MINUTES OF JULY 18, 1991

MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION MEETING

The Martha's Vineyard Commission held a Joint Meeting with the Dukes County Charter Commission before the Regular Meeting on Thursday, July 18, 1991 at 7:30 p.m. at the Martha's Vineyard Commission Offices, Olde Stone Building, New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs, MA.

Jennie Greene, Chairman of the Commission, noted that a quorum was present and invited the members of the Dukes County Charter Commissioners at the table. She asked all to introduce themselves. She asked Ed Logue to discuss the document and give a brief review of the background of the Commission. Mr. Logue noted that the Charter Commission (CC) had met with the MVC and staff in January for the purpose of learning more about the MVC and its relationship to the County. He discussed the charge of the CC and the various meetings that they had held with other agencies and groups including the Barnstable County personnel. He discussed the options available to the CC and the various thoughts that the Commission had had on each. He discussed the option of a Chief elected official, the option of an appointed County Manager or a Board Chairman. He discussed what was contained in the preliminary report which was intended for public discussion.

He discussed the conclusions that were reached by the CC in the report. He then discussed the present functions of the County and the various financial aspects of the County departments. He indicated that all concluded that a full time manager would be necessary. He discussed the role of the MVC in relation to the County. He discussed the Airport and the various aspects of that entity over the past years. He discussed the state agencies that had played a role in the actions of the County. He further discussed the county-wide agencies that had been created through the past few years and the Charter Commissions' feeling that the County was the most appropriate level to conduct these island-wide activities.

Mr. Sullivan, MVC, discussed the implementation of the MVC policy plan and what would be needed to permit the County to do such. Mr. Logue, CC, felt that was the reason for suggesting full time management of county government. Mr. Hulsizer, CC, discussed the role of a revised and reorganized county.

Mr. Colaneri, MVC, discussed the desolvement of county government. Mr. Logue discussed why such was not recommended.
Mr. Colaneri, MVC discussed the airport and compared it to others such as Nantucket.
Mr. Logue discussed the Nantucket situation with respect to the airport.

Mr. Briggs, MVC, discussed continuation of county government and the role of the State.
Mr. Logue, CC, discussed the state and county relationship.
Mr. Ulfelder, CC, further discussed the role of the towns and the county.

Ms. Sibley, MVC, questioned the response of case by case and wondered whether part of the Island could do one thing and the rest another.
Ms. Logue, CC, discussed how this may work on a function by function or a town by town.
Mr. Farrow, CC, further expanded on this matter.

Ms. Bryant, MVC discussed the issue of island-wide policy reorganization and whether it could be accomplished now.
Mr. Logue, CC, discussed this issue.
Ms. Bryant, MVC, questioned whether this also pertained to fire departments.
Mr. Logue, CC discussed the wording of Chapter 16.

Mr. Colaneri, MVC, discussed relinquishment of roles by towns in perpetuity or on a yearly vote.
Mr. Logue, CC, discussed how this matter may work.
Mr. Hulsizer, CC, discussed the matter further.
Mr. Stutz, CC, discussed the actual role of the Charter Commission and its timeframe. He discussed what the Charter Commission needed for the ballot.

Ms. Greene, MVC asked what questions had been raised in the public meetings.
Mr. Logue, CC, discussed what had been heard so far.
Ms. Talbot, CC, discussed her opinion of what was coming out of the meetings.
Mr. Ulfelder, CC, discussed his interpretation of the meetings and the input received from the public.
Mr. Logue, CC, discussed the question of how changes may be paid for and the concern expressed at public meetings.

Mr. Early, MVC, discussed various points in the report and the amount of coordination that was presently in place between regional agencies. He discussed an appointed executive role in the coordination. He discussed the other elected county officials and their relationship to the County Commissioners. He also discussed the resources of the County with respect to financial matters.
Mr. Eldridge, CC, discussed the Barnstable experience in making their changes and what was hoped for from the report.

Mr. Sullivan, MVC, questioned whether the Barnstable structure was similar to that which was being proposed, or was there another county structure in the state.
Mr. Eldridge, CC, discussed the fact that there was none but related how it may be possible. He discussed a manager system and the role of County Commissioners.
Ms. Logue, CC, further discussed the Barnstable experience.

Mr. Colaneri, MVC, questioned the funding for such an administrator. Mr. Logue discussed the assumptions made and had reached no conclusion as yet but felt part of the money could come from better management and the industrial park.

Mr. Logue, CC, suggested that Chapter 2 of the Policy Plan be reviewed in light of the continuation of County government.

Ms. Sibley, MVC, discussed elected vs appointed role for the administrators and the need to have professional expertise. Ms. Talbot, CC, discussed difference between elected and appointed role of official.

Mr. Colaneri, MVC, discussed the present role of the County and what type of review was done on those roles. Mr. Stutz, CC, discussed difference of proposals and present role which was full-time management. Mr. Farrow, CC, discussed the experience on the Cape. Mr. Logue, CC, discussed central purchasing with Barnstable County. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Hall, MVC, discussed the financial aspect of consolidation of functions and how much study had been given to them. He discussed costs vs savings of the proposals. Mr. Logue, CC, discussed the reason for not dealing with that issue as yet.

Mr. Eldridge, CC, discussed the process and means of saving money. He discussed a theoretical situation in some detail. Ms. Talbot, CC, discussed similar examples and discussed how coordination can help make a system function better. She discussed the addressing of needs and what had been addressed already. She discussed the benefits of joining in on cooperative efforts.

Ms. Greene, MVC, questioned what a job description might contain. Mr. Logue, CC, discussed the various elements of the role of an administrator. He discussed the differences between the elected administrator and an appointed administrator. Ms. Greene, MVC, questioned what was meant by the term "direct the departments".

Mr. Logue, CC, indicated no. A discussion of how things function now and that they would not change followed.

Mr. Sullivan, MVC, questioned whether a stepped approach to the changes had been considered. Mr. Logue, CC, attempted to clarify some of the issues previously discussed. Ms. Logue, CC, discussed how some of the changes may be phased in followed. Mr. Ulfelder, CC, discussed how certain management structure changes could be achieved. Ms. Talbot, CC, discussed her concept of how some changes may take place.
Ms. Bryant, MVC, discussed the role of the present day County Commissioners.

Ms. Greene, MVC, discussed the past problems of trying to begin the business park.

Mr. Colaneri, MVC, also noted that there were more agencies involved in the decisions of what happened at the Airport than just the County Commissioners.

Mr. Hall, MVC, noted he supported an elected official who would be responsible to the electorate.

Mr. Early, MVC, disagreed and felt that an appointed manager was best and further discussed his reasons.

Mr. Farrow, CC, discussed the issue of coordination and how this related to appointees.

Mr. Early, MVC, discussed his reasons further.

Ms. Sibley, MVC, favored an appointee and discussed why.

Mr. Hall, MVC, further discussed his reasons for an elected person.

Mr. Eldridge, CC, discussed the manner in which Barnstable now operates.

Mr. Colaneri, MVC, discussed appointed vs elected and felt a person who carries out the wishes and policies of an elected board was best. He discussed his feelings on using the present system and indicated that an appointee was best.

Mr. Eldridge, CC, discussed the need for better management of money.

Mr. Logue, CC, discussed some of the past problems of establishing regional bodies.

Mr. Best, MVC discussed savings due to reorganization and the fact that there may never be a lessening of costs with or without a change.

Mr. Eldridge, CC, discussed the consideration of the issue and the value of elected positions and appointed positions.

A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of what was being proposed followed.

Mr. Logue felt the discussion had been most useful and asked for a chance to return in the fall for further discussions.

Ms. Greene thanked all for coming.

Following a brief break, Ms. Greene reconvened the meeting at 9:48 p.m.

ITEM #1 - Chairman's Report -

Ms. Greene introduced Richard Rooney as the new Transportation Planner. She asked about problems of vandalism with the traffic counters.

A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Best asked exactly what each staff member did.

Mr. Clifford explained exactly what each person did.
ITEM #2 - Old Business -
Ms. Greene discussed the problems of late arrivals for meetings, quorum issues and related matters. She suggested returning to 8:00 p.m. meeting time. Mr. Donaroma suggested 8:00 p.m. in summer and 7:30 p.m in the winter. A discussion of this matter followed.

ITEM #3 - Minutes of July 11, 1991 -
It was moved and seconded to approve as printed with four abstentions (Hebert, Colaneri, Briggs, Donaroma).

ITEM #4 - Committee and Legislative Liaison Reports

LUPC
Mr. Schweikert discussed the past meeting regarding Crow Hollow. A discussion of this matter followed. Mr. Schweikert discussed some of the requests made by the applicant with respect to the fee schedule and other waivers for submittal. He discussed the various points raised at the meeting.
Mr. Hall discussed his thinking regarding the requests for the various waivers.
Mr. Colaneri questioned whether the Cape Cod Company situation was not unlike this request. The answer was no.
Mr. Colaneri discussed the Crow Hollow proposal and his concern for the area. He suggested contacting the West Tisbury Planning Board regarding their concerns over this matter. Mr. Sullivan noted that the future development would have to return to the Commission as a DRI. Ms. Sibley asked that the West Tisbury Planning Board be contacted for input as to what they wanted submitted.
Mr. Donaroma discussed the issue of waivers or delayed payments and the like.
Mr. Colaneri discussed the abutting property and the need to maintain access to the areas.
Mr. Hall discussed the powers of Planning Boards to address the issue of access.

Mr. Schweikert then discussed the Cape Cod Company proposal. He discussed the proposal put forth to address the issue of affordable housing. A discussion of the two options that had been put forth followed. A discussion of any role of the Land Bank followed. Ms. Greene discussed the thinking of the LUPC in discussing the options. Ms. Bryant discussed the fairness of the options. Mr. Best discussed how one deals with various applications fairly. Mr. Sullivan suggested dealing only with what was before the Commission now.
A discussion of the options and timeframes followed.
Mr. Early noted that this was a report time and discussion would occur in ITEM #5.
Mr. Schweikert further discussed the Cape Cod Company and various conditions related to archeological matters.
Mr. Schweikert read a letter from Ernest Boch regarding the request of the Commission for an alternative proposal. He noted that there would be a meeting on this matter on July 22.

Mr. Schweikert discussed a letter from Peter Rosbeck re Magid and noted that the West Tisbury Planning Board would be contacted. He also noted that the Committee had discussed whether a proposal by Moffett to relocate a lot was a DRI.

PED - No Report.

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON REPORT - There was none.

Ms. Bryant discussed problems with the County budget process and how they were being addressed.

ITEM #5 - Possible Discussion -

BOCH DRI - Ms. Greene read the letter from the agent for Mr. Boch regarding the requested changes to the proposal. It was noted that this issue would be discussed on Monday, July 22 at 5:15 p.m. (LUPC).

CAPE COD COMPANY DRI - Mr. Sullivan asked if anyone representing the applicant was present. Mr. Clifford explained why no one was present. Mr. Sullivan questioned the use of an applicant's designee rather than Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC). A discussion of this issue followed. A discussion of the wording of a condition relating to archeological matters followed. Mr. Sullivan read and discussed such wording as is acceptable to the MHC. Mr. Hall discussed his feeling on the matter.

Ms. Sibley discussed the issue of the options being proposed with the respect to affordable housing. A discussion of the desire of the Town of Chilmark to have the Beach lot also followed. A discussion of the timeframe suggested followed. Ms. Greene suggested asking the Regional Housing Authority what timeframe would be satisfactory.

Mr. Early moved approval with conditions, duly seconded by Ms. Sibley.

Mr. Colaneri discussed what was buildable in Chilmark.

A discussion of the need to install a well and septic system and require same followed. A discussion of what the Town of Chilmark was seeking followed. It was agreed that the issue remaining was the timeframe for donation to the Regional Housing Authority.

Ms. Bryant discussed the issue of acceptance of the Beach lot and the amount of monies. A discussion of what happens if the Town refused the Beach lot and how alternate B would become effective within a certain time followed. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Early suggested contacting the Town of Chilmark to see what
timeframe was needed for acceptance of the Beach lot.

Mr. Hall offered additional conditions based upon the suggestions of Bill Wilcox of the staff.

A discussion of whether the Commission would vote on the issues and conditions at this time followed. A discussion of the amount of money for the Regional Housing Authority followed. Mr. Clifford noted that the only issue remaining was the timeframe for the acceptance of the money. A discussion of the issue of the timeframe, the pro rating of any amount followed.

It was suggested that the Housing Authority be contacted as to what timeframe would be satisfactory to them.

Ms. Greene raised a question regarding the continuation of the annual bird counts on the site. A discussion of this matter followed.

ITEM #6 - Possible Vote -

On a motion to approve, the Commission voted to approve the proposal with conditions.

The Commission then discussed a change to the quorum requirements. A discussion of the number which would constitute a quorum followed. A discussion of which towns should be represented during the DRI meetings followed. Mr. Hall noted an omission in wording and it was stated that it would be inserted. The Commission also agreed to make the quorum nine (9) members.

There being a motion to approve the change as corrected, duly seconded, the Commission so voted in the affirmative to amend the by-laws to establish a quorum of nine (9) members. Ms. Greene noted that the Executive Director would supply everyone with the corrected copy.

ITEM #7 - New Business - There was none.

ITEM #8 - Correspondence - There was none.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:14 p.m.
Attendance

Present: Best, Briggs, Bryant, Colaneri, Donaroma, Early, Greene, Hall, Hebert, Schweikert, Sibley, Sullivan

Absent: Combra, Jason, Lee, Wey, Benoit, Clarke, Allen, Davis, Geller, Harney