

REPRESENTATIVE POLICY BOARD

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

MARCH 15, 2023

MEETING TRANSCRIPTION

Jennifer:

Okay, we're all here. Committee is present.

Tim:

All of us are here, need a chairman.

Charles:

Jennifer, was Bob going to be here to start this off or does anybody-

Jennifer:

No, he just put the committee together. The first item is to elect the committee chair.

Stephen:

Would anybody like this?

Charles:

I nominate Mongillo.

Stephen:

No, no.

Charles:

The only comment I was going to make is a number of us have already been chairman of Nominating Committees and it might be of some value to have somebody that hasn't done it before.

Tim:

Has Jamie been the chair?

Tom:

I was thinking. I thought she'd be great.

Jamie:

I have not-

Tim:

Yeah, she'd be great.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Jamie:

Thank you. I would love to do it but I'm in a difficult position right now, in that I'm in the middle of legislation and I'm getting called into lots of meetings at last minute. I was here working until after midnight, the last two nights if it tells you anything. So, I really, I don't have the time to commit.

Stephen:

Who else is maybe available here. I'm not seeing everybody on the screen.

Tim:

I know I'm not available. This is Tim. I just know I'm not be because of my, I'm just too busy at night and my knee surgery's getting to have an impact for the first three weeks anyway.

Charles:

I've got the knee surgery issue, also. I don't think we want to put this off. And I'm having my surgery a week from today, so.

Tom:

Mine is Monday. I know I can Zoom-in and communicate, but I can't do the in between stuff.

Greg:

And this is Greg. The last two times I was on the committee, I was the chairman. I would rather not be the chairman this time because my computer's all messed up.

Stephen:

I'm going to, I guess,

Tom:

I think if I could, I think this proves is that when the committee is comprised, there should be a chairman.

Stephen:

Yeah. Well, in this case, no, Mario was a potential candidate. So he couldn't nominate a chairman.

Tim:

No, but Bob Harvey could.

Charles:

Tom question, are you not interested in it either?

Tom:

I'm not. And everyone's got time constraints.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Charles:

Okay, How about you Steve? Are you have any interest in it?

Stephen:

I don't. I'll do it if I have to, but it's really not a good time for me either.

Charles:

Do we want to do co-chairs or anything like that? Because like Tim said, we got some issues, but maybe with co-chairs we can deal with any attendance issues and things like that. That's going to be my mine and Tim's issue.

Stephen:

No, I realize it's difficult for everybody.

Jamie:

Talk about what the requirements, maybe that would help. Like, how many meetings, what do we have to do, what would the chair be expected to do? And so that, maybe just the timelines involved here. Maybe that makes it easier for somebody to be able to do it.

Charles:

I think it's pretty well spelled out on even today's agenda. Today, we just have to go through some criteria and things like that. That's all pretty straightforward and reporting to the RPB. If you look at the agenda, Jamie, it is pretty straightforward and like everyone has said a number of us had already chaired it. I think we'd be more than ready to pitch in and cover for you if you had some conflicts or something. It'd be great if you wanted to try it. And I would be more than happy to nominate you.

Tom:

Is a time change potentially helpful, Jamie?

Jamie:

Well, I can tell you I'm still in Hartford and this is a tough, tough time. I just found out today that I have testimony due on Monday and I have to get to legislators tomorrow. And I haven't looked at the bill. It just came to me this morning. So, I'm looking at this thinking. I don't know when I'm going to have time. I'm not prepared to run a meeting tonight. So, I don't have, I printed the documents out and left them sitting on my dresser, at home. So, I don't have them printed. I'm looking at my phone trying because I can't pull them up on my work computer.

What I'm hearing, I got elected is what I'm hearing?

Charles:

You want to co-chair it or something? I'll cover when you can't-

Stephen:

I'll do it.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Charles:

Okay, I'll nominate Steve as chairman.

Tim:

I'll second.

Jamie:

Okay. Steve, if we have to do this again, I'm more than happy to do it next time around. I've never done this before, so, I feel like, I don't know.

Charles:

Have you been on a nominating committee before, Jamie?

Jamie:

No.

Charles:

Oh, Okay. So it's still something good just to be on it. And you'll see that it's pretty straightforward.

Stephen:

Yeah, it's not like any other committee. Not unlike any other committee. So, all right.

Jamie:

Once I nominated for judges years ago when I worked in the governor's office. That's not the same thing.

Charles:

Okay. So I nominated Steve, did we have a second and everything or are you going to take.

Jamie:

Yes, I seconded it.

Charles:

Okay, All in favor I guess.

Committee:

Aye.

Tom:

Your meeting Steve.

Stephen:

So, we hit the first item on the agenda here. Jennifer, you got the safety moment up and that is yard cleanup. Okay. And it's the time of year I guess for that. Just not quite ready to do that yet. But, I'm glad to have some suggestions ahead of time. Everyone take a look at that when you get a chance.

Item three is discussing with the Regional Water Authority chairman and chief executive officer, the types of experience and other traits needed by the Authority. Tony brought a lot to the table. We have recognized the need potentially for someone with an engineering or similar kind of technical background, something in the industry that would be helpful just as a gut check on the board for things that come at you. But rather than say anything, we would ask both of you to offer any suggestions, comments, or observations you have. David, you've been in it for a while, now, so you probably have a good handle on what you may be looking for or how we can tweak this.

David:

Well, thank you Steve and thank you members. We appreciate the opportunity to be part of your deliberations here or at least your initial setup. We really weren't surprised that there was a potential vacancy, just that it happened the way it did. We were figuring that there was going to be a replacement come the end of this year anyway, most likely. And so when we met, as when you had a nominee committee a few months ago and we met with you, we felt that as you just summarized, an engineer or somebody who has utility experience would be very helpful.

We don't have those. We have somebody with land use experience who's an attorney. We have someone with government finance experience who's an attorney. We have somebody with nonprofit and government experiences and we have somebody else with government experiences and finance. So, we don't have anybody in the operations area. We don't have anybody in the engineering area. We lost somebody who was a member since the beginning who was an engineer and certainly brought a perspective that was helpful.

We have not, to my knowledge, had somebody who really, well yes we did. We had somebody who had some mid-level utility experience, as well years back and that would not be a bad trait to have again, if you had the possibility of having that.

Larry, did you want to add more color? Yes. Yeah, Greg.

Greg:

This is Greg. How about a business background. Did Tony have that?

David:

He did. He had nonprofit background and business background and he brought those, but he was here so long, that after a while, it becomes the institutional knowledge of the water company. So, he really was that. Business background would be helpful. Yes, especially with the fact that we're doing acquisitions and we're doing a lot of commercial enterprise activities. But, all in all we are doing that. But we are a utility, so, we wouldn't want to lose one or the other. I wouldn't want to see another attorney who didn't have those backgrounds as their main discipline. I wouldn't want to see another municipal government expert or experienced person. I think we need to diversify a little more.

Stephen:

Dave. I think this is sort of a situation that's a case where perhaps expanding your five member authority, for more depth.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

David:

That's a possibility. Over the years you've talked about it, the seven members, what would that do? How would it affect things? The way it works now with the five committees, we have five members, each chair one. It works fine and it's easier with a smaller group to work together in some ways. But you're right, if the Authority was bigger, we could have more experiences brought to the table. I've been part of larger boards.

Stephen:

If all of you were there and had the right backgrounds, it's fine. But as soon as there's a hole, it's a big hole.

David:

Yes, absolutely.

Stephen:

So, just an observation.

Charles:

Steve, well I think that that's important but I think we should remember that we are going to, this term is only for a short period of time. So, we're going to have to re-look at filling a member. I think it's by the first year or April or something the next year. So, this is really a short-term thing. But I think that's a good point Steve, to maybe we could rethink that a little bit and see if that's something we want to explore more fully. The last-

Stephen:

I think, go ahead.

Charles:

Yes, the last time I think we added the engineering, so we talked through that quite a bit last time and I think we also talked about the business thing and that's why I think we at that point decided that the F under criteria with the corporate finance and significant budget experience and everything, I think we decided just to leave that as the corporate business sense thing. Although, again, Steve, I think that's a good point about, now that we're in perhaps expanding outside our core and everything that that makes some sense to explore that too. But again, for this particular cycle, I personally think that the criteria that we used last time would be fine to put forward to the RPB.

Stephen:

No, I think everything's there. We're just kind of talking about what we as a committee might want to focus on in terms of backgrounds or possibly a candid discussion. Tweak the ad a little bit. I don't know yet, but I think this is an absolutely critical appointment right now because it is a short term, but we're probably going to reappoint this person. I agree. We have to go through the whole process so we might as well make it really count. I agree. Any other thoughts? Anybody have any comments on that?

Larry:

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

From my perspective, if I may, as part of this process or did you want me to wait, Steve?

Stephen:

No, go ahead Larry.

Larry:

I certainly agree with David but I also offer that, as we think about this, I think an individual with public utility, regulatory experience that might involve overseeing engineers, they would have that.

Stephen:

Yes.

Larry:

I think somebody that has utility regulatory experience would be that quite frankly, supervises engineers and some of the regulatory agencies do that, I think would be helpful. Also, as I looked at the criteria, a few tweaks to it would be, for instance an item six under behavior characteristics. I would say ability to function as a collaborative team member, I think is important, because you can be a team member and that doesn't necessarily translate into collaboration. I think I would add the word collaborative team member. Under the organizational background for item C, I think I would add something like senior management level of the utility experience. Under D suggests that it be political legislative or utility regulatory agency involvement. I think would be helpful, as well.

And the substantial legal experience, it would be great, if we sometime found a candidate who was actually a senior lawyer with a utility that handled their regulatory work before the regulatory agencies. Whether it's the DEP, or whether it's Department of Public Health, or whether it's PURA's. So, I think that utility legal experience is important if somebody applied because, while we have a land use attorney, as David mentioned, we have a public finance, as well, as municipal government attorney on the board, but we don't have anybody with a utility perspective which is unique. So, I think somebody that has utility experience, or in either running or managing a utility, or having regulatory oversight of one would be a terrific experience to add to the board.

Tom:

But I have a question Larry. Oh, go ahead Jeff.

Jeff:

I repeat under item D, you said political and I missed what else you said for item D, experience.

Larry:

Political, legislative or utility regulatory agency involvement. As you know there's three agencies that oversee water utilities, in particular. Not necessarily RWA but that really doesn't matter. They have the experience. So, if you put utility regulatory agency experience, I think that would be important. A differentiator.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Tim:

I had a comment if not a question. I think it would be somewhat stressful to have three attorneys on board. I'm not sure you'd ever get the type you're looking for. But going to that, I don't mean attorneys, in general, I meant three with different specialties. What does Murtha do for us Larry?

Larry:

Well Murtha certainly provides us with legal counsel, but we're not, but when you bring a board member on, that's an lawyer, you're not asking them to serve in their capacity as a lawyer. And they'll tell you that they're not there in their capacity as a lawyer because they're there as a board member. They use their legal background to form opinions and to perhaps take positions on things. They're not on that board as your counsel. That's in this case Murtha Cullina's job.

Tom:

Okay. I understand as we look at Jeff's role, because that's the role we recognize and see as we attend all these meetings. So in a manner of speaking you're really stating that sort of the role Jeff plays, advising us, even though he's a paid council for consumer council, it's sort of that role.

Larry:

No, I'm suggesting that if you brought somebody that had a legal background in utility experience that they would have that experience and that point of view that they could bring to business matters. But, they would not be on that board as a lawyer providing legal advice. It's not their role.

Tim:

Just like an engineer's not going to provide engineering services.

Larry:

Exactly.

Tim:

But they're helpful. I follow all that. I just wanted to be clear on it because, every attorney I think brings some level and some measure of their profession into it. But, I guess they're also specialized as the point. But

Larry:

I'd like to go back to the idea of the utility regulatory experience because we do have a diverse experience on the board. I think that that utility regulatory experience or running a utility, both, would be either one would be helpful experience particularly on the regulatory side if they've had a lot of community involvement and nonprofit board experience, as well.

Stephen:

So, what that person would bring is the regulatory side, but for the issues that we need that for, we can get that as in a consultant sort of form too, correct?

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Jamie:

Well you can, but, I guess, why hire a consultant if you could get that with a board member on there. You may want to double check something with a consultant, but it could certainly cut down on the amount of consultant time you might use.

Stephen:

Do you see that need as an ongoing need for the water company in terms of issues it's going to address in the future?

Larry:

Yeah, I think so. As you look at the kind of projects that we're going to get involved in, going forward, whether it is expanding the utility through interconnections or if we were to look to acquire a municipal utility that made sense for us. If a town wanted to sell their utility, I think that regulatory experience would be helpful whether it's at the agency or whether it's in legal practice.

Charles:

If I could, if he could... I had one quick question Steve,

Larry:

I can work with you if you want.

Jennifer:

Oh, for the criteria, in revising it?

Larry:

You got these comments, Okay.

Jennifer:

Yes.

Tim:

If I may just have one quick question. I don't mean to belabor this point as much, but where there have been acquisitions of that sort, Larry, already in the organization. Where did you go begging, how did it you fill-in with that lack of experience? Just give us some perspective on that since they obviously came to fruition. But, you may have found that he had issues afterwards that I'm not aware of.

Larry:

Well, the only acquisition that the RWA has made recently, because as you probably know the RWA actually grew through acquiring surrounding water utilities within New Haven County. So, they bought the Branford Water Company, the Milford Water Company, et cetera, et cetera. So, that was way before my time. But the last acquisition that we made was in 2008 when my predecessor purchased the Birmingham Water Utilities. That required a rather extensive review process, not only internally, but it also requires the approval of PURA at the time because that was an investor-owned water utility that

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

was regulated by PURA. So, they needed to seek PURA approval and they needed to go out and get a fairness opinion, for some reason, to make sure that the price that was being paid, the shareholders of the Birmingham utilities was fair and adequate for both parties, both the stockholders of BUI, but as well as the RWA.

Tim:

So it was a serious endeavor.

Larry:

It was a complicated process that might of been, had we had some of this experience that we're talking about. It could have been, maybe, might have been a little smoother. It was done, and clearly we did it and it was successful and I wasn't here to know what the stresses on the organization was at the time, Tim.

Tim:

Right, understood.

Jamie:

It does make sense,. Too though. I think Larry, as you're talking about having somebody with this kind of expertise in the, they'll know the question asked, they understand the regulatory, they know what's in front of us. So when you're trying to plan and make arrangements for what comes first, the sequence of events, things that you have to make sure you do. I know, in working with some state agency that you don't have people in the room if they haven't had any experience with rail. They don't even know there's federal laws you have to follow and make sure it gets taken care of.

You pay lawyers a lot of money to do that or go back and fix it if things don't get done. So having somebody at the table that has that experience, a regulatory experience, knows that there's some federal overlay on doing something, or state overlay, or some rule you have to notify. So, it's all that kind of implicit understanding of the process. But, I think it would be a great asset to the RWA, I think it's a very wise app.

Larry:

And just think about what we have staring us in the face. We have the lead and copper rule that we have to comply with, which the organization is in the process of getting ready to do. We've got the PFAs regulatory requirements and while that's not approved yet, that's going to be something that we're going to have to look at and things are just going to get a lot tougher in the regulatory arena moving forward at both the state and the federal level. So, to your point Jamie, I agree a hundred percent given the regulatory challenges that are coming down the pike.

Jamie:

And I think we're going to see more and more municipalities looking to us for council.

Larry:

Yes.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Jamie:

In our property. So I think there's more and more having somebody on the water authority to know who to go to for what and yeah, I think that it's only beneficial.

Stephen:

Larry, just to go out hit my head here about, is this something we might want to make a position within the RWA, not a board member qualification, but someone within the organization who particularly deals with these things?

Larry:

You mean like hiring in-house council?

Stephen:

Not a council, but just someone who's regulatory person in the industry, to understand all the challenges that come at you, on a daily basis. Who's doing that now?

Larry:

Well, I guess it depends on where it comes in at. If it's in the environmental arena, either Ted Norris, or now, Sunny would handle that probably in consultation with outside council. If it's in the financial arena, Rochelle would certainly handle that, probably in collaboration with a Bond council or somebody at Murtha that handles things in the regulatory arena and that could be Bruce McDermott, for instance, or one of the other attorneys, there right now. So right now, it would be the Vice President, under whose area the particular regulatory issue would fall.

Larry:

Steve, day-to-day person, just for making sure we're in compliance with what we need to do.

Tim:

So Steve, I think you're going in the right direction. I think Steve's direction is maybe the better way to go.

Stephen:

No, I'm not so sure about that because we'd be spending a lot of money to get somebody like that in-house and you would be hiring somebody with a, I think, with a legal background. They're going to have to have that understanding and we have counsel that provides that and our vice presidents or our division heads certainly have that experience to do it, and therefore they can save the organization money, expense, by having that base knowledge and then working with the appropriate legal council, whether it's at Pullman and Connolly or whether it's at Murtha Cullina, depending on the particular issue.

I'm just thinking if we had somebody like that, like even for the lead copper rule they could take, instead of having as many consultants or legal representatives that we need, we'd have somebody in-house to shepherd that kind of project. Just a thought. Well,

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Stephen:

So I would, now, and we'll probably have a senior engineer in the organization that will work on that and do the coordination in-house. We have that, so far, taken care of.

Charles:

But having it in the room, when you guys are talking about big, just having, I think that perspective, as a quality, in the person, the member of the board. I think, or the authority, I think, from my perspective, I think it's only advantageous, official

Stephen:

I mean there's no doubt about that, but what let's remember that the board is the high level here. It's the 30,000 foot view. They're the ones to just guide this, look at this, make those major decisions and observations about the direction for the organization and have somebody with the experience to know what's the impact of this on the organization and have enough knowledge of the organization to know how are we going to address this? That's the person we're looking for. They're not functioning as the person to actually do the job on a daily basis. So, it's a little different.

Larry:

Yeah. Well we'll think about that, Steve.

Stephen:

No, no question. Thank you. Any other thoughts, Larry?

Larry:

No, I think you just may want to tweak the ad a little bit to reflect that utility regulatory experience, but that's not in there, right now. It's got regulatory, but not utility and I think that differentiation would be helpful.

Stephen:

I think the utility sort of criteria is good for what the other characteristics as well. It certainly would be helpful. And you're organized a little different too. You're not a private utility, you're a regional municipal organized utility. It's a little different.

Dave, anything else?

David:

No, I think Larry brought up a good perspective, that I think we would appreciate it if you would consider, and that is that somebody with utility regulatory experience, but I also contend that somebody with engineering or operations experience at a high level would certainly be helpful, as well. And you may find someone with both, you may just split it, you may find somebody totally different that has just the business point of view, but has maybe had some past other experiences. But, I think a concentration on those areas of business or utility regulation experience or a mid-level utility leadership, at least, preferably higher level would be very helpful.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Stephen:

Yes, I think your qualification of high-level engineering is really important. They have to have that, not just the engineering part of it, but the overall impact to the organization.

David:

And, we're doing major projects. We've got the dam coming up. Yeah, we've got the lead and copper rule, which is a major undertaking. So we've got some big projects coming up. It wouldn't be bad to have somebody that might have had experiences that might be somewhat similar to that from some other area in their life's experiences.

Jamie:

If you had somebody that had utility regulatory experience, they've dealt with public meetings and large compliance capital projects and things like that. So, that kind of an individual would bring an interesting experience, and a point, and a perspective to view as we are working through particular issues, as well as providing advice and counsel on stakeholder engagement, as well as moving a project forward for regulatory compliance.

Stephen:

Any other questions from the board members? Any comments, so far? Okay. Well,

Charles:

Thank you.

Stephen:

Thank you for attending. We appreciate your input. I think, as I said before, this is a really important job this time around and we're going to do our best to get you a great candidate.

David:

We appreciate that. We know you will. We know you folks have a lot of good experience and you always, all of you to a person has the RWA as your first, foremost, their wellbeing and upper mind eyes.

When I saw who was on the committee, I was very encouraged because everybody's had been here a while, had some experience and really has been someone that's scared and participated in the past.

Larry:

Great experience on there. So thank you all.

David:

Yes, thank you.

Stephen:

Thank you Larry. Thank you David.

Stephen:

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

We'll move on to agenda item four, which is reviewing the procedure and the by-law provisions.

My understanding is we have to go through the whole process here. Do we have more than one internal candidate, Jennifer, so far?

Jennifer:

No, I think it's just the one that I'm aware of. I don't know if Bob should solicit at the next meeting.

Stephen:

Sure. We should let people know it's open. We are looking and I think, by regulation we do have to go outside, advertise this and interview candidates from the outside. I think it's a really good exercise this time around, to know who's there. As I said, it's an important position to fill, so, I'm not sure what else to do on this part. Does anybody have any questions or comments on the review procedure? Now, that I'm chairman, I'll have to look at it in a little more detail, to see what the next step is here with Jennifer.

Charles:

When do we have to vote on the criteria and present it to the RPB?

Jennifer:

I was going to ask you that. So, I can work with Larry on the criteria. I can also work on the ad with him, if you'd like. And then, I can submit it to the committee and then whenever it's ready we can send it out to the RPB members for comment. I don't know if you want it for the March meeting.

Stephen:

I'm not sure what you're suggesting here. Don't we develop the ad? Why are you sending it to Larry?

Jennifer:

He had mentioned that he wanted some of the information that was going to be in the criteria in the ad, with the regulatory experience, public utility. So-

Stephen:

We can decide as a committee. We can look at that and add it or not. We haven't really discussed their comments yet, as a committee. It's the next thing on the agenda.

Stephen:

So I'll have to go back to the procedure, make sure we're just covering all of those points, as a committee.

Jamie:

I'm having some technical difficulties. So you may want... So on line eight you might want to add that line starts with environmental land use, legislative or you would insert utility regulatory agency issues. I suppose, you could do that. Would that address?

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Stephen:

Just add utility before regulatory or?

Tom:

Yes, that's what I was thinking.

Jamie:

I agree.

Tom:

What Larry was referring to line 8 regulatory experience. So if you want to craft something you could put as Jennifer had offered, maybe there could be a circulation of a draft, if you want, have Larry weigh in on it. That's ultimately a decision of ours.

Tim:

That's an excellent suggestion, Tom.

Stephen:

Okay, let's do that. Let's do that for the next meeting.

Stephen:

I think time is of the essence here though, so we've got to get this thing done pretty quickly.

As I'm looking at this, the ideal candidate must have a degree from a four that's kind of given or equivalent demonstrated accomplishment. I'm not sure this is strong enough for the kind of person that we're looking for. Does anybody else have that feeling about high-level board experience? We've listed a few people-

But we have more things on our job description than finance, human resources, conservation and.. We don't even have engineering on here, which is really an important consideration this time around. So, maybe we can pick up some of those things as we circulate this. Yeah, you have to put engineering.

Jennifer:

Jeff has a question.

Stephen:

Yes.

Greg:

If I could Steve.

Stephen:

Yes.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Greg:

Just from my perspective, I kind of feel the way that David felt because there are so many significant capital project undertakings, very large dollar projects, whether it's Lake Whitney Dam, whether it's lead and copper. You look at the size, based on that rate application, that the Authority just had a public hearing on. Look at the size of the capital improvement program. I do think that somebody with utility regulatory agency experience, at a senior level, either from an operations or an engineering perspective is a must. And the reason I raise my hand is I think that the ad should just say it upfront.

Stephen:

Yes, that's kind of what-

Greg:

You know what I'm saying. Because those people don't grow on trees and I think some of them might look at this and say, "They're not really looking for a senior manager, so I'm not interested." So, I think you just need to say upfront, "senior management experience and engineering operations," whatever. But I think it needs to be called out. Thank you.

Stephen:

You're absolutely right. I think those specific things that we're looking for, this strikes me as a little bit too general and we're going to cast a wide net here and not want to look at all of the things that we catch. If we're really looking for somebody with a higher level of experience to say, let's see here, "The duties of a five member authority are similar to those of a board of directors." That's a line we should take out of there. That's wasted space. So, perhaps in circulating this, we'll have a little more time to get this more specific and at a better level in terms of this defining what we're looking for. Any other suggestions right now as you all look at this?

Tim:

Well, I know that the word collaboration/collaborative came up, so there's lots of ways to sort of pre-qualify with a little insertion of something like that as well as the directness. I think we can come up with an ad that works. How many eyes do you want to put on this? You going to circulate this among this group?

Stephen:

Yes, just to the committee and to Larry and David. Jeff, you want to take a look at it and add any?

Jeff:

Sure. Happy to do it.

Stephen:

Thank you.

Jennifer:

So, is it not going to be distributed to this whole group whole. It's just going to be-

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Stephen:

Yeah, to the Nominating Committee and the other people mentioned.

Jennifer:

I'm sorry. Thank you.

Stephen:

We've had the discussion. I just didn't want to send it out to the whole board. I think it's our job to know what we're to do with this.

Jeff:

Absolutely.

Stephen:

And to look for what we want.

Jeff:

Do you think this will go out to the members by next meeting?

Stephen:

Well, the next meeting,

Tim:

No, we have to talk about this.

Stephen:

No, we haven't even set up our next meeting yet.

Jeff:

Right, right.

Stephen:

We got to circulate this, pin it down and then, we could let the board know at some point. But it won't be this month and it'll probably be the following one.

Jeff:

Yes, I agree.

Stephen:

We might want to do just an email that Jennifer could do before the next board meeting to let them know sooner, We'll see how quickly we can get it together.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Tim:

One thing I would also do, whoever really ends up parsing this, I would like to see this is a part-time salary position down towards the bottom. I don't think we have to start out that it's a part-time job. I think we need to spell out immediately what we're looking for as was indicated by Steve and Jeff I think, and then put some of those other details down toward the bottom with the application process. Just a thought.

Stephen:

No, that's a good observation. Just yeah, it takes away from, I think, the kind of quality and character, the person we're looking for upfront.

Tom:

And then, you could insert those collaborative things like working with the five board prepared to work with a five member Authority collaboratively or whatever, but I it can get a lot better.

Stephen:

The second sentence could start with something like, this is an important high level board member position, which immediately, something to immediately send them in the right direction.

And candidates must reside within the district. That could be down at the bottom too.

Tom:

And you could indicate 16 towns in case somebody wants to look up the district, whatever it is.

Stephen:

Any other comments on this?

Tim:

So we can toss any of this back to Jennifer as we feel, and then, all of it'll be sort of cobbled together. So, basically we have to do a save as, name it "Your save as.", because it sets as a Word document.

Stephen:

Do you want to send out a specific email, Jennifer with this and ask to our committee, asking for revision so we have that specific thing to respond to?

Jennifer:

Yes, I'll send it out. I'll make some red line changes that were discussed, and then, I'll send it out to the committee. Do you want me to copy Larry and David on that one or do you want to wait till the committee looks at it first?

Stephen:

No, have them weigh in at the beginning here.

Jennifer:

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Okay.

Stephen:

Yeah, we need to get to an endpoint here pretty quickly. And Jeff too. Make sure he's copied.

Charles:

So, do we have like 24 hours? What's the turnaround time that you want for this, Steve, for us all to look at it and get it back to you?

Stephen:

We have a few days. I would say the sooner you could do it, the better. Let's see, where are we? Wednesday, maybe by the beginning of next week.

Tim:

If I make a submission, you'll have it by Saturday. I'm not available next week.

Charles:

I won't be available until Sunday.

Stephen:

Okay. Yeah, it's, it is. We'll let it go until next weekend. We'll see if we get it all back. We should have a pretty good idea by then. We cover that topic? So.

Tom:

Perfect.

Stephen:

Draft the selection guidelines. I, well, going back to five for a minute, "Agree on the draft selection guidelines." Did we cover that totally, to the RPB member? We agreed that was pretty much okay as it was.

Tom:

I would say so.

Tim:

Yes.

Jamie:

You mean changing from five to seven?

Stephen:

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

It was the other document, Jennifer, that we have. Yeah, five. All right, item five on the agenda was our job description.

Tom:

I don't think we're ready to change it from five board members to seven. No, we're not talking about that.

Stephen:

No, I'm not talking about that.

Tom:

No.

Stephen:

I'm talking about number five on the agenda.

Jennifer:

Is that the job description, the actual job description? Is this the right document?

Stephen:

No, the one we, where we had the guidelines, were.

Jennifer:

Okay.

Stephen:

Graph selection.

Jennifer:

Criteria.

Stephen:

Criteria. Yeah,

Tom:

I think that's actually the PDF. No, that's the bylaws.

Jennifer:

Yes, I got it. It's coming up. Okay. This should be it.

Stephen:

Yeah. So, are we okay on this? Any other?

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Tom:

Well, this was where, this is actually where there were some changes on number six. The word collaborative was inserted.

Stephen:

Yes, so Jennifer's done this before.

Tom:

Well the only other recorded one that I had was under work and organizational background, item 2D, added the word utility, regulatory utility before the word reg. Those are the only two changes that I heard Larry specifically indicate would be useful.

Jennifer:

On 2C. Somebody said senior level to use that.

Tom:

Oh, they said senior level, instead of high level.

Jennifer:

Instead of high level.

Jeff:

I think Larry said that.

Jennifer:

2D, it said to insert utility regulatory agency involvement. So, I would just add utility and then G was senior lawyer with utility regulatory oversight experience. So, I don't know if you want to put the actual word lawyer in there or-

Stephen:

No, we can leave it more open than that.

Tom:

In other words, leave that as this your suggestion.

Jennifer:

Okay.

Tim:

Well what does that mean actually? What does G mean? Substantial relevant legal experience. That means we can hire any lawyer or have any lawyer serve, I suppose, if we feel it fits in. Is that what that means? Anyone care to entertain that question?

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Stephen:

Jennifer, can you move that document so I can see, put that in the middle.

Jennifer:

Can you see it?

Stephen:

So we're looking at 2G?

Tim:

Yes. And my question was what does it really mean, "Substantial relevant legal experience,"? That means any lawyer is qualified, which is okay by me. I'm just wondering if that's what that means.

Charles:

I thought that was Larry's point instead of relevant that we would plug in utility oversight legal experience.

Jeff:

Yes, I agree.

Tom:

I agree. That's what he said. But does that become too narrow?

Tim:

Look, I think we're picking at a dead horse here. Honestly. We're going to, we going to circulate today and Jeff's going to weigh in, so I think we're in a good place so we can move there.

Stephen:

I don't have any problem with leaving it open. When we did that.

Jamie:

I don't think you have to worry about it.

Stephen:

We're just looking for someone that, you know, we've had different kind of legal backgrounds. We're just looking for someone who's experience was relevant to the organization. That's all.

Greg:

The question, if I could weigh in is-

Stephen:

Was it just a general work background comment?

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Greg:

The question is whether you want to remove the word relevant and say something like substantial legal experience serving in a utility regulatory agency capacity and then eliminate. Because I know last time we got a couple of applications. One was from a real estate lawyer, one was from a municipal lawyer. So, if you want to avoid getting generalist type lawyer applications, then the easy way to do it is just say utility regulatory agency experience, instead of leaving the word relevant. You decide what's relevant, but the applicants don't know what you have in mind.

Tim:

I like that myself, so.

Jamie:

Okay, good point. Good point.

Stephen:

Thank you.

Greg:

Sure.

Stephen:

Okay. Jennifer, you have that?

Jennifer:

Yes.

Stephen:

We can move on if we're done with that. Item seven on the agenda is the timeline and next steps, the dates. So, we have the tough job of just figuring out how quickly we could get together, I guess. Let me look at my calendar here.

Tim:

We do have our regular meeting on the 23rd, is that correct?

Jennifer:

Yes.

Stephen:

Yes, that's correct.

Jennifer:

Consumer Affairs is meeting on the 20th.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Stephen:

How about availability for the following week? We have a couple of people going into surgery here.

Tom:

Yeah, I can't likely meet next week's. Potentially I could on Thursday, but I'm not certain of any time before then.

Stephen:

So, I'm talking about the week after that.

Tom:

Oh, okay. So that would be the week beginning,

Stephen:

27th.

Tom:

The 27th

Stephen:

Is the 27th the date?

Charles:

The next meeting will also be a teams meeting. Until we get to actually interviews, we probably don't need an in-person meeting, do we?

Tom:

Oh, no. No, we can do hybrid.

Stephen:

Hybrid. We can do hybrid but definitely the ability to do electronics. So, we can just do this as quickly as we can. 'Till we to get to that point.

Jamie:

So I can't be there.

Charles:

Are you suggesting Monday?

Stephen:

I'm suggesting the 27th is a next meeting date if everybody can make that, for a virtual meeting.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Jamie:

I cannot.

Charles:

What day is that?

Jennifer:

It's a Monday, the 27th.

Jamie:

This is Jamie. I cannot meet on that day. Is it Okay?

Stephen:

Okay.

Jamie:

Is it okay to change when we have it?

Charles:

Is the 27th on Monday?

Stephen:

Yes.

Charles:

How about a Wednesday, like today?

Jamie:

I can do Wednesday, the 29th.

Jennifer:

The 29th.

Jamie:

Yes.

Charles:

Yep. 29th. Yeah,

Stephen:

I could possibly do it, if it's 5:30PM.

Representative Policy Board
Nominating Committee
March 15, 2023

Charles:

That would work for me.

Jamie:

That works-

Tom:

Yeah, that'll work for me.

Greg:

5:30PM and it's.

Stephen:

On the 29th.

Is that good for everybody?

Charles:

I think it's good for me. It's good.

Stephen:

Okay. So, by then we should have the description done, the ad, the newspaper ad, and we'll be ready to move on and decide what we're going to do in terms of setting up the ad and setting up some interview times and setting up some future meetings. And I think that's it for today. Unless somebody, Jennifer, is there anything else you think we need?

Jennifer:

Nope, I think that was everything.

Stephen:

Okay.

Charles:

Okay. Fantastic.

Stephen:

Appreciate everybody.

Charles:

Thank you Steve.