A. **Open Meeting**: Peter Clark opened the meeting at 4:00PM

B. **Hear General Public Comment**: None.

C. **Discuss and Act on Minutes** from December 17, December 19 Regular Meeting, and December 19 Public Forum, 2018:

   - David Garrison moved to adopt the minutes of 12/17/18 with the discussed changes. Daniel Shearer seconded. All in favor; motion passed.
   - David Garrison moved to adopt the minutes of 12/19/18 with the discussed changes. Daniel Shearer seconded. All in favor; motion passed.
   - Judy Fenwick moved to approve the public forum minutes of 12/19/18. David Garrison seconded. All in favor; motion passed.

D. **Review New Committee Emails and Documents**, including Mr. Waasdorp’s Submission:

   - David Garrison volunteered to engage with officials from Nantucket about the shared processes of government that are common to both towns. Frank Duffy noted that Nantucket was both a town and a county and there were more complexities.
   - Peter Clark reported that he had acknowledged Mr. Waasdorp’s ideas and said he would get back to him.

E. **Review and Act on the Processing and Substance of the Public Survey and the Public Forum Input**:

   A discussion included the following:
   - Some of the answers are not related to the questions.
   - How should the data be analyzed? A 2-3 sentence summary of each answer?
   - It is irresponsible to post the raw data without analysis. We did not say what we would do with the data. People were named and some comments were not kind. Total transparency is one thing and posting total crap is another.
   - We voted at the last meeting to publish the raw data and so need to vote again if we do not do this.
   - The data is already in the public domain; if someone requests the raw data we have to provide.
• There are all manner of responses; many are not the responsibility of the CRC. To review and make sense of would take much work.
• Yes, to review/analyze is not a good use of time, but is it wise to post raw data?
• This data is not a sample in the scientific sense. Analysis would raise the raw data to a higher level.
• If it is not useful, why post?
• It is public record. All other information has been posted.
• People who responded can see their responses. It is part of openness.
• The data has affirmed some of the issues we have raised.
• A summary could precede the raw data.

Carter Hunt moved to post a summary of the survey results, to be posted when approved, along with the raw data. Flannery du Rivage Rogers seconded. All in favor except Charles McCaffery opposed; motion passed.
Flannery du Rivage Rogers will draft summary.

F. Interview with Ms. Pat Kerfoot (at 5:00 for 25 minutes) with Debrief:
Ms. Kerfoot offered the following:
• When considering how specific to be, the committee should consider how likely something is to be changed in the future; If likely, policies or bylaws should then be considered.
• If an issue is important, it should be stipulated in the charter, such as two town meetings per year.
• The Board of Selectmen and Planning Board do meet twice a year but not on the prescribed topics. Other issues have been more pressing. Ms. Kerfoot appreciated that the number of meetings was prescribed and thought that otherwise, the meetings would not happen. There is coordination and good will but time is finite.
• Specific language regarding gender such as selectman/selectperson does not matter.
• The Board of Selectmen should relinquish some of the permitting.
• Not all committees should be listed in the charter but descriptions and sunsets are important. It is the CRC’s decision about what rises to this level.
• Regarding the proposed Community Development Department: details have been lacking. There should be a strong planning element. Any community developer should be well versed in economic development.
• The Planning Board uses the LCP for all endeavors; several elements have been accomplished and they are looking to add more.
• The LCP is a more generalized Master Plan. A Master Plan is difficult to formulate considering the various villages. It is a vision but also somewhat specific and usually to be accomplished within 10 years.
• There is no disconnect between the Capital Plan and the LCP.
• The LCP is for a 50-100 year time period.

The committee noted that that charter mentions 3 plans. Is language needed to see that the plans are adhered to?
Ms. Kerfoot thought not necessarily. She added that there was already a strong manager form of
government which may not need changing. Reducing the number of town meeting members
could make for more efficiency.
Ms. Kerfoot noted that there were more committees in existence at the time than were listed on
the original charter.

G. Continue the discussion of the Town Planning Processes in the Charter
from Item G on December 17:
The Committee explained to Ms. Kerfoot that it has been seeking improved consistency within
and adherence to the charter.

H. Discuss and Act on Evolving List of Charter Questions:
The committee realized that the numbers on revisions were not the same as the original.
Enclosures in the notes could clarify.
Judy Fenwick moved to revise the minutes of 12/19 to clarify the numbering of the
questions. Charles McCaffery seconded. All in favor; motion passed.
A discussion included the following:
• A clarification company is hired by the town to maintain links.
• The sentiment of some is that the town moderator has too much control; others felt the
town moderator had a good amount of authority.
• The Rules and Procedures Committee is run by the town moderator and it seems to work
well.
• The issue of the authority of committees and the source of the authority needs to be
clarified.
• There are several types of committees: mandated by the state, initiated at town meeting,
Board of Selectmen appointed. Each needs to be treated differently.
• Peter Johnson-Staub is working on the issue of committees.
The committee decided to review the evolving list at the next meeting and make decisions about
what category each question should be placed in. Any question not on the list should be emailed
to Peter Clark before the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING: Monday, January 28, 2019; 4:00 PM
Old Water Department Meeting Room - Town Hall
At 6:25 Charles McCaffery moved to adjourn. David Garrison seconded.

Relevant Documents:
• Input ideas from Doug Brown by email 1/7
• Email to Frank Duffy, 1/6
• Input ideas from Michael Palmer 12/21
• Document from Peter Waasdorp in email 12/18, originally from 2013
• Input ideas from Julian Suso 12/21
• Input from Susan Augusta in email from Terri Medeiros 12/20
• The evolving list of questions

• Minutes from December 17, December 19 Regular Meeting, and December 19 Public Forum, 2018