

BARNSTABLE COUNTY ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES
Journal Report and Minutes of the Standing Committee on Finance
Proposed Ordinances 16-02 and 16-03
April 20, 2016

Chairman OHMAN: Good afternoon. I would like to call to order Notice of Public Hearing for Barnstable County Proposed Ordinances 16-02 and 16-03. Could I get a motion to waive the reading of the public hearing notice.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Motion to waive the reading.

Ms. MARTIN: Second.

Chairman OHMAN: We have a motion and seconded. All those in favor?
(Motion passed.)

Proposed Ordinance 16-02: FY17 Proposed Operating Budget

Chairman OHMAN: Thank you. Once again, I'd like to recognize Mr. Lawton and Ms. McIsaac to discuss the Fiscal 2017 proposed operating budget. Thank you.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Good afternoon, everyone.

Chairman OHMAN: I'm sorry; this will be specifically for 16-02. We'll treat the two proposed ordinances separately, although the Public Hearing will encompass both.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Okay. Certainly. With respect to the Operating Budget, we have been before the appropriate standing committees with the departments. The departments have made expressions of their goals and objectives for the next fiscal year and presented their budgets to the committees and all of the budgets were approved. And they were all submitted to the Standing Committee on Finance, I believe, last week or the week before.

And here we are today with the budget submission being dollar for dollar the same amount as the budget that was submitted originally to the Assembly.

At this time, I don't have any further comments about the budget but we would certainly entertain any questions of the committee.

Chairman OHMAN: Thank you, Ms. McIsaac. From the committee? Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: My usual bugaboo. Does the Cape Cod Commission still hold its 2 percent cost of living increase in its salary count?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: The Cape Cod Commission's budget is intact as presented and approved by the committee that heard their budget, yes.

Chairman OHMAN: Deborah.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I had provided some questions to you concerning reserves because the Cape Cod Commission is covering some of its budget with reserves and -- do you have information for us about that?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: We had the history of the reserves that was presented by Gail. Janice was able to receive that by email and I think she copied it for all of the members.

CLERK O'CONNELL: Right. I put it in all of your folders. So it's this little packet of stapled information. I put your name on the top of it. I think you all received a copy.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: It's in our folders now?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Yes.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Would you mind walking us through this, what you have for information?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Sure.

Ms. GAIL COYNE: Gail Coyne, Fiscal Manager for the Cape Cod Commission. I believe you have before you two pieces of information that I submitted to Mary McIsaac and County Administrator Jack Yunits. You have a history of the Cape Cod Environmental Protection Fund balance beginning with Fiscal '03. I didn't go back beyond that through Fiscal '15 and a narrative regarding our use of that Reserve Fund.

You'll see when you look at the numbers we ended last fiscal year with a balance of over \$3 million. There is an unassigned balance of 1-point-almost-\$4 million.

We do have legal reserves facilities and capital reserves. We have encumbrance reserves and next year appropriation reserves out of that fund balance.

Clerk O'CONNELL: I have to print the narrative. I don't think you have the narrative.

Ms. GAIL COYNE: I have copies.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Okay. Good.

Clerk O'CONNELL: I emailed it about 1:30 this afternoon.

Ms. GAIL COYNE: I don't know if you have any specific questions about it. But when we prepare the budget, we prepared the Fiscal '17 budget in the fall of 2015. At that time, we didn't know what grants we would be receiving.

We have since received an \$800,000 NOAA grant and a \$950,000 DEP grant. Additional grants will be coming in over the course of the next year. As those come in, it could offset the amount that we need to take out of that reserve. And you'll see the history shows that we've been conservative in our approach as to how much grant revenue we'll receive.

So this is to show you that if no additional grant funds come in, we may need to take from the reserves, you know, to the extent that we receive additional grant revenue that amount is diminished or eliminated altogether.

And you can see from the graph the history -- recent history has been a steady increase, mostly due to Paul Niedzwiecki's ability to attract funds to the agency.

Chairman OHMAN: And we're also appreciative of your abilities to grant -- to attract grants and do your due diligence that helps Cape Cod look the way it does today.

Those grants, though, are sometimes very specific in their nature. So are you able to maneuver the grant money between your necessary projects adequately to address those reserve questions that come up?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes. That's a good question but we have a very firm philosophy around grants at the Commission which is we don't just look for grants because we need money to support staff that we already have. We only look for grants that fit within the core mission of the Commission as it's established on an annual basis.

And we've been very fortunate to be able to find the money that we're looking for that fits the need, whether it's wastewater, coastal resilience. You know, we've been able to find those funds and stay focused.

So they do come in and they were able to use the people that we already have on

staff rather than to hire someone with an expertise that we don't and wind up losing money on those grants.

So this is the way the undersigned fund balance is used. It's not dissimilar in many ways to the way many towns use Free Cash, which is an unfortunate sort of name for the account, but you never quite know what your expenditures are going to be, and so you have a reserve to offset that so you have a planned account. And it is an efficient way to do that; otherwise, you'd wind up hanging on to a lot of extra money at the end of the year that you collected in taxes that weren't spent for services that can't necessarily be rolled over in a lump sum for the following year.

So that's how we've used it because it's really derived from the Environmental Protection Fund, which is a special revenue account. We could label it as a grant and we could draw down on that grant as we need, but it's a practice that we have been engaged here for over 25 years.

It's not dissimilar to other practices of public budgeting by other towns. The reserves are larger now than they have been because we've been able to bring in a lot more outside revenue to support some of the efforts that we have.

But the 208 Program is a good example. That was a \$3 million grant that came in. But, also, you have to manage the back end of it too, which is we have 39 people at the Cape Cod Commission, same number that was there when I started eight years ago, and we don't want to grow beyond that because there's a swell in the grant and then wind up with people as County employees on staff that we couldn't sustain after the grant went away.

So the 208 Program was good for that. We got to use a lot of our existing staff but we had to augment that a lot with the services of a AECOM, the Consensus Building Institute, and a lot of other people so that now that that money is gone we're not left with four or five people we hired for that purpose and no way to pay them.

Chairman OHMAN: This is a little far-flung from the exact budget talk, but do you think your success in attracting grants is because it's strictly grant writing expertise or do you present proper programs that are very valued by grant organizations.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes, my experience is that has really nothing to do with grant writing expertise, that it really has to be a substantive program. And I'm a firm believer in government that if you have a good program there are ways to get it funded. And good programs tend to speak for themselves.

Now sometimes when you get up on the federal level, the bureaucratic nature of those RFP reviews and you have to fit everything in two paragraphs, that can be -- lend itself to -- a lot of that money tends to go to people who know the right buzzwords to put in the three paragraphs that they give you. But that hasn't been where a lot of our efforts have been.

Chairman OHMAN: Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, I think the Cape Cod Commission because of its reputation and in terms of its work and staff when the grant comes in, it's given very serious consideration because it's, you know, as you said, 25 years of a track record but also probably some targeting to needs, like the 208.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Right.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: That being said, I did speak to --

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: I would like to thank you for that first, and just -- the most recent grant we have is a half a million dollar from NOAA to look at climate adaptation

and coastal resiliency over three years. And there are 132 grants nationwide; there were five that were granted, and the Commission got one of them. I think we did get that in large part to the work that we did on 208 and how we were able to visualize a lot of that information so thank you.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No, I am very appreciative of the level of work and the caliber of your staff. And that being said, I mentioned this at the subcommittee meeting as a member of the audience but I feel that I need to say this formally in a hearing where I'm actually a member at the table.

I understand that the Cape Cod Commission is very well run, that they run with reserves that they bring in. They're run efficiently; they bring in their own money, and that you feel that the cost of living is justified for your staff.

I am going to just go on record as saying as an elected official for the County that is facing some pretty dire fiscal issues coming forward and the fact that the rest of the County employees are not getting their cost of living, it just is a bit of a disconnect from us even though there is a disconnect with the Commission.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: The perception is a problem for me. And for, what, \$58,000 or whatever the 2 percent is, it just, to me, sends the wrong message. So I hope that you will consider going forward, that as we are going to be looking at trying to figure out how to fill a \$7 million hole next year that we are on the line for making judgments.

We are going for a tax -- a deeds tax increase, and it's hard to do that and it's hard to argue, you know, it's easy for people to argue against that when people are getting cost-of-living increases. So just so you know where I'm coming from.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes, and I appreciate that and I understand where you're coming from, and I wouldn't want anything the Cape Cod Commission did to frustrate your ability to get the revenue that you need in order to fix what's wrong out there.

I would just -- I want to point out two things. That sometimes there is this kind of a false equivalency that all County employees are the same. Depending on which department you're in, you have a different view of the world and you get different generalized sort of benefits.

But at a time in the past when the Cape Cod Commission was not bringing in the revenue it needed to support its operation and didn't take cost-of-living increases, we certainly didn't ask the rest of the County not to do that because there are two separate funding streams to do that.

So I guess we see it a little bit differently. And even more recently in the Classification and Compensation Study that was done, the Commission was basically left out. And because we're a very different organization with a different skill set and so we were directed to have our own sort of separate Classification and Compensation Study done.

Since then, there are -- some County employees have received paid benefits associated with Class/Comp Study. We waited and we took -- we did what we were told to do. As soon as that was forwarded to the Commissioners, one of them was on the radio talking about pay raises at the Cape Cod Commission and then, boom, it died. So the Commission hasn't seen the benefit of that Classification and Compensation Program from the County.

So there's just two instances past and one just very recent where the Commission is

not in any way sort of above this or a lead. We've, in fact, been disadvantaged more than we have been advantaged in this position. We carry the cost-of-living increase because it's just part of the internal philosophy that we have in managing the funds and bringing them forward. But I'm sensitive to the fact that I wouldn't want to do anything that would endanger the difficult vote that you have to take here.

Chairman OHMAN: Deborah.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: With respect to the 25-year history and the assessment of taxes by the Commission, did you ever miss a year when you didn't increase 2-1/2 percent?

Ms. GAIL COYNE: I think there was one year in the 90s.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes, once.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Okay. And this -- I find it troubling -- well, let me just back up a little bit. I think the Cape Cod Commission does a remarkable job with the work that it does. I think that it has been excoriated and sometimes wrongfully. Particularly the further away you get from the more developed areas, the more the Cape Cod Commission is -- you're sort of put like in Truro in the same box with the National Seashore and we live with that.

But at times the Seashore is seen by the public as the enemy when, you know, 70 percent of Truro is owned by the Seashore. The Cape Cod Commission, as you know, has been sometimes seriously criticized there, and I'm wondering if you've ever considered not raising taxes as a means of -- I mean these size surpluses of reserves are certainly significant enough to cover your needs; aren't they?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: The reserves as it's currently constructed -- when I first got here 8 years ago, I was concerned about the level of reserves we had especially because we were dealing with Cape Wind and a couple of other big projects at the time; Lowe's since then.

An appeal -- a multi-level appeal on any one of those would easily eat through a million-plus. So that is really what I was concerned about.

And I also think that there was a previous decision against a utility company in the town of Yarmouth that should have been appealed and was not appealed. And I believe it was not appealed because they felt like they did not have the legal reserves in order to do that.

And so one of my focuses was that would not happen again. We would not be left without adequate reserves to appeal a decision at the Commission that supported what the people of Cape Cod want to do. So they may look large.

To not take a 2-1/2 percent increase, especially when you look at the Commission, because the Commission's 2-1/2 percent increase came off a \$2 million number that was set 26 years ago in the legislation.

So unlike the 2-1/2 percent increases that towns take where they get new growth and then they can take it up, it's just 2-1/2 percent off of 2 million. That's what it's been. So it's been a declining proposition. I mean when you adjust for inflation, the rest of it, what costs a family, a household on the Cape \$11 annually for the Cape Cod Commission in 1990 cost them \$18 now and it's actually less.

So the 2-1/2 percent increases that we do annually on that fixed number just barely sort of keep us going. And we realize every year that we have to supplant more of our necessary income with grants and with outside revenue.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Maybe if I could just follow up. You completely went right over my head about the 2 million -- can you explain that to me just --

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: The legislation set out an initial budget for the Cape Cod Commission of \$2 million and it allowed for --

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: It is on that budget that you get the 2-1/2 percent?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Okay.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: So it started with a fixed number. Unlike towns that get to take their revenue numbers plus any new growth and then take 2-1/2 percent off of that and they have -- many towns have other districts that are outside the 2-1/2 percent cap.

Yes, so I don't know if you can see this but this is a chart that charts the Cape Cod assessment and the town levies. You can see this nice fuchsia line here are the increase in the amount of town levies. This flat line on the bottom --

Chairman OHMAN: That's you.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: -- that's us. And when you adjust for inflation, it goes in the negative direction. So, ultimately, the Cape Cod Commission's going to have a real problem at some point in time with such an absolutely flat funding stream even with a 2-1/2 percent increase. But, you know, it's not something we have to worry about this year.

Chairman OHMAN: Is that by legislation?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Chairman OHMAN: You would have to go to the legislature and change that rule about the 2 million flat?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Chairman OHMAN: And you've not chosen to do that or you think it's not --

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: No, it's not popular.

Chairman OHMAN: How about other planning agencies throughout the state? Are they under the same jurisdiction?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: No. Most of them derive their money from -- there is some state money that comes in a couple of different pockets, but a lot of them really revolve around transportation planning and very large transportation contracts from Mass. DOT, except (Inaudible).

Chairman OHMAN: Julia.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes, and I think that what we've just seen on that kind of chart, let's think about what the County's big mistake which was to not continue with the pathetic little 2-1/2 percent increase and leaving that money on the table is one of the major reasons we are in the position that we are now. And I'm very sorry that that was passed. I, of course, never voted for it.

I do also appreciate that the Commission is a County agency, and I'm very grateful that we've kept it in that position. I think it would be bad if it were off on its own. I don't think that's, you know, that's always been my position.

On the other hand, there are these separations and they have dealt with their finances and we've dealt with our finances, and we have dealt with them less successfully in the recent years and that's too bad.

And, of course, I'm now very optimistic but that's all doing to change given not because there's a lot of money coming in but that we've got some terrific leadership and

financial leadership and it's, you know, I'm expecting things are going to be better.

So, their employees might have suffered at one time when they didn't have money coming in; our employees may suffer this time. I'm hoping that in the future all will be better off. But I just don't see it as that everything is in lockstep because it's, in fact, hasn't been. They prudently took their 2-1/2 percent. We foolishly did not, etcetera, etcetera.

I think Paul gave several examples. So I just don't buy that we have to do the same thing for one as the other despite our close association in terms of legal terms.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: If I may, sir?

You know, I understand your argument. However, I think that the problem with the County's finances goes more to mismanagement of County assets than --

Ms. TAYLOR: That's just what I said.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Well, I'm not sure it was foregoing the 2-1/2 percent increase that caused the problem for the County.

Ms. TAYLOR: That's just one reason.

Chairman OHMAN: I think we're getting a little off-point about the budget. That's a more philosophical argument on how we get to where we are, something about the budget going forward.

I would like to take advantage of the fact that Mr. Niedzwiecki and company are up here, Gail, are up here now. If we have any more particular questions for the Cape Cod Commission within the larger context of the Barnstable County budget, I would like to address those now from the committee.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I occasionally do hear complaints about the joint initiatives that there was the Commission sloughing off their costs onto the County. I said, "Well, I didn't really see it that way," but perhaps you could elaborate on it better than I've been able to make the argument.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: When we began that discussion a couple years ago, the Commission had already been working closely with others in sort of that information area. Open Cape was coming in. The towns wanted to be able to exploit Open Cape.

So we were in the process of already seeing how we could help the towns best use that brand new infrastructure. We simultaneously had a discussion with the County and I remember talking to Commissioner Flynn at the time and they had their sort of IT group and we didn't want there to be duplicative efforts as we reached out to the towns.

And as we started to talk to them about primarily information products, there seemed to be some really low hanging fruit. We got a bunch of the towns interested in writing for a Community Innovation grant the first year that the Commonwealth had that under the Patrick administration, and so it all sort of coalesced around that piece of it which involved ePermitting.

So we wrote and were awarded the largest CIC grant that they've ever made today, which is a half million dollars and we started the eProgramming -- ePermitting Program and we're coming online in several towns. And that brings with it the promise, in some cases, of immediate savings up front, certainly savings through attrition over time and easier access for our citizens to the virtual town halls so they can print off permits in their homes and not have to go wait in line.

But very few towns had the available resources to make those kinds of capital investments upfront in software infrastructure and personnel training. So that's where we

thought we could be helpful if we could write some grants; if we could get some County money in order to make -- get those initial investments made then the rest of it would pay dividends over time.

It's been a really successful program. We put together a governance committee that is made up of the 15 town managers. We got a lot of great feedback from them. We've gone from ePermitting to supporting a regional flyover. So instead of 15 towns putting up 15 different planes, one went up at a very high resolution. We got that taken down.

We're in the process of putting together the planimetrics from that which will help us with storm water and wastewater and coastal resilience issues.

And really from the manager's this year, they want to take a look at performance management. So they all want to get the same sort of performance management software and be able to use that in their towns to manage what they do better. That's what the Strategic Information Office is about. That's what the Joint Initiatives Program has really supported.

And so it's not just what you see reflected in that line item on the County level; it's also a lot of the resources that the Commission matches that with and I think for a good purpose.

So we agreed to manage that. So I don't see it as us taking County money to run programs that we were going to run. And, in fact, you've had some conversation. Once these projects mature, that they might go back to the County in full to be sort of regional programs run by the County. So they're not something that the Commission would have to take on long term. They are going to have to demonstrate a financial viability in order to do that.

You know it's funny when we deal with some of the money that we've given back to the towns over the last couple of years, there seems to be some sort of revenue estimates for what might come back in on the other side. In this program, that's going to take several years to step up to get back to that point.

But full cost recovery was never the intent out there. To subsidize some of these one-time costs really was the intent up there. It's not -- does not surprise me at all that we're not taking in as much revenue from the towns as maybe we could. But that always is a bit of a perplexing argument. If you're going to go to full cost recovery, then every service the County serves and gives to towns could be charged for when many of them are not.

So I don't know how we sort of have that discussion but this has been a good program. It does not have to stay at the Commission. And if the County feels that it can't afford it, it doesn't have to stay at the County either. But the option would be, at this point, another Intermunicipal Agreement of towns that would get together for this purpose, for the purpose of shared information infrastructure.

The goal is every five years, just taking the flyover as an example that will be able to bring in enough over five years that will be fully -- we'll have the financial capacity in the next five years to do it without any additional contributions from the County and I think we could maintain that. But these are tough decisions to make. If you feel like you can't afford it, then we can let the towns know that we're going to -- we're not going to be carrying out this program this year. It's certainly too late for them to make any changes in their budgets this year, and we'll have to regroup around a different format and try for this effort to sustain itself outside of the County. But I personally believe it belongs at the County; it's the kind of thing the County should do.

Chairman OHMAN: You know, I couldn't agree with you more. I think that was very well done, both the thought process of the joint initiatives and I'm agreeing with that. But you said -- and the flyover which I think is incredibly important and benefits all 15 towns, the regionalization piece. Do you keep that money separate in a fund that as you get money back from the towns regarding this so that you can afford it in another five years? Is it separate or is it in the general budget?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: I don't think -- we haven't separated it in a specific fund yet. But the discussion with the towns now, especially around performance management, is what does the fee schedule look like? I think all towns should pay a nominal, sort of membership fee because there is a benefit to membership. That could be based on the services that we provide, an increase fee schedule associated with specific services going up. And part of that initial contribution would be to help cede some of these data sets that we know we're going to have to refresh on a regular basis.

Chairman OHMAN: It will be interesting to know exactly how the recovery costs are going so that you can afford the next round of this stuff.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Chairman OHMAN: If it was easily identifiable, it would be beneficial to everyone, especially the towns would know. Hey, look, we're putting into it this but we're going to get this in another five years so we can make our plans long term as well.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yee. When you go out to towns and you're asking them to set aside money in an account that the County holds up front that they might benefit from in five years is a little bit of a difficult sell. It's easier when you go to the towns and saying, "You're going to save \$30,000 this year and then every year after that."

But I understand what you're trying to say, and I think we can get there soon.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I know when Yarmouth tried to do the ePermitting on its own and it was just too big a bite for the taxpayers to handle, so we were very grateful then that it became a regional effort. That was, really, the only way I think we would have been able to do it. I think it was a \$750,000 initial hit for Yarmouth.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: But the fact that you were able to take towns and pull them together and add money and make it a feasibility, then it became an attractive thing for everyone else because it was a cost saver. And I think what the towns are looking for is regional help to save money.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Right.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Get a job done and save money.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: And Ed Senteio in the town of Yarmouth was an essential part of writing the initial grant. He was an essential part of rolling out these ePermitting issues, and so he's in Yarmouth now and running this. And when Yarmouth went live -- this is another added benefit -- they found that it was slow on the Comcast connection that they had. So they were able to go --

Ms. TAYLOR: Broadband.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: -- switch over to the Open Cape network that's part of the RWAN that we set up and then it was great. So Yarmouth has been a big success story for us on this issue, in particular, and Ed deserves a lot of that credit.

Ms. MARTIN: Can I just say one thing?

Chairman OHMAN: Teresa.

Ms. MARTIN: I just want to add something that I think is really important to consider on the initiatives too. The flyover and the extensions as it shows that perfectly that it's not just saving money. It allows a data set that all happens at the same time and the same place so you can get consistency, and that's a huge value add that just comes with the package.

And we talk a lot about how do we do things regionally and, to me, I think some of the value in the joint initiatives isn't, yes, we save money by sharing costs but we coordinated all of the timing so we end up with something that's inherently more valuable than 15 separate segments on different days and different times. And that's a benefit that doesn't show up on the spreadsheets but is incredibly huge.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Just to follow-up. It brings this sort of issue up when you think about what the County's mission is; right? I mean the County provides some discrete services that are better provided at the County level that some towns can't afford but there are larger issues out there that these 15 municipalities are facing.

And to help the 15 towns with County support achieve regional goals is another major focus and mission of the County that I think is often sometimes understated because it's not directly tied to a department or a program or a person.

Chairman OHMAN: Anybody else in the audience that would like to speak? It is a Public Hearing. Linda.

MS. LINDA ZUERN: Thank you. I have a few questions. One is the Cape Cod Water Protection Collaborative. We had the subcommittee and Andrew Gottlieb told us that we didn't have an agreement with the state yet for the \$250,000 that was in the 2016 budget. Do we have that agreement at this point?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes. That was part of the \$950,000 that came through. Whether they've signed all the paperwork yet, I think remains to be seen.

Ms. GAIL COYNE: Not as of this afternoon.

MS. LINDA ZUERN: So that was my next question. The \$950,000, what's that dedicated to and is the \$250,000 or -- what they were asking for was to keep the \$250,000 from this year plus get another \$250,000 in the 2017 budget. So the State would be giving us \$500,000 matching grant; right?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

MS. LINDA ZUERN: And is that what we got with that \$950,000? Was there \$500,000 matching?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: No.

Ms. GAIL COYNE: Just the first year.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Just the first year of that so that only 250,000 of that matching grant from the state for the purposes of monitoring were part of that. The rest -- the \$700,000 is implementation money for the 208 Plan. We have until July 1st to have 53 watershed plans ready.

Chairman OHMAN: Really?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: So they gave us \$700,000 and a deadline of June 30th to spend it all by. So that has been challenging.

Ms. TAYLOR: Are there a lot of contractors out there that do watershed reports?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Not as many as you would think. But we are -- it has

allowed us to sort of use some of the contractors that we had used originally to come in, and there's some direct technical assistance to the towns that we're putting out as part of that. But it's a lot of money to spend in a short period of time but we desperately needed it if we're going to meet the deadline.

MS. LINDA ZUERN: That was one of my comments during the subcommittee was that if we're getting a million dollars altogether, how can we possibly spend that in such a short amount of time?

So is that \$250,000 really necessary for 2017, since you're just starting to spend that money now? Could that \$250,000 from 2016 be carried on over into 2017?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yeah. In order for the monitoring program to work the way that it needs to, we have to build a database and feedback loops from these new projects that are going in to create real-time. So they can spend the \$250,000 on -- to get all of that put together. So I think that they can use it now.

We have to work with other agencies and contractors that actually do the ocean monitoring piece of it. You know, their billing practices aren't always great, so sometimes that's a cash flow issue. But that monitoring program could spend four times that in the next six months if it were available.

MS. LINDA ZUERN: And I have another question about the Collaborative itself. It works very closely with the Cape Cod Commission but it's not really under the budget of the Commission?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: No.

MS. LINDA ZUERN: Who oversees -- is it just -- I mean who really oversees that group, the Collaborative beyond Andrew Gottlieb?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Andrew Gottlieb as the Executive Director reports to the County Commissioners, I believe directly. That's mostly what I've seen but I would have to check his contract language on that.

MS. LINDA ZUERN: Is there a reason why that's split and it's not part of the Commission?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes. A lot of the members of the Collaborative don't like us either. It's hard.

MS. LINDA ZUERN: I thought most of them did.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: The other County departments don't like us, the Collaborative, you know, we're fairly odious individuals.

MS. LINDA ZUERN: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: But we'd take them if they wanted to come.

Chairman OHMAN: Ed.

MR. EDWARD LEWIS: I'm a little confused. I was under the impression there was \$250,000 had been allocated from the state for the Fiscal 2016 because it was in our budget last year when we did this for 2016. This \$250,000 that you're talking about, that's 2017; am I correct or am I incorrect?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: No. It's 2016.

Mr. EDWARD LEWIS: So we only had \$250,000 that's been approved by the state?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Mr. EDWARD LEWIS: And that -- but the budget --

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Well --

MR. EDWARD LEWIS: Well, the reason I'm asking is I believe last year when we approved it, because I remember Andrew came before us, and the \$250,000 was in the '16 budget. And now we're being asked to put \$250,000 in the '17 budget but we have -- we supposedly had a commitment from the state.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: Andrew talked about, when he was in to see us, he talked about there was a delay or there wasn't a delay in getting -- the state needed the i's dotted and the t's crossed. But I just want to make sure and follow up on Linda's that there is \$500,000 -- we committed \$500,000 between the two budgets -- the two fiscal years.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: And, supposedly, but if the State doesn't come through with their -- we got a comment from Andrew that if the State doesn't come through with the second \$250,000 we don't spend our \$250,000. It just goes back -- it's not -- it gets reverted out of the budget.

Chairman OHMAN: That's what he said.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: If that's what he said, that's what he said.

Mr. EDWARD LEWIS: Well, does anybody -- is that agreeable?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: Do you understand it that way?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Well, the way I understand it is --

Mr. LEWIS: I understand he doesn't report to you.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: He certainly does not report to me.

Mr. LEWIS: I understand that.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: There's a \$3 million earmark in an environmental bond bill --

Mr. LEWIS: Right.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: -- that this monitoring program comes out of. So there's been agreement with the State that they would fund from that \$3 million capital appropriation three years at \$250,000; '16, '17, and '18, and that there would be a County match for each of those three years.

Ms. GAIL COYNE: Four years.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Four years. Four years?

Ms. GAIL COYNE: I think it's four.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Oh.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So it's a million.

Mr. LEWIS: The only reason I ask that, Paul, is because there seems to be a disconnect with the money actually being approved by the State.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: We're approving money.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: We're allocating money. Andrew has it in his budget.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: I mean it's in this book for this next year; it was in last year's.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Right.

Mr. LEWIS: It hasn't been spent.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Nope.

Mr. LEWIS: Along with some other money that hasn't been spent. But it's encumbered, if you will.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: And it confuses me as to where because after the budget hearings, things always -- they go up in smoke. All of the sudden, well, we'll worry about it next February. And there doesn't seem to be a follow up --

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: No.

Mr. LEWIS: -- as to where it is and where we are with that program.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Okay.

Mr. LEWIS: And I'm asking you a question based on the fact that these people don't report to you. I thought they were --

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Those are my favorite kind.

Mr. LEWIS: Yes, I know. I thought they reported to this central group of people that every town has a representative on the Water Collaborative is it?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: And they are the governing board of the Water Collaborative?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: And there's some kind of dotted line reporting between Andrew and them?

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: Well, I was a little confused at the very beginning as to why this wasn't part of the Commission but I --

Chairman OHMAN: Ed, I know that you're -- we're all very interested in this but these, more likely, should be directed toward Mr. Gottlieb than Mr. Niedzwiecki.

Mr. LEWIS: I'm sorry.

Chairman OHMAN: And I'd like to stick to the budget that he's responsible for to us and go along that way. And we also have a lot more to go on the Public Hearing.

So anything else for these kind folks from the Cape Cod Commission directly about their budget? Thank you, very much, for your time.

Mr. PAUL NIEDZWIECKI: Thank you.

Ms. GAIL COYNE: Thank you.

Chairman OHMAN: Back to Ms. McIsaac. Mary, just for the public record, can you tell me how much you've been able to cut out of the budget compared to 2016 and put that in relation to how much medical and retirement have gone up? Do you have any numbers that you could come up with to tell us? I know it's about 1.7 down.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Well, we cut \$1.7 million out of the budget with respect to -- our retirement assessment last year alone in one line went up \$250,000 and we don't expect -- we expect that was an anomaly. We're arguing the point about that right now as a matter of fact.

Chairman OHMAN: So, right now, that's a \$2 million difference that you've been able to cover.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Well, we're covering -- we're probably

covering more than that because the departments have submitted new initiatives requests which were over and above the Operating Budget request and those totaled out at about \$600,000 and we immediately advised departments that those were not going to be allowed to move forward. So those were departmental requests based on what they thought their departments needed over and above what was being sustained in this '16 year budget to move to '17, and we said that those could not happen.

So it really was 1.7 million and another \$600,000 if you looked at the department's original request in total.

Chairman OHMAN: Good. I just want that on the record because I think it's a remarkable turnaround in one year to be able to have made and I'm much appreciative of that.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Thank you.

Chairman OHMAN: From the board? Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: This is more of a timing issue, and I apologize for not knowing this. This budget is predicated on a deeds tax increase?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Yes, it is.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So how does this work? Do we have to vote -- to my mind, we can't vote the budget without knowing if we have the revenue for it.

Chairman OHMAN: Well, technically you can't.

Ms. TAYLOR: It's in the budget.

Chairman OHMAN: No.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No. Because if we approve a budget and we don't have the revenue, how can you approve a budget where if you don't have the revenue designated? So I mean --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So my thinking is you know your revenues, then you approve your budget. Otherwise, we approve a budget. If the deeds tax fails, then we have to go back and cut -- then we have to go back and do a second budget then.

Chairman OHMAN: That's correct. We have to go back and do draconian cuts.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Is that what's going to happen?

Chairman OHMAN: That is what the Speaker has chosen as a timeline.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Okay. So budget then deeds tax vote.

Chairman OHMAN: Again, if I'm not mistaken, I can be corrected by anybody in the room if you want. I'm pretty sure that it was the Speaker's decision that he wanted to do it this way.

CLERK O'CONNELL: It was the Speaker's decision, and I believe on May 4th you will have the Proposed Ordinance for the deeds tax first and then the budget Ordinance and the capital Ordinance will be next. So I think the plan is to vote on the deeds tax first.

Chairman OHMAN: Thank you. Are there any other questions for our administration while we've got the entire hierarchy out there regarding any of the programmatic stuff? I know that they looked very hard and fast at not cutting staff and not cutting vital programs for 2017.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I have a question. In terms of looking ahead, the deeds tax is not a tax that's going to be able to be increased every year, is it?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: No, it's not.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: So have you looked ahead at all to the next year and do you

have any idea whether you're going to be able to cover -- assuming you get this increase this year, what do you think are the factors that are going to influence a change in this budget next year?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Well, based on the assumption and we're hopeful that the deed's tax increase will be approved, we are looking at a number of options for changes to our health insurance coverages and the delivery of the group insurances to our active employees and retirees because there's options for savings there.

And I think we talked about that in previous meetings, probably over a couple of months ago when we were first delivering the budget, things like the question about insurance for elected officials; the questions of eliminating some of the plans that are the most costly in terms of their gross premiums and then, obviously, when the County pays 75 percent of it, you know. We need to diligently look at the split of the cost of the premium, so 75/25 and whether that's sustainable.

And we need to also look at the split just for retirees as opposed to the entire pool of our population that we cover because some of the communities have a different rate for retirees than they have for their active employees.

And so we're looking at all those options in terms of what's realistic in terms of savings and how we'd like to proceed with that but those are some options.

And also a huge priority for next year is looking at all of the programs and services and evaluating them not just for cost-effectiveness but for viability and for whether some of these aging programs are still regionally fulfilling the needs of the individual towns that we serve because some programs, you know, programs come and go, and at some point, some are no longer viable and we need to be diligent over that. And if there are some programs that are no longer viable, those programs -- we'll recommend that they be cut. And the funding will be diverted to some other effort that is more of a regional need in this decade or, you know, going forward. And that should be a constant evaluation because programs, you know, things change. The population changes, the needs are changing.

You know, there's been the kind of press we're getting now, today, is certainly different than the press we were getting five years ago about what the crises were on the Cape and what the needs were regionally and how we can assist the communities in a regional effort. And Paul described a lot of that a few minutes ago to go forward, you know, the needs are changing and we need to be looking at ourselves and seeing how we change and making sure that we're efficiently as possible using the dollars that we receive.

So we'll be looking at all of that in the next coming year to get to the next budget.

Chairman OHMAN: Deborah.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Just to follow-up on that a little bit. Have you looked at all or are you anticipating at all revenue from some of these things we heard about, the leases -- occupants here who perhaps are not -- well, yes.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: That's been a huge priority for our new County Administrator. I don't know how deeply you want to get into that. I'm sure he'd be happy to make some comments to you. But he's been in contact with a lot of the responsible parties and, you know, we're bringing people to the table and the dialogue is beginning about solidifying these relationships in proper form. And I would suspect that if we're entering into a lease for space or some other agreement for which at arms' length a party would pay for, we are expecting to be paid for that.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: And directing your attention just briefly to the question of the money spent on benefits; do you have collective bargaining units coming up in next year?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: We have two that are currently being bargained and I think that they're being bargained for a year. So they'll be open next year, again, in time for us to make these thoughtful choices.

Chairman OHMAN: I'm grateful that the administration's going forward with it. I know that we do have to look at those things going forward to find out what our core mission really is and I'm appreciative of that.

I think that what I would like to finish this part off is that I know that we've had discussions that we should involve the Assembly more on an ongoing basis with all of these processes and not wait to the budget process hits us again next winter. I would like to think that I'm not speaking out of turn in saying that we should get some cooperative committees together to look at these things involving the Assembly. I think going forward that's -- anybody that's interested in that should be raising their hands and wanting to get involved in this. And I think that those are the things that the current administration wants to do with us.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Yes, agreed.

Chairman OHMAN: One more question. Go ahead.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Just one last question I had forgotten; have you put any money for OPEB in this budget?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: No, we have not.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Okay. And what do we have so far committed to an OPEB account?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: I confirmed that the County has set aside \$22,000 for OPEB.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Out of a 30/60 million liability?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Huge actuarial liability, yes, unfunded.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: And our auditors aren't writing up -- writing us up in a management letter?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: I haven't seen that.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Thank you.

Chairman OHMAN: We're going to meet with the auditors in the very near future and I'd like you to be involved in that.

Any more questions specifically about the 2017 Operating Budget? From the audience? Linda.

Ms. ZUERN: I have a question about Children's Cove. I thought last year it was about \$500,000, and this year it's up to \$737,000; am I right in that material?

Mr. LEWIS: \$737,799.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Last year, according to the record, last year's budget was \$765,501.

Ms. ZUERN: It was that much last year?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: It was. And this year it's \$737,000 so it's a little bit less than it was last year.

Ms. ZUERN: Okay. And I brought this up last year and I know you weren't here, but, to me, it's a nonprofit organization even though it's important in the community, I don't feel it's something that the County government should be sponsoring or funding.

And a nonprofit can get grants. I can get donations. So that's a lot of money that we're spending just on Children's Cove, which is a nonprofit.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Well, Children's Cove is not technically a nonprofit. There is a nonprofit that contributes to the operations of Children's Cove which is called the "Friends of Children's Cove."

Ms. ZUERN: Okay.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: They fundraise for Children's Cove and they supply some funding for, I believe, it's a nurse and legal services among other things. Children's Cove actually is considered a County department.

Ms. ZUERN: It is; okay.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Yes.

Ms. LINDA ZUERN: And then I looked at some similar organizations and they're not under County governments. They're under the District Attorney's jurisdiction.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Right.

Ms. ZUERN: So is that a possibility that we might have another state agency take over the Children's Cove?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: There hasn't been that discussion in my office but I'm certain that that's something we could look at. We haven't discussed that as an option for Children's Cove.

Chairman OHMAN: Thank you for your comments. Again, if you want to join an ongoing committee going forward, I think that's really important to discuss going forward. I think your questions are very well based, but it's not technically about the FY17 budget. I'd rather stick to any further questions we have about FY17 operational budget as we have another Public Hearing after this.

So, specifically about this budget; first to the board or anyone in the audience including the newest member to show up?

Mr. KANAGA: Thank you, John.

Mr. LEWIS: Ed Lewis got blasted for nothing there. I will ask one question.

Chairman OHMAN: Ed.

Mr. LEWIS: Just so I keep you on your toes. Since the majority or a large portion of the budget in any municipal budget is salaries, it's human beings; I don't know what the percentage is here. In the school district, it's probably close to 80 percent.

So what is the process as far as the County goes when it comes to salaries and individuals or I know there's a union negotiation -- I understand about unions but the majority -- I believe the majority of the County employees are nonunion. There are only small unions or maybe it's 50-50. How does that process work as far as individual employees that are nonunion and increases or non-increases?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Well, there are two small unions. One involves the Registry of Deeds employees and the other union is in the Facilities Department. But most of the employees, and you're correct, are not unionized. They fall under the guidelines of the Personnel Policy that's in effect for the County for things like work hours, wages, you know, all of the nuts and bolts of handling personnel that you would bargain in a union contract.

So the guidelines are there and the Personnel Policy as opposed to a union contract.

Mr. EDWARD LEWIS: Okay. Let me just follow it up because that's just from a

financial standpoint. It's sustainability moving forward on a budget.

The way I understand when you have, for argument sake, if it's written into a union contract that you get a personnel -- the increase will be -- there's a merit increase and there's a COLA increase. There are two increases and one is usually negotiated and one is not. Merit is usually not increased -- negotiated, COLA is or vice versa. But still individuals, in order to get an increase, there's a schedule which they fit in depending upon their job description. But someone one or some group or somebody has to approve increases for groups of individuals or individuals.

And I know what the process is in the town of Brewster. I assume it's similar for Yarmouth or any other town. And I'm not sure if -- I don't know and I don't know if anybody knows what the process is here?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Well, Bob has been through it so I'll let him explain it to you.

Mr. BOB LAWTON: There are steps in the current system. There's an evaluation completed on each of the employees. The department head would then approve that and it goes to the County Administrator for final signoff.

Mr. LEWIS: So nobody -- the County Commissioners don't approve increases?

Mr. BOB LAWTON: Not step increases; no, sir, not that I'm aware of.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: No, they wouldn't.

Mr. BOB LAWTON: Nor would the Board of Selectmen in a town approve a step increase, at least that I'm aware of.

Mr. LEWIS: The Board of Selectmen would approve an overall, in other words --

Mr. BOB LAWTON: Yes.

Mr. EDWARD LEWIS: -- they would -- not the COLA, the merit increase.

Ms. KING: No.

Mr. LEWIS: They could deny merit -- I was a Selectmen for nine years, excuse me.

Ms. KING: I know but I think you're confusing merit with steps.

Mr. LEWIS: I know I'm not confusing it. Thank you. They can, in other words, they can decide there won't be merit increases or that individual doesn't get a merit increase. And the Town Administrator would approve whether or not someone would. The Board of Selectmen would have to approve the overall process.

Mr. BOB LAWTON: We do, just to complete the thought, there are steps. There is only a small group that would receive a merit increase and that is the same process by evaluation. They could get up to 4 percent depending upon their work which is evaluated by the department head and then approved by the County Administrator. Again, the Commissioners do not get involved in that process.

Mr. EDWARD LEWIS: Thank you.

Chairman OHMAN: Any other questions directly related to the FY17 Operating Budget? Hearing none. I would entertain a motion.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Move to recommend the FY17 Operating Budget to the Assembly of Delegates.

Ms. TAYLOR: Second.

Chairman OHMAN: Would you like to put a number to that?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Okay. All right.

Chairman OHMAN: Twenty-seven million 733 --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: \$27,733,930.00 for the total FY2017 operating budget.

Chairman OHMAN: Thank you.

Chairman OHMAN: And is there further discussion among the board? Hearing none. I'll call for a vote. All those in favor? Aye. **It carries 5 to 0.** Thank you, very much. **(Motion carries.)**

Proposed Ordinance 16-03: FY17 Capital Budget

Chairman OHMAN: Now I'd like to move on to Proposed Ordinance 16-03 for the Capital Budget and our familiar members here from the administration. Let's have at it.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Well, the Capital Budget request for Fiscal 2017 are few and simple, and most of the requests fall under the Department of Facilities for necessary repairs.

To comment on each of them, since there's so few of them, there's a necessary replacement to Second District Court and we requested \$170,000 for that. And it's important to note that the State will reimburse us 97 percent of that cost. So it's likely the other 3 percent will be funded from available funds of the county and we won't end up borrowing for that at all.

The next item is the ancient wall that is in front of Superior Court. That is needing repair and the sidewalk in front of it. That appropriation request, capital request was \$75,000. That, too, is subject to reimbursement and we expect a reimbursement possibly of 75 percent of that. So that will follow suit to the other and we probably will fund the remaining 25 percent with available funds of the county.

And the third request under the Facilities Department is to build a sound wall and we've talked about this. There is outside equipment, eight-track equipment out by the lab that is causing a great degree of noise pollution for the abutting neighbors and there's been several complaints. There was a complaint in the past at First District Court of a similar nature that was actually litigated in court and the County lost the suit. So instead of heading down that road and incurring legal fees that would easily probably exceed the \$70,000, we're requesting that we proactively erect a sound wall and mitigate the noise for the abutting neighbors.

The fourth request is renovations at the jail. The ongoing process of the redesign of the County Complex and shifting of personnel out of other buildings so that the State can take more space in the buildings that they're in. This is the second phase of that and that request is \$150,000 for that as well as the sound wall at the Health Lab. There will be no reimbursement.

And the remaining two items are the Information Technology Departments third installment payment on Microsoft licensing contract that they agreed to. That's the third and final payment. There's no reimbursement for anything like that. So we'll be bonding that as well as the \$150,000 and the \$70,000.

The final request is for a new piece of equipment for George Heufelder and that \$60,000 number will not likely be bonded. I'll probably borrow that short term because the increase in his revenues will cover the cost of the equipment.

And it's \$850,000. A good sum of it will be reimbursed. Other portions of it will be paid for by Available Funds, and the remaining amount of it we'll be expecting to bond.

Chairman OHMAN: Julia.

Ms. TAYLOR: And is some of this being done, like the parts that we don't get the money back or by the Facilities Department?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Well, I think the construction that you're talking about, them physically performing the labor, I'm sure that for the jail, particularly, they'll be some assistance from facilities personnel, but I'm sure the construction of the wall will be contracted out.

Chairman OHMAN: I'm always concerned about the timing of the reimbursement from the State. In other words, we have to pay this as it goes on.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Sure.

Chairman OHMAN: Now do we have funds available from past rental agreements that we can pay this with or are we going to have to worry about the cash flow situation of this?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Well, I don't think this will prevent a cash flow problem for us when these projects drop into the timeline of being accomplished. And what we'll do is use county funds and we'll either advance fund them temporarily by bond anticipation notes or we will -- or we'll just wait for the reimbursement.

Chairman OHMAN: In the track record for the state reimbursement, is it usually about 18 months or does it vary depending on the project?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: I think it depends on what kind approval process there is for the project. Steve Tebo from Facilities is, I think, here. He can answer to that if you have a further question about that.

Chairman OHMAN: It is a Public Hearing. He's welcome to speak.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Sure.

Mr. STEVE TEBO: That, actually, I do not know. That would be a question for the Finance Department. That, typically, is put back in the general funds. And I was under the impression that we got it; it was about 18 months past.

Chairman OHMAN: I was given the impression that the roof in the Second District Court might be a little faster tracking.

Mr. STEVE TEBO: We can go to the state directly and see if they'll pay for it upfront, which we've done for a few smaller projects. So that would be something I could talk to the lease attorney, Chris McQuade and find out if they'll pay it completely up front.

But as a caretaker of the building, the roof needs to be repaired so I had to put it in my budget this year. If it's something that they'll pay for willingly directly, then that's something we'll just take directly out of the budget.

Chairman OHMAN: Thank you. More from -- anyone from the board with another question? In the audience? Chris.

Mr. CHRIS KANAGA: Just out of curiosity, who are the neighbors that we're soundproofing for?

Mr. STEVE TEBO: It's the ones directly behind the jail. There's six of them back there. I can't think of the name of the road.

Mr. KANAGA: Okay. Residents.

Mr. STEVE TEBO: Residential.

Chairman OHMAN: Due south?

Mr. STEVE TEBO: Yes.

Chairman OHMAN: Due south of that.

Mr. STEVE TEBO: Due to the fact that that's actually zoned residential to -- it's kind of a weird zoning from the town. But from Superior Court back, we're actually zoned residential. So we meet different requirements, unfortunately.

Chairman OHMAN: Further questions from anyone in the audience? Seeing none. I will entertain a motion to close the public hearing and a vote on a recommendation.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I move to close the public hearing and move to recommend Proposed Ordinance 16-03 for the FY17 Proposed Capital Budget to the full Assembly in the amount totaling \$850,000.

Ms. TAYLOR: Second.

Chairman OHMAN: Okay. There's a motion and it's seconded. Is there further discussion from the board? Seeing none, I'll call for a vote. All those in favor? Aye. Any opposed? No. **It carries 5 to 0.** Thank you.

(Motion carries.)

Chairman OHMAN: Okay. I will recommend -- a recommendation to adjourn the committee meeting.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Move to adjourn.

Ms. MARTIN: Second.

Chairman OHMAN: Seconded. All those in favor? Aye. Thank you, very much, and thank you out there in the audience very much.

Whereupon, it was moved, seconded, and voted to adjourn the Standing Committee on Finance at 3:25 p.m.

Submitted by:
Janice O'Connell, Clerk
Assembly of Delegates

List of materials provided at the public hearing and committee meeting:

- Cape Cod Commission - Cape Cod Environmental Protection Fund Narrative
- Cape Cod Environmental Protection Fund Balance History 2003 - 2015
- Cape Cod Commission Revenues History 2010 - 2016