates beforehand. Some potential questions are included as an attachment – the ones highlighted in yellow may be the set that the Board might want to consider using, at a minimum.

The Board could use a process that would consist of each Board member ranking the candidates from most preferred to least preferred, with a corresponding numerical ranking of 1 to 16. The rankings could then be summed for each candidate, with those having the lowest totals being the most preferred by all of the Board. The Board could then decide what additional deliberation or further interviews might be necessary to reach a decision.

Attachments:
Board Vacancy Applicant List
Potential interview questions

Board Vacancy Applicant List

	Date Received	Received Via	Name	City
1	8/16/2017	Email	Chad Vander Veen	Folsom
2	8/20/2017	Email	Mitchell Dion	Folsom
3	8/22/2017	Email	Kevin Knauss	Granite Bay
4	8/22/2017	Email	Rick Wolfe	Granite Bay
5	8/22/2017	Email	Christopher Peacock	Granite Bay
6	8/22/2017	Dropped Off	Leonard Bruckman	Granite Bay
7	8/23/2017	Email	Leonard Simpson	Folsom
8	8/23/2017	Email	Marty Hanneman	Granite Bay
9	8/29/2017	Email	Suzanne Jones	Granite Bay
10	8/31/2017	Email	Sheri Adams	Orangevale
11	9/1/2017	Email	Edward J. Scheidegger	Fair Oaks
12	9/1/2017	Dropped Off	Richard Costigan	Granite Bay
13	9/4/2017	Email	David Samson	Orangevale
14	9/5/2017	Email	Scott Johnson	Granite Bay
15	9/7/2017	Mail	Ken Cichocki	Granite Bay
16	9/7/2017	Dropped Off	Michael DeLaurentis	Granite Bay
17	9/8/2017	Email	Evan Minton	Orangevale
18	9/8/2017	Dropped Off	Arthur Starkovich	Fair Oaks