

CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT - ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES
Barnstable County Complex
East Wing Conference Center @ 4:00 PM
3195 Main Street, Route 6A
Barnstable, MA 02630

APPROVED Journal of Proceedings - April 17, 2019

CALL TO ORDER

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Good afternoon. This is the Cape Cod Regional Government, Assembly of Delegates. **It's 4 p.m., April 17, 2019, and we are in the East Wing Conference Center at the County Complex.**

We like to start our meetings 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 MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Is there anyone recording this meeting? I'm required to ask that at the beginning, other than our transcriptionist? Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Will the Clerk please call the roll?

ROLL CALL ATTENDANCE

Clerk O'CONNELL: And as we have done in the past, at the previous meeting, while I am calling the roll you'll see that your electronic box has a plus sign that's flashing, so after I call your name if you would log in and you'll see the results on the screen.....maybe some already have.

Roll Call Attendance

Present (86.93%): Mary Chaffee (4.55% - Brewster), J. Terence Gallagher (2.30% - Eastham), Lilli-Ann Green - (1.27% - Wellfleet), Elizabeth Harder (5.67% - Harwich), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), E. Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02%-Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% Truro), Susan Moran (14.61% - Falmouth), Brian O'Malley (1.36% - Provincetown), Randi Potash (2.84% - Chatham), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).

Arrived Late (6.49%): Thomas O'Hara (6.49% - Mashpee – arrived @ 4:10 PM).

Absent (6.58%): John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Madam Speaker, we have a quorum with 86.93 percent of the Delegates present; 13.07 percent are absent.

APPROVAL OF THE CALENDAR OF BUSINESS

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Is there a motion to approve the calendar of business?

Deputy Speaker MORAN: So moved.

Delegate CHAFFEE: Second.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Any discussion? All those in favor? Aye. Any opposed? **It passes unanimously.**

APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS OF 4/3/19

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Is there a motion to approve the Journal from April 3, 2019? Yes.

Delegate O'MALLEY: Madam Chair, I move acceptance of the Journal as distributed.

Deputy Speaker MORAN: Second.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Any discussion? All those in favor? Aye. Any opposed? It passes unanimously.

SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS FROM BOARD OF REGIONAL COMMISSIONERS

Speaker MCAULIFFE: We have Commissioner Flynn with us, but I did not ask for a report for her. The other two Commissioners are on holiday for the vacation week. So we will get any updates from our Assistant Town Administrator Steve Tebo or from Mary McIsaac, our Director of Financial -- and I did not ask them for a report because it wasn't clear whether we were going to have a Commissioner's report or not. So unless there's anything that you feel is a big issue, we can --

Finance Director MCISAAC: No.

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: No.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. I'm getting no's from them.

Finance Director MCISAAC: Not today.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Then we'll move on from Commissioners.

SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS FROM PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Communications from public officials; anything from public officials? No.

SUMMARY OF SPEAKER'S ANNOUNCEMENT / OTHER BUSINESS

- **Delegates asked to think about process for Charter Review**
- **Proposed resolution is being prepared for Charter Review purposes**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. We have our public hearings listed at a 4:15 timeframe. So I'm going to move up a topic that I had. I'm going to come in under public officials and this won't be for discussion or debate or anything. It's just I want to inform you of an idea that I have that I'm thinking of trying that I was going to talk about it in "Other Business" so it will shorten the other end of the meeting.

One of the things we've been looking at is for the Charter Review is trying to figure out the best way to get the Charter Review accomplished in a timely manner so that we can get through all the steps and hoops we need to get on the ballot to make sure that this is a Charter Review that actually creates Charter updates, Charter changes, whatever we want to do.

In the past, it has been traditionally an out-of-Assembly group. It's been sometimes partially Assembly, sometimes just a couple representatives. The group has sometimes taken a year and it hasn't really, I guess, resulted in any changes that the Assembly have approved.

So my thinking is I would like to have you think about, and we'll put this on the next agenda, having the entire Assembly go through the Charter Review in chunks, bringing it

forward almost like we did the budget, bringing forward topics. If it turns out that we get stuck or there's too much or we need more time on something like term limits or governmental structure or even some of the housekeeping stuff because a lot of the language in our Charter and in our Administrative Code and Governance is outdated and not current.

So I was thinking if we chunked it out like we did with the budget; we covered the budget, the whole group in three meetings essentially. It won't take three meetings to do the Charter. It will be probably most of the summer and fall and into our next budget cycle. But that's my thinking is to bring it before the full Assembly and what that does is not only involves everybody, because I know a lot of people are interested, but it also buys a little bit of grassroots support for whatever it is that we're proposing. We know what the Charter needs. We know we can certainly accept topics from anyone if people want to submit topics that they want us to address. We can debate them and decide whether they should go into the Charter as a change. We can actively go to our Selectman and ask them for any thoughts, encourage an open meeting of the public.

But I think to have a document at the end that actually will pass the Assembly, if it comes from the Assembly and is the work product of the Assembly, then we'll actually have something that will be meaningful.

My big concern is that it is a huge job in some areas, and we may get bogged down but then I'm prepared to say, well, maybe we have a subcommittee look at that while we move on with other topics.

So that's my thoughts, no response. This is just a statement that I'm making. I've discussed it with Attorney Troy, and he is willing to come in and kick this off in June. We have the Clerk working on a proposed resolution that will put this process forward, and he will come in and outline the steps of what you need to go through for a Charter Review, you know, sort of what the deadlines are, what the activities are, what the schedules are, different options of what people can do for a Charter Review.

So that would be what my thinking is. And I hope it -- I don't want it to be daunting because I feel like the budget went very well. And I think that if we can, and maybe I'm being naïve, but if we can chunk things out and get things into manageable discussion points and make decisions as we go along, then maybe we'll actually have a product that updates the Charter. So that's my thinking.

Anyone else going to speak in the "Other Business" who wants to just make an announcement under public officials? No. Okay.

But we still have five minutes till 4:15, so what we'll do is we'll just take a brief recess and re-adjoin until 4:15. Oh, members of the public?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Well, if somebody wants to, you could take that out of order.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- **Public comment made by Stephen Buckley from Chatham**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes. I could take members of the public out of order, but this would not be if you're speaking at the hearing. Is there anyone who had a comment or anything that they wanted to say that wasn't part of the hearing? Yes. If you would just give your name.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Sure. My name is Steve Buckley; I'm from

Chatham. I know this is a new, a nice, new location with all the technology and so forth, I'm wondering, first, I've been here before, but I was wondering is this being recorded by audio or video in addition to transcript? I'm just trying to get an idea of what's being recorded and what isn't?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: It is audio and it is available then -- not only as the meeting's going on, but also if you go to the website you can then watch the video of the meeting.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: And video as well?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes. And a transcription

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Okay. Very good. Is there a protocol for, obviously, you have a time for members of the public to say something, but is there anything that the Assembly or -- it's on the website that says what the protocol would be in case members of the public wanted to share something or announce something?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Well, usually its part of our agenda and it's right at the end of the beginning, the first part of our meeting. It says -- there's an actual agenda item that says, "Communications from Members of the Public," and that would be when typically members of the public would come and give comments.

It's a little different when we're having a hearing because then if you're having a Public Hearing on an ordinance that we are passing, then we actually have a time set aside that is specifically devoted to the public. So, typically, comments are allowed during a regular meeting, but I'd say that the hearings are really that we want to hear from the public.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Okay. So, I mean, the Board of Selectman in Chatham, for instance, have an opportunity for the public at the beginning of the meeting --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Right.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: -- to make an announcement but not for debate or discussion. It's just --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Right, right, and that's the way it is for us too.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Okay.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: It's for us to receive comments and we typically don't respond or debate. And it's right at the end of the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Okay. And if someone like myself and whomever wanted to record, would we -- you, of course, mentioned it ahead of time, but is there anything ahead of the meeting or point of contact or, like, I wanted to bring --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: No. It's just, for some reason, it's a requirement of the law that I ask that. It's not that I particularly care; I don't think anyone in the room particularly cares because the meeting's being recorded and going to be on the website. It's just some -- something about in the law that says you have to ask who's recording at the beginning of a meeting.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Right.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So anyone can record. You don't really need to let anyone know ahead of time.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Okay. Well, as a practical matter, I do have -- sometimes I do record public meetings where there aren't cameras but, of course, you all are recording it in three different ways.

But I'm playing around with a 360-video camera that is best, of course, if I put it back there then it wouldn't do very well. But if I put -- it would really need to be like in the

center here. So I mean I just didn't want to march up and plop something down and people go, "What's that?"

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: So I just wanted to follow --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes, I think that goes beyond -- I think that goes beyond what the intent of recording is. I think recording would be a phone or camera from the audience.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Well, who would I talk to about -- because I don't believe that's correct. I mean, I do know I have read and reread the --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Well, I'm not going to make an opinion because I don't know what the electronics here --

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Okay.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: -- what will interfere with them and what the ability is, and I think I would also need to get an opinion on that.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: That's exactly what I wanted, not now, but before a meeting.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: So I guess talk to whom about that?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Well, your request is noted.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Clarification.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And I think I'm going to ask Attorney Troy to take a look at what the options are for recording.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Okay. Thank you, very much.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. All right. One minute. Yes, one minute. I'm not going to recess just for a minute.

PUBLIC HEARINGS BEGINNING @ 4:15 PM)

a. Proposed Ordinance 19-02 as Amended

- **Speakers included David Schropfer, Kate Epperly, Thomas Ryan, Edmund Robinson, Stephen Buckley, Susan Truitt, and Darlene Zerbe (see testimony of each below)**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So, what I'll do is I'll do just a little introduction. The Public Hearings are for ordinances and that's how the Assembly legislates and does its business, puts forth ordinances, I guess you could consider them laws to a certain degree, and we have public hearings on them.

The other Public Hearings that we're having today too are on our budgets because the budget comes in by ordinance. And when I say budgets, there are four ordinances that cover the County budgets this year. So we will hear the ordinances, have the hearing for the ordinances on the budget, but we won't vote on the budget until next meeting with the exception of the Capital Budget which we will vote today because it's very straightforward, limited budget, and it just takes one thing off the table.

So, typically, we open a Public Hearing. We invite people to come to the microphone, either microphone and comment, and then we would close the public hearing. And then in our part of the meeting is when we would debate and discuss anything to do with the ordinances.

All right. Now we have 4:15. We have Proposed Ordinance 19-02 as amended, and this is to repeal the Human Rights Commission Ordinances and Establish the Human Rights Advisory Board.

And I believe we have Dave Schropfer and, I'm sorry, I can't remember your name.

Dr. KATE EPPERLY: Vice Chair, Dr. Kate Epperly.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: That's right, Dr. Kate Epperly. Would one of you like to come up and just maybe give a thumbnail sketch of -- because we did have an ordinance submitted in March and this is a totally amended -- so just a, perhaps, a very brief update of how we got to where this is now. And then we can take public comment from the audience if anyone has any comment on the ordinance itself.

Mr. THOMAS RYAN: No, no, she's asking you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: No. It's fine. You can have as many members of the Human Rights Commission come up if you like.

Mr. DAVID SCHROPFER: Well there was a sign-up sheet and I was second on it.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay.

Mr. DAVID SCHROPFER: I was deferring to -- oh, right.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Well, what I wanted you to do though is just sort of do a brief -- because this is not the original ordinance that was submitted, and I just want to make it clear why we are at this point so that we can look at this ordinance.

Mr. DAVID SCHROPFER: Okay. My name is Dave Schropfer; I am from Eastham. I'm a member of something that was once called the Human Rights Commission. We went before the Commission and they said we don't like the idea that there are Commissioners talking to Commissioners and we're not all the same, and I kind of thought, you know, they've probably got a point there.

So now the proposal is to have established under this ordinance that it would be an advisory board, and we'd change its name to the Human Rights Advisory Board, which we think has, basically, no bearing on what we do or how we do it.

Some controversy arose when there was a very strong attempt to move the Human Rights Committee out of County control and into the hands of the public in the sense that we would be a 501(c)(3). We'd be forced to raise money on our own and to survive like that.

I'm also a member of the Massachusetts Human Rights Organization -- Council, actually, and many of the towns that have a population even less than ours have paid people doing this work. We did have that but when all the tension arose from the Commissioners attempt at the time to disband it, we lost the best employee we could have had. However, someone else was hired within the County and she's now a County employee on the other side of this building. So I'm glad she's back but not working with us. She was perfect, an attorney. She worked for the numbers of hours we had asked and received the pay and was all happy with that. But the pressure and the stress that every single person who was involved in this process has experienced has been staggering.

I finally said to the chairman, you know, you try and run whatever we have left, and I'll take on the responsibility of trying to work with the Commission. I wish to express a personal opinion; I am not speaking at this moment for the whatever we're now called, the Human Rights Group. I come from a traditional government view that the Assembly writes the laws, the ordinances, and sets the structure; that the Commission is more like the executive,

deeply stressed and upset with what's gone on that we absolutely do not function.

In another couple of weeks, we have, you may know, we are largely oriented toward education. Last year we had 21 high schools work the entire year on a program we established for them and that they liked, and it's called, "The Academy," and they came and made presentations of what they're doing about human rights. I was amazed at how in-depth these high school students were in thinking of ways to deal with it.

The idea is a Human Rights Commission would be really not needed if you had human rights at the lowest level, the earliest age that students and children would have human rights as a part of their understanding. If they don't, you have what you got now.

I teach a course in ethics. I went to -- I was both in Florida yesterday and Pennsylvania the week before teaching an ethics class. And I said, "Have you see what's going on in the colleges? You're all waiting to get into college, and you're all putting in your applications to get into college but are you aware that people are coming who are movie stars who are leading people and they are spending up to a half-a-million dollars to get their precious little student into a school. And you," pointing at each of them, "it may be your application that is, whoops, we just took up the last seat for Mrs. Smith who gave us a half-a-million dollars." I said, "Is that what you want?" And one student said, "If they're doing it for me, yes." I said to him, "And why is it that you feel that that's okay?" He said, "Because I can." How's that?

Where are our morals? Where are our ethics? That's what we do for a living. What have I done for a living and for this Commission, done nothing but meet with Commissioners. Only two meetings here and it has been a terrible struggle. Everybody has an opinion how it should be done and some of them have an opinion that it shouldn't be done at all.

But if that's what's out there, if that lack of ethics, lack of morality, lack of care and concern for other people is what's going on, we want to hit it at the lowest level we can get at. And we're in the middle schools and we're in the high schools and that is the lifeblood of what we do.

To have all these ordinances going back and forth is really troubling. You have in -- I'm not quite sure of the title, but the person to your right, Madam Chair, Janice who --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: The Clerk, yes.

Mr. DAVID SCHROPFER: County Clerk?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes, Assembly Clerk and County Clerk.

Mr. DAVID SCHROPFER: Yes. To have someone with her ability to move something along, only wish that I could have worked with her earlier because it was all going on at Commission level, but she did yeoman's work to get as much done as we could get done.

We have a very difficult situation now. We lost almost all or at least a majority of the members of this -- there's a council of towns. We believe that the best way for people who want to talk to the County is through their representatives who sit right here on this group.

To have it come into our organization is not as strong, I don't believe, as it would be if you knew that there was a problem going on and came to us and said, "This is something you should be addressing."

But, right now, we have no employee. We have had no employee since the last one just said you people can't run this operation, right, I'm leaving and left, although she's now back.

We then eventually got to a point where we were allowed to hire again. So we went out and interviewed again and found somebody who was just terrific, and then we were told you don't have a budget.

If this sounds convoluted, it is. If what we have to present to you today is perfect, it isn't. We would like to exist, and we'd like to exist at the end of business today by your positive vote to allow us to either keep the current ordinance exactly as it is and take as a mission in the next fiscal year to write it, get it written properly to involve people.

One of the founders of the Human Rights is here. He's not happy with it. I've talked to a number of you personally and there's a lot of people that just -- and nobody's unhappy with exactly the same thing; it's all over the lot. But those voices weren't heard. The process that was so abusive and what really got me is we're the Human Rights Commission and we were bullied into doing this told, basically, get out and go become a public organization, raise our own funds, and I said, "Which do you think I want to do? Go out and beg for money or to help bring human rights into our schools, into our colleges in any way?"

I met at the university. We're looking at the possibility of getting interns from the university who would be available to also work on these issues.

I was at the Human Rights Committee which got -- from Massachusetts. I was invited to go to the State House and make a presentation. And what did I use for the presentation? What the students created themselves and was voted as the best presentation last year. In another two weeks, we'll have another one.

But I believe if we can't operate, if we don't have a budget, we have no rights or business having another academy. So I said, "Can I really mean this?" We, basically, have lost all but seven -- some of the seven; town representatives don't come at all any more. We've lost -- we actually have a quorum of five; I believe we have six, right? We're down to six from the original nine members that we had. So most of the time we can't get all six -- get enough to get a quorum of nine is five. So any two people who are missing, we can't even have a meeting, so we've had to cancel the last couple of meetings. This is a disaster, and it's a disaster in a service that this County should be doing and should be doing right.

So you can make the choice. You can say to the Commissioners we want the existing ordinance; we want it left alone. We would like you to put on our agenda for the Assembly to rewrite this and to put in the comments that you'll hear from others that could improve it and that would deal maybe in other ways with the towns which in the past have been meeting once every quarter or a proposal that says send your representatives anytime you want because we want to hear what's going on in the towns.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank --

Mr. DAVID SCHROPFER: So, if you wish to go on with what this is, this ordinance has been taken to the Commission and they have voted on it, approved it, and sent it to you. It's a document that works. It is not perfect, but it works. It puts in place smaller groups. It, basically, says there's nine people all of whom would be drawn from the existing Commissioners of which there's only five left, the remaining positions would come from those seven people who've been coming as town representatives. Let's make them, you know, full voting people, as many as we can up to nine, and then from -- we look continually as each term of office expired for any of the advisory members. If that takes place, then we would have those seven people to draw from if they're from a town that doesn't -- our idea is never should we have two people from the same town as one of the Advisory Council members. It should always be to get it as widely spread as possible and to include the Wampanoag tribe.

And I would like to know if I may yield, and you are our vice chair so have at it.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. And I typically don't go out of order. The reason I did call on Dave Schropfer is I have known him for a very, very long time, and I've had

a lot of communication and comment with him about this -- this Odyssey in terms of getting an ordinance forward.

So I just wanted to sort of acknowledge someone who I knew who -- and I apologize if I've slighted anyone who is -- has a different title or who was planning on doing the speaking. I just went with something that was familiar.

Dr. Epperly, did you want to speak for a few minutes?

Dr. KATE EPPERLY: Well, I just wanted to mention what I think is urgent today. And until I walked in the door, I did not know that there were people in this room who were against this document who might have spoken to us sooner to say, oh no, we don't like this or that. So I didn't know we were even thinking possibly about saying, "Can we just go back to our original ordinance?" But that would be fine with me because we did not initiate this process ourselves, as you heard Dave say.

But my concern is very practical. We have volunteers who have been working very hard, in particular our Chair Alan Milsted, who works in Plymouth 12-hour days and we are tired.

But, we really want to be able to hire a coordinator, and I have been working on a program for the fall which would be on both Muslim, Jewish, anti-Semitism, anti-Muslim hate language and behavior, and it was spurred by the Nazi inscriptions down at Craigsville Beach and the neighborhood saying, "What can we do?" And I do have a solid relationship with the leaders of both the Muslim community and the local Hyannis Jewish community.

However, with the program inception in mind and I've done lots of research on how to structure a three-hour Sunday afternoon with a speaker and listening groups and workshops and skills to deal with this subject; we can't do it without a coordinator.

So my concern is that we be able to move ahead, and the County has told us, and I'm not sure what level it's come from, that we can't hire a coordinator until we get this ordinance thing settled. So I'm happy to have it settled to go back to the original ordinance. Again, that was not our initiative; however, if there is something to be changed, the clock is ticking. By fall, we really need our paid staff, and that is my concern because I, too, am tired. It has been an Odyssey; thank you for saying that, and I thank you for those who have been supporting us along the way. And, again, communication is essential, but it has been minimal besides the initial Commissioners urging to do this rewrite.

Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. I will go back to the order. Our first was Thomas Ryan. Thank you for being so patient.

Mr. THOMAS RYAN: I have this one page; could I hand it to the folks?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Sure.

Mr. THOMAS RYAN: Madam Chair, do I have three minutes or five minutes?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: You may take five.

Mr. THOMAS RYAN: I'll try not to use five because, essentially, what I'm going to say is here on this paper for your review. I've been around for a while in terms of the Human Rights Commission. I was part of the initial discussions 12 years ago. I hosted the Office of the Human Rights Commission for half of its life at the Council of Churches offices on Main Street. I was a town rep for a very long time.

I'm concerned that this Proposed Ordinance is flawed and not as good as the current ordinance. So I was not aware that David and Kate would actually allow for keeping the current ordinance. That actually is something that I don't think it needs to be replaced. It may

need editing or fixing, but I certainly -- I'm agreeing partially with what has just had been said. So I'm saying that there are flaws to my viewing in the Proposed Ordinance.

For one thing, the town representatives are essentially done away with within a year or two because some of them would be current town reps are not quote/unquote "Done away with," but effectively, the Town Representative Council has down away with. I found over the first seven to ten years when things were working well -- they have not been working well for three years or four years -- but when things were working well, the town reps were there and known to certain -- to people in the towns, so if there was an issue -- as if I was in Orleans, if the town cops/police heard something that related to this, they would call me and say, "What do you think about this," or they would call me in on something. So I was able to go to the full Commission and say in Orleans, we're thinking or having this problem. So I found them to be useful to have a local person in each town to be there. And also for the Human Rights Academy in the different high schools, the town reps close to each high school were able to go in on a regular basis and meet with those students. So it was very helpful to geographically have reps from P-town to Falmouth; it was very useful for that.

Also, I feel that the current ordinance changes, really severely limits some of the responsibilities the Commissioners had in the past. In fact, I'm not here using my five minutes to find or say all the flaws in this current document. Instead, what I'm saying -- what I'm proposing is to give a 90-day rethink to it. That's my bottom line I have on this paper because I think these flaws need to be examined.

If, however, you chose to simply do away with this whole process and keep the current ordinance, I would also be fine with that. So either of those two bottom lines.

But if you want to move forward with the current ordinance, I'm suggesting strongly that a 90-day period of discernment would be useful. Because I find the process flawed in this way, inadequate in this way, not really flawed but inadequate in this way that the ad hoc committee of last fall set up by the County Commissioners ended with a very toxic meeting, a very loud and precipitous meeting, and then the process went sort of underground, not underground, because it was an official discussion but very fewer people involved in that discussion. So I'm concerned that that committee didn't go anywhere so to speak, and a few of you were on that committee so you know that we didn't go anywhere.

Also, the Assembly of Delegates through the years has had Finance Committee or Human Services Committee meet a month or two before you would do what you're doing today and sort of vet things or talk about things. So that doesn't happen now, so I'm feeling that we're sort of missing some of that ability to have a discussion about things.

Also, you're in the middle of a budget process so it's hard to have considered thought about this and interested citizens like me only knew this a few days ago about this current draft. Historic partners like the Council of Churches were not informed of this, and the towns themselves who send the town -- are supposed to send the town reps were not informed of this until a few days ago.

So for all those reasons, I came here today to ask for a 90-day period of further discernment. So I add to that, if instead you decide to vote to keep the current ordinance, I also approve that.

And I thank you, very much for your time.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you.

Mr. THOMAS RYAN: And I appreciate the work all of you do. Thank you, very much.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Edmund Robinson.

Mr. EDMUND ROBINSON: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thank you, Assembly of Delegates. I'm Edmund Robinson; I'm the Minister of the Unitarian Universalist Meeting House in Chatham. I've been there since 2008. I'm going to retire as of January 1 of 2020.

Before I was a minister, I was an attorney and practiced law in South Carolina for 20 years through which time I was very active with the American Civil Liberties Union serving as volunteer counsel, serving as president, serving as representative on the National Board for several years, so I have that coming out of that civil rights background of a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization which has a great deal of leeway in what cases it takes, what it sees of the issues.

And my colleague, my ministerial colleague in Falmouth saw this opening for town rep for Chatham and said, "Why don't you take that." And I put myself forward for it, and there wasn't any competition for it at the time. I think it was about 2010, and I served until I moved out of Chatham in 2016. So I saw a bunch of stuff there.

The best thing that the Human Rights Commission does is definitely the school program, and that is everything that has been said about that program is absolutely true and that alone is worth keeping the Commission. It also serves as a great speaking ground or way to hash out some issues that came out. So I thought it was a very good -- and from that point of view, the town reps and the Commissioners really didn't make much differentiation between their roles. The town reps don't have any power so to speak in the current ordinance.

I don't know what happened after I left, so I can't speak to the sort of chaotic last couple of years. I will say that I was here on the Commission when we had a problem with something that the coordinator said; Elenita Muniz was serving as our coordinator and she -- it was the time of "Black Lives Matter" and a lot of questions about whether we were going to get a police shooting on the Cape that would -- and nobody, of course, wanted one but it would be similar to the ones that we were reading about in the paper, and there was a conference convened at 4C's about that. And the two representatives of the Human Rights Commission was Elenita Muniz, the coordinator, and John Reed, the president. And Elenita Muniz talked about racism and she said a bunch of things including the statement, "All white people are racist." That was, of course, what the newspaper focused on, blew up, huge problem. To my mind, Elenita was doing exactly what we wanted her to do. She was talking about values in the public square --

Mr. EDMUND ROBINSON: -- and talking about racism in the public square. She gave her -- and she actually had somebody to back up her statement. As it turned out, a computer tests your reactions before you can even think about them, you're sort of automatic reactions.

But we had a division among the County Commissioners; one wanted to eliminate the organization altogether, and that sort of led us through a bunch of steps, and I'm not clear what the steps are between that day and today, but I can't forget that that happened, and I look at this ordinance. This produced --

Oh, the other thing that happened right before I got off of the Commission was it was decided by everybody that thought about it, we had a president at the time who was an employment lawyer looking at the coordinator's position, that the coordinator was hired by the Commission but was not considered a County employee and everybody sort of agreed you can't have that. You've got to have some sort of coherence to what that position is and moved her into the County hiring focus, which is what this ordinance keeps -- now makes her explicitly a

County employee.

But the problem with making the Human Rights Coordinator a County employee is that the Human Rights Coordinator will from time to time have to rub people the wrong way. If he or she is doing her job, they will rub the people in the towns and in the County government the wrong way. And what I don't see in this ordinance is any protections for that Commissioner's freedom of action and freedom of speech in doing that. Elenita almost lost her job because of what she said -- was quoted as saying in the newspaper, and I think from my point of view, she was doing exactly what we wanted her to be doing. And that I was out there picketing the next day and we got that decision reversed.

But going -- looking forward, I would like to see a human rights effort with more teeth in it, with more protection for those who put themselves out boldly on behalf of human rights. Human rights are huge but they're not nice things. They can often be very painful things to recognize. We have a system of majority rule and minority and individual rights together. And if you're going to -- it's like the Founding Fathers, they knew that the constitutional rights that they put into the Bill of Rights were going to have to be enforced against the majority will from time to time, so the people that were doing the enforcing were the federal judges; they gave them lifetime tenure. They gave them protection against the will of the majority, and I don't see that kind of thinking in this.

I'd see -- the phrase that leaps out at me, "You've got to get a coherent message." The Assembly of Delegates and the Commissioners and everybody in the County, Administrator of the County come forward with a coherent message for the Human Rights Coordinator. But suppose the Human Rights Coordinator has a different idea of what that message should be; who wins then? Those are the things that pop up in my mind.

I apologize that I'm coming in here at the last-minute because I hate to waste anybody's energy in a voluntary capacity like this. But I was not asked for my opinion before today, and I come here and give it to you for what it's worth. I don't have a particular opinion as Mr. Ryan does about whether you should table this now or go ahead and move it or try to send it back for redrafting. But I don't think the ordinance in the present form does as much as I would like to see a revised ordinance do.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Next is Stephen Buckley.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Hello, again.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Hello.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Steve Buckley from Chatham. I'll give you a little of my background just to give you a sense of where I'm coming from. I grew up in Chatham but after college went to Washington D.C. where I worked for five different federal agencies doing environmental work and a large part that was public involvement. So the science and engineering is the easy part; it's the explaining it to other people so they can engage and provide feedback on what's being proposed on their behalf and including things like proposing public documents for comment and so forth.

So now that I no longer work for the federal government, I tell people I'm a recovering bureaucrat. So instead of bird watching or playing golf, I go to public meetings and try to give my sense of how they're working right and wrong and nudging them this way and that.

So, anyway, so when the Human Rights Commission was created in 2005/2007, I went to a few meetings to see how this new agency or group was working and so forth. And at that time, they had an email list which we would -- the coordinator would send out when

meetings were coming up and so forth. And so, of course, rather than checking the website every day, you just get an email, okay. So I went to a few of those to see how they were doing and see how they were reaching out to the community and, anyway, over the course of time they stopped doing that. So I kind of stopped going because I didn't know what the agenda was. I didn't know what was going on, so I became disengaged, not willfully, just because I didn't know what was going on.

But from time to time -- and I did go to the -- I did read about, yes, the hubbub that Reverend Robinson was just talking about with about the comment that "All white people are racist" and so forth. I went to the Cape Cod Community College forum that resulted to see how that would go to see if that was a conversation or just a lot of venting, which can sometimes be construed as public engagement, and it can be therapeutic but it might not be productive, just a lot of, you know, venting so to speak. And I think, which in my opinion, that was a way for people to blow off steam and feeling like it had been addressed but I don't think it really had been addressed. And I guess my concern was that the Commission had, and this is, I think, perfectly normal for any government organization, any public organization that has a goal that everybody agrees on, but the devil is in the details.

So we can all -- you can have 100 percent agreement on the goals of this Commission, but it's kind of like, well, how do we go there? How do we do that? And that's where you really get into, in any group, you know, where to have Thanksgiving this year, you know, it doesn't take much for people to disagree about, yes, we're going to have Thanksgiving but where are we going to have it and who's going to go and all those things. So you can start arguments anywhere on something like that. So this is no different how to get there.

And, of course, I think this actually is -- it's a recognition I guess that things weren't working as well as they should, and that this is an attempt at improvement. So this is the opportunity to look over the past 10 years, I guess, and see what worked and what didn't work. So it's nobody's fault. I don't think it can be construed as, you know, no finger-pointing, just to say, huh, how could we have done that better? What might we have done? So forth and so on.

And I think that with the attempt, the proposal to make the Human Rights Coordinator a public employee or more of a public employee, I guess, than before is a step in that direction. I think the previous speaker mentioned that he didn't see how this would -- he had some reservations about how that person would have to conduct themselves under this proposal. But as an employee, they would still be, as any County employee, they would be treated just the same as any other government employee. They still have their freedom of speech as a private individual. But when they're speaking for the County, they have to be very careful. And there is a Barnstable County Regional Code of Conduct that's actually on the existing website right now. And so that's what's supposed to be followed I guess before if it's in the HRC website now, at least a link to it, and then in the future. But I think it looks to me that that person would -- it's more clear now that the person is accountable to the Assembly of Delegates or, I'm sorry, whoever it is as opposed to being accountable or behold to the committee itself, and that's the sense that I got that the -- under existing structure, there was more that the committee was in charge and the coordinator was a helper. And I think this appears to be the other way around where the coordinator has more power and the committee is advisory to the coordinator.

So whether that will work or not, but I can see how this is an attempt to make that more clear about who's in charge of what. My sense was that when I saw and read things like in the Cape Cod Times that the HRC, the Human Rights Commission, was doing things with outside groups, it would be presented and I don't know who -- where this came from but it said

that the Human Rights Commission was partnering with these groups and partnering with these groups to have a particular event. And anytime you have a government, to me, having worked in government, I mean, if you were saying that the FAA was going to be partnering with Southwest Airlines to accelerate their approval process for a new airliner, lights should go off that go, um, that's not -- you don't partner with your government. The government has a role. You can engage with them and they can engage with you, but partnering to me was kind of a Freudian, I guess, type of thing that showed me the true nature of what they thought the role of the committee was to go out and collaborate outside of the public meetings. And as a great advocate of open government, the idea that everything should be in the open, if people want to say whether white people are racist or purple people are racist or whatever, it should be in the public forum not on social media or at an event.

So, anyway, getting back to the one suggestion I have for the actual -- my concern about partnering with groups is that one of the, let's see, Section 3 under the Human Rights Coordinator, 3B, it says that -- I'll wait a minute for people to catch up -- 3B the first sentence it says, "The Human Rights Coordinator shall engage County-wide with the various stakeholders to gather and disseminate information" blah, blah, "and to serve the towns." So that, I think, is the idea being that there are groups, quote/unquote, "various stakeholders" as opposed to the public or interested persons.

But whenever I see "stakeholders," it's like, oh, that's code for people who have a higher interest than the regular public or friends of us or advocates of us and it gets a little incestuous, I guess, would be the saying that was from "Animal Farm" where they say, "All citizens are equal, but some citizens are more equal than others." So it's like, oh, yeah, everybody's invited, especially the stakeholders, you know, which is kind of like code in my way of thinking; I've seen it used where people said, "We're going to invite stakeholders and the public." Like, oh, so there are two classes of public, favored and not favored. So I would change that "stakeholders" to just the "interested public" and not --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: And so that way too. And the other part in that same paragraph it says, "And meet with the region's various diverse communities," which is various and diverse are actually synonyms. They mean exactly the same thing; variety and diversity, look it up in the dictionary, it's the same thing, so that caught my eye too. So the idea that there are diverse communities or that they're supposed to meet with a variety of diverse communities or diversity of diverse communities. So I'm going, well, what's a diverse community because, for instance, if they were to meet with the League of Women Voters, I'm guessing that even though men can join the League of Women Voters, 90 percent, if not, are women and that, to me, would not be quote "An organization that had a diversity," if it was 90 percent this or 90 percent that. So I would just strike the diverse part there and just put "various demographic groups."

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you.

Mr. STEPHEN BUCKLEY: Thank you, very much.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Susan Truitt.

Ms. SUSAN TRUITT: So I don't think anybody's interested in my long history of watching government, but that's what I have done for probably 50 years, about 14 of them here on the Cape.

There is no other more important issue than the issue of human rights. And if that hasn't been clear to people in the last few years with the tensions in this country, I don't know

what to say.

What resolving the differences of opinion among the people who'd been working here in this area will take is a couple of elected leaders who give a damn about human rights. Human rights involves how much tax you have to pay, where you live, what you can eat. Human right is everything that our government facilitates or doesn't facilitate. Surely among this group of people there are several of you who would set aside your need to be reelected the next time or get the decent headline and work in a selfless way to come up with a simple and easily understood human rights system for the entire County. This is not something for people who want an easy solution, but the solution must be simple and explicable.

And as I think many of you who've been Delegates for a while know, you are basically an invisible group. Your actions don't pop. This is an opportunity for several of you to step up and make a real difference in the lives of real people by coming up with something that's simple and easy to write about in the Cape Cod Times. And you can exercise a kind of leadership if you put your ego and your future work needs aside. And so just as some member of the watchful public, I really hope that a couple of you will get together. These people all have had a lot of good ideas but, you know, it takes a couple of leaders and probably people who haven't been involved in the tangle. They should be listened to carefully, but some elected folks here have to say, okay, this is a cause worth spending my reputation on.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Darlene Zerbe. Is there no Darlene -- oh, Darlene, yes.

Ms. DARLENE ZERBE: Yes, I am a very brand-new person here. I just moved here this weekend.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Welcome.

Ms. DARLENE ZERBE: And my background is that I have worked in Human Rights and Human Relations Commissions for over 10 years in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania where I came from. And it was a really important thing to have that organization recognized publicly and the process was very -- was much debated and worked through, and it made a lot of problems between both industry and landlords and all those kinds of things a lot more easy to handle because there was a forum to bring things to.

And I think that -- I'm just learning about this one now, but I think that there is a lot of information that needs to be discussed in public forums and having an organization where it can be brought forward is a really important thing for people across the board.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you, very much. That's the end of the sign-up sheet. Is there anyone who didn't sign up who wanted to make comments?

Okay. Thank you. So what we will do now then is close the Public Hearing on Proposed Ordinance 19-02, the Human Rights Commission Ordinance.

Yes.

Mr. DAVID SCHROPFER: Madam Chair, may I correct something in my comments before you close it?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: It's been closed but you may -- you may, as a member of the public, correct a comment.

Mr. DAVID SCHROPFER: What you just heard is exactly what has been going on every single week. These are good ideas. Nobody composed them until now, but we got that every single week, mostly from the Commissioners.

I would like to suggest that there are some things that are so good in this ordinance, one of them being that the employee becomes an employee reporting to Jack and his

department. It does not work that way now if you take the current -- leave the current one where it is. So if you passed this ordinance as it is and do what has been suggested in a variety of different ways, as the Assembly, take it upon yourselves, however you choose to do that, to help us write it yourself, whatever it is that you think would work best. That would be the way the way that we could, A., begin tomorrow morning, but anything else that we do, we don't get to start again.

And one of Jack's most important points is that was a freestanding employee who reported to no one within the County government and that really needs to be changed and that's the right way to go, and that would be changed in this new ordinance.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Thank you. I really need to -- we have --

Mr. THOMAS RYAN: I need 30 seconds, please.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thirty seconds. The hearing is closed so I'm taking this under communications from the public.

Mr. THOMAS RYAN: Communication from the public and the 2015 ordinance made that change. You don't need to pass this new ordinance for that. The current ordinance is 08 and 15 together, and that means that the coordinator was, since 19 -- 2015, a direct employee of Yunits or the County.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. THOMAS RYAN: Thank you.

b. Proposed Ordinances FY20 County Budget

i. 19-03 County Capital Budget

ii. 19-06 County Operating Budget

iii. 19-07 Cape Cod Commission Operating Budget

iv. 19-08 County Dredge Budget

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Our next item are Ordinances for the FY20 County Budget; Ordinance 19-03 is the County Capital Budget; 19-06 is the County Operating Budget; 19-07 is the Cape Cod Commission Operating Budget, and 19-08 is the County Dredge Budget.

We have spent the last several months going ordinance by ordinance, department by department, line by line, and I think that this has been an ongoing process but this is this opportunity if there's anybody from the public who wants to address the Assembly on the budget, which I said is in four ordinances, this would be the opportunity to do that. Is there anyone here? **I don't have anyone on a sign-up sheet. Anyone on the sign-up sheet?** Okay. Thank you.

So we will close the hearing on the FY20 County Budget which is in the form of four ordinances.

We have covered communications from members of the public.

Assembly Convenes

Speaker MCAULIFFE: I will now convene the Assembly.

ASSEMBLY DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON:

a. Proposed Ordinance 19-02: To Establish a Human Rights Advisory Board as amended

- **Vote was taken to table Proposed Ordinance 19-02**
- **Assembly will wait until additional information can be obtained from County Administrator Jack Yunits regarding this proposed ordinance, the status of the Human Rights Commission and the Coordinator position**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: We are supposed to have a discussion and vote on this Proposed Ordinance, the Human Rights Commission Ordinance and Human Rights Advisory Board.

I'm going to preface the discussion here; it's clear to me that this is a mess, that I don't have all the information that I need to make any kind of decision. I want the Human Rights Commission to be able start hiring tomorrow but if I can't give them that, then -- is there anyone here who can tell me that we can give them that tomorrow if we leave the ordinance as it is and then work on it?

Delegate O'Malley, you've been working with the Human Rights Commission.

Delegate O'MALLEY: I'll speak to that. We have ordinances in place that handle that, and I don't think anything needs to be changed. It has not been demonstrated. We have Ordinance 15-06, which put the coordinator -- "It shall be an employee of the County directly responsible to the County Administrator." That exists. We can hire tomorrow. There's nothing that's different in this Proposed Ordinance regarding the hiring of the coordinator. So this doesn't change anything. The absence of a budget line has been an obvious impediment. We're not going to resolve that by --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: But we have a budget line this year?

Delegate O'MALLEY: That's correct, for the new fiscal year we do. But passing this ordinance today doesn't make budget funds available now. That's only from the budget. So, it's unclear to me there's no obvious reason why we couldn't hire a coordinator under existing ordinances.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Delegate O'Malley has been our representative from the Assembly to several of the meetings with the Human Rights Commission, and I know he had spoken to me before the meeting because he had some concerns about some of the gaps in the current ordinance, specifically, you know, how after you set the initial group, then how do you fill in empty seats or reappointments? And that really isn't addressed in this new ordinance, and this new ordinance does delete or rescind every previous ordinance so that even the things that you want to keep you wouldn't keep.

I'm going to listen to people, but I don't want to necessarily spend a half an hour spinning our wheels when I almost think that this needs to go back to whomever, and maybe it's us, to look at what would be the best ordinance as long as it allows the Human Rights Commission to function.

I guess I would like to suspend the rules for a moment if Steve Tebo, the Assistant County Administrator, or Mary McIsaac could answer the question that if we -- you can nod yes or no, and then I can suspend the rules and have you address us; can we -- can the Human Rights Commission hire based on the budget, this year's budget line, can they hire a coordinator? Can you address that, I guess.

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: Yes, I can.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Can we have -- can we suspend the rules to allow staff to address this?

Delegate O'MALLEY: So moved.

Deputy Speaker MORAN: Second.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: All those in favor? Aye. Any opposed? **Okay. Thank you.**

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: So, Steve Tebo, Assistant County Administrator. I do believe we do have funding this year in this fiscal year to fill that position, but I'll just --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And we have Mary McIsaac, the Director of Fiscal Affairs.

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: So we do have funds available --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Twenty-eight thousand, I think, right?

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: Yes, \$28,150.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay.

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: So \$28,150 so we could technically hire under the old ordinance.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. So the problem last year was there was not a budget line item. It wasn't the ordinance; it was those --

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: I believe the Commissioners had taken it out and the Assembly had put it back in. So I think it was always existing. I think it came down to your technicality of the Commissioners didn't believe that the ordinance was correctly approved originally. I thought that's why we were here.

I know, Brian, we were a part of this, and I'm kind of getting confused on it a little bit myself here. But I remember there was a little bit of a go around on the actual ordinance didn't properly -- procedurally go through or am I lost? And I don't want to speak out of turn here.

Finance Director MCISAAC: Not the budget ordinance.

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: Not the budget ordinance.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: I think there's just so many unanswered questions here, and I don't want to hang the Human Rights Commission out to dry here, but I don't think that we're capable of making a decision with the information we have, and I think this needs to be tabled. I think we need to get --

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: And it's --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And with the assumption that we are operating under the old ordinances if this is tabled, and if the old ordinances then allow the hiring to go forward, we should know that by our next meeting. But I almost hesitate to have us spend any more time, effort, and energy on something where we have so much out there that I can't get my head around it.

Yes, Delegate Harder.

Delegate HARDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't want to table this if it means they don't get to go to work. So what I'm understanding from Steve is that what is in place now, if we do nothing, tomorrow Dave can go hire a coordinator for \$28,000.

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: It wouldn't be Dave; it would be Jack.

Delegate HARDER: Jack.

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: Jack and HR would be able to advertise. And I'm sure they'd be a part of -- I think there would be some consulting on the hiring process on that point. But for the procedural like aspect, there is funding there.

And, again, I have to apologize; I was only in bits and pieces of this meeting as

my role wasn't one of the things that was assigned to me. But I remember one meeting with Doc being there and it was, to be quite honest, I got lost by the end of the meeting on what the actual - I know they wanted a new ordinance, and I just can't recall why. So I have to apologize a little bit.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And we're at a disadvantage because we don't have our County Administrator here.

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: He's on vacation so.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And also we were given an ordinance in March which was not ready which then the Clerk and the attorney worked on which we thought was ready, but it turns out we aren't ready.

Asst. Administrator STEVE TEBO: It looks like it just from my standpoint of it. I think in either way we can hire a coordinator starting the process.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So if it means a two-week delay if we defer this, I think the goal right now is to hire a coordinator. I think if they function the way they've always functioned because that's what's in place, so be it.

I'll go to Delegate McCutcheon and then Delegate Zuern. Yes. It's the little red guy on the lower right, the little guy on the lower right. Too much technology.

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It sounds to me -- I didn't pay a lot of attention to this when it was coming down -- but what it sounds to me happened here is that their money got stripped away and then you're left with volunteers and they're having trouble putting themselves back together.

So it seems to me that the worst thing we can do is stall off on it some more. We're going to give them the money, so why don't we let them hire somebody, and why don't they put that person to work on what their structure and organization ought to be. It's very hard to ask people to come and work for public government for free. I do it up in Truro as the Chair of the Conservation Commission and there are times when I am watching them eat up my time. These people have spent a lot of time trying to get their budget back, trying to get their goals set. If we don't give them money to do it, it's the same as cutting them off at the knees.

And I think I agree with Delegate Harder that we pass the money, tell them to come back in two weeks or 90 days or a month and a half, something, come back and talk to us about your ordinance then. If they can't get it together then, we can always take the money back. That's apparently what happened before.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Delegate Zuern.

Delegate ZUERN: To me, the main problem wasn't that we didn't have a coordinator, it was because the Human Rights Commission was just going off in so many different directions and needed to be reined in, and I think that's what this proposed ordinance is trying to do.

And I think it's very important that we have the goals and the whole structure, the procedures in place before we hire a coordinator so that everybody knows when they're joining the Human Rights Commission what they will be doing. They're not going to be going off and doing academy classes with the U.N. Human Rights material that says everyone has the right to live wherever they want. And that's what was going on before, we weren't using the rights of our country or the rights from our laws; they were using the rights of the U.N.

So I see a real problem there, and for them to get the money for a coordinator right now when this isn't in place, I think we're making a big mistake. So I would agree that we need to do maybe some revision on this, and that maybe it's best to do it as a group with the

Assembly members and just hash through it and see what else has to be done, but I'd rather have this done first.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Delegate Kanaga.

Delegate KANAGA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move that we table this ordinance.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Is there a second?

Deputy Speaker MORAN: Second.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. This is on the motion; is there any discussion?

Delegate KANAGA: Really I think, as you have stated before, there's more to this story than meets the eye because I believe that the money is in the budget and a person could have been hired. I do remember different things happening in the past year such as there was phones cut off or being locked out of offices or all these things, as I recall this was in this last year.

So there's some reason that the administration doesn't want to hire someone it seems to me because there's no impediment to it, and we certainly don't need a new ordinance to do it and the money's there but yet there is no person hired.

So it would be great, I think, if we found out more about that rather than passing a new regulation or ordinance, if you will, to solve something that we don't even know why the ordinances that are in place and why the money that is in place has not been used.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: On the motion? Yes, Delegate O'Hara.

Delegate O'HARA: Thank you, Madam Chair. My question is on the delay, I don't think two weeks is enough for us to do our homework and have the facts and figures that we need to have. I think we need to come up with a time period or do we just wait until we have all of the facts and come up with something that's acceptable to the board and not put a timeline on it. I think it's too important to just put a timeline on it.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Delegate Moran.

Deputy Speaker MORAN: So I'm going to be more in favor of what Delegate Kanaga just mentioned. I think that the Assembly and the public have an absolute right. This has been discussed. A lot of folks are familiar with it. It's gotten press. People have been able to watch the meetings, and I think we can really require the administration to come and give us an update and that that would be the least we should do at the next meeting so that this really urgent request gets moved as quickly as possible and that may mean that other important matters take a second seat.

But I think this is something that we should absolutely prioritize. We have a very talented County Administrator with incredible experience at running large communities, and I think he certainly will be able to inform the Assembly at the next meeting. I understand that there may be issues to work out in terms of whether ordinances need to be tweaked, as you mentioned Delegate O'Hara, but I think in terms the service being out there in the community so that human rights get addressed with the urgent and emergency type of situations that come up. I think that has to have sufficient priority that the Assembly address this at the next meeting and for as many meetings as we have to going forward.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes, Delegate O'Malley. This is on motion to table?

Delegate O'MALLEY: I'm going to speak in favor of the motion to table. I come to this meeting today really quite conflicted clearly wanting to see this entire structure rebuilt and casting in a functional form. And, obviously, there have been some problems in the past couple years with the function of the Human Rights Commission.

I'm sorry to say, however, that because of the very late hour at which this particular Proposed Ordinance was submitted, it has not been sufficient time for any of us to really explore it, and I'm sorry to say it's not in final form. There are so many grammatical errors, duplications, contradictions, and unsaid elements in this that I think it's not workable.

In particular, the process defines very clearly how the first -- the new advisory board will be set up comprised of current commissioners and town reps. It has not a word to say where after their terms expired, where do people come from? So I think there's work that's been left out.

Now I clearly do not want to dismiss all the work that people have done over these past months. It's tremendous work and everybody wants to see us get to the end of this process and have it happen. I can only say to that we have four existing ordinances that we've passed over the last 14 years that define the process. As I pointed out earlier, the commissioner - - the coordinator was moved under this responsibility of the Administrator back four years ago eliminating that concern that somehow the coordinator was being, a County employee, was being directed by civilians, just volunteers, and that was an understood concern and that was addressed.

It's very unclear to me what about the current ordinances is not functioning. What clearly has been true is that for the past two years what's not functioning is the office of the coordinator and that's been done, I have to say, by the executive branch of our government who has not hired, has not provided that person with an office, phone, and Internet access. That was where the Human Rights Commission fell apart. It's where up until a few years ago they had full attendance at all of their meetings. They had their reps showing up. That has disappeared and, as we heard from Dave Schropfer, nobody shows up anymore. It's because the Commission feels like they have no leadership; they have no support at the County level; they can't get anything done. These Human Rights Academy presentations that they do are a lot of work that was really handled through the coordinator's office.

So my sense is that what was wrong with the Human Rights Commission is not before prior ordinances that established it and modified it over the years; what was wrong was that it was cut out of its leadership by administration for these past few years.

And I think this needs more work, and I would say that I agree with Delegate O'Hara that two weeks is not adequate; I think a three month/90-day sort of rethink should be enough to come up with something more appropriate.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Delegate Green and then Delegate McCutcheon.

Delegate GREEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. While I agree that if there isn't another ordinance, I do think that perhaps it may take a lot longer than two weeks. I do agree with Delegate Moran that we should have an update in two weeks, and if they can hire a coordinator, they should be able to hire a coordinator, and we should know that in two weeks. I believe that they should be able to hire a coordinator now. But that would be a great update, and I think that would cover both ends of the spectrum.

Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Delegate McCutcheon.

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: This is on the motion to table?

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: This is on the motion to table. I would agree with Delegate Kanaga that the motion to table is appropriate if it is time-limited.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Was the motion for two weeks or just motion to table?

Delegate KANAGA: Just to table.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Just to table, okay.

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: So I would suggest as a friendly amendment of one month to reply and be certain of what we're doing. This sort of the strangulation of the purse has been a tactic here against other people, and it's a very effective one, and I think it's one that we may need to deal with but not here, not now with this group.

But I think it's very concerning that we can, as happened with the last go-around, we put money back in the budget and the Administrator did not let us spend it or the department spend it. So I think that's an underlying concern, but I very much agree that this needs to be straightened out and soon.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Now you want a friendly amendment, so that's still -- I'm not sure that --

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: He has to agree if it's friendly.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Well, and that could also be -- that needs to be discussed and debated because that might not be everybody's desire and that might kill the -- his amendment. So even though it's a friendly amendment --

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: It's proposed as a friendly amendment.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: On the motion -- before we move on, I don't want to get lost in a parliamentary procedure, a black hole here. What I would like to do is if he has not accepted the friendly amendment, I think that we can go with the tabling motion that's on the table, and then administratively require an update from the County Administrator at our next meeting and then work out what needs to happen and what kind of timeline needs to happen from there.

So I'm not sure that a month would buy us anything if we're going to have someone here in two weeks just for information.

Deputy Speaker MORAN: Right.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And then give us more time to maybe get things done correctly if you would agree to withdraw your friendly amendment?

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: I will.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Delegate Harder.

Delegate HARDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As far as I'm understanding, if we table, the Human Rights Commission as it's called now, I gather, has the money in the budget and can do its work. And it seems to me that if we're doing Charter Review, we may very well want to put this into the Charter to ensure that Human Rights are actively supported by the County.

So I would like to not be in favor of the friendly amendment and move to table indefinitely. Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Well, it's not an indefinite; it's just move to table.

Delegate HARDER: Right.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Without a date certain. All right. I think we're ready -- oh, Delegate Zuern.

Delegate ZUERN: If we're going to table this and then allow a coordinator to be hired, I will vote against the table.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. So we will vote on the -- oh, Delegate Killion; I apologize.

Delegate KILLION: Has this been voted on by the Commissioners yet?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes.

Delegate KILLION: Okay. My question is procedurally is there a time limit on how long we can table this if it's already been voted on by the Commissioners? Do we have to vote on it in a certain amount of time?

Clerk O'CONNELL: No, there isn't. There is no limit. We have several other ordinances that have been tabled and haven't had any additional action going back to 2017; for example the recall and restructuring proposed ordinances. So it can sit there.

Delegate KILLION: And we're going to end up passing or not passing an amended ordinance which has to go back to the Commissioners for approval?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Right.

Delegate KILLION: Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Correct, the bottom line. So a vote on the amendment to table Proposed Ordinance 19-02.

Clerk O'CONNELL: We're going to do a roll call vote on this and, as before, the electronic box in front of you will be set. The green plus sign is for yes; the circle is you're voting to abstain or you're voting present; and the red minus sign is you're voting no.

So as I call the roll, you can respond to me and press the electronic box and we'll see what the numbers look like and if we agree.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So, just so everyone's clear, this is on the amendment to table, so that's what we're voting on.

Roll Call on motion to table Proposed Ordinance 19-02

Voting "YES" (80.50%): Mary Chaffee (4.55% - Brewster), J. Terence Gallagher (2.30% - Eastham), Lilli-Ann Green - (1.27% - Wellfleet), Elizabeth Harder (5.67% - Harwich), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), E. Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02%-Yarmouth), Susan Moran (14.61% - Falmouth), Thomas O'Hara (6.49% - Mashpee), Brian O'Malley (1.36% - Provincetown), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable).

Voting "NO" (9.15): Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).

Voting "PRESENT" (3.77%): Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% Truro), Randi Potash (2.84% - Chatham).

Absent (6.58%): John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Madam Speaker, on the motion to table Proposed Ordinance 19-02, 80.50 percent are voting yes; 9.15 percent are voting no; 3.77 percent voted present, and 6.58 percent are absent.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. So the motion passes, the proposed ordinance is tabled. And as a wrap-up, we will ask our County Administrator to come in and give us an update at our next meeting, and then we will go from there in terms of how we want to help the Human Rights Commission get back on its feet.

But at this point, we're going on the assumption that there is a budget line item for a coordinator so at least for two weeks the Human Rights Commission can feel like they still exist under the previous four ordinances.

Okay. Thank you, very much. I appreciate all your comments and thank you for attending. It certainly helps us to have a variety of information and opinions. And, as I said,

we're all peripherally involved and we hear things but we're not up to speed, and I think the hearing certainly helps.

ASSEMBLY DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON:

b. Proposed Ordinance 19-03: FY20 Capital Budget

- **Delegates voted to approve Proposed Ordinance 19-03 FY20 Capital Budget in the amount of \$975,000.00**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: And then on the next Proposed Ordinance, which is the FY20 Capital Budget, **I think I'd like to start with that by suspending the rules once more and asking Mary McIsaac to give us some information on the Fire Training Academy because we had questions at our last meeting on the budget.**

So those in favor of suspending the rules to allow Director McIsaac to speak?

Aye. Any opposed? Okay. **Unanimously.** Thank you. Welcome, Mary. There was confusion at the last meeting because the salary line item in the Fire Training Academy had two deputies and a full-time head of Fire Training Academy all earning similar amounts within a thousand dollars of each other. So could you clarify that for us?

Finance Director MCISAAC: Sure. We had when we submitted the budget to the Commissioners for their approval in February, the Director of the Fire Training Academy was part-time, and he was 50 percent of his salary was being paid out of the Health Department's budget because he was still working emergency management there and 50 percent of his salary was being paid by the Fire Training Academy.

After the Commissioners passed the budget, administratively, there was another change and Phil Burt was made full-time Director of the Fire Training Academy. But at that time, already the budgets had been brought to the Assembly, and the personnel schedule reflected what was voted at the time. We have these things happen every single year because personnel changes happen when they happen. They don't just happen in line with the timing of the budget.

So what we usually do is we continue to fund the position from where it was budgeted in its first instance in the year in which we're in, and then we strategize to see if the department's budget can handle the change. And if it can't, we move to a supplemental budget for that purpose.

So it's likely that you might see something regarding the Fire Training Academy with respect to the salary increase for Phil Burt, but that would really depend on the plan for their courses for the year and sometimes classes are not held because of one reason or another. So while the tuition that would be paid to the instructors would be available to fund his salary. So we really just have to see how it unfolds.

Right now, the budget as it's submitted, you know, we don't have any intention of changing it until we propose a supplemental budget if that occurs.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. And I apologize, we're supposed to be on the Capital Budget right now. This is Operating Budget and my head just went to the question that we have.

Finance Director MCISAAC: Sure.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So this is not part of the Capital Budget. That's technically what is on the agenda but that was a question that we probably should've asked at the very beginning of the meeting, but we needed an answer for that.

Delegate Green.

Delegate GREEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you, Mary, for being here to answer questions. So the bottom line is what is Mr. Burt's projected salary given that half of it is -- or we don't know if it's half, but a portion of it is in the Fire Training Academy and a portion of it's coming from another department, what is --

Finance Director MCISAAC: Sure. His projected salary is somewhere in the range of \$85,000. I can get you the exact number. I can go back and look it up, but that's my recollection of the number projected for FY20.

Delegate GREEN: I'd appreciate knowing exactly what it is.

Finance Director MCISAAC: Sure.

Delegate GREEN: But I appreciate being forthright with that information. Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Now we'll go to our technical -- what's technically before us which is the Capital Budget. If anyone has any other questions on the regular budget, we are going to be voting at our next meeting, and we can ask the questions and get answers then.

So the Capital Budget needs a motion to put Proposed Ordinance 19-03 on the table.

Deputy Speaker MORAN: So moved.

Delegate O'HARA: Second.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. And this is a Capital Budget for -- the total is six, no, the total is \$975,000, and it's spelled out in the ordinance; interior renovations in the Second District Courthouse, roof replacements, AC unit replacement, vehicle replacement, renovations of the farm facility, vehicle replacement at the Cooperative Extension, and those all total \$975,000.

We discussed this before; we've had presentations on this before. Any further discussion on this ordinance? Yes, Delegate McCutcheon.

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: I'm sorry; I will get the hang of this.

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: Great. I need all the help I can get. I have a couple of questions for Mary, which she has not been here before in the discussion we had. So --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. This is on the Capital Budget right now?

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: Yes, this is on the Capital Budget.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: So let's finish up the Capital Budget, and then do you have questions on the Capital Budget ordinance?

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: Yes, just a couple right now.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay, on the Capital. Okay.

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: I've read a lot of Capital Budgets since I've been a -- capital improvements line items since I've been on the Assembly. And what I understand was that prior to you being the person who counted the money, there was a practice that a lot of money might be put in for windows or for a roof or whatever and then that didn't proceed. That money was used to shift around to pay for new hires, whatever. That practice is continuing; is it not?

Finance Director MCISAAC: Practice of moving money for another purpose? No, that's not legal.

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: Well, that was my question. If you bring such a -- if you seek such an item to move something from capital improvement to regular budget, for

example, does it have to come to the Commissioners? Does it have to come to the Assembly? Is it, are you saying, it's illegal?

Finance Director MCISAAC: I'm saying it's highly inappropriate to come forward with an amendment to a capital budget to move it to an operating line. That's not anything that would ever be allowed.

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: Well --

Finance Director MCISAAC: The Capital Budget stands on its own for capital acquisitions and improvements to capital facilities, and the usual funding source for capital improvements is issuing bonds and notes. You would never be allowed by bond counsel to issue a bond or a note for an operating expense.

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: Now aside from an objection from bond counsel --

Finance Director MCISAAC: Well, then you wouldn't be able to do it if you --

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: If you were selling a bond.

Finance Director MCISAAC: If you were selling a bond, certainly.

Delegate MCCUTCHEON: Okay. All right. I'll save the rest of my questions on this matter until the next budget.

Thank you.

Finance Director MCISAAC: Okay.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Yes, Delegate Green.

Delegate GREEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Mary, could you tell me, as far as the roof replacement and whatnot, are we talking about concerns about energy efficiency and energy conservation when we talk about capital improvement of this nature, and are we exploring solar energy at the same time?

Finance Director MCISAAC: That would be a better question for Jack. I'm the money girl. I don't really get involved in the details of the materials that might be suggested for use for our roof replacement, but I will tell you unilaterally that, you know, there is a shift, you know, with everyone about returning to being conscious of any kind of modification to a building so that you are, you know, that you are more green than you were, that you are energy efficient, that you're utilizing materials that are sustainable, you know, that's the way that construction happens nowadays for the most part. I mean all kinds of buildings, municipal buildings are being retrofit every day for that same reason, and I see no reason why the County's priorities wouldn't be closely aligned with, you know, the kind of procedures that are being used in the industry nowadays.

We also do, at some point, have to go before DCAM for approval for certain things and, you know, sort of if they're the final hurdle and they're not agreeing with what's being proposed, you know, if we have to replace a roof, we have to align with what they're going to approve.

So I can't really speak for them, but I can speak for an interest in Finance and Administration of being very conscious of being green, very conscious of using suitable materials and moving us into another generation of caring for our assets.

Delegate GREEN: Thank you. Because I would be interested in more money being spent if it meant electric vehicles or hybrids or solar energy for the roof or more efficient AC units, I mean, that is something I would sincerely support.

Finance Director MCISAAC: Certainly, and we're fortunate with the buildings that a Trial Court occupied that we are reimbursed a certain percentage based on their occupancy for capital expenditures that are approved.

Delegate GREEN: Thank you.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Are we ready for a vote on Proposed Ordinance 19-03, which is the Capital Budget for FY20?

The Clerk will call the roll for the vote.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Okay. We're going to do this the same way we did it the last time. So you'll see those flashing lights in front of you and, hopefully, the numbers align with my tally.

Roll Call on Proposed Ordinance 19-03: FY20 Capital Budget

Voting "YES" (90.58%): Mary Chaffee (4.55% - Brewster), J. Terence Gallagher (2.30% - Eastham), Lilli-Ann Green - (1.27% - Wellfleet), Elizabeth Harder (5.67% - Harwich), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), E. Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02%-Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% Truro), Susan Moran (14.61% - Falmouth), Thomas O'Hara (6.49% - Mashpee), Brian O'Malley (1.36% - Provincetown), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).
Absent (9.42%): John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Randi Potash (2.84% - Chatham – absent for vote).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Madam Speaker, Proposed Ordinance 19-03 passes with 90.58 percent of the Delegates voting yes; 9.42 percent are absent, and that is now known as Ordinance 19-03.

Ordinance 19-03:

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;

The Cape Cod regional government, known as 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. Make certain Courthouse capital improvements and upgrades and purchase the following equipment for Facilities for use in conducting business specific to the operations and services of the Barnstable County Commissioners:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Interior Renovations & HVAC Replacement	
Second District Courthouse	\$200,000.00
Roof Replacement (Upper)	
First District Courthouse	\$ 80,000.00
AC Unit Replacement	
Registry of Deeds	\$ 30,000.00
Vehicle Replacement	
Complex	\$ 35,000.00
Total Cost	\$345,000.00

- b. **Implement the following capital improvements and purchase the following equipment for the Cooperative Extension Department for use in conducting business specific to the operations and services of the Barnstable County Commissioners:**

<u>Item</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Addition/Renovation – Farm Facility	\$600,000.00
Vehicle Replacement – Cooperative Extension	\$ 30,000.00
Total Cost:	\$630,000.00

The total cost of equipment, improvements and projects equals (=) \$975,000.00

Section 2.

For the purposes set forth in Section 1, the County Treasurer, with the approval of the County Commissioners, may borrow from time to time, on the credit of the County, such sums as may be necessary, and may issue bonds and or notes of the County therefore;

Section 3.

All bonds or notes issued pursuant to this proposed ordinance shall be signed by the County Treasurer and countersigned by a majority of the County Commissioners. The County may sell securities at public or private sale upon such terms and conditions as the County Commissioners may deem proper but not at prices of less than par value. Indebtedness incurred under this proposed ordinance shall, except as herein provided, be subject to Chapter 35 of the Massachusetts General laws.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Okay. Thank you, very much.

Finance Director MCISAAC: Thanks very much, everyone.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: I don't think we have any Committee Reports.

SUMMARY REPORT FROM THE CLERK

- **Conflict of Interest on-line training is now past due**
- **Filing of Statement of Financial Interest due by 5/28/19**
- **Delegates reminded to check folders upon arrival at meeting**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Report from the Clerk.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Thank you, Madam Speaker, just a few items. I think almost everyone at this point has completed the -- I hate to mention it again.

And if you haven't, I think you know who you are, the Conflict of Interest training online.

So now we move on to the timetable for Statements of Financial Interest. And I did check because I'm the liaison for that particular function with the state, and we have five Delegates that already have completed that. You are bound to complete that by I think it's May 28th this year. So just be aware of that, that deadline is approaching.

And I just want to remind everyone to please check your Assembly folder when you come through the door. There are important materials that are contained in those folders for you. I happened to notice that some Delegates have not checked them, so the materials are in there from a previous meeting as well, so please check those.

And I've also instituted the practice of a coffee station in the back for the Delegates at the behest of one Delegate. So there's coffee and if you run the water through it,

it's hot enough for tea. So help yourself at any time during the meeting if you think you need to try to keep yourself awake.

And in case you haven't noticed, there are some new faces on the walls of the East Wing Conference Center -- actually, not new, just sort of --

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Refreshed.

Clerk O'CONNELL: -- refreshed. These were on the wall at the Assembly Chamber, and maybe you don't recognize them because I think they look great now. They've been updated with the frames and the matting. Some of them were starting to deteriorate because they did not have the proper glass or mats on them. The original paperwork that was on the backs of the previous frames have been adhered or they've been put on the new one, so we're not losing any history. So take a look. I think they look great.

And that's it. That's all I have to report.

SUMMARY OF OTHER BUSINESS

- **Speaker asked anyone planning on submitting amendments to FY20 proposed budget ordinances to consider submitting in advance to the Clerk prior to the next meeting**

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. Our next item is the discussion on the FY20 Department Budget, and this is sort of a time for any general comments or questions or specific concerns or issues with the budget. We have department heads here and we can get answers if you need them.

The process typically in the past was when we have our hearings next meeting for the budget and then the Assembly members who wish to could submit amendments to actually alter the budget as it's presented. In the past, it's been done, and we have changed the budget at the last meeting.

I would say that if anyone has anything that they are specifically going to do that to amend the budget where if they would please get the amendment to the Clerk prior to the meeting or at least enough to give a head's up so that we know that there will be some time for discussion and amendments if we're going to change the budget. But I didn't know if anyone had any questions about anything specific to any budgets as it goes through?

Yes, Delegate Harder.

Delegate HARDER: That's what I'm not understanding something because, to me, it seems like if we -- if the budget can still be changed then I would like to make sure that the Fire -- can't we use that to make sure the Fire Training Academy -- Fire Training Academy head is being payed?

Speaker MCAULIFFE: I think it's not an issue of whether that he's being paid. He has a contracted salary; I think it's just where the money's coming from, whether it's going to come from a supplemental budget or revenues that they have that they don't spend.

I know it looks like the salary's only 40-something, but I believe this -- the step and the classification puts him at around \$81,000, I believe. So I believe that's the contract. So it's just a matter of the timing, but he will get his deserved salary.

Delegate HARDER: Okay.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Anyone else have any questions specific? Okay. So, then, hopefully, next meeting will go pretty straightforward then with public hearings on the remaining three ordinances for the FY20 Budget and then vote -- discussion and vote. But, as I

said, you still have an opportunity to amend if there's something that does strike you.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Just voting. The public hearings are all done now.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: All the public hearings are done now. So it will just be a discussion and a vote. So this gives you another two weeks to kind of think it over.

All right. Anything under "Other Business" for anyone else? Okay. I'll take a motion.

Deputy Speaker MORAN: Motion to adjourn.

Delegate CHAFFEE: Second.

Speaker MCAULIFFE: Thank you. We are adjourned.

Whereupon, it was moved and seconded to adjourn the Assembly of Delegates at 5:45 p.m.

Submitted by:

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

List of materials used at the meeting:

- **Business Calendar of 4/17/19**
- **Unapproved Journal of Proceedings of 4/3/19**
- **Proposed Ordinance 19-02: To Establish a BCHRAB**
- **Proposed Ordinance 19-03: FY20 Capital Budget**
- **Proposed Ordinance 19-06: FY20 County Operating Budget**
- **Proposed Ordinance 19-07: FY20 CCC Budget**
- **Proposed Ordinance 19-08: FY20 Dredge Budget**