



*Originally posted to Facebook 7/14/2025*

## **RDA Controversy Defined**

As I have watched the most recent debate in certain posts over the RDA and the lack of involvement of its Taxing Entity Committee (TEC) and whether or not in this aspect, the RDA has been operating in compliance with the law I have been impressed with two things.

1. In all the arguing and haranguing back and forth, no one has stopped to delineate the underlying, unnuanced facts of the case. Let me try to do that now. Here is what I have learned, subject to verification of some minor points:

When the RDA was being established in 2007-2009, the TEC was involved in the process and met as per law prior to the actual start of the RDA (as the law existed in 2007). It does not appear the TEC has physically met since 2010 (At least I have not been able to find minutes of any meetings that would indicate it met.) The next year, in 2011, Senate Bill 70 (2011 SB70) was passed into law. The official position of the Vineyard RDA Board is that as of that time, the requirement for the TEC to meet and oversee the RDA was superseded by the requirement for the RDA Board to issue an Annual Report (instead). So other than possibly for the 2010-2011 fiscal year, the RDA has operated in compliance with the law, with regard to its TEC.

The opposing view, held by the State Auditor and others, is that 2011 SB70 did not remove the obligation of the RDA to consult with its TEC, and that best practice, the law, and its own by-laws requires the RDA to continue to consult with its TEC at least annually. So, the RDA has been in violation of either the law or its own by-laws since year two, and it is time to bring it back into compliance.

(Please, correct me if I have misunderstood or misinterpreted some part of this.) My opinion is that both parties have presented a logical and potentially legal claim. It looks to me like the only way this will be resolved is to get a legally binding opinion as to which side is correct. Arguing for or against either position on Facebook is not going to resolve the issue.

2. No one appears to be deliberately or intentionally lying. No one appears to be purposefully cheating. No one appears to be defiantly violating the law.

Despite the animus and disrespectful bickering tone in many of the comments, at the root of it all is a simple difference of opinion. One opinion is that working within the law

with the legislature to adjust process is perfectly fine and should be used to advantage. The other questions the fairness of that changed process within a larger context, one's intentions for doing so, and what they see as the negative consequences that arise from these particular changes to the law. Again, it is looking like it will take a higher authority's finding to resolve this. (My guess is the state legislature or state Auditor's office)

I hope moving forward in situations like this we can agree to disagree and not be so disagreeable in the process. There is no need for us to be mean, rude or offensive. There is also no need to constantly repeat the same points using charged language to convince the other side how wrong they are. (When was the last time someone convinced you of an error by forcefully repeating how wrong you were.)

We need to be able to identify and discuss the issues that come before our city—like this one—but openly and calmly even though we strongly disagree. We need to be able to do it civilly—without all the hyperbole.

Just so you know, I am trying to run my campaign that way. I will seek first to understand the issues that come before the city. That means I will try hard to learn as much as I can about the issues and the history behind them. I will seek the facts of matters as best they can be determined at the time. That means I will likely not be the first to comment on the latest post, while I learn what I can about it. I will try very hard not to contend just to contend. I will do my best to be respectful, both of people and their stated positions. I hope in doing so to make fewer mistakes and better overall decisions. I will do my best to be open, honest, and intentionally transparent in the process. I will also be open to correction. And I will encourage others to do the same.

My name is David Lauret and I am running to bring that kind of respectful, open dialogue to the Vineyard City Council. I ask for your vote in the August 12th primary election and again in the November 4th general election.

Thank you for listening.