

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT - ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES  
CHAMBER OF THE ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES  
FIRST DISTRICT COURTHOUSE  
ROUTE 6A, BARNSTABLE, MA 02630**

**APPROVED Journal of Proceedings - February 1, 2017**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: It's 4 o'clock. I'm going to convene the meeting of the Cape Cod Regional Government, Assembly of Delegates. This is Wednesday, February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017.

I would like to start with a moment of silence, please, to honor our troops who have died in service to our country and those who are still serving in our country in the Armed Forces.

(Moment of silence.)

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you.

Please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Will the Clerk please call the roll?

**Roll Call (100%): Edward Atwood (2.30% - Eastham), Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Lilli-Ann Green (1.27% - Wellfleet), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Edward Lewis (4.55% -Brewster), E. Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), Susan Moran (14.61% - Falmouth), Thomas O'Hara (6.49% - Mashpee), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Brian O'Malley (1.36% - Provincetown), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).**

Clerk O'CONNELL: Madam Speaker, we have 100 percent of the Delegates present.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Excellent. May I have a motion for approval of the Calendar of Business.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Is there a second?

Ms. ZUERN: Second.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Any discussion? All those in favor? Aye.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: It passes unanimously.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And may I have a motion for approval of the Journal of January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017?

Mr. O'MALLEY: Madam Speaker, I've read through the journal as distributed and move its approval.

Mr. LEWIS: Second.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Any discussion? All those in favor? Aye.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: It passes unanimously.

**Communications from the Board of Regional Commissioners**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: First up for us is the communications from the Board of Regional Commissioners. We have one of our Commissioners -- oh, excuse me, two of our Commissioners; I'm not used to our new Commissioner, Ron Beaty. Ron Beaty and Leo Cakounes are here.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: How's that? Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since our last time visiting with you, we have had three meetings, so I'll go through them relatively quickly.

On January 25<sup>th</sup>, we held a meeting and it was really our last meeting in which we were doing the budget reviews. At that meeting we had you guys, the Assembly of Delegates; we had the Cape Cod Economic Development Council number of grant applications; the Arts Foundation, Elder Services. We also did some revenue projections with the County Administrator and the Director of Finance.

And then we had a number of other, I would call, just, I guess, orders of business that we usually do voting minutes, subordination of mortgages, and we did have a request for an unpaid leave on that meeting; nothing to jumpy up and down to report on.

On January 30<sup>th</sup>, which was yesterday, we held a special meeting at 4 o'clock. And the only purpose for that meeting was to have a presentation and discussion about the future funding and possible restructuring of the Cape Cod Water Collaborative. That meeting was an invited meeting where, basically, the participants were members of the Cape Water Collaborative office staff, Department of Finance; we had -- the Department of Health was there, members of the Cape Cod Commission, and we invited the Speaker to come and/or your representative and you were there.

At that meeting, it was basically a time for me, personally, as one Commissioner to lay out some ideas I had with restructuring and changing the funding mechanism of the Collaborative. And I wanted to present it not only to our department heads but to the Cape Cod Water Collaborative people so that they were comfortable in knowing where we were headed.

With that, I'll segue into today's meeting because that was one of the issues on today's agenda and one of the things that we did today.

First on the docket today, we did two things. We had kind of a combined discussion. Many of you may or may not know there's a Bill filed that's called Docket No. 60. It is legislation that has been filed by one of the other counties here in Massachusetts.

And the legislation basically asks for the state to redo the allocation of the percent of how much money the counties keep and how much the state takes from the deeds excise tax receipts. And four counties have signed onto it, so we put it on our agenda today to discuss it.

We're treated a little differently even in the Bill when you read it because there's just some long history on it. But the downside is that if this Bill does pass, we would retain about \$900,000 in revenue from the Registry of Deeds tax.

Commissioner BEATY: Extra.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Extra. The second part of that discussion was the House Bill Docket 4513 that Barnstable County asked its representatives to file last year, and that one was strictly dealing with the Registry of Deeds here at Barnstable County, and it was asking the state to take over the liability for the Sheriff's Retirement Liability that we assumed when the Sheriff's department left and took the employees with them where we had to assume the previous liability. And that figure is about \$1.2 million roughly.

And that Bill was filed last year by our representatives here on the Cape. It really did not go anywhere. I was told by our legislators that it was tough to push because it only affected one county and, you know, it's nice when you have other counties helping you.

So the decision today by the Commissioners were to table the refiling of the Docket 4513, which is the one that specifically addresses the Sheriff's liability; table that, not ask our legislators to file it again, but to ask our legislators to join the other legislators and push the

Docket 60 legislation, which, again, as a matter of fact will retain us about \$900,000.

And that's not to say that a later date if maybe for some negotiation reasons or if the state has a windfall that we would ask our legislators to refile the original one that we filed last year. But right now, the way it stands, today's action at the Commissioners level was to support Docket 60 and table Docket 4513.

So do you have anything you want to add to that?

Commissioner BEATY: No.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Today was the first day that we did an actual budget vote. We began looking at the budgets. We, over the last month, have been having presentations made to us and, basically, have never really taken a vote or a stand on any of them. So we decided the way it's going to work was that today was going to be our first day to take our first stab at, if you will, trying to balance the budget.

If you want to write these figures down, you can, but you're going to be getting them anyhow. We started out with a projected revenue of 28,823,000-and-some- change. The expenditures that were presented to us were 29 million 633.

So, basically, we began this morning with a budget that was out of sync by about \$770,000, almost \$800,000. We were overspending by \$800,000. So we had a task that we had to take on today.

There were a number of different votes. I won't go through them all. I'll be happy to answer any questions if you'd like, and I can try to get you, you know, you're going to be getting the budget so you will be seeing it.

I just want to say for the record that this was our first stab, our first run at it. We have one more meeting next week where I'm hoping that we will be certainly revisiting and revoting.

In my calculations, and I cannot stress this enough, in my calculations taking what we did today, the cuts that we made today and adding them all up and subtracting that grand total from the projected revenue of 29 598, we have about --

Commissioner BEATY: No, that was expenditure.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: No. The revenues are \$28,823, sorry.

Commissioner BEATY: Right.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: \$28,833. We have about \$400,000 in the plus. So we started the day with an \$800,000 in the negative. Our votes have created a \$400,000-plus. I do want to caution you though there are a number of things, quite large things, that that \$400,000 is going to probably be reflected to.

One certainly is some ongoing operations and maintenance at the Fire Academy, which we haven't budgeted for yet. And, secondly, is in our votes we completely cut the Joint Initiatives with the Cape Cod Commission. And I strongly as one Commissioner will tell you that I do not believe that that is a good place to go into FY18.

So I think as we go back next week, you're going to see some -- maybe some more cuts, but you're also going to see some additions. Because I, certainly, would be proposing some additions if those numbers are actually true.

And again this meeting was done today. A lot of numbers, a lot of going back-and-forth, so don't take any validity to any of this. This is just a dry run with that.

Commissioner BEATY: It's a work in progress.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: A work in progress. Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Commissioner Cakounes, would you, please, just explain to the

Assembly what your plan is with the overall budget so that they know what today is and what next week will be?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Sure.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Because I'm not sure that everybody's aware of your overall plan.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Our goal as the County Commissioners is to hand the Assembly a balanced budget. And the biggest difference between this balanced budget and any other ones that you've received in the past is it's going to be balanced without using any reserve monies to balance it.

I could easily say at the beginning of today let's just send those \$29 million requests in and take \$800,000 out of reserves and call it a balanced budget and that's what has been done in the past. We're not doing that. Our budget message clearly stated, "No use of reserves to balance the budget."

So our goal here is to get you guys by next Friday a balanced budget. Now because it's a little different than like the communities have, and I know Mr. Lewis and I have talked about this, and I think even Mr. Bergstrom and I have gone back and forth; most times selectmen get an approved budget from their administration and then the selectmen tear it apart. That's not what happened here.

Our administration was very busy trying to get us numbers. We just got presentations. We, the commissioners, got presentations from all our department heads, took all those ask numbers, if you will, put them on a sheet, and today was the first day that we actually discussed each one of them and made cuts where we thought were appropriate. So this was round one.

Next week will be round two, and we have to, by Charter, have a vote next week and hand you guys a completed balanced budget.

So that's it in a nutshell as far as the procedure. I will be available for some budget questions after the meeting if you want, but right now, let me just finish the presentation about today.

That budget process took a long time because, as I said earlier, we did not just go to the bottom line. We actually went through every single department, and I believe there's 15 of them, and we discussed what their ask was, made amendments to it, and then voted a new number. And that's where I came up with the new number today of 28 million 430 and change.

After that was done, we had some general business that we had to do, and I'll just run through these very quickly. It's basically our bulletproof stuff that we always do. We approved some minutes. We had assignments of some road construction companies -- reassignments, I should say. We had a renewal of a road construction contract. There was some discharges of the HOME mortgages, and I keep saying H-O-M-E because I don't want people to think it is just home mortgages; Acronym H-O-M-E. Subordination to those mortgages, timesheets, and then we actually had a couple more requests for not only some unpaid leave but some vacation time carryover, and that was really the conclusion of today's meeting. And that's what brought us here.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Commissioner Beaty, anything you wanted to add?

Commissioner BEATY: I just wanted to add -- the reserves are depleted. You can't take money out of something you don't have. And like he mentioned, that's what's been done in the past and the result is now there's nothing there. And they have to rebuild the reserves so

that they can even get the --

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Bond rating.

Commissioner BEATY: -- the bond ratings so that we can start doing other things that counties and governments do, which we haven't done since, what, '89?

So that has to, you know, be done.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Before --

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Can I add one thing?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Just before I forget, on the Cape Cod Water Collaborative, I want to just mention this that there's been a lot of discussion on that -- I'm sorry, not the Cape Water Collaborative -- the Human Rights Committee.

The Human Rights Committee presently does not have enough members on the committee itself to, in fact, meet and take votes. So I would like you all to go home or -- and I'm going to use this opportunity that we're on camera if the Human Rights Committee should -- if they have applicants that want to serve on that committee, they can just give them directly to the Commissioners, and we can appoint people at least to get them to the majority that they need to now continue the reviewing.

Did you have something you want to report on that because I think you went to the meeting?

Commissioner BEATY: Oh no. There's the Human Rights Commission and then there's the Health and Human Services Committee. The Health and Human Services Committee is the one that nominates the members for the Human Rights Commissioners, and we're supposed to meet tomorrow morning to take care of that. But I guess you mentioned there might not be a quorum.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Yes.

Commissioner BEATY: So if there's not a quorum, then we should just do what he just said.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: We'll work it out.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And that's been an issue over -- part of the problems with the Human Rights Commission over the last several months is their inability to -- they're depleted. They haven't been able to fill the quorum.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Right.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So the Commissioners can help with that.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Absolutely right.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: If there are people interested, this lets them not have to wait until they have a quorum.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Right.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: There's another way to build up the numbers on the commission.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Absolutely.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Second thing before I take questions; Cape Cod Water Collaborative is not on the agenda today. I intend to have it be a full agenda item before the Assembly as soon as possible. Dr. O'Malley and Susan Moran by phone were also in attendance at the meeting yesterday.

And this is far deeper, far more comprehensive, and far more critical for the County and the Assembly than just, oh, we're going to restructure and there's a budget issue. There are

four or five layers that were uncovered yesterday. It was an excellent meeting, but I think it is incumbent upon us to know that because it's really going to impact our revenue priorities and our budgetary considerations going forward.

So as soon as possible. It might not be the next meeting but within a meeting or two, I'd like to have the interested parties in with Commissioner Cakounes, Sims McGrath, chair of the Cape Cod Water Collaborative and anyone else who is there; George Heufelder and Paul Niedzwiecki because they all have some very important information to add to this four or five layer puzzle.

So that will be on an upcoming agenda meeting, so we really can't discuss it today because it's not on the agenda. But it is very important and it will be definitely on our agenda.

So questions? Susan.

Ms. MORAN: Sure. Madam Chair, with respect to the timing of the scheduling of the meeting regarding the coalition; you may recall part of the meeting was that the coalition chair decided to put on the coalition's agenda a recommendation from the coalition.

So I was just thinking it would, I think, make sense for the chair to report to you as soon as the coalition has a statement or a recommendation and that that be included in your presentation or in the presentation to the Assembly.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Coalition or Collaborative?

Ms. MORAN: Collaborative, sorry. Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Now any questions of the Commissioners? Yes, I see Ron Bergstrom and then Ed Lewis this way.

Mr. BERGSTROM: Leo, two things. One, just, I guess, kind of a (Indiscernible) point is you said that we used reserves to balance the budget. Well, as you know, if you use reserves, you're not balancing the budget because the balance budget is, you know, revenues and expenditures in a sense. I mean, it's just a word thing, but, to me, a budget that relies on reserves as we had in the past is not a balanced budget. If you're going to cut the balance budget, it's certainly an improvement.

But another thing is that I read the story in the paper this morning of your meeting, and you were quoted or misquoted, God only knows I've been misquoted, by saying that a certain revenue stream for the Collaborative would not be included in the 2018 budget. So the question is how did you know that?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: No. The whole purpose of the meeting was to show my amendments.

Mr. BERGSTROM: Okay.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: So at that time, last night, I made very clear that this was my idea, my amendment. It had not been approved by any of the Commissioners yet.

Mr. BERGSTROM: I understand that.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Now whether the paper took it as if it was a done deal, I don't know. Ironically, today, the way the votes went, it did pass. We have been asked as a committee -- I mean separate commissioners, "Would you support that?" And I know Mr. Beaty has said openly that he would, and I don't know about if Mary Pat has been asked or not if she would or not. So maybe the writer assumed it but you'll have to ask him that question.

Mr. BERGSTROM: Okay.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: But I made it very clear that yesterday's meeting was my ideas for the amendment; number one.

Number two, I clearly said that the Collaborative was not going to be funded in the

FY18 budget the way it is being presented to us.

Mr. BERGSTROM: Okay.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: We were not -- I was not nor will I support \$502,000 to be given in a line item to the Cape Cod Water Collaborative.

Mr. BERGSTROM: All right. But, see, words are important. When you say it will not be done -- before you took any votes and before the Commissioners sent the budget in so that was the quote in the paper. My saying is that you can't --

Commissioner CAKOUNES: It will not be done -- in my presentation to the board yesterday, this is what I said. It will not -- I have no intentions in my amendments to fund --

Mr. BERGSTROM: So it was specific. So you didn't mean to imply any personal knowledge of how the vote would go?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Absolutely not.

Mr. BERGSTROM: Okay.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Nor do I care, to be honest with you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And this is all just part of a very small part of a very big puzzle that makes a lot of sense once you have all the pieces.

Ed.

Mr. LEWIS: Welcome, Commissioners.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Thank you.

Mr. LEWIS: Just a question because I'm not sure from a county standpoint. You talked about the two docket items, Docket 60 and I forget the exact number --

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: -- of the one that --

Commissioner BEATY: 4513.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: 4513, sir.

Mr. LEWIS: 4513. Now were those -- is the one that you filed last year, would that be called a Home Rule petition?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: No, I don't believe it would be a Home Rule petition, sir. I think when you use the word "Home Rule," it usually means that we're somehow amending our Charter, and we're using governing rules, but I don't know. He's shaking his head. He knows more than I do on that.

Mr. LEWIS: Usually Home Rules can be just applied to any town -- any of the --

Commissioner CAKOUNES: I did not hear that term attached to our filing of it last year, so I would have to say no.

Mr. LEWIS: The only reason I ask that is because Home Rule petitions get a -- go to different committees and things like that. In other words, when any town passes the room tax bill, as an example, those are Home Rule petitions in many instances.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: That's correct.

Mr. LEWIS: And I don't know if counties can file Home Rule petitions. If they can and those get treated completely differently. I'm not disagreeing with your thought process on what you're filing. I just want to know if it was a Home Rule petition?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: I can't answer that question; can you specifically?

Commissioner BEATY: No, but --

Commissioner CAKOUNES: I'll be more than happy to ask Ms. Peake. She's the one that filed it for us and get that answer back to you, Mr. Lewis.

Commissioner BEATY: But my understanding is that matter didn't even go before the

County Commissioners last year before it was filed. I think it was requested by the County Administrator and --

Mr. LEWIS: It doesn't need to.

Commissioner BEATY: Okay.

Mr. LEWIS: Doesn't need to. It can be filed with the legislature. If the legislature, whoever, you know, the County -- the Cape legislators decide to file a Home Rule petition on behalf of the County, they can do that.

Commissioner BEATY: Okay.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: I'll get you that answer, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS: Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Brian.

Mr. O'MALLEY: I need some clarification from the chairman. You mentioned in your remarks about today's meeting funding for road reconstruction. Can I assume that's the County complex?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: No, sir. The Barnstable County, through its procurement officer, we handle a lot of different road construction bids and bid documents and awarding of those for a number of different towns.

The particular one -- there was two that we did today. We did a reassignment of one, and we also did the renewal for the roadway construction and that was specifically for the town of Chatham. So this action had nothing to do with the complex here.

Mr. O'MALLEY: All right. That actually confuses me further then. Tell me how this arrangement works. Are we doing permitting? Are we --

Commissioner CAKOUNES: No, we --

Mr. O'MALLEY: -- we don't have a DPW that does that.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: No. It has nothing to do with the actual construction at all, Dr. O'Malley. This is strictly a procurement service that we provide to the towns.

Mr. O'MALLEY: Got it.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Instead of the town going out to the state bid list and trying to get the best deal that they can for paving their roadways, they use the County. The County combines the number of towns together and goes out for a bigger bid document. And that that perceivably we get a better deal because these guys that have been on it know that they're going to be doing the whole lower Cape towns, not just Provincetown. So they're bidding kind of for all of them, and it's been a good system and it certainly one of the things that the towns are very happy using.

Mr. O'MALLEY: No, I think it makes sense.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Strictly procurement though. No -- none of our men are doing any roadwork.

Mr. O'MALLEY: Got it. Okay. Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: John.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you. With your indulgence, I have one question for each one of the Commissioners, if I might?

Leo, this is a repeat of this morning's question to you. The Cape Cod Water Protection Collaborative is generating a lot of interest in the towns, and I understand that many of them have written specific letters in regards to that. Can you tell us how many have written and which towns they are?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: And I apologize, Mr. Ohman, I do not have that specific

number, but I would probably go out on a limb and say all but maybe one or two have not sent one. All members of the Collaborative have sent one.

Mr. OHMAN: And are they similar in nature?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: To my knowledge, there were two where I would call them form letters, and they're pretty much either been one or the other form letter that I've received anyhow.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And I'm going to interject here. I think once you hear the information that was presented yesterday, you will have a different outlook on what some of the requests from the towns were because that was -- it doesn't fit in to how everything that was discussed yesterday. I think you'll get your information as we get our information.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: And if I can respond to that too? It doesn't surprise me the towns are concerned because, once again, they've been used to, after the last seven years, getting \$500,000 from the County. And it has been reported that the County is not going to be funding that and there will be no more money.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: That's not true.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: And that's just not true. So, unfortunately, the majority of the letters that are being sent to us are sent to us with false information and false basis.

And I was hoping that yesterday's meeting -- one of the reasons why I called for that meeting was so that the new way that I wanted to, at that time, proceed to move forward would be addressed to not only the members, but they could take it back to their towns.

And subsequently now, seeing that Mr. Beaty -- and today we did vote it, it appears that the Commissioners are moving that way. We did not unfund it. We cut \$100,000 out of it, not 501 or 502.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes, John.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you. Mr. Beaty, my town reported to me that you had called them and all other 14 towns individually over the weekend and left voicemails. And I could read the transcript but, essentially, you asked if they would kindly give the County --

Commissioner BEATY: No. I said if they --

Mr. OHMAN: -- would you like me to read the --

Commissioner BEATY: Sure.

Mr. OHMAN: With your indulgence? This was sent to every -- this was called into every town hall over the weekend; is that correct, all 15?

Commissioner BEATY: Yes.

Mr. OHMAN: "Hi. I'm calling for" in this case "Dennis Town Administrator as well as the Board of Selectmen. My name is Ronald Beaty, spelled B-e-a-t-y."

Commissioner BEATY: Y.

Mr. OHMAN: "Ron Beaty and I'm a Barnstable County Commissioner. My phone number is -- the office is 375-6680. I'm

Calling to inquire if the town of Dennis might have any interest in donating \$100,000 toward the continued operation, maintenance, functioning of the Cape Cod Water Collaborative. Continue its current format of 15 representatives for each of the 15 Cape Cod towns.

But, once again, I'm calling to inquire if the town of Dennis," and repeat that for all the other towns, "would have any interest in donating \$100,000 toward the continued operation, maintenance, and function of the Cape Cod Water Protection Collaborative. Thank you."

Commissioner BEATY: That's accurate.

Mr. OHMAN: Was that an official notice or --

Commissioner BEATY: Nope, that was me. That was me calling as an individual, who happens to be a Commissioner. And to have dialogue going, I've already gone publicly on record that I did not want the Water Protection Collaborative to be dissolved or cut down from its 15 representatives. I felt that all 15 towns need to have a voice.

And my understanding as a public body, as an independent public body, it's going to stay intact. And I want it to continue in some form or fashion to continue its work. My understanding is that they can go out and get grants from the towns, from the state, and the feds and I'd like to see that continue in whatever format.

I understand the financial circumstances, the dire financial circumstances that the County has been in, and for X number of years the towns have benefited. So if they have an inclination to do so, maybe they can help things out as well if they're in a position to do so.

And that's why I asked if they have an interest. I didn't specific -- I didn't come right out and say, "Give us money." If they have an interest or any -- and I use that figure and if they had an interest in some smaller number perhaps.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. And not to get too far afield on this; this all fits in to the presentation because one of the things that needs to happen is the restructuring, a reorganization, a rededication, or relook at how the Collaborative functions, the needs of the County.

And one of the needs of the County is a sustained revenue stream to look at data, to analyze data, to make data available. All this needs to be done.

So this, in context, you know, searching for a sustained revenue stream, it's not the only way to do that. But this is why all these little bits and pieces out there don't make sense. So you need to hear soup to nuts on this so that you know and this makes sense.

Sorry to put you off. I just had too many other things on the agenda, plus we don't have the Collaborative having had their decision yet as Susan Moran pointed out on how they wanted to participate in this grand plan. So we also need that.

I'll go to Lilli-Ann --

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Could I just, Madam Speaker?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: If I could just add for the record too, I had no knowledge of the phone call.

Commissioner BEATY: Right.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: And as Mr. Beaty expressed, this was not actions of the Commissioners. This was his personal action. And by the way for the record, the Ordinance that established the Collaborative does allow for the towns, if they want to, to donate money or to put money into the Collaborative.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Just looking for money.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: There's nothing in the Ordinance that says the County is the only one that has to pony up 500 grand a year.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: I think it comes out like, "Save the Collaborative," which is not really the message.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: I'm not saying I condone or deny what he did, but I had no knowledge of it until actually John Ohman told me about it today. It's the first I've heard of it.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And the intent was far bigger than the Collaborative. Yes, Lilli-

Ann.

Ms. GREEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the Commissioners; to Leo, I want to thank you for putting so much time and energy into the Water Collaborative. I've had several conversations with people in my town about it as well, and I'm glad to hear that this will be continued as with the Commissioners as well.

I do have a follow-up line of questioning that I've spent a lot of time since our last meeting because of the morning of our last meeting, I learned from our Town Administrator that the Cape Light Compact is going in the direction of a Joint Powers Agreement as something that would actually replace the current Intergovernmental Agreement. And I know that Commissioner Cakounes is the representative to the Cape Light Compact.

Our representative to the Cape Light Compact in Wellfleet has sent a letter to our Board of Selectmen, was on the agenda last Tuesday at the Board of Selectmen's meeting. We had an Energy Committee meeting since our last meeting, which I am on the Energy Committee in my town. And I've learned a lot about this Joint Powers Agreement.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Do you have a question?

Ms. GREEN: I do have a question to Commissioner Cakounes based upon the concerns of my Board of Selectmen. My Board of Selectmen is very concerned that given the Joint Powers Agreement if this were to happen, the County would not be able to be full members with full voting rights in Cape Light Compact. And they would like Barnstable County to continue in this capacity to represent all the towns in the County regarding matters with CLC.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: I'm sorry --

Ms. GREEN: So I don't know if Commissioner Cakounes got that from the Cape Light Compact.

Mr. LEWIS: This is not on the agenda.

Ms. GREEN: He's our representative.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: I'm waiting for a question, Mr. Lewis. Thank you.

Ms. GREEN: So I'd like to ask --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So would you just ask a question and not necessarily give a position.

Ms. GREEN: Okay. Now just given the fact that my Board of Selectmen raised that issue and being on the Assembly, and very concerned about the County's involvement moving forward, did you understand at that point in time did the Cape Light Compact make it clear that the County was going to have limited membership if they move forward as a Joint Powers Agreement?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: The only way I can answer that, Ms. Green, is that at this point in time the County has two things in front of us that we have to consider. One is our relationship with the Cape Light Compact as a fiscal agent. As I said earlier, we have an agreement that has been signed; it's in existence.

Through that agreement, the Cape Light Compact has to come with some kind of a new plan on or before April 1. And at that time, we, the Commissioners, will make a decision whether we continue to be the fiscal agent or not given leeway in the time they need to put their new formulation together; Number 1. I've said that before. Nothing has changed.

Number 2, the Cape Light Compact has not, to my knowledge, to this date asked the County to join the new joint initiatives committee or company, whatever they're calling it.

Ms. GREEN: Joint powers.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: And I will not say here today unequivocally whether we

legally can or cannot join it. But I will tell you that to my knowledge we do not have a formal request from the Cape Light Compact. I haven't seen it yet. If I do when I get back to the office, I'll call you and tell you it is there. But to join the new joint initiatives, I do not believe we've been asked to this point.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: This is not on the agenda.

Ms. GREEN: Isn't it true according to the County Charter --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: But this is not on the agenda; okay. You can ask a question related to his work with the Cape Light Compact.

Ms. GREEN: Okay.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And a meeting he's been to, but we can't have a discussion or a debate in this time because it is -- there's a lot more information that's being presented than just a simple question.

Ms. GREEN: But in that meeting if he understood that they were proceeding to move forward without the County as a member, shouldn't the Assembly be made aware of that because we are members of the Cape Light Compact? Isn't that something that we should --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: This is something I think I will get --

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Yes, I can answer that real quick.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: I'll get you your answer. To my knowledge, we are only members because of the joint service agreement that we have with them currently under their current structure.

If they restructure as a joint, whatever, powers purchaser --

Ms. GREEN: Joint Powers.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: -- I will have to -- right now I've not seeing them to ask us to be a member or not, and I will get you the answer, Ms. Green, on whether we will be invited to be a member of the new structure. Presently I do not have that answer.

Ms. GREEN: Thank you, very much.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Ed.

Mr. LEWIS: Just for that meeting whenever you're going to have it as far as the Water Collaborative --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: -- can you make sure that we get a copy of the Ordinance that created the Water Collaborative, and maybe we can get that in advance so at least we know what we created so what we have to do if we want to do something else?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Right. And that was in 2005.

Mr. LEWIS: Just a copy of it. That's all.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Yes, we'll definite -- I think the Clerk will be able to furnish you with that. And I also, not to belabor this and this will be in our presentation, but the Cape Cod Commission and the County through the management of the 208 Plan are going to have to create or allocate what was called a 208 review committee made up of a member of each town. And this is what was discussed on Tuesday. We were hoping that the Collaborative would take on that task.

So this board may be seeing a change to that ordinance. And if they decide they don't want to do it, then you will be seeing a new ordinance will be coming forward creating almost the same identical entity but directly responsible to the 208.

Commissioner BEATY: If you want to get it more quickly, the Ordinance is also on the

website of the Cape Cod Water Protection Collaborative. There's a link.

Mr. LEWIS: Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Jim and then Ed.

Mr. KILLION: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good afternoon, Commissioner Cakounes and Commissioner Beaty. Back to House Docket No. 60, which would bring back or leave, we should say, 900,000 plus or minus?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Plus or minus.

Mr. KILLION: Has the County or the Commissioners taken a position on what the argument for doing that is? In other words, have they said to the legislators we need this money for this? Is it that or will that effort be coordinated with the other counties as well?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: I won't answer for the other counties. I will tell you in our discussion today at today's meeting, we discussed a couple of things. One of them was to allocate that \$900,000 a year directly to the Sheriff's outstanding liability. So that at least we could move forward knowing that we have 900,000 and growing money coming in which will be going into a revenue account which we can draw off of for that now 1 point -- say 1.2 million liability.

There were some other discussions about allocating it and using it for other things too; putting it and dividing it into other reserve accounts. I advocated and still do believe to get it to pass, one of the best things for us to say up there is, hey, listen, you know, we were going to ask you for 1.2 million. We're thrilled to get the 800,000 or 900,000. What we're going to do down here is allocate that directly to the Sheriff's liability because, let's face it, it's going to free up money on the other end.

But again, no vote was taken on that but a lot of discussion, Mr. Killion, on what we would do with that money and how we would allocate it.

Mr. KILLION: So going forward -- I'm sorry, Mr. Beaty.

Commissioner BEATY: Can you repeat your other question again that you just asked?

Mr. KILLION: Which other question?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: He only asked the one.

Mr. KILLION: I spoke to --

Commissioner BEATY: Repeat the question that you asked.

Mr. KILLION: Oh, I guess the other part of that being whether you were coordinating with other counties as to rationalize or justify this type of -- leaving this money with the County. But going beyond that, will you be keeping us informed as this Bill moves? In other words when it does go to committee so we may have an opportunity to reach out to our representatives to help this along?

Commissioner BEATY: Well, just let me tell you, Dan Pallotta, the chairman of the Plymouth County Commissioners, he called me because I met him and started to get to know him, and he also approached me at the MMA conference to push this and to get our legislators to back it up. But as far as the rest of your question --

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Yeah, because the Commissioners have not taken a strong action on either supporting this or not or moving forward with the other one or not until today, everything that you've asked is where I plan on moving forward now.

We're going to be writing a letter in support. The chair's going to sign it. I will be contacting the other counties to find out what I can do with them to find out, you know, what's going to be our strategy on this. They don't have the sheriff's liability like we do. In fact, they've already had a percentage of the tax allocated to that so that would not be something

that they would be using but, certainly, I think it's a good argument for us.

But, yes, and I will keep you posted all the way. I'm really excited about this one. I mean I don't know if the members of the Assembly know or not, but last year as a single Commissioner, I did not support having our legislation asked to take over the Sheriff's liability. I did not then nor do I think now. It's just not a really comfortable ask for me.

This one though is, and I think this one is something that we can all get on board and fight for. And I believe we're going to have the support of the other communities.

Mr. KILLION: Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Ed McManus.

Mr. MCMANUS: Just a comment, a Home Rule petition is a petition that's made by a municipality and it's made by the legislative body of that municipality, whether it's the Town Meeting or in the case of Barnstable, the Town Council.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: So this wasn't then?

Mr. MCMANUS: Yes.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you.

Mr. MCMANUS: Counties can't do Home Rule petitions but they can request that legislation be submitted on their behalf just like the legislative -- the town -- the --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Like regional schools?

Mr. MCMANUS: -- the Attorney General, State Treasurer, or State Auditor they can ask that legislation be submitted also.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Any other questions?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: That's it? That was easy.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you, very much. Busy few weeks for you.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Thank you.

#### Communications from Finance Director Mary McIsaac

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Next is our Finance Director Mary McIsaac. She has been with us for just over a year now, and I wanted her to meet the new people. I wanted everybody to get an introduction.

Last meeting there was a question on the anticipated revenue projections, and so she has brought those with her, and she will explain her handouts.

But I gave her a very wide-ranging kind of open-ended descriptive for her speaking, so she has no idea really what she's supposed to cover. But I just wanted to make it more of a meet and greet and maybe be able to ask some questions.

She's, obviously, up to her eyeballs in the budget and is not really focusing on many other things at this point. But there may be some specific topics she wants to just mention.

But it's loosely agenzized so that Mary can answer our questions, and you can find out a little about what she's doing. Mary McIsaac.

Finance Director McISAAC: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. For those of you who I haven't met yet, my name is Mary McIsaac. I'm the Finance Director for Barnstable County.

Aside of me is Joanne Nelson, who's our County Accountant and works out of the finance office with me daily. And today, well, Suzanne has put it very nicely, I thought, what's on the agenda today. When I looked at the agenda, I thought about what would be important to say to the people that I've been in front of for a year and people who haven't seen

us yet and will get used to seeing us probably on a regular basis going forward.

In the Finance Department and we've been busy with a lot of major projects during the course of this year. And we've been busy overhauling A/P. We've been looking at payroll. Internally doing a lot of things to strategize to make our office more efficient, to be able to be more responsive to our departments and to the Board of Commissioners and your Assembly of Delegates by devising different sorts of reports that we hope to give to you regularly.

We're also rolling out a number of things. Several of you probably know that we use the Tyler Technologies' Munis software, which is commonly used by all of the communities on the Cape. I would say there's only a few that don't use it.

We are fortunate to have a pretty much all-encompassing use of the Munis software product. We have a lot of modules and a number of them are being tapped into by our offices for the first time. One is called Tyler Content Manager, and it will allow our employees to go in and do from simple things to complicated things. The simple things that everybody would like to do is refinancing if you're looking for copies of old paystubs or your W-2s. People will be on board with having their own login information that they can just login and do all those things themselves. They don't have to call the Finance Department and come and pick something up or have something mailed to them because, obviously, you know, we wouldn't be emailing things like W-2s. And employees can go on and make changes to their withholdings, changes to their address.

It's a really convenient module. It allows us to communicate with our employees. It allows us to track employees who are requiring certifications. It would give the department manager an alert when someone is requiring certification and what the timeline is. It also triggers departments managing for things like scheduling meetings or, you know, a whole host of things that can really be done electronically. And we're trying to really move to doing a lot of things electronically and using less paper to communicate with our employees and with people on the outside. Tyler Content Manager will allow us to do a lot of that.

Another thing that we're just going to start having training on is ExecuTime, which is a new time reporting for the employees that will relieve a lot of the manual burden in the finance office, particularly with payroll.

And what it also has embedded in it is a tracking of people reporting their time and it goes to a manager for a sign-off and release. And so basically internal to the system rather than a piece of paper with a signature; we'll have electronic signatures by virtue of a workflow in the system itself and not people walking paper over or emailing things and that nature. And it all drives to being more paperless and it also, at the same time, is going to increase accountability in our office and allow us to audit internally rather than spending more time tracking paper.

So those are basically easy things that, you know, that haven't really been ruled out but we expect that once they are ruled out and our departments are properly trained and given some time to get used to new systems that all the departments will become more efficient and will become more electronic. And it will save a lot of time in our office and open us up some work hours to do other things that we should be doing.

And we're also rolling out Grant Manager which will allow us to track all of our grants. And a lot of information that's currently housed departmentally or with our RDO office, it's not easily accessible for the people who are working on the grants, are using the grants or involved in the grants. Now it's just another thing we're going to be putting in the system that will be available to people. It will also give us an opportunity to do some internal tracking and

internal auditing because of all the information being central to the system. So were doing a lot of that.

It's exciting; it's daunting. You know, change is not always easy, but I think that the changes are important, the changes are moving us to a place where we are, you know, more paperless, where we are more accountable, and where we have an opportunity to utilize our staff to do an internal audit function rather than pushing paper.

So that's the goal, and that's a big segment of what we've been working on. And you've been hearing from me about us getting ready for our first bond issue since 1996, and we're moving forward with that. That's been a lot of analysis work because when you're looking at spending from possibly 2001 and needing to make the determinations of what we will borrow and what we won't borrow and the timing of it and how much we've been reimbursed/not reimbursed.

A lot of time involved in sort of separating all of the items into buckets of where they'll go and what we need to do. But we're making a lot of progress with that. We're having more frequent conversations and meetings with bond counsel to get us closer to producing an official statement and getting ready for our bond issue.

So those are the big things -- oh, and the budget. That's been a big thing, and it will continue to be for some time, but I think you've heard enough about the budget today.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Did you want to just -- you were going to discuss the revenue?

Finance Director McISAAC: Yes. Everyone should have in front of them a couple page report on its called, "The Next Year Budget Levels Report." It's actually three pages, which is our draft of the revenue side of the budget, which was in front of the Commissioners today and that that's where they referenced from in order to determine where they started to make cuts to balance the budget.

It's important to know and reinforce that in our deliberations, excuse me, with bond counsel and our discussions with them, one of the most important things that Standard & Poor likes to see when they sit with you in a ratings call is they want to see that you're using recurring revenues to cover your recurring expenditures, which is just what you were talking about a few minutes ago.

Last year, we did achieve that; this year would be the second year, and it needs to become a foundation of how we do business. You know, we need to look at the expenditure side and increase our efficiencies and trim our cost as much as we can in order to limit our rising cost to our ability to obtain revenue. So, I think we have some work to do on that.

Last year was the first year we made huge cuts, and the Assembly and the Commissioners were supportive of the deeds tax increase which allowed us to get to a place where we can have workable solutions going forward in terms of achieving those goals.

And so thank you, again, for the support for that. It meant a great deal to where we are today. And this year is the second step in turning it around and moving us forward to a place where we can be healthy and sustainable and be able to serve our towns the way we're charged to do.

So in front of you you have the "Next Year Budget Levels Report." You have another page which I'm not really pleased with. It's hard to read, but I'll send it electronically to Janice and it is our actual revenues in 2006 and our actual revenues from fiscal '09 through fiscal '16. So it's kind of an important read to show you where we've gone in terms of revenues when you start talking about your ability to sustain your budget by your revenue growth.

We'll send it along for your review, and the next time you meet, I'm happy to answer

any questions, or you can certainly email me if you have a chance to review them and you have questions.

But the actual numbers are important because they show, you know, with some adjustments for things that are anomalies and probably only growing about \$240,000 a year for the last 10 years on average. That's not a lot of growth considering where the budget has gone. And fundamentally, that's why we were using reserves because the budget was growing exponentially compared to what our revenue growth was. And so just something to study. We'll send you a copy that you can enlarge or fool around with it however you'd like.

I'm certainly happy to answer any questions if you want to email them though as you start to look at the revenue side, because the revenue side's as important as your expenditure side. You need to know what your ability is in the back of your mind when you're deciding what you can afford to do going forward.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And this wasn't -- this will be also part of our budget discussion too. But that's also a lot that comes in. So this gives us a pretty look at something that's going to -- you can delve questions when the budget does come in.

Deb, you have a question?

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Yes. I have --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Microphone.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: I have some bigger questions about the budget and the revenues. But what happened? Why did you decide not to use 7 and 8 in this analysis?

Finance Director McISAAC: We had to dig to find 6, and 7 and 8 just weren't plugged in because we had scheduled from 9 to 16. Joanne has been faithfully keeping the schedule from year to year. But the beginning of the schedule was, in fact, fiscal '09, and I went and dug out 6 so we could compare 6 to 16, simple as that. We can fill in the blank if you'd like.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Well just so I know.

Finance Director McISAAC: Sure.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: How far back do our records go?

Finance Director McISAAC: Well, our records go back in various forms. The fiscal '06 was the first year we went on Munis.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Okay.

Finance Director McISAAC: So any record prior to that is on a system called "Budget Sense," which is not so easy to work with.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: But you have all of that?

Finance Director McISAAC: We do have that; yes, ma'am.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: That's good. That's good. Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Any questions? Yes, Doc.

Mr. O'MALLEY: If I could just clarify?

Finance Director McISAAC: Sure.

Mr. O'MALLEY: One line that surprises me under the revenue is the courthouse rental which ranges from one year to the next from a low of 1.37 to a high of 2.0.

Finance Director McISAAC: Sure.

Mr. O'MALLEY: Isn't that a fixed -- don't we -- is that not predictable?

Finance Director McISAAC: Well, it's unpredictable in the sense that there are two components to that. The first component and by far the largest is the reimbursement portion of it, which is our reimbursement based on a schedule of costs that's submitted to the state that they approve.

So they approve that. But that difference in that number is usually reimbursement for capital expenditures, which can fluctuate madly depending on what the state's approved for capital improvements in the trial court occupied buildings.

Mr. O'MALLEY: Yes, I'm sorry. We knew that. It's not a fixed contract. We knew that; I'm sorry.

Finance Director McISAAC: No, no. No, no, no worries.

Mr. O'MALLEY: Thank you.

Finance Director McISAAC: Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Any other questions?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: You're getting off easy.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: You were saving it for -- yes, Ed, -- saving it for the budget.

Mr. MCMANUS: Just a comment. I noticed in the interest income we're showing significant growth which I assume has a lot to do with your redoing where we're putting our money these days?

Finance Director McISAAC: We're working on that. Work in progress.

Mr. MCMANUS: Congratulations.

Finance Director McISAAC: Oh, thank you. It's a matter of finding the right banks, and they're starting to move their rates.

Mr. MCMANUS: Yes.

Finance Director McISAAC: We have no loyalty. It's where the money -- where we're making the money is where we're going.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Well, thank you, very much, Mary. Yes, Lilli.

Ms. GREEN: Hi. Thank you. This is really very helpful, and I really appreciate it. I'm just glancing down this very quickly; I'm looking at the Cape Light Compact. I mean there are numbers in these actual revenues for 2006, '09, '10, '11 and '12, and then no numbers after that; is there a reason?

Finance Director McISAAC: My understanding is that it was a part of the operating budget. They budgeted within the budget. The Cape Light Compact also reported in the annual report up through -- it must have been 2012 and then that did not happen after that year.

Ms. GREEN: Do we know why?

Finance Director McISAAC: I do not know why. I was not here but we can inquire about that, if you'd like.

Ms. GREEN: I would.

Finance Director McISAAC: Sure.

Ms. GREEN: I mean it makes sense to understand. I don't see any other department that's like that. It just seems to be an anomaly --

Finance Director McISAAC: Other than the sheriffs, which we know they left us, right?

Ms. GREEN: Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Yes, Jim.

Mr. KILLION: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Quick question on the interest line item that was brought up. In 2006, we went from -- I want to make sure I've got these numbers right -- almost 900,000?

Finance Director McISAAC: Right.

Mr. KILLION: And in 2009 down to 200?

Finance Director McISAAC: Yes.

Mr. KILLION: Can you fill us in on a little of the detail?

Finance Director McISAAC: Well, those were the years, of course, and probably between 2005 and I would say maybe into 2008 and for some people into 2009, the interest rates were crazy. People were making all kinds of money and then the bottom fell out. And it really hasn't come back.

To complicate that for us, we have been tied into a Compensating Balance Agreement with a single bank, and most of our interest -- first of all, the interest rate was not great, and all of the charges that were converted into fees that were offset against the interest-earnings brought the actual interest credited to us down to a nominal amount.

Mr. KILLION: But does that also reflect a change in principle or change in investment?

Finance Director McISAAC: Literally, the money was solely with one bank, not invested. And early on, there were investments in CDs but then the money seems to have been over time left with the one bank that was charged with investing the County's funds.

Mr. KILLION: Okay. But there's still -- the principal amount didn't decline precipitously as this might indicate. It's just --

Finance Director McISAAC: I don't believe so. There isn't really a cash flow back then to look at to be able to analyze what historically happened and how that trend changed and why. I mean I'm assuming most of it is relative to the market.

Mr. KILLION: Okay. Thank you.

Finance Director McISAAC: You're welcome.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Now, you can be prepared. Thank you, very much, Mary.

Finance Director McISAAC: You're entirely welcome.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Communications from Public Officials? Seeing none.  
Communications from members of the Public? None. All right.

### Assembly Convenes

#### Proposed Resolution 17-01:

Whereas, the members of the Assembly of Delegates and the Barnstable County Commissioners have been reviewing the structure and efficiency of Barnstable County Government; and  
Whereas, two reports commissioned by the County and issued within the past, and numerous comments received from the public have recommended a restructuring of County Government.

#### ***NOW THEREFORE,***

***BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED*** that we, the Barnstable County Assembly of Delegates agree to consider a restructuring of the current County Government model and recommend the following Executive and Legislative Branch models:

EXECUTIVE BRANCH: The executive powers of the Cape Cod regional government (Barnstable County) shall be exercised by a board of regional commissioners consisting of five members. Each member shall be elected from one of (5) five districts of Barnstable County.

County Administrator: A so-called strong County Administrator shall be appointed to manage the day to day affairs and business of Barnstable County.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH: The Assembly of Delegates shall consist of one elected non-partisan representative from each town in Barnstable County, with a weighted vote system.

This Resolution represents the opinion of the Assembly of Delegates relative to the model and the initial steps that are necessary to implement a re-structuring of County Government.

The Assembly of Delegates shall seek to refine the concepts outlined in this Resolution by working with the Barnstable County Commissioners, legal counsel, and/or any sub-committees created for this specific purpose so as to present a single restructured governance model for approval by the population of Barnstable County.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So now we will convene the Assembly. Our first item is Proposed Resolution 17-01, County Government Restructuring. This is submitted by Ron Bergstrom from Chatham. Did you want to tee this up for us, please?

Mr. BERGSTROM: Okay. Madam Speaker, this Resolution, and I've been informed that it probably will have to be converted into an Ordinance, is word for word the same Ordinance that was submitted by then Delegate Cakounes about four or five years ago. It was passed if I remember by the Assembly. The then Speaker chose not to move it forward because as you know within weeks we went into a total look at the entire organization of the County and it sort of gotten folded into that. So I'll take some responsibility for that, but here it is again, all right, many years later.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So the public knows, this Resolution is to --

Mr. BERGSTROM: Oh yes.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Mr. BERGSTROM: Let me put it this way. This Resolution is to basically change the executive branch of County government from a three-member commission to a five-member commission. That's the base or the gist of it. And those five members will each -- each one of those five members will be elected from a district, a specific district rather than run Cape-wide.

Now there are two reasons for this that I'm going to go into and it has to do with elections; how they get elected, and how they serve after they get elected.

And the first we -- is to consider an election. And I know -- I've run for County Commissioners many years ago. I've been following the elections. There are many times when there is many blanks as there are votes for any single candidate. I mean, you're running in a huge district. I think the probably drive time between Buzzards Bay and Provincetown is well over an hour. A person running -- Doc says it's two hours.

Mr. O'MALLEY: Its two hours.

Mr. BERGSTROM: And he has a very slow car. He only drives 40 miles an hour. So it's a very, very difficult race to run. You wonder if the public gets a real feel for the candidates considering you've got a ballot that's cluttered with just about everybody. I mean, you know, you're voting for the president and then down the line you're voting for the members of the Cape Cod Commission -- members of the County Commission.

And, indeed, I've been told I think by Commissioner Cakounes a lot of people, when he discusses this, people think he's a member of the Cape Cod Commission. That's how the confusion is.

So to have individuals running in a district would give them more opportunity to meet people that they're going to represent, and have the people they're going to represent meet them and understand who the candidates are and what their position is on moving the County forward.

You know, there are other people who run countywide. I mean the Registry of Deeds, the Registry of Probate, and so on, the Sheriff, but that's a high-profile race. They spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on it. You know, that the party apparatus backs them to the max which hasn't been the case here in the County. You're basically on your own and it's very

difficult race to run. And I just don't think that the public gets a good idea of who they're voting for. I don't think they knew who I was when I ran. Leo says they voted for the cow. I don't know; maybe that's true or not. I mean we laugh about it but it's the truth.

I mean we live in a democratic system. You're supposed to know the people you're voting for and why. You're supposed to have a reason. I don't think that the current system gives them enough information and allows the candidates to put out enough information and make a real good choice for the public. Okay. So that has to do with --

Also, running in a race that has several open seats, okay, two open seats, right? So you have multiple candidates. A lot of chicanery goes on. I mean I did this when I was a selectman. Everybody bullet votes and somebody who might be your second choice doesn't get in because you bullet voted for your first choice. It's not a good system. I mean it exists; it exists in the different towns, but I think having a single seat open in each district will be an improvement over what we have now.

Now the next thing is once you're serving in office, okay, now I asked Leo about his comment in the paper this morning. How did he know that, you know, they weren't going to include us? He thought I was pulling his chain but I was making a point. He can't know. He can't discuss it with anyone. He can't discuss it with Mr. Beaty; he can't discuss it with Mary Pat Flynn because two people represent a quorum.

So if you pass in the hallway, you can say, geez, what do you think of the weather but you can't say, hey, what do you think of the Waste Water Collaborative because that's a violation of the Open Meeting Law. And it's been very awkward, and I know it's been very awkward for the Commissioners and it's been a bone of contention.

And the other thing is that, I mean, right now Commissioner Flynn is temporarily absent. A few months ago Commissioner Lyons underwent a medical procedure where she couldn't participate. I mean you can participate by phone. So if one of the Commissioners is down, now you've got two. So they better be of the like mind, otherwise, you get absolutely nothing done.

That's why we have an odd number of people. So if you have five, if somebody goes down, you still can have a discussion and you can have a disagreement.

So I don't know where this is going to go. It goes to the Commissioners and then to the legislature and then to the ballot. A lot of people would say, well, you've already got 15 members of the Assembly and now you're going to have five Commissioners, that's a lot of people, but it may be a lot of people but I think it's better than the system we have now. I just think the system we have now is antiquated. It was antiquated when the towns had three selectmen. They all moved to five for some of the reasons why I just mentioned.

So that's why I submitted this Ordinance -- I resubmitted this Ordinance --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Resolution.

Mr. BERGSTROM: -- Resolution, rather, and I hope you guys will support it. So there.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And before I open this to discussion, you did just receive electronically at the beginning of this meeting a letter from Attorney Troy on the mechanics of what to do about this Resolution. I apologize. When he wrote me the letter, it was cc Clerk and Assembly of Delegates. I wasn't aware that it didn't go to you, you know, to get it in a timely fashion; you do have it now.

But it addresses that this Resolution is based on Resolution 13-01, which was approved by the Assembly of Delegates on February 6, 2013, with a 63.7 percent vote. So this Resolution has already been approved.

The reason it's coming forward, as Mr. Bergstrom said, is because it was not acted on. So what do we do now? Troy addresses that -- this because this is a similar Resolution. If we want to go forward with it, after the discussion we decide to go forward, then the steps that you outlined -- he says it's a petition; I don't know if that's an Ordinance or not, then it goes to the Commissioners for a vote, goes to the legislature, and then goes to each voter at a state election. So it's a long process. It's a Charter amendment but it's worth considering. It has been approved by the previous Assembly two Assemblies ago and it's worth discussing. It doesn't mean we have to vote it today. We can start a discussion. This is a Charter change.

So I'll open up for discussion; Patrick.

Mr. PRINCI: Just a procedural question. Shall we even be -- since this is a Resolution and it's not in its proper format as a petition, is it even worth considering this today for discussion or should it be resubmitted as a petition?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Well, I think what we can do is have a discussion about whether this Resolution -- because the Resolution is an opinion of the Assembly. If we decide that we -- that this is our opinion, then we can go forward with the next steps.

Yes, Brian.

Mr. O'MALLEY: I think all of us who were here for the dueling efforts of the Charter change that we went through last spring recognized that the structure of how debate can occur within this body was very sorely tested. We had two polar opposite positions on the floor, and it did not give us any real opportunity to discuss this.

It seems to me that the form in which this has been submitted is one which would permit us to have, frankly, a discussion, a conversation and out of that the more specifics.

So this is very short on specifics and I think that's very deliberate. We're not approving a final form here. We're saying this is deserving of a considered conversation in the body in the chamber. And I think, as such, it is a Resolution because it's just an opinion. An opinion that, yes, we should have this conversation, and, yes, we should find a way to restructure. So I would be in support.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: In support of the process or in support of the Resolution?

Mr. O'MALLEY: In support of the Resolution.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Yes, Linda.

Ms. ZUERN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am opposed to this. I don't think that we should start electing people according to district. One of the reasons is you could have different towns being next to each other that are very, very different. Bourne is very different in its makeup than Falmouth is, and you would always have the larger town having more weight to who is elected in that area.

So I would think that would be less fair than having somebody run throughout the whole County. And I would want to think that my Commissioner is the one that is in my district. I would like to be able to go to any one of those Commissioners and feel that that person is representing me.

I don't think that it's really necessary to have five. I know there was a problem before and it makes it difficult sometimes when you only have 3, but we're not really supposed to deliberate and, you know, come to a meeting with our minds made up because we've talked to a couple of people. And I wouldn't want the Commissioners to be able to do that.

So I think it makes everything more transparent and more honest if there are only three and they can't deliberate. So I would be against this totally.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Patrick.

Mr. PRINCI: Me too. First off, to me this completely flies in the face of hypocrisy. We had chances. We talked about this prior to. Last year we talked about Charter changes. And what we're doing here -- we're talking about two issues; elections and open meeting issues, okay? We haven't talked about the County finances. We haven't talked about the fact that there will likely be a lot of jobs cut at the County level next year. We haven't even talked about the 12 percent increase in the health insurance premiums as we look to take on two new employees. We're creating now two districts, districts that we all represent, our individual towns, and some other districts for a couple more County Commissioners.

It just doesn't make sense. It makes absolutely no sense, especially with these fiscal times that we're about to encounter.

My suggestion would be to just end the discussions on this now, let's get through this next budget cycle, and then perhaps take it back up this summer. It's not as if we have an election -- a big election coming up within the next year. We talk about it being a long process; however, last year, when I went forward with the process, it was late and it could have been done if the Assembly had decided to put something forward.

So we have plenty of time to do this. We have plenty of time to talk about it. We should wait until we fully analyze the budget that we're about to get from the County Commissioners first before we go any further with this. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: I'd like to speak.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes. I saw Ed Lewis first and then I'll go down this way.

Mr. LEWIS: With all due respect to my learned colleague from Barnstable, I don't think the budget has anything to do with this Resolution. I really don't.

I like the idea -- the basis of the idea that I think there's a lot of mechanics that would have to be worked out as to how you divvy up a district. Do you do it similar to the way the legislature has done it where one represents eight towns and one represents one town or stuff like that? I mean there are a lot of mechanics that would have to be understood.

But I like the idea for many of the reasons that Ron stated. I think five gives you a better opportunity to have discussion. It gives the Commissioners a better opportunity to have discussions. This is a long process. It's not going to happen this year. It's going to take forever to do, but I think the idea of having this discussion and having a resolution which was approved once before is a good idea.

I commend Ron for bringing this up. I support the idea of having districts or areas represented on the commission. We have a situation where in this last election two people from Yarmouth ran and you couldn't apparently have two people from the same town, so when they ran if they both got elected, one of them -- the one who had the least votes would have to say goodbye, and I don't think the public knew that. I'm betting that the public didn't know that, that we knew that but I don't think the public knew it.

And I do think that from a -- we represent individual towns, the legislature represents individual districts, the Senate, almost every place represents individual districts with the exception of the President of the United States who represents the entire country.

So I don't have a problem with this. I kind of think it's a good idea. Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Deb.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: I'd kind of like to bring this back down to the local level and let's not talk about national figures here.

I happen to agree with Patrick on this one. Let's do it in the summer after we've done the budget and we know how bad things are. I think there are a lot of things to talk about here.

I think that there are some budget problems that are arising out of the gift we're making to Cape Light Compact. I think there are a lot of problems happening, and I think we need to sort those out, figure out where the money is, and where it's not. Find out whether we have to lay people off before we create more positions.

I think Patrick's right on this one. I would move to table this until September, first meeting.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Is there a second?

Mr. PRINCI: Second.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So there's a motion --

Mr. LEWIS: There's no motion on the floor.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes, move to table.

Mr. LEWIS: We never moved it. We never moved the Resolution.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Oh.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Pat, you moved to table it though.

Mr. LEWIS: Move to table something that wasn't moved.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Sure you can.

Mr. LEWIS: You can do whatever you want.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Absolutely. Robert's Rules of Order. Absolutely, you can make a motion -- I'll bet you on that one.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Motion to table is -- but the distinction is was it not moved to table.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: It doesn't matter. It doesn't have to be on the floor.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Wasn't put on the floor.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: All right. Ron, I'll --

Mr. BERGSTROM: Yes, just --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: I recognize you.

Mr. BERGSTROM: No, I understand what Pat and also Deborah has said; we've got a lot of things on our plate. And we deal with this, that, and the other thing.

You've got to understand where I'm coming from, and I've said this before; this isn't about us, okay? It's not about the workings of this body or the workings of the committee. This is about the relationship between the voters and the people they elect. Is that relationship there in any kind of cohesive way that people could make an intelligent decision or do they run down the ballot and say, geez, the County Commissioner, well, this guy's got an Irish name and I'm Irish, I'll vote for him or he lives in my town or she, you know, I think I know her but maybe I'm not sure. I mean even though people don't pay attention, we still have the obligation to give them a choice, a reasonable, realistic choice about who they vote for. It's not about us. It's about the relationship between the voters and the people who represent them. Is that relationship right now, with three people running County-wide, is that credible?

Commissioner BEATY: Yes.

Mr. BERGSTROM: And my answer is no, it isn't.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: You --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: No. Hold on. Would the presenter or the bringer of the Resolution, given the importance and the weight and the timeline of this --

Mr. BERGSTROM: As I -- yes.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: -- would you consider having this postponed to a time definite which could be immediately after the budget is voted and bring it back as a -- for a debate

discussion in going forward at that point?

Mr. BERGSTROM: As I mentioned to you when I submitted it, you have the option -- there was no reason why this had to go on this agenda. That's policy by the previous speaker it usually goes on the next agenda. No, I couldn't -- I'm not in any hurry. I just felt that it should be submitted and if we have -- everybody has time to think about it and, particularly, now that it's out in the open, the public will have a chance to weigh in and say whether they feel the current system serves them well or not.

So I'm willing to with -- actually withdraw it.

**Speaker MCAULIFFE: Not withdraw it but perhaps we have a motion and a second to table.**

Mr. BERGSTROM: Right.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Tabled to a date certain.

**Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: First meeting in September.**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Or just you want to leave it until September?

**Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: I did it to a date certain, the first meeting in September.**

**Speaker MCAULIFFE: September, is that going to be your motion?**

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Well that's my -- sure.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Is that your second?

**Mr. PRINCI: Table it until September, yes.**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: All right. Is September acceptable or would you prefer --

Mr. BERGSTROM: Well, no, you were a part of the Charter Review Committee, and the problem is is that the hearings you have to submit it to the legislature during certain times.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. So we have to have a vote because it is September. If you would want this discussed sooner, you can always vote down the motion.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: You can always move to bring it forward at another point in time.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: If you table to a date certain you can bring it in sooner?

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: You can always move to bring it forward.

**Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. So, even if it does get voted to September, the Speaker can put it on the agenda sooner if there's an opportunity in our agenda. So we will vote on the motion to table until September.**

**Clerk O'CONNELL: Who made the motion?**

**Speaker MCAULIFFE: Deborah seconded by Patrick.**

Ms. MORAN: Madam Chair?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Ms. MORAN: Just a quick question before the vote. Would the movant be willing to exclude a date since it can always be moved by the chair forward just so that it would be simply tabled.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Moved to the first meeting in September or sooner.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Or just table indefinitely.

Mr. KILLION: Rule one of the motions and whatever passes.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: It's my view that if there's a motion to table to a date certain, somebody/anybody in the body politic can move to bring that matter forward. I don't think the chair, with all due respect to --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: No, that's all right.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: -- a personal issue, it's always a personal issue; I don't think you have authority to just move it up.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Ed.

Mr. LEWIS: I'm confused to a large extent. I hear Patrick talk and Deborah talking about getting through the budget. And we'd get through the budget in April or early May and somehow we forgot June, July, and August. We went right to September, and I don't understand why since they said we should discuss this after the budget and we go three months without. I don't understand what September -- the date certain of September. I would think if you said you wanted to table this to after the budget was done and then come up with a date at that time. But to just wipe out the whole June, July -- and late May, June, July, and August for no reason whatsoever as if we have huge things to discuss in June, July and August doesn't make any sense to me. It confuses me.

I understand people don't want to discuss it at all, that's okay. But if they're tabling it to -- it doesn't make any sense.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Tom.

Mr. O'HARA: Can we amend the motion to no later than September and not put a date and so that would open when the schedule and the calendar allowed?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Would you be willing to amend, Deb?

**Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: I'm amendable to a friendly amendment**

**Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. She's amenable to a friendly amendment to no later than September if you will accept?**

**Mr. PRINCI: I would accept.**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: All right. Parliamentary bogged down. We have a motion on the table to -- excuse -- yes, to table Resolution 17-01 to a date certain no later than September 2017. And is this a roll call vote?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Or if somebody requests it.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Roll call.

**Motion to table Proposed Resolution 17-01 until a date no later than September 2017:**

**Voting "YES" (87.75%): Edward Atwood (2.30% - Eastham), Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Lilli-Ann Green - (1.27% - Wellfleet), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Edward Lewis (4.55% -Brewster), E. Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Susan Moran (14.61% - Falmouth), Thomas O'Hara (6.49% - Mashpee), Brian O'Malley (1.36% - Provincetown), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).**

**Voting "NO" (5.67%): Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich).**

**Voting "PRESENT" (6.58%): John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis).**

Clerk O'CONNELL: Madam Speaker, the motion to table until no later than September of 2017 passes with 87.75 percent of the Delegates voting yes; 5.67 percent no; 6.58 percent present.

(Motion passed.)

Mr. BERGSTROM: As Arnold said, "I'll be back."

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. And I want to thank you for bringing this forward. It was unfinished business that was kind of lying around. So this will be brought forward as

soon as the dust settles a little bit on a very vigorous budget process coming up.

### Committee Reports

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Are there any committee reports?

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: The Finance Committee today.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: There were --

Mr. OHMAN: I look to the Chair of Finance.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: No.

Mr. BERGSTROM: Oh yes. We discussed the two Proposed Ordinances submitted; one was for a pickup truck for the Fire Training Academy, and another was a transfer from the legal reserves to a legal fund specific to the ongoing negotiations.

I think the first one was the pickup truck passed 4 to 1, and the one about the legal services passed unanimously 5-0. I don't think we need approval of the minutes on the public hearing.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: You don't have the --

Mr. BERGSTROM: No, we don't. So whether you need them or not --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: -- minutes yet.

Mr. BERGSTROM: Believe it or not --

Clerk O'CONNELL: That will be the next meeting.

Mr. BERGSTROM: That will be the next meeting.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: That will be the next meeting, okay. And then the vote on these before the Assembly will be the next meeting?

Mr. BERGSTROM: Yes.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Under other business, I was --

Clerk O'CONNELL: What about report from the Clerk?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Excuse me, I skipped right over you. I checked you off.

Report of the Clerk.

### Report from the Clerk

Clerk O'CONNELL: Thank you. Just a couple of items. I put the latest Annual Report in your folder. I received that this week. It looks beautiful.

Also, I placed in your folder blank Open Meeting Law forms that you need to complete and get back to me before the end of the meeting.

Also, I think I sent out reminders regarding statements of financial interest that will be due May 30<sup>th</sup>. Did you get an email that sort of didn't have your name in it or a date?

Mr. KANAGA: I delete those.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Your statements of financial interest are due May 30.

And with regards to the budget schedule; understand that what you have is -- I keep updating it because I keep coming up on changes and things that I need to correct. The last one that I sent out was dated January 27<sup>th</sup>. And I think it's probably going to change again.

So once the budget comes over, I will really try to final finalize this, if you will, to reflect the budget that's coming over and the departments, etcetera, that committees will be looking at.

For example, one of the changes that I made for March 1 has Human Rights

Commission and Elder Services listed. However, I have the committee starting at 2 o'clock, which isn't going to work because there are too many to cover between 2 and 4 o'clock. So I'm going to have to backpedal on that and probably change that to 1 or 1:30.

So just a head's up this isn't totally finished yet.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Plus, as the budget goes forward, there may be some topics on your list that will not be even presented.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Correct. If we don't get it in the Commissioner's budget, then you're not going to see it on this list. So we're waiting for the final results and this will need to be tweaked probably, yet again, one more time.

And as a final note at the end of the meeting if I could see Ed Atwood and Ed McManus for a few minutes, please.

And that's all I have today.

#### Other Business:

##### Economic Affairs Committee

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Our next item is the Economic Affairs Committee expansion of committee charge. I had appointed Ed McManus as chair of the Economic Affairs Committee, and he had emailed me with a list of some -- an expansion of their current charges.

The Economic Affairs Committee in the four years I've been on the Assembly has been a pretty low-key committee. I think it used to be a little bit more active because of its involvement with the Cape Cod Economic Development Council, but it's really just kind of become a very quiet low-key committee.

I wanted this before the Assembly because it's an ambitious agenda. It's also a lot of topics. It's a change in how I see the Economic Affairs Committee function, and so I just wanted to give Ed a chance to bring it, you know, sort of bring these ideas to you and see if there's any feedback on if you feel this is how you want the Economic Affairs Committee to go, or do you feel that, you know, this is -- some of these topics might be handled under other barriers, or just say, great, glad you have the energy and hope your committee has a lot of success.

So, Ed, I didn't know if you wanted to say anything other than these were your thoughts to me.

Mr. MCMANUS: Well, first off, I'm not asking actually for an expansion of the charge. The charge, which is specified in our governance document, says that the Economic Affairs Committee has the charge of reporting on economic development in Barnstable County.

All I'm saying is that there are many parts of the budget that have impact on economic development and economic activity in the County other than those areas that simply have economic in their title. And that the Economic Affairs Committee ought to look at those areas and make sure that the entire effort of County expenditures are being done in some sort of cohesive way to support economic development issues in the County.

I went through and identified some areas that seem to fall into that category, and I did indicate that this is an ambitious undertaking and probably not all to be accomplished in a first year of budget hearings.

But I would like, you know, personally as a committee, I think, you know, if we feel we have a desire to make comment on an area of the budget that falls within the purview of that committee, we should be able to do that, first off.

But I think I need to -- I would also like to actually sit down and go over this request with the other members of the economic development -- Economic Affairs Committee and set out a work program for this first year and potentially some of this work would happen not so much during budget season but in the time between budgets.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: You're correct. It's not a change in Charter. It's a change in, I would say, more of the activities or the past activities.

Part of this I see as the Economic Affairs working collaboratively with other committees. The issue we have is the 50 percent cap in terms of having 50 percent of a vote in the room on the committees. So that's something that needs to be considered as you work with other committees.

So if this is what the Assembly wants to go ahead and approve going forward that's fine. It's just a matter of the mechanics of figuring out that we're aware that there's a 50 percent vote cap when Assembly members are -- when Assembly Delegates are meeting together.

The other issue we have to deal with too is, one, I need to hear from Troy in terms of the committee chairs because we do have over the 50 percent cap in that. So going forward, this is something that you would present to your committee.

Mr. MCMANUS: Yes.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Hash out how you would implement it, and then just perhaps report back to the Assembly then afterwards.

Mr. MCMANUS: Yes.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes. Ed and then Deb.

Mr. MCMANUS: As for the -- I forget what the committee's called -- the regional -- the committee chairs.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Right.

Mr. MCMANUS: The charge of that committee is to report on essentially changes to the Regional Policy Plan. I don't really know that the Commission is bringing forward any --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: You're talking about the Government Relations Committee?

Mr. MCMANUS: -- the Government Relations Committee are bringing forward any changes this year, but the membership of that committee is specified of the Economic Affairs, Natural Resources, Human Services, Governmental -- Government Services, and the Finance Committee and those five members don't --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Right, but there's going to be some changes to the Administrative Code to update it so that old Administrative Code language or --

Mr. MCMANUS: But there's no new Administrative Code as of yet.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Right.

Mr. MCMANUS: So I don't really see that there's, as of yet, a problem.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Right. The other time is the entire committee chairs meet up for a budget discussion; that is it, but that's an issue with or without your expansion of activities.

Mr. MCMANUS: Yes.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Is there any comment or feedback on the Economic Affairs Committee and their proposed work schedule or work agenda?

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: I have something.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes, Deb.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Yeah, at prior to the start of this session, I volunteered with a chairperson to look at the Administrative Code and come forward with

some kind of an update and bringing it forward into the, now, 21st century.

I think that particularly the Economic Affairs Committee and perhaps some other committees, I think we need to look at some issues that are coming down here on the Cape that are going to be very important for us.

For example, the B12 I think -- B22, whatever, B-somebody -- I'm sorry I don't know the number, the people who come here to work every year are going to have trouble. And that means that the people who hire them can make money on the Cape in the summer are going to have trouble. And that's going to be a real problem for our revenues, but it's also going to be a real problem for everybody who lives and works on the Cape. I think that's an issue.

I don't know if Economic Affairs owns it. I don't know who owns that issue in terms of our deliberations, but I think we need to take a stand on that, and we need to be involved in that because I think it's economically important to the Cape.

I think there are some other issues that are coming down at a national level that are going to impact us right here at home. And I think we need to be aware of them, and that we, as elected representatives, have an obligation to address them in our work instead of pretending they don't exist.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: But in terms of the Economic Affairs Committee work?

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: I think the people who work here in the summer belong to them.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Maybe not but --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Is there any other -- yes, Linda.

Ms. ZUERN: This isn't about the Economic Affairs but you had asked us at the last meeting if there was anyone interested in working with Deb on the Code.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Can we talk about the Economic Affairs and then we'll get to that.

Ms. ZUERN: Okay. I thought that was finished.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: No. I was just asking for input, and if there is no input, then I would just say such a structure of go ahead. And some of the things that, traditionally, Economic Affairs dealt with in the past may not even be under the County budget anymore. It may be under a grant program somewhere.

So I think it's timely going forward kind of re-creating, you know, diversifying what Economic Affairs did. So I look forward to then hearing what your committee decides and how you go forward with that.

Mr. MCMANUS: Okay.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. All right. Now, do you want to --

Ms. ZUERN: I'm sorry. I am interested in working with Deb. I don't know -- she just mentioned that you were also working with her on that, but I would be interested if you're still looking for somebody to work on that Code.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: No, I'm -- on the Administrative Code?

Ms. ZUERN: Right.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes, no, I'm not working on it; I just read it, and I know how out-of-date it is. The Sheriff's still in it. So it needs a lot of work.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Our job is to shoot the sheriff, and you're more than welcome.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And there's also -- she has a lot of ideas in terms of, you know,

what it should look like, how it should go. It may not just be a quick fix.

So, okay. And before we get into the other business, I just did want to also mention I asked John Ohman to be the Assembly's representative to a Grants Committee that the County is forming to review incoming grants, and John's a member of the Finance Committee, but he's also, you know, a senior member -- the senior member of the Assembly. So he really has a good grasp of, you know, the past grants and existing grants, so he will be representing the Assembly on that.

Anything else coming before --

Mr. MCMANUS: Madam Speaker.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes, Ed.

Mr. MCMANUS: If you're taking volunteers to work on the governance document, I'd also like to volunteer.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. You know, I haven't -- she wanted the Administrative Code.

Mr. MCMANUS: Yes, whatever, yeah.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: There is a governance document too.

Mr. MCMANUS: I know.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Its one big thing and I'll take whoever wants to --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Ed and --

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: If anyone wants to, you can email me.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Ed, Linda, and Deb then will start working on the governmental documents, bring them into today's world.

Anything else before the --

Mr. BERGSTROM: Move to adjourn.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes. Oh, I don't but I want to; yes. Do I need to announce it?

Next, yes, this slipped my mind but this is -- I'm submitting a Proposed Resolution for consideration at the next meeting to announce or to state that we will be making John Ohman Dean of the Assembly as Senior Member. It's an honorary honor, and I think that we sometimes do it when people are on their way out or they're retiring or toward the end of their careers.

I do not want to wait --

Mr. OHMAN: And where did it come from?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: I do not want to wait until then. I think it should be acknowledged that John is, you know, the most senior member of the Assembly, and I would submit a resolution to that effect. I think it should be acknowledged at the beginning of the session.

Anything else?

Mr. BERGSTROM: Move to adjourn.

Mr. LEWIS: Second.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: We are adjourned.

**Whereupon, it was moved, seconded, and voted to adjourn the Assembly of Delegates at 5:40 p.m.**

**Submitted by:**

**Janice O’Connell, Clerk  
Assembly of Delegates**

List of materials used and submitted at the meeting:

- Business Calendar of 2/1/17
- Unapproved Journal of Proceedings of 1/18/17
- Estimated Revenues for FY18 from Finance Director
- Revenue History from Finance Director
- Proposed Resolution 17-01
- Information statement from Delegate McManus regarding Economic Affairs Committee dated 1-25-17