

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT  
ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES  
CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Approved Minutes for May 29, 2013**

**Call to Order:**

Chair BERGSTROM: I call this meeting to order. This is the initial meeting of the Charter Review Committee of the Barnstable County Assembly of Delegates.

And, to begin, I will go around the table and we'll introduce ourselves so people watching -- simulcast. So, we'll start with you.

**Attendance/Introductions:**

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I'm Susan McAuliffe. I'm Assembly representative from Yarmouth.

Ms. TAYLOR: Julia Taylor, Delegate from Falmouth to the Assembly.

Chair BERGSTROM: And I'm Ron Bergstrom, the Delegate from Chatham, and currently the Speaker of the Assembly and Chairman of this Committee.

Mr. KNIGHT: I'm Austin Knight. I am the Chairman of the Board actually on the Provincetown Board of Selectmen. But I must also say I'm on the Cape Cod Commission representative to the town also. I'm here from a Selectmen's point of view.

Chair BERGSTROM: Uh-huh.

Ms. TAYLOR: But it's good to have Commission representation.

Chair BERGSTROM: Ann.

Ms. CANEDY: Ann Canedy, Town Counsel, Barnstable.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I'm Bill Doherty, Barnstable County Commissioner.

Mr. CURRAN: I'm Mike Curran, an Attorney and an outsider.

Chair BERGSTROM: Okay. Linell, who is a former Selectman from Sandwich, should be along shortly. We have a quorum.

**New Business:**

**Assembly Resolution 13-02**

This Committee was formed according to Resolution 13-02, which you have a copy of in your folder. I'm not going to read it but it basically says that we are here -- well, I will read it.

It says, "The Charter Review Committee shall make a report with recommendations to the Assembly of Delegates not later than 10 months following the date such committee is appointed.

The Committee shall be appointed by the Speaker and shall consist of seven members. The composition of this Committee shall be: 1) the Speaker; 2) one County Commissioner, that's Bill; two members of the Assembly, that's Julia and Suzanne, and three members at-large selected by the Speaker representing three districts -- three distinct geographic areas on the Cape." Austin is from Provincetown; Ann is from Barnstable; and Linell is from Sandwich."

**Meeting Schedule & Topics**

So that's where we are right now. I guess the first question I'll ask is this meeting was called -- the reason that we had this initial meeting on Wednesday was because at least four of us are already committed on Wednesday, the three Delegates also Bill when he has his meetings. So is there any objection to having these meetings on Wednesday? Does that fit in to everybody's schedule? So we can presume that possibly after maybe at 6 o'clock.

The problem is the Assembly -- this room is committed at four o'clock for Assembly meetings, but we also have subcommittee meetings before that. For instance, next meeting we might have other

subcommittee meeting at 3:30 or 3 o'clock.

So it would probably be easier to do the meetings at 5 o'clock if that's possible. I just want to find out if anybody jumps up and objects?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Unless there's a non-Assembly day.

Chair BERGSTROM: I'm trying to give everybody an idea of when they'll meet so you can -- so you know what you're faced with, you know, and adjust your schedules accordingly.

Now we could -- nothing is written in stone so if we meet on let's say a Wednesday and we decide on a subsequent meeting that we would be better off meeting at 3 o'clock, we could do that. It's just I want to get some kind of an estimate of, you know, that you'll know when we're going to be --

We put a calendar in front of you, and there are potential dates in there.

I talked to Sarah Peake about a month ago when this committee was first formed. She is the Chair on the Committee on Municipalities.

If there are any changes that require going to the Legislature and the ballot, she recommended that those changes be before her committee filed no later than let's say Thanksgiving.

So we're looking at a schedule between now and let's say late October/early-November of, I don't know, 8 meetings, 10 meetings, 6 meetings. I mean it really depends on how we want to divide up the scope of work.

And included in those, which is another topic we're going to have to talk about, is potential for public comment, so that we can bring people in.

It's been my experience that if you allow open public comment at every meeting, you wind up either having to shut people off or you wind up not doing anything else. So it may be wise for us to have a session that's dedicated exclusively to public comment.

We can get the word out in the media, through the League, and through other sources that people come in if they have recommendations they can make at that point.

So that's where we are on the schedule.

Ms. CANEDY: How long do you anticipate the meetings will run if they start at six?

Ms. TAYLOR: They're more likely they could start at 5:30.

Chair BERGSTROM: More likely. I'm just trying to give the Assembly enough -- see I'm Speaker of the Assembly, so I can adjust our schedules that we get out of there. Gee, there's nothing today. But --

Ms. CANEDY: I, very often, have meetings in the evenings. That's why I asked.

Chair BERGSTROM: Meetings in the evening, yeah. I would say, in my experience, I'm a morning person, so if I have a meeting in the evening and if it goes more than two hours, it usually deteriorates rapidly.

I think if we struck -- my goal, as Chairman is to structure the meeting so when we walk in the door we know exactly what we're going to discuss and that we can get through the business and not wander off and stuff like that. So if we structure it enough and everybody knows, you have two weeks in between, you can pretty much -- so I think six -- I'd like to start at 5:30 and end at 7:30, no later.

Ms. CANEDY: I have a follow-up.

Chair BERGSTROM: Sure.

Ms. CANEDY: You mentioned public comment and my suggestion would be to have a couple of different opportunities for that. One at the beginning to maybe flush out some concerns that people have right off the bat. Maybe half-way through, comment on what we've done so far and then, of course, more intensely at the end.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah, that's a good idea. Bill, did you have something to say?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yeah, unfortunately, well, actually, fortunately for my granddaughter, she's graduating from high school on June 5 up in Wareham, and I would not miss that.

Other than that, I'm good on all the other dates.

Chair BERGSTROM: I'm not going to take you away from your granddaughter.

Ms. CANEDY: I won't be around in the last one in November. My daughter is getting married.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, hopefully, we'll be done by then.

Commissioner DOHERTY: With the exception of that, I'm good on any date -- any dates you have (Inaudible.)

Chair BERGSTROM: We'll presume they're going to have the meetings at 5:30, going no later than 7:30. We'll try to get out of here at 7:30. I mean if there's a conflict, we can always change it.

But just for that. And it's possible that we can meet -- in other words, the Assembly meets twice a month, the first and third Wednesdays. For instance, this is a fourth Wednesday; we don't meet. So it's not like it's every two weeks, it's just twice a month. But I mean it's possible that we find ourselves bogged down, we can have another meeting as long as everybody knows in advance, you know, depending on how the scope of work is done, and we could be done quicker than we think.

Ms. CANEDY: Maybe a public comment should be in between, not everyone would have to come.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah, that might be a good idea.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Mr. Speaker.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm the Chairman today.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Mr. Chairman, okay, by any other name. I'd like to suggest that one of the useful things in public comment is to have something tangible and in writing. I found that in past time that having something in front of us as far as the interest of those from the public who want to make a contribution can be more dispassionately examined.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah.

Commissioner DOHERTY: There is some emotional content in peoples' points of view, and sometimes the substance of what they're trying to get across is lost because we're listening to what I would call a very strongly held position. And if we, indeed, are here to, let's say, to look at things with objectivity, I would say that in that case we would welcome written input throughout the process.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And then we should allow some time for reviewing correspondence as part of the meeting.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah, okay. Another thing I thought of is that, and maybe Mike can help us out on this, is that a lot of this has to do with logistics. You know, if we make changes in the Charter, it's been a long time since I've done this, I did this in Chatham, but do you submit the entire you Charter? In other words, how does it work?

I think in Chatham when I did the Charter review, they had several different questions. Do you want to do this? Do you want to do that? Rather than submit the entire -- they did this in Barnstable too. How did they do that?

Ms. CANEDY: Just like you would for articles incorporation where you would for bylaws for an organization, I would suspect that you would submit the whole document with redline changes.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes, is that pretty much you think --

Mr. CURRAN: Two things. One, I think that the state Charter law, Municipal Charter, Home Rule Amendment to the State Constitution calls for Charter Commissions, Municipal Charter Commissions to start with a Public Hearing, which she suggested.

Ms. CANEDY: My suggestion.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. CURRAN: I agree with that wholeheartedly. Start with an open forum where people can

suggest what areas they think you ought to be looking at.

And then have a Public Hearing on a preliminary report under the procedure for municipalities. After 8 months, they must publish a preliminary report, and then a Public Hearing is held on that so there's something concrete for people to respond to.

If you're only going to be making changes to an existing Charter in certain areas, then there's no need to have the whole document open. That gets confusing to deal with those elements that have been redlined as these are the changes; these are the items that are up for discussion at the Public Hearing.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes. Actually, I was sort of in the same mind. I thought of having a public comment right off the bat, have people come in. And then as we go through and we discuss issues, such that we discuss the relationship between the Administrator and the Executive Branch, or, whatever, their representatives.

So we discussed that and we sort of either come up with a series of options or we decide to go in a certain direction. But, as Mike says, we're not really going -- I don't anticipate us -- I like to move from topic to topic each week -- each session. But I don't think the document should be finalized that we should take a vote on what we submit to the Assembly until we have a Public Hearing and then we vote on the entire proposal and we submit it to the Assembly. So, we would have a Public Hearing.

The problem I'm having now is the next logical time to have this meeting would be the 5th, which is a week from today. And notices to go out Friday --

Ms. TAYLOR: Just do it the 19th and you can have another meeting. You've done that.

Chair BERGSTROM: Okay. I'm wondering how far we're going to push this. It will be Christmas Day we'll be --

Ms. TAYLOR: You could meet the 5th anyway and then still have the Public Hearing the 19th. That's not that late.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, you don't think we could have the Public Hearing in a week?

Ms. TAYLOR: I don't know. When do you have to post it?

Chair BERGSTROM: You think it's too soon?

Ms. CANEDY: Why don't you have the public meeting on the 5th since Bill won't be here, and have a regular meeting next meeting.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, no, I think we can have a Public Hearing on the 5th. I'm just wondering if it's too quick. In other words, can we get the notice out to people, various Boards of Selectmen and so on and --

Mr. KNIGHT: If it's an email, it's an overnight.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah.

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: It's an overnight process.

Chair BERGSTROM: It would be ideal if we could do it on the 5th, I think, because then we would be moving along.

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: I think it's very plausible to have it on the 5th because everything's pretty much instant now, and we're now discussing it. We're now live on TV as we speak. So if we're saying we're going to have it in a public meeting on the 5th, it's already out there at this moment.

My question is about the process is what are we -- that Public Hearing, what are we going to discuss? What are we going to discuss? The whole thing? What is our mission here? What are we going to do so when we have that meeting, it's not an open thing, there's more of a -- in some sort of dialogue that's already starting, I mean as far as the public part goes.

Chair BERGSTROM: It says here is that under the Resolution 9-02, "A Charter Review Committee is hereby established to review the Barnstable County Home Rule Charter as amended and Ordinances of the County for the purpose of determining if any amendments or revisions are necessary

or desirable and prepare a draft petition for filing with the state Legislature under the procedure outlined in Section 9-01.”

So, basically, this is what we’re going to do.

Mike, did you have a chance to go over the existing Charter and see what we can toss out before we start going over it word by word?

Mr. CURRAN: I respond to things.

Chair BERGSTROM: Oh, okay.

Mr. CURRAN: Normal -- I wasn’t given a charge to initiate what I thought were areas. I’d be happy to look at it in that context but I hadn’t.

Based on what you said, the charge that the Commission has been given is similar to what a Municipal Charter Commission has, so that the open Public Hearing, the forum you’re going to hold, is for anybody to come forward and make any suggestions related to any part of the Charter or the Administrative Code that it strikes them as something you ought to direct your attention to.

Having that information, you then decide which are serious and which are not, but you ought to give everybody a chance to zero in on those items they feel are significant.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, I think the issue is that there are some things in the existing Charter, like, for instance, there’s a time frame for submission of the budget and so on that I don’t know if it necessarily has to be in there. That’s the question that I’m looking at.

Mr. CURRAN: I had thought about that issue because I looked through the Charter because one of the charges in the scope of services that was sent to me was to review the Charter with the idea to take out of the Charter and put it in Administrative Code, those things would be more appropriate there.

That’s a value judgment. And one of the reasons things get put into a Charter is because people, at least preparing the Charter, don’t want to leave them to the future for somebody else to determine. They’ve got the chance right then and there to make a decision and say this is what ought to be done. And that means it’s forever that way because it’s in the Charter and it can’t be changed.

If you have an open process, then it can be changed, and it may not, at least in the minds of the people who started it, it may not be the right thing to do.

So that’s where the value judgment comes in. You would have to tell me what things you think are not so important that they should be locked up forever in a Charter, that they ought to be simply taken out of the Charter man-made so that from time-to-time they can be amended as the people then in office think is necessary but that being filed as Ordinances.

Ms. TAYLOR: But could you -- now granted you wrote that Charter at the request of those who were on that original Charter Commission, but is it rational that you could look it over and say many Charters would not include this? That’s not to say we decide to take it out, but it would be this is not the most common thing to have in a Charter. That would be of interest to me.

Mr. CURRAN: Well, in the quick review that I did, nothing jumped out at me.

Ms. TAYLOR: Okay.

Mr. CURRAN: But that doesn’t mean looking at it again I wouldn’t find something. Mostly they’re in there for the reasons that I said. Someone wanted something and they wanted to be sure that was the case and so we put it in the Charter.

Chair BERGSTROM: Bill did you say something like -- was it you or someone, Bill, who said that the County Charter was X number of pages, but most towns and municipalities have a Charter that’s like four pages or something. Maybe it wasn’t you.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I think the first point that I made was the Constitution of the United States has a page and a half with regard to governance. And it covers both the general description of powers of the Executive, Legislative, and the Judicial Branch.

And it occurred to me that many of the discussions that we've had over time, from the time that I was in the Assembly and the time I've been a County Commissioner, revolve around things that seem to have more of an administrative cast than one that would, you know, that I would interpret as being something that's useful to, let's say, to be essential -- maybe that's the word to use -- essential to a Constitution-type document.

But having said that, I appreciate the fact that there would be a concern on those who initiated the Charter to make sure that everything was, indeed, included for the sake of if we left that out and it came to light later on that maybe we should have done it.

However, the present Assembly has demonstrated a significant interest and concern about the management of the -- what I'd call details which require addressing the Charter to do that. And in many cases, they seem to be ones that if you didn't have to go to a vote outside of -- I'd say outside of the Assembly to do that, you probably could have a more flexible let's say response on the part of the people that are trying to use it as a document to move forward.

Now I think there are several people in here who have Charters and have experience with it. Barnstable just went through that. I think Yarmouth has.

Chair BERGSTROM: Chatham. I went through the Charter.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And Chatham.

Chair BERGSTROM: And Chatham years ago.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Now let me ask you this. When you were all looking at a municipal Charter, was there a distinction made with regard to what was identified as being administrative and things that should be left to the responsibility of the town manager, and which things -- because I view a Charter to be supporting the responsibility the elected official has to carry out policy.

Policy, to me, comes from the decisions that were made in the budget process that says the government has decided that we're going to spend our money in this way because it supports the policy that we feel is in the best interest of, let's say, the people that we're serving.

Chair BERGSTROM: Just a quick response and I'll get to Suzanne. I agree with you there, Bill. In Chatham, we had a very strong Charter. The Administrator did all the hiring, and the Selectmen had only veto power -- not veto power of certain, but there's always a clause in there that sneaks in.

In Chatham, the clause was do we have the right to ensure that all the bylaws were administered properly. There was a response -- Selectmen's responsibility to say that all the -- that the bylaws and rules of the towns were properly administered, so right away that code of the camel's nose under the tent because then we go into -- and we say that. And there's a similar clause in our document here which says that, basically, we can investigate any -- so that's something we should look into. I mean because it's ambivalent.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well on the MPO, okay, one of the things that comes up on the MPO all the time -- I think you were on the MPO for a while too weren't you?

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Was that the implementing agency has the ability to veto anything that's passed by the MPO locally. And that was the state holding onto -- and you know that I always question that when we go to the meetings as to whether or not they intend to exercise that power. So far they haven't.

But that kind of a thing I believe provides a support for the reservation of if all things go away and the person that -- let's say if we pursue what we've intended which is to hire a single executive let's say to be the executive of the County, if we follow that line, there needs to be some check on that authority that protects the people. And typically that's what the elected officials are responsible for.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, I don't want to get too far afield because we're still really on topics.

Commissioner DOHERTY: If I may, I had one suggestion to make as far as the hearing and the evaluation process.

Chair BERGSTROM: Okay.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I'm a great believer in looking at low-hanging fruit, and I think that all of us after an examination of the Charter might have some opinion as to what things you have a high comfort level with and that might be a point of departure where we kind of get past the part where we don't see any personal difficulty with regard to the issue.

And if we all listed that, maybe we would end up with a collection of stuff, well, we really don't have to look at that too carefully. And at the same time, you could list those burning issues that say these are the ones that are essential, important, and must be looked at and that kind of a survey rather than taking time in a meeting on a debate.

I think that contribution could facilitate the process that would help in a, for example, when you have your public hearing and get the public's input, you could essentially say that a survey of the present members of the Charter Review Committee have said that these are the things that we think must be pursued. These are the things that we think we can address and accept fairly easily.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah, Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I think to a certain extent we've put the cart before the horse. I think one of the things that we need to do first is look at and discuss whether there's low-hanging fruit or not, the sort of governance we want, because once you have this sort of governance, then whether something falls under an administrator -- strong administrator or not, I think our current Charter is written to fit our current governing structure.

And I think if we had a different governing structure, we would have a different Charter.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: In Yarmouth, we used our Charter to consolidate government and to take all these elected boards and all the elected parties in town and to consolidate them and bring them under the Town Administrator and the Board of Selectmen so that you didn't have many many factums, which you have in many towns.

So once we know or we discuss what sort of structure we want, do we -- that may then define how we want the Charter to look to strengthen the administration or to specify what it is as administrator or not administrator. It's a little sort of backwards to me to go into the Charter now and pull out stuff that may or may not be relevant if we're not going to have an Assembly.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah. Well, at this point, I'm just wondering how far down the road we want to go into substantive issues before we really lay out, in other words, the schedule. If we want to discuss governance, we should put a certain time -- I think you should put a certain time for that. In other words, after the --

And, you know, I had a guy in Chatham who was always complaining that we weren't listening to them, the public. And we'd come out with the document and he'd say "Well, is this the final document?" And we'd say, "No, this is just a draft." And he'd say, "Well, I'm not going to comment on it until you tell me what the final document is." Okay. Fine. Then we come out with the final document. He says, "Well, I'm not going to comment on this; you've already made up your mind."

So, I mean, constantly, I had this battle is do you let the public in during the process, or do you come out with something and say, "Here it is." And I'm a believer in saying, "Here it is. Here's what we think." We listen to the public and we come out and we say, "This is what we're proposing," and then we give them a chance to comment on it.

So I think we should probably not get -- this is my personal opinion. I don't want to dominate

this, but how far do we go down discussing substantive topics before we really layout our schedule and when we're going to do everything.

I mean, I'm more than willing to get into -- also, there's also the GAD flies calling complaining that this wasn't on the Agenda and that was on the Agenda and so on and so forth. I think we're within the framework of this Agenda we're pretty safe.

I don't know; should we take governance first? Should that be our first priority?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Well, I think the first priority has to be a public session.

Chair BERGSTROM: That would be the first session, yeah.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I think there's a lot of interest, and there's a lot of input that people want to give.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Then, I think once we have that, we take those list of things that people have and our list of things. And then we have an organizational meeting where we put things in order for what we want.

That was just my opinion that to change the Charter before you know what the governance is going to look like, unless you're not planning on changing the governance, it might be backwards.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah, well, we got the recommendations of the Special Committee that both Julie and I served on. Ann.

Ms. CANEDY: I agree with Suzanne in a way. I think that we might flush out with some public comment what type of governance people want as well.

But I do want to take a little bit of issue with what you said in that I'm a strong believer of a chart or a pyramid that looks like people at the top, elected officials under that, and then appointed people under that.

And so I like the idea of allowing the public into the process early on and often. I don't believe there's such a thing as too much information. I think the more information, the more sharing with the public, the less suspicion of the final product there's going to be. I mean you're always going to have somebody that doesn't like the process, doesn't like the product, but I think you lessen that the more you let people in at the beginning and all the way through.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah, Austin.

Mr. KNIGHT: I would presume that really the basis of the first meeting, the Public Hearing, is almost the document of the recommendations and the comments about all of that because that seems to be what's driving so much of it.

I think when Charter Reviews come sometimes in municipalities a lot has to do with personalities at the time and things that are going on within the government itself.

And, so, if this document, which I've seen before, and I've been to meetings. I've been to a few of them when it was being -- when the committee was meeting on it. The basis to me is almost a blueprint that we're starting with in order to go into the next part of the process.

So the public's comments, really, a lot of it is going to come right from this.

Ms. CANEDY: Did we all get that?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: It's in your packet right there.

Mr. KNIGHT: Toward the tail end of it. But these are the recommendation that cause such an anxious moment at times. And I think this is what a lot of it is going to be on.

Chair BERGSTROM: You know we had some discussions with this. I was on that committee along with Julia, and a lot of people, 25 I would say, put a lot of work into it.

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: Yes.

Chair BERGSTROM: And it was chaired by former Senators' Rauschenbach and O'Leary. And at the end they come out with these recommendations. Some I agreed with/some I didn't.

But the issue is that a change in governance has to go before the ballot. The Commissioners, present company excepted, would have to, in other words, and the Assembly would have to come up with something in time to go before the Legislature and then go to the Secretary of State and then go to the ballot.

And I said 2014, it may seem like a long way off, but if you schedule it out, if we miss that date, then the next possible chance would be 2016, which is three years from then.

And then you have to think, and I don't know exactly how this works, but let's say you had a Charter change that changed the number of Commissioners, okay, or changed how they're elected to their districts.

If you voted on that -- if you went to the polls let's say in 2014, the existing Commissioners would be on the ballot because you can't presume that everybody's going to pass it.

So what happens now is, assuming that you make the change, you're going to have to have a further election before that change is implemented, whether it's a special election or whether they simply wait until the next biannual election.

So now you're pushing it out. So if we had missed a 2014 date, this is my humble estimate, we would have been pushed out to 2018 before we ever got the actual changes implemented.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Ron, if this group decides on governance change --

Chair BERGSTROM: Right.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: -- it doesn't mean it has to be voted on. Even if it's voted on in '14, you can have an implementation plan that occurs over two to three years so that you phase in people and that there's overlap. You don't have to say that it all happens on November 2014. You can say this is what's happening and this is the program for phasing it in.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah, well, I mean, I don't know. Can you do that?

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: Let me just ask this question. What is it we're trying to do? Are we trying to rush things through to get to the 2014 ballot? Or, are we trying to accurately review and come up with recommendations to go forward with?

I mean that's really the question.

Ms. TAYLOR: I don't think they're contradictory though.

Mr. KNIGHT: Right.

Ms. TAYLOR: I think this should not last as long as the Special Commission. It could come to the same conclusions or radically different conclusions but does not have to go that long.

So, I think we can easily be aiming at this present November deadline and see whether we want to make changes or not. I think we could -- I can't believe we couldn't come to a conclusion about whether we wanted to make changes or not by then.

Mr. KNIGHT: Oh, I agree a hundred percent. And what I'm saying is we have a start already. So it's not like we're starting over.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yeah, and I would think that the public might want to review that as here are some serious suggestions that you might want to look over and weigh in on in addition to those that already did and there may be some other suggestions you have that are not included, but that at least gives the public an idea of not having to reinvent every wheel that ever existed.

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: Right.

Ms. TAYLOR: So that would be my suggestion for them as well.

Commissioner DOHERTY: At this point, I want to offer a philosophical position, and that is that whatever changes we're looking for is not to change where we are as much as are we making those changes that will represent the interest that we think our future holds.

So, I don't know how we get to that that there have been many suggestions. The Commissioners have looked at some of those and have come up with some opinions with regard to the

ones that are useful or not useful.

I think that would be a good start. I think Austin's absolutely right. I think most of the comments that we've heard are in response to that document as opposed to any position the Commission has taken because, quite honestly, I don't believe the Commissioners have taken any kind of a position with regard to much of the stuff that's in there. We discussed it, but we haven't come out with -- we agree with this point, this point, and this point.

Chair BERGSTROM: I'm looking, I know -- you're right about that, Bill. This is an obsession with me is when I wake up in the morning and I know I have a 9 o'clock appointment at night, I kind of like well let me see, I've got to do this first, this first. In other words, I kind of partition out the day to make sure I get everything done.

So I'm in that mode right now as I'm looking at this whole process. I just want to see it from -- to organize it from beginning to end so that I know that it's going to work efficiently and that we're going to get the work done and done in a timely fashion. And that really is what I'm trying to get out of this meeting as -- I think Julia --

Commissioner DOHERTY: I think an (Inaudible) approach is a very important position to take if you know where you want to come out. You basically put the steps in in order to get there.

However, that might not meet what the public expects with regard to the process.

Chair BERGSTROM: Go ahead, Austin.

Mr. KNIGHT: I just want to say because the hearing is on possibly the 5th; we have a basis to let the public know what we're looking at at this point. This document is just a very strong part to have a discussion start.

It can go from that to other areas, but we have something in front of us that we can identify and the public has identified so it's nice place to start. It's not the ending point. It's the starting point for a public conversation again.

And I know you've been through it already and a lot of you have already been through it, but I have not. I went to a few of the meetings, and now I'm asked to sit here and come up with some sort of recommendations or whatever, and I want to see/review some of what's already happening so we can go from that day into the next meeting where we'll have probably more of a concrete idea of more of a process that we're doing so.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I think Austin -- I have to support Austin, and I guess Suzanne's opinion, that in order to look at where we want to go, we have to look at what's been made available to us. And I believe that we have not heard from the public other than a few loud voices, the facts are the facts.

So this would be an opportunity for the rest of the public to comment on something that has been produced and has been floating around for a long time.

So I think that that's a very useful point, and according to the Mullen Rule, I could, even if I don't attend, could review the tape and be up on it.

Chair BERGSTROM: You can be a remote presence.

Ms. CANEDY: Question. We have the Special Commission's recommendations. Did not the Assembly do a number of Resolutions?

Chair BERGSTROM: The Assembly did a Resolution, yeah.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: One Resolution on this.

Ms. CANEDY: Well, I think we should have that before us.

Chair BERGSTROM: Uh-huh.

Ms. CANEDY: Have the Commissioners come out with any opinions whatsoever in writing?

Commissioner DOHERTY: They have taken a vote saying -- given an opinion as to what the governance forum would be.

Ms. CANEDY: I'd like to have that before me too.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah. News to me, but, no, but also, a moving target, you're also involved, Bill, in currently in changing the relationship between the administrator and the Commissioners. So, in a way, you've taken positive steps in that direction.

So, in a way, it's I'd say a moving target, but changes have been -- in other words, changes have been made within their power to do so within the last two months.

Ms. CANEDY: That would have altered the Charter?

Ms. TAYLOR: No.

Chair BERGSTROM: No, no, no.

Ms. TAYLOR: So it's a question of is that something that's needed in the Charter or not?

Ms. CANEDY: Whether or not that's their authority or not.

Chair BERGSTROM: They've seeded a lot of responsibility for minor contract signings and so on and more administrative functions to the Administrator and taking it, you know, off of their plate.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I took the position that the Administrative Code and the Charter allows for the delegation of certain authority, the responsibility is retained by the Commissioners. And that's essentially what the Comm -- and part of my motivation to recommend that was you need to have some experience as to what it is like to have a strong, you know, a strong executive, and this was one way of trying it out.

So, so far, anything under 25,000 is taken care of as far as contracts. And for many years, I felt it wasn't necessary for the Commissioners to sign off on every single nut-and-bolt thing that they went through. It seemed to be what you hire a manager for is to deal with those issues.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, that is something that it was very particular in the Charter in Chatham. I think it's probably in every Charter. There's a relationship between the Administrator or Chief Executive Officer, and the policymaking board.

So I think we're not going to be able to avoid that. That's one issue.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And we have to know what that policymaking board is and what it looks like.

Chair BERGSTROM: Right.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And how many there are. Right now, we have, you know, a lot of ideas.

Ms. CANEDY: And what I thought was -- I've always thought it's odd about County government is that you have two elected bodies.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, you do that and the federal government has two elected bodies too. And, of course, that's not a bad example, I know but --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Well, it's like having full-time Board of Selectmen and a representative Town Meeting. Because the Assembly is the representative Town Meeting. And the Commissioners are the three times -- three people, full-time Board of Selectmen is the Executive. So you have an Executive and then because the Assembly has the authority --

Ms. TAYLOR: It's meant to be a Legislature.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: A Legislative and an Executive function.

Ms. TAYLOR: And they have different duties. They don't have the same duties.

Chair BERGSTROM: And, actually, in Falmouth, you have to get elected to go to Town Meeting, which is something -- that's kind of --

Ms. TAYLOR: (Inaudible) representative.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: That's what I'm saying. Where we're representative to the Assembly is like the representative to Town government. It used to be like that in Barnstable.

Chair BERGSTROM: It's been my observation that there is a lot of -- this is just off the top of my head -- is that there's a lot of ceremony that goes on and a lot of procedure that goes on as opposed

to the amount of work that actually gets done.

And, for instance, we go into the Assembly convenes. We go into different sessions. All of that's -- a lot of it has been inherited. A lot of what we -- has been inherited, you know, and it's gone on for years. So we can look at the structure of the government but we also look at how it functions.

I mean I think that we're going to have to look at the Commission -- a couple of topics right off the bat. We'll look at governance, the structure of governance. We have to look at the Cape Cod Commission. Paul Niedzwiecki is always saying that because they're enabling legislation says that we, as the elected representatives of the people, have to approve their changes in their regional policy plan and changes, you know, DCPCs, that's under the current structure. And they say the Assembly has to.

So if any changes in the Assembly that would impact their legislation and their governance and ours too. So that's an issue there.

And then, like I say, the relationship between the Executive and -- so there's three things right off the bat.

The other thing that was brought up by the Special Commission is that there's a lot of -- County government is almost a conglomerate of things. In other words, that has different underlying powers and authority, for instance. I was surprised. Everybody knows about CVEC and everybody knows -- not CVEC but Cape Light Compact and for instance and the Commission, but then there's a Wastewater Authority, and then there's the Workforce Investment Board, Mosquito Control. I mean all of them have different governing boards. All of them fall under the auspices of Barnstable County, and it was hard to get a handle as these people came in. I think there's a couple more too that I can't even remember as to what the relationship is, the governance structure of the actual County government of the Commissioners and the Assembly in relation to all these other -- there's 15 members of the County Wastewater Collaborative. Fifteen members all appointed by the towns; 15 members of the Cape Cod Commission; 15 members of something else -- there's something else there that Cape Light Compact so. That was an issue because it was hard for people -- when people think of Barnstable County, they think of this umbrella organization, but, in truth, it's a lot more complex than that.

And whether we want to look into that or not is another question. Because there's a lot in that. If we start out with that Special Commission on Governance there's a lot in there that we may not even want to deal with.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Or we can just bang it out and get it done in about six months and --

Chair BERGSTROM: It's not going to take us six months.

Ms. TAYLOR: We can do this. We really can do this. We have Michael to do any heavy lifting. We just have to decide what we would like.

Mr. CURRAN: That's right.

Chair BERGSTROM: So you think --

Ms. TAYLOR: I'm not saying we will be able to but it is doable in a shorter rather than a longer period. There are really pros and cons to any position, and we don't have to figure out the wording of how to say it. That's trickier.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, you know, the governance issue is going to be the biggest issue, so we could start out with that.

Ms. TAYLOR: I think we have to.

Chair BERGSTROM: But if you start out with that --

Mr. KNIGHT: It could take all the time.

Chair BERGSTROM: It could take -- in other words, it's an issue that's not going to go away. So it's going to be very difficult to move on from that because people are going to want to argue back and forth.

Ms. TAYLOR: But if you don't start with it, you'll do what happened with this which was they

didn't start with it, they left it to the end, and it was discussed fully.

Chair BERGSTROM: It wasn't discussed.

Ms. TAYLOR: It was never discussed.

Chair BERGSTROM: It was discussed like -- you know the Massachusetts State Legislature when they pass a Bill, "Everybody in favor, say "Aye. No. Passed." And then move on to the next one.

Ms. TAYLOR: We really have to do it the other way around, I think.

Chair BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And if it starts to get to be an amorphous, energy, life-sucking kind of situation that this is all it's going to be, and then we get very structured. We're meeting every week for two hours. We discipline ourselves to if you can't get it done in two hours this week, then you have to meet, you know, in two-hour sessions and --

Ms. TAYLOR: And if there's things that people don't agree on, then we can't recommend a change.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, I thought of it as sort of a third way which is kind of a cop-out, which is that we come up with options. In other words, we may come out of a meeting and say, "Okay. Some of us think we should go with six Commissioners and two at-large." And somebody else may come out and say, "No, no, I think we should cut out the Assembly."

In other words, we don't necessarily have to go and make a hard and fast judgment that day, but we could put two or three options on the table and then at the end make a final decision before we make the recommendation.

I mean I know that's sort of a cop-out, but in a way, if you move -- what I'm afraid of is I don't want to have issues bleed into each other. In other words, if we have a meeting on govern -- this is my personal opinion. You can do what you want. But if you have a meeting on governance and we say, "Okay. We're decided we're going to go this way." We may leave that alone until the end, but the public is not going to. In other words, it's going to be constantly debated and people will come before us.

Ms. TAYLOR: Tough. They can comment on it at the end.

Chair BERGSTROM: We should put the stuff out there. Yeah, put the stuff out there in draft form. This is where we think we might go. These are the options. And then just before we have the Public Hearing at the end and then we have another meeting and we make our final recommendations and we all run and hide.

Ms. CANEDY: The elephant in the room I think is the many, and you mentioned them, different subcategories, Cape Light Compact, CVEC.

Chair BERGSTROM: Workforce Investment Board, Wastewater Collaborative, Commission. I can't --

Ms. CANEDY: Some of them to me are not separated enough and some people that represent the towns and also the County, they're wearing too many hats.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. CANEDY: And everybody means well, and everybody's well intended, but there's -- it's created problems and there's the appearance of conflict, etcetera.

So I'd like to take that accusation off the table by clearly defining roles and positions and separating these entities.

And including talking about representatives from towns, and I know that my town is guilty of this. I don't think staff members should be representing the town. I think it should be people, you know, citizens.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. CANEDY: So giving people more independence and more separation.

Chair BERGSTROM: We, in Chatham, a few years ago, the new Town Manager came in and we had a practice where some town officials, for instance, the shellfish constable would be on the Conservation Commission or something like that, but he said no town official could be voting members on committees.

So that's an issue. It was actually brought up before the Assembly in a recent Ordinance which failed to pass. I think it was --

Ms. TAYLOR: But it's definitely an issue.

Chair BERGSTROM: It's definitely an issue. Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: And we need to talk about it. No question.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yep.

Chair BERGSTROM: And we got rid of the Mosquito Control. I think we finally schlepped him off to the state; did we Julia?

Ms. CANEDY: No, no, no.

Ms. TAYLOR: No.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: (Inaudible) so well.

Ms. TAYLOR: The mosquito people don't want to go to the state.

Ms. CANEDY: No, and I agree. They should be here.

Ms. TAYLOR: They want to come back here.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I agree.

Ms. TAYLOR: That's not entirely, however, within our power but we do fund it.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And, by the way, we've been pursuing that for some time.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And the holdback is not on the County's part --

Ms. TAYLOR: Right.

Commissioner DOHERTY: As much as it's on getting things straightened out with regard to the state letting certain pieces of it go.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Chair BERGSTROM: Oh, so they were with the state and they wanted to come to the County?

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, they're paid for by the towns.

Ms. CANEDY: It's a hybrid sort of situation.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: The hybrid is the issue.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- control and we would love -- they would now prefer to be with us.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: So we may not have to do anything except be open to that.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes, I think that's really what they want to be.

Ms. TAYLOR: And I think that's the case.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Because the functioning of each mosquito control group is different.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Just as the functioning of each County in the state where there are functions, different. They actually do a good job and are very functional on the Cape.

Ms. CANEDY: Right.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Unlike some of the other ones that have gotten bad press that made the state want to kind of take it over and run with an iron fist.

But now I think that they're beginning to see that there are pockets of Mosquito Control that do function well. And for us it's crucial. I mean any coastal community has to have a reasonable mosquito -- well, not even coastal.

Ms. CANEDY: And a little bit independent too because, for instance, there's statewide policy to spray for aerial spraying. We don't do that. We have very specific treatment.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Hands-on kind of stuff, yeah.

Ms. TAYLOR: So that won't be a controversial thing. It just may not be within our power to do.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, what do you think of Suzanne's suggestion then if we have, let's say, the 5th we -- I can have Janice send out the notice to all the Boards. This goes out to just about everybody anyway, but Boards of Selectmen, the press, and so on that we're going to have a Public Hearing on June 5 where the public is invited to comment on potential changes to Barnstable County Charter, so on and so forth. And then we schedule a meeting and we go right into governance; is that what you're saying?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And make sure that you say, "Comments can also be submitted in writing."

Ms. CANEDY: Writing.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So that people who can't make it on the 5th. And the other thing I think we should say is there will be future opportunities as the work progresses.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I don't want people to think that oh we snuck this in in one week and we're really trying to curtail all public comment. I want the people to understand that this is because we're anxious to get going.

Ms. TAYLOR: To start this way and then we'll continue again.

Chair BERGSTROM: There will be future opportunities for future public comment.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right. But please submit anything in writing if you can't attend a meeting.

Ms. CANEDY: And I think we should accept things in writing at any time.

Ms. TAYLOR: Any time, right.

Ms. CANEDY: And that they should be read at the beginning of every meeting.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Or summarized.

Ms. CANEDY: Or summarized, yes. Acknowledged.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah, I don't mind doing that, but we've had a bad experience with that. I once had public -- we had to go over it and we had a two-hour meeting on something, and it was supposed to be a work session, and the Clerk asked me, "Should we put public comment in there?" And I said, "Okay. Sure. Public comment." And fifty people showed up, each wanting to extend 10 minutes on public comment.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes, I'm talking written comments should be accepted at any time and then you could say, "I got an email from Joe Smith and it's -- he's concerned about mosquito control," something like that.

Commissioner DOHERTY: All right.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well we could do that, yeah.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I point out to you that remembering that meeting very well since I think I was chair of the Cape Light Compact which was there in force.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: If you are going to discuss these entities, the Workforce Board, which the County is the lead elected body that brings that nonprofit into play, fiscal agent is JTEC.

With regard to recently, there's been a move to consolidate housing authorities to make them

regional.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Something that you know that I've been supporting as long as it's a policy board that's elected in the town to consolidate the Administration. And we just lost our governor's representative, and we were told that whoever was appointed had to be in line with what the governor wanted as far as an outcome, which means that the whole housing authority moves off-Cape. So that's another thing.

Chair BERGSTROM: That was met with a great deal of opposition, I think, local officials.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well, we don't know where that's going to turn out. That's all part of what we're supposed to be looking at in terms of if you're looking at entities that might be things you want to address as far as consolidation.

We have a Housing Consortium that is in the Cape Cod Commission only because they had administrative support when it was formed. The idea is that that should go over the human service department because it seems to be more in-line and the Commission's looking at that.

With regard to the Cape Light Compact, if, indeed, you intend to discuss it, then you know that you will get some response from the Cape Light Compact.

And as far as CVEC goes, you'll get some response. I completely agree with Ann about the elected official piece because we had a wonderful town counselor that was -- Audrey?

Ms. CANEDY: I don't know.

Commissioner DOHERTY: She was a representative of the Cape Light Compact for many, many years. I mean she was an elected official and also represented her town very well.

Since that time, David Anthony does a great job and so did Mark Ells, I think, for a while. And Mark Ells, of course, is on the RTA along with a lot of other employees that were on the RTA. But the RTA's recommendation in there is one of where there's some interest of that Commission to consolidate it into the County. I don't think it will work.

Chair BERGSTROM: No, it's not. It's a separate piece of legislation. We'd have to change two things.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So to get back to running the -- if you have 50 people in the room for whatever the reason is, then you just take your time and you say, "All right. We have two minutes or three minutes per person and that's that."

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, see, I don't mind doing that in a meeting set up for public comment.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Chair BERGSTROM: This wasn't really set up for public comment. I thought somebody would get up at the end of the meeting and say --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I remember that.

Chair BERGSTROM: -- you know, and it wasn't so.

Ms. TAYLOR: Written comment is always welcome. We will all get a copy of any written comment.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes, okay.

Ms. TAYLOR: And those that seem worth pursuing, we will pursue.

Chair BERGSTROM: I'm still looking at an initial Public Hearing and one at the end of the process when we come out with recommendations.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And if we decide the governance in the beginning and then we want to go into some of these quasi-County agencies, that might be -- there may be enough that we need to have another Public Hearing at that time too.

Ms. TAYLOR: You can always do that.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So I would just say a Public Hearing to start and then we will, as needed.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah, I'm not looking -- see, the public -- all these satellite agencies are in the recommendations of the Special Commission on County Government.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Okay.

Chair BERGSTROM: I'm not looking to go necessarily go one by one. I'm just looking to define -- if we're going to define governance, we have to understand what we're governing. And we're sort of governing some of this stuff and we're sort of not.

You know, the relation is very complex now. We could leave it the way it is, but it's possible that in changing -- if we do change the governance, it's going to change the relationship between the County and these other agencies.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Chair BERGSTROM: As far as an appointing authority and so on like that, I'm not looking to go one by one. I'm just going to get a general sense of whether Barnstable County wants to consolidate authority --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Chair BERGSTROM: A centralized authority or whether we want to basically delegate the various components of the County to these different agencies which have different governing boards. Each one of these agencies has different --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Chair BERGSTROM: The Commission has a different governing board. The Wastewater Authority has a different -- you know, and that gets -- I mean it hasn't been a serious problem. We've had some controversy with CLC, but, basically, until I sat on that committee, I didn't realize that there was a Workforce Investment -- I didn't realize I had a relationship, a financial relationship to the County. You know, I didn't realize that a lot of this -- I just want to --

Commissioner DOHERTY: I want to make one other mention that the first thing that they teach you when you go to business school is it's always a good idea to investigate doing nothing, okay, you know, that you should look at that as an alternative.

Chair BERGSTROM: I'm genetically predisposed to that, Bill.

Ms. TAYLOR: And I believe that the majority of Charter Commission since the original Charter was written has been along those lines.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: So I think that's a very possible outcome.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And it shouldn't be dismissed, because there's also the thing that's looming --

Ms. TAYLOR: I'm not dismissing it.

Commissioner DOHERTY: That the legislature has essentially said if there's not an agreement --

Chair BERGSTROM: Right.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: -- and I think Mr. Curran can verify that that if there's not an agreement, there will be no support.

Ms. TAYLOR: It's not going to happen.

Chair BERGSTROM: Representative Peake told me the same thing. It would have to be pretty much -- on a Home Rule petition, you'd have to have a pretty good majority behind you, and you know something like that.

So, I think we are starting to understand a little bit. We'll have a Public Hearing session, whatever you want to call it on the 5th. Everyone will be invited. We'll send out notices to the press

and also to the various Boards of Selectmen and public officials.

**Professional/Technical Assistance**

Ms. TAYLOR: And it is the plan to have everything videotaped?

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And because it's an Assembly meeting, are you going to have a light agenda, maybe start the Public Hearing at five or something?

Chair BERGSTROM: I've already looked into our agenda. Right now, I mean the Agenda has to go out Friday. Right now we have nothing on it except the -- is it the auditor?

Clerk O'CONNELL: It's a Committee Report from Finance.

Chair BERGSTROM: On the auditor.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Just a Committee report. There are no votes.

Chair BERGSTROM: So, no, it's a summary. Once we go through the budget process in the summer, things get pretty -- unless the Commissioners hit us with some involved Ordinance and they would have had to submit it at the last meeting anyway. Did they submit -- they submitted an Ordinance?

Clerk O'CONNELL: They did, but there will be a Public Hearing on June 5.

Chair BERGSTROM: Before the 5th, okay.

Clerk O'CONNELL: But you will not be voting on anything at that Assembly meeting.

Chair BERGSTROM: So, yeah, we've got a light agenda. We could probably start at five.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I have to take some responsibility. I was given a copy of that Resolution at the Commission's past -- and I had it in my bag to deliver on the meeting that bombed out.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes. Okay.

Commissioner DOHERTY: However, and I thought I put it in my packet but I did not. I will have that for you. I'll have it sent to all of you.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Could we also have a copy of what the Commissioners have voted for Mr. Curran to do?

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Chair BERGSTROM: The scope of services, yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, the scope of services. We, you know, we know what it is that the Commissioners objectives are.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, the Commissioners have kept us in suspense now for over a year on whether they like that. So, apparently, we're going to be kept in suspense for a while because I have no idea what's in this recommendation you made.

But another thing is is they hired a consultant to look into this and do -- basically, we did a work session a month ago or so and we haven't got that either so.

Ms. CANEDY: Well, I think we need both of those things.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. CANEDY: Any opinion or position of County Commissioners --

Chair BERGSTROM: You can email them to us, Bill.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Okay. Let me make sure that I --

Ms. CANEDY: -- is needed to make this complete, I think.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Let me use the short pencil rather than the long memory.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Otherwise, we'll just sit in our own little bubble and then find out what everybody really wanted.

Ms. O'CONNELL: Ron, can I have some clarification?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Okay. So what I owe you is the Resolution that we passed on our position.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And scope of services for Mr. Curran.

Mr. KNIGHT: For me, the clarity is Bill would send it to whomever the Clerk is and they would send it to us?

Chair BERGSTROM: That's how it works.

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: I just want to make sure.

Chair BERGSTROM: Everything goes through the County email. That way we can't be accused of serial emails.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well, we haven't talked at all about our secret in-closet meetings, you know, that we always get accused of having.

Ms. CANEDY: Don't even suggest it.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Well, I'm going to say upfront that this group is only going to be doing its business in the public. There will be no private communications, no private meetings. We are at the table and on camera and that's that.

Ms. CANEDY: Okay. Now let me clarify something.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Not that this group needs to hear that but I think the public needs to understand that there's no agenda here. Everybody is here doing their business in public.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes, and I can attest that we've received nothing other than administrative instructions.

But I occasionally do get -- occasionally, every day, I get email about some aspect of what we're doing. So, do you feel that I should bring those here too?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I think we get that too.

Ms. CANEDY: So those are all -- everybody gets the same one?

Chair BERGSTROM: Everybody gets the same one.

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: Well, my whole thing is there is the process where someone individually sends things.

Ms. CANEDY: Responds?

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: No, individually sends things. And then there's the process where we get things through the Clerk who's really the one that's giving up the information.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: That's what I'm saying. That's the point I'm making. My point is as far as the committee goes and as far as I'm good, what I receive officially is through the Clerk.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: Anything that comes from individuals outside is not, to me, official part of the duties here. My duties all come from this point here.

Ms. CANEDY: So you're -- those emails that come to us separately probably the person that sends them should be instructed to go through the Clerk rather than --

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: Well they're probably sending it already.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: They may already be going to the Clerk and the Clerk is already passing them on.

Ms. CANEDY: No, I'm getting these directly.

Mr. KNIGHT: No, they're direct. I get them all the time.

Chair BERGSTROM: And I'm getting some direct too. What happens is that right now we set up a County -- so if you email Bill or myself or Julia or Suzanne, we have a County email account. Everything goes through it.

Ms. CANEDY: Well, obviously, I don't.

Chair BERGSTROM: And previous to that, we used our own personal email, but unfortunately we didn't set anything up for you guys that way. But you still can receive it from the Clerk to your personal email accounts.

I would be very reluctant. I mean it's my policy not to respond to people because if I respond to them, then they respond back to me. Next thing you know I'm discussing a public issue via email. And it gets awkward.

So I'd rather say and encourage people saying please make it apparent that anybody that wants to contact a committee can do so through the County. It will be disseminated to the members, and all information and all recommendations and comments will be available to the members.

Ms. CANEDY: Since I don't have a County email, I'll say publicly that any email that I get in regards to this matter, the first email I'll send back a request to go through the Clerk. And after that, I won't be responding personally.

Chair BERGSTROM: Okay.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I would suggest to you that since we've encouraged the public to submit written comments.....

Ms. CANEDY: I've gotten more than one individual that writes me. I'm very popular.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, you're on the Barnstable Town Council -- you have quite a group of people who write you.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes. Very popular.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I would suggest that all those who find us of interest to contact that we say that now that we're convened as a committee that if they have something to say --

Ms. TAYLOR: On this topic.

Commissioner DOHERTY: -- on this topic that they be told that if they're sending it to us personally, we will not take responsibility for sharing it with the committee.

If they want the committee to know about it, submit it to the Clerk with that clearly stated purpose of disseminating it for -- as testimony.

If we do not do that, then we will continue to get what I'd call whole mailboxes full of stuff.

Ms. CANEDY: Well, why don't we share the Clerk's email publicly right now.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes. What is it? Is the Assembly --

Clerk O'CONNELL: There are two emails that I can get email from for the County, and that's AofD@BarnstableCounty.org or my own email address would be JOConnell, two n's and two l's, @BarnstableCounty.org. And I can get email both ways.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And they're both available if you go to the Barnstable County website. Go to the website and you can contact Janice through that.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Can I have a point of clarification on the notice that you want to go out, the Public Hearing notice.

Chair BERGSTROM: Right.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Specifically, the language pertaining to you can fax us information and you can mail it, that's standard part of the notice. But I want to make sure that what we're communicating to the public is, in fact, exactly what you want communicated.

And do I understand your consensus to be that you want to accept public comment on potential changes to the County Charter or County government and is that it? Is that the crux of it?

Without making any other specific reference to any recommendations from a Special Commission, just that phrase?

Ms. CANEDY: Oral public comment on June 5, and then subsequently any written comment at any other time.

Ms. O'CONNELL: That will be part, and I can also incorporate the phrase that there will be future opportunities to make comment, but very important that the public understands what the Public Hearing is for.

So that is to accept comments and/or suggestions on potential changes. I guess it would be to accept comments on potential changes to County -- to the County Charter or County government?

Ms. TAYLOR: No, the Charter.

Ms. CANEDY: The Charter.

Clerk O'CONNELL: The County Charter.

Mr. CURRAN: County governance.

Clerk O'CONNELL: And that's it.

Ms. TAYLOR: Because that could be, you know, let's add this, this and that. It's the Charter.

Clerk O'CONNELL: You see how it can make a difference.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Chair BERGSTROM: If you say "proposed changes," then people are going to presume that we have changes on the table.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right. No.

Chair BERGSTROM: So I guess the potential would be --

Ms. TAYLOR: Comments on any possible changes to the County Charter.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Oh, I have potential. You want potential or possible?

Chair BERGSTROM: Possible.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Possible.

Mr. CURRAN: Not everything potential is possible.

Ms. O'CONNELL: I'm glad I asked.

Chair BERGSTROM: You know this brings up a question, Mike. Are we getting any grief from the Secretary of State? I mean we're presuming we can pretty much do whatever we want, but, for instance, one of the recommendations they wanted to split up the Assembly of Delegates and make fewer, you know. We were designing, you know, little districts.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Chair BERGSTROM: And I'm saying, well, you know, he's not going to make up 50,000 ballots, so we're going to have to -- Do they have to practically say they'll do it or won't do it?

Mr. CURRAN: Not really. I don't think so, initially anyway. If you decided you're going to have Delegates elected by district, rather than a whole municipality as it is now, the Secretary of State's going to make a ballot with those just as you have to do for the state representatives that are now on the ballot. Its extra work for them, but if it's in the legislation -- if the legislation calls for it, then you're going to have it.

Chair BERGSTROM: Okay.

Mr. CURRAN: I never had occasion to deal with the Secretary of State's office on that issue.

Ms. TAYLOR: Wouldn't look good to go against --

Mr. CURRAN: Please?

Ms. TAYLOR: It wouldn't look good.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, we were thinking, you know, I was thinking precinct -- we're thinking of towns, but if you split it up, you're thinking now in precincts. I mean you're not going to have a ballot for this street and another one for that street.

Ms. TAYLOR: No, no. Its precincts.

Chair BERGSTROM: You have to do some kind of manipulation.

Ms. CANEDY: Towns; aren't they?

Chair BERGSTROM: It's an issue so.

### Start/End Dates

Clerk O'CONNELL: The other point of clarification I wanted to ask was with regards to your future meeting schedule. I don't know if you have definitely settled on with maybe some exceptions or some additional meetings that you may have to -- you know, with a committee, you have to give 48 hours notice.

And I think there's recognition here that with this type of a committee you want to give as much notice as possible. And that's why tomorrow I'm going to put this notice out immediately.

Chair BERGSTROM: Right.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Even though technically I've got until Monday to do that. You want to give everyone the opportunity to attend.

But some that may also be the case with future meetings that you may schedule. So was it your intent to tentatively follow a track, the Assembly's meeting schedule and have meetings after the Assembly meeting, because I'm going to get people who are going to ask.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Tentatively, that's the plan.

Ms. TAYLOR: Tentatively, yes.

Ms. O'CONNELL: Which you may have some exceptions to it.

Ms. TAYLOR: These are scheduled and others may be added.

Chair BERGSTROM: Right. So if we went from now until October, let's say, mid-October, that's 10 meetings. Let me see, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. We should be able to -- 10 meetings we should be able to do it.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Because I'm probably going to put something on the website for the Charter Review Commission page that's going to say, "Here are the tentative meeting dates." I'll just put a tentative starting time at 5:30 but I'll preface it with subject to change until that agenda comes out.

Chair BERGSTROM: All right. Because there should be a time.

Ms. O'CONNELL: And others could be added. I guess the only thing I would also call your attention to -- I know that you're looking at the calendar that was given to you earlier at the meeting.

I think Bill made note that there was one meeting he could not attend. If ever you're not able to attend a meeting, if you'll let me know, that's great.

Ms. TAYLOR: I'm not going to be here on the 5th, the 19th, and the 3rd. I will submit some written remarks.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Okay. And, again, even on the 3rd --

Chair BERGSTROM: That's an issue too.

Clerk O'CONNELL: -- any meeting that you may not want to schedule only because it's on the eve of a pretty big holiday.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: The 3rd I'm not available.

Ms. TAYLOR: You may want to cancel that anyway.

Clerk O'CONNELL: You may want to scratch that because of some possible --

Chair BERGSTROM: That might be a good idea because I think we could do it in nine meetings, considering that we're going to have let's say --

Clerk O'CONNELL: You may have more.

Chair BERGSTROM: If we aimed at the 16th for a final meeting, we could have another public session hearing on the 2nd.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Well, we also have October 30. That's open as well.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right. And we could always add September 25, October 9.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yeah, so why don't we --

Ms. O'CONNELL: So this is just potential, but it's good that I can put a list.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Tentatively.

Clerk O'CONNELL: People will know and be able to do a little planning, but I always call the attention to the fact that you need to come back to the website and look the Friday before any meeting to get a definitive agenda, time, and topic. But it gives them a heads-up as to when you might be meeting. And I won't include July 3.

### Next Meeting

Ms. CANEDY: Could we do a press release to -- in view of the fact that the public comment period is so close? Do a press release today or tomorrow?

Ms. O'CONNELL: Well, we have press here tonight, at least one that I see.

Chair BERGSTROM: You have them on your list; right?

Ms. O'CONNELL: Yes. I believe so.

Ms. CANEDY: I think its like -- I think the Register has a deadline on --

Chair BERGSTROM: Today.

Ms. CANEDY: No, yesterday. Tuesday or Wednesday.

Clerk O'CONNELL: I have a list of media who have contacted me and I have them on my email list. So when this notice goes out, they're getting it; Selectmen, Town Managers, Town Clerks.

Chair BERGSTROM: The Patriot I think is Wednesday; isn't it?

Clerk O'CONNELL: I think it is.

Ms. CANEDY: But they don't go to press -- they don't put it to bed until the end of Thursday.

Clerk O'CONNELL: It will be posted. It will be on the website. I don't know what else --

Ms. TAYLOR: That's the best we can do.

Ms. CANEDY: I see Patriot here anyway.

Chair BERGSTROM: Oh, okay.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And the Register is already --

Ms. CANEDY: Out today.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: -- yeah, done for tomorrow. It's already put to bed for this week. So, they're not going to be able to post it so we'll have to get, you know, count on the Cape Cod Times and Patriot.

Ms. CANEDY: It will be out on their next meeting next Wednesday.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, but it won't be for the public comment.

Ms. CANEDY: June 5 is their next publication.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, but it doesn't get to homes until Thursday even though it's available on Wednesday.

Ms. CANEDY: Oh, I see. I see what you're saying.

MALE VOICE: Through you, Mr. Chairman. There had been talk about 5 o'clock or the 5th as part of the public sessions versus 5:30. Are you nailed down on one time or the other?

Clerk O'CONNELL: I think it was 5 o'clock.

Chair BERGSTROM: We're going to do an early one this coming meeting. Okay. Moving on.

Ms. CANEDY: Now what should we be prepared to come and talk about next time? Just listen? Come prepared to be listening?

Chair BERGSTROM: Come and listen, yeah.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I also think that we should each -- anybody who has their own list to -- if you -- some people may have lists and some people may not.

Ms. TAYLOR: And I apologize for being away, but this is a time I'm always away. I can't help it.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So, we're going to go to Greece with you and work there.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yeah. Yeah. I'll be sitting there at the taverna, you know, trying to get the Wi-Fi, but I'll write up some stuff. I have millions of thoughts.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And, ironically, are we streaming?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Okay. Ironically, you could probably do that.

Ms. TAYLOR: I probably can.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: You'll probably get better reception in Greece.

Chair BERGSTROM: I would like to get as much as I can out of this meeting. If the public doesn't beat down the doors on the 5th, I mean, and then we're going to have --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Then why don't we for homework we have read the Special Commission on County Governance recommendations, and if there aren't a lot of people here, we'll start a discussion on that.

Chair BERGSTROM: Okay. That's a general enough topic that we can cover.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Which is something I'm suggesting that we have the burning issues and the things that --

Ms. TAYLOR: Yeah.

Chair BERGSTROM: So, that's just saying we will put that on there as a tentative topic. If we don't get to it -- if there are 50 people and they all want to speak, then we'll just push it off to the next meeting. But I don't want to have it 5:30 and we --

Ms. O'CONNELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to plan on doing the public meeting notice and the Committee meeting notice together and post them on the same day at the same time.

Chair BERGSTROM: Right.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Because that's the practice I'm using now is I'm publishing a public hearing notice and then also a committee meeting notice because the committee meets and listens to the testimony and sometimes after that makes a recommendation or conclusion.

So you really have to notice a meeting notice. In my opinion, in conjunction with that.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, I'll leave that up to you. In case there's trouble, we'll blame you.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Okay. But that will be a tentative agenda item. I don't know --

Chair BERGSTROM: So the public will be warned that we may just go directly to --

Clerk O'CONNELL: If it doesn't happen, it doesn't happen, but better off to have it out there just in case it does versus not.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Silence is consent.

Ms. CANEDY: Can we have the Assembly of Delegates Resolutions and the County Commissioners' opinions or recommendations whatever before --

Commissioner DOHERTY: Okay. I've already sent a note to Mark asking him to send the --

Chair BERGSTROM: You should have done that already.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And the scope of services.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Those two things. Yes, I requested those.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Okay. I just want to make sure I understand what it is you want and what you're going to need. The scope of services pertains to the --

Ms. TAYLOR: The contract.

Clerk O'CONNELL: -- what the consultant is doing?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No, Mr. Curran. He had a specific list of things.

Clerk O'CONNELL: And the Resolution?

Commissioner DOHERTY: The Resolution with regard to the vote that the County Commissioners took to give a position with regard to the number of Commissioners.

Clerk O'CONNELL: And that's the one that you will physically bring to --

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well, unfortunately, I had it in my bag for the other meeting that was bombed out, as I said.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Okay. So if I get it electronically --

Commissioner DOHERTY: I had asked Mark to send it to you electronically for distribution to the Committee in accordance to what we've already agreed to as far as distribution.

Clerk O'CONNELL: And someone else asked with regards to --

Chair BERGSTROM: There's also we have -- the Assembly has an Ordinance or Resolution --

Ms. CANEDY: Resolution.

Chair BERGSTROM: -- regarding their --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: We took a vote.

Chair BERGSTROM: -- change. Yes.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Well, there were a couple of them and I want to make sure that I get the right one.

Chair BERGSTROM: This was the one recommending I think there was a recommendation to go to 5 Commissioners, all elected by district.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Got it. And the last item was someone made reference to is it the -- is there a scope of services for a strategic plan or something somebody made reference to?

Chair BERGSTROM: Carole Ridley was hired by the Commissioners, I think, Bill?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Carole Ridley was hired by the Commission to act as a facilitator to help us complete the strategic planning process. And that is ongoing and underway actually.

Chair BERGSTROM: Do we have the MMA Report in here?

Clerk O'CONNELL: It's in the packets.

Chair BERGSTROM: That's what I thought.

Clerk O'CONNELL: So is that something that --

Chair BERGSTROM: We don't have it, I don't think.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well, as a practical matter, since the strategic plan process is not complete, I don't think it's useful or appropriate to see this work in progress.

However, when it is complete, it will be a public document and will be available to all.

Ms. CANEDY: Point of -- I got this communication, and that seems to be a number of Resolutions; Resolution 13-01, Resolution 12-04.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, I don't know the numbers. There was a Resolution concerning County employees serving on the governing board of any agency in which Barnstable County is the fiscal agent.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And that did not pass.

Ms. CANEDY: Okay. County structure.

Chair BERGSTROM: And then the structure --

Ms. CANEDY: Dual representation of County employees?

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: That's the one that didn't pass. It doesn't indicate that.

Ms. CANEDY: White page. I don't know what that one is.

Ms. TAYLOR: It will all come up. Not to worry.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Believe me, it's on our list.

Ms. CANEDY: I just want to make sure everybody has the same material.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: But when we submit our lists, then it will be part of that.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, that goes to another point which is that as Suzanne brought up, we have to determine exactly who's going to be governing the County because in the existing Charter it talks about the powers of the Assembly, expression of policies, opinions, and so on and so forth, and all the powers that we have to alter or abolish any department of County government and stuff which gives the Assembly at least in some aspects a great deal of power over the Executive branches.

Bill was talking about at the beginning there's language in there even though normally you would say, well, Executive and the Legislative Branch would be separated. There's language in the existing Charter. It says, "Establish, alter, abolish any department, office, or agency is the power of the Assembly. And make appropriations, grant, renew a franchise, regulate any charge for any services, authorize the borrowing of money." You know, we're acting as -- so, we're going to have to go down that list, I think, at some point and decide.

Commissioner DOHERTY: That's why I think that Attorney Curran could be very helpful with.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: It also depends on what we do with the Assembly.

Chair BERGSTROM: Right. That's what I mean. Where are those powers going to go?

Ms. CANEDY: Didn't you also mention that the Commissioners have already carried out some of the recommendations of the Special Commission. I'm sorry, but I'm like probably the only one here that's not a County person, and I don't know which one (Inaudible).

Chair BERGSTROM: They've been somewhat reticent to share that information with us. But Bill's here so that he can --

Commissioner DOHERTY: Okay. Well, right now, we're in the process of examining what we would do both in the short and long-term with regard to hiring a County executive.

Chair BERGSTROM: Right. That we know.

Commissioner DOHERTY: The issue before the Commissioners is that since this Charter Review process is ongoing, it would be difficult to hire a permanent employee, you know, FTE, so that the discussion that the Commissioners have been having is the usefulness of hiring someone for a year, let's say, under contract without the ability to apply for the job afterwards that would be responsible for providing management skills during the period of time of transition.

That's what we've been discussing. Because as Suzanne says, if we decide what the governance is, that might, indeed, change the kind of person that we're looking for.

So, we're looking, in my opinion, I think that -- I don't know -- I don't think I'm speaking for all three Commissioners, but in my opinion we're looking for management -- let's see, management expertise for the short-term. And then at the end of the process, we would be looking for leadership, vision, and management skills in order to fill the permanent role.

Chair BERGSTROM: But for people who are not familiar with County government, for a long time the Charter speaks of an Administrator and a Treasurer. And for many years that position has been held -- both of those positions have been held by one person.

So, apparently, the Commissioners, with certainly the support of the Assembly, although it's not totally our decision, I've decided to once again split that job. Am I right about that?

Ms. CANEDY: Why would you do that when this process is so uncertain?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Because the Assembly passed a Resolution --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Partially because the Special Commission recommendations were just lying around doing nothing.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes. Also --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And I think literally doing nothing.

Ms. TAYLOR: Everybody thought it was a good idea to go back, partly because we wanted a

full-time finance person and partly because we wanted eventually more leadership blah, blah, blah.

But, in the meantime, that's why the Commissioners are not saying, "Okay. Here are the new powers we're definitely delegating." They are just suggesting in the end that may be happening but we're having this interim.

Ms. CANEDY: It still seems to me, excuse me for being naïve or whatever or uninformed, it still seems to me sort of an exercise in futility if you don't know how this County's going to be -- end up being governed why you would go down the route at all about looking --

Ms. TAYLOR: Because we're talking about several years before there'd be any real change from this process anyway.

Ms. CANEDY: But pretty soon you would know whether that person that you want to hire is temporary or permanent for several years?

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I don't think we will.

Chair BERGSTROM: There's going to be a County Administrator no matter what comes out of this process.

And I think when we looked at it in the Special Commission. The first thing we urged is that the Administrator takes on more day-to-day management and hiring responsibility.

So then the dominos started to fall. Now you have this one person who's both Administrator and Treasurer, but, fortunately for him, the Commissioners have been acting more in an administrative capacity signing a lot of documents, hiring minor --

So now that you've passed that responsibility on, you sort of bump the role of Treasurer off. In other words, you've established now a real Administrator who deals day-to-day directly with the Department heads and so on and now you've got a Treasurer.

And, also, I'm coming out of town -- I'm not familiar -- County government is a whole different ball of wax. Bill probably knows more about it than I do. But I mean in town government, the finance people have a state responsibility. In other words, their responsibility is not just to the town but they have responsibilities directly to the state. And they almost act as a sort of hedge against the -- in a way --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Check and balance.

Chair BERGSTROM: Check and balance against the Administrator.

Ms. TAYLOR: And, of course, our Finance Director's handling not just the 25 million of County government, but also millions more in some of these other --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: All these other quasi-County agencies.

Ms. CANEDY: I could see why he's going to be separated.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Only in the Cape and Vineyard Co-op. The other is handled directly by the Cape Light Compact. He is not responsible. He does not handle the money in Cape Light Compact. It is a misconception that needs to be --

Ms. TAYLOR: At any rate --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: There wasn't enough time being spent on either job.

So --

Ms. CANEDY: So Mr. Zielinski's going to be the Treasurer of this whole --

Ms. TAYLOR: The finance director.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I think that Julia and I go back to the time when I was on the Assembly and I was very concerned about the lack of check and balance with the separation of it. I brought it up for the four years that I was on the Assembly. And I would put this at the feet of the same person recommended to be separated was the one who instigated its consolidation and that was Rob O'Leary.

Ms. TAYLOR: But it was always meant as a financial savings, not as an administrative

advance.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, I guess at this point, do we want to go into -- the only other thing we could do, I guess, according to our agenda is go into -- plan out specific topics and specific days or do you want to go through these next couple meetings first and see where we go from there?

Mr. KNIGHT: I think the next meeting first.

Ms. TAYLOR: Our list that we make and the public's input list. Then we set our list.

Chair BERGSTROM: All right.

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: But I think some of that can be done at the next meeting possibly.

Ms. TAYLOR: Definitely. It could be at the end.

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yeah. So I'll send my list and I'll send some thoughts on governance.

Chair BERGSTROM: All right. So why don't we include in the Committee notice governance and potential future topics, just so that if we go onto planning out the meetings, just to cover us in case somebody complains that we didn't give them the heads up on that?

Commissioner DOHERTY: One other thing. You know, Attorney Curran has mentioned that he is expecting to respond to requests from us as far as what needs we have.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I would suggest that he at least look again to see if there are things that are possible issues that you think might -- wouldn't hurt to re-discuss if there could be --

Mr. CURRAN: Yeah, that was one of the charges that I had in the scope of services that was sent to me. I never heard -- I was as much in the dark as you are about my role.

I received the scope of services. I sent back essentially a response to the scope of services, and I never heard anything. I got a call from Mark saying could I come to a meeting on the 15th.

So I came expecting that I was going to hear then what my role is going to be, if they had accepted the proposal I sent back and what action had been taken.

So I either called him or sent him an email after the meeting and nothing happened. And he said, all due respect, that Commissioner Doherty had had a copy of the vote and I should have seen it at the meeting but we didn't have the meeting. But he didn't send me a copy of whatever it was they voted so.

Ms. TAYLOR: I wouldn't worry about it.

Chair BERGSTROM: Now you know why we're thinking about a change in governance.

Ms. TAYLOR: I would just think in terms if there's something that you want to comment on --

Mr. CURRAN: Yeah.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- we're not going to say, oh, great, let's do it. We'll just say, okay. That's worth considering and we'll think about it.

Chair BERGSTROM: See, I'm looking at --

Ms. TAYLOR: You make your list the same way we make our list.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Because we know we're going to need help with language.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yeah, but that's a little bit down the road.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Down the road.

Chair BERGSTROM: So, in other words, to make our job easier, I would take a minimalist approach to it. In other words, if we don't need -- my feeling is, for instance, the budget process. I mean somebody's going to come up and we're going to talk about how many Commissioners we have, and somebody else might get up and talk about maybe we should change the budget process from April till May.

If we could put that in the Manual of Governance, we won't have to deal with it in our eight meetings. So, I'm looking at a minimalist approach saying these are definitely the things we're going to have to put in the Charter.

And I feel, personally, that I'm not going to encumber future generations of County officials with a lot of detail. That's my personal opinion. I'm not going to say, hey, you guys, 20 years from now you're going to have to submit the budget by June or something. I would rather have some faith that they're going to do it properly and just put in the Charter --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: However, you may find people at the table have had experience without that in writing.

Ms. CANEDY: Right.

Chair BERGSTROM: I understand. Well, I just used that as one example. I just used that as one example. Even though it's in the Charter doesn't necessarily mean it's getting paid attention to.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And, indeed, it's been a thing (Inaudible) as far as budget submission. When I was in the dreaded private sector and responsible for creating budgets for let's say an organization that the more information you have of where you were help you design a budget for where you wanted to go.

If you did it too far -- when I was on the Assembly, we were using figures that were at least two years old to come up with a budget and making comparisons ignoring what had happened in between time.

So that was one of the reforms that I think that happened when I was on the Assembly.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, I know in this world, everybody works right up to deadlines. So if you put a deadline in there, you can be sure you're going to get it the day before. That's the issue.

#### **Nomination of Vice-Chair**

Ms. O'CONNELL: Ron, are you going to give any consideration to electing a Vice Chair?

Chair BERGSTROM: Oh, you know, I'm glad you brought that up in case I get hit by a bus or something.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Is this a short-straw thing?

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, it would be for a practical matter, we probably do need a Vice Chair because if I can't make it for one reason or another, somebody has to run the meeting.

Ms. CANEDY: I nominate Suzanne McAuliffe.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I second it, although it doesn't need a second for a nomination.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I was going to nominate Julia.

Ms. TAYLOR: Oh, but I'm away.

Chair BERGSTROM: Unfortunately, after there's a nomination and a second, I have to take the vote.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yeah. All in favor?

Chair BERGSTROM: All those in favor?

Chair BERGSTROM: Okay. Opposed?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: All right. And I'm here too.

Chair BERGSTROM: Yes. All right.

Ms. TAYLOR: We could have done it behind your back but you're here.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I know.

Chair BERGSTROM: All right. Well, I guess we're all set for the next meeting. We've done pretty well here. It's only been an hour and a half.

If there's anybody else that wants to bring anything up?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: The next meeting is the 5th for --

Ms. TAYLOR: Public Hearing.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Okay.

Chair BERGSTROM: Well, how about a motion to adjourn?

MR. AUSTIN KNIGHT: So moved.  
Ms. MCAULIFFE: Second.

**Whereupon, it was moved, seconded, and voted to adjourn the Charter Review Committee at 6:30 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by:

Janice O’Connell, Clerk  
Assembly of Delegates