

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT
ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES**

APPROVED Journal of Proceedings – May 2, 2012

Speaker BERGSTROM: Good afternoon. Welcome to the May 2nd session of the Cape Cod Regional Government Assembly of Delegates. I would like to call this meeting to order and we will begin with a moment of silence to honor our troops who have died in the service to our country and to all of those serving our country in the Armed Forces.

(Moment of Silence)

Thank you.

Now we will stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance)

Thank you.

The Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call (100.00%): Richard Anderson (9.15% - Bourne), Cheryl Andrews (1.36% - Provincetown), Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Leo Cakounes (5.67% - Harwich), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Thomas Lynch (20.92% - Barnstable), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Spyro Mitrokostas (11.02% - Yarmouth), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Paul Pilcher (1.27% - Wellfleet), Anthony Scalese (4.55% - Brewster), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).

Absent (0%):

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, we have a quorum present with 100.00 percent of the Delegates present.

(Applause)

Committee of the Whole

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you.

I will now need a motion to approve the Calendar of Business.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: So move.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It's been moved and seconded. Are there any further additions or corrections?

Hearing none, all those in favor say "aye." Opposed?

(Motion passed)

You should have received a copy of the Journal of April 18, 2012. Are there any additions or corrections to the Journal?

Hearing none, I'll need a motion for the approval of the Journal.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Move approval of the Journal of April 18, 2012.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor say "aye." Opposed?

(Motion passed)

For various reasons the Members of the Board of Regional Commissioners are not here today so we're going to have to skip over item 8.

Are there any Communications from Public Officials?

By the way, this meeting could be recorded.

Are there any Communications from Members of the Public?

Hearing none, the Assembly will now Convene and we'll begin with Report and recommendation on Proposed Ordinance 12-02 for the FY 2013 County budget, and I'll turn this over to John Ohman, Chair of the Finance Committee.

Assembly Convenes

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker and Assembly of Delegates, this is a report on Proposed Ordinance 12-02. The Proposed Ordinance was submitted to the Assembly of Delegates by the Board of Regional Commissioners at the Assembly of Delegates' regular meeting on February 15, 2012.

There was a public hearing scheduled to be held by the Standing Committee on Finance on Wednesday, April 18, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. The public hearing was duly advertised in the **Cape Cod Times** on April 11, 2012. Four of us met and had a public hearing with Mark Zielinski giving another presentation on the nuances of the County government budget for 2013. Mr. Lynch motioned, and it was seconded, to waive the reading and we got right into business.

Among the highlights – the County budget this year is \$23,580,850. This figure represents – which I think is admirable – a decrease of 5.6 percent from FY 2012. The deeds tax will remain the same; the County tax and the Cape Cod Environmental Protection tax fund rate will increase by 2.5 percent.

The 2013 budget includes \$1.3 million dollars in capital programs. On the revenue side, the largest revenue producers are tax revenues at 55 percent and department revenues at 25 percent. On the expense side, salaries – as you would imagine – make up the largest part of the budget, representing 45 percent and the fringes by 18 percent, for a total 63 percent; and the contractual services at 12 percent.

There will be \$10,000 set aside for each of the next two appropriated Reserve Accounts in FY 2013, as compared to \$25,000 set aside for each account in FY 2012. The County tax generated \$70,733 in revenue based on an equalized property value formula.

After due deliberation Ms. King, from Mashpee, motioned, and it was seconded, to close the public hearing. The motion carried 4-0. Subsequently, a motion was made by Ms. King, and it was seconded, that the Assembly approve the budget as stated.

And for your full approval, I so do ask you to approve the budget of fiscal year 2013, as stated.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So Proposed Ordinance 12-02 you're recommending approval?

Mr. OHMAN: Approval of Proposed Ordinance 12-02, as stated. Thank you.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It's been moved and seconded. Do we have any questions on the budget?

Paul?

Mr. PILCHER: Is it within the purview of this discussion to ask questions about the figures that we just got with regard to the operating tax revenues of 2012? I'm concerned, and maybe I don't understand it, but it looks to me from the figures that we just got that the tax revenues for the current year are three-quarters of the way through the year and they only generated 56 percent of the budget and yet it looked like that on the Revenue side we're chugging along at 67 or 68 percent of anticipated Expenses.

So I'm just wondering if that came up in your – through you, Mr. Speaker – if that came up in the Finance Committee's deliberations and if so, was there some accounting for that?

Mr. OHMAN: Yes, Mr. Pilcher, I actually did ask Mr. Zielinski and he was confident that the revenues going forward, especially the deeds tax and deeds business revenues were going to increase to a point by June 30th – he stated with clarity that the 2012 budget would not fall short and be a tax on the Revenue side for fiscal year 2013, but he did not give details as to the numbers. He just said that looking into his business he said that we would be able to meet those without taking anything from 2013 or anything out of Reserves. He was confident of that.

Mr. PILCHER: Could I ask one follow up?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sure.

Mr. PILCHER: Is that because there is a lag between the time of the deeds tax collections and their reporting?

Mr. OHMAN: That was one of the reasons I think that he gave. There is a lag. But he has also cut, and has unexpended budget items that will not be expended. The total in sum will have the net effect of not using any 2013 revenues or any dedicated Reserve revenues to balance the 2012 budget. Those are the words of Mr. Zielinski – not my own.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Julia?

Ms. TAYLOR: I'm glad that we have a budget that we can feel good about voting for and I also thank the Finance Committee for being worried about the Revenue side and looking into that as they have, and we have heard a lot about that throughout the year. I'm glad that they are confident that that's not a big worry now.

I do also commend the department heads, and the Commissioners, and the Finance Committee for even when we had to reduce the budget and it is very, very lean, that it hasn't led to acrimony and blood shed. I'm kind of concerned because when I was on the Finance Committee for one year there was always trouble and that makes me feel worried that I was the cause of it.

(Laughter)

But at any rate, I'm happy that I'm not on the Finance Committee and that things have gone so well. I wish we had revenues that were a little higher as we had in the past but I think that we can feel good that we're not gutting any essential programs and life will be okay.

Mr. OHMAN: In that regard, too, the Register of Deeds – who I think is the key person because his department produces so much of the revenue – was very confident in the budget projections of the Finance Director of the County. I was very pleased to hear that.

In addition to that, on the 16th of May – and the time, Janice, is 2:00 o'clock?

Ms. O'CONNELL: 3:00 o'clock.

Mr. OHMAN: At 3:00 o'clock on May 16th, we're going to have a meeting with the auditors. One of my concerns going forward is we really have brought our reserves down considerably from any point in my tenure – or maybe perhaps your tenure is longer, Julia, which is far longer than mine – but I'm concerned about that. I'm really hoping to hear some very direct comments from the auditors regarding that. You're all welcome to attend that. If you cannot attend, if you could email Janice or email me directly, I will make sure that any of your questions are answered. I think that is very important going forward because I think we're closer to the line than we've ever been before going forward. So we really have to keep an eye, especially more so than ever, on the Revenue side of things in relation to the budget.

Speaker BERGSTROM: John, did you say the 15th or the 16th?

Mr. OHMAN: I said the 16th. I intended to say the 16th. I'm not sure what I said.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Are there any other questions on this?

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Mr. Speaker?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Spyro?

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: I think you all need to know I'm not going to offer an amendment this year so I would like to tell you why I am voting against this budget. The budget is down from last year. After we take out the accounting gimmicks, it's down less than 2 percent from last year – not the 5 percent.

The last time that we were here a year ago we were all scratching our heads trying to figure how we were going to make the previous budget balance without having to tap into Reserves. In the meantime I've come to understand that there are projected Unreserved General Fund balances, and there are Reserves.

We started out this fiscal year with \$5 million dollars in Unreserved General Fund balances and they currently run less than \$3 million dollars, which means we would have tapped into those funds to the tune of over \$2 million dollars, which is what makes this current fiscal year's budget actually work.

This budget, on top of using surpluses for previous years to work, also doesn't account for all of the money that comes in and out of Barnstable County. There are significant revenues that were taken offline and that are expended, even though they are expended with constraints that we don't actually review. I would like to see those funds put back in.

But it's this practice of taking money out of the General Fund balances that's the most troubling. Unless we stop doing that – unless we rectify that practice, we're never really going to know how much money we take in and how much money we spend until the fiscal year closes, and that's not good budgeting practice.

In fact, what we have is a checkbook, not a budget. We start out a year with a certain amount of money in our checkbook. We spend what we said we were going to spend and then we draw down the balance that we started in the beginning of that year. And John is correct; we're going to get dangerously close to eliminating that fund if we keep doing it.

I think this current budget is still out of balance to the tune of about \$400,000 to \$600,000. That's a number not, coincidentally, different from the addition of the COLAs from last year and the addition of the COLAs from this year. \$220,000 times three gets you the difference of this budget. In other words, we're going to dip into our Reserves again – Unreserved General Fund balances, for at least a half a million dollars for this budget to work.

Those are the reasons that I'm going to vote against. I think taking the County Administrator's word for it is not sufficient. I think we need to really do our job ourselves and rectify some of the practices that have been going on around here for the last two years.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Does anybody else have any comments on this or anything else?

My only concern is something that John spoke about. It's unfortunate that the Commissioners or the Administrator can't be here today since this is probably the most important vote we take all year. If there have been cuts made to balance the budget this year, those cuts should not be used for other purposes without going through the Assembly with an Ordinance transferring those funds. In other words, if the Health & Human Services Department loses an employee and they find they have an extra \$100,000, they can't just turn around and use the \$100,000 somewhere else without us transferring the funds; and they don't. So I'm presuming that if indeed there was a decline in anticipated revenues, that that was offset by a decline in expenditures and that there were no transfers made. So I'm presuming that until someone proves me wrong.

Anyway, if there are no further comments, then I'm going to have to take a vote.

Tom?

Mr. LYNCH: I just want to pick up a little bit about what Julia was saying in terms of the cooperation of the committees with the Finance Committee because I thought that as the committees came before the Finance Committee – the Committee Chairs – to talk about changes or issues that they had raised, I got the feeling that they did due diligence with their public-hearing process to ask those department heads that came before them where they might cut if they could cut is a question that consistently came up from the Delegate from Harwich during our committee hearings. And apparently, in some instances, that had been asked before, so it was good to see that the committees were really looking very hard and long at the budgets.

This is a maintenance of service budget, really, and there were some cuts in certain services, but I think they're trying to hold onto many of the services that towns have come to rely on even with some reduced funding and I think we're all looking forward to the days where there are increased revenues so that some of those valued programs can be supported with additional revenues.

I'm most pleased that there were no treasury funds that the Chair of Finance has already mentioned, carrying over into the next budget which means that they're taking a good hard look at what they believe the revenues will be and not trying to balance next year's budget on any of this year's unexpended revenues.

And I think that they were also looking to expand their revenue opportunities through the IT Department. As you know, there is some money in there for additional software development. We hope that in the long run that does provide additional resources to the County and additional, hopefully, services to the towns.

So I applaud the committees for their work. They made the work of the Finance Committee a little easier, and I will be supporting this budget.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Cheryl?

Ms. ANDREWS: I'll keep it short and sweet since I'm from one of the smaller towns, and you know what that means, but since I get to vote early on because of the alphabet, let me explain my vote. I'll be voting "no" as well on this and it's not because the department heads didn't do a good job in front of the committees. It's more that I think the issues facing the County are the same as facing all of the towns which is it's easy to make a list of what you need. It's a lot more challenging to talk about what you can afford. And I think some of the difficult decisions have been deferred here. They were deferred last year; they were deferred this year.

Things will change in the future but to the extent that the Finance Committee has supported the budget, I'll keep my comments brief. But to the extent that this is not a budget that I feel real comfortable with, that will be my vote.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Chris?

Mr. KANAGA: Thank you.

I find myself in a little bit of a difficult position because I agree with everything that the Delegate from Barnstable said that's been said about the budget and the review process. On the other hand, on all of the various committees and commissions that I've served on, I've never actually been in a position of wanting to vote for something that essentially the proponents didn't see fit to attend and answer questions and I don't know what to do with that. But I'm just putting it on the table that that is a position that I do not relish and don't feel comfortable with.

Ms. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Julia?

Ms. TAYLOR: I will say that Pat Flynn had her knee surgery a few days ago and she is not able to leave her house. She's having physical therapy and she is unable to either drive or even walk out of the house at this time.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Is there anything else?

If not, I will then ask the Clerk to call the roll.

Roll Call Vote on Proposed Ordinance 12-02: To make appropriations for Barnstable County's operating budget for the Fiscal Year 2013, including the operations of the County Assembly, Executive branch, County agencies, boards, commissions, departments and institutions and the maintenance of certain County functions: for interest, reserve funds and serial bond requirements of the County, and for County Capital improvements and to borrow money to pay therefore.

Voting YES (74.04%): Richard Anderson (9.15% - Bourne), Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Leo Cakounes (5.67% - Harwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Thomas Lynch (20.92% - Barnstable), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Anthony Scalese (4.55% - Brewster), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).

Voting NO (25.96%): Cheryl Andrews (1.36% - Provincetown), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Spyro Mitrokostas (11.02% - Yarmouth), Paul Pilcher (1.27% - Wellfleet).

Absent (0%).

Ms. O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, Proposed Ordinance 12-02 passes with 74.04 percent of the Delegates voting "yes" and 25.96 percent of the Delegates voting "no."

Whereupon, it was moved, seconded, and by a roll call vote with 74.04% voting yes, 25.96% voting no, and 0% absent: VOTED to adopt Proposed Ordinance 12-02: To make appropriations for Barnstable County's operating budget for the Fiscal Year 2013, including the operations of the County Assembly, Executive branch, County agencies, boards, commissions, departments and institutions and the maintenance of certain County functions: for interest, reserve funds and serial bond requirements of the County, and for County Capital improvements and to borrow money to pay therefore.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you.

We'll move on. I would like to thank all of the Delegates for their diligence in going through the budget process. I know it's always an experience. It's good that there's some dissension, I think, because the budget is a big issue and it has to be addressed in that kind of manner.

So we'll now move on to Reports from Committees, which I think pretty much all the committees met on the budget so we're pretty much set there, is that right?

Okay. We're now down to Report from the Clerk.

Report from the Clerk

Ms. O'CONNELL: I don't have anything to report today.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Is there any Other Business?
Yes, go ahead, Dick?

Report of Committees

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Didn't you guys meet today?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, the CVEC and CLC Committee met and finalized a draft of what will ultimately be submitted to the Assembly at a future meeting, hopefully in June, depending on what else comes down the line between now and then. We're anticipating some Ordinances will be presented to us. But, however, the document was approved so it will be public and it will be sent out to the Members of the Assembly as soon as it is a clean copy and amendments and corrections have been made. So it will be out there and I anticipate that CVEC and CLC may craft a response.

I think it was pretty much a unanimous consent of the Members to agree on this document which contains several observations and several recommendations. I really have to thank the Members. If there ever was a thankless job, it was this one. There were more accusations sent in our directions and questioning our motivation. I especially thank Deborah. We didn't have a secretary but she acted as the de facto secretary and took a bunch of disconnected suggestions and formulated them into a coherent document which is ultimately the one that we approved, so stand by your computers and you'll be getting this pretty soon. Then the committee will issue its report to the full Assembly.

Do you have anything else to add to that, Deborah, or anybody else on the committee?
If not, is there any Other Business to be brought before the Assembly?
John?

Other Business

Mr. OHMAN: It looks to me like, through circumstances beyond our control, the County Commissioners did not have a meeting today. One of their main agenda items was the continued discussion of the Special Commission recommendations. In effect when they don't meet in early May to do this, nothing is going to happen. There is no way that this can go forward and be presented for a vote in the November election so we have a 2-year window, it seems to me, to let the Commissioners have their way and their own time, or are we going to take our own time? We've had this discussion before.

I think it's time that we start looking at the recommendations of the Special Commission on County Governance and come up with our own ideas; I really do. I don't think that the Commissioners are capable of doing it on their timeline to my satisfaction.

Speaker BERGSTROM: This has been an issue that I've gone back and forth with and I've discussed it on an individual basis with some of the Delegates and indeed, you're right, they didn't have that meeting today and I didn't schedule a discussion on this because nothing has changed since the last time that we discussed this.

Now I had thought that maybe we would want to take a stand on some of the recommendations independent of the Commissioners, but that's up to the individual Delegates. Do you really want to stick your neck out on something that is there today and may not be there tomorrow? That's the question.

Julia?

Ms. TAYLOR: I don't think that we need to "take a stand on each recommendation," but I do think that it's very important that we read the recommendations carefully and decide whether any of them need to be passed. It's too late for the November ballot, so what we bring up can be talked about as charter changes, and some of the recommendations are things that only the Commissioners, as the current Executives, can do. On the other hand, there are certainly things that could be done by Ordinance and so I think that if any Delegate feels strongly in favor of a change, then it's perfectly possible to work up an Ordinance.

But I don't know that we need to take a position unless we want to do something. The position should be if we want to make a change, any Delegate who wants to make a change should propose it. We don't really need to go on record against it because there is nothing before us. I did have one conversation with Ron about this and there was some talk about maybe trying to map out which of the recommendations legally could be instituted by Ordinance because that can come from either the Commissioners or from us.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I have talked to Janice about that and we're going to send a letter to the Commissioners, and copy Town Counsel, and divide up the recommendations into those that can be implemented without charter changes and then those that have to be implemented through charter changes. There are two separate processes to go through. One process has to do with the structure of the government and the terms of office, and the other one has to do with everything else. So we'll get clarity on that.

I'm going to allow this. As long as we don't discuss substantively the recommendations – we're only discussing process – we can talk about what we're going to do. My only concern was that this is an important vote, all right? I'm with Julia. When you want to take a vote, if you're going to stand up and take a vote on an issue that's important and that people have strong opinions on, you want it to have some affect. Do you really want to take a vote on something that may or may not happen according to the whim of the Commissioners? That's the issue really.

I'm one to stand out there. I don't mind taking a vote on all of these things but I don't want to force a vote if it's not necessary.

Julia?

Ms. TAYLOR: You and I are on record. Now the fact that I might have supported most of these recommendations doesn't mean I couldn't be interested in some modified version of them – of course. In fact, I don't expect that most of them, especially the more controversial ones, would pass exactly as the Special Commission proposed them. That doesn't seem likely to me.

But if other people have strong views on them, then they're perfectly able to speak up and say what their views are to the press, or here, or anyplace else. But for us to be taking a vote on anything isn't appropriate unless it's in the form of some sort of Ordinance specifically in favor of something. People who are opposed to the things, they're not going to change – you don't have to worry about it because there have been no proposals to change things. But there are things that we could come up with by Ordinance and so the people who want that should proceed with that.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Deborah, did you have a comment?

Ms. Mc CUTCHEON: Yes. I don't think that it would be appropriate for us to just take a reactive vote "yes" or "no" on what the Special Commission recommended. What I would like for us to do is to see if we could come to a consensus about something – whether it's charter change or Ordinances – which the Assembly could support, and then put that forward as

an alternative. I think that there are a lot of different ways to kind of slice this rabbit. We don't have to have it their way. We can have it our own way.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Cheryl?

Ms. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Delegate from Truro just mentioned one of the things that I felt which was that I get the sense that we're not ready to take any kind of vote at all but clearly there's a desire – at least it seems to me – to discuss this. It's important and we haven't discussed it. So I thought the Delegate from Truro had asked if it could remain on our agenda so that we would further the discussion and so I was kind of surprised that it's not on here. And as we see the Open Meeting Law pummeled, I'm not exactly suggesting that we keep discussing it. But I thought we had an agreement that it would stay on the agenda, so I hope it does and I think we should further discuss it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We discussed this and I decided not to put it on the agenda so that's why it's not there because I just believe in substantive discussions. I'm with Julia – and Tom can probably speak to this – if you go up to the State House or you go to the Congress, somebody doesn't stand up in the middle of the room and say there's a problem with the budget; let's discuss it. What they do is they slap down a recommendation. They say here is Ordinance No. 57-5; and that begins the process.

Now, sure, we can discuss it ad infinitum, but that discussion has to have some kind of focus otherwise we could do it every week. There are 15 of us. I'm not against discussing it but I think I'm half way between your opinion and Julia's. I think the discussion has to have some discipline to it. For instance, I could have someone move the recommendations of the Special Committee and put them on the floor and then we could vote it up or down. If we found out, for instance, that more than a majority of us support the current system of the Assembly, then that becomes our public position.

I'll put this on again, if you want, and we'll discuss it, but I really think that we have to have something on the table to discuss.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Mr. Speaker?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Spyro?

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Thank you.

I'm going to contend – as I did at the last meeting – that what we're looking at is somebody else's homework; that this is something that was prepared at the Commissioners' request, and that the Commissioners are currently reviewing it to turn it into their recommendations; at which point it will come to us from them directly, and I would prefer to wait for that process to play out.

However, if I understood correctly, the feedback from the CLC Investigative Panel is wrapping up and we have some bad wind, so to speak. There isn't anything from preventing us from acceding to some of our constituents' requests – I think you've all gotten the same ones that I've gotten – that say that it's time for you to create a Special Commission looking at County Governance. We don't actually have to appoint anybody. We could be that group ourselves. But I would much rather start from scratch and exercise whatever the recommendations the 15 of us have and formulate them into a Resolution – I'm not sure why we're talking about Ordinances. The other part of what we get to do around here is pass Resolutions, and I won't stand in anybody's way if that's what the preference is but I don't think we're talking about Ordinances here at the moment. So would you like to clarify that?

Speaker BERGSTROM: What did you say? I didn't quite get what you were asking?

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: I was attempting to clarify the distinction between Ordinances and Resolutions. Invariably we start to use those words interchangeably when in fact they're two different things. We're going to be changing something by Ordinance by looking at this Special Commission Report or are we're going to signal our favorite newspaper by passing a Resolution?

Speaker BERGSTROM: The Assembly, under the charter, has an ability to amend the charter by going directly to the Legislature under certain circumstances and whether that's in the form of an Ordinance or a Resolution – I think it's a Resolution, but you would have to look it up in the charter – I don't care if it's a Resolution or an Ordinance, I just want something on the table.

Julia?

Ms. TAYLOR: I think, Spyro, that if, for example, there was something in the Special Commission recommendations, or that triggered some idea from one of us, it's primarily an administrative task such as we also have that MMR Report about changing the organization. So we could certainly take a suggestion from that, modify it as we wish; take a suggestion from the Special Commission, modify it as we wish, and although we couldn't implement it by Ordinance, we could pass a Resolution that asks the Commissioners to do that. The other things might be ones that we would need to pass an Ordinance for.

So I just think that there are different things. We have the power to pass an Ordinance if we really want this to happen. If it's not something that we are in charge of, really, but we think it's something that we would want to recommend to the Commissioners strongly, and then we would pass a Resolution. It could come directly from us. It could be borrowed from any number of reports or it could be a combination of any of those things.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Does anybody else want to weigh in on this?

Is there any Other Business to be brought before the Assembly?

If not?

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Motion to adjourn.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say "aye."
Opposed?

Whereupon, it was moved, seconded and voted to adjourn the Assembly of Delegates at 4:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by:

Janice O'Connell, Clerk
Assembly of Delegates