

## Statement from Steven Borne 431 Wallis Rd

While it's a short agenda, I do need to be home for a customer call at 8pm.

I need to talk about what transpired at the April 24<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Shawn Joyce's April 21<sup>st</sup> LTE ended with *"Residents are also encouraging others to attend the meeting at 6:30pm to speak in support of this fair process and hopefully to do the right thing for the Town of Rye"*.

So, I made sure I listened to the RCC recording and read minutes. I was not surprised to see the RCC people there to defend its process. The many others? I assumed they would be in support of Mr. Joyce's LTE and request this change in process.

The Chair made it clear that the time to speak was during Public comment. There was no need for the RCC people to speak unless there were questions. However, what did we get from all the other people there? Crickets – I just did not understand why they were not speaking up, based on the LTE. That was the first red flag. The LTE said that people should speak in support of the Select Board considering all RCC position candidates, but they did not make this request, but the LTE wording implies that is what will happen, but no one made the request that all candidates be considered.

The discussion starts with questioning the two RCC recommendations, that makes sense. The Select Board had questions ready for these two appointments. Then the Select Board started to question the other RCC applicants.

I did not know why this was happening. Going back to the April 10th meeting minutes.

*Vice-Chair Epperson noted that in his thirty years in business with hiring and recruiting, he had people he relied on to recruit, interview and make recommendations. Unless there was some overarching reason why this person should not be hired, he would leave it to that committee.*

*He continued that in looking at the resumes, there are unique qualities in every one of the candidates and they would all bring something to the Library Trustee. However, he also trusts the Trustees to make a recommendation to the Select Board on the person who **they see** as most qualified and most favorable to work with.*

*Selectman McGrath pointed out this is not a business. This is a town and fair should count. Chair King stated there are five people who are qualified to do this job. He tends to agree that the tradition has been to not get involved on the board or commission level. The Select Board trusts the Board to be the subject matter experts and the people that have been "hired" for those committees, commissions, and boards. He thinks they need to be given a certain amount of leeway to do what they've been asked to do.*

Chair King explained “..... He noted that whether it’s for hiring employees for town departments or for the boards, the Select Board is not on the hiring panel doing the interviews. The Select Board takes the recommendations, **unless there is a reason** to overrule it. That is the philosophy the Board works with.”

It was clear – the Select Board relies on that “team” LBOT or RCC to figure out who they need to best complete its responsibilities. Why is this? Its not that a single brilliant Select Board member came up this idea, but from practicality. On Boards/Commissions/Committees that the Select Board does not have a rep or have not served on that Board, Committee or Commission, the Select Board has little knowledge of where the gaps are and the most pressing needs based on the current team.

When the RCC made its first recommendation for the 1 year term, they explained for the last opening, that Mike Boursseau had been attending RCC meetings and preparing to take a larger role. However, there was a greater team need for Hydrology support, so Danna Trustlow was recommended over Mr. Boursseau.

Under the same rational, everyone seems to be in agreement on Karen Olivers appointment for the three year position. Why, well she was like a highly valued 6<sup>th</sup> Man/Person during her 3 years as an alternate, leveraging her legal expertise and years of leading the LBOT.

We hear a lot of chirping about other applicants’ qualifications. Kyrie Irving is one of the most qualified basketball players in the NBA. I don’t care how qualified he is, he has shown himself to be cancerous to a teams ability to perform as a unit.

This is why Select Boards stay out of the weeds, as they don’t know if a point guard is needed, Center, power forward, shooting guard, etc.. or what kind bench players are needed considering the current challenges.

After the RCC recommendations, there was NOT a discussion of why these two appointment recommendations should not be approved. There was no explanation for the 180 degree shift from the last Select Board meeting.

From the additional applicant questioning, we learned more. Either all the Select Board members are natural integrators who can develop lines of questioning on the spot, or there was forethought about these additional applicants. To me, it appeared there was forethought about the questions/points made.

Here is the worst part of the Select Board actions. While I knew something had caused Mike Boursseau to withdraw and he sent a letter. We learned that the ugly and dark side of Social media descended on Rye. The specter of the corelated nastiness we see around our country, drove a resident away from serving in a volunteer position.

There should have been unanimous outrage. Leaders could have taken the high ground. That is not what happened.

Instead, with no explanation of what was wrong with the RCC 1 year nomination, Member McGrath recommends one of the interviewed applicants. Think of this as a qualified Kicker for a basketball team. Then Member Epperson suggests another applicant – a qualified Punter for a basketball team.

I was e-mailed a FB post of Member McGrath calling this a great compromise.

Besides never discussing why the RCC recommendation was not acceptable, what the Board did not choose to do, was to put this on pause and say, more discussion with the RCC is needed.

How did this happen? Well Member McGrath was clear, he let us know that he was representing the 500 or so people who voted for him. What about the 500 or so who did not vote for him or the 3000 plus residents who did not vote?

From my seat in the back row, I saw the Select Board **buckle** and it was disappointing to watch. What was done can be undone and I do suggest you go back to a board, committee or commission figuring out what that team needs to be the most effective. If process, procedures, or our traditions need to adapt, fine, lets have an open public discussion.

RSA 91-A:4, IV(d) permits the Department to charge requestors a reasonable fee to cover the costs of producing/reviewing/redacting records. If the information you are requesting is readily available, you will not be charged a fee. However, if the information you are requesting needs to be compiled, reviewed, and redacted, you may be charged for the cost of producing those records. DHHS will always notify you of the projected costs before fulfilling your request.