

**TOWN OF PROVINCETOWN - BOARD OF SELECTMEN  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2014 6:00 PM  
PROVINCETOWN TOWN HALL - CAUCUS HALL**

Chairman Donegan convened the meeting at 6:00PM noting the following:

Board of Selectmen attending: Tom Donegan, Erik Yingling, Robert Anthony, Cheryl Andrews, and Raphael Richter.

Other attendees: Department of Public Works Director Richard Waldo

Guests: Facilitator for Round Table Michelle Crone, Mark Forest (guest of CA), Michael Canizales (guest of RA), Paul DeRuyter (guest of RR).

Recorder: Loretta Dougherty

**Agenda Item 1. Coastal Community Resilience Grant Program – DPW Director Richard Waldo.**

DPW Director Richard Waldo announced that Provincetown has received a Grant in the amount of \$155,125 from the State of Massachusetts office of Coastal Zone Management. He spoke about the use of Lidar technology to map our town and develop storm water inundation pathways during major weather events. The data would also be used to develop a town wide vulnerability assessment of all town owned infrastructures which would allow us to be more competitive in future grant opportunities.

This grant requires a 25% town match either through in-kind services or cash of the total project cost. The Department of Public Works plans to improve the town's storm water GIS database. He detailed how the staff with assistance from an engineering firm will collect field data of all the attributes of our storm water system. This data will then be put into our data base helping us develop a better asset management program. And help us in preparing us for major storms.

CA asked how often the BOS would be kept informed as to the progress.

RW felt that since this is a two year project and in the beginning they would just be collecting data, he would keep the BOS informed on a quarterly basis.

RA wanted to know when it would be completed. RW stated around June of 2016, with the preliminary maps being completed by around July 2015.

CA asked for clarification that the grant is for doing studies not purchases.

RW spoke briefly about the installation and calibration of a real-time, web accessible tide gauge. This gauge would be installed near the MacMillan Wharf along with a sign explaining its significance and the information the gauge would provide. This same information could also be posted on the town website and published in newspaper articles.

A brief discussion was held among the BOS and RW as to the vulnerability of Provincetown citing the highest recorded tides of 1978. RW feels that there does appear to be a greater vulnerability now than in the past. This project will help to identify those areas within the town that may present a greater risk.

**MOVE that the Board of Selectmen vote to accept and approve the Coastal Community Resilience Grant from the State of Massachusetts office of Coastal Zone Management in the amount of \$155,125.**

**Motion: EY                      Seconded: RA      5/0/0**

TD informed the BOS that FinCom had again suggested that they sit in on the staff budget meetings. It would be beneficial since everyone present would be hearing the same presentation and

contributing to the discussions. Of course, deliberations and recommendations would continue to be done separately. A possible downside to this is that it may make our meetings a little longer as they tend to be more detail oriented. So all of the budget presentations will be held with both the BOS and FinCom present.

EY commented on the idea being a very good one, but has a concern about the process being too lengthy as FinCom's meetings are typically about twice as long as BOS meetings. He wondered if it would result in an impossibly long meeting and if it were possible to look at just having a liaison.

Michael stated that last year they did the budget differently. FinCom challenged staff by outlining what numbers they were looking for. If staff met those numbers then FinCom had no need to ask any questions or to meet any longer. The vast majority of staff hit their targets. FinCom still heard their narratives. Our current format has been to give them forward guidance and this has helped to keep the meeting shorter.

RA agreed that it would be beneficial and a lot easier.

RR stated that he liked the idea. Since a lot of time is asked of staff anything that can be done to lessen the redundancy would be beneficial. He thinks it is worth a try even though it may not work, but will support it.

EY commented that some of FinCom's meetings had been 5-6 hours long in past.

TD informed that time tables have been set up and each department will be making their presentations within that amount of time. TD will work to be a little more aggressive to make sure conversations stay focused and within the time limits.

CA wanted to make sure that FinCom understood that it is the staff budget and not the BOS budget. Being that the BOS takes less budget time now than when she did them in the past she had no objection and deferred to what everyone wanted to do.

TD stated that at the end of the day the BOS have heard staff presentations, asked questions of staff and then adopted a budget. This budget is then transmitted and presented at the Town Meeting. A general consensus to do this was agreed upon. FinCom will be joining the BOS on January 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup>.

## **Agenda Item 2. Round Table Discussion facilitated by Michelle Crone regarding Town Manager Qualifications.**

TD introduced Michelle Crone as a nationally recognized Facilitator and thanked her for the time she would be spending with us.

Michelle ran through some guidelines. Next, she asked each person to introduce themselves and share something about themselves that people might not know.

Then she divided us into 2 teams: one was directed to "draw" an image that represented all those descriptors of an ineffective town manager and how to "turn it around"; the second team was directed to "draw" and image that might represent a very good town manager and add how to "keep it going".

The BOS and guests were then divided into two groups. The groups were given small post-it notes and one group was asked to write in one or two words what they (CA, RR, PD, MC) believed were the attributes of an effective Town Manager while the other group was asked to list what they (EY, TD, RA, MF) believed were the attributes of an ineffective Town Manager.

After completing this task the groups were then given a large white flip chart piece of paper and asked to draw a picture of an animal or figure they felt identified the effective and ineffective traits of the Town Manager. One group drew Superman holding a musical conductor's baton with a clef drawn for those attributes of an effective Town Manager. The other group drew a horizontal line in the middle of the page labeled on the left-hand side "Most" and the right-hand side as "Least". Above the line was written "Management" and below the line was written "Personality".

EY then gave a brief overview of those negative attributes shown on the scale referencing those most impactful to least impactful. He mentioned that even though some of the attributes were listed as being considered negative attributes they could under certain circumstances be used as motivational attributes, if applied in that manner.

RR gave a brief overview of the effective qualities that were listed near a visual sign of Superman's "S" while also taking into consideration the importance of those attributes lacking in Superman. The musical conductor image was chosen because a conductor has to be a good manager and work towards getting all the participants to create music together. He also financially manages the symphony and must change up his repertoire to keep people buying tickets. Mention was made of the use of the musical clef symbol coming from the \$ sign as being symbolic.

It was noted by the Facilitator of how well both groups worked together. The dynamics were very powerful with each taking turns leading the discussion within their respective groups.

Michelle then asked the participants to do some "brainstorming" as to how they could learn from their past efforts without rehashing them. She wanted more focus placed on what could be adapted to improve on what was already done with emphasis on what worked and what did not work.

At the beginning of the round table some brief discussions commenced under the topic entitled by the Facilitator "Process".

There were four subject titles for discussion: 1) Another Search Committee – Consultant - Head Hunter; 2) BOS make the decision alone; 3) Choose from past applicants, and 4) Timeline for hire – how long – why. She asked us to List Pros and Cons.

The group then suggested that we might wish to decide whether to have a search committee vs. a screening committee. A number of folks felt that having a search committee could cause a translation problem between the committee and the Selectmen.

Mark Forest stated that there should be some consensus from the Selectmen as to what we are looking for before we get to the actual search. CA asked why we were talking about the search or a search committee. The issue is can the committee represent us if we don't have a consensus? Mark said we need a profile and to know the traits we are looking for. And it's premature if you have not created a profile. RA agreed and said we need to agree on what we are looking for.

How to learn from the past without rehashing was discussed. Michelle had each participant give input on this issue.

EY: communication between Board of Selectmen and Search Committee was poor.

CA: I feel like I did learn that we are not on the same page and we don't need to rehash it. We have to figure out how to reach consensus even if we each gravitate towards a different candidate.

MC: I predict that at the end of this, you will have group think that can be transmitted to a consultant and thinks we should not use a search committee again. Don't dilute this.

RR: the selectmen need to open themselves more to having a dialogue with the public. Quality managed confrontations.

RR: ditto to what Cheryl said. For me, we need to have clarity with the head hunter so everyone knows what we are looking for, and also we need a timeline. He stated the Search Committee needs to remember they are working for the Board of Selectmen, not the Town. The Board of Selectmen works for the Town.

RA: 3 of us were not on the board when the committee was formed and it acted on its own and did not get a good charge. He'd like to streamline the process. He like to spend the money to get a professional head hunter. Not necessarily in favor of another search committee.

MF: a good charge is critical. It's important for this board to be on the same page in terms of what the board is looking for. Draft a profile. Engage the Community for feedback.

TD: was struck by how narrow the range was, in terms of what we are looking for. It was the issue of prioritization that became important. What are the MOST important characteristics? What type of candidates do we wish the head hunter to bring us? This whole process is very difficult, especially to do in public. We should not do this fast, and do it wrong. We should do it consciously and deliberately.

Michelle then asked each participant to take round colored dots: 12 red, 10 blue and 9 yellow and place them next to a number of statements that had been created by the Facilitator entitled, "Common Threads." A red dot would signify High Priority, a blue dot of Medium Priority, and a yellow dot of least importance.

There was a 15 minute break and the Round Table was back in session at 8:02pm

Each group was then asked to do another drawing listing two things. Firstly, what each person felt they brought to the table from their childhood that continues to nourish them now in the present. Secondly, what skills do they have now to bring to the table that will help the new Town Manager in their role? Each participant then gave a brief explanation of their drawings.

Next Michelle asked a few questions and asked us to go around the table and answer.

Michelle's first question focused on civic responsibility and how each participant viewed it. Brief comments ranged from concerns that the community appeared to no longer be interested in a hands-on approach in participating directly in the government process; partially due to year rounders moving away and a limited number of residents who have served for many years leaving service, to the belief the community was evolving by way of media participation and still committed to their civic responsibility to the town.

Michelle posed the second question asking the BOS how they dealt with decision making when all things are coming against them. Most of the BOS agreed that the decisions they have to make are easy for the most part, but even when having to make those not so easy decisions are before them they are always mindful that they were elected in good faith by the people to do the right thing for the town. At the end of the day they have to know that they have done their job well.

Michelle directed participants to discuss two more things:

A. Timeline for a Hire

EY: just after spring town meeting

TD: draft RFP by mid-Jan. and hire within 90 days of that.

RA: right after Town Meeting, before the summer. We need to hire a police chief

RR: agreed with TD

CA: you know how I feel. If you're going to do it, do it as quickly as we can. The sooner the better.

Mike: get RFP done and out by end of the year.

Paul: do it, do it quickly.

B. Last question. Give us an affirmation and tell us where do we go from here?

Paul: you couldn't pay me to be a Selectman. Please talk to each other more. In public. And find the place for the public to dialogue with you. Be challenged.

Mike: Rock on.

CA: I will meet with you as much as we need.

RR: ready to work on this and go to more meetings

RA: I look forward to a work session a more discussions

MF: accelerate the pace

TD: thank you. This has worked well.

EY: this was more helpful than I thought it would be. This setting is nice.

Michelle called the meeting to a finish.

**Agenda Item 3. Other – Other matters that may legally come before the committee not known at the time of posting - votes may be taken.**

None

**Without objection adjourned at 9:06pm.**

The statements were rated by the participants as follows:

<u>Statements</u>	<u>Red</u>	<u>Blue</u>	<u>Yellow</u>
Brings out the best; not the worst	5	3	2
TM needs to be supportive of staff; not micro managing	0	1	2
TM must be fair	2	3	1
TM must be experienced in government	5 1/2	1	3
TM must be experienced in business	2	1	2
Political skills – building consensus	5	4	0
Knowledge of Real Estate	3	2	3
Good at team building – team player	3	1	2
Able to express visions to community	0	1	1
Able to sell visions; fight for visions	4	3	0
Open door to staff – community - boards	3	2	1
Good with/at details & focus	1	3	1
Buck stops here – leadership skills	10	1	0
Experienced – will not be bullied	0	4	0
Skilled @ management – hands on – interactive	2	3	0
Good with people – knows the Town of Provincetown	4	0	1
Knows MA/Cape – willing to learn quickly	2	1	3
BOS united 5/0 or 4/1 or 3/2	1	1	1
No loyalty to cliques	2	4	2
Revisit guideline of priorities in selection	0	1	0
Will stay at least: 3 years	0	2	1
5 years	0	0	0
7 years	0	0	2
10 years	0	0	1
Good development – communications	4	1	3
A good & fair networker; not aligned to groups	2	1	1
Visionary – coherent accountability	8	2	0

Needs to develop plans & take them all the way through	0	3	0
Creative ideas about year round life in Provincetown	1	6	1
Build morale	0	2	4
Follow rules of how to run government	0	2	1
Good @ selecting staff	0	5	0
Good with public/private partnerships - \$ \$	9	1	3
Ability to deal with people &/or bad information	1	4	0