

**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 - May 4, 2016

Speaker BERGSTROM: Good afternoon. Welcome to the Wednesday, May 4th, 2016, session of the Cape Cod Regional Government, Assembly of Delegates.

This meeting is being recorded by staff. Is anyone else recording the meeting?

MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. Okay. So we have a separate recording. I'll call this meeting to order and we'll begin with a moment of silence to honor our troops who have died in service to our country and all those serving our country in the Armed Forces.

(Moment of silence.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you.

We will now stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: And that beep you heard I think is Chris Kanaga joining us. Chris, are you there?

Mr. KANAGA: I am.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Chris, for those uninformed, is in Tuscany so. Anyway, the Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call (98.73%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Edward Lewis (4.55% -Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% -Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), Brian O'Malley (1.36% - Provincetown), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Julia Taylor (14.61%- Falmouth), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).
Absent (1.27%) VACANT - (Town of Wellfleet).

Clerk O'CONNELL: The town of Wellfleet is vacant. That's an absence. Mr. Speaker, there are 98.73 percent of the Delegates present; 1.27 percent absent.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. The Clerk informs me that when we have someone remotely participating, all votes have to be taken by roll call vote. So even usually perfunctory motions, such as approval of the Calendar of Business or approval of the Journal will be a roll call vote taken on any other votes or motions or amendments.

So, with that said, the next item on our agenda is approval of the Calendar of Business. Do I have a motion to approve the Calendar?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So moved.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Any additions or corrections to the

Calendar? Hearing none. All those in favor?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Roll call.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes

Roll Call Vote to approve the Calendar of Business for 5/4/16:

Voting “YES” (98.73%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Edward Lewis (4.55% -Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% -Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), Brian O’Malley (1.36% – Provincetown), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Julia Taylor (14.61%- Falmouth), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).

Absent (1.27%) VACANT - (town of Wellfleet).

Clerk O’CONNELL: Mr. Speaker 98.73 percent voting for the approval of the Calendar of Business; 1.27 percent absent (town of Wellfleet - vacant).

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Moving on. The approval of the Journal of April 20th. You should have received a copy of the Journal. Any additions or corrections to the Journal?

Mr. O’MALLEY: I will move approval as distributed.

Mr. LEWIS: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Moved and seconded. We’ll now have a vote on the approval of the Journal.

Roll Call Vote to approve the Journal of Proceedings for April 20th, 2016:

Voting “YES” (98.73%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Edward Lewis (4.55% -Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% -Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), Brian O’Malley (1.36% – Provincetown), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Julia Taylor (14.61%- Falmouth), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).

Absent (1.27%) VACANT - (town of Wellfleet).

Clerk O’CONNELL: Mr. Speaker 98.73 percent voting approval of the Journal of proceedings for April 20, 2016; 1.27 absent – (town of Wellfleet - vacant).

Communications from the Board of Regional Commissioners

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Next we have communications and discussions with County Administrator Jack Yunits and Finance Director Mary McIsaac -- don’t we have the Commissioners -- oh no, from the Board of Regional Commissioners. Yes. We have two of the three Commissioners.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Wow, I missed one meeting and you guys don’t want us up here anymore?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Janice is speeding up the meeting here.

Commissioner FLYNN: Well, I think we can help speed that up a little bit.

First, I want to present you with an Ordinance relating to transfers within the Department of Human Services.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Is it a Resolution?

Commissioner FLYNN: Proposed Resolution, sorry. I'll have to get my dictionary out.

Well, I think on your agenda this evening you have Items 9 and 10 related to the County. The first is the Proposed Operating Budget and Capital Budgets with Mary McIsaac and our County Administrator Jack Yunits. And the second is regarding the Water Quality.

So I think on the Commissioners perspective today, I don't really have anything specific to report. Leo.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The only thing I would like to add on a personal note is to thank all of you who sent me some good wishes while I was briefly out of touch with everyone in the hospital. And I just want to let you know that I'm doing physically better and thank you all for your kind wishes.

The second thing I just want to remind everybody or bring people up to speed about. On our April 27th meeting, we did have a report from Shannon Jarbeau -- I hope I pronounce it right.

Commissioner FLYNN: Jarbeau.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Jarbeau. She's our Community Rating System coordinator. And if all of you remember, this is the position that we created on the recommendations of our then County Extension Service Director Bill Clark. He was fortunate enough to get us some help with that when we started it, and then we actually supplemented her salary a little bit.

And all but good things are coming out of the creation of this position. And the Commissioners asked that she reach out to you guys and come and do a report to you because this is vital information that you need to take back to your communities. She's helping we, the County, are really helping save the residents of Barnstable County a lot of money with the hire of Shannon and what she's doing, and I think it's really important. So, hopefully, she'll be coming in front of you once you guys get through the budget.

And on today's agenda, we didn't really do much today. There were only two of the Commissioners present. We basically just voted minutes and some summary of action stuff but nothing major. So, that kind of completes what I have to say anyhow. Thank you, again.

Commissioner FLYNN: I'm glad you brought up the Community Rating Service because I wanted to mention that Shannon is well recognized nationally for her work with FEMA and helping residents, not only here but anywhere in the United States, with flood insurance. And we are so really happy to have her that we were able to get her so quickly.

She was here last year and we were able to fund her position this year because it's so important to the towns. She gave us a report a couple of weeks ago, and she's working very closely with towns who have really requested her services, and there's about five or six right now, Chatham being one, that's she's working very closely with. And she has another group of towns who are kind of waiting for her to be able to step up

and help them.

And I noticed that in her report she never mentioned the town of Falmouth, which of course, Julie and I both kind of come from. And so I inquired about that and learned that Falmouth didn't have enough funding yet to do their hazardous mitigation plan, which is a requirement in order to be able to move forward to help the residents reduce their flood insurance.

And the reductions for residents can be anywhere from 15 to 45 percent. That's a lot on flood insurance. I know because I have to pay flood insurance and that would be a significant help.

So we're doing everything we can. We, obviously, this year but it's going to be more than just this year to help communities -- to help towns be able to help their residents get some relief on flood insurance.

So I'm glad that Leo suggested that she come here because I think it would be important for you and helpful for you to know and understand the kind of work she's doing.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: And I don't want to belabor this too much, but I do think it needs to be said, in staying with the Community Rating System that the Commissioners received an invitation from U.S. Congressman Bill Keating's office who is putting on a seminar, if you will, on Thursday, June 2nd. It's going to be held at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute in their Clark Library at 360 Woods Hole Road, Woods Hole, Mass.

Now that's June 2nd from 11 to 3. And this seminar is actually going to be a presentation by the Barnstable County model on creating the strategy for Community Rating Systems.

So you all should attend this or have people attend it from your communities because you're the guys that really helped start this model. And it's important for you to know that this is now being looked at by the rest of the country who have sites that are on coastal waterways because everybody's looking to save money, and they're going to be looking at our model and what we created here and, hopefully, re-creating it for them.

And that includes -- here in Massachusetts it's certainly going to include Bristol, Dukes, Nantucket and Plymouth Counties.

So, you guys should be very proud of us creating this. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Are there any questions for the Commissioners?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Linda.

Ms. ZUERN: So, Mr. Cakounes, you're saying that if we are going, we can also invite other people as long as they RSVP?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: It's my understanding that this is open to the public. We got an official -- we, meaning the County Commissioners, got an official invitation, but I believe that this opportunity is open to the public.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: It is.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: It is.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Leo, I have an invitation sent --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: We all did.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: And I thought I was special. See.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It was sent all around.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: And I thought Bill was just sending it to me.

You mean you all got one?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: With a personal note.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: I got a little personal note too. Wow. Thanks, we got the wind out of that sail; thanks.

Mr. MCMANUS: Mr. Chair.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, first Marcia and then we'll move on.

Ms. KING: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Commissioners about half an hour ago the Assembly of Delegates members received a list of potential cuts made by the new Administrator. And I want to know when you received it because there seems to be a bit, in my point of view, a conflict of when this came out and why it wasn't given to us until 30 minutes ago. Because I have conflicting stories of who got what when, and I'm just curious when your office -- when the three of you reviewed this -- if you have reviewed it at all and your opinion on it?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: I was only made aware -- I'm only going to speak to me personally. The Commissioners have not received it officially, and the Commissioners have not discussed it or viewed that document as a committee; Number 1.

Number 2; I only heard of its creation at about 11 o'clock today. I attempted to get a copy and I've had other things. So as of today, right now, I have not seen a copy of it; me, personally. So I don't know if --

Ms. KING: Commissioner Flynn?

Commissioner FLYNN: I have nothing to add to that, no.

Ms. KING: You have never seen it until today?

Commissioner CAKOUNES: I haven't even seen it.

Ms. KING: But you've never seen it and you haven't seen it. You have seen it though?

Commissioner FLYNN: No, I have not.

Ms. KING: So you have not seen it. So --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Why don't you ask her again, Marcia.

Ms. KING: So your Administrator created this and gave it to the Speaker, my understanding is two weeks ago, and you have yet to view it at all.

Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Sorry. I've seen it -- but just to clarify it; I have seen it from a distance. Someone held it up and asked me if I have this, but I have not -- I do not possess a copy of it nor have I seen it close enough to read it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Suzanne then Ed.

Ms. KING: There's no reason to apologize. I'm just a little surprised that the Speaker of the Assembly received it two weeks ago from the new Administrator and that you have never seen it and that it seems to be floating around. And then there was discussions about request -- having the Assembly receive it which it never did.

So, thank you.

Commissioner FLYNN: Well, I will say that I was very aware that he was preparing that document because it was going to be in response to probably questions that you would ask. If the deeds excise tax were not approved, then what would be the impact on the County?

And as the person he and the Finance Director, the person responsible for preparing the budget, it was, obviously, his obligation to go back and look at, well, where

would those funds come from -- revenues come from if we had to eliminate them. So I think it's very appropriate that he and the Finance Director prepared that.

Ms. KING: Commissioner, I completely agree. I completely support what he's done and I'm thrilled about it but I'm just a little surprised that you haven't seen it, that the Speaker had seen it two weeks ago, and that it was dropped on our desk 20 minutes ago.

So I applaud him. I'm absolutely thrilled that in six weeks someone could have done this. I'm surprised they could have done it a couple of months ago so that it didn't come to a budget issue.

So I fully applaud the Administrator. I'm just surprised that I'm hearing that your office has no knowledge of it when I thought he reported to you and not to the Speaker of the Assembly.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So for clarification, this is proposed cuts, not a summary of the cuts that have been made in the current budget?

Speaker BERGSTROM: No. This is not proposed cuts. This is an example of what we might have to do.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Okay. But this is not --

Speaker BERGSTROM: The Commissioners have already submitted --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: -- some of what's already been done because there have been cuts made in the current budget.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No, no. If, indeed, the deeds tax is not passed, this is an example of the cuts that we would have to make or similar cuts in order to balance the budget. That's basically what it is.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Okay.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Pat.

Mr. PRINCI: Just very quickly. Many of us, including myself, at our subcommittee meetings were asking the finance director these very questions and you remember; you were at those meetings too, Marcia.

And I remember being -- the response was that's something that we're working on meaning that it seems, to me, as it was forecasted that this tax increase was more or less an automatic but yet there wasn't really a plan B. And now this is sort of like a plan B to give us some information that we -- of potential cuts that could be made.

It would have been nice, obviously, if we had Plan A and Plan B when we first received the budget and so forth, but it didn't happen that way and here we are.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. I'd just like to say, from my own standpoint, the minutes and the recordings of the meeting several meetings ago will show that I was asked about potential cuts and that I indicated to the Delegates in public session that I had this list. All right. So we'll go back and we'll dig it out but that -- and I would see that they get it, and I did make some motions.

The fact that you didn't get it earlier is totally my fault. I should have gotten it to you earlier but you've got to remember these are proposed cuts. These are simply examples of what we would have to do. In other words, if you're going to cut the budget, here are some things you can look at. But I'll take responsibility to the fact that you didn't get it earlier. Okay.

Anyway, with that said, yes, Ed.

Mr. MCMANUS: Coming back to the previous matter -- I guess it's a training session in Woods Hole on June 2. I believe everybody should somewhere in their email box be getting an announcement of it and a link to be able to sign up for the meeting to RSVP through Eventbrite, which is a ticketing service.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you.

Commissioner FLYNN: Thank you.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Thanks.

Communications with County Administrator Jack Yunits and Mary McIsaac

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Moving right along, Jack Yunits and Mary McIsaac, you're on. Step up to the table.

Administrator YUNITS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me begin by just addressing that slip of paper because it's really not worth anything more than a slip of paper.

When the Speaker asked us to give him an idea of what kind of cuts might ensue if this tax break did not come through. We put this list together and we said that this is nothing formal and nothing specific. This is a guideline. This is what may or may not happen because I do want to remind the people in this room that we are responsible for a lot of lives across the way. These are real people. Those aren't just numbers on a piece of paper.

And the last thing we wanted to do is create consternation, doubt, and worry amongst an already beleaguered staff that is working their tail off for us based on assumptions that we weren't sure of.

And that's all that piece of paper is; it's a guideline. It's nothing formal. We haven't formally discussed anything on that piece of paper with the Commissioners yet. We've only given them a general overview and I think we can say enough about that right now.

The other thing I want to be clear about today is we're not going to be here punching the past. The past is over. We're going to try today to explain to you where we hope to go with this budget and why the tax increase is extremely important to us to get to the next level and to become a great County government again.

I also want to put in its proper place the implications that this Assembly has not had a role in helping us prepare this budget. It's just not the truth. The fact of the matter is I met privately with most of you. We have talked with you at Finance Committee meetings and budget preparation meetings and your input has already had dramatic impacts on what we intend to do going forward.

For instance, we made actions at the Children's Cove based on suggestions that were received from Assembly-persons. We eliminated the marketing provision of the Children's Cove and moved it off the campus.

Based on strong feelings of many of the Assembly members, we separated Cape Vineyard Electric Corporation (CVEC) from the County. CVEC is now a separate agency. It's off campus. It has its own 04 number, and by June 1st it should be transitioned to being on its own.

Again, based on meetings we had with some of the Assembly members, we've engaged Steve Johnson at Open Cape in some lengthy conversations about how we can partner going forward to do the things that you all intended Open Cape to do when you

passed that ordinance many years ago, specifically in terms of laying out the last mile and, remember, that's going to take money.

On Information Technology (IT) infrastructure and redundancies, we heard from you that you had some grave concerns. We brought in a consultant. He's presently reviewing all our IT infrastructure and all our communications infrastructure. We're working on with the sheriff on how to apportion revenues from the tower, which is also a concern of the Assembly.

And we've also gone a step further in working with audits on the energy usage in the County to see if we can't put together an energy conservation contract that will save us more money. All of this input came from Assembly-persons, and, of course, our Commissioners who have supported us a 100 percent in these endeavors.

So to suggest that the strategic planning that's (Inaudible) to this day does not involve the Assembly members is totally erroneous. Remember, too, that on this particular budget it's already 8.5 percent less than last year. Mary has already cut out \$1.7 million from last year's budget and denied \$600,000 in department requests. So it's a \$2.3 million turnaround from where it would've been if it hadn't been for these economic times, strong fiscal management, and the feedback from the Assembly.

The last thing I want to just mention on that is we've talked on the periphery about some of the subcommittees that I hope to create going forward. You in your Charter, as you know, have the authority to create subcommittees and I would love you to do that because I think we need to create a finance and management subcommittee with the Assembly group going forward. I think we need a facilities committee going forward; communications subcommittee going forward so the Assembly in the future isn't just a vote. It is part of setting the course for the future of Barnstable County government. And that's got to be extremely important because as we go forward, we're talking about doing a lot more with real dollars and making real impacts. I already mentioned lighting up the last mile with the Open Cape.

I'm talking about getting us back to bond capacity so we can go to the market and help the Cape Cod Commission establish onsite wastewater treatment plants be County financed, cost recovery plus systems so that we can continue being a catalyst for economic growth and economic development on Cape Cod.

In addition to that, we envision once we get our budget back to a proud and suitable place and we have a good bond rating becoming the recipient of SRF monies so that we can work with the Cape Cod Commission and apportion money across the County for the right kind of investments.

Remember, most of the people we represent can't afford these betterment fees. Our retirees and our seasonal workers, they struggle just to make ends meet. They can't afford huge betterment fees. And if we're going to solve some of the water and wastewater problems going forward, we have to be creative in that. To do that, we have to get back to a strong bonding capacity.

And Mary's going to talk to you in just a minute a little bit more about how important creating a reserve fund will be to get us there. And you can't create a reserve fund if you're putting Band-Aids on the wounds all the time.

I just want to point out too a few of the things that sometimes get overlooked regarding just what the County is doing. Let me start with Cultured Clamming. As you know, over the years, Mike Maguire and the Extension has got more and more involved in

the claiming industry on Cape Cod and all the shellfish industry.

At this point in time, we are in the process with the Seaport (phonetic) group and UMass of applying for a feasibility study to create a research center at the Cultured Clam that would help us --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Jack, you're showing your age, Jack. It hasn't been Cultured Clam for 20 years.

Administrator YUNITS: That's right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: ARC (Aquaculture Research Corporation).

Administrator YUNITS: ARC.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Administrator YUNITS: I applied for a job there once. But, remember, 90 percent of the seedling in Massachusetts come out of there; 90 percent. It generates \$18 million dollars and 1,600 jobs across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We need to protect it, and we need to make it better. And to do that, we need to get our bonding capacity back.

We've already talked about water/wastewater/Open Cape. George in the Health Department -- and these cuts would really, really impact the Health Department. Groundwater gas samplings near landfills occurring all over the Cape on a regular basis would be suspect. Recreational water monitoring during the summers.

Right now, George tests the water quality at 350 beaches across the Cape on a regular basis. His seasonal inspection services provide over 1,000 man hours to the towns that get pounded during the summer with needs for more health safety inspectors; public health nursing, immunization. These are the kind of things That are the fringe of us.

The AmeriCorps provides on a number of service; emergency management, irrigation control, water control, water quality assessments. I believe it was 3,500 hours last year. It may even be more.

The Fire Training Academy; this is an important part of our future. And the biggest part of that problem is how do we clean that site. To clean that site would require a huge investment. So the most practical way of doing it is to bring back that site to a useful life, create a purpose, and then apply for Brownfield's money. Without the first part of that equation, it's hard to get the Brownfield's cleanup money.

We can do that and we're planning on doing it with partnering with Mass. Maritime and starting a new line of courses that could generate over a half a million dollars a year. Tim Whelan has got us an earmark for a hundred. So we're off and running in turning that back into a useful, very productive and very successful ongoing enterprise.

We're filing tomorrow for a homeland grant that will allow us to upgrade the equipment out there and bring in new educational programming there. And Mass. Maritime will be a huge player going forward as our partner out there. Again, we can't do that without the money.

There's just so much more; the Children's Cove, the things that are on the bubble, redirecting our IT money to make it more efficient, all these things are on the bubble here. And this is why we need your help so much today. We need it, two counts.

We need it to try to hold this budget in order the best you can, and we need it to give us the \$1.3 million that potentially could be derived from the tax increase.

And I know and I said in my letter to you all that nobody likes to ask for new

taxes, but nobody wants to see a County fall over itself struggling to make ends meet when it doesn't need to.

I'm in the market right now for a new home. The idea of me having to pay \$140 more to close is not disturbing me. It would disturb me greatly if I thought this County was in huge trouble; if I thought that my water wasn't clean; if I thought the 208 program was threatened by cuts that we don't need to make.

What we need to do is to become accountable to you, and we need to, as administrators, and what we need to do as a County is to be accountable to the public. We can make the public proud of us again.

I didn't take this -- come down here to the County because I was looking for a job. I came here because I wanted a challenge, and I was so proud and excited to have a chance to make a difference to this County because it is the best and it is one of the greatest County governments going, and we can make a difference but we need your help today.

We're going to fix so many of the communication gaps going forward and we're doing this with the Commissioners blessings, believe me. They strongly encourage us to do this. So by creating these subcommittees and creating a constant dialogue going forward, a lot of the negative publicity will disappear, and we'll be able to focus now on rebuilding our County and doing it right. Protecting the people that have given us so much across the way is important to us, granted.

I'm just amazed at how spirited they are and how willing they are to make it work. So having to let any of them go would be a huge hurt for us all. I ask you to consider that going forward.

Mary's going to talk a little bit more now about the financial program we're trying to put in place and the savings mechanism and how we hope to get there shortly.

Mr. LEWIS: I'll vote for you, Jack.

Finance Director MCISAAC: Thanks, Jack. Good afternoon, everyone. And today we're before you prior to the discussion of your discussion on the Fiscal '17 Budget, and I think it's important at this time to talk about where finance feels like we fit into the picture of all the things that Jack just talked to you about.

And the most important thing about what Jack said which links to me is our responsibility in finance to develop the financial infrastructure that's going to be needed to accomplish all these goals.

So one of the priorities is to reestablish the reserves that have been depleted by the budgetary process in the past and that will be a painstaking effort. Standard & Poor's looks at the establishments of reserves; they call them Rainy Day Funds. You call them in your town Stabilization Funds and there's not just one kind anymore. There are multiple forms of stabilization funds which all do the same thing which is set aside funds for the rainy day which allows your government to function through economic hardship, to function through catastrophic events, unnatural events. I mean however things occur to fracture the structure -- structural balance of your budget.

And so what we're trying to do as we go forward is to develop a written policy for reserves. We're looking at establishing them, defining them more clearly in terms of -- in terms of what kind of revenue stream might be directed to them; what kind of contributions we would expect or hope to be delivered to them. How those balances stay there. What they can be drawn down for.

And once they're drawn down, which is almost as important as creating

them, is your plan for replenishing them going forward. And so from a perspective of reserves, that's going to be its own goal and objective because the importance of reserves is not just establishing them and having the money sit there. It's having a plan. It's having a written policy and procedure in place so that people understand clearly that they're not just there when you're trying to balance your budget; that they're there and the use of them is predictable and has a framework in which there can only be expenditures and drawdowns from them, and once they're drawn down you have a plan to replenish them.

That's only one of the factors that Standard & Poor's will look at, for instance, when we go to the ratings committee probably for the first time in 20 years. And Standard & Poor's publishes a top 10 characteristics of highly-rated issuers, and I won't get into all the detail. But I would say to you that some of the most important things that they look at are they look at that you focus on a structural balance which means that your recurring revenues are matching your recurring expenditures so that you're not depleting your reserves as a part of your budget process so that you're structurally sound. And the profitability or the positive results of your operations deliver an increase in your reserves or deliver funding for something like a capital plan. And they're also looking for the establishment of the rainy day fund which we talked about.

And some of the other policies and procedures that they look at inside of a ratings call basically focus on whether you're watching the house; whether you have written policies and procedures about cash management, liquidating management, your investment policies, that you have that reserve policy. You know, that you're looking at economic indicators periodically, that you're measuring your revenues and your expenditures periodically so that you can react to something that's not predictable. So that you have the ability to cut back on expenditures when your revenues are not getting there for you and so that you always go through the year being able to, as much as possible, recover from something that's negative before the end of the year when it's too late to really recover from that.

For instance, here we've put a hiring freeze in place as much as possible and necessary in order to not increase our personnel cost and our fringe costs for the rest of the year and going forward until we stabilize budgeting comfortably for our recurring revenues to match our recurring expenditures.

Our focus this year is really going to be on the important criteria that Standard & Poor's looks at in order to judge you as a highly-rated issuer. We go into the market hoping for something that would be a double A or a double A+ and then we're immediately going to work towards positioning ourselves to arguing the triple A. That's going to be a difficult sell. We have a smaller budget. We don't have flexibility because really the County tax can only be increased by 2-1/2 percent and our revenue streams have been, thus far, limited.

But the closer we get to articulating ourselves to success in all the areas that they consider important, you know, the better off we're going to be to have a sound structure for borrowing, for investing in capital.

And good things follow good things, so hard work, you know, we expect the hard work to deliver us a good rating. We expect to get back into the marketplace, and we expect to have a strong presence there and be able to be viable in order to fund our capital and our regional government going forward.

So that's really the focus from finance. We've talked a lot about the budget

in the last few meetings, and I think that you all understand where I'm coming from. But structurally, I'm working to provide Jack with the financial infrastructure that he needs so that our goals and objectives are achieved.

Thank you.

Administrator YUNITS: Let me just add before we take questions; in asking you to pass a tax and asking the residents of Plymouth -- Barnstable County to pay a tax increase, we feel obliged to make a commitment to you. And that commitment, as Mary just said, there will be no COLAs (Cost of Living Adjustments). There will be no new positions created. Any monies that should come in and we are pursuing monies everywhere; we're pursuing monies through leases; we're pursuing monies through adjusting the sheriff's retirement fund; we're pursuing money through new ventures such as Route 6 rest stop, and we're pursuing savings through extrapolating redundancies and eliminating them.

Anything that we generate in excess of what we are presently budgeted for will go into a reserve account. It will not be spent. We will not create new positions.

And as I said to you, it's our hope that starting this summer we have at least two representatives of the Assembly working with us on a regular basis both in generating new growth and generating new revenues but maintaining and monitoring how we spend our money and our time.

So that's our commitment to you. We're going to be prudent. We're going to be fiscally conservative, and we owe it to the taxpayers and we owe it to you to make sure we live up to that promise.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Thank you. I'll take questions from the Assembly on this. Yes, starting with Marcia and then Jim.

Ms. KING: Jack, you mentioned you're looking for a house here. You're buying a house here. You don't pay the tax, the transfer tax. The transfer tax is paid by a seller. Everybody seems to think the buyers are; just number one.

Mary, what's our bond rating currently?

Finance Director MCISAAC: As far as I know, we don't have a confirmed bond rating. We were rated in 1996 when the last bond issue was sold for the County. A rating was reviewed in 2007 as a protocol for continuing disclosure. But in 2007 the last principal payment was made and there's been no rating since.

Ms. KING: And then one more thing, Jack. I go back to the infamous sheet because you have under Human Services, it was suggested a decrease of \$76,834, which you say Out-of-State Travel is \$2,800. And then you say, "Difference between request and payroll," that's \$74,034. What is that? Everything else you delineate but that you don't. What is that?

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: I can speak to that.

Ms. KING: Okay.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: These were from my notes of where I would look if the deeds tax wasn't passed. One of the -- one of the reviews that we performed that we were not able to cut by budget time was the Human Services because a lot of grants were in flux. And since that time, Beth Albert's office has received commitments of other grants. Those grants may require matches and other increased personnel cost to cover the performance of the grants.

So at the time, we had sheets from the payroll departments for all of the

departments in which Nancy Cushing, who's our payroll administrator, analyzed all of the current personnel and what the cost would be for them in the next year, which is fiscal '17.

The number that you see is strictly the difference between what Beth had requested in her budget for salaries and what we currently were analyzed numbers for people who are actually sitting in seats in the Human Services department.

Ms. KING: Thank you.

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: You're welcome.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Jim.

Mr. KILLION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon, Mr. Yunits/Ms. McIsaac. Question, you had talked about reserve accounts and my recollection is that the importance of not only having an account but how it's managed. And given that this tax increase that's being proposed some of the rationale for that is, in fact, to restore our reserve accounts.

Do you think it would be prudent to the taxpayers to get that house in order first before we go and start collecting revenue to demonstrate that, in fact, we can be responsible with it because I think there's some question about how that has gone for the last several years.

Administrator YUNITS: I'll take a shot at that first and then I'll let Mary talk. I think, Mr. Killion, it has to be recognized that this was an extreme budget. Mary did Yeoman's work and the County should have an immense amount of confidence the way we are moving this forward. The commitments we just made, the fact that the budget is almost \$2 million less than it would have been if it hadn't been for Mary's great efforts.

These are the kind of things that should indicate to the public that we're serious about this. We need to build the reserves to keep the County moving forward. If we don't, things start to stop or slow down and that could be detrimental in the long term.

I think what the County's got to do is trust us that we can do this, and I know that trust is a tough word in the political environment nowadays. But, as I said, this is going to be a team effort and we feel pretty confident that we can win their respect.

Mr. KILLION: I don't disagree with you. You folks have done very diligent work, but I guess that still leaves the question aside as to what point do we put those mechanisms in place.

But to move on to question you, Mr. Yunits, you had mentioned wastewater infrastructure. So it is your vision of the County that we will be getting involved in the construction and management to those services?

Administrator YUNITS: No. We'd simply be the fiscal manager. We would be the -- we would probably do the procurements. We'd probably oversee the process with the Cape Cod Commission, and it would be for targeted developments probably -- it might be a 40R, it might be businesses on Route 28, but places that are being threatened by the failing septic in critical areas that can't afford to do it on their own would have a partner in us. It would be a public-private partnership, whether it's a 40R or Route 28.

And the fees that we would collect would carry the bonds plus so that we can continue to build those reserves and continue to make these kinds of investments going forward. I think that's coming. I don't think it's far off.

And there's a reason that Governor asked George Heufelder to supervise the alternative wastewater treatment system program out at the base because he's the best at

what he does. And having him on board and not using him on something like this is -- is an efficiency in and of itself.

So I think that this could be a good future for us. That's one of the things that I think we can do going forward. I think that will work. But I'm talking about public-private partnerships. I'm not talking about the County actually owning systems on private property.

Mr. KILLION: But do you envision the County getting larger to accommodate that service?

Administrator YUNITS: Yes, I think we could. I think there's going to be water and wastewater loans out there. As Administrator, I hope to get a little more involved with the federal government. It's been kind of lacking a little bit for the last few years, and I think there are avenues out there if I start working that avenue to generate new growth for economic development.

Mr. KILLION: Thank you, Mr. Yunits.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Yes, Linda.

Ms. ZUERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions on the list. Under "Registry of Deeds" it says "\$84,000, two vacant positions." So is the deeds tax were passed, would those positions be filled or not filled?

Finance Director MCISAAC: Those positions are possibly needing to be filled depending on the level of activity at the deeds' office in fiscal '17.

Ms. ZUERN: And then I have another question about the Reserve Fund.

Finance Director MCISAAC: Sure.

Ms. ZUERN: You said the extra money would go into the reserve fund. Is there a specific amount that we should have in the Reserve Fund, like 5 percent of the budget or 7 percent or?

Finance Director MCISAAC: Well, the percentage of whatever percentage you would define would be a part of your policy, and that would really be driven by what type of reserve you're talking about. And because different reserves you would expect to fund at different levels because of how their needs -- how their needs are driven. But I would say that dollar amounts are usually what people shoot from in the beginning because rising to a certain percentage of your budget is not usually achievable in the short term. It's usually a long-term goal.

So the policy that you create for reserves is usually what I call a living document. Because it's amended from time to time as you become closer to achieving your goals and then you kind of switch gears and you raise yourself to a higher standard about what level you want. So, usually, I think we start out with a dollar amount and you would hope to have, perhaps, in a certain reserve fund 500,000; perhaps in another reserve fund 250,000, and then, you know, as your budget stabilizes and you have growth or you have unpredicted excesses in revenues, you divert those in and then you start looking at what 5 percent of your probably historical budget over the last five years is in what that number is and you try to hit that.

Ms. ZUERN: So do you have a dollar amount in mind, like \$500,000 or \$250,000?

Finance Director MCISAAC: Well, the difference in county government is that we can be more volatile than cities and towns because of the presence of all the grants and how some years we can have them and some years we can't. So it's hard to predict what

we should have but, you know, we should have a million dollars in reserves here today and we don't have that. And we have \$8 million in capital deficits.

So if we had had reserves along the way and we had a reserve that was a stabilization fund for capital, we probably would have funded those projects as they occurred and not authorized borrowing, you know that now we have to do.

So it's just the way of it. I would say a million dollars would be something that I would want to have today if I could, yes.

Ms. ZUERN: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Ed.

Mr. LEWIS: This Ed?

Speaker BERGSTROM: You. The one with your hand raised.

Mr. LEWIS: I thought Ed also had his hand raised -- the other Ed.

Mr. MCMANUS: Not yet.

Mr. LEWIS: Not yet. Okay. One comment just so -- the tax that we're talking about, the deeds tax, is not a tax for all Barnstable County taxpayers. It's a tax for those people who sell their homes in Barnstable County and that's a small, very small percentage compared to all the people that own property in Barnstable County or live in Barnstable County as that percentage.

The other thing is -- so I wanted to make that clear as we're talking as everybody in Barnstable County's going to get an increase in their taxes and that's not true. This is a separate type of tax. We'll get into that when we vote on that.

As far as reserves are concerned, you're talking about a stabilization reserve which is a very important reserve and most towns have that but they don't touch that for operational expenses. That's not touched for operational expenses. I mean if they have large capital expenditures, they really should be bonded so that you're paying it off over a period of time and you're not depleting your reserves in order to pay for any big, large capital expenditures. And I would hope that that's the same philosophy. I think it is based on my conversations with you, and I'm happy to hear what Mary has said because I think that's good fiscal management.

I would agree that you should have close to a million dollars in reserves, of which a large portion, I think, should be in the stabilization fund. And we should be able to sustain our expenses based on our revenues going forward.

So I think that's a good plan on your part. And thank you, Jack, for your words.

Administrator YUNITS: I just want to point out too that going forward when we talk about the potential of getting this \$1.3 million new revenue, the fixed cost increase that we project for next year will be about \$600,000-plus. So this isn't, by any means, a gravy train. That's the healthcare cost and the other employee-related cost. That's what we anticipate will occur going forward in the future.

So that's why this new revenue stream is extremely important if we're going to stay in the game and keep up with the rest of the pack.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Any other questions for the Commissioners -- I mean for -- Jack, can I ask you -- okay -- do you have something?

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Yes, I do.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Have you had any progress with the state

auditors in terms of money?

Administrator YUNITS: No, we haven't. There's been no change there except for the earmark that passed the house last week for a hundred thousand for the academy which is going to the Police Chiefs Association --

FINANCE DIRECTOR MCISAAC: Fire Chiefs Association.

Administrator YUNITS: -- Fire Chiefs Association -- strike that, sorry, for use at the academy only. Then there's been no real change. The process of getting the sheriff's retirement money is going to be coming soon and it's going to be a time-consuming process. It isn't going to happen overnight. It would be great if it did and we could be surprised by it, but the feedback we're getting out of the State House presently is that A&F will make it a process and rightly so. That's their job. So --

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Okay.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Mary, do you know what the -- the amount of the cost of living increases, I should know this, but is that distributed -- is that a single line item or is that distributed among various departments and employees?

Finance Director MCISAAC: It's all distributed amongst the departments. There were no cost of living adjustments in salaries in the fiscal '17 budget anyway, other than one department.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Do you know what the number would be if we had made the cost of living increases?

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: We thought 1 -- 2 percent was about \$125,000.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So \$125,000 would basically -- it would cost 125,000 to give a COLA to the current employees?

Finance Director MCISAAC: Yes. I believe that was the estimate.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Thank you. Anything else? Okay. Well, thank you, very much.

Administrator YUNITS: Thank you.

Finance Director MCISAAC: Thank you.

Discussion on Water Quality Initiatives

Ms. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Would you -- could I speak briefly on the next item?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. We're now Item 10 and its communications and discussion with County Staff and Assembly of Delegates regarding Department 560. We put this on the agenda. We thought it would be more controversial than it is, but Julia will give you the heads up.

Ms. TAYLOR: As you may remember, the Water Protection Collaborative had originally requested \$502,000. That was cut down so that there would be the salary and the general expenses plus \$250,000 instead of \$400,000 for other initiatives.

I recently had a visit from Eric Turkington and Virginia Valiela who are the head of wastewater planning in Falmouth and very experienced, and they were unhappy about the elimination of the grants to the towns in general because they feel so strongly that our best way to save money in the long run over sewerage is to explore some of the

alternative methods.

They also were worried that the 250 -- it will be matched by the state was not exactly what they had in mind for monitoring that they thought would be the most useful and actionable.

Fortunately, I got Andrew together with Virginia and later Eric chimed in, and because he had been very thrifty when he first heard about budget problems some time ago, he felt that if Mary and Jack could go along with it there could be \$150,000 that could be used on the -- for town grants. Maybe Falmouth will apply; I'm sure they will, but it's, of course, open to every town.

He also was very helpful in explaining how the chance for changes in the regional monitoring system could happen that he would do everything he could in the new contract for that to meet the needs of both Falmouth and other estuaries who need more data -- it would be better for them if they had more data from this regional monitoring.

So I just want to thank Andrew and Jack and Mary for dealing with my little crisis with my, really, you know, important constituents because they really have done so much work for Falmouth on their water -- wastewater project. But I think we are in good shape and I don't need to make any budget amendment and we can proceed.

Thanks to those who helped me.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. I'd just like to add to that. When I heard about this from Julia, I contacted our wastewater people or water quality people in Chatham and they had exactly the same concerns as Virginia Valiela and Eric Turkington. So it's not just a Falmouth issue. I mean we've been doing this for 20 years so the people in house know what they're doing and they were concerned, and I think they had a real significant role along with Andrew in making it more acceptable and better to the people.

So I have them here if anybody has any questions but it seems to be -- yeah. Who's that? Ed.

Mr. LEWIS: I explained this to Julia today but for everybody's edification Andrew had -- when we had our meeting with Andrew -- the budget meeting in advance, Andrew had made it clear that the \$150,000 that was being cut from the budget that he did have enough money that he would be able to handle those grants -- those grants from towns that he originally had turned down because he wasn't sure what the budget would look like but he does have that \$150,000.

The major problem, of course, is that making sure that the towns do the paperwork so that when they do the work they actually bill for it so we don't sit there with encumbered money as against actually paying for what they've asked us to do.

And that's become -- that's a cash flow problem which needs -- the towns need to be more expeditious in the way that they go ahead and do their paperwork. But he committed to that in advance, so it wasn't something that he had said no he wouldn't do.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Jim.

Mr. KILLION: Yes, just a quick question. You both admit the \$150,000 grant. Is that a state grant or is that funding funds that were already encumbered by this body previously?

Ms. TAYLOR: This was funded in the '16 budget. But when he held back on spending it all when there were clearly going to be some issues. So it could be carried into 2017.

Mr. KILLION: So it was excess --

Ms. TAYLOR: It wouldn't be --

Mr. KILLION: Okay. So it was excess capital from our previous budget?

Ms. TAYLOR: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Linda.

Ms. ZUERN: I do have a couple questions if you have him here if he could answer them if --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sure. Oh, you mean this or --

Ms. ZUERN: On the budget.

Speaker BERGSTROM: On the budget, sure. Well, we can -- I mean you can ask him the questions now. When we convene, of course, we have to suspend the rules, but I suspect that we're going to have to suspend the rules if we have any future questions on specific items. Is that what you'd rather do? Either way. It doesn't --

Ms. ZUERN: Well, I did have questions on the \$950,000 grant money that we got from the state and whether part of that money could be used for the water quality \$250,000 if some of that could go towards that \$250,000?

Speaker BERGSTROM: And who got that? Was it the Commission or was that --

Ms. ZUERN: The Cape Cod Commission got that.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. Well then we're going to have to ask one of the -- we're going to have to ask Paul who's been hiding in the back of the room hoping that he won't be called, like a kid in grammar school. Or maybe Andrew, okay, more appropriately.

Mr. ANDREW GOTTLIEB: The seven hundred -- the \$950,000, it came from the state; \$250,000 of it was the state's fulfilling the match obligation that they committed to last spring or last summer that gave rise to the County appropriation of \$250,000.

So in order to utilize that money, we have to maintain the match for it. So it's separate and distinct from the money that would be used for granting to support and share the cost of municipal projects.

Ms. ZUERN: Then I have another question. Do you expect another \$250,000 from the state?

Mr. ANDREW GOTTLIEB: Yes, they made a four-year commitment. They committed a million dollars to the County.

Ms. ZUERN: And we do have that agreement writing with the state now?

Mr. ANDREW GOTTLIEB: They've made it twice now in this course of this fiscal year. The Governor's office has made two announcements that they were funding this initiative for four years.

Ms. ZUERN: But do we have an agreement with the state especially in writing?

Mr. ANDREW GOTTLIEB: We have a contract with the state for Fiscal '16 when you -- the capital budget -- the capital budgeting process the state runs year to year. So they come up with -- the Governor's office comes up with a 5-year capital plan annually on a rolling basis. They've designated \$250,000 a year in each of the four years of this administration's capital plan. We can contract for that money annually post-July 1.

So we have a commitment -- two written commitments from the Baker administration to provide that money and the commitment that we've made to you and to

the Commissioners in the appropriations process last year was we wouldn't spend any of the County money for the match until and unless we got the annual money from the state and we've honored that commitment.

Ms. ZUERN: And then I think I asked this before about getting the next \$250,000 from the state that we would be able to spend that money because we --

Mr. ANDREW GOTTLIEB: The money from the state has to be spent within the 12 months of the fiscal year for which it was appropriated. So, yes, we will be able to spend it.

Ms. ZUERN: And the \$250,000 was part of the \$950,000 has to be spent by July 1?

Mr. ANDREW GOTTLIEB: That's correct. The whole \$950,000 has to be spent by July 1 or it goes back to the Commonwealth.

Ms. ZUERN: And we can do that?

Mr. ANDREW GOTTLIEB: We have contracts in place to expend those funds in accordance with the agreement that we have the state.

Ms. ZUERN: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Anyone else? Thank you.

Mr. ANDREW GOTTLIEB: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So I guess now we'll move on to communications from Public Officials? Anything from members of the Public? Hearing none.

Assembly Convenes

Committee Report Proposed Ordinance 16-07: FY16 Legal Service Supplemental Funds of \$50,000

Speaker BERGSTROM: The Assembly will now convene. We'll begin with a committee report and Assembly vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-07, which was reviewed by the Finance Committee.

John.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Finance Committee met to discuss Proposed Ordinance 16-07 I believe on -- I think it was on April 20.

This is -- and I would suppose that everybody on the committee is able to give me a vote whether we approve the minutes or not; I'll ask for that vote.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Move approval.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Second.

Mr. OHMAN: Move approval, okay, and seconded.

Mr. OHMAN: And all those votes in favor?

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Aye.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Aye.

Ms. TAYLOR: Aye.

Ms. MARTIN: Aye.

Mr. OHMAN: Aye. Thank you.

(Minutes passed.)

Mr. OHMAN: Now, specifically, this is a statutory reserve that was moved to add to the Legal Reserve Fund \$50,000, mostly because we need more money to fight the Fire Training Academy expenses in the town of Barnstable.

Assembly Vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-07:

To add to the County’s operating budget for Fiscal Year 2016, as enacted in Ordinance No. 15-02, by making a supplemental appropriation for legal expenses for the Fiscal Year two-thousand and sixteen.

Section 1.

Based on a revised estimate of income of Barnstable County for the current fiscal year, made as of March 25, 2016, the sum set forth in section one, for the purpose set forth therein and subject to the conditions set forth in sections five through twelve of the Barnstable County Ordinance 15-02, is hereby appropriated from the Statutory Reserve amounts for FY2016 as a supplemental appropriation for Barnstable County for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, two thousand and sixteen. Said funds shall be derived from the Legal Reserve Fund.

<u>Budget #</u>	<u>Sub-Program</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>\$ Amount</u>
0019102	Legal Services	2	\$50,000

TOTAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION \$ 50,000

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Do I have a motion to approve?

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. OHMAN: I would move approval of 16-07 as stated.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Do I have a second?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. We all understand what this is for? We need supplemental appropriations because of the Fire Training Academy litigation. Okay. We will take a voice vote on this --

Ms. TAYLOR: No.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Not a voice vote, I mean a roll call on it. Sorry.

Roll Call Vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-07: To add to the County’s operating budget for Fiscal Year 2016, as enacted in Ordinance No. 15-02, by making a supplemental appropriation of \$50,000 for legal expenses for the Fiscal Year two-thousand and sixteen.

Voting “YES” (98.73%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Edward Lewis (4.55% -Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% -Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), Brian O’Malley (1.36% – Provincetown), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Julia Taylor (14.61%-Falmouth), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).

Absent (1.27%) VACANT - (town of Wellfleet).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, Proposed Ordinance 16-07 passes with 98.73 percent of the Delegates voting yes; 1.27 absent (town of Wellfleet – vacant).
Adopted now as Ordinance 16-04.

Committee Report Proposed Ordinance 16-05: Deeds Tax Increase

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Moving on. A committee report and we also need the minutes -- approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting 3/30/16 on Proposed Ordinance 16-05.

John.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like approval of the minutes for 16-05 as written.

Ms. MARTIN: Second.

Mr. OHMAN: All those in favor?

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Aye.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Aye.

Ms. TAYLOR: Aye.

Ms. MARTIN: Aye.

Mr. OHMAN: Any opposed? No. It carries.

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Speaker.

Assembly Vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-05:

To Amend Ordinance 09-06 (which amended Ordinance 89-3), Section 1 (a), that imposed an excise tax on certain deeds and other instruments to be recorded at the Registry of Deeds, by increasing the amount from \$1.35 to \$1.53, effective July 1, 2016.

BARNSTABLE COUNTY hereby ordains,

Ordinance 09-06, Section 1(a), is hereby amended as follows:

Section 1

- a) There shall be levied, collected, and paid, for and in respect of the deeds, instruments and writings hereinafter mentioned and described, the county excise tax herein specified: the deeds, instrument or writing, whereby any land, tenement or other realty, located in Barnstable County and sold, shall be granted, assigned, transferred or otherwise convey to, or vested in, the purchaser or purchasers, or to or in any other person or persons by direction of the purchaser or purchasers, when the consideration for the interest or property conveyed, exclusive of the value of any lien or encumbrance remaining thereon at the time of sale, exceeds one hundred dollars (\$100.00) and does not exceed five hundred dollars (\$500.00), one dollar and fifty-three cents (\$1.53), and for each additional five hundred dollars (\$500.00) or fraction thereof, one dollar and fifty-three cents (\$1.53). This ordinance shall not apply to any instrument or writing given to secure a debt or to any deed, instrument

or writing to which the Commonwealth or the United States, or any of their agencies, is a party; and,

b) The tax imposed by this ordinance shall take effect on July 1, 2016.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. OHMAN: This is one of the big ones. This is the Deeds Tax that was so eloquently stated by our County Administrator. It effectively increases the Deeds Tax from \$1.35 to \$1.53 per \$500 effective July 1, 2016.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Do we need -- I need a motion to put this on the floor. Motion to approve?

Mr. OHMAN: I would move --

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Second.

Mr. OHMAN: -- Mr. Speaker, the motion as presented.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. And it's been seconded by Truro.

Mr. OHMAN: Is there a discussion?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. OHMAN: Let's go at it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, I thought you were offering to discuss it.

Mr. OHMAN: Well, I can rehash, probably not as eloquently as our County Administrator, but we are facing a deficit of \$1.2 million in our current budget to keep our services level funded going into FY17, and, after much discussion, agreed with the Commissioners and the administration that we should pass this Deeds Tax as stated.

We held a Public Hearing; I believe one realtor showed up and had a written statement which was read into the record and there was not much opposition whatsoever from the public at large.

And since then, our committee met, discussed, and voted 5 to 0 to pass that Ordinance on for approval to the Assembly.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Is there any other discussion? Yes, Linda.

Ms. ZUERN: Mr. Speaker, one person showed up at the discussion, but we also got several letters from realtors. I think the person who came to the meeting represented several realtors. So it wasn't just one person.

Mr. OHMAN: That is true. Thank you, Mrs. Zuern. There was a form letter that was sent to, I believe, every member of the Finance Committee numerous times and they stated the exact same thing, your basic opposition to any raise in tax of the Deeds Tax.

Ms. ZUERN: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Any other discussion? Okay. In that case, we'll take a roll call vote on this.

Roll Call Vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-05: To Amend Ordinance 09-06 (which amended Ordinance 89-3), Section 1 (a) that imposed an excise tax on certain deeds and other instruments to be recorded at the Registry of Deeds, by increasing the amount from \$1.35 to \$1.53 (for each additional \$500 sale value), effective July 1, 2016.

Voting "YES" (52.59%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), Edward Lewis (4.55% - Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% -

Truro), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), Brian O'Malley (1.36% – Provincetown), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Julia Taylor (14.61%- Falmouth). Voting “NO” (46.14%); James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne). Absent (1.27%) VACANT - (town of Wellfleet).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, Proposed Ordinance 16-05 passes with 52.59 percent of Delegates voting yes; 46.14 percent voting no; 1.27 percent absent (town of Wellfleet – vacant). **Adopted now as Ordinance 16-05.**

Committee Report on Proposed Ordinances 16-02 FY17 Proposed Operating Budget of \$27,733,930 and Proposed Ordinance 16-03 FY17 Proposed Capital Budget of \$850,000.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Thank you. So we will now move on to the Finance Committee report and the journal/minutes on Proposed Ordinance 16-02 and 16-03.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move the Minutes for Ordinances 16-02 and 16-03 for approval from the Finance Committee.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Second.

Mr. OHMAN: Having been seconded --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: You said you moved them.

Mr. OHMAN: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Moved and seconded? Oh --

Mr. OHMAN: I moved and -- it has been seconded. All those in favor?

Ms. TAYLOR: Aye.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Aye.

Ms. KING: You can't do that.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No. He moved them; I seconded them.

Mr. OHMAN: Is there a point of order?

Ms. KING: No, I was wrong.

(Minutes approved.)

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Speaker, both the Finance Committee met several times in discussion of this particular article. It's the biggest --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Did you call for a vote on that?

Mr. OHMAN: I believe I did.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Go ahead.

Mr. OHMAN: Okay. And after much discussion, the Finance Committee voted 5 to 0 to -- I'm sorry, it might not have been 5 to 0. Let me get my records out here. We voted in favor, anyway, of the Budget as presented by the County Commissioners of \$27,733,930, and I'd ask for your approval of the Assembly of Delegates.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. So, do we need to move --

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Assembly Vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-02:

AN ORDINANCE FOR THE COUNTY OF BARNSTABLE, MASSACHUSETTS,
ADOPTING A BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR
JULY 1, 2016 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2017.

BE ORDAINED BY THE COUNTY OF BARNSTABLE, MASSACHUSETTS, AS
FOLLOWS...

SECTION 1. A budget consisting of the appropriations listed in SECTION 2 below be adopted for the Fiscal Year July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

SECTION 2. Appropriations for said budget are as follows:

<u>GENERAL GOVERNMENT</u>	
County Commissioners	\$ 499,598
Assembly of Delegates	318,605
Resource Development Office	922,587
Information Technology	1,300,365
Department of Finance	755,303
Water Quality Initiatives	352,000
<i>Total General Government</i>	<i>\$4,148,458</i>
<u>COUNTY SERVICES</u>	
Department of Facilities	\$2,442,257
Cooperative Extension	2,050,708
Registry of Deeds	2,628,385
County Dredge	1,697,504
<i>Total County Services</i>	<i>\$8,818,854</i>
<u>HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES</u>	
Health & Environment Department	\$3,114,111
Human Services	1,121,854
Children's Cove	737,799
Grants to Human Service Providers	40,000
<i>Total Health & Human Services</i>	<i>\$5,013,764</i>
<u>PUBLIC SAFETY</u>	
Sheriff's Dept. Retirement Contrib.	\$1,334,120
Fire Rescue Training Academy	443,555
<i>Total Public Safety</i>	<i>\$1,777,675</i>
<u>PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT</u>	
Cape Cod Commission	\$5,340,260
CCC Joint Initiatives	720,575
<i>Total Planning & Development</i>	<i>\$6,060,835</i>
<u>SHARED COSTS & DEBT SERVICE</u>	
Fringe Benefits	\$1,161,044
Miscellaneous & Contingency	438,300

Debt Service	315,000
<i>Total Shared Costs & Debt Service</i>	<i>\$1,914,344</i>

Total FY 2017 Budget \$27,733,930

SECTION 3. No appropriation listed above may be exceeded without appropriate ordinance action to amend budget.

SECTION 4. The public notice for this proposed ordinance was published at least 48 hours prior to the February 17, 2016 meeting of the Board of Regional Commissioners.

SECTION 5. This ordinance shall take effect July 1, 2016.

Mr. OHMAN: I would like to move Proposed Ordinance 16-02 --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Moved and seconded. Is there any discussion?

This is the Budget, the 2017 Budget.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Point of order.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Do we do two ordinances at the same time? I understand they're two halves of a piece.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No, no.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Or do you typically do one ordinance at a time?

Speaker BERGSTROM: We do one at a time.

Mr. OHMAN: My apology, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move Ordinance 16-02 by itself for approval.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Mr. LEWIS: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Moved and seconded, 16-02. Are there any questions on this? Hearing --

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. OHMAN: This would be for the Proposed Ordinance for the operational budget.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, okay.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Marcia.

Ms. KING: Mr. Speaker, since we've had discussion by the Administrator and by the Commissioners and the new Finance Director about trying to get reserves, I would like to make a motion for some cuts that, hopefully, then will return about \$700,000 that will then go into reserve accounts, hopefully.

And I make the motion to the following:

County Commissioners' budget, \$12,000 reduction; \$5,000 to the Arts Foundation; \$1,000 Out-of-State Travel; \$6,000 In-State Travel.

Resource Development Department, \$2,000 of In-State Travel; \$45,000 in AmeriCorps.

Assembly of Delegates budget, \$5,100 in In-State Travel, \$2,400 for Education of Employees.

Department of Finance, \$5,000 in Software Maintenance.

**Registry of Deeds, \$84,000 to eliminate the two vacant positions.
Joint Initiatives, 350,000.**

Health & Environment, \$40,377 In-State travel.

Human Services, \$2,800 Out-of-State Travel, \$74,034 in difference in salaries.

County Grants to Meals on Wheels, 40,000.

Fire Academy 15,000 -- reduction 3 percent.

Debt Service 65,000 for a total of, and I'm not sure my math is correct; I'm doing that on my phone, about \$705,711. Janice, can you verify that?

And, actually, pull out the 45,000 for AmeriCorps. Let's leave that. And leave the -- and let me withdraw the 40,000 for Meals on Wheels.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Do you have the line items on those?

Ms. KING: No, I do not. Those are the ones that were "suggested" by the new Administrator. I do not.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Marcia, what did the total come to?

Ms. KING: Well, I have about 705,711, but I think I added wrong. But I want to add -- I want to add -- I want to not subtract the 90,000 for -- no, 85,000. So it's -- hang on. I'm going to try --

Clerk O'CONNELL: Marcia, I presume that you're working off the list?

Ms. KING: Yes.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Okay. And I know I'm going to have to have you repeat that.

Ms. KING: Okay. I'll read it to you again. Let's start again.

Ms. KING: County Commissioners, \$5,000 for the Arts Foundation; \$1,000 for Out-of-State Travel; \$6,000 for In-State Travel.

Resource Development Office, \$2,000 in In-State Travel.

Assembly of Delegates, \$5,100 in In-State Travel; \$2,400 in Education of Employees.

Department of Finance, \$5,000 in Software Maintenance.

Registry of Deeds, \$84,000 from the two vacant positions.

Joint Initiatives, \$350,000.

Health & Environment, \$4,377 for In-State travel.

Human Services, \$2,800 for Out-of-State Travel, and Human Services again \$74,034 which is the difference between the real employee salaries and the listed employee salaries.

Fire Academy, \$15,000, 3 percent across the board cut, and

Debt Service, \$65,000.

So you can add that because I kind of messed with it on my phone. That should be --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Marcia, you know, you know having been here for quite a while that normally --

Ms. KING: I know.

Speaker BERGSTROM: -- we identify line items that we detract from and we add to. Now I'll accept your motion as it stands and we'll have to fill in the line items that are --

Ms. KING: Well, if you'd like me to break for a recess and continue this or

we can --

Speaker BERGSTROM: No, we're not going to break for recess.

Ms. KING: Okay. Well, then if you want to, I will go through and it will take -- we'll all sit here and that's fine.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No. Just -- we'll assume that we're going to fish out those line items. There also different salary -- I anticipate there may be cuts and I have a list of reserves here; salary reserve, reserve funds, stabilization fund, legal reserve.

I mean I'm not throwing obstacles in your way but you know what the procedure has been in the past. We take that from one account and we put it in another.

Ms. KING: Arts Foundation, let's go. Here we go. Arts Foundation, what do you want? Do you want the Org Number and the Object Number? 00110045490. Project Number 032.

Let's see. In-state travel --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Just a point, as a member of the Assembly, we were requested to submit amendments ahead of time so that each member could have an opportunity to look into the information.

This is a lot of information that will not be vetted and will not be thoroughly investigated the way the rest of this budget has been because it was not submitted prior to now.

And I respect the intent of the Delegate, but I think that this is an irresponsible way to amend the budget.

Ms. KING: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. It's a request but it's not a bylaw or a law of the Assembly. You can make amendments on the floor at any time.

I understand her point of view and I don't disagree with her but that's -- we're allowed.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Can I just go over these with Marcia. Can I go over these? I just want to make sure I understand.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Marcia. The Clerk didn't get quite the information that --

Clerk O'CONNELL: Marcia, I want to read these back and make sure that I have them correctly.

Ms. KING: Yes.

Clerk O'CONNELL: County Commissioners, the full \$12,000; yes?

Ms. KING: Yes.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Okay. Resource Development, \$2,000 only?

Ms. KING: Yes.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Assembly of Delegates, the full \$7,500?

Ms. KING: Yes.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Department of Finance, \$5,000?

Ms. KING: Yes.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Registry of Deeds, \$84,000?

Ms. KING: Yes, ma'am.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Joint Initiatives, \$350,000?

Ms. KING: Yes, ma'am.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Health and Environment, \$4,377 only?

Ms. KING: Yes, ma'am.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Human Services, totaling \$76,834?

Ms. KING: Yes, ma'am.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Fire Academy, \$15,000?

Ms. KING: Yes, ma'am.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Debt Service \$65,000?

Ms. KING: Yes.

Clerk O'CONNELL: I think that's \$689,211? I'm not sure if somebody else is running a calculator; they could confirm that but that's what I get. Okay. So I understand.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, Marcia, I'm not going to sit here while you fiddle with this. So what's going to happen is we will put the numbers in later, okay, if your motion passes. How's that for a compromise?

Ms. KING: I'm sure it won't pass. Sure. That would be great.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. And do you want that money put into a particular reserve fund? Have you got any idea? Reserve -- salary reserve, legal reserve, stabilization fund?

Ms. KING: No. I assume that they're all talking about creating a stabilization fund. I think this is a good start.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. We'll go --

Ms. KING: \$689,000.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Stabilization Fund.

Ms. KING: And just an FYI, on the sheet that -- the tentative cut sheet had 8 positions we've eliminated and two vacant so a total of 10. There are no positions eliminated. There are two vacant at the Registry. We just are not funding them because we don't pull them. They're just not going to be funded. They're still going to be vacant positions. And we all know that from Town Hall or Town Meeting, you can have positions and not fund them, so we are just not funding them.

I would hope that since the big argument seemed to be about not cutting people, which I completely agree with, is that these are cuts that seem to be reasonable. There's nobody being laid off. We are still doing our responsibility here. And if the money comes in, that's really great, that we can restore all of these at a later date. This body does many supplemental budgets and we can do them again.

So I would hope that you would consider them. I know it's late and I do apologize but, I like everyone else, we received that information today too. So it would have been nice to have it earlier.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: John.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCMANUS: Is there a second?

Mr. OHMAN: Oh, wait a minute. We've got a motion on the floor. We need a second.

Ms. ZUERN: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. It's been moved and seconded by Linda. Yes, any discussion on this?

Yes, John.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Delegate from Mashpee, do

you have any rationale or defense for each one of these? Could you go through with these in a thoughtful manner and tell me exactly why you cut each one of them?

Ms. KING: Sure, if you'd like me to. All right.

\$5,000 in the Arts Foundation. They receive a lot of money from outside sources. At one point we were funding them \$35,000. If we're in a real budget crunch, you know, things have to be cut. Outside and inside travel -- Out-of-State and In-State Travel for all of them, which is a bunch of them here; I'm thinking the same thing. If we're having tight on our budget and we're asking sellers to pay more money, which we just voted on, and, by the way, just for an FYI, a \$350,000 sale of a property outside of Barnstable County, the transfer tax is about \$1,596.

In this state, it will be over \$2,190-something if you got \$675 -- \$672 more. We're asking sellers to pay that, which are going to be former Barnstable residents, I think it's a little prudent for us to then look at our books and say, wait a minute, we have a lot of In-and-Out-State Travel so that's it.

Assembly of Delegates, \$5,100 in In-State Travel. It's going to the MMA, maybe that we all not have to go, and \$2,400 for education. I don't think it's unreasonable.

Software Maintenance, you know, these are items that can be restored.

The \$84,000 for the two vacant positions; they are just not being funded. They can be funded if the Registry needs them. And if the money's coming in, we should fund them.

The Joint Initiatives, \$350,000. No one's really kind of said what that is. That's with us with the Cape Cod Commission. Why don't we just hold on that, and if the money is here, I'm happy to pay for any of these.

Same thing, In-State Travel for the Health and Services -- Human Services, Out-of-State Travel and they're telling us there's a \$74,000 difference between what's on the books and what they submitted. I don't understand how you can feel you can give them the \$74,000.

The Fire Academy just received \$100,000 extra. I don't think it's unreasonable to ask them to cut their budget like 3 percent/\$15,000 in Debt Service. You know, those are numbers you never really know what they are and I think that's not unreasonable.

So I understand you don't want to cut anything, but you've just increased taxes on sellers in this County to the tune of \$672 on an average \$350,000 house. I think it's really incumbent upon you to make some sacrifices in the other side. Nobody's being cut. There are 8 positions on here; it did not cut anyone. I completely agree with that, but I think this is \$689,000 that we can do right now and get the County, as Mary said, back on a better footing so that when we want to do some bonding we're there; we have extra money.

So I would hope that you would do it but I understand if it doesn't pass.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. I'll start with Suzanne and I'll go around.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: This budget started off 1.7 million cut and an additional \$600,000 not put into the budget. So it already is starting more than 2 million from last year's budget cut.

In addition, there have been increases that are in benefits/healthcare, which I think is another \$250,000 which you could add to that. I think that this budget shows a very responsible fiscal nature to it. To cut the budget after the Deeds Tax has been approved to

fund an already lean budget is -- it just doesn't seem to make sense to me. And I really, as I said before, object to just throwing out numbers without understanding the direct impact on them.

And I understand your explanation but I haven't had an opportunity to talk to the various departments to find out what the impact would be.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Julia and then Pat.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, just, you know, I'm sorry you weren't here when we talked about the initiatives and maybe you'd like to get some more information about them. But I see that Joint Initiative project as critical to economic development in the County.

I think that we did get an explanation from Jack and from Mary as to the issue of the Health and Human Services money. It has to do with grants coming in. It doesn't have to do with suddenly hiring two new people out of the blue.

So, I just think -- I really think we should vote the budget as we discussed it at the last few months quite sufficiently.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Pat.

Mr. PRINCI: Just in short because a lot of this was already mentioned. The budget that was presented to us has already been drastically cut. Any chair of any of the subcommittee meetings along with the Finance Committee members would obviously know that.

Personally, I kind of kept my vote on the whole tax increase close to the vest in a sense just because I didn't -- I listened to what our Speaker said and he said that if you're planning on voting against that, you better be prepared to come in here with some possible cuts.

I spent hours and hours and hours going through the budget coming up with the cuts to justify my vote. The vote didn't go the way I had anticipated, but I'm certainly not going to take a sheet that the finance director gave us today with possible cuts and just go through and check off this looks good and that looks good.

I think it takes a lot more time and effort and some conscious thinking when you make these cut, and, therefore, I won't be supporting these cuts.

Ms. ZUERN: Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, wait a minute. We'll go with Deborah and then Linda and then we'll go to the Eds.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: I haven't been very long in this Assembly, but I'd like to think that the people that come in here from our various communities take the time and spend the interest and to show the respect for the people that we represent in the County that we live in.

I think Mr. Yunits and Ms. McIsaac, they may be new here, but I think that we owe them our respect for hard work and for information provided to us.

I am not in favor generally of raising taxes or increasing spending. I rather like cutting budgets, but I think that this is work that has been arduous and difficult and has been very well explained and documented and has taken a lot of thought.

I, myself, spent because I wasn't satisfied with what I had heard in committee over four hours with Mary McIsaac talking about individual issues. She makes herself available to us for that.

I'm really disappointed by this action because I think it doesn't respect us or the body that we're a member of, and I urge you to vote against it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Linda.

Ms. ZUERN: Well, I think it's a brilliant compromise and if we're not ready to go forward with it tonight, maybe we could postpone our vote to the next meeting until we've had more time to think about it. We didn't have this list until five minutes before the meeting started so it would've been better if we could have had this and digested it and maybe talked to people before.

But our County Administrator has said the most important -- the thing we have to do is put reserve or a stabilization budget together and this does it, and we could get our bond rating sooner. So I think it's wonderful. So I'll support it. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Anything else? First we'll go with Ed and then Jim.

Mr. LEWIS: I think this is improper. I must disagree with the Delegate from Mashpee and the Delegate from Bourne, and I assume -- I won't assume anything. I'll let that person speak for themselves.

I agree completely with the Delegate from Truro and what's also been said by the Delegate from Dennis and Barnstable.

If we hadn't received this sheet today, which has been described by the County Administrator as just a piece of paper, then we wouldn't be getting this. This happened to be something which someone -- they went in front of it, they looked at it and started saying, "Well, I can live with that. I can live with that; that's okay. That's fine. Okay. I can live with that."

And I'm sorry, and I don't want to postpone it for a week or two weeks or three weeks or four weeks. I think it's -- I think it's unprofessional the way this is done. I don't think there's been any time and effort put into it. I think this is strictly a shoot-from-the-hip-type situation. I think it's wrong. I think it embarrasses the Assembly the fact that there may have been an article written that we don't come on the floor and make amendments to reduce the budget. We've had three months to work on the budget and we've had many conferences with the different departments and with the Assembly as a whole.

And if you felt there was something in there that should be cut from the start, we should have cut it from the start.

But to do it in this manner as a list off of a sheet that came that nobody's had a chance to really digest, I think, is a shoot-from-the-hip, as I said. I think it's wrong. I think it's improper, and I can't come close to supporting this.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I'd just like to say a few things. First of all, I intend to vote against this amendment. But the question is if somebody says, well, we haven't had the list for only a few minutes.

Well, we've had the list, three months we've had the list. This is the only list that's important. This is the proposed budget. Okay. And everyone here has had this budget for months; all right. Why you would need a list to say, well, I only got a list today so I couldn't -- you had the list. If somebody can stand up here and against the wishes of the County Commissioners and the wishes of the administration and say, "I want to take \$5,000 out of here because I saw it on a list." The question I have is why did you need the list? Didn't you have the budget?

I mean if you thought it was justified, why wasn't it justified two months ago when it was proposed. I don't want to belabor this but I'm going to take two votes. It's actually going to be one vote. The one vote is to approve the budget, which is -- if this

amendment goes down.

But the other budget is the fact is the previous budget which the County Administrator referred to and he's saying that we have cut the previous budget. Well if you remember, we, the Assembly, cut the previous budget so that from what it was proposed from the Commissioners.

So in using that as a benchmark, we've already cut that. We had extensive discussions on the budget last year, and I think we had the discussions because we had serious doubts about the way the budget had been presented. We had serious doubts about the use of some of the reserve funds. We had serious doubts about the fiscal policies of the County and so we did an enormous amount of scrutiny.

Now we have a new finance director and we have a new County Administrator and I think that they proposed a budget which is below what we voted on last year. And so I think we're taking two votes, two votes in one. The one vote is to pass the budget.

The other vote is to give a vote of confidence to the new administration so that they can go forward knowing they have both the support of the Commissioners and the Assembly in trying to do some of the things that have to be done if the County is going to survive.

So I don't criticize Marcia for coming up with these cuts because if we had rubberstamped this budget, it probably would've looked bad. I mean everybody, you know, we have to look at it, and carefully look at it, but I think that they've done due diligence on this.

It's been a long way. Two months ago we thought we were dead in the water. They put their heads together; they came up with a decent budget. It hurt. There's pain is there already and I think that's enough.

So, yes, Marcia you have a word on this?

Mr. OHMAN: Let Jim --

Ms. KING: No, I just wanted to respond to a couple of the comments. I came here with other cuts today and some of them were personnel. If you think this is haphazard, that's fine.

But I decided to take what the new Administrator had suggested, which means he's gone through the budget and he feels comfortable. There are a lot of other cuts that could have been done in this budget, and I put mine aside and said if this is what the Administrator feels he can live with if he didn't get the increase, this is what he would do, I would rather go with his than with mine.

And so I put mine aside on a shelf and I said these are much better. There is no person increased -- I mean, excuse me, decreased. No one lost their job. And so I do take a little umbrage of the fact you think that I just saw the list and said that's great. Yeah, I saw the list and said that's better than mine.

And I actually applaud Jack for doing it and think that they were pretty decent cuts, that he was trying to be reasonable that if he didn't win the vote for the tax increase.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. Linda.

Ms. ZUERN: I support the County Commissioner just as well. I went through that budget. It says \$40,000 for this; \$80,000 for that. How do I know what that

person does in that salary? You really don't know unless you're dealing with this on a daily basis.

So it's only the Town Administrator that can really -- who can really make those wise decisions. We really can't tell by looking at those figures if we take that \$40,000 out what that really means, you know, who that person really is. We don't have those connections. So it's only the Town Administrator -- I mean the County Commissioner -- Administrator, I'm sorry, who can make those decisions wisely.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. ZUERN: So I will go along with them. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Jim.

Mr. KILLION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Much like the Delegate from Barnstable, I, too, went through this and created three amendments and actually, two of them were encompassed on the sheet oddly enough.

And I have to agree with the Delegate from Mashpee that, in fact, the Administrator and those personnel are the ones who are far more qualified to go through and find out areas that can be cut which would create the least amount of pain.

But I think it's also important to note that, you know, we're not essentially wiping these expenses away necessarily. This money is going to go into a reserve account and it gives, I believe, the County greater flexibility with spending. They will have a greater amount of money put away. They'll be able to expend that where it's needed the most.

And I think that for the folks here to be critical of that opportunity, I said in this case it's kind of missing the point of this. In fact, it will give the new administration a vote of confidence saying we're going to set more money aside to give you greater flexibility in fixing the problems that we have.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Teresa.

Ms. MARTIN: Before I came here, I gave this a whole lot of thought. As a member of the Finance Committee, I gave it a lot of thought. And I don't love the budget 100 percent, but I think that message I heard and looking at it, I became comfortable with the budget as it was presented is a platform to do the much more important work that has begun and that's going to accelerate over the next several months.

Specifically, I believe the County needs a stable platform in which it can begin to work on prioritizing what the County functions are so that next year's budget actually has some logic behind it that maps into what the County is about; that the effort of finding the money that's been left on the table can go forth so we know what we actually have as a pool which we're beginning to get hints of; that we can have a thoughtful plan that intentionally refills specific reserves for specific purposes, that none of this was done in a haphazard manner standing on a shaky platform.

I think that's important, and I think if we all care about building a healthy County, you have to have a platform that people feel stable enough to be on to do this important rebuilding work that we're finally starting to talk about.

So I came in here deciding that the Deeds Tax was a necessary evil and the budget, as it was, was going to be the best thing we had for that platform.

So I support things the way they are, and despite Marcia's good intentions and I know we would love to replenish things more quickly, I can't support where this is. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Ed.

Mr. MCMANUS: We still haven't yet voted on the proposed amendment.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Right.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Right.

Mr. MCMANUS: So as to the amendment basis, the proposal made for suggesting the cuts is to show faith for the taxpayers that in her example of the \$350,000 house, we're raising the deeds tax by -- I don't know the exact figure she gave --

Mr. LEWIS: It's \$117.

Mr. MCMANUS: What?

Mr. LEWIS: It's \$117.

Mr. MCMANUS: \$117. I thought -- was that your figure, Marcia?

Ms. KING: No. Ed, what my figure was is the \$672, which is based on the rest of the whole Commonwealth, but Barnstable County pays \$4.56 for a transfer tax.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Marcia, just --

Ms. KING: So that's the difference. You have to go from the full -- so if you're taking a \$350,000 house at \$4.56 per thousand transfer tax, you're now going up -- in Barnstable County only to \$6.48. The difference between that amount is \$672 for a \$350 house.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Mr. Speaker, I move the question.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No. Wait a minute. I don't mind you asking Marcia a question but normally you address the chairman.

Mr. MCMANUS: I'm sorry.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Mr. Speaker, I move the question.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, you can't. He's on the floor right now.

Mr. MCMANUS: My question is as I understand the tax that we've just passed, it raises it from \$1.35 per \$500 to \$1.53 per \$500 or in terms of thousand, it goes from \$2.70 per thousand to \$3.06 per thousand. The figures that the representative from Mashpee are talking about \$4-and-something per thousand, which is not what the tax is.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well -- let me recognize Dr. Brian O'Malley and then we're going to vote on this.

Brian, do you have something on this amendment?

Mr. O'MALLEY: On the amendment. We've already made -- this budget has already been cut seriously, and I look at the things that are proposed. At a time when I see County government landing on its feet in a way that looks better to me than it has during my service here.

And I hear about cutting AmeriCorps, which does service all over the Cape. I hear about cutting education. I hear about cutting travel -- Meals on Wheels. It seems to me we're shooting ourselves in the foot with these cuts and I don't think they're necessary.

The only outcome of all of these cuts, which will really mean reduced services, reduced ability to function is we pad our reserve. I think building the reserve is a very good idea, but I don't think we ought to be cutting some of the functions that we perform in order to do that, and I intend to vote against this amendment.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. That is the final comment on this. I'm going to take a vote.

Ms. KING: Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I need to correct one thing that Dr.

Brian O'Malley said. AmeriCorps is not being cut and neither is Meals on Wheels. I withdrew those.

Mr. O'MALLEY: I'm sorry.

Ms. KING: What basically is being cut is in and Out-of-State Travel and the two vacant positions, and the \$350,000 in Initiatives. That's the big money.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I call the question.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, we're going to take a vote on this.

Ms. KING: Move the question.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. I've cut off debate.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Okay. This is a vote on the amendment as presented by Marcia King. And after doing the tally several times, it totals \$617,334, and it's the list that was read previously, which I think was gone over so everyone knows which numbers were targeted. And the offset to that would be an increase to the Stabilization Fund.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Good.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Because that's what was proposed, so here we go.

Roll Call Vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-02: FY17 Proposed Operating Budget as amended.

Voting "YES" (25.22%): James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).

Voting "NO" (73.51%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), Edward Lewis (4.55% - Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), Brian O'Malley (1.36% - Provincetown), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).

Absent (1.27%) VACANT - (town of Wellfleet).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, the amendment to Proposed Ordinance 16-02 failed to pass; 73.51 percent of the Delegates voting no; 25.22 percent voting yes; 1.27 percent absent (town of Wellfleet – vacant).

(Amendment fails.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. So now the Proposed Ordinance 16-02 as presented by the Commissioners is now still on the floor. Do we have any further comment?

Ed.

Mr. MCMANUS: Earlier in the discussion in the past amendment, the representative from Bourne expressed a concern that as we considered various cuts, different amounts that we don't really know what the impact of those things are because we don't understand exactly what that person does.

And really, quite honestly, as legislatures, as policymakers, that's not really our function to understand the personnel management of each department and how work is apportioned in those departments.

The question is are the priorities we set for what the County is doing being

met? We rely on the executive body of government to come up with a plan of spending that provides for the resources necessary to ensure that the priorities we have and the policies that we've put in place are being met.

I think our problem is, as an Assembly, is over the course of the year we never really discussed that. We meet at budget time when the numbers are all prepared with the departments. But in terms of before those spending plans are being made, we don't sit down with the different areas of natural resources, economic development, a variety of areas and layout what the legislative body's priorities are for spending in the coming years so they can develop a spending plan to fulfill those priorities.

And I think that's something in the coming year over the course of the summer and the fall before the budget process gets going we need to do and then come together with our different committees making recommendations and present a set of priorities that we would like to see fulfilled in the coming year, whether those be financial policies and priorities or whether they be priorities in the field of natural resources and environmental protection or in human services.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. If there are no further comments, we will take a vote.

Clerk O'CONNELL: This is a vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-02, the Proposed Operating Budget for FY17 of \$27,733,930.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Roll Call Vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-02: FY17 Proposed Operating Budget of \$27,733,930.

Voting "YES" (73.51%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), Edward Lewis (4.55% - Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), Brian O'Malley (1.36% - Provincetown), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).
Voting "NO" (25.22%): James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).
Absent (1.27%) VACANT - (town of Wellfleet).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, Proposed Ordinance 16-02 passes with 73.51 percent of the Delegates voting yes; 25.22 percent voting no; 1.27 percent absent (town of Wellfleet – vacant). **Adopted now as Ordinance 16-06.**

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Thank you. Now we will have a vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-03, which is the Proposed Capital Budget of \$850,000. John, do you want to introduce this?

Assembly Vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-03:

To authorize the County to purchase capital equipment, and implement capital improvements for use in conducting the business of the County and to borrow money to pay, therefore;

Barnstable County hereby ordains:

The Board of Commissioners is hereby authorized to purchase capital equipment, and implement capital improvements for use in conducting the business of the County as follows:

Section 1.

a. Purchase the following equipment for the Health and Environment Department for use in conducting business specific to the operations and services of the Barnstable County Commissioners:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Finance Account Number</u>
<u>Replacement of Ion Chromatograph:</u>	<u>\$60,000.00</u>	<u>0053028 5837</u>
<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>\$60,000.00</u>	

b. Purchase the following equipment for the Information Technology Department for use in conducting business specific to the operations and services of the Barnstable County Commissioners:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Finance Account Number</u>
<u>Software Licensing</u>	<u>\$325,000.00</u>	<u>0051058 5849</u>
<u>Total Cost:</u>	<u>\$325,000.00</u>	

c. Implement the following capital improvements for the Facilities Department for use in conducting business specific to the operations and services of the Barnstable County Commissioners:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Finance Account Number</u>
<u>Second District Roof Replacement</u>	<u>\$170,000.00</u>	<u>0052028 5801</u>
<u>Building Renovations – Former House of Corrections</u>	<u>\$150,000.00</u>	<u>0052138 5804</u>
<u>Superior Courthouse Ancient Wall Repair and Ground Repair</u>	<u>\$ 75,000.00</u>	<u>0052038 5860</u>
<u>Sound Wall Construction – Health Lab</u>	<u>\$ 70,000.00</u>	<u>0053028 5860</u>
<u>Total Cost:</u>	<u>\$465,000.00</u>	

The total cost of equipment, improvements and projects equals (=) \$850,000.00.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Proposed Ordinance 16-03 is FY17 Capital Budget of \$850,000 was vetted by the Finance Committee and voted 5 to 0 in favor. And with that, I would recommend that we approve 16-03 as presented.

Deputy Speaker MCCUTCHEON: Motion to approve.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion on this? Hearing none. We'll take a vote.

Roll Call Vote on Proposed Ordinance 16-03: FY17 Proposed Capital Budget of \$850,000.

Voting “YES” (92.24%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Edward Lewis (4.55% - Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% -Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% -

**Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), Brian O'Malley (1.36% – Provincetown), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Julia Taylor (14.61%- Falmouth), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).
Voting “NO” (6.49%): Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable).
Absent (1.27%) VACANT - (1.27%- Wellfleet).**

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, Proposed Ordinance 16-03 passes with 92.24 percent of the Delegates voting yes; 6.49 percent voting no; 1.27 percent absent (town of Wellfleet – vacant). **Adopted now as Ordinance 16-07.**

Report from the Clerk

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. The next item on the agenda is a report from the Clerk.

Clerk O'CONNELL: The next Assembly meeting, you'll have two Proposed Resolutions on the agenda. Power line maintenance that was submitted by Dr. Brian O'Malley, and the Proposed Resolution that was submitted today for Human Services Budget Transfer.

And I don't know yet what the status will be on the agenda with regards to -- at this point, this juncture, one petition for Charter change that has been submitted.

And that's all I have to report.

Other Business

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Any other business to be brought before the board?

Mr. PRINCI: I submitted this back originally on February 3. It's my petition for changes in County Charter. There are just some clarifications as well as a new section on filling of vacancies.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Is there any other business to be brought before the Assembly?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Move to adjourn.

Mr. MCMANUS: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All those in favor? Opposed?

Mr. MCMANUS: Doesn't that need to be a roll call?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Oh, you know, it probably does. Why don't you just take a quick roll call.

Roll Call Vote to Adjourn (98.73%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Edward Lewis (4.55% -Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), Brian O'Malley (1.36% – Provincetown), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Julia Taylor (14.61%- Falmouth), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).

Absent (1.27%) VACANT - (town of Wellfleet).

Whereupon, it was moved, seconded, and voted to adjourn the Assembly of Delegates at 5:50 p.m.

Submitted by:

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

List of materials used at the meeting:

- Unapproved 4-20-16 Journal of Proceedings
- Proposed Resolution 16-04 submitted by County Commissioners
- Finance Committee Report on Proposed Ordinance 16-07 dated 4/20/16
- Proposed Ordinance 16-07
- Finance Committee Report on Proposed Ordinance 16-05 dated 3/30/16
- Proposed Ordinance 16-05
- Finance Committee Report on Proposed Ordinances 16-02 & 16-03 dated 4/20/16
- Budget reference document submitted on 5/4/16
- Proposed Ordinance 16-02
- Proposed Ordinance 16-03
- Charter Change Petition submitted by Delegate Princi on 5/4/16