

REPRESENTATIVE POLICY BOARD

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

MARCH 29, 2023

MEETING TRANSCRIPTION

Stephen:

It is 5:31, so I'll call the Nominating Committee meeting to order. The first item on the agenda is our safety moment, and this one is relative to preventing hearing loss. I have related to the cartoon because I have half loss of hearing from childhood in my left ear, and it's the part that it enables you to distinguish between hearing tests and a hairy chest. So really important to keep those cells working properly. Take a look at that when you get a chance. Item two is our minutes. Do I have a motion?

Tim:

So moved.

Stephen:

Thank you. Second?

Greg:

Second.

Stephen:

Are there any there any corrections? Any additions? Any omissions? Did anyone recognize this? Hearing none, all those in favor?

Committee:

Aye.

Stephen:

Okay. The minutes pass. So item three is to discuss the RPB member responses regarding the Authority member position. And we've done a lot. It was important to have this meeting soon, so we could get the ad together and these other documents finished up. I think we're in good shape here with all of these, and we'll be able to set that in motion and have a little breather until we start getting some applications back. Was there anything else, Jennifer, with regard to RPB responses?

Jennifer:

No, there were no responses.

Stephen:

I didn't hear from anybody else. And you didn't?

Jennifer:

No.

Stephen:

Anything about the criteria either, right?

Jennifer:

No.

Stephen:

Okay. So item four we can move into, which is reviewing that final draft of the criteria. As it stands, unless there's any further additions. Anybody have any comments on this? Tweaks to it? Looks okay.

Tim:

We discussed it pretty good at the last meeting, I think.

Stephen:

Okay. So that's all set.

Jennifer:

Do you want to vote on that to distribute it to the-

Stephen:

I was just wondering if we needed to vote on it.

Jennifer:

Last time, they did.

Stephen:

Okay. I'll entertain a motion.

Tom:

I'll accept the RPB Nominating Committee Criteria as amended.

Tim:

I'll second that.

Stephen:

Thank you. I assume there's no discussion. All those in favor?

Committee:

Aye.

Tom:

Any opposed? Any abstaining? Good. That passes. Now to the newspaper ad. I did take a look at this and reorganize some of it, added some of the things that we wanted to highlight and I hope everybody's had a look at it.

Tim:

And this is what we're looking at, Steve, what you've had a chance and others have had a chance to edit? Is that correct?

Stephen:

Yes. This is the final draft. What we changed is the ideal candidate would have senior level experience, which we wanted to highlight, managing large capital projects, operations and strategic planning. And I added... We had another piece in here, but I thought it was important, along with ,if you're going to say what the ideal candidate is, prior experience on a public or private board of directors would be very helpful. So I just put it onto that a lot. And then-

Tim:

Question? I had a question because I'm sure that there's a lot of thought that went into line three, with would have senior level. I guess that makes it somewhat conditional, and that's probably where the thought came in with would, as opposed to should or shall. But that was just a question of mine. Does that give us wiggle room? Is that what that's all about?

Stephen:

Well, if you say should, then you've defined it. We're talking about the ideal candidate as someone we could get. But it doesn't mean that... I didn't want to discourage somebody from not applying for it, because-

Tim:

I figured that was the weight behind it. But I wanted to have it fully discussed just so everyone understood that. Because I know we're focusing on a lot of different things, and there's a lot of different things in that sentence, which probably would take care of all of it, if you had some of it.

Stephen:

Yes. Correct.

Tom:

What do you mean by take care of all of it if you have some of it? Tim, I'm sorry. I don't understand.

Tim:

Well, I think anybody who's got to interview any one of these candidates is not going to check off every box. So, that's why we don't want to say "should" or "shall" and that's what "would" means.

Stephen:

Yes, that was the thinking.

Tim:

And I know there's legal minds in the room, and that's all I want to know. That that gives us the wiggle room in the selection process, the interviewing process that we feel we need. That's all.

Tom:

Understand.

Tim:

So Tom, you would think that's just fine and fine. The best latitudes?

Tom:

Yes, I would.

Tim:

Okay.

Stephen:

And then in the next sentence, we include a lot of different backgrounds that are possible, although we're trying to cast a little narrower net. And then we put all of the requirements sort of at the bottom here, part-time salary, what the hours were, bachelor's degree, which kind of goes without saying. Then we have to fill in when we want a receipt. So it'll depend upon what we decide for our advertising framework. Anybody have any other comments on this? You think it's okay as it is?

Charles:

Yeah. After Bachelor's degree, do you need "or equivalent experience?" If we're looking for a high-powered person, I mean they got to have a minimum bachelor's.

Stephen:

It's hard to imagine somebody having equivalent experience without having at least a bachelor's. I mean, I would expect them to even have maybe an advanced degree. I wouldn't have problem... That was there, Greg, but I wouldn't have a problem dropping it.

Charles:

Yes, I think you should drop it.

Stephen:

Okay. Everybody agree with that?

Tim:

I have no problem dropping it, unless it's a legal reason. It's got to be there.

Stephen:

Yes.

Tim:

Do you want a motion on it, Steve?

Stephen:

No. This is just an ad we're putting together. I don't think we need a motion on it. Yeah, we can drop that. It caught my attention before. I only retained it because it was there, originally, for a long time.

Charles:

It was there for a long time.

Stephen:

So Jennifer, you can take that out?

Jennifer:

I can, yes.

Stephen:

And we'll fill in... When we decide on the dates, you can put the date in here. So this is the key thing to get this going, in terms of timing, for our procedure here.

Tim:

I had one question. So basically, we're going to end that sentence. "Candidates must reside within the Regional Water Authority District," period and drop "bachelor's degree or equivalent experience." I understand where equivalent experience goes, either. I would just have it end there. You've already defined what you're looking for.

Stephen:

I think we had "equivalent experience" because we had "bachelor's degree." I think drop "bachelor's degree." We don't have to worry about it at all.

Tim:

Right. So that sentence will end with "district," period.

Stephen:

Yeah, that's a very good observation. That makes it really clean. Then we see what we get. It's not a requirement. We just see who the applicants are, and what their backgrounds are. Good suggestion.

Thank you. This coming weekend is Palm Sunday, and then Easter's the following weekend. When do we want to advertise this? We're going to put this in... Jennifer? We normally do... Ken? Or Thursday.

Jennifer:

I think the weekends will probably be the best. I don't know if there's any type of online posting that you want to do. Maybe indeed.com. Maybe we could do something on that. A lot of people use Indeed.

Stephen:

Sure.

Jennifer:

I'm not sure how LinkedIn works. I'm not really on that very often.

Jamie:

If you send it out, we can put it on, one of us can throw it up on LinkedIn too.

Tim:

Even the authority.

Jamie:

Yeah, sorry, go ahead.

Jennifer:

And the authority website, yeah.

Stephen:

I'd like to see it on LinkedIn if we could get it there.

Jamie:

So the authority has a LinkedIn profile, so that's Larry.

Jennifer:

You know what? Yeah, I can contact Communications and have them put it on there.

Tim:

Yeah, just go through HR, whatever they do with their standard there.

Jennifer:

Do you want it in the New Haven register as well? And Connecticut Post?

Stephen:

We need to do those two papers. Question is, did we do those one weekend, or do we do those two weekends? I'm kind of leaning toward two weekends. I don't know what everybody else thinks.

Tim:

Yeah, 10 days, two weekends.

Charles:

Now what papers you're going to put it in? New Haven Register and what's the other?

Jennifer:

Connecticut Post?

Tim:

Right?

Stephen:

Yeah. It is an online world though today. So that's a good thought. And certainly our website, I think. The RWA website. But we could maybe think about online, if there's anything else that comes up to place it. I'm thinking we start the weekend after Easter.

Tim:

I don't see any reason to wait.

Stephen:

You want to go sooner?

Jamie:

The nice thing about doing it over, some people will have time to put together a resume I guess-

Tim:

In long weekend and everything. Yeah.

Stephen:

Okay. So it'll be next weekend that we start?

Tom:

Yeah, I don't think you can get in for this

Jennifer:

Weekend. Yeah, it's a little late for the newspapers, at least, for this weekend.

Stephen:

So, we'll do next weekend and the following weekend.

Jennifer:

Do you want it on Saturday, Sunday, or both days?

Stephen:

Both days.

Tom:

Let me ask you something.

Stephen:

How much time should we give people to respond? What's our date we need? Do we need a month?

Tim:

10 days, two weeks should be more than enough.

Tom:

Yeah, two weeks I think is fine.

Tim:

So does that mean reply by April 30th, or you're going to put a reply date in there, Steve? Is that what you're suggesting?

Stephen:

Yeah. If we're going to advertise it this weekend and the following weekend, it would be two weeks after that, Jennifer.

Jennifer:

Okay. So April 30 at 4:30. Okay. Yeah, that falls right at the end of the month.

Stephen:

And that gives us some time to figure out our dates for future meetings to take a look at them. We could sort of start triaging them as they come in.

Tom:

That's true.

Stephen:

We'll see what happens. But at least we have that part set because that's going to be take some time and we'll define how quickly we can move ahead, in general.

Okay. So the next item on the agenda is "review the authorities job description." And I have a suggestion here, although it's kind of implied at the end of that fourth paragraph there, the duties of five member authority? I wanted to specifically state something about the overall responsibility. Hold on one second. I'm just looking for it, here. I wanted to add a sentence like this, "Overall responsibility for the maintenance and success of the authorities' mission and future goals." Because the CEO is the one kind of doing it, but it's really the responsibility of that board to make sure that that gets done. They are the last stop as to how things go to maintain the proper operation of the mission, which is to provide water at a reasonable cost, and future goals are critical to having that happen continually. I just want to offer that as a suggestion.

Tim:

I think that's fine. I have a question relative to when that paragraph starts, if I may ask that.

Stephen:

Sure.

Tim:

Because it begs a question. It says, "The duties of the five member authority are similar to those of a board of directors," which just begs the distinction. So for me, we either say, "The five member authority is a board of directors that works with senior management," blah, blah, blah, with the rest of that stuff underlined, or we simply don't relate it to a board of directors if it's only similar. Now, does anyone know what the distinction is?

Tom:

I think it might be defined in the enabling legislation.

Tim:

And probably pertains to the role of the RPB?

Tim:

See, I'm not trying to start trouble, but sometimes things that are confusing...

Stephen:

I think I know why they did this, Tim, but you're right. And what it meant to me too was, you could take this to me, and this isn't a real board of directors. That's why I was going with my thought here, that it is a board of directors. It's a little more complex in the way it's structured.

Tim:

I mean, authority implies what it is. Authority. It has power. And to say it's similar to a board of directors just seems like it's just either get rid of it or whatever. But more legal minds could maybe take a look at that. This doesn't impact the ad. But it is relatively descriptive.

Stephen:

Why not just drop "are similar to?" Why not "the duties of a five member authority are those of a board of directors?"

Tim:

Or, "the Five Member Authority is a board of directors concerned with the full scope of activities?"

Stephen:

You could qualify... "The Five Member Authority is a board of directors with specific legislative responsibilities." Something like that.

Tim:

Yeah.

Tim:

I just think we got to look at the legislation because-

Tim:

Well, that's fine. That's your legal minds. But I still think it's a funny sentence.

Tim:

Yeah, you're right.

Jamie:

Say you say the duties of the five member authority are similar to a board of or are... Let's say, "the duties of the five member authority, like a board of directors, are articulated in the statute," or something like that. Let's just refer back to the statute. We could say, "in special act blah, blah, blah, blah, blah."

Stephen:

Yeah. Are those of a board of directors directed by the legislative authority? Yeah. Statutes, whatever.

Tim:

I would clean it up. So it's not confusing. And I don't want to over confuse it with a lot of [inaudible 00:22:13] either.

Jamie:

Yeah, go ahead. Yeah. I don't even know if you need to say [inaudible 00:22:19] a board of directors, but you could say, "the duties of the Five Member Authority are articulated in special act blah, blah," and period. It is concerned with the full scope of activities of the... You know what I mean? So that those are really interested, go look up that statute or Google it at least, to try to figure out what does the authority do.

Stephen:

Well, the next sentence, "it is concerned with the full scope activities of the Regional Water Authority [inaudible 00:22:50] advisory decision basis."

Jamie:

Yeah, I think that defines sort of what a board of director. So I think that's fine. But yeah.

Tim:

Well that defines what the Authority does and that's all we really care about. So it's either a five member authority working with senior management, and then go on. In my estimation, that's what it is. And someone can do a little background on the legalese of it. I'm obviously not trying to break anyone's chops, it just seems like-

Stephen:

No, no, no. I think it's a good point. I think we can make this a lot better and we're not under pressure. We have time to revise this, and even think about it again for the next meeting, and finalize it at some point. But we'll have it before the person comes.

Tim:

Sure.

Stephen:

Yeah, that's a good observation.

Jamie:

Can you all effective... Oh, go ahead.

Stephen:

Yeah, no effective membership. That's good. If it requires a high level personal commitment involving service as... But I just wanted to have that last piece. I can get it to Jennifer, too. I'm not sure if the maintenance is the right word, but somehow the overall responsibility for this success of the authorities' mission and future goals, something like that. We can review it after it's drafted.

Jamie:

Do you also want to remove the educational requirement here, or just in the posting?

Charles:

You mean the equivalent experience?

Charles:

Well, I think you should remove that. It's got to be a minimum four-year college. I mean, the person that we're looking for is, has to have a minimum four-year college,

Tim:

But we don't put that in the ad for some reason.

Stephen:

Yeah, it's kind of assumed.

Tim:

Yeah. I mean, I don't think it has to be in the ad, but this, I assume, was going to go to the packet that they have to read when they prepare for their interview.

Stephen:

I mean, if you want to keep it general, keep education there, you could say commensurate with the responsibilities of the position. Yeah.

Jamie:

Hi. You can do that, Steven.

Charles:

Yep. I think that's excellent, Steve.

Stephen:

Okay. Did you get that, Jennifer?

Jennifer:

Yep, I got it.

Stephen:

Okay.

Tim:

She's still working on the spelling. I'm only kidding.

Jennifer:

That's what Google's for.

Tim:

That's right. They'll do commemorate.

Stephen:

Okay. Anything on the rest of this?

Charles:

I think the rest is okay.

Stephen:

Jennifer, we'll get this drafted again and we'll get back to it.

Jennifer:

Okay.

Stephen:

Okay. So we're on item seven: determine the next steps and some key dates. We have to wait for this process, can we set up a meeting now or should we for... Jennifer, maybe come up with the date by which this comes back. So we're looking toward the end of April. Jennifer, maybe you could suggest some dates? Just send us an email with some dates in early May to see when people are available, and we'll pick a couple of days so we have something that we can use to start reviewing these. Does that sound reasonable to everybody?

Charles:

Yes.

Tim:

Yes it does. Yeah, that makes sense. Thanks. And I think with some of the interviews, Steve, I don't know how many we'll get, but I think with some of them, we were able to have a couple on the same evening when we did it, as I recall.

Stephen:

Oh, yeah. For time and efficiency, we have to do that.

Tim:

Yeah. And I don't think it was a difficult thing, really. Worked out pretty well

Stephen:

To some extent, it may depend upon the candidates too, when they-

Tim:

Absolutely.

Stephen:

When they could make it. But we can still probably... I don't know. I, how many do you people do want to interview? If we get some good applications, would you want to interview six people, say? Three each night?

Tim:

Up to that. I don't know that we'll have that many. I'm trying to think if we had four the last time.

Stephen:

Yeah, that was-

Tim:

Unless we just narrowed it down to four. But I sort of recall four.

Charles:

Oh, we've had more than that in the past, too.

Tim:

Yeah. I would imagine. Maybe we were limited because it was New Haven.

Stephen:

The only thing is, you could have four things that really look good on paper, and then when you interview these people, you quickly eliminate them for one reason or another.

Tim:

Right.

Charles:

Or they eliminate themselves.

Stephen:

Yeah. More the case. I'm hoping we have some good people. We'll see. We're certainly, I think, advertising adequately. The online stuff is especially important. If it has that much visibility, we should get a few good candidates to look at.

Charles:

We should.

Stephen:

Well, good work so far. Appreciate everybody's comments on this. And I think we've done a good job to try to make it as effective and as accurate as possible. I really believe this is a critical appointment for the authority, and a point in time for the direction of this utility. So I know I'm taking this committee seriously, and I appreciate everybody else's interest.

Well that's it for this meeting. We did pretty well to wrap it up in a half an hour.

Tim:

Thanks, Steve.

Stephen:

Thank you. Call for a motion to adjourn.

Tim:

So moved.

Jamie:

Seconded.

Stephen:

All those in favor?

Committee:

Aye.

Stephen:

Everyone have a good evening. Thank you.