

**NOMINATING COMMITTEE**  
**REPRESENTATIVE POLICY BOARD**  
**AUGUST 29, 2022**

MEETING TRANSCRIPTION

Brian:

I will call the meeting to order and we can get this started. I guess we'll start off with the safety moment, tap water safety and yard cleaning tips for August. And everybody use their stuff carefully and don't get yourself hurt. And then let's go into item two on the agenda, which is have a little discussion with David and Larry about what their current view of the Authority is and needs of the Authority and how things are going. So my primary questions would be A, is there anything that the Authority needs that it doesn't have currently being met with its current board members? And from Larry, how does he feel that the Authority is handling things? So, okay. We'll go ask David first. And if anybody has questions, hopefully we can just do this as an interactive with questions.

David:

Thank you very much Brian, and members, and Jeff, I appreciate all of you being here. Larry and I are happy to be here. I guess for Larry. This is an annual thing, but for me I've only been chairman less than two years and last year was my turn up, so you didn't meet with me to talk about myself. But this year it's Kevin's turn to be up and so it's a good opportunity to review where the strengths and weaknesses are of us as a board in terms of experience, level at different disciplines, different areas of expertise.

And quite frankly, I think the first obvious one that many people have said to me, "We've got two lawyers is that overkill?" And they come at it from very different points of view and so I think they both are very helpful in their own ways and both are very valuable. We really appreciate having Catherine, I know she's brand new, but it's been great having her on. She brings a lot to the table, not only from a lawyerly point of view with reviewing contracts and things, but also from a business point of view in experience and from a government point of view, so she's very helpful there.

Kevin brings a lot of land experience because he is a land attorney and land use attorney and he's helpful with that, but also in when we're deciding what to do with our headquarters about fixing it up or considering rebuilding or moving or what, there are a lot of options there and he's been very helpful with that. But he's also taken a great interest in his 20 years with the Authority in one form or another in the health and safety issues of the Authority, and so he's really got those. He's actually participated in some of the tabletop exercises that they've done and things, so I think that's been very helpful to have somebody from the Authority there in that regard.

Tony brings a great historical perspective for us, which is wonderful, a great nonprofit experience, which is helpful in the community. Larry's very involved in a lot of aspects in education. He started that school of utility management and really took the lead on that. So I think we've got somebody in academia and in nonprofits. And Suzanne has her financial background. Mainly in investments and all, but we all know what the ups and downs of the market and all, and a \$60 million investment we've got in the pension fund that it's critical to have somebody who's constantly holding management's, well, not just our management, but the fund management's feet to the fire and trying to get the best we can with that. And that experience is invaluable to us as well.

So those are the positives and I'm a positive person, I like to start out with the positives, but we do miss Joe. We miss Joe, not just for his historical experience, but we miss Joe because engineering was nice to have somebody who was looking at things and maybe suggesting a different way to possibly look at

things. And doesn't mean he re-engineered the projects that were done, that isn't the job of a board member, but it does mean that he had a perspective that was probably important.

Tim:

May I have a comment or a question with David? Dave, it's Tim.

David:

Sure.

Tim:

Obviously you bring to the table experience, not only with RPB, but you're another aspect of experience, but it seems to me assignments within the advisory group, not so much advisory, but the Authority's group makes them focused, makes that individual more focused on something. So as you pursue the goals and objectives, not only of management, but of the Authority members themselves, do you feel like you have the rounded group you need? We're talking about an incumbent. I don't think there's too many people here that think we have to rush in necessarily replace an incumbent, but again, it's an incumbent. So my question goes to the rounded nature of the board. Do you have the skill sets you think necessary as a body?

David:

We do. We have five different perspectives. Are there days when I wish we had had seven or nine? In some ways, yes, because we could add in more perspectives, but in other ways it would make the board maybe a little bit less manageable for such a high-level board if we had additions and more members, certainly that'd be an odd number so that would be going to seven or nine.

Tim:

That wasn't my point. I was speaking among the five.

David:

I think we're well rounded. Yeah. Among the five. I think we're well rounded. I don't think there's any area that we're missing a voice significantly that wouldn't be displacing another voice that we don't want to miss.

Brian:

Well, I guess the question is, you mentioned Joe had the engineering experience, did you or Larry, do you see a need to have that engineering experience on the Authority that we really should have one person with some engineering experience or is there enough expertise there from long-term service that we really don't need to have an engineer type on the board?

Larry:

Well, I think, you certainly have the engineering expertise in house and we have access to some great outside engineering firms that can provide us with a second opinion and value engineer projects and the things like that. I think though that eventually, I certainly wouldn't suggest today, but I think eventually

it would be appropriate to add somebody with engineering background to the board, not, as David said, not to re-engineer projects, but just to look at it from a different point of view, because as you know, engineers think differently about things than many others do. So I think eventually that might be a perspective worthwhile, but I would have to agree with David that we have a well-rounded board. And the fact that we do have two lawyers I think is beneficial to us because Catherine brings the private law practice. She actually worked at Murtha Cullina, and she did mergers and acquisitions work.

So when we're looking at buying a business or buying a company, she has some very insightful legal questions about the acquisition and some things like that based on her legal experiences. She's got the legal as well as the entrepreneurial, plus the governmental the time in government, she was in the treasurer's office for a while. She was their general counsel for a number of years, so she brings a good perspective in terms of our bond financing and the like. Whereas Kevin, as David said, brings the environmental, the land use, the political point of view and plus institutional knowledge given the amount of time that he's been on there. And Suzanne has, she's got that finance background and she asks incisive finance questions.

And Tony, he was an entrepreneur in his younger days, as well as PhD in Organizational Development, so he brings the HR perspective. He's got the nonprofit board experience as well as the institutional knowledge with the RWA, so all that's to say. And then of course, David, I won't mention that because that doesn't need to be mentioned, he brings a great perspective with his municipal experience, government experience, real estate and the like. So I think all of the experience that we have on there is very well rounded currently. And I think they work quite... I see them working quite well together and are able to come to consensus even though they may well start out from different points of view that may be opposing, but they eventually come around to consensus.

Tim:

If I may, interestingly enough, through all of this process, I've only been on the board, it's not a terribly long-time, but if I had to guess that Kevin Curseaden was an attorney, it would be a long stretch for me. I never get that impression, so to speak. Certainly from Catherine, she asks certain questions and you can tell where she's coming from. She has a different reach, maybe it's because I've seen her in finance and there's been some of these things that come up. But it's hard for me to have determined necessarily that we've got too many attorneys on the board, I guess that's the fair way of putting it. I have another question. I don't know how we go through board members. I don't know when... Kevin's up now we've got to consider that position, opportunity costs and everything else. When is the next appointment? How is the rotation? You're talking about maybe you'd love to replace engineering skills when the opportunity arose. What are we looking at with the Authority in terms of position replacement?

David:

Brian, do you want me to answer that? I don't want to step [inaudible 00:10:49].

Brian:

You can answer that. I think if it was in the documents that Jennifer sent in terms of the rules. We have a five member board and as I understand it, it rotates, one member is up each year.

David:

Yes and Tony's up next year.

Tim:

Okay. So that was honestly the answer-

David:

Then it'll be Suzanne the following year.

Tim:

Fine. So Tony's up next year. Fine. Okay.

David:

And keep in mind, the New Haven appointment is you good people get to choose one of three people that the mayor has recommended. Now last year one was not qualified, so it was down to two, but generally you don't get to actually choose, you get to choose among some people. So that seat is New Haven seat. It was always in agreement from the time the Authority was formed and that the mayor would recommend three people and you choose among those. So that skillset may or may not always be consistent, but it was for 30 something years with Joe and Catherine is fitting in very well and may very well stay around a while as well.

Tim:

But in terms of opportunity costs, it's not as if we have a window every year. And I'm sorry I wasn't fully prepared with all the document scans.

Brian:

Not a problem.

Charles:

I'd like to make a comment. Larry answered my question. I had a question. We were talking about engineering skillset. I was thinking about acquisitions and that type and entrepreneurial skill and needing someone in that position, but Larry answered that question with Catherine. But to address your issue about, and not necessarily this time, but at some future time, expanding the board, is it an enabling legislation issue? Because my under... Oh, okay. So it has...

David:

Yes.

David:

Because we purpose the purposely didn't request that.

Charles:

[inaudible 00:12:51] rather than having to do the odd rule and adding two, sometimes boards are made up where the chair doesn't vote except to break a tie.

David:

That's a fair point.

Charles:

It's another option when you got to that point. But if it's enabling legislation, to Tim's point, we have just about an annual cycle on this and I think we're in pretty good shape.

Stephen:

Brian, this is Steve. Can I make a comment?

Greg:

This is for Larry and David.

Brian:

Let's go with Steve first.

Greg:

I have a question.

Stephen:

Okay. Let him go. Go ahead.

Brian:

Go ahead, Greg.

Greg:

Mines just a simple question. Do either one, do you think Kevin has the skill set to be chairman at some point of the Authority?

David:

Do others have the skill set? I humbly say that probably all four of them have a better skills set than I do, but no, as a practical reality in terms of experience with the Authority-

Greg:

We're talking about Kevin right now.

David:

Say that again.

Brian:

I think he wants to refer to specifically Kevin.

Greg:

We're talking about Kevin, we're not talking about the other.

David:

Oh, yeah. Kevin absolutely has the skillset. Whether he has the interest, the desire, the time, that's different. He certainly does have the experience with the Authority. He's got some good understanding in some depth of the Authority, which is important, but you've also got the skillset of being able to get the board to work together and being able to have the in-between meetings, which I did far more than I ever realized. I don't know, but I do. And so there's quite a bit of prep in order to have these meetings where you all may see unanimous votes, but as Larry indicated, we don't always come at it at the beginning of a conversation of a topic that way, but we end up working together for the greater good of the Authority and that requires some work. And would Kevin do it? Yes, he did it on the RPB. If I get hit by a bus tomorrow and Kevin as vice chair would take over, at least for the time being, I think we would be fine.

Brian:

Steve, why don't you go ahead next.

Stephen:

Yeah. What I wanted to comment on is sort of already been touched upon, but I would emphasize that we didn't have a choice with New Haven and bringing out an engineering person at that time, which I've been on the committee before, we felt that was a need. It's kind of a limitation of a five member board. But engineering on the board is a different perspective than engineering in house or engineering from outside. And we are a company that's pumps and pipes, so when we get the opportunity, I think it'd be really important to have that expertise. And I don't in any way diminish the legal role here, that's definitely an asset to the board. And I do work with lots of different attorneys, so not every attorney has a perspective on the different things that they need to address, but that would be the only thing. I don't know. It would be great if the board could be a little bigger, but it is what it is. It's just every year, it's a long-time before, there's a chance to really address these things.

Greg:

If I'm not mistaken, when we sent a letter to the Mayor of New Haven, we kind of emphasized engineering.

Stephen:

Yeah, as I said, we don't have any control over that.

Brian:

That is not... So the question we'll have to come amongst ourselves is decide whether we need to address that at this time, or we need to let that get addressed in the future. And we can come as a board and committee. Does anybody else have any questions for David or Larry?

Tim:

Brian, just a question, I guess then I think we heard Larry say, maybe we didn't, but maybe it was David that said, we're fine now, I guess, but we all agree as those of us that have spoken that an engineering background is probably desirable on some board member in the future, for sure. It's a question of how long do we have to wait and can we get along with it? Maybe that's the answer Larry has or David has or whatever.

David:

Larry, you brought up engineering, in more details, do you want to respond for.

Larry:

All I said was that I think in the future, and I wouldn't say whom, but I think as the opportunity presents itself, that I think that is a skillset that would be useful to have back on the board just to provide that high-level review that engineers bring because they have a different way of thinking about things, and in a good way. So I was just saying, I think we're fine now, Tim, to your point. But I think in the future, I think that's a skillset that we could look at.

David:

I will tell you, Joe, as an engineer, used his way of thinking, his critical thinking, his way of analysis as an engineer, really looking at the budget in a lot of ways. He was really a budget hawk and he really analyzed things the way an engineer would analyze, but from a financial point of view too. And it's been good having Suzanne on there with her financial background and mine with municipal finance as well has been helpful to that, I think.

Brian:

As I see it then the critical question for us as a Nominating Committee is to think about whether or not we need to do this now or let it go to the future. As much as we all like Kevin, if everybody says we do need some engineering perspective, do we address it now or when a future board member comes up?

Tim:

So Brian, here's the question, because that's literally the question that's out there.

Brian:

It is the question.

Jeff:

Well, I think it's been a great discussion. I certainly was sorry to see Joe go, because as everyone has indicated, in addition to a very long career as an engineer, he was a business owner and really had a very good handle on the financial and budgeting pieces, as well as understanding the mission of the author

and understanding the Authority's, business opportunities and challenges. So I do think that having someone with that skillset eventually... To the extent you can find them, because there really hasn't been anyone like Joe in the years that I've been involved and have been privy to applications when there are openings. There really hasn't been anyone like Joe that's come to the forefront and been eligible to serve.

So I think that the five member Authority right now is very strong. I think they compliment each other very well. And Kevin, I think because of his background, as you've all indicated, in his time as an RPB member and as chair of the RPB and in his land use practice, I think he's got a nice, well rounded set of skills that compliment the other four. So I'm certainly not of a mind that this is an opportunity to... If trying to find somebody with Joe's skillset means losing Kevin, I wouldn't be in favor of that.

Tim:

Brian, I think what you're saying is we should probably discuss some of this after we've had the opportunity to speak with both David and Larry. Correct?

Brian:

Yes.

David:

I agree. I would not want to be part of your deliberations. That's your role, please.

Brian:

That's what I was saying. If anybody else has questions for David and Larry if willing to stay on, if not, I'd ask David and Larry to drop off on. Jeff, you're welcome to stay on.

Greg:

Brian. This is...

David:

Oh, Greg's trying to...

Greg:

Brian, I have one more question. This is probably to Dave, Dave knows best. Isn't Tony an engineer?

David:

Is Tony an engineer? No.

Larry:

He has a PhD in Organizational Psychology, I believe it is.

Greg:

No, was Tony Edge an engineer?

David:

I missed the beginning.

Jeff:

He's asking if Tony Edge was an engineer.

David:

Oh yeah. Yes, he was. And he was replaced at the time by-

Greg:

We had some issues with Tony Edge, didn't we?

David:

Yeah. He was replaced with a finance person.

Greg:

[inaudible 00:26:15] Tony Edge, [inaudible 00:26:17]?

David:

Yep.

Greg:

Yeah.

Stephen:

Brian is this Steve. I have one last question for-

Greg:

[inaudible 00:26:23] saying you want an engineer [inaudible 00:26:28]?

Stephen:

I thought Greg was finished. I'm sorry.

Greg:

No. Go ahead. It's okay.

Stephen:

Larry has the board ever, or would it reach out to Sunny, for example, to fill gap in terms of expertise or perspective? Is there some way that need could be utilized that way?

Larry:

Go ahead, David. [inaudible 00:26:59]

David:

Well, I don't think he could be part of board negotiations when he's the one generally presenting and preparing the information to come to us. He can't be the leader and the soldier at the same time.

Stephen:

Yeah. I understand that, but I mean on a different project or something. The board's looking for... Say, you're looking at a company to acquire and you want an engineering perspective. Would you do that? Would you reach out to...?

Larry:

Well, if we were thinking about buying an engineering firm, for instance, which is in the realm of possibility, but if that were a candidate, we would certainly get his input because he's worked at a number of engineering consulting firms. So he would certainly... His opinion, it would be sought in that particular case. And of course the other board members would provide their various perspectives on that acquisition.

Stephen:

Just thinking out loud about-

Larry:

Yeah, good point.

David:

We've had good questions and comments from RPB members in the past that are engineers as well and help. And Jeff has employed people that are necessary to give opinions on applications, only at that point it's kind of far, so we're glad to bring him in and the OCA office in before items are finalized of certain natures.

Brian:

Charles, you have another question. Your hand is still up? No guess not. Okay. Well, I think I want to thank David and Larry for dropping into our meeting and I think we will continue our discussion and stuff about where we're going in the next stage and stuff.

David:

All right. Thank you for inviting us.

Larry:

Thank you very much.

Tim:

Thank you.

Larry:

Have a good night.

Brian:

A good night.

Larry:

Take care.

David:

Bye.

Brian:

So I think the next item on our agenda is to review of what the process is as I understand it. So basically as I understand the process right now is we have to do two things, we have to come up with criteria, and Jennifer sent us two different things in the way of criteria. And I'm trying to make sure that I understand what the difference between the criteria for the Nominating Committee is and the job description, and how those are two separate things, but they're really kind of the same thing and stuff. Does anybody know what the difference between those two is?

Greg:

When do you interview Kevin?

Brian:

My understanding of the process is this. We decide on criteria and the job description, and if the current criteria need to be changed or added to, submit the criteria to the board at their September 22nd meeting. The board can then comment on our criteria and feed it back to us and say, "Yeah, that looks good." Then at that point, once we know the criteria's is good, if we then want to go to Kevin, we then go to Kevin and say, "This is the criteria, the job description, do you want to continue?" If he says yes and we've already said that we want him back, then we can submit it to the board for the October meeting. If he says, no, he's ready to move on, then we start interviewing candidates and we have until November or December to get a candidate in line. But I think at this point, what we need to do between now and the September board meeting is agree on the criteria. And then we contact Kevin after the criteria has been accepted by the board.

Tim:

Seems to me the criteria-

Greg:

[inaudible 00:30:56]. Has he sent the letter that he wants to be reappointed?

Brian:

I have not seen anything about him, I have not talked to him about it at this point. But I don't think we can look at the criteria and decide whether or not we have to do something to the criteria to adjust for that.

Tim:

Because that's actually our outline for establishing credentials and interviewing, so it's sort of our rule book, if not our rule book, it's sort of our pathway to coming to a conclusion.

Brian:

Yes.

Stephen:

The job description is just that. The criteria are different aspects that candidates could have to fill that job description. So they may not have them all or, or whatever, and each time we look at the need of what perceived need of the board, and then select a candidate from that list of criteria that may fit it.

Brian:

So this is the criteria that was adopted last year. And if you can scroll down, I think...

Stephen:

They're pretty general.

Brian:

They're pretty general. And I'm not sure that we need to add anything to that, but we can look at it and decide whether or not-

Tim:

They're very broad.

Brian:

Yes.

Stephen:

Looking at different candidates, what you realize is that somebody could have a particular skill, but a different candidate has more depth in it or a different experience in it. It's very candidate-driven.

Brian:

Well, I think that's why, if you look at the work and organizational background, the basic criteria of characteristics, you don't want someone who's able to understand things, get the big picture and communicate. And then education, clearly. And the work organization background in item two, we have a whole list of things that we all want on the board. We want somebody with financial, somebody with

environmental land use experience, someone with finance, and we say that we should have two of those eight or nine items there, A through I, so that we can go to different candidates at the board and have other items there.

So the question is, is there something not listed in those items, A through I, that needs to be changed? I know two years ago when I was on the Nominating Committee, we added item H, which is communication skills, both in-person and remote working environments because of the change in circumstance. So the question is, are there any new items that we can think about that have to go onto this new working organization background? Myself, when I looked at it, I thought it was pretty comprehensive of what we need on the board, but I'm certainly open to others.

Charles:

I agree, Brian. I was with you. I think I shared that one where we added about the team's meetings and everything. I think they're okay.

Tim:

Yeah. I believe I was on board for that as well.

Charles:

You want a motion to move it to the board or how do you want to go?

Brian:

Sure. I'll entertain a motion to move the current criteria to the board meeting of September 22nd.

Charles:

I'll move that.

Tim:

Okay. Discussion please. Sorry.

Brian:

Can I get a second first?

Tim:

We had a second. That's why I went with discussion.

Brian:

Okay.

Tim:

I thought I heard a second, maybe I'm mistaken.

Charles:

I'll second it, if there isn't one.

Tim:

Okay. If there isn't one. Yeah. The only thing I wanted to cover was I wanted to be sure that private and or public sector also covers corporate background and budget experience. It sort of brings everyone in. You could be a private business owner versus someone who's worked at a corporate culture. I think as long as we're broad based as possible in enabling ourselves to grasp at all skill sets, whether it's-

Brian:

Well, I think item A there, it says private and or public sector experience.

Tim:

I just want to be sure that's how it's completely interpreted. Because it seems to be that it is, and then we get into the corporate finance, blah, blah, blah and what's the difference? So that's all I want to know, that it's all incorporated and seen that way, but I know we do deploy the corporate versus the non-corporate individuals on the board, so that's fine. So not an issue, just an observation.

Brian:

Anybody else with other comments on the criteria? Do we need to change anything?

Greg:

[inaudible 00:36:12] they're pretty good.

Brian:

All in favor of adopting the current criteria for this next round of a board, say aye.

Group:

Aye.

Brian:

Aye. Any opposed?

Brian:

Any abstaining? Great. So I think we now have criteria adopted. The next steps, as I understand it, and Jennifer can correct me if I'm wrong, is this will get submitted to the board for their September 22nd meeting and they can comment on it. And once they comment on it, we can move forward and have our next meeting date. Once it's been accepted by the board and at the next meeting date, if it is accepted by the board. And I get a sense from everyone here that we would like, Kevin, once it's accepted from the board, what I can try and do is contact Kevin and see if he's still interested. And if he is, invite him to

our next meeting, which would be sometime in the month of October, in early October. Does that sound reasonable plan?

Tim:

That sounds reasonable. I did have a question. When is the appointment date required? What is our date certain that we have to conclude? Is it by November?

Brian:

According to the bylaws in page 17, it comes up, "In the event that the [inaudible 00:37:47] recommends reappointment of the incumbent, it shall mail such recommendation to the members of the board not less than 10 days prior to the regularly scheduled October meeting." So if we choose to go with Kevin, we notify the board by the 10 days in front of the October board meeting.

Tim:

So it's a fairly quick pace? Okay.

Brian:

So I think if the board is supposed to meet on the 22nd, then we could meet in the week of... Well, I would say we could meet in the week in the 29th, but there's a good chance I'm going to miss the board meeting and I'm going to be away that week. And we're going to my nephew's wedding in Atlanta on the 23rd, so we're flying down there on the 22nd. So someone's going has to probably represent me at the board.

Tim:

Or realistically we just try and plan it sooner in October?

Brian:

No. But the second week of October through the week of the 3rd to the 7th of October for our next meeting. I don't know what works well for people.

Tim:

Okay.

Brian:

I can do it-

Greg:

Let me ask you something. What happens if you want to go outside and get resumes from outside?

Brian:

If we had decided to go outside, then we have much more time. So that's in section C and page 17, is that, the Nominating Committee determines to consider candidates in addition to the incumbent. It

Nominating Committee  
Representative Policy Board  
August 29, 2022

shall advise the board members, the Authority, prior to the October 22nd meeting. And then we have to interview candidates and we have to now announce the open candidacy period to the appointment to the Authority for the five year term and expect the Authority, the announcements shall include the qualifications. And we have to consider all candidates and report back. And I believe it's by the December meeting that we have to give them our candidate if we decide to go outside.

Greg:

And I'm not recommending that, but [inaudible 00:40:02].

Brian:

No, but just so you know, it was in the materials that were sent to you. So if we go with Kevin, we decide first week in October. And so my question was, in terms of first week, October, does anything work better for people in terms of date of the week on the week 3rd to the 7th?

Stephen:

I think it's pretty clear for me.

Brian:

Is Mondays good? Monday at 5:30, Monday the 3rd.

Tim:

So that would make it like the 3rd? Yeah, that would be good for me, Brian.

Brian:

Okay. Why don't we really set the next meeting for 5:30 on the 3rd.

Greg:

This is October?

Tim:

October.

Brian:

On 3rd of October.

Greg:

October.

Tim:

But in the interim, Brian, we're also going to attempt to interview Kevin prior to that date?

Brian:

Nominating Committee  
Representative Policy Board  
August 29, 2022

No. I'm assuming you've...

Charles:

Tim, don't we have finance on the 3rd?

Tim:

Do we? That's pretty early in the month.

Jennifer:

We do because of the holiday, Columbus Day.

Tim:

So if we could move it to 6:00, we'd be fine. I can't imagine we wouldn't be right, Jennifer?

Brian:

Or we can do it... So I can put it on the 4th?

Charles:

No, I think 6:00. If it works for you, Brian?

Tim:

Yeah, I'm comfortable with 6:00. I'm glad you brought that up, Charles. I just thought that was so early it wouldn't be a thing. Yeah. Okay. So 6:00 would be okay with me. I can't imagine we'd be more than 45 minutes anyway.

Brian:

And I can make contact with Kevin and find out if he is interested even before the... I don't think it's harmful to find out if he's interested [inaudible 00:41:53].

Tim:

No, because that makes October 3rd very important for us. Yeah. We need to know that.

Brian:

And see if Kevin can make the third, that would be great, if not, maybe we'll reschedule.

Charles:

The 4th is all right too, though, if that works. Well, wait minute, isn't the 4th...? Yeah. That begin Yom Kippur, but I don't know if that...

Brian:

Nominating Committee  
Representative Policy Board  
August 29, 2022

Right. So okay, I will contact Kevin. This will get submitted to the board. And like I say, on the board meeting of the 22nd of September, if someone can take any comments to the board gives us, I don't think they're going to give us a lot of comments, but give a report back to the board about what we did. I might try and make it from a hotel room.

Brian:

If we have no other comments, I think we are set for... Jennifer, do you think we're all set?

Jennifer:

I think so.

Brian:

Got everything we need to know?

Jennifer:

I think you covered everything.

Brian:

Jeff, you have any further comments for me?

Jeff:

No. Thank you.

Brian:

If not, I'll entertain a motion to close the meeting.

Tim:

So moved.

Brian:

All right. Thanks, everyone.