

Attachment D: Evaluation of Voting Options

Voting Option 1A: (JPA supermajority - two votes - for every county) Require that any plans to spend excess net toll revenue be approved by (i) a majority vote of the whole JPA board AND (ii) an affirmative vote from at least two Directors from every County serving on the JPA.

- Pros: ensures that each county affirms plan to spend excess net toll revenue and reduces chance that any one county can be outvoted. Possibly creates incentive for regional compromises.
- Cons: allows a few voting directors to potentially block plans to spend excess net toll revenue, allows directors to potentially block plans to spend excess net toll revenue on projects outside their county.

Voting Option 1B: (JPA supermajority - two votes - for each county on a corridor by corridor basis) Require that any plans to spend excess net toll revenue be approved by (i) a majority vote of the whole JPA board AND (ii) an affirmative vote from at least two Directors from each County serving on the JPA for the applicable corridor.

- Pros: focuses on a corridor approach, ensures the plans to spend excess net toll revenue are supported by the county(ies) involved, provides a clear governance structure for initial and future members.
- Cons: allows a few voting directors to potentially block plans to spend excess net toll revenue.

Voting Option 2: (JPA supermajority – future determination) Require that the Board revisit and consider the voting mechanism for expenditure plans and potentially other corridor-specific issues when the JPA expands beyond the initial members.

- Pros: can reflect conditions at the time the JPA expands; allows additional time for continuing dialogue on these issues without impacting current project.
- Cons: may be difficult to actually implement as new requirements once operations have begun; voting changes may require an amendment to the JPA to be binding, creates uncertainty in governance for potential future members.