

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT
CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE**

APPROVED Minutes of January 8, 2014

Call to Order:

Chairman BERGSTROM: Good afternoon. Welcome to the Wednesday, January 8th meeting of the Charter Review Committee of the Cape Cod Regional Government Assembly of Delegates.

I'd like to call this meeting to order.

Attendance:

Chairman BERGSTROM: We have a quorum, four out of seven members. [Present: Ronald Bergstrom, Ann Canedy (arrived at 4:15 p.m.), Bill Doherty, Linell Grundman, Suzanne McAuliffe (arrived at 4:25 p.m.), and Julia Taylor. Absent: Austin Knight].

Meeting Minutes of 10-30-13 and 11-13-13 for Approval:

Chairman BERGSTROM: The first order of business will be to approve the minutes of October 30, 2013. You should have received a copy of the minutes, all of you. Do you have any additions or corrections to the minutes?

Ms. O'CONNELL: Mr. Chair.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Ann does.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Ann isn't here but she did submit a couple of changes that she wanted to make.

A change on October 30th on page 6 should read "have asserted," and on page 8, it should read "the option that is." So those changes --

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. I'll move those changes. Do I have a second on that?

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Second.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Oh, I'm sorry. There's one on page 9 too. It should say, "we have villages." So there were three.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. I move those three changes.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Second.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Moved and seconded. All those in favor of those changes, say "Aye."

Okay. Now I'm going to -- because I'm a stickler for procedure, I'm now going to take a vote on the approval of those minutes now that they've been amended.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I move that we approve the minutes of October 30th.

Ms. TAYLOR: Second.

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

Ms. O'CONNELL: I think Mr. Doherty was present at the October 30th meeting. And he has also recalled that there is a change to made in the minutes that should say, "The Battle for Hearts and Minds," Bill?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yes. It's down at the bottom (page 4).

Commissioner DOHERTY: That's a scribner's error. That's okay.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes, we'll leave that just in there just in case anybody --

Ms. TAYLOR: You can change it.

(Motion passed.)

Chairman BERGSTROM: All right. So now we move onto the minutes of November 13, 2013. You should have received a copy of those. Does anybody have any changes for the minutes?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Yes. Ann Canedy submitted two.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. Let's have them.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Page 11 should read "about the meetings," and page 13 a change, "gee, you are being remiss." So those two changes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: I'll move those changes. Do I have a second on that?

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Second.

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

Commissioner DOHERTY: Abstained.

(Motion passed.)

Chairman BERGSTROM: I don't know if we've got enough to do that but -- Well, why don't we -- I guess technically we're going to have to put off -- you weren't at that meeting, Bill?

Commissioner DOHERTY: No, November I was not.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. We're going to have to put off approval of those minutes until later in the meeting if we get another member because we don't have a quorum.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Actually, a point of information.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: You don't have to do that. You have a quorum, and the people that rep -- you can vote on that to approve because you do have a quorum. It doesn't mean that everybody that was at that meeting has to vote for it.

Clerk O'CONNELL: You've got a majority of what's present today.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. Okay.

Ms. O'CONNELL: So three out of four are --

Chairman BERGSTROM: I don't get it, but if I get arrested, you'll have to bail me out.

So all those in favor of approving those minutes with those changes, say "Aye."
"Opposed?"

Commissioner DOHERTY: Abstained.

(Motion passed.)

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. We've dealt with that.

Other Business:

Chairman BERGSTROM: Regarding a draft petition for consideration by Assembly. I'm going to ask Mike to give us an explanation as to -- he's been doing all the grunt work here and writing something up for us so we know what we're voting on for a change.

Mr. CURRAN: I thought I'd put together something for the two principal matters you're considering, the Executive and Legislative branches. So I made two drafts or a draft of each.

At least making the substitutions of changing the name, which may or may not be a good idea. Maybe you'd want to stay with the Assembly of Delegates but substituting the name "County Council" for "Assembly of Delegates," and "County Executive" for the "Board

of County Commissioners.”

Basically, there are two things that I did and I tried to make other changes consistent, “members,” “councilors,” things like that.

Also raised some questions in the Legislative branch, there are a number of questions, some of which are more difficult to deal with than others.

One simple one is whether it would be a good idea to have a four-year term for the council members. Half of them elected at five -- it won't actually be five and six because it's 11, but its overlapping terms.

So there would be new input on the Council all the time, every two years, every election. You wouldn't have a big turnover, but you'd always have some people who had served with any new people that come on. So there would be a continuation in that respect.

The other issue with the council is the filling of vacancies. Right now it's a very simple procedure because just only one city -- one city, Barnstable, or town is involved and it can all be handled very neatly.

When we have the districts, it will be -- it could be as many as eight on that outer strip or seven anyway, I think, and then others would be smaller numbers. They don't know in advance what numbers it will be, but there will be more than one municipality involved. So it's going to make it more difficult.

If they're four-year terms, you can't have a provision that if the vacancy occurs before the 18th month of the term, it would be filled at the election, the midterm election. The person would be elected and serve at the election in November.

Then the other possibilities are to fill it by having the runner-up at the previous election automatically go in if they have received a certain number of votes. Typically we've used what municipalities are doing is the 30 percent of the vote received by the candidate who was elected to the seat. So they would automatically go in and fill the vacancy.

There's a beneficial effect to having that provision because while under the existing systems there's no incentive for somebody to run against Ron or Julia because they know the voters -- candidates would know that the voters have so much faith in these people they can never knock them off.

Ms. TAYLOR: Naturally.

Commissioner DOHERTY: What a wonderful place to be. Yes, right.

Ms. TAYLOR: I wouldn't go that far, but as an illustration we'll allow it.

Mr. CURRAN: You see the point. It discourages candidates of running against someone who has been a long-term member and is well-known and well-respected in the community.

But if they know that somebody might run because they know that if a vacancy for any reason could occur, that a resignation, whatever, that they would then go into the seat. So they'd put them in the line of succession and create, I think, a beneficial effect in having candidates running opposing each other, raising ideas and discussing things with voters.

So those are some of the things that we would have to discuss.

Ms. TAYLOR: And this is not uncommon in municipalities now?

Mr. CURRAN: To do these -- in these kinds of things? A lot of the Charters being written now do provide for that kind of thing.

Ms. TAYLOR: Okay.

Mr. CURRAN: Or another alternative to simplify things here, that's the most reasonable because it deals with all the situations, really get too complicated with it.

If we go to a special election, there's going to be a tremendous cost and it's going to be very confusing. But I kind of recommend that procedure as a -- or you can have the Council elect. If there is no candidate or if the candidate doesn't get the 30 percent or whatever preset minimum is set, then the remaining members of the Council would elect somebody resident in the district to fill the seat.

Those are the cheap and easy ways to do it. Beyond that, it goes to a special election.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I would have a problem with a Council that was from other districts identifying a candidate within a district to vote to put him on the council. I think the suggestion of the runner-up makes the most sense in terms of the fact that I don't see the budget for the County going any higher to justify what I'd call a lot of interest in it.

Plus the fact the County has never been able to call an election. It's always been at the behest of another agency. So I think your thinking might have followed that kind of logic as far as supporting the idea of a runner-up.

Mr. CURRAN: Yes. The expense would be considerable for relatively small, you know, benefit.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And the fact that we could not call the election because we don't have the ability to --

Mr. CURRAN: Well, you would. The legislation would give you the ability to call it.

Ms. TAYLOR: Or a Clerk.

Mr. CURRAN: Or the County Clerk would notify the clerks in the districts there's a vacancy, of each of the Clerks, however many that might be. They would say there's a vacancy, and then establish some procedure for filling it, again, which would be spelled out in the Legislation which authors how to do it. And the local clerk would be in charge of their municipality. It might only be one precinct in some cases.

Commissioner DOHERTY: We actually have a precedent in our -- I think it's in the MPO where a district representative is elected by the vote of the Boards of Selectmen within the district.

So the Lower Cape, for example, representative to the Metropolitan Planning Organization represents the several towns on the Lower Cape and the Mid Cape and so forth, and that election comes from the Board of Selectman in that district. So they --

Mr. CURRAN: Well, I think it would be difficult because all these districts would be of different size.

Ms. TAYLOR: And different town.

Mr. CURRAN: And then in terms of the number of municipalities involved, we might have conceivably -- we could have one district wholly in Barnstable at the numbers we have. We might even have two districts wholly within in Barnstable.

You might have seven towns involved. Three or four are not unusual. And then you'd have -- would each Board of Selectmen cast the same vote?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Good point.

Mr. CURRAN: Two precincts/ four precincts --

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, I think that doesn't work.

Mr. CURRAN: It gets complicated.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Mike, I'm starting to understand. I mean I'm just concerned that if we, indeed, were -- if the Assembly were to send this petition up to Boston that if we put something in there that somebody is all of the sudden going to pick out as being

overly onerous or complicated, you know, the Secretary of the Commonwealth is going to say, “Wait a minute. I’m not going to have a special election.”

So I think the quickest and easiest way is probably the best -- this is my personal feeling -- is that, yes, for instance, this body now would appoint the next Commissioner if a Commissioner were to step down. That’s how it works in the current Charter.

And even though I agree with Bill it’s kind of awkward to have the Assembly or whatever you want to call it, the Council, nominate a person to fill an unexpired term, it does get us out of the problems of a special election, which, you know, County Clerk’s have to worry about and its expensive and so on, and it’s only what you say for a few months anyways so.

And also you’ve got to realize that, as Bill says, that the County budget’s not going to go up too much, these people are not going to be overly compensated. So the chances of them going, you know, deciding to do something else is quite high.

I would be looking for the easiest and most cost-effective way of replacing someone should they decide to leave. But that’s just one little section of this that we’re going to have to explore.

Mr. CURRAN: Yes, it’s something you have to decide because it could happen.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Mr. CURRAN: If the thing is enacted, you’ve got to have some way of filling vacancies.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well, perhaps the prime thing would be if we’re agreed on district representation. I think that would be the biggest thing to, let’s say, to put on the table and get established.

Once that’s established, I think the other things that we’re talking about are what I’d call administrative management matters that can be resolved and practiced.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, I mean the committee did vote 5 to 1 or something to go forward with both the district representation and the executive authority.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: So I’m assuming that’s where we are and that’s what I told Mike.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yes, I think, as a matter of fact, was that vote a 5 to 1 against the -- just on the elected versus appointed executive?

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: So in that case, I think we’re all in line for district representation.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Not me. I didn’t vote for it.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, no. He voted against it.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Oh, it’s 5 to 1 for that. I see.

Ms. TAYLOR: It was 5 to 1, just different 1’s.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Different 1’s.

Ms. TAYLOR: Could I ask a question?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Mike, I see that in the part on the Legislative branch, you’re not assuming an Executive, you’re assuming a Board of Commissioners just for -- that’s the way it is all the way through; right?

Mr. CURRAN: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: I mean that's fine. I just wanted to clarify that. You haven't made that --

Well, you said the County Council may require the Board of County Executives.

Mr. CURRAN: Then that's a mistake. I think -- I thought -- no, you're right. I didn't make that change.

Ms. TAYLOR: And then the same up in Section 2(6), "Shall deal through the Board of County Commissioners." I don't think that's crazy to have left it like that because you're assuming there are two different possibilities.

Mr. CURRAN: Right. Exactly, yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: So if you went to one executive, you could make that change where you put County Commissioners to Executive.

Mr. CURRAN: I think my thought was to change the word Board of County Commissioners to County Executive and then to define that the County Executive could be either a board or an individual.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Mr. CURRAN: And you'd call it Executive -- County Executive.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And, indeed, the present board of County Commissioners is the Executive branch.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right.

Mr. CURRAN: I know that.

Commissioner DOHERTY: It is the Executive.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right. So, okay.

Mr. CURRAN: So you'd call it the County Executive, it would cover both situations.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, I understand that.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And I think it should be clear to the Assembly that -- and it will probably require two votes on this from the Assembly for both the Executive and the Legislative branch.

Mr. CURRAN: Yes. Oh yes, I think you -- you want to present these as separate questions.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Right. And presumably that will go through the process to go to the Commissioners and potentially to the Legislature as two separate --

Commissioner DOHERTY: Proposals.

Chairman BERGSTROM: -- proposals.

Mr. CURRAN: Yes, we talked about it earlier. We don't want the whole thing to go down the drain because of the combined apposition. Those who oppose the Executive, those who oppose the Legislative changes, I mean, they'd kill it. It would never go anywhere.

So you've got to vote on them separately with the hope and expectation that at least one of them will pass.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Mike, one of the concerns is the cost. To some people looking at things like this, the cost is first thing on their list, you know.

But do you think it would be wise -- I mean let's say this were to pass even through the vote and you would swear in a new group, would they then set their own salaries or should we set a salary when we make a proposal to the Legislature?

Mr. CURRAN: Well I think everything -- definitely as the original Charter set an initial salary of \$1,000.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Mr. CURRAN: We could do that again.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So the initial salary.

Mr. CURRAN: We could do that again. That would be the easiest way probably.

Chairman BERGSTROM: So we're going to have to discuss that then before we go further with the proposal.

Mr. CURRAN: Yes. I would think that the big thing to go before the Council is the concept of the plan. They were given the flexibility to fill in and clean up smaller details.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right. Yes, I think we're facing -- I think both of these read nicely, and I have no serious -- I like them both. I have no serious disagreements.

But what I see as a possible problem is when this first came up at the Assembly and I had tried to count the votes, which is always hard since it's a weighted vote, the votes did exist to have it passed.

However, the slight disadvantage to that vote -- the voters that were willing to vote in favor, several of them had stated that they would be voting primarily on the basis of having it brought before the voters as opposed to their personally being very invested in the change. Okay. That was okay up to the point at that point.

Later, very shortly after that however, those people who had been the most eager to have a change in County government, namely or at least among those most eager were the Business Roundtable and the -- at least the leaders of the Special Commission on County governance, i.e. O'Leary and Rauschenbach.

Both the Business Roundtable and they came out against this proposal because they felt strongly that what they had always wanted was, yes, they liked the districts and no weighted vote, but they wanted a streamline system where there was not a balance between the Executive and the Legislative branch, but that it was more like a Barnstable Town Council with an appointed Administrator.

So it would seem to me that we right now have an extremely slim group of people interested in the present system, which possibly could still pass on the basis of this concept of bringing it before the voters, although, I'm not -- that was weeks ago. I don't really -- I haven't polled people -- and I know -- any rate --

But then we have a problem if it did pass, then we have the problem of it going to the Commissioners, and I don't know whether Bill thinks that the Commissioners would favor this system with the Executive branch being a single elected person. I don't know if you've discussed it with them. I certainly haven't heard anything from any of the other Commissioners telling me how great this idea was.

I'll just say one more thing.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Okay.

Ms. TAYLOR: So that then if, in fact, for some reason the Assembly did go ahead and pass it with that caveat of it's worth going to the voters, we don't know whether it would pass there.

But we do know that if it did pass the Commissioners -- well, if it didn't, that would be another problem, but then let's say both those groups went for it, we're then still missing a fairly important situation where we've got those most active in wanting a change don't like this change and the others are either indifferent or vehemently against the nonweighted vote.

So I'm feeling a little bit worried as to where to go now.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, Julia, we discussed this. We discussed this several meetings ago.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: I mean what is the role of this committee? And I'm never adverse to bringing up politics but I had my wrist slapped and said, "Look, this committee is going to come up with the best possible solution -- you know, the best possible mechanism for County government to go forward." And if that's not -- if people aren't in favor of it, that's their problem.

So I think on the other hand, politics is reality. But I think the issue of what's palatable to the voters and to the Assembly should be left up to the Assembly. You know, let them decide whether it's practical or not. They're the ones who can make the compromises.

Not to pick out O'Leary and Rauschenbach, but if the members of that committee want to stand on ceremony and say, "No, this is our proposal," well I've got 10 other people on the Assembly have different ideas too."

Ms. TAYLOR: I know. Oh, I know. I'm not suggesting we make a change. I'm just bringing up this little teeny problem as I see it now.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Let Linell get in here.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Okay.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Everything you've said I certainly can understand, but I would really like us to focus on kind of what Ron said.

So we did our job. And I can't honestly say that we've come up with the best because that's subjective. But I think I said this at our last gathering in this room, I had no hope we'd come up with anything because we came to the table with the Commissioners wanting one thing, the Assembly having a proposal on the table, and the Special Commission with a different proposal.

The process in this committee, the work that we did with Mike's help, the conversations that we've had, the people who came to speak before us, that's a process. And I know for myself and I know one other member describes it this -- she's not here yet-- Suzanne describes it the same way.

I came to my conclusion based on this process. Based on this process, the recommendation that we've made and I'm not going to judge anybody else's reason why they voted for or against it, but the recommendation that was made at this table due to a Democratic majority vote is a recommendation that came through a healthy process. What happens at the Assembly of Delegates, you know, it remains to be seen.

I do think we should though be very aware that a lot of people have stated that it would be healthy for the County, for the people of Cape Cod, for those -- and I'm not a cynic so I don't get into, you know, nobody pays attention, nobody knows what County does. I just don't get into any of that. And I think it's --

Ms. TAYLOR: That's best.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Well, I've only been here 13 years. And I came to grassroots' politics through my work in Sandwich and then very happy to serve in the County in several capacities.

However, I think it's very important that we respect the fact that all the anecdotal stuff that we hear is just that. That there's a lot of wisdom in thinking that getting this forward to the people of Cape Cod to have substantive conversations within their communities about how they want to be governed.

There's also so many myths out there like I was just -- give me like two minutes here -- that you've got all this stuff about getting rid of the Cape Cod Commission. I'm the vice

chair of the Cape Cod Water Protection Collaborative and proudly serve on that board. I'm in my third year. Love that work. I'm a public health background from the military -- eat that work up.

And we had a two and a half hour today meeting today and, of course, the Cape Cod Commission was there to give us an update on the 208 process. Who's going to do that work? They're doing amazing work, brilliant work. It's going to bring millions of dollars in resources to our community. Who's going to do that work?

So we have to be really, really focused on the things Michael has taught me, Bill has taught me, Julia has taught me, the history of our County. Well, an Ann too but the fact that the County is only 25 years old -- 30 -- not even 30 years old.

Ms. TAYLOR: Present system.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Present system. Well that's what I'm saying.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: That was our task and our fearless leader here said, "We're going to talk about that.

Chairman BERGSTROM: He's not fearless.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: And we learned that with your vote when we made our recommendation.

We have to really remember that we did a good process. We were true to our process and there is value in continuing in this process for the people of this town.

And there are all the naysayers out there and all the paranoia about takeovers and all the political paranoia out there, but that's not what we had at this table.

Chairman BERGSTROM: All right.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: So.

Ms. TAYLOR: All right.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Bill, did you want to say something?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yes. I was going to say think Bedford Falls when you think about the Cape Cod Commission.

And I did propose over there that perhaps we should form -- go to the alumni of the Cape Cod Commission and form a "Friends of" to do let's say to do --

Chairman BERGSTROM: Let's not wander off topic.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Yes, let's not wander.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Okay. But there was a question that Julia raised about where the Commissioners heads were at. And in those discussions we had in open meetings, they made it quite clear that they were in favor of district representation. There might be some question about they wanted fewer numbers but the general support was for that.

The other discussion that was held in open meetings on the subject with regard to the Executive, they feel that's subtle business because the Assembly had voted to create a Strong Executive and separate it from the Treasurer.

So my inference from that is that they would generally, and I am not speaking for them, but my impression is that they would support the idea of a Strong Executive and a single Executive as far as that part of it goes.

The question about whether it be elected or appointed, you know, is a separate issue, I think.

And finally, in 2000, we did have a referendum on the countywide ballot with regard to whether the County should continue to exist, and I believe that that did pass. And the

recommendations that were part of that were sent up to the great General Court and whatever happened up there, who knows what happened.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, I'd just like to say something in regard to the -- I know that the Chamber of Commerce and the Business Roundtable and so on have supported the recommendations that came out of the committee on County governance.

We sat through -- Julia and I sat through those meetings, and they did talk about streamlining the County by limiting the number of elected officials to bring it down to a smaller group. They recommended 7; we recommended 11. And I think they tacitly recognized that that would mean somewhat a loss of control by the individual towns.

So as a fallback as sort of saying, "Well, okay, we're going to go to a -- we're going to have a financial review board made up of the town managers. And I looked at Julia and said to myself, "This is dejavu all over again. We've just gone back thirty years. This is the system that they tried and failed 30 years ago, and I don't know if the people in the room understood that.

But I mean -- Bill and I served on the Regional Transit Authority -- as far as I know he's still on there --

The Regional Transit Authority is made up of the Chairmen of the Boards of Selectmen of the 15 towns. That's who the nominees are or their appointees. Do you know how many towns --

Ms. TAYLOR: Selectmen come?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well you were for a while.

Chairman BERGSTROM: I was the only guy who was the chairman and served. Everybody else appointed somebody else because they're simply too busy doing whatever they're doing.

So I think that even though -- I think for two reasons. First of all, I think having two branches of government provides a balance, and I think that it also gives people of the towns a feeling of more input into the process.

So I respect the recommendations of that committee. We did a lot of hard work, but the Charter designates the Assembly of Delegates as the body that recommends and comes up with Charter changes. We formed this committee. We hired an attorney. We've come up with the recommendations. We were doing our job. This is the vehicle. I mean I'm sure there could be other vehicles if somebody wants to do an end-around, but we're doing our job by responding to the voices out there that are asking for a change. They're not going to get the change they want. That's the thing.

Ms. TAYLOR: I prefer this. This is my choice obviously.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Bill.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I have to add to my concern that Representative Hunt has expressed some concern that there were matters that were brought up that we were supposed to review. Some of them are cans of worms like you can't believe, you know, recall, things like that.

And we do have some obligation to consider the things that had been brought up. As onerous as they are, and you're not going to get me on this, but the point is that they were brought up. They were supposed to be matters that we consider, and I thought that we were looking at governance as a first item and then we were supposed to go to two other things. One, the language of the Charter itself to reduce the amount of administrative code things that were included in the Charter.

And then finally to address these other issues that apparently were considered in the initial Charter but somehow were not included.

And although I might not be eager to pursue that, we do have an obligation to talk about it.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Ann, you wanted to get in here?

Ms. CANEDY: Yes. I do want to -- I know that Bill hasn't been here a couple times, but we have said on a number of occasions that we do recognize there are other issues, recall being one of them, and that we have every intention of discussing them.

But this was the elephant in the room, the number one charge and the most complicated charge. So it needed to be dealt with first. But I am very confident that the other issues are going to be dealt with.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Linell.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I was going to say the same thing but I will also add that the former Charter review prior to the Commission did the homework piece or I should say the housekeeping piece. And I applaud Ron, and I say it again, I think we've said it at every single meeting that we purposely, Ron, purposely made the decision we were not going to do the housekeeping pieces until we tackled and had an understanding whether the governance recommendation was actually going to make it to the state.

So we're still on track for what I think we've designed ourselves to do.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well the reason -- the reason I've got -- I emphasize the reason for that is that the things that have to go to the Legislature and the ballot have time concerns.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We have plenty of time after that -- well, of course, we want to keep Mike on board so he's only on board for a few months. But the thing is -- this is the issue. The change in governance requires a very formal procedure and that's why we have to submit this within a timely fashion.

But yes, we've already had discussion with Mike as to changes in the Charter that would clarify the roles, separate roles of the Legislative and Executive branch, and also talk about how ordinances -- the difference between ordinance and resolutions and so on how the process is. But that can be accomplished, you know, at a later date.

It may have to go to the ballot. So I don't whether it has to -- but it doesn't have to go through the process.

Bill.

Commissioner DOHERTY: So, Ron, right now, as our Chair, what do we need to do to put this behind us?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. What we've got to do is I told the Assembly that they were -- I had originally told the Assembly that we would get a vote from them as to whether or not we wanted to really proceed with this kind of an analysis.

But, of course, I went back on that. For procedural reasons, we didn't get it done. But I didn't want to put -- if we go to the Assembly now and say, "What do you want to do?" We're going to come up with 15 different answers. And they're all going to be credible.

What we really need is a document to present to them and say, "Look, this is our best work. This is our best recommendation. It's not unanimous. I didn't vote for it. Bill didn't vote for part of it either."

Ms. TAYLOR: Its two documents.

Chairman BERGSTROM: But the majority of the Assembly would put this forward. Now it's not written in stone, but at least it's in a form in which they know what they're voting on. There are not enough loose ends later on to say, "well, wait a minute. What does this mean?"

They'll know clearly from what -- the draft that Mike provided us exactly the direction we're going. And then it's up to them to submit it to vote. And I'm going to ask for a vote on next Wednesday, a week from today.

I can't force a vote but I'm going to ask for a vote as to whether or not they want to go to send it to the Commissioners, which there it will sit for the next week.

Ms. TAYLOR: But, Ron, are you wanting us to vote to have these be the two things we're going to bring up for a vote?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: And then have Janice send them out tomorrow and they will have read them and we would vote it on the 15th?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, there are a couple issues that Mike identified. The primary one is the method of replacement.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: All right. We'd like to get -- now, remember, the Assembly could change these things too. I mean so we could slough it off and say, "Well, you know, it's up to you," but I think we should give them some kind of an idea.

And Mike, as we discussed earlier in the meeting, I think the cheapest and easiest method of replacing someone in the short term is simply have the Legislative body appoint someone within the district because it can be done quickly and it's (Inaudible).

Ms. TAYLOR: But wouldn't you want them to also be elected into the next two year election cycle?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Which would change the --

Mr. CURRAN: Yes. And they --

Ms. TAYLOR: -- for a two-year term?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, yes, they would be elected to fulfill the remaining term. And then after the two years, I assume --

Mr. CURRAN: Well, if you went to a four-year term -- if the vacancy occurred in the first 18 months of the term, you'd use this method. But then it would be filled for the two years --

Ms. TAYLOR: Election.

Mr. CURRAN: -- at the regular November election.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And then it would go back to the four-year cycle.

Mr. CURRAN: No. That person would be running for a two-year term.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Oh, I see.

Mr. CURRAN: But they would take office the day following the election and the interim person would then be out.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes. I think that makes the most sense. But I under -- what do we feel about this idea of having the person who got 30 percent of the vote?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well --

Ms. TAYLOR: I understand why he's saying it's good. It encourages more people

to participate.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, my feeling --

Ms. TAYLOR: He doesn't have it written -- yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: My feeling with elections, just to move the argument along, is that there's a lot of people who -- there aren't a lot, but there are some people who jump to an election and don't get any traction, let's say. They get 5 percent or 10 percent. But someone who gets 30 percent has got to have some kind of a following.

Ms. TAYLOR: So would you just assume let that be it? And if there wasn't somebody with 30 percent, then it would be appointed by the Assembly?

Chairman BERGSTROM: I would actually personally, even though I understand Mike's recommendations, I would personally rather just have the Council appoint someone and go to the next election.

Ms. CANEDY: So would I.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And I think I'm leaning in that direction as well because I think that takes out the confusion, and it also gives people an opportunity to present their credentials before a body that they're hoping to join.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And it's also within the power of this -- the new constructed Council to say, "Well, Joe Smith is in front of us and he got 30 percent --"

Ms. TAYLOR: He got 30 percent, yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: "-- at the last election," and we have to find a good reason not to appoint him.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Or he got 28 percent.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, I think almost that's just easier.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: It's clean.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And Secretary Galvin, if he's still around, will be happy because he doesn't have to spend any money and the clerks don't have to spend any money.

Ms. TAYLOR: But it would only be until the next state election.

Mr. CURRAN: That's right.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Right.

Ms. CANEDY: Right.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And if it's after the 18 months, it would just be a vacancy until the next election? If it's within --

Ms. TAYLOR: It would be for a two-year term.

Mr. CURRAN: It would just have to be -- whenever the vacancy occurs, if it's before 18 months, you can have it filled permanently at the next regular election for the balance of the two years.

And then if it occurs after the 24th month, then it's going to be filled by this method until --

Chairman BERGSTROM: Oh, I see. Yes, yes, I see. There's going to be a three-month lag anyway.

Mr. CURRAN: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. Now I understand.

Ms. TAYLOR: All right. So we would erase on page 7 we would eliminate the first

two paragraphs and go to “Filling of vacancy by Town Council”?

Mr. CURRAN: Well, I’ll clean it up --

Ms. TAYLOR: You could clean that up.

Mr. CURRAN: -- what you decide you want.

Chairman BERGSTROM: By not Town Council --

Mr. CURRAN: By County Council.

Ms. TAYLOR: It says “Town.” That would need to be County.

Chairman BERGSTROM: The other controversial issue in here I think which we consider is the actual creation of the districts.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, how do we feel about that?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Because Mike has a provision in there that we actually form a committee to do that.

Mr. CURRAN: And the Charter, I would think, is going to have to have a provision, at least a temporary provision because you want to get people started right away drawing those districts. So I put in a temporary ordinance, it could be changed later, but at least you get started with the committee.

As I mentioned maybe to you, Ron, some people I think that you get the two recognized committees, Democratic -- you have a County Democratic, and a County Republican Committee. They’d get nominees from that party for two, probably Town Clerk would be the easiest -- the best to do. And then maybe the League of Women Voters to pick two independent candidates. They’ve certainly been involved in this Charter Review process, I think, and they’ve been very supportive of the district. Now I don’t know whether they would want to get involved politically.

Ms. TAYLOR: But then we have the issue --

Mr. CURRAN: The alternative to that would be to have the four people picked by the two political committees to agree on two other candidates.

Ms. TAYLOR: But aren’t we assuming this is a nonpartisan position. Does that make it a little trickier having it be --

Mr. CURRAN: Well, they could be nonpartisan but they’re people who know and understand elections and know where the bodies are and who turns out to vote. It seems to me the most knowledgeable people to put those districts together.

You want to take people who are not involved in election; they won’t know what makes a logical district. What precincts in Yarmouth are really active and turn out voters. What precincts in Chatham or Orleans? Someone’s going to know that and that’s why I assume the political people will because they have, as all of you know, I’m sure, I’m telling --

Commissioner DOHERTY: We have a Secretary of State who’s identified the districts.

Mr. CURRAN: No, he has not.

Ms. TAYLOR: No.

Mr. CURRAN: The Secretary of State has not identified the districts.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Who has identified --

Mr. CURRAN: Each Board of Selectmen draws up its own districts.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right now the Cape Cod Commission gave us what was a workable map.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: But that's not -- that's just an example. You could do it other ways. What we do know is 11 can work.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well I would suggest --

Ms. TAYLOR: But you could divide things differently.

Commissioner DOHERTY: You're right, Julia, but the first thought that comes to mind is that we have a point of departure in which would be the map that the Cape Cod Commission had given to us unless there was an overriding political district or precinct arrangement that was already in place.

And with the exception of I guess when you get to the border -- into the border towns, I think you could pretty well come up with the precincts that represent the population. And I think that that's what the Cape Cod Commission had done for us.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes, I don't think there's going to be -- I don't think there are a lot of choices involved. I mean obviously you've got -- you're limited by precincts. So, you know, I mean for instance my district, I don't know how it would extend or the district, let's say, Provincetown down to Orleans I mean if you take another precinct, your choices are limited. You can't take one from Sandwich in other words.

So I think it's going to be -- it's not going to be -- they're not going to start from scratch. The map that the Commission gave us is you can move -- you can take a precinct from Brewster and give it to Harwich, you can move around a little bit but.

And as far as whether they should be elected partisan or nonpartisan, I mean I assume that they'll be elected nonpartisan.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, see, if we think it's going to be nonpartisan, then I'm less interested in this temporary ordinance type of way doing it with the town. I just think that politicizes it in a way that won't be --

Chairman BERGSTROM: So you think you should identify -- you think we could within our submission simply identify the districts -- identify the districts using the map that the Commission gave us.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I think that's their obligation.

Ms. TAYLOR: That would be the temporary ordinance.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. TAYLOR: The Council could then establish its own mechanism within, and it could be done for the next election two years from then. And then every 10 years.

Mr. CURRAN: I suppose you could have the first term only two years for everybody. And then after you get the districts in place -- the Massachusetts Legislature and the House draws its own districts. The Senate draws its own districts. They appoint members.

But again --

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes, but, Mike, the last Speaker that did that in the house got indicted I think it was.

Commissioner DOHERTY: He only got indicted because he told a lie.

Mr. CURRAN: He swore no political considerations took place. It was all a question of numbers.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes, so I don't want to be in that position.

Mr. CURRAN: But that's not realistic.

Ms. TAYLOR: But from my point of view, yes, I would rather it were the temporary was simply what came up on the computer --

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- by trying to, you know, I'm assuming that the Cape Cod Commission did not gerrymander this. I'm assuming it was what came up on the computer because of the numbers.

So that, to me, seems a reasonable two-year plan or a one-year plan even that would give the chance for an election. And then the next election could be under -- then if the Legislature -- the Council wanted to change it, they could. It would be within their power from then on.

Mr. CURRAN: And if I'm thinking wrong, Jessica can correct me, but they just started with Provincetown and came towards the Canal and asked the computer to tell them whatever the number was, 12,000 --

Commissioner DOHERTY: Sixteen.

Mr. CURRAN: Give me 11 districts at approximately 12,000 population using the existing precinct lines and that's what it did.

But if you started at the Canal and came this way, you might get a totally different configuration, again, without any political consideration. It's strictly a numbers thing.

So I guess if people understand that this is not -- there are no political consideration. You had to do absolutely clean principles that I stated. Right, Jessica? Do you want to correct me?

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, could we hear from Jessica. Could we do it the other way, I mean, coming from the Canal?

Ms. CANEDY: I want to ask a question.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, yes, just my understanding, and I'll let Jessica correct me, is that not all precincts are equal in population. There's awkward things like Chatham who has two precincts and they went to one. Well, we didn't lose half our population.

So I think it's not a matter of simply moving precincts. If you move certain precincts, you're going to go over or under that or you're going to go over that 10 percent or 15 percent margin of error.

But we might as well ask Jessica how flexible she thinks that program is.

Ms. CANEDY: Can I ask you a question before she speaks?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. Sure.

Ms. CANEDY: I mean this might have something to do with your answer. Don't we have to have some recognition of the state's precincts and the state's division?

Mr. CURRAN: You have to use the existing town precinct lines.

Ms. CANEDY: Right. Okay.

Ms. TAYLOR: And that did.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes. And we don't want to have the voter confused that they're in this district for state representative purposes and this district for County.

Mr. CURRAN: That can be a problem. That's why we've looked at it.

Ms. CANEDY: That's one for town counsel, yes, so that's whatever method that --

MS. JESSICA WIELGUS: Sure. What the Commission's GIS department did with respect to establishing --

Chairman BERGSTROM: You can give her the mic, Mike, just for the recording because we're being recorded. I can hear her but --

MS. JESSICA WIELGUS: You may recall that the Commission was using that

Constitutional test and the goal was to get the lowest percent deviation from one district to the next.

And the reason that the 11 district came out so favorable is that it was less than a 4 percent deviation from one district to the other.

In terms of establishing the districts themselves, the GIS department did take a look at the populations that were in the districts abutting one another and tried to make sure when they added one to another that District 11 was as equal to District 10 as it was to 9 all the way across.

So I don't know necessarily that they started at one end and then went to the other or went in a particular direction, but they took that directive of trying to meet that Constitutional requirement to the highest degree possible. So that's where they came up with the lines that they did.

Could a district be shifted in one direction or another and still have a low-percent deviation? It is, indeed, possible. It is, indeed, possible to reconfigure it, but in terms of what the Commission did, that was the goal of what the lines represented. But in terms of making any decisions, they don't represent anything political in any way. There was no discussion of there being lines in a particular direction or anything.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes. You know, just to add more complication to this, the original County, whatever, Commission under the -- the Special Committee on Barnstable County with O'Leary and Rauschenbach and the two of us, they -- I did some math, and we decided we could divide the Cape into five districts that would have close to equal population, the smallest one would have 17.9.

Ms. TAYLOR: And that's what you came up with also.

MS. JESSICA WIELGUS: That was the second lowest configuration.

Chairman BERGSTROM: But the problem was there I think it was recognized by the group that simply reducing the elected officials to Barnstable County to five was too little. In other words, it's too much authority.

So then they threw in two at-large districts, which kind of everybody just shook their head and said, "Well, here I am running Cape-wide and this guy next to me is -- all he has to worry about is Orleans.

Ms. CANEDY: It's the same thing.

Chairman BERGSTROM: So I think that that was one of the -- there was a few of those have objected on principle to the limited number. But what happened is once you got above five, it got more complicated until you actually reached 11.

MS. JESSICA WIELGUS: That's right.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And then all of the sudden the numbers started to work again. So people can accuse us of picking these things out of thin air but we didn't. I mean some work went into this.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, again, I would propose that we -- instead of what Mike has suggested here that we propose that we use as the temporary division the nonpolitical GIS --

Chairman BERGSTROM: Cape Cod Commission.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- Cape Cod Commission.

Chairman BERGSTROM: It's totally nonpolitical.

Ms. CANEDY: Is that a motion?

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, that's a motion.

Ms. CANEDY: Second.

Ms. TAYLOR: That we would go with that with the understanding that the Charter would allow the Council to do its own districting, of course, legally and all. And they could take that up when they wished. But this would be the first election.

Ms. CANEDY: Second.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. Now the next thing I want to bring up --

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, wait a minute. We didn't vote that.

Ms. CANEDY: That's a motion.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Oh, you want to --

Ms. CANEDY: And a second.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. So we'll amend this as we go along. Okay. That's fine. You want to make that as a motion?

Ms. GRUNDMAN: She did.

Ms. CANEDY: And I seconded it.

Chairman BERGSTROM: All right. Moved and seconded. We all know what we're voting on? All those in favor say "Aye."

I'm going to vote on these things even though I'm not necessarily for the final thing. (Motion passed.)

Chairman BERGSTROM: But the other thing I want to bring up now is you talked about should it be partisan or nonpartisan and I've had this debate -- and we had this debate within the County -- I keep forgetting the name of it, review committee --

Ms. TAYLOR: Special Commission.

Chairman BERGSTROM: -- Yes, the Special Commission on County governance. I was all for -- having run for office myself a couple times, I was all for partisan because, unfortunately, even Selectmen races and School Committee races are getting political.

And people jump up and even though you're not designated on the ballot, somebody comes along and they're sponsored by the Republicans or Democrats and they immediately have a team of people behind them and they have financing behind them.

And it becomes difficult for an independent candidate to make any traction. You can do that in a Selectmen's race I think, but whether in a district like this you have to consider is it realistic to have nonpartisan races. Maybe it is, I don't know but --

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I think I'd prefer the nonpartisan concept because I have seen that it has worked relatively well. There's certainly no question that the major candidates that have run against me have been put forward and supported by and chose to run very much on a partisan basis.

So we can't say that this is not happening. And then I do think that it's a little tricky to run in a lot of different towns without some organization.

So I'm somewhat in agreement, but I certainly have appreciated that most of what's gone on at the present Assembly over the years has transcended partisan quarreling.

Chairman BERGSTROM: What do you think about that, Ann?

Ms. CANEDY: Well, I'm unenrolled and I have run in the past as enrolled in a party. And when I ran for Town Council, I changed my party affiliation, became unenrolled because it is a nonpartisan position and I wanted to send the message to my constituents and to the Council if I was elected that that would be the attitude that I would have in dealing with their issues.

And I think as far as an organization, "in my organization," and I put that in quotes, I

have had people from both parties who believe in me and some of them didn't even know whether I was a Republican or a Democrat in the past and don't care. And I think that's good because they look at the person, they look at the issues, and they just don't automatically pull a lever because they have a (D) or and (R) next to their name.

Chairman BERGSTROM: I'm not against going nonpartisan. I mean I think we just have to recognize that politics is going to raise its ugly head.

Ms. CANEDY: It always does.

Ms. TAYLOR: I think it can be a very attractive head.

Ms. CANEDY: Not exactly.

Ms. TAYLOR: But we have a lot of recent examples here of less attractive.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And it's not going to change who runs, it's just going to change how they're designated on the ballot, I guess.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I'm going to point out that running nonpartisan means you don't have to face a primary. One of the biggest objections that people have is that primary elections have a, what I'd call, a dedicated minority that basically calls the tune.

Ms. TAYLOR: Good point.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And I think that you can get -- you can belong to a party. You can run in a nonpartisan way but the party can support you as long as you maintain your party affiliation or at least the principle that the party that you represent would support and you only have to do it once.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, I think the primary that's out.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, I'm just looking for a vote on this. How are we going to submit it?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Nonpartisan.

Ms. TAYLOR: It has to be nonpartisan. We can't have primaries for this.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. Could you make that as a motion?

Commissioner DOHERTY: I'll move they're nonpartisan.

Ms. CANEDY: Second.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Second.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. Moved and seconded. All those in favor as nonpartisan for the Council or Assembly?

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, forgot about the primary.

Chairman BERGSTROM: All right. Any opposed?

(Motion passed.)

Chairman BERGSTROM: So, is there anything else you see in there that you think we should clean up before we take a final vote on the documents?

Oh, the Executive branch now. You've got somebody running for office there.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right.

Chairman BERGSTROM: I didn't want to move on -- Are you ready to move on to the Executive?

Mr. CURRAN: Yes, fine.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, we're cruising along here.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well, I, for one, since I represent a three-person board of executives.

Chairman BERGSTROM: They call that a troi --

Commissioner DOHERTY: Troika.

Ms. TAYLOR: Troika in Russia.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Troika, okay. Yes, they didn't suffer good fate.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well, that didn't last very long. But the point is that the whole thrust of the discussion that the Commissioners had in their open meetings was that they were intending to step down and allow themselves to be replaced by this district legislative body.

So, having said that, I would be in favor of voting for a single Executive. However, I still like the idea of a professional being, let's say, or a person being appointed from the Legislative body to be that Executive.

But in any case, so from the point of view of a single Executive, and I think it should be put before the Assembly, because I think the Assembly has to be reinforced in the idea that the Commissioners are not looking to retain power. They're looking to move in a direction that serves the constituents' interests and has what I would call representation that is equal across the Cape.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, I do think that's a very good point, Bill, that the present Board of Commissioners are perfectly willing to give up having a three-person board to which they have been elected.

So I think a disagreement over whether it should be an elected Executive or an appointed Executive is certainly -- we can't say that the Commissioners are standing in the way of either of those.

Commissioner DOHERTY: No.

Ms. TAYLOR: And I think that's an important -- to their credit. I hope the Assembly will be able to say the same thing that they're not standing in the way in terms of retaining their --

Chairman BERGSTROM: We're looking at the alternative to the recommendations in front of us where you have simply like a Town Council election like, for instance, the Barnstable Town Council appoints the Executive.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, he prefers an administrator to an executive.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Right.

Chairman BERGSTROM: The problem is there's a difference, as Mike has reminded us and he's right, there's a difference between administrator and executive.

In other words, administrator's in the office. An executive basically would be elected is basically out in the district who, in this case, the Cape promoting the Cape, explaining what it does. He's also making recommendations just like the President or the Governor says, "I think those jibones in the Assembly should vote for this because this is what I think."

So he's not beholdng to them, he's -- so, there's a big difference here and we have to decide.

Ann.

Ms. CANEDY: And to that big difference, an appointed Executive is only accountable to a majority of the Assembly or in our case in Barnstable the Town Council and they're not elected. They're not accountable to the people.

And I think that creates some issues, some political issues that get in the way of good governance. So I think that an elected person who can speak -- who can promote the County, who can do the meeting and the greeting and the handshaking and the baby kissing and also the governing is a good thing.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I agree.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes. I think we should have someone who's not -- whose job is secure, who's basically not going to be looking over his shoulder at whether or not he has the majority in the Council to support it. Because if he does then he's no longer leading; he's basically following.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right. The administrator, if you go that route --

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- then the council is the policymakers.

Chairman BERGSTROM: But the problem with that is, Julia, is that it's fine for John Boehner who got to give policy for the House of Representatives because he's elected partisan; he has a caucus.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, no, I'm not saying in favor of it, I'm just saying --

Chairman BERGSTROM: They caucus and they decide what they want to do and he reads them. But if you have a nonpartisan group that is all over the spectrum and you're not committed to anything, who's going to step forward and present policy issues? Who would do that?

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I have not felt that a basic problem of the County has been because it had an Executive and a Legislative branch. That's certainly been the criticism by the Business Roundtable and by the Special Commission on County Governance. That was their whole position.

I can see the virtue of that position but it isn't my preferred position. And I'm also swayed by Michael saying that more places are going to the elected Executive as opposed to the County Council. They're leaving the Barnstable Town model and going more to this model; right?

Mr. CURRAN: That's right.

Commissioner DOHERTY: To a Mayor of Cape Cod?

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, to a Mayor of Cape Cod.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And I think there's somebody in the audience that proposed that about two years ago.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, that's more what he says is the trend, and, to me, there are advantages to that. There are disadvantages. One, it's not as efficient. I get that but, hey, you know.

Ms. CANEDY: It can be.

Commissioner DOHERTY: How efficient that we know.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, it can't be -- it's not going to be less efficient than what we have and things have survived.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I guess my only problem with it is the idea of if you hire somebody that you're hiring a professional as part of it.

Ms. TAYLOR: Oh, I think that Executive is still going to hire, you know.

Commissioner DOHERTY: But do you pay double? I mean do you pay -- what do you pay somebody that runs for the Executive across Cape Cod?

Ms. TAYLOR: But you see now we are paying, and I'm not criticizing the pay, but we're now paying three Commissioners a part-time stipend. We're paying our former Administrator a decent salary as the Finance Director, and we've hired a new Administrator.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: So we basically have three people -- three positions, one of which has three people in it. So I don't see having --

Commissioner DOHERTY: So, 42, 150 and 120.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, so to me you have an elected official at some reasonably high fee and then you probably have a Finance Manager essentially. That's how I would see it. So I don't see it as more expensive.

Chairman BERGSTROM: The proposal we have in front of us is for, right now, is for if we're going to go to an appointed -- in other words, we want to take a vote up or down on the proposal in front of us because if we take a vote against this, then we're going to have an Administrator who's appointed.

Ms. TAYLOR: No, no. This is saying we're having an Executive who's elected.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Right.

Ms. TAYLOR: And then we're having him appoint an Administrator; right?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Let Linell get in here then Ann.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: This is the only committee I'm on that people actually don't raise hands.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, I tried but --

Ms. CANEDY: Some people are raising their hands.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I know.

Ms. TAYLOR: Me being a teacher, I just --

Ms. GRUNDMAN: A lot of passion but I think we need a little bound here. So I understand your concerns, Bill, but I do -- and the discussion we had when we came to this at the table, it was Suzanne -- I was shocked that we talked about an elected Executive because it came up kind of as part of the process.

And the more I think about it, the more I'm in favor of it because it provides a level of accountability like no other.

And I'm also in favor of it because of the last three to four years that I've been kind of in this issue, the symposiums that the League of Women Voters have had, the different meetings that I've gone to where we've talked about the evolution of the County government, constantly, constantly, constantly there was reference made to that strong singular leader that could be our quarterback, so-to-speak for the issues, the growing and critical issues of our region.

So this makes sense to me for Cape Cod. This makes sense to me for Barnstable County. And the accountability of election, I mean having been a Selectmen for six years, of course there's accountability there but because we're part-time Selectmen not in that Town Hall every day, there's a disconnect between the authority we're supposed to have and what we can actually accomplish. That disconnect would exist equally for an appointed Administrator. That disconnect does not exist for somebody who's been elected to do a job.

People have fear, "Well, what if they don't do it?" Well, then they don't get elected the next time. And with an 11 -- with a strong County Council, you still have a balance and you have enough leadership to keep going forward.

So I know this is -- it's very unusual. I mean Mike has pointed out to us that in terms of what's happening nationally it's not unusual, but it certainly is unusual for us.

However, I think it is creative, and I think that it will definitely bring a level of accountability to the leadership of the County that cannot occur any other way.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Suzanne, do you have anything to say here?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I couldn't get in the building.

Ms. TAYLOR: Oh no.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I went running around, running around trying --

Ms. TAYLOR: Oh, poor dear.

Chairman BERGSTROM: We knew how you were going to vote, so we --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No.

Chairman BERGSTROM: They do that up in Boston too.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I've also had a change of my thinking because I, as Selectmen, really liked having the ability to tell my Administrator what my policies were and to have someone carry out what the Board had developed as policies. That was very sort of controllable and gratifying.

So when I came to this, I wanted an appointed Administrator, but I think more and more that puts the onus then on the Council. And I think that -- I don't know if the Council would be prepared to be that, I don't know hands on in terms of County Government.

So if you have an elected, you have not only the accountability, you also have hopefully someone who is going to be invested in doing their job and keeping their job.

Chairman BERGSTROM: You know I think -- I mean I've voted against this, the whole proposal, but the one thing that just jumps out at me is that the idea of having someone be the face of the County, and you know I know that the Commissioners do that now and we do that as a Selectmen, but the fact is that an individual Selectmen or a Commissioner can't go out and say, "The County is going to do this." They have to make the decisions within their group and then --

So it's difficult to propose things. I mean you can propose things but you're basically speaking for yourself until you get a vote.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Exactly.

Chairman BERGSTROM: But an individual, elected official, let's say the President or the Governor, the Governor can say, "I've submitted a budget and I think this is the greatest thing in the world."

Of course the Legislature ignores it but at least he can go out there and promote something. And it puts the onus -- it puts more responsibility on the Council because what happens is if you have, let's say, Mr. Smith, who's the Executive, he runs around and says, "I think we should solve this wastewater problem and here's my proposal." So the people in your district are now going to come to you and say, "What do you think about this?"

The next thing you know you've got a controversy, which is not a bad thing, because now you have to take a stand. People are aware of what's going on and they feel more attached to the process.

So, I agree. I'm still wondering if anybody will vote for this outside of us.

Ann.

Ms. CANEDY: Maybe they'll just come and live in Barnstable for a while.

To also elaborate on that, if you do a parallel between the County and the town of Barnstable because the form of government, and that's the only reason I draw the parallel, is that if you did have an elected Executive, what is now -- Tom Lynch would be the Executive -- elected Executive, his assistant, Mark Ells, would be his appointed assistant.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Right.

Ms. CANEDY: So the elected person would go out and he would be the public face, and the appointed Administrator would probably be doing a lot of the work. So that's how it works in towns.

Ms. TAYLOR: And in a way Tom Lynch, being a political person, does do that. He

is the face of the town.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: So he mine as well have run for the office and be elected if there were such a possibility.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, I think we should, at some point, decide whether we're going to --

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, were there any details in here that people didn't like under the Executive issue?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Ron, I have a question.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes.

Clerk O'CONNELL: With regards to the elected County Executive, is that also nonpartisan?

Chairman BERGSTROM: Executive. I would vote -- we were going to get to that.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Oh, okay.

Chairman BERGSTROM: But my feeling on that is that that's a big district, and if you run as an independent, unless you happen to be a former President or Governor or something like that, you're going to have a hard time.

I don't know, maybe that's not true because my --

Clerk O'CONNELL: I only mention it because if there has to be something inserted in that first paragraph.

Chairman BERGSTROM: We were going to take a vote -- we're going to take a vote on that too. But first I want to --

Commissioner DOHERTY: Okay. I'm going to say that my major objection to having an elected versus an appointed one is a financial one because you'd end up paying two things.

I pointed out in this discussion that we're already committed to almost \$300,000 worth of money to do it.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And as far as a part-time versus a full-time elected, you may not need a full-time elected if you're talking about someone who is the face of the County.

I know that in my service, I've spent probably more time at this job -- I remember my wife used to complain about that -- than jobs I got paid for.

So I think that there's a commitment that you make when you get elected and that's all part of it. So I guess you silver-tongued devils have swayed me to your side.

MS. JESSICA WIELGUS: It's all part of the process.

Ms. TAYLOR: But speaking as someone who has had to run Cape-wide, do you feel it really has to be partisan?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Because of that?

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Hard to say.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Because you --

Ms. TAYLOR: I can't picture running Cape-wide with no party.

Commissioner DOHERTY: That's the problem.

Ms. CANEDY: Why? If both of them don't have parties, it's kind of even.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, I mean, you don't have to run with a party. What

we're saying is that can you have a party designation on the ballot? That's what we really need to decide. Can you say can the parties decide it and elect within a primary, and I think --

Commissioner DOHERTY: It's all about having the organization that you can go talk to to get some foot soldiers out there to put out the signs, you know, to invite you to the meetings and hopefully they'll give you some money.

Ms. TAYLOR: I think it's too hard. I think Cape-wide that's too hard.

Speaking as a town pall-type, don't you think so, Phyllis? I mean can you imagine -- I mean you've worked on Commissioners' races.

PHYLLIS: It needs partisan.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes. Well I know but --

Chairman BERGSTROM: That's actually written into these offices whether they're partisan or nonpartisan.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, it is.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Is that a decision --

Mr. CURRAN: Yes, usually they had the provision that all elections shall be nonpartisan and no party mark or designation -- that's language that's in a lot of municipal Charters.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. CURRAN: If you call the election nonpartisan -- you consider the election be nonpartisan provided, however, candidates may indicate if enrolled in a party. I'll work something --

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes, because it has to do with -- it's not just the government. It's the parties themselves that decide, you know, how --

Ms. TAYLOR: Well then you have primaries if it's a usual party.

Mr. CURRAN: Yes, we're not going to make any provision, at least I don't think for primary elections or primary.

Ms. CANEDY: Again, I'm going to argue for nonpartisan and call me Pollyanna but if both candidates are not actively promoting their parties, then it's kind of a level playing field, isn't it, and you draw people to you --

Mr. CURRAN: That's what I would hope, yes.

Ms. CANEDY: -- and you draw people to you and you draw support to you by your ideas and your person rather than your so-called platforms.

Mr. CURRAN: But under existing state law, anybody can run for any office and do not have to have it. Instead, you know, party candidates are nominated by a political process election caucus but -- or a caucus, but nonpartisan people can go out and get signatures. An enormous number. You need a party to collect them for you almost but you can do it.

Ms. CANEDY: Unless you specifically say that you're not going to designate your party and you're not going to run as partisan. Then the reality is this is not an evenly, you know, that there's a majority of one party than the other in this -- on this peninsula.

So it wouldn't be, you know, it would be like saying you should -- you're running a partisan race down here if you allow someone to elect I can put my party designation or I don't.

If you just say it's nonpartisan, which when you looked at the Assembly of Delegates on the ballot, you don't know if the person is a Democrat or a Republican.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes, but the problem I have -- I'll tell you -- one of the problems I had, obviously, there aren't like 150 candidates from Chatham willing to run for the

Assembly, you know and a lot of our elections go unchallenged.

Ms. CANEDY: But I think there will be people interested in running for the Mayor of Cape Cod.

Chairman BERGSTROM: There will be a lot of people --

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And that leaves the possibility that someone would get elected with 27 percent of the vote. You could have 50 candidates.

One of the things that a partisan designation does is it winnows down the candidates. In other words, if you had -- let's say Rob O'Leary wanted to run and Eric Turkington wanted to run, they'd have to run in a primary.

In other words, there wouldn't be five known political figures running for the same office because they'd have to compete against each other in a primary. I just don't want to see anybody elected with less than -- you can get elected with less than 50 percent of the votes but I think it's better to get elected with the majority.

Ms. CANEDY: I think it's more inclusive to make it nonpartisan.

Chairman BERGSTROM: No.

Ms. CANEDY: It includes people who are not actively part of the political machine.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I think that that's naïve.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Linell.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Well, they're not -- if they're unenrolled, they can run. I mean if it's partisan, it does not eliminate people who are unenrolled. You'd have three candidates. And if you had an independent, you'd have four candidates. And if you had the Green Party, you'd have five candidates.

Ms. CANEDY: And the unenrolled person would not have a shot in hell.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: But it does not eliminate a designated --

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I mean I hear what you're saying, and I'm kind of attracted to what you're saying from a philosophical standpoint. But on a practical level, what Ron just said is a very important thing.

Without a partisan designation, we could have 14 candidates, and we might end up with somebody in leadership. And I think we should also -- that is not suited for leadership.

Ms. CANEDY: Yes.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I think it's also important to remember that the budget for the County is smaller than most of -- than a lot of our towns, not most of our towns, but -- so we're not talking about somebody who's going to yield power over every citizen.

And I want to bring this up because it's come up in my head a couple of times while we're talking, and I think this is something people don't think about. They think that the County, you know, it's a hierarchy but it's not.

The County makes certain decisions about certain issues that are regionally based. The County does not take away any authority from municipal decisions. It can't. You know, it can't supersede any state law.

So it was really about the distinction between County government, municipal government, state government, and federal government. The role of County government is what's critical here.

And I would think that your reasoning is probably the best one going forward.

Chairman BERGSTROM: I agree with you. So what we're looking at now is we've

got two votes ahead of us. One is do we vote to have a single elected Executive which is the proposal that's in front of us now. Let's -- it's not an either/or. If we vote this down, then we're going to go somewhere else but the proposal right now --

Commissioner DOHERTY: Okay. I'll move that.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Second.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. You moved that. Moved and seconded. Okay. We've had a discussion on this. All those in favor of having a single, elected County Executive say "Aye." Opposed?

(Motion passed.)

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. So we've got --

Ms. TAYLOR: All right. So we're back to that. And we've even persuaded Bill to join that. Wow.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Now the Partisan thing goes. Now do we allow to have a partisan designation?

Ms. TAYLOR: Did I miss -- is this in it at all? Did I miss this, Mike, partisan issue?

Mr. CURRAN: Did you -- oh, no, it's not discussed in here.

Ms. TAYLOR: It's not put in here, okay.

Mr. CURRAN: Actually, the election provisions are in another section.

Ms. TAYLOR: Okay. That's why it doesn't come up.

Mr. CURRAN: That's why it didn't come up there. I would have to address that.

Ms. TAYLOR: But we'd at least have to tell people what we were proposing?

Mr. CURRAN: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Well, right now we have two proposals that we can go forward that are concrete. And I wonder if we should stop there because the issue -- No, the issue of partisan versus nonpartisan --

Ms. CANEDY: It might be a deal breaker.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: -- it might be one that would obfuscate our intent of getting two solid proposals that set up specific governance. I think we ought to stop there than --

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, that's true. Because that really is how you run the election.

Commissioner DOHERTY: -- go forward with the two.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, I don't know. We're going to need votes in the Legislature to pass this. They think they have people breathing down their neck to vote for them.

Ms. TAYLOR: No, no, but Ron, if we got to that point, we would have had to have done the whole Charter which would include the election provisions. But we haven't gotten to the election provisions, so I think --

Chairman BERGSTROM: It's not critical. I get it.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- I kind of go along with it.

Ms. CANEDY: I agree with Julia.

Ms. TAYLOR: We could put that off.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Good point, Bill.

Chairman BERGSTROM: We've made a decision. We're going to go with in support of both of the major directions of these documents we've amended; we've amended the Legislative document to include a method of replacing someone who steps down.

Ms. TAYLOR: And setting up the initial districts.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And setting up the -- Now, is that the same -- remind me, is that the same provision for the elected Executive, Mike? What happens if he or she steps down?

Mr. CURRAN: Well I think -- well, one -- what happens right now?

Commissioner DOHERTY: The Assembly meets and they appoint --

Ms. TAYLOR: And we appointed. That happened.

Commissioner DOHERTY: -- a replacement for the unexpired term. When Roland, for example, was appointed --

Ms. TAYLOR: And that's what you have in here.

Mr. CURRAN: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: -- and when I ran against him, I was elected and began service surprise-surprise the next day.

Mr. CURRAN: When you run for County Commissioner, do you have your designation on the ballot?

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yes, I ran in a primary.

Mr. CURRAN: So there must have be language in this Charter that allows for that, and we don't have --

Ms. TAYLOR: It does.

Mr. CURRAN: I don't have --

Chairman BERGSTROM: No, we're talking about the Executive -- if the Executive -

Mr. CURRAN: I understand that but he's the Executive now.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Mr. CURRAN: There would only be one Executive in the future.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Right.

Mr. CURRAN: And if the language now allows him to use his political designation, I don't see how that would prevent the County Executive, singular, from doing the same thing.

Chairman BERGSTROM: No, actually, we've moved onto whether or not -- what happens if that Executive is -- doesn't complete his term?

Mr. CURRAN: No, no, we're talking about filling the vacancy. We're talking about just generally whether elections are going to be partisan/ nonpartisan.

Ms. TAYLOR: At the moment --

Mr. CURRAN: At the moment.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- we haven't gotten to the section about elections if we might want to change it to be nonpartisan. But at the moment we're kind of leaving that open.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes, we decided to take that off the table right now.

Mr. CURRAN: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

Ms. TAYLOR: So now we're to the vacancy and here you have it that the County Council chooses the Executive until the next state election.

Mr. CURRAN: Oh, vacancy, okay.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, so I think that we go with that. We are happy with that.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Okay.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: That makes sense.

Chairman BERGSTROM: So now we've -- so we're going to be sending this on

now to the --

Ms. TAYLOR: Assembly.

Chairman BERGSTROM: -- the Assembly as is. They can change it/amend it. It's not written in stone but --

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes. Now we're going to vote on each of these that we're going to - - oh, we did vote this one.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, we sort of -- let's say, yes, we can take two of them. We've approved the documents and now we're going to vote on whether or not to send it up to the Assembly as is.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes. Okay. We already voted this one actually.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Voted actually both of them.

Ms. TAYLOR: To go to the -- no, we didn't vote this to proceed.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, --

Ms. CANEDY: The minutes are not going to reflect what this and this is.

Ms. TAYLOR: Okay. In my opinion, we just voted to approve the draft of Article 3, "Executive Branch," to go forward to the Assembly.

Are votes on Article 2, "Draft Legislative Branch," I believe we're on details, and we now want to vote to proceed forward on that.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Well, I thought -- the way I took it was that we were voting on -- we were voting to approve these drafts or within the ballpark.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And now we can now take a vote. Do we want to recommend this to the Assembly?

Ms. TAYLOR: All right. But then lets do them separately anyway.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: All right. So then I will move that this Charter Review Committee recommend this draft of Article 2, "Legislative Branch" with the changes made --

Mr. CURRAN: Discussions too.

Ms. TAYLOR: -- as discussed. Of course, this is where we had our last little go-around. But -- okay.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Second.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And in discussion, I would say that based upon the language that I heard that it was not a vote, that it's important to make this vote to send it forward.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. My feeling is it's kind of awkward because we're sending -- we are recommending this. I'm not recommending it but -- and it's got --

Ms. TAYLOR: Then I think you should vote no.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. That's what I'm going to do. That's what I was going to do anyway but thanks for the support.

Ms. TAYLOR: All right.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So we won't beat you up.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. But I get to call for the vote anyway regardless of how I vote. So all those in favor of recommending this to the Assembly, say "Aye."

Opposed, no.

Chairman BERGSTROM: (Raised hand.)

(Motion passed.)

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. Now we're onto the "Executive Branch."

Ms. TAYLOR: And I move that we also recommend as a Charter Review Committee the Draft of Article 3 for the Executive Branch.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Second.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Second.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. Any further discussion on this? I might vote for this because it doesn't really --

Ms. TAYLOR: Good.

Commissioner DOHERTY: It doesn't bother you. You're not a stakeholder in this.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Bill and I will run against each other.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Would you? You'd be in big trouble.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes, I'd rather have a root canal.

Okay. So we've got moved and seconded. All those in favor say "Aye" Opposed?

(Motion passed.)

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. So now the next question is is that I am going to hold a vote on this a week from today. How does the committee wish to participate in that vote? Obviously, myself and Suzanne and Julia will be in the Assembly. The other members want to come and answer questions or -- I mean it's pretty straightforward, I think, but --

Commissioner DOHERTY: The Assembly process does not allow for open discussion without permission. I would suggest that since three members of this committee are on the Assembly, they could carry the water with regard to this.

Chairman BERGSTROM: I agree.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: I agree.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Unless you guys want to --

Ms. CANEDY: Unless you want support.

Ms. TAYLOR: You're certainly welcome to come and speak in the public period.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: True.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: At the beginning, yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: But I think that since you have all both voted for it and there's no question about that.

Commissioner DOHERTY: I think our vote speaks for our -- with our intention and our opinion.

Ms. TAYLOR: I don't think you have to.

Chairman BERGSTROM: And I have to say I think this committee basically did a great job with the responsibility given under considering the complicated Charter. And that's the good news.

The bad news is that even if once -- that our work's not done.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Chairman BERGSTROM: As Mike says, we're going to have the next phase will be -- regardless of the vote on next Wednesday, we're going to review -- we've already started review of some of the issues just conversationally and we're going to bring up some other issues that might be transferred to the Manual of Governance or to recommend Charter changes that don't have to go through the Assembly. It can go to the Legislative process.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Do you want to set any dates, Ron?

Chairman BERGSTROM: I want to wait until the Assembly -- Mike, do you have anything to add to this?

Mr. CURRAN: I'll try to get these things cleaned up most of the day tomorrow. So either late tomorrow or early Friday morning to get them out to you, you know, cleaned up versions and if you have any objection, you'll be able to --

Commissioner DOHERTY: Excuse me. Point of order. I would like to suggest at this point in order to avoid a complication with the Open Meeting Law that we authorize our Chair to pass on the final language and present it that way.

Ms. TAYLOR: Based on our discussions.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: Yes, okay. Thank you.

Commissioner DOHERTY: And perhaps we need to formalize that with a vote and I make that motion.

Ms. TAYLOR: I would move that we have the minutes. We have Mike's hearing this. The cleaning up the language of Article 2 will be approved by the Chair.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Second.

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

Okay. And that's not going to be any substantial change.

Mr. CURRAN: And similarly for Article 3 probably.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, there really was nothing that we were --

Mr. CURRAN: Well, just that --

Ms. TAYLOR: Just in -- all right. And that -- same --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Same motion for three.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Second.

Ms. TAYLOR: All right.

Chairman BERGSTROM: All those in favor say "Aye." Opposed?
(Motion passed.)

Chairman BERGSTROM: Okay. So we'll discuss -- we'll vote on governance a week from Wednesday and we'll see how that goes. And we'll move on from there.

And I think then we'll decide -- I think that I'm going to leave a lot to Mike, our attorney, to recommend -- before we sit and look at the Charter ourselves, we'll ask him to look at it and decide what has to be in the Charter and what doesn't and what could be better dealt with in other fashion.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Chairman BERGSTROM: That way somebody knows what they're doing will decide instead of us.

Ms. TAYLOR: Do we -- he hasn't said a meeting date yet.

Chairman BERGSTROM: No, I haven't set a meeting date. I don't think we're going to meet next Wednesday. There would be no reason.

Ms. TAYLOR: I can't meet next Wednesday. I can only --

Chairman BERGSTROM: So then there will be sufficient time after the vote on Wednesday. The next possible meeting would be the following Wednesday, and there will be time to get a notice out by Friday.

So I only need one more vote -- one more motion.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Adjourn.

Commissioner DOHERTY: Move to Adjourn.

Ms. CANEDY: Adjourn.

Ms. GRUNDMAN: Second.

Chairman BERGSTROM: All those in favor say “Aye.”

Whereupon, it was moved, seconded, and voted to adjourn the Charter Review Committee Meeting at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Janice O’Connell, Clerk
Assembly of Delegates