

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT  
CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of OCTOBER 16, 2013**

**Call to Order:**

Chairman BERGSTROM: Good afternoon or good evening, I should say. Sorry we're late. I'd like to call this meeting of the Cape Cod Regional Government Charter Review Committee to order.

**Attendance:**

Chairman BERGSTROM: And we have a quorum with five members present. [Present: Chairman Ronald Bergstrom, Ann Canedy, Linell Grundman, Suzanne McAuliffe, and Julia Taylor. Absent: Bill Doherty and Austin Knight].

**Meeting Minutes 10/9/13 for Approval:**

Chairman BERGSTROM: You should have received a copy of the minutes of our last meeting of 10/9/13. Are there any additions or corrections to the Minutes? Hearing none. All those in favor, say "Aye". Two abstentions.

Okay approved.

**Background:**

Chairman BERGSTROM: Before we begin the public comment portion of our meeting, I would like to recognize Jessica Wielgus from the Commission. We made a request to her about the maps so the people who do comment will know exactly what we're talking about.

Ms. TAYLOR: I do think it's important that people realize these maps are simply an illustrative layout, which are not at all written in stone and there could be -- I mean, understand that there are lots. We know that state Legislatures make, even when they're not gerrymandering, they can make adjustments. So this was the easiest, quickest, I presume, to do it that came out even.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I'd say this is pretty much it.

Ms. TAYLOR: She thinks there's no other way to do it?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No, no.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, at any rate, this is I think my understanding was that this is the way you can do 11 and at 5, 7, 15 didn't work well.

Now whether there'd be anyway to adjust these boundaries, did we have a discussion of that?

MS. JESSICA WIELGUS: I can answer your question.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, before we go any further, I'd like to explain to the people who are listening to this is one of the options that we are considering includes dividing up the Cape into districts, in other words electoral districts of equal population.

We asked Jessica from the Commission to look into possible options because they would have to be an equal population by districts. So she looked into them.

They come up with a couple scenarios. Eleven fit the best and they were -- she divided it up into 11 districts. Now she's here to say how flexible that is and, indeed, where those districts lie in regard to the town boundaries.

Ms. JESSICA WEILGUS: Sure. Thank you. So the Cape Cod Commission was specifically asked to provide these maps to the committee for your illustrative purposes, as Ms. Taylor has just indicated.

And one of the goals of dividing the areas into districts was to make sure that it is constitutional. And by that, we had to make sure that the percent deviation from one district to the

next was less than -- for this particular one, it was actually less than 5 percent. It was 4.6, I believe.

So between your last hearing and today, I was asked by your attorney, Mike Curran, to come forward and give you a map that not only showed the potential districts but also overlaid the town borders on that so that you could see where they lie.

And one of the questions that you have for us that you just articulated is whether or not these lines are hard and fast as they're drawn on here. And certainly the way that these 11 districts were drawn was with an eye to creating that percent deviation as low as possible.

But certainly each of the districts is -- within each of the districts is a subset of voting precincts. And to the extent that those lines exist and can be certainly can be shifted. This is not hard and fast. This is just for illustrative purposes and, certainly, if you decided to go this route, the lines could be analyzed and potentially drawn differently to a certain degree.

Certainly you have to stay within the voting precincts as they exist and you want to keep the same percentage deviation as much as you can. But, no, this isn't a hard and fast.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: All right. I just want to mention that this is being recorded by others besides our normal recorders. Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Just to continue, thank you, very much for explaining that, Jessica.

I felt that I didn't want to get too deep into looking at where the lines were because I was more interested if we wanted to discuss this option and having it be a little less political and more theoretical.

And then later if we wanted to go this direction, we might see reasons or good political reasons why you would want to change lines. But I didn't want to have that be the basis for discussion yet.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: No. But since she was here and she had done this.

Ms. TAYLOR: I'm glad. Thanks.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Are you going to be here for the rest of the meeting? Are you here to observe?

Ms. JESSICA WEILGUS: Sure. Yes.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Okay. Well, in that case, you'll be available later on.

MS. JESSICA WIELGUS: I will.

### **Public Comment Session**

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I want to go to the public comment section of our meeting. Is there anyone from the public who wishes to comment? Okay. You'll have to identify yourself.

**MS. KATHY SHERMAN:** Kathy Sherman and I actually will in lieu of Ms. Taylor's remarks withdraw what I was going to say that, for instance, where I live, it would make more sense to be with the voting district -- it's on the Pleasant Bay side. But if these are sort -- and I think it makes sense for the Pleasant Bay Watershed to be sort of a cohesive voting unit. But given that this is just like illustrative, I'll withdraw my remarks.

My other remark is, I think I made at the beginning, I appreciate your endeavors and I'm anxious to hear what you have to say. But from the input of the Special Commission and even reading the report, the idea if it's not broke, don't fix it is where my sentiments lie.

So I don't know if you're going to discuss an option to leave it alone.

Thank you.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Does anyone else wish to address -- yes, please. We know

who you are but identify yourself.

**MS. NANCY CURLEY:** My name is Nancy Curley. I'm a member of the League of Women Voters and I would like to read the League's position on some of the issues that you're considering.

The League is very pleased with the work of the Charter Review Committee in outlining the positives and problems with alternate suggestions for County structure.

Ever since the recommendations of the Special Commission on governance in 2012, strong positions have been taken by various groups. Your approach gives everyone a chance to think through all the alternate proposals from a fresh start looking at goals and how to get there.

The challenges facing our regional government are many. They include wastewater, offshore pollution, transportation, land use approaches to sustain and preserve our limited resources, and population changes which affect our economy and require responsive action to build a vibrant layered population which includes children and young people.

These issues require a regional approach. Our County Home Rule Charter was designed to provide the basic structure to make this possible.

Our towns give us our strong meaningful identity, a sense of belonging grounded in our history, and serve as well for local governance.

However, the framework to enable all parts of the Cape to tackle necessary joint action is not now sufficient. Our current structure is diffuse. We need a structure in which government can anticipate and/or discern problems as they arise, seek solutions, and bring us together for decision making on a timely basis.

To do this, we need to develop a structure which will provide clear leadership, responsibility, and accountability. Our current government has spread these attributes thinly across too many layers.

We believe an increase in the clarity of leadership, responsibility, and accountability will lead to a corresponding increase in the effectiveness of government. It would also increase County visibility and citizen understanding of County functions and issues.

At this point, we favor a Strong Executive to give visibility and leadership to the County role in meeting these regional issues. This puts the plan to current Administrator who responds to policy decisions of the three elected Commissioners.

We also believe the current structure should be replaced by a single elected board or council which represents a broad cross-section of Barnstable County. This would give real meaning to the legal standard that gives equal standing to each person's vote; one person/one vote.

This new body could carry out both policy and budget oversight combining the functions of the Board of Commissioners and the Assembly of Delegates. The duties of such a merged body require each member to have a broader and more in depth understanding of the issues facing the County.

We believe regional representatives would help foster greater public understanding of regional perspectives and solutions. Such representatives would be in regular contact with their various constituencies. They would be able to both hear their individual concerns and to respond to those concerns with interpretations and solutions that help the constituency see the benefits of regional approaches while not detracting from any town's uniqueness in terms of its identity.

For personal -- that's the end of the statement from the League of Women Voters.

Personally, I would like to just say a word about an issue that the previous person brought up, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." That seems to me that it can't be improved?

I mean things have changed. The world has changed. Technology has changed. We have

to have a government that responds to those changes. And many of our issues are regional: wastewater, transportation. We know that towns have gotten together and benefited from action together, rather the transportation on the Outer Cape, the Cape Cod transportation system. It took a lot of work but it took cooperation among many towns to do that.

It's also clear from the way governments are trying to pass out money that regional requests, town's getting together to do something regionally across borders, gets funded a little bit more readily than single towns looking for money.

Thank you.

### **Other Business:**

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Thank you. Anyone else wish to address the committee?

Okay. We have Item 5, which is continued discussion on the Charter Review process, consideration of comments, progress and schedule approach.

We've heard from the public in three meetings now. They weren't well attended, but there was some continued discussion. I just wondered what the Delegates take out of this.

I would actually like to see a vote taken -- I would take a vote tonight but the fact is there are only five of us here. I'd like to see the entire committee if we could get them in the same room to take a vote on where to go from here.

So that's what the question is. Rather than have me do all the talking, what do you guys think?

Yes, Ann.

Ms. CANEDY: Just to complete the record, I would like to hear from the speaker that suggested, "If it ain't broke, why fix it," as to her rationale for that -- for obviously choosing Option 1?

MS. KATHY SHERMAN: It's simply because I don't think that the way people are elected is really going to fix it. I have spent a fair amount of time both with the Commissioners and much more probably with the Assembly, and I think that the Assembly, even though they're elected by town, and even though I have to say my town-elected Assemblyman is not here that often, I find that there's a very good dialogue in this body in the Assembly of -- that is usually not parochial.

On the other hand, somewhat responding to the issue of the executive as it's currently constituted. I see these regional issues. Yes, they're important but I've seen them in the paper from actually almost before I lived here that we've got to do this, we've got to do this, and nothing has really happened.

I think that we do have in any way the kind of executive leadership that is desirable already in the Executive Director of the Cape Cod Commission about a lot of these things. And we do have regional approaches in terms of money, like one example would be Open Cape, transportation.

And a lot of things really, in actuality, are regional and that sort of serves fine.

If you retain the two-body system but have more people on the Board of Commissioners, would that be maybe a little more dynamic? Yes, I think so. Could there be a lot more dialogue between the County and the towns? I believe there could.

But some towns don't seem to feel that they need the regional, the model of where, for instance, a larger town that had disservices or many other services would actually benefit from regionalization because they could share those services hasn't really gotten across.

The Special Commission spent an awful lot of time really in terms of how the different agencies work. And I think to a large extent the answer was that they were pretty much working fine, maybe they should work a little bit more as teams, but that in a way I think those agencies, you know, the different departments work well sort of in spite of governance.

And I don't mean to be insulting to anybody, but that's just sort of my opinion from my observations as one little citizen.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Thank you.

Ms. CANEDY: A couple of follow-ups just real quick?

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Sure.

Ms. CANEDY: What town are you from?

MS. KATHY SHERMAN: I'm from Brewster.

Ms. CANEDY: Okay. And the second is that you see -- what I hear is you see the Cape Cod Commission as the entity that should be dealing with regional issues.

MS. KATHY SHERMAN: No, I see them as doing so. Do all towns take advantage of it as much as they could? Maybe not.

In a way what I said about that is that that person is -- the Executive Director is someone who does go out into the community with forward looking ideas.

And in a way, I have to admit, I'm responding to something in the Municipal -- Mass. Municipal Associates Consultant Report about that person being subservient to the County Administrator.

And also I'm responding to after that their recommendations came out, the County Commissioners, a statement that they were -- their, the executive of governance now, their planning department. I would like to see the Cape Cod Commission retain the independence. I see it more like EPA that I hope is a political and protective.

Ms. CANEDY: Thank you.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, Julia.

Ms. TAYLOR: I appreciate her comments and we do know each other pretty well now over many visits here. And I have said all along that I don't think that the Assembly is a hotbed of provincialism. I don't think its debates are marked by a strong amount from my town versus the Cape as a whole. And I've always said this and I've always defended the Assembly for feeling that way.

My most serious feeling though is that while it's great that Provincetown and Truro, and Wellfleet and Eastham and Chatham have good, smart, strong people representing them elected by their citizens, and those people do make a good case for their ideas, and people respect them.

But when push comes to shove, those voters are, in effect, disenfranchised because their representatives don't have the significant power that a few of the Delegates have. And it's just been relatively good fortune that I'm such a good government type that I never would throw my weight around inappropriately.

But that could change, and I'm sure it will change when I'm not representing Falmouth. And I simply cannot feel good about continuing with a system where the Delegates are not equal. I don't think its right. So that's one point. It's not that it's terrible the way it works, but it's just wrong.

Secondly, from the meetings that we've been to and from some of the things that have been said, albeit most of it was about retaining each town having a Delegate, I've been giving more thought to the problem of the Strong Executive. And I do think we have a good example in Paul Niedzwiecki. I agree with you there that he's been out there and he is the face of the Cape Cod Commission.

And be annoyed with it or love it, at least he provides that leadership and people know what the story is and they're familiar with. And so, that's a good example of why we need the Strong Executive.

But I'm now tending in response to what the League is saying, which I also think of not just

visibility but accountability, I'm questioning whether we should consider an elected Commissioner/Executive.

These poor County Commissioners now are running Countywide, as hard as that is for a small job, but maybe the Strong Executive needs to be an elected official.

And then if that were the case, that Strong Executive would -- we would definitely have restored the elected checks and balances that we have now.

So for those people who felt that that's a little tricky to give up, and I, in theory, understand that.

So, I remain convinced that we need every elected Legislator to have an equal vote, just like in every other Legislative body that I've ever know.

And I was struck when we were down Cape that you would never know that Sarah Peake was just terribly popular because I mean she's from Provincetown and yet somehow people in Wellfleet find her to be an outstanding representative, and it doesn't seem to bother them that she's not from their town.

And so I think, I mean, doesn't she represent the whole -- how far does she go? Does she do Brewster and Harwich or just through Orleans?

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Brewster, Harwich, and part of Brewster -- no. It's from Harwich -- everything from Harwich and Chatham up to Provincetown. A precinct was added in Brewster.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And part of Brewster.

Ms. TAYLOR: And part of Brewster, okay. Well, this new person for District 11 say, they wouldn't even have Brewster and Harwich. They would be just the Lower Cape.

But then that person that represented them would be equal to every other person on the Assembly. To me, that's just very important.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Before we go any further, we can go back and forth on this because we've talked about it for days, for meeting after meeting.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: And what we're looking for now is to see this come to an end. I mean I could give my opinions of what option I like and give arguments left and right.

But I'm just struck by something I thought of in the last few meetings is that we have three options on the table. Okay. You really can't consider Option 1 an option because we're not going to put that on the ballot. We're not going to the Legislature and say, "We want to stay the same."

Ms. TAYLOR: Well we can vote it.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: We could vote to recommend staying the same, but I've saying ultimately we're either going to do something or we're not.

So that leaves us with 2 and 3. Now I don't know -- the Assembly has already voted an Ordinance suggesting that we have five Commissioners elected, elected by districts.

Now let's say that that didn't survive. Let's say we took it off the table there just for purposes of discussion. Now we have basically a quick decision, do we change the governance or not? In other words, here's an alternative. What we're saying is here's the alternative, a lot of people say, "Why change it?" They would say no. People say -- the League of Women Voters is saying, "Yes, that's a better way. We'll vote for it."

So I'm trying to narrow down our decision here because I think we have to really recommend something to the Assembly, which they are going to -- they then say yes or no.

I mean the arguments that we've made in favor of all three options, we could go over that again and again, but I'd like to move ahead and say how are we going to resolve this because it's important that if let's say Option 3 -- I mean if we get down to -- remember, we're not the ones who

are going to make the decision.

So even if we came down to the point where we say eliminate Option 2, basically we'd be saying to the Assembly these are the alternatives. Here's an option to what we're doing now. Here's the alternative so to speak; do you support it or not. Okay?

Ms. TAYLOR: But I think we need to take a --

Chairperson BERGSTROM: A vote, yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- position. Not just, well, this is the only option left. I think some members of the Assembly could be influenced by the Charter Commission's vote.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I don't doubt that we're going to take a position.

Ms. CANEDY: And rationale.

Ms. TAYLOR: And rationale.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Linell, you haven't said anything yet.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I get what you're trying to get at, Ron, and I agree that we have to, at some point, choose one, and we've all known that.

I do think though it's important that whether we do it prior to the vote or subsequent to the vote, before we go to the Assembly with that choice, we all have to have our reasons lined up. Because the Assembly -- people in the Assembly may be completely against it, but they may have not looked at some of the reasons that we've come up with and why we think it's a good thing.

There are a couple of things. I wasn't at the last meeting, so if you don't mind and indulge me, there's one thing that came up in the Minutes that I'd really like to settle. And I think either Mike or you can answer the question. And that was a concern that if there was a radical change to let's call it the Legislative branch of County government, meaning let's just, for the sake of argument, an 11 district, would that somehow compromise the enabling Legislation for the Cape Cod Commission or its function?

And I noticed nobody answered that question. That was a concern. Has that question been answered? In other words, the fact now that the Assembly approves each and every one of the Cape Cod Commission's --

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I think Jessica's answered that.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: She has. Okay. I want to just be really clear on that.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I've got two lawyers. I've got to choose between two lawyers here. I'll pick the --

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I thought it had been answered but it wasn't in the Minutes.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: She's better looking, so I'll pick her.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I think -- oh Mike, he didn't mean it.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: No, I didn't. I had to come up with some excuse.

MS. JESSICA WIELGUS: In terms of a body superseding the Assembly, we had previously discussed possibly, and certainly we'd have to look at it in its entirety, but the notion of whatever that Legislative body is, if it's replaced by another Legislative body that we could temper the language so that it would function in the same way.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: That what I felt was the answer, and I kind of remembered that from a previous meeting but I wanted to clear it up. Thank you.

MS. JESSICA WIELGUS: Okay.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: And the other thing that I thought was interesting in reading the Minutes and its coming up again here. While I love the idea and I love the fact that we're using the word regional in such a healthy way because when I came to the Board of Selectmen in Sandwich, it was an absolute dirty word. Suzanne knows that. So it's no longer a dirty word.

But I think that we have to be very careful. We can't confuse or replace a regional thinking

concept with what we're trying to do here which is make a recommendation for a methodology for governance.

Now our reason may be that we X, Y, Z, whatever our reasons will ultimately be, Ron doesn't want to hear them right now, so.

But I think it's very, very important that we understand the Charter is not a concept. The Charter is not about becoming comfortable with the word "regionalization." The Charter's not recognizing that our issues are regional. The Charter gives us that tool by which to govern to attack those issues. I don't disagree that all of our issues are regional.

But I think it's very, very important that we distinguish between talking about a concept and talking about what it is we're here to do, which is to make a recommendation about a form of government.

Just real quickly I want to add, this is just my perception, to the question, "If it isn't broke, why fix it?" Now this is strictly my experience. I've only been on the Cape 13 years. I immediately got involved in government. I've been educating myself, but I have a bit of objectivity. What I believe, and people have heard this so forgive me for being redundant, what I believe is important now is after these 25 to 30 years of County governance at this level because prior to that County Governance was no where near this level. There were 50,000 people here in 1970 on a year round basis.

So County Governance at this level is a much different ball of wax then when the Charter was written to create our current and contemporary County government structure.

In addition, the Cape Cod Commission as that planning and development and protection agency coincided with that creation. That now has evolved.

So I think it's important for us to remember that if it isn't broke, don't fix it doesn't really apply to our situation. We're in a government -- a young government that's evolving, and we know now that some of the issues that we tried to pretend -- I wasn't here 25 years ago, but I have a feeling people were pretending they weren't going to exist are now front and foremost in what we need to -- what we need to talk about, would be to prioritize about, and what we need to use our resources to solve.

So I think for me the "If it isn't broke, doesn't fix it" or don't mess with it, whatever that saying is, doesn't really apply. And I think that is also the reason that this is the third group trying to look at improving our model for County government to create the tools we need to tackle the regional issues that are in front of us. I think that's important for us to think about.

And then one other thing somebody's talked, and Suzanne also spoke to, the good modeling in the Cape Cod Commission and, specifically, in the leadership of Paul Niedzwiecki. And this is very, very true.

However, that's a planning entity and a protection entity. And as a former Selectmen from a town that uses a lot of County services that has nothing to do with the Cape Cod Commission, we must also not forget that the County government is more than the Cape Cod Commission. The Cape Cod Commission is a huge and wonderful part of it and a big, big, big important thing we're doing, and planning is what everybody talks about. But it would be inappropriate to consider a planning and development entity as the executive leadership in our particular form of government.

And that's what I wanted to get out there before we leave.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I just wanted to bring up a paragraph from Attorney Curran's letter to us of October 15.

"The public response at least from the incumbent, elected, municipal officials," and I would add to this County officials because I would put the Assembly of Delegates in this as well, "has

been highly against moving away from the town representation basis for Assembly of Delegates to a district system.

This is partly, I believe, because the committee did nothing to explain it's rationale for making the suggestion or explaining how the districts shown on the sample maps came into being.

And, most importantly, that they are at most merely representative what districts might look like, not what they would be."

So we settled that at the beginning. So we've had strong pushback from the Assembly of Delegates and from elected municipal officials that the town identity is crucial. And, in fact, one Selectmen from Sandwich went so far as to say that it was very disappointing to have the people looking at County as a way of taking away local municipal identity, which is not what this is about.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Right.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So, intellectually or theoretically or rationally, if we believe that the district model is the way to go forward in a way that makes a lot of good sense for the future of the County, we have an uphill climb based on the fact that there will be a tremendous amount of pushback.

And, Julia, you said that we could convince the members of the Assembly. Well, the last time we talked, I couldn't see the votes to pass this. So, it may be that we need to -- if we decide we're going to go with the districts because it is doable or possible -- I don't want to do something because we don't think it can't be done because I do like a challenge.

But I do think that we need to do a better job of explaining what the advantages are, why we want to do this, as opposed to here's a map, we should do the districts, and it will even out the voting. We need to ramp that up because the people in the know, who are the municipal officials, don't want this change. So if the people in the know don't want it --

Ms. TAYLOR: But let me --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No, I'm just saying -- if the Selectmen don't want it.

Ms. TAYLOR: The town managers do want it.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, but they're not speaking.

Ms. TAYLOR: I understand but they did speak at the --

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Commission.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Two of them.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- when we had the Special Commission. But they said their whole group -- they presented a document where their management group had --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I'm not saying there is a support for this. I'm just saying that the people who are speaking and the people who are out front right now are against it, the League of Women Voters supports it.

Ms. CANEDY: The people who are voting.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: We, a lot of us, support it. The town managers might support it, but on the face of it, I agree with what Attorney Curran has said here is that we need to do more.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Well, the issue is this is that for all that we appreciate and respect the opinions of the Selectmen and so on; they have no more say in this than anybody else, the man in the street. I mean in a way, the political debate over this and the public information department, that's going to take place when and if the Assembly sends this to the Legislature and the ballot.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: When and if.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: The reason we have to go to the Assembly is because that's the vehicle that is cited in the Charter. So we have to convince them; all right?

After that, if the Selectmen in let's say Eastham or Falmouth want to go out to their public and say, "No, we don't appreciate it," well that's going to be part of the political debate. And I'm

sure it will be quite a lively one.

But I think are the votes in numbers to get -- in other words, is there enough people -- enough Delegates in the Assembly to approve Option 3? Well, the answer is it depends on the weighted vote.

So Julia's only hope of getting this through may be the very process that she doesn't like.

Ms. TAYLOR: No, no

Chairperson BERGSTROM: And the fact that the big votes may vote for it and the majority of them may vote against this.

Ms. TAYLOR: It's not that I don't understand how the County views it, but I just don't think its best.

Well, I will say that when I did speak to the Barnstable Delegate some months ago, he was going to be very interested in forming his opinion based on, that's what he said, based on the recommendations of the Charter Commission.

I'm not saying that he would go along with it, but he was open to hearing that. And so if I think he's open to it and I'm open to it and Suzanne is open to it, then that's a start. But I've never considered this to be a likely outcome.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Why don't we get Ann in here.

Ms. CANEDY: Thank you. Basically, I think Suzanne's point is our first hurdle is the Assembly of Delegates. And to Julia's point, I think it's more accurate to say that the representative from Barnstable will vote however is advantageous to Barnstable. And therein lies the issue that we've been facing that we are talking towns and not districts.

Ms. TAYLOR: Oh, I'm sure he thinks regionally.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Can I say something, Ron?

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Go ahead, Linell.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I agree with Suzanne, and we've not gotten into that, and I kind of thought we'd get into it tonight. But at our next meeting we're going to vote, and then I would think we'd have all of our ideas crystallized about our recommendations and able to articulate them.

I want to remind everybody of a timing issue and it's a very important one. If you recall the Selectmen started jumping on this sending letters before we had even met.

So, there was no discussion at the time most of the Selectmen were getting together saying, "We don't want this. We want it to stay the way it is." And I think that's important to think about.

I know I think at our first meeting I came in basically thinking, and I expressed it more in favor of the towns and I do feel that there's such a need for different pieces of the Cape voice to come together to tackle all these things. People have lived here all their lives, people who had come here to raise their families, people who have retired here, all of that.

But this discussion for me having been a part of it has changed my mind. It made me think about things differently. And I don't think we should cut ourselves short that we won't be able to articulate to the Assembly some of the thinking that we've put in to this process.

No one has been paying attention to all of these meetings and, therefore, they haven't heard the discussions. We haven't had the fullest discussion yet about what options we may be in favor of prior to a vote for that ultimate recommendation.

But I do want to remind us that the Selectmen started deciding before we had really had a very -- any discussion --- well that's because they haven't heard any of our discussions.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, they had been aware of the Special Commission. Although, that had not really had any full-blown discussion at the Special Commission on this topic.

Does anyone want to comment on the concept of elected versus --

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, I'll comment on that. For those who weren't here for the

regular meeting, Mary Pat Flynn representing the Commissioners talked about hiring -- they're hiring an Interim Town Administrator; okay. They've already narrowed it down to a choice and offered him a contract.

And we talked about one of the reasons why. She said the reason they hired an interim was because they want to wait for the outcome of this committee and the vote of the Assembly before they went -- so this person would know what they're getting into.

And I discussed it with her, and one of the things that I believe and I'm glad Julia brought it up is that the League of Women Voters and others have said, well, one of the deficits in the current structure is there isn't a strong leadership role.

Now whether that's responsible to people who were in place or whether -- in some ways that's structural. In some ways, it's just -- the way we have it now doesn't lead.

So the obvious alternative, and the framers of the Constitution discussed this too 200 some-odd years ago, put a powerful person in place. Hamilton wanted a king. He wanted someone who was really strong and he didn't like this diffusion of responsibilities. And looking at things today, maybe he was right.

And so lost in all of our discussion, and I've looked at these options, and even in the context of the Special Commission, and the biggest factor to me that pushed toward Option 3 was not the weighted vote. I wasn't concerned with that.

The biggest factor is we need a Strong Administrator. We need someone to lead, steer the ship. We need someone to be the public face of the County. And if we do that, what are the Commissioners? We still have a Legislative body, what do the Commissioners do?

So that's the issue. And I think that at first we discussed an elected official, and my opposition to that would be -- and I discussed this with Mary Pat, do you want someone who is going to be a good Administrator who understands the checkbook and understands how to run an organization? Or are you going to get a public figure who is basically a politician who's going to say policy?

And there's nothing wrong with the say, nothing wrong with a policy guy who gets out there up front and does it. And has maybe a --

Ms. TAYLOR: Right. And then you hire an Administrator.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: And you hire an Administrator.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: So, I mean, that is a viable option, and that would provide the face of the County.

The only other thing I worry about in the districts and it came up is that when Sarah Peake wants to hold a meeting, let's say she wants to have a meeting on something, you know, let's say the insurance rates for homeowners or something, everybody knows what her district is.

But if I was an elected Delegate from 11, you know, how do I get people from 11 to come to a meeting. Okay. "Everybody from District 11, please show up at the school house."

Ms. MCAULIFFE: You'd have to contact them by voting precincts, literally.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yeah, right. But so I think that the issue brought up about the Administrator is key to the whole thing.

And, you know, we dismissed the idea of an elected Administrator. I don't know why we did that during the Special Commission. But that issue still comes up again. Then you have to go really into the Charter and say what powers this person would have.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: What would they -- they'd obviously have the power to hire and fire.

Ms. TAYLOR: But then they would really in some ways would be easier because they'd have the powers of the Commissioners.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Right.

Ms. TAYLOR: And any others that might be -- I mean I think they would have the powers of the Commissioners.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, but the problem -- another deficit from that --

Ms. TAYLOR: And the account -- but then with one person, I just think you have a lot more accountability and you can get a better person for a full-time position than you're going to get for a part-time position.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: But answer this question, Julia, is that the governor has a Legislature; right?

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: But he has a vote. If he doesn't like what the Legislature likes, he can veto it. President Obama has how much --

Ms. TAYLOR: Just like the Commissioners can veto any budget here.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Right. So then you put your place and power into this person's hands, they're going to be policy makers. They could get thrown out after the next election and we'd get somebody else who wants to go in a different direction.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: So not only are the advantages of leadership an accrue to this but some of the disadvantages too. If you have three Commissioners and, you know, two of them could change, you know.

Ms. TAYLOR: But then no one is accountable.

Ms. CANEDY: Right. I agree.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, go ahead Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: My reason for wanting an appointed is I would think the leader might be more than just a political position. And my fear would be every election cycle you'd have a new person in and it would be very political sort of policy sort of thing as opposed to someone who's actually going to be skilled and know the job and know how to do it.

Because even if you're skilled and you have all the requisites, you know, whatever the skills are for running a County, you still need an assistant even if they're just a financial person.

So I will have to think about the elected. I had dismissed that, but I'd much more prefer an elected board appointing someone and then they're forced to sort of work together.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: The other -- the other alternative is it's similar to like a First Selectmen type of thing they have in Connecticut, which is basically you hire an Administrator who does all the administrating.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Then you pick someone from the elected body and you say, "Okay. You're the lead guy."

Ms. MCAULIFFE: That's accountable.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: For instance, I think in Barnstable they pay -- the Charter they pay the Speaker or whatever they call him that -- the Chairman a little more and he basically goes out to the public.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Ann's cringing on that.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Bad experience?

Ms. CANEDY: May I speak?

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, go ahead.

Ms. CANEDY: Okay. I've been doing a lot of thinking because we've done a lot of comparing Option 3 with the town of Barnstable. And I've been a little bit uneasy because anybody that knows me knows that I don't think it's a perfect form of government.

And I was trying to figure out why is that. And I think we're sort of nailing some of those issues.

One is that our Administrator, our Town Manager, and as fine as he -- our current Town Manager is, is not elected. He only has to please 7 of us to stay where he is. He happens to be very good at dealing with all of us, but we've had experiences where that's not the case.

And to me, if you have an elected official, there is a greater checks and balances and there's a better tension which I think is good. I don't -- I'm not kumbayaing. I don't think everybody has to get along. So that's one thing that I think we have problems with in the town of Barnstable.

The other thing is that we, and people might be surprised to hear this, is that we are elected out of precincts. We're elected and so it sort of becomes a village thing rather than a town thing.

I like the idea when we were doing our own Charter of having five districts. Five people/five equal votes. Instead of 13 people and five of them are from Hyannis and four of them are from Centerville, so slam dunk, you know, whatever Hyannis and Centerville want, that's what we get.

So, I mean I'm oversimplifying it, but that's why I've come to like Option 3 with a few tweaks, and that would be an elected Administrator.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Let me ask -- let me take advantage of our counsel right now. And I apologize if you've already sent this information, but are there examples of counties that have one person running it?

Mr. CURRAN: Yes, yes. It is the coming thing. I think I had sent you a --

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Mr. CURRAN: -- I forwarded a piece from the National Associated Counties magazine, but the elected Executive is clearly the coming thing. And often now called a mayor under County plans.

But the distinction that I think all of you seems to have trouble making is the distinction between an Executive and an Administrator.

It's one thing to hire an Administrator and to give that person, him or her, all extensive powers of administration but the making of policy is an Executive decision.

Ms. CANEDY: Right.

Mr. CURRAN: And the Code of Ethics of the International City and County Managers Association specifically prohibits a manager from getting involved in policy. I will get you a copy of that. I think I've alluded to it in the past, but they're not supposed to make policy.

They made an exception that they can suggest to members of the council policy, but they're not supposed to initiate policy. So that's what an elected Executive does.

I remember a few years ago I worked with a Charter Commission in Framingham, and the Chairman of that Charter Commission was a state Senator. And I couldn't believe the mystique that he attributed to the office of Mayor. He was very much in favor of having a mayor system for the town of Framingham; a city of about 80,000 population now, probably should be a city but still has a town plan.

Anyway, he talked about when a mayor comes into the State House and appearing on Legislation or asking a state department about something, it's all the difference in the world. Three rinky-dink Selectmen, even if they're from Framingham, they don't amount to a hill of beans. Nobody really gives a darn about that.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: It's true. You know it's true.

Mr. CURRAN: But a Mayor, someone who's elected by the people as a Chief Executive, that person has stature when you go before the Legislature.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right. We have a reason. Write that down.

Mr. CURRAN: So it's a very important thing. And I think that the same thing is true for the County. If you had an elected Executive, he or she would have that standing in dealing with the State Legislature and dealing with the various state departments, in dealing with the Federal government, with the United States Senators, your Congressmen, Representative Keating.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. CURRAN: Then he or she would have the opportunity to speak for the County, to go around the County, find out what people are thinking, advocate for programs.

And from that base of strength be able to work with the Assembly in following through and getting implemented Legislation.

I'm sorry that I let myself --

Chairperson BERGSTROM: No, no.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No.

Ms. TAYLOR: No.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: No.

Ms. CANEDY: No.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: That's very good. I just want to add to that now. I see where you're coming from. In Massachusetts, I can cite two examples. One is the Mayor of Boston who's a very strong Mayor. He pretty much does what he wants. He has a council but he beats up on them. They have some powers but they're always complaining they don't have enough.

Then you take I think it is Worcester where they --

Mr. CURRAN: The Manager.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: -- basically the Mayor doesn't do anything. Not saying he doesn't do anything; he has limited power.

Mr. CURRAN: It's like Barnstable. They have a City Council. The City Council, the person elected as Mayor or the President of the Council becomes the Mayor. Same in Cambridge. There's no real clout to the office.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: So you or us would have to, if we choose that and presented it to the Assembly, we'd really have to delineate. We'd have to make a decision as to what powers to give this person.

Mr. CURRAN: Oh, absolutely. Yes.

Ms. CANEDY: Can I ask a question?

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Ann, go ahead.

Ms. CANEDY: May I ask you a question, Attorney Curran?

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Go ahead.

Ms. CANEDY: Under that scenario with a Mayor and an elected body, a Legislative body, would there still be the checks and balances and the tension? You're talking about the Mayor would have the power, but wouldn't the Legislature also have power?

Ms. TAYLOR: Always has the power of the purse.

Mr. CURRAN: Well, the Legislature would be implementing the policies. The Mayor would propose policies, but they would be adapted by the Legislative branch. So it's a team work.

But now, even if the County Commissioners, three people, it's very difficult for them to get together and formulate a policy, and then go before the Assembly and try to present that policy.

A single individual, obviously, can more clearly define and enunciate the policy and go

before the Council and present it.

Ms. TAYLOR: Who would be a full-time person.

Mr. CURRAN: No. It wouldn't have to be a full-time person. Absolutely not.

Ms. TAYLOR: I think it would be good to be a full-time. But that's an issue, I agree.

Mr. CURRAN: It's a money issue.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Are you talking about the Legislative body?

Ms. TAYLOR: I'm definitely not talking about the Legislative body.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: The Executive.

Ms. TAYLOR: I'm talking about if we had an elected one person. I don't think I want to use the word "Mayor" as it has such an urban sound, I would say the single Commissioner or something. The single Commissioner I think should be closer to a full-time job.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Oh yes.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Absolutely.

Ms. TAYLOR: I don't think that the 11 people need to be in that category at all. I think they need to be approving the Ordinances. They need to be doing the budget. They need to have the checks and balances for the Cape Cod Commission. I think they need the similar powers to what they have now.

But I would have the single Executive be more full-time than three part-time County Commissioners.

Because I think one obvious leadership problem is if you're a part-time County Commissioner, it's hard to show, you know, get all around the Cape and be a -- I mean I think they do a lot, basically. But I think a full-time job is different and you're going to see some action.

And if you don't, you'll get elected out. People don't expect much from a part, or certainly not as much, from a part-time Commissioner.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, Linell.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I just want to thank you for pointing out the difference between Administrator and Executive. That's a very important distinction and that really clicked for me.

And the full-time nature of it, back to the importance of recognizing our regional issues, that's something that's going to be critical going, particularly where the wastewater issues are concerned, that we're trying to leverage the partnerships and funding from both the state and the federal government. That issue alone demands a very strong County representative.

The Cape Cod Commission obviously at the head of that whole game, but the governance piece needs to be represented in terms of that leadership too.

So it's kind of exciting to think about the possibility of that strong elected Executive person fighting for what Cape Cod's going to need in terms of those partnerships with both the state and the federal governments.

Thank you, Mike.

Mr. CURRAN: Okay. Thank you.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: It has -- I mean obviously when you take, you know, Cape Cod is still a County unlike other places where you don't have counties in Massachusetts, and within the County structure we elect the Registry of Deeds. We elect the District Attorney.

Ms. TAYLOR: The Sheriff.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: We elect the Sheriff, the Registry of Probate, all one person elected to run an -- but they don't have a Legislative body underneath them.

But, you know, I don't know, so I guess we're going to have to decide if we recommend Option 3 whether we're going to get elected or appointed.

For instance, my experience with the Regional Transit Authority is if you have a good

Administrator, even though he's appointed, he can make a tremendous difference.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: That's correct.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: We hired Tom Cahir. He hit the ground running and he's done a lot of good things. But he has ultimate authority to do a lot of stuff. In other words, he has more strength than let's say the County Commissioners have, what it amounts to is the Assembly which is the governing board.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right. He's a full-time.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: He's a full-time guy. He has an office and he does the work and he supervises everything and we are basically -- there are certain specific things, changes in routes and, for instance, and obviously the budget, a few things that we do but.

Ms. CANEDY: But it's hard to remove someone that's been appointed.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: It is hard to remove someone that's appointed, but that's -- so there's two issues. Do we want a real Strong Administrator? I think the answer is yes. Then the answer is how do we get there? Do we elect? Do we have him popularly elected?

I'll tell you the truth, my decision is going to be based on another -- we're looking at this from a government structure. But, to me, the governance structure starts with the individual voter.

So I'm concerned of how does the voter see his or her participation? How does he or she see their vote having an effect of the governance of Barnstable County?

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, do you want to vote for the person or do you want them to be appointed by someone else?

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: I mean I think they could get excited by the chance to vote for someone who was really going to speak for Cape Cod. And I think if you had a full-time job, a full-time position, you might get some pretty good candidates who could excite the voters.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Let me give you a bad example though.

Ms. TAYLOR: Demagogue.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: No. Well, one of the biggest issues facing Barnstable County in the next 10 to 20 years is wastewater; all right? I went through the wastewater debate in Chatham. Let me tell you --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: It ain't pretty.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: It isn't pretty. And it was dominated by a lot of misinformation and people jumping up and saying a lot of things.

And, unfortunately, if you look at American politics, that's how people get elected. They don't get elected by being insiders who say, "Well, you know, this is a tough decision and there are things that --" They get elected by getting up and saying, "Well those guys are a bunch of chowderheads. I don't know what they're doing. And elect me and I'll straighten it out." But there's a downside to it.

Ms. TAYLOR: But this is part of the problem. Of course if they elected me, and I could do things and I'd be perfect. But, you know, do we really trust the voters? It's hard at times because we get horrible results at times.

But we can't set up a government where we aren't going to basically trust the voters.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Ms. TAYLOR: We'd have to go that route.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Exactly.

Ms. TAYLOR: There could be advantages in an appointed person, but if we really want them to be strong and we really want them to be out there, I think they may, and if Mike is right, that you can't be a policymaker if you're appointed, then I think there's a problem with appointed.

As much as I might like to hire that pro.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Partisan or nonpartisan?

Ms. CANEDY: Nonpartisan.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I just think there are tricky things running countywide with no party, but I can see a lot of reasons why we would like it to be nonpartisan but I'm not sure.

But it might be just, especially right now, given some really unattractive situations nationally where people are truly no matter what their party label must be extremely discouraged. This might be just the time to say we're going to offer a really terrific, strong powerful job that can really do some great things and it's going to be nonpartisan. There could be -- that could be a selling point.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes. I think voting for an Executive and having it be nonpartisan. I think if we're going to present this, this has to be so different from what exists that there has to be -- we have to really build up positives and differences. And the positive is accountability, visibility.

And I love the Speaker mentioning how what a good sort of rapport the Cape Cod Commission has, and that's partially because they're out there. It's not just a regulatory and the annoying stuff that people know. They know it because of Paul Niedzwiecki being a Strong Executive.

And if we had that sort of model in terms of a very Strong Executive and they got to vote for it and it was nonpartisan, that would really have people going, "Huh!"

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I think you guys are naïve but I'll let Ann tell you.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: What will really work?

Ms. CANEDY: I'm excited about that because I think one of the advantages of being on the Town Council is that you vote as a nonpartisan. I mean you run as a nonpartisan, and people -- okay.

And I'll tell you, I'm a Republican. Actually, I'm unenrolled right now because as soon as I was elected or actually as soon as I ran I think -- I don't remember the time schedule, but I changed to a non -- to an unenrolled to send the message to my fellow councilors and to my constituents that there is nothing Republican or Democrat about a pothole. And that it didn't -- I wasn't coming from a party philosophy sort of thought. I'm trying to be the best Legislator I could be.

And the idea that we can actually listen to somebody speak about the issues rather than to start out with a definition, oh, they're pro this and they're anti that because they're Republican or a Democrat, which, frankly, in today's society is not even accurate because I say I was an (R) and I mean most of my (R) friends would say, "No, you're really not."

So, you know, I really like the idea of actually trying to define somebody by what they believe in and their issues and where they stand rather than what party they're from.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Let's hear from a (D) now.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Just a real simple comment though. So, I'm from not a land where there are this many Independents. And I've served with a lot of Independents. And you can't be as naïve to think that people have political ideologies still under the Independent shelter.

So I think that there's a double-edged sword to the nonpartisan. A lot of people like myself who have moved to the Cape with no experience in Boards of Selectmen and, you know, like I'm from Kansas, that form of government didn't make it west of the Mississippi because it takes a lot of time, and farmers don't have that kind of time.

So a lot of people, like me, recognize that many people, you know, still are strongly ideologically one way or the other and they would appreciate, for example, even local elections. There are people who believe local elections should be partisan so people tell us what their colors

are. Because it's one thing to not be, you know, it's very lovely and ideal to think that just because we would say this is a nonpartisan position that we're not going to create ideology.

But there could be as much trouble finding somebody to come in who waives that moderate, "I'm a moderate, I'm a moderate, I'm a moderate" and look this is a nonpartisan position. And then suddenly you see this strong ideological streak. Then you've got three years of people being really angry about that.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I am registered as a Democrat and always had been. And I've had strong opposition running against me a couple of times, and always it was someone who was strongly identified as Republican.

And I don't think they really thought that I was behaving in some, you know, overtly Democratic way, but they wanted, in fact, their party to have more play and that's okay.

So it's not that you're going to have some pure fantasyland, but I don't see that it will improve the situation on Cape Cod to have them be partisan.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: All right. Let me hear from Ann here.

Ms. CANEDY: On a national level, we have people that are identified as Republican and are identified as Democrats and they all run as moderates and they're not moderates.

But in my situation, I identified myself as unenrolled. I've had people to this day that come up to me and go, "I didn't realize you were a Republican," like it made any difference. And if it didn't make a difference for 10 years I've been in this, then why does it make a difference now when they find out I have -- I had an (R) next to my name? You know, I'm no different.

So I have consciously treated this position as a nonpartisan position. Yes, I probably have some sneaky little ideological quirks, but I really try to look at issues and deal with issues for my constituents and not from an ideological party base. And I think you can do that on a local basis.

Ms. TAYLOR: I think so too.

Ms. CANEDY: So that's why I support that.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: So let me jump in here. And I've given this little speech. I gave it to the Special Commission, and I'll give it to you guys. I'll chant the same mantra.

Two reasons, two ideas/reasons in support of partisanship. One is the fact that it helps you do your job. For instance, Barack Obama doesn't -- I don't think he has enough powers in the Constitution to run the country, and they didn't think so when they founded the country either. They didn't consider political parties.

He has ability to move forward because he has allies. He's also the head of his party. He has a group of people within the Legislature who say -- who have a common purpose with him; Harry Reid and -- basically, they're his troops. All right?

So in that sense, partisan helps you. If you elect somebody who doesn't have any allies that you hung out to dry, nobody's going to pay attention to. So that's one reason.

The other reason is from the voters' standpoint. Even in presidential elections, only 50-60 percent of the people vote. A lot of people are detached from their elected officials. They're not going to know -- the majority of them are going to look at my name on the ballot, let's say, in Chatham and say, "I don't know this guy. I know this guy. I don't know who this guy is but I'll vote for him because he's got a nice name or whatever."

So they make decisions based on very superficial reasons. If you have a (D) or an (R) in front of you, that voter will know something about you. In other words, they'll have some insight into how you feel. That's why political parties come -- they'll say, "Well, I don't know any of these people on the ballot for Registry of Probate, but I'm a Democrat and so is he so I'll vote for him."

And you can say that's not a good policy, but human nature being what it is; would you

rather have them vote for somebody because the name comes first in the alphabet? It means something.

Ms. CANEDY: Uneducated voters.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Where does unenrolled fit on your ballot?

Chairperson BERGSTROM: What's that?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Where does the unenrolled fit on your ballot?

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Well, anybody can run; all right? If you had it totally nonpartisan and for a job that might pay \$150,000 a year, you might have someone elected with 30 percent of the vote. That's the danger in the sense of having it totally open. And it happens; do you know what I mean?

Ms. GRUNDMAN: That's true.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: But what I'm saying is if you have -- typically if you have a partisan vote and you have a primary and you have a candidate from two parties.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Right.

Ms. TAYLOR: Or you do it like Menino's successor.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: No, no.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No. What happens to the unenrolled person in that two-party scenario?

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Oh, there's a provision in the Secretary -- Mike can tell you this, but if you go on to the Secretary of State's website, there's two ways to get on the ballot; in a partisan election in a primary or if you're unenrolled you get a certain number of --

Mr. CURRAN: Signatures.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: -- signatures and so on. So there's a whole process set up.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So there's another way to do that.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: For any office.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And I have a response to people not knowing anything about it, you know, and I think that's called a campaign, and I think you really need to, if you're running for an office, do everything you can whether it's signs or adds to get in people's faces.

I agree people don't pay attention, but I have run in races with zero name recognition and just by campaigning and campaigning and campaigning that's how people say, "Oh yeah, I saw her sign, or oh yeah, she was at the dump or the landfill."

I mean I think, to me, that's more worthy asking for the position as opposed to getting it because you have a partisan affiliation.

Ms. CANEDY: See, I would've voted for you.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Yes. I just want to say one last thing.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I agree with Suzanne 100 percent, and I had no name -- I mean I had some name recognition but I won because I campaigned hard and that's the way the people learn your issues.

And it always bothers me that people don't campaign for a local office because that's how you also develop your own voice. That's how you understand who you are and how you're going to operate as a leader or how you're going to operate as a thinker in a Legislative body.

But I still think that this is going to be an interesting debate because I think it's really thinking outside the box which I like a lot. I just wonder if it's practical and if it will yield a good result, but I like thinking about it a lot.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Okay. Next meeting.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I'm with you.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I want to know what we've accomplished tonight. I want to move the --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I think we've done a lot.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I agree but --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: We're setting the table to vote.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: -- but how are we going to structure the vote now? I mean if everyone picked an option, we could have two people for this and three people for that. We could also have some people who support the Option 3 with an elected official. Some people -- so in other words, we're going to have to bring this down to the kind of decisions we're going to have to make.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I think straight up this committee makes a recommendation. We vote based on majority what option and what vote and what partisan or not and just vote her down.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: But I think we should first define what the options are. In other words --

Ms. TAYLOR: There's Option 1.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: There's Option 1, yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Let's have a vote on that.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. TAYLOR: How many people are for Option 1? You might have some people for it. You might have some people against it. It will either pass or it won't pass.

Option 2, let's have a vote. Option 3.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Option 3, but Option 3 now has some --

Ms. TAYLOR: Now I think we might want to discuss Option 3 where we have a Strong Executive and we have an 11 member districts or 11 districts, regional districts. Then a separate vote or a separate --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Elected or appointed?

Ms. TAYLOR: -- elected or appointed.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Partisan or nonpartisan.

Ms. TAYLOR: Partisan or nonpartisan.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Now I think that the vote on let's say we have people who are not for Option 3 but; right? But, yet, when we take a vote on Option 3, I think everyone should have a vote on how that option is presented. In other words, let's define Option 3.

Ms. CANEDY: Make an Option 4.

Ms. TAYLOR: If it passed, then --

Chairperson BERGSTROM: You don't think we should do it before it passes before we vote on it?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No.

Ms. TAYLOR: No.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: If it passes, then you get to make another decision.

Ms. TAYLOR: Then you get to make another decision.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Then the people who weren't for it can weigh in at the Executive. They can be an elected or not an elected.

Ms. CANEDY: And how about an Option 4?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No. I'm just talking about our committee. I'm not talking about --

Chairperson BERGSTROM: No, I understand that. I understand that but it's --

Ms. TAYLOR: I'm afraid that poor Austin has just basically missed all the meetings and

it's going to be hard for him. I mean I don't know what to say about that.

I think Bill has missed some meetings, but he certainly knows a lot about County government, and I think he can have an informed opinion.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: All right.

Ms. TAYLOR: But I think that we've been to almost all the meetings, and we've said the most and thought about it the most.

But I would prefer Option 3 would be considered Strong Executive of some sort. And if that -- and the big question -- one of big question -- the other big question would be the concept of 11 regional districts. If that passed, then we'd go to this next issue.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Ann.

Ms. CANEDY: How about an Option 4? And Option 3 would be an appointed Administrator and an 11 district Assembly.

And Option 4 would be an elected, whatever we're going to call him, King, (Laughter.) and an 11 district.

Ms. TAYLOR: Because I think some people, like me, feel strongly that I want a change in the composition of the Legislature and I want a strong leader. I don't feel as strongly about the elected or appointed. So I would think that --

Ms. CANEDY: But you would have an option? I mean --

Ms. TAYLOR: I understand but I don't really want to pick one of those until after I see whether that's a viable outcome.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: You know, I'm just looking at this from a very practical --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Baby steps. Baby steps.

Ms. TAYLOR: Baby steps, yes.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I'm going to look at that from a very practical standpoint. Let's say we vote on an option in the first meeting in November. At some point, I have to bring this before the full Assembly. They're going to ask a lot of questions that have to do with details.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right. Yes.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: In other words, where are the districts?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: What is going to be the power of this person? So --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Ms. TAYLOR: No. Here's another question though, Ron. They wanted a "white paper." They didn't want us to go into all the details and all of the finished Charter because they wanted to weigh in on the concept. They've said this over and over again.

They don't want us to go through the trouble and I don't either --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yeah, but we've got to submit this to the Legislature.

Ms. TAYLOR: No, no, I know, dear, but we can't do that until the Assembly passes it or rejects it. And then it's crazy to go and spend time and money and energy on the details if the Assembly is just adamant as I fear they may be.

So we really need to say, yes, here is what you asked for, the white paper.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Here are our --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: We can't skip that step.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- the outline of our concept. And if you are willing -- you don't have to vote this outline, but if you're going to say, "No, no, never," then we can drop (Inaudible).

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Okay. You'll be in charge of explaining to the Delegates that

come up with picayune questions that we don't -- we're not going to answer. That's what --

Ms. TAYLOR: Because our mandate last --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: The white paper.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- we were there was the white paper which gives the basic concept and the reasons for it.

And I think it isn't that hard to come up with some basic concept. And I am very reluctant to get into gerrymandering at this time. I prefer to do that in a secret meeting later.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: My feeling is the best possible outcome of this committee would be to have two options. One is, obviously, -- to have one alternative to the current system and that's clearly defined and we present that. If, indeed, it passes --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, right.

Ms. TAYLOR: No, no, but we have to vote on do we favor keeping the current system. That has to be voted.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes. We have to take a vote on each of them.

Ms. TAYLOR: And we have to take a vote on two --

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Well, obviously, if we have one -- in other words, we're looking at the current system or an alternative. And if somebody raises their hand and says, "I think we should change the system," that's an up or down vote. In other words, it's going to be yes or no.

Ms. TAYLOR: I think we should vote on the three systems.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right. Yes.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. TAYLOR: And we should have a full vote on each of those.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And make an effort -- our next meeting is --

Clerk O'CONNELL: 6th.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: -- 6th.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: On the 6th, yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And just make a plea for the full committee to attend because we're going to take a vote.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, and --

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I'm going to have to find out in what form we have to submit this assuming --

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, that, we're just a long way from there.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: No, we're not a long way from there.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: This may not get passed the Assembly.

Ms. TAYLOR: This will never get passed the Assembly probably.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, but what if it does.

Ms. TAYLOR: Then it's all Mike all the time.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, then it's all Mike, yes. Mike, you have two days to rewrite the whole Charter and submit it.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I think that's obvious.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Well, I think we understand that -- we understand what are options are but --

Ms. TAYLOR: But he wants to get it --

Ms. CANEDY: You don't have to rush.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, because Sarah has to hold hearings.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: She has to do it before the holidays.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: I understand. All right.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Now I think that we may have flexibility there. I've discussed it with Mike so maybe an alternative.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, but there's no point in us writing up a Charter change for the Assembly.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: No.

Ms. TAYLOR: The point is to set out what we're recommending if we are recommending a Charter change. This is our recommendation.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: See, the advantage in giving them an up or down vote on a change is that the alternative is to have three of the Delegates say, "You know, I like Option 1." Two of them say, "Gees, I like Option 2."

Ms. TAYLOR: No, no, no, no.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Four of them say, "I like Option 3 with an elected official."

Ms. MCAULIFFE: We're coming in with a recommendation.

Ms. TAYLOR: We're coming in with a recommendation.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: A recommendation?

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: That's what I wanted to hear.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes. That's what --

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Yes, Linell.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I think that's really, really clear. So on November 3, we're going to vote this.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: November 6th.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: November 6 we're going to vote this thing. I think the most important thing Julia said this a couple times is why. I think that is what the white paper's about.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: And I think the whys are there, and I think we've articulated them but we need to get them down into a form.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: After we vote, let's do that.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Exactly. But I think the whys are there. And just I agree with her that we vote on the third option, and if that gets voted in by this committee --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: You have to do it piecemeal.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: -- then do the decisions about the details of it. I agree.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I have to warn you that the date and time of the next meeting may be flexible because I really want to get the seven of us in the room.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Right.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: So we have until four days before the meeting to basically call a meeting. But if Austin -- I mean another thing is we're going to have --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: The other thing is --

Ms. TAYLOR: Sorry. If he can't ever come, he can't ever come.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Just tell everybody we are going to take a vote and they have to be there. And, you know, --

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Well --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Because we may never have the full committee.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right. I mean I might have to do some things.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: That it may be February, you know.

Ms. CANEDY: Well let him give it a shot.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: But we're having -- the Assembly is having two meetings in November. It was on the 4th -- is it the 6th?

Clerk O'CONNELL: 6th.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: 6th and the 20th. Now the 20th is close to Thanksgiving.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No. It's the week before because isn't Thanksgiving late this year?

Ms. CANEDY: Right.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: It's not the Wednesday before. It's the week before so that's a big difference.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. CANEDY: I have a wedding that week so don't do that one.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, don't do it then.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: So we really have to do it the 6th.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: I was thinking earlier than the 6th so we could get it to the Assembly. Because if we get it to the Assembly -- see the time frame's just not working out, but I'll worry. That will be my problem.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: All right.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: You're the chairman, what we pay you for.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Have we accomplished --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes. I feel very good about it.

Chairperson BERGSTROM: Okay. Well then I need a motion.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I move to adjourn.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Second.

Chairman BERGSTROM: All those in favor, say "Aye".

**Whereupon, it was moved, seconded, and voted to adjourn the Charter Review Committee Meeting at 7:05 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by:

Janice O'Connell, Clerk  
Assembly of Delegates